



# **American Bridge**

## **Trump Policy Brief: Muslim Country Travel Ban 2.0**

**3.6.17**

## MUSLIM COUNTRY TRAVEL BAN 2.0

On March 6, 2017, President Trump issued a revised version of his earlier executive order severely limiting travel from seven Muslim-majority countries. The new version removed Iraq from the list of countries from which travelers would be banned, bringing the total number of countries on the list to six, and offered a number of clarifications to vague provisions within in the first ban. Specifically, the revised ban clarified that current visa holders from the six countries on the list would still be permitted access to the United States, as would green card holders. The revised ban also specified that dual nationals with passports from non-listed countries would be allowed to enter, and removed provisions prioritizing religious minorities for entrance as refugees.

Trump's first ban was blocked by a number of courts across the country. Trump made clear that the revised version was meant to accomplish the same goals as the first, but be written in such a way that the courts would accept.

Trump's revised ban came after the Department of Homeland Security issued a report claiming there was "insufficient evidence" to support a ban on travel from seven Muslim-majority countries. Calling the urgent need for the ban even further into question, the Trump administration delayed its scheduled rollout amid an unexpected spate of positive news coverage following a major Trump speech that the administration did not want to disrupt.

The facts didn't support Trump's first travel ban, and they don't support the new one, either. No refugees nor any foreign national from the countries named in the travel ban has carried out a fatal terrorist attack in the United States in over two decades. Furthermore, refugees are already the most heavily-vetted group of travelers into the United States, and it is unclear how to bolster the vetting process further.

While seeking to improve national security, Trump's travel ban could in reality do the opposite. Former military, intelligence, and diplomatic officials have noted the benefits of accepting refugees to combatting terrorism and promoting global stability, and Senators from the President's own party noted the boon the order could be for ISIS's recruitment efforts. The travel ban is also a violation of human rights and humanitarian laws as recognized by the United Nations.

A group of 97 companies, including Apple and Zynga, wrote an amicus brief against the order. Trump issued a revised version of his travel ban despite disapproval from the business community.

### Trump Signed A Revised Version Of His Muslim Country Travel Ban After The First Version Faced A Barrage Of Legal Challenges

#### MARCH 6, 2017: TRUMP SIGNED A REVISED VERSION OF HIS JANUARY 2017 ORDER BANNING TRAVEL FROM SEVEN MUSLIM-MAJORITY COUNTRIES

March 6, 2017: President Donald Trump Signed An Executive Order Titled "Protecting The Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into The United States." [White House, [3/6/17](#)]

The Text Of The Order Specified That It Was A Replacement For Executive Order 13769, Signed On January 27, 2017. According to Executive Order: Protecting The Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry

Into The United States, “Section 1. Policy and Purpose. (a) It is the policy of the United States to protect its citizens from terrorist attacks, including those committed by foreign nationals. The screening and vetting protocols and procedures associated with the visa-issuance process and the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) play a crucial role in detecting foreign nationals who may commit, aid, or support acts of terrorism and in preventing those individuals from entering the United States. It is therefore the policy of the United States to improve the screening and vetting protocols and procedures associated with the visa-issuance process and the USRAP. (b) On January 27, 2017, to implement this policy, I issued Executive Order 13769 (Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States). [...] (i) Given the foregoing, the entry into the United States of foreign nationals who may commit, aid, or support acts of terrorism remains a matter of grave concern. In light of the Ninth Circuit's observation that the political branches are better suited to determine the appropriate scope of any suspensions than are the courts, and in order to avoid spending additional time pursuing litigation, I am revoking Executive Order 13769 and replacing it with this order, which expressly excludes from the suspensions categories of aliens that have prompted judicial concerns and which clarifies or refines the approach to certain other issues or categories of affected aliens.” [White House, [3/6/17](#)]

### **The New Version Removed Iraq From The List Of Countries From Which Travelers Would Be Banned**

**Trump's Revised Travel Ban Removed Iraq From The List Of Countries From Which Travelers Would Be Banned.** According to The New York Times, “President Trump on Monday signed a revised version of his executive order banning migrants from predominantly Muslim nations, removing Iraqi citizens from the original travel ban at the urging of the State and Defense departments.” [New York Times, [3/6/17](#)]

*The Trump Administration Received Particular Criticism For Its Inclusion Of Iraq In The Original Ban, Given Iraqi Troops' Role In The Fight Against ISIS And The Number Of Iraqi Interpreters Seeking Refuge In The United States*

**The State And Defense Departments Urged Trump To Remove Iraq From The List Of Countries Included In The Revised Travel Ban Because Of Iraq's Help Fighting ISIS In Mosul.** According to the Associated Press, “Iraq welcomed its removal from a revised U.S. travel ban on Monday, calling it a ‘positive message’ at a time when American and Iraqi forces are battling the Islamic State group. Iraq was among seven Muslim-majority countries whose nationals were temporarily banned from traveling to the United States in an earlier order issued by President Donald Trump in January, which was blocked by the courts. The White House had said the earlier ban was needed to prevent terrorists from entering the country, but has now removed Iraq from the list under pressure from the State Department and the Defense Department, which had noted the close cooperation between the two countries in battling IS militants in the northern Iraqi city of Mosul.” [Associated Press, [3/6/17](#)]

**Politico: “Blocking The Arrival Of Refugees Who Had Served As Translators For American Troops Generated Significant Blowback From U.S. Lawmakers, Including Republicans Sympathetic To Other Aspects Of Trump's Anti-Terror Agenda.”** According to Politico, “Iraqi officials agreed to new cooperation with the U.S. that will allow for better screening of travelers and refugees from that country, a senior administration official told POLITICO. However, blocking the arrival of refugees who had served as translators for American troops generated significant blowback from U.S. lawmakers, including Republicans sympathetic to other aspects of Trump's anti-terror agenda.” [Politico, [3/6/17](#)]

*The Iraqi Government Had Threatened To Put A Stop To GE's Expansion In Iraq If The Ban Against Its Travelers Were Kept In Place*

**An Iraqi Official Told The U.S. State Department That The Government Would Be Willing To Put An End To GE's Expansion In Iraq If The Ban Against Its Travelers Were Kept In Place.** According to Politico, “The White House has spent more than a month retooling President Donald Trump’s suspended executive order barring travel and immigration from Muslim countries, all along promising the public that the revised version would be substantially the same as the original—while telling courts just the opposite. [...] A State Department memo obtained by POLITICO reported that an Iraqi official called the ban ‘both surprising and insulting to Iraqis,’ while stating that the Iraqi government was willing to pull the plug on GE’s expansion into the region in the health, transportation, and aviation sectors.” [Politico, [3/6/17](#)]

### **The New Version Modified Travel Restrictions On Certain Groups And Made Clarifications To Unclear Provisions In The First**

*Unlike The First Ban, The Revised Ban Allowed Current Visa Holders From The List Of Six Countries To Travel In And Out Of The United States*

**Unlike The First Ban, The Revised Ban Would Allow Current Visa Holders From The List Of Six Countries To Travel In And Out Of The United States.** According to The New York Times, “The new ban only applies to people from the six countries without current visas, like temporary, non-immigrant visas for students and workers. Students with valid F, M or J visas will be allowed. The original ban also affected current visa holders who would normally be allowed to travel and re-enter the country. During the rollout of the first ban, many visa holders were stuck abroad or detained in American airports. Later, a State Department official said that ‘fewer than 60,000’ visas had been provisionally revoked. Several judges who issued injunctions against the original order raised concerns that due process rights were being violated.” [New York Times, [3/6/17](#)]

*The Revised Ban Clarified That Green Card Holders From The List Of Six Countries Would Still Be Allowed To Enter The United States*

**Unlike The First Ban, The Revised Ban Clarified That Green Card Holders From The List Of Six Countries Would Still Be Allowed To Enter The United States.** The New York Times, “The new order explicitly says that green card holders from the targeted countries will still be allowed. In the original order, green card holders were not explicitly cited as exempt, leading to uncertainty at airports. The administration later clarified that they were not affected. From 1999 to 2015, 3.6 percent of new legal permanent residents were from the seven affected countries.” [New York Times, [3/6/17](#)]

*The Revised Ban Clarified That Dual Nationals With Passports From Countries Not Included In The Ban Would Be Allowed To Enter*

**The Revised Ban Clarified That It Did Not Apply To Dual Citizens Entering The U.S. With Passports From Countries Not Included In The Ban.** According to The New York Times, “The ban still does not apply to U.S. citizens, or to dual nationals who enter the United States presenting their passport from a country not under the ban. During the rollout of the original order, it was unclear whether dual nationals from the targeted countries were allowed.” [New York Times, [3/6/17](#)]

*The Revised Ban Removed The Indefinite Ban On Syrian Refugees, Instead Including Them In The Order's General 120-Day Refugee Ban*

**The Revised Ban Removed The Indefinite Ban On Syrian Refugees Entering The United States, Instead Including Syrian Refugees In The Order's General 120-Day Refugee Ban.** According to The New York Times, “The ban on all refugees to the United States is still set at 120 days. Syrian refugees are no longer barred indefinitely, but now fall under the general ban. After the 120 days, the administration will

determine which countries they will reinstate admissions from. Syrians made up the second-largest group of refugee to the United States in 2016.” [New York Times, [3/6/17](#)]

*The Revised Ban Removed The Provision Prioritizing Religious Minorities For Entry Into The United States As Refugees*

**The Revised Ban Removed The Provision Prioritizing Religious Minorities For Entry Into The U.S. As Refugees.** According to The New York Times, “In another change, refugees in minority religious groups will no longer be prioritized for acceptance once the program is reinstated. Although the original order did not explicitly mention Christians as a minority religion that would have been given preference, Mr. Trump said that was what he intended, prompting challenges claiming religious-based discrimination.” [New York Times, [3/6/17](#)]

## **TRUMP’S ORIGINAL BAN WAS BLOCKED BY A NUMBER OF COURTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY, PROMPTING THE ADMINISTRATION TO CREATE A NEW VERSION “TAILORED” TO WHAT THEY BELIEVED THE COURTS WOULD ACCEPT**

**A Number Of Court Orders Across The Country Blocked Trump’s Original Travel Ban, The Broadest Of Which Came From Federal Judge James Robert In Seattle.** According to Politico, “About two dozen lawsuits were filed against Trump’s first ban, resulting in a series of court orders blocking the key parts of the directive. The broadest block on Trump’s initial travel ban order came from Seattle-based federal judge James Robart on Feb. 3. The Justice Department asked the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals to reverse Robart’s order, at least temporarily, but a three-judge panel chose to leave the injunction in place.” [Politico, [3/6/17](#)]

- **More Than 50 Lawsuits Were Filed Against Trump’s Original Order.** According to the Hill, “More than 50 lawsuits have been filed against the order so far, with federal judges issuing temporary injunctions in several states to stop the deportations of people impacted by it.” [The Hill, [2/3/17](#)]

**Trump Said The Revised Travel Ban Would Be “Tailored” To Previous Court Rulings.** According to Politico, “If the order is ‘tailored’ to previous court rulings, as Trump has pledged, it could fare better in the courts. Still, the legal gauntlet could prove challenging for the administration. Any of the variety of judges handling the cases scattered across the country could block aspects of the new directive.” [Politico, [3/6/17](#)]

**After His Travel Ban Was Blocked By A Federal Judge, Trump Said The Ban Was Written “Perfectly” And Expressed Amazement At What He Considered The Judge’s Inability To Understand It.** “Donald Trump insisted that the Muslim ban was written ‘perfectly’ and the federal judges who oppose it were motivated by politics. His executive order to ban nearly all travellers from seven Muslim-majority countries, which prompted widespread protests, was temporarily halted after eight days by federal judge James Robart in Seattle. Mr Trump read out the wording of the executive order to the National Sheriffs’ Association on Wednesday morning, insisting it was written clearly. He railed against the opposing judge’s arguments. ‘I watched last night with amazement and I heard things that I couldn’t believe,’ said Mr Trump.” [Independent, [2/8/17](#)]

## **A Critical Report From The DHS – As Well As A Series Of White House PR Moves Following A Well-Received Trump Speech – Contradicted The Need For A Travel Ban In The First Place**

### **THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CONCLUDED THERE WAS “INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE” TO SUPPORT BANNING TRAVELERS FROM THE ORIGINAL 7 MUSLIM-MAJORITY NATIONS**

**Headline: “Homeland Security Intel Report Disputed Threat Posed By Travel Ban Nations”**

[Associated Press, [2/27/17](#)]

**Homeland Security Intelligence Analysts Found “Insufficient Evidence That Citizens Of Seven Muslim-Majority Countries Included In Trump’s Travel Ban Pose[d] A Terror Threat To The U.S.,” Concluding That Citizenship Was An “Unlikely Indicator” Of Terrorist Threats.** According to The Associated Press, “Analysts at the Homeland Security Department's intelligence arm found insufficient evidence that citizens of seven Muslim-majority countries included in President Donald Trump's travel ban pose a terror threat to the United States. A draft document obtained by The Associated Press concludes that citizenship is an ‘unlikely indicator’ of terrorism threats to the United States and that few people from the countries Trump listed in his travel ban have carried out attacks or been involved in terrorism-related activities in the U.S. since Syria's civil war started in 2011.” [Associated Press, [2/27/17](#)]

### **THE ADMINISTRATION DELAYED A SCHEDULED ROLLOUT OF THE REVISED BAN SO AS NOT TO INTERFERE WITH AN UNEXPECTED SPATE OF POSITIVE NEWS COVERAGE**

**Three Administration Officials Said The Rollout Of The Revised Ban Was Pushed Back Until A Politically Advantageous Time.** According to The New York Times, “The order, which comes about a month after federal judges blocked Mr. Trump’s haphazardly implemented ban in January on residents from seven Middle Eastern and African countries, was delayed for about a week as the White House sought to better coordinate its activities with federal agencies. It was also pushed back to maximize its public relations impact, according to three administration officials. The timing of the ban is intended to reset the White House political narrative, after a tumultuous week that began with a well-received address to a joint session of Congress. That was overshadowed quickly by the controversies over the failure of Attorney General Jeff Sessions to inform the Senate of his contacts with a Russian diplomat and of Mr. Trump’s unsupported accusation that President Barack Obama tried to wiretap his phones during the 2016 campaign.” [New York Times, [3/6/17](#)]

**Politico: Plans To Sign The New Order Were Pushed Back The Day After Trump Gave A Well-Received Speech Before A Joint Session Of Congress, With Administration Officials Explaining “They Wanted To Allow Trump To Bask In The Rare Positive Publicity.”** According to Politico, “Trump first suggested a new order was in the works back on Feb. 10, indicating it would emerge within a few days. Timing of an announcement was repeatedly pushed back for a couple of weeks, undercutting Trump’s claims that the order was initially rushed because of concerns about national security. The most advanced planning for a roll-out came last week, as aides prepared for a signing of the new order at the Justice Department on Wednesday, the day after Trump’s prime-time address to Congress. However, White House aides scuttled the executive order signing event late Tuesday night after positive reviews for Trump’s speech began to roll in. Administration officials told reporters that they wanted to allow Trump to bask in the

rare positive publicity rather than immediately confront another round of critical travel ban coverage.” [Politico, [3/6/17](#)]

**Politico: “It’s Unclear Whether [...] Judges’ Skepticism Will Be Fueled Even Further By Indications That Public Relations Concerns Played A Key Role In The Timing Of An Order The Administration Insists Was Prompted By Urgent National Security Concerns.”** According to Politico, “It’s unclear whether courts will be more inclined to give the Trump team credit for taking a more deliberate approach the second time around or whether judges’ skepticism will be fueled even further by indications that public relations concerns played a key role in the timing of an order the administration insists was prompted by urgent national security concerns.” [Politico, [3/6/17](#)]

## **The Trump White House Made Clear That The New Order Did Not Represent A Change Of Intentions**

### **TRUMP ADVISER STEPHEN MILLER: “NOTHING WAS WRONG WITH THE FIRST EXECUTIVE ORDER” AND THE NEW ONE WILL HAVE THE “SAME BASIC POLICY OUTCOME”**

**Trump Adviser Stephen Miller: “Nothing Was Wrong With The First Executive Order” And The New Order Will Have The “Same Basic Policy Outcome.”** According to the Hill, “White House policy adviser Stephen Miller on Tuesday slammed court rulings against President Trump’s temporary ban on refugees and people traveling from seven Muslim-majority nations. ‘The rulings from these courts were flawed, erroneous and false,’ he said on Fox News’s ‘The First 100 Days.’ ‘Nothing was wrong with the first executive order.’ [...] Miller said Tuesday that the new order will have the ‘same basic policy outcome.’” [The Hill, [2/21/17](#)]

### **THE SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE NEW AND ORIGINAL ORDERS WERE NOT LOST ON OPPONENTS OF THE “MUSLIM BAN”**

**NY Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman: “While The White House May Have Made Changes To The Ban, The Intent To Discriminate Against Muslims Remains Clear.”** According to The Washington Post, “Even before the ink was dry, though, Democrats and civil liberties groups asserted the new order was legally tainted in the same way as the first one: it was a thinly disguised Muslim ban. ‘While the White House may have made changes to the ban, the intent to discriminate against Muslims remains clear,’ said New York Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman (D), who had joined the legal fight against the first ban. ‘This doesn’t just harm the families caught in the chaos of President Trump’s draconian policies – it’s diametrically opposed to our values, and makes us less safe.’” [Washington Post, [3/7/16](#)]

**Gregory Chen Of The American Immigration Lawyers Association: “The President Has Said He Would Ban Muslims, And This Revised Version [...] Still Does That, Even If They Have Removed Iraq From The List.”** According to The Washington Post, “The new order drew condemnation from immigrant rights advocates. ‘The president has said he would ban Muslims, and this revised version — in these preliminary fact sheets — still does that, even if they have removed Iraq from the list’ said Gregory Chen, director of advocacy for the American Immigration Lawyers Association. ‘In its oral argument before the 9th Circuit, the government was unable to provide any evidence to the 9th Circuit that acts of terrorism had been committed by the nationals of seven countries initially designated. That was an embarrassment, but now weeks later, in these preliminary fact sheets, they still have not explained why people from these countries pose risk to America’s national security.’” [Washington Post, [3/7/16](#)]

## **The Facts Didn't Support Trump's Original Travel Ban, And They Don't Support The New One, Either**

### **NEITHER REFUGEES NOR ANY FOREIGN NATIONALS FROM THE COUNTRIES LISTED IN THE BAN HAS CARRIED OUT A FATAL TERRORIST ATTACK IN THE U.S. IN MORE THAN TWO DECADES**

**No Refugee Has Been Implicated In A Major Fatal Terrorist Attack Since The Refugee Act Of 1980.** According to CNN, “No person accepted to the United States as a refugee, Syrian or otherwise, has been implicated in a major fatal terrorist attack since the Refugee Act of 1980 set up systematic procedures for accepting refugees into the United States, according to an analysis of terrorism immigration risks by the Cato Institute.” [CNN, [1/29/17](#)]

**No Muslim Extremist From Any Of The Places Cited In Either Of Trump's Executive Orders Has Carried Out A Fatal Attack In The U.S. In More Than Two Decades.** According to NPR, “President Trump's freeze on immigration from seven mostly Muslim countries cites the potential threat of terrorism. But here's the twist — it doesn't include any countries from which radicalized Muslims have actually killed Americans in the U.S. since Sept. 11, 2001. The president's executive action, which he signed Friday at the Pentagon, applies to these countries: Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Yemen, Iraq and Sudan. Yet no Muslim extremist from any of these places has carried out a fatal attack in the U.S. in more than two decades.” [NPR, [1/27/17](#)]

**Foreign Affairs: “Trump's Order Will Do Almost Nothing To Improve National Security But Will Impose A Great Cost On Americans.”** According to Foreign Affairs, “But although the legality of the order is important, so too is the question of whether it will achieve its goal to ‘protect the American people from terrorist attacks by foreign nationals admitted to the United States.’ The answer is a resounding ‘No.’ A thorough look at terrorist attacks by foreigners on U.S. soil demonstrates that Trump's order will do almost nothing to improve national security but will impose a great cost on Americans.” [Foreign Affairs, [2/10/17](#)]

### **REFUGEES ARE ALREADY MORE HEAVILY VETTED THAN ANY OTHER CATEGORY OF TRAVELER TO THE U.S., AND IT IS UNCLEAR THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE STRONGER VETTING PROCEDURES**

**The Atlantic: Refugees Have Been More Rigorously Vetted Than Any Category Of Travelers Who Enter The United States And Thus It Is Unclear What Trump's 120-Day Suspension Would Achieve Beyond The Existing Vetting Procedures.** According to the Atlantic, “Indeed, refugees are more rigorously vetted than any category of travelers who enter the United States. The U.S. can reject asylum-seekers on grounds such as health, criminal activity, and links to terrorism. As I've previously reported, the process involves three agencies: the State Department, which leads the program, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) at the Department of Homeland Security, and the Office of Refugee Resettlement at the Department of Health and Human Services. It takes anywhere from 18 to 24 months or even longer to process a case from referral or application to arrival in the U.S. It's unclear what the 120-day suspension is meant to achieve beyond the existing vetting procedures.” [Atlantic, [1/26/17](#)]



## The United States' Acceptance Of Refugees Helps Combat Terrorism And Promote Global Stability

### ACCEPTING REFUGEES HAS BEEN CRUCIAL TO THE UNITED STATES' EFFORTS TO COMBAT TERRORISM AND PROMOTE STABILITY AROUND THE WORLD

**Vox: “The More The West Treats” Refugees “With Suspicion And Fear, The More It Supports ISIS’s Narrative Of A West That Is Hostile To Muslims And Bolster’s ISIS’s Efforts To Recruit From Migrant Communities In Europe.”** According to Vox, “ISIS despises Syrian refugees: It sees them as traitors to the caliphate. By leaving, they turn their back on the caliphate. ISIS depicts its territory as a paradise, and fleeing refugees expose that as a lie. But if refugees do make it out, ISIS wants them to be treated badly — the more the West treats them with suspicion and fear, the more it supports ISIS's narrative of a West that is hostile to Muslims and bolsters ISIS's efforts to recruit from migrant communities in Europe.” [Vox, [11/17/15](#)]

- **Vox: “The Fewer Refugees The West Lets In [...] The Better For ISIS.”** According to Vox, “But if refugees do make it out, ISIS wants them to be treated badly — the more the West treats them with suspicion and fear, the more it supports ISIS's narrative of a West that is hostile to Muslims and bolsters ISIS's efforts to recruit from migrant communities in Europe. The fewer refugees the West lets in, and the chillier their welcome on arrival, the better for ISIS.” [Vox, [11/17/15](#)]

### David Petraeus And Henry Kissinger: Accepting Refugees “Supports The Stability Of Our Allies And Partners”

**National Security Experts Including General David Petraeus, The Former CIA Director, And Henry Kissinger Pointed Out That Accepting Refugees “Supports The Stability Of Our Allies And Partners.”** According to the Atlantic, “National security experts, such as General David Petraeus, the former CIA director, and Henry Kissinger, the former secretary of state, who have served under both Republican and Democratic presidents, in a letter to Congress, pointed out that accepting refugees ‘support[s] the stability of our allies and partners that are struggling to host large numbers of refugees.’” [Atlantic, [1/26/17](#)]

**National Security Experts Including General And Former CIA Director David Petraeus And Henry Kissinger Have Said That Restricting Our Acceptance Of Refugees Would “Undermine Our Core Objective Of Combating Terrorism.”** According to the Atlantic, “National security experts, such as General David Petraeus, the former CIA director, and Henry Kissinger, the former secretary of state, who have served under both Republican and Democratic presidents, in a letter to Congress, pointed out that accepting refugees ‘support[s] the stability of our allies and partners that are struggling to host large numbers of refugees.’ Restricting their numbers, they added, would ‘undermine our core objective of combating terrorism.’” [Atlantic, [1/26/17](#)]

- **Trump’s Order Would Exclude Syria, Somalia And Iran, Which Were All Among The Top Seven “Countries Of Origin” For Refugees Admitted In The US In 2016.** According to BuzzFeed, “The action is also expected to suspend visas to countries the administration deems ‘of particular concern.’ Those nations reportedly include Syria, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen. Syria, Iraq, Somalia and Iran were all in the top seven ‘country of origin’ for refugees admitted in the US in 2016.” [BuzzFeed, [1/27/17](#)]

- **Former U.S. Ambassador To Afghanistan And Iraq Ryan Crocker: Trump’s Order “Sets The Stage For The Next Generation Of Terrorists.”** According to the Atlantic, “Ryan Crocker, a former U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan and Iraq, said in an interview that the draft order is going to be read in the Muslim world ‘for what it is.’ ‘We’ve already seen it in ISIS commentary [that] the Americans are out to do in the Muslims everywhere,’ he said. ‘So it sets the stage for the next generation of terrorists. Imagine some kid out there, a 12-year-old now in a refugee camp; that gets played and replayed, and replayed. He knows he doesn’t have a viable economic future. And ISIS or its successor is there with money and a gun.’ [Atlantic, [1/26/17](#)]

### **Senators McCain And Graham Warned That Trump’s Order Could Be A “Self-Inflicted Wound In The Fight Against Terrorism”**

**Sens. John McCain And Lindsey Graham: Donald Trump’s Executive Order On Immigration May “Become A Self-Inflicted Wound In The Fight Against Terrorism” As It Sends “A Signal, Intended Or Not, That America Does Not Want Muslims Coming Into Our Country.”** According to the Hill, “Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) on Sunday said they fear President Donald Trump’s executive order on immigration ‘will become a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism.’ ‘Our most important allies in the fight against ISIL are the vast majority of Muslims who reject its apocalyptic ideology of hatred,’ the senators said in a joint statement, using an alternate acronym for the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. ‘This executive order sends a signal, intended or not, that America does not want Muslims coming into our country. That is why we fear this executive order may do more to help terrorist recruitment than improve our security.’” [The Hill, [1/29/17](#)]

- **John McCain Said The Executive Order May Fuel ISIS Propaganda.** According to the Hill, “He also said the executive order may fuel propaganda disseminated by ISIS. ‘I think the effect will probably in some areas give ISIS some more propaganda,’ he said.” [The Hill, [1/29/17](#)]

### **CRITICS DREW PARALLELS BETWEEN TRUMP’S REFUGEE BAN AND JEWS BEING DENIED REFUGE DURING THE HOLOCAUST**

#### **Trump Signed His Executive Order On Holocaust Remembrance Day**

**Huffington Post: “Trump Approved The Refugee Ban Amid The Biggest Refugee Crisis In History And On Holocaust Remembrance Day.”** According to the Huffington Post, “President Donald Trump signed an executive order Friday that bans Syrians from taking refuge in the United States, halts the U.S. refugee resettlement program for four months and temporarily blocks people from a handful of unnamed countries from entering the U.S. at all. ‘I am establishing new vetting measures to keep radical Islamic terrorists out of the United States of America. We don’t want them here,’ he said at a swearing-in ceremony at the Pentagon for Secretary of Defense James Mattis. ‘We don’t want to admit into our country the very threats we are fighting overseas.’ Trump approved the refugee ban amid the biggest refugee crisis in history and on Holocaust Remembrance Day, which honors the millions of people killed during World War II, many of whom tried to flee to the U.S. but were turned away.” [Huffington Post, [1/27/17](#)]

#### **Trump’s Action Has Been Denounced By The Anne Frank Center For Mutual Respect**

**Donald Trump’s Refugee Order Has Drawn Intense Criticism From The Anne Frank Center For Mutual Respect, Whose Executive Director Remarked That Such Action Would Drive The Nation “Off A Moral Cliff.”** According to TIME, “President Donald Trump’s executive orders concerning U.S. immigration policy and refugees have prompted intense criticism from the Anne Frank Center for Mutual Respect, the U.S.-based partner of the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam. The center’s executive director,

Steven Goldstein, wrote a long post on Facebook on Wednesday, saying 'Trump 'is beyond the wrong side of history' and warned that he is 'driving our nation off a moral cliff.'" [TIME, [1/26/17](#)]

**Anne Frank Center For Mutual Respect: "Which New Anne Frank Will Your Refugee Ban Turn Away, POTUS?"** The center's executive director, Steven Goldstein, wrote a long post on Facebook on Wednesday, saying 'Trump 'is beyond the wrong side of history' and warned that he is 'driving our nation off a moral cliff.' 'Donald Trump is retracting the promise of American freedom to an extent we have not seen from a President since Franklin Roosevelt forced Japanese Americans into internment camps during World War II,' Goldstein wrote. 'Today the Statue of Liberty weeps over President Trump's discrimination.' The organization has also posted heated messages from its Twitter account. AnneFrankCenter(US)[:] Which new Anne Frank will your refugee ban turn away, @POTUS ? Which new Anne will your Wall turn away, @realDonaldTrump ? #NoBanNoWall.'" [TIME, [1/26/17](#)]

**Retired American University History Professor Richard Breitman: The Anti-Semitism That Prevented Anne Frank From Receiving Refuge In The U.S. Has Been Echoed Today In The Islamophobic Treatment Of Syrian Refugees.** According to ABC, "Anne Frank and her family's story of their failed attempt to flee to the U.S. as Jewish refugees echoes the challenges faced by Syrian refugees today, according to an American historian. After the Nazis conquered France, fears were stirred that they would send Jewish refugees as spies to the U.S. 'The State Department determined that anyone who had close relatives in Germany, the Soviet Union or fascist Italy were a security threat, and even though Otto and Anne were in the Netherlands, Otto was originally a German citizen, which presented a lot of problems,' historian Richard Breitman, a retired history professor at American University, told ABC News today. '[Frank's father] tried and tried but he eventually figured out he wasn't going to qualify for refugee status.' Syrians face a similar situation -- with legislation being considered that would make the bar for entry extremely high out of fears terrorists might enter the country under the guise of being an asylum seeker, said Breitman, who wrote a paper in 2007 on the Franks' situation. 'The level of Anti-Semitism in 1940 and 1941 was quite substantial, and the level of fear of Muslims and Syrian refugees today is quite substantial,' he said. 'These fears were not totally imaginary as there was a kernel of truth when the government did find a few spies imposing as refugees, but these were literally a few...any time you judge an entire group with a label of security threats, you're not judging them as individuals, which is the way our immigration system is supposed to work.'" [ABC, [11/25/15](#)]

- **Nicholas Kristof: Anne Frank's "Fate Was Sealed By A Callous Fear Of Refugees."** According to an op-ed by Nicholas Kristof in the New York Times, "We all know that the Frank children were murdered by the Nazis, but what is less known is the way Anne's fate was sealed by a callous fear of refugees, among the world's most desperate people." [Nicholas Kristof - New York Times, [8/25/16](#)]

## **Trump's Travel Ban Violated Human Rights And Humanitarian Laws**

### **U.N. HUMAN RIGHTS EXPERTS CONDEMNED TRUMP'S TRAVEL BAN AS ILLEGAL DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE, NATIONALITY, AND RELIGION**

**United Nations Human Rights Experts Condemned Trump's Executive Order For Breaching The United States' International Human Rights Obligations, "Which Protect The Principles Of Non-Refoulement And Non-Discrimination Based On Race, Nationality Or Religion."** According to the UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, "A group of United Nations human rights experts today said that the Executive Order signed by US President Donald Trump on 27 January 2017 breaches the country's international human rights obligations, which protect the principles of non-refoulement and non-

discrimination based on race, nationality or religion. [...] ‘Such an order is clearly discriminatory based on one’s nationality and leads to increased stigmatization of Muslim communities,’ said the UN Special Rapporteurs on migrants, François Crépeau; on racism, Mutuma Ruteere; on human rights and counter-terrorism, Ben Emmerson; on torture, Nils Melzer; and on freedom of religion, Ahmed Shaheed.” [UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, [2/1/17](#)]

- **United Nations Human Rights Experts Claimed That Trump’s Order Risked People Being Returned, To Places Where They Risk Being “Subjected To Torture And Other Cruel, Inhuman Or Degrading Treatment In Direct Contravention Of International Humanitarian And Human Rights Laws.”** According to the UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, “‘The US recent policy on immigration also risks people being returned, without proper individual assessments and asylum procedures, to places in which they risk being subjected to torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, in direct contravention of international humanitarian and human rights laws which uphold the principle of non-refoulement,’ they warned.” [UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, [2/1/17](#)]

**German Chancellor Angela Merkel Informed Trump That His Policy Broke The United States’ Commitment To The Geneva Convention.** According to BBC, “During a phone call with Mr Trump, German Chancellor Angela Merkel told the president his immigration order may also run afoul of international commitments. ‘The Geneva refugee convention requires the international community to take in war refugees on humanitarian grounds,’ Merkel spokesman Steffen Seibert wrote in a statement. ‘All signatory states are obligated to do. The German government explained this policy in their call yesterday.’” [BBC, [1/31/17](#)]

## **Trump Issued The Revised Travel Even After The Business Community Slammed His First One As Bad For Business**

### **A GROUP OF 97 COMPANIES, INCLUDING APPLE AND ZYNGA, CONDEMNED TRUMP’S TRAVEL BAN**

**97 Companies, Including Apple Inc. And Zynga Inc., Filed An Amicus Brief Condemning Trump’s Executive Order.** According to Bloomberg, “Ninety-seven companies, from Apple Inc. to Zynga Inc., filed an impassioned legal brief condemning President Donald Trump’s executive order on immigration, stepping up the industry’s growing opposition to the policy. The amicus brief was filed late Sunday in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and emphasizes the importance of immigrants in the economy and society. The companies originally planned to file the brief later this coming week, but accelerated efforts over the weekend after other legal challenges to the order, according to people familiar with the matter. The participating technology companies include Airbnb Inc., Facebook Inc., Google, Intel Corp., Netflix Inc., Snap Inc. and Uber Technologies Inc. Companies beyond technology signed on as well, including Levi Strauss & Co. and yogurt maker Chobani LLC.” [Bloomberg, [2/5/17](#)]

**The Amicus Brief Called The President’s Executive Order Discriminatory And Criticized It For Significantly Departing From The “Principles Of Fairness And Predictability That Have Governed The Immigration System Of The United States.”** According to the Hill, “The amicus brief comes after the federal appeals court early Sunday rejected a Department of Justice request to restore the president’s travel ban. The court of appeals denied the DOJ’s request for an emergency stay, pending full consideration of the motion. Other companies involved in the new filing include Lyft, Pinterest, Yelp, Square, Reddit, Dropbox and Medium, according to the Post. The filing calls the president’s executive order discriminatory. ‘The Order represents a significant departure from the principles of fairness and predictability that have

governed the immigration system of the United States for more than fifty years,' the brief said." [The Hill, [2/6/17](#)]

**The Amicus Brief Argued That The Executive Order Was Harmful To Business Since Immigrants Or Their Children Founded More Than 200 Of The Companies On The Fortune 500 List.** According to the Hill, "The brief also says immigrants or their children founded 'more than 200 of the companies on the Fortune 500 list,' noting that immigration and economic growth are 'intimately tied.' 'The problems that render the Executive Order harmful to businesses and their employees also make it unlawful,' the companies said." [The Hill, [2/6/17](#)]

- **Tech Companies Criticized Trump's Executive Order For Making It Difficult And Expensive To Recruit, Hire, And Retain The Best Talent And For Threatening Their Ability To Attract Investment To The U.S.** According to the Hill, "The Order makes it more difficult and expensive for U.S. companies to recruit, hire, and retain some of the world's best employees. It disrupts ongoing business operations. And it threatens companies' ability to attract talent, business, and investment to the United States." [The Hill, [2/6/17](#)]