

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

May 21, 2026

The Honorable Todd Blanche
Acting Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

The Honorable Scott Bessent
Secretary
U.S. Department of Treasury
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20220

The Honorable Shana M. Broussard
Chair
Federal Election Commission
1050 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20463

The Honorable Dara Lindenbaum
Commissioner
Federal Election Commission
1050 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20463

Dear Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, Secretary Bessent, Chair Broussard, and Commissioner Lindenbaum,

I write today with grave concern regarding the establishment of the “Anti-Weaponization Fund” and the potential for \$1.776 billion of taxpayer funds to be laundered as part of a scheme to fund the President’s favored political campaigns and projects.

On May 18, 2026, likely in response to fears that the judge overseeing President Trump’s lawsuit against the Internal Revenue Service was considering dismissing the case, President Trump reached a settlement agreement,¹ with his *own* political appointees at the U.S. Department of Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service. This agreement directed the U.S. Department of Justice² to create an “Anti-Weaponization Fund” containing \$1.776 billion to “provide a systematic process to hear and redress claims of others who ... incurred harm from similar Lawfare and Weaponization...” The agreement provides that the Fund will determine “its own procedures for submitting, receiving, processing, and granting or denying claims” and will have the power to “issue monetary relief owed to claimants.”

The intentionally vague construction of the “Anti-Weaponization Fund” suggests that it will be yet another tool for President Trump’s rampant graft. The Department of Justice has not publicly specified the criteria for determining who may be a claimant, nor has it defined what activity constitutes “similar Lawfare and Weaponization.” Disturbingly, the agreement does not require the Department to publish the identity of claimants who receive payments from the Fund –

¹ Trump, D. J., Trump, D. J., Jr., Trump, E., & Trump Organization, LLC v. Internal Revenue Service & U.S. Department of the Treasury, No. 1:26-cv-20609-KMW (S.D. Fla. May 18, 2026). *Settlement agreement*. U.S. Department of Justice. <https://www.justice.gov/opa/media/1441201/dl?inline>

² U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Public Affairs. (2026, May 18). *Justice Department announces Anti-Weaponization Fund* [Press release]. <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-announces-anti-weaponization-fund>

essentially creating a secret slush fund for Trump-allied individuals and entities to inappropriately benefit from taxpayer dollars without any review or oversight.

While Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche testified to the Senate Appropriations Committee that “anyone can apply,” his testimony defies credibility. The Administration has repeatedly misallocated federal resources to target and punish the President’s perceived enemies and to reward his allies and supporters, including financial contributors to his campaign.

Section 527 organizations, more commonly known as political organizations, can include campaign committees, party committees, political action committees (PACs), and super PACs, and are subject to a myriad of federal laws and regulations regarding their activities, contributions and expenditures, and public disclosures. As such, federal departments and agencies, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, routinely enforce these laws by receiving complaints and referrals that can subsequently result in investigations, audits, conciliation agreements and other forms of resolutions, including judicial action. While political fundraising is part of our democracy, it comes at a hefty cost and with rules to support transparency and accountability.

Public parameters of the Fund suggest that President Trump may use it as a mechanism for siphoning taxpayer dollars to his favored political campaigns. This Fund is without precedent in American history and, once laundered through the President’s chosen political candidates and issues, it will provide a massive advantage in upcoming elections, paid for by American taxpayers. Federal funds which are being diverted into this slush fund could do tremendous things for the American people – things that a real leader would do to win the approval and favor of the electorate. This Fund is outright corruption, cheating, and illegal.

Given President Trump’s long track record of appropriating public resources for his personal benefit, I am extremely concerned that political organizations loyal to him will seek and obtain payments from the Fund for the express purpose of funding political activity. It is critical that taxpayer dollars and federal government resources not be misused to support political activities, and certainly not partisan political activities that fund political candidates and intend to influence an election.

In light of these concerns, I respectfully request that you provide written responses to the following questions within two weeks of receiving this letter:

1. How does the Department of Justice define “lawfare” and “weaponization”?
2. How will the Fund distinguish between appropriate government enforcement of federal laws and “lawfare” and “weaponization”?
3. Who qualifies as a “victim of weaponization” and what formula does the Department of Justice use to calculate the value of being a “victim of weaponization”? Is victimhood in this instance determined per individual or per household?
4. Prior to the creation of this Fund, what avenues were available to “victims of weaponization”?

5. Will political organizations defined under 26 USC 527(e)(1), super PACs, and 501(c)(4) organizations be eligible for taxpayer compensation from the judgement fund?
6. The settlement provides that the Attorney General will receive a confidential written report that includes the name and addresses of each claimant. Will this report be made public in a regular manner?

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Mark R. Warner