

MICHEL MARTIN, HOST: President Trump continues to talk about deploying National Guard troops to various cities. On Tuesday, he sent a message to Illinois Governor JB Pritzker. (SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected.

MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that. (SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)

JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.

MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.

STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.

MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?

VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.

President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.

MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.

MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.

VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.

MARTIN: Yeah.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.

MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.

Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[*L■i d■ch*]

MICHEL MARTIN, HOST: President Trump continues to talk about deploying National Guard troops to various cities. On Tuesday, he sent a message to Illinois Governor JB Pritzker. (SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING) PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected. MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that. (SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING) JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want. MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us. STEPHEN VLADeCK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you. MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome? VLADeCK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week. MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors? VLADeCK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them. MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them. VLADeCK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADeCK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADeCK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio.

Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[L■i d■ch]

President Trump continues to talk about deploying National Guard troops to various cities. On Tuesday, he sent a message to Illinois Governor JB Pritzker.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected.MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this

is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website [terms of use](#) and [permissions pages](#) at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[*L■i d■ch*]

President Trump continues to talk about deploying National Guard troops to various cities. On Tuesday, he sent a message to Illinois Governor JB Pritzker.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected.MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that

state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[L■i d■ch]

(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected.MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to

President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[L■i d■ch]

(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected.MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this

matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[L■i d■ch]

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected.MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure.You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want

them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[*L■i d■ch*]

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I would love to have Governor Pritzker call me - I'd gain respect for him - and say, we do have a problem. And we'd love you to send in the troops - because you know what? - the people, they have to be protected.MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that

authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[*L■i d■ch*]

MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this

matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[L■i d■ch]

MARTIN: So here's what Pritzker said about that.(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops

from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

[L■i d■ch]

(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face

confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

(Soundbite c̄a ghi âm ■u tr■) JB Pritzker: Hãy ■■ tôi rõ ràng.T■ng th■ng ■ang c̄u xin tôi ḡi anh ta ■■ yêu c̄u anh ta làm ■■u gī ó mà chúng ta không mu■n.Trump có th■ tr■n khai quân ■■i ■■n các thành ph■ khác nh■ ông nói ông s■, ho■c ít nh■t là mu■n?Và ■■u gī s■ x■y ra ■■u các th■ng ■■c nh■ Pritzker t■p t■c nói không?Hãy h■i Stephen Vladeck v■ ■■u này.Ông là giáo s■ lu■t t■i ■■i h■c Georgetown, ng■i ■ã vi■t v■ c■ quan pháp lý ■■ tr■n khai b■o v■ trong m■t thay th■ ■■u tiên c̄a ông.Giáo s■ Vladeck, c■m ■n r■t nh■u vi ■ã tham gia v■i chung tôi.Stephen Vladeck: C■m ■n, Michel.Th■t tuy■t khi ■■■c ■■ bén b■n.T■i sao anh ta s■ làm ■■u ó?Có ph■i s■ ó là m■t s■ th■a nh■n r■ng th■ng không có th■m quy■n ḡi quân ■■i mà h■ khong ■■c chào ■ón? Vladeck: Tôi ngh■, ít nh■t, Michel, ó là m■t s■ nh■ng b■n th■ng th■ng s■ d■ dàng h■n r■t nh■u khi ḡi quân ■■i v■i m■t yêu c̄u t■ th■ng ■■c.Michel, ■ng quên, Th■ng ■■c Pritzker có V■ binh Qu■c gia c̄a riêng mình, L■c ■■ng V■ binh Qu■c gia Illinois, r■ng ông s■ ■■■c t■ do tr■n khai ■■u ông ngh■ r■ng các tinh hu■ng ■■■c b■o ■■m.Nh■ng tôi ngh■ nh■ng gī anh ■y th■c s■ c■ g■ng ■■ có ■■■c là, anh ■y th■c s■ có th■ ■■n bánh c̄a mình và ■■n nó khong?Anh ta có th■ ḡi quân mà khong s■ c■ng ■■o lu■t gây tranh cãi ■ó và khong có s■ ■■ng ý c̄a th■ng ■■c?Ó th■c s■ là m■ h■n ■■n mà chúng ta ■ang th■y trong tu■n này.Và ■■u ó d■ng nh■ nh■ i m■t cái gī ó mà b■n ■ã vi■t vào n■m 2020 khi t■ng th■ng c̄a vào các th■ng ■■c thân thi■n ■■ ḡi quân t■i Washington, D.C., sau các cu■c bi■u tinh c̄a George Floyd.Bây gi■, b■n bi■t, rõ ràng, h■ ■ã khong ■■i lâu.Ó là m■t tinh hu■ng khac.D.C. là m■t con k■ lân h■p pháp, nh■ chúng ta bi■t.Nh■ng b■n th■c hi■n nh■ng gī v■ s■ thay ■■i này ■■i v■i các th■ng ■■c c■ t■p thu h■n? Vladeck: Tôi ngh■ r■ng nó th■c s■ t■ b■ trò ch■i, Michel, v■ vi■c t■t c■ nh■ng ■■u này t■ng r■ng nh■ th■ nào.B■n bi■t ■■y, Th■ng ■■c Landry, gi■ng nh■ Th■ng ■■c Pritzker, là T■ng t■ ■nh V■ binh Qu■c gia c̄a chính ông, V■ binh Qu■c gia Louisiana.N■u có ■■, b■n bi■t ■■y, vô lu■t pháp và ■■i lo■n ■■ New Orleans ■■ bi■n minh nh■u h■n là m■t ph■n ■ng th■c thi pháp lu■t thông th■ng, Th■ng ■■c Landry khong c■n T■ng th■ng Trump.Anh ta có th■ t■ làm ■■u ■ó.Và vì v■y tôi ngh■ r■ng nh■ng gī chúng ta th■c s■ th■y, Michel, là r■t nh■u nh  hát trong m■t ph■n c̄a chính quy■n Trump, n■i mà nó ■ang c■ g■ng trông gi■ng nh■ ■ó là v■ c̄u tinh cho các tinh hu■ng có nh■u bi■n pháp kh■c ph■c ■■a ph■ng h■n, ■■c ḡi quy■t h■p pháp h■n nh■u ■■u h■ th■c s■ b■o ■■m cho h■.B■n ■ã vi■t m■t cái dài.Và nó r■t, lo■i, thú v■ và r■t chi t■t v■ nh■ng gī con ■■ng h■p pháp có th■ ■■ T■ng th■ng th■c s■ ■■a V■ binh Qu■c gia ■■n nh■ng n■i mà m■i ng■i khong mu■n h■, ho■c các th■ng ■■c, các quan ch■c ■■ó khong mu■n h■.Vì v■y, có hai con ■■ng, Michel.Vì v■y, ■■u tiên là m■t trong nh■ng chúng tôi ■ã nói v■ m■t vài phút tr■c, ó là liên bang hóa L■c ■■ng V■ binh Qu■c gia, vì v■y nh■ng gī T■ng th■ng Trump ■ã c■ g■ng làm ■■ California.B■n bi■t ■■y, anh ta ■ã b■ m■t th■m phán liên bang ■■ San Francisco tát vào th■ ba.Nh■ng gī Trump ■ang suy ng■m, Michel, là m■t ■■u gī ó kh  hi■u h■n.B■n ■ã ■■ c■p ■■n vi■c s■ c■ng n■m 2020 c̄a quân ■■i V■ binh Qu■c gia ngoái ■■u bang ■■ D.C. Michel, trong m■t b■i c■nh mà h■ khong liên k■t hóa, trong ■ó 11 qu■c gia ch■ ■■ T■ng th■ng m■■n quân ■■i qu■c gia c̄a h■.Và tôi ngh■ r■ng ■■m quan tr■ng ■■y là n■i chúng ta ■■ trong lãnh th■ ch■a ■■c khám phá, ■■u th■ng ■■c ■ã c■ g■ng s■ d■ng th■m quy■n ■ó ■■ ḡi, ví d■, L■c ■■ng V■ binh Qu■c gia Texas vào m■t ■■u bang khong mu■n h■.N■u anh ta th■c hi■n m■i le d■a c̄a mình ■■ ḡi các ■■i quân V■ binh Qu■c gia khong ■■c tôn tr■ng t■ các qu■c gia này sang ■■u bang khac mà khong có s■ ■■ng ý c̄a ■■u bang ■ó, ch■c ch n s■ có ki n t■ng.Và ■ó là m■t ■■u t■t b■i vi s■ thay th■ là m■t cu■c ■■i ■■u tr■c t■p.T■t c■ quy■n ■■c b■o ■■u.Truy c■p WebSitetermsofUseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tính s■n có c̄a b■ng ■■m NPR có th■ khac nhau.V■n b■n b■ng ■■m có th■ ■■c s■a ■■i ■■ s■a ■■i ho■c kh■p c■p nh■t v■i âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có th■ ■■c ch n s■a sau khi phát sóng ho■c xu■t b■n ban ■■u.H■ s■ có th■m quy■n c̄a ch■ng trình NPR, là b■n ghi âm thanh.

(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING)JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

(Soundbite c̄a ghi âm ■u tr■) JB Pritzker: Hãy ■■ tôi rõ ràng. T■ng th■ng ■ang c■u xin tôi g■i anh ta ■■ yêu c■u anh ta làm ■■u gi ■ó mà chúng ta không mu■n. Trump có th■ tri■n khai quân ■■i ■■n các thành ph■ khác nh■ ông nói ông s■, ho■c ít nh■t là mu■n? Và ■■u gi s■ x■y ra ■■u các th■ng ■■c nh■ Pritzker t■p t■c nói không? Hãy h■i Stephen Vladeck v■ ■■u này. Ông

là giáo sh lut ti i hc Georgetown, ngsi ã vt vc quan pháp lý trn khai bo vu
trong mt thy thu tiên ca ông.Giáo sh Vladeck, cm nrt nhu vã tham gia vu
chúng tôi.Stephen Vladeck: Cm n, Michel.Tht tuyt khi c bn.Ti sao anh ta sh
làm u ó?Có phi ó là mt s tha nhn rng tng khng có thm quyn gi quân
i mà ho khng c cho ón?Vladeck: Tôi nghu, ít nht, Michel, ó là mt s nhng bo
ng tng sh dng hn rt nhu kh gi quân i vi mt yêu cu thng
c.Michel, ng quên, Thng c Pritzker có Vbinh Quc gia ca riêng minh, Lc ng
Vbinh Quc gia Illinois, rng ông sh c tdo trn khai nu ông nghu rng các tinh hung
c bo m.Nhng tôi nghu nhng gi anh y thc sh cgng c có c là, anh y
thc sh có tht nbnh ca minh và ln nó khng?Anh ta có thgi quân mà khng sh dng
o lut gáy tranh cá ó và khng có sh ng ý ca thng c?Ó thc sh là mhn n
mà chúng ta ang thy trong tun này.Và u ó dng nhu nhu mt cái gi ó mà bn
á vt vào nm 2020 kh tng thc vào các thng c thán thn gi quân i
Washington, D.C., sau các cuc bu tinh ca George Floyd.Bây gá, bn bit, rõ ràng, ho á
khng li lâu.Ó là mt tinh hung khac.D.C. là mt con kh lan hp php, nhu chúng ta
bit.Nhng bn thc hn nhng gi vu sh thay i này i vi các thng c at p thu
hn?Vladeck: Tôi nghu rng nó thc sh tb tro chi, Michel, vu vc tt cu nhng u này
trng rng nhu thn nào.Bn bit y, Thng c Landry, gáng nhu Thng c Pritzker, là
Tng tu nh Vbinh Quc gia ca chín ông, Vbinh Quc gia Louisiana.Nu có u, bn
bit y, vô lut php và lon New Orleans bin minh nhu hn là mt phn ng
thc thi php lut thng thng, Thng c Landry khng cn Tng thng Trump.Anh ta có
tht tu làm u ó.Và vì vy tôi nghu rng nhng gi chúng ta thc sh thy, Michel, là rt
nhu nhá hát trong mt phn ca chín quyn Trump, nu mà nó ang cgng trng gáng
nhu ó là vu cu tinh cho các tinh hung có nhu bn php khc phc ca phng hn,
c gi quyt hp php hn nhu nu hn thc sh bo m cho hn.Bn á vt mt cái
dài.Và nó rt, loi, thú vu và rt chi tt vu nhng gi con ng hp php có tht Tng
thng thc sh a Vbinh Quc gia n nhng ni mà mi ngu i khng mun hn, hoc các
thng c, các quan chc ó khng mun hn.Vì vy, có hai con ng, Michel.Vì vy, u
tiên là mt trong nhng chúng tôi á nói vu mt vài phút truc, ó là liên bang hóa Lc ng
Vbinh Quc gia, vì vy nhng gi Tng thng Trump á cgng làm California.Bn bit
y, anh ta á bm tm phn phán liên bang San Francisco tát vào thba.Nhng gi Trump
lang suy ngám, Michel, là mt u gi ó khó hn hn.Bn á cp c nvc sh dng
m 2020 ca quân i Vbinh Quc gia ngoài tiu bang D.C. Michel, trong mt bi cnh
mà ho khng liên kt hóa, trong ó 11 quc gia chu Tng thng mnn quân i quc gia
ca hn.Và tôi nghu rng u quan trng uây là ni chúng ta u trong lanh thc ac ckám pha,
nu thng u á cgng sh dng thm quyn ó gi, ví du, Lc ng Vb
inh Quc gia Texas vào mt tiu bang khng mun hn.Nu anh ta thc hn mie du ac a
minh gi các u i quân Vbinh Quc gia khng c tôn trng tu các quc gia này sang
tiu bang khac mà khng có sh ng ý ca tiu bang ó, chc chn sh có kun tng.Và ó là
mt u tb i vi sh thay thu là mt cuc u tic tup.Tt cu quyn c bo
u.Truy cp WebSitetermsofUseAnDperMissionsPages
ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÈM.Accuracy và tính sn có ca bng um NPR có
tht khac nhau.Vn bn bng um có tht c sh u sh au hc khp cp nhut vu
âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có tht c chn sh sau khi phát sóng hc xut bn ban
u.Ho sh có thm quyn ca chn trình NPR, là bn ghi âm thanh.

JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADÉCK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget,

Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.

MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.

MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.

VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.

MARTIN: Yeah.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.

MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.

Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website [terms of use](#) and [permissions](#) pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

JB Pritzker: Hãy tôi rõ ràng. Tôi có yêu cầu anh ta làm điều gì đó mà chúng ta không muốn. Trump có thể triễn khai quân ở trong các thành phố khác nhông nói ông sao, hoặc có ít nhất là muốn? Và điều gì sẽ xảy ra nếu các thành phố này Pritzker tiếp tục nói không? Hãy hỏi Stephen Vladeck về điều này. Ông là giáo sư luật tại Đại học Georgetown, người đã viết về các quan pháp lý trong triễn khai binh trong một thời gian dài. Ông là một nhà tham gia và chúng tôi. Stephen Vladeck: Cảm ơn, Michel. Thật tuyệt khi được bên bạn. Tôi sao anh ta sẽ làm điều đó? Có phái đó là một số thách thức rất nghiêm trọng không có thể quyên giao quân cho tôi mà họ không chấp nhận? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ, ít nhất, Michel, đó là một số những bài rong trong thương mại cờ đang hiện ra với nhu cầu khai giao quân cho việc mặt yêu cầu của tôi. Michel, cũng quên, Thượng nghị Pritzker có Vệ binh Quốc gia riêng mình, Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia Illinois, riêng ông sẽ điều khiển để triển khai nếu ông nghĩ rằng các tinh lực có thể bị mua. Nhưng tôi nghĩ rằng gì anh ấy thực sự cần là có điều gì là, anh ấy thực sự có thể bán bánh của mình và bán nó không? Anh ta có thể giao quân mà không sẽ đang chờ luật giao tranh cãi đó và không có sự đồng ý của thượng nghị? Đó là điều mà họ không muốn mà chúng ta đang thấy trong tuần này. Và điều đó đang nhảy múa mặt cái gì đó mà bạn đã viết vào

mùn 2020 khi Tổng thống dà vào các thùng cát thân thi n gai quân t i Washington, D.C., sau các cuộc biểu tình của George Floyd.Bây giờ, bắn bắt, rõ ràng, h ã không i lâu. Đó là một tình huống khác.D.C. là một con k lân h?p pháp, nh chung ta bắt.Nhưng bắn th?c h?n nh?ng gi v s thay i này i với các thùng cát t?p thu h?n? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ r?ng nó th?c s t b trò ch?i, Michel, v? v?c t?t c nh?ng m?u này tr?ng r?ng nh? th? nào.Bắn bắt m?y, Th?ng c Landry, gi?ng nh? Th?ng c Pritzker, là Th?ng t? m?nh V? binh Qu?c gia c?a chính óng, V? binh Qu?c gia Louisiana.N?u có , bắn bắt m?y, v? lu?t ph?p và r?i l?n New Orleans bắn minh nh?u h?n là m?t ph?n ng th?c thi ph?p l?lt th?ng th?ng, Th?ng c Landry kh?ng c?n T?ng th?ng Trump.Anh ta có th? t? làm m?u m?o.Và v?y tôi nghĩ r?ng nh?ng gi chung ta th?c s th?y, Michel, là r?t nh?u nh?a h?t trong m?t ph?n c?a chính quy?n Trump, n?i mà n?o mang c g?ng tr?ng gi?ng nh? ó là v? c?u tinh cho các tinh hu?ng c? nh?u b?n ph?p kh?c ph?c ?a ph?ng h?n, m?c gai quy?t h?p ph?p h?n nh?u n?u h th?c s b?o m?m cho h?.Bắn m?a v?t m?t cái dài.Và n?o r?t, lo?i, thú v? và r?t chi ti?t v? nh?ng gi con t?ng h?p ph?p có th? T?ng th?ng th?c s a V? binh Qu?c gia c?n nh?ng n?i mà m?i ng?i kh?ng mu?n h?, ho?c các th?ng c, các quan ch?c ó kh?ng mu?n h?.Vì v?y, c? hai con t?ng, Michel.Vi v?y, m?u ti?n là m?t trong nh?ng chung tôi ã n?i v? m?t v?i ph?t tr?c, ó là li?n bang h?a L?c m?ng V? binh Qu?c gia, v? v?y nh?ng gi T?ng th?ng Trump ã c g?ng l?m California.Bắn bắt m?y, anh ta ã b m?t th?m phán li?n bang San Francisco t?t vào th? ba.Nh?ng gi Trump mang suy ng?m, Michel, là m?t m?u gi ó kh? h?u h?n. B?n ã c?p m?n v?c s d?ng n?m 2020 c?a qu?n i V? binh Qu?c gia ngo?i thu bang D.C. Michel, trong m?t b?i c?nh m? h? kh?ng li?n k?t h?o, trong ó 11 qu?c gia ch? T?ng th?ng m?n qu?n i qu?c gia c?a h?.Và tôi nghĩ r?ng m?m quan tr?ng m?y là n?i chung ta t?ng l?nh th? ch?a c khám phá, n?u th?ng c?c ã c g?ng s d?ng th?m quy?n ó g?i, v? d?, L?c m?ng V? binh Qu?c gia Texas vào m?t thu bang kh?ng mu?n h?.N?u anh ta th?c h?n m?i e d?a c?a minh i gai các i qu?n V? binh Qu?c gia kh?ng c tôn tr?ng t? các qu?c gia n?y sang thu bang kh?c m? kh?ng c? s?ng ý c?a thu bang ó, ch?c ch?n s? c? k?n t?ng.Và ó là m?t m?u t?t b?i v? s? thay th? là m?t cu?c i m?u tr?c t?p.T?t c? quy?n m?c b?o m?u.Truy c?p WebSite terms c?a chung tôi v? UseAnDperMissionsPages AT WWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN TH?M.Accuracy v? t?nh s?n c? c?a b?ng m?m NPR c? th? kh?c nhau.V?n b?n b?ng m?m c? th? m?c s?a i s?a s?a ho?c kh?p c?p nh?t v?i âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org c? th? m?c ch?nh s?a sau khi ph?t sóng ho?c xu?t b?n ban m?u.H? s? c? th?m quy?n c?a ch?ng trinh NPR, l? b?n ghi âm thanh.

JB PRITZKER: Let me be clear. The president is begging me to call him to ask him to do something that we don't want.MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it.President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this

is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.

MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.

VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.

MARTIN: Yeah.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.

MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.

Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website www.npr.org for further information.

Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

h[] th[]c s[] b[]o []m cho h[]. B[]n []ā vi[]t m[]t cái dài. V[] nó r[]t, lo[]i, thú v[] và r[]t chi t[]t v[] nh[]ng g[]i con []ng h[]p ph[]p có th[] [] T[]ng th[]ng th[]c s[] []a V[] binh Qu[]c gia []n nh[]ng n[]i mà m[]i ng[]i kh[]ng mu[]n h[], ho[]c các th[]ng []c, các quan ch[]c [] ó kh[]ng mu[]n h[]. V[] v[]y, có hai con []ng, Michel. V[] v[]y, []u tiên là m[]t trong nh[]ng ch[]ng t[]i []ā nói v[] m[]t vài ph[]t tr[]c, []ó là li[]n bang hóa L[]c I[]ng V[] binh Qu[]c gia, v[] v[]y nh[]ng g[]i T[]ng th[]ng Trump []ā c[] g[]ng làm [] California. B[]n bi[]t []y, anh ta []ā b[] m[]t th[]m ph[]n li[]n bang [] San Francisco t[]t vào th[] ba. Nh[]ng g[]i Trump []ang suy ng[]m, Michel, là m[]t []u gi[] ó kh[]o h[]u h[]n. B[]n []ā [] c[]p []n vi[]c s[] d[]ng n[]m 2020 c[]a qu[]n []i V[] binh Qu[]c gia ngo[]i t[]u bang [] D.C. Michel, trong m[]t b[]i c[]nh mà h[] kh[]ng li[]n k[]t h[]a, trong []ó 11 qu[]c gia ch[] [] T[]ng th[]ng m[]n qu[]n []i qu[]c gia c[]a h[]. V[] t[]i ngh[] r[]ng []m quan tr[]ng [] ây là n[]i ch[]ng ta [] trong l[]nh th[] ch[]a []c khám ph[]a, n[]u th[]ng []c []ā c[] g[]ng s[] d[]ng th[]m quy[]n []ó [] g[]i, ví d[]i, L[]c I[]ng V[] binh Qu[]c gia Texas vào m[]t t[]u bang kh[]ng mu[]n h[]. N[]u anh ta th[]c h[]n m[]i e d[]a c[]a m[]nh [] g[]i các []i qu[]n V[] binh Qu[]c gia kh[]ng []c t[]n tr[]ng t[] các qu[]c gia này sang t[]u bang kh[]c mà kh[]ng có s[] []ng ý c[]a t[]u bang []ó, ch[]c ch[]n s[] []c k[]i[]n t[]ng. V[] []ó là m[]t []u t[]t b[]i v[]i s[] thay th[] là m[]t cu[]c []i []u tr[]c t[]p. T[]t c[] quy[]n []c b[]o []u. Truy c[]p WebSiteTerms c[]a ch[]ng t[]i v[] UseAnDperPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính s[]n có c[]a b[]ng []m NPR có th[] kh[]c nhau. V[]n b[]n b[]ng []m có th[] []c s[]a []i [] s[]a []i ho[]c kh[]p c[]p nh[]t v[]i âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th[] []c ch[]nh s[]a sau khi phát sóng ho[]c xu[]t b[]n ban []u. H[] s[] có th[]m quy[]n c[]a ch[]ng trình NPR, là b[]n ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us. STEPHEN VLADeCK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you. MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome? VLADeCK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week. MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors? VLADeCK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them. MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them. VLADeCK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned

the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Vì sao ông nói như vậy? Ông có thể giải thích khái quát về các thành phần khác nhau ông nói ở đây là gì? Ông có thể giải thích khái quát về các thành phần khác nhau ông nói không? Ông là giáo sĩ luật gia của Georgetown, người đã viết về các quan pháp lý và triết khai bao gồm trong một thay đổi tiên của ông. Giáo sĩ Vladeck, cảm nhận rõ nhất về điều tham gia với chúng tôi. Stephen Vladeck: Cảm nhận, Michel. Thật tuyệt khi nói về bên bạn. Tôi sao anh ta làm điều đó? Có phải là một số thời gian ngắn trong thời không có thời gian giải quyết quân sự mà họ không chào đón? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ, ít nhất, Michel, nó là một số không bao giờ trong thời gian dài chờ đợi khi giải quyết vấn đề yêu cầu thời gian. Michel, không quên, Thời gian Pritzker có Vệ binh Quốc gia riêng mình, Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia Illinois, trong ông sẽ có một số điều triết khai như ông nghĩ rằng các tình huống khác bao gồm. Không tôi nghĩ rằng gì anh ấy thực sự có gắng có điều gì là, anh ấy thực sự có thời gian bánh của mình và nó không? Anh ta có thời gian mà không sẵn sàng cho luật gây tranh cãi đó và không có sẵn sàng ý nghĩa là không có điều gì là một hành động mà chúng ta đang thấy trong tuần này. Và điều đó không phải là một cái gì đó mà bạn đã viết vào năm 2020 khi thời gian của vào các thời điểm gần đây tại Washington, D.C., sau các cuộc biểu tình của George Floyd. Bây giờ, bạn biết, rõ ràng, họ đã không ở lâu. Đó là một tình huống khác D.C. là một con khỉ lân hợp pháp, nhưng chúng ta biết. Nhưng bạn thời gian gì và sự thay đổi này là với các thời điểm tiếp thu họ? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rằng nó thực sự là trò chơi, Michel, và việc tiếp cận này trong rằng nó là gì. Bạn biết vậy, Thời gian của Landry, giống như Thời gian của Pritzker, là Thời gian Vệ binh Quốc gia của chính ông, Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia Louisiana. Nếu có điều gì đó, bạn biết vậy, vô luật pháp và rủi ro ở New Orleans bị minh nhiên là một phần trong thời thi pháp luật thông thường, Thời gian của Landry không còn trong thời Trump. Anh ta có thời gian làm điều đó. Vì vì vậy tôi nghĩ rằng những gì chúng ta thấy, Michel, là một niềm nhà hát trong một phần của chính quyền Trump, nơi mà nó đang có gắng trông giống nhau là vì tình yêu cho các tình huống có nhiều biến pháp khác pha trộn với nhau, điều gì quyết định pháp luật như những luật pháp cho họ. Bạn đã viết một cái dài. Và nó rất, tôi, thú vị và rất chi tiết về những gì con người hợp pháp có thời gian trong thời gian của Vệ binh Quốc gia và những người mà không muốn họ, hoặc các thời điểm, các quan chức không muốn họ. Vì vậy, có hai con người, Michel. Vì vậy, điều tiên là một trong những chúng tôi đã nói về một vài phút trước, đó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy những gì Thời gian Trump đã cố gắng làm California. Bạn biết vậy, anh ta đã bắt một thời gian phản liên bang San Francisco tát vào tháng ba. Những gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một điều gì đó khó hiểu họ. Bạn đã có một số câu hỏi và câu trả lời năm 2020 của quân sự Vệ binh Quốc gia ngoài tenu bang D.C. Michel, trong một bài đánh mà họ không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quốc gia chỉ có Thời gian một phần quân sự quốc gia của họ. Vì tôi nghĩ rằng nó là quan trọng đây là điều chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chưa có khám phá, nếu thời gian điều gì đó không sẵn sàng để thời gian quyết định điều gì đó, ví dụ, Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tenu bang không muốn họ. Nếu anh ta thấy họ không muốn họ, điều đó là điều gì đó quyết định điều gì đó của quân Vệ binh Quốc gia không có tôn trọng các quốc gia này sang tenu bang khác mà không có sẵn sàng

ý c̄a t̄u bang ó, ch̄c ch̄n s̄ có k̄n ng. V̄o là m̄t t̄u t̄t b̄i v̄i s̄ thay th̄ là m̄t cūc c̄i u tr̄c t̄p. T̄t c̄ quȳn c̄c b̄o u. Truy c̄p WebSitetermsofUseAndPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính s̄n có c̄a b̄ng m̄m NPR có th̄ khâc nhau. V̄n b̄n b̄ng m̄m có th̄ c̄c s̄a c̄i s̄a h̄c kh̄p c̄p nh̄t v̄i âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th̄ c̄c ch̄nh s̄a sau khi phát sóng h̄c xūt b̄n ban u. H̄ s̄ có th̄m quȳn c̄a ch̄ng trình NPR, là b̄n ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: So what happens now? Can Trump deploy troops to other cities like he says he will, or at least wants to? And what if governors like Pritzker keep saying no? Let's ask Stephen Vladeck about this. He's a professor of law at Georgetown University who has been writing about the legal authority for guard deployments in his One First Substack. Professor Vladeck, thanks so much for joining us.

STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you.

MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?

VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.

MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.

MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.

VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.

MARTIN: Yeah.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.

MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websitetermsofuseandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of

NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: **V**y chuyn gì xy ra b\u00e1y g\u00f3? Trump c\u00f3 th\u00e1n khai qu\u00e1n i n\u00e0n c\u00e1c th\u00e1nh ph\u00e1 kh\u00e1c nh\u00e1c \u00f3ng n\u00f3i \u00f3ng s\u00f1, ho\u00e1c \u00ed nh\u00e1t l\u00e1 mu\u00e1n? V\u00e1 u g\u00f3 s\u00f1 x\u00eay ra n\u00e0u c\u00e1c th\u00e1ng c nh\u00e1c Pritzker t\u00f3p c n\u00f3i kh\u00f4ng? H\u00e1y h\u00e1i Stephen Vladeck v\u00e1 u n\u00e0y. \u00d6ng l\u00e1 gi\u00e1o s\u00f1 lu\u00e1t t\u00f3i i h\u00e1c Georgetown, ng\u00f3i \u00e1 v\u00e1t v\u00e1 c quan ph\u00e1p l\u00e1y t th\u00e1n khai b\u00f2o v\u00e1 trong m\u00e1t thay th\u00e1n ti\u00eann c\u00e1a \u00d6ng. Gi\u00e1o s\u00f1 Vladeck, c\u00e1m n r\u00e1t nh\u00e1u v\u00e1 \u00e1 tham gia v\u00e1i ch\u00f9ng t\u00f3i. Stephen Vladeck: C\u00e1m n, Michel. Th\u00e1t tuy\u00e1t khi c b\u00e1n b\u00e1n. T\u00f3i sao anh ta l\u00e1m u n\u00e0o? C\u00f3 ph\u00e1i \u00e1 l\u00e1 m\u00e1t s\u00f1 th\u00e1a nh\u00e1n tng th\u00e1ng kh\u00f4ng c\u00f3 th\u00e1m quy\u00f3n g\u00f3i qu\u00e1n i m\u00e1 h\u00e1c kh\u00f4ng c ch\u00f2o \u00e1 n\u00e0n? Vladeck: T\u00f3i ngh\u00e1, \u00ed nh\u00e1t, Michel, n\u00e0o l\u00e1 m\u00e1t s\u00f1 nh\u00e1ng b\u00f2 r\u00e1ng th\u00e1ng s\u00f1 d\u00e1ng h\u00e1n r\u00e1t nh\u00e1u k\u00fbi g\u00f3i qu\u00e1n i v\u00e1i m\u00e1t y\u00eau c\u00e1u t\u00f3i th\u00e1ng c. Michel, \u00e1ng qu\u00e9n, Th\u00e1ng c Pritzker c\u00f3 V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia c\u00e1a ri\u00e4ng m\u00ednh, L\u00e1c \u00e1ng V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia Illinois, tng \u00d6ng s\u00f1 c t\u00f3 do th\u00e1n khai n\u00e0u \u00d6ng ngh\u00e1 tng c\u00e1c t\u00f3inh hu\u00e1ng c b\u00f2o m. Nh\u00e1ng t\u00f3i ngh\u00e1 nh\u00e1ng g\u00f3i anh y th\u00e1c s\u00f1 c\u00e1 g\u00e1ng c c\u00f3 c l\u00e1, anh y th\u00e1c s\u00f1 c\u00f3 th\u00e1n b\u00e1nh c\u00e1a m\u00ednh v\u00e1 \u00e1n n\u00f3 kh\u00f4ng? Anh ta c\u00f3 th\u00e1m quy\u00f3n g\u00f3i qu\u00e1n m\u00e1 kh\u00f4ng s\u00f1 d\u00e1ng \u00e1 lu\u00e1t g\u00e1y tranh c\u00e1i n\u00e0o v\u00e1 kh\u00f4ng c\u00f3 s\u00f1 tng \u00d6ng y c\u00e1a th\u00e1ng c? \u00d6ng th\u00e1c s\u00f1 l\u00e1 m\u00e1 h\u00e1n \u00e1n m\u00e1 ch\u00f9ng ta \u00e1ng th\u00e1y tr\u00f3n n\u00e0y. V\u00e1 u n\u00e0o d\u00e1ng nh\u00e1n nh\u00e1i m\u00e1t c\u00e1i g\u00f3i \u00e1 m\u00e1t b\u00f2n \u00e1 v\u00e1t v\u00e1o n\u00e0m 2020 k\u00fbi th\u00e1ng th\u00e1ng ca v\u00e1o c\u00e1c th\u00e1ng c th\u00e1n thi\u00e1n \u00e1 g\u00f3i qu\u00e1n t\u00f3i Washington, D.C., sau c\u00e1c cu\u00e1c b\u00e1u t\u00f3inh c\u00e1a George Floyd. B\u00e1y g\u00f3i, b\u00f2n bi\u00e1t, r\u00e1r\u00e1ng, h\u00e1c \u00e1 kh\u00f4ng \u00e1 i l\u00e1u. \u00d6ng l\u00e1 m\u00e1t t\u00f3inh hu\u00e1ng kh\u00f4c. D.C. l\u00e1 m\u00e1t con k\u00e1 l\u00e1n h\u00e1p ph\u00e1p, nh\u00e1c ch\u00f9ng ta bi\u00e1t. Nh\u00e1ng b\u00f2n th\u00e1c h\u00e1n nh\u00e1ng g\u00f3i v\u00e1 s\u00f1 thay \u00e1i n\u00e0y \u00e1i c\u00e1c th\u00e1ng c d\u00e1t t\u00f3p thu h\u00e1n? Vladeck: T\u00f3i ngh\u00e1 r\u00e1ng n\u00e0o th\u00e1c s\u00f1 t\u00f3 b\u00e1 tr\u00f2 ch\u00f2i, Michel, v\u00e1 v\u00e1i c\u00e1t c\u00e1t nh\u00e1ng \u00e1u n\u00e0y tr\u00f3ng r\u00e1ng nh\u00e1c th\u00e1n n\u00e0o. B\u00f2n bi\u00e1t \u00e1y, Th\u00e1ng c Landry, g\u00e1ng nh\u00e1c Th\u00e1ng c Pritzker, l\u00e1 Th\u00e1ng t\u00f3 \u00e1nh V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia c\u00e1a ch\u00f9ng \u00d6ng, L\u00e1c \u00e1ng V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia Louisiana. N\u00e0u c\u00f3 \u00e1, b\u00f2n bi\u00e1t \u00e1y, v\u00e1o lu\u00e1t ph\u00e1p v\u00e1 r\u00e1i lo\u00e1n \u00e1 New Orleans \u00e1 b\u00f2n minh nh\u00e1u h\u00e1n l\u00e1 m\u00e1t ph\u00e1n \u00e1ng th\u00e1c thi ph\u00e1p lu\u00e1t th\u00e1ng th\u00e1ng, Th\u00e1ng c Landry kh\u00f4ng c\u00f3n Th\u00e1ng th\u00e1ng Trump. Anh ta c\u00f3 th\u00e1m t\u00f3 l\u00e1m \u00e1u n\u00e0o. V\u00e1 v\u00e1i v\u00e1y t\u00f3i ngh\u00e1 r\u00e1ng nh\u00e1ng g\u00f3i ch\u00f9ng ta th\u00e1c s\u00f1 th\u00e1y, Michel, l\u00e1 m\u00e1t nh\u00e1u nh\u00e1a h\u00e1t trong m\u00e1t ph\u00e1n c\u00e1a ch\u00f9ng quy\u00f3n Trump, n\u00e0i m\u00e1 n\u00e0i d\u00e1ng c\u00e1 g\u00e1ng tr\u00f3ng g\u00e1ng nh\u00e1c l\u00e1 v\u00e1 c\u00e1u t\u00f3inh cho c\u00e1c t\u00f3inh hu\u00e1ng c\u00f3 nh\u00e1u b\u00e1n ph\u00e1p kh\u00e1c ph\u00e1c c\u00e1a ph\u00e1ng h\u00e1n, \u00e1c g\u00f3i quy\u00f3t h\u00e1p ph\u00e1p h\u00e1n nh\u00e1u n\u00e0u h\u00e1c th\u00e1c s\u00f1 b\u00f2o \u00e1m cho h\u00e1. B\u00f2n \u00e1 v\u00e1t m\u00e1t c\u00e1i d\u00e1i. V\u00e1 n\u00e0o r\u00e1t, lo\u00e1i, th\u00f3u v\u00e1 v\u00e1 m\u00e1t chi t\u00f3t v\u00e1 nh\u00e1ng g\u00f3i con \u00e1ng h\u00e1p ph\u00e1p c\u00f3 th\u00e1m Th\u00e1ng th\u00e1ng th\u00e1c s\u00f1 \u00e1a V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia \u00e1n nh\u00e1ng n\u00e0i m\u00e1 m\u00e1i ng\u00e1i kh\u00f4ng mu\u00e1n h\u00e1, ho\u00e1c c\u00e1c th\u00e1ng c, c\u00e1c quan ch\u00f2c \u00e1 kh\u00f4ng mu\u00e1n h\u00e1. V\u00e1 v\u00e1y, c\u00f3 hai con \u00e1ng, Michel. V\u00e1 v\u00e1y, \u00e1u ti\u00eann l\u00e1 m\u00e1t trong nh\u00e1ng ch\u00f9ng t\u00f3i \u00e1 n\u00f3 n\u00f3 m\u00e1t v\u00e1i ph\u00e1t tr\u00f3c, \u00e1 l\u00e1 li\u00e9n bang h\u00e1o L\u00e1c \u00e1ng V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia, v\u00e1 v\u00e1y nh\u00e1ng g\u00f3i Th\u00e1ng th\u00e1ng Trump \u00e1 c\u00e1 g\u00e1ng l\u00e1m \u00e1 California. B\u00f2n bi\u00e1t \u00e1y, anh ta \u00e1b\u00f2 m\u00e1t th\u00e1m ph\u00e1n li\u00e9n bang \u00e1 San Francisco t\u00f3t v\u00e1o th\u00e1ng ba. Nh\u00e1ng g\u00f3i Trump \u00e1ng suy ng\u00e1m, Michel, l\u00e1 m\u00e1t \u00e1u n\u00e0o kh\u00f4 h\u00e1u h\u00e1n. B\u00f2n \u00e1 c\u00e1p \u00e1n v\u00e1c s\u00f1 d\u00e1ng n\u00e0m 2020 c\u00f3 a qu\u00e1n \u00e1i V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia ngo\u00e1i ti\u00e1u bang \u00e1 D.C. Michel, trong m\u00e1t b\u00f2i c\u00e1nh m\u00e1 h\u00e1c kh\u00f4ng li\u00e9n k\u00e1t h\u00e1o, trong \u00e1 11 qu\u00e1c gia ch\u00f2 \u00e1 Th\u00e1ng th\u00e1ng m\u00e1n qu\u00e1n \u00e1i qu\u00e1c gia c\u00e1a h\u00e1. V\u00e1 t\u00f3i ngh\u00e1 r\u00e1ng \u00e1m quan tr\u00f3ng \u00e1 y l\u00e1 n\u00e0i ch\u00f9ng ta \u00e1 trong l\u00e1nh th\u00e1 ch\u00f2a \u00e1c kh\u00f4m ph\u00e1, n\u00e0u th\u00e1ng \u00e1a c\u00e1 g\u00e1ng s\u00f1 d\u00e1ng th\u00e1m quy\u00f3n \u00e1 g\u00f3i, v\u00e1 d\u00e1, L\u00e1c \u00e1ng V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia Texas v\u00e1o m\u00e1t ti\u00e1u bang kh\u00f4ng mu\u00e1n h\u00e1. N\u00e0u anh ta th\u00e1c h\u00e1n m\u00e1i le d\u00e1a c\u00e1a m\u00ednh \u00e1 g\u00f3i c\u00e1c \u00e1i qu\u00e1n V\u00e1 binh Qu\u00e1c gia kh\u00f4ng \u00e1c t\u00f3n tr\u00f3ng t\u00f3 c\u00e1c qu\u00e1c gia n\u00e0y sang ti\u00e1u bang kh\u00f4c m\u00e1 kh\u00f4ng c\u00f3 s\u00f1 \u00e1ng y c\u00e1a ti\u00e1u bang \u00e1, ch\u00f2c ch\u00f2n s\u00f1 c\u00f3 k\u00e1n t\u00f3ng. V\u00e1 \u00e1 l\u00e1 m\u00e1t \u00e1u t\u00f3t b\u00f2i v\u00e1i s\u00f1 thay th\u00e1ng cu\u00e1c \u00e1i \u00e1u tr\u00f2c. T\u00f3t c\u00e1 quy\u00f3n \u00e1c b\u00f2o \u00e1. Truy c\u00e1p WebSite terms c\u00e1a ch\u00f9ng t\u00f3i v\u00e1 UseAnDperMissionsPages AT WWW.NPR.ORGFOR TH\u00d4NG TIN TH\u00d4M.Accuracy v\u00e1 t\u00f3nh s\u00f1n c\u00e1a b\u00f2ng \u00e1m NPR c\u00f3 th\u00e1m kh\u00f4c nhau. V\u00e1n b\u00f2n b\u00f2ng \u00e1m c\u00f3 th\u00e1m c\u00e1c s\u00f1a \u00e1s\u00f1a \u00e1s\u00f1a ho\u00e1c kh\u00e1p c\u00e1p nh\u00e1t v\u00e1i \u00e1m thanh.\u00d4m thanh tr\u00f3n npr.org c\u00f3 th\u00e1m c\u00e1c ch\u00f2nh s\u00f1a sau khi ph\u00e1t s\u00f1g ho\u00e1c xu\u00e1t b\u00f2n ban \u00e1. H\u00e1 s\u00f1 c\u00f3 th\u00e1m quy\u00f3n c\u00e1a ch\u00f2ng trinh NPR, l\u00e1 b\u00f2n ghi \u00e1m thanh.

STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you. MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome? VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard,

the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week. MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors? VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them. MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them. VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Stephen Vladeck: Cám ơn, Michel. Tôi tuyệt khi có cựu binh bên cạnh. Tôi sao anh ta sẽ làm điều gì? Có phải nó là một số thách thức của nhau rằng trong không có thêm quyền giao quân mà không có điều gì chào mừng? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ, ít nhất, Michel, nó là một số người không đồng ý với điều này. Michel, tôi quên, Trong số các đồng minh của riêng mình, Lý Công Vinh Quang Vinh Quang gia Illinois, ông sẽ làm điều gì để trấn khai nếu ông nghĩ rằng các tinh thần không đồng lòng. Nhưng tôi nghĩ rằng điều gì anh ấy thực sự đang có điều gì là, anh ấy thực sự có thể bán bánh của mình và nó không? Anh ta có thể giao quân mà không sốc đến mức lật đổ tranh cãi nó và không có số lượng ý của nó? Ông có thể là một hòn đảo mà chúng ta đang thấy trong tuần này. Và nó là điều gì nhỉ? Tôi nghĩ cái gì nó mà bạn đã viết vào năm 2020 khi rằng điều đó vào các tháng trước đây là giao quân tại Washington, D.C., sau các cuộc biểu tình của George Floyd. Bây giờ, bạn biết, rõ ràng, họ đã không lâu. Đó là một tinh thần khác. D.C. là một con kia lân pháp, nhưng chúng ta biết. Nhưng bạn thắc mắc điều gì và thay đổi này với các tháng trước đây thu hút? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rằng nó thực sự là trò chơi, Michel, và việc đặt câu hỏi này trong rằng nó thắc mắc điều gì. Bạn thấy, Trong số các Landry, giống như Trong số các Pritzker, là Trong số những Võ binh Quang gia

của chính ông, Võ binh Quốc gia Louisiana. Nếu có thể, bạn biết sao, vô luật pháp và rủi ro ở New Orleans là bạn minh nhau hơn là một phần trong việc thi pháp luật thông thường, Thống đốc Landry không cần Tặng thằng Trump. Anh ta có thể làm điều đó. Vì vì vậy tôi nghĩ rằng không gì chúng ta thấy sáu tháng Michel, là rất nhiều nhà hát trong một phần của chính quyền Trump, nói mà nó đang cố gắng trong giờ phút này là vì cung tình cho các tỉnh huống có nhiều biến pháp khác phaccia phong hàn, cũng cung cấp quyền pháp hàn nhiều nêu họ thắc sầu bao gồm cho họ. Bên kia vẫn là một cái dài. Và nó rất, lâu và rất chí ít là những gì con trai Tặng thằng thắc sầu Võ binh Quốc gia là những nơi mà mọi người không muốn họ. Vì vậy, có hai con trai, Michel. Vì vậy, đầu tiên là một trong những chúng tôi đã nói về một vài phút trước, nó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Võ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy những gì Tặng thằng Trump đã cố gắng làm ở California. Bên kia đây, anh ta đã bị một thẩm phán liên bang San Francisco tát vào tay ba. Nhung gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một điều gì khó hiểu họ. Bên kia là cấp năm và sau đó năm 2020 của quân đội Võ binh Quốc gia ngoài tenu bang D.C. Michel, trong một bài cảnh báo không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quan gia chia Tặng thằng mìn quân đội quốc gia của họ. Và tôi nghĩ rằng năm quan trọng nhất là nơi chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chưa sẵn sàng khám phá, như thằng sáu đã cố gắng sử dụng thẩm quyền đó để, ví dụ, Lực lượng Võ binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tenu bang không muốn họ. Nếu anh ta thắc chắn mọi điều của mình với các điều quân Võ binh Quốc gia không điều tôn trọng là các quốc gia này sang tenu bang khác mà không có sự đồng ý của tenu bang đó, chẳng hạn như có kiến nghị. Và đó là một điều tôi biết vì sự thay thế là một cuộc cải cách tenu trắc tố. Tất cả quy định điều đó. Truy cập WebSiteTerms của chúng tôi và UseAnDperMissionsPages AT WWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sẵn có của bài viết NPR có thể khác nhau. Võ binh đang làm có thể điều sáu điều sáu họ có kharp cấp nhặt và âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể điều chỉnh sáu sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản sau. Họ có thể điều chỉnh điều sáu sau khi phát

STEPHEN VLADECK: Thanks, Michel. Great to be with you. MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome? VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week. MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors? VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them. MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them. VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You

know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.

MARTIN: Yeah.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.

MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.

Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website [terms of use](#) and [permissions pages](#) at www.npr.org for further information.

Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio.

Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Stephen Vladeck: *Có mìn, Michel. Tôi tuyệt khi có cõi bên bờ n. Tôi sao anh ta sẽ làm điều gì? Có phái nó là một số thằng nhóc rỗng thòng không có thím quyền gõi quân mà mà không có cõi chào bán? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ, ít nhất, Michel, nó là một số nhóc rỗng thòng số cõi dâng hòn đất nhóc khi gõi quân cõi vui mà yêu của tôi thòng cõi Michel, cõi quên, Thòng cõi Pritzker có Võ binh Quốc gia cõi riêng mình, Lực lượng Võ binh Quốc gia Illinois, rỗng ông số cõi đó triền khai nõu ông nghẽ rỗng các tinh huống cõi bão cõi m. Nhõng tôi nghĩ nhõng gì anh ấy thõc số cõi gõng cõi có cõi là, anh ấy thõc số cõi có thõn bánh cõi minh và nõ khõng? Anh ta có thõi gõi quân mà khõng số dõng cõi luõt gây tranh cãi nó và khõng có số cõi ng ý cõi thòng cõi? Ó thõc số là mõ hõn cõi n mà chúng ta mang thõy trong tuõn này. Võ sốu nó dõng nhõc nhõi mõt cái gì ó mà bõn ãi viõt vào nõm 2020 khi thòng thõng dõa vào các thòng cõi thân thiõn cõi gõi quân tôi Washington, D.C., sau các cõi bõu tinh cõi George Floyd. Bây giờ, bõn bõt, rõ ràng, hõn ãi khõng mõi lâu. Ó là mõt tinh huống khác D.C. là mõt con kõi lân hõp pháp, nhõc chúng ta bõt. Nhõng bõn thõc hõn nhõng gi võ số thay cõi này cõi vui các thòng cõi dõi tõp thu hõn? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rõng nó thõc số tõi bõt trò chõi, Michel, võ viõc tõt cõi nhõng cõi u này trõng rõng nhõc thõn nào. Bõn bõt cõi, Thòng cõi Landry, gõng nhõc Thòng cõi Pritzker, là Tõng tõi nhõc Võ binh Quốc gia cõi chính ông, Võ binh Quốc gia Louisiana. Nõu có cõi, bõn bõt cõi, vô luõt pháp và rõi loõn New Orleans cõi bõn minh nhõu hõn là mõt phõn thòng thõc thi pháp luõt thông thõng, Thòng cõi Landry khõng cõn Tõng thòng Trump. Anh ta có thõi tõi làm cõi u ó. Võ vì võ y tôi nghĩ nhõng gì chúng ta thõc số thõy, Michel, là mõt nhõu nhà hát trong mõt phõn cõi chính quyền Trump, nõi mà nó mang cõi gõng trõng gõng nhõc ó là võ cõi tinh cho các tinh huống có nhõu bõn pháp khõc phõc cõi a phõng hõn, cõi gõi quyết hõp pháp hõn nhõu nõu hõc số bõo cõi m cho hõi. Bõn ãi viõt mõt cái dài. Võ nó rõt, loõi, thú võ và mõt chi tõt võ nhõng gi con cõi ng hõp pháp có thõi tõi Tõng thòng thõc số cõi a Võ binh Quốc gia cõi nhõng nõi mà mõi ngõi khõng muõn hõi, hoõc các thòng cõi, các quan chõc cõi ó khõng muõn hõi. Võ võ y, có hai con cõi ng, Michel. Võ võ y, cõi tiên là mõt trong nhõng chúng tôi ã nói võ mõt vài phút trõi, ó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Võ binh Quốc gia, võ võ y nhõng gi Tõng thòng Trump ãi cõi gõng làm cõi California. Bõn bõt cõi, anh ta ãi bõt mõt thõm phán liên bang cõi San Francisco tát vào thõi ba. Nhõng gi Trump mang suy ngõm, Michel, là mõt cõi u gi ó khõ hõu hõn. Bõn ãi cõi cõp cõi võc số dõng nõm 2020 cõi quân cõi Võ binh Quốc gia ngoài tõu bang cõi D.C. Michel, trong mõt bõi cõi nhõm mà hõi khõng liên kết hóa, trong ó 11 quõc gia chõi cõi Tõng thòng mõi nõu quân cõi quõc gia cõi a hõi. Võ tôi nghĩ nhõng cõi m quan trõng cõi ây là nõi chúng ta cõi trong lãnh thõi chõa cõi khám phá, nõu thõng cõi ãi cõi gõng số dõng thõm quyõn ó cõi gõi, ví dõi, Lực lượng Võ binh Quốc gia Texas vào mõt tõu bang khõng muõn hõi. Nõu anh ta thõc hõn mõi le dõa cõi a minh cõi gõi các cõi quân Võ binh Quốc gia khõng cõi tôn thõng cõi các quõc gia này sang tõu bang khõc mà khõng có số cõi ng ý cõi a tõu bang ó, chõc chõn sõi có kõi n tõng. Võ ó là mõt cõi u tõt bõi vì sõi thay thõi là mõt cõi cõi cõi tõu trõi. Tõt cõi quyõn cõi bõo cõi. Truy cõi p WebSite terms cõi chúng tôi võ UseAnDperPermissionsPages AT WWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sốn có*

c a b ng m m NPR c  th  kh c nhau. V n b n b ng m m c  th  c c s a m i s a m i ho c kh p c p nh t v i  m thanh.  m thanh trên npr.org c  th  c c ch nh s a sau khi ph t s ng ho c xu t b n ban m u. H  s  c  th m quy n c a ch ng tr nh NPR, l  b n ghi  m thanh.

MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome?VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: V i v y, nh  c  ch ng ta v a nghe m o, T ng th ng Trump d ng nh  mang y u c u ho c c  g ng g y  p m c cho Th ng c c Pritzker y u c u Trump g i trong b o v . T i sao anh ta s  làm m u l ? C  ph i l  là m t s  th a nh n r ng t ng th ng kh ng c  th m quy n g i qu n m i m t h  kh ng m c ch o l ? Vladeck: T i ngh , t t nh t, Michel, m o l  m t s  nh ng b  r ng t ng th ng s  d  d ng h n r t nh u khi g i qu n m i v i m t y u c u t ng c c. Michel, m ng quên, Th ng c c Pritzker c  V  binh Qu c gia c a ri ng minh, L c

ng V_n binh Qu_c gia Illinois, r_{ng} ông s_o c_o t_o do tri_n khai n_u ông ngh_i r_{ng} các tinh hu_{ng} c_o b_o m.Nh_{ng} tôi ngh_i nh_{ng} g_i anh y th_c s_o c_o g_{ng} c_o có c_o c l_a, anh y th_c s_o có th_i n_u b_{anh} c_a m_{nh} và n_o kh_{ng}?Anh ta có th_i g_i qu_c m_{nh} kh_{ng} s_d_{ng} c_o lu_t g_y tranh c_i ó và kh_{ng} có s_d_{ng} y c_a th_{ng} c_o?Ó th_c s_o là m_n h_n n_u m_{nh} ch_{ng} ta n_{ang} th_y trong tu_n n_{ay}.Và n_u ó c_d_{ng} nh_i nh_i m_t t_{ái} g_i ó m_{nh} b_n n_ă v_i t_o vào n_m 2020 k_{hi} t_ong th_{ng} c_a vào các th_{ng} c_o th_{an} thi_n g_i qu_c t_i Washington, D.C., sau các cu_c b_{iu} tinh c_a George Floyd.Bây g_i, b_n bi_t, r_o ràng, h_u kh_{ng} i l_au.Ó là m_t tinh hu_{ng} kh_{ac}.D.C. là m_t con k_o l_an h_p ph_{áp}, nh_u ch_{ng} ta bi_t.Nh_{ng} b_n th_c h_in nh_{ng} g_i v_n s_o thay n_u i n_{ay} n_u i v_i các th_{ng} c_o t_o p thu h_n? Vladeck: Tôi ngh_i r_{ng} nó th_c s_o t_o b_o tr_o ch_i, Michel, v_i v_i c_t t_c nh_{ng} n_u n_{ay} tr_{ng} r_{ng} nh_u th_n n_{ao}.B_n bi_t c_y, Th_{ng} c_a Landry, gi_{ng} nh_u Th_{ng} c_a Pritzker, là T_{ng} t_o l_{nh} V_n binh Qu_c gia c_a ch_{nh} ông, V_n binh Qu_c gia Louisiana.N_u có s_o, b_n bi_t c_y, v_o lu_t ph_{áp} và r_i lo_n New Orleans b_n minh nh_u h_n là m_t ph_n ng th_c thi ph_{áp} lu_t th_{ng}, Th_{ng} c_a Landry kh_{ng} c_n T_{ng} th_{ng} Trump.Anh ta có th_i t_o l_am n_u ó.Và v_i v_y tôi ngh_i r_{ng} nh_{ng} g_i ch_{ng} ta th_c s_o th_y, Michel, là r_t nh_u nh_u nh_u h_{át} trong m_t ph_n c_a ch_{nh} quy_n Trump, n_ui mà n_o n_{ang} c_o g_{ng} tr_ong gi_{ng} nh_u ó là v_i c_u tinh cho các tinh hu_{ng} có nh_u b_n ph_{áp} kh_c ph_c c_a ph_{ng} h_n, c_o g_i quy_t h_p ph_{áp} h_n nh_u n_u h_n th_c s_o b_o s_m cho h_n.B_n n_ă v_i t_o m_t c_{ái} dài.Và n_o r_t, l_oi, thú v_n và r_t chi t_t v_i nh_{ng} g_i con n_ung h_p ph_{áp} có th_i T_{ng} th_{ng} th_c s_o c_a V_n binh Qu_c gia n_ung n_u m_{nh} m_{nh} i kh_{ng} mu_n h_n, ho_c các th_{ng} c_o, các quan ch_c c_o kh_{ng} mu_n h_n.Vì v_y, có hai con n_ung, Michel.Vì v_y, n_u ti_n là m_t trong nh_{ng} ch_{ng} tôi n_ă n_oi v_i m_t v_i ph_{út} tr_c, ó là l_{ien} bang h_oá L_c n_ung V_n binh Qu_c gia, vì v_y nh_{ng} g_i T_{ng} th_{ng} Trump n_ă c_o g_{ng} l_{am} California.B_n bi_t c_y, anh ta n_ă b_o m_t th_m ph_{án} l_{ien} bang San Francisco t_{át} vào th_ba.Nh_{ng} g_i Trump sang suy_n m_m, Michel, là m_t n_u g_i ó kh_o h_u h_n.B_n n_ă c_p c_a p v_i c_s o_{ng} n_m 2020 c_a qu_c n_u V_n binh Qu_c gia ngo_i t_u bang D.C. Michel, trong m_t b_i c_{nh} m_h kh_{ng} l_{ien} k_t h_oa, trong ó 11 qu_c c_a ch_i T_{ng} th_{ng} m_n qu_c n_u i qu_c c_a h_n.Và tôi ngh_i r_{ng} c_o quan tr_{ng} ó là n_ui ch_{ng} ta c_a trong l_{anh} th_c h_a c_o khám phá, n_u th_{ng} c_a g_{ng} s_o d_{ng} th_m quy_n ó g_i, ví d_o, L_c n_ung V_n binh Qu_c gia Texas vào m_t t_u bang kh_{ng} mu_n h_n.N_u anh ta th_c h_in m_{nh} e_o c_a m_{nh} g_i các n_ui qu_c c_a h_n V_n binh Qu_c gia kh_{ng} c_o c_t tôn tr_{ng} t_o các qu_c c_a h_n này sang t_u bang kh_{ac} mà kh_{ng} có s_d_{ng} y c_a t_u bang ó, ch_c ch_n s_o có ki_n t_{ng}.Và ó là m_t n_u t_t b_i v_i s_o thay th_i là m_t cu_c n_u tr_c t_op.T_t c_o quy_n c_o b_o o. Truy_cp WebSite terms c_a ch_{ng} tôi v_i UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tinh s_n có c_a b_o ng m_m NPR có th_i kh_{ac} nhau.V_n b_n b_o ng m_m có th_i c_a s_o i s_o a m_{nh} h_oc kh_p c_p nh_t v_i âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có th_i c_a ch_n s_o sau khi phát sóng h_oc xu_t b_n ban n_u.H_u s_o có th_i m_m quy_n c_a ch_{ng} trình NPR, là b_n ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: So as we just heard there, President Trump seems to be asking or trying to pressure Governor Pritzker into asking Trump to send in the Guard. Why would he do that? Is that an acknowledgment that the president does not have the authority to send troops where they are not welcome? VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.

MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state

National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Vì vậy, nh^ó chúng ta v^a nghe n^ó, T^{ang} th^{ang} Trump d^{ang} nh^ó lang yêu c^u ho^c c^u g^{ang} g^{ay} áp l^c cho Th^{ang} c^u Pritzker yêu c^u Trump gⁱ trong b^o v^a. Tⁱ sao anh ta l^am n^ó? C^ó phⁱ i l^ó là m^t t^s th^a nhⁿ r^{ang} th^{ang} kh^{ong} có th^m quyⁿ gⁱ qu^{ân} n^ó i mà h^ó kh^{ong} n^ó c ch^{ào} n^{ón}? Vladeck: Tôi nghⁱ, ít nh^t, Michel, n^ó là m^t t^s nh^{ang} b^o r^{ang} th^{ang} s^o d^{ang} h^{an} r^t nh^u khⁱ gⁱ qu^{ân} n^ó i v^a i m^t t^{yêu} c^u t^u th^{ang} c^u. Michel, n^óng qu^{ên}, Th^{ang} c^u Pritzker có V^a binh Qu^c gia c^u a ri^êng minh, L^c n^óng V^a binh Qu^c gia Illinois, r^{ang} óng s^o n^óng c^u t^u do triⁿ khai n^óu óng nghⁱ r^{ang} các t^{inh} hu^{ng} n^óng b^o o n^óm. Nh^{ang} tôi nghⁱ nh^{ang} gⁱ anh v^a t^h c^u s^o c^u g^{ang} n^ó có n^óng c^u là, anh v^a t^h c^u s^o có th^m n^óng b^{án}h c^u a minh và n^ón nó kh^{ong}? Anh ta có th^m gⁱ qu^{ân} mà kh^{ong} s^o d^{ang} n^óo lu^t g^{ay} tranh c^{ai} n^ó và kh^{ong} có s^o n^óng ý c^u a th^{ang} n^óng c^u? L^ó th^m c^u s^o là m^t h^{an} n^ón mà chúng ta l^ang th^y trong tuⁿn này. V^a n^óu n^ó o n^óng nh^ó nh^ó i m^t t^{cái} gⁱ n^ó mà b^{án} b^{án} v^at vào n^óm 2020 khi t^{ang} th^{ang} d^{ang} vào các th^{ang} n^óng c^u th^{anh} thiⁿ n^ó gⁱ qu^{ân} t^u Washington, D.C., sau các c^uc b^{án}u t^{inh} c^u a George Floyd. Bây gi^u, b^{án} b^{án} t^u, rõ ràng, h^ó n^ó kh^{ong} n^ó i l^{âu}. N^ó là m^t t^{on} k^u l^{án} h^{áp} ph^{áp}, nh^ó chúng ta b^{án} t^u. Nh^{ang} b^{án} th^c hⁱⁿn nh^{ang} gⁱ v^a s^o thay n^ó i n^ó này n^ó i v^a i các th^{ang} n^óng c^u d^{ang} t^u p^{hu} h^{an}? Vladeck: Tôi nghⁱ r^{ang} nó th^c s^o t^u b^o trò chⁱ, Michel, v^a v^ac t^u t^c nh^{ang} n^óu n^ó này t^{ang} r^{ang} nh^ó th^{ang} nào. B^{án} b^{án} t^u, Th^{ang} c^u Landry, g^{ang} nh^ó Th^{ang} c^u Pritzker, là T^{ang} t^u n^ónh V^a binh Qu^c gia c^u a ch^{ính} óng, L^c n^óng V^a binh Qu^c gia Louisiana. N^óu có n^ó, b^{án} b^{án} t^u, v^a lu^t ph^{áp} v^a r^{ang} l^{ón} New Orleans n^ó b^{án} minh nh^u h^{an} là m^t ph^{an} n^óng th^c thiⁿ ph^{áp} lu^t th^{ông} th^{ang}, Th^{ang} c^u Landry kh^{ong} c^un T^{ang} th^{ang} Trump. Anh ta có th^m t^u l^am n^óu n^ó. V^a vì v^a y tôi nghⁱ r^{ang} nh^{ang} gⁱ ch^{úng} ta th^c s^o th^y, Michel, là r^t t^{nh}u nh^u nh^u h^{át} trong m^t ph^{an} c^u a ch^{ính} quyⁿ Trump, n^ó i mà nó l^ang c^u g^{ang} tr^{ong} g^{ang} nh^ó n^ó là v^a c^u t^{inh} cho các t^{inh} hu^{ng} có nh^u b^{án} ph^{áp} kh^{ac} ph^{ac} n^ó a ph^{an} h^{an}, n^óng c^u gⁱ quy^t h^{áp} ph^{áp} h^{an} nh^u n^óu h^{an} th^c s^o b^o n^óm cho h^{an}. B^{án} b^{án} v^at m^t t^{cái} dài. V^a nó r^t, l^oi, thú v^a và r^t t^{chi} t^t v^a nh^{ang} gⁱ con n^óng h^{áp} ph^{áp} có th^m T^{ang} th^{ang} th^c s^o n^ó a V^a binh Qu^c gia n^óng nh^{ang} n^ó i mà m^t i ng^u i kh^{ong} muⁿ h^{an}, ho^c các th^{ang} n^óng c^u, các quan ch^cc n^ó kh^{ong} muⁿ h^{an}. V^a v^ay, có hai con n^óng, Michel. V^a v^ay, n^óu tiên là m^t trong nh^{ang} ch^{úng} tôi n^ó i nói v^a m^t t^{vài} ph^{út} tr^{ang}, n^ó là li^ên bang h^{oa} L^c n^óng V^a binh Qu^c gia, v^a v^ay nh^{ang} gⁱ T^{ang} th^{ang} Trump n^ó c^u g^{ang} l^am n^ó

California. Bán biết đây, anh ta đã bắt mạt thám phán liên bang ■ San Francisco tát vào tháp. Nhưng gì Trump đang suy ngầm, Michel, là mạt mưu gì đó khó hiểu hơn. Bán đã cấp cho n việc sẵn sàng năm 2020 của quân ■ i Vận binh Quốc gia ngoài tulu bang ■ D.C. Michel, trong mạt bối cảnh mà họ không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quốc gia chia ■ Tông thống muốn quân ■ i quốc gia của họ. Và tôi nghĩ rằng ■ m quan trọng ■ đây là nơi chúng ta ■ trong lãnh thổ chia ■ c khám phá, ■ u thung ■ c đã c giao s ■ dng thám quy ■ n đó ■ ghi, ví dụ, Lực lượng Vận binh Quốc gia Texas vào mạt tulu bang không muốn họ. Nhu anh ta tháp hìn m ■ e d ■ a minh ■ ghi các ■ i quân Vận binh Quốc gia không ■ c tôn trọng ■ các quốc gia này sang tulu bang khác mà không có s ■ mng ý chia tulu bang ■ ó, ch ■ c ch ■ n s ■ có k ■ n t ■ ng. Và ■ ó là mạt ■ u t ■ t b ■ i vì s ■ thay th ■ là mạt cu ■ c ■ i ■ u tr ■ c t ■ p. T ■ t c ■ quy ■ n ■ c b ■ o ■ u. Truy cập WebSiteterms ■ a chúng tôi ■ UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính ■ n có ■ a b ■ ng ■ m NPR có th ■ khác nhau. ■ n b ■ n b ■ ng ■ m có th ■ ■ ■ c s ■ a ■ i ■ s ■ a ■ i ho ■ c kh ■ p c ■ p nh ■ t v ■ âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th ■ ■ ■ c ch ■ nh s ■ a sau khi phát sóng ho ■ c xu ■ t b ■ n ban ■ u. H ■ s ■ có th ■ m quy ■ n ■ a ch ■ ng trình NPR, là ■ n ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week. MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors? VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them. MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them. VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast

or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ, ít nhất Michel, nó là một số người trong Tổng thống sẽ giúp quân hàn rết nhau và một yêu cầu là Thống đốc Michel, đang quên, Thống đốc Pritzker có Vệ binh Quốc gia của riêng mình, Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia Illinois, đang ông sẽ không do triễn khai nếu ông nghĩ rằng các tỉnh hung hăng bao gồm. Nhưng tôi nghĩ những gì anh ấy thắc sẽ có gì có thể là, anh ấy có thể có bánh của mình và nó không? Anh ta có thể giải quyết mà không số đông số lượng gây tranh cãi nó và không có số lượng ý của thống đốc? Đó là một hòn đảo mà chúng ta đang thấy trong tuần này. Và như nó đang nhỉ i một cái gì đó mà bạn đã viết vào năm 2020 khi Tổng thống Obama vào các tháng thân thiện với quân đội Washington, D.C., sau các cuộc biểu tình của George Floyd. Bây giờ, bạn biết, rõ ràng, họ đã không lâu. Đó là một tình huống khác. D.C. là một con kền lân pháp, nhưng chúng ta biết. Nhưng họ có gì thay đổi này? Vì các tháng nào? Tại sao, Michel, bạn viết, Thống đốc Landry, đang nhận Thống đốc Pritzker, là Tổng tư lệnh Vệ binh Quốc gia chính ông, Vệ binh Quốc gia Louisiana. Nếu có, bạn biết, vô luật pháp và tại least New Orleans bịt minh như hiện là một phần của thi pháp luật thông thường, Thống đốc Landry không còn Tổng thống Trump. Anh ta có thể làm điều đó. Vì vì vậy tôi nghĩ rằng những gì chúng ta thấy, Michel, là một nhà hát trong một phần của chính quyền Trump, nói mà nó đang cố gắng trống ngực nó là về tình cho các tỉnh hung hăng có nhu cầu bịt minh pháp khác phái của phái hung hàn, của giới quý tộc pháp hung hàn nhu cầu họ thắc số bao gồm cho họ. Bạn đã viết một cái dài. Vì nó rất, lời, thú vị và rất chi tiết và những gì con đang học pháp có thể Tổng thống thắc số là Vệ binh Quốc gia số những nói mà mai ngày không muốn họ, hoặc các tháng sốc, các quan chức số không muốn họ. Vì vậy, có hai con sống, Michel. Vì vậy, sốu tiên là một trong những chúng tôi đã nói về một vài phút trước, Đó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy những gì Tổng thống Trump đã cố gắng làm California. Bạn biết, anh ta đã bắt đầu phán liên bang San Francisco tắt vào tháng ba. Nhưng gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một điều gì đó khó hiểu hiện. Bạn đã sốp sốn viết số dảng năm 2020 của quân sối Vệ binh Quốc gia ngoài tịu bang D.C. Michel, trong một bài cảnh báo không liên kết hóa, trong số 11 quốc gia chỉ số Tổng thống sốn quân sối quốc gia của họ. Và tôi nghĩ rằng sốm quan trọng sốay là nói chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chia sốc khám phá, sốu thông sốc sối cố gắng sốm quyển sốo ghi, ví dụ, Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tịu bang không muốn họ. Nếu anh ta thắc hìn sối để sốa của mình sối các sối quân Vệ binh Quốc gia không sốc tôn trọng số các quốc gia này sang tịu bang khác mà không có số lượng ý của tịu bang đó, chia chia sối có kinh tịng. Và sốo là một điều tôi biết vì sối thay thế là một cuộc sối sốu tịp. Tất cả quyển sốc bao lùu. Truy cập WebSite terms của chúng tôi và UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sốn có của bao lùm NPR có thắc khác nhau. Bạn biết bao lùm có thắc sốc sốa sối sốa sối hoa c khía c sốp nhết sối âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thắc sốc chia sốa sau khi phát sóng hoa c xuôi ban sốu. Họ sối có thắc quyển sốa chia sống trình NPR, là bao lùm ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: I think, at the very least, Michel, it is a concession that it's a lot easier legally for the president to send in troops with a request from the governor. Michel, let's not forget, Governor Pritzker has his own National Guard, the Illinois National Guard, that he would be free to deploy if he thought the circumstances warrant it. President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.

MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this

is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them. MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them. VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ, ít nhất, Michel, nó là một số người bạn trong Tống thống số giờ quân hòn rết nhau và một yêu cầu là Thống đốc Michel, sống quên, Thống đốc Pritzker có Vùng binh Quốc gia của riêng mình, Lực lượng Vùng binh Quốc gia Illinois, trong ông số những tay do triễn khai nhu ônghing các tình huống khác bao gồm. Nhưng tôi nghĩ rằng gì anh ấy thắc số c gì có thể có là, anh ấy thắc số có thể là bánh của mình và là nó không? Anh ta có thể giải quân mà không số đang số lutt gây tranh cãi đó và không có số sống ý của Thống đốc? Đó thắc số là một hòn sốn mà chúng ta đang thấy trong tuần này. Và như là ó dường như nh i m t cái gì đó mà b n ã viết vào năm 2020 khi Tống thống đã vào các thành thân thin g i quân tại Washington, D.C., sau các cuộc biểu tình của George Floyd. Bây giờ, b n biết, rõ ràng, h ã không là một tình huống khác. D.C. là một con k lân hợp pháp, nh chung ta biết. Nhưng b n thắc h ãn nh ng gì và số thay đổi này i viết các thành sốc đ t p thu h ñn? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rằng nó thắc số t b trò chơi, Michel, v viết t t c nh ng sốu này trong rằng nh th nào. B n biết sốy, Thống đốc Landry, giải nh Thống đốc Pritzker, là Tống t nh Vùng binh Quốc gia của chính ông, Vùng binh Quốc gia Louisiana. Sốu có số, b n biết sốy, vô lutt pháp và i lo n New Orleans số b n minh nh iu h ñn là một phần trong thi pháp lutt thông th ñng, Thống đốc Landry không c n Tống th ñng Trump. Anh ta có th t làm sốu đó. Và vì vậy tôi nghĩ rằng nh ng gì chung ta thắc số thấy, Michel, là r t nh iu nh à hát trong một phần của chính quyền Trump, n i mà nó mang c g ng trong g ng nh ó là v c u tình cho các tình huống có nh iu b n pháp kh c ph c a ph c h n, sốc giải quyết hợp pháp h n nh iu n u h thắc số b o sốm cho h . B n ã viết một cái dài. Và nó r t, lo i, thú v và r t chi t v nh ng gì con sống hợp pháp có th Tống th ñng thắc số a Vùng binh Quốc gia sốn nh ng n i mà m i ng i không mu n h , ho c các th ng sốc, các quan ch c số kh ng mu n h . Vì v y, có hai con sống, Michel. Vì v y, sốu tiên là một trong nh ng chung tôi ã nói v m t vài phút trước, số là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Vùng binh Quốc gia, vì v y nh ng gì Tống th ñng Trump ã c g ng làm California. B n biết sốy, anh ta ã b m t th m phán liên bang San Francisco tát vào th ba. Nhưng gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là m t sốu gi ó kh ó iu h ñn. B n ã sốp sốn viết số d ng năm 2020 c a quân sối Vùng binh Quốc gia ngoài t u bang D.C.

Michel, trong m t b i c nh m  h  kh ng li n k t h o , trong  o 11 qu c gia ch  T ng th ng m n qu n i qu c gia c a h . V  t i ngh  r ng m n quan tr ng  y l  n i ch ng ta trong l nh th  ch a c c kh m ph , n u th ng c c g ng s  d ng th m quy n  o g i, v  d , L c h ng V  binh Qu c gia Texas v o m t t u bang kh ng mu n h . N u anh ta th c h n m i e c a c a minh g i c c i qu n V  binh Qu c gia kh ng c c t n tr ng c c qu c gia n y sang t u bang kh c m  kh ng c  s ng y c a t u bang  o, ch c ch n s  c  k n t ng. V   o l  m t m u t t b i v i s  th y th  l  m t cu c c u tr c t p. T t c  quy n c c b o h u. Truy c p WebSitemterms c a ch ng t i v  UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR TH NG TIN TH M.Accuracy v  t nh s n c a b ng m n NPR c  th  kh c nhau. V n b n b ng m m c  th  c c s a c i s a i ho c kh p c p nh t v i  m thanh.  m thanh tr n npr.org c  th  c c ch nh s a sau khi p t s ng ho c xu t b n ban h u. H  s  c  th m quy n c a ch ng tr nh NPR, l  b n ghi  m thanh.

President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websitemterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

T ng th ng Trump c  th  c u xin m t s  c  quan c  v  kh ng th ng xuy n s  d ng, m t m o lu t c c g i l  m o lu t n i d y, v  d , c  g i qu n i m  kh ng c  s ng y c a th ng c c. Nh ng t i ngh  nh ng g i anh y th c s  c  g ng c  c c l , anh y th c s  c  th n b nh c a minh v  n o kh ng? Anh ta c  th  g i qu n m  kh ng s  d ng m o lu t

gây tranh cãi ■ó và không có s■■ng ý c■a th■ng ■■c?■ó th■c s■ là m■ h■n ■■n mà chúng ta ■ang th■y trong tu■n này.Và ■■u ■ó d■ng nh■ i m■t cái gì ■ó mà b■n ■ã vi■t vào n■m 2020 khi t■ng th■ng d■a vào các th■ng ■■c thân thi■n ■■ g■i quân t■i Washington, D.C., sau các cu■c b■u tình c■a George Floyd.Bây gi■, b■n b■t, rõ ràng, h■ ■ã không ■■i lâu.■ là m■t tình hu■ng khác.D.C. là m■t con k■ lân h■p pháp, nh■ chúng ta b■t.Nh■ng b■n th■c h■n nh■ng gi■ v■ s■ thay ■■i này ■■i v■i các th■ng ■■c d■ t■p thu h■n? Vladeck: Tôi ngh■ r■ng nó th■c s■ t■ b■ trò ch■i, Michel, v■ v■c t■t c■ nh■ng ■■u này tr■ng r■ng nh■ th■ nào.B■n b■t ■■y, Th■ng ■■c Landry, gi■ng nh■ Th■ng ■■c Pritzker, là T■ng t■ m■nh V■ binh Qu■c gia c■a chính ông, V■ binh Qu■c gia Louisiana.N■u có ■■, b■n b■t ■■y, vô lu■t pháp và ■■i lo■n ■ New Orleans ■■ b■n minh nh■u h■n là m■t ph■n ■ng th■c thi pháp lu■t thông th■ng, Th■ng ■■c Landry không c■n T■ng th■ng Trump.Anh ta có th■ t■ làm ■■u ■ó.Và vì v■y tôi ngh■ r■ng nh■ng gi■ chúng ta th■c s■ th■y, Michel, là ■■t nh■u nh  hát trong m■t ph■n c■a chính quy■n Trump, n■i mà nó ■ang c■ g■ng trông gi■ng nh■ ■ó là v■ c■u tinh cho các tình hu■ng có nh■u b■n ph p kh c ph c ■■a ph ng h■n, ■■c gi■i quy■t h■p ph p h■n nh■u n■u h■ th■c s■ b■o ■■m cho h■.B■n ■ã vi■t m■t cái dài.Và nó r■t, lo■i, thú v■ và ■■t chi t■t v■ nh■ng gi■ con ■■ng h■p ph p có th■ ■■ T■ng th■ng th■c s■ ■■a V■ binh Qu■c gia ■■n nh■ng n■i mà m■i ng■i không mu■n h■, ho■c các th■ng ■■c, các quan ch■c ■■ó kh ng mu■n h■.Vì v■y, có hai con ■■ng, Michel.Vì v■y, ■■u ti■n là m■t trong nh■ng chúng tôi ■ã nói v■ m■t vài ph t tr■c, ■ó là li n bang h o  L■c ■■ng V■ binh Qu■c gia, v■ v■y nh■ng gi■ T■ng th■ng Trump ■ã c■ g■ng l m ■ California.B■n b■t ■■y, anh ta ■ã b■ m■t th■m ph n li n bang ■ San Francisco t t vào th■ ba.Nh■ng gi■ Trump ■ang suy ng■m, Michel, là m■t ■■u gi■ ■ó kh  h■u h■n.B■n ■ã ■■ c p ■■n vi c s■ d■ng n■m 2020 c■a qu n ■■i V■ binh Qu■c gia ngo i t u bang ■ D.C. Michel, trong m■t bli c nh mà h■ kh ng li n k t h o , trong ■ó 11 qu■c gia ch■ ■■ T■ng th■ng m■■n qu n ■■i qu■c gia c■a h■.Và tôi ngh■ r■ng ■■m quan tr■ng ■■y l  n■i chúng ta ■■ trong l nh th■ ch■a ■■c kh m ph , n■u th■ng ■■c ■■i c■ g■ng s■ d■ng th■m quy■n ■ó ■■ g■i, v i d■, L■c ■■ng V■ binh Qu■c gia Texas vào m■t t u bang kh ng mu■n h■.N■u anh ta th■c h■n m■i e d■a c■a m nh ■■ g■i các ■■i qu n V■ binh Qu■c gia kh ng ■■c t n tr■ng t■ các qu■c gia n y sang t u bang kh c mà kh ng c  s■ ■■ng y c■a t u bang ■ó, ch c ch n s■ c o ki n t ng.Và ■ó l  m■t ■■u t t b■i v i s■ thay th■ l  m■t cu■c ■■i ■■u t c t p.T t c■ quy■n ■■c b o ■■u.Truy c p WebSiteTerms c■a chúng tôi v■ UseAnDperPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN TH M.Accuracy và t nh s■n c  c a b ng ■■m NPR c  th■ kh c nhau.V n b n b ng ■■m c  th■ ■■c s■a ■■i ■■ s a ■■i ho■c kh p c p nh t v i âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org c  th■ ■■c ch nh s a sau khi ph t s ng ho■c xu t b n ban ■■u.H■ s■ c  th■m quy■n c■a ch ng tr nh NPR, l  b n ghi âm thanh.

President Trump could invoke some old and not often used authorities, a statute known as the Insurrection Act, for example, to send in troops without the governor's consent. But I think what he's really trying to get at is, can he actually have his cake and eat it, too? Can he send in troops without using that controversial statute and without the governor's consent? That's really the mess that we're seeing this week.MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago,

which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website terms of use and permissions pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

T^ung th^ung Trump c^ó th^u c^hu xin m^ut s^o c^h quan c^h và kh^ong th^ung xuy^{en} s^o a^{ng}, m^ut s^o lu^ut c^h gⁱ là s^o lu^ut n^oi d^uy, vⁱ d^u, c^h gⁱ qu^an c^h i mà kh^ong c^ó s^o c^hng ý c^ha th^ung c^hac. Nh^ong t^oi ngh^o nh^ong gⁱ anh c^h y th^uc s^o c^h g^ong c^h có c^hac l^o, anh c^h y th^uc s^o c^h có th^u n b^{anh} c^ha minh và n^o kh^ong? Anh ta c^ó th^u gⁱ qu^an mà kh^ong s^o d^ung s^o o lu^ut g^{ay} tranh c^{ai} l^o và kh^ong c^ó s^o c^hng ý c^ha th^ung c^hac? ó th^uc s^o là m^u h^{an} n^oln mà ch^ung ta s^oang th^uy trong tu^un n^oay. V^a s^oiu s^o d^ung nh^o nh^o i m^ut c^{ai} gⁱ l^o mà b^{an} s^oã vi^ut v^ao n^om 2020 k^{hi} t^ung th^ung d^ua v^ao c^{ac} th^ung c^hac th^un s^o gⁱ qu^an t^ui Washington, D.C., sau c^{ac} cu^uc b^{an} tinh c^ha George Floyd. B^{ay} g^{ia}, b^{an} bi^ut, r^or^{ang}, h^{an} s^oã kh^ong s^o i l^{au}. ó l^o là m^ut tinh hu^ung kh^oac. D.C. l^à m^ut con k^u l^{an} h^up ph^{ap}, nh^o ch^ung ta b^{an} t^u. Nh^ong b^{an} th^uc h^{an} nh^ong gⁱ vⁱ s^o thay c^hia n^oay c^hia vⁱ các th^ung c^hac d^u t^up thu h^{an}? Vladeck: T^ui ngh^o r^{ang} n^o th^uc s^o t^u b^{an} tr^o ch^ui, Michel, vⁱ vⁱc t^ut c^hia nh^ong s^oiu này tr^ong r^{ang} nh^o th^un n^oo. B^{an} b^{an} s^oay, Th^ung c^hac Landry, g^{ia}ng nh^o Th^ung c^hac Pritzker, l^à T^ung t^unh V^a binh Qu^ac gia c^ha ch^{inh} óng, V^a binh Qu^ac gia Louisiana. N^ou c^ó s^o, b^{an} bi^ut s^oay, v^o lu^ut ph^{ap} v^a r^oi lo^un New Orleans s^o b^{an} minh nh^ou h^{an} l^à m^ut ph^{an} s^ong th^uc thi ph^{ap} lu^ut th^ong th^ung, Th^ung c^hac Landry kh^ong c^hia T^ung th^ung Trump. Anh ta c^ó th^u t^u làm s^oiu s^oó. V^a vⁱ vⁱy t^oi ngh^o r^{ang} nh^ong gⁱ ch^ung ta th^uc s^o th^uy, Michel, l^à r^ot nh^ou nh^ou h^{at} trong m^ut ph^{an} c^ha ch^{inh} quy^un Trump, n^oi mà n^o l^à s^oang c^hia g^ong tr^ong gi^ung nh^o l^o là vⁱ c^hu tinh cho c^{ac} tinh hu^ung c^ó nh^ou b^{an} ph^{ap} kh^oc ph^{ac} c^ha ph^{an} h^{an}, s^oc gⁱ qu^at h^up ph^{ap} h^{an} nh^ou n^ou h^{an} th^uc s^o b^{ao} s^om cho h^{an}. B^{an} s^oã vi^ut m^ut c^{ai} dài. V^a n^o r^ot, lo^ui, thú vⁱ và m^ut chi t^ut vⁱ nh^ong gⁱ con s^ong h^up ph^{ap} có th^u T^ung th^ung th^uc s^o c^ha V^a binh Qu^ac gia n^ong n^oi mà m^ui ng^oi kh^ong mu^un h^{an}, hoc các th^ung c^hac, các quan ch^uc l^o kh^ong mu^un h^{an}. Vⁱ vⁱy, có hai con s^ong, Michel. Vⁱ vⁱy, s^oiu ti^un l^à m^ut trong nh^ong ch^ung t^oi s^oã n^oi vⁱ m^ut vⁱ ph^{ut} tr^oc, s^o là li^u bang h^{oa} L^oc t^ung V^a binh Qu^ac gia, vⁱ vⁱy nh^ong gⁱ T^ung th^ung Trump s^oã c^hia g^ong l^à California. B^{an} bi^ut s^oay, anh ta s^oã b^{an} m^ut th^um ph^{an} li^u bang San Francisco t^{at} v^ao th^u ba. Nh^ong gⁱ Trump s^oang su^u ng^om, Michel, l^à m^ut s^oiu gⁱ l^o kh^ong h^{an} h^{an}. B^{an} s^oã c^hia c^hap s^on vⁱc s^o d^ung n^om 2020 c^ha qu^an c^hia V^a binh Qu^ac gia ngo^u t^uu bang D.C. Michel, trong m^ut b^{an} c^hia nh^o mà h^{an} kh^ong li^u k^hát h^{oa}, trong l^o 11 qu^ac gia ch^u c^hia T^ung th^ung m^un qu^an c^hia qu^ac gia c^ha h^{an}. V^a t^oi ngh^o r^{ang} s^om quan tr^ong l^{ay} l^à n^oi ch^ung ta c^hia trong l^{an} th^uc c^hia khám ph^{ap}, n^ou th^ung c^hia s^oã c^hia g^ong s^ong th^um quy^un l^o c^hia, vⁱ d^u, L^oc t^ung V^a binh Qu^ac gia Texas v^ao m^ut t^uu bang kh^ong mu^un h^{an}. N^ou anh ta th^uc h^{an} m^ui le d^ua c^ha minh c^hia các c^hia qu^an V^a binh Qu^ac gia kh^ong c^hia tôn tr^ong t^u các qu^ac gia n^oay sang t^uu bang kh^oac mà kh^ong c^ó s^ong ý c^ha t^uu bang l^o, ch^uc ch^un s^o có k^hin t^ung. V^a l^o là m^ut s^oiu t^ut b^{an} vì s^o thay th^uc l^à m^ut cu^uc c^hia t^uu tr^oc. T^ut c^hia quy^un c^hia b^{ao} s^ou. Truy c^hap WebSite terms c^hia ch^ung t^oi vⁱ UseAnDperPermissionsPages AT WWW.NPR.ORG FOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính s^on có c^hia b^{ao} s^om NPR có th^u khác nhau. V^an b^{an} b^{ao} s^om có th^u c^hac s^ola c^hia s^ola h^oc kh^op c^hap nh^ot vⁱ âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th^u c^hac ch^{inh} s^ola sau khi phát sóng h^oc xu^ut b^{an} s^ou. H^os^o có th^u m^ung c^hia ch^ung trình NPR, là b^{an} ghi âm

thanhs.

MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.

MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.

VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.

MARTIN: Yeah.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.

là liên bang hóa L^cng V^c binh Qu^cgia, vì v^y nh^{ng} gⁱ T^{ng} th^{ng} Trump ^ā c^o g^{ng} làm California.Bⁿ b^t y, anh ta ^ā b^c m^t th^m phán liên bang San Francisco tát vào th^b ba.Nh^{ng} gⁱ Trump ^{ang} suy ng^m, Michel, là m^t i^u gⁱ ^ó khó h^un. Bⁿ ^ā c^p n^vc s^d ng n^m 2020 c^a quân i^l V^c binh Qu^cgia ngo^{ai} t^u bang D.C. Michel, trong m^t bⁱ cⁿh mà h^c kh^{ng} li^{en} k^t h^oa, trong ^ó 11 qu^cgia ch^c T^{ng} th^{ng} m^cn quân i^l qu^cgia c^a h^c.Và tôi nghⁱ r^{ng} m^cm quan tr^{ng} ^ā y là nⁱ ch^{ng} ta trong l^{nh} th^c ch^a c^c khám phá, n^u th^{ng} c^a g^{ng} s^c d^{ng} th^m quyⁿ ^ó gⁱ, ví d^c, L^cng V^c binh Qu^cgia Texas vào m^t t^u bang kh^{ng} muⁿ h^c.N^u anh ta th^c h^{ln} mⁱ e o^a c^a minh gⁱ các i^l qu^cgia V^c binh Qu^cgia kh^{ng} c^cc tôn tr^{ng} ^c các qu^cgia này sang t^u bang khác mà kh^{ng} có s^c ng^y c^a t^u bang ^ó, ch^cc chⁿ s^c có kⁱn t^{ng}.Và ^ó là m^t i^u t^t bⁱ vì s^c thay th^c là m^t cu^c i^l u tr^c t^{ip}.T^t c^u quyⁿ c^cb^o u.Truy c^p WebSiteterms c^a ch^{ng} t^oi v^c UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÈM.Accuracy và tính s^cn có c^a b^cng m^cNPR có th^c khác nhau.Vⁿ bⁿ b^{ng} m^c có th^c c^cs^a i^l s^a i^l ho^c kh^{cp} nh^t v^c âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có th^c c^cchⁿ s^a sau khi phát sóng ho^c xu^t bⁿ ban u.H^c s^c có th^m quyⁿ c^a ch^{ng} tr^{ng} NPR, là bⁿ ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: So then the president mentioned the possibility of sending Guard forces to New Orleans, which Louisiana's Republican governor seemed to welcome. And that seems to recall something that you wrote about back in 2020 when the president relied upon friendly governors to send troops to Washington, D.C., in the wake of the George Floyd protests. Now, you know, obviously, they didn't stay for long. It was a different situation. D.C. is a legal unicorn, as we know. But what do you make of this shift to more receptive governors?VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Vì v^y, t^{ng} th^{ng} ^ā c^p n^k n^{ng} gⁱ l^cng b^o v^c n^m New Orleans, mà th^{ng} c^cng C^{ng} hòa c^a Louisiana d^{ng} nh^c hoan nghênh.Và ^ā u ^ó d^{ng} nh^c nh^c i^m t^cái gⁱ ^ó mà bⁿ ^ā v^t vào n^m 2020 khi t^{ng} th^{ng} d^a vào các th^cng c^cthân th^cn gⁱ quân i^l Washington, D.C., sau các cu^c bi^u tinh c^a George

Floyd.Bây giờ, bạn biết, rõ ràng, họ đã không đợi lâu. Đó là một tình huống khác.D.C. là một con kê lân hợp pháp, nhưng chúng ta biết.Nhưng bạn think họ nghĩ gì và sao thay đổi này với các things like this thu hút? Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rằng nó thực sự là trò chơi, Michel, và việc đó có nghĩa là điều này trong rằng nó là gì?Bạn biết vậy, Thống đốc Landry, cũng như Thống đốc Pritzker, là Tổng tư lệnh Quốc gia của chính ông, Lực lượng Quốc binh Quốc gia Louisiana.Nó có thể, bạn biết vậy, vô luật pháp và rất lớn ở New Orleans là binh minh như họ là một phần trong thi pháp luật thông thường, Thống đốc Landry không cần Tổng thống Trump.Anh ta có thể làm điều đó.Và vì vậy tôi nghĩ rằng những gì chúng ta thấy Michel, là một người nhà hát trong một phần của chính quyền Trump, mà nó đang cố gắng trông giống nhau là vẫn còn tình cho các tình huống có nhu cầu binh pháp khác phascia phải hàn, đặc biệt là quy định pháp hàn nhu cầu họa binh súng bão để cho họ.Bạn đã viết một cái dài.Và nó rất, tôi, thú vị và rất chi tiết về những gì con người pháp có thể làm Tổng thống thống kê sau Quốc binh Quốc gia là những gì mà mà tôi nghĩ không muốn họ, hoặc các things like, các quan chức không muốn họ.Vì vậy, có hai con người, Michel.Vì vậy, đầu tiên là một trong những chúng tôi đã nói về một vài phút trước, đó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Quốc binh Quốc gia, vì vậy những gì Tổng thống Trump đã cố gắng làm ở California.Bạn biết vậy, anh ta đã bị một thẩm phán liên bang ở San Francisco bắt vào tháng ba.Nhưng gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một người gì đó khó hiểu họ.Bạn đã cấp cho tôi viết tháng 2020 của quân đội Quốc binh Quốc gia ngoài thành phố D.C.Michel, trong một bài cảnh báo mà họ không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quốc gia chịu Tổng thống mìn quân đội quốc gia của họ.Và tôi nghĩ rằng làm quan trọng nhất là những gì chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chia sẻ có khám phá, như tháng trước đây có những quy định đó là giải, ví dụ, Lực lượng Quốc binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tiểu bang không muốn họ.Nó anh ta thích họ ở đây để họ có một mình là giải các quốc gia Quốc binh Quốc gia không có quốc gia tôn trọng các quốc gia này sang tiểu bang khác mà không có sự đồng ý của tiểu bang đó, chia cắt sẽ có kinh nghiệm.Và đó là một điều tôi biết vì sao thay đổi là một cuộc chiến đấu trại.Tất cả quy định quốc gia bao nhiêu.Truy cập WebSiteterms của chúng tôi về UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tính sẵn có của bảng làm NPR có thể khác nhau.Và bạn biết làm có thể có những điều gì họ có khép kín để họ có nhặt và âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể có những điều gì sau khi phát sóng họ có xu hướng ban hành.Họ có thể có những điều gì của chương trình NPR, là bạn ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure.You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms

of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rằng nó thắc sỗt bỗt trò chơi, Michel, và mặc dù trong rằng cõa tột cùng không của bạn này.Bạn biết vậy, Thống đốc Landry, rằng nhõ Thống đốc Pritzker, là Tổng thống Võ binh Quốc gia của chính ông, Võ binh Quốc gia Louisiana.Nó có thể, bạn biết vậy, vô luật pháp và rồi loan New Orleans bịn minh nhõu hồn là một phần trong thõc thi pháp luật thông thường, Thống đốc Landry không cần Tổng thống Trump.Anh ta có thể làm điều đó.Và vì vậy tôi nghĩ rằng nhõng gì chúng ta thắc sỗt vậy, Michel, là rất nhõu nhà hát trong một phần cõa chính quyền Trump, mà nó đang cố gắng trông giống nhõ nó là Võ cõu tinh cho các tình huống có nhõu bịn pháp khõc phõc của phõng hồn, cõi gõi quyết pháp hồn nhõu nõu hõt thắc sỗt bõo cõm cho hõ.Bạn đã viết một cái dài.Và nó rất, lời, thú vị và rất chí tõt võ nhõng gì con cõng hõp pháp có thể là Tổng thống thắc sỗt a Võ binh Quốc gia cõn nhõng nõi mà mõi ngõi không muñn hõt, hoặc các thõng cõc, các quan chõc cõo không muñn hõt.Vì vậy, có hai con cõng, Michel.Vì vậy, cõu tiên là một trong nhõng chúng tôi đã nói võ một vài phút trước, nó là liên bang hóa Lõc Tổng Võ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy nhõng gì Tổng thống Trump đã cố gắng làm California.Bạn biết vậy, anh ta đã bõt thõm phán liên bang San Francisco tát vào thõt ba.Nhõng gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một cõu giõ khõ hõu hõt.Bạn đã cõp cõn vĩc sỗt cõng nõm 2020 cõa quân cõi Võ binh Quốc gia ngoài tõu bang D.C. Michel, trong một bõi cõnh mà hõt không liên kết hóa, trong cõo 11 quõc gia chõ Tổng thống mõn quân cõi quõc gia cõa hõt.Và tôi nghĩ rằng cõm quan trõng cõay là nõi chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chõa cõnh khám phá, nõu thõng cõc đã cõg sỗt cõng thõm quyến rõ gõi, ví dõ, Lõc Tổng Võ binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tõu bang không muñn hõt.Nõu anh ta thắc hõn mõi lõe cõa cõa mình cõi gõi các cõi quân Võ binh Quốc gia không cõnh tôn trõng cõ các quõc gia này sang tõu bang khác mà không có sõng ý cõa tõu bang cõo, chõc chõn sõt có kõn tõng.Và nó là một cõu tõt bõi vi sõt thay thõt là một cõu tõt cõi cõu tõt cõp.Tõt cõ quyến cõc bõo hõu.Truy cõp WebSiteTerms cõa chúng tôi võ UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tính sõn có cõa bõng cõm NPR có thõt khác nhau.Võn bõn bõng cõm có thõt cõc sõa cõi sõa lõi hõc khõp cõp nhõt või âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có thõt cõc chõnh sõa sau khi phát sóng hõc xuõt bõn ban cõu.Hõt sõt có thõm quyến cõa chõng trình NPR, là bõn ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: I think it really gives up the game, Michel, on how empty all of this is. You know, Governor Landry, like Governor Pritzker, is the commander-in-chief of his own state National Guard, the Louisiana National Guard. If there were enough, you know, lawlessness and disorder in New Orleans to justify more than just an ordinary law enforcement response, Governor Landry doesn't need President Trump. He can do it himself. And so I think what we're really seeing, Michel, is a lot of theater on the part of the Trump administration, where it's trying to look like it is the savior for situations that have far more local, far more legally settled remedies if they actually warrant them.MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure.You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It

will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rằng nó thắc sỗn bỗn trò chơi, Michel, và mặc dù trong rằng câu trả lời của tôi có nhung nhữn này.Bản chất này, Thống đốc Landry, đang nói Thống đốc Pritzker, là Tổng tư lệnh Vệ binh Quốc gia chính ông, Vệ binh Quốc gia Louisiana.Nó có thể, bạn biết đây, vô luật pháp và rồi loan New Orleans bịn minh nhữn hòn là một phần trong việc thi pháp luật thông thường, Thống đốc Landry không còn Tổng thống Trump.Anh ta có thể làm điều đó.Và vì vậy tôi nghĩ rằng nhung gì chúng ta thắc sỗn này, Michel, là rất nhiều nhà hát trong một phần của chính quyền Trump, nơi mà nó đang cố gắng trông giống nhau là về cung tình cho các tình huống có nhữn bịn pháp khác phaccia phong hòn, đặc biệt là quyết định pháp hòn nhữn nhữn hòn thắc sỗn bao gồm cho hòn.Bản thân vấn đề mâu thuẫn, thú vị và rất chí ít vẫn nhung gì con người hành pháp có thể là Tổng thống thắc sỗn của Vệ binh Quốc gia nhung nơi mà mọi người không muốn hòn, hoặc các thành phố, các quan chức nào không muốn hòn.Vì vậy, có hai con đường, Michel.Vì vậy, đầu tiên là một trong nhung chúng tôi đã nói về một vài phút trước, đó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy nhung gì Tổng thống Trump đã cố gắng làm California.Bản chất này, anh ta đã bắt đầu tham phán liên bang San Francisco tát vào tháng ba.Nhưng gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một điều gì đó khó hiểu hòn.Bản thân các cấp chính phủ năm 2020 của quân đội Vệ binh Quốc gia ngoài tìn bang D.C. Michel, trong một bối cảnh mà họ không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quốc gia chỉ có Tổng thống mìn quân đội quốc gia của họ.Và tôi nghĩ rằng điều quan trọng là đây là nơi chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chia sẻ khâm phá, như tháng trước đã có các giao kèo số đồng thời quyết định giao, ví dụ, Lực lượng Vệ binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tìn bang không muốn hòn.Nó anh ta thắc hòn mìn để đến cung minh với các quốc gia Vệ binh Quốc gia không có tôn trọng các quốc gia này sang tìn bang khác mà không có sự đồng ý của tìn bang đó, hoặc chia chia số có kinh tìn.Và đó là một điều tôi bối rối vì số thay thế là một cuộc chiến tìn trắc tiếp.Tất cả quyết định cung bộ lầu.Truy cập WebSiteTerms của chúng tôi và UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tính sẵn có của bản ghi nhớ của NPR có thể khác nhau.Và bản ghi nhớ có thể không chính xác và có thể không phản ánh实际情况.Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể không chính xác sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản dưới.Họ có thể quyết định chương trình NPR, là bản ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them.VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure.You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR

transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Vì vậy, hãy quay lại thay thế. Bạn đã viết một cái dài. Và nó rất, lời, thú vị và rất chi tiết về những gì con người pháp có thể làm. Tổng thống thắc mắc Võ binh Quốc gia không những nói mà mới nghĩ i không muốn họ, hoặc các thành viên, các quan chức đó không muốn họ. Vì vậy, có hai con đường, Michel. Vì vậy, trước tiên là một trong những chúng tôi đã nói về một vài phút trước, đó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Vũ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy những gì Tổng thống Trump đã có gắng làm ở California. Bạn biết đấy, anh ta đã bắt đầu phán liên bang ở San Francisco tát vào tháng ba. Những gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một điều gì đó khó hiểu hơn. Bạn đã cấp cho tôi viết tháng năm 2020 của quân đội Vũ binh Quốc gia ngoài tiểu bang D.C. Michel, trong một bài cảnh báo mà không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quốc gia chỉ có Tổng thống muốn quân đội quốc gia của họ. Và tôi nghĩ rằng tháng năm quan trọng nhất là nói chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chia sẻ có khám phá, như tháng trước đó là tháng năm 2020 của quân Vũ binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tiểu bang không muốn họ. Nếu anh ta thắc chắn mình sẽ giải quyết các vấn đề quân Vũ binh Quốc gia không có tôn trọng với các quốc gia này sang tiểu bang khác mà không có sự đồng ý của tiểu bang đó, chẳng hạn như có kiểm soát. Và đó là một điều tôi bắt bùi vì sẽ thay thế là một cách khác để truy cập. Tất cả quyền lực của bão lụt. Truy cập WebSiteTerms của chúng tôi và UseAnDperPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sẵn có của bao giờ cũng NPR có thể khác nhau. Bạn bao giờ cũng có thể không có ai sau khi phát sóng hoặc chụp ảnh với âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể không chính xác sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản sau. Họ có thể thay đổi chương trình NPR, là bao giờ âm thanh.

MARTIN: So let's go back to the Substack. You wrote a lengthy one. And it's very, sort of, interesting and very detailed about what might the legal path be for the president to actually send the National Guard into places that people don't want them, or the governors, the officials there don't want them. VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Vì vậy, hãy quay lại thay thế. Bạn đã viết một cái dài. Và nó rất, lời, thú vị và rất chi tiết về những gì con người pháp có thể làm. Tổng thống thắc mắc Võ binh Quốc gia không những nói mà mới nghĩ i không muốn họ, hoặc các thành viên, các quan chức đó không muốn họ. Vì vậy, có hai con đường, Michel. Vì vậy, trước tiên là một trong những chúng tôi đã nói về một vài phút trước, đó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Vũ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy những gì Tổng thống Trump đã có gắng làm ở California. Bạn biết đấy, anh ta đã bắt đầu phán liên bang ở San Francisco tát vào tháng ba. Những gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một điều gì đó khó hiểu hơn. Bạn đã cấp cho tôi viết tháng năm 2020 của quân đội Vũ binh Quốc gia ngoài tiểu bang D.C. Michel, trong một bài cảnh báo mà không liên kết hóa, trong đó

quốc gia chung. Tíng thng mìn quân i quốc gia cña h. Và tôi nghĩ rằng mìn quan trng nay là n i chúng ta trong lãnh th chia ckhám phá, n u thng c i g ng s dng thm quy n ó g i, ví d, Lc l ng V binh Quốc gia Texas vào mt tlu bang khong mu n h. N u anh ta th c hln m i e da c a minh g i các i quân V binh Quốc gia khong c tôn trng t các quốc gia này sang tlu bang khác mà khong có s ng ý c a tlu bang ó, ch c chn s có k ln tng. Và ó là mt tlu t t b i vì s thay th là mt cu c i tlu trc tlp. T t c quy n c b o u. Truy c p WebSiteterms c a chúng tôi v UseAnDperPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tính s n có c a b ng m NPR có th khac nhau.Vn b n b ng m có th c s a i s a i ho c kh p c p nh t v i âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th c chnh s a sau khi phát sóng ho c xu t b n ban u. H s có th m quy n c a chng trình NPR, là b n ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't

federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think

the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use

that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want

them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that

state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly

end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this

is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of

useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR

transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio.

Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Ph i. V i v y, c o hai con ng, Michel. V i v y, u ti n là mt trong nh ng chung t o i n n i v m t v i ph t tr c, ó là l ien bang h o a Lc l ng V binh Quốc gia, v i v y nh ng g Tíng thng Trump n a c g ng l am California. B n b t v y, anh ta n a b m t th m phán l ien bang San Francisco tát vào th ba. Nh ng g i Trump n g suy ng m, Michel, là mt u gi ó khó h lu h n. B n n a c p n v c s d ng n m 2020 c a qu n i V binh Quốc gia ngo ài tlu bang D.C. Michel, trong mt b i c nh m h khong l ien k t h o a, trong ó 11 qu c gia chung. Tíng thng mìn quân i quốc gia cña h. Và tôi nghĩ rằng mìn quan trng nay là n i chúng ta trong lãnh th chia ckhám phá, n u thng c i g ng s dng thm quy n ó g i, ví d, Lc l ng V binh Quốc gia Texas vào mt tlu bang khong mu n h. N u anh ta th c hln m i e da c a minh g i các i quân V binh Quốc gia khong c tôn trng t các quốc gia này sang tlu bang khác mà khong có s ng ý c a tlu bang ó, ch c chn s có k ln tng. Và ó là mt tlu t t b i vì s thay th là mt cu c i tlu trc tlp. T t c quy n c b o u. Truy c p WebSiteterms c a chúng tôi v UseAnDperPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tính s n có c a b ng m NPR có th khac nhau.Vn b n b ng m có th c s a i s a i ho c kh p c p nh t v i âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th c chnh s a sau khi phát sóng ho c xu t b n ban u. H s có th m quy n c a chng trình NPR, là b n ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: Right. So there are two avenues, Michel. So the first is one we talked about briefly a couple minutes ago, which is federalizing the National Guard, so what President Trump tried to do in California. You know, he just got slapped down on Tuesday by a federal judge in San Francisco. What Trump is contemplating, Michel, is something more obscure. You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't

federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website [terms of use](#) and [permissions](#). Pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Phí. Vì vậy, có hai con người, Michel. Vì vậy, người tiên là một trong những chúng tôi đã nói với một vài phút trước, đó là liên bang hóa Lực lượng Vũ binh Quốc gia, vì vậy những gì Tổng thống Trump đã cố gắng làm ở California. Bên dưới đây, anh ta đã bắt một thẩm phán liên bang ở San Francisco tát vào mặt ba. Nhưng gì Trump đang suy nghĩ, Michel, là một điều gì đó khó hiểu hơn. Bên dưới đây có một số tin tức sẽ đến năm 2020 của quân đội Vũ binh Quốc gia ngoài tiểu bang D.C. Michel, trong một bài cảnh báo mà họ không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quốc gia chỉ có Tổng thống muốn quân đội quốc gia của họ. Và tôi nghĩ rằng điều quan trọng nhất là nói chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chia sẻ khám phá, như trong số các nhà cung cấp số đang thêm quyền đó gọi, ví dụ, Lực lượng Vũ binh Quốc gia Texas vào một tiểu bang không muốn họ. Nếu anh ta thắc chắn mãi để đưa ra chính phủ các lực lượng Vũ binh Quốc gia không có tôn trọng với các quốc gia này sang tiểu bang khác mà không có sự đồng ý của tiểu bang đó, chắc chắn sẽ có kiện tụng. Và nó là một điều tôi rất bối rối vì sẽ thay thế là một cuộc chiến với trục tiếp. Tất cả quyền lực của bộ trưởng. Truy cập WebSite terms của chúng tôi và UseAnDperMissionsPages AT WWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM.Accuracy và tính sẵn có của bài viết trên NPR có thể khác nhau.Và bài viết có thể khác nhau sau khi phát sóng hoặc cập nhật về âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể khác nhau sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản sau. Họ có thêm quyền của chương trình NPR, là bài ghi âm thanh.

You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them. MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Bà xã của ông là D.C. Michel, trong một bài cảnh báo mà không liên kết hóa, trong đó 11 quốc gia chỉ mang tên là các quốc gia có quan trọng và đây là nơi chúng ta trong lãnh thổ chia sẻ cấm khám phá, như tham gia các công ty dầu khí, ví dụ, Lực lượng Cảnh sát bang Texas vào một tiểu bang không muốn họ. Nếu anh ta thắc mắc tại sao có một mình với các quốc gia Cảnh sát bang Quốc gia không tôn trọng các quốc gia này sang tiểu bang khác mà không có sự đồng ý của tiểu bang đó, chắc chắn sẽ có kiến nghị. Và nó là một điều tôi vì sự thay thế là một cuộc chiến

truy cập WebSite terms của chúng tôi và UseAnDperMissionsPages AT WWW.NPR.ORG FOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sẵn có của bài hát trên NPR có thể khác nhau. Vì bài hát trên có thể có các sửa đổi sau khi phát sóng hoặc không có bài hát nào. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể không chính xác sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản sau. Họ có thể có quyền của chương trình NPR, là bản ghi âm thanh.

You mentioned the 2020 use of out-of-state National Guard troops in D.C. Michel, that was in a context in which they weren't federalized, in which 11 states just let the president borrow their National Guard troops. And I think the critical point here is that's where we'd be in uncharted territory, if the governor were to try to use that authority to send, for example, the Texas National Guard into a state that didn't want them.MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Bà [[c]] Michel, [[c]] D.C. Michel, trong [[m]] t [[b]] i [[c]] nh mà [[h]] không liên [[k]]t [[h]]oá, trong [[ó]] 11 [[qu]]c [[gia]] ch [[t]] [[ng]] [[th]] [[ng]] m [[n]] [[qu]]n [[i]] [[b]] [[o]] [[v]] [[qu]]c [[gia]] [[c]] [[a]] [[h]]. Và tôi nghĩ [[r]] [[ng]] [[m]] [[qu]]n [[tr]] [[ng]] [[â]]y là n [[i]] [[ch]]ung ta [[trong]] [[lãnh]] [[th]] [[ch]] [[a]] [[c]] [[kh]] [[ám]] [[ph]] [[á]], [[n]] [[u]] [[th]] [[ng]] [[i]] [[c]] [[g]] [[i]] [[ng]] [[s]] [[d]] [[ng]] [[th]] [[m]] [[qu]]n [[ó]] [[g]] [[i]], ví [[d]], [[L]] [[c]] [[t]] [[ng]] [[V]] [[binh]] [[Qu]]c [[gia]] Texas vào [[m]] t [[t]] [[u]] [[b]] [[ang]] không [[mu]]n [[h]]. [[N]] [[u]] [[anh]] ta [[th]] [[c]] [[h]] [[n]] [[m]] [[i]] [[e]] [[d]] [[a]] [[c]] [[a]] [[m]] [[i]]n [[g]] [[i]] [[c]] [[á]]c [[c]] [[i]] [[qu]]n [[V]] [[binh]] [[Qu]]c [[gia]] không [[c]] [[t]] [[o]]n [[tr]] [[ng]] [[t]] [[c]] [[á]]c [[q]] [[u]]c [[gia]] [[n]] [[á]]y sang [[t]] [[u]] [[b]] [[ang]] [[kh]] [[ác]] mà không có s [[c]] [[ng]] [[ý]] [[c]] [[a]] [[t]] [[u]] [[b]] [[ang]] [[ó]], ch [[c]] [[ch]] [[n]] [[s]] [[c]] [[ó]] [[k]] [[i]] [[n]] [[t]] [[ng]]. Và [[ó]] là [[m]] t [[t]] [[u]] [[t]] [[b]] [[i]] vì [[s]] [[t]] [[h]] [[ay]] th [[t]] [[l]] [[a]] [[m]] t [[c]] [[u]] [[c]] [[i]] [[t]] [[u]] [[tr]] [[c]] [[t]] [[p]]. T [[t]] [[c]] [[qu]]n [[c]] [[b]] [[o]] [[u]]. Truy [[c]] [[p]] WebSite terms [[c]] [[a]] [[ch]]ung [[t]] [[o]] [[i]] [[v]] [[UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính s [[n]] [[c]] [[a]] [[b]] [[ng]] [[t]] [[m]] NPR có th [[t]] [[kh]] [[ác]] [[nh]] [[au]]. V [[n]] [[b]] [[n]] [[b]] [[ng]] [[t]] [[m]] [[c]] [[ó]] [[th]] [[c]] [[s]] [[a]] [[t]] [[i]] [[s]] [[a]] [[m]] [[h]] [[o]] [[c]] [[kh]] [[p]] [[c]] [[p]] [[nh]] [[t]] [[v]] [[i]] [[â]] [[m]] [[th]] [[an]] [[h]]. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th [[t]] [[c]] [[ch]] [[n]] [[s]] [[a]] sau khi phát sóng ho [[c]] [[x]] [[u]] [[t]] [[b]] [[n]] [[b]] [[an]] [[u]]. H [[s]] [[c]] [[ó]] [[th]] [[m]] [[qu]]n [[c]] [[a]] [[ch]] [[ng]] [[tr]] [[h]] [[i]] [[n]] [[P]] [[R]] [[,]] là [[b]] [[n]] [[ghi]] [[â]] [[m]] [[th]] [[an]] [[h]].

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court? VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation. MARTIN: Yeah. VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation. MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News. Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our website [terms of use](#) and [permissions](#) pages at www.npr.org for further information. Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

hỗc kh?p c?p nh?t v?i âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có th? m?c ch?nh s?a sau khi phát sóng h?p xu?t b?n ban ?u.H? s? có th?m quy?n c?a ch?ng trinh NPR, là b?n ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: Before I let you go, just briefly, do you think this matter is going to end up before the Supreme Court?VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Tr?c khi tôi cho phép b?n i, ch? ng?n g?n, b?n có ngh? r?ng v?n n?y s? k?t th?c tr?c T?o án t?i cao kh?ng? Vladeck: Tôi ngh? r?ng n?ng th?i ti?p theo là ph? thu?c vào T?ng th?ng Trump.N?u anh ta th?c hi?n m?i e d?a c?a m?nh s? g?i các s?i qu?n V? binh Qu?c gia kh?ng s?c t?n tr?ng t? các qu?c gia n?y sang t?u bang kh?c mà kh?ng có s? n?ng ý c?a t?u bang ó, ch?c ch?n s? có k?n t?ng.Và ó là m?t t?u t?t b?i vì s? thay th? là m?t cu?c s?i t?u tr?c ti?p.T?t c? quy?n s?c b?o ?u.Truy c?p WebSiteterms c?a ch?ng tôi v? UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÈM.Accuracy và t?nh s?n có c?a b?ng s?m NPR có th? kh?c nhau.V?n b?n b?ng s?m có th? m?c s?a s?i s?a m?i ho?c kh?p c?p nh?t v?i âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có th? m?c ch?nh s?a sau khi phát sóng h?p xu?t b?n ban ?u.H? s? có th?m quy?n c?a ch?ng trinh NPR, là b?n ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Tôi ngh? r?ng n?ng th?i ti?p theo là t?u thu?c vào T?ng th?ng Trump.N?u anh ta th?c hi?n m?i e d?a c?a m?nh s? g?i các s?i qu?n V? binh Qu?c gia kh?ng s?c t?n tr?ng t? các qu?c gia n?y sang t?u bang kh?c mà kh?ng có s? n?ng ý c?a t?u bang ó, ch?c ch?n s? có k?n t?ng.Và ó là m?t t?u t?t b?i vì s? thay th? là m?t cu?c s?i t?u tr?c ti?p.T?t c? quy?n s?c b?o ?u.Truy c?p WebSiteterms c?a ch?ng tôi v? UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÈM.Accuracy và t?nh s?n có c?a b?ng s?m NPR có th? kh?c nhau.V?n b?n b?ng s?m có th? m?c s?a s?i s?a m?i ho?c kh?p c?p nh?t v?i âm thanh.Âm thanh trên npr.org có th? m?c ch?nh s?a sau khi phát sóng h?p xu?t b?n ban ?u.H? s? có th?m quy?n c?a ch?ng trinh NPR, là b?n ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: I think the next move is up to President Trump. If he carries through on his threat to send un-federalized National Guard troops from one state into another without that state's consent, there will definitely be litigation.MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of

NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Tôi nghĩ rằng chúng thái trip theo là tùy thuộc vào Tông thống Trump. Nếu anh ta thắc chắn mài đe dọa mình thì giao các quan binh Quốc gia không có tôn trọng tôi. Các quốc gia này sang khu bang khác mà không có sự đồng ý của khu bang đó, chắc chắn sẽ có kinh tảng. Vào đó là một khu vực tách biệt vì sẽ thay thế là một cuộc chiến khu vực trên trip. Tất cả quyển sách bao lùu. Truy cập WebSiteTerms của chúng tôi và UseAndPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sẵn có của băng làm NPR có thể khác nhau. Vấn đề là có thể có sự khác nhau trong cách sử dụng hoặc cách kháp cập nhật về âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể khác nhau sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản ban đầu. Họ sẽ có thời gian để chỉnh sửa chương trình NPR, là bản ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Yeah.vladeck: Nó gần như chắc chắn sẽ kết thúc tại Tòa án Tối cao. Và đó là một khu vực tách biệt vì sẽ thay thế là một cuộc chiến khu vực trên trip. Tất cả quyển sách bao lùu. Truy cập WebSiteTerms của chúng tôi và UseAndPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sẵn có của băng làm NPR có thể khác nhau. Vấn đề là có thể có sự khác nhau trong cách sử dụng hoặc cách kháp cập nhật về âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể khác nhau sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản ban đầu. Họ sẽ có thời gian để chỉnh sửa chương trình NPR, là bản ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: Yeah.VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Yeah.vladeck: Nó gần như chắc chắn sẽ kết thúc tại Tòa án Tối cao. Và đó là một khu vực tách biệt vì sẽ thay thế là một cuộc chiến khu vực trên trip. Tất cả quyển sách bao lùu. Truy cập WebSiteTerms của chúng tôi và UseAndPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sẵn có của băng làm NPR có thể khác nhau. Vấn đề là có thể có sự khác nhau trong cách sử dụng hoặc cách kháp cập nhật về âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể khác nhau sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản ban đầu. Họ sẽ có thời gian để chỉnh sửa chương trình NPR, là bản ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Nó gần như chắc chắn sẽ kết thúc tại Tòa án Tối cao. Và đó là một khu vực tách biệt vì sẽ thay thế là một cuộc chiến khu vực trên trip. Tất cả quyển sách bao lùu. Truy cập WebSiteTerms của chúng tôi và UseAndPermissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÊM. Accuracy và tính sẵn có của băng làm NPR có thể khác nhau. Vấn đề là có thể có sự khác nhau trong cách sử dụng hoặc cách kháp cập nhật về âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thể khác nhau sau khi phát sóng hoặc xuất bản ban đầu. Họ sẽ có thời gian để chỉnh sửa chương trình NPR, là bản ghi âm thanh.

VLADECK: It will almost certainly end up in the Supreme Court. And that's a good thing because the alternative is a face-to-face confrontation.MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Vladeck: Nó gìn nhì chìc chìn sì kít thíc tì Tòa án tì cao. Và ó là mít iuu tít bì vì sì thay thì là mít cucc iuu tric tìp. Tít cù quyìn cùc bò u. Truy cùp WebSiteterm cùa chúng tôi vù UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÈM.Accuracy và tính sìn có cùa bìng cùm NPR có thì khác nhau. Vùn bùn bìng cùm có thì cùa cùa sìa cùa iùc khùp cùp nhìt vùi âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thì cùa cùa chình sìa sau khi phát sóng hoic xuít bùn ban cùu. Hì sì có thìm quyìn cùa chìng trình NPR, là bùn ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Ó là Stephen Vladeck, giáo sì luít tì iùc Georgetown, và ày là NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. Tít cù quyìn cùc bò u. Truy cùp WebSiteterm cùa chúng tôi vù UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÈM.Accuracy và tính sìn có cùa bìng cùm NPR có thì khác nhau. Vùn bùn bìng cùm có thì cùa cùa sìa cùa iùc khùp cùp nhìt vùi âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thì cùa cùa chình sìa sau khi phát sóng hoic xuít bùn ban cùu. Hì sì có thìm quyìn cùa chìng trình NPR, là bùn ghi âm thanh.

MARTIN: That's Stephen Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University, and this is NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

Martin: Ó là Stephen Vladeck, giáo sì luít tì iùc Georgetown, và ày là NPR News.Copyright © 2025 NPR. Tít cù quyìn cùc bò u. Truy cùp WebSiteterm cùa chúng tôi vù UseAnDperMissionsPages ATWWW.NPR.ORGFOR THÔNG TIN THÈM.Accuracy và tính sìn có cùa bìng cùm NPR có thì khác nhau. Vùn bùn bìng cùm có thì cùa cùa sìa cùa iùc khùp cùp nhìt vùi âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có thì cùa cùa chình sìa sau khi phát sóng hoic xuít bùn ban cùu. Hì sì có thìm quyìn cùa chìng trình NPR, là bùn ghi âm thanh.

Copyright © 2025 NPR. All rights reserved. Visit our websiteterms of useandpermissionspages atwww.npr.orgfor further information.

Bùn quyìn © 2025 NPR. Tít cù quyìn cùc bò u. Truy cùp các cùu khoùn trang web cùa chúng tôi vù UseandPerMissionsPages www.npr.org cùt thêm thông tin.

Accuracy and availability of NPR transcripts may vary. Transcript text may be revised to correct errors or match updates to audio. Audio on npr.org may be edited after its original broadcast or publication. The authoritative record of NPR's programming is the audio record.

chính xác và tinh kh^{íc} c^óa b^{ên} m^{ột} NPR có th^ể kh^{ác} nhau. V^àn b^{ên} b^{ên} m^{ột} có th^ể c^ó s^ố i^{nh} s^ố i^{nh} h^oc k^h^íp c^óp nh^ét v^ài âm thanh. Âm thanh trên npr.org có th^ể c^ó ch^ính s^ố sau khi phát sóng ho^c xu^t b^{ên} ban^g u. H^{ết} s^ố có th^ểm quy^đn c^óa ch^íng trinh NPR, là b^{ên} ghi âm thanh.