



The Metropolitan Museum of Art's Temple of Dendur sits in the glass-enclosed Sackler Wing, seen here from Central Park.

KARSTEN MORAN FOR THE NEW YORK TIMES

Met Museum Spurns Family Tied to Opioids

By ELIZABETH A. HARRIS

The Metropolitan Museum of Art said on Wednesday that it would stop accepting gifts from members of the Sackler family linked to the maker of OxyContin, severing ties between one of the world's most prestigious museums and one of its most prolific philanthropic dynasties.

The decision was months in the making, and followed steps by other museums, including the Tate Modern in London and the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York, to distance themselves from the family behind Purdue Pharma. On Wednesday, the American Museum of Natural History said that it, too, had ceased taking Sackler donations.

The moves reflect the growing outrage over the role the Sacklers may have played in the opioid crisis, as well as an energized activist movement that is starting to force museums to reckon with where some of their money comes from.

"The museum takes a position of gratitude and respect to those who support us, but on occasion, we feel it's necessary to step away from gifts that are not in the public interest, or in our institution's interest," said Daniel H. Weiss, the president of the Met. "That is what we're doing here."

The Met's relationship with the Sacklers goes back decades, and one of its biggest attractions, the Temple of Dendur, sits in the

Continued on Page A20

Path to Nullify Roe v. Wade a Little Bit at a Time

By ADAM LIPTAK

WASHINGTON — Abortion rights are at risk at the Supreme Court, but the short-term threat may not come from extreme measures like the one passed by Alabama lawmakers.

The court led by Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. is more likely to chip away at the constitutional right to abortion established in 1973 in Roe v. Wade than to overturn it outright. It will have plenty of opportunities to do so.

As soon as Monday, the court could announce whether it will hear challenges to three provisions of Indiana abortion laws on issues like the disposal of fetal remains and an 18-hour waiting period after state-mandated ultrasound examinations. The court will in the coming months almost certainly agree to hear a challenge to a Louisiana law that could reduce the number of abortion clinics in the state to one.

Many Cases With the Potential to Eat Away at Abortion Rights

The Alabama bill, signed into law on Wednesday, is a different kind of measure, one that squarely conflicts with Roe. It would ban almost all abortions in the state, without exceptions for rape and incest, and subject abortion providers to harsh criminal penalties. Because the Roberts court tends toward incrementalism, it is not likely to want to take on a direct confrontation with that

Continued on Page A15

A NEAR BAN Alabama's governor signed the most restrictive abortion law in the country. PAGE A14



DANIEL ACKER FOR THE NEW YORK TIMES

Where Rivers Are Rising

As they face damaging floods, a city's officials try to stay clear of climate-change politics. Page A10.

Drive to Ban Fur Sales in New York Faces a Tapestry of Opposition

By WILLIAM NEUMAN and JEFFERY C. MAYS

As Corey Johnson, the speaker of the New York City Council, urged his colleagues on Wednesday to ban the sale of fur in the city, he argued that it was the "moral thing to do."

from a diverse set of opponents, including black pastors and Hasidic leaders. They say a prohibition would fly in the face of centuries of religious and cultural tradition.

Black ministers have staged protests, saying that for many African-Americans, wearing furs is a treasured hallmark of achieve-

Black Pastors, Hasidim and Rapper Fight Bill

and garment manufacturers have raised alarms over the potential loss of jobs and an attack on an in-

ing on the proposal on Wednesday, the deep dissension was evident outside City Hall. Protesters yelled, "Put people first," and counterprotesters responded, "How many animals have to die?"

Each side had celebrity power: The anti-fur movement was represented by Tim Gunn, the "Project

Trump's Plan Upends Rules On Migration

Basing Entry on Skills More Than Families

By MICHAEL D. SHEAR

WASHINGTON — President Trump on Thursday will unveil a plan to overhaul parts of the nation's immigration system that would impose new security measures at the border and significantly increase the educational and skills requirements for people allowed to migrate to the United States.

The proposal, senior administration officials said on Wednesday, would vastly scale back the system of family-based immigration that for decades has allowed immigrants to bring their spouses and children to live with them, the officials said. In its place, the new plan would provide opportunities for immigrants who have specific skills or job offers to work in the United States, provided they can demonstrate English proficiency and educational attainment, and pass a civics exam.

Jared Kushner, the president's son-in-law and a White House adviser, spent months working on the plan, which will serve as a central part of Mr. Trump's re-election campaign message. Working with him was Stephen Miller, the president's top immigration adviser, but the plan falls short of the more extreme measures that Mr. Miller has long pressed the president to adopt and that have long been opposed by Democrats in Congress.

Attempts by Mr. Trump's two predecessors, George W. Bush and Barack Obama, to overcome those kinds of differences and achieve a bipartisan consensus on immigration policy ended in failure. Since then, the divisions between the parties have only worsened, and there is little chance the new proposal will change that. For different reasons, the broad outlines of the plan described on Wednesday are certain to be unpopular with lawmakers on both sides of the aisle.

It calls for construction of some of the border wall that is a preoccupation of Mr. Trump's and vehemently opposed by Democrats, and upends family-based migration in ways that Democrats and immigrant advocates have long opposed. And it contains no provision for providing legal status to people brought to the United States as children, known as Dreamers, or other undocumented

Continued on Page A11

MISSILE PICTURES STOKE ARGUMENT OVER IRAN THREAT

DEBATING INTELLIGENCE

White House Sees a Peril at Sea — Some Warn of an Overreaction

This article is by Julian E. Barnes, Eric Schmitt, Nicholas Fandos and Edward Wong.

WASHINGTON — The intelligence that caused the White House to escalate its warnings about a threat from Iran came from photographs of missiles on small boats in the Persian Gulf that were put on board by Iranian paramilitary forces, three American officials said.

Overhead imagery showed fully assembled missiles, stoking fears that the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps would fire them at United States naval ships. Additional pieces of intelligence picked up threats against commercial shipping and potential attacks by Arab militias with Iran ties on



SARAH SILBIGER/THE NEW YORK TIMES

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo is wary of Tehran's moves.

American troops in Iraq.

But just how alarmed the Trump administration should be over the new intelligence is a subject of fierce debate among the White House, the Pentagon, the C.I.A. and America's allies.

The photographs presented a different kind of threat than previously seen from Iran, said the three officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to talk about it publicly. Taken with the other intelligence, the photographs could indicate that Iran is preparing to attack United States forces. That is the view of John R.

Continued on Page A8

Trump Found a Love for Tariffs Battling a Booming '80s Japan

By JIM TANKERSLEY and MARK LANDLER

WASHINGTON — Donald J. Trump lost an auction in 1988 for a 58-key piano used in the classic film "Casablanca" to a Japanese trading company representing a collector. While he brushed off being outbid, it was a firsthand reminder of Japan's growing wealth, and the following year, Mr. Trump went on television to call for a 15 percent to 20 percent tax on imports from Japan.

"I believe very strongly in tariffs," Mr. Trump, at the time a Manhattan real estate developer with fledgling political instincts, told the journalist Diane Sawyer, before criticizing Japan, West

Germany, Saudi Arabia and South Korea for their trade practices. "America is being ripped off," he said. "We're a debtor nation, and we have to tax, we have to tariff, we have to protect this country."

Thirty years later, few issues have defined Mr. Trump's presidency more than his love for tariffs — and on few issues has he been more unswerving. Allies and historians say that love is rooted in Mr. Trump's experience as a businessman in the 1980s with the people and money of Japan, then perceived as a mortal threat to America's economic pre-eminence.

"This is something that has been stuck in his craw since the

\$1,500, and any money made from selling banned fur would be subject to forfeiture. The bill would not ban wearing fur.

Los Angeles is the largest city in the country to have banned the

Shouts of 'Put people first,' and 'How many animals have to die?'

sale of fur; other cities include San Francisco and West Hollywood. But New York City is the largest fur retail market in the United States, according to FurNYC, a trade group representing 130 fur retailers in the city. The 150 fur businesses in the city create 1,100 jobs and produce \$400 million in revenue per year, according to the group.

Maria Reich, 43, chief executive of Reich Furs, a Manhattan-based manufacturer of fur coats, said a ban on fur sales would have a drastic impact on the 20 or so people she directly employs and an

J. David Goodman contributed reporting.

started in the 1940s by the grandfather of Ms. Reich's deceased husband. The business is in its fourth generation of family ownership.

"There's a political agenda. If this ban happens, the leather industry will be attacked, the meat industry will be attacked," Ms. Reich said. "There's a slippery slope. Are politicians going to tell us what to do, what to wear and what to eat? It's a little bigger than fur."

Dan Mathews, a senior vice president of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, an advocacy group, said the city's fur-making tradition should not impede a ban.

"Once in a while, we just take a look around and decide that certain practices should not be part of our modern society," he said, "and electrocuting and skinning animals alive for a luxury product is something that just turns people's stomach, and that's why it's going by the wayside."

The bill was introduced by Mr. Johnson, the Council speaker and an enthusiastic animal lover who, in 2017, co-sponsored a bill that led to the ban of circuses using wild and exotic animals in the city. At the hearing on Wednesday, he called the fur industry brutal and



SAM HODGSON FOR THE NEW YORK TIMES



NEAL BOENZI/THE NEW YORK TIMES

Hasidim point to the many men who wear fur hats on the Sabbath. Above, modeling a leopard coat with golden sable trim.

pointed to the cruel treatment of animals raised or killed for their pelts.

Mr. Johnson played a video showing animals living in cages

and then being electrocuted or having their necks broken. "The evidence of cruelty in the fur industry is overwhelming," he said.

Local furriers should "diversi-

the effect on workers in the fur industry.

"I think if something happens here there has to be some sense of how to phase it in, in a way that really does try and protect some jobs," Mr. de Blasio said in March.

Councilman Chaim Deutsch of Brooklyn said that he opposed the ban for several reasons, including that many Hasidic Jewish men wear hats made of fur, known as shtreimels or spodik.

"If we ban fur and then you have people that are still out there wearing it, considering the fact that hate crime in New York City is on the rise, people will be targeted on the streets, saying, 'Why are you wearing this if there's a fur ban?'" Mr. Deutsch said.

In its current form, the bill includes an exemption for fur items worn as a "matter of religious custom," but Mr. Deutsch was nonetheless wary.

"Today they're going to ban fur, tomorrow our pants are going to start falling down because they're going to ban leather, we're not going to have belts," he said. "We're not going to have shoes. Once you start with one thing, where does it end? What is next? We can't eat chicken? We can't eat meat?"

For Mobilizing Preachers and Communities, a group of mostly

York City, but allow it to be sold in Westchester, is culturally insensitive," he added, referring to the suburbs north of the city.

Mr. Green owns a mink coat that hits below the waist and says he likes to wear it when he travels and on special occasions. "I wear it because I like the way it looks," he said. "I like what it represents. I like the style."

The pastor dismissed the argument against animal cruelty. "I'm more concerned about saving black lives," he said. "When the activists are more concerned about saving black lives than black minks, let me know."

Mr. Samuels, the rapper, is known for his affinity for furs. "My stylist let me know about it and I was like, a fur ban in New York City? How could they do that in one of the fashion capitals, if not the fashion capital, of the world?" he said.

Asked for the price of his new coat, he turned to his stylist. "How much was this one, Messiah?"

"Fifty five," came the reply.

"Fifty-five thousand?" he asked.

"Yeah."

"Furs are expensive," Mr. Samuels concluded. "It's an expensive habit."

Met Museum to Spurn Some Sacklers

From Page A1

glass-enclosed Sackler Wing. Mr. Weiss said the museum had no plans to remove the name, as some protesters have demanded.

But its decision to stop accepting future gifts from Sacklers connected to Purdue Pharma, or their foundations, could spur other cultural institutions to follow suit. The family has given tens of millions of dollars and put its name in or on museums, universities and medical schools in the United States, England and Israel.

In the New York area alone, in addition to the Met, the Guggenheim and the Natural History Museum, the Metropolitan Opera and the Dia Art Foundation are among the institutions that have received substantial gifts from the Sacklers. Columbia University, which has the Sackler Institute for Developmental Psychobiology, has said it would not accept further donations for the time being.

In a statement, the family members with ties to Purdue Pharma said that "while the allegations against our family are false and unfair, we understand that accepting gifts at this time would put the Met in a difficult position."

"We respect the Met and that is the last thing we would want to do," the statement said. "Our goal has always been to support the valuable work of such outstanding organizations, and we remain committed to doing so."

The move by the Met comes as the Whitney Museum finds itself caught in the politics of the era, facing growing calls from artists, protesters and even some staff members to remove one of its vice chairmen, Warren B. Kanders, from its board. Mr. Kanders is the chief executive of Safariland Group, which sells equipment to law enforcement agencies and militaries, including tear gas, which the art publication Hyperallergic said was used against migrants at the Mexican border.

Dozens of artists connected to the Whitney Biennial, a prestigious contemporary art exhibition that begins on Friday, signed an open letter calling for his resignation. And a group called Forensic Architecture, in partnership with Praxis Films, has made its Biennial exhibition a direct challenge to Mr. Kanders: It will show a 10-minute film that documents instances when Safariland's Triple-Chaser tear gas grenades have been deployed.

Mr. Kanders has rebuffed the demands for him to step down, saying that Safariland's products, which also include riot gear and bomb disposal robots, protect law enforcement officers and let them defuse dangerous situations without loss of life. He said he had no role in how the company's products were ultimately deployed.

The increased scrutiny on donors is forcing museums to navigate moral dilemmas and a political climate where a protest can go viral in a matter of hours. At the

same time, they must mollify the wealthy benefactors who help keep the lights on.

"There really aren't that many people who are giving to art and giving to museums — in fact it's a very small club," said Tom Eccles, the executive director of the Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard College. "So we have to be a little careful what we wish for here."

There is also the difficult question of where to draw a line. What sort of behavior is inexcusable?

"We are not a partisan organization, we are not a political organization, so we don't have a litmus test for whom we take gifts from based on policies or politics," said Mr. Weiss of the Met.

"We would only not accept gifts from people if it in some way challenges or is counter to the core mission of the institution, in exceptional cases," he added. "The OxyContin crisis in this country is a legitimate and full-blown crisis."

Three brothers, Arthur, Mortimer and Raymond Sackler, bought a small company called Purdue Frederick in 1952 and transformed it into the pharmaceutical giant it is today. In 1996, Purdue Pharma put the opioid painkiller OxyContin on the market, fundamentally altering the company's fortunes.

The family's role in the marketing of OxyContin, and in the opioid crisis, has come under increased scrutiny in recent years. Documents submitted this year as part of litigation by the attorney general of Massachusetts al-



KARSTEN MORAN FOR THE NEW YORK TIMES

The Metropolitan Museum of Art will not rename its Sackler Wing, but it will decline future gifts from some family members.

lege that members of the Sackler family directed the company's efforts to mislead the public about the dangers of the drug. The company has denied the allegations and said it "neither created nor caused the opioid epidemic."

Arthur Sackler died before OxyContin's creation and his side of the family, which has supported institutions including the Smithsonian and the Brooklyn Museum, sold his stake in the pharmaceutical business. One of his children, Elizabeth A. Sackler, has called the company's role in the opioid epidemic "morally abhorrent."

Mr. Weiss, who described the Met's decision as a "suspension," said the museum would refuse only gifts from members of the Sackler family closely connected to Purdue. Several family members, or their charities, have given to the museum in recent years, including the Mortimer D. Sackler Foundation, which has donated at least \$200,000 since 2012.

That is a relatively small amount for a museum with a \$320 million annual budget, but the symbolism of the Met's decision was unmistakable.

The family's contributions to

Cutting ties with donors enriched by the drug OxyContin.

the Met go back some 50 years. A 1978 news release announcing the dedication of the Sackler Wing said it cost \$9.5 million to build — about \$36 million in today's dollars — and called the Sacklers "major donors" to the project.

Nan Goldin, a photographer who overcame an OxyContin addiction, has led demonstrations at institutions that receive Sackler money; in March 2018, she and her supporters dumped empty pill bottles in the Sackler Wing's reflecting pool.

"We commend the Met for making the ethical, moral decision to refuse future funding from the Sacklers," a group started by Ms. Goldin, Prescription Addiction Intervention Now, or PAIN, said in a statement.

The group also called for the removal of the Sackler name from buildings. Mr. Weiss said that the museum would not take the more drastic step of taking the family's name off the wing, saying that it was not in a position to make permanent changes while litigation against the family was pending and information was still coming to light.

The Met also said that its board had voted to codify how the museum accepts named gifts, formalizing a longstanding practice of circulating those proposals through a chain of departments.