

THE HOMELAND SECURITY *NEWS CLIPS*

PREPARED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BY BULLETIN INTELLIGENCE

(b)(7)(E)

TO: THE SECRETARY AND SENIOR STAFF
DATE: SUNDAY, JANUARY 29, 2017 7:00 AM EST

TODAY'S EDITION

Leading DHS News

Full Executive Order Text: Trump's Action Limiting Refugees Into The U.S. (NYT).....	3	'These Are People's Lives They Are Playing With': World's Airports Turn Into Limbo For Many Under Trump Order (WP).....	23
Federal Judge Grants Stay For Those Detained Under Trump's Travel Ban (NYPOST).....	6	Despair, Confusion Reign As Trump's Travel Ban Hits (AP).....	24
Judge Stays Deportations; Trump Order Barring Refugees, Migrants From Muslim Countries Triggers Chaos, Outrage (WP).....	7	An Iraqi Family Split By The Vicissitudes Of Asylum (NYT).....	26
Trump Says Immigration Ban Working 'Nicely' As Protests, Detainments Hit Airports (USAT).....	9	Families Divided By Trump's Refugee Order Worry About The Future (LAT).....	28
Trump Defends Order: 'It's Not A Muslim Ban' (HILL).....	11	Airport Detentions Of Iraqi Travelers Spark Lawsuit, Protest (WSJ).....	28
White House Defends Immigrant Ban As Airports Stop Travelers (BLOOMPOL).....	12	First Lawsuit Filed To Challenge Trump's Refugee Policy (WT) 28	
Donald Trump Says His Order To Bar Refugees And Travelers Is 'Working Out Very Nicely' (HUFFPOST).....	14	Iraqis Who Spent Years Helping U.S. Among The First Detained Under Trump's Ban (HUFFPOST).....	29
Trump Says New Order On Refugees Is Not A Muslim Ban (REU).....	14	Broad Lawsuit Challenges Trump Immigration Order (POLITICO).....	29
Trump Order Barring Refugees, Migrants From Muslim Countries Triggers Chaos, Outrage (WP).....	14	Massive Crowds Gather At JFK In Protest Of Immigration Ban (HILL).....	30
White House Defends Executive Order Barring Travelers From Certain Muslim Countries (WSJ).....	16	NYC Airport Becomes Scene Of Anguish After Trump Travel Ban (AP).....	31
White House Says U.S. Still Most Open Immigration System Even After Trump Orders (WT).....	16	Striking New York Cabbies Join Airport Protest Against Trump's Muslim Crackdown (HUFFPOST).....	31
Trump Visa Ban Also Applies To Citizens With Dual Nationality, State Department Says (WSJ).....	17	Cuomo Says State Will Explore Helping Detainees At Airports After Trump's Order (POLITICO).....	32
Green Card Holders Included In Trump Ban: Homeland Security (REU).....	17	Trump's Executive Order Is Already Hurting Refugees, Muslims And Families (HUFFPOST).....	32
'Case By Case' Approach For U.S. Green Card Holders Under Trump's New Order (REU).....	17	Protests Erupt Against Ban On Refugees (USAT).....	34
Trump Orders Publication Of Stats On Terror-linked Crime By Foreign Nationals (HILL).....	17	U.S. Immigrants React To Ban: 'Our President Is Trying To Divide Us' (USAT).....	35
Officials Say Visas Were Being Revoked Prior To Trump's Executive Order (NBCNEWS).....	18	Hundreds Rally In Boston Against Trump's Immigrant Policies (BOSGLOBE).....	36
Trump's Order Blocks Immigrants At Airports, Stoking Fear Around Globe (NYT).....	19	Baker, Local Pols Oppose Trump Immigration Order (BOSGLOBE).....	37
Trump Order On Refugees, Muslims Sparks Confusion, Worry (AP).....	21	Congresswoman, Lawyers Working To Free 13 Detainees At O'Hare (CHIST).....	38
'How Do I Get Back Home?' Iranians Turned Away From Flights To U.S. (NYT).....	22	18 People Held At O'Hare After Trump Order, Including Park Ridge Man: Lawyers (CHIT).....	40
Migrants Prevented From Boarding Flights To The U.S. In Wake Of Trump Order (WSJ).....	23	Immigration Attorneys At LAX Helping Immigrants, Many From Iran, Detained By Federal Officials (LAT).....	41
		Trump's Immigration Ban Draws Deep Anger And Muted Praise (NYT).....	42

More Republicans Are Speaking Out Against Trump's Refugee Ban. Paul Ryan And Mitch McConnell Aren't Among Them. (WP)	43	US Suspends Immigration Program Helping Non-Muslim Iranians (AP).....	68
After Trump Order, Some Lawmakers Remain Silent, While Others Speak Out (WSJ).....	45	State Dept Web Page On Refugees Disappears (HILL).....	69
A Very Few Republicans Finally Criticize Trump's Refugee And Travel Ban (HUFFPOST)	45	A Sweeping Order Is Unlikely To Reduce Terrorist Threat (NYT)70	
Republicans Go Largely Silent As Trump Bars Refugees And Immigrants From U.S. (HUFFPOST).....	46	Trump Redefines The Enemy And 15 Years Of Counterterrorism Policy (WP).....	71
GOP Critics Hit Trump Immigration Order (POLITICO).....	47	Open Doors, Slamming Gates: The Tumultuous Politics Of U.S. Immigration Policy (WP).....	72
Democrats Slam Trump's Immigration Ban As Callous And Cruel (HUFFPOST)	48	Will We Be Forced Into A Religious Test? The Dangerous Questions Muslims Are Facing. (WP).....	74
Schumer Calls For Trump Admin To 'Rescind' Refugee Order (HILL).....	49	Trump Shuts Door On Refugees, But Will The US Be Safer? (AP).....	75
'Lady Liberty Is Crying,' Democrats Declare In Wake Of Trump's Visa, Asylum Executive Order (WT)	50	There Have Been No Fatal Terror Attacks In The U.S. By Immigrants From The 7 Banned Muslim Countries (HUFFPOST).....	76
Dem: Feds Need To Explain Refugee Order (HILL).....	50	Little National Security Benefit To Trump's Executive Order On Immigration (CATOINST).....	77
Keith Ellison, First Muslim Congressman, Calls For 'mass Rallies' To Stop Trump Orders (WP)	51	Trump's Visa Ban Order: The View From A Worried Middle East (BLOOM)	78
Sanders: Trump 'Fostering Hatred' With Refugee Ban (HILL) ...	51	Countries Where Trump Does Business Are Not Hit By New Travel Restrictions (WP).....	79
Warren Goes On Tweetstorm Over Refugee Ban (HILL).....	51	Experts Question Legality Of Trump's Immigration Ban On Muslim Countries (USAT).....	80
How Trump Just Made America Less Safe (HUFFPOST)	52	Trump's Claim That It Is 'Very Tough' For Christian Syrians To Get To The United States (WP)	81
Iraqis Who Aided U.S. During War Now See Visa Hopes Dim (WSJ).....	53	Anxiety About Muslim Refugees Is Stoked Online By The Far-Right Media (NYT).....	82
Iran Retaliates, Canada Opens Arms After Trump Immigration Ban (USAT)	53	Donald Trump's Muslim Ban Is Cowardly And Dangerous (NYT)83	
Trump Ban Sparks U.S. Immigration Chaos, Infuriates Muslims (REU).....	54	Pandering To Fear (WP).....	84
U.N. Agencies Urge Trump To Allow Refugees Entry (REU)....	54	A Sisterly 'No' To Donald Trump (NYT)	84
UN Hopes US Refugee Ban Is Temporary (DAYMAIL).....	54	President Trump, Meet My Family (NYT).....	86
Advocacy Groups Condemn U.S. Suspension Of Refugee Program (WSJ).....	55	Immigration	
Heartbreak And Anger Follow Trump's Immigration Order (BOSGLOBE)	55	Texas Border Leaders Discuss How To Approach Trump On Security, Trade (WSJ).....	87
Warm Welcome For Syrians In A Country About To Ban Them (NYT)	56	One Certainty Of Trump's Wall: Big Money (NYT)	87
Donald Trump's Un-American Refugee Policy (NYT).....	57	Miami Mayors Chide Gimenez Over County Immigration Detentions (MH).....	89
Trump Shuts The Door On Men And Women Who Have Sacrificed For America (WP).....	58	Trump Aides Divided Over Policy Shielding 'Dreamer' Immigrants: Sources (REU)	90
I Went Through America's Extreme Vetting (PMZ).....	59	Terrorism Investigations	
Tech Firms Recall Employees To U.S., Denounce Trump's Ban On Refugees From Muslim Countries (WP)	61	Trump Orders Joint Chiefs To Draft ISIS Strategy, Restructuring Of Security Council (WP)	90
Silicon Valley Leaders Target Donald Trump's Travel Restrictions (WSJ).....	62	Trump's Call For Deadlier Islamic State Push May Hit Limits (REU).....	90
Trump Immigration Ban Sends Shockwaves Through Tech (USAT).....	62	How An American Ended Up Accused Of Aiding ISIS With Gift Cards (NYT).....	91
Google, Facebook Reflect Tech Dismay On Trump Immigration Order (BLOOM).....	64	Suspected U.S. Commando Raid In Yemen Kills Three Al Qaeda Members: Residents (REU)	92
Tech Industry Reacts To Trump's Executive Order On Immigration With Fear And Frustration (LAT).....	65	Cyber News	
Airlines Rushing To Comply With Trump's Surprise Travel Ban (BLOOM)	67	Hackers Hit D.C. Police Closed-circuit Camera Network, City Officials Disclose (WP).....	92
Trump's Signing Of Immigrant Ban Puts Pentagon In Uncomfortable Light (NYT).....	67	US No Longer Has Geography As Defense, Ally In Cybercombat (AP).....	93

National Security News

Donald Trump Signs Order To Revamp National Security Council (WSJ).....	94
Trump's Making His Own Rules As A Diplomat, Too (POLITICO).....	94
Trump Administration Holds Off On Issuing U.N. Funding Order (NYT)	95
Trump, Putin Use First Formal Phone Call To Seek Better Ties (BLOOMPOL)	95
Donald Trump, Vladimir Putin Discuss Working Together To Fight Terrorism (WSJ).....	96
Trump Holds Calls With Putin, Leaders From Europe And Asia (WP).....	96
Trump And Putin Have First Official Phone Conversation Amid European Anxiety About Future Relations (LAT).....	98
Germany's Merkel, Trump Agree On Importance Of NATO In Call (AP).....	99
Trump, Merkel Agree NATO Members Must Pay Fair Share (REU).....	99
Shinzo Abe Discusses Importance Of Japan-U.S. Alliance With Donald Trump (WSJ).....	99
Japan PM Abe: To Meet Trump February 10; Reaffirmed Importance Of Alliance (REU).....	99
Trump Tells Abe U.S. Commitment To Japan Security 'Ironclad': White House (REU)	99
Trump To Honor Pacific Island Refugee Deal With Australia (BLOOM)	99
Mexico Rebukes Israel Over Netanyahu Wall Tweet (REU)	100
Israel PM Netanyahu Praises Trump's Plan For Mexico Border Wall (WSJ).....	100
Inside The Contentious Israeli Settlement That Counts Trump As A Donor (WP).....	100
Rice Blasts Trump For Not Mentioning Jews In Holocaust Statement (HILL)	101
Evoking Reagan And Thatcher, May Hails New UK-U.S. 'Special Relationship' (REU)	102
May's Mission To Woo Trump A Success, But Makes Some Uneasy (AP)	102

May Under Fire Over Her Failure To Condemn Trump's Refugee Ban (BLOOMPOL).....	103
Trump-May Meeting A Win For Two Great Nations (NYPOST)103	
France's Hollande Warns Trump Against Protectionism (REU)104	
French Leader Chides US Populism, Urges European Unity (AP).....	104
Jordan's King Abdullah II To Visit Washington On Monday (WSJ).....	104
The Questions That Could Reshape A Worried Europe In 2017 (NYT)	104
Ten Centuries Later, A Pope And Knights Do Battle (NYT)	106
Meet The Youngsters Helping Solve Japan's Caregiving Crisis. Like Kunio Odaira, 72 (WP).....	108
Russia's Blow To Women (WP).....	109
Kabul On Edge Amid Standoff Between Afghan Government And Vice President (WP).....	109
Former Warlord's Return Could Shake Up Afghan Politics (AP)110	
Taliban, Collecting Bills For Afghan Utilities, Tap New Revenue Sources (NYT).....	111

National News

Inside The GOP Debate Over Strengthening Defense Spending, Despite The Cost (WP).....	113
Troops Who Cleaned Up Radioactive Islands Can't Get Medical Care (NYT)	114
New York City To Pay \$8.2 Million Over Shooting By Off-Duty Officer (NYT).....	116
After Trump Criticism On Chicago Violence, Emanuel Touts Police Smarts (CHIT).....	117
Trump's Vision Of 'Carnage' Misses Complex Reality Of Many Cities (NYT)	118
Fashion Police: Cops Ease Rules On Tattoos, Turbans, Beards (AP).....	119
After Roof Trial, SC Addressing Faith, Violence Intersection (AP).....	120
Shooting At Tennessee Armory Leaves 10 Wounded, Three Still Hospitalized (REU)	121

LEADING DHS NEWS

Full Executive Order Text: Trump's Action Limiting Refugees Into The U.S.

[New York Times](#), January 27, 2017

President Trump signed an executive order on Friday titled "Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States." Following is the language of that order, as supplied by the White House.

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq., and section 301 of title 3, United States Code,

and to protect the American people from terrorist attacks by foreign nationals admitted to the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Purpose. The visa-issuance process plays a crucial role in detecting individuals with terrorist ties and stopping them from entering the United States. Perhaps in no instance was that more apparent than the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, when State Department policy prevented consular officers from properly scrutinizing the visa applications of several of the 19 foreign nationals who went on to murder nearly 3,000 Americans. And while the visa-issuance process was reviewed and amended after the September 11 attacks to better detect would-be terrorists

from receiving visas, these measures did not stop attacks by foreign nationals who were admitted to the United States.

Numerous foreign-born individuals have been convicted or implicated in terrorism-related crimes since September 11, 2001, including foreign nationals who entered the United States after receiving visitor, student, or employment visas, or who entered through the United States refugee resettlement program. Deteriorating conditions in certain countries due to war, strife, disaster, and civil unrest increase the likelihood that terrorists will use any means possible to enter the United States. The United States must be vigilant during the visa-issuance process to ensure that those approved for admission do not intend to harm Americans and that they have no ties to terrorism.

In order to protect Americans, the United States must ensure that those admitted to this country do not bear hostile attitudes toward it and its founding principles. The United States cannot, and should not, admit those who do not support the Constitution, or those who would place violent ideologies over American law. In addition, the United States should not admit those who engage in acts of bigotry or hatred (including "honor" killings, other forms of violence against women, or the persecution of those who practice religions different from their own) or those who would oppress Americans of any race, gender, or sexual orientation.

Sec. 2. Policy. It is the policy of the United States to protect its citizens from foreign nationals who intend to commit terrorist attacks in the United States; and to prevent the admission of foreign nationals who intend to exploit United States immigration laws for malevolent purposes.

Sec. 3. Suspension of Issuance of Visas and Other Immigration Benefits to Nationals of Countries of Particular Concern. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, shall immediately conduct a review to determine the information needed from any country to adjudicate any visa, admission, or other benefit under the INA (adjudications) in order to determine that the individual seeking the benefit is who the individual claims to be and is not a security or public-safety threat.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the President a report on the results of the review described in subsection (a) of this section, including the Secretary of Homeland Security's determination of the information needed for adjudications and a list of countries that do not provide adequate information, within 30 days of the date of this order. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a copy of the report to the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence.

(c) To temporarily reduce investigative burdens on relevant agencies during the review period described in subsection (a) of this section, to ensure the proper review and

maximum utilization of available resources for the screening of foreign nationals, and to ensure that adequate standards are established to prevent infiltration by foreign terrorists or criminals, pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), I hereby proclaim that the immigrant and nonimmigrant entry into the United States of aliens from countries referred to in section 217(a)(12) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(12), would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, and I hereby suspend entry into the United States, as immigrants and nonimmigrants, of such persons for 90 days from the date of this order (excluding those foreign nationals traveling on diplomatic visas, North Atlantic Treaty Organization visas, C-2 visas for travel to the United Nations, and G-1, G-2, G-3, and G-4 visas).

(d) Immediately upon receipt of the report described in subsection (b) of this section regarding the information needed for adjudications, the Secretary of State shall request all foreign governments that do not supply such information to start providing such information regarding their nationals within 60 days of notification.

(e) After the 60-day period described in subsection (d) of this section expires, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the President a list of countries recommended for inclusion on a Presidential proclamation that would prohibit the entry of foreign nationals (excluding those foreign nationals traveling on diplomatic visas, North Atlantic Treaty Organization visas, C-2 visas for travel to the United Nations, and G-1, G-2, G-3, and G-4 visas) from countries that do not provide the information requested pursuant to subsection (d) of this section until compliance occurs.

(f) At any point after submitting the list described in subsection (e) of this section, the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security may submit to the President the names of any additional countries recommended for similar treatment.

(g) Notwithstanding a suspension pursuant to subsection (c) of this section or pursuant to a Presidential proclamation described in subsection (e) of this section, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security may, on a case-by-case basis, and when in the national interest, issue visas or other immigration benefits to nationals of countries for which visas and benefits are otherwise blocked.

(h) The Secretaries of State and Homeland Security shall submit to the President a joint report on the progress in implementing this order within 30 days of the date of this order, a second report within 60 days of the date of this order, a third report within 90 days of the date of this order, and a fourth report within 120 days of the date of this order.

Sec. 4. Implementing Uniform Screening Standards for All Immigration Programs. (a) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of

Investigation shall implement a program, as part of the adjudication process for immigration benefits, to identify individuals seeking to enter the United States on a fraudulent basis with the intent to cause harm, or who are at risk of causing harm subsequent to their admission. This program will include the development of a uniform screening standard and procedure, such as in-person interviews; a database of identity documents proffered by applicants to ensure that duplicate documents are not used by multiple applicants; amended application forms that include questions aimed at identifying fraudulent answers and malicious intent; a mechanism to ensure that the applicant is who the applicant claims to be; a process to evaluate the applicant's likelihood of becoming a positively contributing member of society and the applicant's ability to make contributions to the national interest; and a mechanism to assess whether or not the applicant has the intent to commit criminal or terrorist acts after entering the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to the President an initial report on the progress of this directive within 60 days of the date of this order, a second report within 100 days of the date of this order, and a third report within 200 days of the date of this order.

Sec. 5. Realignment of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program for Fiscal Year 2017. (a) The Secretary of State shall suspend the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) for 120 days. During the 120-day period, the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Secretary of Homeland Security and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall review the USRAP application and adjudication process to determine what additional procedures should be taken to ensure that those approved for refugee admission do not pose a threat to the security and welfare of the United States, and shall implement such additional procedures. Refugee applicants who are already in the USRAP process may be admitted upon the initiation and completion of these revised procedures. Upon the date that is 120 days after the date of this order, the Secretary of State shall resume USRAP admissions only for nationals of countries for which the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence have jointly determined that such additional procedures are adequate to ensure the security and welfare of the United States.

(b) Upon the resumption of USRAP admissions, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is further directed to make changes, to the extent permitted by law, to prioritize refugee claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution, provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion

in the individual's country of nationality. Where necessary and appropriate, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security shall recommend legislation to the President that would assist with such prioritization.

(c) Pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), I hereby proclaim that the entry of nationals of Syria as refugees is detrimental to the interests of the United States and thus suspend any such entry until such time as I have determined that sufficient changes have been made to the USRAP to ensure that admission of Syrian refugees is consistent with the national interest.

(d) Pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), I hereby proclaim that the entry of more than 50,000 refugees in fiscal year 2017 would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, and thus suspend any such entry until such time as I determine that additional admissions would be in the national interest.

(e) Notwithstanding the temporary suspension imposed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security may jointly determine to admit individuals to the United States as refugees on a case-by-case basis, in their discretion, but only so long as they determine that the admission of such individuals as refugees is in the national interest — including when the person is a religious minority in his country of nationality facing religious persecution, when admitting the person would enable the United States to conform its conduct to a preexisting international agreement, or when the person is already in transit and denying admission would cause undue hardship — and it would not pose a risk to the security or welfare of the United States.

(f) The Secretary of State shall submit to the President an initial report on the progress of the directive in subsection (b) of this section regarding prioritization of claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution within 100 days of the date of this order and shall submit a second report within 200 days of the date of this order.

(g) It is the policy of the executive branch that, to the extent permitted by law and as practicable, State and local jurisdictions be granted a role in the process of determining the placement or settlement in their jurisdictions of aliens eligible to be admitted to the United States as refugees. To that end, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall examine existing law to determine the extent to which, consistent with applicable law, State and local jurisdictions may have greater involvement in the process of determining the placement or resettlement of refugees in their jurisdictions, and shall devise a proposal to lawfully promote such involvement.

Sec. 6. Rescission of Exercise of Authority Relating to the Terrorism Grounds of Inadmissibility. The Secretaries of State and Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, consider rescinding the exercises of authority in section 212 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182, relating to

the terrorism grounds of inadmissibility, as well as any related implementing memoranda.

Sec. 7. Expedited Completion of the Biometric Entry-Exit Tracking System. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall expedite the completion and implementation of a biometric entry-exit tracking system for all travelers to the United States, as recommended by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the President periodic reports on the progress of the directive contained in subsection (a) of this section. The initial report shall be submitted within 100 days of the date of this order, a second report shall be submitted within 200 days of the date of this order, and a third report shall be submitted within 365 days of the date of this order. Further, the Secretary shall submit a report every 180 days thereafter until the system is fully deployed and operational.

Sec. 8. Visa Interview Security. (a) The Secretary of State shall immediately suspend the Visa Interview Waiver Program and ensure compliance with section 222 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1222, which requires that all individuals seeking a nonimmigrant visa undergo an in-person interview, subject to specific statutory exceptions.

(b) To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of State shall immediately expand the Consular Fellows Program, including by substantially increasing the number of Fellows, lengthening or making permanent the period of service, and making language training at the Foreign Service Institute available to Fellows for assignment to posts outside of their area of core linguistic ability, to ensure that non-immigrant visa-interview wait times are not unduly affected.

Sec. 9. Visa Validity Reciprocity. The Secretary of State shall review all nonimmigrant visa reciprocity agreements to ensure that they are, with respect to each visa classification, truly reciprocal insofar as practicable with respect to validity period and fees, as required by sections 221(c) and 281 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1201(c) and 1351, and other treatment. If a country does not treat United States nationals seeking nonimmigrant visas in a reciprocal manner, the Secretary of State shall adjust the visa validity period, fee schedule, or other treatment to match the treatment of United States nationals by the foreign country, to the extent practicable.

Sec. 10. Transparency and Data Collection. (a) To be more transparent with the American people, and to more effectively implement policies and practices that serve the national interest, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall, consistent with applicable law and national security, collect and make publicly available within 180 days, and every 180 days thereafter:

(i) information regarding the number of foreign nationals in the United States who have been charged with terrorism-

related offenses while in the United States; convicted of terrorism-related offenses while in the United States; or removed from the United States based on terrorism-related activity, affiliation, or material support to a terrorism-related organization, or any other national security reasons since the date of this order or the last reporting period, whichever is later;

(ii) information regarding the number of foreign nationals in the United States who have been radicalized after entry into the United States and engaged in terrorism-related acts, or who have provided material support to terrorism-related organizations in countries that pose a threat to the United States, since the date of this order or the last reporting period, whichever is later; and

(iii) information regarding the number and types of acts of gender-based violence against women, including honor killings, in the United States by foreign nationals, since the date of this order or the last reporting period, whichever is later; and

(iv) any other information relevant to public safety and security as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, including information on the immigration status of foreign nationals charged with major offenses.

(b) The Secretary of State shall, within one year of the date of this order, provide a report on the estimated long-term costs of the USRAP at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Sec. 11. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

(i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or

(ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.

(b) This order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

(c) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

Federal Judge Grants Stay For Those Detained Under Trump's Travel Ban

By Jennifer Bain And Kathianne Boniello

[New York Post](#), January 28, 2017

A federal judge in Brooklyn ordered a stop to the Trump administration's deportations of hundreds of travelers who arrived in the US on Friday and Saturday from seven predominately Muslim countries.

Judge Anne Donnelly on Saturday night granted a request from the American Civil Liberties Union to stop

deportations of those who were on their way to the US as Trump's order took effect.

The 100 to 200 detainees, including at least 10 at Kennedy Airport, will not be released immediately. But for now, they also will not be sent back to where they came from.

Donnelly issued her order after ACLU lawyer Lee Gelernt stated that at least one person at JFK was being put on a flight back to Syria as the hearing commenced.

That led the judge to ask aloud if the Trump administration could assure that the people about to be deported would not suffer irreparable harm.

Susan Riley, a civil lawyer who works in the Brooklyn US Attorney's office, couldn't answer the judge's question. Judge Anne Donnelly

New York Law Journal

"This has unfolded with such speed that we haven't had any opportunity to address any of the issues, the legal issues of the status of anyone who may be at the airport," Riley said.

"If they had come in two days ago we wouldn't be here. Am I right?" Donnelly asked.

The judge noted that the government did not argue that the detainees posed any risk.

The government hasn't shared the names of those detained and won't let ACLU lawyers see all the detainees, ACLU lawyer Lee Gelernt said.

The ACLU insisted the detainees posed no risk. "It's not as if these people weren't vetted, they were just caught in transit. They were in a horrible position," said Gelernt.

Donnelly's decision came in a class action lawsuit filed in Brooklyn federal court earlier Saturday. Hundreds of people gathered outside the courthouse in downtown Brooklyn, and a few filtered in to the courtroom to attend the hearing.

The detainees may find themselves in government detention for several weeks at least. Further proceedings in the case are set for next month.

Judge Stays Deportations; Trump Order Barring Refugees, Migrants From Muslim Countries Triggers Chaos, Outrage

By Jerry Markon, Emma Brown And Katherine Shaver
[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

A federal judge in New York stayed deportations nationwide of those detained on entry to the United States following an executive order from President Trump that targeted citizens from seven predominantly Muslim countries.

Judge Ann Donnelly of the U.S. District Court in Brooklyn granted a request from the American Civil Liberties Union to stay the deportations after determining that the risk of injury to those detained by being returned to their home countries necessitated the decision.

And only minutes after the judge's ruling in New York, another came in Virginia when U.S. District Judge Leonie Brinkema issued a temporary restraining order to block the removal of any green-card holders being detained at Dulles International Airport for seven days. Brinkema's action also ordered that lawyers have access to those held there because of the president's ban.

Trump's order reverberated across the world on Saturday making it increasingly clear that the controversial measure he had promised during his presidential campaign was casting a wider net than even his opponents had feared.

Confusion and concern among immigrant advocates mounted throughout the day as travelers from the Middle East were detained at U.S. airports or sent home. A middle-of-the-night lawsuit filed on behalf of two Iraqi men challenged Trump's executive action, which was signed Friday and initially cast as applying to refugees and migrants.

But as the day progressed, administration officials confirmed that the sweeping order also targeted U.S. legal residents from the named countries — green-card holders — who happened to be abroad when it was signed. Also subject to being barred entry into the United States are dual nationals, or people born in one of the seven countries who hold passports even from U.S. allies, such as the United Kingdom.

The virtually unprecedented measures triggered harsh reactions from not only Democrats and others who typically advocate for immigrants but also key sectors of the U.S. business community. Leading technology companies recalled scores of overseas employees and sharply criticized the president. Legal experts forecast a wave of litigation over the order, calling it unconstitutional. Canada announced it would accept asylum applications from U.S. green-card holders.

Yet Trump, who centered his campaign in part on his vow to crack down on illegal immigrants and impose what became known as his "Muslim ban," was unbowed. As White House officials insisted that the measure strengthens national security, the president stood squarely behind it.

"It's not a Muslim ban, but we were totally prepared," Trump told reporters in the Oval Office. "You see it at the airports, you see it all over. It's working out very nicely, and we're going to have a very, very strict ban, and we're going to have extreme vetting, which we should have had in this country for many years."

In New York, Judge Donnelly seemed to have little patience for the arguments presented by the government, which focused heavily on the fact that the two defendants named in the lawsuit had already been released. At one point, she visibly lost patience with a government attorney who was participating by phone.

Donnelly noted that those detained were suffering mostly from the bad fortune of traveling while the ban went into effect. "Our own government presumably approved their

entry to the country,” she said at one point, noting that, had it been two days prior, those detained would have been granted admission without question.

In the middle of the hearing, ACLU attorney Lee Gelernt informed the court that he’d received word of an imminent deportation to Syria, scheduled within the hour. That prompted Donnelly to ask if the government could assure that the person would not suffer irreparable harm. Receiving no such assurance, she granted the stay to the broad group included in the ACLU’s request.

A senior Department of Homeland Security official had no comment about the judicial rulings late Saturday and said the department was consulting with its lawyers.

The official said enforcement of the president’s order on Saturday had created minimal disruption given that only a small number of the several hundred thousand travelers arriving at U.S. airports daily had been affected.

Nationwide, he said, 109 people had been denied entry into the United States. All had been in transit when Trump signed the order, and some had already departed the United States on flights by late Saturday while others were still being detained awaiting flights. In addition, 173 people had not been allowed to board U.S.-bound flights at foreign airports.

The official said that officers doing case-by-case reviews had granted 81 waivers so far to green-card holders.

DHS began implementing the president’s order immediately after he signed it, according to the official. He declined to say whether the department had an operational plan ready at that time.

Though several congressional Republicans denounced the order, the vast majority remained silent, and a few voiced crucial support — including, most prominently, House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.), who had rejected Trump’s anti-Muslim proposals during the campaign. “This is not a religious test, and it is not a ban on people of any religion,” Ryan said Saturday. “This order does not affect the vast majority of Muslims in the world.”

The president’s order, signed Friday, suspends admission to the United States of all refugees for 120 days and bars for 90 days the entry of any citizen from Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Libya and Somalia. That list excludes several majority-Muslim nations — notably Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Indonesia — where the Trump Organization, now run by the president’s adult sons, is active and which in some cases have also faced troublesome issues with terrorism.

According to the text of the order, the restriction applies to countries that have already been excluded from programs allowing people to travel to the United States without a visa because of terrorism concerns. Hewing closely to nations already named as terrorism concerns elsewhere in law might have allowed the White House to avoid angering powerful

and wealthy majority-Muslim allies, such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Amid widespread confusion on Saturday about how the order will be enforced, some administration officials acknowledged that its rollout had been chaotic. Officials tried to reassure travelers and their families, pointing out that green-card holders in the United States will not be affected and noting that DHS is allowed to grant waivers to those individuals and others deemed to not pose a security threat. It can take years for someone to become a green-card holder, or lawful permanent resident authorized to permanently live and work in the country.

“If you’ve been living in the United States for 15 years and you own a business and your family is here, will you be granted a waiver? I’m assuming yes, but we are working that out,” said one official, who could not be more specific because details remained so cloudy. A senior White House official later said that waivers will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and that green-card holders in the United States will have to meet with a consular officer before leaving the country.

But officials made clear that the federal officers detaining refugees and migrants with valid U.S. visas and restricting them from entering the country were following orders handed down by top DHS officials, at the White House’s behest.

The order drew cries of outrage from a range of activist and advocates for Muslims, Arabs and immigrants. More than 4,000 academics from universities nationwide signed a statement of opposition and voiced concern the ban would become permanent. They described it as discriminatory and “inhumane, ineffective and un-American.”

The executive action has caused “complete chaos” and torn apart families, said Abed Ayoub, legal and policy director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee.

At Dulles International Airport, Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe (D) addressed more than 100 people protesting Trump’s order.

“We want to know who is being detained and why they are being detained,” McAuliffe said. “I remind everybody we are a land of immigrants. . . . Discriminatory tactics breed hatred.” His remarks were cheered by demonstrators holding signs saying “Refugees welcome here” and “Stand with Muslims.”

In New York City, lawyers for two Iraqi men detained at John F. Kennedy International Airport — one of whom served the U.S. military mission in Iraq — filed a federal lawsuit challenging the order as unconstitutional. They also are seeking class certification so they may represent all refugees and visa-holders who are being held at U.S. ports of entry.

One of the men, Hameed Khalid Darweesh, was released Saturday afternoon without explanation from federal officials. “This is the humanity, this is the soul of America,” he

told reporters. “This is what pushed me to move, to leave my country and come here. . . . America is the land of freedom — the land of freedom, the land of the right.”

While immigration advocates said at least one refu-gee family had been detained at San Francisco International Airport, there was no immediate count of how many refugees were being held at airports nationwide. Advocates said that ticketed passengers also had been barred from boarding U.S.-bound flights overseas, and they confirmed that some green-card holders who left the United States have been unable to return.

In Cairo, airport officials said seven U.S.-bound migrants — six from Iraq and one from Yemen — were prevented Saturday from boarding an EgyptAir flight to JFK Airport, according to the Associated Press.

Other advocates promised further legal challenges. The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) denounced the order and said it would file a lawsuit challenging it as unconstitutional.

“There is no evidence that refugees — the most thoroughly vetted of all people entering our nation — are a threat to national security,” Lena F. Masri, CAIR’s national litigation director, said in a statement. “This is an order that is based on bigotry, not reality.”

In a conference call with reporters, immigration lawyers and advocates said Trump’s order violated the Constitution, along with U.S. and international laws that guarantee migrants the right to apply for asylum at the border and the Immigration and Nationality Act, which forbids discrimination in the issuance of visas based on race, nationality, place of birth or place of residence.

But Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, which advocates for lower immigration levels, praised Trump for taking action to pause the refugee resettlement program and limit immigration from the seven countries.

“It’s a prudent measure,” he said. “It’s not the end of the world. It’s not the Statue of Liberty crying. The reaction has been hyperbolic.”

The effects of Trump’s order played out nationwide.

In Dallas, Behzad Honarjou, 43, was supposed to pick up his mother, 70-year-old Shahin Haffanpour, at the airport on Saturday. But when she arrived from Iran via Dubai, she was told that because of the executive order she would be sent back to Iran the next morning.

“I don’t know what to do,” Honarjou said. He said he was seeking an attorney to file an emergency habeas petition, but the courts were closed. Haffanpour has an immigrant’s visa issued by the U.S. Embassy in Ankara, Turkey, last year.

In Philadelphia, Sarah Assali said six relatives from Syria — two uncles, their wives and two cousins — were detained after arriving at the airport there early Saturday.

Although they are Christian immigrants with valid visas to join family in this country, they were put on a plane back to Doha, Qatar, three hours later, Assali said.

She said her family members were not allowed to call or contact their family in the United States before being removed. “We don’t know what’s going to happen next.”

Philip Bump in Brooklyn, Louisa Loveluck in Beirut, and David Nakamura, Philip Rucker, Mike DeBonis, Lori Aratani, Carol Morello and Rachel Weiner in Washington contributed to this report.

Trump Says Immigration Ban Working ‘Nicely’ As Protests, Detainments Hit Airports

By Doug Stanglin And Alan Gomez

[USA Today](#), January 28, 2017

The fallout from President Trump’s temporary ban on refugees to the U.S. struck with full force Saturday, blocking some travelers from boarding their planes overseas, compelling others to turn around upon arrival in the U.S., and prompting customs agents at New York’s JFK Airport to detain at least a dozen people, including a former Iraqi translator for the U.S. military in Baghdad.

The growing chaos also sparked legal challenges, airport protests, condemnations from politicians and denunciations from advocacy groups.

American Civil Liberties Union lawyers were scheduled to appear in federal court in Brooklyn Saturday evening to argue for a nationwide stay that would block deportation of people stranded in U.S. airports under the ban. The ACLU and other legal groups had filed a lawsuit in reaction to the ban earlier in the day.

New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo Saturday tweeted an offer of support to those who had been stopped at the state’s airports: “I have directed Port Authority, @NYSDOS, & my Counsel’s Office to jointly explore all legal options to assist anyone detained at NY airports.”

Cuomo’s tweet linked to a statement in which he objected to refugees being blocked from entering the U.S.

“I never thought I’d see the day when refugees, who have fled war-torn countries in search of a better life, would be turned away from our doorstep. We are a nation of bridges, not walls, and a great many of us still believe in the words ‘give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses ...’ “ he wrote. “This is not who we are, not who we should be.”

Speaking to hundreds of demonstrators at JFK Airport, Rep. Jerrold Nadler, D-N.Y., called the ban ineffective, discriminatory, “disgusting,” and said it “goes against every ounce of our traditions from George Washington onward.”

“We are here to say it should be stopped and be revoked,” he said.

The reverberations began only hours after Trump signed the executive order Friday that suspends the entry of all refugees to the United States for 120 days, halts the admission of refugees from Syria indefinitely and bars entry for three months to residents from the predominantly Muslim countries of Iraq, Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia and Yemen.

In brief remarks while signing his latest executive orders Saturday, Trump maintained the order isn't a "Muslim ban."

"It's working out very nicely. We're going to have a strict ban, and we're going to have extreme vetting, which we should have had in this country for many years," he said.

The ban includes green card holders who are authorized to live and work in the United States, according to Gillian Christensen, a Homeland Security spokeswoman, Reuters reported. It was unclear how many green card holders would be affected, but exceptions can be made on a case-by-case basis, the news agency says.

At Washington's Dulles International Airport, where a protest was mounted, Gov. Terry McAuliffe and Virginia Attorney General Mark Herring said the state was considering taking legal action to challenge the ban.

About 50 people were detained at Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport, said Alia Salem, executive director for DFW Chapter of the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR). Families have been waiting at Terminal D in anticipation of meeting relatives who been held up in U.S. Customs. A representative with CAIR met with families waiting for relatives. Some of them have been waiting for several hours.

At Philadelphia International Airport, two Syrian families, described as Christians, were briefly detained Saturday after arriving from Qatar and sent back three hours later. The families included two brothers, their wives and two children, according to a family member from Allentown, Pa., NBC10 reported. "This is like a nightmare come true," said Joseph Assali, who noted that the families had visas and green cards legally obtained months ago.

Mohammed Al Rawi, chief information officer for Los Angeles County, said on Facebook that his father was removed from a flight in Qatar as a direct result of the order. "My 71 year old dad is in Qatar boarding LAX flight to come visit us and he's being sent back to Iraq. Some US official told him that Trump canceled all visas," he wrote.

Foreigners studying at U.S. universities who were part of study abroad programs were also stuck. Even Customs and Border Protection agents were confused about how to handle Trump's order and responding in different ways, he said.

Those holding dual nationality in the seven nations involved in the ban will also be barred from entering the United States, the Wall Street Journal reported citing a

statement from the State Department that has yet to be released.

In Cairo, seven migrants — six from Iraq and one from Yemen — were being escorted by officials from the U.N. refugee agency when they were stopped from boarding the EgyptAir plane, the Associated Press reported, quoting Cairo airport officials.

The authorities stepped in after contacting their counterparts at JFK Airport, where the plane was headed. The officials spoke to AP on condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to brief the media.

Only one of the 12 picked up at JFK Airport was freed by Saturday afternoon. Hameed Khaldi Darweesh, who worked a translator for American forces for 10 years, had been detained overnight following his arrival from Istanbul. He said he had feared he would be sent back to Iraq, which his family fled because of death threats.

When asked by reporters outside the airport what he thought of Trump, Darweesh said, "I don't know. He's a president, I'm a normal person."

He said he was focused instead on the lawyers who won his release. "This is the soul of America," Darweesh said. "This is what pushed me to move, to leave my country and come here. America is the land of freedom."

Among the 11 still being held at the airport was another Iraqi refugee, Haider Sameer Abdulkhaleq Alshawi, who was trying to join his wife and child. His wife worked for a U.S. contractor in Iraq as an accountant, was granted a refugee visa and is now living in Houston. Alshawi was approved for a visa to join his wife and their 7-year-old son on Jan. 11.

According to a federal complaint filed on behalf of two Iraqis being held at JFK airport, one attorney approached Customs and Border Patrol agents with a request to speak to his client, but was told they were not the ones to talk to about seeing him.

"Who is the person to talk to?" the lawyer asked, according to the complaint. The unidentified CBP agents responded: "Mr. President. Call Mr. Trump."

According to one of the lawyers, Mark Doss, the pair had been approved for entry as refugees but were in the air flying to the U.S. night when the order was being signed.

A senior administration official said in a White House briefing Saturday afternoon that U.S. Customs and Border protection was working to provide waivers for the two Iraqis involved in the lawsuit.

"No person living or residing overseas has a right to entry into the United States," the official said, declining to be identified under the rules of the briefing. "There is not a travel ban (from the seven countries). It is a cessation of most travel with case-by-case exceptions."

Abed Ayoud, legal and policy director for the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, said they've received

more than 1,000 calls by midday Saturday from people who have been stranded or detained in the U.S. and abroad.

He said legal immigrants traveling overseas to attend funerals and visit family when the president signed his order are now unable to return to the U.S.

“The impact of what President Trump was looking for is in full effect,” Ayoud said.

“Complete chaos.”

In Tehran, Iran’s foreign minister, Javad Zarif, said his country would respond by banning all U.S. citizens from the country as long as the U.S. policy was in effect, but would not include anyone who already received a visa. In a statement, the foreign ministry called the U.S. order “a clear insult to the Islamic world, and especially to the great nation of Iran.”

In signing the executive order, Trump said the new administration needed time to develop a stricter screening process for refugees, immigrants and visitors. “I’m establishing new vetting measures to keep radical Islamic terrorists out of the United States of America. Don’t want them here,” he said.

The executive order, which he said was aimed at protecting Americans from terrorist attacks, singled out Syrian refugees as “detrimental to the interests of the United States.”

When the refugee program resumes, the executive order calls for changes to “prioritize refugee claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution, provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country of nationality.”

“We only want to admit those into our country who will support our country and love deeply our people,” Trump said.

CAIR said it will file a federal lawsuit Monday in the Eastern District of Virginia to challenge the constitutionality of the order, charging its apparent purpose and underlying motive is to ban people of the Islamic faith from Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States.

“There is no evidence that refugees – the most thoroughly vetted of all people entering our nation – are a threat to national security,” said CAIR National Litigation Director Lena F. Masri. “This is an order that is based on bigotry, not reality.”

Marielena Hincapié, executive director of the National Immigration Law Center, one of the groups representing the Iraqi men detained at JFK, said the lawsuit is directed solely at immigrants who have been caught in legal limbo following Trump’s announcement. The lawyers are trying to expand it into a class action suit to cover the untold number of refugees caught in the same situation.

Hincapié said they are planning separate lawsuits challenging the legality of Trump’s executive actions on immigration, partly because they target majority Muslim nations. But she said for now, they simply want to resolve the cases of people who are being detained at airports. They are

trying to get an emergency hearing before a judge this weekend.

“These are people who already had a horrific experience of being a refugee,” she said. “They left everything behind. And now, to find themselves in detention at an airport with no contacts, not knowing what can be done, only hearing little bits and pieces on the news about this executive order. I think folks are just scared and don’t know how to respond at this moment.”

Trump Defends Order: ‘It’s Not A Muslim Ban’

By Jordan Fabian

[The Hill](#), January 28, 2017

President Trump on Saturday denied that his sweeping executive order barring refugees and individuals from several predominantly Muslim nations amounted to a ban on Muslims.

“It’s not a Muslim ban,” Trump told reporters in the Oval Office after he signed three new directives.

The order, handed down Friday evening, sowed chaos as government agencies scrambled to implement the broad new policy.

But Trump insisted his administration was “totally prepared” to carry out the refugee and travel ban, which affects more than 100 million people around the world.

“It’s working out very nicely,” he said. “You see it at the airports, you see it all over.”

The new policy sparked widespread outrage from civil-liberties groups and Democrats, who called it a discriminatory and unconstitutional policy directed at Muslims.

The Trump administration has already found itself embroiled in a legal battle over the order after two Iraqi nationals with ties to the U.S. military filed a lawsuit after they were detained upon their arrival Friday night in New York.

Both men had been granted visas to enter the U.S. Hameed Khalid Darweesh, who worked as an interpreter for the U.S. military, was released from custody early Saturday.

The president said he is sticking with the new policy over the objection of its critics, saying it will help keep out people who could carry out terrorist attacks on American soil.

“We’re going to have a very, very strict ban and we’re going to have extreme vetting, which we should have had in this country for many years,” he said.

Trump’s order bars Syrian refugees indefinitely and halts the country’s refugee resettlement program for four months.

It also denies entry for 90 days to individuals from seven majority-Muslim countries: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan and Libya; affecting roughly 134 million people.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has designated those nations as “countries of concern” for terrorism.

The order also directs DHS to determine which other nations do not provide appropriate information about its citizens, and therefore could be added to the list.

Despite Trump's claims, critics of the policy say it amount to a ban on Muslims.

"On Holocaust Memorial Day, Trump restricted refugees from Muslim-majority countries. Make no mistake — this is a Muslim ban," Sen. Kamala Harris (D-Calif.) said in a statement on Friday.

Speaker Paul Ryan's (R-Wis.) office defended Trump's executive order on Saturday, maintaining that it does not target Muslims.

"This is not a religious test and it is not a ban on people of any religion," Ryan's spokeswoman AshLee Strong told The Washington Post.

"Mr. President, look at us — this is America, what you have done is shameful, it's un-American and it has created so much confusion," said Rep. Nydia Velázquez (D-N.Y.) while standing outside of New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport, where the two Iraqi men were detained.

They point to Trump's Dec. 2015 call for a "total and complete shutdown" of Muslim immigration to the U.S. He later softened his stance, saying he wanted to target individuals from terror-prone nations.

The ban does not cover all Muslim-majority countries or Muslims worldwide.

The nations where the Sept. 11 hijackers hailed from — Saudi Arabia, Egypt the United Arab Emirates and Lebanon — are not included on the list. Neither is Pakistan, the home of the 2010 Times Square bomber Faisal Shahzad.

But some of the president's most ardent backers still referred to the order as a Muslim ban.

"Making America Great Again! #MuslimBan #saturdaymorning #AmericaFirst @GenFlynn @realDonaldTrump" tweeted Michael Flynn, Jr., the son of Trump's national security adviser.

Making America Great Again! #MuslimBan #saturdaymorning #AmericaFirst @GenFlynn @realDonaldTrump <https://t.co/fyn6JYpJf9>— Michael Flynn Jr (@mflynnJR) January 28, 2017

Trump also said in an interview Friday he wants to prioritize Christian refugees from the Middle East over Muslims once admissions resume.

There was additional confusion over the implementation of the order.

Multiple media reports indicated senior officials at the State Department and DHS, the agencies charged with carrying out the ban, were not aware of the changes before Friday.

Travelers and refugees at airports around the world were grounded as authorities scrambled to interpret the new travel restrictions, including whether they applied to U.S. permanent residents from the affected countries.

A senior administration official later said green-card holders currently abroad do fall under the ban, although they would be considered on a case-by-case to return.

More broadly, the White House pushed back on reports of miscommunication, saying key officials at both agencies has been informed of the plans over the past few weeks.

Asked whether the government was ready to put the order in place, Trump replied, "totally, totally."

—Nikita Vladimirov contributed

White House Defends Immigrant Ban As Airports Stop Travelers

By Bob Van Voris

[Bloomberg Politics](#), January 28, 2017

President Donald Trump defended his order suspending refugee resettlements in the U.S. and barring entry to people from Iraq, Syria and five other Middle East nations, as confusion broke out at airports around the world and government agencies and airlines tried to interpret the new rules.

"It's not a Muslim ban," Trump told reporters in the Oval Office. "We were totally prepared. It's working out very nicely. You see it at the airports, you see it all over. It's working out very nicely."

The executive order, aimed at stopping would-be terrorists from entering the U.S., led to people being detained at airports from Dallas to Atlanta to New York, and provoked an outcry from immigration lawyers, who said it violated the U.S. Constitution. Airlines around the world, given no advance warning, blocked travelers from the affected countries — including some who are legal U.S. residents — from getting on planes to the U.S. and struggled to understand what they should do.

At least a dozen people were being held at New York's John F. Kennedy Airport, including 10 Iranians, Andre Segura, a lawyer with the American Civil Liberties Union, said in an interview. Officials there agreed to release Hameed Khalid Darweesh, an interpreter who had worked for the U.S. military in Iraq, after he was detained. Another Iraqi was also released.

The order impacted immigrants from Muslim-majority countries Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. A senior White House official, who asked not to be identified because he wasn't authorized to speak publicly about the matter, said the administration had serious concerns about abuses in immigration programs and needed to impose the 90-day ban on immigrants from the seven countries while it comes up with new vetting procedures.

The order also halts refugee resettlement to the U.S. for 120 days, and orders that refugee admissions for 2017 be cut to 50,000 from the planned limit of 110,000.

The official said reports of individuals stranded at airports or uncertain about their travel plans paled in comparison to the possibility that a terrorist or someone with terrorist sympathies could enter the U.S.

The outcry from overseas leaders was also swift. In a phone call with Trump today, French Prime Minister Francois Hollande said defending democracy “requires observing fundamental principles,” among them welcoming refugees, according to a statement from Hollande’s office.

On Twitter, Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif promised reciprocal measures, though he said anyone with a valid visa would be welcomed “unlike the U.S.”

The U.S. move “will be recorded in history as a great gift to extremists and their supporters,” Zarif wrote on Twitter. “Collective discrimination aids terrorist recruitment by deepening fault-lines exploited by extremist demagogues to swell their ranks.”

Abed Ayoub, the legal and policy director at the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, said on a conference call that Trump’s move was causing “chaos within the community and at our borders.” Along with the ACLU and others, his group filed a lawsuit in federal court in Brooklyn claiming that the order is unconstitutional and exceeds presidential authority under immigration law. It asks the court to block enforcement.

“This is a Muslim ban. It has nothing to do with national security. It has everything to do with Islamophobia and xenophobia,” Ayoub said. He said people from the countries in question were being told not to leave the U.S. because they wouldn’t be allowed back in.

As Saturday went on, new details emerged about the extent of the order’s reach. A State Department official, who wasn’t authorized to speak publicly and asked not to be identified, said the order applied not only to citizens of the seven countries but also to dual nationals who aren’t U.S. citizens. The official said visa interviews won’t be scheduled for nationals of the countries during the 90-day ban.

Green-card holders – legal permanent residents – from the seven nations were also barred. Ayoub said people had been detained at airports in Atlanta, Houston, Detroit and Washington, as well as New York.

Exemptions Possible

A second senior administration official said it was “ludicrous” to describe the extreme vetting order as a Muslim ban, noting that countries like Afghanistan were excluded from the list of countries from which immigration was blocked. The first noted that the U.S. admitted more Muslims to visit or immigrate than any country in the world not in the region, and would continue to do so.

Those already outside the country can apply for a case-by-case exemption, the White House said, pledging they would be expeditiously processed. Green-card holders from

the affected countries already in the U.S. can seek a waiver before they travel abroad.

The official acknowledged the priority the plan gives to Christians. Language in the order demands that when refugee admissions are allowed again, priority must be given to claims of persecution based on religions that are in the minority in the country. The seven targeted by the order are all predominantly Muslim.

Speaking with Christian Broadcasting Network on Friday in an interview that will air in full on Sunday night, Trump suggested that Christians had been treated unfairly by U.S. procedures.

“If you were a Muslim you could come in, but if you were a Christian, it was almost impossible and the reason that was so unfair – everybody was persecuted, in all fairness – but they were chopping off the heads of everybody but more so the Christians,” Trump said. “And I thought it was very, very unfair. So we are going to help them.”

Google Response

Alphabet Inc.’s Google said more than 100 employees who were out of the country on vacation or work assignments are subject to the order. A spokeswoman declined to say Saturday whether any of them had been denied boarding on flights or detained in the U.S. One employee rushed back from a trip to New Zealand to make it into the U.S. before the order was signed, Chief Executive Officer Sundar Pichai wrote in a memo to employees.

The consulting firm McKinsey & Co. sent a memo to employees advising them of the travel ban and outlining who may be affected. The memo from the consulting firm’s assistant general counsel said in part:

“To be safe, we are advising for now that all who are not U.S. citizens and who were born in one of these countries not depart the U.S. as you may not be able to get back in for at least another 90 days. For those who are currently outside of the U.S. – we urge you to try to return immediately as you may not be readmitted.”

Officials from the State Department and Department of Homeland Security were preparing guidance Saturday to help airlines and other travel companies better guide their clients, the White House said. That information wasn’t provided ahead of time because the administration didn’t want information about the action to leak, which, they said, could have allowed a potential terrorist to circumvent the new rules.

Criticism of Trump’s executive order emerged from both the left and the right. Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration-policy analyst at the conservative Cato Institute, wrote a post before the order was signed saying that foreigners from the seven nations affected by the ban had “killed zero Americans in terrorist attacks on U.S. soil between 1975 and 2015.”

“The measures taken here will have virtually no effect on improving U.S. national security,” he wrote.

Democrats in Congress roundly criticized the order, while Republican response was more muted. Senator Tim Kaine, the Virginia Democrat who was Hillary Clinton's running mate, said Trump had "defied everything our nation stands for." Republican Senator Ben Sasse of Nebraska called the order "too broad."

"If we send a signal to the Middle East that the U.S. sees all Muslims as jihadis, the terrorist recruiters win by telling kids that America is banning Muslims and that this is America versus one religion," he said in a statement.

Donald Trump Says His Order To Bar Refugees And Travelers Is 'Working Out Very Nicely'

He got what he wanted.

By Elise Foley

[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON — President Donald Trump, like many people around the world, has seen reports about what's happening at airports in the aftermath of his executive order that left refugees, immigrants and other travelers unable to enter the United States.

He thinks it's going great.

"It's working out very nicely," Trump said of his executive order on Saturday. "You see it at the airports, you see it all over."

The president signed the order on Friday to bar all refugees from entering the U.S. for 120 days, keep out Syrian refugees indefinitely, and restrict travel for individuals from seven countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. The ban applies even to green card holders from those countries who reside in the United States: They may now be admitted only on a case-by-case basis. It also applies to dual-nationals of one of the seven countries and another nation.

Trump is right that airports have become the principal place to observe the effect his order is having on people's lives.

Many people who fit the banned categories arrived at U.S. airports with their previously approved visas, only to be detained and barred from entry. There are numerous individual stories: an Iraqi who worked for the U.S. military as an interpreter during the war, only to be detained at the airport; a Syrian woman trying to visit her sick mother; a Syrian family who was set to move to the United States and now won't be allowed to.

There are infants who are U.S. citizens being detained at Los Angeles International Airport because their parents are legal permanent residents and elderly people whose families are unable to reach them to ensure they have their medication, according to attorneys.

Hundreds of protesters have also gathered at airports, with especially large crowds at New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport.

Some of the chaos has resulted from the language of the order and the fact that it's not clear what it all means. Trump's own administration doesn't seem to have worked out all the details. A White House official told reporters on Saturday that the administration is trying to determine how to define "in transit" in a segment of the order that says there can be an exception for certain refugees "when the person is already in transit and denying admission would cause undue hardship."

"We were totally prepared," Trump said about the order later on Saturday.

He also said the executive order was "not a Muslim ban" — something some Republicans, such as House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), have used as a justification for accepting it even though they'd condemned Trump's call back in 2015 for a blanket ban on people who practice Islam.

The new executive order does not mention any religion specifically, but all of the countries on the list have Muslim-majority populations.

The president also said on Friday that he would prioritize resettling Syrian Christian refugees, in spite of his directive to bar refugees in general. The executive order would give him an avenue to do so: It says an exception can be made for refugees who are members of a persecuted religious minority in their home country, which would leave Syrian Muslims out.

Update: The American Civil Liberties Union and refugee relief organizations filed an action in federal court Saturday morning on behalf of two Iraqi nationals who were detained at JFK Airport. On Saturday night, a federal judge temporarily halted parts of Trump's executive order.

Trump Says New Order On Refugees Is Not A Muslim Ban

By Jeff Mason

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Trump Order Barring Refugees, Migrants From Muslim Countries Triggers Chaos, Outrage

By Jerry Markon, Emma Brown And David Nakamura

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

President Trump's executive order barring refugees and migrants from predominantly Muslim countries from entry into the United States rippled across the world on Saturday, causing widespread confusion, triggering outrage among

immigrant advocates and leading to the detention at U.S. airports of people flying into the country.

In addition to blocking all entries from seven countries, including business people, students and others, the ban is also being applied to U.S. legal residents from those nations — so-called green card holders — who were traveling abroad at the time the order was signed, federal officials said Saturday.

Those familiar with the order, who spoke on condition of anonymity because they said its rollout had been chaotic, said green card holders currently in the United States will not be affected. They noted that the Department of Homeland Security is allowed to grant waivers to those individuals and others deemed to not pose a threat to national security.

“If you’ve been living in the United States for 15 years and you own a business and your family is here, will you be granted a waiver? I’m assuming yes, but we are working that out,” said one official, who could not be more specific because details of the possible waivers remained cloudy, as did many other details of how the ban will be enforced.

But officials made clear that the federal officers detaining refugees and migrants holding valid U.S. visas and restricting them from entering the country were following orders handed down by top DHS officials. Those orders, the officials said, reflect the desires of Trump’s White House.

The president’s order, signed Friday, suspends admission to the United States of all refugees for 120 days and bars for 90 days the entry of any citizens from Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Libya and Somalia. Trump said that the goal is to screen out “radical Islamic terrorists” and that priority for admission would be given to Christians.

The executive action has caused “complete chaos” and torn apart families, said Abed Ayoub, legal and policy director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. “It’s causing a negative and destructive impact on the Arab-American community,” Ayoub said.

The White House on Saturday rushed to explain and defend its action, saying it strengthens national security and denying that it targeted Muslims. “The notion that this is a Muslim ban is ludicrous,” one senior administration official said. A second official noted that many majority-Muslim countries, including Afghanistan, Pakistan and Turkey, were excluded from the measure.

And House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.), who frequently clashed with Trump during the presidential campaign, strongly backed the president’s executive order. “This is not a religious test and it is not a ban on people of any religion,” he said. “This order does not affect the vast majority of Muslims in the world. It does not affect a large number of nations that are Muslim-majority.”

Lawyers for two Iraqi men detained at New York’s John F. Kennedy International Airport, one of whom served the U.S. military mission in Iraq, filed a middle-of-the-night lawsuit

in federal court challenging Trump’s order as unconstitutional and seeking the release of their clients. They also are seeking class certification so they may represent all refugees and visa-holders who are being held at U.S. ports of entry.

One of the men, Hameed Khalid Darweesh, was released Saturday afternoon without explanation from federal officials, according to his lawyer, Mark Doss. “We are very grateful that Mr. Darweesh has been released,” Doss told reporters outside JFK International Airport in an interview broadcast on CNN. But 11 others are still being detained at JFK, he said, and “people will stay here until they are released.”

While immigration advocates said at least one refu-gee family had been detained at San Francisco International Airport, there was no immediate count of how many refugees were being held at airports nationwide. Advocates said that people have not only been held at the border but that ticketed passengers have been barred from boarding U.S.-bound aircraft overseas, and they confirmed that green-card holders who left the U.S. have been unable to return.

Cairo airport officials say seven U.S.-bound migrants — six from Iraq and one from Yemen — were prevented Saturday from boarding an EgyptAir flight to JFK airport, according to the Associated Press.

As outrage mounted, other advocates promised further legal challenges. The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) denounced the order and said it would file a lawsuit next week challenging it as unconstitutional.

“There is no evidence that refugees — the most thoroughly vetted of all people entering our nation — are a threat to national security,” Lena F. Masri, CAIR’s national litigation director, said in a statement. “This is an order that is based on bigotry, not reality.”

Both Iraqi men detained at JFK airport held valid U.S. visas and had been receiving pro-bono legal assistance for several months from the New York-based International Refugee Assistance Project. Betsy Fisher, the organization’s policy director, said the men were in the air on separate flights when Trump signed the temporary refu-gee ban Friday. She called their detention “our worst-case scenario.”

“In the coming weeks we will be advocating to show why this policy is bad for U.S. national security, why it goes against our humanitarian responsibilities, and why it is fundamentally un-American,” Fisher said. “If there is one fundamentally American value, then it is welcoming those who are fleeing persecution. At our best, this is what we can do.”

The International Refugee Assistance Project was among several prominent immigration-rights organizations that filed the lawsuit in New York, including the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Immigration Law Center.

One of the Iraqi men detained at JFK is Sameer Abdulkhaleq Alshawi, 33, who holds a visa that allowed him

to join his wife and young child in Texas. His wife had worked for a U.S. government contractor and came to the United States as a refugee in 2014.

Darweesh, 53, had worked as a contractor for the U.S. government in Iraq for about a decade, including as an interpreter for the Army. He and his wife and three children had spent more than two years securing a special immigrant visa, granted to Iraqis who assisted U.S. military forces.

The Darweesh family landed in New York at approximately 6 p.m. Friday, and Hameed Darweesh was detained by U.S. Customs and Border Protection officials, according to the complaint filed in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. He is at risk of being returned to a country where he faces enormous personal danger due to his aid to the U.S. government, the complaint says.

Darweesh told reporters outside the airport on Saturday that he was thankful so many people came to his aid, leaving their families to help secure his release.

"This is the humanity, this is the soul of America. This is what pushed me to move, to leave my country and come here," Darweesh said. "America is the land of freedom, the land of freedom, the land of the right. ... America is the greatest nation, the greatest people in the world."

Brandon Friedman worked with Darweesh in 2003, when he was an infantry officer with the Army's 101st Airborne Division. He said Darweesh, who was among the first Iraqis to sign up to serve the U.S. military, was "fearless" and saved countless U.S. lives.

"This is a guy who has done a lot more for this country than most people who were born here," Friedman said. He said he hopes Trump's executive order is rescinded quickly: "This is putting U.S. troops in danger because it is withdrawing the incentive that folks like Hameed have to work with us. And we depend on them to a great extent."

The detention of a man who served the U.S. military was particularly objectionable to Matt Zeller, founder of No One Left Behind, which aims to help Iraqi and Afghan people who worked for the U.S. military secure special immigrant visas.

He said America is breaking its promise to men and women who served the U.S. military at great personal risk to themselves — which is not only wrong, he said, but also undermines trust in the United States and endangers the lives of any future service member sent overseas.

"This is going to get future Americans killed in future wars. It comes down to that," he said. "We're never going to live down this shame if we let this go on."

Marielena Hincapie, executive director for the National Immigration Law Center, said immigration advocates first learned of immigrants being detained Friday evening after a report from a family detained in San Francisco. The advocates attempted to reach U.S. Customs and Border Protection but were unsuccessful.

"We were trying to find out if it was lack of communication or what was the plan?" she said in an interview Saturday morning.

The lawyers for those detained at JFK said they were told officials at the airport couldn't help them when they began to seek their clients' release.

"Who is the person to talk to?" the attorneys asked, according to the court complaint. The CBP agents responded: "Mr. President. Call Mr. Trump."

White House Defends Executive Order Barring Travelers From Certain Muslim Countries

President Donald Trump says temporary ban is 'working out very nicely,' but 'it's not a Muslim ban'

By Peter Nicholas And Damian Paletta

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

White House Says U.S. Still Most Open Immigration System Even After Trump Orders

By Stephen Dinan

[Washington Times](#), January 28, 2017

The U.S. will still be the most open country in the world for foreign visitors even after President Trump's new executive order hitting pause on the refugee program and the Visa Waiver program and suspending visits from a half-dozen war-torn countries, administration officials insisted Saturday.

Mr. Trump's order has sparked confusion and fear and even invited an attempted class action lawsuit from civil liberties groups who are trying to force the administration to back down, citing two Iraqi men who were already denied entry despite having obtained visas earlier this month.

A senior administration official, briefing reporters as reports of chaos spread, said one of the two men has already been granted a waiver and the other would soon be approved under the exemptions Mr. Trump wrote into his executive order.

"The exemptions and waiver process that we've put in place are already working exactly as intended," the official said.

The official went on to say that even with the new restrictions and a halt to admissions from a number of countries, the U.S. will still be more open than any other country.

"We're still admitting and processing more people than any other country in the history of civilization. We're still letting in more people from more war-torn regions than any country in the history of civilization," the official said.

Critics have called the new policy a "Muslim ban," citing the majority religion in the countries now on the list of suspended travel.

“Make no mistake — this is a Muslim ban,” said Sen. Kamala Harris, a freshman Democrat from California. “Broad brush discrimination against refugees and immigrants from Muslim-majority countries, most of whom are women and children, runs counter to our national security interests, and will likely be used as a terrorist recruitment tool.”

The White House, though, has bristled at that characterization, pointing to a list of some 25 Muslim-majority countries that are not affected by the ban.

Airports across the globe have reported chaos, saying they were left in the dark and aren’t sure how to handle flights to the U.S. Even at home, officials seemed to struggle with it.

In the lawsuit filed early Saturday on behalf of two men from Iraq who were snared in the ban, one Customs and Border Protection official, after being challenged by lawyers who demanded to know why the men were being held, seemed to acknowledge the confusion.

“Call Mr. Trump,” the CBP official told the lawyers, according to the lawsuit.

The senior officials who briefed reporters Saturday afternoon, nearly 24 hours after the ban went into effect, said in order not to let would-be terrorists exploit the system, they couldn’t tell everyone what their plans were ahead of time.

“Everybody who needed to know was informed. The rest were being informed in an expeditious fashion,” the official said. “It went exactly as it should have gone.”

Copyright © 2017 The Washington Times, LLC. Click here for reprint permission.

Trump Visa Ban Also Applies To Citizens With Dual Nationality, State Department Says

By Tamer El-Ghobashy And Felicia Schwartz

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Green Card Holders Included In Trump Ban: Homeland Security

By Doina Chiacu

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

‘Case By Case’ Approach For U.S. Green Card Holders Under Trump’s New Order

By Jeff Mason And Roberta Rampton

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Trump Orders Publication Of Stats On Terror-linked Crime By Foreign Nationals

By Mark Hensch

[The Hill](#), January 27, 2017

President Trump in an executive order he signed Friday tasked top administration officials with providing recurring information about terrorism, gender-based violence and “honor killings.”

The order says “the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall, consistent with applicable law and national security” to make the first data available within 180 days.

The directive then states the two Cabinet officials should “every 180 days thereafter” issue new updates about foreign nationals engaged in terrorism and related extremism in the U.S.

Trump’s order first seeks “information regarding the number of foreign nationals who have been charged with terrorism-related offenses in the United States.”

The measure also applies to those “convicted of terrorism-related offenses,” “removed from the United States based on terrorism-related activity,” or “material support to a terrorism-related organization.”

The order also applies the same criteria to the “number of foreign nationals who have been radicalized after entry into the United States.”

The missive’s next section, meanwhile, calls for “information regarding the number and types of acts of gender-based violence against women, including ‘honor killings,’ in the United States by foreign nationals.”

Trump’s Homeland Security secretary and Attorney General, the order added, can additionally provide “any information relevant to public safety and security” at their own discretion.

Trump vowed while signing Friday’s new order it would thoroughly vet refugees to ensure terrorists do not enter the U.S.

“I’m establishing new vetting measures to keep radical Islamic terrorists out of the United States,” he said during a ceremony at the Pentagon. “We don’t want them here.”

“We want to ensure that we are not admitting into our country the very threats our soldiers are fighting overseas. We only want to admit those into our country who support our country and love deeply our people.”

The order indicates Trump’s administration will indefinitely block refugees from war-torn Syria from entering America.

The directive also suspends all refugee admissions for 120 days while the Trump administration determines which countries pose the least risk.

Democrats have already pounced on the details of Trump's order, arguing it will prolong the suffering of refugees and unfairly target Muslims.

Officials Say Visas Were Being Revoked Prior To Trump's Executive Order

By Safia Samee Ali

[NBC News](#), January 28, 2017

President Donald Trump signed an executive order halting refugee admissions and immigration from certain Arab countries on Friday, but federal officials told NBC News that immigration officers may have been stopping and even banning valid visa holders from returning to the country weeks before the official directive.

Two federal officials familiar with the situation confirmed to NBC News that as many as 40 individuals with F1 student visas, many who left the country for winter break, were told their visas were revoked when they returned stateside to resume classes.

One of the individuals left the country on Jan. 3 and his visa was revoked on Jan. 4, one immigration official confirmed. An official stated that this is highly unusual since the individual had already been put through extensive security vetting prior to his departure.

Related: [Trump Travel Restrictions Leave Refugees Stranded: Reports](#)

It's unclear whether the visa issues were directly related to the president's recent executive order, and the circumstances around each case are different. Nonetheless, some are advising caution to international students — particularly those from Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Sudan, and Somalia, the seven countries enumerated by Trump as needing "extreme vetting."

"My advice to anyone holding a visa from any of these countries is do not go home because you will not get back in," the official said.

However, the students who ran into visa problems are not from the countries listed in Trump's executive order. Instead, they hold passports from places like Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Turkey, the official added.

Hazami Barmada, a social justice activist and Harvard graduate student who is currently working with four individuals whose F1 student visas were rejected after they returned to American soil, said the students are terrified and scared of coming forward.

"There is definitely a pattern," she said. "Totally unrelated people are saying the same thing happened to them, even down to what they were told by immigration officers."

They are graduate students, some of whom attend Ivy League universities and are well-credentialed, she added. An immigration official confirmed to NBC that at least two

students attended Ivy League universities, one on a full scholarship.

Related: [Trump Signs Order Suspending Admission of Syrian Refugees](#)

Princeton University preemptively issued a notice cautioning its faculty and student body on Friday. "We have strongly advised students and scholars who might be affected and who have travel plans in the coming days to defer travel outside of the United States until there is some clarity and legal analysis of the situation or, if they must travel, to seek legal counsel before they do."

Those with student visas who are in the country are now facing two very difficult scenarios: One where they cannot leave to go home to see loved ones and the other losing their education if they do.

M. A. Majid, an international college student on an F1 visa at the University of Illinois, said he was planning on going back to Jordan to attend his brother's wedding in the summer. His plans have now changed.

"If I want to complete my education, what I spent so much time and money on achieving, I may have to do it at the cost of not seeing my family now," he said. "I don't have a choice anymore."

Another high-ranking federal official verified to NBC News that there was an abnormal increase in complaints by Middle Eastern students who said they were blindsided with visa revocations after arriving in the United States in the week before Trump order.

It's possible that immigration officials saw the tide turning and preemptively applied policies they were anticipating, the official said.

Individuals stopped at immigration were told they have the option of returning to their country voluntarily or face criminal penalties for violating U.S. law, said another federal official. No other explanation was given as it is not legally required, the official said.

"To slap an expedited removal without any question and answer is odd," said Leslie Holman, an immigration attorney and former president of the American Immigration Lawyers Association. "It seems improper."

In addition to the visa revocation and expedited removal, several individuals were hit with a five-year ban, barring them from re-entering the country, including those who left voluntarily, the official confirmed. People leave voluntarily in order to avoid a ban, but it was put on them anyway, the official said.

"Essentially all valid visas are irrelevant now," the official said. "And they have been before the order."

The Department of Homeland Security did not immediately return a request for comment. A State Department spokesperson said the department was prohibited from commenting on individual visa cases.

The American Association of Immigration Lawyers also advised caution. In a statement released one day before Trump's executive order, the group said to "consider advising clients who might be affected by the Executive Order to refrain from traveling outside of the United States if they are already here, or try to return to the United States as soon as possible if they are outside of the country."

Since Trump's order does not define what it means to be "from a country," the order should be read to include "passport holders, citizens, nationals, dual nationals, etc." "in an abundance of caution," the statement added.

Trump's Order Blocks Immigrants At Airports, Stoking Fear Around Globe

By Michael D. Shear And Nicholas Kulish
[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

President Trump's executive order on immigration quickly reverberated through the United States and across the globe on Saturday, slamming the border shut for an Iranian scientist headed to a lab in Boston, an Iraqi who had worked for a decade as an interpreter for the United States Army, and a Syrian refugee family headed to a new life in Ohio, among countless others.

Around the nation, security officers at major international gateways had new rules to follow, though the application of the order appeared uneven. Humanitarian organizations scrambled to cancel long-planned programs, delivering the bad news to families who were about to travel. Refugees who were on flights when the order was signed were detained at airports.

"We've gotten reports of people being detained all over the country," said Becca Heller, the director of the International Refugee Assistance Project. "They're literally pouring in by the minute."

There were numerous reports of students attending American universities who were blocked from returning to the United States from visits abroad. One student said in a Twitter post that he would be unable to study at Yale. Another who attends the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was refused permission to board a plane. A Sudanese student at Stanford University was blocked for hours from returning to California.

Human rights groups reported that legal permanent residents of the United States who hold green cards were being stopped in foreign airports as they sought to return from funerals, vacations or study abroad.

The president's order, enacted with the stroke of a pen at 4:42 on Friday afternoon, suspended entry of all refugees to the United States for 120 days, barred Syrian refugees indefinitely, and blocked entry into the United States for 90 days for citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen.

The Department of Homeland Security said that the executive order also barred green card holders from those countries from re-entering the United States. In a briefing for reporters on Saturday, White House officials said that green card holders from the seven affected countries who are outside the United States would need a case-by-case waiver to return to the United States.

Legal residents who have a green card and are currently in the United States should meet with a consular officer before leaving the country, a White House official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, told reporters. Officials did not clarify the criteria that would qualify someone for a waiver from the president's executive order, which says only that one can be granted when it is "in the national interest."

But the week-old administration appeared to be implementing the order chaotically, with agencies and officials around the globe interpreting it in different ways.

The Stanford student, a legal permanent resident of the United States with a green card, was held at Kennedy International Airport in New York for about eight hours but was eventually allowed to fly to California, said Lisa Lapin, a Stanford spokeswoman. Others who were detained appeared to be still in custody or sent back to their home countries.

White House aides claimed on Saturday that there had been talks with officials at the State Department and the Department of Homeland Security over the past several weeks about carrying out the order. "Everyone who needed to know was informed," one aide said.

But that assertion was denied by multiple officials with knowledge of the interactions, including two officials at the State Department. Two of the officials said leaders of Customs and Border Protection and Citizenship and Immigration Services — the two agencies most directly affected by the order — and other agencies were on a telephone briefing on the new policy even as Mr. Trump signed it on Friday.

At least one case prompted a legal challenge as lawyers representing two Iraqi refugees held at Kennedy Airport filed a motion early Saturday seeking to have their clients released. They also filed a motion for class certification, in an effort to represent all refugees and other immigrants who they said were being unlawfully detained at ports of entry.

Shortly after noon on Saturday, Hameed Khalid Darweesh, the interpreter who worked on behalf of the United States government in Iraq, was released. After nearly 19 hours of detention, Mr. Darweesh began to cry as he spoke to reporters, putting his hands behind his back and miming handcuffs.

"What I do for this country? They put the cuffs on," Mr. Darweesh said. "You know how many soldiers I touch by this hand?"

The other man the lawyers are representing, Haider Sameer Abdulkhaleq Alshawi, remained in custody as his legal advocates sought his release.

Inside the airport, one of the lawyers, Mark Doss, a supervising attorney at the International Refugee Assistance Project, asked a border agent, "Who is the person we need to talk to?"

"Call Mr. Trump," said the agent, who declined to identify himself.

The White House said the restrictions would protect "the United States from foreign nationals entering from countries compromised by terrorism" and ensure "a more rigorous vetting process." But critics condemned Mr. Trump over the immediate collateral damage imposed on people who, by all accounts, had no sinister intentions in trying to come to the United States.

Peaceful protests began forming Saturday afternoon at Kennedy Airport, where nine travelers had been detained upon arrival at Terminal 7 and two others at Terminal 4, an airport official said.

The official said they were being held in a federal area of the airport, adding that such situations were playing out around the nation.

An official message to all American diplomatic posts around the world provided instructions about how to treat people from the countries affected: "Effective immediately, halt interviewing and cease issuance and printing" of visas to the United States.

Internationally, confusion turned to panic as travelers found themselves unable to board flights bound for the United States. In Dubai and Istanbul, airport and immigration officials turned passengers away at boarding gates and, in at least one case, ejected a family from a flight they had boarded.

Seyed Soheil Saeedi Saravi, a promising young Iranian scientist, had been scheduled to travel in the coming days to Boston, where he had been awarded a fellowship to study cardiovascular medicine at Harvard, according to Thomas Michel, the professor who was to supervise the research fellowship.

But Professor Michel said the visas for the student and his wife had been indefinitely suspended.

"This outstanding young scientist has enormous potential to make contributions that will improve our understanding of heart disease, and he has already been thoroughly vetted," Professor Michel wrote to The New York Times.

Peter McPherson, the president of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, which represents many of the biggest public colleges in the country, said he was "deeply concerned" about the new policy. He said it was "causing significant disruption and hardship" for students, researchers, faculty and staff members.

A Syrian family of six who have been living in a Turkish refugee camp since fleeing their home in 2014 had been scheduled to arrive in Cleveland on Tuesday, according to a report in The Cleveland Plain Dealer. Instead, the family's trip has been called off.

Danielle Drake, a community relations manager at US Together, a refugee resettlement agency, told the newspaper that Mr. Trump's ban reminded her of when the United States turned away Jewish refugees during World War II. "All those times that people said, 'Never again,' well, we're doing it again," she said.

On Twitter, Daniel W. Drezner, a professor at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University in Medford, Mass., posted an angry message for Mr. Trump after the executive order stopped the arrival of a Syrian family his synagogue had sponsored.

In an interview on Friday night on "The Rachel Maddow Show" on MSNBC, he expressed sorrow for the fate of the family and apologized for cursing in his Twitter message.

"I can't quite describe the degree of anger that I felt as a reaction to this, which then caused me to curse at the president on social media," he said, adding, "which is probably something I should not do as a general rule."

It was unclear how many refugees and other immigrants were being held nationwide in relation to the executive order.

A Christian family of six from Syria said in an email to Representative Charlie Dent, Republican of Pennsylvania, that they were being detained at Philadelphia International Airport on Saturday morning despite having legal paperwork, green cards and visas that had been approved.

In the case of the two Iraqis held at Kennedy Airport, the legal filings by his lawyers say that Mr. Darweesh was granted a special immigrant visa on Jan. 20, the same day Mr. Trump was sworn in as president. Mr. Darweesh worked with the Americans in Iraq in a variety of jobs — as an engineer, a contractor and an interpreter for the Army's 101st Airborne Division in Baghdad and Mosul starting shortly after the invasion of Iraq on April 1, 2003.

A husband and father of three, he arrived at Kennedy Airport with his family. Mr. Darweesh's wife and children made it through passport control and customs, but agents of Customs and Border Protection detained him.

In Istanbul, during a stopover on Saturday, passengers reported that security officers had entered a plane after everyone had boarded and ordered a young Iranian woman and her family to leave the aircraft.

Iranian green card holders who live in the United States were blindsided by the decree while on vacation in Iran, finding themselves in a legal limbo and unsure whether they would be able to return to America.

"How do I get back home now?" said Daria Zeynalia, a green card holder who was visiting family in Iran. He had

rented a house and leased a car, and would be eligible for citizenship in November. "What about my job? If I can't go back soon, I'll lose everything."

Trump Order On Refugees, Muslims Sparks Confusion, Worry

By Alicia A. Caldwell

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON (AP) – Confusion, worry and outrage grew Saturday as President Donald Trump's crackdown on refugees and citizens from seven majority-Muslim countries took effect. Airlines blocked people traveling to the United States, legal challenges were underway and doubts abounded about whether the order would make America safer.

The immediate fallout from Trump's order meant that an untold number of foreign-born U.S. residents now traveling outside the U.S. could be stuck overseas for at least 90 days – despite holding permanent residency "green cards" or other visas. And some foreign nationals who were allowed to board flights before the order was signed Friday were being detained at U.S. airports, told they were no longer welcome.

Trump billed his sweeping executive order as a necessary step to stop "radical Islamic terrorists" from coming to the U.S. Included is a 90-day ban on travel to the U.S. by citizens of Iraq, Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia or Yemen and a 120-day suspension of the U.S. refugee program.

Trump's order singled out Syrians for the most aggressive ban, indefinitely blocking entry for anyone from that country, including those fleeing civil war.

The directive did not do anything to prevent attacks from homegrown extremists who were already in America, a primary concern of federal law enforcement officials. It also omitted Saudi Arabia, home to most of the Sept. 11 hijackers.

As a candidate Trump pledged to temporarily ban Muslims from coming to the U.S., then said he would implement "extreme vetting" for people from countries with significant terror concerns.

Trump told reporters Saturday the order is "not a Muslim ban."

"It's working out very nicely," Trump said of the implementation of his order. "We're going to have a very, very strict ban and we're going to have extreme vetting, which we should have had in this country for many years."

The order drew criticism from U.S. lawmakers and officials around the globe.

Sen. Ben Sasse, a Nebraska Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said while Trump is right to focus on border security, the order is "too broad."

"If we send a signal to the Middle East that the U.S. sees all Muslims as jihadis, the terrorist recruiters win by telling kids that America is banning Muslims and that this is

America versus one religion," Sasse said. "Our generational fight against jihadism requires wisdom."

In Tehran, Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif said Iran would stop issuing new visas to U.S. citizens in response to Trump's ban, but that anyone already with a visa to Iran wouldn't be turned away.

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau took to Twitter Saturday afternoon to say that refugees were welcome in Canada, "regardless of your faith."

Two of the first people blocked from entering the United States were Iraqis with links to the U.S. military.

Hameed Khalid Darweesh and Haider Sameer Abdulkhaleq Alshawi were detained by immigration officials after landing at New York's Kennedy airport Friday night. Darweesh had worked as an interpreter for the U.S. Army when it invaded Iraq in 2003. Later he worked as a contract engineer. He was allowed into the U.S. Saturday afternoon, hours after his attorney petitioned a federal court to let the two men go.

In their court filing, his lawyers said Alshawai's wife had worked for a U.S. security contractor in Iraq. Members of her family had been killed by insurgents because of their association with the U.S. military.

The government can exempt foreign nationals from the ban if their entry is deemed in the national interest. But it was not immediately clear how that exemption might be applied.

Diplomats from the seven countries singled out by Trump's order would still be allowed into the U.S.

Those already in the U.S. with a visa or green card would be allowed to stay, according to the official, who wasn't authorized to publicly discuss the details of how Trump's order was being put in place and spoke only on condition of anonymity.

Trump's order also directed U.S. officials to review information as needed to fully vet foreigners asking to come to the U.S. and draft a list of countries that don't provide that information. That left open the possibility that citizens of other countries could also face a travel ban.

The U.S. may still admit refugees on a case-by-case basis during the freeze, and the government would continue to process requests from people claiming religious persecution, "provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual's country."

The Council on American-Islamic Relations said it would challenge the constitutionality of Trump's order.

"There is no evidence that refugees – the most thoroughly vetted of all people entering our nation – are a threat to national security," said Lena F. Masri, the group's national litigation director. "This is an order that is based on bigotry, not reality."

John Cohen, a former Department of Homeland Security counterterrorism official who worked under Democratic and Republican administrations, said the order

didn't address America's "primary terrorism-related threat" – people already in the U.S. who become inspired by what they see on the internet.

Trump's order drew support from some Republican lawmakers who have urged more security measures for the refugee vetting program, particularly for those from Syria.

"We are a compassionate nation and a country of immigrants. But as we know, terrorists are dead set on using our immigration and refugee programs as a Trojan Horse to attack us," House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Michael McCaul said in a statement Friday. "With the stroke of a pen, he is doing more to shut down terrorist pathways into this country than the last administration did in eight years."

It is unclear how many people would be immediately impacted by the non-refugee travel ban. According to the statistics maintained by the Homeland Security Department, about 17,000 students from the seven designated countries were allowed into the U.S. for the 2015-2016 school year. In 2015 more than 86,000 people from those countries arrived in the U.S. on other, non-immigrant visas and more than 52,000 others became legal permanent residents.

Last year the U.S. resettled 85,000 people displaced by war, political oppression, hunger and religious prejudice, including more than 12,000 Syrians. Before leaving office President Barack Obama announced that the U.S. would accept 110,000 refugees in the coming year, but Trump's order cut that by more than half to 50,000.

No refugees were in the air when the travel ban was signed Friday, but about 350 people were in transit in Nairobi, Kenya, and were now stuck there, said Melanie Nezer, vice president of policy and advocacy for HIAS, a refugee resettlement aid agency. She said several hundred more people who were booked on U.S.-bound flights in the next week were now stranded around the globe.

"This in effect could be a permanent ban," she said. "Many of these people may never be able to come."

Associated Press writers Darlene Superville and Eric Tucker in Washington, Ellen Knickmeyer in San Francisco, Jeff Karoub in Detroit, and Rachel Zoll, Verena Dobnik and William Mathis in New York contributed to this report.

Follow Alicia A. Caldwell on Twitter at www.twitter.com/acaldwellap

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

'How Do I Get Back Home?' Iranians Turned Away From Flights To U.S.

By Thomas Erdbrink

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

As Iranians woke on Saturday to the news that none of them would be able to enter the United States for at least 90 days, on the orders of President Trump, panic reigned.

They were turned back from flights to the United States in Tehran and in the major transfer hubs of Istanbul and Dubai. Some of those who arrived in the United States after midnight, when the decree went into effect, were held or deported, rights groups and airline representatives said.

No one, not passengers, airline representatives or even United States border control officials, seemed to know how to interpret the executive order that went into effect at midnight on Friday. Under the new policy, refugees, immigrants and almost anyone from seven countries deemed to be hotbeds of terrorism are banned from the United States for 90 days, pending a review of policies.

Officials are just interpreting the directive by themselves, said one representative for an international airline who was based in Tehran. He said the airline did not know if Iranians could fly to the United States or not.

On Saturday, three international airlines shuttling passengers between Iran and the United States — Emirates, Lufthansa and Qatar Airways — had stopped allowing Iranians with visas or even permanent residence cards to board their planes. The Qatar Airways office in Tehran confirmed that all Iranian passengers without United States passports were stopped from flying to the United States on Friday evening and sent back to Iran.

In Istanbul, during a stopover on Saturday, passengers reported that security officers had entered a plane after everybody boarded and ordered a young Iranian woman and her family to leave the aircraft.

Holders of green cards, which confer the right to live and work indefinitely in the United States, received conflicting information about whether or not they would be permitted to return to the United States. But on Saturday, the Department of Homeland Security clarified the executive order, saying it applied even to permanent residents from the seven Muslim-majority countries named in the ban: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen.

"It will bar green card holders," Gillian Christensen, the Department of Homeland Security's acting spokeswoman, told Reuters.

Many were blindsided by the decree while on vacation in Iran. "How do I get back home now?" said Daria Zeynalia, a green card holder who was visiting family in Iran. He had rented a house and leased a car and would be eligible for citizenship in November. "What about my job? If I can't go back soon, I'll lose everything," he said.

It is unclear how many Iranians have green cards, but experts say the number runs into the hundreds of thousands.

In an online survey tracking entry challenges, two out of 112 passengers holding green cards said they were not allowed into the United States, but the reasons were unclear. Card holders can be barred, for instance, if they owe back taxes.

Others spent years preparing to study in the United States only to see their plans abruptly thwarted on Friday. About 4,000 Iranians are granted study visas to attend American universities each year, often after a long and complicated process that can take years.

Shadi Heidarifar, a philosophy student just admitted to New York University, said in a message on Twitter that she had spent three years trying to apply to universities in the United States.

"I had to work to save money, gather documents. The application fees were so expensive that a whole family could live for a month" on them, Ms. Heidarifar wrote. When she was accepted recently, she was over the moon. "But now my entire future is destroyed in one second."

Migrants Prevented From Boarding Flights To The U.S. In Wake Of Trump Order

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

'These Are People's Lives They Are Playing With': World's Airports Turn Into Limbo For Many Under Trump Order

By Kareem Fahim, Mustafa Salim

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

After working as an interpreter for an American security company in Iraq and enduring years of background checks after applying for a U.S. visa, Labeeb Ali's hopes of moving to the United States ended abruptly in Qatar's international airport on Saturday, when officials prevented him from boarding a flight to Texas.

"I have the visa in my passport," he said hours later, after he had stopped yelling at the airport staff and his rage had given way to despair and regret at having already sold his business and belongings in Iraq.

"They have killed my dream," he said. "They took it all away from me, in the last minutes."

President Trump's order on Friday to temporarily ban citizens of several Muslim countries from entering the United States sowed panic, confusion and anguish in airports across the globe Saturday, as nationals of the affected countries were either barred by airlines from traveling or detained upon arrival in the United States.

Those prevented from boarding U.S.-bound planes included Iraqis like Ali, who said he had been granted a special immigration visa on Jan. 24 reserved for interpreters and translators who had worked for American forces in Iraq or Afghanistan. Others had fled war in Yemen or Syria or repression in Sudan or Iran. Taken together, Saturday's restrictions amounted to another cruel trial for people who had escaped conflict and overcame the hurdles to win coveted American visas, only to be turned back on what should have been the final leg of their journeys.

Countless others were left in a paralyzing limbo as they struggled to understand the president's edict. They included Syrian students granted admission in American universities and facing the certainty that they would not be able to attend, and Iraqi or Iranian green-card holders traveling abroad and terrified at the possibility that they would not be able to return home.

Sarah Amer, an Iraqi who lives in New York, had left her daughter at home and was visiting friends in Iraq when Trump signed the executive order. "They can't just change the rules in one night," she said Saturday, amid confusion about whether green-card holders from Iraq could return to the United States.

"These are people's lives they are playing with," she said.

The executive order, titled "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States," bars citizens from Syria, Iran, Iraq, Yemen, Sudan, Somalia and Libya, all predominantly Muslim nations, from entering the United States for the next 90 days. The order also indefinitely bars Syrian refugees from resettling in the United States and suspends the entry of all refugees from any country for 120 days.

The order followed Trump's repeated campaign pledges to restrict Muslim immigration to the United States. But the speed with which it was promulgated — a week after the president took office — still caught those most affected by surprise.

The confusion extended to airlines, which issued contradictory or vague rules about who would be allowed to fly. Lufthansa, the German carrier, released a statement saying it was "obliged by law to strictly adhere to U.S. immigration requirements." But, reflecting the uncertainty over the American directive, the airline said only that citizens of the affected countries "might not be accepted onboard U.S. flights."

Qatar Airways said that passengers would be allowed to travel only if they were permanent green-card holders or had visas that were exempt from the order.

Manel Vrijenhoek, a spokeswoman for KLM, the Dutch carrier, said "It's not 100 percent clear who is allowed in and who is not." The airline had barred seven passengers from traveling to the United States on Saturday, she said, after

informing them “that there is no use in flying to the U.S. because you will be rejected. You won’t even be able to leave the plane.”

She would not say which country the passengers had come from, only that they were from one of the seven countries named in the presidential order.

Ali, the Iraqi citizen, said that two Syrians were also prevented from traveling on his flight to Texas. In Egypt, security officials stopped five Iraqis and a Yemeni national from boarding a flight to New York. There were unconfirmed reports that Iranian visitors as well as permanent green-card holders were restricted from traveling to the United States by officials at airports in Amsterdam, Abu Dhabi as well as Qatar, according to Hazhir Rahmandad, an Iranian American professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who created a crowdsourced database to track Iranian travelers affected by the ban.

Although the details in the database could not be independently verified, the reports also suggested scores of Iranian visitors and green-card holders were also being turned away at several U.S. airports upon arrival.

The data and reports so far “suggest there is confusion among border agents about how to treat” the various categories of visa holders, Rahmandad said.

And there was consternation for Iranians who received the news while on the road. On Saturday, Ali Abdi, a 30-year-old Iranian green-card holder who studies at Yale University, was in transit in Dubai, on his way to Afghanistan to do research for his doctoral thesis, but he was suddenly worried that Trump’s directive had left him stranded.

He had received reports from friends and acquaintances that green-card holders were subject to the ban. Abdi, a human rights activist who claimed asylum in the United States in 2011, said he would not be able to return to Iran if he was denied reentry to the U.S.

“I’ll be stateless,” he said. “I left Iran eight years ago, and I have been looking for a home. I don’t think of the U.S. as that kind of place anymore,” he said.

Abed Ayoub, the legal director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, an advocacy group that was counseling citizens from the affected countries, said the majority of the calls the group had received were from people overseas wondering whether they should even bother boarding a plane. They included an Iraqi woman who was flying to visit her family in the United States but at the last minute decided to go to Canada instead.

Calls had also come from citizens of countries that were not affected by the ban, including Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Morocco — part of what Ayoub called a broader “chilling effect” the presidential order had imposed across the Muslim world.

The group had advised the callers to double-check the latest rules before they begin their travels. “That list can be

expanded at any point,” Ayoub said. “You want to be aware before you board the plane.”

When Fuad Sharef and his family landed at Cairo airport Saturday morning, they were clutching boarding passes for their connecting flight to New York and valid one-year visas to the United States. They were headed, eventually, to Nashville, to start a new life.

But soon after they entered the terminal, Egyptian airport authorities stopped them and ordered them to hand over their passports. They informed him that the American Embassy in Baghdad had sent a communique saying the family could no longer travel on to the United States.

“They didn’t explain why,” said Sharef, 51, who spoke by phone because he and his family were inside the transit section of the terminal and were not allowed to leave. “But I knew this was because of the executive order signed by Donald Trump.”

He was traveling with his wife, Arazoo, 41; his son Bnyad, 19; his daughter Yad, 17; and another daughter, Shad, 10.

Like many Iraqis wanting to resettle in the United States, Sharef took advantage of a program to assist Iraqis who worked for the U.S. government and American media in Iraq. Sharef had worked for Research Triangle Institute (RTI), a USAID subcontractor, for several years after the 2003 U.S.-led invasion, first as translator and later running a program that gave out microbusiness loans to Iraqis.

Working for the Americans was filled with perils, he said. He and other colleagues faced death threats — he knew co-workers who were kidnapped or killed. His work and background swayed the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, and after two years of vetting, they deemed him safe enough to be resettled in the United States.

Sharef sold his house, his car and all his remaining possessions. He pulled his three children out of their schools. He spent \$5,000 for air tickets and quit his job as a supply-chain manager for a large pharmaceutical firm. He was confident he would find an opportunity in Nashville, with his three degrees, including an MBA.

Sharef admits that he took a gamble. When he heard of Trump’s impending visa ban, he pushed their trip to the United States forward by a few days. The family is now scheduled to be placed on a flight back to Irbil on Sunday morning — after spending the night inside the airport terminal.

“Donald Trump destroyed my life,” said Sharef. “How can he do this to people who risked their lives to help America?”

Despair, Confusion Reign As Trump’s Travel Ban Hits

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

An Iraqi pleaded for his life to President Donald Trump. A longtime New Yorker, born in Syria, wondered how he would get home from a trip abroad. Church groups, geared up to welcome refugee families, looked in dismay at homes prepared for families that may never arrive.

Despair and confusion set in Saturday among citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries who found themselves abruptly unable to enter the United States a day after Trump signed an order he billed as a necessary step to stop "radical Islamic terrorists" from coming to the U.S.

Included is a 90-day ban on travel to the U.S. by citizens of Iraq, Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia or Yemen and a 120-day suspension of the U.S. refugee program.

Travelers from those nations were either barred from getting on their flights or detained at U.S. airports after they landed, including tourists, foreign students and people trying to visit friends and family.

"What's next? What's going to happen next?" asked Mohammed al Rawi, an Iraqi-born American citizen in the Los Angeles area, after his 69-year-old father, coming to visit his grandchildren in California, was abruptly detained and sent back to Iraq after 12 hours in custody. "Are they going to create camps for Muslims and put us in it?"

After an appeal from civil liberties lawyers, a federal judge in New York issued an emergency order Saturday night barring the U.S. from summarily deporting people who had arrived with valid visas or an approved refugee application.

U.S. District Judge Ann Donnelly said travelers had a strong argument that their legal rights had been violated. Her order, though, only affected a portion of Trump's order.

That ruling came as protests broke out at several U.S. airports where travelers were being held, including a gathering of several hundred people outside San Francisco's main airport and a raucous demonstration of at least 2,000 people at New York's Kennedy International Airport.

Hameed Khalid Darweesh, a translator and assistant for the U.S. military in Iraq for 10 years now fleeing death threats, was among at least a dozen people detained at New York's Kennedy airport their arrivals Friday and Saturday.

He walked free midday Friday after his lawyers and two members of congress went to the airport to try and gain his release.

"This is the soul of America," Darweesh told a crowd of demonstrators and reporters, adding that the U.S. was home to "the greatest people in the world."

Others were less lucky. Parisa Fasihianifard, 24, arrived after a long trip from Tehran, Iran, only to be detained and told she had to go home.

"She was crying and she told me she was banned to come inside and go through the gates," said her husband Mohamad Zandian, 26, an Iranian doctoral student at Ohio State University. He was hoping to get her out of the country on a late night flight to avoid her being jailed until Monday.

Staff at U.S. agencies that resettle refugees were scrambling to analyze the order and girded for the wrenching phone calls that would have to be made to the thousands of refugees just days away from traveling to the U.S. Several staff who spoke to the AP burst into tears as they contemplated the future for people who had waited years to come into the country.

"It's complete chaos," said Melanie Nezer, policy director for HIAS, one of nine refugee resettlement agencies that work with the U.S. State Department.

The International Refugee Assistance Project, which aids foreign nationals targeted for their work for the U.S. government as well as other refugees, was sending the same message to asylum-seekers, most of them who had been waiting for years.

Meathaq Alaunaibi, also a refugee from Iraq, was hoping to soon be reunited with her twin 18-year-old daughters who are in Baghdad. Alaunaibi, her husband, a son and another daughter were settled last August in Tennessee, as the twins completed their government review to enter the U.S. After Trump signed the order, she spoke by phone with her daughters.

"They are so worried and afraid because they're stuck there in Baghdad," Alaunaibi said Saturday. "They are young and they are strong, but I am crying all the time. I miss them."

An Iraqi in Mosul, an Iraqi city where the Islamic State group had seized control, despaired at word that what he had thought was an imminent flight to safety in America was now canceled, indefinitely.

"If you can write to Mr. Trump or find any other way to help me reunite with my family, please, I am dying in Iraq, please," the man, whose identity was withheld because he is still in danger in Iraq, wrote back to his U.S. lawyer by email.

The order also caused confusion for longtime, legal U.S. residents traveling abroad.

Kinan Azmeh, a clarinetist born in Syria who has lived in the U.S. for 16 years, left his home in New York City three weeks ago for a series of concerts that included a date with cellist Yo-Yo Ma. Now, he doesn't know if he will be able to return home.

"I don't know what's going on," Azmeh told The Associated Press by phone Saturday from Lebanon. "It is home as much as Damascus," he said of New York City. "I really don't know how to react."

Before Trump signed the order, more than 67,000 refugees had been approved by the federal government to enter the U.S., said Jen Smyers, refugee policy director for Church World Service. More than 6,400 had already been booked on flights, including 15 families that had been expected over the next few weeks in the Chicago area from Ethiopia, Eritrea, Iran, Syria and Uganda.

The bulk of refugees entering the U.S. are settled by religious groups, who organize churches, synagogues and

mosques to collect furniture, clothes and toys for the refugees and set up volunteer schedules for hosting duties. All that work ground to a halt after Trump signed the order.

In Massachusetts, Jewish Family Service of MetroWest had been coordinating a group of doctors, community leaders, a local mosque and other volunteers to resettle 15 Syrian families, including a 1-year-old and 5-year-old who arrived Tuesday.

Now, two fully outfitted apartments remain empty and it's unclear when, if ever, the other refugees will be allowed to enter, said Marc Jacobs, chief executive of the Jewish service group.

Nour Ulayyet of Valparaiso, Indiana said her sister, a Syrian living in Saudi Arabia, was sent back after arriving from Riyadh at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport on Saturday and told she couldn't enter the U.S. to help care for their sick mother. Ulayyet said some officials at the airport were apologizing to her sister, who had a valid visa.

"My mom was already having pain enough to go through this on top of the pain that she's having," Ulayyet said.

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

An Iraqi Family Split By The Vicissitudes Of Asylum

By John Otis And Rana F. Sweis
[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

Maha al-Obaidi's family is divided.

She immigrated to New York City in 2014, reuniting with her three sons who had arrived earlier. She expected that her husband, Husham al-Qadhi, and her two other sons would soon join her from Amman, Jordan, finally bringing the family together after a tumultuous decade of surviving the Iraq war, fleeing to Jordan and then searching for a permanent home.

But on Friday, the family was dealt another blow, after President Trump approved a sweeping executive order on immigration that, among other things, blocked entry into the United States for 90 days for citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries including Iraq, where members of the family are citizens. Her husband and two sons in Jordan are for now locked out of the United States, and Ms. Obaidi cannot travel away, or risk being denied re-entry.

"Now our family in the U.S. can't even come to visit us, nor can we visit them," Mr. Qadhi said on Saturday in Amman. "We just sit and watch like the rest of the world what is happening, and our fate is being decided for us, in front of our eyes."

The family lived in Baghdad as American tanks, troops and missiles tore into the Iraqi capital in 2003. It stayed for several years, despite gunfire and bomb blasts outside its

house and the kidnapping of several family members. The family helped American soldiers even though other Iraqis targeted it for doing so.

One of the sons in Amman, Thabit al-Qadhi, said he and his father had run a snack bar on an American base in Baghdad, serving candy and soft drinks to troops, and operated a 24-hour internet cafe, which required them to be vetted and approved to begin work.

After Thabit al-Qadhi was kidnapped in 2006 by Qaeda terrorists and eventually released, he said, he reported details about the episode to American officials in the hope that they would be caught. And on his way home from the Baghdad base one day, he came upon four American troops injured along the road, and he said he had loaded them into his car and driven them to the Green Zone.

"America has abandoned its responsibility to protect those who protected and cooperated with the Americans," he said. "It's a decision solely based on my religious faith. It's discrimination solely on religious grounds."

He added: "This is the wrong decision. Is it even constitutional?"

The family's home was along one of Baghdad's major highways, an entry point for American troops during the invasion. The family huddled in a windowless section of the home for 10 days, as bullets shattered windows and rockets blazed through the sky, until the United States took control of Baghdad.

In the years after the invasion, the family remained in Iraq, even as unrest spread, militants took up arms and centuries-old tensions between Sunnis and Shiites flared up.

In addition to Thabit al-Qadhi, Ms. Obaidi's husband was also kidnapped, on two separate occasions. The family members recalled the lengths to which they went to get them freed, how they stuffed \$60,000 in Iraqi dinars into garbage bags and were instructed by cellphone to travel to a series of locations before dropping off the ransom.

"It was like in the movies," Ms. Obaidi said in an interview this month.

Fearing more attacks, the family left Iraq for Jordan. It joined many other Iraqi refugees, including extended family members. Ms. Obaidi and her husband used their savings to buy a home in Amman. Employment opportunities were scarce for Iraqis, leading three of her sons, starting in 2010, to venture to the United States to find work.

When Ms. Obaidi later followed them, she hoped that her entire family could apply for asylum and unite in America. She made the trip despite a number of concerns.

"At first, I felt afraid," she said. "How can I live in this country? It is a foreign country. It is very far from my culture. How will I be compatible with the community?"

To her surprise, Ms. Obaidi found New York to be unlike its gruff stereotypes. People smiled as she walked

down the street. Men helped her haul heavy bags up stairs. Others offered her seats on the subway.

"Everybody in America is very nice," she said. "They are very polite, helpful people, nice people, always with a smile on their face. That is my experience."

She has found additional support from the International Rescue Committee, a global humanitarian aid, relief and development nongovernmental organization based in New York. Founded in 1933, the organization is the newest organization supported by The New York Times Neediest Cases Fund, and the only one of the eight groups whose work extends beyond the New York area. It operates in 29 cities in the United States and in more than 40 countries.

The organization was instrumental in helping Ms. Obaidi adjust to her new life and connecting her with a number of social services, including health insurance and food stamps. It helped her obtain a Social Security card, navigate New York's streets and understand its transportation system. The group also helped her study for her driver's license permit exam, among other services.

"I feel I am not lonely," she said. "I have somebody. I have somebody to support me."

She shares a home in the Astoria neighborhood in Queens with two of her sons, Saif al-Qadhi and Qaed al-Qadhi. Her third son, Tameem al-Kadhi, and his wife, Melissa Forstrom, also live in the neighborhood.

"I have a nice life," Ms. Obaidi said. "Even though my apartment is small, I feel happy in it. I like it."

But it is a home with some notable, painful absences. "I've divided myself," Ms. Obaidi said. "Some part is there in Jordan, and some parts ..." She trailed off, overcome with emotion.

In Amman, Thabit al-Qadhi, her oldest son, lives with his wife and 5-year-old son across the street from Ms. Obaidi's husband, Husham, and their youngest son, Omar al-Qadhi. They have been denied asylum in the United States.

In October 2015, Husham al-Qadhi was sent a conditional acceptance letter for asylum in the United States. About a year later, he received a second letter, denying him resettlement. Omar al-Qadhi, who works at Unicef to help provide water, sanitation and hygiene to Syrian refugees in Jordan, was also denied resettlement.

"We have lived here as if we were waiting for something, as if everything was temporary, but now we no longer know what we are waiting for," Omar al-Qadhi said in his apartment in Amman.

Thabit al-Qadhi, who has traveled to New York several times to visit his family, has not received the same denial letters for resettlement in the United States. His tourist visa was renewed, but a week later, an officer at the American Embassy in Amman told him that his visa had been canceled, and his case for resettlement was denied.

Whether they will ever get approval to move to the United States is even more uncertain now. Thabit al-Qadhi said that Mr. Trump's order was particularly painful and that he felt America was turning its back on Iraqis who had risked their lives to help soldiers during the war.

"At the end we realized we were no longer welcome, neither from the Iraqis because we worked with the Americans, nor from the Americans because we were Iraqi," he said.

Like many Iraqis, Thabit al-Qadhi is living in Jordan on a conditional basis. He must renew his permission every year, and it is dependent on the family's financial means.

"Nothing is guaranteed in business," he said. "Today, my trade company here is successful, but if one day the business fails, then what will happen? Where do I go?"

In the United States, his siblings, even with employment and legal immigration status, live in a similar state of unsteadiness and concern.

For three years, Tameem al-Kadhi's only proof of his legal status was an arrival-departure record known as an I-94 form, a document without a photo of him and only his name and identification numbers. It has hindered his attempts to travel even within the United States. Visas for Saif al-Qadhi's wife and children were approved recently after a wait of more than two years. They were booked on a plane expected to arrive Feb. 7, but Friday's executive order by Mr. Trump has dashed those plans.

"The kids, they grow up far from their father," Saif al-Qadhi said. "All of a sudden, I told them 'I'm sorry, something changed. I may not be able to see you soon.'"

He and his wife are distraught by the development, which leaves them in a precarious position. In anticipation of the move, their children were taken out of their private school and the lease on their apartment in Amman is to expire on Feb. 1.

"I'm watching the news every second," Mr. Qadhi said.

Ms. Obaidi's children have been able to acclimate to their new surroundings and establish a rhythm in their lives. Tameem al-Kadhi owns a cellphone store in the East Village in Manhattan, Qaed al-Qadhi works as an information technology manager, and Saif al-Qadhi is an Uber driver. Ms. Obaidi stays busy by volunteering at the Masjid Dar Al-Dawah mosque.

The family gathers as often as work schedules and other responsibilities allow, most often on Sundays, when Ms. Obaidi prepares a large meal. They all await the day when more chairs can be placed around the table.

Halfway across the world, the other half of the family shares that sentiment. Omar al-Qadhi said he missed his brothers, but especially his mother. "It just feels weird that we are now split, and the future looks grim," he said. "We are travelers on a journey with no destination, and my family is so far away."

Families Divided By Trump's Refugee Order Worry About The Future

By Harriet Ryan And Melissa Etehad, Contact Reporters

[Los Angeles Times](#), January 28, 2017

Ali Abdi, a 30-year-old student from Iran, has been studying for his PhD in anthropology at Yale University. Last week, he left the U.S. for the United Arab Emirates on his way to a research trip in Afghanistan.

That was only days before President Trump issued his executive order on Friday suspending admissions from seven majority Muslim countries, including Iran.

Now Abdi, who has been living in the U.S. for the last four years, is unsure what to do. He cannot return to Iran, where he faces potential imprisonment for his political activism. His visa for the UAE won't allow him to stay there long, nor does he have permission for an extended stay in Afghanistan.

Most seriously, under Trump's new order, he can no longer return to the U.S. to finish his studies.

Abdi is trying to be philosophical. "I'm not worried about anything... From an anthropological perspective I can write a lot," he said in a telephone interview Saturday. "What has happened is very illuminating. The main problem is the lives of thousands of others who are torn apart by what happened."

The executive order signed on Friday suspends all refugee entries for 120 days, blocks Syrian refugees and bars for 90 days the entry of citizens from Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Libya and Somalia.

Around the world, students and workers caught outside the U.S. were uncertain when they would be allowed to return under the new executive order. Refugees expecting safe resettlement in the U.S. were stranded and detained at airports. And families whose loved ones were stranded abroad were left in a state of crippling anxiety.

Many were scanning their social media feeds or watching television, trying to make sense of the new policy and understand what happens next.

Bahareh Aslani, a 34-year-old Iranian American, has been planning to have a formal wedding ceremony in Baltimore in April to celebrate her marriage to her husband, Mostapha Roudsari, who teaches at the University of Pennsylvania.

Roudsari's parents, who live in Iran, went to Dubai in December and applied for a visa to enter the U.S., waiting 2 ½ months for an appointment at the U.S. embassy. The couple was told that the mother's visa had been approved and that the father's visa had been approved, pending additional documents.

Now, both are barred from entry and will not be able to attend the wedding and are devastated, Aslani said.

"It's frustrating, most of all. Makes me sad for my in laws and family, but mostly I'm really scared, because is this the beginning? Are they going to come after me? Once you start the slippery slope to losing all your basic rights, and no one seems to know what to do about it," Aslani said.

Nobar Elmi Golhar, 36, lives in Brooklyn and has never been to Iran, but worries about whether her family in Iran will be able to continue to visit. Her aunt and uncle, both green card holders who have children in the United States, were in the U.S. when the executive order was signed, and now both are uncertain whether it's wise to go back home to Iran — they may not be allowed to return.

"They are here and want to return to Iran, but now they are very worried if they can come back," Golhar said. "They are trying to better understand what is going on and watch the news and ask what they should expect."

What they are feeling, she said, is "panic."

"It's a real mix of emotions," Golhar said. "First, it's disbelief: Is this seriously happening? And then, it's the anger... How could we have allowed this to happen?"

Airport Detentions Of Iraqi Travelers Spark Lawsuit, Protest

By Miriam Jordan

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

First Lawsuit Filed To Challenge Trump's Refugee Policy

Officers told Iraqi man's attorneys to 'Call Mr. Trump'

By Stephen Dinan

[Washington Times](#), January 28, 2017

Civil liberties groups filed the first lawsuit Saturday morning challenging President Trump's pause on migration from countries troubled by terrorism, saying the halt has already snared two Iraqis who'd already been approved to come to the U.S., and who fear for their lives back home.

The lawsuit says that when lawyers for one of the men demanded to speak to the person responsible for keeping them out, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officers told them they would have to take it up with new chief: "Call Mr. Trump."

One of the two men refused entry is an interpreter and engineer who was to be admitted under a program rewarding those who helped the U.S. efforts in Iraq, at risk to themselves. The man's family was admitted, but he was detained.

The other man was coming to the U.S. to rejoin his wife and seven-year-old son, who were admitted as refugees three years ago.

Both men were denied entry at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York in the hours after Mr. Trump issued his executive order Friday.

The lawsuit said the Trump order is unconstitutional because it discriminates based on someone's country of birth, and "was substantially motivated by animus" toward Muslims.

"President Trump's war on equality is already taking a terrible human toll. This ban cannot be allowed to continue," said Omar Jadwat, director of the American Civil Liberties Union's Immigrants' Rights Project.

Mr. Trump's new policy pauses the refugee program and halts admissions from countries troubled by terrorism, including Syria and Iraq.

The pause is intended to give the new administration a chance to improve screening, Mr. Trump said in the executive order.

The order makes good on his campaign pledge to impose "extreme vetting" of those coming to the U.S.

Human rights groups have called it a "Muslim ban," saying they believe that's what Mr. Trump was really trying to achieve with his policy.

Copyright © 2017 The Washington Times, LLC. Click here for reprint permission.

Iraqis Who Spent Years Helping U.S. Among The First Detained Under Trump's Ban

One man, who worked for the U.S. military as an interpreter, has since been released.

By Willa Frej and Sebastian Murdock
[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

NEW YORK — Iraqi and Afghan refugees who helped U.S. war efforts were among those detained at airports Friday night after President Donald Trump signed an executive order targeting Muslims and refugees.

Hameed Khalid Darweesh and Sameer Abdulkhaleq Alshawi, Iraqis with ties to U.S. operations overseas, were detained late Friday at New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport. Darweesh had worked for the U.S. government for 10 years, including as an interpreter. Darweesh's wife and children were let through, but Darweesh was not. Brandon Friedman, a former colleague of Darweesh's, told [The Huffington Post](#).

Darweesh was released Saturday afternoon. In a press conference afterward, he said he'd been held since 6 p.m. Friday in several rooms, and was questioned for many hours.

But despite his ill treatment, Darweesh offered praise for the U.S., calling it "is the greatest country in the world."

Alshawi is a refugee who was rejoining his wife and child in America. His wife, who had worked for a U.S. government contractor, came to the U.S. a few years ago, [The Washington Post](#) reported.

Alshawi was released Saturday night, after a federal judge halted parts of Trump's executive order.

Mark Doss, an attorney with the International Refugee Assistance Project who is representing Darweesh and Alshawi, said he and his team were unable to meet with their clients through the night on Friday.

"We've been at JFK all night and none of us have been able to speak with our clients. As far as we know, they are still detained, and we have been unable to actually meet with them in person," Doss told CNN Saturday before Darweesh's release. "To be unlawfully detained here at the airport is really just disgraceful."

"We're fighting very hard to make sure they're not deported to their countries where they can be killed," he added.

Things were also chaotic on the West Coast. An Afghan interpreter was detained at San Francisco International Airport on Friday while his wife and children were allowed through, said Matt Zeller, founder of No One Left Behind, a nonprofit that helps Afghan and Iraqi combat interpreters with special immigrant visas resettle safely in the United States.

Protesters gathered around the country on Saturday in support of the detainees.

U.S. veterans of the Iraq War criticized their government's actions on Saturday as well.

"The idea that we could be detaining Iraqi interpreters who put their lives on the line to help troops like myself in Iraq is disgraceful," Jon Soltz, a veteran and the chairman of VoteVets, said in a statement. "Not only does this not do anything to protect America, but it now sends the message that even if you put your life on the line to help America, if you are Muslim we don't want you here."

The executive order, which Trump signed Friday afternoon, bans Syrian refugee resettlement in the U.S. indefinitely, shuts down the entire refugee program for 120 days, and bars all immigrants and visitors from seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the country for at least 90 days.

U.S. District Judge Ann Donnelly of the Eastern District of New York halted parts of the executive order Saturday after the American Civil Liberties Union, immigrants' rights groups and refugee relief organizations filed a lawsuit against Trump and the U.S. government. A federal judge in Virginia and a district judge in Seattle came to similar decisions later that night.

Broad Lawsuit Challenges Trump Immigration Order

By Josh Gerstein
[Politico](#), January 28, 2017

A California attorney filed a federal lawsuit Saturday broadly challenging President Donald Trump's new executive

order limiting immigration from Muslim-majority countries in order to combat terrorism.

The suit, filed Saturday afternoon in U.S. District Court for Northern California, argues that the order intrudes on Congress' legislative authority and violates the Establishment Clause of the Constitution by discriminating on the basis of religion.

"It's a legislative function, so that violates separation of power and it does not meet any of the well-recognized exceptions, so we're asking to enjoin it or repeal it," said Andrew Shalaby, an attorney with East Bay Law in Albany, Calif., near Oakland.

The order Trump signed Friday restricts citizen of seven majority-Muslim countries from traveling to the U.S., implements new procedures for green-card holders from those countries and suspends admission of refugees to the U.S.

The suit does not name any specific plaintiffs, but was filed on behalf of the American public generally and the people of California. Shalaby said he believes the case can be pursued under a California law allowing private individuals to sue on behalf of the public, but it's not clear that will allow the suit to proceed in federal court.

Shalaby said he's confident he can find individual plaintiffs to add to the suit, if a judge rules that is necessary. "I don't think we have a standing problem. If we do, we have a solution to it," he said.

Shalaby said he filed the case because he considered it important to go after the Trump order right away.

"A lot of people in my circles encouraged me to file it," he said. "We wanted to act on it immediately."

A separate class-action federal lawsuit challenging Trump's order was filed early Saturday in New York on behalf of two Iraqi men who had valid visas but were detained on arrival at JFK Airport Friday. One of the men was released Saturday.

The New York case is focused on the impact of the executive order on immigrants who have arrived in the U.S. and are in detention or face possible expulsion in connection with Trump's order. The class action suit, brought in Brooklyn, has the backing of several major immigrant rights organizations, including the International Refugee Assistance Project, the National Immigration Law Center, the American Civil Liberties Union and a legal clinic at Yale Law School. A total of 18 attorneys were listed on legal papers filed in the case, along with seven law-student interns.

The Council on American-Islamic Relations has also announced plans to file another lawsuit Monday against Trump's order.

The cases all face uphill battles in court because most foreigners outside the U.S. have few rights under U.S. law. Cases involving impacts that the Trump order may have on foreign nationals who are U.S. permanent residents (also

known as green card holders) could get more traction because they're usually considered to have more legal rights. U.S. citizens may also have success in challenging situations where their foreign spouses or family members appear to be barred from entry into the country.

However, parts of the order seem to be worded to try to undercut legal challenges. For example, part of the order effectively giving priority to Christians in the refugee program refers to cases where "the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual's country of nationality." In addition, most of the changes in the order are framed as temporary suspensions or reviews—the kinds of measures courts rarely overturn particularly when the executive branch claims national security concerns are at stake.

Massive Crowds Gather At JFK In Protest Of Immigration Ban

By Brooke Seipel

[The Hill](#), January 28, 2017

Massive crowds have gathered at New York City's JFK International Airport in protest of President Trump's executive order calling for a temporary immigration ban that led to the detention of several refugees at the airport.

One of the detainees has since been released, but crowds have continued to grow.

Happening right now at #jfkairport #JFKTerminal4 #Terminal4 Go! Go! Go! #ResistTrump #muslimban #RefugeesWelcome pic.twitter.com/czSebYqmqJ— Vera Rodrigues (@VeraJailhouse) January 28, 2017

#NoMuslimBanJFK crowd keeps growing. #RESIST! Terminal 4 arrivals. #MuslimBan #RefugeesWelcome #NoBan pic.twitter.com/AJuNrFM3nQ— Women's March (@womensmarch) January 28, 2017

Stunning scene at JFK airport pic.twitter.com/ZAwNymELo8— Judd Legum (@JuddLegum) January 28, 2017

The scene from above as thousands chant and scream, draping banners from above at JFK international arrivals shouting "LET THEM IN!" pic.twitter.com/ugU8zbKYiv— Jack Smith IV (@JackSmithIV) January 28, 2017

Documentary filmmaker Michael Moore cheered on the protest calling for more to join. Moore said thousands were at the airport.

Everybody in NYC area-- head to JFK Terminal 4 NOW! Big anti-Trump protest forming out of nowhere! Ppl mobilizing against Trump's Muslim ban— Michael Moore (@MMFlint) January 28, 2017

Thousands keep pouring into JFK Terminal 4! An amazing sight! No planning, no organizing – just me and others saying "get to JFK now!"— Michael Moore (@MMFlint) January 28, 2017

Crowds were protesting President Trump and his ban on immigrants and refugees from entering the country.

Trump on Friday signed an executive order that he said would provide a thorough vetting of refugees to ensure that “radical Islamic terrorists” cannot get into the United States.

Trump’s order indefinitely blocks refugees from war-torn Syria from entering the U.S. and suspends all refugee admissions for 120 days while the administration determines which countries pose the least risk.

NYC Airport Becomes Scene Of Anguish After Trump Travel Ban

By William Mathis

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

NEW YORK (AP) – New York City’s Kennedy airport became a scene of anguish and desperation Saturday for the families of people detained after arriving in the U.S. from nations subject to President Donald Trump’s travel ban.

Many flights to the U.S. already were in the air Friday when the president’s order barred entry to citizens of seven predominantly Muslim nations.

Lawyers and advocates working at the airport said they didn’t have a hard count on the number of people taken into custody after getting off their flights.

Yosre Ghaled, 25, was among about a dozen distraught people waiting at an airport terminal Saturday to see if loved ones would be released, or put back on an outgoing plane.

Her mother-in-law’s sister, a 67-year-old Yemeni citizen coming to live with family in the U.S. because she is sick from heart problems and diabetes, was detained after getting off a plane from Saudi Arabia.

“We’re very sad. She lives a very bad life. We try in her last days to (give her) a good life,” Ghaled said, adding that the family had been told that she would be refused entry and put on a jet back to Saudi Arabia. “We’ve waited for this many years, (for) her to come. They should just let us see her. Seeing her would make you feel a little better.”

Trump said the goal of the temporary travel restriction was to keep out potential terrorists.

Two members of congress, Democrats Jerrold Nadler and Nydia Velazquez, joined several hundred protesters who spent part of the day at the airport trying to win the release of about a dozen people they said had been detained.

People in the crowd chanted “Let them in.” Celebrities including “Sex and the City” actress Cynthia Nixon joined the demonstration.

The detainees in New York included two Iraqis who had previously been given permission to come to the U.S. because of their ties to the U.S. military.

One of them, Hameed Khalid Darweesh, who had worked as an interpreter for the U.S. Army after it invaded

Iraq in 2003, emerged from custody to cheers from the crowd in the mid-afternoon.

He pronounced the U.S. “the land of freedom” home to “the greatest people in the world” upon his release, but also expressed dismay about having been initially held.

Still being held at the airport in the late afternoon was Haider Sameer Abdulkhaleq Alshawi, 33, an Iraqi who had been trying to reunite with his wife in Texas. She had come to the U.S. because she feared for her life after having worked for a U.S. security contractor.

Lawyers sat on the floor of an airport terminal Saturday evening working up court petitions on their laptops on behalf of detainees.

New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo, a Democrat, said he had directed state lawyers and the agency that controls Kennedy to “explore all legal options” to assist anyone detained at New York airports.

“I never thought I’d see the day when refugees, who have fled war-torn countries in search of a better life, would be turned away at our doorstep,” Cuomo said. “This is not who we are, and not who we should be.”

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

Striking New York Cabbies Join Airport Protest Against Trump’s Muslim Crackdown

Drivers slam the president’s “inhumane and unconstitutional ban.”

By Mary Papenfuss

[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

New York City cab drivers turned mounting chaos at John F. Kennedy International Airport into even more of a snarl with a strike to protest President Donald Trump’s crackdown on refugees and support travelers trapped by his executive order.

As hundreds of protesters packed the streets outside JFK’s Terminal 4, cabbies stopped whisking people from the airport for an hour on Saturday evening, leaving the taxi line empty and a growing number of frantic travelers scrambling to find alternative transportation.

“We cannot be silent,” the New York Taxi Workers Alliance tweeted. “We go to work to welcome people to a land that once welcomed us. We will not be divided.”

The action was launched after about a dozen travelers were detained at the airport under Trump’s executive order blocking arrivals from seven predominantly Muslim nations. Demonstrators gathered throughout the day to protest the

crackdown. The NYTWA called on all cabbies, including Uber drivers, to join them.

A statement from the NYTWA posted on Facebook slammed the “hatred spewed from the bully pulpit.” The union vowed: “Our 19,000-member-strong union stands firmly opposed to Donald Trump’s Muslim ban. As an organization whose membership is largely Muslim, a workforce that’s almost universally immigrant, and a working-class movement that is rooted in the defense of the oppressed, we say no to this inhumane and unconstitutional ban.”

Protests against Trump’s edict shutting out travelers from Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen were erupting in airports across the nation on Saturday. Hundreds of protesters gathered at San Francisco International Airport, and police shut down access to one of the airport roads, ABC 7 reported.

One Iraqi man detained at JFK on Friday night was later released. Hameed Khalid Darweesh had worked for the U.S. government for 10 years, including as an interpreter.

Cuomo Says State Will Explore Helping Detainees At Airports After Trump’s Order

By Bill Mahoney

[Politico](#), January 28, 2017

ALBANY — Gov. Andrew Cuomo announced Saturday night that he has directed several government entities to “explore all legal options” that might be available to help individuals detained at state airports as a result of an executive order issued by President Donald Trump on Friday.

At the same time, one of these entities initially announced that it would effectively limit the ability of individuals to protest the order, before Cuomo said he had asked for that step to be reversed.

Trump’s order bans citizens of seven countries with significant Muslim majorities from entering the United States. John F. Kennedy International Airport, which is operated by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, became the flashpoint for protests against the order Saturday after the New York Times described the ordeals of a former Army interpreter who was detained there, and reports emerged of others detained at the airport.

In a release from his campaign committee Saturday, Cuomo, as he’s fond of doing, quoted Emma Lazarus.

“I never thought I’d see the day when refugees, who have fled war-torn countries in search of a better life, would be turned away at our doorstep. We are a nation of bridges, not walls, and a great many of us still believe in the words ‘give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses,’” he said. “This is not who we are, and not who we should be.”

In a separate release from the state on Saturday, the governor added that he’s tasked two offices he directly

controls and the Port Authority to begin exploring ways to help the detainees.

“I have directed the Port Authority, the Department of State, and my Counsel’s Office to jointly explore all legal options to assist anyone detained at New York airports, and ensure that their rights are protected,” Cuomo said. “America is a nation of laws and those laws provide rights that must be respected and followed regardless of political ideology.”

Attorney General Eric Schneiderman issued a similar statement on Saturday night, saying he “will do everything in [his] power to help those who have been victimized by President Trump’s discriminatory and dangerous executive action.”

He added that his staff “has been in contact with lawyers for the detained refugees.”

Soon after Cuomo made his declaration, the Port Authority announced that in order “to control crowding,” it would require tickets to access the AirTrain that numerous individuals have used to arrive at a large protest outside JFK’s Terminal 4. This prompted the scorn of some Democrats.

“I am told to prevent NYers joining JFK protest you are requiring airline tix at AirTrain,” wrote Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer in a tweet directed at the Port Authority. “If true, unacceptable. Explain immediately.”

Just after 8 p.m., the governor said he had ordered the Port Authority to change course.

“One of the fundamental rights that is granted to the people of this country is the right to peacefully protest,” he said in an official statement. “I have ordered the Port Authority to reverse its decision regarding the JFK AirTrain. I have also directed the MTA and the New York State Police to assist with transportation and security needs to ensure the safety of all those participating. The people of New York will have their voices heard.”

A number of other New York officials have participated in the protests. U.S. Reps. Nydia Velazquez and Jerry Nadler were at the airport Saturday to announce the release of the detained interpreter, Hameed Jhalid Darweesh.

“This is the soul of America,” Darweesh said while embracing Velazquez.

Trump’s Executive Order Is Already Hurting Refugees, Muslims And Families

People are being turned away at airports.

By Elise Foley

[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON — President Donald Trump’s executive order targeting Muslims and refugees led to chaos in the hours after he signed it, as refugees and immigrants arrived at U.S. airports only to be detained or told they couldn’t enter

the country and businesses had to scramble to adjust to the new policy.

“We are hearing that last night a lot of people were turned away,” said Abed Ayoub, legal director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. “It’s had a direct impact on a lot of people.”

The order, which Trump signed Friday afternoon, bans Syrian refugee resettlement in the U.S. indefinitely. It will also shut down the entire refugee program for 120 days and bar all immigrants and visitors from seven Muslim-majority countries — Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen — from entering the U.S. for at least 90 days.

The order goes far beyond refugees or tourists — it means that about 500,000 green card holders who reside in the U.S. but are originally from one of the seven countries will need a waiver to return to their homes, White House officials said Saturday. It also applies to people from the seven countries who hold dual citizenship and are not U.S. citizens. This means that people of both French and Yemeni nationality, for example, would be denied entry.

Coming in the late hours of Friday, and with little apparent consultation with other agencies and groups prior to its publication, the president’s order has created havoc and confusion among those tasked with overseeing entry into the country, to say nothing of the people actually trying to enter the U.S.

On Saturday afternoon, nearly 24 hours after Trump signed the order, a White House official said the administration was still working to determine the exact meaning of a very important piece of language: “in transit.” The order says that authorities may “determine to admit individuals to the United States as refugees on a case-by-case basis” in instances “when the person is already in transit and denying admission would cause undue hardship.”

Because the precise meaning of that language is not clear, however, many people who were in transit when the order was signed have been detained and in some cases barred from entering the country.

In the hours after Trump signed the order, government authorities detained two Iraqis at New York’s John F. Kennedy International Airport, The New York Times reported. One of the men, Hameed Khalid Darweesh, worked for the U.S. government for 10 years as an interpreter. He was detained upon landing at JFK on Friday night, but his wife and children were let through, a former colleague of Darweesh’s told The Huffington Post. Darweesh was released the following day.

The other detained man, Sameer Abdulkhaleq Alshawi, was coming to the country to join his child and wife, who had worked for a U.S. government contractor, The Washington Post reported.

Lawyers for the two men told CNN they have filed a lawsuit against the president and the government over their

detention. The action in federal court seeks a writ of habeas corpus — an order declaring their detention illegal — and the certification of a class action covering any immigrants and refugees denied admission at ports of entry across the country, according to the complaint filed in New York.

Google, meanwhile, told traveling staff members to come back to the U.S., BBC News reported.

And refugee organizations began notifying volunteers that the families they planned to help were no longer on their way. Alisa Wartick, 36, said she and a group of 38 people in her neighborhood had co-sponsored a Syrian refugee family through the organization Refugee One in Chicago.

The family — a mother, father and 16-month-old daughter — was supposed to arrive on Monday to join the woman’s parents and siblings. The co-sponsorship group had already furnished their apartment, and met the family via FaceTime so they could see their new home, which they now may never see again.

“Just imagining raising a child in a refugee camp environment and then being told you could see your family again, you could be reunited with your mom and your daughter’s grandma and being told ‘No, sorry, you’re three days too late for that’ — I can’t imagine what that’s like,” Wartick said.

Church World Service, one of the organizations that handles refugee resettlement, had been planning to welcome 212 refugees next week, 164 of them joining family members already in the United States, according to a spokeswoman. Those 212 refugees are no longer expected to arrive.

Protesters gathered at airports throughout the country on Saturday to demonstrate against Trump’s executive order. Hundreds crowded JFK’s Terminal 4, chanting “Love trumps hate!” and “No hate, no fear, refugees are welcome here!” BuzzFeed broadcast the protest live on Facebook.

Large crowds were also reported at San Francisco International Airport, Chicago O’Hare International Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport.

Though Trump, on the campaign trail, had pledged to stop refugees from certain Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States, there was some skepticism that he would actually follow through on the proposal. Business groups had warned against it, as did religious organizations, including some with traditionally conservative political leanings.

Moreover, congressional Republicans spoke out over the summer against any policy that would bar people from entering the United States based on their religion. House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) was one of those critics. But on Friday evening, he offered a statement of support for Trump’s proposal.

The ripple effects of the executive order make clear the difficulty in taking a blunt campaign promise and applying it to real-world governance, with seemingly unforeseen outcomes

and immediate, frightening disruption in people's lives. People took to Twitter to share the uncertainty now surrounding their Syrian colleagues and friends.

In other cases, people who made it to safety in the United States are now having trouble meeting family members from their home countries. Mohammed Al Rawi, who risked his life working for the Los Angeles Times bureau in Baghdad, moved to Long Beach, California, in 2010. His 69-year-old father was leaving Qatar to fly to Los Angeles to visit him Friday night when a U.S. official stopped him and informed him that Trump had "canceled all visas," Al Rawi wrote on Facebook.

U.S. officials then detained Al Rawi's father in an unknown location and confiscated his passport, making it impossible for Al Rawi to book him a hotel in Qatar to sleep for the night, he said. His father's phone died, so he has not been able to get in touch.

Meathaq, 45, and Mahmoud, 49, of Baghdad just arrived in Knoxville, Tennessee, in August with their 5-year-old son and 15-year-old daughter. But they have twin 18-year-old daughters still living in Iraq.

Thanks to Mahmoud's work as a translator for the U.S. Army, they were able to get a special immigrant visa. The process for approving their visas took four years, beginning when they first applied in 2012. By that time their daughters were over 18, which meant the U.S. government required greater processing. Now the twins are stuck in Baghdad, and their parents fear they will not be able to reunite with them. (Both Meathaq and Mahmoud withheld their last names out of concern for their twin daughters' safety.)

"I am crying all the time, especially after the new law from President Trump," Meathaq said. "I miss them and the situation in Iraq is so bad and I don't know what to do to help."

Even the film industry has felt the impact. The executive order will prevent Iranian film director Asghar Farhadi from traveling to the Oscars ceremony next month. Farhadi's "The Salesman" was nominated in the Best Foreign Language Film category this year. Farhadi became the first Iranian director to win an Oscar in that category in 2012. Iranian actress Taraneh Alidoosti, a co-lead in "The Salesman," said this week that she would boycott the Oscars over the visa ban.

Trita Parsi, president of the National Iranian American Council, shared several stories on Twitter of individuals affected by the ban, including people with green cards to be in the U.S. The Huffington Post is working to verify those stories.

Zane Shami, a naturalized U.S. citizen who has lived in the U.S. for over two decades, said he'd been expecting his mother, who is 67, to arrive to live with him on Feb. 7.

Shami's mother was born in Syria but has been living in Kuwait, where Shami was born and where his siblings live, since the civil war in her native country leveled her town. She

was approved to come to the U.S. as a refugee after extensive vetting, Shami said. But now she's unable to move here as planned, or even to visit.

"I've done everything right. I did the checklist," Shami said. "There's no reason my mom can't come here. It's very un-American to say that we're going to ban her just because she has a Syrian passport. That doesn't sound American to me."

NBC Philadelphia reported that two Syrian families were blocked from entering the United States in Philadelphia and were sent back on a flight home.

Ayoub said that given confusion over whether the executive order applies to people who hold green cards, and that some have been detained for hours before being released.

Nashwan Abdullah, 25, of Damascus, Syria, is on track to finish his master's degree in music performance at Indiana University of Pennsylvania in May. Now that Trump has banned immigration from Syria, Abdullah's not sure if he'll be able to stay. He had been hoping to apply for a 12-month work visa available to foreign students, but does not know if this is possible any longer.

Abdullah is sure, however, that he will not return to Syria. He does not want to be drafted into the Syrian military, or deal with the danger and scarcities of basic necessities in the Syrian capital.

"Of course I am afraid to go back. It's a war zone. It's an unsafe, bad situation," he said.

There is one glimmer of hope for Abdullah: He is Catholic, so he is not sure if the ban is "going to include me or not."

This story will be updated as more information becomes available.

Willa Frej, Daniel Marans, Sam Stein and Travis Waldron contributed reporting.

Protests Erupt Against Ban On Refugees

By Hannan Adely

[USA Today](#), January 28, 2017

Protests erupted at area airports Saturday as Americans reacted in outrage to President Trump's sweeping order that banned people from seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the U.S. and suspended the nation's refugee program — an order that many assailed as un-American and discriminatory.

More than 120 people gathered at Newark Liberty International Airport clutching signs denouncing the executive order, alongside lawyers who rushed to airports to defend the rights of refugees, immigrants and green-card holders, among others, who were being detained and denied entry.

"This banning of people based on religion is not constitutional and it's not what we are about," said Yamandou Alexander of Jersey City, who hurried to Newark airport when

he found out about the demonstration. Alexander, a U.S. citizen who was born in France and who is Muslim, said he couldn't stay away.

At the airport, attorneys stood by to help those in need. Attorney David A. Isaacson, who practices primarily immigration law in New York, said he learned of a Syrian citizen with a green card who arrived from Germany at around 4 p.m. was still being questioned two hours later, as his daughter waited for him to be released.

A Rutgers Ph.D student who went to visit her ill mother in Syria and was on her way back also was having problems getting back into the country, said Attorney Ayanna Lewis-Gruss. She said the student's host family reached out to attorneys at the airport after the woman was stopped on a layover in Paris and was not allowed to fly to Newark.

The protests on Saturday were organized spontaneously and grew throughout the day as news spread about the far-reaching impact of Trump's order. There were reports about legal residents detained at borders, stranded in other countries and in some cases deported. At the same time, refugees who had gone through years-long approvals to come to the U.S. were also being barred. As word spread, protests were organized too in other cities including Chicago and Dallas.

Protesters at John F. Kennedy International Airport Saturday Jan. 28, 2017. (Photo: Keldy Ortiz/NorthJersey.com)

At John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York, more than 1,000 people gathered by Saturday evening as word spread of the protest.

"I was in disbelief. I just had to jump in my car and head out here," said Hillary Frileck, of Brooklyn.

"This is what really scares me. This resonates with me. One person (who was detained) works for us. These people have visas. It's important for us to speak up. We have to rise up. We can't just lay on our couches and think things will be okay."

Emily Witt, of Brooklyn, said she viewed that the ban was a "bad moral decision" especially given that it was Holocaust Remembrance Day.

Protesters at Newark Liberty International Airport protesting President Trump's immigration policy on Saturday, Jan. 28 2017. (Photo: Michael Karas/Northjersey.com)

"Like everyone else, I'm just shocked and afraid," she said. "I didn't think I would see this. It's a rebuke to us. Once you start registering people because of their beliefs, it's the first step toward a country that goes against American values, where our right to free speech and freedom of religion and freedom of expression is threatened."

Sara Cullinane, director of Make The Road New Jersey, which organized the demonstration in the Newark, said they chose the airport because it's one of the hubs for refugee arrivals who are then relocated to different parts of the

country. "We are all learning about the order means and how it will be interpreted," she said.

U.S. Immigrants React To Ban: 'Our President Is Trying To Divide Us'

By Usa Today Network

[USA Today](#), January 28, 2017

The nation's immigrants watched in trepidation Saturday as President Trump's immigration ban went into effect with abrupt results.

The executive order temporarily banning all refugees — as well as more specific restrictions on predominantly Muslim countries — drew lawsuits, protests and outrage on social media as travelers were stopped from boarding U.S-bound planes and detained at international airports.

Across the country, some immigrants already in the United States were enveloped in feelings of fear and uncertainty.

Ibado Mahmud came to the United States as a refugee in 1993 after fleeing the civil war in her native Somalia and spending more than two years living in a refugee camp in neighboring Kenya.

Today, she is one of 7,193 Somali refugees resettled in Arizona since 1992. It's a far cry from her old life. She recalls fleeing Somalia for her life with her husband and two young daughters in December 1990 and then driving in a car to Kenya with a caravan of nearly 50 other refugees. She saw people die and be raped.

"You heard the lions roaring every night," she said. "I used to wrap me and my two girls in long clothes so if the lion came, he would have to eat all three of us."

Since coming to the U.S., Mahmud has rebuilt her life in Arizona and raised seven children. She owns her own house and for the past 17 years has worked at Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, alongside refugees from Iraq, Eritrea, Libya, Sudan, Ethiopia and many other countries.

But Mahmud worries other refugees will not get the same chance because of Trump's decision Friday to temporarily freeze the arrival of all refugees and indefinitely halt the arrival of refugees from Syria.

"A lot of people are grateful to be here, to be part of this country. We appreciate what the United States did for us," the 56-year-old said. "We are hoping they will do many other great things to people who are hurting, that people who are dying for no reason, to people who don't have a life."

Mahmud said she has felt welcome in the U.S. but worries Trump's executive orders could lead to discrimination against Muslims like her.

"What I am scared of is that he is going to divide us," she said.

At the Masjid Bilal Islamic Center in West Louisville on Friday afternoon, dozens of refugees from Somalia, Syria and

Iraq gathered for prayers. They said many were now cut off from ailing or impoverished family members who were trying to join them in the U.S., and some worried about what some called an atmosphere of “Islamophobia.” Advocates were organizing rallies of support.

“It is devastating,” said Abanur Saidi, chairman of the mosque who also works with refugees for Catholic Charities and who is among thousands of Somalis in the Louisville region. “These are people that don’t have anything to do with terrorism. They are victims of terror, that’s why they are leaving their country.”

Others said they worried the new Trump directive would be counter-productive.

“This policy seems to be directed at the Muslims — and I’m really concerned that this decision will strengthen terrorists and extremist groups, they will have more material to brainwash people that America is against Islam,” said Mohammad Babar, a Muslim leader in Louisville.

Those at the Bilal mosque Friday were signing a petition organized by a coalition of refugee groups seeking to get 10,000 signatures before a planned rally next month. Leaders are urging supporters to write letters to legislators. Meantime, the Louisville Muslim Community and a coalition of groups said they would host an event Saturday to highlight the importance of dialogue and consider grassroots actions in the face of what they called “increasing Islamophobia” and other issues.

“Our president is trying to divide us,” said Farhan Abdi, executive director of Muslim Americans for Compassion. He said refugees and immigrants are “doctors, teachers, lawyers, business owners, factory workers” who will “keep fighting to keep America welcoming.”

Charlotte Gosso came to Rochester in December from Côte d’Ivoire via a refugee camp in Ghana; she was the first Ivoirian refugee here. Her prayers go to her country and her relatives there, the only ones she has.

There are only a handful of Ivoirians in Rochester, and it seems unlikely any more will be arriving.

Gosso thinks of a woman she knew in the refugee camp in Ghana. It would take Gosso up to three days to travel to Accra, the capital, for bureaucratic matters, and there was no one to watch her son while she was gone. The woman would help her, and give her some rice when she needed it to feed her sons.

The woman and her husband would like to come to the United States, and Gosso would welcome them. She speaks only French and is confined to her small apartment unless someone can help her with Guy.

Lisa Hoyt, director of the Catholic Family Center’s Refugee, Immigration & Language Services Department, described another case. A mother and seven children were supposed to arrive in Rochester on Tuesday. The family is Somali but is living in a refugee camp in Kenya.

The oldest of the children is 19. The youngest is 2. Their new life here is waiting. But someone in the group got sick, postponing their travel.

“Think about what’s happened,” she said. “These people literally could have missed this opportunity ... through no fault of their own.”

Caught in the middle of the Syrian civil war, Abdul and Manal fled the bombs and the fighting in the city of Homs. In December 2015, after years in a refugee camp, the door opened for them to come to America and, more specifically, Indianapolis.

The young couple joined a tiny colony of Syrian refugees who’ve been relocated here by groups such as Catholic Charities, as in their case, and Exodus Refugee Immigration. In a little more than two years, Exodus has resettled 225 Syrians to Indianapolis. Catholic Charities has resettled 77 Syrians.

More than a year after their arrival, Abdul (whose full name is Abdul Sater Khaled Assaf) and Manal (al Khadour) are making a decent life for themselves and their two young daughters. But the immigration controversy leaves them fearful that the loved ones they left behind — namely Abdul’s parents and his brother — could be denied a similar rescue.

“I’m concerned a lot that they might not get to come,” Manal said in Arabic, through his Catholic Charities translator, Sajjad Jawad, himself once a refugee from Iraq.

Abdul and Manal say they like Indiana — even the weather, which they say is similar to Homs. But the joy of their new life is tempered by their awareness of the death and destruction they left behind in Syria. They worry about their family in refugee camps in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey, where they say life is hard. They doubt they’ll ever see their homeland again.

Abdul has been picking up what he can about American politics. Asked if he could tell President Trump something about the Syrian refugee situation, he said: “I would tell him ‘Bring the refugees. Let them come. Because I lived with them. And I know the conditions.’”

Contributing: Daniel Gonzalez, The Arizona Republic; Chris Kenning, The (Louisville, Ky.) Courier-Journal; Brian Sharp, Justin Murphy, the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle; and Robert King, The Indianapolis Star

Hundreds Rally In Boston Against Trump’s Immigrant Policies

By Nicole Fleming And Martha Schick

[Boston Globe](#), January 28, 2017

A crowd of more than 300 gathered in Chinatown Saturday afternoon to protest President Trump’s controversial executive order that bars immigrants from some predominantly Muslim countries and refugees from entering the country.

Marching toward the State House, the protesters held signs reading, "Immigrants make America great" and "No trade war," as they chanted, "Donald Trump, you racist clown! Build a wall, we'll tear it down!"

Trump, elected in November, made immigration a top issue in his presidential campaign, vowing to build a wall along the country's southern border with Mexico and deport many undocumented immigrants. In the days since he took office, Trump has signed several executive orders that could have long-reaching effects on the country's immigration system.

Under a Friday order, Trump suspended entry to the country for all refugees for 120 days and banned Syrian refugees indefinitely. Immigration from seven predominantly Muslim countries — Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen — has also been suspended for 90 days.

The order has created chaos for people who were in transit to the United States. Boston-area academics, including members of the MIT and Harvard communities, are among those affected by Trump's order.

Ron Newman of Somerville, who attended the rally, said the order reminded him of how the MS St. Louis, a ship carrying more than 900 Jewish refugees from Germany, was turned away by countries including the United States in 1939. Many of the refugees later died in concentration camps.

"It seems like Donald Trump wants to repeat that history," said Newman, who is Jewish. "I think anyone who fought in World War II, whose family fought in World War II, should consider this [executive order] to be a betrayal of what they fought for."

"Immigrants are giving more than they are taking," said Martha Rodriguez, a Venezuelan immigrant who attended the rally with her two young sons. Rodriguez said she became a citizen last year but has relatives who are undocumented.

Many undocumented immigrants do pay taxes, Rodriguez said, and they can't benefit from government assistance because of restrictions already in place.

"The three of us are here for those who are too afraid to speak for themselves," she said.

The rally was organized by Boston May Day. The immigrants' rights group is affiliated with Cosecha, a group that is organizing a "Migrant Boycott" with immigrants pledging to abstain from shopping, as well as attending work and school, to show the influence of immigrants on the economy.

Gerardo Molinari of Somerville, who attended the protest as a member of a local chapter of the International Socialist Organization, said he moved to the United States from Central America in 2009.

"I'm not here because I want to be," Molinari said. "I work 40 hours a week. I'd love to be in my house resting, but I feel like I need to be here in solidarity with those standing up to Trump's hate speech."

In front of the State House, the group listened to speakers, several of whom criticized President Obama's immigration policy along with Trump's. The Obama administration deported more than 2.5 million undocumented immigrants — the most of any administration in history.

"Obama voted for the wall; Hillary Clinton voted for the wall," Lyn Meza said. "Donald Trump is just increasing a wall that is already there, that has been voted for by Democrats."

"We continue to be the working class," said Sergio Reyes, with Boston May Day. "Let us not have the Democrats hijack our people's movement."

Cairo Mendes stressed the importance of intersectionality as he addressed the crowd, saying that he would stand with Muslims and LGBT people, calling them his "family."

Mendes, an organizer for the Student Immigration Movement, said he and his family are undocumented immigrants. His mother works as a housekeeper and must drive to work every day without a license, he said.

"Being an undocumented immigrant is a walking embodiment of resistance," he said.

As Amy Cardoso of Woburn reached the State House with the other protesters, she said she was happily surprised by the turnout. Her husband Rivelino immigrated from Brazil, she said, so she knows the country's broken immigration system firsthand.

"If I changed one person's mind on the way here, that's success to me," Cardoso said.

The Massachusetts chapter of the Council on American Islamic Relations has organized another protest against Trump's executive order, scheduled for 1 p.m. Sunday at Copley Square, followed by a 2:30 p.m. Muslim prayer.

By 5 p.m. Saturday, more than 5,000 people had RSVP'd to the Facebook event, with another 15,000 indicating interest.

Hundreds of people participated in the protest a day after President Trump issued his order.

Nicole Fleming can be reached at nicole.fleming@globe.com. Martha Schick can be reached at martha.schick@globe.com. Follow her on Twitter @MarthaSchick.

Baker, Local Pols Oppose Trump Immigration Order

By Jim O'Sullivan

[Boston Globe](#), January 28, 2017

Republican Governor Charlie Baker opposes the immigrant ban President Trump has imposed on migrants and refugees from seven Middle Eastern and North African nations, Baker aides said Saturday.

"Governor Baker opposes applying religious tests to the refugee system and believes that focusing on countries'

predominant religions will not make the US any safer, as terrorists have demonstrated a determination to strike from all corners of the world,” spokesman Brendan Moss wrote in an e-mail.

“Instead, Governor Baker believes the federal government should focus on improving the techniques and systems in place to stop dangerous people from entering the country, regardless of the nation they seek to strike from,” he added.

Nationally, Republicans have been largely quiet since Trump signed the executive order on Friday. But Baker is one of many elected officials in Massachusetts who stated their opposition to Trump’s order, including Mayor Martin J. Walsh, US Representative Seth Moulton, and US senators Edward J. Markey and Elizabeth Warren.

The ban, which explicitly forbids refugees from war-ravaged Syria from entering the United States, has also reportedly affected longtime residents, many of whom are green card holders effectively blocked from returning to the country.

“There are people around the world who have nothing to do with ISIS, and he’s trying to make them all the same,” Walsh said in a telephone interview Saturday evening.

Walsh, who held a defiant and emotional press conference last week during which he promised to use City Hall to house undocumented immigrants sought by federal immigration officials, charged Trump with ignorance of the nuances of geopolitics and terrorism.

The first-term Dorchester Democrat said he has had several conversations in recent days with other Democratic big-city mayors about a host of issues — including immigration, health care, and climate change — and they shared concern over Trump’s actions.

“What he’s doing potentially could have drastic, lasting impacts on the American economy, and by extension the Massachusetts economy,” Walsh said.

Moulton, a Salem Democrat and decorated Marine veteran of the Iraq War, said the ban extends to foreign nationals who have aided US forces in war zones. He said “a lot more Marines that I served with would have died” without assistance from Iraqi translators and intelligence sources.

“They kept us from being killed and they helped us find our enemies,” Moulton said during a phone interview Saturday afternoon. “These are people who have put their lives on the line for not just their countries but ours. The least we owe them is a chance to keep on living.”

“Frankly, it’s a pretty dangerous situation,” said Moulton, an outspoken Trump critic who likened the president’s campaign to Adolf Hitler’s rise. “What Americans need to realize is that this absolutely puts out national security and our troops on the front line in danger.”

Moulton said one of his own Iraqi translators, from Najaf, just moved to the United States “a month or two ago. Thank God he got here before Trump got into office.”

Moulton, who served under General James Mattis when the latter commanded the First Marine Division in Iraq, backed his nomination to become Trump’s defense secretary. But the congressman said he was “shocked” that Mattis stood alongside Trump as the president signed the executive order on Friday.

Moulton said he was confident that Mattis privately opposes the measure. “But General Mattis knows better” than to lend his tacit approval by appearing at the signing, he said.

Warren urged Trump via Twitter to rescind the executive order and stand behind refugees from the affected countries.

She also noted that Friday was Holocaust Remembrance Day, a reminder of what can happen when people remain silent.

“Turning our back on refugees because of their religion creates recruiting fodder for ISIS and other terrorist groups,” Warren wrote.

Markey said on Twitter Saturday afternoon that he will fight Trump’s “immoral Muslim ban” that could affect the Bay State.

Massachusetts “thrives from the diversity of our immigrant community — in universities, business, and workforce,” he wrote. “Isolation harms our economy and families.”

Baker’s opposition to the order is far from his first break with Trump. In December 2015, after Trump proposed banning Muslims from entering the country, Baker swiped at him.

“I think that’s ridiculous, and I would never support a policy like that,” he told reporters at the time. “I have no idea what the motivation is on that. First of all, it’s unrealistic. Secondly, it’s inappropriate. And third, it doesn’t make any sense.”

Globe correspondent Mina Corpuz contributed to this report. Jim O’Sullivan can be reached at jim.osullivan@globe.com. Follow him on Twitter at @JOSreports.

Congresswoman, Lawyers Working To Free 13 Detainees At O’Hare

By Sam Charles, Lynn Sweet And Matthew Hendrickson

[Chicago Sun-Times](#), January 28, 2017

At least 13 people remained under detention at O’Hare International Airport Saturday evening, a day after President Donald Trump signed an executive order barring refugees and green card holders from seven Muslim-majority nations from entering the country.

Dozens of attorneys crowded the international terminal for most of the afternoon Saturday, offering pro bono legal aid to anyone who said their family members had been held by authorities.

U.S. Rep. Jan Schakowsky said she was working to secure the release of the rest.

Just before 6 p.m., the first person to tell attorneys his family was detained, Mohammad Amirisefat, was reunited with his sister, brother-in-law and their 6-month-old son, who were returning from visiting family in Iran.

After more than five hours of detention, Hessameddin Noorian and his wife Zahra Amirisefat, along with their baby son Ryan, passed through the gates of O'Hare's International Terminal.

Noorian said he was interviewed a half hour.

"They asked us to sit there, no cell phone, no call, no nothing," he said. "It was like 20 hours flight, and (we) were there for almost six hours, and I'm so tired."

Noorian said he didn't know the executive order applied to those like him who hold green cards.

"I thought as long as you have a green card, then you're safe, you're fine," Noorian said.

Asked how it felt to be detained in a country where he lives, works and had a child, Noorian said: "The only thing I could say is [it] seems something changed."

Julia Schlozman, one of the attorneys who traveled to O'Hare, helped resolve the Mohammad family's detention.

"I heard that there was a gentlemen being detained who had dual Iranian/British citizenship, and I had the idea, 'Maybe the British government has something to say about the fact that a U.K. passport is not being recognized by U.S. immigration authorities,'" Schlozman said.

Schlozman called "an emergency line" in London to see if the British authorities could follow up, and they said they would.

"I have no idea whether that had anything to do with any movement on the case, but I guess it was something," she said.

Rep. Schakowsky said after making "non stop" phone calls, she finally reached someone at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, which helped free the family who had arrived early Saturday afternoon on a flight from Frankfurt, Germany.

"It's unbelievable," she said.

As of 6 p.m., attorneys estimated there were still at least 13 people being detained. Earlier in the evening, immigration attorney Fiona McEntee said the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol would not let her see her client or honor the G-28 agreement that gave her the right to make decisions on her client's behalf.

About 150 protesters came to the international terminal to decry the executive order, eventually holding a rally outside Gate 5B.

Saturday night, attorneys for the American Civil Liberties Union and other groups were in federal court in New York, arguing that Trump's executive order was unconstitutional.

Earlier Saturday, Mohammad Amerisifat worried about when his relatives, who teach at Oakton Community College and live in Park Ridge, would be released.

"The officer told me, 'go out and wait patiently,'" he said, adding that family members of both his sister and brother-in-law were constantly text messaging him for new information, though he had none to give them.

As Amerisifat was addressing reporters, another man walked up and asked attorneys for help because, he said, his wife and child had been detained as well.

The fallout grew Saturday from Trump's immigration crackdown as U.S. legal permanent residents and visa-holders from seven Muslim-majority countries who had left the United States found they could not return for 90 days.

It was a period of limbo for an unknown number of non-American citizens from Iraq, Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia or Yemen now barred from the country where they were studying or had lived, perhaps for years.

A federal law enforcement official who confirmed the temporary ban said there was an exemption for foreigners whose entry is in the U.S. national interest. It was not immediately clear how that exemption might be applied. Trump's order exempts diplomats.

Those already in the U.S. with a visa or green card will be allowed to stay, according to the official, who wasn't authorized to publicly discuss the details of how Trump's order was being put in place and spoke only on condition of anonymity. Immigrant rights groups and lawyers were advising those in the U.S. with a visa or a green card to not leave the country.

Customs and Border Protection was notifying airlines about passengers whose visas had been canceled, and legal residents scheduled to fly back to the U.S. Airlines were being told to keep them off those flights.

Representatives from the Chicago Department of Aviation and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement deferred questions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Messages left with several agency representatives were not acknowledged Saturday.

Trump's order barred all refugees from entering the U.S. for four months and indefinitely halted any from Syria. He said the ban was needed to keep out "radical Islamic terrorists."

The next group of refugees was due to arrive in the U.S. on Monday, but the official said they would not be allowed into the country.

The president's order immediately suspended a program that last year resettled in the U.S. roughly 85,000 people displaced by war, political oppression, hunger and

religious prejudice. The order singled out Syrians for the most aggressive ban, ordering that anyone from that country, including those fleeing civil war, are indefinitely blocked from coming to the U.S.

“We want to ensure that we are not admitting into our country the very threats our soldiers are fighting overseas,” Trump said as he signed the order at the Pentagon. “We only want to admit those into our country who will support our country and love deeply our people.”

Trump’s ban on asylum-seekers came down even as Iraqis endangered by work for the United States in their home country were mid flight to their hoped-for refuge in the United States. As a result, they and countless other refugees, their families and aid workers scrambled Saturday as Muslim travelers were turned back on arrival at U.S. airports or blocked from boarding flights to America.

Organizations including the International Refugees Assistance Project, which helps former Iraqi translators for the U.S. military and other refugees seeking entry to the United States, and other organizations aiding asylum-seekers, rushed translators and lawyers to airports to try to help U.S.-approved asylum-seekers already on their way to the country as Trump’s ban came down.

Earlier Saturday, several groups, including the International Refugees Assistance Project, the National Immigration Law Center and the American Civil Liberties Union, filed a lawsuit in federal court in New York after two Iraqi men were detained at Kennedy International Airport and threatened with deportation even though they have valid visas to enter the United States, the complaint alleged.

One of the men was released after hours of detention, the New York Times reported Saturday afternoon.

“The situation is chaotic,” said Ahmed Rehab, a spokesman for the Council on American-Islamic Relations. “People have been turned away. People have been put in handcuffs.”

Rehab added that CAIR was building a database of those detained as of Saturday morning and working to connect them with lawyers.

Added Lena F. Masri, the group’s national litigation director: “There is no evidence that refugees — the most thoroughly vetted of all people entering our nation — are a threat to national security. This is an order that is based on bigotry, not reality.”

But Trump said the halt in the refugee program was necessary to give agencies time to develop a stricter screening system. While the order did not spell out what additional steps he wants the departments of Homeland Security and State to take, the president directed officials to review the refugee application and approval process and find any more measures that could prevent those who pose a threat from using the refugee program.

The U.S. may admit refugees on a case-by-case basis during the freeze, and the government will continue to process requests from people claiming religious persecution, “provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country.”

In an interview with CBN News, Trump said persecuted Christians would be given priority in applying for refugee status.

“We are going to help them,” Trump said. “They’ve been horribly treated.”

As a candidate, Trump called for a temporary ban on all Muslim immigration to the U.S. He later shifted his focus to putting in place “extreme vetting” procedures to screen people coming to the U.S. from countries with terrorism ties.

The Council on American-Islamic Relations said it would challenge the constitutionality of the executive order.

During the past budget year, the U.S. accepted 84,995 refugees, including 12,587 people from Syria. President Barack Obama had set the refugee limit for this budget year at 110,000.

According to Trump’s executive order, he plans to cut that to 50,000. Refugee processing was suspended in the immediate aftermath of the Sept. 11 attacks and restarted months later.

The president’s action was applauded by House Speaker Paul Ryan, who said it was “time to re-evaluate and strengthen the visa-vetting process.”

But many Democrats cast the measures as un-American.

“Tears are running down the cheeks of the Statue of Liberty tonight as a grand tradition of America, welcoming immigrants, that has existed since America was founded has been stomped upon,” Senate Democratic leader Chuck Schumer of New York said Friday.

Trump’s order was signed on Holocaust Remembrance Day, which brought to mind the global effort to help refugees during World War II and its aftermath.

The order makes no mention of a plan to provide safe zones in Syria and the surrounding area. A draft of the order had directed the Pentagon and the State Department to produce a plan for safe zones in the war-torn Mideast nation.

Contributing: Matt Hendrickson and Associated Press

18 People Held At O’Hare After Trump Order, Including Park Ridge Man: Lawyers

By Grace Wong and Stacy St. Clair

[Chicago Tribune](#), January 28, 2017

The family of a Park Ridge man said Saturday he was detained at O’Hare International Airport after returning with his family from Iran, one of the countries affected by President Donald Trump’s executive order on immigration.

In addition to the Park Ridge man, a resident of Oak Lawn also was possibly being detained, according to his son.

They were believed to be among as many as 18 people held at O'Hare because of the order, according to lawyers working with the International Refugee Assistance Project.

"This is insulting. This is insane, this is truly insane," said Mohammad Amirisefat, brother-in-law of the Park Ridge man.

The man returning from Iran, Hessem Noorian, was detained after landing at O'Hare shortly after noon, Amirisefat said. He said his sister and the couple's 6-month-old child were initially held too but were let go.

Noorian has a dual citizenship with Iran and the United Kingdom and has been living in Park Ridge with a green card, Amirisefat said.

Both he and Amirisefat's sister, Zehra Amirisefat, are professors at Oakton Community College. Zehra Amirisefat is a U.S. citizen, he said.

The couple left about a month ago to visit Tehran and introduce their baby to their family.

"The previous government granted a person a green card and the next government is just like, 'We don't care,'" Amirisefat said.

Trump's executive order, signed late Friday afternoon, suspends entry of all refugees to the United States for 120 days, bars Syrian refugees indefinitely and blocks entry for 90 days for citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen.

The Department of Homeland Security said the order also bars green card holders from those countries from re-entering the United States. White House officials said Saturday that green card holders from the seven affected countries would need a case-by-case waiver to return to the United States.

As Amirisefat spoke, about 25 lawyers summoned by the International Refugee Assistance Project gathered near McDonald's at O'Hare. They paced through the arrivals terminal, making their presence known to people who were waiting for travelers.

Hannah Garst, a Chicago lawyer, said as many as 18 people have been held in "secondary detention" at O'Hare because of the order.

She claimed they were being illegally held because they have not been granted lawyers and are being held in a room. Garst said many of them are not being allowed cellphones.

Elissa Mittman, executive vice president for operations of the International Refugee Assistance Project, said the executive order prompted the group to mobilize attorneys from around the country because refugees are being detained and sent back to their countries and Trump has shut down the refugee program for 120 days.

"Shutting down the refugee admission program is misguided in terms of national security and international interests," Mittman said.

About eight protesters were also on hand at O'Hare, holding signs. A rally was planned for 6 p.m.

An Oak Lawn man, Nasser Mused, 36, said he believed his father was being held at O'Hare because of Trump's order. He said he started to think something was wrong when his father didn't contact him two hours after his plane landed.

Abdulsalam Mused, 67, left Chicago in December to attend his son's wedding in Saudi Arabia. He is a Yemen passport holder with an American green card, his son said.

Nearly five hours after his father's plane landed, Nasser Mused said he had received no texts or calls on what was taking so long.

Abdulsalam Mused is a green card holder and was looking forward to seeking citizenship this May, Nasser Mused said.

"He did everything right," Nasser Mused said of his father. "He feels safe here because you have freedom of speech and freedom to be who you want to be. This is our country. He would do anything to serve this country."

Nasser said he feels concerned that people are being divided into groups and that he has never felt singled out like this before. He didn't expect his father to be held.

"It's indescribable," he said, wiping the side of his face with his hand while closing his eyes. "I've never felt that before. Never in my life."

Nour Ulayyet, 40, of Valparaiso, Ind., told the Associated Press that her sister, a Syrian living in Saudi Arabia, was sent back after arriving at O'Hare from Riyadh and told she couldn't enter the U.S. to help care for their sick mother. Ulayyet said some officials at the airport were apologizing to her sister, who had a valid visa.

"My mom was already having pain enough to go through this on top of the pain that she's having," Ulayyet said.

gwong@chicagotribune.com

stclair@chicagotribune.com

Immigration Attorneys At LAX Helping Immigrants, Many From Iran, Detained By Federal Officials

By Matt Pearce And Dakota Smith, Contact Reporters

[Los Angeles Times](#), January 28, 2017

At least 10 to 15 immigration attorneys have gathered at the Tom Bradley International Terminal at LAX international terminal to help travelers, mostly from Iran, who have been detained, one of the attorneys said Saturday.

Attorneys have not yet been able to determine the number of fliers detained, as customs officials are not allowing attorneys or their families any access or

communication with the detainees, said immigration attorney Jordan Cummings.

“We’re literally walking around, asking people, are you waiting for someone who has been detained?” said Cummings, describing a scene of worried family members who had arrived bearing flowers and welcome signs for their loved ones.

Some of the detained travelers included green-card holders, tourists, people with children and people with medical problems, Cummings said.

One detained traveler was an Iranian woman who’d held a green card in the U.S. for five years and whose citizenship swearing-in ceremony is in two weeks, Cummings said.

The woman has an 11-month old child with her who is an American citizen.

“People don’t have phone access or communication access to the people waiting for them, or their attorneys,” Cummings said. “It’s just really heartbreaking.”

A candlelight vigil to support Muslim refugees is scheduled for Saturday afternoon at Los Angeles International Airport. Meanwhile, another protest was underway in downtown Los Angeles.

The vigil comes in response to President Trump’s executive order suspending refugee arrivals and banning travel to the United States from seven Muslim-majority countries.

The abrupt ban ensnared people from all walks of life who were caught in transit or expecting to soon return to the U.S. — students on a break from studies, business travelers, tourists, even the bereaved who had gone home for a funeral.

The LAX candlelight vigil is being organized by the Service Employees International Union, and several politicians are expected to attend, including Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon. The protest is planned for 5 p.m.

A group of advocacy organizations, including the American Civil Liberties Union, filed a legal action against the policy on Saturday in New York, acting on behalf of two Iraqis who were stopped at John F. Kennedy International Airport hours after the order was signed. The writ seeks the release of the two Iraqis, who hold valid U.S. visas, unless the government can show lawful grounds for their detention.

The groups bringing the action, which also included the International Refugee Assistance Project and the National Immigration Law Center, said a separate motion sets the stage for a larger action involving other would-be refugees, visitors and immigrants stopped at other ports of entry.

4:05 PM: This article was updated with more information about the protest.

3:40 P.M.: This article was updated with more immigration attorneys.

Trump’s Immigration Ban Draws Deep Anger And Muted Praise

By Richard Pérez-Peña

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

A group of Nobel Prize winners said it would damage American leadership in higher education and research. House Speaker Paul D. Ryan and some relatives of Americans killed in terrorist attacks said it was right on target. An evangelical Christian group called it an affront to human dignity.

The reaction on Saturday to President Trump’s ban on refugees entering the United States, with particular focus on certain Muslim countries in the Middle East and Africa, was swift, certain — and sharply divided.

The order drew sharp and widespread condemnation Saturday from Democrats, religious groups, business leaders, academics and others, who called it inhumane, discriminatory and akin to taking a “wrecking ball to the Statue of Liberty.” Thousands of professors from around the country, including several Nobel laureates, signed a statement opposing the president’s action and calling it a “major step towards implementing the stringent racial and religious profiling promised on the campaign trail.”

At a news conference in Paris, the foreign ministers of France and Germany, Jean-Marc Ayrault and Sigmar Gabriel, said they were worried by the restrictions. “Welcoming refugees who flee war and oppression is part of our duty,” Mr. Ayrault said.

Immigration policy experts questioned the logic behind the action. They noted that terrorists who had carried out attacks in the United States had not entered as refugees, and that Muslim attackers had been people who were born here or came from countries like Pakistan or Saudi Arabia — which were not on the list of seven mostly Muslim countries that the administration has singled out for a complete halt to entry into the country. “Foreigners from those seven nations have killed zero Americans in terrorist attacks on U.S. soil between 1975 and the end of 2015,” Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration policy analyst at the libertarian Cato Institute, wrote on the group’s website.

Kathleen Newland, a senior fellow and co-founder of the Migration Policy Institute, a research group, said the new policy “will do damage not only to tens of thousands of refugees, but also to the reputation of this country as a reliable partner in the global humanitarian system.”

But the president’s executive order, issued on Friday, brought a positive, if more muted, reaction from Republicans, and could prove popular politically. During the presidential campaign, public opinion polls showed that about half of Americans favored the broader, more bluntly religion-based measure Mr. Trump originally called for, a ban on Muslims entering the country.

Michael Banerian, 22, who was a Trump elector in the Electoral College, and is the youth vice chairman of the Michigan Republican Party, said he saw the president's more narrowly tailored order as common sense. "I feel that it's a necessary step for us to take for the security of our nation," he said. "I don't think it's un-American. I think it's very reasonable."

Kathleen Ganci, 67, whose husband, Peter J. Ganci, the highest-ranking uniformed officer of the New York City Fire Department, was killed in the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, said she supported the order "because I know the pain that can be caused if even one person gets through."

"I don't care how difficult it makes it for these people to come over," she said. "I don't want other Americans to go through what I did — because we have to care for our own first, before we care for others."

The executive order put an indefinite halt to citizens of Syria, a country racked by civil war and an immense refugee crisis, entering the United States. It suspended immigration for 90 days from countries linked to terrorism that the State Department said would mean seven Muslim-majority countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. It also suspended the nation's program for admitting refugees from anywhere in the world for 120 days, while the government comes up with a stricter process for vetting them, but allowed for exceptions for persecuted religious minorities, like Christians in Muslim countries.

Mr. Trump said the moves were needed to protect the United States from the infiltration by "radical Islamic terrorists." Speaker Ryan released a statement saying, "President Trump is right to make sure we are doing everything possible to know exactly who is entering our country."

Many other leading congressional Republicans did not make statements on the matter, including Mitch McConnell, the Senate majority leader, whose aides said he had no plans to do so on Saturday. As reports began accumulating of legal migrants being stopped at airports in response to the president's order, some Republican aides on Capitol Hill started grumbling privately about how little the White House was defending its own policy.

The response from Democrats, however, was scathing. "This administration has mistaken cruelty for strength and prejudice for strategy," said Nancy Pelosi, the Democratic House minority leader. On Twitter, Senator Chris Murphy, Democrat of Connecticut, wrote: "To my colleagues: don't ever again lecture me on American moral leadership if you chose to be silent today."

The reaction was also largely negative from leaders of Silicon Valley, which relies heavily on employees from abroad, and has many companies founded or headed by immigrants or their children. A Google representative said, "We're concerned about the impact of this order and any

proposals that could impose restrictions on Googlers and their families, or that could create barriers to bringing great talent to the U.S."

Google's chief executive, Sundar Pichai, a United States citizen who was born in India, sent a memo to the company's work force, saying that as many as 187 of its employees who happened to be overseas were affected by the travel restrictions. In the memo, first reported by Bloomberg News, Mr. Pichai urged affected employees to contact Google's security team, noting that one person rushed back from New Zealand before the order was signed.

Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg wrote on the site that the nation should "keep our doors open to refugees and those who need help."

Some colleges and universities had urged students who might be affected by Mr. Trump's policies to return to the United States before inauguration day if they were abroad, or to remain in the country if they were already here.

The seven countries covered by the temporary ban on entry to the United States have about 13,000 citizens who are college or graduate students in the United States, said the American Council on Education, the largest association of those schools. The group said it was unclear how many were stuck abroad. "The challenge is, it is clearly up to the federal government to decide how to safeguard our nation, but at the same time, it is in America's interest to remain the destination of choice for the world's students and scholars," said Terry W. Hartle, the group's executive vice president.

In interviews, news conferences and petitions, many religious leaders criticized what they called a decision to give preference to Christian refugees.

The president's action poses a particular challenge to Christian leaders who have hailed his anti-abortion stances, and whose followers have largely supported Mr. Trump, but whose organizations are among the most active on behalf of refugees. Most of the groups that the government uses to resettle refugees are religious. "Any limitation against any vulnerable population is to fly in the face of human dignity, of people made in the image of God," said Scott Arbeiter, the president of World Relief, a charity affiliated with the National Association of Evangelicals.

Jen Smyers, director of policy and advocacy for the immigration and refugee program of Church World Service, said that the executive order was "akin to President Trump taking a wrecking ball to the Statue of Liberty."

More Republicans Are Speaking Out Against Trump's Refugee Ban. Paul Ryan And Mitch McConnell Aren't Among Them.

By Kelsey Snell, Karoun Demirjian And Mike Debonis
[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

Several congressional Republicans on Saturday questioned President Trump's order to halt admission to the U.S. by refugees and citizens of seven Muslim-majority countries, even as House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) continued to defend it.

Ryan was among the first lawmakers on Friday to back Trump's order, and his office reiterated his support on Saturday.

"This is not a religious test and it is not a ban on people of any religion," said spokeswoman AshLee Strong.

The order blocks citizens from Iran, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Somalia and Libya from entering the country for at least 90 days. It also bans refugees from anywhere in the world for 120 days — and from Syria indefinitely. Trump said that the goal is to screen out "radical Islamic terrorists" and that priority for admission would be given to Christians.

Republicans defending the executive order did so pointed to an exception for people already in transit and argued that some elements, including the religious minority preference, would not immediately be implemented. But as cable news footage brought scenes all day Saturday of chaos at airports around the country, where business travelers, students and even legal U.S. residents were being barred entry, other Republicans began weighing in.

"This is ridiculous," said Rep. Charlie Dent (R-Pa.). "I guess I understand what his intention is, but unfortunately the order appears to have been rushed through without full consideration. You know, the many, many nuances of immigration policy that can be life or death for many innocent, vulnerable people around the world

"I understand what his intention is," of the president. "But the order appears to have been rushed though without consideration. This is life and death for people around the world."

Dent, who represents a large Syrian community in the Allentown area, said he was contacted Saturday by a constituent who had family members turned away early in the morning at Philadelphia International Airport. Six family members who had secured visas and even bought a house in Pennsylvania arrived on a Qatar Airways flight but were returned back within hours, he said.

Dent called on the Trump administration to halt immediately action on the order.

"This family was sent home despite having all their paperwork in order," Dent continued, "so this 90-day ban could imperil the lives of this family and potentially others, and it's unacceptable, and I urge the administration to halt enforcement of this order until a more thoughtful and deliberate policy can be reinstated."

House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Ed Royce (R-Calif.) said Saturday that he backs the order but hopes for some resolution for those who were in transit as the order was announced.

"Pausing the intake of refugees from terror hotspots is the right call to keep America safe," Royce said. "I hope cases of individuals with visas traveling as this executive action went into effect — including some who served alongside U.S. troops — will be resolved quickly."

Some conservatives worried that denying entry to permanent residents and green card holders could violate the Constitution. Many worried privately that the order will face significant challenges in court. Rep. Justin Amash (R-Mich.) was among the few GOP members to air his concerns publicly. Amash posted on Twitter that the order "overreaches" and "undermines" the Constitution.

"It's not lawful to ban immigrants on basis of nationality," Amash tweeted. "If the president wants to change immigration law, he must work with Congress."

Sen. Ben Sasse (R-Neb.) credited Trump with properly focusing on protecting the country's borders and said it is necessary to connect "jihadi terrorism" with Islam and particular countries. However, he also noted that the order is "too broad."

"If we send a signal to the Middle East that the U.S. sees all Muslims as jihadis, the terrorist recruiters win by telling kids that America is banning Muslims and that this is America versus one religion," Sasse said. "Our generational fight against jihadism requires wisdom."

The statement from Ryan's office came after several requests seeking comment on how the order differs from the Muslim ban that Ryan rejected during the campaign, whether such a ban is in line with American values and if Ryan is concerned that the order is a first step towards a religious litmus test.

Ryan has been a consistent advocate for increased vetting standards and has frequently said he opposes a complete ban on Muslims entering the country.

"Freedom of religion is a fundamental constitutional principle. It's a founding principle of this country," Ryan told reporters following a closed-door morning meeting at the Republican National Committee in December of 2015. "This is not conservatism. What was proposed yesterday is not what this party stands for. And more importantly, it's not what this country stands for."

The majority of Republicans in Congress were silent on the order Saturday — including Senate Majority Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.). Calls and emails to more than a dozen top GOP lawmakers were not returned. Only one Republican senator contacted for this story had responded at the time of publication.

Conservative advocacy groups, meanwhile, generally supported Trump's actions.

In an interview Saturday with The Post, Faith and Freedom Coalition Chairman Ralph Reed defended Trump's executive order, calling it an "entirely prudent move" and

rejecting the notion that it amounts to a ban on Muslims or infringes on religious liberties.

"It makes perfect sense not to try to build the airplane in the air," said Reed, who advocated hitting "the pause button" on current practices on immigration and refugee policies, over concerns about terrorism.

Congressional aides who did respond generally insisted that Trump was merely adopting a policy that passed the House last year with a veto-proof majority. The seven countries named in the order are currently included in the list of as "countries of concern" by the Department of Homeland Security. People who have traveled to or lived in those countries were already subject to additional scrutiny when applying for visa waivers.

One senior GOP aide said in an email that the executive order was "narrow, a faint shadow of the policy Trump ran on."

The silence is a major departure from the outrage many Republicans expressed when Trump floated a Muslim ban during the campaign. At the time, several leading Republicans, including Ryan and McConnell said proposals to bar visitors based on religion are "completely inconsistent" with American values.

Statements trickled in slowly Saturday as lawmakers and government agencies scrambled to make sense of how the order would be applied. Confusion over the directive played out at airports across the country as immigration officials attempted to decide how to handle refugees and travellers from those seven nations who were already in transit or on the ground when the executive order was issued.

Several news outlets reported instances of travelers being detained in airports, including Hameed Khalid Darweesh, a 53 year old Iraqi man who spent several years acting as an interpreter for the U.S. Army in Iraq. Darweesh was released from detention in New York's John F. Kennedy airport after two New York Democrats, Reps. Jerry Nadler and Nydia Valazquez, intervened on his behalf.

Several Congressional aides who spoke on condition of anonymity said Saturday that the executive order itself does not single out a preference for Christians, and the temporary travel ban is focused on areas where terrorism is a particular concern. One senior aide dismissed as "false" accusations that the order constitutes a blanket policy against Muslims or Muslim-majority nations.

The House voted last year on legislation to suspend the admission of refugees from Syria and Iraq until the White House could certify that no person entering the United States would pose a security threat. Democrats blocked a vote on the legislation in the Senate and it ultimately failed to reach President Obama's desk.

Aides also said it is not uncommon for an administration to prioritize refugee requests on the basis of religious persecution. However, since the beginning of the -Syrian civil

war and the rise of the Islamic State, many more Muslims than Christians have been killed or displaced because of the violence.

Additionally, a 2015 Washington Post poll found that 78 percent of Americans favored equal consideration for refugees regardless of religion.

Ryan said Friday that while he supports the refugee resettlement program, he thinks it is time to "reevaluate and strengthen the visa vetting process."

"President Trump is right to make sure we are doing everything possible to know exactly who is entering our country," the speaker said Friday.

Other Republicans offered similar support for the order on national security grounds.

"President Trump signed an order to help prevent jihadists from infiltrating the United States," House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Michael McCaul (R-Texas) said in a statement. "With the stroke of a pen, he is doing more to shut down terrorist pathways into this country than the last Administration did in eight years."

Evan McMullin, a former CIA officer and House GOP policy director who waged an independent presidential bid in 2016, was one of a small number of Republicans to publicly oppose the ban. McMullin tweeted a photo of the Statue of Liberty on Saturday morning, and was promptly mocked by the white nationalist Richard Spencer.

"That's who they're in league with — white supremacists and white nationalists," McMullin said in an interview. "I'm not expecting much opposition from the vast majority of Republicans in Congress. There is anti-Muslim bigotry at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue and it fundamentally un-American and tangibly damaging to our national security and strength."

Most Republicans, McMullin predicted, would decline to criticize the executive orders. "Those who are silent on this will be defined by that silence," he said.

Sean Sullivan and David Weigel contributed to this report.

After Trump Order, Some Lawmakers Remain Silent, While Others Speak Out

Republican Charlie Dent says 'the order appears to have been rushed through without full consideration of the nuances of immigration policy'

By Natalie Andrews And Kristina Peterson

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

A Very Few Republicans Finally Criticize Trump's Refugee And Travel Ban

Most GOP members aren't talking about it at all.

By Elise Foley

[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON — Five Republican members of Congress broke with most of their party and President Donald Trump on Saturday by condemning his executive order to bar refugees and citizens of seven Muslim-majority countries.

Sens. Ben Sasse (R-Neb.), Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) and Susan Collins (R-Maine), along with Reps. Charlie Dent (R-Pa.) and Justin Amash (R-Mich.), said they opposed Trump's executive order, which has already wreaked havoc on the lives of refugees, travelers, immigrants and even U.S. citizens whose family members will now be barred from visiting them.

"I urge the admin to halt enforcement of this order until a more thoughtful and deliberate policy can be instated," Dent, a Trump critic who represents a large Syrian community, told The New York Times' Jonathan Martin.

Sasse said the order was too broad and potentially dangerous, even if it wasn't technically the blanket Muslim ban that Trump once proposed.

"If we send a signal to the Middle East that the U.S. sees all Muslims as jihadis, the terrorist recruiters win by telling kids that America is banning Muslims and that this is America versus one religion," Sasse said in a statement.

Amash said the executive order was unlawful because such a policy change should have gone through Congress.

Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), who is third in line for the presidency, issued a statement Saturday night urging the Trump administration to "move quickly to tailor its policy."

Dent told The New York Times that some of his constituents' family members were informed they could not enter the U.S. when they touched down at Philadelphia International Airport. In fact, many refugees, visitors and even green card holders who reside in the U.S. have been turned away in the 24 hours since Trump's order was issued.

Flake spoke out against the executive order later on Saturday.

"President Trump and his administration are right to be concerned about national security, but it's unacceptable when even legal permanent residents are being detained or turned away at airports and ports of entry," Flake said in a statement. "Enhancing long term national security requires that we have a clear-eyed view of radical Islamic terrorism without ascribing radical Islamic terrorist views to all Muslims."

Collins told Maine's Sun Journal that the refugee ban "is overly broad and implementing it will be immediately problematic."

Trump's executive order suspends refugee resettlement entirely for 120 days, bans Syrian refugees indefinitely and temporarily bars individuals from seven countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. Legal permanent residents, also called green card holders, from those same countries can be admitted only on a case-by-case basis,

according to the White House. Dual-nationals of those countries — a British-Iranian citizen, for example — are barred from entry.

Most Republicans in Congress have said nothing about the ban, which is unusual because most controversial White House policy announcements are met with either applause or criticism.

Only a few Republicans have issued statements. House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), who forcefully condemned Trump's call for a Muslim ban in 2015, said this time that "President Trump is right to make sure we are doing everything possible to know exactly who is entering our country." A spokeswoman for Ryan told The Huffington Post that Trump's order did not constitute a ban on Muslims, pushing back on the idea that Ryan's past statement was relevant to the current situation.

House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) and House Homeland Security Chairman Michael McCaul (R-Texas) also put out statements saying Trump did the right thing. The vast majority of Republicans remained silent.

This article has been updated to include comments from Sens. Jeff Flake and Susan Collins.

Republicans Go Largely Silent As Trump Bars Refugees And Immigrants From U.S.

But Paul Ryan is speaking up – in favor of a Muslim ban he used to condemn.

By Jennifer Bendery

[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON — There's been thunderous outcry on Capitol Hill in the hours since President Donald Trump signed an executive order on Friday stopping Muslims and refugees from entering the U.S.

Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) said "tears are running down the cheeks of the Statue of Liberty" as the U.S. turns away immigrants.

Sen. Chris Murphy (D-Conn.) warned that the president "just handed ISIS a path to rebirth."

Rep. Seth Moulton (D-Mass.), a Marine veteran, said that Trump's action puts U.S. troops' lives at risk and that Moulton is "ashamed that he is our president."

"History will judge where America's leaders stood today," lamented Senate Minority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.).

That's just a sampling of dozens of statements being fired out by Democrats. On the Republican side, the reaction is significantly different: silence.

GOP lawmakers, who now control both chambers of Congress, have gone quiet in response to the president's unilateral action that bans Syrian refugee resettlement in the U.S. indefinitely, shuts down the nation's entire refugee program for 120 days, and bars all immigrants and visitors

from seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the U.S. for at least 90 days.

As The New York Times' Glenn Thrush observed on Twitter, Republicans haven't been this quiet "since the last positive jobs report under Obama." HuffPost spotted statements from just four GOP members of Congress, all in support of Trump's move. One of them, Rep. Michael McCaul (R-Texas), said it's important to deny refugees entry "to help prevent jihadists from infiltrating the United States."

It's worth noting that the U.S. refugee screening process is already very intensive. The likelihood of being killed by a refugee terrorist in the U.S. is 1 in 3.6 billion, per a new Cato Institute report.

The smattering of Republicans who issued statements didn't raise concerns about the fact that Trump had effectively imposed a religious test for traveling to the United States. The president's order was already causing chaos at U.S. airports, as refugees and immigrants arrived late Friday or Saturday, only to be detained or told they can't enter the country.

It's not just rank-and-file Republicans trying to duck the issue. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) hasn't said a peep. His counterpart, House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), is one of the handful who did respond to Trump's action — by supporting it, while simultaneously saying America is a "compassionate" nation.

"Our number one responsibility is to protect the homeland. We are a compassionate nation, and I support the refugee resettlement program, but it's time to reevaluate and strengthen the visa vetting process," Ryan said. "This is why we passed bipartisan legislation in the wake of the Paris attacks to pause the intake of refugees. President Trump is right to make sure we are doing everything possible to know exactly who is entering our country."

It was just months ago that Ryan was condemning Trump's campaign trail threat to institute a Muslim ban. Back then, when few expected Trump to win the election, Ryan said targeting immigrants didn't reflect "America's fundamental values."

Before he was vice president, Mike Pence, too, denounced the idea of banning an entire group of people from the country based on their religion. Here he is in December 2015, when he was governor of Indiana:

On Saturday, Ryan spokeswoman AshLee Strong pushed back on the idea that Trump's action targets Muslims.

"This is not a religious test and it is not a ban on people of any religion," she said.

The difference between then and now is that Trump is the president. Republican Party leaders like Ryan and McConnell appear willing to give him a pass on whatever extreme actions he wants to take — instituting a Muslim ban, directing Congress to spend billions to build a wall along the Mexican border — as long as he helps them pass laws they want pass, like cutting taxes for corporations and repealing

the Affordable Care Act. These are types of things Republicans have been itching to do, but couldn't under President Barack Obama.

It remains to be seen when, or if, Republicans will draw a line on embracing Trump's controversial and, in this case, racist actions. When even hawkish former Vice President Dick Cheney has suggested Trump's ideas go too far, it appears there is a line somewhere.

"This whole notion that somehow we can just say no more Muslims, just ban a whole religion, goes against everything we stand for and believe in," Cheney said in December 2015.

This story has been updated with comment from Ryan spokeswoman AshLee Strong.

CORRECTION: Dick Cheney condemned Trump's proposed Muslim ban in December 2015, not his executive order on Friday.

GOP Critics Hit Trump Immigration Order

By John Bresnahan

[Politico](#), January 28, 2017

Several Republicans have come out in opposition to President Donald Trump's executive order barring immigrants from seven Muslim-majority nations, criticizing it as "overly broad" or poorly conceived.

Yet most Republicans, especially those on Capitol Hill, have kept silent, declining to publicly comment on a hugely controversial move by Trump that many party leaders had harshly criticized when he first raised it during the presidential campaign.

And Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), once a harsh critic of any ban on Muslim immigration, came out in defense of the president's order. Senior GOP congressional aides said that Trump's action was not targeted specifically at Muslims and therefore did not mean the White House was imposing a religious test on refugees.

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) would not comment on Trump's order. McConnell plans to make his position known during a Sunday morning TV interview.

Democrats across the country reacted with fury over Trump's declaration, and they vowed to fight the order legally and politically.

Trump's executive order, issued on Friday night, calls for a temporary halt to the admission of people from seven Muslim-majority countries; a temporary ban on all refugees; and an indefinite ban on Syrian refugees.

There is also a directive that religious minorities from those Muslim-majority countries, which by implication means Christians in many cases, get priority among refugees eventually admitted to the United States.

Sen. Ben Sasse (R-Neb.), who clashed with Trump during the campaign, said the order could hurt U.S. standing with Muslims worldwide.

According to Sasse, “while not technically a Muslim ban, the order is too broad. There are two ways to lose our generational battle against jihadism by losing touch with reality. The first is to keep pretending that jihadi terrorism has no connection to Islam or to certain countries. That’s been a disaster. And here’s the second way to fail: If we send a signal to the Middle East that the U.S. sees all Muslims as jihadis, the terrorists win by telling kids that America is banning Muslims and this is America versus one religion.”

Rep. Charlie Dent (Pa.), one of the few remaining GOP moderates in the House, was upset about a Syrian refugee family turned away by U.S. immigration authorities at Philadelphia’s airport.

In a statement, Dent said, “A Syrian Christian family who, according to family members in my district, held valid visas and were not refugees, yet were detained at the Philadelphia International Airport and then forced to leave the country as a result of the Executive Order. This family now faces the uncertain prospect of being sent back to Syria.”

Dent called the episode “unacceptable and I urge the administration to halt enforcement of the order until a more thoughtful and deliberate policy can be instated.”

Rep. Justin Amash (R-Mich.), a frequent critic of executive power, objected to Trump’s action in a series of statements on Twitter.

“The president’s denial of entry to lawful permanent residents of the United States (green card holders) is particularly troubling,” Amash said. “We must do much more to properly vet refugees, but a blanket ban represents an extreme approach not consistent with our nation’s values.”

Ryan was one of the few Republicans to openly praise Trump’s order.

“We are a compassionate nation, and I support the refugee resettlement program, but it’s time to reevaluate and strengthen the visa vetting process. This is why we passed bipartisan legislation in the wake of the Paris attacks to pause the intake of refugees,” Ryan said in a statement. “President Trump is right to make sure we are doing everything possible to know exactly who is entering our country.”

When pressed on whether this is a reversal by Ryan, who previously said he did not support any effort to bar Muslim immigration, an aide to the Wisconsin Republican noted Muslims are not explicitly targeted or singled out in the Trump order.

“This is not a religious test and it is not a ban on people of any religion,” AshLee Strong, Ryan’s spokeswoman, insisted.

A senior GOP congressional aide noted that Trump’s order is focused on fighting terrorism and preventing potential terrorists from getting into the country, something the American public strongly backs.

The aide also said the order did not affect refugees or visa applicants in the “vast majority” of Muslim nations.

“The visa suspension is focused only on those nations where terrorism is a particular concern,” the aide said. “And the refugee program suspension, other than for Syria, is applied to all countries. To suggest that is a blanket policy on Muslims or Muslim-majority nations is false.”

House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), a hardliner on the issue of Syrian refugees, also backed Trump’s move.

“The primary duty of the federal government is to keep Americans safe. Today, President Trump has begun to fulfill this responsibility by taking a number of critical steps within his authority to strengthen national security and the integrity of our nation’s immigration system,” Goodlatte said. “As ISIS terrorists have vowed to use the immigration system to inflict harm, it’s imperative that we know who is coming and going from our country. National security officials have repeatedly warned that we dramatically lack the resources and information to fully vet refugees from countries of concern, like Syria.

With reports that refugees were being held up at U.S. airports, including some who had aided U.S. soldiers fighting in Iraq and elsewhere, Democrats rushed to try to intervene.

New York Democratic Reps. Jerrold Nadler and Nydia Velazquez went to John F. Kennedy Airport to help a group of men who had been prevented from entering the country.

According to a statement from the two Democrats, “after meeting with officials from the Custom and Border Patrol agency, one of the refugees, Hameed Khalid Darweesh, an Iraqi translator who helped the United States government, was released. Reps. Velazquez and Nadler are still working to release 11 others being held at JFK under the new executive order.

“The order almost banned a man from entering the country who has worked for the United States government for 10 years, who risked his life to help us and to help our troops, and who loves our country,” said the two Democrats. “Thankfully, we did not sit idly by. We took action. We demanded his release, and the release of the others who are being unlawfully detained. We are pleased to announce that Hameed Khalid Darweesh has been released and can now be reunited with his family.”

The lawmakers said they were working to get 11 more men released from custody.

“This should not happen in America,” Nadler and Velazquez said. “We shouldn’t have to demand the release of refugees one by one. We must fight this executive order in the streets, in the courts, anywhere, anytime.”

Democrats Slam Trump’s Immigration Ban As Callous And Cruel

The Statue of Liberty is crying, Nancy Pelosi said.

By Sam Levine

[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

Democratic lawmakers harshly and unequivocally condemned President Donald Trump's executive order Friday that blocks refugees from entering the United States and bars all people coming from seven Muslim-majority countries.

The widespread criticism from Democrats contrasted sharply with the response from Republicans, who went largely silent after Trump signed the order.

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) said there were tears in the eyes of the Statue of Liberty over the president's action.

"As the Statue of Liberty holds her torch of welcome high, there are tears in her eyes as she sees how low this Administration has stooped in its callousness toward mothers and children escaping war-torn Syria. This Administration has mistaken cruelty for strength and prejudice for strategy," Pelosi said in a statement.

Trump's order did nothing to address threats of terrorism, Pelosi added. There have been no terror attacks on U.S. soil from individuals from the seven countries specifically targeted by the president's action.

Sens. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) and Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) both argued that the order would actually make America less safe.

Rep. Keith Ellison (D-Minn.), the first Muslim elected to Congress, said the executive order "runs contrary to everything we cherish about America."

"To all those afraid: you are not alone. We are with you. And we will fight for you," Ellison said in a statement.

Rep. Seth Moulton (D-Mass.), a Marine veteran, said he was "ashamed" that Trump was president.

"His policies literally put our troops' lives at risk — I've heard this loud and clear when I have visited them overseas. They also prove he has zero understanding of our country's values and no intention of defending our Constitution," Moulton said in a statement. "We are a nation of immigrants, and America is stronger when we welcome the refugees of our enemies. These policies do not put America first. I am ashamed that he is our president."

Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) tweeted that she was nauseated after reading about Hameed Khalid Darweesh, a man who had worked on behalf of the United States in Iraq for 10 years but was still detained at New York's JFK Airport on Friday night.

Reps. Jerry Nadler and Nydia Velazquez, both New York Democrats, went to the airport on Saturday to try to intervene on behalf of multiple individuals who had been detained because of Trump's executive order. Nadler later tweeted a picture of him and Velazquez with Darweesh, who had been released.

"What is happening at JFK International Airport right now is an affront to American values. This harkens back to a previous dark episode in our nation's history when we turned

away Jewish refugees seeking safe harbor from the horrors of Nazism. I will not and cannot stand idly by as the Trump administration begins repeating such unconscionable acts," Velazquez said in a statement.

Trump had initially discussed his proposal to ban Muslims from entering the United States in December 2015, prompting broad condemnation even from Republicans.

Schumer Calls For Trump Admin To 'Rescind' Refugee Order

By Jesse Byrnes

[The Hill](#), January 28, 2017

Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) is calling on the Trump administration to back off the president's sweeping order barring many refugees after a number of detentions at U.S. airports Saturday.

Schumer said that he called Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly on Saturday "to urge the administration to rescind these anti-American executive actions that will do absolutely nothing to improve our safety."

"In fact, they will do the opposite. We have a long and proud tradition of accepting refugees who seek safety in the United States, after a long and thorough vetting process. That tradition should continue," he said.

"These executive orders were mean-spirited and un-American in their origin, and implemented in a way that has caused chaos and confusion across the country. They will only serve to embolden and inspire those around the globe who would do us harm. They must be reversed, immediately," Schumer added.

The Democratic leader's statement came after two refugees were detained at John F. Kennedy International Airport on Friday after Trump's order went into effect.

The American Civil Liberties Union and other legal groups filed a lawsuit on behalf of two Iraqi refugees detained and threatened with deportation at JFK early Saturday morning.

Hameed Jhalid Darweesh, who worked for the U.S. government in Iraq for 10 years, was blocked from entering the U.S. when he landed at JFK on Friday night. He was later released.

Democratic Reps. Nydia Velazquez (D-N.Y.) and Jerrold Nadler (D-N.Y.) worked to secure his release on Saturday as reports emerged that a number of other refugees were being detained.

Trump defended his order on Saturday amid chaos as the administration moved to implement his directive, which was handed down Friday evening and bars Syrian refugees indefinitely while halting the resettlement of all refugees for four months.

It also blocks entry for 90 days for individuals coming from Iraq, Iran, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Libya and Yemen.

The Department of Homeland Security said Saturday the order also applies to green card holders from the seven impacted countries. A senior administration official clarified green card holders from countries outside the U.S. could receive a waiver on a case-by-case basis.

'Lady Liberty Is Crying,' Democrats Declare In Wake Of Trump's Visa, Asylum Executive Order

By Andrew Blake

[Washington Times](#), January 28, 2017

Democratic leadership in the House and Senate slammed President Trump's signing of a broad executive order targeting refugees Friday as antithetical to the nation's tradition of welcoming "huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

"As the Statue of Liberty holds her torch of welcome high, there are tears in her eyes as she sees how low this Administration has stooped in its callousness toward mothers and children escaping war-torn Syria," House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, California Democrat, said Friday.

"Tears are running down the cheeks of the Statue of Liberty tonight as a grand tradition of America, welcoming immigrants, that has existed since America was founded has been stomped upon," Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, New York Democrat, said in a statement of his own.

The lawmakers' comments came within hours of Mr. Trump issuing an executive order Friday effectively closing the United States' borders to citizens from seven Muslim-majority countries as part of what the president has touted as a plan to eradicate Islamic terrorism as promised on the campaign trail. The order temporarily bars entry to citizens of Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen, as well as suspending accepting Syrian asylum seekers "until such time as I have determined that sufficient changes have been made ... to ensure that admission of Syrian refugees is consistent with the national interest."

Other Democrats similarly denounced the president's order into the weekend, contrasting his so-called "Muslim Ban" with the credo that has greeted millions of immigrants arriving in the U.S. by way of Ellis Island and its neighboring landmark, the Statue of Liberty.

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!" reads a sonnet inscribed on the base of the statue.

"Trump's action is not based on national security, it is based on bigotry. Lady Liberty is crying." Rep. Ted Lieu, California Democrat, said in a statement Friday.

"I can think of few things more un-American than discriminating against people seeking refuge on our shores because of their religion. This action betrays who we are as a country and makes us less safe," said Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, Maryland Democrat.

The libertarian Cato Institute said in a report last year that 20 of the 3.2 million refugees admitted into the U.S. between 1975 and 2015 were terrorists, amounting to around 0.00062 percent of total refugees allowed.

Copyright © 2017 The Washington Times, LLC. Click here for reprint permission.

Dem: Feds Need To Explain Refugee Order

By Max Greenwood

[The Hill](#), January 28, 2017

A Democratic lawmaker is urging the Department of Homeland Security to release an explanation of President Trump's executive order blocking admissions of citizens from seven Muslim-majority countries and what the action means for travelers.

In a letter to Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly, Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.) blasted Trump's order, saying that it ran counter to "the principles of religious liberty, equality, and compassion that our nation was founded upon."

"In its discriminatory impact of Muslims, it also plays into the Al Qaeda and ISIS narrative that the West is no place for Muslims and that we are engaged in a war of civilizations," Schiff said, referring to the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

"The capricious enforcement of this order is likely to heighten its harmful effects and present legal and constitutional issues," he added.

Schiff also demanded to be notified if any refugees were being detained at Los Angeles International Airport, which is part of his district, saying his office would provide assistance to anyone having difficulty navigating any roadblocks they may face.

"The Department of Homeland Security must immediately make available a full explanation of the order and its implications for travelers. It is unconscionable that such an order would be released without warning, effective immediately, a decision that can only seem designed to maximize suffering," he said.

"DHS must spell out plainly the order and ensure it is available to travelers and Americans, hundreds of thousands of whom now fear for themselves and their loved ones."

Schiff's letter comes amid wide backlash to Trump's executive order handed down Friday that halts the country's refugee resettlement program for 120 days and bars people from seven predominantly Muslim countries from traveling to the U.S.

The order stirred controversy almost immediately. Reports of refugees being detained upon their arrival at U.S. airports prompted a lawsuit against the Trump administration

by several legal groups, and Democratic lawmakers scrambled to call for the president to rescind the measure.

Many civil-rights groups and Democratic lawmakers compared the order to Trump's campaign proposal in late 2015 to temporarily ban Muslims from entering the U.S., but Trump on Saturday denied that his order amounted to a "Muslim ban."

Keith Ellison, First Muslim Congressman, Calls For 'mass Rallies' To Stop Trump Orders

By David Weigel

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

HOUSTON — Rep. Keith Ellison (D-Minn.), who in 2007 became the first Muslim member of Congress, said in an interview Saturday that opponents of President Trump's executive orders on immigration and refugees should oppose them in the streets.

"It's time for people to get active, to get involved, to vote and to organize," said Ellison, who was in Houston to campaign for chairman of the Democratic National Committee. "Trump must be stopped, and people power is what we have at our disposal to make him stop. We need mass rallies. We need them all over the country. We need them in Texas. We need them in D.C. We need them in Minnesota."

Ellison, one of the first candidates to enter the DNC race, is also the most politically prominent member of a faith singled out in Trump's executive orders temporarily halting the visa interview process from seven nations and the refugee flow from Syria. On Friday, before heading to Houston, he joined a rally in Miami-Dade County against plans for it to cooperate in Trump's crackdown on sanctuary cities; former labor secretary Tom Perez, seen as the other front-runner in the DNC race, responded to Trump's plan to investigate "voter fraud" with an op-ed about Texas's experience chasing after phantom fraud cases.

Once in Houston, Ellison found himself zipping between meetings with DNC members while Muslim legal groups were collecting stories of stranded refugees and working, in vain so far, to reunite them with families.

"I've heard from people who were on the way to Minnesota and were blocked," said Ellison. "They're stopping people at the border right now. They're breaking up families now. This is an absolute affront to America as a welcoming nation that gives refuge to suffering people. It is basically sending a positive signal to people who hate this country, because now ISIS gets to say — 'See? They don't want you.' They get to whip up hate and anti-American sentiment."

While no Republican members of Congress have spoken out against last night's executive orders, Ellison pointed out that his colleagues had opposed them in the past — before the 2016 election.

"Speaker Ryan said that using religion as a criteria for any treatment of people is wrong an un-American," said Ellison. "Well, Trump said he wanted a Muslim ban. He has selected only Muslim countries to ban people. We can't tolerate it."

Sanders: Trump 'Fostering Hatred' With Refugee Ban

By Max Greenwood

[The Hill](#), January 28, 2017

Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) on Saturday accused President Trump of "fostering hatred" with his executive order barring people from certain Muslim-majority countries from entering the U.S.

"Trump's anti-Muslim order plays into the hands of fanatics wishing to harm America. Love and compassion trump hatred and intolerance," Sanders tweeted.

"Demagogues survive by fostering hatred. We won't allow anyone to divide us up by our religion, country of origin or the color of our skin," he added.

Trump's anti-Muslim order plays into the hands of fanatics wishing to harm America. Love and compassion trump hatred and intolerance. <https://t.co/hUzvqqd9H>— Bernie Sanders (@SenSanders) January 28, 2017

Demagogues survive by fostering hatred. We won't allow anyone to divide us up by our religion, country of origin or the color of our skin.— Bernie Sanders (@SenSanders) January 28, 2017

Trump signed an executive action Friday barring people from seven Muslim-majority countries from traveling to the U.S., and halting the country's Syrian refugee resettlement program.

The president has argued that the move will help protect the U.S. from terrorists that use the resettlement program to enter the country. But opponents argue that the action eviscerates a program that provides vital assistance to refugees, and ultimately empowers terrorist organizations.

Warren Goes On Tweetstorm Over Refugee Ban

By Brooke Seipel

[The Hill](#), January 27, 2017

Massachusetts Democratic Senator Elizabeth Warren went on a tweetstorm against President Trump Friday night for his executive order that calls for new vetting of refugees and those seeking to enter the U.S. from certain Muslim-majority countries, and a complete ban on refugees from Syria.

Trump's order declares that "the entry of nationals of Syria as refugees is detrimental to the interests of the United States" and suspends their entry until the president has

determined that their entry “is consistent with the national interest.”

“Let’s be clear: A Muslim ban by any other name is still a Muslim ban,” Warren said in her series of tweets. “Donald Trump’s order restricting immigrants from Muslim countries & freezing admission of refugees is a betrayal of American values.”

15 months ago, I traveled to the Greek island of Lesbos – the 1st stop for many Syrian refugees as they flee the terrors of ISIS. pic.twitter.com/Q02rbWqoWJ— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 27, 2017

I saw the shoddy, paper-thin rubber rafts that people cram onto with a hope & a prayer that they’ll make it across the choppy, rocky sea.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 27, 2017

I saw the plastic pool floaties parents put on small children, hoping that would be enough to save them if the raft went down. pic.twitter.com/C8HQpWIB11— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 27, 2017

And I met a 7-yr-old girl – younger than my own granddaughters – who had been sent out on that perilous journey alone. pic.twitter.com/00beGm7URo— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 27, 2017

I thought about what horrors must have possessed her parents to hand a wad of cash & their little girl over to human smugglers.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 27, 2017

Today, @realDonaldTrump closed the door on that little girl – & so many others who are running for their lives.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 27, 2017

Let’s be clear: A Muslim ban by any other name is still a Muslim ban.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 28, 2017

.@realDonaldTrump’s order restricting immigrants from Muslim countries & freezing admission of refugees is a betrayal of American values.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 28, 2017

We are a country of immigrants & refugees, of people fleeing religious persecution & seeking freedom, a country made strong by diversity.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 28, 2017

The Syrian refugees admitted to the US last yr are kids, doctors, teachers, engineers, & college students who sought safety from terrorists.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 28, 2017

Turning our back on refugees because of their religion creates recruiting fodder for ISIS and other terrorist groups.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 28, 2017

On #HolocaustRemembranceDay, we remember what can happen when hatred & fear turns neighbor against neighbor. When we abandon those in need.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 28, 2017

I urge @realDonaldTrump: embrace policies that reflect America’s core values & protect our ntl security. Rescind this executive order now.— Elizabeth Warren (@SenWarren) January 28, 2017

Trump is also imposing a 90-day ban on entry to the U.S. for visitors hailing from “countries of particular concern” when it comes to terrorism. The order does not list specific countries that would fall under the ban, but the Department of Homeland Security said they included Iran, Sudan, Syria, Libya, Somalia, Yemen and Iraq.

When refugee admissions resume, Trump ordered his administration to prioritize claims “made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution, provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country of nationality.”

That would allow the Trump administration to put Christians from Muslim-majority nations first in line for refugee status, a drastic shift from the policy under former President Barack Obama.

Warren’s statements join those of other prominent party members such as Senate minority leader Chuck Schumer and California Sen. Kamala Harris.

How Trump Just Made America Less Safe

The president just handed ISIS a path to rebirth.

By Sen. Chris Murphy

[Huffington Post](#), January 27, 2017

Donald Trump’s long-awaited Muslim ban became a reality today. No, you might say, it’s not actually the proposal he outlined during the campaign. True, the ban doesn’t cover every Muslim globally, just a set of Muslims from countries Trump perceives, rather arbitrarily, to be dangerous.

But today’s announcement is anchored in his campaign rhetoric, and the fact that every country on today’s list is a Muslim-majority nation confirms that he meant what he said – that Muslims are dangerous and need to be treated differently than any other set of people.

This is why today’s proposal is likely to get Americans killed.

ISIS, the most dangerous of a global array of radical Islamic terrorist groups, is in retreat. Every day, they lose more territory, and it is only a matter of time before their self-proclaimed caliphate disappears before the world’s eyes. The continual loss of territory robs from ISIS one of their two main rationales for existence – the creation of a geographic entity based on their perverted interpretation of Islam.

But ISIS has a second purpose – to take part in an imagined global struggle of civilizations between Christians and Muslims. President Obama and President Bush before him knew the danger of stoking talk of war between east and west. Obama knew how important this kind of talk was to ISIS’s recruitment and expansion, and he went out of his way to tamp it down.

The decision to turn our backs on millions of men, women, and children attempting to flee torture and terror shrinks us as a nation, and marks an unconscionable abandonment of our founding principles.

Trump has now handed ISIS a path to rebirth. They can and will use his announcement today as confirmation that America is at war with Muslims, especially those Muslims living in desperate circumstances. Their recruitment bulletin boards will light up with new material. Their entreaties to would-be lone wolf attackers in America will have new energy and purpose.

All the work we have done to cut down on extremist recruitment at home and abroad now goes out the window. It's a new day for terrorist recruiters.

And the list is dangerous for other reasons. It makes Americans think that terrorists can be contained simply by focusing on a few countries that are often in the news. But the real threats to America are much broader than just these countries. Where is Saudi Arabia on this list? Or Pakistan? Does Trump not recall that the attackers on September 11th came not from Syria or Iran or Sudan, but from Saudi Arabia, our supposed ally? And what about Europe, a continent that now enjoys relatively unfettered travel rights to the United States? Radicalized European citizens have already carried out massive terrorist attacks, and under current law, they can travel to the U.S. without almost any security screening. Terrorist threats do not originate in one set of countries, and thus a geographic approach is feckless.

If President Trump was serious about tackling the terrorist threat, he would make sure the Europeans were sharing counterterrorism intelligence with each other, and with us, so we can track potential terrorists no matter what country they come from. Another commonsense measure would be to ban people on the terrorist watch list from buying deadly firearms in America. But rather than do any of these things that would actually make Americans safer, Trump is pursuing misguided policies rooted in bigotry and fear.

And the boon to flailing terrorist groups is just the beginning of the tragedy of today's announcement. During my last trip to the Middle East, I was upbraided by our allies in the region for our country's refusal to help them with the flow of refugees out of Iraq and Syria. Over and over they told me, as they had told the Obama administration, that we would never be perceived a partner in the fight against Islamic extremism if we washed our hands of the refugee problem.

We assail Libya and Yemen and Syria and Iraq with bombs, and then simply expect other countries to deal with the consequences. We make the mess, then expect others to clean up. This infuriates our friends and damages our partnerships. Now, Trump's Muslim ban will risk severing ties between us and many of these nations. They will see our policy as xenophobic and detrimental to the displaced

persons crisis in the region. Our ability to build a truly multi-national response to extremism will become impossible.

We assail Libya and Yemen and Syria and Iraq with bombs, and then simply expect other countries to deal with the consequences.

Finally, the decision to turn our backs on millions of men, women, and children attempting to flee torture and terror shrinks us as a nation, and marks an unconscionable abandonment of our founding principles. Remember, those who make it into the U.S. refugee program have survived the worst of the worst – they are those who are so badly injured, so in danger, that they cannot survive in refugee camps. The vast majority of them are women, young children and the elderly. They are desperate and scared, and without harbor in the United States, many of them will perish.

We are a nation founded by religious refugees. Over and over, we have opened our doors to those fleeing war and terror. Jews during the Second World War. The Vietnamese in the 1960s and 1970s. Bosnians and Albanians during the Balkan War. I am proud to represent Connecticut, a state which is a testament to this past practice. Each time we found ways to sort out the good guys (99%) from the bad guys (1 percent). There were terrorists in Vietnam and the Balkans who wanted in – we kept them out. We can do the same here. We can protect ourselves from terror and rescue others from terror – these are not mutually exclusive ends.

And we must do both. Trump's Muslim ban is a moral abomination. It is fundamentally un-American. And it is dangerous – it will give life back to the terrorist movement and eventually get Americans killed.

We knew today was coming. Trump means what he says, and now his offensive ramblings against people of Muslim faith are edified in law. But we don't have to accept it. We must fight this new policy. We must seek to rescind it. We must let the world know that Trump's discriminatory views do not reflect the true America. And we must rally Americans who think that keeping Muslims out keeps us safe to understand that this policy does exactly the opposite.

This isn't who we are. It's not who we should be. And I will fight this policy with all that I have.

Iraqis Who Aided U.S. During War Now See Visa Hopes Dim

By Maria Abi-Habib

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Iran Retaliates, Canada Opens Arms After Trump Immigration Ban

By Bill Keveney

[USA Today](#), January 28, 2017

World leaders reacted harshly Saturday to President Trump's executive order suspending immigration and visas for citizens from certain countries with majority Muslim populations. Iran, one of the targeted nations, suggested it would limit issuing visas to American tourists.

Trump on Friday suspended all refugee admissions to the U.S. for four months and banned the entry of Syrian refugees indefinitely pending a security review meant to ensure terrorists cannot slip through vetting. Trump also issued a 90-day ban on all entry to the U.S. from seven Muslim-majority countries with terrorism concerns, including Syria.

The official IRNA news agency Saturday carried a statement by the Iranian foreign ministry that says Iran will resort to "counteraction" to Trump's executive order.

"Iran, to defend the dignity of the great Iranian nation, will implement the principle of reciprocity until the removal of the insulting restriction against Iranian nationals," the statement reads. "It will apply corresponding legal, consular and political actions."

The two countries have had no diplomatic relations since 1979 when militants stormed the U.S. embassy.

Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif issued a series of tweets in response to President Trump's order, saying the move would be "a great gift to extremists and their supporters."

He explained that statement further, tweeting: "Collective discrimination aids terrorist recruitment by deepening fault-lines exploited by extremist demagogues to swell their ranks."

A follow-up tweet promised a reciprocal response: "While respecting Americans & differentiating between them & hostile U.S. policies, Iran will take reciprocal measures to protect citizens."

Other world leaders, including officials from Canada and Scotland, also tweeted responses to the new U.S. policy.

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau embraced refugees, also temporarily prohibited from entering the U.S., making a pointed comment about not discriminating on religious grounds: "To those fleeing persecution, terror & war, Canadians will welcome you, regardless of your faith. Diversity is our strength #WelcomeToCanada"

Nicola Sturgeon, first minister of Scotland, retweeted Trudeau, seconding his invitation: "#WelcometoScotland too."

People in the affected countries reacted with dismay to the U.S. move, the Associated Press reported.

"I am shocked beyond words. This will mean that my new husband will never be able to join me in the U.S.," said Fatima Ashkir, a Somali-American woman from Florida who came to Mogadishu to marry her Somali boyfriend.

In Jordan, a Syrian refugee who submitted to an initial security screening in the hopes of moving to the U.S., sees his hopes dashed with President Trump's order.

"When we heard of the order, it was like a bolt of lightning, and all our hopes and dreams vanished," Ammar Sawan said Saturday.

Other Syrian refugees in Jordan warned that U.S. policy could inflame anti-American sentiment in the region.

"This decision made the U.S. lose its reputation in the world as the biggest economy, the biggest democracy," said refugee Nasser Sheik, 44, who was paralyzed by a stroke two years ago and lives with his family in Amman.

"We are not going out to harm people of other countries," added his wife Madaya, 37.

Trump Ban Sparks U.S. Immigration Chaos, Infuriates Muslims

By Jeff Mason And Jonathan Allen

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

U.N. Agencies Urge Trump To Allow Refugees Entry

By Stephanie Nebehay

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

UN Hopes US Refugee Ban Is Temporary

[Daily Mail](#), January 28, 2017

UN hopes US refugee ban is temporary

Afp

1/28/2017 2:52:33 PM

By Afp

Published:

14:52 EST, 28 January 2017 |

Updated:

14:53 EST, 28 January 2017

The United Nations hopes that US President Donald Trump's decision to ban refugees is a temporary measure and that they will again be given protection, its spokesman said Saturday.

"We hope that the measures concerning the suspension of refugee flows are temporary as refugee protection needs have never been greater," said UN spokesman Stephane Dujarric.

"The US resettlement program is one of the most important ones in the world."

Trump on Friday signed an executive order suspending the US refugee resettlement program for 120 days.

In addition, all visa applications from seven Muslim countries – Iraq, Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia and Yemen – were put on hold for at least 90 days.

The UN refugee agency UNHCR and the International Organization for Migration said in a joint statement that they hoped the United States “will continue its strong leadership role and long tradition of protecting those who are fleeing conflict and persecution.”

On Friday, UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres told a Holocaust commemoration that discrimination against migrants and refugees along with the stereotyping of Muslims were opening the door to more extreme hatred.

“A ‘new normal’ of public discourse is taking hold, in which prejudice is given a free pass and the door is opened to even more extreme hatred,” Guterres told the General Assembly.

Share or comment on this article

Sorry we are not currently accepting comments on this article.

Advocacy Groups Condemn U.S. Suspension Of Refugee Program

By Miriam Jordan

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 27, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Heartbreak And Anger Follow Trump's Immigration Order

By Evan Allen

[Boston Globe](#), January 28, 2017

Across the state, people working to resettle refugees and immigrants reacted with heartbreak and anger Saturday to President Trump's executive order barring people from seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States.

“This is just really ugly, for us to close our doors like this,” said Marc Jacobs, chief executive officer at Jewish Family Service of Metrowest. Jacobs watched more than six months of careful planning — and the desperate hopes of people fleeing war for their lives — evaporate on Friday night when the executive order went into effect.

The order closes the border to immigrants from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen for 90 days, bars all refugees for 120 days, and bars Syrian refugees indefinitely. The order caused confusion for people who were traveling when it was signed, and protests broke out Saturday in Boston and elsewhere around the country.

For Jacobs, whose organization has built a wide coalition of groups — synagogues, Islamic centers, academic institutions, and health-care providers — to support 15 Syrian refugee families, the impact of the order was immediate and harsh. Five families had made it to America. Ten had not.

The last family had arrived Tuesday night, he said. They stepped off a plane at Logan International Airport, the mother cradling their 1-year-old, the father holding the hand of their 5-year-old. They were just thankful to be safe, he said. When they got to their new apartment to enjoy a welcome meal cooked by another refugee, their 5-year-old took to her new toys with delight, holding a tea party for her teddy bear.

“These are young parents that would do anything for their children,” said Jacobs. “It’s a child at a time. That’s what the horror of this is.”

The timing of the executive order — signed on International Holocaust Remembrance Day — lit up social media. One Twitter account spent the day tweeting the entire passenger manifest of the St. Louis — a ship carrying about 900 Jewish refugees to the United States in 1939, which refused it entry.

“Our community knows all too well the suffering that comes from a time America turned away refugees,” said Rabbi David Lerner, the rabbi at Temple Emunah in Lexington and president of the Massachusetts Board of Rabbis.

Many synagogues across the state, he said, are taking in and supporting refugees. For Jews and many other religious groups, charity toward refugees and immigrants is a core principle of faith.

“People find this almost a pure opportunity to do what the Gospel says, what our religion teaches — which is the value of serving the poor and rejected, and welcoming strangers and sojourners,” said Judson Brown, a member of St. John’s Episcopal Church in Northampton, which has made a commitment to sponsor a refugee family of three from the Democratic Republic of Congo.

The family — a mother, father, and 10-month-old baby — was slated to arrive sometime between February and May, he said. Church members and community members have been busy arranging them housing, gathering furniture, and lining up language instruction. Parishioners were even planning to learn a bit of Swahili and Kinyarwanda.

But on Saturday, Brown, like many other people trying to digest the executive order, was not sure how or if it would affect their plans, as the DCR is not one of the seven countries named in the executive order. Even without the order, he said, the process of coming to the United States includes extensive vetting and a thick web of rules and regulations.

“It’s not exactly a railroad train,” he said.

At St. Peter’s Episcopal Church in Weston, where parishioners had raised \$2,375 in grants and gift cards toward an interfaith effort organized by Temple Beth Elohim in Wellesley to sponsor two families of Syrian refugees for a year, the Rev. Lynn Campbell said she was crestfallen.

The congregation undertook the effort because it is important to recognize the human dignity of the refugees, she

said. The first family, which includes four children under the age of 8, arrived last week. But the second family, due to arrive in the spring, will likely not be resettled after all.

Community organizations that work with immigrants saw their plans thrown into disarray as well.

The International Institute of New England, which resettles about 600 refugee and immigrant families every year, was expecting to receive a family of four from Syria this Monday, said president and CEO Jeffrey Thielman.

Four years after fleeing the war, and after painstakingly following every regulation from the US government, the institute had an apartment and a new life waiting for them in Lowell. But with the order, Thielman said, they have been stranded in Turkey.

"This is a very mean-spirited and unnecessary executive order," said Thielman. "This isn't going to help keep the United States safer. It's not going to make us a stronger country."

Globe correspondent Amanda Burke contributed to this report. Evan Allen can be reached at evan.allen@globe.com. Follow her on Twitter @evanmallen.

Warm Welcome For Syrians In A Country About To Ban Them

By Jodi Kantor

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

On Friday afternoon, a group of suburban synagogue members clustered at O'Hare International Airport, waiting to greet one of the last Syrian refugee families to be accepted in the United States, to give them the warmest possible welcome to a country that no longer wanted their kind.

In Washington, the presidential limousine was already speeding toward the Pentagon, where President Trump would sign a paper officially slamming the door shut on Syrian refugees. But here the volunteers had yellow roses, more warm coats than the newcomers would need and, a few miles away, an apartment ready with a doormat that said "welcome" in 17 languages.

"Welcome to chicag Hope you make your selfs at home" said a sign made by one of the youngest members of the group.

Whatever the new president said about the supposed dangers of Syrian refugees, the volunteers, who knew almost nothing about the family they were about to welcome, instantly identified with them anyway. They had already committed to helping guide and care for the newcomers for six months.

Some of the volunteers were children or grandchildren of refugees. Their synagogue, Am Shalom ("Nation of Peace") in Glencoe, Ill., displays a statue depicting members' families who perished at the Nazis' hands. The Syrian family, and the president's orders, were coming on International

Holocaust Remembrance Day, some of the volunteers noted with tears in their eyes. A hundred synagogue members had contributed in some way to helping resettle the Syrians: renting an apartment steps from a playground, assembling a vacuum cleaner, lining up juice boxes in the refrigerator.

Some of the synagogue members had signed on instinctually, so the Syrians would be helped the way their own parents or grandparents had been aided when they arrived in the United States. Others had joined as a way of countering Mr. Trump — just a few of the many Americans, of varied backgrounds, reacting with shock, outrage and concern to his curtailment of the country's long-established refugee resettlement system.

"The Statue of Liberty has always been our symbol of welcome," Rabbi Steven Stark Lowenstein, the group's leader, said at the airport. "It feels like Trump turned off the light," he said.

At the Pentagon on Friday, the preparations for the president's actions were orderly: High-level officials gathered in a room called the Hall of Heroes, and photographers assembled. But around the country, refugees, resettlement workers and volunteers expressed panic. Resettlement workers did not know if they would have jobs once Mr. Trump's refugee and immigration plans have been fully carried out. Volunteers wondered what they would do with furniture and money they had collected for refugees who were supposed to arrive soon.

RefugeeOne, the resettlement agency responsible for the family coming into O'Hare, had been expecting another Syrian family to arrive on Monday.

"That's not happening," Kim Snoddy, the program's liaison to groups like the Am Shalom volunteers, said as she waited with them at the airport on Friday.

A volunteer from another Chicago group posted a photograph on Facebook of an empty crib, made up with a pink sheet and a stuffed bunny, for the baby of a family that would no longer arrive.

Resettlement workers and volunteers across the country said that since Election Day, Americans of diverse backgrounds had been lining up to aid refugees, channeling their opposition to Mr. Trump into a desire to help vulnerable newcomers. Sloane Davidson, 37, a graduate student in Pittsburgh, hosted refugees for Thanksgiving dinner and said she was so moved by the experience that she took a job as a case aide at a local agency.

"The more I learned about what I felt to be the truth and the truth that Trump was telling," the more she wanted to get involved, she wrote in an email.

Resettlement agencies said that volunteers had been swarming their offices and that even more had surfaced last week when Mr. Trump's specific plans became public. When the International Refugee Assistance Project put out a call for lawyers to help new arrivals in danger of being turned away, it

received 3,000 volunteers in four hours, said Becca Heller, the organization's director.

"People are desperate to help refugees as a way to counter these discriminatory policies," she said.

As the minutes passed at O'Hare, the volunteers checked the time again, tense with the knowledge that Mr. Trump was about to commit pen to paper. The family they were awaiting had flown into Washington the night before, meaning they had cleared immigration with less than a day to spare. But the volunteers said they would not be able to exhale until the newcomers landed in Chicago. The flight was delayed, they heard. They glanced at the time on their phones again.

As soon as the Syrian family of four stepped into the baggage claim area, the synagogue members surrounded them protectively, offering the flowers and signs, as a resettlement worker translated. Because they spoke no English, the newcomers wore tags around their necks, like Paddington Bear, so if they got lost, they could be identified.

In a moment, the two Syrian children's arms were laden with gift bags of toys. The parents said they were too terrified to talk to a reporter, out of concern for family members — some still trapped in dangerous areas of Syria and others who had been cleared to travel to the United States but had not yet received plane tickets.

After hugs and snapshots and many professions of welcome and thanks, the group at the airport dispersed. The refugees headed to their new home with a few escorts, the synagogue members back to their far more stable lives. Just before they parted, Rabbi Lowenstein gathered his congregants and gave them a charge.

"If this is the last group of refugees to get in, we will show them the best of America," he said.

The family was driven to its new home, where a meal and a Syrian-style semolina cake were waiting. Members of the family said they had not checked the news since landing in the United States, and no one from the volunteer group told them what was about to happen. Moments before they arrived at the cozy, fully stocked apartment, Mr. Trump, wearing an American flag pin, signed the orders in front of an audience of his advisers and Pentagon officials. As he finished, the clapping in the room was loud.

Behind him hung an oversize medal depicting the Statue of Liberty, a beacon of welcome.

Donald Trump's Un-American Refugee Policy

By David Miliband

[New York Times](#), January 27, 2017

President Trump's executive order suspending the entire resettlement program for 120 days and banning indefinitely the arrival of Syrian refugees is a repudiation of fundamental American values, an abandonment of the United States' role as a humanitarian leader and, far from protecting

the country from extremism, a propaganda gift to those who would plot harm to America.

The order also cuts the number of refugees scheduled for resettlement in the United States in the fiscal year 2017 from a planned total of about 110,000 to just 50,000. Founded on the myth that there is no proper security screening for refugees, the order thus thrusts into limbo an estimated 60,000 vulnerable refugees, most of whom have already been vetted and cleared for resettlement here. The new policy urgently needs rethinking.

Refugees coming to the United States are fleeing the same violent extremism that this country and its allies are fighting in the Middle East and elsewhere. Based on recent data, a majority of those selected for resettlement in America are women and children. Since the start of the war, millions of Syrians have fled not just the military of President Bashar al-Assad but also the forces of Russia, Iranian militias and the Islamic State.

There are also thousands of Afghans and Iraqis whose lives are at risk because of assistance they offered American troops stationed in their countries. Of all the refugees that my organization, the International Rescue Committee, would be helping to resettle this year, this group, the Special Immigrant Visa population, makes up a fourth.

Giving haven for those persecuted for their politics is a core American value. The more than 62,000 Cubans resettled by the committee since 1960 would find this executive order's denial of refugee needs not just insulting, but bizarre.

The order also suggests that the resettlement program should make persecuted religious minorities a higher priority, implying that they have been neglected in the past. This is incorrect; existing law already places strong emphasis on religious persecution among the criteria for resettlement. For example, most of the refugees from Iran — a Muslim-majority country — who are resettled by my organization are not Muslim.

Compared with other types of immigrants, refugees are the most thoroughly vetted group to enter the United States. The resettlement process can take up to 36 months and involves screenings by the Department of Homeland Security, the F.B.I., the Department of Defense, the State Department and the National Counterterrorism Center and United States intelligence community. According to the Cato Institute, the chances that a citizen here will be killed by a refugee are one in 3.64 billion; an American is far more likely to be killed by lightning than by a terrorist attack carried out by a refugee.

The United States can be proud of its wide network of refugee champions, for good reason: Refugee resettlement is an American success story. And this is true not just on the coasts but across the country. In the 29 cities where the Rescue Committee has resettlement offices, elected officials

like the mayor of Boise, Idaho, and the governor of Utah, along with police officers, school principals, faith leaders and small-business owners, actively welcome refugees. They do so out of a sense of a moral obligation, of course, but also because they have witnessed the myriad ways refugees have enriched their communities over the years.

To take one example, over the course of a decade, refugees created at least 38 new businesses in the Cleveland area alone. In turn, these businesses created an additional 175 jobs, and in 2012 provided a \$12 million stimulus to the local economy.

There is a further concern raised by the president's refugee ban. When the United States abjures its responsibility to the world's most vulnerable people, it forgoes its moral authority to call upon the countries of Europe, as well as poorer nations like Lebanon, Turkey, Kenya and Pakistan, which host over five million refugees among them, to provide such shelter.

Historically, the United States has welcomed the "huddled masses yearning to breathe free," and this has helped cement America's leadership of the international order. But why should others continue to bear their heavy burdens when the United States won't? Support for refugees is not charity; it is a contribution to the global stability on which all nations depend — and this is especially important at a time when the world faces a heightened threat of terrorism.

Terrorists are strategic in their work and their messaging. The civilized world must be equally strategic in its response. Where extremists seek to foster a clash of civilizations, democratic governments should not play into their hands.

That is what a ban on specific nationalities does. It is not right, it is not needed and it is not smart.

In 1980, when Congress passed the Refugee Act with bipartisan support, President Carter's secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Joseph A. Califano Jr., said the refugee issue required the United States to "reveal to the world — and more important to ourselves — whether we truly live by our ideals or simply carve them on our monuments."

That still resonates today. Expert review of the resettlement vetting process is part of good government. Hasty dismissal of carefully developed systems is harmful in and of itself. It is also a distressing departure from fact-based policy making.

The world looks to America for enlightened leadership. Its citizens seek the same from their government. Refugee policy is a telling test for every nation. The United States passed that test for so many years, so it is a tragedy for it now to fail when its commitment is needed more than ever.

Trump Shuts The Door On Men And Women Who Have Sacrificed For America

By Matt Zeller

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

Matt Zeller is a veteran of the war in Afghanistan and the co-founder and chief executive of No One Left Behind

With his latest executive order and immigration ban, President Trump has shut the door on thousands of foreign interpreters, our wartime allies, who have served alongside our military since 2001. As a combat veteran who has served in the U.S. Army, this action deeply disappoints and angers me. I shouldn't be alive today. I am only here writing this piece because of my Afghan Muslim translator, Janis. He shot and killed two Taliban fighters who nearly ambushed me in a firefight in Afghanistan in 2008.

The president's actions on Friday are troubling for so many reasons. First, the sweeping ban doesn't take into account that our allied military translators are quite possibly the most vetted individuals aligned with our military. The stringent background checks begin long before they are cleared to work alongside Americans in a combat zone. Then the process for granting the Special Immigrant Visa (SIV), which allows them to resettle in the United States, is even more painstaking. To even apply for the SIV, one must meet ALL of the following criteria:

Be a national of Iraq or Afghanistan; and

Have worked directly with U.S. armed forces or under Chief of Missions authority as an interpreter for at least 12 months; and

Have obtained a favorable, written recommendation from a military or civilian member of the U.S. government.

All this to simply apply for the SIV. To be approved, the interpreter must clear these additional hurdles:

- Receive the written nomination;

- Prove he or she provided at least 12 to 24 months of honorable and valuable service to the United States war effort;

- Prove he or she is under immediate duress due to that service;

- And, lastly, pass the most extreme form of vetting the United States can muster — a comprehensive national security background investigation completed by every single component of the U.S. national security apparatus (the CIA, FBI, National Security Agency, etc.). All agencies conduct separate investigations and do not coordinate cross-agency. The decision from the national security apparatus must be unanimous, meaning that all the agencies involved must approve the application package. If even one agency dissents on a visa approval, that applicant is barred from entry to the United States and placed on the no-fly list — forever.

These men and women have served our country honorably — in some cases, for more than a decade. A decade of combat service to America, fighting alongside Americans, wearing the same uniforms, bleeding their blood for our country. Is that not the most American thing one could

do — fight for the ideals they believe in to better one's country? These wartime allies are true-blooded Americans, though they were born half a world away.

Would we deny a man who was injured in multiple improvised explosive device (IED) attacks, repeatedly led U.S. service members through enemy territory safely and fostered local relations? Would we deny a man who is credited with saving five American soldiers lives, including mine? Remember, this man's name is Janis, and if he were an American-born veteran, we'd pin medals to his chest and call him a hero.

This ban leaves thousands of our wartime allies to fend for themselves against the very enemies we asked them to fight. Veterans of the Vietnam War speak often of their half-century injury at having abandoned so many of our Vietnamese allies. Friday, the president cast the same injury upon our newest generation of American veterans and we didn't get a say. Many of our wartime allies have already been waiting on their visas for years and some, with approved visa in hand, will simply not be able to make it to safety because of the president's decision.

We are permanently harming the fabric of U.S. national security. Our credibility is forever tarnished if not eroded. Why would any potential ally trust the United States to keep its word again? It pains me to think how many U.S. service-members will die in future conflicts because we were unable to recruit the local, on-the-ground support that is often the difference between life and death. These men and women have sacrificed so much for the United States. Friday's order means the enemy wins, and we have turned our backs on our own ideals.

I Went Through America's Extreme Vetting

By Mostafa Hassoun

[Politico Magazine](#), January 28, 2017

I'm a Syrian refugee living in the United States. My family, which fled to Turkey in 2011 as protests against the government grew, is Muslim. And on Friday, Donald Trump signed an executive order that would have made it difficult, if not impossible for me to find safety in America.

This executive order, which suspends visas for the citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries and calls for "extreme vetting," isn't just discriminatory and heartless — it doesn't make any sense. Because in every conceivable way, the vetting process is already extremely thorough. I know this because I went through the process myself.

Over 15 months I was interviewed five times — in person, over the phone, by the United Nations and by the United States. They asked me about my family, my politics, my hobbies, my childhood, my opinions of the U.S., and even my love life. No less than four U.S. government agencies had the opportunity to screen me. By the time I received my offer

to live in the United States, the U.S. officials in charge of my case file knew me better than my family and friends do.

In fact, there is probably nobody in the world that knows me better than the United States government. But that didn't stop Trump from saying last December, "People are pouring in from regions of the Middle East. We have no idea who they are, where they come from."

President Trump knows both who I am and where I'm from, and a whole lot more. If there is something else he'd like to know — anything short of my family renouncing its Syrian and Muslim identities — I can't imagine what it might be.

Until the start of the civil war, I had never left Syria. But in 2011, my parents, my three sisters, my brother and I fled our coastal hometown of Latakia. We really didn't have a choice — the regime knew that my father and I had participated in the protests, and government forces were on their way to occupy our city. If we stayed, we would have been killed.

When we arrived at the Turkish border, we camped there for two weeks, waiting for an international solution that would stop the fighting. None came, but with regime forces approaching, we asked the Turkish army for permission to cross the border. They took down our information, gave us refugee identification numbers, and brought us to camps.

By the time my family and I applied for resettlement in 2013, my family was living in Antakya, a city in southern Turkey. As a group, we walked into a refugee center run by the United Nations, gave them our basic information and formally applied. We got a call a week later, asking us to come for an interview in Ankara, Turkey's capital, and two weeks after that we got on buses to take the nine-hour trip.

Riding on the bus that day, I had no idea that I was about to begin the longest application process of my life.

When we first arrived, the United Nations officials measured our height, our weight, took our fingerprints and our photos. Once every member of the family had been accounted for, they ushered us into our first interview. They asked what our religion was, what our politics were, where we went to school, what we were doing 10 years ago. I'm not religious, but my father answered for the family and said that we're Muslim. After an hour, they split us up and interviewed individually. Then the questions got even more specific: "Why do you hate Syria's president, Bashar al-Assad?" "Why were you protesting?" "What's your opinion of Barack Obama?" They asked about my friends, my relatives, who they are, where they are and what they do. When I told them that several of my friends had died in the uprising, they pressed for details. The interviewers checked for discrepancies in my story as they repeated to me the questions they had already asked my father. This went on for another two hours.

By the time our family headed home, we had divulged the majority of our life stories. But as it turns out, this was just

an introductory interview. Two months later we were back on the bus, heading to Gaziantep, Turkey, for the next round. They asked us all of the same questions as before, but this time with follow-up questions and an aggressive attention to detail. "If Assad gives you freedom and democracy, why are you protesting him? What is it exactly that you want from him?" "Who were you protesting with? Were you involved with any groups?" My interviewer wanted to know all of my associations and connections, from before and during the revolution.

And this time, it was clear that the interviewer had done her research beforehand. She would follow up my answers with a pointed, "Are you sure?", and she would ask questions that clearly had a right and a wrong answer. At one point, she asked me how long my family had camped on the border Turkish-Syrian border. I told her two weeks. She looked at me and inquired, "Two weeks, or more like 20 days?" I said yes, 20 days sounded about right.

Between the in-person interviews, I know that the officials handling my application were looking for anything, anything at all, that could disqualify me for resettlement. And when they thought they found something, they wouldn't hesitate to follow up. A month after my second interview, I received a phone call out of the blue. The resettlement agency asked me about a field hospital I worked in for seven months, after we first arrived in Turkey. Did I know who owned it? Does he work with a jihadist group? Whose donations are funding this hospital? I told them I knew little – I was just working there, helping out. Their probing continued for half an hour.

By this point, my family had an online file. We could check the status of our application online, and we did check every day.

A few weeks after I received the phone call, our status was updated: The International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) had accepted our application for settlement in the United States. This did not mean the United States was accepting us as refugees; it just meant that the ICMC, which is a federally funded Resettlement Support Center, had accepted our application for consideration. There was no guarantee our application would succeed, and the American vetting process was just beginning.

Next we were on our way to Istanbul, a 15-hour bus ride from Antakya. The ICMC center we walked into felt like an embassy; beyond multiple security checkpoints was a flurry of activity, and the reception area was full of refugees from Syria, Iraq and elsewhere, waiting for their chance at a new life.

As had happened during our first interview, the employees took our fingerprints and a variety of profile photos. This time, they even scanned our irises.

The interview went much the same way as before, repeating many of the same questions we had already heard.

This time, there were more questions about the United States. If I lived in America, what would I want to do there? They wanted to know if I'd be interested in protesting in the United States, and what would I protest for? What are some good things and bad things about the United States? They even asked if I had a girlfriend, and if I did, would I want to bring her with me? During the entire two hours, cameras in the room were rolling.

My family grew accustomed to waiting – who knew when we would receive the next phone call? Maybe if we were rejected, we never would be told? I now know that as the months rolled by, I was being screened by any number of U.S. agencies, such as the State Department, the FBI and the National Counterterrorism Center, to name a few. For cases of Syrian refugees specifically, the Department of Homeland Security conducts an enhanced review.

Finally the phone call came in and we headed back to Istanbul, this time for an interview with the State Department. We were made to swear that everything we had said in past interviews was true, and told that if we made it to the United States and the government later discovered we had been lying about something in our past, we would be in major trouble. The U.S. officials mostly asked questions we've been asked before – biographical history, political affiliations, our reasons for protesting Assad. The officers asking the questions had been specially trained for this moment, the final interview in what had become a 15-month process. In many ways, I'm lucky – the average wait for a refugee applicant is 18 to 24 months. Or, at least it was.

With the final interview completed, and a few more months of waiting after that, I only had one barrier left: the medical check. This wasn't a check-your-temperature, hit-your-knee-with-a-hammer kind of doctor's appointment; this was a top-to-bottom, full-scale health assessment. They took blood samples, X-rayed most of my body and stripped me of my clothing. My eyes, and then my ears, were tested as healthy. All told, the medical examination was an eight-hour day.

Finally, after nearly a year and a half of being poked and prodded, physically and figuratively, I had been given clearance to start a new life in the United States. The U.S. government by then had a complete picture of who I am and who I've been. Getting through the five interviews was truly an exercise of autobiography, and if you told me beforehand the depth and breadth of United States' vetting process, I probably wouldn't have believed you. It was definitely extreme.

But not everyone in my family was given the same offer to move to the U.S. Only my sister and I were granted the opportunity, and my sister decided she didn't want to part with her parents and other siblings. As for my mom and the others, after the final interview, they never heard back from the American resettlement agency. Luckily, they eventually

received offers from other countries; my mom, my brother and one of my sisters are in Sweden, I have another sister in Germany, and my father is still in Turkey but hopes to join my mom in Sweden soon.

It's almost beyond belief to me that anyone could mischaracterize the U.S. government's vetting process as weak and insufficient, when it's clearly anything but, to justify shutting the gate to millions of Syrian refugees. There is no way to look at my experience and the experience of tens of thousands of other refugees living in America and conclude that the country's vetting system is not exhaustive and thorough.

To me, the real rationale behind Friday's executive order is obvious: The president and his supporters do not trust people like me. Being both Syrian and Muslim (though I'm not personally religious) makes me doubly suspicious. I'm happy to be in the United States, a country I love. But it saddens me deeply to see what is happening here.

Mostafa Hassoun is a Syrian refugee living in the United States.

Tech Firms Recall Employees To U.S., Denounce Trump's Ban On Refugees From Muslim Countries

By Brian Fung And Tracy Jan

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

The country's leading tech companies are recalling overseas employees and sharply criticizing President Trump in the wake of his order on Friday that barred foreign Muslims from entering the United States for 120 days.

Google chief executive Sundar Pichai late on Friday ordered scores of staffers traveling overseas to return to the United States immediately. Pichai sent out a company-wide memo that was highly critical of Trump's action, saying it could prevent roughly 190 foreign-born Google employees from entering the United States, according to a person who has seen the memo and verified its authenticity.

"We're upset about the impact of this order and any proposals that could impose restrictions on Googlers and their families," wrote Pichai, "or that could create barriers to bringing great talent to the US."

Thousands of tech workers living in Silicon Valley or abroad could potentially be impacted by Trump's executive order, according to Zahra Billoo, executive director of the San Francisco Bay Area office of Council on American-Islamic Relations.

About 250,000 Muslims are estimated to live in the Bay Area, many of whom are Arab or South Asian immigrants working at companies such as Google, Facebook, Twitter and Microsoft. Green card holders are at risk as well.

"This is just where it starts. What happens when they add Pakistan? Or a Gulf country? Indonesia and Malaysia?"

said Billoo, a civil rights attorney. "By targeting immigrants in this way, Trump's executive orders not only directly impacts certain workers, their families and these companies, they also impact co-workers because people from other Muslim-majority countries could be next."

In addition to blocking travelers from Iraq, Iran, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Libya and Yemen, the restrictions on foreign entry will also apply to those who hold dual nationality. That would mean a person born in one of those seven countries, but holding a passport from some other country such as the U.K., could also be denied entry into the United States.

Microsoft General Counsel Brad Smith, in a letter to staff Saturday, said that at least 76 employees will be affected by Trump's policy. The company said it has already contacted those individuals with offers of legal assistance, and urged other employees who may be subject to the ban to contact the company as soon as possible.

"As an immigrant and as a CEO, I've both experienced and seen the positive impact that immigration has on our company, for the country, and for the world," wrote Satya Nadella, Microsoft's chief executive, in a LinkedIn post. "We will continue to advocate on this important topic."

Facebook chief executive Mark Zuckerberg on Friday wrote in a public message that both he and his wife, Priscilla Chan, are indebted to the United States' policy of welcomeness and inclusion.

"We should also keep our doors open to refugees and those who need help. That's who we are," wrote Zuckerberg. "Had we turned away refugees a few decades ago, Priscilla's family wouldn't be here today."

Similar sentiments were expressed across the tech industry. Apple chief executive Tim Cook, who was in Washington to meet with Republican officials, tweeted a historic quote from President Lincoln highlighting "malice toward none" and "charity for all" during a visit to Ford's Theatre.

Meanwhile, a major trade group representing firms such as Amazon, Netflix, Microsoft and LinkedIn said Saturday that Trump's decision had "troubling consequences" for Silicon Valley companies who depend on talent from overseas.

"The internet industry is deeply concerned with the implications of President Trump's executive order limiting immigration and movement into the United States," said Michael Beckerman, president of the Internet Association.

Trump's hostility toward Muslim refugees and immigrants raises tensions between the White House and Silicon Valley. Aside from PayPal co-founder Peter Thiel, who has been closely advising Trump, much of the tech industry had supported Hillary Clinton for president. In open letters and other public statements during the campaign, tech execs and workers objected to Trump's anti-Muslim views, and some signed onto a commitment not to help design Trump's proposed Muslim registry.

Trump's action against Middle Eastern travelers obligates tech companies to take a stand, said Sam Altman, president of the influential startup accelerator Y Combinator, in a blog post Saturday.

"The precedent of invalidating already-issued visas and green cards should be extremely troubling for immigrants of any country or for anyone who thinks their contributions to the US are important," said Altman in a blog post. "This is not just a Muslim ban. This is a breach of America's contract with all the immigrants in the nation."

For many in Silicon Valley, Trump's order crossed "a red line," according to Hunter Walk, a partner at the San Francisco-based venture capital firm Homebrew VC.

"For those of us who've already been vocal ... [it's] moving people from saying 'focus on midterm elections' to apply direct pressure to our industry's CEOs and our politicians to take a stand," said Walk. "And for those in our industry who thought they could just wait and see, they're taking our administration both literally and seriously this morning."

Silicon Valley Leaders Target Donald Trump's Travel Restrictions

Executives worry order will affect their companies' employees, say ban violates personal and company principals

By Jack Nicas

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Trump Immigration Ban Sends Shockwaves Through Tech

By Jessica Guynn And Laura Mandaro

[USA Today](#), January 28, 2017

SAN FRANCISCO — President Trump's order banning immigrants from seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the U.S. began hitting the tech industry Saturday, with Google's CEO leading a growing list of tech executives condemning the ban.

The CEOs of Microsoft, Apple, Netflix and Uber denounced with the policy, which would affect their own employees working here legally, as well as their competitive quest for talent.

"Trump's actions are hurting Netflix employees around the world, and are so un-American it pains us all," Netflix CEO and founder Reed Hastings said in a Facebook post. "It is time to link arms together to protect American values of freedom and opportunity."

In a staff memo, Google CEO Sundar Pichai said the move affects at least 187 of the Internet giant's staff.

"We're concerned about the impact of this order and any proposals that could impose restrictions on Googlers and their families, or that could create barriers to bringing great talent to the U.S.," Google said in a statement. "We'll continue to make our views on these issues known to leaders in Washington and elsewhere."

The president's executive order suspends the entry of all refugees to the United States for 120 days, halts the admission of refugees from Syria indefinitely and bars entry for three months to residents from the predominantly Muslim countries of Iraq, Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia and Yemen.

The order made good on one of Trump's most controversial campaign promises, a series of Muslim-focused restrictions he says should prevent terrorists from entering U.S. soil. For many of his supporters, preventing or delaying legal immigrants from returning to high-paid tech jobs, which they say should go to U.S.-born workers anyway, is a small price to pay for the promise of more security.

The move is already roiling the tech industry, with affected employees being urged to return to the U.S. and consult with corporate immigration experts.

Internet Association President and CEO Michael Beckerman said the Internet industry is "deeply concerned" by Trump's order.

"While this order impacts many companies outside of the tech industry, Internet companies in particular thrive in the U.S. because the best and the brightest are able to create innovative products and services right here in America," Beckerman said in an emailed statement. "While we support President Trump's efforts to grow our economy and allow 'people of great talent' to come into the U.S., the executive order signed yesterday has troubling consequences."

The ban includes green card holders who are authorized to live and work in the United States, according to a Homeland Security spokeswoman, Reuters reported. Some immigrants with legal visas trying to return to the U.S. from trips abroad were also detained, according to news reports.

"The blanket entry ban on citizens from certain primarily Muslim countries is not the best way to address the country's challenges," Elon Musk, CEO of Tesla and SpaceX and an adviser to President Trump said on Twitter. "Many people negatively affected by this policy are strong supporters of the U.S. They've done right, not wrong & don't deserve to be rejected."

In a memo sent to Google employees first reported by Bloomberg News and the Wall Street Journal, Pichai said one employee was rushing back from a trip to New Zealand before the order was assigned, while two others were grappling with what this might mean to their families.

A similar situation was playing out at other tech companies.

Microsoft CEO Satya Nadella said, "As an immigrant and as a CEO, I've both experienced and seen the positive impact that immigration has on our company." (Photo: Mat Hayward, Getty Images)

Microsoft said it's providing legal advice and assistance to its employees affected by the executive order.

"We share the concerns about the impact of the executive order on our employees from the listed countries, all of whom have been in the United States lawfully," the tech giant said in a statement.

According to Microsoft's general counsel Brad Smith, 76 Microsoft employees are citizens with a U.S. visa from the affected countries.

"We've already contacted everyone in this group," he told employees in a memo. "But there may be other employees from these countries who have U.S. green cards rather than a visa who may be affected, and there may be family members from these countries that we haven't yet reached."

Microsoft CEO Satya Nadella said in a LinkedIn post that his company would "continue to advocate on this important topic."

"As an immigrant and as a CEO, I've both experienced and seen the positive impact that immigration has on our company, for the country, and for the world," Nadella said.

Uber CEO Travis Kalanick told employees he would raise the immigration ban on Friday when he takes part in President Trump's first business advisory group meeting.

"While every government has their own immigration controls, allowing people from all around the world to come here and make America their home has largely been the U.S.'s policy since its founding. That means this ban will impact many innocent people," Kalanick said.

Apple CEO Tim Cook attends a meeting of technology chiefs in the Trump Organization conference room at Trump Tower in New York, New York, USA, 14 December 2016. E (Photo: Albin Lohr-Jones / POOL, EPA)

Apple CEO Tim Cook is in Washington, D.C., where he has been meeting with GOP lawmakers and with Trump's daughter Ivanka and her husband, Jared Kushner.

In a memo to employees, he said "it is not a policy we support."

"In my conversations with officials here in Washington this week, I've made it clear that Apple believes deeply in the importance of immigration — both to our company and to our nation's future. Apple would not exist without immigration, let alone thrive and innovate the way we do," Cook wrote, according to a memo sent to employees worldwide and obtained by USA TODAY. Apple co-founder Steve Jobs was the son of a Syrian immigrant.

For Box CEO Aaron Levie, the Trump order also hit home. One of the founders of the cloud-based storage and

services company is Iranian-American and Box is currently trying to assess how many of its employees are affected.

"At the corporate level, we are trying to take inventory on who could be impacted and ensuring that they stay within the country for now," Levie said. "We are really just getting a handle on the legal side of the situation, what we can fight and ultimately how we protect employees in the process."

More broadly, the order sends "the wrong moral message to the world and within our own country," Levie said, turning away refugees and doing nothing to make Americans safer. "It's very unfortunate and very disappointing," he said.

Slack CEO Stewart Butterfield also condemned the immigration ban.

"Immigration is unambiguously an economic benefit, but, doesn't matter: do the right thing because it's right," he wrote in a series of posts on Twitter. "My grandfather came from Poland between the wars, at 17, sponsored by an elder sister. Two more siblings made it. Everyone else died."

Technology investor Chris Sacca pledged to match donations to the American Civil Liberties Union up to \$25,000 and then quickly raised it to \$50,000. The American Civil Liberties Union and the Council on American-Islamic Relations, or CAIR, say they have either filed lawsuits or will do so shortly challenging the ban.

"The @aclu took Trump to court. Let's stand with them," he tweeted.

With protests spreading to airports on Saturday, Sam Altman, president of Silicon Valley tech incubator Y Combinator, urged the tech industry to speak up.

"It is time for tech companies to start speaking up about some of the actions taken by President Trump's administration," Altman said in a blog post. "The tech community is powerful. Large tech companies in particular have enormous power and are held in high regard. We need to hear from the CEOs clearly and unequivocally. Although there is some business risk in doing so, there is strength in numbers—if everyone does it early this coming week, we will all make each other stronger."

Immigrants account for a significant part of the workforce in the tech industry, which has for years advocated loosening laws to increase the flow of skilled immigrants into the U.S. With its heavy reliance on the H-1B visa program that allows software engineers and other skilled workers to work in the U.S., Silicon Valley fears what immigration restrictions will come from the Trump administration.

Trump's perspective on immigrants, and Muslims in particular, has caused tensions between the White House and Silicon Valley. Tech executives and workers have denounced the president's anti-Muslim views and some have pledged not to help build Trump's proposed Muslim registry.

On Saturday, Airbnb CEO Brian Chesky pushed back against Trump's executive order in a tweet. "Open doors brings all of U.S. together. Closing doors further divides U.S.,"

he wrote. "Let's all find ways to connect people, not separate them."

Some in Silicon Valley have direct ties to the Trump administration. Peter Thiel, a Trump transition team member, sits on the board of Facebook and he's a part-time partner at Y Combinator. He's an investor in many companies including Airbnb.

A Facebook employee of Middle Eastern descent told BuzzFeed News that some Facebook employees want the company to "clarify" its relationship with Thiel.

"There are questions here that we want answered. Does Thiel support this ban?" the person said. "Does he think the Facebook employees who come from Iran and those other countries shouldn't be allowed to keep working here? We deserve to know his position on this."

Uber's Kalanick said his policy is to engage with Trump.

"We partner around the world optimistically in the belief that by speaking up and engaging we can make a difference. Our experience is that not doing so shortchanges cities and the people who live in them. This is why I agreed in early December to join President Trump's economic advisory group," he told employees. "I understand that many people internally and externally may not agree with that decision, and that's OK. It's the magic of living in America that people are free to disagree."

The growing number of public statements from technology leaders was unusual, a measure of the perceived threat to their businesses and to their own political beliefs.

"As a tech leader and public CEO, I'm often advised to stay apolitical," Twilio CEO Jeff Lawson wrote in a Medium post. "But this isn't politics, I believe this is a matter of objective right and wrong. Staying silent doesn't feel like leadership to me. I encourage other leaders to consider the cost of silence."

Google's Pichai was the second executive of a major tech company to speak out against Trump's immigration order. Earlier Friday, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg said he was concerned about the immigration order's reach.

"Expanding the focus of law enforcement beyond people who are real threats would make all Americans less safe by diverting resources, while millions of undocumented folks who don't pose a threat will live in fear of deportation," he wrote on his Facebook page.

In a statement on Saturday, Facebook said: "We are assessing the impact on our workforce and determining how best to protect our people and their families from any adverse effects."

Trump's stance on immigration was one of the key reasons the tech industry widely opposed Trump's candidacy. Many of tech's most successful companies have been founded or are run by immigrants, and the industry employs thousands of immigrants, often from Asian countries.

After Trump's win, tech executives from Google, Facebook, Amazon and others met with the president-elect in a summit seen as a pragmatic move to find some common ground with the new administration. Tech leaders were largely silent as Trump has rapidly signed orders in his first week in office.

That changed later in the week. Facebook COO and Lean In author Sheryl Sandberg also broke her silence, taking to Facebook to criticize the order that would bar funding to overseas healthcare providers that give abortion counseling.

Google, Facebook Reflect Tech Dismay On Trump Immigration Order

By Mark Bergen And Eric Newcomer
[Bloomberg News](#), January 28, 2017

Alphabet Inc.'s Google asked staffers who may be affected by a new executive order on immigration to return to the U.S. quickly, joining a growing number of technology executives voicing concerns over restrictions that could interfere with how they do business.

Google Chief Executive Officer Sundar Pichai slammed President Donald Trump's move in a note to employees Friday, telling them that more than 100 company staff are affected by the order. Microsoft Corp. said it's in touch with 76 staffers from the seven countries identified in the executive order.

"It's painful to see the personal cost of this executive order on our colleagues," Pichai wrote in the memo, a copy of which was obtained by Bloomberg News. "We've always made our view on immigration issues known publicly and will continue to do so."

The comments underscore a growing rift between the Trump administration and several large U.S. technology companies, which include many immigrants in their ranks and have lobbied for fewer immigration restrictions. Facebook Inc. CEO Mark Zuckerberg voiced concern over the policy on Friday, and Airbnb Inc. CEO Brian Chesky said Saturday in a tweet that "closing doors further divides" people.

Uber Technologies Inc. CEO Travis Kalanick said Saturday that he plans to outline his misgivings about the order at the first meeting of the Trump administration's business advisory group next Friday in Washington. Stranded Drivers

Uber has about a dozen staffers affected by the order, as well as a number of drivers, Kalanick said in an e-mailed statement.

"This order has far broader implications as it also affects thousands of drivers who use Uber and come from the listed countries, many of whom take long breaks to go back home to see their extended family. These drivers currently outside of the U.S. will not be able to get back into the country

for 90 days," he said. He said his company was working out a plan to compensate those drivers stranded abroad.

Trump signed the executive order on Friday prohibiting entry by people from seven majority-Muslim nations for 90 days. Citizens of Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, Somalia, Syria and Yemen would be banned from entering the U.S. for the period, while the government determines what information it needs to safely admit visitors.

Some visa and green-card holders were blocked from boarding flights to the U.S. after the order was issued and several people were being detained at U.S. airports when they arrived, the New York Times reported. The Department of Homeland Security issued a directive on Friday afternoon ordering the Customs and Border Control agency to enforce the order immediately. Barriers for Talent

"We're concerned about the impact of this order and any proposals that could impose restrictions on Googlers and their families, or that create barriers to bringing great talent to the U.S.," a Google spokeswoman said in a statement. "We'll continue to make our views on these issues known to leaders in Washington and elsewhere."

Some Google employees were traveling abroad and were trying to get back to the U.S. before the order took effect. The company asked them to reach out to Google's security, travel, and immigration teams for assistance, according to a person familiar with the situation. The person asked not to be identified talking about internal company communications.

Google declined to say Saturday whether any employees were detained or blocked from boarding flights. Rushing Home

The employees in question normally work in the U.S. but just happened to be abroad either on work assignments or vacations. One employee rushed back from a trip to New Zealand to make it into the U.S. before the order was signed, Google's Pichai wrote in his memo.

"We are advising our clients from those seven countries who have green cards or any type of H-1B visa not to travel outside the U.S.," said Ava Benach, a partner at immigration law firm Benach Collopy LLP, while noting that the order takes effect immediately.

"No one is really sure whether a green card holder from these seven countries can return to the U.S. now. It's fairly clear that an H-1B visa holder can't," Benach said. The H-1B lets U.S. companies employ graduate-level workers from other countries in technical occupations such as technology, engineering and science.

"If anyone in these situations has the misfortune to have gone abroad recently, it's a treacherous moment, possibly for green card holders too," Benach said.

Other technology companies are likely in a similar situation, she added. Microsoft Memo

Microsoft Chief Legal Officer Brad Smith said Saturday in a memo to staff that the company is working with affected personnel and that it supports immigration policies that "protect the public without sacrificing people's freedom of expression or religion."

Microsoft also affirms "the importance of protecting legitimate and law-abiding refugees whose very lives may be at stake in immigration proceedings," Smith wrote.

The company included language in a securities filing on Thursday on the issue, cautioning investors that immigration restrictions "may inhibit our ability to adequately staff our research and development efforts."

Facebook's Zuckerberg said Friday that he was "concerned" by Trump's recent moves to restrict immigration.

Tech Industry Reacts To Trump's Executive Order On Immigration With Fear And Frustration

By Tracey Lien, Contact Reporter

[Los Angeles Times](#), January 28, 2017

The morning after Donald Trump won the presidential election, Silicon Valley entrepreneur Amr Shady called his immigration lawyer in a panic.

"My 10-year-old daughter asked me, 'Does this mean we're going to get kicked out?'" said the 40-year-old founder of analytics start-up Reveel, who emigrated from Egypt to the Bay Area in 2015. "I had to find out what Trump winning meant for my immigration status, but also what it meant for my chief data scientist."

His lawyer, Los Angeles immigration attorney Ayda Akalin, was inundated with calls from similarly nervous clients who were either already living and working in the U.S. on visas, or had visa applications pending.

At the time, Akalin assured them that nothing had yet changed, and it was too soon to be worried. But after Trump signed an executive order Friday banning citizens of Syria, Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Somalia, Yemen and Libya from entering the U.S. for 90 days, Akalin had an update for her clients, particularly those from Muslim-majority countries: Stay inside the United States.

"All of my Muslim clients are scared, even those from other countries," said Akalin, who herself is Iranian American, having immigrated to the U.S. when she was 5 years old.

The move blindsided the technology industry, which thought that its main battle on the immigration front was over the number of H-1B visas — granted to high-skilled foreign workers — that will be made available each year. The tech sector relies heavily on foreign-born software engineers to meet its staffing needs, and it has long lobbied for the government to lift the cap on the H-1B visa program to allow more foreign workers temporary employment with U.S. firms.

But H-1Bs took a backseat on Friday as tech workers and entrepreneurs already legally living and working in the U.S. worried about their own futures. Many were caught off guard by the order's reach, which extends to lawful permanent residents — or green card holders — too.

"For those abroad, we are telling them to come back as soon as possible, and be prepared to face questioning and possible refusal," Akalin said.

The order also compelled several big tech companies to break their silence about the Trump administration. Google Chief Executive Sundar Pichai slammed the order in a memo to employees.

"It's painful to see the personal cost of this executive order on our colleagues," Pichai wrote, according to Bloomberg News. "We've always made our view on immigration issues known publicly and will continue to do so."

Bloomberg reports that the memo urged employees traveling overseas who are affected by the order to seek help from the company's security and immigration teams. More than 100 employees are affected, Pichai said.

"We're concerned about the impact of this order and any proposals that could impose restrictions on Googlers and their families, or that could create barriers to bringing great talent to the U.S.," a Google spokesperson said. "We'll continue to make our views on these issues known to leaders in Washington and elsewhere."

Mark Zuckerberg, Facebook's chief executive, also spoke out against Trump's action, although in a less direct way, taking to his personal Facebook page to remind his millions of followers that his wife, pediatrician and philanthropist Priscilla Chan, is the daughter of refugees.

"My great grandparents came from Germany, Austria and Poland. Priscilla's parents were refugees from China and Vietnam," Zuckerberg wrote. "The United States is a nation of immigrants, and we should be proud of that."

The chief executives of Netflix, Microsoft and Lyft similarly issued statements or internal memos opposing the president's directive.

Even tech executives close to the Trump administration criticized the order.

Uber CEO Travis Kalanick — who serves on a panel advising Trump on business issues — said many drivers for the ride-hailing service are immigrants from the affected countries who often visit extended families abroad and might have trouble reentering the U.S. The company is considering compensating those drivers "over the next three months to mitigate some of the financial stress and complications with supporting their families and putting food on the table." Kalanick said he would raise issue when the panel convenes for its first meeting Friday in Washington.

Tesla Motors and SpaceX CEO Elon Musk — who met with Trump at the White House last week — said on Twitter a "blanket entry ban on citizens from certain primarily Muslim

countries is not the best way to address the country's challenges."

"Many people negatively affected by this policy are strong supporters of the US," wrote Musk, who also serves on the panel. "They've done right, not wrong & don't deserve to be rejected."

The tech industry has in the past highlighted the value of immigrants to American culture and the economy: Steve Jobs was of Syrian descent, high-profile executives at Twitter, Yahoo, Google and eBay are of Iranian descent. Along with most of the world's biggest technology companies, the Bay Area is home to some 250,000 Muslims, according to a study by the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding, of which 60% are foreign-born.

Venture capital firms see Trump's move as a slap in the face, especially since it comes less than two weeks after the Department of Homeland Security passed a rule allowing eligible foreign entrepreneurs to work in the U.S. for up to five years. The rule change — which Silicon Valley saw as a boon, and is expected to take effect July 17 — was proposed by President Obama last summer.

"We felt that, finally, things were moving forward," said Zafer Younis, a partner at venture capital firm 500 Startups, which prides itself on its international investments, many of which are in countries that are predominantly Muslim. "This new development really dampened it."

The executive order increases the uncertainty and risk of investing internationally, Younis said. And while 500 Startups will continue investing abroad, there's concern that other venture capital firms that were once eyeing international opportunities will now get cold feet.

"It changes the risk profile all of a sudden," he said.

But for Younis, it's personal, too. Originally from Jordan, Younis has lived in the Bay Area for the past two years on an EB-1 visa — a green card that is granted to those deemed to have "extraordinary ability." Though Jordan is not on Trump's list of countries whose citizens are banned from entering the U.S., it is a Muslim-majority nation, and it has given him pause.

"My wife is here. I have upcoming business trips to Japan and Europe. I'm not affected, yet I have to think twice — do I really need to travel or not?" he said. "It's a feeling I thought I left back in the Middle East. It's an anxiety, that things are beyond your control."

That anxiety is shared by other technologists and entrepreneurs in the Bay Area. Shady, the Egyptian entrepreneur, is also in the U.S. on an EB-1 visa. He and his children have Canadian citizenship, but his wife is an Egyptian citizen.

"So what does that mean?" he said. "If Egypt is on the list three months from now, what does that mean for our family?"

The American Civil Liberties Union on Saturday filed a lawsuit against the Trump administration on behalf of two men who were detained at New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport while traveling back to the U.S. after Trump's immigration crackdown. Silicon Valley venture capitalist Chris Sacca tweeted that he would match donations to the ACLU up to \$25,000.

Tech CEOs are slowly raising their voices. Immigration lawyers are advising their clients to stay put. And in a Silicon Valley mosque where Shady attended Friday prayers, the sheikh preached that everyone needs to stand against injustice toward all communities, even if their own is not directly affected.

"This is the most important thing for me right now because, even though it doesn't affect me directly, it's important for us to all understand what it means to stand against unfairness and the splitting of families," Shady said.

This article was updated to include comments from Elon Musk, chief executive of Tesla Motors Inc. and SpaceX.

This article was updated to include a comment from Uber Chief Executive Travis Kalanick.

This article was originally published at 1:20 p.m.

Airlines Rushing To Comply With Trump's Surprise Travel Ban

By Michael Sasso And Christopher Palmeri

[Bloomberg News](#), January 28, 2017

Global airlines are struggling to comply with new travel restrictions after being caught flat-footed by President Donald Trump's executive order blocking visitors from seven predominantly Muslim nations.

U.S. carriers didn't get advance notice of the travel ban or briefings from government officials on how it should be implemented, people familiar with the matter said.

The order was causing chaos at airports in the U.S. and abroad as border agents blocked travelers from entering the country and airlines barred visa-holders from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen, as well as people from those countries who are lawful U.S. residents, from getting on planes to the country.

"We are aware of the directive and are working with the federal government to comply," United Continental Holdings Inc. spokesman Luke Punzenberger said in a statement.

The president's order has the potential to impose costs on the airlines, which are struggling to understand its terms, said Robert Mann, president of aviation consultancy R.W. Mann & Co. Carriers are responsible for returning passengers to where their travel began if they were brought to the U.S. improperly, he said.

"It's very confusing for airlines," he said in an interview. "They literally don't have a reference point now on how they can accommodate their customers."

Airlines follow a detailed set of government regulations specifying who is allowed into the U.S. Based on news reports, Mann said it appears that Trump issued his order without giving carriers a chance to change their existing rule books. [Airline Reaction](#)

Airlines worldwide reacted to Trump's order on Saturday:

Delta Air Lines Inc. said it would contact customers affected by the ban about rebooking options including refunds, according to a statement by the carrier detailing the new travel restrictions.

Emirates, the world's biggest long-haul carrier, is providing similar assistance. "A very small number of our passengers traveling were affected by the new U.S. immigration entry requirements implemented by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection today," the Dubai-based company said in a prepared statement.

British Airways is offering affected customers "a refund for their travel to the U.S." and will give passengers the option of rebooking flights. WestJet Airlines Ltd., Canada's second-largest carrier, is providing full refunds to customers barred from the U.S. Air Canada is waiving change fees and allowing refunds.

American Airlines Group Inc. and industry trade group Airlines for America declined to comment, referring questions to the U.S. government. [Immigration Lawyers](#)

"It is imperative we find the right balance between security and facilitation, and we stand ready to support the administration and Congress to achieve this goal," said Roger Dow, chief executive officer of the U.S. Travel Association, a nonprofit lobbying group,

Lawyers "are trying to make sense of what happened," said Christine Alden, an immigration attorney in Miami. "It's all really far-reaching. It's going to affect businesses, families and students going back to school," she said.

The U.S. has treaties with some of the targeted countries that allow investors to visit the U.S. under the E-2 visa program, she said. Those people won't be allowed to come run their businesses. Oil companies, tech companies and others that depend on foreign workers may see them stranded overseas.

Trump's Signing Of Immigrant Ban Puts Pentagon In Uncomfortable Light

By Helene Cooper

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON — Six months ago, Jim Mattis stood at a lectern at the Hoover Institution, a conservative think tank at Stanford University, and sharply criticized Donald J. Trump's campaign proposal for a ban on Muslim immigration, saying that such a move would distress American allies around the world.

“This kind of thing is causing us great damage right now, and it’s sending shock waves through the international system,” Mr. Mattis said.

On Friday, in a Pentagon room dedicated to men and women who have received the country’s highest military decoration, the Medal of Honor, Mr. Mattis, now the country’s defense secretary, stood behind his new commander in chief, President Trump, as he signed an executive order on immigration. The order suspended entry of all refugees to the United States for 120 days, barred Syrian refugees indefinitely and blocked entry for 90 days for citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries. It also allows Christians to be granted priority over Muslims.

For Mr. Mattis, it was an uncomfortable end to a tumultuous first week as defense secretary that found him choosing which battles to fight and which to step away from.

He won a huge one on Friday, when Mr. Trump, in a remarkable show of deference, said that he would let Mr. Mattis “override” his view that torture could be effective in interrogations. Mr. Mattis is a strong opponent of such techniques.

But Mr. Mattis was also outflanked by the White House, which chose the Pentagon to unveil Mr. Trump’s executive order on immigration, a sharply divisive move in front of military leaders who view themselves as apolitical.

In a building where uniformed men and women work alongside civilian officials, several rank-and-file workers expressed outrage that Mr. Trump would use the Defense Department, home to a military that includes people of many faiths, including Islam, to announce that he was blocking visa applicants from Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen.

“Using the military as a backdrop for politically charged activities is bad for the military,” said Kori Schake, a Hoover Institution fellow who edited the new book “Warriors and Citizens: American Views of Our Military” with Mr. Mattis. She added that associating the military with “unconstitutional policies is especially damaging, since our military take their oath to the Constitution, not to the president.”

The president cited the Sept. 11 attacks in his decision to issue the immigration restrictions, which he cast in national security terms. “We will never forget the lessons of 9/11,” he said, nor the people “who lost their lives at the Pentagon.”

But none of the 19 terrorists who were on the planes that crashed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and in Shanksville, Pa., were from any of the countries on Mr. Trump’s visa ban list.

Instead, Iraq, where the American military is fighting with Iraqi security forces against the Islamic State, is among the countries on the list. Military officials have repeatedly called the nation an American ally.

“After all the money and lives spent in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Pentagon knows better than anyone that terrorism is a problem of a small number of enemies

embedded in a population of people you need to win over,” said Jon B. Alterman, director of the Middle East Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. “I don’t see the part of this that’s meant to win over anyone.”

Two people close to Mr. Mattis, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because they said they were wary of undercutting him, said he was still sharply opposed to the Muslim ban. But he spent this week battling the White House on other issues, including the establishment of “safe zones” in Syria, something the Pentagon has long opposed because it would deepen American involvement in the war there, out of the executive order.

Military officials sought to distance the Pentagon from the immigration ban, and focused instead on the second executive order that Mr. Trump signed at the Pentagon, which called for plans to improve military readiness. Mr. Mattis, standing behind Mr. Trump, took only the ceremonial pen that Mr. Trump used to sign the military readiness order. Mr. Trump gave the other one to Vice President Mike Pence.

Afterward, the Defense Department put out a statement about Mr. Trump’s visit to the Pentagon that pointedly made no mention of the Muslim ban. “The secretary shares the president’s goal of ensuring our military leaders have the support they need to accelerate the campaign against ISIS, and to build combat readiness now and for the future,” Capt. Jeff Davis, the Pentagon spokesman, said in the statement.

Last week, the Defense Department posted a message on Twitter about a former refugee who became a Marine. “From refugee to #Marine. @USMC Cpl Ali J. Mohammed takes the fight to the doorstep of those who cast his family out,” it read.

A military official noted on Saturday that the American military, which uses translators and fixers in Iraq and Syria, two of the countries on the banned list, would find it harder to recruit, since the Pentagon has long offered the promise of refuge in America.

“It’s very difficult for people to cooperate with the United States military when they feel humiliated by the United States,” said Vali Nasr, dean of the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University.

“The Iraqi situation is the most grievous,” Mr. Nasr added. “We are fighting a war with the Iraqis, against ISIS. How can we fight with them when the message from the White House is discriminatory?”

US Suspends Immigration Program Helping Non-Muslim Iranians

By George Jahn And Alicia A. Caldwell

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

VIENNA (AP) – Austria has shut its door to about 300 non-Muslim Iranians hoping to use the country as a way station before establishing new homes in the United States,

The Associated Press has learned. The action is an early ripple effect of U.S. President Donald Trump's effort to clamp down on refugee admissions.

Under a 27-year-old program originally approved by Congress to help Jews in the former Soviet Union, Austria had been serving until recently as a conduit for Iranian Jews, Christians and Baha'i, who were at risk in their home country and eligible to resettle in the United States. Iran has banned the Baha'i religion, which was founded in 1844 by a Persian nobleman considered a prophet by followers.

U.S. officials had been interviewing the candidates in Austria because they cannot do so in Iran. But the United States suspended the so-called "Iranian Lautenberg Program" in recent days, according to Austrian officials, who in turn stopped Iranians from reaching their territory. It's unclear when the program might restart.

The episode isn't directly linked to an executive order Trump signed Friday that orders strict new screening for refugees to keep "radical Islamic terrorists" out of the United States. But it reflects the knock-on effects already occurring from his tougher line on immigration and refugees. Similar to how tighter German migration rules had consequences across Europe, Trump's actions could lead other nations to take a harder look at people wishing to use their territories as transit points.

The net result could be even tougher conditions for people hoping to escape war and persecution for a better life abroad. There are more than 20 million refugees worldwide, according to the United Nations.

Austrian Foreign Ministry spokesman Thomas Schnoell said the Alpine country acted after "U.S. authorities told us that the onward trip for people to the U.S.A., who received visas from Austrian authorities as part of the program, would be put on hold for now."

A State Department email sent Tuesday said the Austrian government had "electronically canceled" its visas for applicants who hadn't yet reached Austria. If they try to reach Austria anyway, they will be permanently blocked from Austria, according to the email, which was obtained by AP.

Schnoell said the move affects about 300 Iranians with visas waiting to enter Austria. He said about 100 of them had been tracked down and informed that they can no longer do so. The search continues for the rest through airline ticket bookings and other means, Schnoell said.

Other officials said a small number of Iranians with such short-term visas already were in Austria. It wasn't immediately clear what would happen with them.

The end of the program, named for former Sen. Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey, could have broad implications for religious minorities in Iran.

HIAS, a global Jewish nonprofit organization that works to protect refugees, says on its website that ending the U.S.-Austrian partnership "puts people seeking religious freedom

in danger and sends the wrong message about the pervasive violations of religious freedom in Iran."

Trump is expected to pause the flow of all refugees to the U.S. and indefinitely bar those fleeing war-torn Syria. The president's upcoming order is also expected to suspend issuing visas for people from several predominantly Muslim countries – Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen – for at least 30 days, according to a draft executive order obtained by the AP.

Cancellation of the U.S. program could mean Iranians arriving in Austria with temporary visas would seek asylum in Austria. Immigration is a highly sensitive issue throughout Europe, which is struggling to deal with hundreds of thousands of people from Syria, North Africa and beyond.

Austria, a nation of fewer than 9 million people, is already strained by efforts to accommodate and integrate more than 100,000 migrants who have flowed in since 2015.

Caldwell reported from Washington.

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

State Dept Web Page On Refugees Disappears

By Brooke Seipel

[The Hill](#), January 27, 2017

Two pages on the State Department website that chronicled the "myths and facts" about refugees have been removed.

On Friday, President Trump issued an executive order banning Syrian refugees from entering the country.

The two web pages, one titled "Myths and Facts on Refugees, Migration, and Humanitarian Assistance," and the other "Myths and Facts: Resettling Syrian Refugees," had been removed as of Friday, though the exact timing of when they were taken down is unclear.

The White House and federal agencies have been updating web sites and social media as part of the routine transition to the new administration. Both pages were created and remained up throughout Obama's presidency.

The old pages can still be found through a cache online.

Both of the pages included information on how the U.S. takes in refugees and its work on the refugee crisis.

One post read:

"MYTH: The United States government brings refugees here without screening."

"FACT: All refugees of all nationalities considered for admission to the United States are subject to the highest level

of security checks of any category of traveler to our country, involving multiple federal intelligence, security and law enforcement agencies, such as the National Counterterrorism Center, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Departments of Homeland Security, State and Defense, in order to ensure that those admitted are not known to pose a threat to our country. The safeguards include biometric (fingerprint) and biographic checks, and an interview by specially trained DHS officers who scrutinize the applicant's explanation of individual circumstances to ensure the applicant is a bona fide refugee. Mindful of the particular conditions of the Syria crisis, Syrian refugees go through an enhanced level of review."

The number of website pages have disappeared as Trump gets his administration up and running, including pages on LGBT rights and climate change on the White House website.

A Sweeping Order Is Unlikely To Reduce Terrorist Threat

By Scott Shane

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

Rarely does an executive order announce a more straightforward and laudable purpose than the one President Trump signed on Friday: "Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States." But the president's directive is unlikely to significantly reduce the terrorist threat in the United States, which has been a minuscule part of the overall toll of violence since 2001. Many experts believe the order's unintended consequences will make the threat worse.

While the order requires the Department of Homeland Security to issue a report within 180 days providing detailed statistics on foreign nationals who commit acts of violence, terrorism researchers have already produced rich and revealing data. For instance: Since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, no one has been killed in this country in a terrorist attack by anyone who emigrated from, or whose parents emigrated from, any of the seven countries named in the order's four-month visa ban: Syria, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen, according to Charles Kurzman, a sociology professor at the University of North Carolina.

Of Muslim Americans involved in violent extremism of any kind — for instance, charged with plotting terrorism or supporting a terrorist group — only 23 percent had family backgrounds in those countries, said Mr. Kurzman, who just published the latest of his annual studies of Muslim Americans and terrorism.

The larger point of experts is that jihadist attacks garner news attention that far outstrips their prevalence in the United States, and the president's order appears to be designed to address not a rational calculation of risks but the visceral fears that terrorists set out to inflame.

There was a random quality to the list of countries: It excluded Saudi Arabia and Egypt, where the founders of Al Qaeda and many other jihadist groups have come from. Also excluded are Pakistan and Afghanistan, where persistent extremism and decades of war have produced militants who have occasionally reached the United States. Notably, perhaps, the list avoided Muslim countries where Mr. Trump has major business ventures.

Nor did the list include the European countries in which disenfranchised Muslim communities have become hotbeds of militancy, leading to major attacks in the name of the Islamic State in Paris and Brussels. Because no visas are required for travel by most European citizens to the United States, and because of the volume of tourism and business, prohibiting travel from Europe would have been far more difficult and consequential than banning it from only the seven countries named.

By Mr. Kurzman's count, 123 people have been killed in the United States by Muslim terrorists since the 2001 attacks — out of a total of more than 230,000 killings, by gang members, drug dealers, angry spouses, white supremacists, psychopaths, drunks and people of every description. So the order addresses, at most, one-1,870th of the problem of lethal violence in America. If the toll of 9/11 is included, jihadists still account for just over 1 percent of killings.

"My advice to the new administration would be to declare victory," Mr. Kurzman said. For the average American, he added, "your odds of being victimized by a terrorist attack are infinitesimal."

But terrorists — the root of the word means "to cause to tremble" — do not operate in the realm of dry facts and statistics. Their purpose is to terrify, and they use random and spectacular violence to do it, with an invaluable assist from the saturation coverage on cable television and news websites that such outrages inevitably draw.

To the rational calculations of Mr. Kurzman, one might simply reply with the list of American cities where horrific jihadist attacks have occurred in recent years: Boston, San Bernardino, Orlando — place names that conjure up images of ghastly wounds, bullet-ridden corpses and frightened people running for cover. In Gallup polls, the number of Americans "very worried" or "somewhat worried" about such attacks generally hovers between 30 and 50 percent, with understandable spikes after new attacks.

In the political realm, where emotions and symbols hold sway, Mr. Trump's order may reassure some Americans that they are safer from terrorism, and more generally, from concerns that Muslim immigrants may bring an alien culture. (While ostensibly addressing terrorism, it also says that the United States should be protected against those with "hostile attitudes toward it and its founding principles" or those "who do not support the Constitution.")

The trouble with such reassurance, even if it is effective, is that it comes at a high cost, in the view of many experts on terrorism. That cost will be counted not just domestically but also abroad, where the United States relies on allies, including Muslim countries, for intelligence and other help against terrorism.

"In my opinion, this is just a huge mistake in terms of counterterrorism cooperation," said Daniel Benjamin, formerly the State Department's top counterterrorism official and now a scholar at Dartmouth. "For the life of me, I don't see why we would want to alienate the Iraqis when they are the ground force against ISIS."

At home as well, Mr. Benjamin said, the president's order is likely to prove counterproductive. The jihadist threat in the United States has turned out to be largely homegrown, he said, and the order will encourage precisely the resentments and anxieties on the part of Muslims that fuel, in rare cases, support for the ideology of the Islamic State or Al Qaeda.

"It sends an unmistakable message to the American Muslim community that they are facing discrimination and isolation," Mr. Benjamin said. That, he said, will "feed the jihadist narrative" that the United States is at war with Islam, potentially encouraging a few more Muslims to plot violence.

For an action aimed at terrorism, the order appeared to garner little or no support among experts and former officials of every political stripe with experience in the field. Jonathan Schanzer, vice president for research at the conservative Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, said that if the temporary visa ban was used to review and improve immigration vetting procedures, it might be justified.

But he added that he knew of no obvious problems with those procedures, and no specific plans to address such issues over the 120-day ban. "The order appears to be based mainly on a campaign promise," he said.

Mr. Schanzer said he was frustrated that during the Obama administration, there had been inadequate attention to the ultimate driver of refugee flows and jihadist terrorism in the United States and elsewhere. "We have several bloody, complex and interlocking conflicts in the Middle East," he said. "It's the job of the new administration to come up with policies that address those conflicts. Admittedly, that is not easy."

Much easier, clearly, is issuing an executive order with political appeal and a title that seems to smack of common sense. But as the Trump administration is finding out, such pronouncements from an American president have many consequences, not all of them intended, anticipated or desired.

Trump Redefines The Enemy And 15 Years Of Counterterrorism Policy

By Greg Jaffe

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

In just his first week in the White House, President Trump has sought to redefine America's most lethal enemy in terms far broader than his post-9/11 predecessors.

The net result of Trump's new approach — outlined in speeches, interviews and executive orders — is a vast departure for a country that has often struggled over the past 15 years to say whether it is at war and precisely who it is fighting.

With a few sweeping moves, Trump has answered those questions with a clarity that is refreshing to his supporters and alarming to some U.S. counterterrorism officials as well as most of the Muslim world.

For Trump and his senior policy advisers, America is locked in a world war for its very survival, and the enemies in this wide-ranging battle are not only radical Islamist terrorists but a chaotic, violent and angry Muslim world.

"The world is as angry as it gets," Trump said last week from the White House. "Take a look at what's happening with Aleppo. Take a look at what's happening in Mosul. Take a look at what's going on in the Middle East. . . . The world is a mess."

One day later, in an appearance at the Pentagon and in signing an executive order — "Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States" — Trump laid out his plan to deal with what he had described as a vast and pressing threat. He closed America's borders to all refugees temporarily and additionally suspended the entry of anyone from Iraq, Syria and five other predominantly Muslim countries.

"The optic of this is really awful," said Nada Bakos, a former CIA analyst, of the refu-gee ban. "What they've done goes too far. All it does is help [Islamic State] recruiting."

Trump also vowed new "extreme vetting measures" to permanently keep radical Islamist terrorists out of the United States and promised to give Christians from the Middle East and other minority religions in the region priority over Muslim refugees.

Finally, he promised to pump new money into America's military, what he called "a great rebuilding of the armed services of the United States."

Both former presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama had defined the enemy in significantly narrower terms while in office, eager to avoid any moves that might make it appear as if the United States was at war with Islam.

For Bush, the enemy was al-Qaeda and state sponsors of terrorism to include former Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein, Iran and the Taliban. Obama insisted that Bush's definition was a recipe for "endless war" and singled out an even smaller group. To him, the enemy was a series of terrorist death cults that he said were perverting the peaceful religion of Islam.

The executive order on immigration and refugees was produced at a “frenetic pace” that included none of the interagency reviews that characterized similar orders in the Bush and Obama administrations, a senior U.S. counterterrorism official said.

“The process was remarkable,” said the official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss sensitive internal deliberations. “Nobody in the counterterrorism community pushed for this. None of us ever asked for it.”

Trump described the order as a key cog in an effort to prevent terrorists from entering the United States, but the policy does not affect countries such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan or Egypt, whose citizens have launched terrorist attacks inside the United States. Not one of the 19 hijackers who struck on 9/11 came from a country targeted by the order.

The measure drew negative responses across the world, some of which was heard by U.S. forces on the ground in the Middle East.

U.S. commanders advising Iraqi forces reported back that their partners were mystified by the order. “It’s already flowing back,” said the senior counterterrorism official. “They are asking, ‘What do you think of us? Do you see us as the threat?’ “

Some Iraqi lawmakers proposed banning U.S. troops and civilians from entering Iraq — an action, if followed through, that could lead the authorities in Baghdad to turn to Russia and seek more support from Iran.

Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif tweeted that the ban would be “recorded in history as a great gift to extremists and their supporters.”

Trump on Saturday described the move as sensible and not aimed at any particular religious group.

“It’s not a Muslim ban, but we were totally prepared,” he told reporters in the Oval Office. “It’s working out very nicely, you see it at the airports, you see it all over . . . and we’re going to have a very, very strict ban and we’re going to have extreme vetting, which we should have had in this country for many years.”

The stark departure from American policy over the past 15 years is a reflection not only of Trump but the somewhat dystopian vision of his closest advisers.

“We’re at the very beginning stages of a very brutal and bloody conflict,” said Stephen K. Bannon, Trump’s chief strategist, in a 2014 speech to a Vatican conference. “We are in an outright war against jihadist Islamic fascism and this war is . . . metastasizing far quicker than governments can handle it.”

Michael Flynn, Trump’s national security adviser, similarly describes the fight against al-Qaeda and the Islamic State as a “world war.”

“We could lose,” he wrote in his recent book, “The Field of Fight.” “In fact, right now we’re losing.”

Those sorts of analyses represent a radical departure from Obama, who believed that the United States had succumbed to a “season of fear” following the 9/11 attacks that produced a disastrous war in Iraq and a betrayal of America’s core values. As commander in chief, he banned torture — a policy Trump has suggested he might revisit — and sought unsuccessfully to close the U.S. detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

“Shameful” was the word that Obama used to describe calls from Trump and other presidential candidates to impose religious tests on refugees or immigrants.

Obama was convinced that groups like al-Qaeda and the Islamic State did not pose an existential threat to the country. Rather, he suggested that the biggest threat came from an overreaction to the attacks that would cause the United States to turn away from the world.

His approach stressed America’s fearlessness in the face of attacks. “That’s who the American people are — determined and not to be messed with,” Obama said in describing his counterterrorism strategy in 2013. “Now we need a strategy and a politics that reflects this resilient spirit.”

Trump, meanwhile, has chosen a different route.

Open Doors, Slamming Gates: The Tumultuous Politics Of U.S. Immigration Policy

By Marc Fisher

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

In his farewell address to the nation in 1989, President Ronald Reagan told the story of a Navy sailor patrolling the South China Sea who came upon a “leaky little boat” crammed with refugees from Indochina trying to find a way to America.

“Hello, American sailor,” a man in the boat shouted up to the Navy vessel. “Hello, freedom man.” Reagan couldn’t get that moment out of his mind because of what it said about what the United States meant — to those who live here and to the rest of the world.

But history reveals that even as U.S. policy moved from the restrictive immigration policies of a century ago to Reagan’s advocacy of an open door to refugees, public opinion has continued to oscillate. President Trump’s move Friday to bar entry into the United States for residents of seven majority-Muslim countries harks back to a period when the U.S. government regularly banned immigrants and refugees from countries whose people were considered inferior, dangerous or incompatible with American values.

Trump’s executive action marks the first time a president has sought to bar people because of their nation of origin — or their religion, as only Muslim-dominated countries are included in the order — since the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act scrapped national-origin quotas, putting the

focus instead on immigrants' skills and personal connections to Americans.

"This is a paradigm shift," said David Bier, who studies immigration policy at the Cato Institute, the libertarian think tank. "This is an explicit rejection of the approach that George W. Bush and Barack Obama embraced, in which a big part of the war on terror was to bring in allies, to prove we're not waging a war on Islam and to show that we're an open society toward Muslims."

The history of this nation of immigrants is one of open doors and gates slammed shut, of welcoming words like those engraved inside the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty ("Give me your tired, your poor, / Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, / The wretched refuse of your teeming shore") and of generations of politicians and activists proclaiming that American values would be undermined by a new influx of foreigners.

"Both open and restrictive refu-gee policies have gotten very high approval in polls through the years," said Roger Daniels, a historian of U.S. immigration and professor emeritus at the University of Cincinnati. "In times of trouble, nativist policies — what Trump would call 'America First' — get more attention. Since colonial times, there's been a strong strain of nativism that either dominates or is just ignored."

"America must remain American," President Calvin Coolidge said in 1924 as he signed into law a measure that ended the biggest wave of immigration in U.S. history. The new law used the then-popular pseudoscience of eugenics to set drastic limits on entry by groups the government considered "socially inadequate" — mainly Italians and Eastern European Jews.

That same year, that same president declared the Statue of Liberty a national monument. And four decades later, President Lyndon B. Johnson traveled to the statue to sign the act that is still the basis of U.S. immigration policy. The 1965 law, Johnson said, "corrects a cruel and enduring wrong. . . for over four decades, the immigration policy of the United States has been twisted and distorted by the harsh injustice of the national origins quota system. Under that system, the ability of new immigrants to come to America depended on the country of their birth. Today . . . this system is abolished."

Bier and others argue that the Trump order is illegal because it seeks to restore national origin as a factor in deciding who gets into the country. The Trump administration contends that the president has the authority to suspend entry for any group he finds detrimental to the national interest.

However that issue plays out in the courts, the debate over how to decide who comes to the United States stretches back centuries and has been a hot issue in presidential and local elections for several decades. Although every president

since Franklin D. Roosevelt has supported admitting refugees fleeing political and religious persecution, those presidents has also struggled to defend such policies against strong voices advocating tighter limits on newcomers.

Near the end of World War II, Roosevelt, after a long period of resisting pleas by American Jews to admit European Jews fleeing the Nazis' program of extermination, decided to allow 1,000 refugees into the country and put them at an Army base in Upstate New York.

"That's the beginning of the presidential authority to interfere with immigration policy," Daniels said. "And it has continued ever since."

Trump's focus on blocking people from predominantly Muslim countries and carving out openings for Christians fleeing those countries "is at variance with everything we've done since Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower built our approach to refugees," Daniels said.

Perhaps paradoxically, the gates to the United States have tended not to tighten during wartime — in the late 2000s, George W. Bush increased the flow of refugees into the country as a way to thank people who had helped U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, and to demonstrate that he was serious about attacking terrorism rather than Islam.

Economic hardship has sometimes led to louder calls for more restrictive immigration and refu-gee policies, historians say, but surges of nativist sentiment have emerged more from cultural backlash than from hard times or wartime. The restrictive 1924 law, for example, "came about in the Roaring Twenties, a time of great economic growth," Bier noted.

From the late 19th century through the 1930s, popular belief in eugenics, along with rivalries among religious groups, fed movements aimed against Catholics, Jews, Eastern Europeans, Asians and Africans.

"It's really the civil rights movement of the 1960s that changed the approach," Bier said. After the Civil Rights Act passed in 1964, ending legal segregation and banning employment discrimination based on race, religion or national origin, the idea of admitting immigrants based on where they came from seemed anachronistic.

In the 1980s, the immigration debate centered on illegal immigration; policies of that period were driven by the idea that expanding legal pathways into the country might curb the flow of illegal entrants. It didn't work; the battle over illegal immigration continued.

Some anti-immigration activists argued that the problem was not limited to illegal immigration but extended to all newcomers. Those activists focused on crimes committed by noncitizens, and Trump campaigned on that theme, highlighting stories of Americans whose loved ones had been killed by immigrants.

That approach won support from activists who have long sought not only a wall on the U.S.-Mexican border but

also sharp cuts in legal immigration. Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, which seeks “low-immigration” policies, welcomed Trump’s latest moves, but noted that executive action is not enough. A “reduction in legal immigration — which is the most important objective from a jobs or welfare or even security perspective — has to come from Congress,” Krikorian said in a blog post.

“We’re seeing populism take control of immigration policy for the first time” since World War II, Bier said. “You don’t have leaders in politics right now who are willing to say that we welcome people fleeing the enemies of the United States.”

Reagan began and ended his farewell speech with powerful pleas for the country to open its arms. The “shining city upon a hill” that he wanted America to be was, he said, a place “teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace. . . . And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here.”

Will We Be Forced Into A Religious Test? The Dangerous Questions Muslims Are Facing.

By Shadi Hamid

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

There is panic at the airport. Some of the stories, after President Trump issued his executive order targeting Muslim immigrants, remind me of what I saw in the Middle East. No one has been killed, of course. But when an Iraqi who risked his life an interpreter for the Army arrives in New York only to be denied entry, it has the hallmarks of a different world, one he probably thought he had left behind: the fear of not knowing; the manipulation of law; the capriciousness of strongmen in midflight; and families divided in the name of politics.

The executive order may, in fact, be illegal, causing considerable confusion over what it means for the hundreds of thousands of legal U.S. residents from the seven Muslim countries listed. The legal debate and challenges will probably be with us for some time, maybe for the long remainder of Trump’s tenure. The president’s decree, though, is just as frightening — perhaps even more so — for what it tells us about a young presidency and how the office intends to use its power in its flurry of seemingly manic energy and activity.

With several notable exceptions, such as Defense Secretary James Mattis, a worryingly large number of Trump advisers and appointees share what, at best, can be described as a suspicion of not just Islam but Muslims. The executive order underscores the new administration’s fixation on what it views not as a terrorist threat but a civilizational one in which the very act of being Muslim is grounds for scrutiny.

The president’s order prioritizes “refugee claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution,” which is understandable enough, because Muslims and Christians alike (and Muslims more so) are targets of groups like the Islamic State.

One clause, however, imposes a religious test, almost overwhelming in its starkness: “The religion of the individual [must be] a minority religion in the individual’s country of nationality.” In other words, they cannot be Muslim regardless of the level of persecution they face. As Reza Aslan, an author who is Muslim, writes: “A Christian fleeing discrimination in Yemen would be given entry, but a Shia facing death and starvation would not.”

Islam, at least to some in Trump’s inner circle, is not considered a religion. As national security adviser Michael Flynn has said: “Islam is a political ideology masked behind a religion, using religion as an advantage against us. Islam is a political ideology. Sharia, the law of Islam, OK? Sharia is the law. Just like our Constitution is our law.” Since Muslims wouldn’t know how to pray, fast or give charity (zakat) without “sharia,” then any Muslim who observes any aspect of their faith or partakes in any ritual might have dual loyalties, to the clashing legal traditions of Flynn’s imagination.

Trump’s early moves are not just an attack on some of the most vulnerable refugees, but on Islam as an overarching ideological threat. It is easy to see echoes of Trump surrogate and former House speaker Newt Gingrich’s July remarks, which at the time may have seemed like musings of a man who would never again be close to the centers of American power.

“We should frankly test every person here who is of a Muslim background, and if they believe in sharia, they should be deported,” Gingrich said. It wasn’t clear whether Gingrich had in mind citizens and noncitizens alike or just the latter, but even the most charitable reading was sufficiently ominous.

I did not come of political age during the Cold War, so perhaps the language of ideological tests shouldn’t be as surprising as I found it while parsing the text of the executive order.

This is noteworthy: “The United States cannot, and should not, admit those who do not support the Constitution, or those who would place violent ideologies over American law.” What constitutes “supporting” the Constitution, especially considering that our own president has an ambivalent relationship with many of its amendments, including the first? How is that to be judged?

Ideological tests are something that American Muslims, including my family and I, are safe from. But I shudder to think that my parents, upon entering the United States as immigrants decades ago, would have been “tested” for sufficient adherence to the Constitution by an administration that already held them in suspicion. Would they have been

asked to disavow aspects of their own religion, culture or identity?

Trump's actions didn't just begin with his presidency. They began when Trump, the candidate, propelled Muslims to the center of his agenda. For the first time, in my own country, I felt like an object of analysis.

I remember when Trump first proposed his Muslim immigration ban in December 2015 and hearing it discussed endlessly on television. Everything seemed to be about "us."

I was no longer just who I happened to be but a member of a group that was being debated and dissected as a potential threat. We had become a problem, and all problems need to be resolved. In the coming four or eight years or perhaps longer, we will find out what, exactly, that means.

Shadi Hamid is a senior fellow in the Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World at the Brookings Institution and the author of "Islamic Exceptionalism: How the Struggle Over Islam Is Reshaping the World."

Trump Shuts Door On Refugees, But Will The US Be Safer?

By Eric Tucker

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON (AP) – President Donald Trump says his halt to immigration from seven Muslim-majority nations and ban on refugees is being done in the name of national security. But it's not clear that these measures will help prevent attacks on American soil, and they could wind up emboldening extremists who already view the U.S. as at war with Islam.

The list of countries does not include Saudi Arabia, where the majority of the Sept. 11 hijackers were from, and recent high-profile acts of deadly extremist violence have been carried out either by U.S. citizens or by individuals whose families weren't from the nations singled out.

The admissions ban announced Friday also does not directly address a more urgent law enforcement concern: homegrown violent extremists already in the United States who plot their attacks without any overseas connections or contacts.

"The primary terrorism-related threat facing the U.S. today comes from individuals living here who become inspired by what they see on the internet who carry out attacks independent of any terrorist organization," said John Cohen, a former Department of Homeland Security counterterrorism official who worked in government under Democratic and Republican administrations and who has been involved in refugee vetting policy.

The FBI has for years been concerned by the prospect of airplane bomb plots and terrorists dispatched from overseas to commit violence in America. But the ascendancy

of the Islamic State, and the group's ability through slick and easily accessible propaganda to reach followers in all corners of the country, has been a more immediate challenge – and a more realistic danger – for counterterrorism officials.

"Dealing with that threat should be a top priority for this administration," Cohen said.

The executive order suspends refugee admissions for 120 days and bars all immigration for 90 days from Muslim-majority countries with terrorism concerns: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen.

It indefinitely bars the processing of refugees from Syria, a country that's been of particular alarm to the FBI even though the number of Americans who have looked to travel there to fight with the Islamic State has been dwindling.

But the culprits of recent deadly terror attacks aren't linked to the countries singled out by Trump's order.

Omar Mateen, the man responsible for the Orlando nightclub shooting, the deadliest terror attack in the U.S. since the Sept. 11 attacks, was born in New York to Afghan parents.

Syed Rizwan Farook, who took part in the December 2015 San Bernardino attack, was born in Chicago. His wife, Tashfeen Malik, had been living in Pakistan and visiting family in Saudi Arabia before she passed the background check and entered the U.S.

The brothers who bombed the Boston Marathon were ethnic Chechens who had been living in the U.S.

In general, Islamic extremists have accounted for a minuscule amount of the roughly 240,000 murders since Sept. 11, 2001.

Charles Kurzman, a sociology professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill who has studied the issue, said his research shows that people with ancestry from the seven nations in the executive order have accounted for only a small fraction of extremist-related arrests and disrupted plots since Sept. 11.

"I can only conclude that this is whipping up fear and hostility toward Americans who have family background from these countries," Kurzman said.

Still, while refugees are subject to screening – including in-person interviews, checks with law enforcement databases and collection of biometric data, when available – the process is not perfect.

FBI counterterrorism officials have long expressed concern about the lack of background information on refugees from Syria, a home base of the Islamic State, and Director James Comey has said that he could not guarantee a mistake-free vetting process.

There have been isolated incidents of refugees later accused in terror-related plots.

An Iraqi refugee who entered the U.S. in 2009, for instance, pleaded guilty in Houston in October to attempting to provide material support to the Islamic State. Two Iraqi

refugees who lived in Kentucky are now in prison after having been convicted in a plot to send sniper rifles, Stinger missiles and money to al-Qaida operatives waging an insurgency back home.

And the man accused in the November car-and-knife attack at Ohio State University was a refugee originally from Somalia who, as an adolescent, moved with his family to the United States in 2014 after living in Pakistan.

Though not immune from lapses, the screening process has improved over the years, Cohen said. He said he was concerned that the refugee ban could deter Muslim-majority countries from cooperating with the U.S. on policy matters and could embolden an extremist already bent on violence.

"That's something," Cohen said, "that law enforcement folks are going to be factoring into their violence prevention efforts."

Follow Eric Tucker on Twitter at <http://www.twitter.com/etuckerAP>

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

There Have Been No Fatal Terror Attacks In The U.S. By Immigrants From The 7 Banned Muslim Countries

More evidence that the ban makes no sense.

By Christopher Mathias

[Huffington Post](#), January 28, 2017

There have been zero fatal terror attacks on U.S. soil since 1975 by immigrants from the seven Muslim-majority countries President Donald Trump targeted with immigration bans on Friday, further highlighting the needlessness and cruelty of the president's executive order.

Between 1975 and 2015, foreign nationals from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen killed exactly zero Americans on U.S. soil, according to an analysis of terror attacks by the Cato Institute.

Moreover, a report released this week shows that Muslim Americans with family backgrounds in those seven countries have killed no Americans over the last 15 years.

Twenty-three percent of the Muslim Americans involved with violent extremist plots since Sept. 11, 2001, had family backgrounds in Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria or Yemen, according to a Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security report released this week. None of those plots resulted in American deaths.

Similarly, none of the 19 plane hijackers on 9/11 were from any of those seven countries.

"Contrary to alarmist political rhetoric, the appeal of revolutionary violence has remained very limited among Muslim-Americans," Charles Kurzman, a professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the author of the Triangle Center report, said in a statement. "Let's use this empirical evidence to guide our policy-making and public debates on violent extremism."

This is a dramatic and misdirected overreaction to a relatively small-scale problem. Charles Kurzman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill professor

On Friday afternoon, Trump issued an executive order indefinitely banning Syrian refugee admissions, temporarily banning entry of people from the seven aforementioned majority-Muslim countries and suspending visas to countries of "particular concern."

The order, at the end of Trump's first week as president, is an extension of a presidential campaign in which Trump routinely stirred fears and peddled misinformation about Muslims in America. It also partially fulfills Trump's 2015 call to ban all Muslims from entering the U.S.

"This is a dramatic and misdirected overreaction to a relatively small-scale problem," Kurzman wrote in *The WorldPost* Thursday in anticipation of Trump's executive order.

The threat of Muslim American involvement in violent extremism is greatly inflated, Kurzman wrote, and violence by Muslim Americans represents an incredibly small fraction of overall violence in this country.

Kurzman told *The Huffington Post* he defined "Muslim Americans" in his report as people who had lived in the U.S. at least a year before radicalization. There were 46 such Muslim Americans associated with violent extremism in 2016, according to the report, a 40 percent drop from the year before.

Of those 46 people, Kurzman said, 26 were U.S. citizens, six were of unknown nationality and the rest were immigrants, only one of whom was undocumented.

The extremism of nearly half of those 46 Muslim Americans entailed them traveling or attempting to travel to join militant groups in the Middle East.

Twenty-three were involved or allegedly involved in plots against U.S. targets, resulting in 54 deaths. (Forty-nine of those deaths occurred when 29-year-old Omar Mateen opened fire in a Florida nightclub in June.)

According to the report, that brings the total number of U.S. deaths caused by Muslim American extremists since 9/11 to 123.

By way of comparison, in 2016 alone, 188 people were killed on U.S. soil in mass shootings not involving Muslim American extremists, the report says. Meanwhile, there have been 230,000 murders in the U.S. since 9/11.

David Schanzer, director at the Triangle Center, said in a statement that “it is flatly untrue that America is deeply threatened by violent extremism by Muslim-Americans; attacks by Muslims accounted for only one third of one percent of all murders in America last year.”

Moreover, according to the State Department, of the nearly 800,000 refugees who have come to the U.S. since 9/11, fewer than 20 have been arrested on terrorism charges.

But, Schanzer added, “it is also untrue that violent extremism can be ignored as a problem within the Muslim-American community. Collaborative efforts between government agencies and Muslim-Americans to address this problem are justified and needed.”

In his WorldPost article Thursday, Kurzman wrote that “instead of inflating the threat of extremism, Trump and the rest of us ought to treat it as the small-time criminal enterprise that it is, matching our response to the scale of the problem.”

“Let’s stand strong,” he wrote. “Stop giving terrorists the obsessive attention and inflated importance that they crave.”

Little National Security Benefit To Trump’s Executive Order On Immigration

By Alex Nowrasteh

[Cato Institute](#), January 25, 2017

Little National Security Benefit to Trump’s Executive Order on Immigration

Cato At Liberty

Alex Nowrasteh

1/25/2017

Tomorrow, President Trump is expected to sign an executive order enacting a 30-day suspension of all visas for nationals from Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. Foreigners from those seven nations have killed zero Americans in terrorist attacks on U.S. soil between 1975 and the end of 2015. Six Iranians, six Sudanese, two Somalis, two Iraqis, and one Yemini have been convicted of attempting or carrying out terrorist attacks on U.S. soil. Zero Libyans or Syrians have been convicted of planning a terrorist attack on U.S. soil during that time period.

Many other foreigners have been convicted of terrorism-related offenses that did not include planning a terrorist attack on U.S. soil. One list released by Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) details 580 terror-related convictions since 9/11. This incomplete list probably influenced which countries are temporarily banned, and likely provided justification for another section of Trump’s executive order, which directs the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to release all information on foreign-born terrorists going forward, and requires additional DHS reports to study foreign-born terrorism.

I exhaustively evaluated Senator Sessions’ list of convictions based on publicly available data and discovered some startling details.

First, 241 of the convictions (42 percent) were not for terrorism offenses. Senator Sessions puffed his numbers by including “terrorism-related convictions,” a nebulous category that includes investigations that begin due to a terrorism tip but then end in non-terrorism convictions. My favorite examples of this are the convictions of Nasser Abuali, Hussein Abuali, and Rabi Ahmed. An informant told the FBI that the trio tried to purchase a rocket-propelled grenade launcher, but the FBI found no evidence supporting the accusation. The three individuals were instead convicted of receiving two truckloads of stolen cereal. That is a crime but it is not terrorism.

Second, only 40 of the 580 convictions (6.9 percent) were for foreigners planning a terrorist attack on U.S. soil. Seeking to join a foreign terrorist group overseas, material support for a foreign terrorist, and seeking to commit an act of terror on foreign soil account for 180 of the 580 convictions (31 percent). Terrorism on foreign soil is a crime, should be a crime, and those convicted of these offenses should be punished severely but the government cannot claim that these convictions made America safe again because these folks were not targeting U.S. soil.

Third, 92 of the 580 convictions (16 percent) were for U.S. born citizens. No change in immigration law, visa limitations, or more rigorous security checks would have stopped them.

The executive order includes national security exemptions to be made on a case-by-case basis. The President reserves the option to ban the entry of nationals from additional countries in the future based on a national security risk report written by DHS. Furthermore, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security can recommend visa bans for nationals from additional countries at any time.

In addition to the visa restrictions above, Trump’s executive order further cuts the refugee program to 50,000 annually, indefinitely blocks all refugees from Syria, and suspends all refugee admissions for 120 days. This is a response to a phantom menace. From 1975 to the end of 2015, 20 refugees have been convicted of attempting or committing terrorism on U.S. soil, and only three Americans have been killed in attacks committed by refugees—all in the 1970s. Zero Americans have been killed by Syrian refugees in a terrorist attack on U.S. soil. The annual chance of an American dying in a terrorist attack committed by a refugee is one in 3.6 billion. The other 17 convictions have mainly been for aiding or attempting to join foreign terrorists.

President Trump tweeted earlier this week that executive orders were intended to improve national security by reducing the terrorist threat. However, a rational evaluation of national security threats is not the basis for Trump’s orders,

as the risk is fairly small but the cost is great. The measures taken here will have virtually no effect on improving U.S. national security.

Trump's Visa Ban Order: The View From A Worried Middle East

By Ladane Nasser And Zainab Fattah
[Bloomberg News](#), January 28, 2017

With the stroke of a pen, Donald Trump barred most citizens from seven mainly Muslim Mideast and East African nations from entering the U.S. While the latest executive order of his week-old presidency delivers on a campaign pledge to strengthen America's borders, it was denounced in advance by human-rights groups as an attack on some of the world's most vulnerable people, and will alarm many in the Islamic world.

Under the order – which also placed a 120-day ban on virtually all refugee admissions – nationals from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Yemen, Sudan and Somalia won't be able to enter the U.S. for at least 90 days while officials determine what information is needed from other countries to safely admit visitors. While the order doesn't list the countries, it points to laws that cover those seven, which were provided by the White House. Most of the countries are home to conflict or Islamist insurgency, while the U.S. has sanctioned Iran for sponsoring terrorism. So, what's at stake?

'Fears Confirmed'

Above all, the move will “confirm the fears many had of Trump escalating tensions with the Muslim world,” said Ibrahim Fraihat, a professor of conflict resolution at the Doha Institute. With this act, it's clear Trump intends to deliver on pledges that many in the region had hoped to dismiss as campaign rhetoric, he said. That means other stated intentions – including the incendiary idea of moving the U.S. embassy in Israel to disputed Jerusalem from Tel Aviv – can't be brushed off, Fraihat said.

Less Cooperation on Security

In an interview, Trump said he wanted to keep out people intent on carrying out “tremendous destruction” in the U.S. But the executive order is likely to do “a very poor job” of helping to counter terrorism, said Amir Handjani, a senior non-resident fellow at the Atlantic Council based in Dubai. It's more likely to “hurt cooperation on terrorism rather than enhancing it,” he said. “If these countries feel that the U.S. government is shutting their citizens out, they have fewer incentives to collaborate.”

In a briefing published Jan. 27, security analysts at The Soufan Group noted that no major terrorist plot or attack in the U.S. since 2001 has involved “a perpetrator or plotter from six of the seven countries listed in the ban.” A Somali immigrant wounded 10 people in September knife attack at a Minnesota mall that was claimed by Islamic State, it said.

Extremists will use the ban as a recruiting tool, said Fraihat in Doha. It provides “just the right message” to bolster their argument that the U.S. is hostile to all Muslims, he said.

Blanket Ban

Citizens of Middle Eastern and African nations applying for a U.S. visa already face some of the most stringent documentation requirements. But that's very different from a “blanket ban,” said Handjani. It will be perceived as “very un-American because you are discriminating against people based on country of origin and religion,” he said. Relatives of U.S. citizens, students, academics, businessmen and those seeking medical care will be shut out for now. In 2015, the last year for which full official data is available online, citizens of the seven nations were granted a total of 89,387 non-immigrant and immigrant visas.

The order bans entry of “aliens” from the nations, leaving room for strict interpretation, said the National Iranian American Council, a Washington-based advocacy and civil rights group. If the Trump administration takes a broad interpretation of this order, U.S. permanent resident aliens and dual nationals who aren't U.S. citizens and holding a passport from one of these countries may be prevented from entering or re-entering the U.S., it said in a report.

Foes

Iran's inclusion comes at a sensitive time for the Islamic Republic. Trump and leading members of his cabinet oppose the 2015 nuclear deal that lifted sanctions on Iran in return for curbs on its nuclear program. And with Iran holding a presidential election in May, any spike in tensions between the foes could swing support behind hardline critics of President Hassan Rouhani.

Iranian officials say they'll reserve judgment on Trump until he rolls out policies. So the visa ban may come to be seen as “sending the first signal” as to how the new administration will treat Iran, said Handjani. It's likely to be interpreted as a provocation and “a backdoor way” to pressure the Iranian government, he said. The order “certainly doesn't do anything to convince Iranians that the Trump administration has any interest in reducing tensions with Iran,” said Trita Parsi, author of the forthcoming book “Losing an Enemy – Obama, Iran and the Triumph of Diplomacy,” and president of the National Iranian American Council. It “will add fuel to arguments of Iranian hardliners” who will point to Iran's compromise as part of the nuclear accord and “say ‘look what it generated: this extremely negative response against Iranian people.’”

And Friends

U.S. allies in the Middle East mostly escaped being covered by the order, with the exception of Iraq, a nation that has probably suffered more than any other at the hands of Islamic State jihadists and is a key American military partner. Neither Saudi Arabia, 15 of whose nationals were among the 19 men who hijacked aircraft on Sept. 11, 2001, nor Egypt,

which is fighting its own Islamist insurgency in Sinai, were subject to the action.

Saudi Arabia and Iran are on opposing sides in many of the region's major conflicts, such as those in Syria and Yemen. Speaking last week, Saudi Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir said he would work with Trump toward "containing" Iran. Saudi opposed the nuclear agreement, which has unlocked Iran's oil exports, and cut diplomatic relations.

Business Impact

There's little commerce between the U.S. and the seven nations, most of which are either at war or poor – or both. American citizens and entities are already barred from working with Iran under sanctions not removed by the 2015 accord. But Trump's order will further worry global investors considering a move into Iran but who fear running afoul of U.S. policy toward the Islamic Republic. Any investor who's risk-averse or who has significant interest in also maintaining good relations with the U.S. is going to pause and wait six months to see what happens, said a Western diplomat based in the Gulf, who spoke on condition of anonymity.

Countries Where Trump Does Business Are Not Hit By New Travel Restrictions

By Rosalind S. Helderman

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

The seven nations targeted for new visitation restrictions by President Donald Trump on Friday all have something in common — they are places he does not appear to have any business interests.

The executive order he signed Friday bars all entry for the next 90 days by travelers from Syria, Iran, Iraq, Yemen, Sudan, Somalia and Libya. Excluded from the lists are a series of majority Muslim nations where the Trump Organization is active and which in some cases have also faced troublesome issues with terrorism.

According to the text of the order, the restriction applies to a series of countries that have already been excluded from programs allowing travelers to travel to the U.S. without a visa because of concerns over terrorism. Hewing closely to nations already named as terrorism concerns elsewhere in law might have allowed the White House to avoid angering some more powerful and wealthy majority Muslim allies, like Egypt.

But without divesting from his company, as bipartisan ethics experts had advised, Trump is now facing questions about whether he designed the new rules with his own business at least partly in mind.

"He needs to sell his businesses outside his family and place the assets in a blind trust, otherwise every decision he makes people are going to question if he's making the decision in the interests of the American people or his own bottom line," said Jordan Libowitz, the spokesman for

Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, a liberal watchdog group. The group has filed a lawsuit arguing that Trump is already in violation of a constitutional provision barring federal officials from accepting payments from foreign officials.

Earlier in the week, former Obama ethics adviser Norm Eisen, the group's chairman, tweeted "WARNING: Mr. Pres. your Muslim ban excludes countries where you have business interests. That is a CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION. See u in court."

A White House spokeswoman did not respond to a question about the order and Trump's business on Saturday.

Trump has said he has handed management of his real estate, licensing and merchandising business over to his adult sons to avoid the perception that he is making presidential decisions to boost his own business. But he has retained ownership of the company, meaning that if it thrives during his presidency, he will personally profit.

The new executive order points to the complications that are likely to arise from the arrangement.

Among notable omissions, Trump's order makes no mention of Turkey, which has faced a series of terrorist attacks in recent months. On Wednesday, the State Department updated a travel warning for Americans visiting Turkey, noting that "an increase in anti-American rhetoric has the potential to inspire independent actors to carry out acts of violence against US citizens."

Trump has licensed his name to two luxury towers in Istanbul. A Turkish company also manufactures a line of Trump-branded home furnishings. Trump's most recent financial disclosure, filed in May when he was a presidential candidate, showed that he had earned as much as \$6 million in the previous year from the deals.

Trump himself acknowledged in a December 2015 interview with Breitbart News "I have a little conflict of interest 'cause I have a major, major building in Istanbul," he said. More recently, he has insisted has no conflicts because laws making conflicts illegal do not apply to the president.

Also untouched by Friday's executive order is the United Arab Emirates, a powerful Muslim ally with whom the U.S. nevertheless has complicated relations. Trump has licensed his name to a Dubai golf resort, as well as a luxury home development and spa.

Trump has seemed particularly disinclined to divorce himself of interests in the project. Its developer, Hussain Sajwani, attended a New Year's Eve party at his Florida estate, Mar-a-Lago, where a video showed Trump singling him out for praise, calling him and his family "the most beautiful people."

Trump returned to the topic of his Dubai partnership again in mid-January, at a news conference intended to demonstrate how he was separating from his business.

“Over the weekend, I was offered \$2 billion to do a deal in Dubai with a very, very, very amazing man, a great, great developer from the Middle East, Hussein Damack, a friend of mine, great guy. And I was offered \$2 billion to do a deal in Dubai — a number of deals and I turned it down,” Trump said then.

His point was that he was voluntarily turning aside new projects that could raise ethical questions. A lawyer for the company announced at the same event the Trump Organization will embark on no new foreign deals while Trump is in office. But the comment also served as a reminder that Trump’s business, included the personal relationships he forged with wealthy partners around the world, was still very much on his mind as he entered the presidency.

The executive order makes no mention of Saudi Arabia, home of 15 of the 19 terrorists involved in the September 11 attacks. The Trump Organization had incorporated a series of limited liability companies in preparation for an attempt to build a hotel in Saudi Arabia, showing an interest in expansion in the country. The company canceled those incorporations in December, indicating that no project is moving forward.

Excluded as well is Indonesia, the world’s largest majority-minority nation, where there are two large Trump-branded resorts underway, built in partnership with powerful local interests.

“To be blunt, we really don’t know what to make of which motives are driving this president’s decisions,” said Kamal Essaheb, director of policy and advocacy for the National Immigration Law Center. “From what we could tell from his campaign and his actions since he became president, what seems to be first and foremost on his mind is his own self interest and an obsession with his brand.”

Experts Question Legality Of Trump’s Immigration Ban On Muslim Countries

By Alan Gomez

[USA Today](#), January 28, 2017

The future of President Trump’s executive order suspending immigration from seven predominantly Muslim countries may come down to a legal battle between his powers as commander in chief and discrimination limitations established by Congress.

Lawyers and protesters spent most of the day Saturday focused on immigrants who were traveling when Trump’s order was issued, leaving them either detained at U.S. airports or stranded overseas.

But the legality of Trump’s order will not be clear until it’s argued in federal court, which could happen as early as next week, when civil rights and immigration advocacy groups begin filing their lawsuits.

Supporters of Trump’s plan say he is standing on firm legal ground to ban immigrants and refugees temporarily from those countries because they pose a national security threat. Trump’s order opens by citing the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11, 2001, and explains that the immigration suspension is necessary to give the federal government time to strengthen its vetting procedures for people coming from terror-prone countries.

“Throughout the history of this country, courts have given, for obvious reasons, the executive extraordinary latitude in making determinations associated with national security,” said Dan Stein, president of the Federation for American Immigration Reform, a group that advocates for lower levels of legal and illegal immigration. “And this is a national security judgement, something that courts would never want to interfere with.”

Critics of Trump’s plan say his national security argument is undercut by his repeated calls on the campaign trail for a “Muslim ban” and his comments Friday that he wants to prioritize the immigration of persecuted Christians over Muslims. Trump’s ban also applies to everyone from Syria.

David Leopold, a Cleveland immigration attorney and past president of the American Immigration Lawyers Association, said a president clearly has a right to bar certain immigrants or groups of immigrants from entering the U.S. Trump’s order cited a long-standing federal law that allows a president to bar entry to any immigrants or group of immigrants who the president deems “detrimental to the interests of the United States.”

“But what the Trump administration failed to do,” Leopold said, “is understand that nothing in our law justifies banning an entire religion, banning an entire nationality. He’s going to have to answer how he can say that all of Syria is detrimental.”

Leopold’s argument rests largely on the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, which forbids discrimination against immigrants based on their “nationality, place of birth, or place of residence.” The U.S. had previously used an immigration system that set a limit on the number of people who could enter the U.S. from each country, a system that heavily favored immigration from western Europe.

But that law has been set aside by presidents during national emergencies, according to Michael Hethmon, senior counsel at the Immigration Reform Law Institute, which provides legal support to legislators and politicians who want to reduce immigration.

Hethmon uses the example of President Carter, who in 1980 barred some Iranians from entering the U.S. during a crisis over 52 Americans being held hostage in Tehran. He said that case mirrors what Trump is facing now — the United States facing a large number of people in specific countries who are trying to harm the U.S.

“The court will say, ‘There’s a rational basis for picking these seven countries,’” Hethmon said. “They’re all in the midst of civil conflict, they’re all places where terrorist networks that are particularly dangerous to the U.S. exists. There are multiple reasons why refugees from these countries merit additional, or even extensive, scrutiny.”

The seven are Iran, Sudan and Syria — which comprise the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism — plus Iraq, Libya, Somalia and Yemen.

The key for a court to understand the true intent behind Trump’s order — whether it’s a religious ban or a national security concern — could lie in one paragraph of his executive order. It declares that once the refugee program is reinstated, the Department of Homeland Security must prioritize refugee claims made by persecuted religious minorities.

“Whoever drafted the order, I think they thought they were being incredibly clever immunizing this from legal scrutiny,” said Jens David Ohlin, an international law professor at Cornell Law School. “But they might have shot themselves in the foot with that one.”

Ohlin said that one section, which he said was the only piece of the order that did not pin itself to the national security argument, may open the entire order to questions about favoring one religion over another. It also follows comments Trump made to the Christian Broadcast Service on Friday, when he said Christians had been treated unfairly under the U.S. refugee program and they needed to be prioritized in the future.

“Courts are going to be giving really serious scrutiny to that one,” Ohlin said.

As legal questions continue to swirl over Trump’s order, only one certainty exists. “This is the start of a wave of litigation,” said Omar Jadwat, director of the ACLU’s Immigrants’ Rights Project.

Trump’s Claim That It Is ‘Very Tough’ For Christian Syrians To Get To The United States

By Glenn Kessler

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

“They’ve been horribly treated. Do you know if you were a Christian in Syria it was impossible, at least very tough to get into the United States? If you were a Muslim you could come in, but if you were a Christian, it was almost impossible and the reason that was so unfair, everybody was persecuted in all fairness, but they were chopping off the heads of everybody but more so the Christians. And I thought it was very, very unfair.”

— President Trump, interview on Christian Broadcasting Network, Jan. 27, 2017

Shortly before issuing a sweeping executive order to suspend refugee admissions for 120 days, President Trump

gave an interview in which he said he wanted to give priority to Christians in Syria. (The actual order does not single out Christians, but religious minorities in countries.) He said that “if you were a Christian in Syria it was impossible, at least very tough to get into the United States.”

Is this really the case? The Facts

A White House spokesman did not respond to a query about Trump’s assertion, but the numbers certainly indicate that relatively few Christians have been admitted as Syrian refugees. Here’s what the State Department website shows for Syrian refugees admitted in calendar year 2016:

Muslim Sunni: 15,134

Muslim Shiite: 29

Christian: 89*

Total: 15,152

Christians, in other words, represent about half of 1 percent of the refugees admitted, even though they make up about 5 percent of the Syrian population, according to the Pew Research Center.

But this is a case where figures can be misleading. Let’s look at the numbers for Iraq, whose refugees register at the exact same offices in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and other countries maintained by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. UNHCR identifies refugees for possible admission to the United States, though the final approval and screening is done by the U.S. government.

Muslim Sunni: 5,106

Muslim Shiite: 3,342

Christian: 1,502*

Total: 9,950

In the case of Iraq, Christians represent 15 percent of the Iraqi refugees, even though they only make up less than 1 percent of the Iraqi population. (*correction: an earlier version of this article undercounted the number of Iraqi and Syrian Christians because many were listed as “Catholic” or another Christian faith rather than “Christian.”)

The simple fact is that the reason for the disparity is unclear, though there are a number of theories. Nina Shea, who heads the Center for Religious Freedom at the Hudson Institute, says that Syrian Christians are “marginalized” in U.N. programs, especially in refugee camps. She says that many Christians are afraid to settle in camps because the camps are dominated by Muslims.

UNHCR data shows that only about 10 percent of refugees — 490,000 — are in camps, whereas nearly 4.4 million refugees are in urban and rural areas.

But Shea said that she has met with many Syrian Christian refugees who are “clamoring” to get out but can’t get processed.

“I don’t know how to explain this,” she said. “It raises a red flag of de facto discrimination.”

Still, UNHCR data indicates that relatively few of the Syrian refugees have identified themselves as Christian. In

Syria, 1.5 percent of the 1 million refugees are Christian, in Jordan, 0.2 percent of the 655,000 refugees are Christian, in Iraq, 0.3 percent of the 228,000 refugees are Christian, and in Egypt, 0.1 percent of the 115,000 refugees are Christian. However, religion is not recorded in Turkey, where 2.7 million Syrian refugees have fled.

Chris Boian, a UNHCR spokesman, said that the agency did not know why there was such a disparity between the Christian makeup of Iraqi and Syrian refugees arriving in the United States, except that the agency does not discriminate. “We believe part of it is that Syria is not Iraq,” he said. “Many Syrian refugees may have the financial and social means to move without going through UNHCR.”

For instance, Lebanon has a relatively large Christian population and has historically been linked to Syria.

In October 2015, Shea directly asked then-U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres — now U.N. secretary general — during an appearance at the National Press Club about the dearth of Christian refugees from Syria. He responded by noting that the percentages were higher for Iraq, in part because he believed the experience for Christians was far worse in Iraq. He also noted that most of the Syria Christians had fled to Lebanon because of the long-standing links between the two countries.

Guterres said that Lebanon’s then-Christian president had even told him: “Don’t resettle Christians. They are vital to us.” Guterres went on to say that the Middle East “is where Christianity was born, and to see these communities at the risk of being eradicated from that area is something I consider with horror. ... [To remove Christians from] that part of the world that would be to really do an amputation in the DNA of Christianity and in the DNA of the Middle East.”

To Shea, those comments indicated an unwillingness by the U.N. to let Syrian Christians move out of the region. She said it was necessary for the United States to directly interview potential refugees.

The Pinocchio Test

Trump goes too far to claim that it is “very tough” for Syrian Christians to become refugees in the United States, and that they have been “horribly treated.” While it is correct that a relatively small percentage of Syrian refugees have been admitted, the Iraqi experience is exactly the opposite, even though the same U.N. agency is handling the refugee requests. The basic fact is no one understands why there is such a disparity. The president could highlight that situation without suggesting that something nefarious is going on.

Anxiety About Muslim Refugees Is Stoked Online By The Far-Right Media

By Caitlin Dickerson

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

Type the word refugees into Facebook and some alarming “news” will appear about a refugee rape crisis, a refugee flesh-eating disease epidemic and a refugee-related risk of female genital mutilation — none of it true.

For the months leading up to the presidential election, and in the days since President Trump took office, ultraconservative websites like Breitbart News and Infowars have published a cycle of eye-popping stories with misleading claims about refugees. And it is beginning to influence public perception, experts say.

That shift was evident on Friday, as many Americans heralded the news that the Trump administration intended to temporarily curb all refugee resettlement and increase the vetting of Syrians.

“There really is a kind of cultural battle going on,” said Cecilia Wang, the deputy legal director for the American Civil Liberties Union. “There’s no question that kind of xenophobic or anti-Muslim bias is infecting our political discourse about refugees.”

In speaking to pollsters about refugee resettlement, Americans tend to cite concerns about the country’s national security and economic health as their biggest worries, but they have also begun to point to disease or rape, experts say.

“This is something where the fear outruns the fact by a factor of 100 to 1 or even 1,000 to 1,” said William Galston, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution who has tracked American sentiment about refugee resettlement over years.

Mr. Galston said the reaction to misleading coverage of refugees was reminiscent of the wave of measures introduced in state legislatures in recent years to stop the spread of Islamic law, despite scant evidence that it has been promoted anywhere. And while he doubted that alarmist stories about refugees were powerful enough to change people’s minds, he said the coverage played to existing fears and pushed mere differences of opinion into hyperpartisan outrage.

“I think their opinions are being intensified because the intensification of contrary sentiments is increasing polarization,” Mr. Galston said.

Outside his job as a police officer in Kansas, Okla., Mike Eason begins and ends his day with the television news — first CBS, then Fox, but never CNN, which he hates. Then, he scrolls through Facebook, where he’s read stories about refugees who commit violent crimes against women.

“It’s one of them Facebook things where you see Muslim men are attacking women, and stuff like that, and having no respect for them at all. I’ve got a real issue with that,” he said. “I see story after story after story, and I don’t know how true it is.”

Mr. Eason said he was skeptical of stories by unfamiliar websites like American News, but he reads them anyway. He commented on one that was posted to Facebook:

The post, which was shared 14,000 times, linked to a story about a case in which the authorities have not described the immigration status of the suspect, or said that he was a noncitizen. They have also discredited the claim that the man yelled "Allahu akbar" during the episode.

Nevertheless, the comment that Mr. Eason posted on the site, which he later said he could not remember making, garnered 87 likes. "If Muslims are taught hate by their religion," he wrote, "then all Muslims are potential terrorists and should be treated accordingly. TRUMP will stop this kind of stuff."

Sgt. Timothy Briggeman of the Cass County Sheriff's Office in North Dakota, which is investigating the case, said such stories and responses often appeared on social media when a person in his jurisdiction with an Arabic-sounding name is charged with a crime.

"To be honest," he said, "it's embarrassing and it's disheartening when anyone with a name of such ends up in the news — the comments that get thrown around. That seems to be the No. 1 remark: 'Send them back and get rid of them,' and, 'We don't need them.'"

Worries that refugees might be radicalized have also been amplified on the internet. This story was shared at least 1,400 times:

And this one, posted by The Daily Caller, was shared more than 3,000 times, despite linking to a story with no evidence of a cover-up:

The actual number of refugees who have become extremists in the United States has been estimated at between three and 12 — out of the more than 800,000 who have resettled here since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.

The online stories about refugees range from outright fake news to those based on a grain of truth and then stretched out of proportion. For example, the Breitbart article about genital mutilation was based on a study that estimated that a half-million women currently living in the United States have had their genitals mutilated. But most of them were immigrants who had fled here because of such treatment in their home countries.

Mr. Eason, the police officer in Oklahoma, said that part of the challenge for him in evaluating stories on the internet is that many are written with headlines that appeal to common sense.

He pointed to the vetting of Syrian refugees, for example, which is currently under review as part of Mr. Trump's executive order. As The New York Times has reported, the process involves dozens of layers of evaluation and can last up to two years.

But Mr. Eason has read stories that suggest the conditions in Syria are so bad that it is impossible to verify refugees' stories, which has made him worry that no level of scrutiny will be sufficient.

"They were saying with them coming from these areas, it's hard to vet them," Mr. Eason said. "And it makes sense."

Donald Trump's Muslim Ban Is Cowardly And Dangerous

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

First, reflect on the cruelty of President Trump's decision on Friday to indefinitely suspend the resettlement of Syrian refugees and temporarily ban people from seven predominantly Muslim nations from entering the United States. It took just hours to begin witnessing the injury and suffering this ban inflicts on families that had every reason to believe they had outrun carnage and despotism in their homelands to arrive in a singularly hopeful nation.

The first casualties of this bigoted, cowardly, self-defeating policy were detained early Saturday at American airports just hours after the executive order, ludicrously titled "Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States," went into effect. It must have felt like the worst trick of fate for these refugees to hit the wall of Donald Trump's political posturing at the very last step of a yearslong, rigorous vetting process. This ban will also disrupt the lives and careers of potentially hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have been cleared to live in America under visas or permanent residency permits.

That the order, breathtaking in scope and inflammatory in tone, was issued on Holocaust Remembrance Day spoke of the president's callousness and indifference to history, to America's deepest lessons about its own values.

The order lacks any logic. It invokes the attacks of Sept. 11 as a rationale, while exempting the countries of origin of all the hijackers who carried out that plot and also, perhaps not coincidentally, several countries where the Trump family does business. The document does not explicitly mention any religion, yet it sets a blatantly unconstitutional standard by excluding Muslims while giving government officials the discretion to admit people of other faiths.

The order's language makes clear that the xenophobia and Islamophobia that permeated Mr. Trump's campaign are to stain his presidency as well. Un-American as they are, they are now American policy. "The United States must ensure that those admitted to this country do not bear hostile attitudes toward it and its founding principles," the order says, conveying the spurious notion that all Muslims should be considered a threat. (It further claims to spare America from people who would commit acts of violence against women and those who persecute people on the basis of race, gender or sexual orientation. A president who bragged about sexually assaulting women and a vice president who has supported policies that discriminate against gay people might well fear that standard themselves.)

The unrighteousness of this new policy should be enough to prompt the courts, Congress and responsible members of Mr. Trump's cabinet to reverse it immediately. But there is an even more compelling reason: It is extremely dangerous. Extremist groups will trumpet this order to spread the notion, today more credible than ever, that the United States is at war with Islam rather than targeting terrorists. They want nothing more than a fearful, recklessly belligerent America; so, if anything, this ban will heighten their efforts to strike at Americans, to provoke yet further overreaction from a volatile and inexperienced president.

American allies in the Middle East will reasonably question why they should cooperate with, and defer to, the United States while its top officials vilify their faith. Afghans and Iraqis currently supporting American military operations would be justified in reassessing the merits of taking enormous risks for a government that is bold enough to drop bombs on their homelands but too frightened to provide a haven to their most vulnerable compatriots, and perhaps to them as well.

Republicans in Congress who remain quiet or tacitly supportive of the ban should recognize that history will remember them as cowards.

There may be no one better positioned to force a suspension of this policy than Mr. Trump's secretary of defense, Jim Mattis. Mr. Mattis was cleareyed about the dangers of a proposed Muslim ban during the election, saying that American allies were reasonably wondering if "we have lost faith in reason." He added: "This kind of thing is causing us great damage right now, and it's sending shock waves through this international system."

His silence now is alarming to all who admire his commitment to American security. Mr. Mattis and other senior government officials who know better cannot lend their names to this travesty. Doing so would do more than tarnish their professional reputations. It would make them complicit in abdicating American values and endangering their fellow citizens.

Pandering To Fear

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

The executive order that President Trump signed on Friday calling a temporary halt to travel to the United States from seven predominantly Muslim nations — and indefinitely blocking refugees from the world's largest humanitarian crisis, in Syria—is an affront to values upon which the nation was founded and that have made it a beacon of hope around the world. George Washington declared in 1783 that the "bosom of America is open" not only to the "opulent and respectable stranger" but also "the oppressed and persecuted." Now Mr. Trump has slammed the door on the oppressed and persecuted in a fit of irrational xenophobia.

He ordered foreign nationals from Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia, Yemen and Iraq be barred immediately from entry into the United States for 90 days while more rigorous visa screening is put into place. This touched off panic and chaos at airports on Saturday as people with already-issued visas were turned away from boarding flights and others detained on arrival. Among those caught in the mess and held at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York was an Iraqi who had worked for the United States in Iraq for a decade. Green card holders, already permanent residents in the United States who happened to be overseas, were told they could no longer re-enter. Untold thousands of people who have applied for visas — including translators and interpreters who have worked with U.S. forces in Iraq — were left wondering if they would ever make it to American shores.

Syria's civil war has forced about 4.8 million people to flee to neighboring countries, and 1 million are seeking asylum in Europe. Mr. Trump callously and without evidence declared that Syrian refugees are "detrimental to the interests of the United States," although in fact the relatively small number who have come to the United States have proven overwhelmingly positive. Mr. Trump's four-month ban on refugees from these predominantly Muslim nations was accompanied by an instruction to prioritize refugee claims made by religious minorities facing persecution, chiefly Christians whose communities have suffered greatly over many decades. We think there's a legitimate place in refugee policy for favoring persecuted minorities, but favoring one faith while blocking people from another is demeaning to all and runs counter to the basic tenet that the United States does not discriminate by religion.

Mr. Trump claims these seven countries might produce terrorists who "will use any means possible to enter the United States." The country that supplied 15 of the 19 hijackers in the 9/11 attacks is Saudi Arabia, which is not on Mr. Trump's list. Vigilance is always called for, but refugees to the United States are as a whole grateful and hard-working and have not resorted to terrorism. Cutting them off not only punishes the most vulnerable, but may encourage terrorist recruitment and violence.

Mr. Trump's actions pander to rage and fear of outsiders. Yet our long history shows these fears are unfounded. The diversity, experience and striving of immigrants and refugees have immeasurably strengthened the United States; outbursts of anti-alien sentiment have only weakened it.

A Sisterly 'No' To Donald Trump

By Frank Bruni

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

On his first full day in office, our new president harangued the National Park Service about more flattering inauguration photos and preened in front of a memorial to

real American heroes, crowing about how often he's been on the cover of Time magazine.

Before his first full week was done, he temporarily barred refugees from entering the United States, halted immigration from several predominantly Muslim countries and decreed that Christians get preference over Muslims when we let outsiders in.

I watch this and feel heartsick about America, whose most fundamental values and claim to moral leadership are at stake.

Then I talk to my friend Maya Rao and her sisters and I feel just a little bit better. I feel pride and hope.

They're precisely the kind of Americans who feel so insulted and threatened by President Trump. They're precisely the kind who make this country so special and fill me with such fierce love for it. It gave them a home and horizons they might not have found elsewhere. They treasure that enough to defend it.

A week ago Saturday they woke in New Jersey at 3:30 a.m. for a 5:30 a.m. bus. Then they traveled for four hours, to Washington and the Women's March.

Maya, 41, had never done anything like this before. Neither had her older sister, Mythili Lahiri, 44, or her younger one, Meera Oliva, 39. No national marches. No street-corner demonstrations. No hoisting of signs. No chanting of chants.

Until recently they thought it was enough to keep up with the news and cast their votes in accordance with their support of the Democratic Party. There didn't seem to be time for anything more. They have demanding careers. They have three children each. They have husbands.

An extra hour of sleep is a luxury. An extra two is a fantasy.

Then: Trump. As women, they gasped at his sexism.

As first-generation Indian-Americans, they shuddered at his quickness to demonize people of color with Asian, African or Latino ancestry.

"I feel devastated," Maya told me. "For me, the acceptance of diversity is one of the things that makes this country great. This election is destroying that. And that gets me into the street."

What we've seen from the White House in this opening stage of the Trump administration isn't encouraging. Trump's promised pivot to a presidential demeanor never happened, and apparently never will: It's outside of his skill set. It's alien to his psychology. He's all ego and spleen, with only the loosest of tethers to truth.

But we're seeing something else — something sunnier — beyond the White House: an awakening in many Americans who were trusting, complacent or distracted before. That's what the protests all around the country demonstrated, though whether they will translate into consequential action — and become an insurance policy

against the damage Trump may do — isn't clear. The three sisters are trying to figure that out.

They're scared. Mythili told me that as she watches Trump and the people around him reject science, construct alternate realities and try to silence anyone who balks at that, she worries that the very idea of America is in jeopardy.

"We believe in freedom of expression," she said, meaning Americans. "We believe in facts. We believe in transparency. And what he's doing — it's a slippery slope toward a country that I don't recognize and a country that I don't want to live in."

I've known Maya for more than five years, I had a long dinner with Mythili once and I've talked repeatedly with Meera on the phone. They're ferociously smart, all three of them. They're contagiously upbeat. Maya's laugh is as long and loud as any I've heard. I crave, relish and envy it.

They grew up first in Texas, which Mythili recalled as a "brutal time." No one at her school looked like her. No one shared her family's traditions — its vegetarianism, for example. Once, for a lesson on nutrition, she and her classmates were told to keep a food diary. Her teacher looked at hers and, in front of the other kids, gasped, "You didn't eat any meat?" Then she opined that Mythili's parents were leaving her malnourished.

Later they moved to the suburbs of New York. Their mother died when they were still young. Their father pushed them to excel, wanting every opportunity for them. For college, Mythili went to Barnard and both Maya and Meera to Brown.

Mythili teaches at a private school in central New Jersey. Maya, a physician, treats economically disadvantaged patients at a Manhattan hospital. Meera is the head of marketing for a start-up near her home in the Boston suburbs.

They pay taxes at the high rate of prosperous two-income couples like theirs. They instill an ethos of achievement in their sons and daughters. They contribute to this country. They flatter it.

Trump's campaign stunned them. "Who talks that way?" Mythili said, adding that he promoted "the total objectification of people who were different than he is, this concept that there's only one definition of what an American is: this white, male, gun-toting person."

Meera's thoughts were captured in a journal about the march that she contributed to Yahoo News. She wrote this:

"I am a woman of color, a child of immigrants, a wife of a Latino man and a mother to multiethnic children. And I take the election of a man who built his campaign on anti-immigration rhetoric — while shamelessly embracing racism and misogyny — very personally."

So she took that trip to Washington — four hours down, four back — although she'd never done anything like that before. She made and carried this sign: "Women's rights are

human rights.” Maya’s sign, befitting her work in medicine, said, “Health care is a right, not a privilege.” Mythili’s said, “E pluribus unum.” Out of many, one.

Normally, the sisters told me, a crowd as densely packed as the one that day would have made them nervous. Not this crowd. “You would accidentally hit somebody in the head with your sign and it was always, ‘No worries, it’s O.K.’” Meera recalled.

Maya remembered how someone started singing “The Star-Spangled Banner” and fellow marchers joined in, whether they could carry the tune or not.

They got back to New Jersey after 10 p.m. When Meera looked at comments attached to her Yahoo posts, she was chilled:

“That many angry cows marching in the same direction is called a stampede.” “Marching for Shariah law in U.S.A.: bunch of total idiots!” “If you want a free ride, move to Canada. Better yet, any brown country.” “What’s with the men in the march? Do they squat to pee?”

Ah, the internet.

Wanting to do what she can, Mythili recently called the offices of her state’s two senators — Cory Booker and Robert Menendez — to register her opposition to two of Trump’s cabinet nominees, Rex Tillerson and Betsy DeVos. She’d never done something like that before, either.

But these aren’t usual times. One week in, that’s even clearer than before.

President Trump, Meet My Family

By Nicholas Kristof

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

This newspaper has periodically, to its shame, succumbed to the kind of xenophobic fearmongering that President Trump is now trying to make American policy.

In 1875, The Times sternly warned that too many Irish and German immigrants (like the Trumps) could “deprive Americans by birth and descent of the small share they yet retain” in New York City.

In 1941, The Times cautioned in a front-page article that European Jews desperately seeking American visas might be Nazi spies. In 1942, as Japanese-Americans were being interned, The Times cheerfully suggested that the detainees were happily undertaking an “adventure.”

We make bad decisions when we fear immigrants we “otherize.” That’s why Americans burned Irish Catholics alive, banned Chinese for decades, denied visas to Anne Frank’s family and interned Japanese-Americans. And yes, The New York Times sometimes participated in such madness.

But we will not be part of that today.

Trump signed an executive order on Friday that suspends refugee programs and targets Muslims from certain countries. It’s hypocritical for Trump to be today’s avatar of hostility to immigrants, since his own family suffered from

anti-German sentiment and pretended to be Swedish. But I’m indignant for a more personal reason — and I’m getting to that.

Kirk W. Johnson, a former American aid official in Iraq, fears that the executive order will bar military interpreters who have bled for America and to whom we have promised entry. He told me about one interpreter, nicknamed Homeboy, who ran through fire to rescue a wounded American soldier, and then was himself shot. Homeboy survived, barely, but lost his leg — and as he recovered, a grenade was thrown at his home by insurgents angry that he had helped Americans.

After years of vetting, Homeboy was approved for a visa for interpreters who helped the United States. Does Trump really want to betray such people who risked more for America than Trump himself ever did?

Yet if fear and obliviousness have led us periodically to target refugees, there’s also another thread that runs through American history. It’s reflected in the welcome received by somebody I deeply admire: Wladyslaw Krzystofowicz. And this is personal.

Raised in what was then Romania and is now Ukraine, Krzystofowicz was jailed by the Gestapo for assisting an anti-Nazi spy for the West. His aunt was murdered in Auschwitz for similar spying, but he was freed with a bribe. When World War II was ending, he fled his home as it fell into the hands of the Soviets.

After imprisonment in a Yugoslav concentration camp, he made it to Italy and then France, but he couldn’t get a work permit, and he thought that neither he nor any children he might later have would ever be fully accepted in France.

So he dreamed of traveling to America, which he had heard would be open to all. He explored a fake marriage to an American woman to get a visa, but that fell through. Finally he met an American woman working in Paris who convinced her family back in Portland, Ore., to sponsor him, along with their church, the First Presbyterian Church of Portland.

As Krzystofowicz stood on the deck of the ship Marseille, approaching New York Harbor in 1952, a white-haired woman from Boston chatted with him and quoted the famous lines from the Statue of Liberty, “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free” Krzystofowicz spoke little English and didn’t understand, so she wrote them down for him and handed him the paper, saying, “Keep it as a souvenir, young man.”

Then as she was walking away, she corrected herself: “young American.”

Krzystofowicz kept that scrap of paper and marveled that he — a refugee who had repeatedly faced death in the Old Country for not belonging — now somehow counted as an American even before he had set foot on American soil, even before he had learned English. It was an inclusiveness that dazzled him, that kindled a love for America that he passed on to his son.

That strand of hospitality represents the best of this country. The church sponsored Krzysztofowicz even though he wasn't a Presbyterian, even though he was Eastern European at a time when the Communist bloc posed an existential threat to America. He could have been a spy or a terrorist.

But he wasn't. After arriving in Oregon, he decided that the name Krzysztofowicz was unworkable for Americans, so he shortened it to Kristof. He was my dad.

Recently I returned to the First Presbyterian Church to thank the congregation for taking a risk and sponsoring my father, who died in 2010. And the church, I'm delighted to say, is moving to support a refugee family this year.

Mr. President, please remember: This is a country built by refugees and immigrants, your ancestors and mine. When we bar them and vilify them, we shame our own roots.

IMMIGRATION

Texas Border Leaders Discuss How To Approach Trump On Security, Trade

Previously scheduled meeting took on new urgency after President Trump's executive order this week to speed construction of a wall along Mexican border

By Dan Frosch And Dudley Althaus

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

One Certainty Of Trump's Wall: Big Money

By Danielle Ivory And Julie Creswell

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

It was the border wall that didn't get built.

In 2006, Boeing and a team of other companies won a federal contract to construct a wall to protect the United States border with Mexico, which stretches roughly 2,000 miles, from California to Texas.

Five years and about \$1 billion later, the government threw in the towel. Costs had ballooned, and the surveillance systems suffered from technical difficulties. Nearly all of the money had been spent on just 53 miles of the border in Arizona.

The project was a loss for taxpayers. But for contractors, it was a big win.

Today, as President Trump declares his intention to move forward with plans to build a barrier along the Mexican border, many of the details remain little more than a guessing game. Does Mr. Trump intend to build miles of concrete blocks, or fencing? Could parts of the wall be virtual, using technology like cameras and sensors to monitor the border, or be manned by drones? Will Mexico, as Mr. Trump has promised repeatedly, pay for it?

There is no doubt that if the United States moves ahead with plans for an ambitious border wall — one of the biggest infrastructure projects in decades, perhaps running in the tens of billions of dollars — it will be a boon for contractors.

An examination of failed efforts from the past highlights the potential gains for companies and potential pitfalls for taxpayers. Among the possible winners are construction firms, high-tech surveillance companies and cement manufacturers including, in what would be an ironic turn, one of Mexico's largest materials companies.

"There's no question that, when the government spends money on a big project like this, companies are going to make a lot of money," said Joe Hornyak, a partner with the law firm Holland and Knight, who specializes in government contracting law. "There's no question about that."

In the past week, the Senate majority leader, Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, said Congress would move ahead with plans to build the wall, estimating that it would cost \$12 billion to \$15 billion.

Researchers at M.I.T. said last year that a 1,000-mile, 50-foot-high steel-and-concrete wall would run taxpayers about \$40 billion.

Whether the number ends up on the low or high end of these ranges, it has already caught the eye of companies and investors eager to get a piece of the construction action, despite the myriad political and social battles that will surround it. The stocks of several construction companies and cement and concrete manufacturers jumped after the latest talk from Mr. Trump, as investors bet not only on a payday coming from a Mexican border wall but also from proposals floated for about \$1 trillion in infrastructure projects.

The White House did not immediately respond to an inquiry. In 2011, when the Department of Homeland Security canceled the fence project, it said the effort was ineffective and too costly.

History would suggest that such efforts can have problematic results. Past attempts at a wall have favored companies with decades of government contracting experience. From 2007 to 2012, the federal government paid contractors more than \$1.5 billion for border protection, according to a New York Times analysis of spending under the Department of Homeland Security's Secure Border Initiative.

The initiative, started in 2005, has been one of the most aggressive attempts to protect the border. An office at Customs and Border Protection was assigned to develop and construct a virtual and physical wall along the border with Mexico, to reduce illegal immigration.

The company that won the biggest contract through that office was Boeing, which is best known for building aircraft but also performs a variety of tasks for the government, making it the nation's second-largest federal contractor.

Boeing was paid more than \$20 billion in contracts during the last fiscal year.

Boeing was not the only winner. The security company Wackenhut Corporation, now known as G4S Secure Solutions, received more than \$119 million. I.B.M. won more than \$56 million, and ManTech International, the technology company, received upward of \$43 million.

The project with Boeing, though, ran into snags almost immediately. Boeing and its team had built a complicated system consisting of sensors, radar and cameras mounted on towers to help border agents find people crossing into the country illegally. But the system worked inconsistently in some rough terrain.

The project became the subject of multiple, and scathing, Government Accountability Office reports, some of which cited poor fiscal oversight. And after about \$1 billion had been spent, the Obama administration canceled the project.

In recent days, Boeing's chief executive, Dennis Muilenburg, has been asked whether the company had discussed border security with the president, and whether it could harvest any information from its earlier project for the new wall. He said the company was not actively pursuing anything in that area but was open to working with the government. The company, otherwise, did not comment on its scrapped project.

There have been other attempts at a barrier that also ran into financial trouble. As a result of the various projects, hundreds of miles of wall already exist along the border, though in a form — wire mesh, chain link, sheet piling, concrete vehicle barriers, post and rails and X-shaped beams — that Mr. Trump may not have envisioned.

In 2005, one border project was harshly criticized by lawmakers after it was reported that cameras broke down frequently. In another, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of the Inspector General reported in 2011 that officials had wasted \$69 million in taxpayer dollars on an effort to build border walls, including the purchase of \$44 million worth of extra steel that it did not need.

In 2006, President George W. Bush signed the Secure Fence Act into law, requiring 700 miles of double-layered reinforced fencing to protect the border. The law was altered later to give the Department of Homeland Security more discretion to decide what kind of fencing was needed. Much of that wall consists of vehicle barriers, which do not stop people on foot.

None of this history seems to have tempered Mr. Trump's enthusiasm. But it comes at a time when a construction boom across much of the country has created a significant shortage of legal labor to build the wall, according to construction executives and others in Texas. Separately, a study released in 2012 estimated that half the construction workers in Texas were undocumented workers. Which means

that many of the laborers on the wall could be illegal immigrants.

"If this wall gets built in Texas, there is a high likelihood that a significant bit of the work force will be undocumented," said Jose P. Garza, the executive director of the Workers Defense Project, which supports low-income workers.

In another twist, money may flow to Mexicans or Mexican companies. Analysts say it is basically cost prohibitive to ship heavy rock or concrete more than 70 miles, or cement more than several hundred miles. That means manufacturers closest to the border may prove to be the most economical. That could be a big win for Cemex, Mexico's largest cement manufacturer, which has a United States-based subsidiary that could bid for the project and several plants dotting the border, analysts note. The company could also potentially receive hard-to-trace subcontracts that even government agencies sometimes have a difficult time tracking.

Also, the government already gives preferences to contractors that supply American-made construction materials when it awards such contracts, said Mr. Hornyak, but for certain large construction projects, the Trade Agreements Act waives requirements for materials made in countries that have entered into trade agreements with the United States.

So, Mr. Hornyak added, the president would most likely need Congress to change the law if he wanted to dictate that agencies, for instance, buy only American-made cement.

All of which means that, in an almost subversive inversion of the running debate over who will pay for what, the United States could ultimately wind up paying Mexican citizens and Mexican-owned businesses to construct the wall.

An infrastructure build-out could also increase the cost of cement and other materials, say analysts. Currently, the United States is operating at 90 percent of its capacity levels, estimates Garik Shmois, an analyst at Longbow Research in Independence, Ohio. "We're going to be effectively sold out by 2018, based on current projects," Mr. Shmois said. "So any additional period of growth, such as an infrastructure cycle, will put upward pressure on prices."

That is good news for cement and materials companies with significant operations in the United States, including Vulcan Materials, Martin Marietta Materials and German-based HeidelbergCement Group, as well as Mexico's Cemex and Grupo Cementos de Chihuahua.

Companies that specialize in surveillance technology or even "virtual" barriers could also benefit. Elbit Systems of America, whose parent company is based in Israel, won a contract in 2014 with Customs and Border Protection to build a set of towers with radar and cameras covering 170 to 200 miles along the Arizona border. When the radar detects movement, cameras zoom in and send images to command centers.

“When looking at the border, there is not a one-size-fits-all approach,” said Gordon Kesting, vice president for homeland security solutions for Elbit Systems of America. “But if you look at the costs associated with some of the approaches, they are quite different. There is a discussion to be had on the most effective and efficient use of taxpayer dollars.”

Miami Mayors Chide Gimenez Over County Immigration Detentions

By Patricia Mazzei

[Miami Herald](#), January 28, 2017

The current and former mayors of the city of Miami — a Republican and a Democrat, respectively — publicly chided Miami-Dade Mayor Carlos Gimenez for directing county jails to comply with federal immigration detention requests following President Donald Trump’s crackdown on “sanctuary” jurisdictions for immigrants in the country illegally.

Mayor Tomás Regalado tweeted Friday night that he’s “disappointed” by Gimenez’s Thursday decision. Regalado also seemed to indicate city cops have no interest in acting as immigration deputies — something Gimenez insists the county won’t be doing either, even as it subsidizes federal detentions. The city doesn’t manage any jails of its own.

“@MiamiPD job is to protect and serve the residents of the @CityofMiami,” Regalado wrote. “I am disappointed with the decision of the County.”

Several Twitter users, perhaps unaware that the county and city are separate jurisdictions, had apparently confused Regalado with Gimenez, and Regalado responded to some of them as well.

“I am an immigrant,” Regalado wrote to one person. “The City of Miami will not comply. However Miami Dade County is a whole different government.”

Though both Republicans, Regalado and Gimenez have been at odds politically for decades, most recently when Regalado’s daughter ran last year against Gimenez. When big-city mayors urged then-President-elect Trump last month to protect “DREAMers,” immigrants brought into the country illegally as children, Regalado was quick to offer his support. Gimenez took longer to say he backed President Barack Obama’s program to protect DREAMers from deportation.

Separately, former Miami Mayor Manny Diaz wrote in a pointed Miami Herald op-ed published Saturday that Gimenez, who is his friend, acted too hastily, without seeking enough legal guidance about Trump’s executive order.

“While other mayors have taken an approach that protects their communities, Mayor Gimenez has rushed into action to please the president, betraying our community’s long history of welcoming immigrants,” wrote Diaz, a lawyer.

He argued that Miami-Dade, which notifies the feds of all of the people it arrests and is willing to detain them as long

as Immigration and Customs Enforcement defrays the expense, already complied with Trump’s order.

“When the president tells cities to obey him or face his wrath, it is the mayor’s duty to at least question him,” Diaz wrote. “Democracy is not the president saying jump, and Mayor Gimenez asking how high.”

Both Diaz and Regalado weighed in after angry protesters demonstrated outside County Hall on Friday, and deluged Gimenez’s office with phone calls and emails opposing his directive.

All three mayors — Diaz, Gimenez and Regalado — were born in Cuba.

Reactions from other local politicians requested by the Herald were either muted or generally divided along party lines.

U.S. Sen. Marco Rubio, a Florida Republican, praised Gimenez for making “the right decision.” U.S. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Miami Republican, called unfunded mandates — like requiring municipalities to detain inmates for longer without paying for it — “an evasion of responsibility by the federal government” but said local governments are now on notice and she supports withholding funds from them if they “choose to ignore federal law.” U.S. Rep. Carlos Curbelo, also a Miami Republican, warned Trump’s policy “focuses on a symptom, not one of the root causes of our flawed immigration system, and has the potential of undermining the work of law enforcement officials investigating serious crimes in urban areas.”

U.S. Sen. Bill Nelson, a Florida Democrat; U.S. Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, a Miami Republican, and U.S. Rep. Frederica Wilson, a Miami Gardens Democrat, did not respond to requests for comment.

Two Republicans on the county commission, Chairman Esteban “Steve” Bovo and Joe Martinez, sided with Gimenez. Two Democrats, Daniella Levine Cava and Jean Monestime, questioned — but only mildly — Gimenez’s quick decision. Other commissioners did not respond.

The biggest denunciation came from U.S. Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz of Weston, whose Broward County-based district dips into northeast Miami-Dade.

“The only way to deal with a bully is to confront him,” she said in a statement. “We need to stand with local officials who should oppose Donald Trump’s intimidating executive order that threatens to strip federal funding from sanctuary cities and counties. This ham-fisted approach will only spread mass anxiety into communities throughout Florida and the country, and split up countless families who are our friends, coworkers and neighbors.”

Miami Herald staff writer Douglas Hanks contributed to this report.

Trump Aides Divided Over Policy Shielding 'Dreamer' Immigrants: Sources

By Julia Edwards Ainsley And Richard Cowan

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

TERRORISM INVESTIGATIONS

Trump Orders Joint Chiefs To Draft ISIS Strategy, Restructuring Of Security Council

By Philip Rucker And Missy Ryan

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

President Trump signed three executive orders on Saturday afternoon, including one directing the Joint Chiefs of Staff to draft a plan to destroy the Islamic State and another formalizing new lobbying restrictions on administration officials.

One of Trump's directives orders the Joint Chiefs to submit a strategy within 30 days to defeat the Islamic State, signaling that the new president hopes to make good on his campaign promise to more aggressively confront global terrorism than his predecessor.

"I think it's going to be very successful," Trump said. "That's big stuff."

Both Trump and his new defense secretary, retired Marine Gen. James Mattis, have expressed a desire to expedite an end to the battle against the Islamic State. Iraqi forces, backed by U.S. air power and American advisers, have cleared half of the city of Mosul, but they have taken heavy losses and could require additional outside support. In Syria, the United States is struggling to recruit sufficient Arab fighters to recapture the city of Raqqa, an offensive that American officials hope can begin within several months.

Even before Saturday's order, military officials had been at work developing a series of potential actions for Mattis and Trump's entire national security team to consider. Those include potentially deploying additional advisers to Iraq and Syria, allowing U.S. military personnel to accompany local forces closer to the front lines, and delegating greater decision-making power to field commanders.

Changes to the existing campaign are expected to be modest adjustments to the existing strategy rather than any radical departure. How far the new measures go "would depend upon the political risk that the president is willing to take when we do certain things that could exacerbate things with Russia or Turkey or the PMF," one defense official said, referring to Iranian-backed militias that have played an important role in fighting the Islamic State in Iraq.

U.S. ties with Turkey are already strained in Syria over U.S. support to Kurdish fighters there, and any move to expand that support is sure to inflame existing tensions.

The proposals will seek to ensure that commanders in the field "have the wherewithal and the leeway to do what they have to do to successfully prosecute the campaign," the official said, speaking on condition of anonymity to discuss internal deliberations.

But employing more combat power may come with serious drawbacks, including risking additional American lives and adding to the already significant cost of military operations overseas.

Trump also signed an executive order restructuring the National Security Council and streamlining procedures in a way that the White House believes would be more adaptive to modern threats.

Trump said that the change would bring "a lot of efficiency and, I think, a lot of additional safety."

"People have talked about doing this for a long time," he said. "Like, many years."

The third executive order institutes new lobbying rules for administration officials. It stipulates that administration officials can not register as lobbyists for a full five years after leaving the government — and can never lobby on behalf of a foreign government. The lobbying rules are in keeping with Trump's campaign promise to "drain the swamp."

"Most of the people standing behind me won't be able to go to work or do anything adverse to our wonderful country," Trump said, as the aides standing around his desk in the Oval Office laughed.

As a small group of reporters were leaving the Oval Office, someone shouted out a question about the president's executive order signed Friday that temporarily blocks the arrival of refugees and immigrants from seven countries that are predominantly Muslim.

"It's not a Muslim ban, but we were totally prepared," Trump said. "It's working out very nicely. You see it at the airports, you see it all over. It's working out very nicely, and we're going to have a very, very strict ban and we're going to have extreme vetting, which we should have had in this country for many years."

It wasn't immediately clear on Saturday what effect the Trump administration's executive order halting entry of migrants and green card holders from Iraq and other Muslim-majority nations would have on the U.S. partnership with the Iraqi government in the battle against the Islamic State. Iraqi lawmakers have asked the country's Foreign Ministry to explain how the measure will affect Iraq.

Trump's Call For Deadlier Islamic State Push May Hit Limits

By Phil Stewart

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

How An American Ended Up Accused Of Aiding ISIS With Gift Cards

By Eric Lichtblau

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

The F.B.I. had a job offer for Nick Young, a veteran Washington transit officer: Become an undercover informant for the bureau and gather information at local mosques on fellow Muslims who might pose a terrorism threat.

The clandestine work would be “a lot sexier” than his current job, Mr. Young remembered an agent named Ryan telling him. And it could pay him a lot of money if the intelligence was good.

Mr. Young turned him down. But it would not be the last time he would see the F.B.I. agent.

Last August, five years later, Mr. Young was summoned to the headquarters of the transit agency, Metro, where Ryan and other agents were waiting for him. “You probably don’t recognize me, do you?” Ryan, whose beard was now thicker, asked him. “Oh, I recognize you,” Mr. Young said. This time, the agent handcuffed Mr. Young on a charge of supporting the Islamic State — a case built, in a twist, by an informant who posed as a would-be terrorist fighter.

The prosecution of Mr. Young, the only law enforcement officer among more than 100 Americans who have been accused of helping the Islamic State, offers a revealing look at the F.B.I.’s shadowy cat-and-mouse efforts to identify possible Islamic extremists. President Trump has vowed to intensify the effort as part of a campaign to “annihilate” the militant group.

Mr. Young’s case also poses a challenge to the F.B.I.’s expanding use of undercover operations to identify Islamic State sympathizers inside the United States who might travel overseas to help the terrorist group or commit “lone wolf” attacks at home. His lawyer claims that the F.B.I. entrapped him, with undercover operatives popping in and out of his life for at least six years.

To law enforcement officials, however, Mr. Young represents one of their worst fears: a longtime officer, with access to sensitive facilities, who they suspect was “radicalized” to support Islamic extremism.

He is charged with providing “material support” to the Islamic State, in the form of \$245 worth of Google Play gift cards. The authorities say he gave the gift cards to a Muslim friend named Mo — in reality, an undercover informant — to support recruitment for the terrorist group.

Before now, very few American suspects linked to the Islamic State have spoken out. But in three and a half hours

of interviews from jail, Mr. Young, a convert to Islam, portrayed himself and many other American Muslims under investigation as victims of religious persecution. He accused an “overzealous” F.B.I. of “manufacturing” the case.

“I know for sure I wouldn’t have been targeted if I was an evangelic Christian or a Sikh or a Hindu or something,” said Mr. Young, 37.

“I’m not a terrorist,” he added. “Seeing these horrible allegations and the way they’re trying to paint me, it’s just a nightmare.”

Officials at the F.B.I. and the Justice Department declined to comment on the case. In general, the F.B.I. said in a statement, the investigative techniques used in such national security cases “are subject to vigorous oversight and require us to use the least intrusive means possible.”

The F.B.I. has moved aggressively since the rise of the Islamic State in 2014 to identify suspected extremist supporters inside the United States, opening hundreds of investigations and generating convictions from Brooklyn to Southern California, often against young Muslim men.

Mr. Trump has declared that the country must do more to confront what he calls “radical Islamic terrorism,” including the possibility of expanding surveillance and intelligence operations, creating a “registry” of American Muslims, and reviving torture as an interrogation technique.

While Mr. Trump has sent mixed signals on some of those proposals, they have worried some civil liberties advocates, who say they are eager to see whether the Justice Department and the F.B.I. seek to expand their investigative powers still further in domestic terrorism cases.

Mr. Young sees himself as a pawn in that broader fight.

He acknowledges holding passionate views about the Middle East and the “slaughter” of Syrians by the government of President Bashar al-Assad. On breaks from the transit agency, Mr. Young traveled to Libya twice in 2011 with body armor to join rebels fighting the Qaddafi regime.

“I didn’t kill anyone while I was there,” he said, laughing, but “I got shot at a lot.”

He insisted that he had never supported terrorists. He plans to take the witness stand at his trial, an unusual tactic for a terrorism suspect. “Nick doesn’t have anything to hide,” said Nicholas D. Smith, one of his lawyers.

As he waits for his trial date, he sits in a rural jail in Warsaw, Va., reading science fiction occasionally, with “The Jerry Springer Show” sometimes playing on a television in the background. “My brain’s turning to mush,” he said.

He said the jail had denied him access to Muslim prayer sessions. But the conditions are far better, he added, than the solitary confinement he was placed in for 23 hours a day for months after his arrest. That ordeal, he said, has caused lingering panic attacks and other problems.

Unlike the bulk of the Americans charged with supporting the Islamic State, Mr. Young is not accused of

plotting violence or trying to travel to the Middle East to fight with the group.

He said he was under investigation for so long, it was almost inevitable that the authorities would find a way to charge him. "At the end of the day, the crime I'm being accused of — a crime of sending gift cards — it would be laughable if it wasn't really happening," Mr. Young said.

He declined to explain the gift cards, citing a pretrial order that restricts what he can say about documents in the case. But he said his explanation would come out at his trial.

Since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, dozens of terrorism defendants caught in undercover stings have claimed in court that they were illegally entrapped into saying or doing incriminating things. None have succeeded.

Judges have given the Justice Department wide latitude in using undercover stings in terrorism cases. "You almost need a perfect case" to prove entrapment, said Seamus Hughes, a terrorism expert at George Washington University's Program on Extremism, "and that's difficult to find."

Still, several legal analysts said Mr. Young might have a legitimate shot, because of the unusual elements of the F.B.I.'s yearslong undercover investigation. They point out that even an obstruction-of-justice charge that Mr. Young faces is based on his statements to agents about a fictional F.B.I. investigation into the whereabouts of a would-be Islamic State fighter who never existed.

Mr. Young apparently first came onto the F.B.I.'s radar around 2010 because he knew a fellow student at George Mason University, Zachary A. Chesser, who, like him, was a white convert to Islam from Northern Virginia and attended the same mosque.

The F.B.I. interviewed Mr. Young that year as part of an investigation into Mr. Chesser, who ultimately pleaded guilty to terrorism-related charges after he was accused of threatening the creators of "South Park" over the show's depiction of the Prophet Muhammad.

Mr. Young does not appear to have been an F.B.I. target at the time, even as undercover informants began giving the bureau reports about the activities of him and some of his associates.

He continued working as an armed officer patrolling Washington-area subways and bus lines. He said F.B.I. agents — Ryan and a second agent — had met with him twice in 2011 to recruit him as an informant.

Mr. Young said he found the idea of becoming an informant distasteful. The F.B.I. said in a court affidavit that he had used stronger language in a conversation with one of the bureau's undercover informants, saying that if he were ever betrayed by one, "that person's head would be in a cinder block" at the bottom of a lake.

Based on wiretaps and statements from informants, the F.B.I. reported that Mr. Young had made a number of other

incendiary and perhaps even threatening comments over the years about Muslim informants, F.B.I. investigators and "kaffirs" — or nonbelievers.

Mr. Young acknowledged that he could have used "a little self-editing" in some of his private remarks. But he said he had never meant them to be taken literally. "Everyone's capable of saying stupid, blustery things," said Mr. Smith, his lawyer.

Some F.B.I. officials pressed to bring criminal charges against Mr. Young years ago, but the Justice Department rebuffed them because of an apparent lack of evidence that he was involved in supporting terrorism, according to law enforcement officials.

It was not until 2014 that Mr. Young crossed the line into supporting terrorism, the Justice Department now alleges. That was when he first met Mo, a Middle Easterner who said he was a military reservist, at a mosque where he prayed. Mr. Young said he had suspected early on that Mo might be an informant because of his strange mannerisms.

But his concerns eased, and the two became friends, meeting at a Starbucks or elsewhere. Mo later told Mr. Young that he was thinking of traveling to Syria to join the Islamic State, prosecutors said.

While Mr. Young sometimes appeared to offer Mo advice on how best to avoid government scrutiny if he went to the Middle East, he also told him at times that he did not need to join the terrorist group — at least not then, according to the F.B.I.'s account.

"There is no one with a gun to your head that is counting down," he told Mo in a conversation recorded in October 2014.

Such statements, said Mr. Smith, his lawyer, show that "the government is really grasping at straws here." Prosecutors are acting on "really more of a hunch that he might commit crimes in the future," he said, "and they can't prove it."

Suspected U.S. Commando Raid In Yemen Kills Three Al Qaeda Members: Residents

By Noah Browning

[Reuters](#), January 29, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

CYBER NEWS

Hackers Hit D.C. Police Closed-circuit Camera Network, City Officials Disclose

By Clarence Williams

[Washington Post](#), January 27, 2017

Hackers infected 70 percent of storage devices that record data from D.C. police surveillance cameras eight days before President Trump's inauguration, forcing major citywide reinstallation efforts, according to the police and the city's technology office.

City officials said ransomware left police cameras unable to record between Jan. 12 and Jan. 15. The cyberattack affected 123 of 187 network video recorders in a closed-circuit TV system for public spaces across the city, the officials said late Friday.

Brian Ebert, a Secret Service official, said the safety of the public or protectees was never jeopardized.

Archana Vemulapalli, the city's Chief Technology Officer, said the city paid no ransom and resolved the problem by taking the devices offline, removing all software and restarting the system at each site.

An investigation into the source of the hack continues, said Vemulapalli, who said the intrusion was confined to the police CCTV cameras that monitor public areas and did not extend deeper into D.C. computer networks.

Ransomware is malware that is said to be proliferating. It infects computers, often when users click on a link or open an attachment in an email. It then encrypts files or otherwise locks users out until they pay.

The D.C. hack appeared to be an extortion effort that "was localized" and did not affect criminal investigations, city officials said.

On Jan. 12 D.C. police noticed four camera sites were not functioning properly and told OCTO. The technology office found two forms of ransomware in the four recording devices and launched a citywide sweep of the network where they found more infected sites, said Vemulapalli.

The network video recorders are connected to as many as four cameras at each site, she said.

"There was no access from these devices into our environment," Vemulapalli said.

Interim Police Chief Peter Newsham said that police worked with OCTO but that the incident was limited to about 48 hours. He said there was "no significant impact" overall.

City officials declined to say who they suspected in the attack.

US No Longer Has Geography As Defense, Ally In Cybercombat

By Tami Abdollah

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON (AP) – The United States has long relied on its borders and superior military might to protect against and deter foreign aggressors. But a lack of boundaries and any rulebook in cyberspace has increased the threat and leveled the playing field today.

It's unclear how President Donald Trump, who has emphasized an "America First" approach to domestic issues, will respond to cyberspace threats, which transcend traditional borders and make it easier and cheaper than ever for foreigners to attack the U.S. Whatever the approach, it will set the tone and precedent for global policies during a critical time when the ground rules are still being written.

At a hearing this month on foreign cyberthreats, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., ran through a list of recent operations the U.S. believes was carried out by foreign countries – Russia, China, Iran and North Korea. The targets: the White House, State Department, Office of Personnel Management, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Navy, major U.S. financial institutions, a small New York dam and Sony Pictures Entertainment Inc.

"Our adversaries have reached a common conclusion, that the reward for attacking America in cyberspace outweighs the risk," McCain said.

With most of the U.S. critical infrastructure in private hands and Americans among the most connected citizens in the world, the potential attack surface for any hacker is vast and increasing. U.S. officials and lawmakers have argued that because there is no official policy on cyberwarfare, the response to any attack can be slow, politicized and ultimately ineffectual.

The U.S. took two months, after publicly accusing Russian government hackers of trying to influence the presidential election, to respond with economic sanctions and other more symbolic measures.

The reality is that the "nature of conflict has moved to the information space instead of just the physical kinetic space, and it now operates at greater scale and quicker speed," said Sean Kanuck, who served as the first U.S. national intelligence officer for cyber issues in the Office of the Director for National Intelligence.

Under the Obama administration, the U.S. proposed international cyber rules for peacetime, including that countries should not target another's critical infrastructure. But otherwise, it has maintained existing international laws and reserved the right to respond to any cyberattack.

The Trump administration is reviewing cyber policies, but it has said it will prioritize developing defensive and offensive cyber capabilities. It has also said it will work with international partners to engage in "cyberwarfare to disrupt and disable (terrorist) propaganda and recruiting."

Unlike conventional warfare, the costs in cyberspace can have rippling impacts for both the victim and attacker. Malicious software may end up spreading in an unforeseen and unplanned manner, and a hacker who gets into a single computer can cause unpredictable effects to a network.

"Look at what North Korea did to Sony or what China did to us via the OPM hack," said David Goe, a history fellow at the Army Cyber Institute at West Point and a former

intelligence officer. “You’ve got all of these aircraft carriers and all of this ocean, and it really doesn’t matter because we’re still feeling effects. They’re not kinetic effects, but they’re surely effects.”

More than 20 million people had their personal information compromised when the Office of Personnel Management was hacked in what the U.S. believes was a Chinese espionage operation.

“Really it’s our geeks versus their geeks,” Gioe said. “In the same way as single combat. It doesn’t matter how good my army is or your army is, it’s me versus you.”

Follow Tami Abdollah on Twitter at <https://twitter.com/latams>

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY NEWS

Donald Trump Signs Order To Revamp National Security Council

White House official says move would make operation ‘more adaptive’ to threats

By Carol E. Lee

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Trump’s Making His Own Rules As A Diplomat, Too

By Michael Crowley

[Politico](#), January 28, 2017

Donald Trump made his own rules as a presidential candidate, and now he’s pushing ahead with global diplomacy in a similarly freewheeling fashion—with no Secretary of State yet in place and relatively little guidance from seasoned diplomatic advisers.

Trump plans to speak by phone Saturday with the leaders of Australia, France, Germany and Japan, as well as with Russian President Vladimir Putin. The calls follow his White House meeting Friday with British Prime Minister Theresa May, and a phone call with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto. On Monday, Trump will host Jordan’s King Abdullah, a crucial Arab ally.

The outreach comes despite the continued gaps in Trump’s diplomatic team. For decades, presidential meetings with foreign leaders have involved copious preparation by the

State Department and the White House’s National Security Council which produces clear guidance to avoid surprises or misunderstandings that could trigger an international incident.

Trump is still filling vacancies, including for posts with responsibility for coordinating policy for Europe and Russia. National Security Advisor Michael Flynn, a former military intelligence officer whose background is limited to the Middle East and Afghanistan, has no traditional diplomatic experience.

The State Department is also a work in progress: Trump’s nominee for Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson, isn’t expected to be confirmed until Monday at the earliest. Even if he is confirmed as expected, Tillerson will need to install invaluable deputies—including new senior officials for Russia and the Middle East. The occupants of those two jobs, Victoria Nuland and Anne Patterson, resigned this month, taking a trove of institutional knowledge with them.

Even in some key parts of the State Department where new faces have arrived, confusion lingers. At the department’s influential office of Policy Planning—a kind of in-house think tank traditionally led by particularly bright minds—Carnegie Mellon associate professor Kiron Skinner has been working in the director’s office. But White House and State Department officials would not say whether she will be the new policy planning chief, and Skinner, a Harvard Ph.D. who has written extensively about Ronald Reagan, has had little contact with career staffers there.

The Trump team has recently unveiled the names of some incoming national security officials. On Wednesday the White House announced that Andrea Thompson, a retired Army intelligence officer, would be national security advisor to Vice President Mike Pence. Sebastian Gorka, national security editor for Breitbart News, and Victoria Coates, national security advisor to Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) will reportedly also join the national security council.

Trump’s approach contrasts with the one adopted by President Barack Obama, who in 2009 retained George W. Bush’s defense secretary Robert Gates. Obama also kept on Bush’s top national security council official overseeing the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, Douglas Lute.

One of Trump’s key conduits to foreign officials is his 36-year-old son in law, Jared Kushner, who’s never worked in government. Kushner sat in on his meetings Friday with May.

A White House spokesman would not provide details on the preparations for Trump’s conversations with other leaders. A State Department official would say only that the department is “playing its traditional role to support the President in his engagement with foreign leaders.”

A lack of seasoned support didn’t prevent Trump from pulling off a seemingly smooth meeting with May. The two leaders held a cheerful joint press conference at which Trump showed relative self-restraint and sprang no surprises on the British leader.

The stakes will be higher in Trump's call with Putin, his first as president, during which the men are expected to discuss the possibility that Trump might lift some U.S. sanctions on Moscow.

Even the idea of lifting sanctions is politically explosive. On Friday, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) warned Trump that backing down on Russia would be "a reckless course" that he would seek to reverse with Congressional legislation.

The focus on Trump's Putin call has overshadowed his planned talks Saturday with French President Francois Hollande and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Many analysts consider the German leader America's most important ally, and President Barack Obama worked assiduously to develop a strong relationship with her.

Merkel greeted Trump's election somewhat coolly, issuing a congratulatory statement that said she would cooperate with the incoming president on the basis of agreement over "values of democracy, freedom and respect for the law and the dignity of man, independent of origin, skin color, religion, gender, sexual orientation or political views."

The German chancellor is also a skeptic of Putin and will likely expect clarity from Trump about his plans for dealing with the Russian leader.

On Monday, Trump will host Jordan's King Abdullah, whom many have long considered Washington's closest friend in the Arab world—but who arrives amid politically explosive talk that Trump might seek to move the U.S. embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, an act that could ignite the Palestinian population within and along Jordan's borders.

Trump Administration Holds Off On Issuing U.N. Funding Order

By Max Fisher

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

The Trump administration is delaying its plans to issue two executive orders that would reduce funding to the United Nations and begin a process to review and potentially cancel certain multilateral treaties, according to current and former officials briefed on the matter.

Both draft orders were submitted to the National Security Council for approval, but the council's advisers were granted less than an hour and a half to review them, though this process normally takes weeks. Federal agencies were granted similarly brief windows for review.

Federal officials that were asked to review the documents balked at their contents, warning they required legal vetting.

The draft orders are now being withheld for a more complete review by a number of agencies, including the State Department, which is expected to begin as early as next week.

The draft order on the United Nations funding, according to copies acquired by The New York Times, called for "at least a 40 percent overall decrease" in contributions by the United States to the world body and its agencies. Much of this funding currently goes to international peacekeeping operations and other core United Nations missions. The draft order would have allowed for similar cuts to other international organizations, but it did not name them.

Some provisions in the draft order were either unclear or redundant. For example, one suggested considering cuts in funding toward the International Criminal Court, but the United States does not recognize that body or make contributions to it. Another called for the termination of funding for any United Nations agency that grants full membership to a Palestinian representative, which is already United States law.

Nikki R. Haley, the new American ambassador to the United Nations, said in comments at the United Nations headquarters on Friday, "You're going to see a change in the way we do business."

Ms. Haley added, "For those who don't have our backs, we're taking names."

President Trump expressed antipathy toward the United Nations during the campaign.

A second draft order called for establishing a process to review whether some multilateral treaties should be annulled, including current and pending treaties. The order's text excluded treaties "directly related" to extradition, trade or national security, though it is unclear which treaties would have qualified.

Experts said that permission for the reviews of treaties related to the environment — such as the Paris climate agreement — or to human rights also appeared to be intended in the draft order.

Trump, Putin Use First Formal Phone Call To Seek Better Ties

By Jake Rudnitsky

[Bloomberg Politics](#), January 28, 2017

President Donald Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin pledged cooperation in fighting the Islamic State, the two sides said, as the pair seek to reverse tension after Russia's invasion of Ukraine, its support for Syria, and allegations that Russian hackers sought to sway the U.S. election.

"The positive call was a significant start to improving the relationship between the United States and Russia that is in need of repair," the White House said in a statement. Putin told Trump he "sees the U.S. as a most important partner in the fight against international terrorism," according to a readout of the call from the Kremlin that described the conversation as "positive and businesslike."

The conversation, one of several Trump held with world leaders on Saturday, was the among the first formal steps in his effort to reset relations with the Kremlin, which soured under the Obama administration after Russia's invasion of Ukraine and its support for Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad in his fight against rebel groups. Trump's critics have questioned the wisdom of his calls for better ties with Putin, especially in light of the U.S. intelligence community's conclusion that Russia hacked e-mails of the Democratic National Committee in a bid to swing the November election in Trump's favor.

Trump has said he would consider easing financial penalties imposed by the U.S. over the annexation of Crimea in 2014 in exchange for Russia's support on a nuclear weapons deal or fighting terror groups like the Islamic State. Critics have argued that Russia's support of Assad has nothing to do with Islamic State fighters based there, pointing to the fact that its air war has focused on rebels around Aleppo not affiliated with the group.

'Active Joint Efforts'

Vice President Mike Pence participated in the call with Putin along with senior counselor Stephen Bannon, chief of staff Reince Priebus, national security adviser Michael Flynn and press secretary Sean Spicer. The White House said the call lasted about an hour.

"In the course of the conversation, both sides demonstrated a desire for active joint efforts to stabilize and develop Russia-American relations on a constructive, equitable and mutually beneficial basis," the Kremlin said. "The importance was underlined of restoring mutually beneficial trade and economic ties between business on both sides."

There was no mention in either readout of the wide-ranging U.S. sanctions targeting Russia's banking, energy, and defense sectors. Some were imposed via executive order by former President Barack Obama, which Trump has the power to undo quickly.

Trump downplayed the possibility of sanctions relief during a press conference on Friday, saying, "We'll see what happens. As far as the sanctions, very early to be talking about that."

Climate Accord

Also Saturday, Trump spoke with Japan's Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, French Prime Minister Francois Hollande, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Hollande said the sanctions on Russia must only be lifted if progress is made on the Minsk agreement aimed at bringing peace to Ukraine, according to his office.

He told Trump that "the defense of democracies requires observing fundamental principles and among these are welcoming refugees," a criticism of the president's executive order, signed Friday, that suspended refugee

admissions and put a 90-day ban on admissions of immigrants from seven Muslim-majority nations including Iran, Iraq and Syria.

Hollande also warned Trump of the "economic and political consequences" of protectionism, according to his office, as the U.S. president looks to renegotiate trade agreements and potentially put a tax on imports.

NATO Alliance

In the call with Merkel, Trump agreed on the importance of the NATO alliance and the need for allies to contribute their fair share, according to readouts from both sides. The White House said they discussed Ukraine but provided no details; Merkel has previously said she wants Europe to maintain pressure on Russia over Ukraine regardless of what the U.S. decides to do.

Trump accepted Merkel's invitation to attend a Group of 20 summit in Hamburg in July, according to the readouts.

Lawmakers on Capitol Hill also warned Trump they would look to act if he rolled back the penalties on Russia.

'Reckless Course'

Senator John McCain, an Arizona Republican, on Friday called on Trump to "reject such a reckless course" and remember that Putin is "a murderer and a thug who seeks to undermine American national security interests at every turn."

"If he does not, I will work with my colleagues to codify sanctions against Russia into law," McCain said.

There was no indication that Putin and Trump discussed Russian attempts to interfere in the election. The Obama administration imposed additional sanctions and expelled Russian intelligence officials from the U.S. over alleged interference. As part of a report detailing the Russian effort, both the former and current president also were briefed on an unsubstantiated dossier of salacious personal and business intelligence about Trump allegedly collected by Russian security services.

Trump has denied the allegations in the dossier, which was subsequently published by the website BuzzFeed, and the Kremlin has said it didn't spy on the president during his trips to Russia as a private citizen.

Donald Trump, Vladimir Putin Discuss Working Together To Fight Terrorism

No mention of Russian sanctions in statements from White House, Kremlin after phone call

By Olga Razumovskaya

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Trump Holds Calls With Putin, Leaders From Europe And Asia

By Philip Rucker And David Filipov

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

President Trump called Russian President Vladimir Putin on Saturday in hopes of cultivating “a great relationship,” one in a series of telephone conversations with world leaders as he develops a personal rapport with the heads of several traditional U.S. allies.

Trump’s conversation with Putin, which began about noon Eastern time, comes as the president faces pressure to maintain sanctions against Moscow. He is reaching out to repair the U.S.-Russian relationship, which has been badly strained by the Ukrainian crisis, the war in Syria and the conclusion by U.S. intelligence agencies that Putin ordered systematic hacking of Democratic emails to tip the presidential election in Trump’s favor.

Trump spoke with Putin from behind his desk in the Oval Office, which was stacked high with papers and a glass of soda. The president was flanked by Vice President Pence, National Security Adviser Michael Flynn, White House chief of staff Reince Priebus, chief strategist Stephen K. Bannon and press secretary Sean Spicer.

Trump began the day with a call to Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe to discuss security and trade issues between the two countries and the mutual threat posed by North Korea.

“President Trump affirmed the iron-clad U.S. commitment to ensuring the security of Japan,” a White House statement said. It continued, “President Trump and Prime Minister Abe said they would consult and cooperate on the threat posed by North Korea.”

Trump and Abe also discussed an upcoming visit to Japan and other countries in the region by newly installed Defense Secretary James Mattis. Abe, who during Trump’s transition phase became the first foreign leader to talk face-to-face with the president-elect, agreed to meet Trump during a visit to Washington on Feb. 10, according to the White House.

Trump then spoke by phone from with German Chancellor Angela Merkel. His outreach to Merkel comes after his repeated attacks on her during the campaign, during which he blasted the German policy on admitting Syrian refugees for, he said, putting German citizens in danger of terrorist attacks.

Trump is planning to speak later Saturday with French President François Hollande and Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull.

Ahead of Trump’s call with Putin, leaders in Moscow expressed cautious hope that the new American leader could forge stronger ties than former president Barack Obama did.

On Saturday, Nikolai Patrushev, the influential head of the Russian Security Council, welcomed the first contact.

“We will await the results, but I believe everything will be positive,” Patrushev said Saturday, according to Russia’s Interfax news agency.

From Moscow’s point of view, lifting the sanctions imposed by the Obama administration for interference in the presidential election and Russia’s intervention in Ukraine would be a good start, as would a reduction of NATO’s military presence near Russia’s borders.

Washington’s European allies, meanwhile, have expressed concern over whether Trump’s first moves with Russia will signal a reduction of the U.S. commitment to European security.

But Trump, speaking Friday at a White House news conference with British Prime Minister Theresa May, said that it is “very early” to discuss lifting sanctions on Russia. May also stated her commitment to keep the sanctions in place until the Minsk Agreement, a plan to end the conflict in Ukraine, has been implemented. And she added that she continues to argue that position “inside the European Union.”

Trump’s first contact with Putin as president comes after months of speculation over the Kremlin’s role in the 2016 election — starting with Trump’s frequent expressions of admiration for Putin and culminating in the assessment of the U.S. intelligence community that Russia interfered in the campaign on Trump’s behalf.

Trump has vehemently denied allegations that his positive view of Moscow stems from business ties or blackmail by Russian intelligence, and he has sought to portray his upbeat words about Putin as a positive.

He has consistently argued that Russia can be a strong ally instead of a strategic ally, saying the two countries could cooperate on counterterrorism in general and rolling back the Islamic State in particular, as well as countering nuclear weapon proliferation. Trump has suggested that Washington can work with Moscow on the conflicts in Syria and Ukraine and that he might be ready to negotiate down NATO’s strong defensive posture on Russia’s western border.

U.S. lawmakers from both parties, and others including Trump Cabinet picks, have raised alarms or at least questioned his softer approach to Russia.

But on Friday, the president expressed more tempered expectations.

“As far as, again, Putin and Russia, I don’t say good, bad or indifferent,” Trump said. “I don’t know the gentleman. I hope we have a fantastic relationship. That’s possible. And it’s also possible we won’t. We will see what happens. I will be representing the American people very, very strongly, very forcefully.”

On a grander scale, the Kremlin seems to hope the Trump administration will relax what it sees as a policy of containment since the fall of the Soviet Union left the United States as the world’s sole superpower. In the new world order outlined by Putin, Russia would have greater influence in world affairs and, from Moscow’s point of view, feel more secure at home.

But Moscow has consistently cautioned about “excessive optimism” over what Trump’s presidency will mean for Russia, and Putin spokesman Dmitry Peskov stayed on script Friday. “One can hardly expect substantive contacts on the entire range of affairs from this call,” he told reporters. “Let us wait and see. Let us be patient.”

Moscow’s establishment has welcomed Trump as a pragmatist who will not try to enforce American values on the rest of the world.

“He is a businessman. He is a pragmatic person,” Andrei Norkin, co-host of a popular Russian political talk show, said this week. “I hope that his attitude to foreign policy will be like to some sort of business deal. People who will work with him will be telling him ‘Mr. President, we are taking a risk here,’ and he will agree.”

Trump And Putin Have First Official Phone Conversation Amid European Anxiety About Future Relations

By Christi Parsons And Tracy Wilkinson, Contact Reporters

[Los Angeles Times](#), January 28, 2017

President Trump made a flurry of phone calls to world leaders Saturday as he began shaping his new administration’s foreign policy, but none was as anxiously anticipated as the first official president-to-president contact with Russia’s Vladimir Putin.

As his top aides looked on, Trump sat in the Oval Office and spoke with the Russian president on his desk phone, at one point peering out the windows at the White House journalists watching from across the Rose Garden.

The pair discussed combating terrorism, confronting Islamic State militants, the crisis in Ukraine and the Iranian nuclear deal, according to a statement from the Kremlin. Moscow said the topic of easing U.S. sanctions against Russia over its 2014 annexation of Crimea did not come up.

And the men agreed to a set a possible date and venue for a personal meeting, and vowed to maintain “regular personal contacts,” the Kremlin statement said.

In its own statement after the one-hour phone call, the White House said, “The positive call was a significant start to improving the relationship between the United States and Russia that is in need of repair. Both President Trump and President Putin are hopeful that after today’s call the two sides can move quickly to tackle terrorism and other important issues of mutual concern.”

Trump’s budding relationship with Putin is certain to be one of the most closely watched of his administration, both at home and around the world.

Trump has alarmed European leaders and U.S. lawmakers from both parties with his praise and unusually friendly overtures toward the Russian leader, whom much of

the world considers an authoritarian who has taken increasingly aggressive actions in Europe and the Middle East.

And Trump’s oft-stated desire to improve relations with Russia comes despite the recent conclusion by American intelligence agencies that Russia hacked into the email systems of U.S. political organizations last year in an audacious bid to interfere with the presidential election and help Trump.

Trump said Friday that having Russia as an ally “would be an asset.” He says Russia can help the U.S. defeat Islamic State militants in Syria, even though Putin’s priority so far in Syria has not been attacking Islamic State but supporting his ally Syrian President Bashar Assad, who is opposed by the U.S.

Trump’s pick for secretary of State, America’s top diplomat, has further cemented the concerns. Rex Tillerson, the former chief executive officer of Exxon Mobil, has acknowledged a close relationship with Putin, honed through years of multibillion-dollar deals for oil exploration and drilling in Russia.

Both Trump and Tillerson have been less than enthusiastic about economic sanctions imposed on Russia after Putin invaded Ukraine and annexed the Crimean peninsula in 2014. Trump even suggested the U.S. could lift the sanctions if Russia agreed to compromise on nuclear arms, an unrelated matter.

Alexei Pushkov, a Russian senator and former chairman of the parliamentary foreign relations committee, said Saturday that the phone call marked the start of a new, closer U.S.-Russia relationship.

“The Trump-Putin conversation will give a new beginning to the fight against [Islamic State], a solution of the crises in Syria, Ukraine. Merkel only has old solutions,” he tweeted, referring to German Chancellor Angela Merkel.

Trump supporters said that his outreach toward Russia was intended to curb Putin’s aggressive behavior.

“I do think they are going into this with a general negotiating tactic: Offer Russia a chance to back off and not be antagonistic,” said James Jay Carafano, a senior fellow at the conservative think tank Heritage Foundation, who briefed Trump on foreign affairs during the transition. “That is different from placating [Putin] and giving him whatever he wants.”

In addition to the chat with Putin, Trump made phone calls Saturday to four other world leaders: Merkel, French President Francois Hollande, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull.

And the president kept up his frenetic pace of executive action by signing new directives that put his own imprint on the national security apparatus.

Trump signed executive actions to reorganize the National Security Council and to direct the joint chiefs of staff to present him with a plan to defeat Islamic State.

He also issued a five-year ban preventing people who work for him from lobbying his administration after they leave it.

The action came right on the heels of an executive order Friday closing U.S. borders to refugees from around the world and temporarily halting immigration from several mostly Muslim countries.

Special correspondent Mansur Mirovalev in Moscow contributed to this report.

This article was updated after statements were released by the White House and Kremlin.

This article was originally published at 10 a.m.

Germany's Merkel, Trump Agree On Importance Of NATO In Call

By Frank Jordans

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

BERLIN (AP) – German Chancellor Angela Merkel and U.S. President Donald Trump discussed conflicts in the Middle East and Ukraine on Saturday and agreed on the importance of NATO during their first call since Trump's inauguration, according to joint statement by Merkel's office.

The two leaders had an "extensive phone conversation" in which they also talked about relations with Russia, said Merkel's spokesman Steffen Seibert.

"They expressed their intention to further deepen the already excellent bilateral relations in the coming years," Seibert said.

On NATO, both agreed on the "fundamental importance that the NATO alliance has for trans-Atlantic relations" and the need for all members to pay their fair share. Trump has repeatedly said some U.S. allies don't spend enough on their militaries.

In the joint statement, there was no mention of refugees, not even of Trump's move on Friday banning refugees from several Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States. That move drew sharp criticism Saturday from French President Francois Hollande, Germany's European Union ally, among others.

Trump had severely criticized Merkel during his election campaign, claiming she was "ruining" Germany by allowing hundreds of thousands of asylum-seekers into the country.

In turn, Merkel had raised eyebrows after Trump's victory by insisting that the basis for cooperation between Berlin and Washington should be "democracy, freedom and human rights worldwide, and to strive for an open and liberal world order."

Seibert said Trump accepted Merkel's invitation to attend the G-20 meeting in Hamburg, Germany, in July.

Trump also said he looked forward to welcoming Merkel in Washington "soon," according to the statement.

It was the second time Trump and Merkel have spoken by phone. They first spoke when the German chancellor called Trump shortly after the election to congratulate him on his victory.

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

Trump, Merkel Agree NATO Members Must Pay Fair Share

By Andrea Shalal

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Shinzo Abe Discusses Importance Of Japan-U.S. Alliance With Donald Trump

By Takashi Nakamichi

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Japan PM Abe: To Meet Trump February 10; Reaffirmed Importance Of Alliance

By Kiyoshi Takenaka And Roberta Rampton

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Trump Tells Abe U.S. Commitment To Japan Security 'Ironclad': White House

By Roberta Rampton And Lesley Wroughton

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Trump To Honor Pacific Island Refugee Deal With Australia

By Edward Johnson

[Bloomberg News](#), January 29, 2017

U.S. President Donald Trump has vowed to uphold an agreement with Australia to resettle asylum seekers held in

Pacific island camps, an Australian government official said Sunday.

Trump made the commitment during a 25-minute phone conversation with Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, according to the official, who asked not to be identified as there has been no public announcement.

About 1,600 asylum seekers who tried to reach Australia by boat are being detained on Manus Island and Nauru, with many potentially eligible to be resettled in the U.S. under an agreement reached last year with the Obama administration.

The deal appeared in jeopardy when Trump on Friday signed an executive order indefinitely banning admission of people fleeing Syria, temporarily freezing the entry of other refugees and prohibiting entry by people from seven majority-Muslim nations for 90 days.

Turnbull told reporters on Saturday, before his phone hook-up with the Oval Office, he was "very confident" the agreement would be upheld. The prime minister has not spoken publicly since the call with Trump.

The White House said in an earlier statement that Trump and Turnbull "emphasized the enduring strength and closeness of the U.S.-Australia relationship that is critical for peace, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region and globally." The White House didn't immediately respond to a late-night request for comment on the refugee deal with Australia.

The two leaders committed to making the U.S.-Australia alliance even stronger, according to the Australian official. They discussed their shared objective to defeating Islamic State and tackling global instability, including in the Asia-Pacific region. They also acknowledged their common interest in preventing irregular and illegal migration, the official said.

Australia's foreign ministry said the embassy in Washington was "engaging" with U.S. officials on what Trump's executive order meant for Australian dual nationals from Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen.

The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade "has not received any requests for consular assistance from Australians unable to board transport to the United States," it said in an e-mailed statement Sunday.

Mexico Rebukes Israel Over Netanyahu Wall Tweet

By Dave Graham

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Israel PM Netanyahu Praises Trump's Plan For Mexico Border Wall

By Rory Jones

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Inside The Contentious Israeli Settlement That Counts Trump As A Donor

By Loveday Morris And Ruth Eglash

[Washington Post](#), January 29, 2017

In a modern building of beige and black stone, hundreds of Jewish students pore over religious texts and learn of their right to settle the land surrounding this hillside settlement, as promised by God to their forefathers.

The new building for the religious seminary, or yeshiva, opened just a month ago, despite controversy over any new construction here. A sign reading "danger construction" still hangs on the fence outside.

Located deep inside the occupied West Bank, near the Palestinian city of Ramallah, the settlement is considered illegal by most of the international community. But still, it has some influential backers, the most famous of whom now sits in the White House.

Several of President Trump's close associates have strong links to the right-wing Zionist community, home to 1,300 families. Trump's pick for U.S. ambassador to Israel, his former bankruptcy lawyer David Friedman, is president of the American Friends of Bet El Institutions, which raises around \$2 million a year in funding. Its website says the group has helped bring about an influx in young couples and is working to create "facts on the ground" to prevent international attempts to uproot the community.

The family of Trump's son-in-law and adviser Jared Kushner has donated tens of thousands. Trump himself made a \$10,000 donation in 2003, his foundation's tax filings show.

Palestinians say these communities present a major barrier to peace and the creation of a contiguous future state. It is a view that much of the world shares.

But Trump's ties to the settler movement could upend decades of U.S. policy on dealing with the conflict here, allowing Israel more freedom to build without censure from Washington, which previously considered West Bank settlements "illegitimate."

The first signs of a shift emerged last week, as Israel made a bold announcement of 2,500 new housing units in West Bank settlements, including some in Beit El. So far the Trump administration has avoided condemning the move.

"We are now more hopeful," Yael Ben-Yashar, who has lived in Beit El for 20 years, acts as the settlements

spokeswoman and runs tours, said this week. “We think it may be a new era.”

Beit El was established in 1977 by members of a right-wing messianic activist movement determined that Jews return to repopulate Judea and Samaria, the biblical name for the West Bank. Despite restrictions on building, it has burgeoned from a hardscrabble hilltop outpost of a few caravans to a small town dotted with palm trees and a clinic and schools.

The area of Beit El, meaning “House of God,” held particular resonance for the settlers. It was believed to be the site where, according to the Bible, Jacob had his dream of angels ascending and descending a ladder to heaven, when God promised him that his descendants would return to the surrounding land.

“Today, in Beit El, we are living that dream,” Ben-Yashar said from an observation point on top of a water tanker, from which the view stretches from Tel Aviv to the West to Mount Scopus to the south and the Golan Heights to the north. In the center of the viewing platform a mosaic depicts a map of greater Israel.

“You can see why God promised it here,” she said. “You can see it all from here.”

Nearby, down a dirt track, is the smooth flat rock where believers say Jacob slept. The site and the settlement attract about 5,000 visitors a year, said Ben-Yashar.

Some also visit its small winery, run by Hillel Manne and his wife, Nina, who met Friedman when he came to pick grapes several years ago.

“I think it was just after 2008 because I remember we joked he’d made a lot of money,” Manne said with a chuckle, referring to Friedman’s work as a bankruptcy lawyer during the financial crash. His wife described Friedman as a “family person.”

“He came with all the family, his wife is wonderful, too,” she said.

Friedman, the son of an Orthodox rabbi was picked as ambassador by Trump, despite having no diplomatic experience. He has publicly said that the “two-state narrative” needs to end, is a staunch supporter of settlements, and has said he expects to work from Jerusalem. A move of the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem has been opposed by Palestinians and would be seen as tacit recognition of Israel’s sovereignty over the contested city.

But Hillel Manne said he fears that Friedman, and a more sympathetic ear in the White House, still may not be able to change much.

“It’s good to see people excited,” he said of Friedman’s appointment. “But if you want change you’ll need big change at the State Department. The State Department staff, they’ve managed the U.S. to bet on a lot of losers.”

“This land was promised to me as a Jew,” said Nina Manne. “It is ridiculous that we need to live in this situation. That we have to justify ourselves to be here.”

But Beit El was largely established on private Palestinian land that had been designated by the Israeli state for military purposes, according to a report published by the Israeli newspaper Haaretz.

Approval for 20 new units came last week when the expansion in the West Bank was announced, according to Beit El’s mayor, Shay Alon.

The plans are “disastrous” said Hanan Ashrawi, a member of the Palestinian Liberation Organization’s executive committee, condemning Israeli “land theft.”

“It is evident that Israel is exploiting the inauguration of the new American administration to escalate its violations and the prevention of any existence of a Palestinian state,” she said in a statement, urging the international community to take action.

For Alon, however, the expansion plan didn’t go far enough. He said he felt “ambivalent” about the news, given that 300 new units in Beit El had been promised when several apartment blocks were razed by the government five years ago.

Building permits were restricted for years under former president Barack Obama, and Alon hopes that Friedman “is the sort of person who can bring about a change.”

Like other Orthodox residents here, he believes their presence is preordained. Yishai Babad was the ninth family to arrive, setting up a factory that makes tefillin – small leather phylacteries containing verses from the Torah.

He said Obama “loved the Arabs and not the Jews,” but that the incoming administration would make no difference.

“We don’t believe that the policy towards Beit El is going to change anything, because it’s all written in the scriptures,” he said. “We’ve always had difficulties, but all of Israel was built despite the difficulties.”

Rice Blasts Trump For Not Mentioning Jews In Holocaust Statement

By Nikita Vladimirov

[The Hill](#), January 28, 2017

Former National Security Advisor Susan Rice on Saturday tore into President Trump for releasing a statement on International Holocaust Remembrance Day without mentioning the Jewish victims.

“What sickness enables a statement on [Holocaust Memorial Day] that ignores 6 million Jews! Just imagine the response if Pres. Obama did that,” Susan Rice said in a tweet.

What sickness enables a statement on #holocaustmemorialday that ignores 6 million Jews! Just

imagine the response if Pres. Obama did that.— Susan Rice (@AmbassadorRice) January 28, 2017

The White House statement on Friday included quotes from President Donald Trump, who did not mention Jews.

“It is with a heavy heart and somber mind that we remember and honor the victims, survivors, heroes of the Holocaust. It is impossible to fully fathom the depravity and horror inflicted on innocent people by Nazi terror,” Trump said in a statement.

“In the name of the perished, I pledge to do everything in my power throughout my Presidency, and my life, to ensure that the forces of evil never again defeat the powers of good. Together, we will make love and tolerance prevalent throughout the world,” he added.

Rice criticized the president’s use of the phrase “innocent people,” arguing it does not adequately reflect the genocide that was committed against Jews.

“Innocents’ in [Holocaust Memorial Day] statement refers to all civilians killed in WW2. Not genocide against jews,” she tweeted, adding a hashtag “#whitewashinghistory.”

“Innocents” in #HolocaustMemorialDay statement refers to ALL civilians killed in WW2. NOT GENOCIDE against JEWS. #whitewashinghistory— Susan Rice (@AmbassadorRice) January 28, 2017

Evoking Reagan And Thatcher, May Hails New UK-U.S. ‘Special Relationship’

By Elizabeth Piper

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

May’s Mission To Woo Trump A Success, But Makes Some Uneasy

By Jill Lawless

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

WASHINGTON (AP) – Prime Minister Theresa May went to Washington, and President Donald Trump extended the hand of friendship. Literally.

May left Washington after a 24-hour visit as Saturday’s British newspapers splashed front-page photos of the two leaders touching hands as they walked at the White House before a strikingly collegial news conference.

May wanted her meeting, Trump’s first as president with a foreign leader, to revitalize the trans-Atlantic “special relationship.” She got her wish – delighting those who think Trump’s presidency will be good for Britain but alarming others who loathe the brash Republican populist.

She flew home – after a stop in Turkey Saturday to meet President Recep Tayyip Erdogan – with Trump’s commitment not to abandon NATO, his praise for what he

called “this most special relationship” and – a prize she had eagerly sought – the first steps toward an early trade deal with Britain once it leaves the European Union.

Britain can’t begin formal negotiations with other countries until it actually leaves the bloc, likely in 2019 at the earliest. But May’s office said Saturday that she and Trump had agreed to start high-level talks and joint working groups immediately to ensure “a seamless transition to a new bilateral relationship.”

Trade between the two countries is already worth 150 billion pounds (\$188 billion) a year, and May said a future trade deal “could provide huge benefits to our economic muscle and will give businesses additional certainty and confidence.”

Trump did not come away empty handed from the meeting, either. He gets the seal of approval from a generally well-respected British prime minister. And there’s an invitation from Queen Elizabeth II to come for a state visit later this year – a treat for a president with Scottish roots and a taste for opulence.

So there was satisfaction from May’s team aboard her RAF Voyager jet at how well the hastily arranged trip had gone.

May also praised Trump’s “stunning” election victory and declared that they shared a commitment to make government serve “working people.” May’s embrace of aspects of Trump’s policies infuriated her opponents in Britain and could make other European leaders uneasy.

British Liberal Democrat leader Tim Farron said May “clearly spent her time with Trump dodging his despicable comments on torture, on women, on Muslims and on Mexicans.”

Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn said May “failed to challenge Trump and stand up for our values” at a joint news conference with the president Friday.

Trump, meanwhile, extolled Britain’s vote to leave the EU, saying Brexit would be “a tremendous asset and not a tremendous liability.”

Those comments and the warmth of the visit drew approval from the pro-Brexit sections of Britain’s press.

“It was one of the most extraordinary days in the long history of U.K.-U.S. relations,” said the Daily Mail under the headline “Love-In at the White House” and a picture of the hand-holding moment.

May’s office said Trump offered his hand in a chivalrous gesture as the pair approached an unexpected ramp, and she took it.

The trip will provide images for countless future stories about the trans-Atlantic bond. As well as the shoulder-to-shoulder press conference, May got a handshake in the Oval Office beside a bust of Winston Churchill that has become minor obsession for sections of the British press since it was moved to another spot in the White House by President

Barack Obama. Trump restored it to a prominent place beside the Oval Office fireplace.

At times it seemed the visit would be overshadowed by Trump-related headlines that had nothing to do with May, including his feud with Mexico over who would pay for the border wall.

While May was in town the White House announced that Trump would speak by phone with Russian President Vladimir Putin Saturday, amid speculation he could be preparing to lift U.S. sanctions over Ukraine. May said Britain wants to see the sanctions stay in place.

And at the news conference with May, Trump repeated his belief that torture works – though he said he would defer to Defense Secretary James Mattis, who thinks otherwise. Britain, May stressed during the trip, is firmly against torture.

May had scarcely left when Trump issued an executive order barring all refugees from entering the U.S. for four months and imposing a 90-day ban on people from seven Muslim-majority countries.

On the whole, May emerged from the joint appearance looking confident and controlled. Trump, too, was notably calm and measured in her presence.

When May said Trump has assured her he was “100 percent” behind NATO, a body he once called “obsolete,” the president muttered his agreement.

May’s office told reporters that warm conversation had flowed during the pair’s working lunch – and that Trump told an aide to keep the menu card so he could remember the special occasion.

Downing St. said conversation turned to Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, and Trump told May he wanted their relationship to be “even better” than that famously close and productive partnership.

At the press conference, Trump said he was confident the pair were going to get along.

“I am a people person,” Trump said. “I think you are also, Theresa.”

Follow Jill Lawless on Twitter at <http://Twitter.com/JillLawless>

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

May Under Fire Over Her Failure To Condemn Trump’s Refugee Ban

By Robert Hutton

[Bloomberg Politics](#), January 29, 2017

Prime Minister Theresa May faces a political storm on her return from visiting Donald Trump for her repeated failure to condemn the U.S. president’s order limiting immigration from Muslim-majority countries.

Trump on Friday indefinitely banned the entry of people fleeing Syria, temporarily froze the entry of other refugees and prohibited entry by people from seven majority-Muslim nations for 90 days. The order is needed, Trump said, to prevent terrorists from entering the U.S.

May’s refusal to publicly disagree with him has unleashed a flood of criticism at home, where 5 percent of the population is Muslim. Most damaging is the fury from her own Conservative Party colleagues at a particularly delicate time in the Brexit process. She only has a majority of 16 votes in the 650-member House of Commons.

Nadhim Zahawi, an Iraqi-born Tory lawmaker, pointed out that the ban covered him and his wife. Another Tory, Sarah Wollaston, said Trump should not be invited to address Parliament in his state visit to London later this year. Heidi Allen, also a Conservative, scolded May for being afraid to tell “someone powerful when they’re wrong.”

In Ankara, May was asked three times what she thought of the ban, and three times she ignored the question. Only when journalists heckled her to answer for a second time did she respond: “The United States is responsible for the United States’ own policy on refugees.”

Going into the White House, May knew that Trump’s policies toward Muslims were going to be a problem for her domestic audience. On the flight out and even at a news conference with Trump she avoided questions that at the time were hypothetical. Until they weren’t.

May’s first trip to the White House had earlier been celebrated as a triumph, with Trump accepting a personal invitation to Buckingham Palace. On the plane back, her aides retreated to the curtained area at the front of her Royal Air Force plane, and weren’t seen again for the rest of the three-and-a-half hour flight.

Trump-May Meeting A Win For Two Great Nations

[New York Post](#), January 28, 2017

It’s good to see the US-UK “special relationship” is back, along with the Oval Office bust of Winston Churchill, after President Trump’s meeting Friday with British Prime Minister Theresa May.

The two very different leaders owe their offices to twin populist surprises — Trump’s remarkable Election Day win, and the British vote to leave the European Union, which prompted the resignation of May’s predecessor, David Cameron.

The surprises kept up with the failure of the elites’ doomsday predictions: UK growth sped up after the Brexit

vote, and beat expectations in the latest quarter, too. Over here, the “Trump rally” has pushed the Dow above 20,000, with polls also showing average Americans’ economic optimism on the rise.

The two countries seem to be in step again — as in the days of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, or Bill Clinton and Tony Blair.

Trump was right to note that the “special relationship between our two countries has been one of the great forces in history for justice and for peace” and that “a free and independent Britain is a blessing to the world.”

And May was on point in her turn: “We are at a moment now when we can build an even stronger special relationship” — since she must deal with EU leaders eager to make Brexit as painful as possible, while Trump has to show how his “America first” approach can boost traditional US alliances.

On that note, it was good to hear May report, after their closed-door meeting: “We are united in recognition of NATO as the bulwark of our collective defense.”

For the new president’s first face-to-face with a fellow world leader, it couldn’t have gone better.

France’s Hollande Warns Trump Against Protectionism

By Michel Rose

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

French Leader Chides US Populism, Urges European Unity

By Barry Hatton

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

LISBON, Portugal (AP) – French President Francois Hollande on Saturday urged Europe to present a united front against populist movements which, he said, are being encouraged by political developments in the United States.

“Europe is facing a moment of truth,” Hollande said. “The issue is populism. What we are hearing from the U.S. encourages populism and even extremism. They are saying that Europe should not take immigrants, shouldn’t stay together, not believe in climate change.”

European Union countries should stick to their principles and defend their interests – and stand firm in talks with U.S. President Donald Trump, Hollande said.

“Europe should be true to itself. It should guide itself according to its values, its principles, and its interests,” Hollande said on the sidelines of an informal meeting with six other EU leaders in Lisbon, Portugal. “We should engage in discussions (with the U.S.) that sometimes should be very firm.”

“And as long as there are statements from the U.S. president about Europe, when he speaks about the model of Brexit for other countries, when the U.S. president talks about climate change ... saying he’s not convinced of it, we should respond to him. When he takes protectionist measures, we should respond to him. When he destabilizes the economies of other countries, not only European ones, we should respond to him. When he rejects the arrival of refugees, while Europe has done its duty, we should respond to him,” he told reporters.

Italian premier Paolo Gentiloni said the EU will “find a way to work with the U.S. administration” but added that the bloc should remain true to its core values including human rights and anti-protectionism.

The EU leaders emphasized their commitment to the European Union, in the wake of Britain’s vote to leave the bloc.

“We believe that in a world confronted with growing uncertainties and instability, we will be stronger by acting together,” they said in a joint statement. “Weakening Europe is not an option.”

However, they said they hoped “to have the United Kingdom as a close partner of the EU.”

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

Jordan’s King Abdullah II To Visit Washington On Monday

By Damian Paletta And Peter Nicholas

[Wall Street Journal](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

The Questions That Could Reshape A Worried Europe In 2017

By Rick Gladstone

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

Europe is facing multiple tribulations in 2017, engulfed in uncertainties over terrorism, borders, migration, economics and President Trump’s new America First message booming from across the Atlantic.

“It’s not the first time Europe has been challenged by crisis,” said Anna-Lena Högenauer, a researcher at the Institute of Political Science at the University of Luxembourg, but “there’s definitely a combination of crises.”

Here are some of the potentially disruptive issues and events looming for the year that could reshape — or at least

deepen — the fractures in the European Union, a 28-nation bloc of more than a half-billion people and the world's largest single free-trade zone.

Negotiations for Britain's exit from the European Union, known as "Brexit," the outcome of a referendum last June, could officially start by the end of March, a self-imposed deadline set by Prime Minister Theresa May. But the run-up to those negotiations — further complicated by a Supreme Court ruling that Ms. May needs Parliament's approval to begin the process — has created enormous uncertainties. They include how European Union citizens residing in Britain — and the British citizens residing in other European Union countries — will work and live if they cannot freely traverse borders as they do now.

Big banks and other multinational companies with operations in London and elsewhere in Britain are not awaiting the outcome of the negotiations, expected to last two years, that will determine the scope of the country's changed status. They are making contingency plans to move thousands of jobs elsewhere. Other European Union members are eager to get those jobs. Their leaders also have suggested that Britain must be penalized economically to discourage further defections from the bloc.

Britain's decision also threatens to alter its geography and possibly stoke political instability. Scotland and Northern Ireland had wanted to stay within the European Union, and may now move to leave Britain. A new referendum on Scottish independence — reprising a measure that was defeated in 2014 — is now considered likely. Unrest in Northern Ireland could resume if the border with Ireland, a European Union member, is restricted.

Guy Verhofstadt, the European Union's negotiator for Britain's exit, wrote in *The Guardian* on Jan. 18 that "Brexit will be a sad, surreal and exhausting process."

Turkey has been negotiating to become a European Union member for more than a decade, but that prospect has turned more doubtful, partly because of the authoritarian actions of the Turkish president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, particularly since a failed coup attempt in July.

Increasingly exasperated with the European Union, Mr. Erdogan has suggested that he may hold a referendum in Turkey this year on whether to withdraw its membership application. Mr. Erdogan has also suggested that he may seek to restore the death penalty in Turkey, a step that other European leaders say would disqualify the country from joining the European Union.

Nonetheless, European officials are loath to suspend the negotiations for fear that Mr. Erdogan will scrap an agreement to restrict the flow of migrants and refugees from Turkey into Europe, an exodus that has placed extraordinary strains on the Continent and helped incite nationalist and populist anger.

The country that came to symbolize Europe's economic travails a few years ago has receded from the headlines somewhat, obscured by Brexit, fears of terrorist attacks in European cities and coming elections in the Netherlands, France and Germany. But Greece's economy remains anemic and in need of more debt relief.

Despite three bailouts in five years, poverty rates are increasing and the unemployment rate is Europe's highest. Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras of the leftist Syriza Party, who rose to power in 2015 on his defiance of Greece's creditors and threat to leave the European Union's single-currency zone, is sagging in the polls, raising the possibility of political turbulence and new elections.

Negotiations for further restructuring of Greece's debts, involving Germany and the International Monetary Fund, also have encountered difficulties. "If the I.M.F. and Germany cannot find a way out, this is a serious problem," said Dimitrios Argyroulis, a political economics scholar at the University of Sheffield.

The chronically troubled economy of Italy, the European Union's fourth largest, has aroused growing concern as possibly the next Greek-style debt crisis. The main reason is the weakness of Italy's big banks, which are carrying hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of bad loans. They are reluctant to lend more money, which is precisely what Italy needs to stimulate its economy.

Italy's debt levels also have irked Germany, Europe's strongest economy, where leaders are reluctant to help finance any bailout. "The current developments do not bode well and point to the possibility of repeating the Greece disaster on a much larger scale," Geopolitical Futures, a forecasting firm, said in a Jan. 20 posting on its website.

The regional parliament of Spain's semiautonomous Catalonia region voted in November 2015 to begin a process to achieve independence in 2017 — an outcome the Spanish government has vowed to block. But the secessionists, buoyed by the Brexit referendum, say the momentum of nationalist movements in Europe is on their side. Whether they will succeed remains unclear at best.

The European Union and United States have closely coordinated their regimen of economic sanctions imposed on Russia in 2014, a response to Russia's annexation of the Crimean Peninsula and military actions in eastern Ukraine. But President Trump has injected uncertainty into Europe over a unified stand toward Russia, suggesting he wants to ease or terminate the sanctions. Mr. Trump, whose amity toward Russia is a political issue in the United States, also has criticized NATO, asserting that the alliance is obsolete — a description that Russian officials have welcomed.

While Mr. Trump's subordinates have sought to reassure European Union leaders that the United States remains a reliable ally, doubts have been planted. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, the foreign minister of Germany at the

time Trump made those remarks, said they had “caused astonishment.”

Emboldened by the momentum of Brexit and Mr. Trump, nationalist politicians espousing hostility toward the European Union and Muslim immigrants have made strong gains in campaigns for coming elections in three European countries, including the two largest.

In the Netherlands, where a national vote is set for March 15, the populist lawmaker Geert Wilders, who wants to slash immigration and follow Britain out of the European Union, is doing well in the polls. Other Dutch politicians, including Prime Minister Mark Rutte, have ruled out working with Mr. Wilders and his Party for Freedom and Democracy, which most likely means that Mr. Wilders will not be the next prime minister.

But in a sign of Mr. Wilders’s influence, Mr. Rutte has taken his own hard-right turn, warning immigrants against behavior that offends the “silent majority.”

In France, where presidential elections are set for April 23 with a runoff between the two top candidates on May 7, the rise of the extreme right has been a dominant theme. Marine Le Pen, leader of the National Front, has said she hopes to replicate Mr. Trump’s success. She supports a referendum on European Union membership and new border controls.

Germany holds federal elections Sept. 24, which will determine the future of Chancellor Angela Merkel. But her positions on European unity, open borders and generosity toward refugees have seriously weakened her popularity. Mr. Trump mocked and insulted her during his campaign, describing his Democratic adversary, Hillary Clinton, as “America’s Merkel,” and called the German leader’s refugee policy “insane.”

At the same time, Germany’s biggest political story is the rapid ascent of the far-right Alternative for Germany party, which has evoked memories of the Nazis as it campaigns on denunciations of Ms. Merkel, the euro, immigration and Islam.

Even if Ms. Merkel survives to win a fourth term as chancellor, political analysts see her as a weakened figure, and at the worst possible time.

“Europe has never needed a strong Merkel more,” Ian Bremmer, founder and president of the Eurasia Group, a political risk consultant firm in Washington, said this month in an assessment of the year’s most dangerous risks. “In 2017, she’ll be unavailable for the role.”

Ten Centuries Later, A Pope And Knights Do Battle

By Jason Horowitz

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

It began as a fight over staffing. Then came a dispute about condoms, followed by papal concerns about

Freemasons. Now it has become a full-scale proxy war between Pope Francis and the Vatican traditionalists who oppose him, with the battleground being a Renaissance palace flanked by Jimmy Choo and Hermès storefronts on Via dei Condotti, Rome’s most exclusive street.

The palace is the headquarters of the Knights of Malta, the medieval Roman Catholic order. For months, an ugly, if quiet, spat over staffing simmered behind the order’s walls before spilling across the Tiber River to the Vatican, setting off a back-and-forth between the two camps. Francis and his lieutenants sent angry letters. The Knights ignored them, claiming sovereignty.

This past week, the dispute finally blew up. Fed up, Francis took the extraordinary steps of demanding the resignation of the order’s leader — a decision the Knights officially accepted Saturday — and announcing that a papal delegate would step in.

Conservatives promptly denounced what they called an illegal annexation and ideological purging by a power-obsessed pontiff, while liberal observers saw the whole episode as resulting from an act of subterfuge by the pope’s most public critic within the Vatican hierarchy, the American cardinal Raymond Burke.

A seemingly obscure intra-Catholic squabble had erupted into an unexpected shock to the church with ideological fault lines running to the top of the Vatican.

“The Vatican is a thing built of tradition,” said John Thavis, the author of “The Vatican Diaries” and a veteran church analyst, “and once those traditional parts start feuding with each other, that is a dangerous sign.”

Francis remains one of the world’s most popular figures, but the spat with the Knights is a small indicator of how the political tensions rippling across the globe are alive in the Vatican, too. Only a year ago, Francis’ calls to fight climate change and help migrants seemed to place him in the lead of a progressive global vanguard, in keeping with his push for a more welcoming church.

Now, suddenly, he is more politically isolated. The election of President Trump and the rise of far-right populists in Europe have ushered in an angrier era — and emboldened traditionalists inside the Vatican who sense that the once-impregnable pope could be vulnerable.

The Knights of Malta is a bastion of Catholic tradition. Founded in the 11th century by Amalfian merchants to help Christian pilgrims in the Holy Land, it later became a military force, defending the faith during the Crusades and eventually holding off the armies of the Ottoman Empire from its fortress in Malta. The group, now with a wealthy and aristocratic membership of elite Catholics who parade in ornate raiment, has more recently specialized in aiding refugees and the poor in more than 100 countries.

Until this past week, the order was led by the conservative and elaborately titled His Most Eminent

Highness the Prince and Grand Master of the Order of Malta, Matthew Festing of Britain, a former Sotheby's representative who had taken a monastic oath.

Long-building tensions between Mr. Festing and the order's Grand Chancellor Albrecht von Boeselager of Germany, whose father participated in a plot to assassinate Adolf Hitler, escalated in recent months amid accusations that Mr. Boeselager had knowingly overseen the distribution of condoms as head of the order's charitable arm. Into this volatile situation stepped Cardinal Burke.

In 2014, Francis had demoted Cardinal Burke, a leader of the church's traditionalist movement, from his position on the Vatican's Supreme Court. The cardinal's supporters say Francis did this because of Cardinal Burke's opposition to the pope's tentative opening to the possibility of allowing divorced Catholics to receive communion.

Cardinal Burke's exile was at least a cushy one, as the pope named him as the Knights' patron and liaison to the Vatican, where he would be out of the way.

But the soft-spoken cardinal has made his presence felt.

During the summer, as tensions mounted inside the order, Michael Hichborn, the president of the Lepanto Institute, a conservative Catholic organization in Virginia, conducted what he called a "short investigation" into the order's international aid arm, which Mr. Boeselager oversaw.

Mr. Hichborn said he had discovered that the aid organization was promoting the use of condoms and other contraceptives in Africa and Myanmar, a violation of church rules.

"As I was digging around I thought, 'Well, Cardinal Burke ought to know about this,'" Mr. Hichborn said in an interview.

In November, he sent a summary to Cardinal Burke's office and said he was told that the cardinal "would be working on something" regarding the information.

A few days later, Cardinal Burke relayed his concerns about Mr. Boeselager to Francis. According to supporters of the cardinal, the pope then instructed him to root out from the order elements of Freemasonry, Vatican shorthand for adherents of a secular moral view. But other people familiar with the events inside the order said the pope had also urged Cardinal Burke and the order's leadership to settle the dispute through dialogue.

Instead, Mr. Festing and Cardinal Burke met Mr. Boeselager on Dec. 6 and requested his resignation, claiming, Mr. Boeselager said in a statement, "that this was in accordance with the wishes of the Holy See."

Mr. Boeselager denied knowing about the condom distribution program and considered the move a coup and an attempt to tarnish him as a "liberal Catholic." He argued that once he had discovered the program, he had informed the Vatican and it ended.

He also refused to leave, setting off a disciplinary procedure that led to his suspension, and reached out to the Vatican for confirmation that the pope desired his removal. Mr. Boeselager declined to comment for this article.

Francis was apparently not pleased about the firing and did not want the dispute to spill into the public, which it did when The Tablet, a Catholic publication in England, broke the news.

The pope was already critical of the ornate dress favored by the Knights (red military jacket and gold epaulets) and by Cardinal Burke (a long train of billowing red silk known as a cappa magna). Francis also had a history of run-ins with the Knights during his time as a cardinal in Argentina.

So on Dec. 21, Francis wrote directly to Mr. Festing, conveying his decisions on what he called the "painful circumstances" and making clear that those decisions had "value, regardless of anything else to the contrary." Attached to his letter, signed simply "Francesco," were more letters from his second-highest-ranking official, Secretary of State Pietro Parolin, stating that "His Holiness asked for dialogue as the way to confront and resolve eventual problems" and that "he never spoke, instead, of kicking someone out!"

Cardinal Parolin also wrote that the firing "not be attributed to the will of the pope." Critically, he noted that the Knights, because of the group's status as a lay religious order, fell under the pope's authority, and that the pope had formed a commission to investigate the firing of Mr. Boeselager. But Mr. Festing refused to comply with the papal commission, citing the order's status as a sovereign entity and raising questions about the integrity of a commission full of Mr. Boeselager's allies.

"I think maybe he was getting bad advice" from Cardinal Burke, said one senior Vatican official, who requested anonymity because he was not authorized to speak by the Vatican. (Cardinal Burke and Mr. Festing declined to comment.)

Others say Mr. Festing hardly needed to be egged on by Cardinal Burke, and note that despite having no territory, the order is, in fact, sovereign, issuing its own passports and stamps and conducting diplomatic missions.

Either way, the Vatican was not thrilled. On Jan. 17, it issued an unusually tough statement supporting the commission and rejecting "any attempt to discredit these members of the group and their work." The commission ultimately ruled that the pope did have authority over the Knights of Malta.

On Tuesday, he exercised it. He called Mr. Festing to the Vatican and asked for him to step down, a move the Vatican announced the next day. The order followed with its own statement, saying Mr. Festing's resignation would become official once the order's counselors met on Via dei Condotti to formally accept it. On Saturday, they did just that,

immediately reinstating Mr. Boeselager and promising to collaborate with the pope's delegate.

This delighted the pope's supporters, who said it showed that conniving conservatives would not push him around.

But supporters of Mr. Festing were horrified by the Vatican's de facto takeover. Supporters of Cardinal Burke complained that the pope, for all his talk of fostering debate, was intolerant of opposing views, especially more orthodox ones.

"It sends a message to the rest of the Catholic world that if you try to stand for orthodoxy in the church, you are going to be sent away," Mr. Hichborn said. "And the people pushing for heterodoxy will be put in power."

What was not up for debate was that, in the Vatican, Francis gets his way.

At the order's headquarters, a stately wooden mailbox hangs on the doorman's wall. The three top slots are reserved for the order's top three officials. On Wednesday morning, Mr. Boeselager's name had been erased. Mr. Festing's would soon be gone.

The third slot belonged to the order's interim leader, Grand Commander Ludwig Hoffmann von Rumerstein. But only, a Vatican statement made clear, "pending the appointment of the papal delegate."

Meet The Youngsters Helping Solve Japan's Caregiving Crisis. Like Kunio Odaira, 72

By Anna Fifield

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

It's lunch hour at the Cross Heart nursing home, and a 72-year-old, slightly stooped man is spooning soup and filling tea cups.

But Kunio Odaira isn't one of the residents. He's one of the staff, part of an increasingly gray workforce in an increasingly gray country.

"I enjoy talking to the people here. It's fun, but it's also hard work," Odaira said during a break from his caregiving duties on a recent day.

Japan is considered a "super-aging" society. More than a quarter of the population is over 65, a figure set to rise to 40 percent by 2050. The average life expectancy is 85, and that means many Japanese remain relatively healthy for a good two decades after retirement age.

At the same time, the birthrate has plummeted to well below the level needed to keep the population stable. Now home to 128 million people, Japan is expected to number less than 100 million by 2050, according to government projections.

That means authorities need to think about ways to keep seniors healthy and active for longer, but also about how to augment the workforce to cope with labor shortages.

Enter the septuagenarian caregiver.

At Cross Heart, more than half of the 119 caregivers are over 60, and 15 of them are over 70.

"When we advertise for people to work here, we get lots of responses from older people, not younger people," said nursing home director Kaori Yokoo in the lobby where residents were doing leg curls and chest presses on weight machines.

The foundation that runs this nursing home and others in Kanagawa Prefecture has raised the official retirement age to 70 but allows employees to keep working until 80 if they want to and can. Municipalities around the country are also actively recruiting people over 60 to do lighter duties at nursing homes.

It's one way of dealing with the problem. Meanwhile, researchers are working on robots that can lift the elderly out of beds and wheelchairs, and inward-looking Japan is slowly coming around to the idea that it may need to allow in more foreign workers.

Although older workers have constraints — some can't do the heavier tasks — they also offer advantages over younger workers who want time off for their children, said Yokoo, who is 41.

"Plus, because they're close in age to the residents, they can relate to each other more," she said. "We younger people think this must be nice for them. Older staff can understand things like physical pains more because they are living through the same things."

Some of the older workers here are doing it because they need the money. For others, the money is a nice benefit, but the main motivation is the activity and sense of community.

Kiyoko Tsuboi, a 95-year-old who comes into the rest home during the day, said she likes having Odaira around.

"He's very attentive to our needs and knows things like how hot we like our tea. My son is not as kind as Odaira-san," Tsuboi said as Odaira cleared away the lunch dishes. "He's quite active despite his age, and even though he's a man, he has an eye for detail."

The dynamic works well for Odaira, too, who started here 17 years ago after retiring from his job in the sales department of an auto parts maker. He works eight hours a day, four days a week.

His father died when he was small, his mother when he was 22. "It's not like I'm replacing my mother, but I thought I could help someone else's parents," he said.

He also does it to stay young, Odaira said with a twinkle in his eye. "I think it's good for me physically and mentally, so as long as I can keep working, I will."

He's not the oldest worker here, though. That title is shared by two 78-year-olds, a man who works in the office and Noriko Fukuju, who helps with pickups and drop-offs and does activities with "the old people."

"It's fun. I enjoy it," she said.

Hiroko Akiyama, at the University of Tokyo's Institute of Gerontology, said a Japanese 65-year-old is in much better physical and mental shape than a 65-year-old a few decades ago. "They are full of energy, and healthy and long-living," she said.

Akiyama's research has found that working helps keep seniors that way. "They operate on a regular schedule. They wake up, get ready, go to work and talk to people and stay connected," she said. "We had a depressed old woman who changed completely after she started working."

Still, Japan can't rely solely on seniors or, potentially, robots to staff its nursing homes, where the need will only grow as the population ages, analysts say.

Japan has agreements with Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines under which applicants who complete job training and pass a Japanese language test can work at a Japanese nursing home.

But if they want to stay beyond three years, they must pass a national caregiver's exam so difficult that 40 percent of Japanese applicants fail. Many Japanese also express concern about cultural differences.

Next year, the Japanese government will loosen the regulations slightly and set up a technical intern program, but there will still be time limits and difficult tests to pass.

Perhaps 2,000 people will come to Japan through the intern program, said Yasuhiro Yuki, an expert on elderly care at Shukutoku University. "But we hear we will need 300,000 more caregivers in the next 10 years," he said. "So I still don't think we will have enough."

That means aging caregivers will increasingly become the norm.

"I can do this at least for two more years," said Fukuju, the 78-year-old, before she dashed out the door to renew her driver's license.

Russia's Blow To Women

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

Victims of domestic violence are often helpless to fight back, for reasons of fear, shame and feelings of defeat. A civilized society enacts laws to protect such vulnerable people. The decision by the Russian parliament to change the law in order to decriminalize some forms of domestic violence is wrong-headed and sends a message that brutality in a family is legitimate.

On Friday, the Russian lower house of parliament, the State Duma, approved a bill that decriminalizes domestic battery for first-time offenders. Battery against a family member will be subject to administrative rather than criminal penalty if it does not cause serious medical harm. Violations can be punished with a fine of up to 30,000 rubles or about \$500, police custody of up to 15 days or compulsory community service of up to 120 hours. Second-time offenses

and those causing serious medical harm would still be criminal violations and punishable by up to two years in prison.

The reason this came about now is that last summer, parliament decriminalized battery among strangers but not among family members, which remained a criminal matter. This irked some lawmakers and the Russian Orthodox Church. They felt that it meant a parent could be punished more harshly for slapping a child than a neighbor. According to the Economist, the church said that "reasonable and loving use of physical punishment is an essential part of the rights given to parents by God himself." The result was the legislation just passed. After the Duma voted 380 to 3 on a third reading, the bill went to the upper chamber, the Federation Council, where it is expected to pass easily and then be signed by President Vladimir Putin.

The move fits a larger drive by Mr. Putin and some of his allies to instill what they call traditional family values. There's precious little data, but by all accounts, domestic violence remains a serious problem in Russian society. One Interior Ministry estimate is that 12,000 women are killed every year in assaults by their partners. But there are deep divisions over the issue. In Soviet times, the presence of the state was pervasive, and now some people say the state should keep its nose out of family matters. At the same time, there has been a growing grass-roots awareness, including a social media campaign in Russia and Ukraine last year under the hashtag "#IAmNotAfraidToSpeak."

What's most objectionable about the law is the broader message it sends: that a domestic assault that doesn't break bones or result in a concussion — a beating that could be humiliating, painful and cause deep emotional damage to the victim — should bring little or no penalty from the state. It is hard to see how a healthy society and healthy families benefit when the most vulnerable are left exposed.

Kabul On Edge Amid Standoff Between Afghan Government And Vice President

By Pamela Constable

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

An ominous week-long standoff between the government and its rogue first vice president is choking traffic and dominating talk in the edgy Afghan capital. Police units have been stationed at strategic points near his fortified compound, and everyone is asking the same question: Are they going to arrest Abdurrashid Dostum?

Six weeks ago Dostum, 62, a powerful ethnic Uzbek boss and former warlord with a history of alleged war crimes and personal abuses, was publicly accused of brutality and rape by a former governor and political rival, Ahmad Eschi, who charged that Dostum had held him captive in a rural stronghold and ordered him sodomized with a military rifle.

The scandalous allegation thrust the government of President Ashraf Ghani into a tense predicament. Western governments and human rights groups strongly urged him to take legal action, calling the case a major test of civilian rule and institutions. Some influential Afghans counseled caution, warning that Dostum and his armed followers could react violently and urging Ghani to settle the matter through negotiations.

The president sternly declared he would follow the law, and his attorney general vowed to undertake a thorough, impartial investigation. Repeated letters were sent to Dostum requesting that he and his guards appear for questioning, but they went unanswered. On Monday, arrest warrants were issued for nine of his employees, and they were also ignored. Dostum's spokesmen insist he cannot be held accountable.

Yet no move has been made to detain Dostum or his men. The first vice president, who could be suspended from his post by parliament for defying the law, remains sequestered in his militarized compound in a wealthy residential enclave, protected by armed guards and reporting for no official duties. There are also reports that some of the police units in the area are commanded by Dostum loyalists.

"President Ghani does not have the power to act. You need a strong and serious police commander to go after him," said Atiqullah Amarkhail, a retired general. "In Afghanistan, there are many centers of power," he said. "The government is divided, and the army and police are loyal to individuals and factions."

Government officials said they are in no rush to go after Dostum and that they are focused on following proper legal procedures to avoid any suggestion of a political motive. "We want to be extremely careful, because this is such a sensitive case. It is going to take time," one official said, speaking on the condition of anonymity because he is not authorized to comment publicly. He said Dostum's associates "understand the gravity of the situation" and are in discussions on possible ways to comply.

Meanwhile, the government's uncertain relationships with other former warlords are further complicating the tense picture, raising alarms at an unsettled political moment. Even as the government attempts to bring Dostum to justice, it has invited fugitive militia leader Gulbuddin Hekmatyar to return to Kabul in a peace deal, hoping to persuade Taliban insurgents to follow suit.

Hekmatyar, a onetime Cold War U.S. ally, turned his forces against the Afghan government a decade ago and was put on a U.N. terrorist list. He was supposed to return only if the United Nations lifted sanctions against him. But this week, his spokesman in Kabul suddenly announced that Hekmatyar plans to come to the capital anyway, reportedly bringing hundreds of armed supporters as he enters national politics.

Davood Moradian, director of the Afghan Institute for Strategic Studies, noted that both Dostum and Hekmatyar

have popular followings, have been accused of serious wartime abuses and have never been held accountable. The government must take pains to ensure that Hekmatyar's "invitation to Kabul is not seen as the state following a political double standard, trying to bring one warlord to justice while unfolding a red carpet to receive the other," Moradian said.

The other strongman in this volatile mix is Attah Mohammed Noor, a wealthy northern governor and longtime rival of Dostum, who has been negotiating with Ghani to obtain more influence and status. Noor is seen as a possible replacement for Dostum or Ghani's governing partner, chief executive Abdullah Abdullah, with whom the president has had a rocky relationship since they took power two years ago.

In a recent interview, Noor said that he did not want to prejudge the charges against Dostum, but he called the case shameful. "We need the rule of law in Afghanistan, and no one should be above it," he said. Noor denied that he was seeking a senior appointment from Ghani, but he expressed concern that Dostum could retaliate against the government by unleashing violence or chaos in the north.

Some Afghan analysts said the politically debilitating charges against Dostum and the likely return of Hekmatyar could lead to dangerous ethnic divisions in the government and possibly strengthen the Taliban. Hekmatyar and Ghani are both ethnic Pashtuns, but Ghani is a Westernized intellectual, while Hekmatyar is a hard-line Islamist who could reinforce rather than help pacify the Taliban.

For the moment, though, it is Dostum who presents the most immediate challenge to Afghanistan's weak coalition government. The longer he remains bunkered in his luxury compound a dozen blocks from the presidential palace, defying legal orders and dragging out the case against him, the more it looks as though the elected government, for all its international backing, is being held hostage by a strongman from another era in Afghan history.

Former Warlord's Return Could Shake Up Afghan Politics

By Kathy Gannon

[Associated Press](#), January 29, 2017

KABUL, Afghanistan (AP) – The only insurgent leader to sign a peace pact with Afghanistan's government will return to the country within weeks, his chief negotiator says, in a move that could shake up Afghan politics and complicate the much wider war against the Taliban.

Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, a former warlord who battled U.S. forces after the 2001 invasion and nursed a bitter rivalry with other Afghan factions, agreed to lay down arms last year. Amin Karim, his chief negotiator, told The Associated Press earlier this week that he would return to the capital in "a matter of weeks, not months."

Hekmatyar is seen as a potential rival to President Ashraf Ghani and Chief Executive Abdullah Abdullah, who have governed the country through a shaky, U.S.-brokered power-sharing agreement since the disputed elections of 2014. His return could inject new political uncertainty as the government struggles to confront a reinvigorated Taliban that has been advancing on several fronts.

The former warlord battled the Soviets in the 1980s and then took part in the civil war that erupted after their withdrawal, clashing with the so-called Northern Alliance, in which Abdullah was a leading figure. Hekmatyar was driven out when the Taliban seized power in 1996, but returned after the American invasion, vowing to resist the foreign "occupation."

His forces were largely confined to just two provinces, however, and have carried out few attacks in recent years.

Last year he became the only insurgent leader to sign a peace agreement with the Afghan government, in what many hoped would provide a model for a wider reconciliation with the Taliban. But he has yet to return to the fold.

His Hezb-e-Islami party wants his name taken off the U.N. and the U.S. Treasury lists of wanted terrorists. Karim declined to say whether Hekmatyar would return to Afghanistan without first being removed from the lists, and there has been no indication that the U.N. or Washington is considering his removal. Both Canada and Britain consider Hezb-i-Islami to be a terrorist group.

Hekmatyar, like Ghani, hails from Afghanistan's ethnic Pashtun majority, and a revitalized Hezb-e-Islami could become a powerful player in the 2019 parliamentary elections, says Andrew Wilder, vice president of the Asia Program at the U.S. Institute of Peace.

"Hekmatyar's return to Kabul would certainly be significant," he said. "But the significance of his return, if it happens, will have a lot more to do with the impact of an influential Pashtun political figure who had been sidelined re-entering the political fray, and much less to do with moving the peace process forward.

The prospect of his return has already caused Abdullah's fractured Jamiat-e-Islami Party to try to unify its ranks in order to better compete, Wilder said in an email interview. Abdullah and Ghani are also political rivals, and traded accusations of fraud after the hard-fought election three years ago.

No one expects Hekmatyar's return to end the 15-year-old war with the Taliban, who control large swathes of rural territory in the south and east, and rule eight districts outright. A three-way struggle for power among Ghani, Abdullah and Hekmatyar could further divide the government at a critical time.

"The Taliban has ample momentum on the battlefield and is gaining territory, while Hezb-i-Islami is a shadow of its former self and not particularly active," said Michael

Kugelman, deputy director of the Washington-based Wilson Center's South Asia program. "I simply don't think the Taliban will pay much mind to Hekmatyar and his peace deal with Kabul."

Karim, who negotiated the peace pact, lives behind two cordons of security in a heavily guarded Kabul villa. He accused unnamed Afghan rivals and regional countries of trying to sabotage Hekmatyar's return, saying several Hezb-i-Islami commanders who ventured into the capital have been arrested.

The government says it remains committed to the peace deal and Hekmatyar's return, which government spokesman Mohammad Haroon Chakhansuri said would be a "positive" step.

Kabul writer Amir Shah contributed to this report. Follow Kathy Gannon at www.twitter.com/kathygannon

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

Taliban, Collecting Bills For Afghan Utilities, Tap New Revenue Sources

By Mujib Mashal And Najim Rahim
[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

The Afghan government faces a peculiar problem in at least two major provinces: It provides precious electricity, some of it imported at costly rates from neighboring countries, but Taliban militants collect most of the bills.

If the government cuts off power, it will further anger a population that is already disenchanted. If it does not, the revenue from the power will continue to provide more income to an already emboldened Taliban.

The Taliban, fighting the Afghan government and a large international military coalition, have long tapped into Afghanistan's lucrative drug trade and illegal mining, in addition to the streams of donations they receive from supporters abroad, mainly in the Persian Gulf states.

But as they have taken over increasingly large areas in the past two years, they have found new ways of diversifying and collecting revenue, according to interviews with officials, Taliban commanders and local residents.

The diversification of the revenue collection system, in the face of a central government largely dependent on Western donations and hobbled by corruption, has raised fears that the balance of the war could tilt even further in the year ahead, and that the insurgency is becoming more

entrenched and acting as a shadow government in parts of the countryside.

“What it suggests, essentially, is that the group is becoming more efficient in systematically taxing the areas they either control or have a lot of influence on,” said Timor Sharan, senior analyst for Afghanistan at the International Crisis Group, a research institute. “Efficiency of taxation is quite significant in terms of sustaining the group for a long time.”

In addition to collecting electricity bills from thousands of homes in provinces such as Kunduz and Helmand, the insurgents levy taxes on potato harvests, flour mills, teachers’ salaries, marriage ceremonies, and fuel and vegetable trucks crossing their checkpoints.

At the same time, the Taliban continue to pursue their original sources of funding. The United Nations, in a recent report, said narcotics, illegal mining and external donations remained major income streams, with the drug economy bringing in up to \$400 million in 2016.

But the United Nations report also spoke of the group’s diversification efforts.

“Analysis of Taliban revenue sources suggests that they remain highly diverse, with various income streams that enable the Taliban to quickly substitute for declining asset streams,” the report said.

Mr. Sharan said the increased revenue collection was largely due to a restructuring of the insurgency spearheaded by its former leader, Mullah Akhtar Muhammad Mansour, who was seen more as a businessman heavily involved in the drug trade than a conventional Taliban ideologue. Part of the reason for the change was an expected decline in external funding amid growing competition for resources from other militant groups like the Islamic State.

“Mansour, in his restructuring, gave more autonomy to the local Taliban groups and tasked them with finding more locally driven revenues and securing their funding at the local level,” Mr. Sharan said.

The Taliban have also been hit by a dwindling number of major NATO military contracts and development projects from which they could take a cut.

Western and Afghan officials say the greater fund-raising autonomy for local commanders is also a consequence of chaos within the Taliban leadership and infighting over resources after an American drone strike killed Mullah Mansour in May.

A Taliban spokesman, Zabihullah Mujahid, said the group relied on a variety of resources, including Islamic taxes and offerings from farmers and local residents, donations from traders abroad and from Islamic countries, and booty captured from Afghan forces. He acknowledged that in their areas of control in places like Kunduz and Helmand, the Taliban collected the electricity bills.

“Our territory has expanded in some areas, and since our presence has increased there, our resources have also increased,” Mr. Mujahid said.

At first glance, each strand of Taliban revenue might seem insignificant. But for an insurgency numbering about 30,000 men, who operate in small groups, it is a substantial sum.

The head of the power department in Kunduz Province, Hamidullah, said the Taliban were collecting electricity payments from close to 14,000 homes in the province, possibly as much as \$200,000 for every two-month cycle.

Haji Ayoub, an elder from Boz Qandahari village, north of Kunduz city, said that two months ago, the Taliban had stopped government electricity workers and taken the bills they delivered by bicycle. Then, they started calling people to come to the local mosque and pay.

Mr. Ayoub said he owed the government about \$200, for electricity used at his home and a flour mill he ran before it went bankrupt.

“The Taliban representative took the money,” Mr. Ayoub said. “He didn’t sign or stamp the bill. He just tore half of it and gave me back the other half and wrote something in his notebook.”

He added, “I said, ‘At least put your signature on the bill so I can bring it to the government to show that I have paid,’ but he didn’t.”

In Helmand Province, members of the provincial council said most of the territory was controlled by the Taliban, who collected bills in places they held where there was electricity.

“We cannot switch off the electricity in Taliban areas, because then they create big problems for electrical poles along the way to cities like Kandahar and Lashkargah,” said Nasrullah Qani, the power department’s director in Helmand.

Residents in Helmand said the collection of electricity charges differed by district. In Kajaki district, the Taliban collect a fee once a year, from \$60 to \$150 depending on usage. In other areas, it is monthly.

“For each electric bulb you use, they charge you \$2 a month,” said Haji Ziaudin, a shopkeeper in Musa Qala district.

The Taliban have a multitude of ways to make money and to finance their local groups.

In the northeastern province of Badakhshan, a study last year found that the Taliban made as much as \$6 million a year from illegal lapis lazuli mining. Then, there are taxes: up to \$20 a year on water mills in their areas of control, and from \$40 to \$70 a year from electric mills. And one sheep per every 40 owned by farmers.

Just south of Kabul, the Taliban set up checkpoints, taxing vehicles transporting vegetables, according to residents. New York Times journalists saw copies of receipts the Taliban provided to drivers for vehicles they taxed.

In the western province of Ghor, farmers described paying taxes in cash and kind. Abdul Qayoum, 47, a potato

farmer in Pasaband district, said he paid taxes to the Taliban twice a season, and two months ago had handed over about 220 pounds of potatoes.

"The reason we give tax to the Taliban is because we have to take our vegetables to the Dahane Jamal bazaar, which is the main market for us, and it is controlled by the Taliban," Mr. Qayoum said.

Sakhidad, 48, another resident of Pasaband, described how the Taliban had moved from an arbitrary system of collection, to a more ordered one enforced with strictness and fear.

When the Taliban first took over the district three years ago, Mr. Sakhidad said in an interview last year, all those who had worked for the government had to pay a fine. Then, they imposed a regular 10 percent tax on harvests.

Reached over the phone again recently, Mr. Sakhidad said that he continued to pay taxes to the Taliban and that he had given the new commander in the village \$60 in taxes two months ago — a large sum for a farmer.

But he said he was relieved that the former Taliban commander in his village, Mullah Gul Agha, had been replaced. In one of his final acts, he said, Mullah Gul Agha pulled out his pistol and shot and killed a man who had protested paying his taxes, saying he had already paid one of the commander's associates, Mr. Sakhidad said.

"They force people to pay the taxes — it is not voluntary."

NATIONAL NEWS

Inside The GOP Debate Over Strengthening Defense Spending, Despite The Cost

By Karoun Demirjian

[Washington Post](#), January 28, 2017

On Friday, President Trump announced his plans to lavish spending on the nation's military in remarks at the Pentagon near Washington. But just one day beforehand, congressional Republicans debated the costs of such a buildup and how to pay for it at their annual policy retreat in Philadelphia.

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chair Bob Corker was the most outspoken in questioning whether Republicans would be able to stomach making the kind of cuts necessary to fund a Republican wish list of new defense and foreign policy priorities.

"I'm sorry, I wonder sometimes where we as a party are going," Corker (R-Tenn.) told a roomful of House and Senate Republicans Thursday during a national security discussion, adding that he was "discouraged" by the apparent lip service being paid to the potential costs.

"There's a spending side of this that if we don't deal with, we're not going to come close to defending the needs of

our country," he warned. "I fear that we're going to leave here without thinking of the other side of the equation."

Corker's remarks were part of a recording of several private sessions held this week at the GOP retreat in Philadelphia and later sent to The Washington Post and several other news outlets from an anonymous email address. The identities of the lawmakers in the recordings were verified by Post reporters.

Spokespeople for Corker, Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn (R-Texas), Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and House Armed Services Chair Mac Thornberry (Texas) — all of whom are heard in the recording — either did not return requests to comment or declined to comment for this story.

Republicans also fretted about the consequences of quickly repealing Obamacare, according to a recording of another closed session at the retreat; and Vice President Pence vowed that the administration would undertake an extensive examination of the voter rolls after Trump's claim that 3 to 5 million people voted illegally in the November election.

The conversation about defense spending among Hill Republicans reveals a potentially troublesome rift for the party between those who want to strengthen the military with more spending and the traditional stance of many Republicans that new spending needs to be paid for elsewhere in the budget. Trump made clear where he stands this week when he told Fox News's Sean Hannity that he wasn't worried about increasing the deficit by strengthening the military.

"Our military is more important to me than a balanced budget," President Trump told Hannity on Thursday.

In an executive order signed at the Pentagon on Friday, Trump signaled his intention to embark on a "great rebuilding of the Armed Forces," ordering a review of the military's war-readiness and the country's nuclear and ballistic missile defenses.

In order to pay for more defense spending, however, the GOP would first have to lift budget caps that were part of the 2011 Budget Control Act, or move new funding into a separate account for emergency war funding that isn't counted against the caps known as sequestration. Trump called for an end to the defense sequester on the campaign trail.

Corker began Thursday's session by challenging his colleagues to "prioritize within our own government" in order for the country to be successful on the world stage without going broke. But by the end of it, he questioned whether Republicans were willing to pay for a burgeoning military with major financial reforms to entitlement programs like Medicaid, Medicare and Social Security. Trump has said he does not intend to dip into those popular programs to fund his agenda.

"Unless we have the moral fortitude and courage to deal with the elephant in the room, all this other stuff we're

talking about is a total waste of time,” Corker said. “National security is our first responsibility, but leaving the nation greater for other people certainly is up there, and we’re not willing to deal with this?”

Cornyn also appeared concerned about how to pay for a substantial military buildup without big cuts elsewhere, suggesting lifting the budget caps was insufficient.

Cornyn warned against trying “to deal with this by just tinkering around with sequestration. We’re not going to just deal with this by tinkering around with overseas contingency spending,” he said, referring to the emergency war funding measures lawmakers have relied on to cover some budgeting shortfalls over the last few years.

“Unless we deal with the 70 percent of spending that’s mandatory spending...then we’re never going to pick up enough money to be able to appropriate for what our national priorities are, starting with the military,” Cornyn added.

GOP hawks in Congress have argued for years that the country needs to at least replenish defense spending lost because of across-the-board budget cuts. They point out that the cuts have cost the military in terms of the health and viability of its aircraft and ships, and the readiness of its members – particularly pilots, some of whom have been reduced to as little as four hours of training flights per month.

“I say to the defense doves...we need to negate the effects of the Budget Control Act,” McCain said, according to the recording, calling the current way of funding the Pentagon “a disgrace.”

“While we’re dealing with our fiscal problems, there are men and women risking their lives to protect us and we have got to support them along the way,” said House Armed Services Committee Chair Mac Thornberry (R-Texas).

Some of the Republicans bemoaned the idea that the military’s capacity shrunk during the course of former President Obama’s tenure. They listed the threats to the United States as emanating chiefly from Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and extremist groups such as the Islamic State, pointing to everything from nuclear strikes to cyber attacks. Cyber, McCain warned his colleagues, “is the one aspect of our potential confrontation where I believe that our adversaries are ahead of us.”

The Republicans leaders expressed a great degree of confidence in Trump Cabinet appointees to steer defense and foreign policy, particularly Gen. James Mattis, who was recently confirmed as secretary of Defense; Rex Tillerson, who is likely to be confirmed by the Senate next week as secretary of state; and even Gen. Mike Flynn, Trump’s pick to serve as National Security Adviser.

But not all of them are completely sold on Trump himself just yet.

“We have to have a little straight talk here. I don’t know what the president’s policy towards Russia is,” McCain told

his colleagues, stressing that Trump had to be tough on the Kremlin and Russian President Vladimir Putin.

“He is bent on restoring the Russian empire,” McCain said of Putin to his colleagues. “He is a thug and a bully and we can’t treat him any other way.”

Mike DeBonis contributed to this report.

Troops Who Cleaned Up Radioactive Islands Can’t Get Medical Care

By Dave Philipps

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

When Tim Snider arrived on Enewetak Atoll in the middle of the Pacific Ocean to clean up the fallout from dozens of nuclear tests on the ring of coral islands, Army officers immediately ordered him to put on a respirator and a bright yellow suit designed to guard against plutonium poisoning.

A military film crew snapped photos and shot movies of Mr. Snider, a 20-year-old Air Force radiation technician, in the crisp new safety gear. Then he was ordered to give all the gear back. He spent the rest of his four-month stint on the islands wearing only cutoff shorts and a floppy sun hat.

“I never saw one of those suits again,” Mr. Snider, now 58, said in an interview in his kitchen here as he thumbed a yellowing photo he still has from the 1979 shoot. “It was just propaganda.”

Today Mr. Snider has tumors on his ribs, spine and skull — which he thinks resulted from his work on the crew, in the largest nuclear cleanup ever undertaken by the United States military.

Roughly 4,000 troops helped clean up the atoll between 1977 and 1980. Like Mr. Snider, most did not even wear shirts, let alone respirators. Hundreds say they are now plagued by health problems, including brittle bones, cancer and birth defects in their children. Many are already dead. Others are too sick to work.

The military says there is no connection between these illnesses and the cleanup. Radiation exposure during the work fell well below recommended thresholds, it says, and safety precautions were top notch. So the government refuses to pay for the veterans’ medical care.

Congress long ago recognized that troops were harmed by radiation on Enewetak during the original atomic tests, which occurred in the 1950s, and should be cared for and compensated. Still, it has failed to do the same for the men who cleaned up the toxic debris 20 years later. The disconnect continues a longstanding pattern in which the government has shrugged off responsibility for its nuclear mistakes.

On one cleanup after another, veterans have been denied care because shoddy or intentionally false radiation

monitoring was later used as proof that there was no radiation exposure.

A report by The New York Times last spring found that veterans were exposed to plutonium during the cleanup of a 1966 accident involving American hydrogen bombs in Palomares, Spain. Declassified documents and a recent study by the Air Force said the men might have been poisoned, and needed new testing.

But in the months since the report, nothing has been done to help them.

For two years, the Enewetak veterans have been trying, without success, to win medical benefits from Congress through a proposed Atomic Veterans Healthcare Parity Act. Some lawmakers hope to introduce a bill this year, but its fate is uncertain. Now, as new cases of cancer emerge nearly every month, many of the men wonder how much longer they can wait.

The cleanup of Enewetak has long been portrayed as a triumph. During the operation, officials told reporters that they were setting a new standard in safety. One report from the end of the cleanup said safety was so strict that “it would be difficult to identify additional radsafe precautions that could have been taken.”

Documents from the time and interviews with dozens of veterans tell a different story.

Most of the documents were declassified and made publicly available in the 1990s, along with millions of pages of other files relating to nuclear testing, and sat unnoticed for years. They show that the government used troops instead of professional nuclear workers to save money. Then it saved even more money by skimping on safety precautions.

Records show that protective equipment was missing or unusable. Troops requesting respirators couldn't get them. Cut-rate safety monitoring systems failed. Officials assured concerned members of Congress by listing safeguards that didn't exist.

And though leaders of the cleanup told troops that the islands emitted no more radiation than a dental X-ray, documents show they privately worried about “plutonium problems” and areas that were “highly radiologically contaminated.”

Tying any disease to radiation exposure years earlier is nearly impossible; there has never been a formal study of the health of the Enewetak cleanup crews. The military collected nasal swabs and urine samples during the cleanup to measure how much plutonium troops were absorbing, but in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, it said it could not find the records.

Hundreds of the troops, though, almost all now in their late 50s, have found one another on Facebook and discovered remarkably similar problems involving deteriorating bones and an incidence of cancer that appears to be far above the norm.

A tally of 431 of the veterans by a member of the group shows that of those who stayed on the southernmost island, where radiation was low, only 2 percent reported having cancer. Of those who worked on the most contaminated islands in the north, 20 percent reported cancer. An additional 34 percent from the contaminated islands reported other health problems that could be related to radiation, like failing bones, infertility and thyroid problems.

Between 1948 and 1958, 43 atomic blasts rocked the tiny atoll — part of the Marshall Islands, which sit between Hawaii and the Philippines — obliterating the native groves of breadfruit trees and coconut palms, and leaving an apocalyptic wreckage of twisted test towers, radioactive bunkers and rusting military equipment.

Four islands were entirely vaporized; only deep blue radioactive craters in the ocean remained. The residents had been evacuated. No one thought they would ever return.

In the early 1970s, the Enewetak islanders threatened legal action if they didn't get their home back. In 1972, the United States government agreed to return the atoll and vowed to clean it up first, a project shared by the Atomic Energy Commission, now called the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense.

The biggest problem, according to Energy Department reports, was Runit Island, a 75-acre spit of sand blitzed by 11 nuclear tests in 1958. The north end was gouged by a 300-foot-wide crater that documents from the time describe as “a special problem” because of “high subsurface contamination.”

The island was littered with a fine dust of pulverized plutonium, which if inhaled or otherwise absorbed can cause cancer years or even decades later. A millionth of a gram is potentially harmful, and because the isotopes have a half-life of 24,000 years, the danger effectively never goes away.

The military initially quarantined Runit. Government scientists agreed that other islands might be made habitable, but Runit would most likely forever be too toxic, memos show.

So federal officials decided to collect radioactive debris from the other islands and dump it into the Runit crater, then cap it with a thick concrete dome.

The government intended to use private contractors and estimated the cleanup would cost \$40 million, documents show. But Congress balked at the price and approved only half the money. It ordered that “all reasonable economies should be realized” by using troops to do the work.

Safety planners intended to use protective suits, respirators and sprinklers to keep down dust. But without adequate funding, simple precautions were scrapped.

Paul Laird was one of the first service members to arrive for the atoll's cleanup, in 1977. Then a 20-year-old bulldozer driver, he began scraping topsoil that records show contained plutonium. He was given no safety equipment.

“That dust was like baby powder. We were covered in it,” said Mr. Laird, now 60, during an interview in rural Maine,

where he owns a small auto repair shop. "But we couldn't even get a paper dust mask. I begged for one daily. My lieutenant said the masks were on back order so use a T-shirt."

By the time Mr. Laird left the islands, he was throwing up and had a blisterlike rash. He got out of the Army in 1978 and moved home to Maine. When he turned 52, he found a lump that turned out to be kidney cancer. A scan at the hospital showed he also had bladder cancer. A few years later he developed a different form of bladder cancer.

His private health insurance covered the treatment, but co-payments left him deep in debt. He applied repeatedly for free veterans' health care for radiation but was denied. His medical records from the military all said he had not been exposed.

"When the job was done, they threw my bulldozer in the ocean because it was so hot," Mr. Laird said. "If it got that much radiation, how the hell did it miss me?"

As the cleanup continued, federal officials tried to institute safety measures. A shipment of yellow radiation suits arrived on the islands in 1978, but in interviews veterans said that they were too hot to wear in the tropical sun and that the military told them that it was safe to go without them.

The military tried to monitor plutonium inhalation using air samplers. But they soon broke. According to an Energy Department memo, in 1978, only a third of the samplers were working.

All troops were issued a small film badge to measure radiation exposure, but government memos note that humid conditions destroyed the film. Failure rates often reached 100 percent.

Every evening, Air Force technicians scanned workers for plutonium particles before they left Runit. Men said dozens of workers each day had screened positive for dangerous levels of radiation.

"Sometimes we'd get readings that were all the way to the red," said one technician, David Roach, 57, who now lives in Rockland, Me.

None of the high readings were recorded, said Mr. Roach, who has since had several strokes.

Two members of Congress wrote to the secretary of defense in 1978 with concerns, but his office told them not to worry: Suits and respirators ensured the cleanup was conducted in "a manner as to assure that radiation exposure to individuals is limited to the lowest levels practicable."

Even after the cleanup, many of the islands were still too radioactive to inhabit.

In 1988, Congress passed a law providing automatic medical care to any troops involved in the original atomic testing. But the act covers veterans only up to 1958, when atomic testing stopped, excluding the Enewetak cleanup crews.

If civilian contractors had done the cleanup and later discovered declassified documents that show the government failed to follow its own safety plan, they could sue for negligence. Veterans don't have that right. A 1950 Supreme Court ruling bars troops and their families from suing for injuries arising from military service.

The veterans' only avenue for help is to apply individually to the Department of Veterans Affairs for free medical care and disability payments. But the department bases decisions on old military records — including defective air sampling and radiation badge data — that show no one was harmed. It nearly always denies coverage.

"A lot of guys can't survive anymore, financially," said Jeff Dean, 60, who piloted boats loaded with contaminated soil.

Mr. Dean developed cancer at 43, then again two years later. He had to give up his job as a carpenter as the bones in his spine deteriorated. Unpaid medical bills left him \$100,000 in debt.

"No one seems to want to admit anything," Mr. Dean said. "I don't know how much longer we can wait, we have guys dying all the time."

New York City To Pay \$8.2 Million Over Shooting By Off-Duty Officer

By Christopher Mele

[New York Times](#), January 27, 2017

New York City will pay more than \$8 million to settle a lawsuit stemming from an unprovoked drunken shooting by an off-duty police officer that seriously injured one man and traumatized another, the city confirmed on Friday.

Under the settlement, Joseph Felice of New Rochelle, N.Y., who was struck by gunfire six times, will receive \$6.9 million and a friend of his, Robert Borrelli, who was with him during the shooting but not hit, will receive \$1.3 million.

Settling the case was "in the best interests of the city," a spokesman for the city's Law Department said.

The shooting occurred on April 29, 2014, shortly before midnight, in Pelham, just north of the Bronx. The officer, Brendan Cronin, had been drinking alcohol — at least 10 drinks, by his own admission, including whiskey shots and beer, according to the lawsuit — at a bar on City Island after a day of tactical police training in the Bronx, officials said.

Mr. Borrelli, also of New Rochelle, was taking Mr. Felice to his home after they had played in a hockey game. They were stopped at a traffic light at the intersection of Sixth and Lincoln Avenues in Pelham when, in what an official at the time described as a "completely random" attack, Mr. Cronin fired at least 14 shots, hitting Mr. Felice six times in the back, shoulder, arm and chest.

One bullet remains lodged in Mr. Felice's chest, and it was more than six months before he could sit in the front seat

of a car as a passenger, according to the lawsuit. His lawyer, Randolph M. McLaughlin, said in an interview that his client had instructed him not to discuss his current medical condition.

In a statement, Mr. McLaughlin said, “Hopefully the city’s settlement demonstrates the beginning of a zero-tolerance policy for alcohol abuse by its police officers, particularly when they are in possession of their service weapons or driving cars.”

Mr. Cronin, a six-year veteran of the Police Department, pleaded guilty to attempted murder in 2015. He was sentenced to nine years in prison.

After Trump Criticism On Chicago Violence, Emanuel Touts Police Smarts

By Bill Ruthhart, Jeremy Gorner, Hal Dardick
[Chicago Tribune](#), January 27, 2017

Two days after President Donald Trump told a national television audience that Mayor Rahm Emanuel needed to “smarten up and toughen up” on fighting gun violence, the mayor held a carefully orchestrated news conference to discuss Chicago’s “smart-policing strategy.”

As Emanuel summoned a swarm of cameras to the 7th District police station in Englewood on Friday to highlight new police cameras and gunshot tracking technology, sources said the Police Department’s top brass was busy carrying out an order to flood the city’s most violent neighborhoods with extra officers this weekend.

In a Tuesday night tweet in which he said he “will send in the Feds!” if the city doesn’t fix its violent crime problems, Trump cited Chicago Tribune crime data that showed January homicides up 24 percent compared with 2016, a year marred by the highest number of killings in two decades. Trump again criticized Emanuel and the city’s handling of gun violence in his first television interview as president Wednesday night, describing Chicago’s rampant shootings as “horrible carnage” and “a problem that is very easily fixable.”

Now, hundreds of additional Chicago police officers assigned to tactical, gang, saturation and mission teams have had their regular days off canceled from Friday through Sunday, according to police sources familiar with the change that was announced during a meeting at police headquarters. The city’s beat officers also were given the option of earning overtime by working weekend days off, the sources said.

Adding so many officers to the street on their day off is more typical during hot summer months or special occasions such as when the president is visiting the city; is unusual for a cold-weather month such as January. This month has been marked by weekends with dozens of shootings, including 54 people shot last weekend alone.

Through Thursday, there had been 42 homicides so far with five days left in the month. In January 2016, there were 50 homicides. If the number of killings for January were to come in lower than last year, that would allow Emanuel to try to counter Trump’s narrative of this year being off to an even worse start.

Chicago police spokesman Anthony Guglielmi said the staffing adjustment was unrelated to recent attention paid to Chicago’s gun violence by the Republican president.

The mayor did not bring up the weekend staffing increase at his Friday news conference, instead focusing on technological advances the department is making in its two most violent police districts on the South and West sides — including the expansion of a gunshot detection system and crime cameras on the street along with new surveillance centers and new cellphones with software to instantly inform officers of shootings.

The mayor’s announcement came to an abrupt end when police Superintendent Eddie Johnson grew faint and had to be helped to a chair, leading officers to call paramedics and escort reporters out of the room. On Friday night, Johnson said he had become lightheaded earlier in the day after taking blood pressure medication on an empty stomach, but he confirmed he’s had a kidney disease for more than 30 years and is on a list waiting for a transplant.

While Johnson’s health episode Friday came as a surprise, the rest of Emanuel’s policing message for the day was scripted for public consumption.

Before Emanuel’s arrival at the Englewood district, six police officers already were stationed at computers in a small, windowless room that featured four large flat-screen TVs on the wall. While a sign proclaimed the spot as a “viewing room,” the Police Department’s brass and the mayor’s office called it the “Strategic Decision Support Center,” which is staffed by a district intelligence officer who will incorporate the new technology with offender criminal history and crime data.

“The mayor is 10 minutes out, so if everyone could stage and get ready, all right? No pressure,” Jonathan Lewin, CPD’s deputy chief of bureau support services, told the room. “I need the officers who are going to meet the mayor in the lobby.”

About 15 minutes later, Emanuel arrived through the station’s back door and greeted the officers who were staffing the new “nerve center,” as the mayor called it. “I’ll be back,” he told them. “They want me to do something.”

Emanuel then made his way to the lobby, where 17 television cameras were recording as Emanuel and Johnson greeted the four officers — one each African-American, Asian, Latino and white — who had been waiting to participate in the prearranged shot.

After that photo op, the crush of cameras followed Emanuel into the tiny surveillance room, where Lewin walked Emanuel through the new technology as officers remotely

zoomed in street cameras on license plates and explained how the gunshot tracking technology would allow officers to respond to a scene five minutes faster than from a 911 call.

"You can control the cameras from here?" Emanuel asked. "Yes," Lewin responded. "This is real time?" the mayor inquired. "Yes," was the answer again.

Much of what was discussed was difficult to hear, as the Police Department's media handlers barked orders to the TV photographers, who were being directed in and out of the room in shifts to record Emanuel's interest in the effort.

"Which screen are you looking at?" a photographer asked the mayor at one point.

"The one on the far left," Emanuel responded, pointing to a map of the 7th District that had labels for territory covered by various gangs, including the Gangster Disciples, Conservative Vice Lords, Mickey Cobras, Black P Stones, Black Disciples and Latin Kings. A second screen showed a "heat map of homicides." A third was streaming live street surveillance footage.

As Lewin explained how all the technologies eventually will be merged into one cohesive software system, Emanuel stopped him. "Do that again for me," the mayor said as the cameras rolled. "I'm slow."

Once Lewin finished his presentation, Emanuel headed upstairs to the district's roll call room, where he lauded the new technology, which he's paying for with money from unclaimed property tax rebates aimed at easing the pain from the record property tax increase he and aldermen approved.

"This allows our police officers to be all that much smarter and more effective in using technology and command ability to make sure people are in the right place at the right time to prevent a shooting in the first place," Emanuel said.

In a news release, Emanuel's office described the technology as part of the city's "smart-policing strategy," a term that had not been used in previous mayor's office announcements.

Less than 48 hours earlier, Trump had called Emanuel out on needing to run a smarter policing effort.

"It has been going on for years," Trump said of Chicago's rash of shootings and homicides. "So, all I'm saying is, to the mayor, who came up to my office recently, I say you have to smarten up and you have to toughen up, because you can't let that happen. That's a war zone. I want them to straighten out the problem. It's a big problem."

At the news conference, Emanuel was asked if there "was any coincidence" that his Friday announcement came after Trump's recent criticism.

"You don't put something like this together overnight," Emanuel replied. "It's about what's right for the future, not about any current event."

Chicago Tribune's Rosemary Regina Sobol contributed.
bruthart@chicagotribune.com

jgorner@chicagotribune.com

hdardick@chicagotribune.com

Trump's Vision Of 'Carnage' Misses Complex Reality Of Many Cities

By John Eligon

[New York Times](#), January 28, 2017

PHILADELPHIA — As President Trump tells it, American cities are dangerous war zones. Bullets fly. Criminal aliens roam free. Mothers and children languish in poverty.

Mr. Trump perpetuated this grim vision — "carnage" is what he calls it — when he incorrectly told a gathering of Republicans here on Thursday that Philadelphia's murder rate had increased over the last year. He also took aim at violence in one of his favorite urban targets, Chicago, asking, "What the hell is going on?"

But the president's broad and cutting rhetoric fails to capture the complicated reality of urban America.

With declining crime, rising populations and growing innovation, cities in this country are prospering on many levels, albeit unevenly.

"Our streets are clean, always," said Isaiah Thomas, 32, cruising past the Dutch Colonials, Tudors and other well appointed homes in his predominantly black neighborhood on this city's northwest side. "Our neighbors in our community, we know each other and we get along. We got backyards, man. We go outside in our backyards and play. We go swimming. We got ballet lessons. We grew up playing instruments. We're doing the same things that most people do in the country."

Cities do remain places of segregation and enormous wealth gaps. Black and Latino families often bear more than their fair share of poverty, poor schools and violence. The number of people nationwide living in extremely poor neighborhoods has increased by about five million over roughly the last decade, according to a Brookings Institution study.

When Mr. Trump speaks about cities' problems, he focuses almost exclusively on these pockets of entrenched social ills.

Although Mr. Trump's assessment of cities is incomplete, he was "tapping into a level of outrage that we ought to have about our cities," said Lee Huang, the senior vice president of Econsult Solutions, an economic consulting firm based here. "Whether it's violence in Chicago, whether it's unemployment and poverty in Philadelphia, whether it is these structural and physical examples of blight and disinvestment and disparity, I don't think he's off in saying our cities have a lot of challenges," Mr. Huang said.

But Mr. Trump's critics say that by generalizing conditions in cities, he is sowing fears and solidifying stereotypes, which serves to divide the country.

"It never seems like he's talking in the context of saying, 'I want to help in these situations,'" said Lucas Leyden, 28, slurping a 16-ounce can of Miller High Life in a corner market converted into a bar in a gentrified neighborhood north of downtown. "It's always just disparaging remarks. 'This is bad!'"

During the campaign, when discussing issues of race, Mr. Trump often focused on what he considered inner cities, once saying that "African-Americans, Hispanics, are living in hell, because it's so dangerous."

Sulaiman Rahman, said he worried that by portraying the communities where minorities live as disastrous, Mr. Trump is trying to justify deploying aggressive policing tactics.

Just this week Mr. Trump said on Twitter that if local officials in Chicago could not control the rampant shooting there, "I will send in the Feds!"

"When he speaks and uses certain coded language, we kind of understand who he's talking about," said Mr. Rahman, who heads a professional network here. "You're framing it to justify a more detrimental agenda. That's the issue."

Although homicides in large cities in 2015 increased about 15 percent from 2014, they were still down 51 percent from two decades earlier, Richard Rosenfeld, a professor at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, said.

While murders did rise nearly 13 percent in Philadelphia from 2014 to 2015, they dipped slightly last year.

"Carnage doesn't describe the reality of crime in American cities," Mr. Rosenfeld said.

Mr. Trump's assessment of cities is rooted in the problems of segregation, discrimination and economic inequality that "urban progressives" have emphasized, argued Aaron Renn, a senior fellow in urban policy at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, a conservative think tank.

The president wants to correct those disparities, Mr. Renn said.

"I've never heard him once say, 'You're to blame for the problem,'" he said.

As Shanise Bolden, 26, strolled through her Northside neighborhood, Frankford, to her job working with the mentally ill, she had earbuds in her ear and carried her iPhone in a colorful case. A brown tote bag dangled from her wrist. Despite the high crime statistics in this part of town, she had little concern walking around here.

"Why would it be scary when we know each other?" she asked.

That sense of community and kinship belies the rough edges on Frankford's surface, residents say. It is something that people would never see or appreciate if they judged the community only by crime and economic statistics, they said.

It is a neighborhood of tightly packed rowhouses. An elevated train track cuts through the main drag, Frankford Avenue, which is jammed with convenience stores and cellphone shops, and storefronts boasting haircare products, clothes and pawned goods.

For all the Frankfords there are in cities, there are also many neighborhoods like Fishtown, about 15 minutes south. Once a tattered haven for drugs and other vices, it is now a place of nighttime joggers. It is common to see people with yoga mats slung over their shoulders, cycling in and out of a studio where a receptionist has to buzz them in. Corner stores that once peddled chips and candy have been replaced by bars with Skee-Ball machines and pool tables.

Gentrification has driven a lot of low-income residents to Frankford, and that sometimes leads to violence.

Leshay Davenport is not too worried, though. She recently strolled through a park behind the boxy, red brick public housing complex where she lives in Frankford, holding her 3-year-old daughter, Lyric, by the hand.

Ms. Davenport, 23, said she avoided certain parts of the neighborhood known for having a lot of ruffraff. But having lived here for a decade, she said, she feels comfortable enough to let Lyric play outside.

"It's pretty good," she said. "The kids are friendly. There's not really too much violence. It's really a pretty friendly neighborhood."

The challenges of living in a place like Frankford are real, said Rasheed Ross, 18, a senior at Sankofa Freedom Academy.

Positive role models are hard to find, he said, and it is easy to get caught up in the wrong thing. A lot of people think their only avenues for success are rapping, basketball or dealing drugs, he said.

"It's hard and it's, at the same time, scary," he said. "You can get shot anywhere, at any time."

Yet Mr. Ross also described a nuanced reality. Most shootings stemmed from personal conflicts, he said. "It's not like somebody would just walk up to you and shoot you for no reason."

Fashion Police: Cops Ease Rules On Tattoos, Turbans, Beards

By Colleen Long

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

NEW YORK (AP) — The Joe Friday look is out. Tattoos, turbans and beards are in.

Police departments, compelled by a hiring crisis and eager for a more diverse applicant pool, are relaxing traditional grooming standards and getting away from rules that used to require a uniformly clean-shaven, 1950s look.

More officers are on the job with tattoos inked on their forearms, beards on their chins or religious head coverings

like hijabs and turbans in place of – or tucked beneath – their blue caps.

“My turban is a part of me,” said Mandeep Singh, among 160 Sikhs in the New York City Police Department who last month were allowed to wear navy blue turbans in place of the standard-issue police caps. “This opens a gate for other potential candidates who felt they could not be a police officer because they would have to choose either the job or their faith.”

That followed a 2014 move by the St. Paul, Minnesota, police to create a special hijab for its first female Somali Muslim officer.

Muslim NYPD officer Masood Syed, who grows a beard for religious reasons, was suspended for its length and sued his department last year over a rule requiring beards to be trimmed to within a millimeter of the skin. As a result, the department changed the length to a half-inch and reinstated him. Syed’s suit is still pending, though, because he said the length is arbitrary and it should be case by case, depending on the officer’s needs.

“It’s 2017,” Syed said. “The police department is supposed to reflect the community that it’s policing.”

Many departments say it’s tougher to attract candidates to a physically demanding job that offers low pay and is under increasingly intense public scrutiny. That has led many to make a nod to shifting fashion trends, particularly among millennials, and ease longstanding bans on beards and visible tattoos.

New Orleans; Portland, Oregon; Austin, Texas; and Pinellas Park, Florida, are among the departments that look the other way if a recruit comes in with visible tattoos.

“Modern practice is colliding with dress codes,” said Will Aitchison, an attorney who represents police unions during labor-related disputes. “And what police departments really should be focused on is how the officer performs his or her job, as opposed to how they look.”

In Kansas, state police did a public survey on whether officers should be allowed to have tattoos to help determine whether to change their policy after they couldn’t fill about 100 trooper jobs.

Half of the nearly 20,000 respondents had tattoos themselves. Sixty-nine percent said the department shouldn’t have a policy prohibiting visible tattoos.

“We were surprised by the response,” said Lt. Adam Winters. “It just doesn’t seem to bother people.”

Still, the department’s prohibition on visible tattoos has stayed in place, in part because of the potential challenge of regulating the content of tattoos that might be offensive.

In Philadelphia, the department is considering tightening its policy after photos surfaced last fall of an officer in uniform with a tattoo on his forearm showing a Nazi symbol: a spread-winged eagle under the word “Fatherland.”

In Chicago, a federal judge threw out a lawsuit filed by tattooed officers – all military veterans – who objected to a new requirement that they wear long sleeves to cover up their inked arms during a sweltering Midwestern summer. The judge argued it would be too difficult for departments to determine what would be considered offensive and need to be covered.

But, the police brass recently started allowing them again – they said as a morale booster for a beleaguered force.

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our Privacy Policy and Terms of Use.

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

After Roof Trial, SC Addressing Faith, Violence Intersection

By Meg Kinnard

[Associated Press](#), January 28, 2017

COLUMBIA, S.C. (AP) – The federal trial of the South Carolina man who slaughtered nine Bible study participants has come and gone, with Dylann Roof’s death sentence assuring he will spend the rest of his limited days in custody.

But the June 2015 shootings at Emanuel AME continue to prompt a conversation about the uneasy intersection of faith and gun violence, as thousands of worshippers around South Carolina gather this weekend to memorialize crime victims and call for reform.

It isn’t just the church slaughter that has sounded the alarm bells. The Center for American Progress found South Carolina ranked sixth in the nation for the overall rate of gun violence, noting someone was killed with a gun in the state roughly every 13 hours.

Events throughout the state are part of Stand Up Sunday, launched last year by a group meeting in the very room where the Rev. Clementa Pinckney and eight others were gunned down as they prayed. Pinckney’s lifelong best friend, fellow AME Pastor Kylon Middleton, is now heading the group he says provides an opportunity for people of faith to stand up for those they’ve lost and talk about real solutions to problems of gun violence.

Middleton was recently chosen to head the board for Arm-In-Arm: South Carolinians for Responsible Gun Ownership, a grassroots group of more than 1,200 faith leaders, gun owners, teachers and others across South Carolina that is coordinating the weekend’s events. What they all have in common, Middleton says, is a desire to find ways to cut down on gun violence.

Prosecutors who secured a death sentence against Roof argued the 22-year-old white supremacist researched and picked his victims because, as loyal, churchgoing folk, he figured they'd be less likely to resist his attack. He fired his first shot at Pinckney as the worshippers closed their eyes in the evening's final prayer.

Stand Up Sunday isn't about encouraging people to arm themselves as they worship, although the group counts among its members people who have purchased weapons and practiced using them in real-life situations. This weekend, congregants are signing petitions and talking about ways to cut down on violent gun deaths in South Carolina.

At Charleston's Mt. Zion AME, where Middleton is pastor, the altar will be decorated with white crosses bearing the names of South Carolina gun violence victims, whose names will be read aloud in Sunday's service. Choir members will sing a song specially written to talk about gun violence in South Carolina.

"It allows us the opportunity to articulate their story and to give them a space to at least publicly be acknowledged in their grief, and to move the pendulum in another direction toward activism," Middleton told The Associated Press recently.

Roof, who was sentenced to death last month in a federal trial, should never have been able to purchase a gun because of a prior drug arrest. But authorities later told The Associated Press that, due to a combination of errors, Roof managed to buy one anyway.

Victims' families are suing the FBI for negligence in allowing the sale. FBI Director James Comey has said Roof should have never been allowed to buy the gun and promised a full review.

Advocates for tighter gun regulations have pushed for more days to be added onto South Carolina's three-day waiting period, but that legislation has failed. There are several bills pending in South Carolina's recently reconvened Legislature dealing with guns, including a measure that would require a national instant background check before sales, exchanges or transfers.

Gerald Malloy, a former Senate colleague of Pinckney's and also his personal friend, has made such a proposal this year.

Existing laws, Middleton said, "are useless unless the gaps in our existing background system are fixed."

Kinnard can be reached at <http://twitter.com/MegKinnardAP>. Read more of her work at <http://bigstory.ap.org/content/meg-kinnard/>

© 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our [Privacy Policy](#) and [Terms of Use](#).

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

Shooting At Tennessee Armory Leaves 10 Wounded, Three Still Hospitalized

By Alex Dobuzinskis

[Reuters](#), January 28, 2017

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2017 1:21 AM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Subject: Section 5(e) Redelelegation Language
Attachments: Delegation to CBP 5(e) waiver authority.docx; DHS Action Memo for Refugees.docx

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
 CBP Associate Chief Counsel (Enforcement and Operations)
 (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
 ** Attorney Work Product / Attorney-Client Privileged **

From: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 10:50 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); Owen, Todd C (AC OFO); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; FLANAGAN, PATRICK S <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Subject: FW: Section 5(e) Waiver Approved

(b)(5)

KM

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 8:39 PM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO) <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; WAGNER, JOHN P <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; ALLES, RANDOLPH D <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; HOFFMAN, TODD A <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; HUTTON, JAMES R <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: Section 5(e) Waiver Approved

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
 CBP Associate Chief Counsel (Enforcement and Operations)
 (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
 ** Attorney Work Product / Attorney-Client Privileged **

Department of Homeland Security
DHS Delegation Number: _____
Revision Number: 00
Issue Date:

**DELEGATION TO THE
COMMISSIONER OF U.S.
CUSTOMS AND BORDER
PROTECTION FOR THE
EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY
UNDER § 5(e) OF THE
PRESIDENT’S EXECUTIVE
ORDER ENTITLED
“PROTECTING THE NATION
FROM FOREIGN TERRORIST
ENTRY INTO THE UNITED
STATES”**

I. Purpose

This delegation vests authority in the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to exercise the authority granted to the Secretary under § 5(e) of the President’s Executive Order entitled, “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States,” (January 27, 2017).

II. Delegation

Subject to my oversight, direction, and guidance, and notwithstanding the temporary suspension of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program imposed by § 5(a) of the President’s Executive Order entitled, “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States,” (January 27, 2017), I hereby delegate to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the authority under § 5(e) of the Executive Order to admit individuals to the United States as refugees on a case-by-case basis, but only if the Commissioner and the Secretary of State, or his designee, jointly determine that the admission of such individuals as refugees is in the national interest and would not pose a risk to the security or welfare of the United States.

III. Re-delegation

Unless re-delegation is otherwise prohibited by law, the authorities delegated herein may be re-delegated in writing to an appropriate subordinate official of the

Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, but in no event may this authority be delegated to an official occupying a position less senior than the Senior Executive Service or its equivalent.

IV. Authorities

- A. Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002), as amended (6 U.S.C. § 112).
- B. Title 8, U.S.C. Section 1103, "Powers and duties of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Attorney General" [Immigration and Nationality Act, § 103(a)(1)].
- C. Title 8, U.S.C. Section 1357, "Powers of immigration officers and employees" [Immigration and Nationality Act, § 287].
- D. The President's Executive Order entitled, "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States," (January 27, 2017).
- E. Title 8, U.S.C. Section 1182, "Inadmissible aliens" [Immigration and Nationality Act, § 212].

V. Office of Primary Interest

The Office of the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection is the office of primary interest in this delegation.

John F. Kelly
Secretary of Homeland Security

Date



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

January 28, 2017

ACTION MEMO FOR

FROM:

SUBJECT: (SBU) Determination to except certain refugees from the President's Executive Order so they may enter the United States

Recommendation

(SBU) That you determine to admit the 872 refugees provide by the Department of State (DOS) scheduled to enter the United States through February 2 because their admission is in the national interest and would not pose a risk to the security or welfare of the United States.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Background

(SBU) The Executive Order "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States" (EO) suspends certain aspects of the US Refugee Admissions Program for 120 days, including the entry of refugees. Section 5(e) of the EO provides that "the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security may jointly determine to admit individuals to the United States as refugees on a case-by-case basis, in their discretion, but only so long as the determine that the admission of such refugees is in the nation interest – including...when the person is already in transit and denying admission would cause undue hardship – and it would pose a risk to the security or welfare of the United States."

(SBU) **XXXX** is seeking for you and DOS to determine jointly to admit 872 refugees who are already in transit through February 2. This group does not include nationals from the specific countries restricted in the Executive Order (Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen). A list of these individuals has been provided by DOS. Many of these individuals have already been moved from camps or other remote locations to U.S.-run refugee processing hubs in

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

-2-

preparation for departure. Most have sold or relinquished their accommodations, household effects and other belongings; given up employment; and or discontinued schooling for their children. Many have had their residency permits rescinded by their countries of asylum once granted exit permits to imminently depart to the United States and other have been preparing for life in the United States to join U.S. family members who are already here. These individuals are mostly families with children and immediate cancelation of their travel would impose extreme hardship on people who have fled persecution and conflict in order to be resettled in the U.S. Without this humanitarian measure, some refugees could be stuck in limbo or even risk being returned to a country where they would face persecution. As such, each individual in this group is in transit and denying them admission would cause undue hardship.

(SBU) You must also determine jointly with the Secretary of State that the admission of each of these individuals would not pose a risk to the security or welfare of the United States. Refugees under this exemption request have cleared security vetting. All of the information (including biographic and biometric) collected on applicants has been screened against a multitude of USG databases and watch lists, with an emphasis on counterterrorism, but including concerns pertaining to criminality, trafficking of arms, narcotics, and trafficking in persons. Where appropriate, certain aspects of screening were automated, but human intelligence analysts were engaged throughout.

- Prior to the granting of Refugee status, USCIS officers conduct extensive interviews with refugee applicants to develop all relevant issues related to eligibility for refugee resettlement and admissibility to the United States. Refugee applicants are subject to robust security screening protocols to identify potential fraud, criminal or national security issues. All available biographic and biometric information is vetted against a broad array of law enforcement, intelligence community, and other relevant databases to help confirm a refugee applicant's identity, check for any criminal or other derogatory information, and identify information that could inform lines of questioning during the interview. Screening is performed both internally by the departments with the responsibility for adjudication of benefits (DHS and the Department of State) and externally by Intelligence Community and law enforcement partners.
- Prior to departure, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) will run the full complement of checks against FBI investigative holdings.

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

-3-

- Throughout the travel process, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) National Targeting Center (NTC) traveler vetting checks run against Interpol, USCIS holdings, US-VISIT, Watchlisting Service, NCIC, TECS, ESTA and DOS Visa and U.S. Passport holdings. Additionally, NTC has several classified targeting programs with Intelligence Community (IC) partners that identify matches to previously unknown, analytically significant terrorism information pertaining to inbound travelers through comparison of CBP data with IC information. These programs are able to operate in the unclassified environment through workflows that grant NTC visibility into classified derogatory holdings that are associated to an intending traveler.
- Upon arrival to the port of entry, the refugees will be interviewed by CBP Officers who are specially trained in counterterrorism (CT) response and are responsible for the examination of travelers identified within the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB), other travelers suspected of having a nexus to terrorism and their associates or co-travelers who arrive to a port of entry. These Port-based Tactical Terrorism Response Teams (TTRT) work closely with analysts at the NTC to exploit information derived from the interview to mitigate any possible threat. TTRT members hold TS/SCI clearance and are immersed in the current and developing threat picture through the continuous review of sensitive and classified information.

(SBU) This exemption must be jointly determined by the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security. We have coordinated with the Department of State and understand that its Secretary is prepared to make this determination for these individuals jointly with you. Because of the nature of travel bookings, this waiver must be issued today or tomorrow to allow such travel.

Attachment:

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

-4-

Approved:

Drafted:

Cleared:

SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED

From: Baroukh, Nader
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 11:18 PM
To: Maher, Joseph; Hamilton, Gene; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) MCALEENAN, KEVIN K; Metzler, Alan
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: Visa Revocation Letter
Attachments: UPDATE Signed Revocation Letter 1-27-2017.pdf

All:

Attached is the signed renovation letter DOS forward to us.

Thanks,

Nader Baroukh
Associate General Counsel, Immigration
Department of Homeland Security, Office of the General Counsel
Office: (b)(6)
Cell: (b)(6)
email: (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete this message.

From: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2017 3:09 PM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Subject: FW: WA lawsuit

V/R
Patrick

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2017 5:51:22 PM
To: (b)(5); FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

Hi (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5)

Thanks,

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2017 9:07:58 AM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(5)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2017 9:06:20 AM
To: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

From: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2017 4:20:34 AM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(5)

V/R
Patrick

[Patrick Flanagan](#)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Notice: FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - this transmission contains material covered by the Privacy Act of 1974 and should be viewed only by personnel having an official "need to know." If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 11:16 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

Hi Patrick,

(b)(5)

Best,
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 10:41:19 PM
To: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(5)

From: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S

Sent: Friday, February 3, 2017 10:24 PM

To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5)

V/R
Patrick

Patrick Flanagan

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Notice: FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - this transmission contains material covered by the Privacy Act of 1974 and should be viewed only by personnel having an official "need to know." If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 10:05 PM

To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Cc: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(5)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, February 3, 2017 9:54 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Deputy Associate Chief Counsel
Office of Chief Counsel
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (office)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (cell)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 9:31 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(5)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 9:27:17 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: WA lawsuit

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Deputy Associate Chief Counsel
Office of Chief Counsel
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (office)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (cell)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 9:24 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Cc: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Subject: WA lawsuit

(b)(5)

From: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 6:36 PM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K; ALLES, RANDOLPH D
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: Litigation Tracker
Attachments: Executive Order Litigation.2317.2.docx

C1 and C2,

Please see attached FYSA.

V/R
Patrick

Patrick Flanagan

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Notice: FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - this transmission contains material covered by the Privacy Act of 1974 and should be viewed only by personnel having an official "need to know." If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 5:07 PM
To: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S (b)(6) (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: Litigation Tracker

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Deputy Associate Chief Counsel
Enforcement and Operations
Office of the Chief Counsel
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (desk)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (cell)

This document, and any attachment(s), may contain information which is law enforcement sensitive, attorney-client privileged, attorney work product, or U.S. Government information. It is not for release, review, retransmission, dissemination, or use by anyone other than the intended recipient. Please consult with the CBP Office of Chief Counsel before disclosing any information contained in this message or any attachment(s).

**ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT**

(b)(5)

**ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT**

(b)(5)

**ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT**

(b)(5)

From: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 2:31 PM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Subject: FW: Section 5(e) Redlegation Language
Attachments: CBP Delegation of Case-by-Case Waiver Authority per Executive Order on Protection the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States.pdf

Sir see below. Staff requesting an email from you confirming 5e Redlegation below.

V/R

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 6:08:31 PM
To: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Cc: Owen, Todd C (AC OFO); WAGNER, JOHN P; HOFFMAN, TODD A; HUTTON, JAMES R; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: Section 5(e) Redlegation Language

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
CBP Associate Chief Counsel (Enforcement and Operations)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
** Attorney Work Product / Attorney-Client Privileged **

From: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2017 1:40 AM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C); HUTTON, JAMES R
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO) <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

FLANAGAN, PATRICK S <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Subject: RE: Section 5(e) Redefinition Language

Ryan,
Please communicate redefinition appropriately to the field.
KM

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2017 1:36 AM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO) <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>;
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
FLANAGAN, PATRICK S <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Subject: RE: Section 5(e) Redefinition Language

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
CBP Associate Chief Counsel (Enforcement and Operations)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
** Attorney Work Product / Attorney-Client Privileged **

From: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2017 1:30 AM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO) <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>;
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
FLANAGAN, PATRICK S <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Subject: RE: Section 5(e) Redefinition Language

(b)(5)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2017 1:21 AM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO) <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>;
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
FLANAGAN, PATRICK S <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Subject: Section 5(e) Redefinition Language

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

CBP Associate Chief Counsel (Enforcement and Operations)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

** Attorney Work Product / Attorney-Client Privileged **

From: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K

Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 10:50 PM

To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

<(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO) <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>

Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) FLANAGAN, PATRICK S (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Subject: FW: Section 5(e) Waiver Approved

(b)(5)

KM

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 8:39 PM

To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; Owen, Todd C (AC OFO)

<(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; WAGNER, JOHN P <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; ALLES, RANDOLPH D

<(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; HOFFMAN, TODD A <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; HUTTON, JAMES R

<(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>

Cc: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

<(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>

Subject: Section 5(e) Waiver Approved

(b)(5)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

CBP Associate Chief Counsel (Enforcement and Operations)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

** Attorney Work Product / Attorney-Client Privileged **

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
To:
Subject: FW: Delegation of Case-by-Case Waiver Authority per Executive Order on Protection the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States
Date: Saturday, January 28, 2017 12:26:26 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

From: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 12:23 AM
To: Owen, Todd C (AC OFO) <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>; WAGNER, JOHN P <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
 <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
 <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
 <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)> FLANAGAN, PATRICK S <(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)>
Subject: Delegation of Case-by-Case Waiver Authority per Executive Order on Protection the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States

Acting Deputy Commissioner/EAC,

Subject to my oversight, direction and guidance, I hereby delegate to the Deputy Commissioner, Executive Assistant Commissioner, Deputy Executive Assistant Commissioner, Executive Director Admissibility and Passenger Programs, Executive Director Operations, Executive Director National Targeting Center, Executive Director, National Targeting Center-Passenger, Directors, Field Operations, Port Director, John F. Kennedy Airport, and Port Director, Los Angeles International Airport, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the authority, on a case-by-case basis, and when in the national interest, and only with respect to Lawful Permanent Residents of the United States, to issue a visa or other immigration benefits to nationals of countries for which visas and benefits are otherwise blocked under Section 3 of the President’s Executive Order entitled, “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States,” (January 27, 2017). Prior to taking any such action, the Lawful Permanent Resident who is the subject of the action must be subjected to a thorough examination by an immigration officer. This authority may not be further delegated.

KM



Kevin K. McAleenan
Acting Commissioner
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

We are the guardians of our Nation’s borders. We are America’s frontline.

Vigilance • Service • Integrity

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 8:58 PM
To: Fulghum, Chip; MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Cc: Higgins, Jennifer; (b)(6); Burriesci, Kelli; (b)(6);
 (b)(6); LOWRY, KIM M; (b)(6);
 Nielsen, Kirstjen; Metzler, Alan; (b)(6);
 (b)(6)
Subject: S2/CBP Hill Brief on EOs 01FEB17
Attachments: S2 Hill Brief on EO 01FEB17 FINAL.docx

Sirs,
 Attached is the preparatory material for tomorrows briefing/discussion with the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee members.

We will walk through this material in the morning at the scheduled 0830 session, as well as provide a quick summary of the S1 meeting late today that included HSGAC Senators Johnson and McCaskill.

Best regards (b)(6)

(b)(6)
 Acting Assistant Secretary
 Department of Homeland Security
 Office of Legislative Affairs

(b)(6)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)