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Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — It was supposed to be an auspicious moment: Prime Minister Theresa May of Britain[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] traveling to India[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/india/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] to prepare the ground for what could be the country’s first trade deal after it leaves the European Union, and show that Britain can thrive outside the bloc.

But Mrs. May had barely hit the ground when her aspiration to forge closer ties with one of the world’s fastest-growing economy began to falter over **immigration**, the same thorny and emotive issue that helped propel Britain’s decision to leave the European Union.

Mrs. May’s three-day visit, which began on Sunday, had been billed as a first test of Britain’s ability to forge new and mutually advantageous trade deals with countries around the world, a way to demonstrate its ability to prosper outside the European single market. But while India is notoriously difficult to please in trade matters, the rocky reception was not an ideal way to start her first trip to India as prime minister.

Specifically, India is complaining about student visas, including a requirement that foreign students from outside the European Union must find a job four months after they finish their studies or face deportation.

Speaking at a technology conference on Monday in New Delhi, India’s capital, Prime Minister Narendra Modi[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/narendra\_modi/index.html?inline=nyt-per] warned that education and mobility across borders for young Indians would help define India’s relationship with Britain.

Indian business leaders have also called on Britain to slash the cost of a two-year visa to Britain from about $409 to $108, which is the rate that applies to Chinese citizens.

But Mrs. May, under pressure at home to reduce **immigration**, has resisted calls to liberalize the visa system. The policy has had a chilling effect with the number of student visas issued to Indians falling to 11,864 in 2015, from 68,238 in 2010, according to official figures.

In a move aimed at reducing **immigration**, the British government last week also introduced visa restrictions that would raise the salary threshold for foreign companies that want to transfer workers to Britain. The new restriction has alarmed executives[http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-news-india/it-capital-bengaluru-concerned-over-theresa-may-visit-india-uk-visa-rules-3742218/] at Indian information technology companies, who say workers need to be able to spend months in Britain when working on specific projects.

During the referendum campaign on whether to leave the European Union, proponents of exiting the bloc argued that Britain could offset its dependence on Europe by forging new trade deals with nations of the Commonwealth[http://thecommonwealth.org/] such as India, with which Britain has longstanding economic and cultural links.

But supporters of exiting the union, a move known as Brexit, made emotional appeals to limit **immigration** a central part of their campaign. That has circumscribed Mrs. May’s room for maneuver as she seeks to court countries like India that regard easing the mobility of their citizens as a necessary condition for attaining access to their expanding markets.

Mrs. May has insisted that Britain’s visa system is still attracting talented students and workers to the country. “We have a visa system for countries outside the European Union which ensures that the brightest and the best are able to come to the United Kingdom,” she said on Monday. “The figures show that we issued more work visas to India than, I think, the U.S., Australia, Canada and China put together.”

But she said Britain could be more flexible about granting visas if Indians who overstayed their visas returned to India more quickly. She also invited the Indian government to nominate business executives for a streamlined visa and **immigration** service that would ease the entry of wealthy Indian businesspeople who want to come to Britain.

In what some interpreted as another snub, Mrs. May said she had been unable to arrange a meeting with senior executives at Tata Steel Ltd. during her visit. In March, the company said it was selling its steel operations[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/31/world/europe/steel-maker-plans-to-sell-british-plants-threatening-15000-jobs.html] in Britain amid losses due to fierce competition from China and weak demand.

Brexit proponents say the difficulties with India on trade are not surprising, and do not necessarily bode ill for other trade negotiations. The European Union, they point out, has struggled for nearly a decade to hammer out a free trade agreement with India, stymied by concerns over **immigration** and obstacles such as punishing Indian tariffs on cars and alcohol.

Meanwhile, Indian industry has warned that trade between Britain and India could suffer a “double blow” as a result of the Brexit vote. Speaking to The Guardian[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/05/trade-uk-india-suffer-double-hit-theresa-may-visit-brexit-sterling] ahead of Mrs. May’s visit to India, Alwyn Didar Singh, the head of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, warned that exports from India to Britain were being hit by the significant fall in the pound that followed the vote to leave the European Union.

He also said the vote posed a challenge for some of the 800 Indian businesses operating in Britain, which viewed the country as a gateway to the bloc.

Even proponents of Brexit appealed to Mrs. May to show more flexibility over the visa issues. Jacob Rees-Mogg, a conservative member of Parliament and leading Leave campaigner, called on her to offer the same concessions on short-term visas to India that had been offered to China. He said it was “quite wrong that we should give preferential terms to China rather than one of our closest allies.”

Allie Renison, the head of trade policy at the Institute of Directors, a business federation, said Mrs. May needed to understand that labor mobility and visas were essential for a service-based economy like Britain’s if it wanted to deepen its trade relationships.

“A case in point is higher education, one of Britain’s most successful exports, where applications from Indian students are significantly down in recent years,” she said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**“O, yes,

I say it plain,

America never was America to me,

And yet I swear this oath —

America will be!”

— Langston Hughes, “Let America Be America Again”

What old men know is that everything can change. Langston Hughes wrote these lines when I was 8 years old, in the very different America of 1935.

It was an America where the life of a black person didn’t count for much. Where women were still second-class citizens, where Jews and other ethnic whites were looked on with suspicion, and **immigrants** were kept out almost completely unless they came from certain approved countries in Northern Europe. Where gay people dared not speak the name of their love, and where “passing” — as white, as a WASP, as heterosexual, as something, anything else that fit in with what America was supposed to be was a commonplace, with all of the self-abasement and the shame that entailed.

It was an America still ruled, at its base, by violence. Where lynchings, and especially the threat of lynchings, were used to keep minorities away from the ballot box and in their place. Where companies amassed arsenals of weapons for goons to use against their own employees and recruited the police and National Guardsmen to help them if these private corporate armies proved insufficient. Where destitute veterans of World War I were driven from the streets of Washington with tear gas and bayonets, after they went to our nation’s capital to ask for the money they were owed.

Much of that was how America had always been. We changed it, many of us, through some of the proudest struggles of our history. It wasn’t easy, and sometimes it wasn’t pretty, but we did it, together. We won voting rights for all. We ended Jim Crow, and we pushed open the Golden Door again to welcome **immigrants**. We achieved full rights for women, and fought to let people of all genders and sexual orientations stand in the light. And if we have not yet created the America that Langston Hughes swore will be — “The land that never has been yet” — if there is still much to be done, at least we have advanced our standards of humanity, hope and decency to places where many people never thought we could reach.

What old men know, too, is that all that is gained can be lost. Lost just as the liberation that the Civil War and Emancipation brought was squandered in Reconstruction, by a white America grown morally weary, or bent on revenge. Lost as the gains of our labor unions have been for decades now, pushed back until so many of us stand alone in the workplace, before unfettered corporate power. Lost as the vote is being lost by legislative chicanery. Lost as so many powerful interests would have us lose the benefits of the social welfare state, privatize Social Security, and annihilate Obamacare altogether.

If he wins this Tuesday, Donald J. Trump would be, at 70, the oldest president ever elected. But there is much about Mr. Trump that is always young, and not in a good way. There is something permanently feckless and immature in the man. It can be seen in how he mangles virtually the same words that Langston Hughes used.

When Hughes writes, in the first two lines of his poem, “Let America be America again/ Let it be the dream it used to be,” he acknowledges that America is primarily a dream, a hope, an aspiration, that may never be fully attainable, but that spurs us to be better, to be larger. He follows this with the repeated counterpoint, “America never was America to me,” and through the rest of this remarkable poem he alternates between the oppressed and the wronged of America, and the great dreams that they have for their country, that can never be extinguished.

Mr. Trump, who is not a poet, either in his late-night tweets or on the speaker’s stump, sees American greatness as some heavy, dead thing that we must reacquire. Like a bar of gold, perhaps, or a bank vault, or one of the lifeless, anonymous buildings he loves to put up. It is a simplistic notion, reducing all the complexity of the American experience to a vague greatness, and his prescription for the future is just as undefined, a promise that we will return to “winning” without ever spelling out what we will win — save for the exclusion of “others,” the reduction of women to sexual tally points, the re-closeting of so many of us.

With his simple, mean, boy’s heart, Mr. Trump wants us to follow him blind into a restoration that is not possible and could not be endured if it were. Many of his followers acknowledge that (“He may get us all killed”) but want to have someone in the White House who will really “blow things up.”

What old men know is that things blown up — customs, folkways, social compacts, human bodies — cannot so easily be put right. What Langston Hughes so yearned for when he asked that America be America again was the realization of an age-old people’s struggle, not the murky fantasies of a petty tyrant. Mr. Trump asks us what we have to lose, and we must answer, only the dream, only everything.

Harry Belafonte is an artist and activist.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERKELEY, Calif. — Although the University of California, Berkeley, has some of the best resources in the country for undocumented students like me — in the form of financial and legal aid, for example — it’s been a tense couple of years, magnified by the anti-**immigration** build-a-wall language of Donald J. Trump’s presidential campaign.

Berkeley’s Undocumented Student Program[http://undocu.berkeley.edu/home/our-history/], which the university established in 2012, works with more than 400 undocumented students and continues to grow as more go public about their **immigration** status, sometimes at considerable risk to themselves and their families.

But by coming out of the shadows, undocumented people open themselves to cruelty and threats. Last year, when I helped organize a campus protest to get the University of California to renew funding for some crucial programs for undocumented students, I was called an illegal leech who should be deported. I shrugged it off: I was proud of marching at Berkeley, where the Free Speech Movement started in the 1960s.

But looking back, I think I should have made a bigger deal about the maliciousness I witnessed and saw building. A few months later, I received an anonymous email threatening to report my family and me to **immigration** agents. The threat included details about my actions during the protest — it seemed to be coming from someone who had seen me on campus. I was so disturbed I stopped attending classes, and even when I returned a week later, my anxiety kept me from engaging in class discussions or focusing on my studies.

Soon after that, the Undocumented Student Program began to receive anonymous email threats about students, and a fellow undocumented friend — a prominent member of the student government — was told by another student on Facebook: “Thanks for identifying yourself as an illegal … Now get out. I’ll look for you on campus.” All of this information was brought to the administration, but there was no follow-up.

Despite the supposed pride the administration takes in our accomplishments as undocumented students — often displaying our faces on posters around campus or on the school’s social media pages — the university remains silent when we are threatened. This September, after a group of Trump supporters came onto campus to build a mock wall[http://www.dailycal.org/2016/09/12/protests-arise-response-activists-building-wall/] and spew racially charged talk about “illegals,” the undocumented students were told to draft a statement of inclusion as a response, and that perhaps certain departments would send it through their email listservs as a gesture of support.

Administrators have said they are determined to earn our trust, but undocumented students on campus don’t want to be placated — we want our administrators to fully stand with us through actions and not just promises. After all, when posters with anti-Semitic language began to crop up[http://www.dailycal.org/2016/09/25/anti-semitic-posters-found-throughout-campus/] around campus in late September, the associate chancellor took swift action by sending an email to all students condemning this language.

Some argue that hateful displays of racism or anti-Semitism are different from the actions of those on campus who yell, “Build a wall!” But too often, hate speech toward **immigrants** in this country is written off as political opinion, and school administrators don’t want to side with one political group or another. However, this political issue happens to be our futures, in the country where we grew up.

That’s why it was disheartening when Janet Napolitano, the president of the University of California system — and, it should be noted, the former head of the Department of Homeland Security — wrote, in a Boston Globe op-ed essay[https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2016/10/01/time-free-speech-campus-again/v5jDCzjuv710Mc92AhaAqL/story.html], that students must be willing to listen to not just opposing views, but offensive ones, for the sake of free speech. She did not condone hate speech — “that which is designed to personally intimidate or harass” — but wrote that exceptions to free speech should be “narrowly construed.”

So many powerful college administrators across the country have made this argument now that I think they have no idea just how offensive speech has gotten, especially during this election. They lament what they see as a lack of resilience in students and fail to realize that some speech that might qualify as merely offensive — and could not be “narrowly construed” as hateful — has become extremely intimidating. The political climate is ugly.

This is not to say that those with conservative opinions should be silenced. But because it is often campus conservatives who complain of the scourge of political correctness, I think it is tempting for college administrators to rally behind conservative students, to see them as the new gadflies, the protectors of free speech. Yet it is comical to think that those of us with lesser rights are somehow infringing on those who have no fear of deportation.

What is a matter of political discourse for one group of students can be a threat to the future of another group. The university could best demonstrate its dedication to free speech by dispensing with empty rhetoric and speaking out for undocumented students — or even by taking a controversial stance on the political issues that affect them.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Juan Prieto is a senior at the University of California, Berkeley.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Americans beaten down by the vitriolic presidential campaign can be forgiven for accepting the conventional wisdom that the country is irredeemably polarized, with divisions so profound as to make governing in the next administration even harder than it has been for President Obama.

Now comes new data suggesting that on foreign policy, at least, there is more consensus among voters than is normally thought. It offers some hope that Hillary Clinton, if she is the next president, could rally a majority of the nation around a common agenda. All bets are off if Donald Trump wins.

The data comes from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, which has conducted regular surveys of public opinion since 1974. The latest report[https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/publication/america-age-uncertainty], issued last month, divided respondents into four groups by political affiliation: Democrats, Independents and Republicans, with those who said they supported Mr. Trump broken out separately.

Mr. Trump’s supporters are far more anxious than other voters about the economic effects of globalization and about a nation that is becoming more multiethnic and multicultural. Eighty percent view **immigration** as a critical threat to the United States, compared with 67 percent of Republicans, 40 percent of Independents and 27 percent of Democrats, the survey found.

But on other issues, there are areas of convergence between Trump supporters and the others. For instance, 51 percent of Trump supporters want the United States to play an active international role, compared with 64 percent of all respondents. Although Mr. Trump’s campaign slogan is “Make America Great Again,” most Americans, including the candidate’s core base, already see their country as the most influential in the world.

One of Mr. Trump’s most dangerous positions has been to question America’s commitment to NATO and its alliances with South Korea and Japan. That is at odds with the vast majority of Americans, including 60 percent of Trump supporters, who want to increase or maintain the commitment to NATO and who believe that alliances in general are effective.

All groups cited international terrorism as the primary threat, with nuclear proliferation and North Korea’s nuclear program among other top concerns. Mr. Trump, by contrast, has glibly suggested that he wouldn’t care if South Korea, Japan and Saudi Arabia acquired their own nuclear weapons.

On **immigration**, most Americans, 58 percent, favor a path to citizenship for undocumented workers. Support for globalization — specifically, increasing economic connections with the rest of the world — resonates with 74 percent of Democrats, 61 percent of Independents and 59 percent of Republicans. Although Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton have criticized the 12-nation Trans-Pacific Partnership, the survey found that 60 percent of all respondents, including 49 percent of Trump supporters, actually favor the trade deal.

The bottom line is that “this is quite a united nation when it comes to the main ways of thinking about foreign policy, why the United States should engage and how it should engage,” said Ivo Daalder, president of the Chicago Council on Global Affairs.

That means that if Mr. Trump is elected and tries to effect many of the controversial and dangerous foreign policies he has espoused, he could run into serious trouble with his base, not to mention most other Americans. As for Mrs. Clinton, who is more in step with majority views, she would have an opportunity to forge consensus around the kind of bipartisan foreign policy that for decades has been the American way.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ten years ago, Jim Gilchrist was waging a lonely battle.

His organization, the Minuteman Project, which sent volunteers, often armed, to patrol America’s southern border, was widely considered a fringe vigilante group with alarmist views about the dangers posed by Mexican **immigrants**.

Today, Mr. Gilchrist feels vindicated.

“I never thought I’d see the day where illegal **immigration** was included in a presidential candidate’s top three issues,” Mr. Gilchrist, a supporter of Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per], said. “For me personally, my mission has been accomplished.”

While Mr. Trump seems likely to lose the election, many of his most extreme supporters say they believe that they have already won. Whether the subject is **immigration**, military intervention, the news media or federal government corruption — and even the entire democratic process — their views, long thought to be well outside the political mainstream, have been given a voice inside it. And that voice belongs to the presidential nominee of a major political party.

Of course, Mr. Trump’s populist candidacy has energized ordinary Americans across the country who previously felt **alienated** from the political system, but it has also emboldened extremist groups that say he has validated their agendas.

It is unclear how much legitimacy these organizations can realistically expect to gain, given the extreme nature of their views to most Americans. But if they are able to maintain even a measure of influence on the right after the election, this could be Mr. Trump’s most enduring legacy.

“Trump has shown that our message is healthy, normal and organic — and millions of Americans agree with us,” said Matthew M. Heimbach, a co-founder of the Traditionalist Youth Network, a white nationalist group that claims to support the interests of working-class whites. It also advocates the separation of the races.

Whatever happens on Nov. 8, Mr. Trump’s candidacy has brought groups like Mr. Heimbach’s out of the shadows, and they say they have no intention of returning.

“For racists in this country, this campaign has been a complete affirmation of their fears, worries, dreams and hopes,” said Ryan Lenz, the editor of the Hatewatch blog at the Southern Poverty Law Center, which tracks such groups from its headquarters in Montgomery, Ala. “Most things they believe have been legitimized, or have been given the stamp of approval, by mainstream American politics to the point now where it’s no longer shameful to be a racist.”

The biggest beneficiary may well be the so-called alt-right, the once obscure and now ascendant white nationalist movement with close ties to Breitbart News, the website operated by Mr. Trump’s campaign manager, Stephen K. Bannon.

“If Trump loses, I am going to be a little bit sad, but I’m certainly not going to feel like all is lost, because he sling-shotted us a long way,” said Richard Spencer, who is credited with coining the term alt-right in 2008. “We can just look at 2015 and 2016 as the beginning of a new stage.”

Some on the far right say they believe the election of Hillary Clinton could prove to be its own sort of boon, further embittering and maybe even radicalizing some disappointed Trump supporters.

“There will be people who will say, ‘There’s nothing we can do to change this system from within,’ and they are going to look to perhaps alternative options,” said Nathan Damigo, the founder of Identity Europa, a California group dedicated to fighting what it calls the “dispossession” of white Americans.

Mr. Damigo envisions building a protest movement along the lines of Black Lives Matter — only to promote the interests of whites. Others on the far right talk about working from inside the political system, lobbying Congress or getting behind Republican candidates who espouse similar views. Some even draw parallels to the post-2008 period, when roiling anger at Barack Obama’s election gave birth to the Tea Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/t/tea\_party\_movement/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], which ended the political careers of Republican moderates from Washington to state capitals.

In short, they say they believe that Mr. Trump’s campaign has turned them into a force that the Republican establishment cannot ignore.

“What you can’t say is that we’re just a bunch of marginal loons,” Mr. Spencer said. “The truth is that we have a deeper connection with the Trumpian forces and Trumpian populism than the mainstream conservatives do. They’re going to have to deal with us.”

Mr. Spencer predicted that the conservative movement’s broader embrace of the far right could start with news media outlets adding what he described as “alt-lite” hosts. These would be people who did not consider themselves members of the movement, but shared the conviction that policies on **immigration** were threatening the country’s identity and well-being.

To members of the alt-right, Mr. Trump is a transformative figure. It has been a long time since a mainstream politician, let alone a presidential nominee, talked about the mass deportation of undocumented **immigrants** and warned about “international banks” plotting “the destruction of U.S. sovereignty.” Mr. Trump has given them the legitimacy they long craved.

“Trump reaffirms what we say,” Mr. Heimbach said. “He has brought to the forefront the policies of nationalism and secure borders.”

While he made headlines in the spring for shoving a young black woman at a Trump rally in Louisville, Ky., Mr. Heimbach said he had not formally endorsed Mr. Trump because “he is not a white nationalist.” But Mr. Heimbach added that he and other white nationalists were grateful to Mr. Trump for championing ideas they support.

For his part, Mr. Trump has not expressed support for the white nationalist groups that have rallied to his candidacy. But neither has he distanced himself from them, with the exception of David Duke[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/11/us/david-dukes-senate-run-in-louisiana-draws-attention-but-not-support.html?\_r=0], the former Klansman who is running for Senate and whom Mr. Trump disavowed after some initial wavering last winter.

They are now beginning to grapple with how to best harness the energy that his campaign has stirred up. Mr. Spencer’s group, the National Policy Institute, which says it is “dedicated to the heritage, identity and future of people of European descent in the United States, and around the world,” is organizing a valedictory conference in the Ronald Reagan Building in Washington shortly after the election.

The aim is to take stock of the presidential campaign — “when our ideas began invading the mainstream” — and figure out what’s next. In addition to Mr. Spencer, the speakers will include Peter Brimelow, the founder of Vdare.com[http://vdare.com/], an anti-**immigration** website named for Virginia Dare, the first white baby born in the English colonies.

Many of these groups say they have seen a significant surge in interest in the last year. Jared Taylor, a prominent white nationalist, said traffic to his website, American Renaissance, was up 30 percent since the beginning of the Trump campaign.

Mark Pitcavage, a senior researcher at the Anti-Defamation League, suggested that these extremist groups might be trying to rationalize the growing certainty of a Trump loss for their supporters.

“They need an optimistic message for their followers, lest there be demoralization and dropouts,” he said. “They are less likely to be willing to talk about how a Trump defeat might hurt their cause.”

It is possible that without the organizing force and urgency of his candidacy, these groups will lose much of the momentum that they have gathered over the last 18 months. Other politicians may try to replicate his success, but Mr. Trump is in many ways a unique figure, between his name recognition and his embrace of provocative and even offensive language and ideas as a campaign strategy.

Whether they are able to build on the success of the Trump campaign will depend in part on what Mr. Trump decides to do after the election. It is unclear whether his America First platform was largely a product of political opportunism, or if he is truly committed to the nativist cause. It is equally unclear whether he will try to remain an active political force, most likely through his own media organization, after the election.

In the meantime, Mr. Trump’s candidacy has served as a call to arms for extremist leaders who usually have little use for electoral politics.

Mr. Taylor, who has not supported a presidential candidate since Pat Buchanan sought the Republican nomination in 2000, recorded robocalls for Mr. Trump during the Republican primary. And Andrew Anglin, the founder of the neo-Nazi website The Daily Stormer, endorsed Mr. Trump days after he issued his first promise to build a wall to keep out Mexican criminals and “rapists” in June 2015.

“I basically agree with everything Donald Trump advocates,” Mr. Anglin wrote in an email. He went on to say Mr. Trump has made it “socially acceptable” to talk about thing that were once off limits, such as “the globalist Jewish agenda.”

Even in the age of Trump, not everything is socially acceptable. The Daily Stormer recently featured a post urging its readers to make one final push for Mr. Trump via their social media feeds.

“ONLY NORMIE FRIENDLY STUFF,” it specified. “NO Nazi stuff, just intense anti-Hillary stuff.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Trip Gabriel and David Zucchino contributed reporting.

\* For Whites Sensing Decline, Donald Trump Unleashes Words of Resistance[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/us/politics/donald-trump-white-identity.html]

\* Anti-Semitic Posts, Many From Trump Supporters, Surge on Twitter[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/anti-semitism-trump-supporters-twitter.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per] maligned undocumented **immigrants** as murderers and rapists. Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] hired one as her national director of Latino outreach.

Clinton organizers rolled through the streets of Orlando, Fla., blasting reggaeton music from their cars, calling out to Puerto Rican residents to vote for the woman many of them know as “La Hillary.”

And in Arizona, a grass-roots group released an online video game that rewards players with points every time they smack Mr. Trump and the Maricopa County sheriff, Joe Arpaio, in the face with a flip-flop, but that also tells those who play where to vote.

Many votes have yet to be counted, but this much is already clear: Hispanic America has been mobilized like never before in the 2016 election, and is emerging as a formidable force with the power to elect a president.

Energized by anger at Mr. Trump and an aggressive Democratic campaign to get them to the polls, Latinos are turning out in record numbers, and could make the difference in the outcome in several highly contested states.

And with African-American turnout so far failing to match the historic levels of 2008 and 2012, Hispanics could make up the difference. In fact, they could turn out to be Mrs. Clinton’s firewall.

In Florida, a state that is likely to be decided by the thinnest of margins, about one million of the nearly 6.2 million early votes counted as of early Sunday had been cast by Hispanics, an increase of almost 75 percent over 2012. In Clark County in Nevada, home to Las Vegas and the state’s largest Hispanic population, a record 57,000 people voted on Friday alone.

Eight years ago, President Obama inspired a wave of African-American turnout, with black voters hopeful and deeply moved by his candidacy. This time, it is not an admired figure but a disliked one — Mr. Trump — who is driving the surge among Hispanics.

Motivated by fear about what a Trump presidency would mean for their families, many Hispanics say they cannot afford to stay home.

“I’m scared for my country’s future,” said Cinthia Estela, 30, who is helping to organize Latinos for the Arizona Democratic Party. Sometimes, Ms. Estela brings along her mother and two young daughters, who are 8 and 9, to help in the effort.

“This is breaking us apart,” she said of the election. “This is taking us back many years.”

Crucially, many of the Latinos casting ballots are new voters. According to an analysis of early vote returns in Florida by Daniel A. Smith[https://electionsmith.wordpress.com/] of the University of Florida, more than one-third of Hispanics who have cast ballots so far did not vote in November 2012.

“It is truly historic,” Mr. Smith said. “Donald Trump has done more to energize Hispanics in Florida than any Democratic candidate.”

But the Democrats were laying the groundwork even before Mr. Trump emerged as the Republican nominee, with years of organizational planning and tens of millions of dollars in investment by pro-**immigration** groups, state Democratic Party organizations and the Clinton campaign itself.

From the beginning of her campaign, Mrs. Clinton and her team saw untapped potential in the 27 million Hispanics who would be eligible to vote in 2016, a 26 percent increase since 2012.

But voter turnout among Hispanics was stubbornly low. In the 2012 presidential campaign, 48 percent of eligible Hispanics voted, compared to 64 percent of eligible white voters, according to Pew.

So they set out to reach them in their communities, talking to them in their language, with the belief that touching them in the most personal way possible, at churches, bodegas, bus stops and nail salons, was also the most persuasive. And the effort was focused on more than registering potential voters. Democrats sought to make electoral politics part of the daily conversation for a demographic that had until now largely sat on the sidelines.

Starting in Nevada, the campaign convened groups of women to discuss issues that were important to them, like health care and education. After each meeting, the women were asked to write down the names and contacts of five other women who might support Mrs. Clinton. The program, called “Mujeres in Politics,” was deemed such a success that the campaign replicated it in Colorado and other states with large Hispanic populations.

“We understand this community. We know culturally what are the strongest messages that work for them,” said Lorella Praeli, Mrs. Clinton’s national director of Latino Outreach, who had lived undocumented for years after coming to this country from Peru. “This wasn’t created in an office. This was built on the ground.”

Mrs. Clinton also had to grapple with the fact that many Latino voters were disappointed with Mr. Obama, who had increased deportations and failed to bring about an overhaul of the country’s **immigration** laws. Mrs. Clinton knew she would need to tell Latino voters at the start of her presidential campaign that she would go further than Mr. Obama in extending a path to citizenship, even if it meant upsetting the president.

Mrs. Clinton and her Democratic allies now have a presence in every state with a large Hispanic population with customized strategies for each.

In Florida, the campaign identified early on the influx of Puerto Ricans who had fled the island amid its economic crisis as a potential bloc of new Democratic voters. Both Bill Clinton and Amanda Renteria, the campaign’s political director, were dispatched to Puerto Rico. And the campaign issued bilingual messages of support for funding to combat the spread of the Zika virus[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/zika-virus?inline=nyt-classifier] and to encourage legislation to address the debt crisis in Puerto Rico.

In Arizona, a state Democrats believe they have a chance of winning for the first time since Mr. Clinton carried it in 1996, Mrs. Clinton and her allies have focused much of their efforts on the restrictive **immigration** policies that have been approved by the Republican-led state government.

Ian Danley, executive director of One Arizona, a coalition of 14 organizations that lead voter mobilization efforts, said the group was sending 350,000 text reminders to Latinos, urging them to vote.

While Hispanic turnout this year is largely driven by on-the-ground voter outreach, Mrs. Clinton has also paid careful attention to select the right issues.

And there are few issues that have bonded her as closely to Latinos as **immigration**. On the polarizing questions surrounding what to do with undocumented **immigrants**, Mrs. Clinton has taken a more sympathetic posture than many in her party have, including the president, whom she has criticized as acting too aggressively on deportations.

She has embraced undocumented **immigrants** in a way that would have been practically unthinkable when her husband ran for president in 1992. And she has pledged to make the politically combustible issue of **immigration** reform a priority of her first 100 days in office if elected.

The Democrats have especially leaned on Hispanic women for their campaign. Similar to how black women became an influential engine of support for Mr. Obama, Hispanic women have been central to the organizing efforts of Democrats.

Latinas have been working phones and knocking on doors, often in mother-daughter pairs. And they say they are hearing the same story again and again from the neighbors they have persuaded to go to the polls: They have never voted before, but feel they must now because they cannot stomach the thought of Mr. Trump in the White House.

Asked if there was anything in particular that drove him to the polls in West Tampa, Fla., on Sunday, Oscar Diaz, 44, a maintenance worker with Puerto Rican roots, said simply, “Trump’s big mouth.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Les Neuhaus contributed reporting from Tampa, Fla.; Fernanda Santos from Phoenix; and Nick Corasaniti from New York.

\* Hillary Clinton Appears to Gain Late Momentum on Surge of Latino Voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-campaign.html]

\* Are Get-Out-the-Vote Efforts Targeting Latinos Working?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/magazine/are-get-out-the-vote-efforts-targeting-latinos-working.html]

\* Florida’s Changing Latino Population Veers From G.O.P.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/us/hispanic-voters-florida-republicans.html]

\* 27 Million Potential Hispanic Votes. But What Will They Really Add Up To?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/27-million-potential-hispanic-votes-but-what-will-they-really-add-up-to.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**DELRAY BEACH, Fla. — Some pro-Clinton videos circulating in this part of South Florida do not feature Barack Obama, Bernie Sanders or Elizabeth Warren. Instead, the praise came from Shimon Peres, Henry Kissinger and the son of Yitzhak Rabin.

Republicans are sending around cards showing a glowering Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per], an Iranian flag and missiles, and saying: “The Obama/Clinton Iran Deal Puts Israel at Risk and Makes Us Less Safe.”

Then there is the Facebook ad and robocall campaign puckishly titled “WWJD.” It answered the question many Jews here were wondering: What would Joe (as in Lieberman) do?

Both campaigns see a path to victory in Florida, the largest swing state, if they can engage the right demographic groups, from the Cuban refugees in Miami to the rural whites in the panhandle. But one of the most prized groups of voters in the Sunshine State is its hundreds of thousands of Jews, whose interest in the race often goes beyond the usual questions of Hillary Clinton’s judgment or Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per]’s temperament.

In interviews, Jewish voters here have said their votes were motivated by the same issues that matter to much of the rest of the electorate, such as **immigration**, the makeup of the Supreme Court and, perhaps more so this year, the character of the candidates.

But layered on top of that are specific concerns over support for Israel; the nuclear arms agreement with Iran, which is unpopular with Jewish conservatives; and unease over anti-Semitism that has surfaced among segments of Mr. Trump’s supporters.

“Trump has become their champion,” said Rabbi Mark Winer, the president of the Florida Democratic Party Caucus of American Jews. “To me, that’s disqualifying in itself.”

At an early-voting site on Friday in Delray Beach, where an almost hourlong line had formed on a sidewalk, Al Drelich showed up in his red “Make America Great Again” cap. He gave his spare hat to a Trump volunteer, and stayed around to talk up Mr. Trump and to debate the many Clinton supporters.

He bristled at the criticism he had heard about Trump supporters, saying they were wrongly maligned as racist. Plus, he seemed to be saying, Jews should know better than to blame anti-Semitism on Mr. Trump.

“That will be there forever. It will never change,” Mr. Drelich, a retired mortgage underwriter in his 80s, said. “We survived, and we will survive. But Trump is better for Israel than Hillary.”

Clinton supporters argued that her support for Israel was clear. Beyond that, they said, she is simply more qualified to be president.

“She’s a decent, educated, well-prepared human being, who respects people’s rights and who conducts herself like a lady,” said Ken Sommers, 73, a retired dentist from Long Island.

Benna Golub, 69, a retired special education teacher, conceded that she had to think hard before picking Mrs. Clinton over Mr. Sanders in the primary. But there was no wavering, she said, when she voted for Mrs. Clinton again in the general election: “She’s more stable, more experienced, more capable.”

Early-voting turnout in South Florida has been higher than it was in 2012, and Democrats are hoping that Jewish support can counterbalance the Republicans who have been flooding voting sites elsewhere in the state. More than six million Floridians had voted as of Sunday morning, according to state statistics, with Democrats holding a slight edge. (Who these voters chose will not be known until Tuesday.)

The three large South Florida counties have more than 500,000 Jews, or roughly 7 percent of the population, a percentage higher than anywhere in the country outside the New York metropolitan area, according to a 2015 study[http://www.jewishdatabank.org/Studies/downloadFile.cfm?FileID=3393] by researchers working under the auspices of the Jewish Federations of North America[https://www.jewishfederations.org/].

For decades, Jews brought their politics with them from the Northeast as they filled up South Florida’s many condominiums and subdivisions for middle-class retirees. Mrs. Clinton is widely expected to carry a majority of the Jewish voters in Florida, just as President Obama and other Democratic nominees have done.

The Democrats had once counted on the assistance of so-called condo commandos,[http://www.nytimes.com/1984/03/12/us/retired-voters-wavering-in-florida.html] who imported the machine-style politics from back home and were considered very effective at drumming up support from their neighbors. Though their influence has faded[http://www.nytimes.com/1999/04/08/us/a-political-era-fades-in-florida-s-condos.html], as many of those political organizers have died and the area has become more diverse, the contingent of Jewish voters has remained significant enough that both parties court them religiously.

Republicans have tried repeatedly to siphon Jewish voters, making appeals based on promises of lower taxes and being a stronger ally of Israel. Many here recall a crush[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/27/us/politics/republicans-go-after-jewish-vote.html] of direct mail and television ads in 2012, as well as the billboards placed by the Republican Jewish Committee along Interstate 95 lamenting, “Obama … Oy Vey!!”

Republican Jewish activists believe they have a good chance of helping Senator Marco Rubio win his race for re-election against Patrick Murphy, a Democratic congressman from South Florida. But Mr. Trump’s candidacy, which has been divisive even among Jewish Republicans, has tempered those ambitions for the presidential campaign.

“There was hope that the Iran arms deal would provide an avenue, but that’s frankly drowned out by the concern about Trump,” said Kenneth D. Wald, a political scientist at the University of Florida, who studies Jewish political behavior. “The level of alarm about Trump is very high.”

While Palm Beach County is one of the centers of Jewish life in the United States, it is also notorious in the history of American, and American Jewish, politics. Its confusing “butterfly” presidential ballot in 2000 helped lead to the defeat of Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, who would have been the country’s first Jewish vice president. Thousands of voters in the area mistakenly voted for Pat Buchanan, the ultraconservative candidate deeply disliked by many Jews. The Supreme Court ultimately ended a statewide recount of votes, giving the election to George W. Bush.

Mr. Lieberman later became an independent and a free agent of sorts, endorsing Senator John McCain, a Republican, over Mr. Obama in 2008 and speaking at that year’s Republican National Convention. That, Jewish Democratic leaders believe, made it all the more potent when he announced this summer that he was backing Mrs. Clinton, citing their years in the Senate together and saying she would be good for bipartisanship.

Whether Mr. Lieberman’s endorsement, and the numerous Facebook ads and robocalls touting it, has influenced anyone is not clear. It certainly has not moved Eddie Rosianu, 88, who said he had been a steadfast supporter of the Republican Party since he arrived in the United States from Romania by way of Israel.

“Eisenhower brought me here, and gave me a good future, a good family,” said Mr. Rosianu, a jewelry manufacturer whose business was on 47th Street in Manhattan for nearly 40 years.

His vote for Mr. Trump was based on more than party loyalty. “He has charisma,” he said. He also recalled a yearslong process to get him into the country, but now, echoing Mr. Trump, he said **immigrants** were entering more easily and with less scrutiny today. “We don’t know who they are,” he said.

And as it is November, Jeff Goldings, a 50-year-old freelance writer and editor who had come to the Palm Beach County Democratic Party’s office to volunteer with his mother, expressed a simple feeling many Floridians, Jewish or gentile, have been feeling of late.

He complained about the commercials on television and radio that “bombard you every day,” the constant phone calls and canvassers knocking on doors, trying to eke out every swing state voter they can.

“You can’t escape it — it’s everywhere, on every medium,” Mr. Goldings said. “I think people need a break.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the Morning Briefing newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/morning-briefing].

Jonathan Mahler contributed reporting from New York.

\* Early Turnout Tilts Toward Democrats in Swing States[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/31/us/politics/early-voting-trump-clinton.html]

\* Florida Voters With the Longest Memories Don’t Like What They See[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/29/us/florida-voters-2016-election.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Forget the fight for the White House, if just for a moment. As the 2016 campaign rumbles into its final hours, there are other things going on around the country on Election Day that are just as important and engaging. Well, almost.

Here’s a quick guide:

Marijuana

Look for marijuana to take another big step into the American mainstream. Voters in five states — California, Nevada, Arizona, Maine and Massachusetts — will decide whether to make recreational marijuana legal; if they all pass, that means that recreational marijuana will be legal in nine states. And four other states — Montana, North Dakota, Arkansas and Florida — will decide whether to legalize the use of medical marijuana[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/m/marijuana/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

Given the size of California — the nation’s most populous state with nearly 40 million people — approval there alone would be a milestone in the movement toward legalized pot, and no matter that federal law still outlaws it. Voters there narrowly defeated an initiative that would have made pot legal in 2010, but it is back on the ballot now with polls suggesting it is heading for an easy win, particularly in a high-turnout presidential election year.

“The name of the game is California — and that’s where our chances of winning are the best,” said Ethan Nadelmann, the executive director of the Drug Policy Alliance[http://www.drugpolicy.org/], which has been pushing for legalization.

Blue, Blue, Blue?

Democrats and Republicans have long thought that the nation’s political map has been changing as increasingly diverse and urban states become more favorable for Democrats.

One of the most intriguing states being watched is Georgia, which has not voted for a Democrat since a Southerner — Bill Clinton — was elected president in 1992. (It voted against him in 1996.) With the state growing increasingly diverse, Hillary Clinton has waged a vigorous campaign there. Some polls show it close, and, win or lose, Democrats see Georgia as another state coming into play.

Outside of the south, the political upheaval has been particularly notable in the West and in states with heavy Latino populations. The question is whether the shift that members of both parties believe is taking place is going to be accelerated this year, in no small part because of Donald J. Trump’s tough language on **immigration**. Keep an eye on Arizona, North Carolina and, to a lesser extent, Virginia.

Indeed, Arizona was a turn-it-blue target for President Obama in 2012, before his aides decided early in the summer the time had not yet come and pulled out.

“Arizona has been slower to change because of the high senior citizen population,” Jim Messina, who managed Mr. Obama’s campaign in 2012, told me. “But when you have Donald Trump and you are talking historic numbers of Latino votes, you are putting Arizona in play. When states become battleground states, they tend to stay battlegrounds.”

Latinos

Mr. Messina’s remarks about turnout among Latino voters signals something else to watch on election night: Is this the year that the Latino vote really comes through? In states across the country — California, Texas, New York, Florida, Arizona, Nevada, Iowa — the Latino population has been on the rise. But that has not translated into power at the polls, despite concerted efforts by Democrats and Latino political organizations to turn out Latino voters.

If that changes this year, it could make a dramatic difference in swing states like Arizona, Florida, Nevada and Colorado.

“All of the early data is pointing to a record Latino turnout,” said Matt Barreto, a professor of political science at U.C.L.A. and an adviser on Latino issues to Mrs. Clinton’s campaign. “In Florida, 30 percent of early votes among Latinos are from new first-time voters, and Latino early voting is up by 173 percent compared to 2012. There is no question that the Trump campaign has struck a serious nerve with Latinos.”

The Obama Legacy

President Obama is as popular as he has been for most of his presidency. But can he translate that popularity into votes for Mrs. Clinton? The president has put his reputation and support behind Mrs. Clinton more than any outgoing president in memory. And there is a reason for that: concern for the fate of his biggest legislative priorities — Obamacare — but also because the election of Mrs. Clinton will be judged in part as a validation of Mr. Obama’s legacy as president.

There is one important side note here: Can the nation’s first African-American president inspire the kind of turnout among African-Americans that Mr. Obama himself saw when he ran? Can Democrats count on the high levels of participation among African-Americans once Mr. Obama has left the scene? The early signs were not encouraging for Democrats in early voting; election night should answer that question.

Where the Action Really Is

Things may have ground to a halt in Congress over these past eight years, but that doesn’t mean that legislators have stopped making new policy or passing laws. It passed to the statehouses — and considering the fact that Republicans have made huge gains in statehouses during the Obama presidency, that means that much of the new policy reflects a Republican view of the world. Over the years, Republicans have used their dominant power in statehouses to, for example, put restrictions on voting, union organizing and access to abortion. Democrats have pushed to expand services to the poor or provide more services to **immigrants**.

A key question on Tuesday is whether Democrats can recapture some of the statehouses and governorships they lost during the Obama years, in states like Nevada and New Hampshire, where Mrs. Clinton had been particularly competitive. Right now it is a bit of a mismatch[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/24/us/obama-assists-150-state-candidates-targeting-gops-grip-on-legislatures.html]: Republicans held 36 of the nation’s 99 statehouse chambers in 2010, and that number has climbed to 68.

By the way, there is one important thing these legislatures will not be attending to next year: Drawing district lines for Congressional and state offices. Redistricting does not happen until 2020, the year when Democrats would hope to get back enough statehouses to make up for the redistricting shellacking they took in 2010.

Remember Bernie Sanders?

A final question: Will this election produce signs of a lasting movement inspired by Senator Bernie Sanders? Will he be a player in Democratic and national politics going into the next four years, and will the policies he advocated as a presidential candidate influence policy in a Clinton administration or in statehouses?

There are a few things to look for in measuring the durability of a Sanders movement. One, Mr. Sanders has campaigned heavily in California for a voter initiative — Proposition 61 — that would hold down the cost of prescription drugs. He endorsed it during his primary race against Mrs. Clinton here, and has stuck with it since.

In Oregon, Mr. Sanders has endorsed a voter initiative that would impose a sharp increase in corporate taxes for many companies. And he has thrown his weight and name behind a single-payer health care proposal that is on the Colorado ballot, another one that might have come right out of the Sanders playbook.

Mr. Sanders is also campaigning for Democratic candidates across the country, among them Russ Feingold, the Democratic candidate for Senate in Wisconsin; Katie McGinty, a Democrat running for Senate in Pennsylvania; and Zephyr Teachout, a liberal organizer running for Congress in upstate New York. Their victories could certainly enhance Mr. Sanders’s standing in Washington.

Of course, the best way to measure just how much of a force Mr. Sanders might be in American politics — and in a Clinton White House, should she win — is how successful he is in getting his army of supporters to the polls to support her on Tuesday.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Hillary Clinton Appears to Gain Late Momentum on Surge of Latino Voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-campaign.html]

\* 27 Million Potential Hispanic Votes. But What Will They Really Add Up To?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/27-million-potential-hispanic-votes-but-what-will-they-really-add-up-to.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**They campaigned urgently, even frantically, at airfields and arenas, on a college campus in Wisconsin and in a Philadelphia church. Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] and Senator Tim Kaine[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/k/tim\_kaine/index.html?inline=nyt-per], their prospects brightened by news[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/07/us/politics/hilary-clinton-male-voters-donald-trump.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=span-ab-top-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] that the F.B.I. had found no new troublesome emails in a review of Mrs. Clinton’s private server, pleaded with Americans on Sunday to get out and vote as if their very way of life were on the line.

Scrambling across the electoral map, Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per] and his running mate, Gov. Mike Pence, addressed supporters in darker and even graver terms, with Mr. Trump casting the election as a now-or-never moment for his brand of right-wing nationalism.

Surpassing the anxious entreaties of an ordinary presidential race, Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump begged voters to see the 2016 election as a choice of almost apocalyptic significance. Mr. Trump called the vote on Tuesday a final chance to turn back foreign forces menacing American identity, while Mrs. Clinton said the country’s long journey toward equality for women and minorities was at risk of being reversed in a day’s balloting.

Mrs. Clinton began her day in Philadelphia, speaking at the Mount Airy Church of God in Christ with Senator Cory Booker of New Jersey, a fellow Democrat. In a city where high black turnout could seal her grip on the presidency, Mrs. Clinton framed the campaign in the context of historic struggles for equality — from the origins of the women’s rights movement in Seneca Falls, N.Y., to the march for black civil rights in Selma, Ala.

“Everything you care about, everything I care about and have worked for, is at stake,” Mrs. Clinton said, without mentioning Mr. Trump.

Mrs. Clinton has delivered a broad message of national unity in the closing days of the campaign, offering herself to voters as an avatar of tolerance and reconciliation, in contrast to Mr. Trump. She was to campaign later on Sunday in New Hampshire with Khizr Khan, the father of an Army captain slain in Iraq, whose speech in July castigating Mr. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/31/us/politics/donald-trump-khizr-khan-wife-ghazala.html] as biased against Muslims and **immigrants** electrified the Democratic National Convention[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/d/democratic\_national\_convention/index.html?inline=nyt-org].

Mr. Trump, for his part, warned voters that they would never again see a candidate like him within reach of the presidency. At a midday rally in Sioux City, Iowa, Mr. Trump said over and over that he represented a “last chance” for voters angry about foreign trade and **immigration**.

“The media, Wall Street and the politicians are trying to stop us because they know we will fix the rigged system,” he said.

The announcement from James B. Comey, the F.B.I. director, reaffirming his assessment that Mrs. Clinton should not be charged with a crime over her handling of classified information, came as a blow to Mr. Trump and other Republicans hoping that a pre-election bombshell would upend Mrs. Clinton’s campaign.

As it stands, Mrs. Clinton appears to be entering Election Day as a solid if not overwhelming favorite, even as the race has narrowed over the past few weeks. A poll published Sunday by NBC News and The Wall Street Journal[http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/2016-election-day/final-nbc-wsj-poll-clinton-holds-four-point-national-lead-n678611] found her ahead of Mr. Trump by four percentage points nationally, and she maintains a clear upper hand[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/upshot/clinton-has-solid-lead-in-electoral-college-trumps-winning-map-is-unclear.html] in the Electoral College.

And Mrs. Clinton appears to be benefiting from a surge in participation by Latino voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-campaign.html] as well as unusually high enthusiasm among women. Early voting by Latinos may have already given Mrs. Clinton a decisive lead in the swing state of Nevada, as well as a meaningful edge in Florida, a state without which Mr. Trump has no path to the presidency.

Mrs. Clinton and her leading surrogates have also been making a last-minute appeal asking voters to embrace the idea of a female president, seeking to increase her lead among women and to persuade some hesitant men to discard their reservations about Mrs. Clinton’s gender.

Campaigning in Florida over the weekend, Mr. Kaine of Virginia accused Mr. Trump of tapping into sexism as a political tactic. He reproached Mr. Trump for saying at a rally that military officers would not want to follow orders from Mrs. Clinton, and for suggesting that she did not look presidential.

In Wisconsin on Sunday, Mr. Kaine hailed the historic nature of Mrs. Clinton’s candidacy and urged confident Democrats not to take victory for granted.

“If it had been easy for there to be a woman president of the United States, there would have been a woman president of the United States,” he said.

The Clinton campaign also booked national airtime during football games on Sunday night to run a pair of commercials featuring men who said they could not vote for Mr. Trump because of his treatment of women.

And Mrs. Clinton campaigned this weekend with two singers, Katy Perry and Beyoncé, who have hailed the Democratic nominee as a barrier-breaking candidate.

In some respects, the campaign of encouragement and reassurance echoes the Democrats’ successful push in 2008 to ease any hesitation about Barack Obama among white voters. That year, prominent white men in the party — including Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, now the vice president, and Richard L. Trumka, an A.F.L.-C.I.O. executive — made intensive efforts to bring along reluctant white voters.

Stephanie Schriock, the president of Emily’s List, a group that supports female Democratic candidates, said it had been important for leaders like President Obama and Mr. Kaine to speak directly to voters who “may still feel hesitant” about electing a woman.

Ms. Schriock said Mr. Kaine and Mr. Obama had also helped send the message to wavering men that Mr. Trump’s treatment of women was “not normal behavior.”

Tom Bonier, a Democratic data strategist and the chief executive of the firm TargetSmart, said there was ample evidence that women were “especially motivated to vote in this election.” He added that enthusiasm from female voters alone could push Mrs. Clinton’s final vote tally a point above where she stands in public polls.

“In every single battleground state, women not only make up a clear majority of ballots cast thus far, but the female share of the electorate is larger than it was in the 2012 election,” he said.

Female voters may play an especially influential role in a few states Mr. Trump is targeting late in the campaign, including Pennsylvania, Michigan and Minnesota, where there are fewer nonwhite voters and Mrs. Clinton’s lead depends in part on white women in the suburbs.

Mr. Trump has increasingly staked his candidacy on long-shot states in the Upper Midwest that have not voted Republican in a generation or more, in an attempt to escape the powerful backlash against his candidacy from Latino voters in more diverse swing states.

He was scheduled to campaign at a frenzied pace on Sunday, holding events in five states. But with the exception of Iowa, where he is ahead in the polls, Mr. Trump is competing on unfriendly turf, scrounging for support in unlikely areas like liberal-leaning Minneapolis and the prosperous suburbs of Northern Virginia.

While Mrs. Clinton has campaigned with an eye toward turning out specific voter groups in crucial states — firing up black voters in North Carolina and Latinos in South and Central Florida, for instance — Mr. Trump has crisscrossed a wider map of states, trumpeting the same fiery themes that have animated his candidacy from the start. With days left to campaign, he has done little to expand the reach of his message beyond his overwhelmingly white, less educated political base.

In Minneapolis, home to a sizable population of **immigrants**, Mr. Trump railed against refugees coming into the United States and singled out Minnesota’s Somali community for attack.

Mr. Trump’s campaign drew criticism over the weekend for releasing a two-minute closing advertisement that cast Mr. Trump as an opponent of international financial interests, and pictured three people — Janet L. Yellen, the Federal Reserve chairwoman; Lloyd C. Blankfein, the chief executive of Goldman Sachs; and George Soros, the liberal investor — as emblematic of the forces aligned against Mr. Trump. All three of those people are Jewish.

In a statement, the Anti-Defamation League said the commercial had — perhaps unintentionally — invoked “subjects that anti-Semites have used for ages.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the Morning Briefing newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/morning-briefing].

Amy Chozick, Thomas Kaplan and Nicholas Fandos contributed reporting.

\* Inside Donald Trump’s Last Stand: An Anxious Nominee Seeks Assurance[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/07/us/politics/donald-trump-presidential-race.html]

\* Emails Warrant No New Action Against Hillary Clinton, F.B.I. Director Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/07/us/politics/hilary-clinton-male-voters-donald-trump.html]

\* Hillary Clinton Appears to Gain Late Momentum on Surge of Latino Voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-campaign.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**VILNIUS, Lithuania — Facing trial in Russia over the theft of a street-art drawing valued by its creator at $1.55, Nikita Kulachenkov, a Russian forensic accountant involved in anticorruption work, fled to Lithuania to avoid what he decided was a doomed battle against trumped-up charges.

What he did not realize was that Russia’s reach these days extends far beyond its borders. Arriving in Cyprus from Lithuania in January to join his mother for a holiday, Mr. Kulachenkov was stopped at airport passport control, questioned for hours by **immigration** officials and then taken in handcuffs to a police detention center.

“They told me there was a problem with Russia and kept asking me what crime I had committed,” Mr. Kulachenkov recalled. Cypriot **immigration** and police officers seemed as mystified as he was, he said, by a note in their computer systems that described him as a wanted criminal requiring immediate arrest.

The wanted notice had been put there in August last year by Russia, where the theft of millions and even billions of dollars by the politically connected goes mostly unpunished but where the alleged theft of a street sweeper’s all-but-worthless drawing has been the focus of a lengthy investigation involving some of the country’s most senior law enforcement officials.

The arrest demand, known as a “diffusion,” had gone out to Cyprus and 50 other countries through the international police organization, Interpol[http://www.interpol.int/]. It had not been endorsed by Interpol, which is “strictly forbidden” by its Constitution from any action of a “political character,” but nonetheless labeled the 34-year-old anticorruption activist as a criminal in databases around the world.

Determined to punish domestic opponents who flee abroad, as well as non-Russians whose lives and finances it wants to disrupt, Moscow has developed an elaborate and well-funded strategy in recent years of using — critics say abusing — foreign courts and law enforcement systems to go after its enemies.

Some countries, including Russia, “work really hard to get Interpol alerts” against political enemies, said Jago Russell, the chief executive of Fair Trials International[https://www.fairtrials.org/], a human rights group in London, because “this helps give credibility to their own prosecution and undermines the reputation of the accused.”

“It is also potentially a good threat to use against people still in the country: ‘You may be able to leave, but don’t assume you will be safe,’” he added.

The efforts have often fallen flat in the end, but have succeeded in tying up their targets in legal knots for months and years.

Acting on a Russian request, a British court, for example, froze the worldwide assets of Sergei[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/21/world/europe/sergei-pugachev-russia.html] Pugachev[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/21/world/europe/sergei-pugachev-russia.html], a former close friend of President Vladimir V. Putin’s who fell out with the Kremlin in a squabble over property and fled to Britain, then France.

Russia has also used British courts and Interpol to pursue what many Western governments view as a vendetta against William F. Browder, an American-born British citizen. Mr. Browder was convicted in absentia[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/12/world/europe/russian-court-convicts-a-kremlin-critic-posthumously.html] in Russia of tax fraud after he fled to London and mounted an international campaign against Russia over the killing of his jailed Moscow lawyer, Sergei Magnitsky[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/23/world/europe/23magnitsky.html].

Mr. Browder defeated a libel case in 2013 brought in London by a Moscow police officer whom the financier had accused of involvement in a fraud uncovered by Mr. Magnitsky. But he faces a new fight as Russia seeks to get British courts to find and freeze his assets and enforce a civil judgment against him in Russia.

The only winners in most such cases are expensive lawyers, for whom pursuing Russia’s foes in foreign courts has become a highly lucrative business.

Russia pushed three times between 2012 and 2015 to get Interpol to issue arrest orders against Mr. Browder. Having failed each time[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/26/world/europe/interpol-rebuffs-russia-on-its-hunt-for-a-kremlin-critic.html] to convince the police organization that it did not have political motives, it announced this summer that it would try yet again.

“The Russians try stuff a hundred times, and sometimes it works,” Mr. Browder said. “They can fail 99 times, but the 100th time it could work. For them, that makes it all worthwhile.” He described the practice as “lawfare.”

Based in Lyon, France, and comprising 190 countries, Interpol defines its role as enabling “police around the world to work together to make the world a safer place.” It has often done this, allowing police forces to share information about the whereabouts of mafia bosses, murderers and other criminals, and to secure their arrest.

But the Interpol membership of nations — like Russia, Iran and Zimbabwe — that routinely use their justice systems to persecute political foes has stirred worries that wanted notices can be easily misused. In September, the congressional Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission[https://humanrightscommission.house.gov/] heard a litany of complaints about abuse from experts and victims of Interpol notices during a discussion of how to reform the police organization’s system of so-called red notices[https://www.interpol.int/INTERPOL-expertise/Notices/Red-Notices].

Interpol issues such notices, which amount to an international arrest warrant, at the request of a member country seeking help in catching a fugitive who has fled abroad. Interpol’s computer system also circulates diffusions like the one against Mr. Kulachenkov. These are less formal than red notices, but are also used to request the arrest or location of an individual, or information, in relation to a police investigation.

Interpol does not release figures for how many red notices or other arrest alerts are issued through its computer system by each member country, but the number of people identified in Interpol’s databases as wanted criminal suspects has risen sharply in recent years.

In 2004, Interpol issued just 1,924 red notices at the request of member countries. Last year, it issued 11,492, as well as 22,753 diffusions.

As a result of one of those, Mr. Kulachenkov spent nearly three weeks in a Cypriot jail while the authorities in Cyprus reviewed a request from Moscow that he be sent to Russia to stand trial in a case that even Russia’s prosecutor general had initially ruled was not worth pursuing.

The drawing he is accused of stealing was done by Sergei Sotov, a street sweeper and artist who had left it and other examples of his work hanging on railings around Vladimir, a city east of Moscow. The street sweeper made no complaint to the police when the drawing disappeared, and said he was glad that someone liked his work.

In the end, Cyprus decided not to extradite Mr. Kulachenkov after Lithuania advised it that he had no criminal record and had been granted political asylum because of his work in Russia with Alexei Navalny[http://www.politico.eu/article/opposition-leader-alexei-navalny-anti-corruption-putin-russia-democracy/]. A prominent anticorruption campaigner and Kremlin opponent, Mr. Navalny himself has been ensnared in a tangle of apparently trumped-up criminal cases in Moscow, including the supposed art theft.

The Russian authorities, said Mr. Kulachenkov, whose name has been purged from Interpol’s databases, “don’t really care about me, but they wanted to send a message that if you get involved with Navalny, we will make problems for you, even if you leave Russia.”

Stung by criticism that its role fighting real crime is being hijacked by repressive regimes, Interpol has moved to strengthen safeguards against abuse, particularly since the naming of a new secretary general, Jürgen Stock, in late 2014. Mr. Russell, of Fair Trials International, acknowledged that the group “is trying to make it more difficult to game the system.”

Interpol said last year that it would not issue arrest notices against people who had been granted political asylum or other forms of refugee status, though this did not help Mr. Kulachenkov when he traveled to Cyprus in January.

Asked about that, a spokeswoman for the Interpol General Secretariat[https://www.interpol.int/About-INTERPOL/Structure-and-governance/General-Secretariat] in Lyon said that she could not comment on individual cases, but that the policy of not targeting recipients of political asylum for arrest would work only if countries passed on information about who had been granted such a status. In most cases, she added, “this information is not available to the General Secretariat” when red notices or diffusions are issued.

Whatever Interpol finally does to stop the gaming of the system, it is too late for Petr Silaev[https://www.fairtrials.org/petr-silaev/], a 34-year-old Russian editor. Mr. Silaev took part in demonstrations against the destruction of a forest in Khimki near Moscow[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/15/world/europe/15russia.html] in 2010 and fled to Brussels seeking refuge after several protesters were badly beaten and the authorities branded the protests an armed riot.

He was later given political asylum in Finland and felt safe, until he took a trip to Spain to visit friends. Two days after his arrival, Spanish antiterrorism police officers stormed a hostel where he was staying and arrested him on the basis of a red notice issued against him by Interpol at Moscow’s request.

Held for nearly two weeks in a Spanish prison while a Madrid court approved his extradition to Moscow, he finally managed to phone a lawyer in Finland and contact Fair Trials International, which has campaigned against abuses of Interpol by repressive governments.

After appeals from a German member of the European Parliament and a storm of protest in the European news media, the authorities released Mr. Silaev from prison but ordered that he report to the Spanish police once a week.

Six months later, in early 2013, a Madrid court canceled Mr. Silaev’s extradition order and allowed him to return to Finland, where he spent another year pleading with Interpol to purge his name from its database.

“Interpol is a very Soviet-style organization,” Mr. Silaev said, describing it as “absolutely nontransparent” and easily manipulated by governments that regard protesters as no different from “rapists and murderers.” Interpol says it cannot publicly share information that belongs not to itself but to the member countries that provide it.

“It is a nightmare that keeps coming back if you don’t know how to fight it,” said Eerik-Niiles Kross, a member of Parliament in Estonia and former coordinator of the country’s intelligence services who has been targeted for arrest at least twice by Russia through Interpol.

Pilloried on Russian state television as a dangerous criminal, Mr. Kross has battled for years to purge international arrest orders issued against him. He and Estonian government officials say the orders are based entirely on fabricated claims by Russia that he was involved in hijacking a cargo ship off the coast of Sweden in 2009.

Mr. Kross, who is the son of a prominent Estonian writer arrested by the Soviet authorities and a frequent critic of Russia’s direction under Mr. Putin, believes the Russian accusations are payback for his work helping Georgia during its 2008 war with Russia[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/10/world/europe/10georgia.html].

“All Western institutions, particularly those in law enforcement, are based on good faith in government,” Mr. Kross said. “It is not foreseen that governments themselves are criminal. They can cook up anything they want and put it in the system, and the whole system starts to work against its purpose.”

Invented criminal cases, he said, “work like a computer virus: You put it in the system, and it starts to create havoc.”

Mr. Kulachenkov, the accused Russian art thief, said friends had warned him that Russia might try to get at him through Interpol. After his flight from Moscow to Lithuania in 2014, he wrote a lengthy letter to the police organization, pleading that it not list him as a criminal.

“It has become evident that Russian authorities use local investigation bodies and criminal justice systems to pursue their own political objectives,” he wrote. He detailed the Russian case against him for the supposed theft of the crude drawing that even Russian investigators, after inflating the artist’s initial evaluation of less than $2, valued at just $75.

He said he wished he had never taken the drawing, which he and a colleague gave to Mr. Navalny as a birthday gift. Taking the art “was a bad idea, but it was not a criminal offense,” Mr. Kulachenkov said.

“This whole thing is not about the drawing or me, but about Alexei,” he said of Mr. Navalny. “They are making him toxic. Anybody involved with Alexei gets a criminal case.”

\* Russian Hacker, Wanted by F.B.I., Is Arrested in Prague, Czechs Say[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/world/europe/prague-russian-hacker.html]

\* The Misuse of Interpol’s Database[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/11/opinion/the-misuse-of-interpols-database.html]

\* Interpol Calls for Arrest of Yanukovych and Other Former Ukrainian Officials[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/13/world/europe/interpol-calls-for-arrest-of-yanukovych-and-other-former-ukrainian-officials.html]

\* Interpol and U.N. Back ‘Global Policing Doctrine’[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/12/world/europe/12iht-interpol.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

PUEBLO, Colo. — After obliging a request for a selfie from a woman in the lobby, Bill Clinton[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/bill\_clinton/index.html?inline=nyt-per] left his hotel here on Friday and rode to his rally, where he made the case that Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] cared more about restoring jobs to forgotten workers than Donald J. Trump did.

Mr. Clinton said that his wife got things done, as evidenced by “a lady in a hotel lobby right here.”

“I said, ‘Who do you think we ought to elect?’” Mr. Clinton said, supposedly recounting his conversation with the woman. “She said, ‘You don’t have to ask me that. I’m from Belfast. I remember what she did to help make the peace in Northern Ireland.’”

It was Mr. Clinton, not his wife, who played a major role in brokering a peace accord. And the woman in the lobby, Lorraine Gordon, who **immigrated** from Belfast and is now an American citizen, never said those things.

Like so many white Americans who adored Mr. Clinton but despise his wife, Ms. Gordon and her husband have already cast their ballots for Mr. Trump.

“I don’t trust Hillary,” said Ms. Gordon, 57, who added that she resented illegal **immigrants** because she went through a long and expensive naturalization process. Her husband, John, 62, an engineer, added that “there’ll be more jobs” with Mr. Trump in charge.

Since January, Mr. Clinton has done nearly 500 public events, a good deal of them designed to capture the affection white working-class voters had for him and then transfer it to Mrs. Clinton. But that happens to be the demographic that constitutes Mr. Trump’s base. Indeed, the man who was arguably the greatest political mind of his era has become something of a peripheral player, even within his wife’s campaign. He has spent much of his time seeking support on the Democratic margins among those white voters he refuses to believe have abandoned him — and his wife — for good. “They took a leave of absence from normal politics because, you know, they went a long time without a raise,” Mr. Clinton explained in a brief, post-selfie interview with a reporter in the hotel lobby. “So that’s cyclical.”

Mrs. Clinton’s campaign managers and pollsters, aided by sophisticated data models and experience in the elections of 2008 and 2012, have shifted their focus away from the “Bubba” voters and to the winning Obama coalition of African-Americans, young progressives and Hispanics who are powering Mrs. Clinton. And while members of his campaign say they cannot imagine a more valuable political spouse to have, in interviews as well as hacked emails released by WikiLeaks[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/w/wikileaks/index.html?inline=nyt-org], Mr. Clinton has sometimes come off as an old master struggling to get with the new program.

According to two advisers to the Clintons, who declined to be identified because they were describing internal conversations, Mr. Clinton has at times doubted the trust-the-data approach of her campaign manager, Robby Mook, and has required mollifying assurances from senior staff members. Sometimes lower-rung staff members, or one of his numerous Democratic allies in the country, have gone to Mr. Clinton to complain about decisions being made by Mrs. Clinton’s top campaign officials, causing irritation all around.

One of the Clinton advisers said Mr. Clinton feared that her primary opponent, Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont, would commit voter fraud in the Iowa caucuses by busing college students into the state, and urged the campaign to divert valuable energy away from organizing and onto defense against dirty tricks.

Mr. Clinton saw his wife’s coming blowout loss in New Hampshire, where his unexpectedly strong showing[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/02/08/us/politics/bill-hillary-clinton-new-hampshire.html?\_r=0] in 1992 helped propel him to the nomination, as a crisis that desperately needed to be staved off, despite polling that showed Mrs. Clinton would quickly rebound as the race moved to more diverse states.

“He still thinks that HRC/he should be spending more time in Iowa/NH — earlier in January,” his chief of staff emailed Mr. Mook last December.

Mr. Clinton’s travel schedule, while robust, has operated on a second tier, with Clinton surrogates such as President Obama and his wife, Michelle, Mr. Sanders and Senator Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts appearing in the most prime locations. At times, the campaign even seems to prefer him off the radar.

Before Mrs. Clinton’s debate with Mr. Sanders in October 2015 in Nevada, Jake Sullivan, Mrs. Clinton’s top policy aide, responded to an email from Huma Abedin, her top personal aide, confirming that Mr. Clinton would be joining his wife on the plane to Las Vegas with the words, “This is not a positive development.”

Asked about Mr. Clinton’s role and standing in the campaign, his aides said his trips to Massachusetts and Missouri, both of which Mrs. Clinton narrowly won in the primaries, were based on his feedback and that the campaign’s data showed Mr. Clinton was decisive in delivering victory. And Mr. Mook said Mr. Clinton has been nothing but helpful.

“He’s been an integral part of this campaign throughout,” said Mr. Mook in a statement. “Once or twice a day I’m able to get his feedback and advice, and I could not be more grateful to have someone who is at once a mentor, a political junkie and a brilliant tactician for our campaign.”

Mr. Clinton acknowledged that he was glad the campaign was finally drawing to a close but added, “I’m having a good time, as you can see.”

But it has not always seemed like much fun. One of Mr. Clinton’s closest allies said he had been demoralized by an election that had resuscitated talk of his sexual affairs, alleged and otherwise.

He has generally stuck to the script but sometimes unintentionally causes trouble, as when he met with Loretta Lynch, the attorney general, on a tarmac in Phoenix, an encounter Mr. Trump has used to accuse Ms. Lynch of rigging the State Department email investigation for Mrs. Clinton. In a January email, Mr. Clinton’s press secretary, Angel Ureña, let Mrs. Clinton’s staff know that one trip by Mr. Clinton to New Hampshire had resulted in no such drama: “Fair to say we didn’t break anything.”

And on the trail, his age can show, with drifting sentences coming out of a dried mouth.

At a rally at the New Belgium brewery in Fort Collins, Colo., where a propeller plane with the words “Go Trump” painted under its wings buzzed overhead, Mr. Clinton relayed how he had told hurting coal miners who disliked his wife, “You guys did well when I was president, let’s come in and talk.”

But his few applause lines came when he mentioned the Black Lives Matter movement and Mr. Sanders, and when he doled out progressive red meat about free college.

In a Denver nightclub, Mr. Clinton made his case under a giant disco ball. Brooke McReynolds, 24, said she was impressed, but found his attention to the white working classes “a dying mind-set.” Still, she said, “He’s getting there.”

And yet when Mr. Clinton returns to form, he remains something to behold.

At his Pueblo rally, Mr. Clinton had the crowd uh-huhing as he lamented Mr. Trump’s degradation of politics. (“It looks more like reality TV and doesn’t do anything to change reality.”) He got them laughing when he told men who feared a female president to get over it because when women work on weekends, “We’ll have more time to watch football.” And a hush fell over the crowd when Mr. Clinton slipped inside the mind of the white voters who had left his family to support Mr. Trump.

“Look, his base is where I grew up. I was born in Arkansas to a mother of Scots-Irish lineage,” Mr. Clinton said. These were good, trustworthy people, he said, “but always and forever we have been manipulated by scoundrels.”

Mr. Trump, he said, followed in a long line of exploiters who “just — rub — salt — in our wounds.”

A white middle-aged man standing beside his young son in the back shouted the refrain often heard at Mr. Trump’s rallies: “Lock that bitch up.”

Mr. Clinton continued as if he had not heard a thing.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Correction: November 8, 2016, Tuesday

Because of an editing error, an article on Monday about Bill Clinton’s efforts to secure the support of white working-class voters for Hillary Clinton misstated Mr. Clinton’s finish in the 1992 New Hampshire primary. While he achieved an unexpectedly strong showing, he placed second, not first.

\* The Road Trip That Changed Hillary Clinton’s Life[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/29/us/politics/hillary-clinton-road-trip.html]

\* If Hillary Clinton Moves to Oval Office, Aides’ Baggage May Be Heavy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/us/politics/hillary-clinton-white-house.html]

\* For the Clintons, Two Investigations, One Protective Reflex[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/01/us/politics/clintons-comey-kenneth-starr.html]

\* How Hillary Clinton Grappled With Bill Clinton’s Infidelity, and His Accusers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/us/politics/hillary-bill-clinton-women.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

BOSTON — The television ads are relentless, fueled by a historic surge of campaign spending. Fliers are clogging mailboxes. Both sides are knocking on doors across the state.

But in deep blue Massachusetts, the contentious campaigning is not for president but for a ballot question on whether to expand charter schools[https://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/ele16/ballot\_questions\_16/ballot\_questions16.htm].

The pitched battle in this state, known as a bellwether on education policy, reflects the passions that charter schools[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/charter\_schools/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] arouse nationwide, particularly regarding a central part of the debate: If they offer children in lagging traditional public schools an alternative path to a quality education, do they also undermine those schools and the children in them?

Because Massachusetts’s charter schools rank among the nation’s best[http://credo.stanford.edu/documents/MAReportFinal\_000.pdf], advocates say a yes vote to allow more of them would send a strong signal that they have a crucial role to play in improving student learning and closing the achievement gap between white and black students.

But opponents say a no vote would show that even in a state where charter schools have been successful, most voters believe the schools — privately run but publicly financed — undermine traditional public schools, drain resources and perpetuate inequities, and should be curtailed.

“What happens in Massachusetts will send shock waves throughout the United States either way,” said Parag Pathak, a professor at M.I.T.’s Department of Economics, who studies education.

“If the voters reject more urban charters here,” he said, “then it’s not clear what more the charter movement can do to convince opponents and skeptics.”

Question 2 on the ballot asks whether the state should be allowed to approve up to 12 new charter schools or larger enrollments at existing charters each year, not to exceed 1 percent of the statewide public school enrollment.

The measure would affect nine communities that have either reached their caps on charter enrollment or have room for only one more charter school: Boston, Chelsea, Everett, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Springfield and Worcester. All have long waiting lists.

It would not affect 96 percent of the state’s school districts, yet strategists say voters in those districts — largely in suburbs with good public schools — could determine the outcome Tuesday.

Earlier this year, the charter proposal appeared to be nonpartisan and headed for passage. But in recent weeks, as the ad war has heated up, the campaign has taken on a partisan edge, with Republicans generally favoring charter expansion and Democrats generally opposing it, with the no side gaining steam.

Polls show that support for the measure has slipped. The most recent[http://www1.wne.edu/news/2016/11/PollingTables\_FINAL\_11\_04\_16.pdf], from Western New England University and conducted through Wednesday, showed that 39 percent of likely and registered voters supported lifting the cap on charters, while 52 percent opposed it.

The money raised so far — more than $34 million — exceeds the amount raised for any other ballot question in state history, and makes the campaign one of the most expensive in the country this year. The yes side has raised almost $22 million, much of it from out-of-state groups that do not have to identify their individual donors; the no side has raised more than $12 million, most of it from teachers’ unions.

What has really inflamed the argument is the question of equality, which has persisted since the inception of charter schools here 20 years ago: Do they exacerbate inequality? Or do they ease it?

Voters can be forgiven for being at sea in this debate as the spin machines on both sides have gone into overdrive and prominent political leaders have diverged.

“This is an issue about social justice,” Gov. Charlie Baker, a Republican leader of the yes side, said recently as he campaigned for the measure in Dorchester, a heavily minority section of Boston. “This is an opportunity to give every kid in Massachusetts the same opportunity my kids have.”

But Senator Elizabeth Warren, a Democrat who has supported school vouchers in the past[http://commonwealthmagazine.org/politics/warren-as-school-choice-champion/] and had remained aloof from this battle, issued a statement of opposition in September.

“I am very concerned about what this specific proposal means for hundreds of thousands of children across our Commonwealth,” Ms. Warren wrote, “especially those living in districts with tight budgets where every dime matters. Education is about creating opportunity for all our children, not about leaving many behind.”

Still, one thing is indisputable: The charter schools here — which, like those around the country, operate independently from school committees, are rarely unionized and have more flexibility in matters like hiring, termination, curriculum and length of the school day — have performed well. The urban charter schools, in particular, have produced better academic results than the district schools have.

Unlike other states, Massachusetts has increased its charters gradually; it still has only 78. In districts like New Orleans, they multiplied at a faster clip and have been less successful[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/23/opinion/sunday/the-myth-of-the-new-orleans-school-makeover.html].

In addition, Massachusetts has no for-profit charter schools, which have been blamed for uneven quality in areas like Detroit, and no online charter schools, which have been controversial in Ohio[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/19/us/online-charter-schools-electronic-classroom-of-tomorrow.html].

Voters in cities like Boston who otherwise have much in common can differ on charters.

Claudia Rodriguez, 50, a social worker who lives in Hyde Park, a Boston neighborhood, and has two children in a charter school, voted yes in early voting, hoping to expand her options.

“To me, it’s about choice,” said Ms. Rodriguez, an **immigrant** from Guatemala. “Why we cannot have the choice?”

But Irlande Plancher, 51, a Haitian **immigrant** in Hyde Park who sent three children to district schools and one to a charter, is voting no.

Ms. Plancher, a registered nurse, was glad her youngest child had the charter option. But with four charter schools in her area, she has seen two public schools close. She said she worried that adding more charters would further crimp the traditional schools.

“I think whatever we have is enough,” she said. “We cannot pick and choose which kids we educate and leave the rest out.”

What has further confused[http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2016-08-23/why-does-the-naacp-oppose-charter-schools] voters is how public figures and especially African-American organizations have been lining up.

Most Democrats here, including Mayor Martin J. Walsh of Boston, oppose the measure, while President Obama[https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2016/04/29/presidential-proclamation-national-charter-schools-week-2016] and Hillary Clinton[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2016/10/13/the-washington-post-asked-clinton-trump-for-their-education-vision-heres-what-they-said/], the Democratic presidential nominee, have supported charter schools. (They have not taken positions on Question 2 despite a misleading mailer[http://www.thesunchronicle.com/news/local\_news/despite-campaign-flier-white-house-says-obama-neutral-on-charter/article\_e7ef2dfc-9fd5-11e6-a233-8b70e629109b.html] and YouTube video[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lrJn3GODraA&feature=youtu.be] from supporters of the yes campaign implying that Mr. Obama had endorsed it.)

While the Urban League[http://iamempowered.com/] and many black educators support the ballot measure, the N.A.A.C.P.[http://www.naacp.org/] opposes it and has called for a moratorium[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/21/us/blacks-charter-schools.html] on charters, saying they worsen segregation. Black Lives Matter in Cambridge[https://saveourpublicschoolsma.com/black-lives-matter-cambridges-position-on-question-2/] has also come out against the measure.

The opponents’ chief message has been that charter schools drain money from district schools.

“This year alone,” one piece of campaign literature claims, “charter schools will drain more than $400 million that would otherwise stay in neighborhood public schools to help all students.”

Opponents also cast the ballot measure as a goal of “out-of-state billionaires,” including the brothers Charles G. and David H. Koch and members of the Walton family, which controls Walmart. Their real intent, Question 2 opponents say, is to bust teachers’ unions and privatize public schools.

“We can’t let people demonize our schools, particularly those who never have and never will set foot in any of our schools in the city of Boston,” Mayor Walsh declared Tuesday at a raucous rally.

But supporters of expanding charter schools say the argument that they drain money from public schools is alarmist and misleading. The yes side points to a study[http://www.masstaxpayers.org/sites/masstaxpayers.org/files/PR%20MTF%20Report%20Examines%20MA%20Charter%20School%20Funding%20September%202016.pdf] by the nonpartisan Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation[http://www.masstaxpayers.org/] — the Boston Foundation, which supports charters, financed the study — which concluded that charters do not take more money than their fair share, since financing follows children when they switch schools. This year, the study reported, 3.9 percent of the state’s students attend charter schools, which are receiving 3.9 percent of education money.

Opponents counter that when students leave, public schools still have to pay overhead, teacher salaries and other costs, which can lead to closings.

Maurice T. Cunningham, a political scientist at the University of Massachusetts Boston, said he was shocked at how big this ballot fight had become. Mr. Cunningham, a member of a teachers’ union who said he had not taken a position on the ballot question or on charters, noted that the labor movement had turned the campaign into “a good old-fashioned union brawl,” which escalated the spending on both sides.

Because the unions had worked so hard to defeat this measure, he said, the outcome would show that “if you can’t stop the hidden billionaire money[http://blogs.wgbh.org/masspoliticsprofs/2016/11/2/incurious-election/] in Massachusetts, then you can’t stop it anywhere.”

Correction: November 13, 2016, Sunday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An article last Sunday about a ballot question in Massachusetts on charter schools misstated the academic affiliation for Prof. Parag Pathak, who discussed the issue. He teaches at M.I.T.’s Department of Economics, not its Sloan School of Management.

\* Condemnation of Charter Schools Exposes a Rift Over Black Students[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/21/us/blacks-charter-schools.html]

\* Online School Enriches Affiliated Companies if Not Its Students[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/19/us/online-charter-schools-electronic-classroom-of-tomorrow.html]

\* A Sea of Charter Schools in Detroit Leaves Students Adrift[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/29/us/for-detroits-children-more-school-choice-but-not-better-schools.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per] is in striking distance of winning the election with two days to go, and there’s really just one reason for that: He’s leading white voters without a college degree by a huge margin.

In recent national surveys, Mr. Trump leads Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] by 59 percent to 30 percent among that group. It’s larger than the 57-35 lead that Mitt Romney had with those voters in the final polls in 2012.

On their own, Mr. Trump’s gains among this group have been enough to cancel out four years of favorable demographic shifts for Democrats among Hispanic and well-educated white voters.

He has even won supporters among some of the same white voters who were supporters of Barack Obama[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack\_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per] in 2008. It suggests that Mr. Trump and Mr. Obama might have a little more in common than you might think — at least from a political standpoint.

If he wins the presidency, that will ultimately be why. It has been a consistent pattern all year. Whenever Mr. Trump fights his way into a tight race with Mrs. Clinton, it’s because he manages to run up the score with blue-collar white voters.

Analysis of the early vote already makes it clear that turnout will be more than high enough for a Democrat to win a presidential election. Latino turnout will be high. Black turnout may not reach 2012 levels, but it will not be so low that one could reasonably blame black turnout for a Clinton loss.

But Mr. Trump’s strength among the white working class gives him a real chance for an Electoral College victory, a possibility that was largely discounted as recently as the summer. He could even win enough electoral votes without winning the popular vote, since Democrats depend on strong support among white working-class voters in Midwestern and Northeastern battlegrounds like Wisconsin and New Hampshire. It could even be enough for Mr. Trump to win Florida, where Mrs. Clinton’s strength among Hispanic voters would otherwise all but doom a Republican.

The conventional wisdom after 2012 held that Mr. Obama was a historically weak candidate among white working-class voters, and that there wasn’t much room for the Republicans to make additional gains. To the extent that there was an argument for how Republicans could make big gains among the group, it was that they could rally the support of missing white voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/upshot/donald-trump-cant-count-on-those-missing-white-voters.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fupshot&action=click&contentCollection=upshot®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=4&pgtype=sectionfront] — a group that in reality appears more Democratic than the white voters who do turn out in elections.

But exit polls tend to undercount the number of less educated voters, and the national exit polls obscured Mr. Obama’s strength among white voters in the North. They showed him faring worse among white voters than any Democrat since Walter Mondale, but that was exclusively because of the South. In many Northern states — like Iowa and Ohio — Mr. Obama did better among white voters than past Democrats. There was a lot of room for Mrs. Clinton to fall. She’s proving it.

For many, it was very hard to imagine that Mrs. Clinton — a white Democrat who excelled among white working-class voters in the 2008 Democratic primary — could lose voters who supported Mr. Obama in the 2012 election, or who approve of his performance today. It’s even stranger if one believes that racism is at the core of Mr. Trump’s appeal: If Mr. Trump’s supporters are animated by racism, then why did so many of them vote for Mr. Obama?

Racism might well animate Mr. Trump’s base. But his appeal among some white Obama supporters suggests that Mr. Trump and Mr. Obama might have something in common.

Mr. Trump has reversed the story of the 2012 and 2008 elections — and tapped into many of the same issues and frames that helped Mr. Obama.

In 2008, Mr. Obama depicted himself as an agent of hope and change: He ran against Washington, the establishment and special interests. In 2012, the Obama campaign attacked its Republican opponent, Mitt Romney, as a plutocrat who would outsource jobs and help the wealthy, not the middle class.

Those are the kinds of reasons that white working-class Democrats in places like Scranton, Pa., and Youngstown, Ohio, remained with the Democrats.

In this election, Mr. Trump flipped that frame. He ran against the establishment — and against a candidate who embodies it far more than John McCain or Mr. Romney. He depicted Mrs. Clinton as someone who supports corporate — even global — interests over the middle class on issues like trade and **immigration**. The various allegations against Mrs. Clinton neatly complement the notion that she’s not trying to help ordinary Americans.

Mrs. Clinton, meanwhile, has emphasized Mr. Trump’s fitness for the presidency more than the traditional Democratic campaign message about the economy.

Mr. Trump might fall short of the presidency, in part because he can’t capitalize on Mrs. Clinton’s deep weakness among white working-class voters. There are probably many young white men without a degree, for instance, who liked Mr. Obama and don’t like either Mr. Trump or Mrs. Clinton.

Regardless of the outcome, these voters will loom over American politics. Huge parts of the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org]’s establishment would undoubtedly prefer a candidate who’s friendlier to their views on **immigration** and trade. If Mrs. Clinton wins with strength among the well educated and Hispanic voters, much of the Republican establishment will conclude that those groups are in their electoral interest as well.

But the voters receptive to Mr. Trump’s views on these issues would have pulled Republicans awfully close to victory, even with a deeply flawed candidate. They’re also among the voters likeliest to be skeptical of Mrs. Clinton in four years. It would be difficult for the party not to cater to them.

Democrats would have the opposite challenge. Four years after demographic shifts were credited for Mr. Obama’s victory, the party would undoubtedly realize the extent to which they remain dependent on the support of voters whom they might have assumed they no longer needed. At the same time, their winning coalition would be better educated and more diverse than ever before. Without a Republican like Mr. Trump as a foil, it could be hard to devise an agenda and a message that would hold Mrs. Clinton’s coalition together.

The Upshot[http://www.nytimes.com/upshot/] provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/upshot] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/UpshotNYT]. Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/upshot/].

\* Why Does Education Translate to Less Support for Donald Trump?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/02/upshot/why-does-education-translate-to-less-support-for-donald-trump.html]

\* Clinton Has Solid Lead in Electoral College; Trump’s Winning Map Is Unclear[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/upshot/clinton-has-solid-lead-in-electoral-college-trumps-winning-map-is-unclear.html]

\* Why Republicans Don’t Even Try to Win Cities Anymore[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/03/upshot/why-republicans-dont-even-try-to-win-cities-anymore.html]

\* ‘It Really Does Get Into Your Head.’ The Election, Through the Eyes of Teenage Girls.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/05/upshot/it-really-does-get-into-your-head-the-election-through-the-eyes-of-teenage-girls.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hope, said the philosopher Francis Bacon, is a good breakfast, but an ill supper. Only a quarter-century ago, hope was an active force in world politics. The Cold War ended peacefully, and functioning constitutional democracies took root in Eastern Europe. The European Union was formally established, and membership was steadily extended eastward. The Oslo accords between Israel and the Palestinians were signed, and Nelson Mandela became president of South Africa after spending three decades in prison.

Do we even remember what hope looked like? Today, politics worldwide is being driven instead by anger, despair and resentment. And above all, nostalgia. “Make X Great Again” is the demagogic slogan of our time, and not just with the presidential candidacy of Donald J. Trump in the United States. What is political Islamism but the violent translation of a fantasy of return, in this case to an imagined era of religious purity and military might? Prime Minister Narenda Modi of India made his career by propagating Hindutva, a fanciful Hindu nationalism that extols Indian civilization before the arrival of Muslims. Far-right parties across Europe traffic in similar imagined pasts.

We live in a reactionary age. Revolutionaries traffic in hope. They believe, and wish others to believe, that a radical break with the past is possible and that it will inaugurate a new era of human experience. Reactionaries believe that such a break has already occurred and has been disastrous. While to the untrained eye the river of time seems to flow as it always has, the reactionary sees the debris of paradise drifting past his eyes. The revolutionary sees the radiant future, and it electrifies him. The reactionary thinks of the past in all its splendor, and he, too, is electrified. He is, he thinks, the guardian of what actually happened, not the prophet of what might be. This explains the strangely exhilarating despair that courses through reactionary literature and political rhetoric, the palpable sense of mission. As the editors of the right-leaning magazine National Review put it in its very first issue, the mission is to stand “athwart history, yelling Stop.”

Reactionaries are not conservatives. This is the first thing to be understood about them. Conservatives have always seen society as a kind of inheritance we receive and are responsible for. The healthiest way to bring about change, the conservative believes, is through consultation and slow transformations in custom and tradition, not by announcing bold reform programs or inventing supposedly inalienable individual rights. But the conservative is also reconciled to the fact that history never stands still and that we are only passing through. Conservatism seeks to instill the humble thought that history moves us forward, not the other way around. And that radical attempts to master it through sheer will bring disaster.

Reactionaries reject this conservative outlook. They are, in their way, just as radical as revolutionaries and just as destructive. Reactionary stories always begin with a happy, well-ordered state where people willingly shared a common destiny. Then **alien** ideas promoted by intellectuals and outsiders — writers, journalists, professors, foreigners — undermined that harmony. (The betrayal of elites is central to every reactionary myth.) Soon the entire society, even the common people, were taken in. Only those who have preserved memories of the old ways — the reactionaries themselves — see what happened. Whether the society reverses direction or rushes to its ultimate doom depends entirely on their resistance.

Nor are reactionaries to be found only on the right. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and of revolutionary hopes for the post-colonial world, the European left has traded the rhetoric of hope for that of nostalgia. Nostalgia for its own past power. The story the reactionary left tells itself begins with the revolutions of centuries past, the uprisings, the general strikes. Then, with Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, came the fall. Who is to blame? Once again: intellectuals — in this case an international cabal of “neoliberal” economists. They somehow managed to persuade governments and formerly working-class voters that to get rich is glorious. And when the riches never arrived, racist politicians persuaded those voters to blame **immigrants** and minorities. This illusion can be dispelled only if we Make the Left Great Again — though what exactly a revivified left will do remains a mystery. Not one of the new anti-globalization parties in Europe — Podemos in Spain, Syriza in Greece, the Five Star Movement in Italy — has put forward a remotely plausible program for the future.

There is a connection between the popularity of these parties, the British vote to leave the European Union and the enthusiasm for Mr. Trump in Middle America. Economic globalization and the paralysis of democratic institutions has left ordinary people in Western societies feeling disenfranchised. So has the fact that no party or movement across the political spectrum has offered a plausible vision of the future based on present realities, which change with increasing speed. To live a modern life anywhere in the world today, subject to perpetual social and technological transformations, is to experience the psychological equivalent of permanent revolution. Anxiety in the face of this process is now a universal experience, which is why reactionary ideas attract adherents around the world who share little except their sense of historical betrayal.

Every major social transformation leaves behind a fresh Eden that can serve as the object of somebody’s nostalgia. And the reactionaries of our time have discovered that nostalgia can be a powerful political motivator, perhaps even more powerful than hope. Hopes can be disappointed. Nostalgia is irrefutable.

Mark Lilla, a professor of the humanities at Columbia and a visiting scholar at the Russell Sage Foundation, is the author, most recently, of “The Shipwrecked Mind: On Political Reaction.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — The young Mexican couple packed their possessions in boxes and garbage bags 20 years ago, locked them in a room of their half-built house in Mexico City and then migrated illegally to the United States with their 3-year-old daughter in search of work, taking only what they could carry.

The plan was to return a couple of years later, but instead they remained, undocumented, in New York City. The boxes and bags stayed where they had left them, their contents mostly forgotten: a family’s beacon of hope.

One recent morning, the daughter, Guadalupe Ambrosio, now 23, stood in front of the locked door of that room, the key in her hand. It was her first visit to Mexico[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/mexico/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] since she had left when she was 3. She was about to open those boxes and bags for the first time since they had been stored, reconnecting with her interrupted childhood and closing a yawning circle for her family.

Ms. Ambrosio, an undergraduate at Borough of Manhattan Community College, was never sure she would have this chance. She, too, is undocumented. For most of her life, had she tried to visit Mexico, she would have been barred from re-entering the United States.

But in 2012, she enrolled in a federal program that allows young, undocumented **immigrants** to remain in the United States temporarily and work legally. Participants in the program, known as deferred action, can also apply to travel abroad for humanitarian, educational or work purposes, and re-enter the United States without penalty. Since the advent of the program in 2012, thousands of young undocumented **immigrants** have used the travel permission to visit the countries they left as children.

But with the American presidential election at hand, the future of the program, an initiative of the Obama administration, remains uncertain. The new president could cancel it, leaving young undocumented **immigrants** to wonder whether they can ever return to their homelands without having to forsake their lives in the United States.

“People are scared,” Ms. Ambrosio said. “We’ve been fighting for this.”

The trips have been intense periods of discovery, and rediscovery, as the young **immigrants** reconnect with relatives and family friends — many known only through phone calls or their parents’ stories — and return to places that have come to seem more imaginary than real.

The visits have been marked by deep and sometimes painful reflection about identity and belonging, freighted with the yearnings of undocumented parents back in the United States who are unable to make the trip themselves without giving up everything they built.

“It has always been so difficult to find words to describe how important this journey is,” said Alyshia Gálvez, the director of the Jaime Lucero Mexican Studies Institute at the City University of New York[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/c/city\_university\_of\_new\_york/index.html?inline=nyt-org]’s Lehman College.

She added, “To live most of their lives with secondhand information about Mexico and why their families left, and given the awful stagnation in **immigration** law, they haven’t been able to develop their own understanding of their country and their relationship to it.”

Ms. Ambrosio was part of a group from CUNY who spent about six weeks in Mexico this summer. Nearly all were Mexican-born and returning to their birthplaces for the first time since leaving the country as children.

Nearly all were undocumented — the sons and daughters of construction workers and domestic workers, landscapers and restaurant workers — and were traveling with permission. The justification for the trip was a community-service program in San Miguel de Allende, after which the group split up to visit relatives and friends around Mexico.

Sergio Torres, 25, a theater student at Borough of Manhattan Community College, planned to confront his estranged father, whom he had refused to talk to for years because of his violent treatment of the family when Mr. Torres was a boy.

Marlen Fernandez, 24, a staff member at the Jaime Lucero Mexican Studies Institute in the Bronx, was returning with her daughter, who is 2 — a year younger than Ms. Fernandez was when her parents took her to New York City.

Gloria Farciert, 21, a senior at Brooklyn College, was heading back to her hometown, a village in rural Puebla State that, in recent years, has been gutted by migration to the United States, especially to the New York region. She had left Mexico when she was 11.

“Sitting on this airplane feels surreal,” Ms. Farciert wrote on her Instagram account on July 4 next to a photo of her Mexican passport and airplane tickets. “There’s a lot of mixed emotions happening.”

The flight to Mexico City was, for some, a transcendent experience, temporarily erasing a political barrier that had defined their lives. As the plane flew from American airspace into Mexican airspace, with the border somewhere below, Ms. Fernandez thought to herself how easy it was to cross.

“That border is so heavy for me,” she said.

In Mexico, they were something between natives and tourists, regarded by other Mexicans as not quite brethren yet not quite foreigners. This uncertain acceptance echoed the feeling of dislocation that hounded them in the United States: They had grown up American in every way but lacked the legal status of belonging.

“I don’t know if I’m an American in disguise or a Mexican trying to be American,” Mr. Torres said midway through the visit. “We’re coming home in a sense, but it doesn’t feel like home anymore.”

Many also came to realize just how much the trip meant for their parents, for whom they were serving as envoys. “That puts a little pressure on you because you’re giving them voice,” Ms. Fernandez said.

After the program in San Miguel de Allende, Ms. Ambrosio stayed with her paternal grandparents in San Miguel Teotongo, a working-class neighborhood on the outskirts of Mexico City. Reconnecting with her relatives, she felt a sense of acceptance that she had struggled to find growing up in the United States.

A watershed moment came when she opened the boxes that had been packed and stored 20 years ago. Her grandparents had gone in from time to time to dust the storage room but everyone had left the boxes as they were.

“They always thought that we would come back,” Ms. Ambrosio said.

She found a large garbage bag with dozens of stuffed animals and another full of children’s’ clothes and plastic toys — all of them once hers, though long forgotten.

“I didn’t imagine I had so many things,” she said as she methodically unpacked the stuff.

There was kitchenware, furniture, costume jewelry and even artifacts from her mother’s quincienera party. But the grand prize for her, it seemed, were the photo albums.

She had grown up with only a few photos of herself as a girl in Mexico. Now she had the motherlode in her hands. As Ms. Ambrosio flipped slowly through one of the albums — photos of her as a baby and as a child, with her mother, with her relatives, with her late grandmother — she began to cry.

“This is a childhood that I always wanted,” she said.

Elsewhere in Mexico, the other students were making discoveries of their own.

In Puebla State, Ms. Farciert was struck by the emptiness of her hometown, the rural village of San Miguel de Lozano. And she saw the length of her time away reflected in the aging of her grandparents.

“Whenever my grandfather talks to my dad, the question is always: ‘When are you coming back?’” she said. “The truth is, there is no definite answer because my mother nor my dad knows when they’ll come back.”

“I wish that my parents had this opportunity and not me,” she continued. “Borders break us in all different types of ways.”

In Mexico City, Mr. Torres visited relatives and made a trip to the Basilica de Guadalupe, a national shrine, to buy religious iconography that his mother, back in East Harlem, had requested. He then traveled to Puebla to visit more relatives. But all of that was a preamble to the most important task on his agenda: confronting his father.

When Mr. Torres was 6, his father had violently thrown him, his younger brother and his mother out of their house in the state of Guerrero. Mr. Torres had not spoken with his father since he was 13.

“I need to know why he did what he did,” he said.

The encounter, about a week later, did not go well.

“I was hoping he would be, like: ‘I’m sorry. I’m sorry the way I treated your mom. I’m sorry about the way I treated you guys,’” Mr. Torres said. “But all he was, was like, ‘Oh, what I did was because your mom talked back to me.’” After arguing with his father for 40 minutes, Mr. Torres left. As Mr. Torres recounted the episode, there was pain in his voice. But he insisted his father’s total lack of remorse allowed him to move on. “I’m ready to close that chapter,” he said.

The students — now back on the American side of the border, in a country that regards them with ambivalence — have resumed their classes and returned to their jobs, caught between two nations, yet of neither place entirely.

“I came back more angry than I was,” Ms. Fernandez said about American **immigration** laws. Her anger extended to the Mexican government for its failures to “provide us with a better place to live,” she said.

Her relatives pleaded with her not to wait another 20 years before visiting again, but asked, if she could not make it, that she send her sister or her daughter instead.

One aunt had not seen her son since he migrated to the United States about 15 years ago. “She was like, ‘Please tell him to come back and see me before I die,’” Ms. Fernandez recalled. “‘Tell him to send me my grandchildren. I don’t care if they don’t speak Spanish. I just want to hug them.’”

\* **Immigrants** Living ‘On Pause’ Fear Obama’s Leniency Will Not Outlast Election[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/05/us/immigrants-obama-election-fear-leniency.html]

\* Afghanistan Itself Is Now Taking In the Most Afghan Migrants[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/05/world/asia/afghanistan-migrants.html]

\* Paris Is the New Calais, With Scores of Migrants Arriving Daily[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/world/europe/paris-migrants-refugees.html]

\* For Helping **Immigrants**, Chobani’s Founder Draws Threats[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/01/business/for-helping-immigrants-chobanis-founder-draws-threats.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The United States has seen worse than Donald Trump. It has endured political crises and corruption, war abroad and bloodshed at home. But that doesn’t make it any easier to contemplate the catastrophe that looms if we wake up Wednesday morning to President-elect Trump.

There’s no sense complaining anymore. The hurricane is three days from landfall. The urgent thing now is to avert the worst, minimize the damage, save the foundations, clear the mess.

Averting the worst starts with electing Hillary Clinton. For many voters that will mean defying Republican efforts to jam the electoral machinery through lies, legal obstructions and the threat of violence. We hope the voters hold out, however intimidating the process and long the lines. For Americans who may feel unmoved or unwilling to vote for Mrs. Clinton, here is a question from the future: In 2016 we were closer than ever to electing an ignorant and reckless tyrant — what did you do to stop him?

This surreal, miserable presidential campaign exposed a lot of rot in our democracy’s infrastructure, and anger in the populace. Those conditions are related. It has exposed a sick Republican Party. Some in the never-Trump movement tried and failed to stop the nominee. But history will not be kind to the other Republicans who, out of cravenness or calculation, sidled up to a man they knew to be unfit for office. Paul Ryan, Mitch McConnell, Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio — weaklings all. A party of holier-than-thous standing athwart history, saying, “Stop Hillary, whatever the damage.” Mike Huckabee, on Twitter[https://twitter.com/GovMikeHuckabee/status/794483288282955776] ,[https://twitter.com/GovMikeHuckabee/status/794483288282955776] shared this pithy lunacy: “Trump may be a car wreck, but at least his car is pointed in right direction.”

It is a history of coded race-baiting combined with myopia and cowardice that puts the Republican establishment in lock step now with the alt-right, the Ku Klux Klan, the racists and misogynists and nut jobs, the guy who shouts “Jew-S.A.,” the crowds that scream, “Lock her up.” For some it is taxes, abortion or **immigration**, for many it is simply Clinton hatred that allows them to justify supporting a candidate who also stands for torture, reckless war, unchecked greed, hatred of women, **immigrants**, refugees, people of color, people with disabilities. A sexual predator, a business fraud, a liar who runs on a promise to destroy millions of **immigrant** families and to jail his political opponent.

If Mr. Trump is rejected on Tuesday, the nation will have a momentary breather. And some good news to build on. The Republicans who have spent the last weeks and months jumping on, then off, then on the Trump bus will have been discredited, and some may be unseated. Those in the Trump inner circle will be freshly disgraced, and perhaps go away — like Rudy Giuliani, former New York mayor, now Mr. Trump’s conspiracy ghoul, and Gov. Chris Christie[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/opinion/gov-christies-shadow-over-bridgegate.html] of New Jersey, who has been separately brought low in an unrelated courtroom drama. And the electorate will have demonstrated its decency.

The rejection of Trump is the simple part. Win or lose, the harder job will be confronting the conditions that spawned him. This country’s problems will still be deep and complex, and the Republicans in Congress show [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/opinion/donald-trumps-impeachment-threat.html] no signs[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/opinion/donald-trumps-impeachment-threat.html] of giving Mrs. Clinton any more respect than they gave President Obama, or of abandoning their jihad against responsible governing. If she wins, Mrs. Clinton will have the burden of managing the jihadis, while governing for the benefit not only of her supporters but also of the tens of millions who will have voted for Mr. Trump expecting — against all evidence — that he will make everything better. It won’t be easy.

“Winter Is Coming” is the title Garry Kasparov gave his book about Vladimir Putin. Autumn is here in the United States, too. It’s time to focus. To confront what Trump represents, the better to end it. Let this election have the salutary effect of reminding Americans as a nation of who we are, and the good we can do, when we are put to the test.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With only hours left before Election Day, here’s the painful, self-evident truth facing lifelong Republicans like me: The 2016 presidential campaign has revealed dark and disturbing things about not only Donald J. Trump but also the party that nominated him.

Self-renewal starts — but doesn’t end — with self-examination.

The forces that propelled Mr. Trump’s rise need to be confronted and defeated. It won’t be easy, given that tens of millions of Americans will vote for him and believe deeply in him. But if these forces are not defeated, what happened this year will be replicated in one form or another, and the Republican Party will continue to inflict great harm on our republic.

If Mr. Trump loses the presidential race, as I believe is likely but hardly a sure thing, it will not be enough for Republicans to excuse or ignore his candidacy. It could never have happened unless things had gone terribly awry in the Republican Party. Its political and moral recovery requires Republicans to reverse three destructive trends that have emerged over the last decade.

Anti-intellectualism. As Margaret Thatcher once said, first you win the argument, then you win the vote. One of the appealing things to me about the Republican Party in the early 1980s, as a young conservative, was that it had become a party of ideas, of governing experiment. But somewhere along the way large numbers of Republicans began to devalue serious ideas. For example, as early as 2013, Gov. Chris Christie of New Jersey, one of Mr. Trump’s most emphatic supporters, said[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/new-jerseys-chris-christie-looks-to-send-a-message-to-gop-with-his-reelection-campaign/2013/11/03/863f5708-433f-11e3-a624-41d661b0bb78\_story.html] of his fellow Republicans, “I think we’ve had too many people who’ve become less interested in winning an election and more interested in winning an argument.”

Pointing to the precise moment this devaluation occurred is difficult; it was a gradual process. But the embodiment of what I’m talking about is someone like Sarah Palin, who started out as a relatively conventional, if unaccomplished, Republican governor and was thrust into the spotlight as John McCain’s vice-presidential nominee in 2008. Since then she has become the proud personification of thoughtlessness. I don’t agree with President Obama on very much, but he was right when he said[http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/10/barack-obama-on-5-days-that-shaped-his-presidency.html] there was a straight line that could be drawn from Ms. Palin to Mr. Trump. A party that produces Ms. Palin as its vice-presidential nominee and Mr. Trump as its nominee is at war with reason.

Political recklessness. Over the years a large number of Republicans began to dismiss the craft of governing. They embraced a style of politics characterized by unceasing combativeness, intemperance and a deep hostility toward compromise and temperamental moderation. One example: the 2013 shutdown of the government, a ridiculous and politically damaging move led by Senator Ted Cruz of Texas.

Particularly since the election of Barack Obama, we have witnessed on the Republican side the rise of fear, anger and apocalyptic rhetoric. It didn’t have to be this way, but we’ve also seen the growing appeal of conspiracy theories, with the most poisonous and revealing being that Mr. Obama was not born in the United States.

In 2011, I wrote a column in The Wall Street Journal criticizing Mr. Trump’s embrace of birtherism[http://www.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/articles/SB10001424052748703551304576260773968228358], warning that “when prominent figures in a party play footsie with peddlers of paranoia, the party suffers an erosion of credibility.” I also pointed out that “people are generally uneasy about political institutions that give a home to cranks.” But I never for a moment imagined that Mr. Trump, as the chief apostle of this crazed, racist conspiracy theory, would become the nominee of the Republican Party five years later. Yet he did, and he did it in large part not despite but because he has championed one conspiracy theory after another[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/09/16/here-are-10-more-conspiracy-theories-embraced-by-donald-trump/]. When conspiracy theories gain wide currency within a political party, it means it is losing — or has lost — contact with reality.

Appealing to nativism and xenophobia. Within the Republican Party there are legitimate concerns about illegal **immigration**. While I favored comprehensive **immigration** reform in the past, I never believed that most of the opposition to it was based on nativism. (Even now, most Republicans favor a pathway[http://www.people-press.org/2015/06/04/broad-public-support-for-legal-status-for-undocumented-immigrants/] to legal status and citizenship[http://thehill.com/homenews/news/274575-poll-majority-of-republicans-support-path-to-citizenship] for illegal **immigrants**.) But what can’t be denied is that the Republican nominee began his campaign by appealing to nativism and xenophobia, and as the primaries unfolded it was the issue he returned to time and time again. Mr. Trump’s success has emboldened ugly forces within the Republican Party that had been confined to its fringes. Demonizing people of other races, cultures and faiths succeeded; demeaning women and war heroes succeeded. The fact that we’re now so familiar with his offenses shouldn’t inure us to how damning they are.

That a demagogue like Mr. Trump would emerge when there is a lot frustration in the lives of Americans who feel that their suffering is ignored isn’t without precedent. Which is why the greater sin of the Republican Party wasn’t that Mr. Trump won the nomination by carrying a plurality of votes in a large field. It was that people who surely knew better rallied to Mr. Trump once he became the nominee. Some advised him, others defended him and excused him, and still others tried to ignore him. Certain people acted worse than others. But in the end, they were all caught up in Mr. Trump’s ethical confusion and moral corruption. They didn’t pull him up; he pulled them down.

It is not as if the trends cited above were unknown to responsible Republicans and conservatives before the advent of Mr. Trump. They were, and some party loyalists challenged them at the time. Those efforts clearly failed, and Republicans have to come to terms with the fact that the rot was far more advanced than we understood.

Those of us who have long defended the Republican Party could do worse than honestly assess what role we might have played in all this, what we missed and why, and what more we could have done to stop it. When you are part of a political movement that chose Donald Trump as your nominee, some serious self-reflection is in order.

For now, though, the Republican Party faces a crisis. If Mr. Trump loses, the party faces a daunting reconstruction challenge. Policies that promote economic growth, social mobility and greater opportunity are important. But in some respects the party’s stance on the tax code, wage subsidies, higher education, tax credits or entitlement programs are a secondary priority.

Republicans need to wrestle with more fundamental questions first: Will their party choose as its leaders people who respect democratic institutions and traditions, or not; who conceive of America as a welcoming society or as one that is racially and religiously closed; who are committed to helping or exploiting the weak and vulnerable; who admire or oppose tyrants; who respect truth or view it in purely utilitarian ways; who abhor ignorance or embrace it? Will Republicans gravitate toward leaders who have authoritarian tendencies, who incite violence in their followers, and whose personalities are vindictive, cruel and disordered?

In a post-Trump world, Republicans need to ask themselves if their party will be characterized by its aspirations or its resentments. Can it make its own inner peace with living in an increasingly diverse and nonwhite America? Does it conceive of its role as tamping down or inflaming ugly passions? Does it believe in a just social order or not?

These questions are not about whether the economic concerns of Mr. Trump’s core constituency should be taken seriously and addressed by Republican policy makers. They clearly should, and in fact many of the people who urged the party to focus on this long before Mr. Trump entered the race are his most scathing critics. These questions go to how the Republican Party conceives of itself, its role and purpose in our political system and our common life. No single person can answer them. This self-definition rests with Republicans in every state and social stratum.

The next few months will tell us a lot about whether Mr. Trump and Trumpism were an anomaly or are now the new norm of the party that Lincoln helped create. Even liberal critics of the Republican Party who believe Mr. Trump was an inevitable result of the party’s political machinations have to concede he is in a different category than the nominees who preceded him. President Obama and Hillary Clinton have both said as much.

If Mr. Trump should win on Nov. 8, the Republican Party will be fundamentally redefined, to put it mildly. Many of us could not continue to be a part of a political institution defined by Donald Trump, by Breitbart.com and Ann Coulter, one that most resembles the right-wing nationalist parties we see in Europe. Our allegiance isn’t to a party; it is to a set of ideas and ideals, to the good of the whole, to what the prophet Jeremiah called “the welfare of the city.” No party is simply the embodiment of ideas, of course. All parties are coalitions. But a party that is recast into the image of Mr. Trump is something many of us would want nothing to do with.

Of course, if Mr. Trump wins, it won’t simply be the Republican Party that faces its moment of reckoning. Our republic will, too. That worries me a great deal more, because I love my country far more than I love my party.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Peter Wehner, a senior fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, served in the last three Republican administrations and is a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HOW did we get here? How did it come to this? Not just to the Donald Trump phenomenon, but to the whole choice facing us on Tuesday, in which a managerial liberalism and an authoritarian nationalism — two visions of the president as essentially a Great Protector: a feisty grandmother or fierce sky father — are contending for the votes of an ostensibly free people?

Start with the American family. Start with my own family, as an illustration — white Protestants for the most part on both sides with a few Irish newcomers mixed, rising and falling and migrating around in the way of most families that have been in this country a long time.

My maternal great-grandfather had five children, four of whom lived to have families of their own. His son, my grandfather, also had five children, two sons and three daughters, who grew up as part of a dense network of cousins.

On my father’s side, the families were a little smaller. But my dad was one of three siblings, meaning that I had six aunts and uncles overall.

Then the social revolutions of the 1970s arrived. There were divorces, later marriages, single parenthood, abortions. In the end all those aunts and uncles, their various spouses and my parents — 12 baby boomers, all told — only had seven children: myself, my sister and five cousins.

So instead of widening, my family tree tapered, its branches thinned. And it may thin again, since so far the seven cousins in my generation have only three children. All of them are mine.

This is a very normal Western family history. Everywhere across the developed world, families have grown more attenuated: fewer and later marriages, fewer and later-born children[https://newrepublic.com/article/110861/how-older-parenthood-will-upend-american-society], fewer brothers and sisters and cousins, more people living for longer and longer stretches on their own[http://thepenguinpress.com/book/going-solo/]. It’s a new model of social life, a “post-familial” revolution[http://www.newgeography.com/content/003133-the-rise-post-familialism-humanitys-future] that’s unique to late modernity.

For a while, conservatives have worried that this revolution is a boon to liberalism, to centralization and bureaucratic control — because as families thin people are more likely to look to politics for community and government for protection.

This idea is borne out in voting patterns, where marriage and kids tend to predict Republican affiliation, and the single and divorced are often reliable Democratic partisans. The Obama White House’s “Life of Julia” ad campaign in 2012 — featuring a woman whose every choice was subsidized by the government from cradle to grave, with a lone child but no larger family or community in sight — seemed to many conservatives like a perfect confirmation[https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/obamas-julia-ad-and-the-new-hubby-state/2012/05/11/gIQAcRdoIU\_story.html] of our fears: Here was liberalism explicitly pitching the state as a substitute for kith and kin.

But while we worried about the liberal vision, our own ideological side was adapting to the family’s attenuation in darker ways — speaking not to singletons or single mothers, but to powerful post-familial anxieties among the middle-aged and old.

Human beings imagine and encounter the future most intensely through our own progeny, our flesh and blood. The Constitution speaks of “our posterity” for a reason: We are a nation of **immigrants**, but when people think about the undiscovered America of the future, its strongest claim on them is one their own descendants make.

If those descendants exist. But for many native-born Americans there are fewer of them — fewer children and, as birthrates drop[http://www.cnn.com/2016/08/11/health/us-lowest-fertility-rate/] and marrying age rises, still-fewer grandchildren or none at all. Which means that when they look ahead into their country’s future, white baby boomers especially see less to recognize immediately as their own.

This **alienation** is heightened when the descendants they do have seem to be faring worse than they did — as in those white working-class communities where opioid addiction, worklessness and family breakdown have advanced apace. The combination of small families and social disarray feeds a grim vision of the future, in which after you’ve passed, your few kids and fewer grandkids will be beset, isolated and alone.

This sense of dread, in turn, bleeds easily into ethno-racial anxiety when the benefits of that imagined future seem to belong increasingly to people who seem culturally **alien**, to inheritors who aren’t your natural heirs. For this reason mass **immigration**, the technocratic solution to the economic problems created by post-familialism — fewer workers supporting more retirees — is a double-edged sword: It replaces the missing workers but exacerbates intergenerational **alienation**, because it heightens anxieties about inheritance and loss.

In this landscape, the white-identity politics of Trumpism or European nationalism[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/01/the-ruthlessly-effective-rebranding-of-europes-new-far-right] may be a more intuitively attractive form of right-wing politics than a libertarian conservatism. Right-authoritarianism offers some of the same welfare-state protections that liberalism offers to its Julias, it offers tribal solidarity to people whose family bonds have frayed — and then it links the two, public programs and tribal consciousness, in the promise of a welfare state that’s only designed for you and yours.

For conservatives who abhor Trumpism this presents a hard dilemma. No politician can address a Trump voter (or a LePen or UKIP supporter) **alienated** from their country’s future and say — as strangely true as it may be — that “you should have had more children when you had the chance.” So conservatives have to figure out how to go partway with their anxious older voters, to push against[http://conservativereform.com/pro-family-policies-to-strengthen-marriage-and-give-kids-a-better-shot-at-the-american-dream/] the post-familial trend in public policy while also adapting to the anxieties[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/17/opinion/sunday/a-cure-for-trumpism.html?\_r=1] that it creates — and all without being swallowed up by bigotry.

For liberals, to whom an expansive state is a more uncomplicated good, the challenge may seem easier. They can hope that with time the racial and ethnic differences between the generations will diminish, and that eventually state programs can more smoothly substitute for thinning families without ethno-cultural anxieties getting in the way.

But I’m not so sure that it will work like this. A post-familial society may unleash tribal competition within the coalition of the diverse, as people reach anew for ethnic solidarity and then fight furiously over liberalism’s spoils.

Or else a technocratic and secular liberalism may simply not be satisfying to a fragmented, atomized society; there may be a desire for a left-wing authoritarianism to bind what’s been fragmented back together, in comradeship and common purpose.

In either case, the demagogues of the future will have ample opportunity to exploit the deep loneliness[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/19/opinion/sunday/douthat-loneliness-and-suicide.html] that a post-familial society threatens to create.

This loneliness may manifest in economic anxiety on the surface, in racial and cultural anxiety just underneath. But at bottom it’s more primal still: A fear of a world in which no one is bound by kinship to take care of you, and where you can go down into death leaving little or nothing of yourself behind.

I invite you to follow me on Twitter (@DouthatNYT)[http://twitter.com/DouthatNYT].

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The government of Australia has come under withering criticism for its harsh anywhere-but-here approach to refugees and other migrants who attempt to reach the country by boat. But instead of revisiting a cruel and costly policy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/opinion/australias-stranded-refugee-prisoners.html] — which involves sending everyone intercepted at sea to offshore prisons — Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull has decided to double down.

His administration intends to propose[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/01/world/australia/refugee-asylum-seeker-lifetime-ban.html] legislation this week that would bar anyone who seeks to enter Australia without authorization and by boat from ever setting foot in the country. That would ban, among others, the approximately 1,200 people currently being held in camps in Nauru and Papua New Guinea from finding a legal way to even visit Australia, where some have relatives.

Mr. Turnbull billed the lifetime ban as a stern message to smugglers. “They must know that the door to Australia is closed to those who seek to come here by boat with a people smuggler,” he said last Sunday during a news conference. “It’s closed.” But his initiative targets refugees who are scrambling to find a haven amid the largest displacement crisis since World War II.

Australian lawmakers should oppose this proposal. Draconian **immigration** measures are often passed without due consideration for the human toll and opportunity cost they represent.

The United States adopted a similarly austere policy when it passed a sweeping overhaul of **immigration** laws in 1996. The Illegal **Immigration** Reform and **Immigrant** Responsibility Act said that anyone who lived without authorization in the United States for more than a year would have to wait 10 years before seeking to be admitted lawfully. This made it nearly impossible for American citizens to sponsor foreign-born spouses who were subject to the 10-year ban for permanent residency.

A blanket ban on migrants who attempted to reach Australia by boat would surely deprive Australia of talented people. Take, for instance the remarkable Afghan photojournalist Barat Ali Batoor[https://www.ted.com/talks/barat\_ali\_batoor\_my\_desperate\_journey\_with\_a\_human\_smuggler], who was admitted lawfully to Australia in May 2013 — the year Australia began its zero-tolerance approach toward smugglers — after he documented a harrowing failed attempt to reach the island by boat in a series of haunting photos.[http://www.batoor.com/#a=0&at=0&mi=2&pt=1&pi=10000&s=0&p=3] How would the country benefit from barring skilled and energetic **immigrants** like Mr. Batoor?

Bill Shorten, the opposition leader in Parliament, reacted to the proposal with reasonable skepticism, saying it seemed “ridiculous to me that a genuine refugee who settles in the U.S. or Canada and becomes a U.S. or Canadian citizen” after being barred from Australia “is banned from visiting Australia as a tourist, businessman or businesswoman 40 years down the track.”

Beyond being ridiculous, this is a cruel, shortsighted and shameful position for a nation that has historically welcomed refugees.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BELFAST, Northern Ireland — On the surface, Britain[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] would seem to be in the throes of an alarming wave of hate crimes.

In 2015, Britain recorded eight times as many hate crimes as the United States, which has five times as many people; that was 31 times the hate crimes reported in France and 88 times the total in Italy.

The rise of the nationalist U.K. Independence Party, resentment of **immigration**, terror attacks in Europe and perceptions of anti-Semitism on the fringes of the Labour Party have all contributed to an atmosphere of increased fear and hostility in parts of Britain.

Things seemed to worsen after Britain voted in June to leave the European Union, an outcome driven in large part by anti-**immigrant** sentiment. A Polish family’s house and a Romanian-owned shop were set on fire; Eastern Europeans were spat upon, beaten up and told to go home.

The assaults extended to Muslim women, whose face veils were torn off. Blacks, Asians, gays and people with disabilities also reported abuse. Britain recorded 71,140 hate crimes in the 2015-16 financial year, ending in March. In July, the month after the referendum, the number of hate crimes recorded by the police was 41 percent higher than in July of last year, though they have fallen lately.

All in all, it is a numerical portrait of a society in the grip of hatred and bigotry. Except the statistics are misleading, said Mark Hamilton, the assistant chief constable of the Northern Ireland[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/northernireland/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] police, who leads Britain’s hate crime policy for the National Police Chiefs’ Council.

“In most cases, it’s not a rise in hate crimes. It’s a rise in reporting,” he said in an interview in his Belfast office. Since hate crimes are generally underrecorded, he said, “our national strategy is to increase the level of hate crime reporting.”

The number of reported hate crimes in Britain has risen for two reasons: increased public awareness and changes in the law so that almost anything can be recorded as a hate crime so long as the victim experiences a verbal or physical assault as such. Many of the changes stem from the racially charged murder of Stephen Lawrence[http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-26465916], an 18-year-old black man who was stabbed while waiting for a bus in 1993.

Many crimes counted in the statistics are registered through True Vision[http://www.report-it.org.uk/home], a government-funded website that allows anyone to anonymously report what they have experienced or witnessed as a hate crime.

Rather than a hotbed of racial hatred, then, Britain is more a country that takes hate crime seriously and encourages citizens to report such acts when they occur. Far from painting Britain as a xenophobic society, Mr. Hamilton said, the numbers point to greater intolerance among Britons directed not at foreigners, but at hateful behavior toward them. The figures also suggest that public trust in the police is improving, he said.

Although the so-called Brexit vote “created a license” for some to lash out, Mr. Hamilton said, “if we look at what we’re reporting, we’re not reporting massive numbers of serious crime.”

Data from the Home Office published last month showed that more than half of all hate crimes were categorized as threatening but nonviolent behavior. Still, a third involved some physical violence.

Excluding online hate crimes, which are difficult for the authorities to monitor, police data show that about 82 percent of hate crimes are racially or religiously motivated, including ones related to anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. The remainder are crimes against gays, transsexuals and people with disabilities, which the police consider to be badly underreported.

Interest groups have their own counts. Community Security Trust, a British charity, said anti-Semitic incidents rose 11 percent year on year in the first six months of 2016, after totaling 924 in 2015. Tell Mama, which tracks Islamophobia, said it had received 1,128 reports in 2015, more than double those in the previous year. European embassies in Britain have also logged dozens of incidents against their citizens, mostly from Eastern Europe.

But because the official figures do not break down hate crimes by religion, it is difficult to verify such counts.

The rate of prosecution varies across the four countries that make up Britain. In England and Wales, about a quarter of reported hate crimes were prosecuted last year. In Scotland, the rate was about 80 percent, while in Northern Ireland, it was more than half.

Once brought to court, more than four in five hate crime prosecutions result in conviction in Britain.

“The police response has improved in a lot of ways,” said Neil Chakraborti, a criminology professor and the director of the Center for Hate Studies at Leicester University. “Britain has a clear set of laws, a policy that is victim-led, and there is a collective endeavor” to tackle hate crime.

The shift to a perception-based definition of hate crimes emerged from the Lawrence case.

The police were dogged by allegations that Mr. Lawrence had been denied first aid because of his race, and that they had run a smear campaign against his family and supporters who criticized how the authorities conducted proceedings.

A subsequent government inquiry described the London Metropolitan Police as “institutionally racist.” It said there had been a “collective failure” by the authorities “through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people.”

Although the British police still struggle with minority relations, officials say the recognition of racism in the police force drastically changed the mind-set inside the organization.

Most of the recommendations made by the report[https://www-gov-uk.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/277111/4262.pdf] were put into practice shortly after its publication in 1999.

The police are now subject to greater public scrutiny. The handling of racist incidents is closely monitored, as are stop-and-search procedures. The police routinely measure how satisfied minorities are with their service. Officers are given racial awareness training, and there have been efforts to make the force more racially diverse, even though the number of minorities remains disproportionately low.

Some of the changes also came about because of the 1998 Human Rights Act, which incorporated the European Convention on Human Rights into British law. It enshrined, among other things, an individual’s right to life, humane treatment and fair trial. In addition, the Human Rights Act requires minimal use of force and firearms by police officers.

“The threading of human rights through every response of the police service has been a fundamental element in changing how we go about our business and how we view how we do our business,” Mr. Hamilton said. “It’s a superb thing.”

Mr. Hamilton is based in Belfast, once called the hate crime capital of Europe because of Northern Ireland’s long history of sectarian violence between mostly Protestant pro-British unionists and mostly Roman Catholic pro-Irish republicans.

Given the history, the police force in Northern Ireland has led Britain’s hate crime strategy for 20 years out of a bunkerlike compound on the outskirts of Belfast.

Tensions remain, but the reframing of hate crimes and a greater emphasis on human rights in British law also had an impact here.

Sectarian crimes in Northern Ireland are now categorized as hate crimes, which officials say has encouraged more people to come forward. But mistrust of the police still runs deep, and reports of hate crimes in Northern Ireland are generally lower than in England and Wales. (Leaflets recently pasted on street lamps urged citizens not to give information to the police.)

Today, anyone caught painting a fresh mural seen as inciting racial hatred can be prosecuted for a hate crime.

“In recent years, we’ve had a collective courage to name hate crime for what it is,” Mr. Hamilton said, adding that most people develop hatred for other communities because they themselves have suffered.

“What we’re talking about is what motivates people,” he said. “Those are things you can affect. Those are things you can challenge.”

\* Attacks in a British Town Highlight a Debate Over Ethnic Tensions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/world/europe/uk-hate-crimes-jozwik.html]

\* Fatal Beating of Polish Man Fuels Debate Over Xenophobia in Britain[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/world/europe/britain-polish-man-killed-brexit.html]

\* After ‘Brexit’ Vote, **Immigrants** Feel a Town Turn Against Them[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/world/europe/brexit-immigrants-great-britain-eu.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LOS ANGELES — The message on the steel roll-up gate of Mihai Nicodim’s gallery could not have been clearer: With obscene language, the spray-painted words condemned what they labeled “white art.”

It was not the first time Mr. Nicodim had been targeted by activists in Boyle Heights, a neighborhood long seen as the heart of Los Angeles[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/great-homes-and-destinations/destinations/southern-california/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s Mexican-American community. Just days before, two cars pulled in front of his gallery[http://www.nicodimgallery.com/] during an opening and the passengers, their faces covered in bandannas, hurled potatoes, hitting one woman in the leg. At the opening of another gallery, protesters threw beer bottles through the windows.

Earlier this fall, activists placed mock eviction notices in front of galleries. Marching down the street, they shouted “fuera!” — “out!” — and carried signs declaring “Keep Beverly Hills Out of Boyle Heights.”

The protests come at a time when the city has gained a reputation as a contemporary art capital that some critics say eclipses New York. Over the past decade, the Los Angeles art scene has grown tremendously, with the opening of the popular Broad museum, large flagship spaces created by local galleries, and outposts set up by a string of prominent New York and European dealers, including Hauser Wirth & Schimmel’s 100,000-square-foot complex, all of which have helped transform downtown.

Few neighborhoods have seen the change as much as Boyle Heights, just east of downtown, where at least a dozen galleries, both local and from out of town, have opened in the past three years.

But the backlash from activists in the neighborhood has reached a new intensity in the past month. Now the Los Angeles Police Department is investigating the vandalism as a hate crime and is promising more patrols in the area.

Urban areas across the country, including Oakland, Calif.; Washington; and Brooklyn have also battled anti-gentrification movements, but typically the ire has been directed at developers and city hall. In Boyle Heights, the anger is focused almost entirely on the art galleries, which they portray as outsiders that are simply harbingers of real estate speculators looking to make money off the lower-income neighborhood.

Mr. Nicodim opened his gallery two years ago, after operating a smaller space in Chinatown. An **immigrant** from Romania, he has lived in Boyle Heights for more than a decade. For a year, he said, he ran the gallery with no problem. Now, he said, “It has escalated to the point where it feels dangerous.”

“There is this perception that if you are doing art you are this rich white guy from Beverly Hills,” he said. “But I am not this rich white guy. I came to this country with $36 in my pocket. And it’s pretty sad that after 30 years I am being told to go back where you came from.”

The activists in the neighborhood are making no apologies for the radical tactics and portray themselves as defenders of working-class neighborhoods in the city. They look to other neighborhoods, such as Echo Park and Silver Lake, that were once working class and are now filled with upscale bakeries that sell artisan doughnuts and have replaced mom-and-pop taco shops and locally owned grocery stores.

“We think of gentrification as displacement and white supremacy,” said Nancy Meza, an organizer of Defend Boyle Heights[https://www.facebook.com/defendboyleheights/?fref=ts], a group that formed nearly a year ago and has organized most of the protests against the galleries. Ms. Meza said that some gallery owners brought dogs out to intimidate local residents walking the street. “These galleries are coming in and trying to replace the current culture that is already in Boyle Heights. They are not looking to attract members of our communities.”

As the protests have built in recent months, many gallery owners have tried to ignore them. Mr. Nicodim did not report either episode in front of his gallery to the police. But somebody did. After Capt. Rick Stabile saw reports of three separate cases of vandalism targeting what was labeled white art, he said it was “common sense” to pursue the acts as hate crimes because they were targeting the owners based on race. There are no suspects so far, but a hate crime conviction is punishable by up to a year in jail. After the episodes, he organized a meeting of the gallery owners and promised them a greater police presence for gallery openings.

“Everyone has a right to protest, but when it becomes a hate crime, we have a problem in the area that we really need to address,” Captain Stabile said. “The concern is this getting more out of hand.”

As rents across the city have skyrocketed, gentrification has been a persistent worr[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/18/us/los-angeles-neighborhood-tries-to-change-but-avoid-the-pitfalls.html] y[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/18/us/los-angeles-neighborhood-tries-to-change-but-avoid-the-pitfalls.html] for longtime residents of Boyle Heights. Some welcome the changes, which include a bustling subway station in Mariachi Plaza and improvements to local parks and schools that had been neglected for decades. More recently, Chicano residents who grew up in the area but left for college have begun to move back in, opening their own businesses in the area — a process they’ve referred to as gentefication[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/18/us/los-angeles-neighborhood-tries-to-change-but-avoid-the-pitfalls.html], a play on gentrification and gente, Spanish for people.

Self Help Graphics and Art[http://selfhelpgraphics.com/], a nonprofit that has worked in the area for more than 40 years, has held forums about the pitfalls of gentrification for years. The vast majority of residents in the neighborhood are renters, many living with a near constant threat of eviction. When the group opened its doors for such a meeting this summer, a dozen activists came in and took control of the microphone, holding signs that read “Out with the galleries, out with the sellouts.”

Betty Avila, the associate director of Self Help, said it was unfair to conflate the nonprofit, which focuses on exhibiting Latino artists, with the galleries that have opened up on Anderson Street, the industrial-looking strip that has been drawing the art collectors east of the Los Angeles River. But Ms. Avila shares many of the protesters’ concerns.

“Residents see that the neighborhood is attracting more people who would have never come in here before, and they see people who are interested in living here who can’t afford downtown looking to move here,” she said. “You have a community that is really frustrated and afraid of being displaced. The galleries are the most visible sign of change now, and you go after what you see. It’s not all art; it’s art that’s not for this community.”

The gallery owners see the focus on race as misplaced and unfair. After Eva Chimento opened Chimento Contemporary[http://www.chimentocontemporary.net/] last year, she said, two activists came into her gallery, threatened her and demanded that she show Latino artists. This summer, she attended a Defend Boyle Heights meeting only to be shouted down by activists.

Ms. Chimento said she refuses to discuss her ethnicity with the activists, but she has shown several local artists and is preparing an exhibition with two Puerto Rican artists about **immigration**. She has repeatedly told activists that she hires from the community and welcomes local residents into the space. This year, she took down the sign from her gallery to try to deflect threats. And she no longer uses local banks or restaurants out of fear of being recognized and targeted.

“I’ve been scared and nervous and jumpy. In the beginning I wanted to leave, but now it’s principle,” she said. “To say that white galleries need to leave, so they can decide what goes in their spaces, it’s an unrealistic expectation. There’s no way I can leave my space unless they give me $20,000-plus to buy me out of my space, because I have a landlord, just like everyone else.”

Jori Finkel contributed reporting.

\* This City Is 78% Latino, and the Face of a New California[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/california-latino-voters.html]

\* Los Angeles Neighborhood Tries to Change, but Avoid the Pitfalls[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/18/us/los-angeles-neighborhood-tries-to-change-but-avoid-the-pitfalls.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Donald Trump campaign inadvertently performed a public service when it exposed the weakness and vulnerability of the euphemisms long used by political journalists. News organizations have been forced to acknowledge that phrases like “stretched the truth” and “fudged the facts” are useless for describing a candidate who speaks falsely in virtually every breath. Genteel circumlocution has given way to calling out lies as lies.

Mr. Trump’s campaign has also made it difficult for opinion writers — even those disposed to give him the benefit of the doubt — to avoid describing his behavior as racist. The signal moment came when, having already characterized Mexican **immigrants** as criminals and rapists, he declared an American-born judge of Mexican descent unfit to preside over a lawsuit against the con game known as Trump University. Even the House speaker, Paul Ryan, had to concede that this was “the textbook definition of a racist comment.”

Instead of using phrases like “racially inflammatory” or “racially insensitive,” editorial pages were calling racism by its name. The shift was clear in the language of the endorsements Hillary Clinton received from news organizations across the political spectrum.

The Cincinnati Enquirer — endorsing a Democrat for president for the first time in a century — observed that Mr. Trump seemed incapable of even opening his mouth “without saying something misogynistic, racist or xenophobic.” The Dallas Morning News[http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/2016/09/07/recommend-hillary-clinton-us-president] — in its first Democratic presidential endorsement since before the United States entered World War II — argued that Mr. Trump’s appeal to racism and other pathologies brings out the worst in the country. The New Yorker[http://www.newyorker.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/magazine/2016/10/31/the-new-yorker-endorses-hillary-clinton] recoiled from a Trump campaign it described as “sickeningly sexist and racist.”

This brand of frankness came second-hand to the traditional press through social media, especially Twitter, where younger African-Americans are more likely than other internet users to be heavily engaged. That Americans in general — and news organizations in particular — are increasingly using social media has also helped push frank racial discussions to the fore.

The black-inflected online community has offered a nonstop tutorial on the nature of institutional racism and how it has led to tragedies like the Charleston church massacre and the shootings of Trayvon Martin, Walter Scott, Tamir Rice, Laquan McDonald, Philando Castile and many others.

Black Twitter has ridiculed attempts by traditional news media and others to draw a distinction between racism and “unintentional bias.” Those who defend this distinction typically argue that deploying the charge of racism commits harm by **alienating** people and stopping “the conversation.”

This argument reduces the discussion of structural racism to the equivalent of dinner party chatter, in which one guest challenges the bigoted views of another without spilling the Margaux. But life is no dinner party. And an unarmed black man shot by a police officer is dead whether the officer is openly bigoted or not. The Black Lives Matter movement deserves much of the credit for pushing back against that distinction and advancing a candid way of speaking about racism that is making its way into the national consciousness.

Social media platforms and online publications have also given the country a window into another world, one defined by hate: the white supremacist Trump supporters who rain down anti-Semitic vitriol on people like Jeffrey Goldberg, editor in chief of The Atlantic. Mr. Goldberg, in a recent interview[http://www.npr.org/2016/10/24/498860864/atlantic-editor-on-acrimony-in-u-s-i-have-to-imagine-that-it-actually-gets-worse], described the dispiriting feeling of signing onto Twitter some days and finding “100 messages all with basically the same theme, which is that I should be gassed and that my family should be put in the ovens.” Noting the candidate’s failure to take a definitive stand against this brand of horror, Mr. Goldberg has reached the conclusion that Mr. Trump himself is a racist.

The bigoted outpouring licensed by the Trump campaign will surely persist — whether or not Mr. Trump wins. This election has made clear that racism, anti-Semitism, misogyny and xenophobia still have broad constituencies in America. The first step toward keeping them at bay is to insist on calling them by their rightful names.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

SYDNEY, Australia — In the United States, painting yourself black to impersonate a person of color is considered a particularly grotesque form of racism. In Australia, it keeps happening. Indeed, 2016 has been a notable year for Australian blackface incidents.

In January, a fan at the Australian Open painted her face shoe-polish black in what she intended as a show of support for Serena Williams. A month later, a player for a women’s basketball team, Alice Kunek, posted a photo of herself dressed as Kanye West, complete with blackface makeup. In August, a proud Perth mother posted a picture of her 9-year-old son covered in brown makeup as a tribute to his Fijian-Australian hero, Nic Naitanui, the Australian rules football player.

Many Australians who regard racism as a profound evil will defend blackface as harmless fun, or at least “not racist.” Their argument is that if there is no intention to be racist, it can’t be racist, regardless of how unflattering people of color find it to have their skins adopted as costumes.

These episodes provoke reactions ranging from bemusement to horror when Americans hear about them. “In Australia, Blackface Is Still Only Slightly Offensive,” was a headline on the website Gawker in 2009. Writing about the Serena Williams incident, Adrian Hasenmayer of Fox Sports said[http://www.foxsports.com/tennis/story/serena-williams-fans-wears-blackface-aussie-australian-open-final-twitter-explodes-013016] blackface was considered “beyond taboo in modern times,” something that seems self-evident to Americans but not to Australians.

Why isn’t blackface taboo for Australians?

The problem isn’t that Australians fail to understand the American historical context of blackface. The problem is we think only Americans have reason to be upset by it.

Australia and the United States share a history of white domination. Both were founded as settler colonies whose existence depended on driving indigenous peoples from their lands. Both denied political and economic rights to nonwhite people, whose labor was exploited. And both countries adopted restrictive **immigration** laws to keep their national complexions white.

The similarities did not go unnoticed. In 1894, Theodore Roosevelt rejoiced that “democracy” in Australia and America had “kept for the white race the best portions of the New Worlds’ surface.”

In Australia the price of keeping land for the white race was brutal frontier wars and massacres of the indigenous population that began soon after the British colonized the continent in 1788. The last recorded massacre occurred in 1928. In the 20th century, governments could remove children from Aboriginal families for almost any reason. Aboriginal people were denied equal wages and government benefits, and didn’t get full voting rights until the 1960s.

Today, indigenous communities in Australia suffer from many of the same difficulties as Native Americans in the United States: high levels of poverty, health problems, violence, imprisonment and suicide.

Now that racism is seen as a unique moral sin, white Australians and Americans share guilt, rather than pride, at the practices of the past. But Americans have to confront at least some of their past every day. The legacy of slavery is a large, politically robust African-American population whose struggle for equality has become central to United States politics and the narrative of American history.

White Australians do not have to face up to our past in the same way.

Indigenous Australians make up some 3 percent of Australia’s population and have not known real political power since white settlement violently robbed them of their land.

Nor is their story very well known. An Australian journalist of Aboriginal ancestry, Stan Grant, recently noted that Australians were more likely to know about Sitting Bull and Custer and Little Big Horn than Aboriginal resistance leaders like Pemulwuy or massacres in places like Coniston.

Commemorating war is central to our national identity, but the frontier wars that made modern Australia are left out of official remembrances. Nor do we give much thought to the legacy of the White Australia policy, which barred nonwhite **immigrants** until the Vietnam War. Today people of Asian descent make up 12 percent of the population, but you wouldn’t guess this from looking at legislative bodies or TV shows.

White domination seems so natural here that whites don’t recognize it, though it is shockingly obvious to outsiders.

Indeed, white Australians seem to have a much better understanding of how racism shaped American society. Thanks to its cultural reach and political power, as well as its violent history, the United States has given us many of our ideas about what racism is: slavery, segregation, the Ku Klux Klan and police brutality. It also gives Australians a convenient alibi when it comes to blackface: Blackface is a problem only because of America’s racist past, not ours.

Indigenous and other nonwhite Australians are tired of telling the country what is wrong with blackface.

Nakkiah Lui, an indigenous writer and actor, said in an interview[http://www.abc.net.au/triplej/breakfast/blog/s4416348.htm] this year that blackface was “not this act of respect — usually it’s something there to be funny and to be made fun of.” It “makes you feel like you’re put back in your place.”

Maxine Beneba Clarke, an Australian writer of African-Caribbean descent, notes that blackface has long been used to mock Aboriginal people, from theater in the 1830s to TV in the 2000s. The indigenous rapper Briggs describes[http://www.abc.net.au/triplej/programs/hack/briggs-calls-out-blackface-photo/7129830] the exhausting routine of having to explain, in 2016, that blackface is racist. “People look at me like it’s my problem,” he said to an ABC radio program, as if “pointing out racism is worse than the act itself.”

White Australians pay little attention when indigenous Australians say that what whites see as entertainment, they see as degradation. Australians seem to believe that such complaints create racial conflict where there is none. Aboriginal people do not have the political power to make us reconsider our casual racism. But we do take notice when Americans criticize us for it.

In Melbourne in 2009, Harry Connick Jr. condemned a blackface tribute to the Jackson Five on a talent show that he had been invited to judge in front of an estimated TV audience of 2.5 million (more than 10 percent of Australia’s population). “I just want to say on behalf of my country,” said Mr. Connick, “we’ve spent so much time trying to not make black people look like buffoons, that when we see something like that, we take it really to heart.”

Days of debate followed, with disbelief from some quarters that an American would have the temerity to criticize Australians for racism. In an article, the psychologist Clemence Due cataloged[https://digital.library.adelaide.edu.au/dspace/handle/2440/89384] the many online responses. “The U.S. is uncomfortably aware of its slavery history, leading to a degree of P.C. that is unwarranted in Australia,” declared one. Another said: “Oh, that’s rich. Being called racist by the Americans. We didn’t import black slaves and beat them to work for us. We didn’t have ‘whites only’ waiting rooms, buses, schools and so on.”

The “real sin,” according to the widely read commentator Andrew Bolt[http://www.heraldsun.com.au/blogs/andrew-bolt/not-racist-but-dumb/news-story/9884d8d9d0020c55e59c070c88ded5d2], was failing to realize that an American like Mr. Connick would be offended by the performance. In the United States, he wrote, blackface has a “very, very different cultural resonance” and he reflected that Americans wouldn’t understand that “blackface isn’t for us an iconic symbol of racism.” Similarly, in response to Alice Kunek’s Kanye West homage this year, a broadcaster described the offense given by blackface as “an American thing,” the result of “a long history in America, not here.”

These commentators reflect a broader Australian sentiment that the “political correctness” involved in policing language and behavior is an American creation, a response to racial tension that isn’t necessary in our easygoing homeland.

We Australians don’t consider ourselves a racist country. We take pride in our cultural diversity. But our nearly all-white governments and boardrooms reflect a historical reality of white domination that was more complete than what was achieved in the United States. And this is why we still don’t fully understand the problem with blackface. White Australians are rarely forced to think about things from a nonwhite point of view.

The day after Barack Obama was elected president of the United States, The Sydney Morning Herald reported[http://www.smh.com.au/world/us-election-2008/historic-victory-for-barack-obama-20081104-5hzx.html] that his presidency “marks a stunning cultural shift, with Senator Obama, the son of Kenyan father and white mother from Kansas, the first African-American president of a nation still riven by racial divides.” Such sentiments were echoed all over the world in other majority-white countries.

We marveled at how such a racially troubled country could elect a black man to its highest office, giving little thought to how remote such a possibility was in our own countries.

The legacy of white supremacy in Australia isn’t the fiery cross and the white hood. It’s the luxury of white thoughtlessness.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook [https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTOpinion) [http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] , and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/] .

David T. Smith, academic director of the United States Studies Center at the University of Sydney, is the author of “Religious Persecution and Political Order in the United States.”

Correction: November 4, 2016, Friday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An earlier version of this article misidentified the sport played by Nic Naitanui. It is Australian rules football, not soccer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Prime Minister Theresa May of Britain faced a complex new reality on Friday. Not only had a ruling by Britain’s High Court[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/world/europe/uk-brexit-vote-parliament.html] imperiled her “Brexit” strategy, but she also had to contend with leaders from the Continent who had once begged the British to stay in the European Union[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org] but who were now saying they wanted them out, and fast.

The court ruling that she must gain Parliament’s approval to begin the process of withdrawal from the European Union — or Brexit — raised the possibility that negotiations could drag on far past Mrs. May’s deadline of the end of March.

But that poses problems not only for the British prime minister but also for the political establishment on the Continent, where among other things France and Germany are heading toward important elections, with populist parties gaining strength.

The High Court ruling also is a reminder of the fragility of the European Union, which seemingly is buffeted by an existential threat every other week. Last week, it was Wallonia’s nearly killing a trade deal[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/29/world/europe/belgium-farmers-block-eu-trade-deal.html] with Canada. Next month, it is a constitutional referendum[https://www.ft.com/content/e6c12f4e-4c1b-315a-9e78-7e6fafcb4afe] in Italy.

The European Union was already struggling with a witches’ brew of problems: low economic growth; high joblessness; uncertainty in the eurozone, with Greece again in economic difficulties and questions about the soundness of Italian banks; a crackdown in Turkey; and an aggressive Russia. **Immigration** from the Middle East, North Africa and Afghanistan, seemingly under control earlier this year, is on the rise once again.

Looming over all of this are the growing populist, nationalist and far-right movements in core European Union countries like France, Germany and the Netherlands, not to speak of newer members like Hungary and Poland.

Nor has faith in the European Union been helped by recent embarrassments, like the hangup on the trade deal with Canada. That led Peter Ziga, the Slovak economy minister, to wonder, “If we don’t agree with Canada, with whom will we agree?”

Cecilia Malmstrom, the bloc’s trade commissioner, went further, saying with a smile, “If we can’t make it with Canada, I’m not sure we can make it with the U.K.”

The European Union found a way to buy off the Walloons, a tactic it often relies on when under great pressure. But few think lurching from crisis to crisis without addressing fundamental problems is any way to manage an alliance of 28 nations that share important aspects of sovereignty including, for 19 of them, a single currency.

And then there is the vexed, complicated problem of Britain and its exit after more than 40 years, which few European countries either expected or wanted. Like the guest at a party who overstays his welcome, Britain and its internal psychodrama are getting on the nerves of its European partners, who fear further economic and political uncertainty to add to the already unhappy mix.

The British government and the ruling Conservative Party are deeply divided about what kind of relationship they want with the European Union, apparently having forgotten that the other 27 nations must unanimously agree to any new deal, and what Britain wants is not entirely the point.

The frustration for Brussels is that it cannot force Britain to act. It has to wait for the government to trigger Article 50, which begins a two-year negotiating period for exit. While many European leaders had wanted Article 50 to be invoked immediately after Britons voted to leave on June 23, they agreed to the March timetable.

That remains Mrs. May’s stated goal. But the High Court decision — which the government is appealing to the Supreme Court — has created the potential for months more delay, as well as the prospect that Parliament might lay down negotiating parameters that could make the talks even more difficult.

Mrs. May’s few public statements imply that she is leaning toward a “hard Brexit,” emphasizing control over **immigration** and Britain’s borders, even if that forces the country to leave Europe’s single market[https://ec-europa-eu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/growth/single-market\_en] and hurts the economy. But the pro-European forces who make up a majority in Parliament, emboldened by the court ruling, may now have the means to soften her stance enough to keep Britain in the single market.

That would mean compromising on **immigration**, which is anathema to hard-line supporters of Brexit in her party and right-wing nationalists. The haggling could go on for some time.

On Friday, in telephone calls with Angela Merkel, the German chancellor, and Jean-Claude Juncker, president of the European Commission, Mrs. May said she was confident she would meet the March deadline and that the government would win in the Supreme Court, which will hear the case in early December.

But not everyone is so sure, and the timing matters. The bloc’s leaders want Britain out before elections for the European Parliament, scheduled for 2019, and to allow for planning a new European Union budget. Mrs. May’s original timetable works for that, but it is no longer certain she can deliver on her promises. And no one really knows how to handle, or budget for, a Britain that is not yet out but does not want to be in.

In Berlin on Friday, the German foreign minister, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, told his British counterpart, Boris Johnson, “Dragging things out won’t serve anyone.”

He warned Britain against expecting special treatment and urged for negotiations to start as soon as possible.

“Two years sounds at first like a lot of time,” he said, “but if you look at the complexity, two years is comparatively short.”

Mr. Johnson, who backed Brexit, said that Britain would leave the bloc but remain a part of Europe. But the future balance of the relationship remains extremely unclear.

As a measure of Britain’s febrile political mood, the largely right-wing British press, which mostly supports Mrs. May, attacked the three High Court judges for being “out of touch” and seeking to undermine the popular referendum in favor of Brexit. One paper, the popular and often rabid Daily Mail, had a huge headline under photographs of the judges, reading, “Enemies of the People.”

Even the more staid Daily Telegraph headlined its front page: “The judges versus the people.” With that was a front-page column by Nigel Farage, the leader of the pro-Brexit U.K. Independence Party, saying that the court ruling means that “a great betrayal is underway.”

Even though Mr. Farage and the “Leave” camp won the referendum handily, 52 percent to 48 percent, many, like him, are obsessed with the idea that Mrs. May is feigning support for Brexit and that the government, Parliament, the judges and “the elite” will betray the more than 17 million voters who wanted out of the European Union.

It is an obvious irony that one prime reason they had for supporting Brexit was to restore the full sovereignty of Parliament, a stance taken by the judges, too, but inconveniently now, because it might slow down Britain’s exit.

Mrs. May also faced criticism from another front on Friday, when a Conservative member of Parliament, Stephen Phillips, who supported Brexit but has accused her government of trying to sideline Parliament, resigned his seat.

Last month, he crystallized his objections in an opinion article in The Guardian[https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/11/we-voted-brexit-keep-parliament-sovereign-wont-be-gagged] in which he said that “not giving Parliament the chance, before Article 50 is invoked, to say where it thinks these negotiations should end up is, at its core, undemocratic, unconstitutional and likely to exacerbate the divisions in our society to which the referendum gave rise.”

With a small majority in Parliament, Mrs. May is being urged by some, including The Times of London, to call an early election to win her own mandate and increase her majority at a time when the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties are weak.

She has vowed not to have an election before its scheduled date of 2020, but if Parliament creates too many difficulties and delays for her, she may have no choice.

Reporting was contributed by Stephen Castle from London, Alison Smale and Katarina Johannsen from Berlin, and Gaia Pianigiani from Rome.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

PHOENIX — “No hablo español perfectamente,” Senator Tim Kaine[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/k/tim\_kaine/index.html?inline=nyt-per] of Virginia told an audience of 150 guests here on Thursday, during a political event billed as historic by the Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] campaign. For the first time, a candidate on a United States presidential ticket delivered a speech entirely in Spanish, a language that is a synonym for **immigration** in this state.

Well, Señor Kaine, lo hablaste muy bien.

Mr. Kaine’s Spanish delivery was steady, confident but far from flawless.

From a stage at a community center in Maryvale, this city’s most Hispanic neighborhood, he corrected himself, repeating the word “llegaron” (arrived) after mistakenly placing the stress on the last syllable, instead of properly on the second. He spoke with ease, drawing connections between his Irish ancestry and the story of Africans who were “brought here against their will” and Native Americans, “who have always been here.”

“La fundación de nuestro país tiene raíces en todas partes del mundo,” he said — The foundation of our country has its roots in all parts of the world.

Mr. Kaine learned Spanish during a year he spent in Honduras in 1980 working with Jesuit missionaries.

During his speech here, he occasionally pronounced his r’s as English speakers do. In most cases, though, he placed his tongue where it should be — on the roof of his mouth, just behind his front teeth. His r’s came out sounding like drumrolls, even in a word as tricky as “carrera,” as in career.

He was relaxed enough to add a line here or there to his prepared comments. When he talked about Sheriff Joe Arpaio, who is facing criminal contempt charges for his refusal to obey a federal judge’s orders to stop singling out Latinos for enforcement, a woman bellowed, “¡Que lo pongan en la cárcel!” — stick him in jail.

Without missing a beat, Mr. Kaine retorted, “En su carcel” — in one of the jails Sheriff Arpaio runs.

He thanked the guests for their patience with his “Castilian,” which seemed an odd choice of words for some in the audience. Castilian refers to the dialect of Spanish spoken in a region of Spain. But anyone would be hard-pressed to find a Spanish speaker in the audience who called the language anything other than Spanish.

To a reporter who asked him, in Spanish, if it had been his idea to deliver a speech in Spanish, Mr. Kaine replied, in Spanish, that yes, it had, and that it made sense to do it in Arizona because of the demographic makeup of the state.

If all projections hold, Latinos will be the majority by 2030. And this may well be the year when enough Latino voters turn out to deliver Arizona to a Democrat, which would be the first time since another Clinton, Bill, won the state in 1996.

“Vamos a votar,” Mr. Kaine said. Let’s vote.

The community center in Maryvale, between a public library and a public pool, ordinarily hosts jazz, ballet and belly dancing classes for children and adults; private music instructions; and sports leagues. (Two basketball hoops were folded up above the stage.) On Thursday, it had a mix of elected officials, community activists, **immigration** advocates, union leaders and teachers wearing T-shirts that read “Educators for Hillary” and “Families Fighting Back.”

Everyone who spoke at the rally did so in Spanish, from Ray Martinez, a candidate for the State House of Representatives who read entirely from a script, to Thomas E. Perez, the United States secretary of labor, who spoke off the cuff — mixing up pronouns and genders, but getting his message across. There were plenty of English-only speakers in the crowd, including people of Hispanic heritage, look and last names like Salgado and Benevidez.

One of them was Lorenzo Sierra, a city councilman from Avondale, home to Arizona’s second-largest Latino community. He said his parents forbade him from speaking Spanish at home some 40 years ago, fearing that if he did so, he would not be able to learn English. It is a common narrative among older generations of Hispanics in the United States.

Mr. Sierra did not mind that he could not quite understand what Mr. Kaine was saying. That he spoke Spanish at all, and for a whole 30 minutes, “speaks volumes of the importance of our community,” Mr. Sierra said. “It’s a sign of respect that we haven’t seen from anyone else on this and other presidential campaigns.”

Follow Fernanda Santos @fernandanyt[https://twitter.com/fernandaNYT?ref\_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Eauthor] on Twitter.

Correction: November 4, 2016, Friday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An earlier version of this article referred imprecisely to the term Castilian. The term refers to the dialect of Spanish spoken in a region of Spain but is also used in some South and Central American countries to refer to the language in general. It does not just denote Spanish from Spain.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HERNDON, Va. — During the 10 hours a day that Bianca spends stretching and massaging patients at the chiropractic clinic where she works, she allows her mind to rest. But around 8 p.m., as she drives home to her husband and three children, her fear comes rushing back:

When a new president steps into office, will she be sent back to Honduras?

A rapt 11-year-old when she first entered the United States illegally, Bianca, 27, was nearly deported this year after making herself known to the American government by applying for asylum. When a judge explained that he did not have sufficient evidence to let her stay, a government lawyer offered to pause the proceedings rather than deport her immediately — something the Department of Homeland Security has done with increasing frequency under President Obama[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack\_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per].

As a result of the agreement she made, known as administrative closure, Bianca is not legally allowed to live in the United States, but she is not forced to go, either.

“You can’t have a normal life,” she said in barely accented English, “We just don’t know what’s going to happen.”

Bianca, who asked to be identified only by her first name because she could be called back into court at any time, is one of about 24,000 **immigrants** who have accepted the government’s offer to put their deportation cases on hold this year. Government figures show nearly 80,000 **immigrants** have done so since 2012, hoping that a route to legal status will materialize while they wait.

Their uncertain status reflects a chronic enforcement problem in the absence of new **immigration** laws that could offer protection to some **immigrants** who are here illegally. Attempts at reform have stalled throughout the Obama presidency. Instead, the application of current laws has been guided by a series of memos and informal policies that can shift with the political winds.

With administrative closure, for example, no specific laws or rules dictate who qualifies.

Government lawyers have been instructed by the Department of Homeland Security to consider factors such as the length of time **immigrants** have lived in the United States, their family ties and any criminal records. But **immigrants** and their lawyers say that it is difficult to anticipate who will be offered prosecutorial discretion, and that the application of the policy can feel random.

They add that while those who have accepted administrative closure are not being actively pursued for expulsion, they have few rights or protections. Some qualify for work permits depending on the details of their cases; none are allowed to come back if they leave the country. And the government could reactivate their cases at any time without stating a reason.

Some report feeling more vulnerable than before because **immigration** officials know who they are and where to find them. But their main concern is over what, if anything, the next administration will decide to do with their cases.

“People are increasingly frightened about how secure they are with this status,” said Judy London, a directing attorney at Public Counsel, a pro bono law firm that serves **immigrants** in Los Angeles. “And the answer to that question is, there is no answer.”

For both Bianca and her husband, Bairon, who live in a small two-bedroom apartment in Virginia, the end of the Obama era brings enormous risk. Both lack legal status.

Bairon, 27, works as a mechanic and is also Honduran. He came to the United States when he was a teenager — the two met at the repair shop where he worked.

In 2012, Bairon was deported after being caught driving without a license. Bianca and the couple’s only child at the time went, too, planning to rebuild their lives in Honduras.

But she was unsettled by the sounds of gun shots that woke them in the middle of the night. And when gang members started threatening the family directly, she said, they decided to return to the United States and apply for asylum.

**Immigration** lawyers have struggled with how to advise clients like Bianca. Turning down a temporary reprieve is risky, but a successful **immigration** case can yield much greater rewards — including permanent legal status and ability to apply to bring family members to the United States.

Those odds convinced Mayra Lopez to decline an offer to pause her asylum case in April. Ever since, she has spent much of her time inside of the bare-walled apartment in Herndon, where she rents a room for her three children and herself. She has stopped letting her children play outside, almost superstitiously afraid of drawing attention to their family until their cases are resolved.

Ms. Lopez said that she fled her home country of El Salvador because her partner was physically abusive to her children and her, and threatened their lives. She is not legally allowed to work in the United States while she awaits an **immigration** judge’s decision, so her two brothers — one who is 18 and works at Chipotle, the other 28 and a restaurant manager — split her $800 rent. She uses food stamps to pay for groceries.

“I want to walk freely in the streets, I want to be able to drive my kids to school,” she said in Spanish. She had been tempted by the government’s offer, but ultimately could not settle for a life spent in limbo with the constant fear of being deported.

“It’s like I’m not of here, or of there,” she said.

But Bianca and many other **immigrants** — some who know their claims to stay are not strong, and others who don’t feel the need to find out — have chosen to settle for that lack of belonging.

The administrative closure agreements, which fall under a broad category known as prosecutorial discretion, have already increased 35 percent since last year, and 160 percent since 2012, according to data from the Justice Department.

Those **immigrants** who have accepted administrative closure are temporarily shielded from deportation — the same protection that Mr. Obama sought to offer millions of **immigrants** through an expansion of his deferred action policies, which was blocked by a federal appeals court. Since then, the administration has been doling out protection on a case-by-case basis.

Donald J. Trump’s hard-line statements against **immigrants** throughout his presidential campaign has made clear that if he wins, this kind of leniency would most likely end.

Hillary Clinton has provided few specifics around her plans for overhauling **immigration** laws. “Theoretically, a new president could come in and stop it tomorrow,” Ms. London, the **immigration** lawyer, said.

On the drive back and forth to work, Bianca clenches the steering wheel of her S.U.V. as she retraces the same route. Even when she is running late, she never drives above the speed limit, acutely aware that the break she was given can just as easily be taken away.

Her lawyer has offered to file a motion to reopen their asylum case, and try again to obtain legal status. Bianca has resigned herself to the temporary fix. It feels safer, for now at least.

“I’m just going to wait and see if something else happens,” she said.

Follow Caitlin Dickerson on Twitter @itscaitlinhd.

\* Obama Administration Is Quietly Delaying Thousands of Deportation Cases[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/us/delayed-deportations-illegal-immigrants.html]

\* Supreme Court Tie Blocks Obama **Immigration** Plan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/supreme-court-immigration-obama-dapa.html]

\* Tears Flow and Spirits Sag, but Some **Immigrants** Look to November With Determination[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/tears-flow-and-spirits-sag-but-some-immigrants-look-to-november-with-determination.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Turnout for early voting is up among Latino voters[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/clintons-coalition-hispanic-support-is-up-black-turnout-is-down/], compared with the 2012 election, in Florida and other swing states. That’s a relief for Hillary Clinton and her supporters. It’s also an opportunity for the small army of organizers, data analysts and researchers who try to better understand and refine the methods for getting people to the polls. Through Tuesday, they will field-test methods that could shape the demographic future of the major parties.

In Florida, Latinos make up almost a quarter of the population and 16 percent of registered voters[http://www.floridatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/10/30/hispanics-lead-gains-floridas-registered-voters/93022802/]. That’s more than enough to make the difference in any close election. Polls show[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/upshot/florida-election-forecast.html] a tight race in the state between Clinton and Donald Trump, and historically Latino turnout nationwide has been stubbornly low. Many people of all races don’t vote in presidential elections: Turnout among eligible citizens[http://bipartisanpolicy.org/library/2012-voter-turnout/] was 57.5 percent in 2012 and 62.3 percent in 2008. But while the rate was in the mid 60s in both elections for African-Americans and whites, it went as high as 50 percent for Latinos only in 2008 and stayed below 47 percent for Asians in both elections.

This year, the anti-**immigrant** rhetoric of Donald Trump represented an opportunity for Democrats to increase those numbers (and a threat to Republicans in the medium- to long-term, given the country’s shifting demographics). But Trump’s presence alone may not make the difference. The political scientists Lisa García Bedolla and Melissa Michelson wrote in their 2012 book “Mobilizing Inclusion[https://www.amazon.com/Mobilizing-Inclusion-Transforming-Get-Out-Vote/dp/0300166788]” that infrequent Latino voters become habitual ones only when voting becomes core to their sense of identity. That can take real effort for people who come from a variety of countries, sometimes spend years without citizenship and don’t necessarily grow up in families or neighborhoods where voting is just what everyone does. “For first-generation Americans, politics is often just one more cultural expression that they must decipher on their own,” Marcela Valdes wrote[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/27-million-potential-hispanic-votes-but-what-will-they-really-add-up-to.html] in this magazine in September.

How do you help people with that deciphering? Chris Torres and María Rodriguez are at the center of one effort, among several around the country, to answer that question. Rodriguez is on the ground directing a canvassing operation for Florida **Immigration** Coalition Votes. Torres is suggesting strategies and tracking voter data from his desk in Washington at the Center for Community Change Action. The groups are aligned with the Democrats, and C.C.C.A. raised $15 million for a get-out-the-vote effort this year in three swing states. The focus in Florida, in partnership with FLIC Votes, Rodriguez’s group, is 442,000 “low propensity” voters. The term generally refers to people who have voted, if at all, in no more than one of the last four elections. C.C.C.A. is also working with **immigrants**-rights groups in Colorado and Nevada.

The most effective way to change the voting patterns of people who vote infrequently (and generally to drive more people to the polls) is to reach them one on one, social science suggests. In a 2014 article in Vox, the political scientists David Broockman and Joshua Kalla laid out the evidence that campaigns generally spend too much on television ads and not enough on canvassing and other kinds of personal contact. They cautioned, however, that canvassing varies in quality. It’s most effective, Broockman and Kalla wrote[http://www.vox.com/2014/11/13/7214339/campaign-ground-game], “when voters who don’t care much about politics engage in a genuine conversation about why voting is important.”

The conversation can happen when someone knocks on your door or over a personal text. An app called Hustle used[http://www.dailydot.com/layer8/hustle-app-bernie-sanders-texting/] by the Bernie Sanders campaign loads a text that can be sent individually to many people by pushing send over and over again. It’s time-consuming but far more effective than blasting out spam, Torres says. He’s also using a phone bank for what he called “catch-and-release calls.” The caller asks the voter to tape a short message about why he or she thinks voting is important. On Election Day, the messages will be played back, via automated calls, to the people who taped them, so voters are effectively prodding themselves to go to the polls.

Research shows that these communications have the best chance of succeeding when they’re initiated by someone from the community — someone a voter might know personally or easily believe shares his or her concerns. Leticia Nieves is a newly minted canvasser from Kissimmee, Fla. She started work five weeks ago, and she’s voting for the first time this year herself. “Before now, I just left it up to the nation to make the guess,” she told me over the phone. Nieves is 37 and was born in the Bronx; her family comes from Puerto Rico. When she heard about a job offering $15 an hour to sign up people to vote, she was skeptical. Learning more about Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, she decided that this year the choice was clear: “I needed to support her and stop him,” she said, and she wanted to persuade other people to do the same. “If all of us get together, there are a lot of Latinos in Florida, and that would give us power,” she said. “This job changed how I think.”

So far, more than 117,000 of the 442,000 people on C.C.C.A.’s list of low-propensity voters have voted early, compared with about only 10,000 early voters among this group in 2012. Nieves says that among almost all of the hundred or so people she has talked to, the pro-Clinton message that resonates most is about raising the minimum wage and improving benefits for working families. “You say money, and people’s eyes open,” she said. Focusing on Trump galvanizes some Latino voters — I spoke to one 56-year-old woman from Ecuador who has lived in the United States for 25 years and said she became a citizen to oppose him — but also risks simply making them feel helpless and cynical about politics in general. Last spring, C.C.C.A. asked a focus group of Latinos about the candidates and reached a similar conclusion. “Trump-centered rhetoric only serves to remind voters of just how bad things truly are,” a memorandum on the focus group reads. “Making Trump the focus of our messaging fails to build long-term interest in the political process.”

Long-term goals are a measure for this get-out-the-vote effort because C.C.C.A. and FLIC Votes are trying to use it for another end: strengthening the **immigration** reform movement. The canvassers are asking voters to become a part of that as well as promise to vote. “This time is a completely different experience from other election cycles,” Rodriguez said. “We’re positioned in a way to build muscle.”

There’s another agenda at stake. In a book published this year, “Brown Is the New White[http://www.brownisthenewwhite.com/],” Steve Phillips, a founder of the social-justice organization PowerPAC.org, argues that Democratic candidates should quit tacking to the center during general elections and concentrate instead on turning out more of their progressive base. In other words, they should put more faith in low-propensity voters of color. To Phillips, who helped run voter-mobilization efforts for Barack Obama and Cory Booker, the voters who C.C.C.A. and FLIC Votes are reaching are a crucial component of a “new American majority.” This year, states like Florida, Colorado and Nevada could stay blue. Arizona and Georgia are not out of the realm of possibility for Democrats in the next cycle, or even this one. The most significant aspect of the Latino vote is its distribution on the electoral map — and the fact that it’s growing.

Emily Bazelon is a staff writer for the magazine and the Truman Capote fellow at Yale Law School.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FORT LAUDERDALE, Fla. — Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] stood beneath the strobe lights, her back to the palm trees — hoarse, but hiding it well, at least for a moment.

It was the third event of an endless Tuesday, well after 10 p.m., and an occasion, again, for Mrs. Clinton’s ritual plea: begging Americans to care enough about themselves to vote for her.

“Any issue you care about — anything — is at stake,” she began. “I get sometimes a little overwhelmed by the fact.…”

She lost the crowd midsentence. Something was stirring on the lawn in front of her, a man with a neon green sign and a chant to match: “Bill Clinton[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/bill\_clinton/index.html?inline=nyt-per] is a rapist!”

She glared back at him, raising her index finger and thinking.

This is Mrs. Clinton’s view the week before Election Day: a final national slide show as she trudges to the White House, or to the most stunning loss in modern American political history, produced amid the blur of “Hello, (Insert City Here)!” rallies and bewildering political headaches that have consumed her final sprint.

Perhaps on a different day, at a different hour, she would have resisted the urge to engage. She had seen such protests before — and especially lately — goaded by the far-right, Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per]-supporting website Infowars in attempts to highlight Mr. Clinton’s treatment of women.

But this time, Mrs. Clinton did not pretend not to hear.

“I am sick and tired,” she called out, off-script, pointing toward the man, “of the negative, dark, divisive, dangerous vision and behavior of people who support Donald Trump.”

Her supporters roared. The candidate collected herself. It was time to discuss income inequality.

Mrs. Clinton’s period in public life — undulating, pathbreaking, exhausting — has spanned more than a generation. The portrait feels complete. The surprises are few. It can seem as though she has faced down every kind of moment there is.

This — tugging her bid to the precipice of history, four days out — is a new one.

It is also familiar, delivering her political career to its logical climax.

So she campaigns in contradictions: alternately high-minded and scorched-earth, inspirational and deflating, triumphantly reveling in her gender identity but still subjected to the impulses of men.

She speaks of the need for “positive energy” — “I Believe in Love + Kindness,” read a sign behind her head on Wednesday — and of the obligation to oppose a man known for “demeaning, degrading, insulting and assaulting women.”

She has smiled through speeches from Representative John Lewis of Georgia, the civil rights icon, and Alicia Machado, the former Miss Universe whom Mr. Trump once called “Miss Piggy.”

She has ventured to Arizona, typically safe Republican turf, to present her opponent as a singular threat to **immigrants**, and has repeatedly asked voters to really, truly, thoroughly consider the specter of Mr. Trump in the Oval Office.

“Imagine, with me, what it would be like,” she said in Las Vegas, setting off on the thought exercise at a training center for plumbers and pipe fitters.

Aboard her campaign plane, aides project relative confidence, thumbing through text messages but not, they insist, stolen emails about themselves. (They appear to believe that nothing less than the fate of the Republic is at stake, which tends to focus the mind.)

Still, her events can crackle with the anxious hum of people who read too many polls, their attendance swelling some but remaining shy of Mr. Trump’s standard, both in head count and volume.

“Lock him up!” a man shouted in Dade City, Fla., as Mrs. Clinton relayed Mr. Trump’s history of disparaging women. No one echoed his call.

In Raleigh, N.C., on Thursday evening, Mrs. Clinton led supporters in something resembling group therapy, taking stock of the election’s physical toll.

“I’ve had people say that they can’t sleep,” she said to nods, “that their stomachs are bothering them, that they have headaches.”

It is by now electoral gospel that Mrs. Clinton can struggle to generate passion with the Democratic base, particularly young people. But among some admirers, there appears to be less an enthusiasm gap than a personality distinction, a class of voters reflecting its candidate.

The intensity is quieter, the moments less conspicuous to a television audience.

There is the woman in her wheelchair, sitting on one Clinton sign and holding another, propelling herself briefly onto two feet as the candidate took the stage in Florida; the boy with a “Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles” sweatshirt, shifting on a parent’s shoulders, waving as Mr. Lewis held forth on the “precious” voting right he nearly died in Selma, Ala., to defend; the teenage girl, snapping pictures from the back and repeating after Mrs. Clinton.

“I will defeat ISIS,” Mrs. Clinton said sternly.

“I will defeat ISIS,” the girl mouthed with a giggle, turning to her friends.

Not long ago, Mrs. Clinton seemed eager to end her campaign with soaring optimism, a prospective luxury of the sturdy polling lead she had built after the presidential debates.

Last week, before her latest brush with the F.B.I., she was exultant. Voters serenaded her on her birthday. Staff members surprised her with a cake, which she later shared with the traveling press corps that she had earlier often avoided.

She made an impromptu stop at an Adele concert in Miami, joining aides, including Huma Abedin, who were indulging in pizza and power ballads.

She sat for a series of increasingly madcap television and radio interviews, twirling to salsa music with a television host named El Gordo (“The Fat One”) and proposing a remedy for a politics-weary nation. “I think we need a big national dance,” she said.

The moment passed.

Now, there is mostly urgency, insistent and raw.

In Sanford, Fla., on Tuesday, Mrs. Clinton seemed to hit upon a guiding principle of sorts, as she parried Mr. Trump’s ubiquitous “Make America Great Again” with the kind of rhetorical Q. and A. that can breach the bumper-sticker character limit.

“Do we have problems? Of course we have problems!” she said. “But we’ve never not had problems in America’s history.”

Imperfection was inevitable, she suggested, as surely as progress was achievable.

By Wednesday evening in Tempe, Ariz., where some 15,000 people greeted her, the message was simpler.

Mr. Trump, she said, had insulted **immigrants**. African-Americans. Muslims. Prisoners of war. Pope Francis. Carly Fiorina.

“All I ask is that you really think about the kind of person he’s shown himself to be,” she said.

In an overflow space beyond a barricade, a small protest rippled. One heckler held a sign bearing an offensive four-letter term for female genitalia.

Mrs. Clinton pressed on. “Sometimes,” she said, “sometimes the fate of the greatest nations comes down to single moments in time.”

She implored the people to protect themselves against that irksome inner voice, festering top-of-mind after Election Day, that would wonder, “Ohhhhhh, if only I had done a little more.”

She did not want that for herself, she said. She did not want that for anyone.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the Morning Briefing newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/morning-briefing].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Welcome to the October edition of Teenagers in The Times[http://www.nytimes.com/column/learning-teens-in-the-times], our monthly round up of the news and feature stories about young people that have recently appeared across sections of NYTimes.com[http://NYTimes.com]. You can find our next installment on Dec. 2.

For ideas on bringing these teen-related articles to your classroom, we have a lesson plan[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/08/teaching-with-teenagers-in-the-times/] and a special activity sheet[https://static01.nyt.com/images/blogs/learning/pdf/2014/TeenagersinTheTimesHandout.pdf] that you can use with this or any other edition.

We encourage you to invite the teenagers you know to choose the pieces that interest them most to read and discuss.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Education

The School of Wants and Needs— and Wood-Fired Showers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/29/your-money/california-prep-school-teaches-self-reliance.html]

A prep school that prepares students for entry into competitive colleges, but also teaches them how to raise livestock, grow vegetables and chop wood.

Unraveling Zero Tolerance[http://www.nytimes.com/video/us/100000004683057/unraveling-zero-tolerance.html]

Over the last 30 years, schools across the country have enacted tough disciplinary policies. Did they go too far?

How Taking a Gap Year Can Shape Your Life[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/22/your-money/reflections-on-a-gap-year-decades-after-taking-one.html]

Looking back, adults who took time off before or during college say they have no regrets.

College Is the Goal. Will These Three Teenagers Get There?[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/cp/national/college-applications/senior-year-at-topeka-high]

It’s college application season, and The New York Times is at Topeka High School in Kansas, following seniors as they decide where to apply — and whether college is even the right choice for them.

Is It Time to Desegregate the Sexes?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/opinion/sunday/is-it-time-to-desegregate-the-sexes.html]

The fiercest battleground between gender inclusivity and bodily privacy is the locker room, not the bathroom.

Nudges That Help Struggling Students Succeed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/30/opinion/nudges-that-help-struggling-students-succeed.html]

Small interventions can help underperforming students thrive in the classroom and even rethink their place in the world.

A Whistle Was Blown on ITT; 17 Years Later, It Collapsed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/business/a-whistle-was-blown-on-itt-17-years-later-it-collapsed.html]

In the interim, the for-profit education company made billions off federal student aid, while students amassed mountains of debt and few job prospects.

No Kegs, No Liquor: College Crackdown Targets Drinking and Sexual Assault[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/30/us/college-crackdown-drinking-sexual-assault.html]

Dozens of universities have introduced stricter rules on alcohol, especially at fraternities. We sent reporters to five campuses to examine the new measures.

Why Halloween at College Is So Frightening[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/29/opinion/why-halloween-at-college-is-so-frightening.html]

This Opinion essay asserts that costume crackdowns at universities reveal an absence of moral guidance from administrators who should be mentoring students.

University of Wisconsin Student Arrested in Multiplying Sexual Assault Cases[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/us/university-of-wisconsin-student-arrested-in-multiplying-sexual-assault-cases.html]

The student, Alec Cook, was arrested last week and accused of sexually assaulting a fellow student. After the arrest, more women started coming forward.

Study-Abroad Programs Address a Risk: Road Fatalities[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/business/study-abroad-programs-address-a-risk-road-fatalities.html]

With more American students studying overseas, particularly in parts of the world with weak traffic-safety standard, parents and educators are on guard.

Don’t Use Girls as Props to Fight Trans Rights[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/opinion/dont-use-girls-as-props-to-fight-trans-rights.html]

Op-Ed essay that asserts all students are at risk if schools embrace too narrow a vision of what a woman is supposed to be.

Brigham Young Students Who Report Sexual Assault Won’t Face Honor Code Sanctions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/us/brigham-young-sexual-assault-honor-code-violations.html]

The university said that offering amnesty from potential punishment would help encourage students to report sex-related crimes.

More New York City Schools Join Diversity Initiative[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/nyregion/more-new-york-city-schools-join-diversity-initiative.html]

Twelve more public schools are joining a city program allowing them to alter admissions policies to enroll additional disadvantaged students.

At a Christian College, Student Journalism Gets Religious[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/opinion/at-a-christian-college-student-journalism-gets-religious.html]

Administrators at Wheaton urge students to live righteously from an academic pulpit. We students hold them to high spiritual standards, as well.

Harvard Reaches Tentative Agreement to End Cafeteria Workers’ Strike[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/26/us/harvard-reaches-tentative-agreement-to-end-cafeteria-workers-strike.html]

Hundreds of employees walked out three weeks ago, asking for higher wages and no increase in health care costs.

Bob Dylan 101: A Harvard Professor Has the Coolest Class on Campus[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/arts/music/bob-dylan-101-a-harvard-professor-has-the-coolest-class-on-campus.html]

Richard F. Thomas teaches a freshman seminar about Mr. Dylan. Here’s a look inside the class and his take on the Nobel Prize in Literature.

Bronx Science Student Arrested After Threat Over ‘Fight Club’ Article[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/22/nyregion/bronx-science-fight-club-arrest.html]

The 16-year-old was taken into custody after The Daily News said he had sent a threatening message to a reporter who wrote about the students’ public fights.

White Schools vs. Black Hair in Post-Apartheid South Africa[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/opinion/white-schools-vs-black-hair-in-post-apartheid-south-africa.html]

This Opinion essay asks, how can Nelson Mandela’s dream of a Rainbow Nation be realized when institutional racism still runs through education?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Civics, Politics, Economics and Business

What Makes a New York City Kid?[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/10/20/nyregion/nyc-kids.html]

To answer that question, we talked to a dozen young New Yorkers, who told us their stories and shared videos shot on their phones.

Hillary Clinton to Girl’s Question on Body Image: ‘Let’s Be Proud of Who We Are.’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/politics/hillary-clinton-campaign.html]

Since last week’s debate, Mrs. Clinton has brought attention to Donald J. Trump’s history of making disparaging remarks about the appearance of women.

How One 19-Year-Old Illinois Man Is Distorting National Polling Averages[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/upshot/how-one-19-year-old-illinois-man-is-distorting-national-polling-averages.html]

The U.S.C./Los Angeles Times poll has consistently been an outlier, showing Donald Trump in the lead or near the lead.

Teaching Seventh Graders in a ‘Total Mess’ of an Election Season[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/teaching-seventh-graders-in-a-total-mess-of-an-election-season.html]

In Wisconsin, a crucial swing state, one teacher has aimed for civility in class, but has struggled to discuss the shocking tone of the presidential race.

‘Get Off Me. I Can’t Breathe.’ Philadelphia Teenager Dies After Struggle at Treatment Center[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/28/us/get-off-me-i-cant-breathe-philadelphia-teenager-dies-after-struggle-at-treatment-center.html]

Pennsylvania has moved to shut down the Wordsworth Academy, a residential treatment center for troubled young people.

Black Student in Mississippi Had Noose Put Around His Neck, N.A.A.C.P. Official Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/us/black-student-in-mississippi-had-noose-put-around-his-neck-naacp-official-says.html]

The president of the Mississippi N.A.A.C.P. said white high school students put a noose around the neck of a black student and yanked it tight.

Prosecutors Seek to Try Teenager as Adult After Shooting at South Carolina School[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/jesse-dewitt-osborne-south-carolina-school-shooting-jacob-hall.html]

Jesse Dewitt Osborne, 14, has been charged with murder in the deaths of his father in his home and a 6-year-old boy at an elementary school in Townville last month.

Carolina Boy, 14, Held After Father Is Killed and 3 Are Shot at School[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/us/townville-school-shooting-south-carolina.html]

A teenager killed his father before going to a nearby elementary school and wounding a teacher and two students, the authorities said.

Donn Fendler, Who Was Lost in Wilds of Maine as a Boy, Dies at 90[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/donn-fendler-who-was-lost-in-wilds-of-maine-as-a-boy-dies-at-90.html]

The 12-year-old’s tale of survival gained him fame and honors and was turned into a book that became required reading for schoolchildren in the state.

21 Girls Kidnapped From Chibok School Released by Boko Haram, Nigeria Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/world/africa/boko-haram-nigeria.html]

Officials revealed that they had been negotiating with the Islamist militant group to gain the release of girls taken in April 2014.

Jordan Tones Down Textbooks’ Islamic Content, and Tempers Rise[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/world/middleeast/jordan-tones-down-textbooks-islamic-content-and-tempers-rise.html]

An effort to help youths avoid drifting to extreme ideologies has provoked a backlash, with many viewing the curriculum tweaks as a declaration of war on Islamic values.

Migrant Children, Alone and Desperate in Calais, Look to Britain With Hope[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/world/europe/migrant-children-alone-in-condemned-jungle-look-hopefully-to-britain.html]

With the French government’s planned dismantling of the migrant camp looming, officials say Britain may finally be accelerating steps to admit dozens of children.

Joshua Wong, Hong Kong Democracy Leader, Is Detained at Bangkok Airport[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/world/asia/joshua-wong-thailand-hong-kong.html]

Mr. Wong, 19, said after returning to Hong Kong that he had been held with little explanation from Thai officials, who he said had “mentioned a blacklist.”

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Science, Health, Technology and Sports

Uprooted to Brooklyn, and Nourished by Cricket[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/sports/uprooted-to-brooklyn-and-nourished-by-cricket.html]

Bangladeshi **immigrants** form bonds in high school while spreading the game in their adopted country.

Supreme Court Declines to Consider N.C.A.A. Rules on Paying Athletes[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/us/politics/supreme-court-declconsider-ncaa-rules-on-paying-athletes.html]

The justices turned down a review of a California ruling that the association could restrict athletes’ compensation beyond scholarships and a few thousand dollars.

Protest Started by Colin Kaepernick Spreads to High School Students[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/us/national-anthem-protests-high-schools.html]

Like the San Francisco 49ers quarterback, football players across the country are silently taking a knee during the national anthem to protest racism.

Auston Matthews Scores Four Goals in His First N.H.L. Game[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/sports/hockey/auston-matthews-toronto-maple-leafs-four-goals.html]

Matthews, 19, the No. 1 selection in this year’s draft, had arguably the greatest debut in the league, scoring on his first three shots of the game.

Everybody Hates a Winner: A Brooklyn High School Football Coach Inspires and Exasperates[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/nyregion/everybody-hates-a-winner-a-brooklyn-high-school-football-coach-inspires-and-exasperates.html]

The dismissal of Bruce Eugene, the coach of the Grand Street Campus Wolves in Brooklyn, has locked players, parents and administrators in a bitter dispute.

Push to Develop Young Players Revives A.C. Milan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/26/sports/soccer/push-to-develop-young-players-revives-ac-milan.html]

Manuel Locatelli, an 18-year-old midfielder, and Gianluigi Donnarumma, a 17-year-old goalkeeper, have helped carry Milan toward the top of the Serie A standings.

The Anti-Helicopter Parent’s Plea: Let Kids Play![http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/magazine/the-anti-helicopter-parents-plea-let-kids-play.html]

A Silicon Valley dad decided to test his theories about parenting by turning his yard into a playground where children can take physical risks without supervision. Not all of his neighbors were thrilled.

The Fear of Having a Son[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/well/family/the-fear-of-having-a-son.html]

The common wisdom is that most men want sons, but that’s starting to shift.

Generation Adderall[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/magazine/generation-adderall-addiction.html]

Like many of my friends, I spent years using prescription stimulants to get through school and start my career. Then I tried to get off them.

Teaching Your Child Emotional Agility[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/well/family/teaching-your-child-emotional-agility.html]

Learning to handle negative emotions is critical for children, but parents tend to teach avoidance rather than acceptance.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Arts, Media and Culture

Review: Teenagers Grapple With Their Demons in ‘Wilderness’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/theater/wilderness-review.html]

Dig beneath the usual stories of broken marriages and adolescent angst, and we discover wells of darkness that seem to have no bottom.

Declaring ‘That’s Me,’ and Empowering Latinas[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/arts/music/soy-yo-sarai-gonzalez-empowering-latinas.html]

How a viral music video featuring a defiant and adorable little girl stood up to the anti-Latino rhetoric of the Trump campaign.

Are You There? It’s Me, Reality: Grit Returns to Young-Adult Novels[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/nyregion/are-you-there-its-me-reality-grit-returns-to-young-adult-novels.html]

Issue-driven fiction is having a renaissance. Several new books are an outgrowth of the financial crisis, the rise of racial tensions and the increased animosity toward **immigrants**.

Bottle-Flipping Craze Is Fun for Children but Torture for Parents[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/bottle-flipping-craze-is-fun-for-children-but-torture-for-parents.html]

The compulsion to toss a partly filled bottle and try to get it to land upright has captivated children. But for parents the repetitive noise of flipping (gurgle), landing (thud) and grabbing (crunch) the bottles is brutal.

Harsh Crowd: Indie Rock Veterans at Age 14[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/nyregion/harsh-crowd-indie-rock-veterans-at-age-14.html]

Mature beyond their years, the four teenagers in this New York band are forging a feminist pop-punk sound all their own.

Rare Find in New York: A Teenage Birder[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/nyregion/rare-find-in-new-york-a-teenage-birder.html]

Kai Victor, a high school senior, grew up next to Central Park and has been fascinated with birds since infancy.

Fashion’s New ‘It’ Kids[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/10/20/fashion/fashions-new-it-kids.html]

Meet the next generation of Kendall Jenners and Gigi Hadids: children of celebrities parlaying their parents’ fame and good genes into careers.

Meet CoverGirl’s New Cover Boy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/fashion/meet-covergirls-new-cover-boy.html]

James Charles, a high-school senior and beauty junkie who has amassed a sizable social media following, joins the ranks of Zendaya and Katy Perry.

Rowan Blanchard: The Unlikely Evolution of a Disney Star[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/fashion/rowan-blanchard-disney-star-it-girl.html]

Rowan Blanchard takes to Instagram and Twitter to help her overcome the child Disney star stereotype. And it seems to be working.

High School Pushover No More: The Power of the Polo Shirt[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/jobs/high-school-pushover-no-more-the-power-of-the-polo-shirt.html]

A heavy, awkward girl dressed in the uniform of her summer job at a convenience store overcomes her shyness to stand up to a wealthy, cool classmate.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**JACKSON, Ga. — “Put the guns down!”

The order crackled over a loudspeaker from two sheriff’s deputies crouched behind the doors of police cruisers, semiautomatic rifles at their sides.

Several middle-aged militiamen were toting loaded AR-15 rifles and 9-millimeter pistols at a makeshift checkpoint — two lawn chairs and a narrow board — on a dirt driveway in central Georgia. The men, members of the Georgia Security Force III% militia, grumbled but laid their weapons down on the red clay earth.

The brief standoff ended with an amicable chat, and the men retrieved their weapons the moment the lawmen drove away. But the episode further stoked the militiamen’s abiding fears that their cherished Second Amendment rights are under assault.

The Georgia Security Force is one of scores of extremist militias nationwide that have rallied around the presidential campaign of Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per], heartened by his harsh attacks on **immigrants**, Muslims and Syrian refugees. But no single issue motivates militiamen more than guns — and the enduring belief that Hillary Clinton is plotting to take them away.

The Georgia militiamen mobilized in the piney woods here last weekend to fire weapons and train for the day when, they believe, they will be forced to defend what they call “our way of life.” Two dozen armed men and women conducted live-fire search-and-destroy drills, pumping out enough rounds to saw through and topple a loblolly pine.

“We thought it was bad under eight years of Obama, but the gun-grabbing is going to get a whole lot worse if Hillary gets elected,” said Chris Hill, 42, a blond-bearded paralegal who goes by the code name Blood Agent and commands the militia. He wore combat fatigues and packed a .40-caliber Smith & Wessonpistol on his hip.

When Mr. Trump says he wants to make America great again, Mr. Hill and his roughly 50 local militiamen are enthralled. They long for an America they believe has been stolen from them by liberals, **immigrants** and “the P.C. crowd.” Their America is one where Christianity is taught in schools, abortion is illegal and **immigrants** hail from Europe, not faraway Muslim lands.

These weekend warriors form the obdurate bedrock of Trump Nation: white, rural and working class. They vote, and they are heavily armed, right down to the .22-caliber derringer fired by Nadine Wheeler, 63, a retiree who calls her tiny gun “the best in feminine protection.”

During two days of conversations, grievances poured forth from the group as effortlessly as bullets from a gun barrel. On armed excursions through sun-dappled forests, they spoke of a vague but looming tyranny — an amalgam of sinister forces to be held at bay only with a firearm and the willingness to use it.

They are machinists and retirees, roofers and factory line workers, all steeped in the culture of the rural South. They say Mr. Trump, a Manhattan billionaire and real estate tycoon, speaks for them.

“Within the extreme right, many of Trump’s most passionate backers come from the militia movement,” said Mark Pitcavage, a senior research fellow at the Center on Extremism at the Anti-Defamation League. “The militia movement is overwhelmingly behind Trump’s candidacy.”

For militias, Mr. Trump’s anti-establishment views “play right into their paranoid style of politics,” said Ryan Lenz, editor of the Hatewatch blog at the Southern Poverty Law Center.

The Georgia Security Force is noteworthy among militias for its acute Islamophobia, Mr. Pitcavage said. Its members are so-called 3 percenters, who believe that only 3 percent of colonists fought in the Revolutionary War. That is “a historical myth,” said Mr. Pitcavage, a historian, but useful for those who believe a few people with guns can defeat tyranny.

At least 330 such 3 percenter groups have formed in all 50 states, by Mr. Pitcavage’s count. There were 276 active militias in 2015, Mr. Lenz said. The number includes some 3 percenter groups.

Mr. Trump has retweeted posts from white nationalists and Nazi sympathizers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/us/politics/donald-trump-white-identity.html?\_r=0], but Mr. Hill and his followers insist that they are not racists, only staunch citizens and patriots with an admittedly apocalyptic outlook. They consider Mr. Trump a bulwark against the candidate they call “Shillary” Clinton.

Teresa Bueter, 41, worked for 26 years behind a hot grill at a Waffle House while raising three children. Now she is an active member of the Georgia Security Force, decked out in military fatigues. She owns a .32-caliber pistol and a German-made sniper rifle.

Mrs. Bueter said Syrian refugees entering the country “scare the crap out of me.” With her guns and the militia’s weekend paramilitary drills, she said, she is prepared to fight for the values she has instilled in her children and three grandchildren.

“Donald Trump would fit right in with our little group,” she said. “He wants America the way we want it, back like it used to be.”

Firearms are central to their identities. In September, some Georgia Security Force members paraded with guns while protesting plans for a local mosque[http://www.myajc.com/news/news/state-regional/known-extremists-fan-mosque-debate/nscXZ]; one wore a T-shirt that read, “Islam Is of the Devil.” Last year, armed Security Force militiamen rallied in support[http://www.myajc.com/news/news/hundreds-rally-at-stone-mountain-for-confederate-f/nnBT2/] of the Confederate battle flag.

At their campground, militia members squeezed off several dozen rounds before breakfast. Then they sat down to scrambled eggs and sausage amid the lingering scent of cordite. Mr. Hill asked who was voting for Mr. Trump. Everyone shouted a unanimous “Oorah!” .

The militia members seem comfortable inside the same sort of echo chamber of self-confirming arguments they ascribe to the liberal elites they say denigrate and demean them. They repeat tropes gleaned from militia websites and social media. They seem convinced that either the Islamic State, or agents dispatched by Mrs. Clinton, or both, may soon descend on the woods of central Georgia.

In separate interviews, various militiamen shared the same conspiracy theories, almost word for word: Muslim refugees have established terrorist training camps on American soil. The liberal billionaire George Soros has rigged voting machines for Democrats.

“We’re like a small military of like-minded people,” said Donald Ensey, 44, a father of four and grandfather of two, who wore fatigue pants and a black T-shirt bearing a profane depiction of an Islamic State fighter and a goat.

Mr. Ensey, who has a 3 percenter logo tattooed on the back of his hand, said training with the militia was essential to securing everything he had worked for in his lifetime. Even if Mrs. Clinton is not elected, he said, surely someone else will come for his guns.

Mr. Hill, a Marine veteran, holds FTX sessions, or field training exercises, roughly once a month. Otherwise the members communicate via regular posts on Facebook. Prospective members are approved by a “review board” of current members who vet them on their compatibility with the militia’s beliefs. This session was held on 14 acres owned by Devin Bowen, a machinist who was having a miserable day even before the deputies forced him to drop his pistol.

The door of his trailer — the one with a sign that reads, “If You Don’t Live Here, Don’t Come Here” — was smashed in earlier that day. Three rifles, a crossbow, 13,000 rounds of ammunition and an 800-pound gun safe were taken — not by federal agents, but by local thieves. Worse, Mr. Bowen was coughing up blood from an unknown malady. He soothed his throat by chugging cold Coca-Colas.

Mr. Bowen’s comrades urged him to see a doctor, prompting a sour discussion about yet another conspiracy they see: the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Bowen waved them off. He was more concerned about Muslim **immigrants**’ imposing Shariah law[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/sharia\_islamic\_law/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

“You cannot come to my country and shove your religion down my throat,” he said, coughing.

Phillip King, 25, who builds ductwork for a living, was outfitted in camouflage fatigues and a tactical vest holding ammunition clips. Mr. King, code name Cowboy, is the only African-American member of the Georgia Security Force.

He said he was not offended by the militiamen’s affection for the Confederate battle flag. He shares their love of guns, their conservative values and their view of Mr. Trump as someone who will insulate them from the tyranny of the political left.

“This is my family — a brotherhood,” he said.

For Daniels Potts, 21, owning a gun and learning to use it as part of a well-trained militia are essential to halting what he calls “the spread of radical Islam.” He appreciates Mr. Trump’s fierce opposition to Muslim refugees. “Not every Muslim is ISIS, but a lot of them are,” Mr. Potts said.

He proudly calls himself an infidel and a deplorable. His arms bear tattoos of the 3 percenter logo and of the Kuntry Krackerz, a group affiliated with the Georgia Security Force.

Mr. Potts earns $16 to $18 an hour as a commercial roofer. He considers himself the type of law-abiding, hard-working American he said is belittled and marginalized by coastal elites. “We’ve been forgotten,” he said.

Mr. Hill, the militia commander, led Mr. Potts and two dozen other members through a boot camp-style obstacle course carved out of the woods. They clambered over a wall of logs and fired at imaginary enemies as they “cleared” rooms made of plywood and sheets of black plastic.

One militiaman wore a shirt with a message that read, “When Tyranny Becomes Law, Resistance Becomes Duty.”

It was all part of the militia’s efforts to be armed, ready and united for looming threats, especially if Mrs. Clinton is elected, Mr. Hill said. He mentioned his two children. “The security and safety of my kids motivates what I do,” he said.

Mr. Hill, who calls his group a “defensive militia,” predicted unrest and violence from extremists on both sides no matter who wins the presidential election. If Mrs. Clinton wins, he said, millions of gun owners will march on Washington at the first attempt to restrict gun ownership.

“If the people decide they can no longer suffer the inequities,” he said, “I’d be with the people and I’d take my guns up to Washington, D.C.”

\* Scary Dogs! Rigged Machines! Votes From the Grave! This Election, Paranoia Reigns[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/02/us/politics/voter-fraud-anxiety.html]

\* Some Donald Trump Voters Warn of Revolution if Hillary Clinton Wins[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/28/us/politics/donald-trump-voters.html]

\* For Whites Sensing Decline, Donald Trump Unleashes Words of Resistance[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/us/politics/donald-trump-white-identity.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I heard it often, traveling around Europe as a journalist. I even heard it from an **immigration** officer at Gatwick Airport outside London, who teased me as he looked at my passport. I was an American abroad, which meant being held accountable for the strange and fevered state of my homeland, which meant facing some version of the question “What is going on in the United States?” Sometimes the query had an air of schadenfreude, but just as often there was a hint of real concern. The rest of the world already seemed to be going off the rails. It couldn’t afford to have America follow.

I didn’t really know how to respond. I hadn’t lived in the United States since 2003, when The New York Times moved me to Beijing as a foreign correspondent, along with my wife and two kids. We assumed we would move back home soon enough, but it never happened. We lived for six years in China, where our third child was born, followed by four years in New Delhi, where my beat was South Asia. By the time we settled in Rome in 2013, we had drifted into the category of American expatriates. When we saw our countrymen around the city — big, friendly tourists, a bit loud — my kids referred to them as “the Americans.”

We weren’t completely cut off. Most summers, we visited family and friends in the States; the kids streamed the American shows; my wife listened to “Morning Edition.” I worked for an American company, for American bosses, and I wrote articles trying to explain the world to a mostly American audience. All of this created the gentle illusion that we were still truly connected to home. Yet as the years passed, I realized that I had lost touch, that the country I left was no longer the same.

The year I moved away, George W. Bush stood beneath a “Mission Accomplished” banner on an aircraft carrier and declared an end to major combat operations in Iraq. Facebook hadn’t yet been turned into a company. The iPhone did not exist. I left before Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans, before Detroit went bankrupt. I missed the Great Recession (though I am still living the European translation of it). I missed most of the last two presidencies. I missed Brangelina.

Instead, I witnessed from the other side the global forces that would bring profound changes to America. I visited industrial regions of southern China where the ground seemed to vibrate under the weight and bustle of all the countless new factories. Once iPhones had been invented, it was Chinese workers who assembled them. I watched Bangladeshi seamstresses stitch clothes sold at Walmart. American consumers benefited from the cheaper goods, but American manufacturers did not. Between January 2000 and December 2014, the United States lost roughly five million manufacturing jobs.

Then I moved to Rome and watched the European Union grow ineffective and paralyzed, as the dream of a vibrant, unified Europe seemed to wither. Democracy was losing ground in Hungary and the Philippines; it had all but surrendered in Russia. Syria became a slaughterhouse. The Islamic State dispatched terrorists around the world. China’s politics became more oppressive, as President Xi Jinping cracked down on dissent and nurtured a Maoist-style cult of personality. Economic globalization was supposed to accelerate political liberalization around the world, but instead authoritarianism appeared to be on the rise. The West, it seemed, had failed to anticipate the possibility that globalization could contribute to the destabilization of — or pose a threat to — democracy, even in the United States.

This summer, I decided I wanted to explore this place that had become a foreign country to me. I didn’t understand what had happened since I left, why so many people seemed so disillusioned and angry. I planned a zigzag route, revisiting places where I once lived or worked, a 29-day sprint through 11 states (and four time zones). I knew I would be moving too fast to make any sweeping declaration about the state of America, and I wouldn’t ask people which presidential candidate they were voting for. I was more interested in why they were so anxious about the present and the future. I wanted to find out why the country was fragmenting rather than binding together. Most of all I wanted to see with my own eyes what had changed — and so much had changed.

By the time I arrived in Washington in late July, the notion that American democracy could come unmoored was not being easily laughed off. Before beginning my journey in earnest, I paid a visit to Patrick J. Buchanan at his white mansion near the headquarters of the Central Intelligence Agency in Northern Virginia. I’d thought of Buchanan often over the last year, as Donald Trump secured the Republican nomination. In 1992, I covered Buchanan during a campaign stop in Macomb County, outside Detroit, when he was a Republican insurgent running for president, the Trump of that era. He mocked Republican elites, denounced free trade and globalization, antagonized minorities and vowed to build a “Buchanan fence” along the Mexican border. Buchanan’s nostalgia for the era of white-majority America was often interpreted, not without cause, as barely concealed racism. He lost in 1992, and again in 1996 and 2000, but he always predicted that his issues and his angry coalition would endure.

When I asked if he had any concern about this election damaging American democracy, he said he didn’t worry too much about that. He talked about the European Union as evidence of the political dangers posed by **immigration** and described “ethno-nationalism” and economic nationalism as potent political forces. “I look around the world, and I think all those countries are coming apart,” he said. “And I think ours is going to come apart. The melting pot is not melting anymore.”

I mentioned that I was leaving the next day to travel along the Texas-Mexico border. Buchanan grimaced for a moment and jokingly offered to lend me a shotgun. I thanked him, and later I flew off into the heat.

From the sky, there is no border. The helicopter thump-thumped above downtown El Paso as we passed over the concrete ditch through which the Rio Grande flows, dividing El Paso from the Mexican border city of Ciudad Juárez. If not for the ditch, you’d assume the two cities were one, a single urban sprawl blanketing a valley between two desolate mountain ranges. Only when we headed west did the border become distinctly visible, a straight brown line jutting into the scrub desert. I could see a metal fence that divided the two countries and, near it, the white S.U.V.s of the American agents on patrol. My colleague, the photographer Tomás Munita, leaned out of the copter to take pictures.

I had been in contact with United States Customs and Border Protection but never thought to mention my aerial tour. A few hours after we landed, an agency spokesman emailed me. He was friendly but anxious: Agents reported seeing someone taking photographs from a helicopter tracing the border. Was it us?

I had gone to El Paso often as a national correspondent for The Times, and I always liked the atmosphere there. Everybody seemed to know everybody else. El Paso is isolated from most of Texas, yet Juárez lies no more than a long baseball toss away. There is a fluid give and take between the two sides, even as the disparities are stark: Juárez has frequently ranked among the most violent cities in the world, while El Paso routinely rates among the safest municipalities in the United States.

My helicopter ride had come about in typical El Paso fashion: I called a state senator, who connected me to the county judge, who nudged a local businessman to organize the trip. They saw it as a good opportunity to help rebut the 2016 election narrative that the border was a lawless, out-of-control sieve through which illegal **immigrants** flooded north and wreaked violence upon unsuspecting Americans. The county judge, Veronica Escobar, had grown wearily accustomed to the assumptions made in other parts of the country. “One of the first questions people frequently ask is, Will I be safe?” she told me. “You can tell people that deportations are up and that in-migration is down from Mexico. You can tell people that the border has never been safer. You can provide people with as many statistics as possible — and it doesn’t make a difference.”

Escobar, a Democrat and El Paso County’s highest elected official, grew up here and considers the city an unlikely oasis of tolerance. She is Mexican-American; the city’s police chief is African-American. We had dinner my first night in El Paso, and when I mentioned something Pat Buchanan said to me — he dared me to drive around El Paso with a Trump bumper sticker on my car — she laughed. But she worried that El Paso was changing. Even some of her own relatives, people who had moved away from El Paso, have posted pro-Trump, anti-**immigrant** messages on Facebook. Fear and anger overcame the facts on the ground, she said.

“How did America get that way?” she asked. “I don’t know. And it’s heartbreaking.”

I was starting my journey in El Paso because six months earlier I was across the border in Juárez, on the outside of America, looking in. As a correspondent based in Rome, I also cover the Vatican, so I traveled with Pope Francis’ retinue on his trip to Mexico in February. His final stop was Juárez. As he prayed for migrants at the border’s edge, I stared through the fence into the United States. Snipers were posted on rooftops; police cars with flashing lights blocked an overpass; agents watched from horseback or peered across the border with binoculars. Presumably some of this was to protect the pope, but I flew back to Italy startled by this show of force, this demonstration of American power and anxiety.

Soon after setting out in my rental car from El Paso, I saw just how thoroughly the Texas border had become militarized. Since I left, the number of Border Patrol agents nationwide had roughly doubled, to more than 20,000, a vast majority of them stationed along the 1,989-mile border with Mexico. They have motion detectors, helicopters, cameras, fixed-wing aircraft and drones at their disposal. Their boats ply stretches of the Rio Grande. Texas state troopers have also been dispatched to “secure the border.”

The El Paso County sheriff, Richard Wiles, who has criticized the buildup, told me that so many troopers were present that they often had little to do besides enforce traffic laws. “It is a waste of money,” Wiles said. “It was a response to the rhetoric that the border is unsafe. And that is wrong.” (A new study by the Border Network for Human Rights found that troopers have been disproportionately stopping Latino motorists in many border counties, including El Paso.) At a convention of the Texas Republican Party this year, Gov. Greg Abbott falsely stated that the Islamic State was “running through the border.” In April 2015, the conservative watchdog group Judicial Watch asserted that the Islamic State had a training camp in Mexico, near El Paso. Again, there was no evidence to back up the claim.

Safety feels like a tenuous concept right now, when a malcontent can detonate a homemade bomb in Chelsea or suicide bombers can blow themselves up outside a soccer stadium in Paris. But so much of the safety rhetoric around the border blends legitimate concerns — especially when it comes to smuggled drugs, money and weapons moving in both directions — with political opportunism. The rate of people being apprehended while trying to cross the border from Mexico declined in 2015 and is now at its lowest point in more than 40 years. And even as President Obama pushed for **immigration** reform, his administration approved high numbers of deportations.

One afternoon, I pulled up to a checkpoint on Interstate 10, about an hour or so east of El Paso, near the town of Sierra Blanca, Tex. A Border Patrol agent in a bulletproof vest asked if I was an American citizen while a dog sniffed the rental car for drugs. Less than an hour later, a Texas state trooper pulled me over on State Highway 90 in Presidio County for failing to use my blinker while changing lanes. The road was so quiet that a jack rabbit hopped across. The trooper asked if I was an American citizen, checked my passport and sent me on my way with a warning. Traffic enforcement.

I had forgotten how big the people are, how big the cars are, how much fried food can be stacked onto a single plate. Everything seemed larger than I remembered, even the night sky. Driving along the 610 Loop in Houston, I saw a cigar shop named SERIOUS CIGARS that was easily triple the size of my grocery in Rome.

“This country is huge,” Tomás said one day. “It is like 50 countries all together.”

Tomás, a Chilean, has traveled the world, but this was his first long tour across the United States. On seeing one rural road sign, he asked what it meant to “adopt a highway.” Another day, another road sign: “Hitchhikers May Be Escaping Inmates.” Tomás was startled by how thoroughly so many American cities emptied out at night. In Colorado Springs, we attended a rodeo where the announcer made a long soliloquy praising our military for defending our freedom at home. Tomás had embedded many times with American forces in Afghanistan. He liked the soldiers, but he didn’t understand how sending troops to other countries, particularly Iraq, kept Americans free at home.

Before the rodeo, I met two ranchers, Rob Alexander and Bill Craig. The air smelled faintly of horse manure as we sat on a plastic cooler drinking Coors. Alexander, 53, explained that the rodeo was a fund-raiser for ranch hands, who often lacked health insurance or a safety net to help out in emergencies. Ranching families had taken a hit in the past two decades, in part because trade agreements led to the consolidation of many cattle operations and an increase in imported beef from South America. Craig, 35, is a fourth-generation rancher, but he said land is now so expensive and profit so meager that he could never afford to start a ranch from scratch today. They talked like men whose lifestyles and values were endangered.

“Something is wrong,” Craig said. “Watch the TV. The moral compass is so far out of whack in our country right now.”

At the University of Texas at Austin, I met Lisa Moore, a professor of English and women’s studies who is one of three plaintiffs suing to overturn a new state law allowing students to carry concealed handguns on campus. Born in Canada but a resident of Texas for 27 years, Moore is a naturalized American citizen who is still a bit baffled by her new country. “That is the weirdness of the United States to me: Everybody is always talking about their rights,” she said, while identity in Canada derives from the idea of the social compact.

Moore is a gay, married mother of two children who teaches courses on L.G.B.T. literature. “Campus carry” infringes on free speech, she argues, by inhibiting her ability to provide a safe learning environment. What if a student becomes enraged by the subject matter and pulls out a Glock?

American gun manufacturers produced 3.3 million guns the year I left for China, according to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. By 2014, the number was nine million (supplemented by 3.6 million guns imported into the country). According to some recent estimates, there are now roughly as many guns as people in the United States, maybe even more. To many foreigners, the American infatuation with guns is an inexplicable, if defining, national trait. On a taxi ride in Beijing once, the driver, upon discovering I was American, shaped his hand like a pistol and began shooting imaginary bullets.

At a firing range outside Austin, I met six guys shooting semiautomatic rifles. Several of them worked for Defense Distributed, the open-source organization in Austin that came up with a plastic handgun whose design can be downloaded from the web and produced with a 3-D printer. The State Department ordered the company to remove the design code, but the company is challenging that order in court. For Benjamin Denio, at the time a 36-year-old who worked in desktop support and did product testing at Defense Distributed, being able to produce your own plastic gun is a safeguard against the tyranny of the state. “The term I would use to describe the level of vitriol in the country,” Denio said, “is that it is the ‘cold civil war.’ ”

I was running into so many disgruntled people that I began to worry, as I dipped in and out of places, that I was inadvertently being drawn to angry people. I figured I would get a taste of Middle America by stopping in Russell, Kan., which I visited 20 years earlier when a local hero, Bob Dole, was the 1996 Republican presidential nominee. Walking along the redbrick Main Street, I saw a crowd streaming out of a local theater. Inside, Christina Fowler, a pastor, had just finished services for her nondenominational congregation. Today was her son’s birthday, and she invited me to a potluck lunch with the congregation in her backyard.

Everyone sat at folding tables eating potato salad and lasagna. I sat with the associate pastor, Lonnie Whitten Jr., and a congregant named Cindy, who asked that her last name not be published. Whitten, who had a bushy ZZ Top beard and arms covered in tattoos, described himself as a reformed bad boy. This congregation, he said, was moving away from the culture of the “corporate church” and also opposed same-sex marriage. Cindy had been part of a local delegation taken to San Diego for the 1996 Republican National Convention as living proof of Dole’s hometown values. “We were treated like royalty!” she said. Now 59, Cindy explained that too many ministers around the country watered down the true message of the Gospel, serving up baby food, not meat. And what was the real message? That homosexuality is a sin. That Islam is incompatible with Christianity.

“It’s just a matter of time when someone gives the signal,” she told me of Muslims living in America, “and we’re all going to be beheaded.”

I ate some potato salad, a bit stunned.

My iPhone broke in Baton Rouge, La. — something to do with the “lightning port” — so I headed to the Mall of Louisiana. I walked into the carefully engineered retail ecosystem of the Apple store, where a young, friendly, racially mixed staff in matching blue shirts circulated in the showroom. Apple products lay sparsely across the counters like pieces of art. I waited at the Genius Bar until an Apple employee gave me a replacement iPhone 6. Only later did I realize that the Mall of Louisiana had played a not-insignificant role in the continuing struggle over segregation in Baton Rouge.

Living in Louisiana in the 1990s, I regularly visited the capital for stories about state politics. I thought back to 1991, when the white supremacist David Duke made it to a runoff in his gubernatorial campaign against Edwin Edwards, the former Democratic governor who was perpetually under investigation for corruption. “Vote for the Crook: It’s Important,” his supporters’ bumper stickers read. (Years later, he was finally convicted.) Now Duke is running for the Senate, and his re-emergence has coincided with the racial splintering of Baton Rouge.

On July 5, Alton Sterling was shot by the police as he sold CDs outside a convenience store. The police shooting of yet another black man, captured on video, became a national scandal. Twelve days later, a black veteran of the Marines shot six law-enforcement officers in Baton Rouge, killing three, including one who was black.

One afternoon, Lionel Bazile Jr. picked me up at my hotel for a tour of the neighborhood where Sterling was killed. Bazile, a 66-year-old retired postman, is a Roman Catholic and a member of an interracial, interfaith coalition called Together Baton Rouge. It was founded about six years ago, after a prominent black pastor, Lee T. Wesley, led an outreach effort to some white ministers and community leaders because he felt the city was dangerously, if silently, divided. That split became clear when a predominantly white group of organizers in southern Baton Rouge sought to create their own school system and, ultimately, incorporate their own city, St. George. They needed a new school system, they argued, because the East Baton Rouge Parish schools were struggling. But carving out a wealthy area of Baton Rouge as a new municipality would have drained tax revenues from the surrounding city and gutted the funding for Baton Rouge public schools. The new municipality was also laid out to include the Mall of Louisiana, a major source of sales-tax revenue. Bazile, along with others from Together Baton Rouge, helped defeat the St. George movement, but the underlying problems had hardly gone away.

“Now we are crossing Florida Boulevard,” Bazile told me as we rode in his truck. “We call Florida Boulevard the Mason-Dixon line that divides Baton Rouge.”

Once we entered North Baton Rouge, the historically black section of the city, the road immediately became bumpier. According to Bazile, the neighborhood received only a small slice of the money from the citywide road-improvement project. “You are not going to see too many shopping centers around here,” he said as we passed dilapidated strip malls. We drove by a hospital where the emergency room had been closed down. During our drive, I did not see a single national chain store.

North Baton Rouge had apparently died from gradual abandonment. Most politicians ignored the neighborhood. When crime began to rise, Bazile’s home was burglarized four times, and the value of his property began to depreciate. He and his family moved out, as did many middle-class black families. The Mall of Louisiana opened in the late 1990s near the city’s predominantly white southern suburbs and soon became a magnet for more public and private investment. “North Baton Rouge was dying,” Bazile said, “but southern Baton Rouge was booming.”

Bazile and I pulled into the parking lot of the Triple S Food Mart, where Sterling was killed. Someone had painted Sterling’s image on the side of the store, and soggy bouquets of flowers and tributes lay piled on the pavement. Veda Washington-Abusaleh, one of Sterling’s aunts, stood nearby with a protest poster rolled up in her hands. She told me she was out there every day. When I explained that I was a journalist, she began shouting. “Ain’t nothing changed!” she said. “It is still the same. I can tell you what needs to change! White police officers need to be better trained.” She pointed to the spot in the parking lot where activists and political leaders erected a stage in the days after the killing. “Right where his blood stained the street,” she shouted. “It is a political thing for them. But I want justice.”

A lot of people did. Today, Baton Rouge is a reminder of the entrenched racial and economic segregation in many American cities. Nationally, stubborn disparities remain between whites and blacks as far as income, college-graduation levels and employment. The median adjusted income for white households was roughly $71,300 in 2014, compared with $43,300 for black ones. The median net worth of white households is about 13 times as high as that of black ones, according to the most recent figures from the Pew Research Center. John Logan, a sociologist at Brown University, told me that racially biased economic development is one reason these disparities remain entrenched. Black communities have been routinely passed over for commercial projects, like shopping malls, which attract other development projects and lift property values.

On my last morning in Baton Rouge, I met Gary Chambers Jr., a black civil rights advocate and journalist who was a leader of the protests over the Sterling killing. We met at an IHOP, which Chambers picked because the franchise was black-owned. Chambers had become an outspoken advocate for North Baton Rouge and a blunt critic of the city’s racial status quo. He blamed the police and politicians, including the city’s black mayor. Chambers described his own agenda as being unabashedly “pro-black.” “We are supposed to live in this society where we want everybody to be a part of what we’re doing,” he told me. “And we do. But I live in Baton Rouge, and it’s just not the case.”

To Chambers, the Sterling killing was as much about economics as bad policing. “Why is Alton Sterling selling CDs in the middle of the night, outside a convenience store in the hood?” he asked. “Because we don’t have economic opportunities in North Baton Rouge.” When I mentioned Together Baton Rouge and the efforts to build deeper relationships between whites and blacks, Chambers chuckled softly and then paused a moment. “They are all right,” he said. “They are trying.”

But I could tell he was skeptical. He told me that it was time for the older generation to simply get out of the way. “I’m 31,” he said. “So if you’ve been in office since the ’80s and my community looks like this, then you have some blame. My generation is inheriting this. We didn’t create this. So don’t tell us how to feel about it.”

A week or so after I left Baton Rouge, the city flooded; some areas were inundated with six to eight feet of water. Parts of the region were declared disaster areas. After I sent a sympathy note to Broderick Bagert, an organizer of Together Baton Rouge, he wrote back: “We’ll invite you back when the plague of locusts arrives, which I understand is expected to be next week.”

I lived in the Bay Area as a teenager, and while it was affluent then, the levels of wealth, along with the cost of living, are magnitudes greater today. Tomás and I arrived in San Francisco late at night after searching for hotels online. A basic room at a Holiday Inn was more than $300. Finally, we found one advertised at $217 a night that turned out to be in the Tenderloin, the neighborhood that has long absorbed new **immigrants** but has also become the catch basin for the city’s poorer residents. One reason for this is that churches, nonprofit groups and city agencies operate soup kitchens and subsidized housing programs in the neighborhood. But another is the tech money driving up property values in neighborhoods like SoMa, the Mission and Bayview.

This has pushed some low-income people onto the streets, or out of the city, and intensified the pressure on street people to move on, often to the Tenderloin and other commercial neighborhoods downtown. After three days in the city, Tomás and I were dazed by what we had seen: drug addicts shooting up; two people engaging in oral sex, in broad daylight; a young woman vomiting on the sidewalk, unable to digest a donated pastry; homeless people camping on streets that reeked of urine; two old men, wheeling their possessions in dueling grocery carts, fighting midday on Market Street near the offices of Twitter, with one man waving a steel rod and the other swinging a bear knife until the police arrived.

“Homelessness issues are very real, but they are also very symbolic of so many other inequities and stressors that are happening in the city,” Peter Cohen, an affordable-housing advocate, told me one morning. “You say, What’s the problem? The tech economy is booming. Employment is up. It only becomes apparent when you drill down to the level of the neighborhood. We are struggling in San Francisco, to some extent, with the excesses of wealth that have concentrated here.”

In the November elections, San Francisco has multiple local ballot initiatives related to homelessness (which has been a woefully nonexistent issue in the presidential campaign). There is also a battle over the rapidly expanding sharing economy, some of whose largest companies were started in the area. Airbnb, which is based in San Francisco, markets thousands of units in the city and spent heavily to defeat a local ballot initiative last November that would have severely restricted short-term rentals. In June, the city’s Board of Supervisors approved some restrictions anyway, prompting a lawsuit from Airbnb. Whatever the outcome, the usual parameters of housing issues — say, tenants versus landlords — seem forever changed.

Dale Carlson, a consultant who has played a central role in the political fight against Airbnb, said the sharing economy has contributed to the rise in rents and has encouraged some landlords to evict tenants and convert apartments to short-term rentals. (Advocates for house-sharing platforms say the rentals are vital in helping people make extra money to afford the high cost of living in the city.)

“It’s essentially, Who gets to live here?” Carlson said of the political fight. “And who is squeezed out?”

One day, I drove down Highway 101 to Silicon Valley to meet Reid Hoffman, a partner at the venture-capital firm Greylock and the chairman of LinkedIn, the professional-social-networking company, which was then in the process of being sold to Microsoft for $26.2 billion. Hoffman founded LinkedIn the same year I left for Beijing; now he was a billionaire. He is politically active, having supported and advised Obama and raised money for and donated money to Hillary Clinton. I mentioned how the election had become a referendum of sorts on globalization and trade, yet there had been little discussion about the next big earthquake — artificial intelligence, or the approaching world of self-driving cars, smartphones that can diagnose a melanoma and much more. Globalization may have ravaged blue-collar America, but artificial intelligence could cut through the white-collar professions in much the same way.

Hoffman said the reactions to artificial intelligence range from utopian to dystopian. The utopians predict huge productivity gains and rapid advances in medicine, genetic sequencing, fighting climate change and other areas. The dystopians predict a “Robocalypse” in which machines supplant people and, possibly, threaten humanity itself. “My point of view,” he said, “is that it is a massive transformation and does really impact the future of humanity, but that we can steer it more toward utopia rather than dystopia with intelligence and diligence.”

Either way, another major economic shift is coming, perhaps sooner than people realize. Hoffman said that many of the jobs in today’s economy will change fundamentally during the next 20 years. On the same day I met with Hoffman, Uber announced a pilot program to test self-driving vehicles in Pittsburgh. It also bought a company developing self-driving trucks. “We have to make sure that we don’t have a massive imbalance of society by which you have a small number of people that own the robots and everyone else is scrambling,” he said.

Back in the Tenderloin, I met with Del Seymour, a former drug dealer who runs a nonprofit organization called Code Tenderloin, in which he trains local low-income people for the job market. In recent years, the city had granted major tax breaks to companies that opened offices in the area, and Seymour offered tours to show tech workers their new neighborhood. I joined a small group from Zendesk, a cloud-based customer-service software company founded in Denmark whose headquarters are in the Tenderloin. Its employees had already done volunteer work with a local nonprofit organization, distributing clean syringes to local drug users to prevent the spread of AIDS. It was not the usual tech job.

The tour ended inside the Cadillac Hotel. Jerry Garcia once lived there in the early 1960s, Muhammad Ali once sparred there, and it now has many subsidized rooms for low-income residents. Seymour asked the Zendesk employees to sit in the lobby and praised the company for its volunteer work. But then he pointed out that tech companies hire more than just techies — about 30 percent of the jobs, he said, did not require technical training. He told them how he was once one of the biggest dope dealers on Taylor Street. He had changed, however, and other people in the Tenderloin could, too. “Let us in your back door,” he said, his voice rising like that of a preacher. “We don’t want your food. We don’t want your sympathy. We want jobs.”

I was in Detroit, in the August heat, and it was just so weird. Downtown was coming back, but so much else was strangely empty. Entire neighborhoods were practically abandoned, and arsonists had torched hundreds of houses. Wildflowers grew on the empty lots. It was as if the city had fragmented into mismatched pieces. One street was a ghost town. Another was a construction site for a new Red Wings hockey stadium.

“There will be fires tonight,” Elaine Cromie said as we drove through the city streets. “That is for sure.”

Cromie, a freelance news photographer, was giving me a tour of the city. Even though Detroit was out of bankruptcy and downtown boosters were pushing a resurgence narrative, the arson fires were still happening often enough that the local media had to pick and choose which ones to cover. “It’s really only news if it is a hazardous-materials fire,” she said.

We turned onto Goldengate Street and parked near a few vacated houses. Trees still shaded the rotting homes where middle-class families once lived, before many of them walked away from bad mortgages. The emptiness of some streets reminded me of photographs of the depopulated, decaying buildings left behind after the nuclear disaster at Chernobyl. That part of Ukraine has been largely without people for 30 years and is now known as the Zone of **Alienation**, which seemed like a fitting phrase to describe parts of Detroit too.

Five years back, the organizers of Occupy Detroit spent the winter on Goldengate, but the anticapitalist movement fizzled and the street today is mostly populated by hippies and squatters. It is, in fact, a counterculture oasis, known as Fireweed Universe-City. Cromie was looking for a guy who was supposed to connect us with a community leader, Doctor Bob, but instead we bumped into Zack Zduniak. Zduniak, 26, had simply checked out of mainstream America, which today’s Detroit made possible.

Zduniak grew up in suburban St. Clair Shores in an era of diminished prospects, while the local auto industry declined. He liked living off the grid, but it wasn’t easy; he was sleeping with his cat in a friend’s delivery truck. He worked part-time at a restaurant, sometimes foraged for berries and knew which churches gave out free food. Visitors turned up, often Europeans, some via couchsurfing.com, for a binge of partying or a voyeuristic taste of life on the antimaterialist fringe. “We just don’t want to be involved in this crazy, consumerist society,” he told me.

Zduniak thought Doctor Bob could better represent the community, so we knocked on his door. Bob Pizzimenti is a chiropractor, urban farmer and the proprietor of the healing center and vegetarian cafe down the street, which was the only nearby outpost of private enterprise that I spotted. Everyone called him Doctor Bob. He bought his two-story brick house six years ago for $1,400 when others were fleeing. He liked that there were seemingly no rules in Detroit. He bought several empty lots around his house and planted corn and other vegetables on them. He wanted a different type of community, something new. He thought America had lost its way.

“We’ve bought into a system that nobody believes in, but everybody walks around like something real is going on,” he told me. He added: “This is real.” He was pointing to a stalk of corn.

Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Jim Yardley is The Times’s Europe editor. He last wrote for the magazine about whether the European Union is at risk of breaking apart.
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\* My Saga, Part 1[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/01/magazine/karl-ove-knausgaard-travels-through-america.html]
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**We asked students what they would do if they were in charge, what their concerns and hopes for the future would be. Empathy and forgiveness — a plea for more — and climate change[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] were recurring themes, as well as issues political and personal. Here are condensed selections. Add your own ideas in the comments section at the bottom of this page (student submissions will be highlighted). Photos and drawings that interpret the question can be submitted via email, to edlife@nytimes.com[mailto:edlife@nytimes.com].

HYEWON CHOI, American International School Chennai (India), sixth grade:

If I were the president of the world, I would first prevent girls from marrying at a young age. One of the reason I want to prevent girls from marrying at a young age is because the girls who are marrying quickly are not able to spend their childhood and they have to stay inside the house. And the second reason is that it is violating the international Declaration of Human Rights article 16, which says that men and women have right to marry. It means that child bride is violating the human rights. So if I were the president of the world, I would prevent more creation of child brides.

JINWON CHOI, American International School Chennai (India):

By looking at Malala [Yousafzai], I got to learn about lots of women not getting education in Pakistan and also other countries. I want to fix this problem. Human Rights article 26 says that everyone has their rights to have education, just being a woman doesn’t changes that. Some people think that women should stay at their house and do housework while men gets to study and get jobs. Well, it’s WRONG! Men and women are same humans who only has different gender. So if I become the president, I want to fix the discrimination between girls and boys.

JASON FONG, Redondo Union High School (Calif.), class of 2017:

If I were in charge, I would spread the word that there is strength in empathy. Those who can step into the shoes of another are powerful. They can imagine what it is like to lose a child to gun violence, to plead for your husband’s life at the hands of police. They can imagine what it is like to come to a new country as a kid. They can see the loneliness of a soul struggling alone against a powerful, raging addiction. Our country is made stronger when we help each other lighten our loads. Let’s rise together — not fall apart.

ANNA ROTH, Beacon College (Fla.), class of 2020:

I’m terrified. I’m terrified of a world where everyone hates each other. I’m terrified of the way people put other people into boxes and assume they’re different from people in their box. I’m terrified the outcome of the election could see L.G.B.T. people further be **alienated** in our culture and I’m terrified that some of my friends think Donald Trump supporters are evil.

I’ve experienced unkindness. Despite this, I don’t really believe evil exists. Everyone makes mistakes. We’ve all said something hurtful in our lives. I believe that almost everyone deserves forgiveness, including people who are sexist or racist or homophobic. However, I know some people have trouble accepting humanity’s blemishes while also being open-minded about people different from themselves.

If I were president, somehow I’d want to create an atmosphere of empathy for all.

MADELEINE GAISER, Gettysburg College (Pa.), class of 2017

If I were president, of my college or the country, I would put resources into making diversity work. Cultural education would start in kindergarten and colleges would make use of the safe spaces they brag about. Fostering diversity is not creating a rainbow of skin tones and filling the air with a symphony of languages and smells. Those colors and sounds, which came because of promises, because of recruitment, cannot be placed on the pedestal of diversity and inclusion if they are met with bigotry and hate.

Leaders do not understand that diversity is a culture. That culture is learned and requires all the time and resources that recruiting the diversity required. True diversity is achieved when hearing Korean spoken at the gas station, and Arabic spoken by a hijabi at the Apple store doesn’t turn heads; when the sounds and smells mingle harmoniously.

DAN McCARTHY, Boston College, class of 2020:

I’ve been at Boston College for a month now, exploring deep questions and confronting complex issues in classes. Thus far, nothing has terrified me more than climate change. If I were president, I would lead the greatest push for climate mitigation. Carbon taxes, funding alternative energies, advocating for Elon Musk’s next revolutionary project. I would do my best to champion compromise as the primary tool of politics. That is what I want to see of our politicians. Compromise for the sake of improving our world. In short, doing their jobs.

MARSHALL BENDER, Vilseck High School (Germany), class of 2019:

If I were the president of the United States, I would enforce stricter gun laws. Japan, a country where guns are banned — even something like firing a gun can get you a hefty jail sentence or fine — has virtually zero gun violence.

Second, I would end the war on drugs, which has caused mass incarceration, the waste of billions of dollars, killed many innocent people and hasn’t solved a single problem that was addressed. In Portugal, drugs are still illegal, but the citizen found with drugs is sent to treatment, not prison.

Third, I would adopt a prison system like Norway’s, which focuses on rehabilitation. By teaching the prisoners that we care for them and want to help them, we can bring them back into the real world successfully and without them being multiple-time offenders.

Finally, and arguably the most important of the four, I would work to make America use 50 percent renewable energy by 2050.

JILLIAN KLASCIUS, Syracuse University (N.Y.), class of 2018:

I have many concerns for the future — overturning the Supreme Court’s Citizens United ruling, fighting climate change (more regulations, decreased greenhouse gas emissions, etc.) and raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour.

But my biggest issue is our need to get money out of politics. This issue has bipartisan support from the people, yet nothing is done because those with the power to enact these changes need the corporations and 1 percenters’ money to get re-elected. It’s a vicious cycle that has serious consequences in regards to which laws and policies are passed or not passed. Without our elected government truly being representative of the people, and responsive to the people, all other policy issues won’t stand a chance unless they are aligned with corporate interests.

I am hopeful for the future of our country because Bernie Sanders received high percentages of the young vote in the presidential primary, and I will be (and am currently) looking, supporting, volunteering and voting for other Bernie-esque candidates at every level of government.

ALEJANDRO VAZQUEZ, Northbrook High School (Houston), class of 2017:

If I were president of the United States of America, I would emphasize **immigration** reform, dedicating my administration to improving the opportunities given to Dreamers and parents of Dreamers. The deferred action for childhood arrivals policy would be altered to protect a larger population of **immigrants**, with benefits like traveling outside the country without any problem. I would also create a financial aid process for undocumented students. Although this already exists in some states, I would make sure to enforce it in all 50 states.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Emeka Ogboh

‘Das Afrikanische Bierlaboratorium I’

Ludlow 38, MINI/Goethe-Institut Curatorial Residencies

38 Ludlow Street, near Hester Street, Lower East Side

Through Nov. 13

What if a Nigerian **immigrant** in Berlin created a spicy stout that became the most popular beverage in the land? Emeka Ogboh imagines this possibility in his exhibition “Das Afrikanische Bierlaboratorium I,” at Ludlow 38[http://www.ludlow38.org/archive/index.php?/root/Emeka-Ogboh-DAB/].

The show’s centerpiece is an 11-minute video — part mockumentary, part fake infomercial — for Sufferhead Original, a fictional “black beer” brewed with chili peppers and named after the Fela Kuti song “Original Suffer Head” (1981), which detailed Nigerian political problems that spurred mass emigration. The video includes cameos by curators and friends posing as beer experts and enthusiasts, as well as Mr. Ogboh explaining the concept and development of Sufferhead Original.

Both silly and poignant, the video and accompanying bottles and canvases, which are affixed with Sufferhead Original labels, point to the challenges for migrants thrust into cultures where they are treated as interlopers, disrupters or terrorists. (The exhibition was inspired partly by a right-wing German politician’s demeaning remarks — quoted in a gallery handout — about the “life-affirming African mode of propagation.”)

But Sufferhead Original also underscores the importance of food and taste as cultural touchstones and imagines a utopian assimilation in which **immigrants**are not only accepted, but also embraced. Precedents for this type of reverse-colonization-through-food exist: In the 1990s, curry surpassed fish and chips as Britain’s favorite national dish[http://news.bbc.co.uk.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/2/hi/talking\_point/30926.stm]. And since Mr. Ogboh is a craft-beer enthusiast who has formulated his own recipes, perhaps Sufferhead Original will become a reality, capturing Germany by the taste buds.

MARTHA SCHWENDENER

R. Luke DuBois

‘The Choice Is Yours’

bitforms gallery

131 Allen Street, near Rivington Street, Lower East Side

Through Dec. 23

Just in time for Election Day, the data-driven artist R. Luke DuBois has mounted an interactive, intellectually stimulating show about the way we vote, at Bitforms[http://www.bitforms.com/]. By connecting mechanical voting machines from the mid-20th century to computerized surveys, he examines both the psychology behind the act of pulling a lever and the sometimes fragile technologies that record our decisions.

Step behind the burgundy velvet curtains of “Learning Machine #1: Values,” a 1945 voting booth purchased from a government-supply store upstate, and you are confronted not with candidates and party names, but rather with 300 “values,” drawn from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator personality test. Some are shown in binaries that mimic the two-party system (“Adventurous v. Credible”; “Motivated v. Helpful”). Your selections are then funneled into a computer program that uses them as search terms on Instagram and the digital version of The New York Times; once you exit the booth, you can step back and look at a scrolling digital montage of images and articles. (As the artist has observed, the Times searches have a tendency to bring up obituaries.)

You can also play with smaller “learning machines” (small voting machines of similar vintage, purchased on eBay) that look as if they might have been designed by Dada poets; one asks you to choose from sound effects such as “roar/bang,” “whistle/hiss” or “screech/buzz.” Your choices produce small, customized digital animations, which are often less engaging than the menu that precedes them. Real-time results from all the interactive “learning machines” are tallied on a monitor in the gallery’s front window, which reads like an absurdist FiveThirtyEight[http://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/2016-election-forecast/?ex\_cid=rrpromo] website.

Mr. DuBois has thoughtfully included a kind of mini-museum of voting, with a display case of punch-card ballots, party-line labels and other historical ephemera. Also in this section, an upbeat 1957 promotional film produced by the Automatic Voting Machine Corporation is a real period piece (as seen from our era of hanging chads and hacking fears).

Posted around the gallery, an essay by the New York University history professor Jonathan Soffer, outlining the history of vote-recording in this country, from the oral votes of Colonial America to today’s touch-screen systems, is essential reading. (It delivers stinging examples, along the way, of technology’s leapfrogging social progress; the earliest use of mechanical voting machines, for instance, dates to the 1890s, predating women’s suffrage by almost three decades.) However you cast your ballot on Tuesday, a visit to this show is likely to render you a little more self-conscious about the process, but a lot less likely to take the right for granted.

KAREN ROSENBERG

Benjamin Butler

‘Forest(s)’

Klaus von Nichtssagend

54 Ludlow Street, near Grand Street, Lower East Side

Through Dec. 4

Benjamin Butler started painting trees about 15 years ago. At first they appeared in recognizable landscapes, sometimes with snowy mountains or by the sea, but they quickly shed their worldliness in favor of a minimal, partly abstracted tree-ness with which they could also masquerade as multicolored snake skins, veiny leaves backlit by the sun, or esoteric chemical diagrams.

In his latest show, at [http://klausgallery.com/] Klaus von Nichtssagend,[http://klausgallery.com/] Mr. Butler has narrowed his focus even further, to thrillingly psychedelic effect: His work now seems balanced on a razor blade between Conceptual practice and “The Starry Night[http://www.moma.org/learn/moma\_learning/vincent-van-gogh-the-starry-night-1889],” but at the same time, somehow, it has ample room to move.

Across every one of the 15 paintings that fill this recently expanded gallery [http://klausgallery.com/about-the-gallery/] marches a brigade of evenly spaced vertical lines. Mr. Butler works in sizes ranging from open notebook to barn door. But every painting uses the same untreated, burlap-colored linen; the thickness of the lines varies, yet only — as far as I could tell — among two or three brushes. And the brigades march in tighter or looser formation, but all stop equally short of the edges. In “Red Forest” and “Autumn Forest,” red lines scorched with black stand beside black lines bloodied red, all of them flickering yellow — but the colors are mostly somber. And then there are the branches, extending up from these “trunks” at 30 or 45 degrees, sometimes with a slight curve, usually in the painting’s upper half, with an effect more like that of a fasces or of an Ogham stone than of a forest.

WILL HEINRICH

Carolee Schneemann

‘Further Evidence — Exhibit A’

PPOW

535 West 22nd Street, Chelsea

‘Further Evidence — Exhibit B’

Galerie Lelong

528 West 26th Street, Chelsea

Both through Dec. 3

Carolee Schneemann[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/30/arts/design/carolee-schneemann-challenges-boundaries-with-her-naked-body.html?\_r=0] made her name in the 1960s and ’70s with performance pieces and videos that pushed contemporary limits[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fw\_wW2v45eI] of feminist and artistic expression. But her laserlike focus, aggressively personal material and volatile intensity have carried on across the decades. This first double show since PPOW and Galerie Lelong announced joint representation of the artist[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/15/arts/design/galleries-to-mount-joint-carolee-schneemann-exhibition.html] last year brings welcome light to a scattershot but vital selection of hits from the ’80s and the more recent past.

The highlight at Lelong is the 2009 multichannel video installation “Precarious,” which runs an obsessive, trance-inducing loop consisting of three stable wall-size projections and two more that bounce around the room. We see images of a cockatiel violently bobbing its head like a teenager at a concert. We also see Filipino prisoners[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hMnk7lh9M3o] in red uniforms doing synchronized dance routines; a dancing bear on a chain; and a frame of leafy branches, accompanied by the sound of rushing water, that quivers like an unattainable fantasy of liberation from this world or from the body.

But the stronger work is at PPOW, in particular, “Fresh Blood — A Dream Morphology,” the video of a 1983 performance. Here, Ms. Schneemann veers from the mind-bending difficulty of pushing back against power in the power structure’s own language (“Are we dreaming ourselves or dreaming the dreams of the men dreaming us?”) to the kind of bedeviled search for meaning that teeters between insight and a panic attack.

WILL HEINRICH

Aki Sasamoto

‘Delicate Cycle’

SculptureCenter

44-19 Purves Street, Long Island City, Queens

Through Jan. 2

It’s not easy to make funny art. What’s even more difficult is to achieve what the Japanese-born artist Aki Sasamoto has in her first solo American museum show: to make work whose humor coexists with, and amplifies, its vividly humane sense of tragedy.

Ms. Sasamoto is best known for performance. And, indeed, the laundry-themed, site-specific pieces with which she has filled the [http://www.sculpture-center.org/exhibitionsExhibition.htm?id=113710] SculptureCenter[http://www.sculpture-center.org/exhibitionsExhibition.htm?id=113710]’s courtyard, stairwell and complex, crypt-like basement aren’t so much sculpted objects as a series of set dressings so suggestive that they work even when she’s not in them. (The show does include performances, though the remaining two — one this month and one in December — are sold out.)

In fact, her absence is key. Ms. Sasamoto, like Cosima von Bonin, whose exquisitely sad stuffed-fabric clams[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/arts/design/cosima-von-bonin-swimming-against-the-tide.html] and octopuses are on this museum’s ground floor, gets a lot of mileage out of the so-called pathetic fallacy[http://www.merriam-webster.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/dictionary/pathetic%20fallacy]. “Washboard Belt — Maidrite,” an old-fashioned washboard hanging from one corner in the stairwell, with a barbecue fork slung across its back, like some character in a Pixarprison-break movie, is so sweetly doomed that it’s hard not to see it as a mirror of all of your own most foolish hopes.

What is most striking throughout is an almost psychotherapeutic sense of receptivity. In the courtyard, five ghostly white twin contour sheets, one of them signed Sasamoto (in all caps) in a Sharpie marker, flap around a double clothesline hung on the diagonal. In the basement, two commercial washers and a double stack of dryers, arranged in step fashion like the most ancient Egyptian pyramids[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pyramid\_of\_Djoser], stand gaping under a video with a heavily accented voice-over lecturing on the sacred significance of the dung beetle. In the hall, in emulation of the dung beetle, the artist constructed a ball of knotted white sheets five feet across. And back in the courtyard again, three cheap aluminum pots and pans, with speakers concealed under their lids, juxtapose recorded washing sounds with the manic construction noise[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/14/realestate/long-island-city-fast-growing-with-great-views.html] of Long Island City.

The work’s studied neutrality, partly down to its color scheme, but mostly because of its careful balance of satire and empathy, creates an empty space in which viewers can, to an unusual degree, hear their own thoughts and notice, maybe for the first time, just how peculiar they sound.

WILL HEINRICH

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Early voting is underway, and according to Donald J. Trump, so is voter fraud. Almost daily, he proclaims that “large-scale voter fraud” is happening and that the election is “rigged.” Politicians across the spectrum have criticized this nonsense as divorced from reality, deleterious to our democracy and unprecedented in our elections.

It’s good to see such a strong, bipartisan pushback, but the critics are wrong on that last point. Thinly supported allegations of electoral malfeasance have been deployed throughout American history, often by those who want to restrict the vote.

In the Jim Crow South, discriminatory devices from poll taxes to all-white primaries were justified as a means of fraud prevention. In 1902, Texas adopted a poll tax. Its champions argued in The Dallas Morning News that the tax would prevent fraud and protect against “corrupt methods at the polls.” Their reasoning? If casting a vote is free, then poor people will sell their votes “for a trifle.”

An 1875 article in The Houston Telegraph made clear who the potential vote sellers were: “the low, groveling, equal-before-the-law, lazy, purchasable Negro, who pays no taxes,” and who must be prevented from “neutralizing the vote of a good citizen and taxpayer.” The specter of vote buying was also invoked to justify the state’s all-white primaries.

This strategy was not unique to the South. Around the same time, progressive reformers in the North made similar appeals to justify more elaborate requirements for voter registration. New Jersey, for example, established a voter registration system in 1911 that gave prospective voters four days to register, required voters to re-register every time they failed to vote and applied only to large cities.

History books often portray such measures as well-intentioned responses to the corruption that sometimes characterized early 20th-century urban machine politics. But that’s not entirely accurate, according to the pre-eminent voting rights historian Alexander Keyssar of Harvard. “What is most striking is not how many but how few documented cases of electoral fraud can be found,” he wrote in “The Right to Vote.” “Most elections appear to have been honestly conducted,” with systematic fraud being “the exception, not the rule.”

Without such evidence, many Progressive Era reformers justified the new restrictions with “thinly disguised” appeals to “antagonism toward poor, working-class and foreign-born voters,” and “unabashedly welcomed the prospect of weeding such voters out of the electorate,” Mr. Keyssar wrote.

These registration “reforms” had their intended effect: After New Jersey adopted the 1911 registration law, turnout declined sharply, particularly among African-Americans and **immigrants**.

Fraud continues to be a rallying cry. Today, states are mandated by federal law to make voter registration opportunities available at Department of Motor Vehicles offices, public assistance agencies and through other means under the National Voter Registration Act, known as the Motor-Voter law.

But in the early 1990s, opponents of Motor-Voter raised fraud concerns. President George H. W. Bush vetoed an early version of the law, admonishing that it was “an open invitation to fraud and corruption.” That warning proved inaccurate, and today most Americans don’t think twice about the propriety of offering voter registration services at D.M.V.s.

Years later, the conservative writer Kevin Williamson warned [https://www.nationalreview.com/nrd/articles/330065/block-vote]ominously in National Review that the 2012 election would be marred by “fraud” and called for the repeal of Motor-Voter. Without much evidence of fraud, he quickly pivoted to another justification, lamenting “the ongoing conversion of our republican institutions into so many tribunes of the plebs.” He added that “it is perfectly fine (and maybe more than that) if fewer people vote.”

The truth is that electoral fraud is vanishingly rare. A comprehensive study by Justin Levitt, a senior Justice Department official, found only 31 credible allegations of in-person voter impersonation from 2000 to 2014, during which over one billion ballots were cast.

This brings us to Mr. Trump’s recent calls to watch polling places in “certain areas.” In itself, there is nothing wrong with poll monitoring. States often allow certified observers to watch polls. Trained poll monitors can help prevent mishaps on Election Day, like ensuring that eligible voters don’t slip through the cracks because of poll-worker error.

But undisciplined poll watching can degenerate into voter intimidation. In 2013, a Texas federal court found that voting practices in Harris County, home to Houston, had “a dilutive effect” on Latino voting power, crediting testimony that “poll watchers have intimidated Latino voters at the polls, such as inquiring about the voters’ citizenship status.”

There is still cause for concern. A Trump supporter recently told The Boston Globe[http://www.bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2016/10/15/donald-trump-warnings-conspiracy-rig-election-are-stoking-anger-among-his-followers/LcCY6e0QOcfH8VdeK9UdsM/amp.html] that he would racially profile “Mexicans. Syrians. People who can’t speak American.” And he wasn’t shy about what he’d do next: “I’m going to go right up behind them,” he said, and “make them a little bit nervous.”

We’re witnessing merely the latest round of efforts to delegitimize and exclude minority and **immigrant** voters with baseless allegations of fraud. But our commitment to universal suffrage demands that every eligible voter who wants to vote has the chance, free from intimidation and harassment. In this election, unnecessary barriers to the ballot and calls to racially profile voters are the real threats. Voter fraud is not.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Dale Ho is the director of the A.C.L.U.’s Voting Rights Project.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERWYN, Pa. — Melania Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/melania-trump?inline=nyt-per] made a rare appearance on the campaign trail in the battleground state of Pennsylvania on Thursday, seeking to soften her husband’s coarse image by proclaiming to voters that Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per] respects all Americans and promising that as president he would promote values of compassion and charity across the country.

The deployment of Ms. Trump comes as the Trump campaign is trying to extend a late burst of momentum before Election Day by swaying undecided voters and women who have been wary of the Republican nominee. Urging Americans to “find a better way to talk to each other” amid one of the most caustic presidential campaigns in recent history, Ms. Trump cast **immigrants** as patriots and lamented, in spite of her husband’s tough talk on Twitter, cyberbullying[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/cyberbullying/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] as one of the country’s worst problems.

Mr. Trump needs the trove of wealthy and educated voters in the counties surrounding Philadelphia to succeed in turning the state red for the first time since 1988, but many of those former Republicans have been turned off by his comments about **immigrants** and women.

Ms. Trump, who is trying to change that, spoke at a recreational center in a Main Line town about 20 miles west of Philadelphia.

As her fans waved “Women for Trump” signs, Ms. Trump told her story of **immigrating** to the United States, emphasizing the arduous 10-year process that she went through, and described **immigrants** as the ultimate patriots.

“I’m an **immigrant**, and let me tell you that nobody values the freedom and opportunity of America more than me,” Ms. Trump, dressed in pink and standing between six American flags, said.

Despite signs of overall tightening, a Quinnipiac University poll of likely Pennsylvania voters[https://poll.qu.edu/2016-presidential-swing-state-polls/release-detail?ReleaseID=2399] released this week showed the uphill fight that Mr. Trump is facing among women in the state. Hillary Clinton leads him with that demographic by 20 percentage points, as many female voters have been turned off by Mr. Trump’s proclivity to make sexist comments.

The hope for the Trump campaign is that Ms. Trump, a former Slovenian supermodel, can help smooth Mr. Trump’s rough edges. On occasion, she has even told him to tone down his habit of being on Twitter into the wee hours, and on Thursday she explained that combating online bullying would be her top priority as first lady.

“Our culture has gotten too mean and too rough, especially to children and teenagers,” Ms. Trump said. “It is absolutely unacceptable when it is done by someone with no name hiding on the internet.”

She added, “We have to find a better way to talk to each other, to disagree with each other, to respect each other.”

The comments were a sharp contrast from the vitriol of the campaign, and some on social media noted that Mr. Trump had attributed much of his political success to his ability to bully rivals and critics with cutting posts on Twitter.

The calls for a more civil discourse also clashed with the tone of some of Mr. Trump’s supporters who came to see Ms. Trump. Before Ms. Trump arrived, chants of “lock her up” directed at Mrs. Clinton spontaneously erupted. Some Trump supporters carried signs labeling former President Bill Clinton a rapist and others wore shirts suggesting that Mrs. Clinton should be killed.

Whether Ms. Trump’s late foray into campaigning will work remains to be seen. Many of the women who attended her rally in Pennsylvania said they were already committed to Mr. Trump and that they had been waiting to finally see his wife in person.

“She’s a beautiful, classy woman,” Micki DiBella, 61, of Broomall, Pa., said. “And she’s an **immigrant**. To me that means Donald Trump doesn’t care if you were born in America.”

Susan Jane, of Gwynedd Valley, Pa., said that Ms. Trump was the most effective advocate for her husband because of her warmth and positive persona. “They try to paint him as a monster,” she said, “but if he was a monster she wouldn’t be married to him.”

Although Ms. Trump has tried to avoid the brutal combat of presidential politics, it has proved to be nearly impossible to escape. During the campaign, she has faced scrutiny of her **immigration** status, questions about her educational history and even accusations that she was once an escort. She has also had pictures of her posing nude strewn across the internet, and last month she had to publicly accept Mr. Trump’s apology for talking, in a 2005 “Access Hollywood” video, about inappropriately grabbing women.

Ms. Trump has been mostly absent from the campaign trail, aside from a handful of television interviews, since an address at the Republican National Convention in July.

That ended in calamity[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/20/us/politics/melania-trump-convention-speech.html?\_r=0] after it was revealed that passages from Ms. Trump’s remarks were lifted from a speech delivered years ago by Michelle Obama. The episode became a surprising distraction at the convention, and Ms. Trump has largely receded from the spotlight since to focus on raising her 10-year-old son with Mr. Trump, Barron.

In welcoming Ms. Trump to the state, the Pennsylvania Democratic Party made light of the convention speech incident on Thursday, sending out an email that purportedly contained “exclusive” excerpts from Ms. Trump’s remarks.

The text, however, was of a speech that had been given by Mrs. Obama.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the Morning Briefing newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/morning-briefing].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The widespread use of self-driving cars promises to bring substantial benefits to transportation efficiency, public safety and personal well-being. Car manufacturers are working to overcome the remaining technical challenges that stand in the way of this future. Our research, however, shows that there is also an important ethical dilemma that must be solved before people will be comfortable trusting their lives to these cars.

As the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has noted, autonomous cars may find themselves in circumstances in which the car must choose between risks to its passengers and risks to a potentially greater number of pedestrians. Imagine a situation in which the car must either run off the road or plow through a large crowd of people: Whose risk should the car’s algorithm aim to minimize?

This dilemma was explored in a series of studies[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301293464\_The\_Social\_Dilemma\_of\_Autonomous\_Vehicles] that we recently published in the journal Science. We presented people with hypothetical situations that forced them to choose between “self-protective” autonomous cars that protected their passengers at all costs, and “utilitarian” autonomous cars that impartially minimized overall casualties, even if it meant harming their passengers. (Our vignettes featured stark, either-or choices between saving one group of people and killing another, but the same basic trade-offs hold in more realistic situations involving gradations of risk.)

A large majority of our respondents agreed that cars that impartially minimized overall casualties were more ethical, and were the type they would like to see on the road. But most people also indicated that they would refuse to purchase such a car, expressing a strong preference for buying the self-protective one. In other words, people refused to buy the car they found to be more ethical.

This is a version of the classic “tragedy of the commons”: People acting in their self-interest behave contrary to the actions that everyone knows are necessary for the common good. One solution to such dilemmas is for the government to enforce regulations. But our research suggests that when it comes to self-driving cars, Americans balk at having the government force cars to use potentially self-sacrificial algorithms.

Car manufacturers, for their part, have generally remained silent on the matter. That changed last month when an official at Mercedes-Benzindicated[http://fortune.com/2016/10/15/mercedes-self-driving-car-ethics/] that in those situations where its future autonomous cars would have to choose between risks to their passengers and risks to pedestrians, the algorithm would prioritize passenger safety. But the company reversed course[https://jalopnik.com/now-mercedes-says-its-driverless-cars-wont-run-over-ped-1787890432] soon after, saying that this would not be its policy.

Mercedes was confronting the same dilemma suggested by our research. Carmakers can either **alienate** the public by offering cars that behave in a way that is perceived as unethical, or **alienate** buyers by offering cars that behave in a way that scares them away. In the face of this, most car companies have found that their best course of action is to sidestep the question: Ethical dilemmas on the road are exceedingly rare, the argument goes, and companies should focus on eliminating rather than solving them.

That’s a commendable goal, but the widespread adoption of driverless cars will happen only when people are comfortable with carmakers’ solutions to these ethical dilemmas, however seldom they arise. Last June, the first fatal accident[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/07/01/business/inside-tesla-accident.html] in a driverless car drew considerable media attention, and the victim was a passenger; imagine the level of public interest in the first driverless car accident that harms someone not in the car.

This is why, despite its mixed messages, Mercedes-Benz should be applauded for speaking out on the subject. The company acknowledges that to “clarify these issues of law and ethics in the long term will require broad international discourse.” Bill Ford Jr., the executive chairman of the Ford Motor Company, recently called[https://www-bloomberg-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/news/articles/2016-09-13/robot-car-ethics-need-urgent-review-in-society-bill-ford-says] on the auto industry to engage in “deep and meaningful conversations” with the public on the subject.

To promote such a discussion, we have created an online platform, which we call the Moral Machine[http://moralmachine.mit.edu/], and which allows people all over the world to share their intuitions about what algorithmic decisions they see as most ethical. So far, more than two million people from more than 150 countries have participated.

The sooner driverless cars are adopted, the more lives will be saved. But taking seriously the psychological as well as technological challenges of autonomous vehicles will be necessary in freeing us from the tedious, wasteful and dangerous system of driving that we have put up with for more than a century.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Azim Shariff is an assistant professor of psychology at the University of California, Irvine. Iyad Rahwan is an associate professor of media arts and sciences at the M.I.T. Media Lab. Jean-François Bonnefon is a research director at the Toulouse School of Economics.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Mexico City — To dramatic music, the video[https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\_continue=2&v=ukYj5eR80m4] starts with a clip of the Republican nominee for president, Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per], threatening to jail his rival, Hillary Clinton, before the words “Te recuerda a alguien” (“Does this remind you of someone”) pop up. The image switches to the former Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/hugo\_chavez/index.html?inline=nyt-per], founder of the self-declared Socialist revolution, who steered his oil-rich nation to meltdown.

The video goes on to compare their attacks on the press, from Mr. Trump’s throwing out Univision’s Jorge Ramos to Mr. Chávez’s announcing the shutdown of a TV network that had criticized him. “No votemos por Donald Trump,” it finishes — “We don’t vote for Donald Trump.”

The video, with Spanish subtitles, comes from the Democratic National Committee and is aimed at a particular group of Latino voters: those who fled Mr. Chávez’s Venezuela and other authoritarian countries, like Cuba. It has a particular resonance in Florida, a battleground state and home to an increasing numbers of Venezuelans, especially in Doral, west of Miami, where Senator Marco Rubio has an office.

Many voters with ties to Cuba and Venezuela are highly suspicious of anything resembling the left, the province of both Mr. Chávez and the Cuban government, making them sympathetic to Republicans. Claiming that Mr. Trump could lead to the tyranny and poverty they fled, then, is a powerful emotive argument to reject the Republican candidate. And it comes at a time when Venezuela’s crisis is reaching a boiling point, with social unrest and a looming humanitarian disaster. But does the comparison between a Latin American Socialist and an American billionaire really hold up?

Unsurprisingly, the Venezuelan government rejects staining the name of its deceased “comandante,” whom it has elevated to near saint status, with someone who waves the flag of the empire. “It is an expression of the racist arrogance and irrationality of a party that doesn’t attend to its voters,” Venezuela’s foreign affairs minister, Delcy Rodríguez, tweeted. Some American leftists likewise reject the comparison, pointing out that Mr. Trump attacks undocumented **immigrants**, while Mr. Chávez built his base in the kind of barrios they come from.

The debate has spread to Mexico, where politicians are comparing Mr. Trump to the leftist presidential hopeful Andrés Manuel López Obrador. As Mr. Trump has suggested he might do, Mr. López Obrador rejected the results of Mexico’s last two presidential elections, claiming he was robbed by fraud, and leading protests. Mr. López Obrador knocked down his Trump comparison, tweeting “no manchen” — a popular Mexican expression that could be roughly translated as “Get out of here!”

These arguments underline the murkiness of the populism debate. While the label is pinned on politicians from Brexit Britain to resurgent Russia, most people fail to nail a satisfactory definition. The central confusion is that it includes those from both ends of the ideological spectrum, from the socialist Mr. Chávez to the anti-**immigrant** Mr. Trump.

Reporting on Latin America and sitting in news conferences with Mr. Chávez, Mr. Trump and Mr. López Obrador over the years, I have been cautious about using the populist label flippantly. That said, given the particular flavor of the current political turmoil, there’s obviously an authentic phenomenon that we have to come to terms with, however tricky to define. Whoever wins the election, Mr. Trump has changed American politics.

John B. Judis, the author of “The Populist Explosion,” offers one of the most convincing explanations for our global unrest. “It is not an ideology,” he writes, “but a political logic.” It pitches the idea of a noble section of the people against the idea of an utterly corrupt elite. The populist political strategy centers on this conflict in an emotive way, adapting to fit different contexts — anti-**immigrant** in the United States, anti-American in Venezuela.

Seen that way, the comparison between Mr. Trump and the pro-Brexit U.K. Independence Party on the right, and Mr. Chávez and Mr. López Obrador on the left, holds up. While they have wildly different backgrounds and advocate different policies, they are united in posing as the enemy of the entrenched, corrupt elite, who make possible whatever ails the people, be it Muslim refugees or global capital.

Mr. Trump pits hard-working Middle America against the Washington establishment. Mr. Chávez pitted the noble Venezuelan poor against what he called “the oligarchs” and the imperial United States. Mr. López Obrador pits his notion of the “pueblo Mexicano” against “the mafia of power.”

It’s a strikingly flexible strategy. As the establishment is held as corrupt, today’s populists blame it and its institutions — government, the media — for anything that goes wrong, even when it’s the populists themselves who are to blame. When newspapers report accusations of sexual assault by Mr. Trump, he blames a media conspiracy. When Venezuelans march to complain they have no food, the government denounces a plot by oligarchs and the media. Mr. Trump assailed a judge overseeing a lawsuit against him as being biased. Mr. Chávez jailed a judge who made a ruling he disagreed with.

Even the chants converge. Trump supporters at rallies shout, “Tell the truth!” at journalists. When Mr. López Obrador marched against electoral fraud, his supporters would shout the same thing — “Que diga la verdad!” — at reporters.

One reason the populist strategy is effective is that it does touch on certain truths. Washington is corrupted by special interests. Latin American governments do suffer immense corruption. However, Venezuela shows that a populist strategy can lead to an even worse alternative. That is a worthwhile lesson when considering where Mr. Trump’s blaming the media, crying of fraud and assault on judges could take us.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Ioan Grillo is the author of “Gangster Warlords: Drug Dollars, Killing Fields and the New Politics of Latin America” and a contributing opinion writer.

\* What Hugo Chávez Tells Us About Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/opinion/what-hugo-chavez-tells-us-about-donald-trump.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The American political map that has emerged over the last half-century, with blue cities and red beyond, is a product of both the ideological realignment of the two parties and geographic sorting among voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/03/upshot/why-republicans-dont-even-try-to-win-cities-anymore.html]. It also raises a fascinating question about how our politics are shaped by where we live.

Is it simply that people who are already liberal choose dense urban environments and conservatives choose more suburban living? Or do these places influence how we feel about government — and each other — in ways that make us more liberal or conservative?

Political scientists, fortunately, cannot randomly assign people to cities, suburbs or rural outposts and then wait to see if their politics adapt. But their theories of why density might matter for partisanship add a provocative layer to how we think about the differences among us that are more often defined in an election year by education, income or race.

A large Pew survey[http://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/] two years ago of American political life found that self-described liberals overwhelmingly said they’d prefer to live where the homes are smaller and closer together but where the amenities are within walking distance. Conservatives chose the opposite trade-off: big homes, spaced farther apart, but with schools and restaurants miles away. The question got at a pattern underlying politics today: Beyond our disagreements about taxes, welfare or health care, partisans also fundamentally favor different kinds of places.

Like the pattern linking education and politics[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/02/upshot/why-does-education-translate-to-less-support-for-donald-trump.html], this one is a bit of a mystery.

“There is something really kind of strange and interesting about the connection between peoples’ preferences — what they view as the good life, where they want to live — and their partisanship,” said Jonathan Rodden, a political scientist at Stanford. His precinct-level maps[http://atlas.esri.com/Atlas/VoterAtlas.html?t=1&m=1&x=-94.69&y=38.62&l=5] of presidential election results show deep blue in the densest, central parts of metropolitan areas, where you’d find the Main Streets, city halls, row homes and apartment buildings. The farther you travel from there, the redder the precincts become. And this is true whether you look around New York City or Terre Haute, Ind[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/31/this-map-will-change-how-you-think-about-american-voters-especially-small-town-heartland-white-voters/].

Answers to another Pew question from that 2014 survey show the same. It asked people about their preferences and not their current addresses:

Other survey data suggests this divergence has existed for decades, whether you ask people how they’d like to live or where they actually do. Conversely, ask them about their politics, and an underlying picture emerges about where (and how) they live:

What befuddles even political scientists is whether we’re looking here at a treatment or a selection effect — or how much of each is operating. Have Clinton supporters self-selected into dense places (for reasons that may have little to do with density itself), or is the experience of living in a dense area a kind of treatment that has altered their politics?

“How would we ever figure that out empirically?” Mr. Rodden said. “Because we know that sorting is also happening. We know if you grow up gay in rural Nebraska, and you’re looking for ways out, you might start in Omaha and end up in New York City.”

Thomas Ogorzalek, a political scientist at Northwestern, argues that liberalism has its roots in big-city governments trying to solve the kinds of local problems that arise when diverse populations cram together. Compared with the suburbs or rural America, cities are more complex. They’re harder to govern, which means in many ways that they demand bigger government: a large transit agency to move people around, intricate parking rules to govern scarce spaces, a garbage truck armada to keep the streets clean.

“Externalities accumulate faster in dense places, and you need to do something about them,” Mr. Ogorzalek said. In other words, the trash piles up.

New York City, with its 24,000 restaurants and bars, needs a system of publicly posted health grades. A town with two restaurants may not. New York needs some colossal bridges connecting Manhattan and Brooklyn. A smaller community doesn’t need public-works projects on that scale. New York requires a large police force. A rural resident may need self-reliance when the closest officer is 10 miles away.

It’s conceivable that people who live in cities come to value more active government. Or they’re more receptive to investing in welfare because they pass the homeless every day. Or they appreciate **immigration** because their cab rides and lunch depend on **immigrants**. This argument is partly about the people we’re exposed to in cities (the poor, foreigners), and partly about the logistics of living there.

“As someone who’s lived in cities for almost all of my adult life, it’s impossible to conceive of a well-functioning city without a strong public works and a strong governmental infrastructure,” said Thomas Sugrue, a historian at New York University. Government has actively shaped suburbia, too, for example engineering the mortgage tax breaks that make owning large homes[https://hbr.org/2014/03/the-mortgage-interest-deduction-mainly-helps-the-rich-buy-bigger-homes] more affordable[https://hbr.org/2014/03/the-mortgage-interest-deduction-mainly-helps-the-rich-buy-bigger-homes]. But those government interventions are often less visible. “They’re not invisible,” Mr. Sugrue said, “when you’re going down Eighth Street as it’s being repaved and the sewer lines underneath it are being replaced.”

The political analyst William Schneider articulated a similarly plausible idea about the politics of suburbia in a classic 1992 article for The Atlantic[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/past/politics/ecbig/schnsub.htm]. As cities require reliance on the commons, Mr. Schneider argued that “to move to the suburbs is to express a preference for the private over the public.” The suburbs entail private yards over public parks, private cars over public transit, private malls over public squares. Suburban living even buys a kind of private government, Mr. Schneider wrote, with the promise of local control of neighborhood schools and social services that benefit only the people who can afford to live there.

His theory supports self-selection; people who want that environment move to it. But Jessica Trounstine, a political scientist at the University of California, Merced, believes that people who move to the suburbs, apolitically, can also become part of a political ideology that they find benefits them and their pocketbooks.

Nature acts, she argued. And although researchers can’t geographically shuffle people to prove this, they can try in modest ways to alter the context around us. Ryan Enos, a Harvard political scientist, has simulated the effects of added diversity[http://people.hmdc.harvard.edu/~renos/papers/EnosTrains/EnosTrains.pdf] in white suburbs by hiring Spanish speakers to board commuter trains outside Boston. It looked as if **immigrants** had moved into the neighborhood. Commuters who seemed alarmed at first[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/08/08/researchers-put-two-spanish-speakers-on-a-train-and-changed-commuters-views-of-immigration/] (and more hostile to **immigration** as a result) later grew more at ease with their new fellow passengers.

“There are a lot of things we can experiment on, but context in itself is this widely diffuse and complex thing,” Mr. Enos said. Nailing down how we’re shaped by it, he said, “is the most impossible problem in social science.”

The Upshot[http://www.nytimes.com/upshot/] provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/upshot] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/UpshotNYT]. Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/upshot/].

\* Why Republicans Don’t Even Try to Win Cities Anymore[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/03/upshot/why-republicans-dont-even-try-to-win-cities-anymore.html]

\* Why Does Education Translate to Less Support for Donald Trump?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/02/upshot/why-does-education-translate-to-less-support-for-donald-trump.html]

\* Actually, Many ‘Inner Cities’ Are Doing Great[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/upshot/actually-many-inner-cities-are-doing-great.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Asking what’s new in Manhattan is like asking what’s old in Rome: too much for 10 visits, so don’t bother trying in one. The eight or so square miles of Manhattan south of Central Park sees more restaurant, hotel and shop openings per year than many nations. While some Manhattan residents lament skyrocketing rents and the demise of neighborhood institutions, visitors freed from nostalgia can focus on newfangled attractions and refangled improvements to the surviving classics. Sure, some tourists are venturing farther afield to other boroughs. Want dirt-cheap Tibetan momo dumplings? That’s Queens. Looking for hipsters and their locally sourced millennial angst? Head to Brooklyn. But the center of the world still radiates east and west from Broadway at Columbus Circle to the Battery.

\_\_\_\_\_

Friday

1. Pic Two, 3 P.M.

Confusing, overwhelming, unsettling — those words often describe visitors’ first hours in Manhattan anyway, so why not double down with a visit to the debut exhibition of the International Center of Photography’s[https://www.icp.org/] new Lower East Side museum ($14). In “Public, Private, Secret” (through Jan. 8), artists try to make sense of the torrent of images unleashed by YouTube, social media, surveillance cameras and more, as older works from the 36-exposure era stand in contrast. Kim Kardashian’s selfies between works by Andy Warhol and Cindy Sherman? What hath digitalization wrought? A 10-minute walk away, the Morrison Hotel Gallery[https://www.morrisonhotelgallery.com/slideshow.aspx] soothes with stunning, classic images of rock ’n’ roll heroes. Hidden in a second-floor space on Prince Street, the gallery represents 110 of the world’s best music photographers. You might find Hendrix and Springsteen, or Elton John in a sequined baseball uniform at one of his 1975 Dodger Stadium concerts. No need to look up archival footage on YouTube, though, of course, you could.

2. Early Bird Special, 5 P.M.

There’s no happy hour at the Top of the Standard[http://www.standardhotels.com/new-york/features/top-of-the-standard], informally known as the Boom Boom Room, but getting there early makes it easier to slip in (fashionably dressed and with a reservation) before things get too velvet ropey. The glittery setting and live jazz appeal, but the attraction is the view: From this height even the Sanitation Department facility on the Hudson is picturesque. You’ll pay for it — cocktails are in the low $20s and appetizers are as dear as they are tasty — but it’s worth it, especially if you stick around for sunset.

3. Chicken Feed, 7 P.M.

Manhattan’s ethnic enclaves have largely gone by the wayside, but the Koreatown business district, a stone’s throw from Macy’s, is still going strong. And you don’t have to know your galbi from your bulgogi to know what to order at Turntable Chicken Jazz[http://www.turntablenyc.com/], a hidden (but mobbed) spot up a blue-lit stairway from Fifth Avenue. The slow-fried, thin-crusted chicken wings in hot and spicy or soy garlic versions ($9.95 a half-dozen) are worth fighting the crowds for a table. The crunchy fried dumplings are also addictive, and you can get your fix for gochujang — the fermented spicy pepper paste ubiquitous in Korean street food — with an order of rice cakes.

4. Intimate Broadway, 9:30 P.M.

A few hundred bucks will get you a Broadway show — make it a thousand and you might even find a pair of cheap seats to “Hamilton” on StubHub. But there’s a more intimate and affordable theatrical affair to be had down the stairs and into the lush red lighting of Feinstein’s/54 Below[https://54below.com/] supper club. The underground (literally) cabaret features solo shows by some of musical theater’s finest talents. You’ll either delight in the insider Broadway name-dropping or feel like an anthropologist documenting the rituals of a mysterious subculture. Reserve $45 bar rail seats for a still-excellent view and order stiff ($16) Manhattans with Grand Marnier.

\_\_\_\_\_

Saturday

5. Line-Free Brunch, 10 A.M.

What’s worse, arguing over where to go for brunch or waiting in a line once you decide? Avoid both problems by patching together a glorious meal in one of Manhattan’s newest food halls, which are to mall food courts what Emirates business class is to Spirit Airlines. TurnStyle[http://www.turn-style.com/] may be in a subway tunnel at Columbus Circle, but it’s bright and cheery, and like the subway itself, is mobbed on weekdays but runs on a slower weekend schedule. Stop at Bosie Patisserie for a Breton kouign-amann ($2.50) and a cortado — or perhaps a greens 3 (greens, celery, cucumber, apple, lemon and ginger, $6.50) from the Pressed Juicery. For more substantial fare try a grilled cheese from MeltKraft or a pork shoulder salteña ($8, don’t call it an empanada) from Bolivian Llama Party. You can also take it to go and head to Central Park, depending on how seriously you’re taking this “south of 59th Street” thing.

6. Coming to America II, Noon

Ellis Island accepted 12 million **immigrants** between 1892 and 1954 (and rejected a couple hundred thousand), but the story of American **immigration** started well before and continues today (in case you haven’t been paying attention this election season). In 2015, the National Park Service site[https://www.nps.gov/elis/index.htm] opened the Peopling of America Center[http://www.libertyellisfoundation.org/peopling-of-america-center], which recounts **immigration** back to Native Americans, Pilgrims and slaves and forward to Cubans, Hmong[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/hmong\_tribe/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and Somali girls who play basketball in Minnesota in traditional dress. The $18 ferry includes admission to the Statue of Liberty[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/statue\_of\_liberty/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], but you can just admire it from the boat; after all, that’s what the 12 million **immigrants** did.

7. Rabbit Whole, 7 P.M.

Critics have gone — what’s the word? — nuts over Le Coucou[http://www.lecoucou.com/], Stephen Starr’s French restaurant that opened this year under the helm of the American-born, Paris-famous chef Daniel Rose. There are a few surprises: The space is cavernous (forget about eavesdropping on the celeb at the next table), and the expected French formality is on the plate, but not in the service, which has an American-style, I’m-your-buddy vibe. Servers may refuse to suggest a favorite dish, but “tout le lapin” (“the whole rabbit”) is first among equals, a three-part entree of rabbit loin under crumbled rabbit kidney, a front-leg pot au feu and deboned hind legs marinated in Dijon and white wine and slow baked for four hours. Reserve in advance. Dinner for two without wine, about $200.

8. Up in Arms, 9:30 P.M.

Suffolk Arms may look like an English pub but strives to be a very New York cocktail bar, from Streit’s matzo ball soup, short rib steamed buns and bone marrow to its walls covered with sketches of local personalities, from Ed Koch to Sonia Sotomayor, and Grandmaster Flash to the leonine library guardians Patience and Fortitude. Eyes over 25 years old may have trouble making out the 0.01-point-font-size menu in dim light, but eyes under 25 may have trouble appreciating the expertise behind the drinks (around $15): a classic New York Sour (with egg white and a splash of malbec); recipes borrowed from New York cocktail royalty like Brian Miller of Death & Co. (the rye-bourbon-Calvados-cognac Conference); and the passion fruit, lime and vanilla Porn Star Martini.

9. I Love the ’80s, 11 P.M.

Where to dance in New York is a question for the ages — specifically, your group’s ages. But people young and old, or at least young and middle-aged, agree: The ’80s were a glorious decade for popular music. That explains the Saturday night, age-diverse crowd at (Le) Poisson Rouge[http://lpr.com/]. Named for the 1981 Rick Springfield hit, the (Karma) chameleonlike cover band Jessie’s Girl makes choreographed costume (and wig) changes to perform very danceable impressions from Cyndi Lauper to Dexys Midnight Runners. Their version of Wham!’s 1984 classic, “Wake Me Up Before You Go-Go,” will put the jitterbug into your brain, going bang bang bang till your feet do the same. (I said the music was glorious, not the lyrics.)

\_\_\_\_\_

Sunday

10. Latkes to Like, 9 A.M.

The deli-diner décor at Russ & Daughters Cafe [http://www.russanddaughterscafe.com/]might seem kitschy if it weren’t for its Lower East Side pedigree — the original 1914 Russ and Daughters deli is still hawking smoked fish and noodle kugel (alongside modern interlopers like wasabi-infused flying fish roe) a few blocks away. The same ingredients make for a great New York brunch. Skip the matzo ball soup in favor of the rich smoked whitefish chowder; add a herring variety plate to share. For dessert, the challah bread pudding is a wild ride, as if a Jewish grandmother and a Six Flags amusement park had a son.

11. Snack and Shop, 11 A.M.

You probably can’t afford to live in the West Village, but you can pretend by wandering its elegant streets, crookedly unhinged from the orderly Manhattan grid. Even if some of the shops are too pricey — yes, that T-shirt costs more than your cable bill — others are only mildly overpriced. First, pacify your shopping-averse companion with a bag of bulk Swedish candy from Sockerbit[http://sockerbit.com/]. Then you’re off — ’50s and ’60s glass and ceramics in riotous color at the End of History[http://theendofhistoryshop.blogspot.com/]; quirky cards ($5) at Greenwich Letterpress[http://greenwichletterpress.com/]; and bow ties and 1980s bar mitzvah shirts at Star Struck Vintage[http://www.starstruckvintage.com/] Clothing, on Greenwich Street since 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_

Lodging

Manhattan has too many attractions to spend much time in your hotel, unless your hotel is an attraction itself. Rooms at the Beekman (thompsonhotels.com/the-beekman[http://thompsonhotels.com/the-beekman]) in the Financial District wrap around an astonishingly restored nine-story atrium topped with a pyramidal skylight in what used to be called the Temple Court. It had been closed to the public since the 1940s until September, when the hotel opened its doors. Unlike the atrium, where you can almost imagine top-hatted bankers plotting financial conquests, the rooms themselves have an elegant yet homey feel, and start at $399 a night.

For those more interested in location than luxury, who want to be surrounded by the sights and sounds of life in one of the few holdout areas that recall Manhattan’s grittier days, the Leon Hotel (leonhotelnyc.com[http://leonhotelnyc.com/]) near the foot of the Manhattan Bridge brings you quiet, uncramped rooms (from $170) inside and the clatter and bustle of Chinatown outside. There are no services to speak of, unless you count the park across the street, filled with local tai chi practitioners, as a gym.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SAME FAMILY, DIFFERENT COLORS

Confronting Colorism in America’s Diverse Families

By Lori L. Tharps

203 pp. Beacon Press. $25.95.

In Danzy Senna’s 1998 novel “Caucasia,” two sisters — Cole and Birdie — share a bond so intimate that they create a language only they can understand. Engulfed in the racial chaos of Boston in the mid-70s, the sisters nestle themselves away in the cozy world they have created in their attic bedroom. Their lives are forever changed when their mother, a liberal white New Englander, and their father, a black man with radical political leanings, decide to divorce. The sisters are divided: Birdie lives with her mother and essentially passes for white, while Cole, who looks black, moves in with her father and his black girlfriend. In a city as racially divided and explosive as Boston in the 1970s, this separation by skin color strikes the reader as a chillingly rational decision.

Forty years later, America is no longer the bipolar racial regime of black and white that set Birdie and Cole on such different paths. Not only have personal attitudes changed, but the Hart-Celler Act of 1965 — which upended American **immigration** policy by abolishing the quota system based on national origins — has also transformed the country’s demographic character. The landmark Loving v. Virginia case of 1967 prohibited legal restrictions on interracial marriages. Federal racial classifications now recognize mixed-race identities. But neither Cole nor Birdie would have been widely understood as mixed-race in the 1970s. As Danzy Senna, who is mixed-race, has written of her own experiences during that tumultuous decade: “Mixed wasn’t an option. . . . No halvsies. No in between.”

Lori L. Tharps’s new book, “Same Family, Different Colors: Confronting Colorism in America’s Diverse Families,” is an urgent and honest unveiling of how generations of American families have lived with these changes. Tharps focuses on “colorism,” which she notes is not an official word, but has been defined by Alice Walker as “prejudicial or preferential treatment of same-race people based solely on their color.” Most of the book discusses the preferential treatment that has been reserved for light-skinned African-Americans, but Tharps, a journalist, also includes chapters on Latino and Asian-American families. She makes the claim that treating lighter-skinned people more favorably is a worldwide problem, not just one that was developed in the United States. To solve it, everyone must recognize his or her part in perpetuating it. As Tharps writes, “For every African-American girl hiding from the sun under her mother’s strict orders, there is a Korean-American girl playing in the shadows as well.”

With great sensitivity and unapologetic boldness, Tharps skillfully weaves the rich historical context of the United States, the Americas and Asia with wrenching contemporary first-person accounts to investigate how color operates in the most intimate spaces of American families. Relying on numerous interviews of parents and children with a wide range of skin colors, Tharps proves the quotation by the social scientist Frank Sulloway to be painfully true: “No social injustice is felt more deeply than that suffered within one’s own family.”

“Same Family, Different Colors” begins with Tharps’s story of marrying a man from the south of Spain whom she met during her junior year of college, while she was studying near Madrid. Tharps describes her husband as having a “milky-white complexion” and describes herself as having medium-brown skin that easily darkens in the sun. Their three children represent a broad range in skin color, from, borrowing Tharps’s descriptions, “the color of cinnamon” to “beige” to “warm almond,” yet two could pass for white. While Tharps and her husband were not concerned with these differences, they found that people all around them were noticing that there was something unusual about their family — the neighborhood dry cleaner, a 5-year-old playing an innocent game of “I Spy” (“I spy something white!” the girl exclaimed, pointing to Tharps’s daughter), the Brooklynites who assumed that Tharps was her son’s nanny. Tharps soon faced the reality that our identities are rarely our own. She was constantly seeing herself, her husband and her children through the eyes of others.

Mixed-race families like Tharps’s often find themselves open to public scrutiny. The lack of phenotypical uniformity that many people expect to be clearly visible led to stares, whispers and uncomfortable questions, including one about whether her son was adopted. Onlookers seemed to question the coherence of her family and to wonder whether they were a family at all. As Tharps writes: “Most of the time I try to ignore other people’s issues with my children’s skin color, but sometimes it really bothers me. And sometimes it just hurts.”

It may come as a surprise that often those who can be the most unkind are one’s own family members. Tharps delicately but honestly presents the recollections of many people who were insulted — indeed, wounded — by family members mocking their darker skin. She also tells the stories of light-skinned individuals who felt isolated from their own families and communities because their skin color made them feel as though they did not fit in. Some parents prized their lightest child’s beauty, while others paid more attention to their darker children, worried about the emotional consequences of societal beauty norms that would ignore or denigrate them. Some parents did not talk about color at all. The range of experiences that Tharps presents is wide and rich. In all but a few cases, skin color exerted considerable pressure on those of nonwhite backgrounds and played a profound role in shaping self-understanding and sense of personal value.

Tharps reminds us that this problem is found not only in the United States: Latin America, East and South Asia, the Caribbean and Africa all grapple with colorism. It is an interracial and an intraracial problem.

Studies have shown that white Americans often demonstrate preferential treatment of lighter-skinned blacks that leads to disparities in employment and hiring practices and in socioeconomic mobility. In Latin American countries, popular telenovelas focus on white-skinned Latinos and Latinas, correlating lighter skin with higher social class and casting darker-skinned actors to portray the roles of lower-class characters, including maids, gardeners and even criminals. In East and South Asian countries, the legacy of colonialism has led to the reverence of white skin and European features. The Bollywood movie industry in India prizes lighter-skinned actresses, sometimes even importing white actors to play Indian people.

These ideas, planted in one’s home country, become even more insidious in the United States. Observing that African-Americans were situated and largely stuck on the lowest rungs of the social, economic and political ladders, **immigrants** learned upon arriving in the United States that to succeed, one had to distance oneself as far as possible from blacks — despite the common oppression and common economic disadvantages that nonwhite groups shared.

Progress on this front, given the long histories and the worldwide phenomenon of colorism, seems to occur only at a glacial pace. But we are already seeing the diversification of the black-white American racial binary, as well as cracks in the edifice of the “one-drop rule.” Tharps ends on a hopeful note: Beliefs that parents with mixed-race children do not “match” are giving way to new ideas about the irrelevance of skin color to the composition of a loving family. We are on the front lines of a new racial order that has been a long time coming.

People of all races and backgrounds deal with race each and every day in a multiplicity of ways. This thoughtful, honest, historically textured and valuable book offers a detailed and current syllabus of work on the social and cultural meanings of colorism around the world and brings colorism “out of the closet,” as Tharps writes. Most important, “Same Family, Different Colors” makes clear that we are all implicated in how just and inclusive that new order will be.

Allyson Hobbs is a history professor atStanford University and the author of “A Chosen Exile: A History of Racial Passing in American Life.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Has the Democratic Party joined the Republican Party[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2012/08/26/sunday-review/a-new-guide-to-the-republican-herd.html] in becoming inhospitable to the accommodation of intraparty factions?

Hillary Clinton must juggle three competing interest groups: her party’s upscale[http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/01/the-politics-of-going-to-college/?\_r=0] pro-trade[http://www.politico.com/story/2015/06/tpa-trade-bill-democrat-vote-tally-119331], globalist wing[http://www.humansandnature.org/the-ethics-of-globalism-nationalism-and-patriotism#.WBPBovqz\_aZ.twitter]; its underdog minority wing; and organized labor. She is paying a price for her triple allegiance.

Clinton’s outspoken support[http://time.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/4411058/baton-rouge-shooting-hillary-clinton-transcript/] for African-American, Hispanic and **immigrant** rights has contributed to new levels[http://www.npr.org/2016/09/13/493763493/charts-see-how-quickly-white-non-college-voters-have-fled-the-democratic-party] of Republican loyalty among white working class voters. The Oct. 30 A.B.C. tracking poll[http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/clinton-trump-turnout-critical-poll/story?id=43159639] found Trump ahead of Clinton by 38 points among white men without college degrees and by 27 points among white women without college degrees.

Clinton also has deep roots among relatively affluent, professional Democratic voters, who tend to support the trans-Pacific Partnership and are largely tolerant of the business sector. This fits well with her ties to investment banking[http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2014/11/why-wall-street-loves-hillary-112782], but has cost her with segments of organized labor[http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-08-06/wary-on-trade-iowa-unions-aren-t-ready-for-hillary-clinton] and with the idealistic, anti-business[http://www.ontheissues.org/2016/Bernie\_Sanders\_Corporations.htm] millennial voters who turned out in strength for Senator Bernie Sanders[https://berniesanders.com/press-release/clinton-and-corporate-welfare/] during the primaries.

Clinton’s association with Wall Street — illustrated in transcripts of her Q. and A. sessions with top officials at Goldman Sachs — has added to the erosion of backing from 18 to 29 year olds. These youthful voters were decisively pro-Obama, supporting him by 34 and 23 points in 2008 and 2012. By Oct 31 of this year, according to A.B.C[http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/deep-unfavorability-clinton-trump-marks-elections-sharp-divisions/story?id=43177423]., their earlier 56-21 margin of support for Clinton had fallen to 48-35.

In the Goldman Sachs sessions[http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2016-10-15/here-are-hillary-clintons-three-speeches-goldman-sachs-which-she-was-paid-675000], Clinton’s comments reflect her commitment to the American financial sector. Many Occupy veterans[https://medium.com/@kmassa/your-gleeful-liberal-takedown-of-hillary-clinton-is-affirming-institutional-sexism-c7f8c7995719#.tq2rmmir2], however, for whom a degree of anticapitalism has become reflexive, contend that Clinton’s comments reveal an excessive deference to Fortune 500 firms.

In one Goldman Sachs talk, Clinton was clearly sympathetic to the concerns of the finance industry, noting that assessing the right level of regulation is no easy task:

There’s nothing magic about regulations, too much is bad, too little is bad. How do you get to the golden key, how do we figure out what works? And the people that know the industry better than anybody are the people who work in the industry.

Segments of the Democratic left — including many followers of Senator Elizabeth Warren — remain determinedly critical[https://newrepublic.com/article/129247/hillary-clinton-wants-believe-shes-tough-wall-street-shes-not] of Clinton’s sympathy for business goals[http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/08/2016-big-business-corporations-hillary-clinton-wall-street-l] even though, in terms of her policy agenda, the left has little or no basis for complaint. The Democratic platform[https://www.demconvention.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Democratic-Party-Platform-7.21.16-no-lines.pdf] is the most progressive in the history of the party. So too is the Clinton campaign’s governing blueprint[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/wall-street/], which calls for the enactment of almost every proposal advocated by liberal interest groups.

But even as the labor movement strongly supports this year’s Democratic platform, many on the broader left are suspicious of the Clinton family’s entanglement with wealthy donors. This is not surprising, particularly in light of the fact that, as the Washington Post[https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/clinton-money/] reported in November 2015, “The grand total raised for all of their political campaigns and their family’s charitable foundation reaches at least $3 billion.”

Clinton’s difficulties speak to the challenges of reconciling the various interests within a changing Democratic coalition.

Class-based New Deal liberalism has been challenged by the collapse of manufacturing employment[http://www.epi.org/publication/manufacturing-job-loss-trade-not-productivity-is-the-culprit/], the Great Recession of 2008, **immigration**, the erosion of cultural conservatism[http://www.people-press.org/2016/04/26/a-wider-ideological-gap-between-more-and-less-educated-adults/4-22-2016\_02/], the decline of unions[http://www.bls.gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/news.release/pdf/union2.pdf], racial and ethnic divisions among those with low to moderate incomes, and the realignment of whites with professional degrees from the Republican Party to the Democratic Party.

At the same time, major segments of the corporate universe, especially high tech, have become Democratic mainstays[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/07/opinion/how-did-the-democrats-become-favorites-of-the-rich.html?\_r=0], in terms of votes and money.

In June 2016, CNN found[http://money.cnn.com/2016/06/06/technology/crowdpac-donations-silicon-valley-trump/] that while Donald Trump had received contributions from 52 employees of technology firms, Clinton had received 2,087 such contributions.

The most recent data on Opensecrets[http://www.opensecrets.org/pres16/select-sectors?sector=B] shows that Clinton received $55.7 million from the communications/technology sector to Trump’s $1.0 million. The major Democratic Party committees also dominate contributions from telecom services, internet companies, electronic manufacturers, business service companies and the TV/radio/music industry.

Understandably, this largess sits well with the pro-business faction within Democratic ranks.

Schisms in the Democratic Party pale in comparison to schisms within the larger population, as partisan divisions are being overshadowed by an emerging split — in this country and abroad — between what can loosely be described as globalists versus nationalists[http://www.the-american-interest.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/2016/07/10/when-and-why-nationalism-beats-globalism/], of cosmopolitan versus parochial interests.

Jonathan Haidt, a psychologist at NYU’s Stern School of Business, argues in two recent articles[http://www.humansandnature.org/the-ethics-of-globalism-nationalism-and-patriotism#.WBPBovqz\_aZ.twitter] that 2016 marks “the year that the battle between globalists and nationalists became the central axis of conflict within and across many nations, especially in Europe and the United States.”

Haidt describes[http://www.the-american-interest.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/2016/07/10/when-and-why-nationalism-beats-globalism/] nationalists as follows:

Nationalists see patriotism as a virtue; they think their country and its culture are unique and worth preserving. This is a real moral commitment, not a pose to cover up racist bigotry. Some nationalists do believe that their country is better than all others, and some nationalisms are plainly illiberal and overtly racist. But as many defenders of patriotism have pointed out, you love your spouse because she or he is yours, not because you think your spouse is superior to all others.

I asked Haidt where Clinton fits into this scheme, and he replied in an email:

She’s a globalist, through and through. Globalist morality tends to be very concerned about human rights and transnational concerns, especially those related to suffering and oppression. One of Clinton’s most famous lines from the 1990s is her speech in Beijing where she said “Human rights are women’s rights, and women’s rights are human rights.”

Along similar lines, Charles Stewart[http://web.mit.edu/polisci/people/faculty/charles-stewart.html], a political scientist at M.I.T., makes the case that restraints on spending and tax hikes that have been in place since the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan have created incentives in both parties to shift toward “identity politics.”

The result, Stewart wrote in an email, is the emergence of two competing identities or “two distinct views about what constitutes a good society, one cosmopolitan and the other parochial.”

David Leege, a professor of political science emeritus at Notre Dame, has a parallel, but different, take. He argues that “a major source of the unwieldiness is the changed meaning of liberalism/conservatism” that can no longer be measured “along an economic dimension” alone.

By the year 2000, Leege argues, the Republican Party and conservative movement successfully merged “white nativism” with “the family values” appeal to demonize “blacks, Hispanics, single mothers, Hollywood, educated elites at the universities who did not advocate or live the moral life of conservative Protestants and Catholics” as “unworthy of recognition by the state with financial resources.”

The result, according to Leege, has been “a new referent for ‘liberal’ and ‘conservative’ anchored in cultural differences, i.e., the way we are supposed to live as an American people. It has strong overtones of change and expressive individualism, on the one hand, and tradition and respect for authority on the other” — a division similar to that of globalists v. nationalists and cosmopolitan v. parochial.

Clinton’s struggles, in the view of David Mayhew, a political scientist at Yale, reflect disturbing developments within the Democratic Party. In an email, Mayhew wrote:

The Democratic Party has become inhospitable to the accommodation of multiple intraparty interests. That is obvious. Clinton’s crack about the “deplorables” and “irredeemables” wasn’t just a misstatement. It was a window into the thinking of the party’s current activist core. Central to the party’s mind-set is an arrogant dismissal of a major share of the U.S. population. These folks are dismissed as incapable of making judgments about their own lives, their aspirations, and the larger politics and society surrounding them.

Mayhew warned: “This dismissiveness does not go unnoticed.”

Haidt[http://www.humansandnature.org/the-ethics-of-globalism-nationalism-and-patriotism] puts it this way:

Globalists see nationalists as hopelessly parochial. The word “parochial” means, literally, concerned with matters of the local parish, rather than the larger world. But as it is commonly used, the word is an insult. OxfordDictionaries.com[http://oxforddictionaries.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu] offers these synonyms: narrow-minded, illiberal, intolerant, conservative.

There is a case to be made for the contribution so-called elites make to the progressive project, disagreements between globalists and nationalists notwithstanding.

Daron Acemoglu, an MIT economist, argues that the left alliance needs its upscale wing.

Democrats, Acemoglu argues, “should seek a coalition that stands for the most vulnerable people in society,” but he believes “such a coalition could not stand by itself without the support of influential, well-off members of American society.”

Such a coalition is possible, Acemoglu said,

As long as the Democratic Party shakes off its hard-core anti-market, pro-union stance, there is a huge constituency of well-educated, socially conscious Americans that will join in.

Realistically, the likelihood that Democrats will abandon labor in the foreseeable future is zero.

Neither Clinton nor Trump has shown a noticeable talent for reconciliation. But the process of finding common ground between globalists and nationalists, between business and anti-business factions[http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa10.htm], between ethnic and racial identity groups, between male and female voters — both within the Democratic Party and between the two parties — has to be a priority. That process must begin in earnest in just six days, the morning after Election Day.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Senate race in Nevada between Catherine Cortez Masto[http://catherinecortezmasto.com/], a Democrat, and Representative Joe Heck, a Republican, is gripping on several levels. Nevada is the only state where Republicans have a solid chance of winning a Democratic Senate seat this year. The seat has belonged for 30 years to Harry Reid, the current minority leader, who is not seeking re-election. A Republican victory would thus be not only a loss for the Democrats but a personal embarrassment for a venerable power broker. It would also be a triumph for the Koch brothers, who say they’re seeking poetic justice after years of being denounced by Mr. Reid for their conservative politics, and are spending lots of money[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/harry-reid-koch-brothers-nevada-senate-race.html] to make that happen.

Mr. Reid calls Mr. Heck, a three-term congressman, “an absolute stooge for these right-wing nut cases.” He hand-picked Ms. Cortez Masto, a former Nevada attorney general, to succeed him and is throwing the state Democratic machine behind her battle in a race that is now too close to call. Ms. Cortez Masto, the granddaughter of a Mexican **immigrant**, would be the first Latina to enter the Senate. Her victory would be a proud repudiation of Donald Trump’s anti-**immigrant** platform in a state where Latinos’ proportion of the electorate has grown to 17 percent[http://www.pewhispanic.org/interactives/mapping-the-latino-electorate-by-state/] from 10 percent in 2004[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/11/07/latino-voters-in-the-2012-election/].

Ms. Cortez Masto addressed a host of problems during her years as attorney general, from 2007 to 2015: drug use, fraud schemes exploiting senior citizens, domestic violence and sexual assault.

When the 2008 financial crisis left Nevada with one of the nation’s highest unemployment rates, Ms. Cortez Masto started a broad effort to hold predatory lenders to account. In 2010, she defied the state’s Republican governor in declining to join other attorneys general in filing suit against the federal government to block an expansion of Medicaid as part of the Affordable Care Act. The League of Conservation Voters[http://www.lcv.org/media/press-releases/LCV-Action-Fund-Endorses-Catherine-Cortez-Masto-for-U-S-Senate.html?referrer=http://www.lcv.org/media/press-releases/LCV-Action-Fund-Endorses-Catherine-Cortez-Masto-for-U-S-Senate.html] credits her help in winning several environmental battles.

On **immigration**, a critical issue in Nevada, Ms. Cortez Masto worked with[https://ballotpedia.org/Catherine\_Cortez\_Masto] Republicans in the State Legislature to combat human trafficking, and she supports a path to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants**.

Mr. Heck is a doctor and brigadier general in the U.S. Army Reserve who ran the trauma center in a field hospital outside Baghdad during the Iraq war. He seems torn between moderate voters in his district south of Las Vegas and the radical rightists in Nevada’s G.O.P. apparatus. He says he supports a path to legalization for undocumented **immigrants**, paired with tougher border controls and identity checks, but he also joined Republicans in opposing President Obama’s efforts to protect undocumented children and their parents from deportation.

Mr. Heck has a good reputation for constituent service, but on a broad range of policies his views are indistinguishable from those of most other House Republicans. He’s voted to repeal Obamacare, defund Planned Parenthood and block measures to combat climate change.

He was an early, enthusiastic supporter of Mr. Trump. Asked, cameras rolling[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_MCLQR0Qesc], whether he trusted Mr. Trump with the nation’s nuclear codes, his answer was, “Why wouldn’t I?” It wasn’t until the infamous “Access Hollywood” tape was released last month that Mr. Heck made a tactical retreat, saying[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dKdTZcOTCd4], “Americans deserve better.”

Nevadans deserve better than Mr. Heck, whose votes accomplish little for Nevada’s workers. Neither candidate possesses Mr. Reid’s long record of service to his home state, but Ms. Cortez Masto would be a far more faithful steward of his legacy.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The sensational, spidery plot of the most gripping game of thrones in modern history is best captured by two images. The first is from Donald J. Trump ’s extravagant third wedding at his Mar-a-Lago estate in 2005: The junior senator from New York, glowing in gold silk and pearls, smiles up at the mogul in white tie with genuine delight as he says something that cracks up Hillary, Bill and Trump’s bejeweled bride, Melania. Donald and Hillary look “just like teenagers in love” in the flashbulb moment, as David Patrick Columbia, the editor of the website New York Social Diary [http://www.newyorksocialdiary.com/], notes dryly. The second, more sinister image is from the St.

Louis presidential debate last month: A Tang-colored Trump looms behind Hillary like a horror-movie fiend as she makes a point, while three of Trump’s guests in the front row, women who accused Bill of sexual assault, give her the stink eye and Chelsea and Bill sit nearby looking grim. What a difference a decade makes: from a Babylonian celebration, with Hillary and Bill cozying up to Donald, to a seething face-off, with Donald summoning ghosts from Bill’s scandalous past and threatening to throw Hillary in the clink if he’s elected.

We are in the final days of the first presidential contest between two New Yorkers in 72 years, since Thomas Dewey ran against Franklin D. Roosevelt: The 42-year-old Republican governor of New York used a Trump-style attack on the 62-year-old Democratic president, calling him “a tired old man.” On election night, the party and the wake will both be held in Manhattan. Hillary will hold hers at the Javits Convention Center, with its literal glass ceiling and, as The Times’s campaign reporter Maggie Haberman noted, an air of trolling: Back in the late 1970s, Trump wanted to build the center and slap the Trump name on it, but the city refused.

In this historically dreadful and mesmerizing election, which could lead to the death of the Republican Party and the ideological makeover of the Democratic Party, the New York aspect has been largely overshadowed. Only Lin-Manuel Miranda made a point of highlighting it, on “Saturday Night Live,” urging people to take their minds off the crazy election by coming to “Hamilton”: “It’s about two famous New York politicians locked in a dirty, ugly, mudslinging political campaign. Escapism!”

In the “single compact arena” of New York, E.B. White wrote, a gladiator and a promoter can come together in a city vibrating with great undertakings. “These two names, for the last two or three decades, represent what has been incredible and vulgar about this country at the same time,” says the Manhattan ad man and television personality Donny Deutsch. “We can trace our downfalls or upticks as a society through them.” The story of how Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton rose and reinvented themselves and embraced and brawled is the story of New York itself. It is a tale of power, influence, class, society and ambition that might have intrigued Edith Wharton, whose family once owned a grand home down the block from what is now Trump Tower.

The Clintons started their move to New York from Washington in 2000, so Hillary could pursue her bid for the United States Senate and fly on her own after the Monica Lewinsky scandal. She had never lived in New York, but carpetbagging was no sin to cosmopolitan New Yorkers, who embraced Bobby Kennedy when he decamped from Massachusetts and suburban Washington in 1964, so she looked North to Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s Senate seat.

When they arrived, the Clintons found a lot of raw nerve endings among the moneyed elite, who were bitterly divided following Bush v. Gore. Although wealthy Democrats and Republicans in New York have largely united around Hillary this time, business executives were more suspicious of Gore than they were of the Clintons. In those days, Democrats were complaining that the election had been stolen from them, and Republicans were whinging that it had almost been stolen from them.

Hillary knew she should not be seen as a Manhattan insider, so just as Bobby chose Long Island as his base, she chose Westchester. She recast herself as a Yankees -loving New Yorker in the city and a Chicago-born daughter of the Great Lakes when she campaigned upstate. New York — and being a senator in the horrific aftermath of 9/11 — would change Hillary. “It toughened her up,” says Senator Charles Schumer of New York. “She’s harder-nosed about things. Life did that, but New York did, too.”

Bill also needed a reinvention. After the impeachment and the Marc Rich pardon, he was in bad odor. He had to abandon plans to rent lavish offices for their foundation in Carnegie Hall Tower for almost $800,000 a year after critics pounced. He moved instead into offices in Harlem for $210,000 a year. The mulligan-loving ex-president was snubbed by four of the prestigious Westchester County golf clubs he reportedly tried to join. As Trump marveled to me at the time: “Now Clinton can’t get into golf clubs in Westchester. A former president begging to get in a golf club. It’s unthinkable.” Bill started an elaborate campaign to improve his image, making speeches at colleges and enlisting former cabinet members and other surrogates to talk up his legacy. Once Bill moved up in public estimation, he moved downtown with the foundation.

With Hillary’s Senate bid underway, the Clintons held out their tin cup. They had been fund-raising in the city nonstop since 1990, but the asks intensified as they started their foundation in 2001 and rubbed shoulders with all the new wealth on Wall Street, which was driven by hedge funds and technology funds. With book deals and lucrative speeches and Bill’s role as an adviser to Ronald Burkle’s private-equity firm, Yucaipa, the Clintons worked their way out of the debt accrued by legal bills from a cascade of federal investigations to earn an estimated $230 million in the next 15 years.

As the Clintons fashioned a new life in New York, Trump was transforming himself as well — from a risk-taking developer facing bankruptcy to a low-risk licenser of his name for other people’s projects, from a brazen builder to a gilded reality-TV star on “The Apprentice.” He had come out of Queens, a pushy New York kid with family money but no social tools to climb the society ladder. “Even stuck out on Avenue Z, his head was always in Manhattan,” says Wayne Barrett, author of the biography “Trump: The Greatest Show on Earth.” Gwenda Blair, author of “The Trumps,” says Trump, resplendent in the ’70s in his three-piece burgundy suit with matching shoes and matching limo, recalled “this strapping lad from the provinces who comes to the city, like a figure out of Balzac’s ‘Lost Illusions.’ ”

The New York society scene was set by the Rockefellers and the Astors with a tradition of civility, philanthropy and the arts at its heart. Even those who make money the rough way — especially them — adopt this genteel facade. Michael Bloomberg is the quintessential emblem of this model and Donald Trump is the quintessential raspberry to it. One top New York foundation official who requested anonymity — many people will only speak anonymously about the Trumps and the Clintons, because both clans are known to be vindictive — notes that “in the community of plutocrats and superachievers who come to New York, Donald Trump is seen as persona non grata. He’s not a civic leader.” New York, this person says, is a place where private-equity C.E.O.s like Henry Kravis and Stephen Schwarzman see themselves making commitments to the public good. Their status doesn’t come only from being in charge of powerful corporations. “It also comes from some attachment to a hospital or university or cultural center. Trump was never part of that ecosystem.” When the tightfisted Trump hosts a charity event for veterans or a charity golf tournament, it is dismissed as something to polish the Trump brand. Trump has turned off many people in the worlds of real estate, banking and law with his strong-arming, fee-shaving or stiffing, bankruptcies and litigiousness. “Most real estate guys won’t go near him,” a leading New York financial executive says. “You lie down with dogs, you get up with fleas.”

Trump thumps his chest about money, acting as if he’s Bloomberg-wealthy, while the Clintons pretend they have less than they do. Trump wants to belong, to get more legitimacy by elbowing his way into the power crowd, while the Clintons passed that threshold of belonging after two terms in the White House. A top media mogul dismisses all three as outsiders: “No one here thinks of the Clintons as New Yorkers, and Donald is a bridge-and-tunnel person. He’s always been a poseur in New York.”

Trump realized that golf was his entree if he wanted to pal around with Bill Clinton , whom he considered a kindred spirit in some ways — a great man who attracted jealous haters. “Bill is kind of Trump with a dictionary,” one author who has written about New York real estate says. Trump had been obsequious in trying to lure Ronald and Nancy Reagan to his business empire, and tried just as hard with the Clintons. He happened to have his own country club with a golf course in Westchester, which he bought out of foreclosure in the late 1990s. He closed the club in 1999 to redevelop it from top to bottom and reopened it as Trump National Golf Club in 2002. It was six miles from the Clintons’ house, and Trump could play with him, ingratiating himself further by hanging photos of Bill on the wall. As of June, Bill still had a locker at Trump’s golf club.

Trump once told me that he rebuilt the club, in part, because he knew Bill Clinton would need a place to play. As Don Van Natta Jr., an ESPN senior writer, wrote in his book about presidents and golf, “First Off the Tee,” Trump enjoyed playing with the ex-president. “He’s got a lot of golf talent, but he really likes those mulligans,” Trump told Van Natta. “If he misses a shot, he wants to take another crack at it. It’s like life.”

Trump greased the wheels of his relationship with the ex-president and the senator, giving the Clinton Foundation a $100,000 gift from his own foundation. According to “Trump Revealed,” by Michael Kranish and Marc Fisher, Trump donated to Hillary’s Senate war chest six times between 2002 and 2009, for a total of $4,700, and between 1999 and 2012, he switched his registration among the Republican, Democratic and Independence parties seven times.

The friendship, on both sides, was a transaction. Not personal, as they say in the “The Godfather” — just business. Trump’s life in New York was all about promoting the brand and making money for the family business. It was the same for the Clintons. A former Clinton White House official puts it more bluntly: “This was a classic Clinton go-where-the-money-is move.”

“They all played the same game in the same town with the same thing in mind,” says Bernard Kerik, the former New York City police commissioner, who was invited to Trump’s third wedding and served prison time for tax fraud and other felony charges. “Better your relationships and build the business. It’s all about money and getting ahead and hedging your bets and playing the angles.”

Trump wasn’t on the dinner-party circuit. He lived in a narrow alternate universe called Trumpworld, and his favorite way to spend the evening was ordering a steak or cheeseburger (well done) from Fresco by Scotto, eating quickly and watching a sporting event on TV. “Trumpworld is a world he weaves for his own needs and desires, depending on what they are and when they are,” says Louise Sunshine, a former Trump Organization vice president, noting that Clintonworld is much broader and more global.

Though the Clintons might show up at some events and galas and friends’ birthday parties, they were never really around enough to become part of the society dinner-party circuit, either. When I asked Trump last summer to describe his relationship with the Clintons, he was neutral: “As a businessman, you have to get along with all politicians,” he said. “I wouldn’t say it was a close relationship.”

Hillary presents the trip to Trump’s wedding as a lark. “The dates worked,” a friend says. But some of her aides expressed surprise that she was going to such a gaudy affair; they believed Hillary rearranged her schedule because she thought Trump was a more important donor than he was.

The senator and former president beamed in pictures, mingling with the starry crowd, which included Heidi Klum , Barbara Walters, Arnold Schwarzenegger , Sean Combs, Usher, Steve Wynn, Derek Jeter, Don King, Simon Cowell, Gayle King, Matt Lauer and Katie Couric, who got in trouble for her enterprising move of bringing a purse-cam. Paul Anka, Billy Joel, Elton John and Tony Bennett all performed.

André Leon Talley attended with Anna Wintour because the bride was going to be featured on the cover of Vogue , where he was then American editor at large. He had flown to Paris to shop with Melania for the dress — she chose a John Galliano for Dior strapless gown worth $230,000 and a Vera Wang cocktail dress to change into later — and he was “on duty” at the wedding and the reception paying attention to the “birthday cake of a dress” when Melania “was walking around or dancing.” He calls Melania “the most silky, well moisturized, meticulously groomed woman” he has ever known, adding that “dehydrated skin is so unattractive.”

Trump was a reality-show star now, starting his third hit season of “The Apprentice” on NBC . Just as his taste in his apartment at Trump Tower was “like Louis XIV dropped acid,” as Timothy O’Brien, author of “TrumpNation,” describes it, so was his third wedding straight-up Versailles. “This was a man building a ballroom for his trophy wife,” Talley said. “It was Baroque, the way he loves it. The marble was flown in from Italy, and the ceiling was like a palace, all gold, painted by artisans flown in from France. He had a full-on live symphony orchestra.”

David Patrick Columbia, the society editor, asserts that the Clintons were another accouterment: “Donald liked the fact that the Clintons were there because it was just another affirmation of who he had become in his life, a successful person. That’s what matters to him.”

Perhaps the collision of Donald Trump and the Clintons on the biggest stage of all was inevitable. But was it orchestrated? At the restaurant in Trump Tower last summer, I asked the mogul about the “Manchurian Candidate” buzz, about that phone call he got from Bill Clinton in May 2015, when the businessman and reality star was making up his mind whether to run. The Washington Post quoted four Trump allies and one Clinton associate as saying that Clinton encouraged Trump’s efforts to play a larger role in the Republican Party.

Roger Stone, author of “The Clintons’ War on Women” and a longtime confidant of Trump’s, claims that Bill urged Trump to get in the race and told him he thought he could get the nomination. “That’s why the people with the tinfoil hats are convinced the whole thing is a setup,” Stone says. “Bill can’t help himself from giving advice. He loves the game. He’s the great kibitzer.” Stone said Trump also asked Bill three years ago if anyone could be elected president as an independent, and Bill told him no.

I tried to get to the bottom of this murky story that day at Trump Tower, but when you’re dealing with Bill and Donald and truth, it’s an elusive goal.

“Did Bill tell you that you should run?” I asked.

“He didn’t say one way or the other,” Trump replied, over a plate of meatballs.

To make the whole conspiracy wackier, when I began fact-checking this story, the Trump Tower version flipped, with Trumpsters saying that the phone call entailed Bill trying to talk Donald out of running because the former president knew that Trump could beat Hillary.

This new version was met with eye-rolling and mockery from Clintonistas. “Bill Clinton is not Frank Underwood,” a former top aide says. “I guarantee you he did not call Trump with an uber-plan, where he was five moves down the chessboard. He has a theory: You’ve got to give a lot to get a lot. But he doesn’t meddle like that, telling people to get in and get out. Trump shouldn’t flatter himself that Bill gave a damn one way or the other. Trump was just another guy on the call list.”

No matter how Trump got into the race, the way he has conducted it has made Bill burn. Trump escalated his attacks after the Billy Bush hot mike incident, dragging Bill’s accusers back onto the stage. No one else would have gone there or said, as Trump did, that Hillary had “one of the great women-abusers of all time sitting in her house, waiting for her to come home for dinner.” As a Clinton ally ruefully notes, “The last 15 years, everyone had forgotten about that, and now it’s back.” Trump also eagerly pounced to lash the Clintons to an astonishing new twist in the F.B.I. email investigation, involving Anthony Weiner, the estranged husband of Hillary’s closest aide, Huma Abedin, and his sexts to a 15-year-old North Carolina girl.

New York elites have gone from flabbergasted that Trump got this far to debating how the Trump family and one of Trump’s top strategists, Jared Kushner , Ivanka’s husband and the publisher of The New York Observer, will be received if they have to slink back into town. Some people say the attitude toward the Trump children will be more lenient; others think that the Trump brand is irrevocably damaged and that the whole family will be pariahs.

“Will the word ‘Trump’ be used almost in profanity for some time to come among average New Yorkers?” asks Hank Sheinkopf, a veteran Democratic political consultant. “Likely so.”

It may be beginning to dawn on Trump that he has thrown acid on his brand. He left the campaign trail during the final push to promote his new Washington hotel. The hotel is clearly struggling, cutting its expensive room rates and losing the famed chef José Andrés after Andrés decided Trump was “a racist, a divider.” I went to check it out recently, and it had a deserted feel. There was one African-American family posing under the Trump sign — giving a thumbs-down — and a strip of yellow crime tape across the front after vandals wrote “Black Lives Matter” on it.

“I can tell you, in my crowd, they would rather not do anything associated with Trump,” says one advertising and marketing big shot. “People are nauseated by what he’s doing.”

Cindy Adams, the New York Post columnist, disagrees: “He’ll go back to being the most famous face on this planet. No, his brand won’t be hurt. Trump will be Trump. Everybody will still want to meet him.”

Trump has said he hopes that Chelsea and Ivanka — who shared the problems of coming of age when their fathers were enmeshed in very public affairs — can remain friends. But on the Clinton side, people privately play down the friendship, saying that Ivanka, as with her father and the Clintons, was the one pushing the alliance. “There’s no Ivanka-Chelsea relationship,” the foundation executive says. “There was an Ivanka P.R. moment. It was a transaction. They both got what they wanted.”

Some say it will be hardest for Kushner, an Orthodox Jew who got in deep with helping Trump as anti-Semitic sentiment swirled around the candidate. Joe Conason , author of “Man of the World” and a former employee of Kushner’s at The Observer, says: “People will remember this. Maybe you could get away with this in parts of Florida. But in New York City, this doesn’t fly.”

One friend of Trump’s from the real estate world is worried that Trump does not understand how the groups he has derogated and demeaned will wreak revenge on him. “He’s **alienated** women,” the friend says. “He’s **alienated** wealthy people. He’s **alienated** people from the Middle East. He’s **alienated** people from Latin America. These are all fertile ground where people could buy condos from him.”

At the annual Al Smith dinner last month at the Waldorf Astoria, a white-tie charity fête put on by the Catholic Archdiocese of New York that brings together high society and media and features humorous speeches by politicians, Trump was greeted warmly enough after he was introduced by Al Smith IV. “A kid from Queens with a big heart and a big mouth is without question a New York institution,” Smith said.

But when Trump began to make harsher cracks about Hillary toward the end, out of sync with the tone of the event, he was repeatedly booed — spurned by the same Manhattan elites whose approval he had spent so long seeking. Afterward, he fled quickly with Melania without talking to anyone. As Trump returned to the seclusion of his Fifth Avenue Xanadu, he was playing a scene of megalomania and mortification straight out of one of his favorite movies, “Citizen Kane,” about the fall of a brash New York mogul who flew high, gave politics a shot and then had a steep fall after a sex imbroglio. “ ‘Citizen Kane’ was really about the accumulation,” Trump once said. “At the end of accumulation, you see what happens, and it is not necessarily all positive.” Hillary, meanwhile, was spotted nearly 20 minutes after he left, still laughing and mingling with the crowd.

Sign up for our newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GRANTVILLE, Pa. — It didn’t take long for Jack Morris to regret voting for President Obama. A few months after Mr. Morris, a lifelong Republican, cast his first vote for a Democrat in 2008, he learned that the carpet company where he worked planned to lay off 36 people in Pennsylvania and move his job to Maryland.

He went home and lamented to his wife that he had made a big mistake buying into Mr. Obama’s message of hope and change. The president had been in office less than half a year, and already the disappointment that would color the next eight years for Mr. Morris was sinking in.

“I just told my wife, ‘I screwed up. I should’ve never voted for him,’” said Mr. Morris, 46, who now supports Donald J. Trump. “I took the chance, left my party to come and try and vote for him to change. It didn’t work, and now I’m back to my party.”

Mr. Morris is one of a small subset of voters who supported Mr. Obama in 2008 and have now embraced Mr. Trump, attracted by his vow to shake up the political status quo and restore lost jobs. A CBS News poll[http://www.cbsnews.com/news/cbs-poll-clintons-lead-over-trump-widens-with-three-weeks-to-go/] conducted last month found that 7 percent of likely voters who supported Mr. Obama in 2012 now back Mr. Trump, a ray of hope for a candidate who remains behind in most polls and has **alienated** many centrist voters.

Interviews with Mr. Morris and more than a dozen others show a common theme: The message of change that inspired them to vote for Mr. Obama is now embodied by Mr. Trump, whom they see as a brash outsider unconnected with Washington bureaucrats and the big-money donors funding Democratic and Republican candidates.

Many of those interviewed said they felt duped by the president and frustrated by their personal circumstances. They said Mr. Obama had not done enough to create jobs, unfairly pushed through the Affordable Care Act, and damaged the international reputation of the United States with his handling of foreign affairs. Some also complained that the first black president had bungled his response to racially charged killings.

Susanne Murphy, 63, of Gettysburg, Pa., voted for Mr. Obama twice but said she now supported Mr. Trump. The Affordable Care Act led her and her husband to fire five employees from their electrical company because they could not afford to provide them benefits, she said. “It made us feel like we failed,” she said while waiting for the start of a rally featuring Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, Mr. Trump’s running mate.

Ms. Murphy said that while Mike Huckabee, the former governor of Arkansas, had been her first choice for president, she gradually warmed to Mr. Trump. “For me, Donald Trump speaks the truth, tells it like it is,” she said. “He wants to unify this country. He wants to take care of America first.”

Gary Kerns, 42, of Gettysburg, said he had been impressed with Mr. Trump for a long while and called himself a “bandwagon voter” — one who is drawn to the most popular candidates. In 2008, Mr. Kerns voted for Mr. Obama because he was moved by the charismatic young senator’s speeches.

“Obama was blazing hot,” he said. “There was momentum with him, and I got caught up with it. I loved it.”

Now Mr. Kerns, a registered Republican, sees Obama-like energy in Mr. Trump’s candidacy. “Let’s roll with the hot hand,” he said.

Mr. Trump has even attracted some black voters who were inspired by Mr. Obama’s 2008 candidacy but have since soured on him.

Chuck Linton, 69, of Baltimore, a retired military veteran, described Mr. Obama as “condescending” and said that as a black man, he was fed up with Democrats telling him how to vote.

“Have you ever seen somebody that talks so good and makes you feel that he is in your favor, he’s in your corner, but the truth of the matter he’s not?” he asked. “That’s Obama.”

Mr. Linton, a longtime Democrat, said he planned to vote for Mr. Trump because he believes the businessman will work to quell violence in places like Baltimore, where Mr. Linton said several people he knows have lost loved ones to gun violence.

“‘What do you have to lose?’ That’s a very good question,” he said, repeating a question frequently posed by Mr. Trump in stump speeches to blacks. “What difference does it make if you try something else? He’s absolutely right. We need to try something else.”

For others it was Mr. Obama’s stances on racial justice issues that made them recoil at his presidency.

Meg Amamolo, 57, voted for Mr. Obama in 2008 and 2012, and was excited, as a black woman, to vote to put a black man in the White House. But she grew especially frustrated in 2012 when Mr. Obama weighed in on the shooting death of 17-year-old Trayvon Martin, who was shot by a neighborhood watch volunteer in Sanford, Fla. “If I had a son, he’d look like Trayvon,” Mr. Obama said.

While many praised Mr. Obama for sympathizing with the teenager’s family, Ms. Amamolo thought the president was unfairly taking sides and signaling to her sons that they would face discrimination because they are black.

“It became all about making the young black boys realize that the country doesn’t want them,” she said. “Black Americans, they are being made victims by the Democrats so they can get the votes, but nothing is changing.”

Laverne Gore, 58, a registered Republican in Cleveland, thinks Mr. Obama didn’t do enough to help black people after she excitedly cast her ballot for him in 2008.

She said she cried when Mr. Obama was declared the winner, but soon lost faith in his administration because he focused more on gay rights and **immigration**than the concerns of black people.

“I kept waiting and praying for him to show me that I mattered, my children mattered, my neighbors who are black mattered,” Ms. Gore said. “I didn’t get it.”

For other former Obama supporters, the attraction to Mr. Trump is more visceral.

“He is a blue-collar man’s billionaire,” said James Bates, 37, a sales trader who lives in Cleveland, said of the Republican nominee.

Mr. Bates said that he felt he could have a friendly conversation with Mr. Trump, and that because of the candidate’s riches he would not be indebted to anyone if elected.

“Much like how I voted for Barack Obama in 2008 is how I am voting for Donald Trump in 2016,” Mr. Bates said. “He is the only person who can get in, I believe, and really bust out the Washington establishment.”

“I believe 110 percent that Donald Trump is for the American electorate,” he added. “Not for the Washington special interests. Not for his own interests. For the people.”

Mr. Morris also believes Mr. Trump will make his life better.

Six months after he agreed to a three-hour daily commute to and from Baltimore to keep his carpet company job, the company moved again, this time to Georgia. Rather than uproot his life, he gave up the $125,000-a-year job.

Now, he said, he lives paycheck to paycheck and supports his wife and three children making about $72,000 doing maintenance for apartment complexes. He said he hoped Mr. Trump would follow through on his promises to bring back high-paying jobs.

“He’s not going to put up with crap from anybody,” Mr. Morris said of Mr. Trump. “He’s not going to promise me change, and then not do that.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Obama’s 3-Day Swing Will Try to Push Blacks and Millennials Hillary Clinton’s Way[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/03/us/politics/obama-hillary-clinton-donald-trump.html]

\* Presidential Election: With 6 Days Left, Candidates Work Overtime[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/02/us/politics/presidential-election.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ronald Reagan visited the South Bronx in the summer of 1980, when Charlotte Street was still lined with vacant lots and the rubble of toppling tenements. The place looked like London after the blitz[http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9D0CEED6103BE732A25755C0A96E9C94619FD6CF&legacy=true], he said, and he wanted to do something about it.

The Republican candidate for president that year, Mr. Reagan wasn’t merely mugging for the kind of photo op that unnerves white suburban voters. Earlier that day, he spoke[http://www.csmonitor.com/1980/0805/080529.html] to the National Urban League in New York. Then he flew to Chicago to meet with the editors of Ebony and Jet magazines, pillars of the black press, and Jesse Jackson, the civil rights leader.

He wasn’t always greeted warmly, but it was the kind of campaign itinerary that’s hard to imagine a Republican presidential candidate even contemplating in 2016. Mr. Reagan believed he could make a genuine play for urban voters in 1980. Today, his party has all but conceded them.

Only three of the 25 largest cities in America now have Republican mayors. In the House of Representatives, Republicans from dense urban congressional districts have become extinct. In the 2012 presidential election, the counties containing Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, Washington, San Francisco and Philadelphia each gave less than 20 percent of their vote to Mitt Romney. In this coming election, Donald J. Trump is unlikely to do better — and may fare worse.

Even as much else about this election feels unprecedented, America’s urban-rural divide will be as strong as ever, continuing a decadeslong process in which the two parties have sorted themselves ever more clearly by population density.

The Realignment

The pattern highlights a paradox about Mr. Trump: “He’s the most urban candidate in American history — he was born in Queens and lives in a skyscraper on Fifth Avenue,” said Aaron Renn, a senior fellow at the conservative Manhattan Institute. And Mr. Trump’s personal fortunes have risen with the comeback of major American cities, with signature real estate projects in New York, Washington and Chicago. But he has portrayed these same cities as dystopias.

Mr. Trump has elevated a strategy that is risky to the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] in the long run. Not only have recent Republican candidates neglected cities, but they’ve also run against them, casting urban America as the foil to heartland voters. Rick Santorum and Sarah Palin caricatured coastal cities[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/11/us/politics/kansas-caucuses.html?\_r=1&scp=1&sq=Santorum%20Missouri&st=cse] as unmoored from the “real America.”[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/21/AR2008102102449.html] Ted Cruz derided “New York values,”[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/cruz-confronts-new-york-values-in-the-empire-state/2016/04/08/c4bbd528-fd9c-11e5-9140-e61d062438bb\_story.html] as if those values, whichever ones he meant, were **alien**. Mr. Trump has pre-emptively annulled the votes of Chicago, St. Louis and Philadelphia, cities where he warns the election will be rigged[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/upshot/funny-stuff-in-philadelphia-zero-votes-does-not-equal-fraud.html?action=click&contentCollection=upshot®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront&\_r=0] against him.

“It’s unimaginably distressing, even by eight years ago, let alone 16 years ago,” said Stephen Goldsmith, a former Republican mayor of Indianapolis and an adviser to George W. Bush in the 2000 campaign. “We had an opportunity to reach broadly across the country to have an inspiring voice of opportunity, and there’s a set of coherent Republican policies that would amplify that opportunity. We’re doing the opposite. We’re insulting folks who could vote for us.”

The history of how the G.O.P. got here is partly about the ideological realignment of the two parties, and the disappearance of liberal Republicans like Jacob Javits, a senator from New York State, and John Lindsay, a mayor of New York City (a Republican who left the party, he said, when it left him). The party even moved away from conservative Republicans like Jack Kemp[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/06/sunday-review/note-to-republicans-channel-jack-kemp.html], the secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the George H.W. Bush administration, who spoke often about urban opportunity. But this history is also about the physical realignment of voters, as the rise of suburbia enabled Democrats and Republicans to move, literally, farther apart.

One Word: Race

In 1966, white voters in Chicago who’d long supported the city’s Democratic machine began to bolt for the Republican Party. They were alarmed by urban riots, by civil rights legislation in Congress and — much closer to home — by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s campaign in Chicago that year[http://kingencyclopedia.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/encyclopedia/enc\_chicago\_campaign/] for “open housing.”

Pamphlets soon began to appear on the stoops of the city’s middle-class bungalows: “Your Home is your castle — Keep it that way by Voting STRAIGHT REPUBLICAN.” This was the summer, the historian Rick Perlstein writes in his book “Nixonland,” when the party of Lincoln changed its mind.

Those newly converted Republicans in Chicago voted in 1968 for Richard Nixon. “But these were the people,” Mr. Perlstein said in an interview, “who largely would have left the city within 10 years.”

Those Chicago voters embody both trends — party realignment and white flight — that have remade political geography since then. In the 1950s, in presidential election results compiled by the Stanford political scientist Jonathan Rodden, a county’s population density was a poor predictor of how its residents voted. Today, the pattern is remarkably consistent: The denser the county, the more overwhelmingly its residents vote Democratic.

“This story could be written in one word,” Mr. Perlstein said of that historical arc. “The one world would be ‘race.’ ”

In the early days of white flight, two federal policies — the construction of the interstate highway system and mortgage guarantees for the new suburbs — pulled whites out of cities even as they were getting pushed by racial tension, desegregation and school busing.

“The people who go to the suburbs are not a random selection,” said Jessica Trounstine, a political scientist at the University of California, Merced. They were the middle and upper class. They became homeowners. They prized neighborhoods of single-family houses. Those characteristics today all correlate with leaning Republican. “These population shifts happen for reasons that are external to politics,” Ms. Trounstine said, “but politics is embedded in who goes.”

Metropolitan areas with more highway construction became more polarized over time between Democratic cities and Republican suburbs, according to research by Clayton Nall[http://web.stanford.edu/~nall/docs/nall--jop--finalpublished.pdf], a Stanford political scientist. Where highways were built, they helped sort people. Where they led, suburbs became more reliably Republican. They created entirely new places, Mr. Nall argues, with new politics.

In the 1980s, after Mr. Reagan’s election, the link between population density and partisanship tightened further. Mr. Rodden suspects the battles over moral values helped drive the trend. Issues like abortion with urban-rural divides in public opinion further widened the gap between the two groups.

In many ways, it was becoming clearer over this time what each party stood for, whether on race or cultural cleavages or transportation or poverty. The basic party infrastructure Republicans would need to win in cities, at any level, disintegrated. Even the average congressional district held by Republicans today has a quarter of the population density it did in 1950.

As they have had less to say to cities, Republicans have come to talk, instead, about them.

“They have it in their interest to appeal to suburban voters who are looking back to the city through their rearview mirrors with a mix of disgust and romance for an imagined past,” said Thomas Sugrue, a New York University historian.

In party platforms, the G.O.P. eventually tiptoed to an almost anti-urban stance. In 1988, the platform called for “special attention to urban residents” in the census to ensure their full federal representation. In 2000, the party still nodded toward support for transit. By 2012, it accused the Obama administration of “replacing civil engineering with social engineering as it pursues an exclusively urban vision[http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=101961] of dense housing and government transit.”

Cities today come up in the platform[https://www.gop.com/platform/] when they’re scolded for their **immigration** stands as “sanctuary cities.” They’re mentioned for their “soaring” murder rates and the funds they siphon to mass transit that should be spent on highways instead. And that’s about it.

Density Defines

The approaching election will look no different. Hillary Clinton’s strongest base of support — where adults surveyed by Gallup are most likely to say they hold favorable views of her — is in the densest counties. Mr. Trump fares the best in the sparsest places.

Beneath this election’s dark plotlines about temperament, party infighting and accusations of sexual assault, that underlying pattern bodes badly for the G.O.P.

“What happens if you abandon the places where most people live?” said Mr. Perlstein, the historian. After its 2012 defeat, the Republican Party wrung its hands over the need to face demographic change in a country that’s becoming majority-minority. But geography poses a problem, too: Once-white suburbs are growing more diverse; poverty is spreading there; and central cities that Republicans relinquished are now the country’s economic engines[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/upshot/actually-many-inner-cities-are-doing-great.html].

The anti-city strategy holds up today only because Democrats, with their tight clusters of urban support, are at a structural disadvantage in Congress[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/07/upshot/why-democrats-cant-win.html].

“One of the most important implications of all this is that ignoring cities can be a winning strategy in House races,” Mr. Rodden said. “The mix of positions that the Republicans have taken has served them really well in winning the House. But it’s not working out so well in presidential elections.”

The seemingly cynical solution is to count on low turnout among urban voters. The alternative is to compete for them.

“If you compete in cities, you don’t have to win in them,” said Thomas Ogorzalek, a political scientist at Northwestern. “If you go 70-30 in Chicago, instead of 90-10 like Trump is going to do, you can win Illinois. That’s not a bad strategy.”

Mr. Goldsmith, the former Republican mayor of Indianapolis, says the idea isn’t far-fetched. Picture a Republican who runs on effective government instead of against government: a Michael Bloomberg type minus the nanny-state laws. Or a school-choice advocate, but not a culture warrior. Or someone who talks about crime without caricaturing the communities that confront the worst of it.

“I think that would work for a Republican candidate, if they could get nominated,” Mr. Goldsmith said. And cities short on conservative policy ideas would be better for it, he added.

The question, though, is what Republicans would lose if they tried. What if they didn’t evoke urban iniquity to excite exurban voters, or if they toned down the values overtures that play well in Utah?

Electoral necessity will demand at least a new round of Republican soul searching.

Looking back in history, and to a future beyond Mr. Trump, the G.O.P. may need, not a Ronald Reagan, but a Jack Kemp[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/06/sunday-review/note-to-republicans-channel-jack-kemp.html]. That is, a conservative articulate on racial justice and upward mobility who would be comfortable in any incarnation of the Bronx — the dismal 1980 landscape or the one today[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/01/dining/coffee-shops-south-bronx.html], where fancy coffee shops fuel concern about gentrification. The party in 2016 still contains some of Kemp’s acolytes[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2012/08/31/what-paul-ryan-learned-from-jack-kemp/], although it is hard to make out his influence.

The Upshot[http://www.nytimes.com/upshot/] provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/upshot] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/UpshotNYT]. Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/upshot/].

\* Actually, Many ‘Inner Cities’ Are Doing Great[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/upshot/actually-many-inner-cities-are-doing-great.html]

\* Fraud Claims in Philadelphia? They Add Up to Zero[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/upshot/funny-stuff-in-philadelphia-zero-votes-does-not-equal-fraud.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CASA GRANDE, Ariz. — Since moving to Arizona 15 years ago, Nieves Lorenzo watched as Hispanics grew in numbers but only haltingly asserted themselves as a political force. Then came Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per]’s presidential candidacy.

“He has woken up the sleeping giant,” Ms. Lorenzo, a native of Venezuela, said as she stood in a local Democratic campaign headquarters here in the desert between Phoenix and Tucson.

By driving women, educated white voters and, most significantly, growing blocs of minorities away from the Republican Party, Mr. Trump has hastened social and political changes already well underway in two key regions, the interior West and the upper South, that not long ago tilted to the right.

Now, even as Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] contends with inflamed Democratic anxiety over renewed scrutiny of her private email server, these once-red areas — a string of states that voted twice for George W. Bush — are providing an unexpected firewall for her campaign.

Democrats are already strongly confident of victory in three of them — Colorado, Nevada and Virginia — and believe that a fourth, North Carolina, is likely to break their way as well. Added to the party’s daunting advantage in the Electoral College, these states have impeded Mr. Trump’s path to amassing the 270 electoral votes needed to win, limiting his ability to exploit Mrs. Clinton’s late vulnerabilities and forcing him to scrounge for unlikely support in solidly Democratic places like Michigan and New Mexico.

The shift is stark enough that Democrats are pressing for victory in Arizona and Georgia, two historically Republican strongholds, while Mrs. Clinton’s standing has wobbled in familiar battlegrounds like Ohio and Iowa.

Mrs. Clinton has moved aggressively on Arizona, seeing it as a substitute for any losses in the Midwest. She plans to campaign in Phoenix on Wednesday; her running mate, Senator Tim Kaine of Virginia, will be there and in Tucson on Thursday; and she and her allies have poured millions of dollars into commercials in Arizona and Georgia, which they view as a longer-shot target.

Looking beyond the election, Republicans fear that Mr. Trump’s geographic dilemma could offer a grim glimpse of their party’s future: Unless they can win back constituencies he has driven away, the two fastest-growing regions of the country may continue to move decisively toward the Democrats.

“I think we may be seeing the ground shift under us,” said Senator Tom Udall, Democrat of New Mexico, a member of one of the West’s most enduring political families. “This may be a major political turning point.” Of Mr. Trump, he said, “He’s done some real damage nationally and in the West to Republicans by using some of the nastiest, angriest rhetoric we’ve ever had in politics.”

While Mr. Trump is running a racially tinged campaign of restoration, pledging to make America great again, minority voters in the states that increasingly decide presidential elections have been working to harness their newfound political power.

In Nevada, which has the fastest-growing populations of both Hispanics and Asian-Americans, the new **immigrant** blocs have become political powerhouses. Early voting data shows Democrats with such a clear lead in the state that the race may be decided there well before Election Day.

“People are organized that have never been organized before,” said Senator Harry Reid, the Democratic leader whose career in Congress began when Nevada was awarded a second House seat in 1982.

Many leading Republicans, alarmed by Mr. Trump’s candidacy and intimately familiar with the demographic shifts underway, believe the party must immediately change course after this election.

“You’ve got to stop **alienating** large swaths of the electorate,” said Senator Cory Gardner, Republican of Colorado, who has withdrawn his support for Mr. Trump. “And I don’t just mean in the Hispanic community — I mean Hispanics, Asians, communities of color and women.”

The Upper South

Mr. Trump, as the face of the Republican Party, has acted as a kind of political accelerant in the South and West, helping Democrats mobilize in the demographically diverse suburbs around cities like Atlanta and Phoenix.

Stacey Abrams, the Democratic leader in the Georgia House of Representatives, said the presidential race had been a “godsend election,” opening the eyes of national Democrats to unimagined opportunities in her state. Priorities USA Action, a “super PAC[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/campaign\_finance/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]” supporting Mrs. Clinton, is spending more than $2 million in Georgia.

Shaking hands last week in a lunchtime crowd at a mall in south DeKalb County, Ms. Abrams said the electoral calculus in Georgia had changed sharply. The booming Atlanta suburbs, she said, had opened a path to victory without winning over white conservatives — but only if Democrats were able to turn out black voters and other minorities effectively.

“Trump was helpful, because it allowed people to move past the prejudice that said, you should never even think about a Deep South state being in play,” Ms. Abrams said. The dictum that elections in the South are decided by white voters, she added, “is no longer true in the Deep South.”

Democrats say Georgia is unlikely to put Mrs. Clinton over the top in the presidential race, and would tip her way only in the event of a sizable win nationally. But for Democrats to even compete there is a sign of how far into the South they have ventured.

Anthony Foxx, the federal transportation secretary and a former mayor of Charlotte, N.C., said it was almost “unavoidable” that states from Virginia to Georgia would turn blue, absent a major overhaul of the Republican Party.

“What people are seeing now is that the demographic trends in North Carolina and several other Southern states are moving in an unchangeable direction toward more progressive politics,” Mr. Foxx, a Democrat, said.

Bolstered by carefully drawn legislative maps and the results of nonpresidential elections, in which minority turnout usually dips, Republicans have maintained an iron grip on state government in places like Georgia and North Carolina, as well as some Western states.

But Republican leaders acknowledged that a moment of reckoning was ahead, perhaps sooner than expected because of this year’s presidential contest. State Representative B. J. Pak of Georgia, a Republican of Korean descent, said that he doubted that Mrs. Clinton would win the state but that his party’s leaders were acutely aware of the fast-changing terrain.

Mr. Pak, who represents Gwinnett County, a booming suburban area near Atlanta where minorities now outnumber whites, said it had been hard this year to recruit a diverse slate of candidates, or to win over women and minorities.

“Donald Trump has really made it extremely difficult,” said Mr. Pak, who has not endorsed Mr. Trump. “They feel that the party’s not welcoming, and that’s a tremendous challenge when you’re trying to get people to give the party a chance.”

Bob McDonnell, the former governor of Virginia, whose 2009 election marked the last major Republican victory in a once-reliably red state, said his party must embrace “the new Americans, the **immigrants** that are really kind of remaking America, like how the Irish did in the mid-1800s.” He noted that he had learned phrases in Korean and Mandarin to campaign in Northern Virginia.

“We get accused, as conservatives, of writing off certain groups of people because they don’t fit a certain political stereotype. You can’t do that as a Republican,” Mr. McDonnell said. “It’s a recipe for certain minority status.”

The Interior West

Senator Jeff Flake, Republican of Arizona, feels just as strongly about the need for the party to expand its reach to members of minority groups — and argues that a crucial ingredient in doing so is to pass a comprehensive **immigration** overhaul.

“You can’t win statewide here if you take completely unreasonable positions on **immigration**,” said Mr. Flake, one of the country’s most outspoken anti-Trump Republicans.

Arizona’s tumultuous internal politics have made it especially inviting for Mrs. Clinton, and most likely an easier pickup in the last week of the race than Georgia.

For the past decade, the question of what to do about the estimated 12 million **immigrants** in the country illegally has cleaved the Republican Party. Perhaps nowhere has it proved more divisive than in Arizona, where most schoolchildren from kindergarten to eighth grade are Hispanic.

While Mr. Flake and his Republican colleague, Senator John McCain, have led the charge for what critics call an amnesty, Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County attained national prominence with his harsh treatment of Hispanic migrants. Mr. Arpaio’s re-election bid and Mr. Trump’s campaign have galvanized the state’s Latino residents, whose presence on the voter rolls has lagged their representation in the population over all.

Seizing on this energy, Mrs. Clinton’s campaign has redeployed staff to Arizona and has dispatched top-shelf surrogates, including Michelle Obama and Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont, to campaign there.

Janet Napolitano, a former Democratic governor of the state, said that Mrs. Clinton could win Arizona, but that a victory was by no means “in the bag.” Yet Ms. Napolitano said that, win or lose, there was no going back.

“Arizona is now going to be a battleground state,” she said.

Western Democrats cautioned that the national party should not interpret victory in 2016 as approval of a strongly ideological agenda, as much as rejection of Mr. Trump by a changing region.

“When either party wins a decisive election, they feel that it’s a validation of the most extreme parts of the party,” said Gov. John Hickenlooper of Colorado, a Democrat. “But that isn’t always what people are voting for.”

Until Republicans recalibrate their approach and project a more inclusive message, Democrats believe their future is as limitless as the Arizona desert can feel.

As he and his wife left the Casa Grande Democratic offices for their daily round of canvassing, Lee Seabolt, 70, said the Republican quandary was a matter of simple arithmetic.

“There are a whole lot more old white men like me who are going to be dying over the next four years,” he said, “and there are a lot of Hispanics who are going to be turning 18 who are going to start voting.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Jonathan Martin reported from Casa Grande, and Alexander Burns from Georgia.

\* Black Turnout Falls in Early Voting, Boding Ill for Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/02/us/politics/black-turnout-falls-in-early-voting-boding-ill-for-hillary-clinton.html]

\* How Do You Say ‘Vote for Clinton’ in Spanish? Ask the Abuelas[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/02/us/politics/hillary-clinton-hispanic-support-abuelas.html]

\* ‘He Used Us as Props’: Conservative Hispanics Deplore Donald Trump’s Speech[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/gop-hispanic-reaction-trump.html]

\* Donald Trump Is Seen as Helping Push Asian-Americans Into Democratic Arms[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/us/politics/trump-asian-american-voters.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Article: ‘For Helping **Immigrants**, Chobani’s Founder Draws Threats[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/01/business/for-helping-immigrants-chobanis-founder-draws-threats.html]’

Before Reading

What is xenophobia? In pairs or alone, write down as many examples of xenophobia you have read about or seen as you can. You may choose local, national or international examples.

Questions for Comprehension and Analysis

1. Who is Hamdi Ulukaya? Who is unhappy with him, and why? Why has his life been threatened? How is his company being threatened?

2. How is Mr. Ulukaya’s life in the United States an example of an American success story?

3. In the article, Mr. Ulukaya said, “The minute a refugee has a job, that’s the minute they stop being a refugee.” Mr. Ulukaya is creating jobs at Chobani, and he is hiring refugees. How does this make some people uncomfortable?

4. What other things is Mr. Ulukaya doing to help his employees at Chobani?

5. In what ways has the coming presidential election had an impact on Mr. Ulukaya and his actions to help refugees?

What do you think?

In the video below, watch Mr. Ulukaya speak at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland.

[Video: Davos 2016 - Press Conference: The Refugee and Migration Crisis Watch on YouTube.[http://youtube.com/embed/dApJnaaNwQY]]

Do you agree with Mr. Ulukaya’s message that corporations need to do more to help refugees from Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Turkey, among other countries? Why or why not?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Jan. 22, 1973, the Supreme Court of the United States, by a 7-2 majority[https://www.oyez.org/cases/1971/70-18], discovered a sweeping constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy and struck down abortion laws across the country. Within five years, the number of abortions in America annually climbed above a million, where it would remain for 20 years.

To be pro-life, to regard abortion as obviously a form of murder and all those millions of dead unborn as its nameless victims, is to believe that the Roe v. Wade decision was a moment of deep moral rupture in the history of the republic. When it comes to the possibility that the modern American order is corrupt and under judgment, nobody is more “woke” than the committed opponent of abortion.

Yet abortion opponents, in the 1970s and afterward, responded to Roe v. Wade for the most part like normal citizens of a normal democratic state, not as dissidents within a murderous dystopia. The pro-life movement accepted, even in the face of what it considered a monstrous evil, the good of civic peace, and treated the evil of abortion as something to be addressed through the usual work of democratic politics — however long that work might take, across however many presidential elections and Supreme Court battles and public arguments and acts of private persuasion, and through however many setbacks and defeats along the way.

To the pro-choice side, especially to lukewarm pro-choicers looking to feel better about their own muddled sense of things, this choice has sometimes been cast as evidence that pro-lifers don’t really believe our own rhetoric — that if we really believed abortion to be murder, really murder, we wouldn’t be incrementalists and small-r republicans on the issue; we would support violence, rebellion, nullification, secession, you name it.

It’s an argument that rears its head[http://theweek.com/articles/591382/deeply-irresponsible-rhetoric-prolife-movement] whenever someone on the pro-life fringe turns to violence — the idea that abortion-clinic shooters are acting appropriately given full anti-abortion premises, that the logical implications of the pro-life position point to a wild radicalism rather than an acceptance of democratic politics’ continuing ebb and flow.

The strongest counterpoint to this line of argument comes from the Roman Catholic catechism’s teaching on just war. As the Catholic writer John Zmirak noted in the aftermath of the Planned Parenthood shootings last years, the church does not allow nations to take up arms and go to war merely when they have a high moral cause on their side. Justice is necessary, but it is not sufficient: Peaceful means of ending the evil in question need to have been exhausted, there must be serious prospects of military success, and (crucially) “the use of arms must not produce evils and disorders graver than the evil to be eliminated.”

What this teaching suggests is that we should have a strong bias in favor of peaceful deliberation so long as deliberation remains possible. And that bias can be reasonably applied to the internal peace of a republic as much as to the peace between nations. So long as your polity offers mechanisms for eventually changing unjust laws, it’s better to accept the system’s basic legitimacy and work within it for change than to take steps, violent or otherwise, that risk blowing the entire apparatus up.

Perhaps you have already guessed that this argument has some application to the position of principled conservatives in the year of Donald Trump.

A vote for Trump is not a vote for insurrection or terrorism or secession. But it is a vote for a man who stands well outside the norms of American presidential politics, who has displayed a naked contempt for republican institutions and constitutional constraints, who deliberately injects noxious conspiracy theories into political conversation, who has tiptoed closer to the incitement of political violence than any major politician in my lifetime, whose admiration for authoritarian rulers is longstanding, who has endorsed war crimes and indulged racists and so on down a list that would exhaust this column’s word count if I continued to compile it.

It is a vote, in other words, for a far more chaotic and unstable form of political leadership (on the global stage[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/30/opinion/sunday/the-dangers-of-donald-trump.html?\_r=0] as well as on the domestic) than we have heretofore experienced, and a leap unlike any that conservative voters have considered taking in all the long years since Roe v. Wade.

And what is striking is how many conservatives seem to have internalized that reality and justified their support for Trump anyway, on grounds that are similar to ones that the mainstream pro-life movement has rejected for four decades: Namely, that Hillary Clinton would usher in some particular evil so severe and irreversible that it’s better to risk burning things down, crashing the plane of state[http://www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/the-flight-93-election/], or whatever metaphor for Trump’s potential effect on the republic you prefer, than to allow the other political party to hold the presidency for the next four years.

It is not just pro-life writers (including Zmirak[https://stream.org/with-hillary-clinton-in-the-white-house-christians-would-be-in-a-fight-for-civil-survival/], I should note) making versions of this argument. It is constitutional conservatives arguing that permitting another progressive president would make the Constitution completely irrecoverable, so better to roll the dice with a Peronist like Trump. It is **immigration** restrictionists arguing that Clinton’s favored amnesty for illegal **immigrants** would complete America’s transformation into Venezuela, so better to roll the dice with a right-wing Chávez. It is a long list of conservatives treating an inevitable feature of democratic politics — the election of a politician of the other party to the presidency — as an evil so grave that it’s worth risking all the disorders that Trump obviously promises.

I agree with them that grave evils will follow from electing Hillary Clinton. But the Trump alternative is like a feckless war of choice in the service of some just-seeming end, with a commanding general who likes war crimes. It’s a ticket on a widening gyre, promising political catastrophe and moral corruption both, no matter what ideals seem to justify it.

It is a hard thing to accept that some elections should be lost, especially in a country as divided over basic moral premises as our own. But just as the pro-life movement ultimately won real gains — in lives saved, laws altered, abortion rates reduced — by accepting the legitimacy of the republic even as it deplored the killing of the unborn, so today’s conservatism has far more to gain from the defeat of Donald Trump, and the chance to oppose Clintonian progressivism unencumbered by his authoritarianism, bigotry, misogyny and incompetence, than it does from answering the progressive drift toward Caesarism with a populist Elagabalus.

Not because it is guaranteed long-term victory in that scenario or any other. But because the deepest conservative insight is that justice depends on order as much as order depends on justice. So when Loki or the Joker or some still-darker Person promises the righting of some grave wrong, the defeat of your hated enemies, if you will only take a chance on chaos and misrule, the wise and courageous response is to tell them to go to hell.

I invite you to follow me on Twitter (@DouthatNYT)[http://twitter.com/DouthatNYT].

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

As this ghoulish, absurd spectacle of an election sputters to the finish line, we can confidently say there is one winner: American Muslims.

We are asserting our rights with swagger and demanding to be treated with fairness instead of being used as political props, the “eyes and ears” you can plug in to be a front-line defense against the Islamic State. We’re not Mr. Potato Head counterterrorism experts. We are Americans, and **alienating** us could prove to be politically costly.

Rampant Islamophobia has inspired Muslims to get more politically engaged. We’re not a huge group of voters; we make up about 1 percent[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/01/06/a-new-estimate-of-the-u-s-muslim-population/] of the population. But many of us live in states such as Michigan, Ohio, Virginia and Florida, where swing voters — and voters who might be turned off by a candidate who pledges “extreme vetting” of Muslims — can make a difference. One Muslim advocacy group reports an increase of more than 30 percent[http://www.cnn.com/2016/06/21/politics/muslim-voters-election/] in Muslim voter registration since 2012.

Two weeks ago, Hillary Clinton began running a powerful ad[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WCqFCCgU1xk] featuring Khizr Khan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/us/politics/khizr-khan-hillary-clinton.html], the Pakistani Muslim father of an Army captain killed in Iraq who beat down Donald J. Trump at the Democratic National Convention with his worn-out copy of the Constitution.

I spoke to Mr. Khan, the very unlikely star of this election season, shortly after the ad featuring him was released. He is affectionately known as “Khizr Uncle” to many of us South Asians who are not related to him but still proudly claim kinship due to shared **immigrant** roots. I asked if he’d considered stepping back from the campaign because of the spotlight on his family and the nasty trolling. “Those are my words and I have spoken them a million times,” he said. “That criticism is worth it. We will do this a million times over and over again.”

Mr. Khan, who refers to Mr. Trump as “the bogus candidate,” says that after his convention speech and being criticized by Mr. Trump, he has received encouragement from people all over the country, who tell his wife and him that they are “testaments to the goodness of America.”

In 2008, it is unlikely that Mr. Khan would have been the star of a campaign ad or a symbol of American goodness. That year, two Muslim women in headscarves were barred[http://www.politico.com/story/2008/06/muslims-barred-from-picture-at-obama-event-011168] from sitting behind the podium by volunteers for the Obama campaign. That shameful act was done to protect Barack Obama from the “Muslim” rumor he’s had to endure for years, one that was fanned enthusiastically by the current Republican presidential nominee.

Linda Sarsour[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/09/nyregion/linda-sarsour-is-a-brooklyn-homegirl-in-a-hijab.html], the executive director of the Arab American Association of New York, says for some Muslim voters this year, “fear is a motivator,” but for others “Islamophobia fuels us to demonstrate our political power in the face of the opposition.” In a poll, Muslims cited civil rights as the key election issue for them[http://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/muslim-voters-name-civil-rights-key-election-issue-electorate-turns-n665716], next to education, the economy and a concern about harassment of Muslim students.

Khurru[http://khurrumwahid.com/] m Wahid[http://khurrumwahid.com/], a Florida lawyer who helped found Emerge USA[http://www.emerge-usa.org/], a nonprofit group that encourages Muslim political engagement, explained the uptick in registration as a response to both outrage at the Republican nominee and Muslims being embraced by the Democrats.

Thanks to Mr. Trump, however, Democrats don’t need to work too hard to convince Muslim women. By suggesting that Ghazala Khan, Mr. Khan’s wife, may not have been “allowed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/31/us/politics/donald-trump-khizr-khan-wife-ghazala.html]” to speak at the Democratic convention because of her religion, Mr. Trump unintentionally prompted the creation of the American Muslim Women PAC[http://www.americanmuslimwomen.com/], the first of its kind.

“Most Muslim women didn’t realize they were being viewed like that,” said Shailee Seddiq, communications director for the PAC. “They didn’t know people thought we weren’t allowed to speak.”

Seeme Gull Khan Hasan, a co-founder of the group Muslims for America[http://www.muslimsforamerica.us/founders/seeme-hasan/], also helped found the group Muslims for Bush in 2003 and raised a significant amount of money for the 2008 McCain-Palin campaign. This year, she’s with Mrs. Clinton — “by default.”

“Muslims are almost like leprosy for Republicans, who do not want to come near us,” she said. “Even if we promise them voters. Because their base does not want them to talk to us.”

There are Muslims who support Mr. Trump too, loyal to the very candidate who demands loyalty oaths. A Virginia businessman, Sajid Tarar, started something he called American Muslims for Trump[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/07/19/meet-the-muslim-with-an-unusual-record-praying-in-arabic-at-the-rnc-tonight/] and gave the closing prayer at the Republican convention. He was booed.

Although one poll[https://www.cair.com/press-center/press-releases/13822-cair-muslim-voter-survey-indicates-86-percent-turnout-support-for-hillary-clinton.html] shows that Mrs. Clinton is likely to get about 70 percent of the Muslim vote, some believe she isn’t so much better than Mr. Trump, and would stand in the way of the radical change needed to improve the lives of average Juans and Muhammads. That’s why some Muslim voters I talked to are considering third-party candidates.

Tauhid Mahmud, a graduate student in New York, said he was planning to vote for the Green Party candidate, Jill Stein, as a way of saying: “No, I’m not going to vote for you just because you’re not Trump. You need to earn it. ”

Mr. Wahid understands this impulse. But he wants Muslim voters to understand that lasting change has proved to be evolutionary, not revolutionary. “It takes sustained engagement and the building of pressure to move the giant cruise ship known as American policy,” he said. “Do not give up so quickly.”

It is affirming to see that eight years after America elected its first “Muslim, socialist, Kenyan” president, some people are openly embracing Muslims, rejecting bigotry and inviting us to their dinner tables to taste this strange phenomenon known as meat loaf. However, I’m not content with table scraps, pity invitations and opportunistic photo-ops. We’re speaking out, voting and throwing down. To echo Khizr Uncle, we’ll keep doing it — a million times over and over again.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook [https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTOpinion) [http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] , and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/] .

Wajahat Ali is the creative director of Affinis Labs, a hub for social entrepreneurship and innovation.

Correction: November 4, 2016, Friday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An Op-Ed article on Wednesday about voting by Muslims misspelled the surname of the communications director for the American Muslim Women PAC. She is Shailee Seddiq, not Siddique.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — Things finally seemed to be going better for Noor Salman and her husband, Omar Mateen[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/19/us/omar-mateen-gunman-orlando-shooting.html?action=click&contentCollection=Politics&module=RelatedCoverage®ion=EndOfArticle&pgtype=article]. He had just been accepted into a police training program and had showered her with jewelry to celebrate. He had given her permission to visit her family in California and handed her spending money for the trip. And he had stopped hitting her.

So when Mr. Mateen told her that he would not be home for dinner the afternoon of June 11, she asked him not to go. It was Saturday — and she hoped it would be a family night. But he told her he had to see a friend, kissing her and hugging their 3-year-old son as he left.

Mr. Mateen never returned home. Instead, he drove two hours from the family’s home in Fort Pierce, Fla., to a nightclub in Orlando, where he killed 49 people[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/2016-orlando-shooting] and wounded dozens more before the police fatally shot him, ending one of the worst terrorist attacks in the United States since 2001.

Ms. Salman, whose parents **immigrated** to the United States from the West Bank in 1985, was immediately a person of interest. F.B.I. agents questioned her for hours, eliciting from her that she had been with her husband when he bought ammunition and scouted the club. Some agents came to believe that she was not being truthful.

But in an interview, the first she has given, Ms. Salman denied any involvement in the attack or any knowledge of what her husband was going to do. She described him as someone who angered easily, beat her often, and lived his life in secret.

“I was unaware of everything,” she said. “I don’t condone what he has done. I am very sorry for what has happened. He has hurt a lot of people.”

Her husband’s crime, Ms. Salman said, has left her shattered and afraid. She lives in fear of turning on the television and hearing Mr. Mateen’s name. She often can’t get out of bed and depends on family members to take care of her son. She has moved three times since the attack, hoping to avoid the media, and asked that her current location not be disclosed.

And she lives in legal limbo, with prosecutors weighing charges that could include lying to the F.B.I. Her lawyers, Linda Moreno and Charles Swift, say their client did nothing wrong. They declined to let Ms. Salman, 30, talk about her discussions with the F.B.I., but Mr. Swift said his client had told investigators “everything she knew to the best of her ability.”

In the interview, Ms. Salman said she had a reason for talking publicly now: “I just want people to know that I am human. I am a mother.”

She first met Mr. Mateen in 2011 on an internet dating site called Arab Lounge. She was smitten almost immediately. While he was religious and she was not, it was not an issue. “I thought he was the whole package,” she recalled.

She also thought she was getting a second shot at happiness.

Ms. Salman grew up in Rodeo, Calif., one of four daughters of a small-business man. She was a poor student in high school, but managed to earn an associate degree in medical administration at a local college. Her dream was to fall in love, but the arranged marriage in 2006 with a man she met on a trip to her father’s hometown did not work out.

Mr. Mateen, the son of Afghan **immigrants**, had also been married before. He never told Ms. Salman that his first wife left him after he began beating her.

They were engaged shortly after meeting online and married soon afterward. Wedding photographs show a happy couple, eating cake and holding hands. In one photo, Mr. Mateen is dancing awkwardly. Another depicts them covered with a shawl and looking into a mirror as a married couple for the first time, an Afghan tradition.

After they married, the couple moved to Fort Pierce and into a two-bedroom condominium that Mr. Mateen’s mother owned. Ms. Salman quickly became pregnant. Her husband worked nights as a security guard, and she cooked and did the laundry.

“He was a gentle spirit,” she said.

But Mr. Mateen’s behavior changed abruptly about six months into the marriage. Once, after the couple went shopping for baby clothes while when she was pregnant, Mr. Mateen flew into a rage and punched his wife’s shoulder hard enough that it bruised, she said. Afterward they drove to his parents’ house, and before they went inside, he warned her: “Wipe your eyes. This stays between us or it’s going to get worse.”

When he became angry, he would start biting his lips and clenching his fists. In public, he also had a code word he used if she was doing something he didn’t like. He would call her “shar.” That was short for sharmuta — slut or whore, in Arabic.

He would also pull her hair, something she has since learned he also did to his first wife. He choked her and threatened to kill her. He never said he was sorry. “He had no remorse,” she said.

But Ms. Salman said she was afraid to end the marriage. If she left, Mr. Mateen taunted her, he would get custody of their son. “You have no proof I hit you,” he said. “No job.”

Warning Signs

Warning signs of radicalization can seem obvious in hindsight. Ms. Salman knew her husband watched jihadist videos, but she did not think much of it because the F.B.I. seemed to have cleared him, she said.

Agents had investigated Mr. Mateen in 2013 after he told work colleagues he was a member of Hezbollah, had family ties to Al Qaeda and wanted to die as a martyr. Ten months later, the F.B.I. closed the case. That same year, they questioned him again in connection with another terrorism investigation. So when Mr. Mateen told his wife to mind her own business about the videos, she did.

“The F.B.I. let him go,” she said.

Jacquelyn Campbell, a nurse and professor at Johns Hopkins University who has received funding from the Justice Department for research on domestic violence, evaluated Ms. Salman’s case at the request of her lawyers. Ms. Salman, she said, was in extreme danger from her husband. “She would be totally oblivious to clues that he is getting radicalized or planning anything,” Ms. Campbell said.

Ms. Salman was too busy trying to survive.

Mia Bloom, a professor at Georgia State University who has studied the role of women and children in terrorist groups, is more skeptical. She said there had been instances in which terrorists such as Mr. Mateen had managed to keep quiet about their plans. But she pointed to a recent study[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/doi/10.1111/1556-4029.12312/abstract] of 119 lone-actor terrorists in Europe and the United States. Researchers found that in about 64 percent of the cases, family members and friends had been aware of the individual’s intent to commit terrorism.

“It’s possible she didn’t know because he was not confiding in her, but she does have every incentive in the world to retell this story as a different kind of victim,” Ms. Bloom said. “I am not trying to minimize the experience she had in a domestic abusive relationship, but it doesn’t give her a free pass as a bystander to not come forward.”

Suspicions about what Ms. Salman might have known focus on several trips she took with her husband.

In April 2015, Mr. Mateen took his wife and son to Disney World. Law enforcement officials suspect that Mr. Mateen went there to see if it would be a good target and hinted at his intentions to conduct an attack. Ms. Salman’s lawyer would not let her discuss what Mr. Mateen said at the amusement park.

Ms. Salman also went with her husband to buy ammunition at Walmart. She did not think this was suspicious, she said. Her husband was a security guard and regularly visited the shooting range. Ammunition was cheaper at Walmart than at the range, she said.

Similarly, when she and her son accompanied him to Orlando in the months before the shooting, she said she had no idea he was checking out Pulse, the nightclub he eventually attacked. He told her, “Let’s go to Orlando for a drive,” she recalled.

The F.B.I. is still sorting out these accounts.

The Last Night

In the last weeks of Mr. Mateen’s life, Ms. Salman said, her husband started being kind again. She believed she was being rewarded for her silence.

On the day of the attack, Mr. Mateen came home from work around 3 p.m. He told Ms. Salman about the trip to California to visit her mother for the first time in years. He gave her $500 for the trip, and drove her and their son to McDonald’s. They stopped at a bank, where Mr. Mateen withdrew another $500 for his wife. Then he left.

At home that night, Ms. Salman filled out a Father’s Day Card she had bought for her husband[https://static01.nyt.com/us/2016/crop\_1261965496823868140.jpg] and went to bed. At about 4 a.m., Mr. Mateen’s mother called, worried and looking for him. Ms. Salman tried calling him on his cellphone but got no answer.

Finally he sent her a text message: Did you see what happened? She texted back that she had not.

“I love you babe,” he responded, the last she heard from him.

Later that morning, she learned from the F.B.I. that her husband had died in a shootout after carrying out a mass murder. Months later, recalling that day, she began to cry.

“How can someone be capable of that?” she said.

Follow Adam Goldman on Twitter @adamgoldmanNYT [https://twitter.com/adamgoldmanNYT] .

Kitty Bennett contributed research.

\* ‘Always Agitated. Always Mad’: Omar Mateen, According to Those Who Knew Him[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/19/us/omar-mateen-gunman-orlando-shooting.html]

\* Was the Orlando Gunman Gay? The Answer Continues to Elude the F.B.I.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/26/us/was-the-orlando-gunman-gay-the-answer-continues-to-elude-the-fbi.html]

\* Was Orlando Shooter Really Acting for ISIS? For ISIS, It’s All the Same[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/13/us/orlando-omar-mateen-isis.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Call it the crisis of whiteness.

White anxiety has fueled this year’s political tumult in the West: Britain’s surprising vote to exit the European Union, Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per]’s unexpected capture of the Republican presidential nomination in the United States, the rise of right-wing nationalism in Norway, Hungary, Austria and Greece.

Whiteness, in this context, is more than just skin color. You could define it as membership in the “ethno-national majority,” but that’s a mouthful. What it really means is the privilege of not being defined as “other.”

Whiteness means being part of the group whose appearance, traditions, religion and even food are the default norm. It’s being a person who, by unspoken rules, was long entitled as part of “us” instead of “them.”

But national and racial identity were often conflated for the white majority. That identity felt to many white people like one of the most important pillars holding up their world — and now it seems under threat.

There are, of course, complicated contours to 2016’s unusual politics. In Britain, **immigrants** from South Asia voted heavily to leave the European Union, citing hopes that curtailing European migration might open space for more people from Asia. In the United States, frustration with and **alienation** from status quo politics have helped drive Mr. Trump’s rise.

There has also always been a certain fluidity to this concept of whiteness. Irish and Italian **immigrants** to the United States, and Jews in Britain, were once seen as separate from the white national majority, and are now generally considered part of it, benefiting from racial privilege. At the same time, Jews’ white skin did not protect them from being cast as outsiders by some of Mr. Trump’s supporters who have circulated anti-Semitic memes on social media.

Still, experts see a crisis of white identity underlying much of the West’s current turmoil.

“It’s fundamentally about ‘who are we?’” said Eric Kaufmann, a professor of politics at Birkbeck College, University of London. “What does it mean to be part of this nation? Is it not ‘our’ nation anymore, ‘our’ meaning the ethnic majority?

“These kinds of questions are really front and center, even though they’re not necessarily verbalized.”

The questions can seem like a sudden reversal after decades of rising multiculturalism, through the civil rights movement in the United States and the European Union’s opening up of borders.

In fact, academic research suggests that other economic and social transformations unfolding at the same time have led many people to anchor themselves more fully in their whiteness — even as whiteness itself has lost currency.

“When I look at the data, I keep coming back to this issue that it’s really about identity politics,” said Elisabeth Ivarsflaten, a professor at Norway’s University of Bergen who studies Europe’s far-right parties. “This is the most powerful predictor of support for the populists.”

Gains and losses in a changing world

Identity, as academics define it, falls into two broad categories: “achieved” identity derived from personal effort, and “ascribed” identity based on innate characteristics.

Everyone has both, but people tend to be most attached to their “best” identity — the one that offers the most social status or privileges. Successful professionals, for example, often define their identities primarily through their careers.

For generations, working-class whites were doubly blessed: they enjoyed privileged status based on race, as well as the fruits of broad economic growth.

White people’s officially privileged status waned over the latter half of the 20th century with the demise of discriminatory practices in, say, university admissions. But rising wages, an expanding social safety net and new educational opportunities helped offset that. Most white adults were wealthier and more successful than their parents, and confident that their children would do better still.

That feeling of success may have provided a sort of identity in itself.

But as Western manufacturing and industry have declined, taking many working-class towns with them, parents and grandparents have found that the opportunities they once had are unavailable to the next generation.

That creates an identity vacuum to be filled.

“For someone who is lower income or lower class,” Professor Kaufmann explained, “you’re going to get more self-esteem out of a communal identity such as ethnicity or the nation than you would out of any sort of achieved identity.”

Focusing on lost identities rather than lost livelihoods helps answer one of the most puzzling questions about the link between economic stress and the rise of nationalist politics: why it is flowing from the middle and working classes, and not the very poor.

While globalization and free trade have widened economic inequality and deeply wounded many working-class communities, data suggests that this year’s political turmoil is not merely a backlash to that real pain.

In Britain’s referendum on membership in the European Union, low education was a much stronger predictor of people voting “leave” than low income, according to an analysis by Zsolt Darvas[http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/2016/08/31/brexit-should-be-a-wake-up-call-in-the-fight-against-inequality/], a senior fellow at the Bruegel research group.

A recent Gallup study[http://poseidon01.ssrn.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/delivery.php?ID=738087006122102118085101086071118099028084089093023056077007094000084014118020011108061062023062037126053099111100111113094110015017074002012105123127093027003088116053086035068004002077102028114070119126068099065089111076068001107127000097126116117115&EXT=pdf] found that Mr. Trump’s supporters tend to earn above-average incomes for their communities, but also tend to live in majority-white areas where children are likely to be worse off than their parents.

Arlie Russell Hochschild, the author of “Strangers in [https://www.amazon.com/dp/B01EEQ9BSW/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?\_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1] Their Own [https://www.amazon.com/dp/B01EEQ9BSW/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?\_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1] Land: Anger and Mourning on the American Right[https://www.amazon.com/dp/B01EEQ9BSW/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?\_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1],” describes a feeling of lost opportunity as the “deep story” of the rural Louisiana communities she spent four years studying.

Her subjects felt like they were waiting in a long line to reach the top of a hill where the American dream was waiting for them. But the line’s uphill progress had slowed, even stopped. And **immigrants**, black people and other “outsiders” seemed to be cutting the line.

For many Western whites, opportunities for achieved identity — the top of the hill — seem unattainable. So their ascribed identity — their whiteness — feels more important than ever.

Whiteness is becoming less valuable

Michael Ignatieff, a historian and former Liberal Party leader in Canada, said that in much of the West, “what defined the political community” for many years “was the unstated premise that it was white.”

The formal rejection of racial discrimination in those societies has, by extension, constructed a new, broader national identity. The United States has a black president; London has a Muslim mayor of Pakistani descent.

But that broadening can, to some, feel like a painful loss, articulated in the demand voiced over and over at Trump rallies, pro-Brexit events, and gatherings for populist parties throughout Europe: “I want my country back.”

The mantra is not all about bigotry. Rather, being part of a culture designed around people’s own community and customs is a constant background hum of reassurance, of belonging.

The loss of that comforting hum has accelerated a phenomenon that Robin DiAngelo, a lecturer and author, calls “white fragility” — the stress white people feel when they confront the knowledge that they are neither special nor the default; that whiteness is just a race like any other.

Fragility leads to feelings of insecurity, defensiveness, even threat. And it can trigger a backlash against those who are perceived as outsiders.

Even some conservative analysts who support a multiethnic “melting pot” national identity, such as the editor of National Review, Reihan Salam[http://www.nationalreview.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/439257/immigration-nationalism-multiculturalism-american-politics], worry that unassimilated **immigrants** could threaten core national values and cultural cohesion.

The effect of rapid change

Social scientists, after crunching data from both sides of the Atlantic, have discovered something surprising: it’s not the amount of racial or ethnic diversity in a community that predicts white resentment and support of anti-**immigrant** policies, but the pace of change.

Denmark, for instance, is 88 percent white Danish today — hardly a majority in jeopardy. But a generation ago, in 1980, it was 97 percent white. The anti-**immigrant** Danish People’s Party is now the second-largest party in the Danish Parliament. In Germany, where the foreign-born population shot up by approximately 75 percent between 2011 and 2015, the anti-**immigrant**, populist Alternative For Germany party is now drawing record support.

Britain saw a 66 percent increase in its foreign-born population between 2004 and 2014. Voters who chose “leave” in the recent referendum overwhelmingly cited **immigration** as their main concern.

Professor Kaufmann and a colleague, Gareth Harris, found[http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Changing\_places\_-\_web.pdf] that white Britons who lived in areas that are rapidly diversifying became more likely to vote for the right-wing British National Party. Daniel Hopkins, a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, found a similar pattern[http://www.uh.edu/honors/undergraduate-research/scholarships/houston-scholars/programming/reading-materials/fall-2015-immigration/3B\_Politicized%20Places%20Full%20Text.pdf] of ethnic change leading to anti-**immigrant** politics in the United States.

**Immigrant** populations in Arkansas, North Carolina and Tennessee have more than tripled since 1990, noted Lee Drutman, a senior fellow at the New America Foundation, in an analysis for Vox[http://www.vox.com/polyarchy/2016/8/30/12697920/race-dividing-american-politics]. Anxiety over those changes may explain why the Republican Party became so much more focused on limiting **immigration** over that period — and why white voters in those states overwhelmingly support Mr. Trump.

The whiteness taboo

For decades, the language of white identity has only existed in the context of white supremacy. When that became taboo, it left white identity politics without a vocabulary.

If you are a working-class white person and you fear that the new, cosmopolitan world will destroy or diminish an identity you cherish, you have no culturally acceptable way to articulate what you perceive as a crisis.

Some of these people have instead reached for issues that feel close to their concerns: trade, crime, the war on drugs, controlling the borders, fear of Islamist terrorism. All are significant in their own right, and create very real fears for many people, but they have also become a means to have a public conversation about what society’s changes mean for white majorities.

Professor Ivarsflaten cited the U.K. Independence Party, whose official platform focused on Brexit but whose pitch to voters emphasized **immigrants**’ effects on the economy and culture, as an example of an effective hybrid populist pitch.

The approach has in some cases moved from the political fringes into the mainstream. Some leaders from Britain’s center-right, governing Conservative Party, for example, helped push a British exit, and since the referendum the new Conservative prime minister, Theresa May, has signaled sympathy with white identity politics.

Mrs. May’s government proposed a rule that would publicly shame employers who hired foreign workers. And her first major speech was full of barbs directed against multiculturalism, including a jab against people who claimed to be “citizens of the world,” whom she called “citizens of nowhere.”

But the struggle for white identity is not just a political problem; it is about the “deep story” of feeling stuck while others move forward.

There will not likely be a return to the whiteness of social dominance and exclusive national identity. **Immigration** cannot be halted without damaging Western nations’ economies; **immigrants** who have already arrived cannot be expelled en masse without causing social and moral damage. And the other groups who seem to be “cutting in line” are in fact getting a chance at progress that was long denied them.

Western whites have a place within their nations’ new, broader national identities. But unless they accept it, the crisis of whiteness seems likely to continue.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GLENDALE, Ariz. — When Ofelia Cañez’s relatives see her coming, they do almost anything they can to avoid her and her incessant reminders to vote. They dart out of the room. They pretend to be busy. “They close the door,” Ms. Cañez, a 65-year-old Arizona Democratic Party field organizer, said here recently, wearing a satisfied smile and a Hillary Clinton button the size of a tea saucer.

Grandmothers like Ms. Cañez — abuelas, as they are known in Spanish — are at the front lines of the Democratic Party’s effort to overcome a stubborn paradox: Hispanics have been voting in record numbers but have also stayed home in record numbers, as their voter participation continues to lag behind their population growth.

And one way to help drive more of them to the polls, Democrats believe, is by courting the “abuela vote,” and leveraging the unique influence and respect that older women command in Hispanic communities.

Armies of abuelas are out by the hundreds in states like Arizona, Nevada and Colorado, an initiative rooted in experience and research showing that the best mobilizers are often not popular politicians or celebrities, but the people a target audience knows very well.

“We’ve been studying and trying to understand who the most effective influencers are to turn out the vote,” said Lorella Praeli, director of the Clinton campaign’s Latino outreach program. The answer, she said, was staring them in the face: “You don’t question what Grandmother has to say.”

Abuelas may not quite be a new kind of political boss, but with expansive and interconnected social and family networks, the ones working on Mrs. Clinton’s behalf are persuasive messengers. They are matriarchs of families that often have multiple generations living under one roof. Outside, many are leaders of church groups or organizers of social and civic gatherings of women.

That Mrs. Clinton could become the first female president, several said in interviews, makes their activism feel especially urgent.

Ms. Cañez’s son and daughter are both conservative, she said, but she has forced Clinton campaign literature on them and wears her Hillary buttons whenever she sees them. “I’m here every day and will be here every day,” she said during an afternoon shift at a state Democratic Party office in Glendale, a Phoenix suburb. “This is a very personal campaign for me. For all of us.”

Here in Arizona — a state with a large Hispanic population that is already voting — the Clinton campaign and the state Democratic Party have used abuelas, and more conventional tactics, to turn a deep-red state into one where Mrs. Clinton has pulled close to Donald J. Trump in polls.

Close to half of the Arizonans expected to vote have already cast ballots; registered Democrats in early voting are within a few percentage points of Republicans, who have carried the state in all but one presidential election since 1952. Women have constituted 54 percent of all early voters. Mrs. Clinton will make her first campaign appearance in the state, on Wednesday in Tempe.

Nationally, the Democratic abuela outreach is a more formal, centralized version of what has happened on the local level for some time.

In Nevada, Natalie Montelongo and Vanessa Valdivia, two young volunteers, recognized the power that Hispanic mothers and grandmothers wielded in driving turnout last year when they were organizing Democrats for the presidential caucuses.

After watching how women came into their office asking to register their children, grandchildren, nieces and nephews, the two developed an approach that combined grass-roots politics with Mary Kay-style marketing: Each Hispanic woman who signed up pledged to recruit five friends, who would each recruit five more.

Ms. Montelongo and Ms. Valdivia were so successful that the Clinton campaign hired them both. And they are now working in Colorado, trying to replicate their efforts in the heavily Hispanic neighborhoods in and around Denver.

“This opens a door that wasn’t open to us before,” Ms. Montelongo said. It does not hurt, she added, that the abuelas are seldom wallflowers.

“They’re not afraid to be direct,” she said. “They have the harder conversations that we can’t always have with people who we want to be supporters.”

She offered a bit of advice gleaned from personal experience: “Don’t mess with them.”

Turnout among Latinas, and among minority women more broadly, is one of the more overlooked aspects of a presidential campaign that has so focused on swaying white, college-educated women. But minority women were a critical factor in President Obama’s 2012 re-election. Black women turned out at a rate of 70 percent — higher than any other group. Latina turnout was 50 percent, exceeding Hispanic male turnout by four percentage points.

Three-quarters of women newly eligible to vote since 2000 have been minorities, according to an analysis of census data[https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/WOCvoters3.pdf] published by the Center for American Progress, and Latinas made up the biggest chunk. There are now at least 5.9 million more of them who can vote than there were when George W. Bush was first elected — an 83 percent increase. At the same time, population growth among white women has plateaued.

The trend is especially pronounced in Arizona, where the Latina voting-age population has grown by almost 70 percent since 2000. In a sign of their nascent political power and high level of engagement, Latinas here have made up a larger share of the electorate in midterm elections, when far fewer people vote on the whole, than they have in presidential years, the Center for American Progress said.

“There’s a saying that I never forget,” said Barbara Valencia, 64, a retired college administrator who lives in Tempe. “You educate a man, you educate a person. You educate a woman, you educate a family.” Ms. Valencia, like Ms. Cañez, is part of a group of Hispanic women in their 50s, 60s and 70s who are working with the state Democratic Party to bolster turnout in their communities.

It has not been easy, for a variety of reasons. Indifference about voting can be pervasive and hard to crack, these women said. In families that are first-generation American, which can sometimes include undocumented **immigrants**, there is often a sense of unease about interacting with the government. And the 27.3 million Hispanics of voting age are, by and large, younger than their black, white and Asian-American counterparts. Some 44 percent of Hispanics eligible to vote this year are millennials, according to projections from the Pew Research Center[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/01/19/millennials-make-up-almost-half-of-latino-eligible-voters-in-2016/].

In fact, much of the growth in the Hispanic voting-eligible population is coming from people who are turning 18, making the pool of available voters not just unreliable but also often unregistered.

Mary Rose Wilcox, 66, who in 1982 became the first Latina elected to the Phoenix City Council, says she fights apathy every day.

She recalled how, early in Donald J. Trump’s campaign, she grew so offended by his remarks about Mexican **immigrants** that she emailed her five sisters and told them they could not sit this election out. “I told them, ‘It’s time, ladies,’” she said. “We’ve got to make sure all our kids are registered, all their friends are registered, and we’ve got to get them out.”

But the Trump fear factor actually might not be as potent as Democrats hoped. In a survey published in September, Univision asked voters[http://www.univision.com/univision-news/politics/poll-september] in Arizona, Colorado, Florida and Nevada whether they believed Mr. Trump would deport all undocumented **immigrants**. Only about a third of voters replied that they did.

Which leaves it to abuelas like Ms. Wilcox to use their powers of persuasion.

Those powers are especially important in bridging the generational divide in families that are not new to the country, because second- and third-generation children are often far removed from the struggles of their **immigrant** elders.

“You have to bring them back down to reality,” Ms. Wilcox said of her grandchildren, some of whom work for her in the small chain of Mexican restaurants she owns with her husband.

“I said, ‘If you don’t vote for Hillary, you’re out,’” she said, laughing.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* ‘He Used Us as Props’: Conservative Hispanics Deplore Donald Trump’s Speech[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/gop-hispanic-reaction-trump.html]

\* Hillary Clinton Is Getting Surprisingly Little Extra Lift From Blacks and Hispanics[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/upshot/hispanic-and-black-support-for-hillary-clinton-is-overrated.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MELBOURNE, Australia — If you were designing a nation from scratch, it would look something like Australia[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/australia/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]. A Eurasian people, boring politicians, and an economy that virtually runs itself.

Australia, uniquely, has avoided every major shock of modern globalization. Its economy mostly kept growing through the Asian financial crisis in the late-1990s, the tech crash at the turn of the millennium and the global financial crisis of 2008.

While other wealthy nations struggle to define their purpose, Australia has unlocked the secret to its next wave of prosperity. The key is the very thing that intimidates the United States, Britain and most of Europe: large-scale **immigration**.

Led by students from India and young professionals from China, new arrivals have managed to extend Australia’s winning streak for longer than any policy maker imagined.

It has been 25 years since the last recession in Australia. This growth period can be divided into three distinct phases.

The first phase, from 1991 to the end of the decade, was hard-earned. It was driven by the surge in productivity from the economic reforms of the 1980s and early 1990s but left many people behind. The second phase, from 2003 to 2008, didn’t require as much effort. China set off the greatest mining boom in modern Australian history, and income flowed freely. But this proved to be a short phase in the long-growth period. It ended with the financial crisis.

Before the market-based reforms of the mid-1980s, Australia was one of the most regulated economies in the world, and the inflexibility of the system made it vulnerable to global setbacks. A collapse in Australian export prices would herald a deep recession.

History didn’t repeat itself at the end of this mining boom because the open economy was able to quickly tap a new source of growth through **immigration**. The reforms — initiated by the Labor governments of former prime ministers Bob Hawke and Paul Keating — gave up political control of the Australian dollar, interest rates and wages and removed the tariff wall. They were balanced with universal health care and a high minimum wage.

Subsequent conservative and Labor governments then adapted the program to **immigration** policy — and this explains the third phase of Australia’s remarkable 25-year run of growth. Since 2001, governments have largely let the market decide whom to bring into the country.

They did this by declaring a preference for skilled **immigration** over family reunion when granting permanent settlement. Twenty years ago, only 30 percent of **immigrants** were skilled. Today they account for 70 percent of a much larger number. A second group of **immigrants** was recruited through temporary visas: students, holiday makers and workers on short-term contracts. Australia now has about 750,000 people on temporary work visas, according to my research, accounting for 7 percent of the nation’s work force.

Both doors, for permanent and temporary **immigrants**, remained open throughout the financial crisis. Around half of the 190,000 permanent settlers in Australia each year are from the existing pool of temporary-visa holders.

The economist Bob Gregory calculates that almost all of the additional full-time jobs created since 2008 have gone to overseas-born workers. Many of those **immigrants** are in the professional work force, including accountants, architects, computer programmers, doctors and scientific researchers.

The surge in **immigration** has allowed Australia to continue to climb the income ladder when most other rich nations have been losing ground. In 2001, Australia was the 15th largest economy in the world. Today it is 13th.

In doubling the number of **immigrants** it receives each year, the country has transformed its ethnic face, from predominantly white to Eurasian. Fifteen years ago, migrants accounted for 23 percent of the total population, with Europeans the dominant group at 6 percent. Today, the overseas-born are 28 percent of the total population, with those from Asia accounting for more than 10 percent. No other nation looks like Australia today.

Beneath this national snapshot is another remarkable story. One of the fastest growing groups in Australia is Americans.

The United States rarely loses more people to another country than it receives. It is a destination for migrants, not a source. But over the past 15 years, the American population in Australia has almost doubled, from just over 50,000 to more than 100,000, while the Australian population in the United States increased by around 15,000 to 95,000.

The Americans are coming to Australia for much the same reasons as the Chinese, Indians and Europeans: well-paid jobs and a high quality of life. And they are being recruited in the same way: They start with a short-term posting and then decide to become Australians.

Mainstream politicians have played their part by resisting whatever temptation there might have been to demonize the new arrivals for electoral gain. There has been little public backlash against **immigrants**. Donald J. Trump and Theresa May, the British prime minister, should take note.

The catch has been that national and state governments were too slow to expand the infrastructure to cater to the growing population. The political system had grown complacent during the windfall years of the mining boom. Budget surpluses were returned to voters as handouts, instead of reinvested in transportation, schools and hospitals. When the mining boom ended, the federal budget[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/federal\_budget\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] tumbled into deficit. Now, the cost of correcting those earlier errors is much higher than it should have been. The property market is also inflated, and it may yet bring down the entire economy.

Nevertheless, these are problems of growth that most rich nations would kill for.

Australia’s **immigration** policy has one major flaw: its treatment of asylum seekers, who are either turned back at sea or intercepted and transported to an offshore detention center. The policy has been ruthlessly effective at stopping the boats, but it is also undeniably cruel.

The country’s political leaders believe a tough refugee policy is a precondition for an open **immigration** policy. They could not have doubled the **immigration**flow without securing the border, they claim. While the message may resonate locally, it compromises Australia’s ability to act as a role model for openness.

That’s unfortunate because we have a valuable lesson to share with the world: **Immigration** fosters resilience.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

George Megalogenis is an author and commentator. His latest book is “Australia’s Second Chance.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Adam Crapser was adopted from South Korea nearly four decades ago, but today he languishes in an **immigration** detention center in Washington State awaiting deportation because his American parents never filed citizenship paperwork for him.

Mr. Crapser, 41, built a life in Oregon, got married and raised children but will soon be forced to leave the country in which he has lived since he was 3 for South Korea, where he plans to eventually reunite with his biological mother in a small town three hours outside of Seoul, the capital. His family will remain in the United States temporarily, and they hope to reunite in South Korea.

“At this point I’m ready to just go back and try to make my life over there,” Mr. Crapser said on Monday night in a telephone interview from Tacoma Northwest Detention Center. “There’s been some good things that came out of all this, surprisingly.”

Mr. Crapser’s sanguine attitude toward the wrenching dislocation that looms ahead is thanks in part to the media attention his case has attracted in both the United States and South Korea, he said. A South Korean documentary on his plight and the lives of other Korean adoptees led to his birth mother coming forward.

“I do have a Korean family back in Korea,” Mr. Crapser said. “They’ve been informed that I am returning. It’s good, and it’s bad. It’s kind of bittersweet.”

That promising development is far from a universal experience, however. His lawyer, Lori Walls, said on Monday that Mr. Crapser’s case illustrates how easy it is for permanent residents to be placed in deportation proceedings, even when they entered the country lawfully as adoptees but were not naturalized by their adoptive parents.

According to the Adoptee Rights Campaign[http://adopteerightscampaign.org/our-mission/], an advocacy group, there are about 35,000 people in the United States who were adopted by American couples as children but who do not have citizenship.

Mr. Crapser had been living legally in the United States under IR-4 documents given to adopted children, Ms. Walls said. In 2001, the Child Citizenship Act[https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/files/pressrelease/ChildCitizenshipAct\_120100.pdf] automatically made IR-4 holders citizens, but the law was not retroactive — it did not benefit adoptees who were already legal adults. “Adam was over 18 and so missed the cutoff date,” Ms. Walls said.

Mr. Crapser said he first spoke to his family in Korea during a series of FaceTime conversations last winter. He communicated with his birth mother through an interpreter because he does not speak Korean. (He said he planned to bring a tourist phrase book with him when he is deported “so I can read signs and stuff.”)

His American family plans to join him in Korea next year after his wife, a Vietnamese **immigrant**, becomes a United States citizen. His stepfather in Korea owns a construction company where he hopes to work so he and his family can start a new life, he said.

“That’s hopefully the plan, but it’s not written in stone yet,” he said. “We’re hoping that will end up working out.”

Mr. Crapser’s positive attitude belies the Kafkaesque nature of his life in the United States. The decision to deport him was just the latest trying experience in a span that has been, by any measure, exceptionally difficult.

Mr. Crapser was adopted along with his sister by an American family that physically abused both children, he told The New York Times Magazine for an article that was published[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/01/magazine/adam-crapsers-bizarre-deportation-odyssey.html] in April 2015.

After six years, that family put both children up for adoption again. They were separated, and Mr. Crapser was adopted by new parents, Thomas and Dolly Crapser, who also abused him. They had several other foster and adopted children whom they also treated brutally. In 1992, they were both convicted of criminal mistreatment and assault, and Thomas Crapser was convicted of sexual abuse.

Adam Crapser was kicked out of the Crapser home at 16 and later broke back in to retrieve his personal belongings. He pleaded guilty to burglary and served 25 months in prison.

More brushes with the law followed. After his release, he was convicted of unlawful possession of a firearm. A couple of misdemeanors followed, and he was later convicted of assault after a fight, The Times magazine reported.

“Because of the chaotic nature of his upbringing, he was not able to document his status,” Lori Walls, his lawyer, said.

Mr. Crapser said he did not realize there was a difference between being a permanent resident and a citizen until he was reunited with his sister, a naturalized citizen, in 2012.

Deportation proceedings began that year, shortly after he applied for residency documents and the authorities learned about his criminal record. The final decision was made on Oct. 24 at an **immigration** court in Tacoma, Ms. Walls said. Mr. Crapser said Monday that he expected to be deported within the next 30 days.

Mr. Crapser had never held down a steady job for more than 90 days because he could never prove his legal status, he said, something he always chalked up to a chaotic childhood. “I pretty much had to work under the table for most of my life,” he said.

He hoped his fortunes might finally turn around in South Korea.

“I guess in a sense the good thing is that I am a citizen of Korea so when I go back I will already be a citizen of some country,” he said. “I guess that’s where I belong.”

\* Adam Crapser’s Bizarre Deportation Odyssey[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/01/magazine/adam-crapsers-bizarre-deportation-odyssey.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CITY OF DREAMS

The 400-Year Epic History of **Immigrant** New York

By Tyler Anbinder

Illustrated. 738 pp. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. $35.

In publishing as in politics, timing is everything. Tyler Anbinder’s sweeping “City of Dreams: The 400-Year Epic History of **Immigrant** New York” scores big on both counts. A richly textured guide to the history of our **immigrant** nation’s pinnacle **immigrant** city has managed to enter the stage during an election season that has resurrected this historically fraught topic in all its fierceness.

With the exception of a thinly argued final chapter, the writer, a professor of history at George Washington University and the author of two previous books on early American history, rightly avoids drawing explicit lessons for today’s controversies from the past, though readers can find plenty. Support for the ideals of diversity and tolerance on the one hand and fears of tribalism and social fragmentation on the other collide on almost every page, beginning in the chaotic, polyglot trading outpost that was New Amsterdam. At the southern tip of Manhattan, Dutch fur traders, English merchants’ sons, random fortune seekers from Spain or Norway, Welsh tavern keepers, Gaelic blacksmiths, religious dissidents and a smattering of Jews and freed slaves somehow managed to conduct business even while speaking 18 different languages.

Over the next two centuries the arrival of starving, war-ravaged, oppressed or just plain restless huddled masses, almost all of them from Europe, pushed the settlement north, turning New York into the largest and most diverse city in the United States. By 1860, an extraordinary 69 percent of voting-age New Yorkers were foreign-born. Only Vienna and Berlin had more German inhabitants, and they were still considerably outnumbered by the Irish. Fifty years later the flood of foreigners, who began disembarking at the iconic Ellis Island in 1892, showed no signs of receding. As many as a million migrants, an increasing number of them Italians and Russian Jews, arrived annually in the years leading up to World War I. After Congress passed restrictive laws in the 1920s, the city experienced its first and only sustained **immigration** drought. But in 1965, with the passage of the Hart-Celler Act, Gotham began to return to its original **immigrant**-rich identity. Today more than a third of the population is foreign-born. “To me this city appeared as a tremendous overstuffed roar, where people just burst with a desire to live,” a Russian **immigrant**, Morris Shapiro, recalled about his arrival in the 1920s. His description might well strike today’s migrants, now largely from Latin America, the Caribbean and Asia, as apt.

Anbinder devotes at least one chapter to each of the major **immigrant** groups — Irish, Germans, Russian Jews and Italians — vividly detailing the political turmoil, famines and pogroms that led them to leave their homes and families, the horrific steerage voyages across a turbulent Atlantic Ocean and their lives in New York. Despite the Babel of cultures, newcomers adapted to New York in similar ways, by first creating their own isolated ethnic islands. Early Irish arrivals moved into the wooden tenements in the notorious, gang-infested Five Points. The area we now know as the Lower East Side was Kleindeutschland, a German enclave further subdivided as South Germans, Hessians, Prussians and Bavarians laid claim to separate neighborhoods. Likewise in Little Italy, Sicilians clustered near Elizabeth Street while Neapolitans and Calabrians kept company along Mulberry Street.

The social benefits of the **immigrant** enclave were immense, especially at a time when governments didn’t provide much in the way of garbage collection — roving pigs were about the best slum dwellers could expect until later in the 19th century — much less social services. In their transplanted villages, newly arrived Irish found jobs on the docks or as servants with the help of a cousin’s brother-in-law on the next block. Lower East Side Jews could track down tailoring jobs on a tip from a neighbor. Ethnic groups sorted themselves into distinct occupations, as they still do: Italians became barbers, shoemakers, longshoremen and newsboys; Germans ruled the brewery, peddling and saloon businesses.

Some of the enclaves became reeking, overcrowded slums that would catalyze progressive reformers like Jacob Riis, the author of the classic “How the Other Half Lives.” But they also hummed with Tocquevillian energy. **Immigrant** civic groups sprang up to meet every sort of need from the medical to the recreational to the spiritual. Neighborhood churches, some of them built and sustained by successful fellow **immigrants** with a stake in edifying their greenhorn countrymen, were crucial, especially to the poorest migrants. As early as 1756, Scottish **immigrants** founded the still extant St. Andrews Society under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church. Churches also started schools and hospitals; by the early 20th century, New York had eight Catholic hospitals alongside an assortment of Lutheran, Methodist, Jewish and Baptist institutions. The Germans were avid participants in gymnastic societies. Every ethnic group had its own home-language newspaper.

Hostility from the native-born majority undoubtedly intensified ethnic separatism. “Hordes of wild Irishmen” were especially reviled: “Any country or color . . . except Irish,” read one 1853 Herald help wanted ad. But Jews and Italians were hardly spared: Rental ads might warn, “No Jews and no dogs.” In the eyes of many New Yorkers, the **immigrants**’ “low moral tendency” — the words are Theodore Roosevelt’s — made them seem hopeless as future citizens. As the numbers of foreigners grew, officials passed harsh restrictions, starting with Peter Stuyvesant’s limits on the rights of Lutherans, Quakers and Jews, continuing with the **Alien** and Sedition Act of the late 18th century and the Naturalization Act (which expanded from five to 14 the years before an **immigrant** could become a citizen) and then in the 19th century a variety of statutes barring convicts, “idiots,” paupers, polygamists, epileptics, anarchists, prostitutes and other outcasts. Finally, in 1924 the National Origins Act, “one of the most momentous laws enacted in all of American history,” imposed strict quotas and turned Ellis Island into a historical curiosity.

It’s tempting to chalk up this anti-**immigrant** record to simple bigotry, but “City of Dreams” casts doubt on that conclusion. The Know Nothing party accused German states of programmatically shipping their poorest and least desirable citizens to the United States; according to Anbinder, they turned out to be right. Decades later, New Yorkers worried that newcomers would become a “public charge” for a reason. Their city was ill-equipped to help the many desperately poor and ill; housing was scarce and shoddy, creating disease-ridden slums more crowded than modern Mumbai. And accusations of divided loyalties and subversion were not necessarily paranoid fantasies. As World War I broke out, German **immigrants** were discovered preparing to return to fight for their home country. It was most likely Italian **immigrant** anarchists who killed 38 in a Wall Street bombing in 1920. And during World War II, Anbinder writes, “New York was crawling with **immigrant** spies.”

These stories raise the question: How did New York turn so many of its **immigrants** into able American citizens? The enclaves were a life preserver for recent arrivals, but also isolated them in their Old World customs and their poverty. Women and children in particular didn’t venture beyond their immediate blocks. “I did not see any reason for learning English,” one **immigrant** woman recalled. “Everywhere I lived, or worked, or fooled around there were only Italians.” The text of “City of Dreams” clocks in at nearly 600 pages, yet it gives little insight into how newcomers like these assimilated, and how their children and grandchildren were educated into the growing middle class, as they so often were.

To delve into that question, an especially crucial one today as **immigrants** struggle to make their way in an “hourglass” postindustrial economy, readers of this admirable history will have to look elsewhere.

Kay Hymowitz is the William E. Simon fellow at the Manhattan Institute and author of “The New Brooklyn,” due out in January.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SYDNEY, Australia — Australia [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/australia/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s prime minister, Malcolm Turnbull , faced increasing criticism on Monday over a law he proposed that would stop asylum seekers who try to arrive by boat from ever setting foot in Australia.

The legislation, which he said would be presented to Parliament when it resumes its session next week, would block migrants and refugees who have been sent to Australia’s offshore processing centers on Manus Island [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/18/world/australia/manus-detention-center-papua-new-guinea.html] and Nauru [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/11/world/australia/nauru-asylum-seeker-refugee-abuse.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FAustralia&action=click&contentCollection=world®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=search&contentPlacement=2&pgtype=collection]. The lifetime ban would apply to adults who attempt to come to Australia by boat, regardless of where they settle and are eventually granted citizenship.

“It is a critically important strong message to send to people smugglers,” Mr. Turnbull said at a news conference in Sydney on Sunday. “They must know that the door to Australia is closed to those who seek to come here by boat with a people smuggler. It is closed.”

A draft of the proposed legislation has not yet been released, and it must pass the Senate, where the government lacks a majority, before it can become law. But it has already drawn strong criticism from refugee advocates and some opposition lawmakers.

“Refugees go on to be world leaders, chief executives of major companies, doctors, scientists, lawyers,” said Madeline Gleeson, a lawyer at the Kaldor Center for International Refugee Law at the University of New South Wales . “Those people can never come here. Not as a tourist, not to attend a medical conference.”

The government needs the support of the opposition Labor Party or independent lawmakers in the Senate to pass the legislation. The government holds a one-seat majority in the House of Representatives. Independent lawmakers, including Senator Pauline Hanson [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/world/australia/pauline-hanson-muslims-senate.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FAustralia&action=click&contentCollection=world®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=search&contentPlacement=3&pgtype=collection], leader of the right-wing One Nation party, gained greater support from voters in a national election in July. Ms. Hanson has welcomed the proposed changes to the Migration Act.

But the leader of the left-leaning Australian Greens, Senator Richard Di Natale, described the proposed law as “barbaric.” He said a number of refugees on Manus Island and Nauru already had family members in Australia whom they would never see again if the legislation were passed. He accused the government of pandering to a hard right-wing agenda and said he would call on independent lawmakers to block the proposal.

“They will be prevented from seeing their parents and from seeing brothers and sisters under this policy,” Mr. Di Natale said. “It is barbaric. It’s cruel. It’s shameful. It’s cynical politics.”

The leader of the opposition Labor Party, Bill Shorten, did not immediately rule out supporting the legislation but said in a statement that his party would need to examine it after it was released. “It seems ridiculous to me that a genuine refugee who settles in the U.S. or Canada and becomes a U.S. or Canadian citizen is banned from visiting Australia as a tourist, businessman or businesswoman 40 years down track,” he said. One Labor lawmaker, Senator Lisa Singh, described the proposed changes as cruel.

Hugh de Kretser, a lawyer from the Human Rights Law Center in Melbourne, said the changes would mean a lifetime ban from visiting Australia for any migrant who had been sent to Manus Island or Nauru. He added that under the legislation, a refugee who was resettled in a third country could never come to Australia to visit family, or even as a tourist, despite gaining citizenship elsewhere.

The changes would affect all adults who arrived at the offshore processing centers after July 19, 2013. The date was selected because that was when former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd announced that “as of today, asylum seekers who come here by boat without a visa will never be settled in Australia,” Mr. Turnbull said on Sunday.

Peter Dutton , the **immigration** minister, said anyone who was under 18 when they were sent to either Manus or Nauru would be exempt from the law.

Mr. de Kretser said the legislation, if passed, would permanently separate families. He said one refugee’s wife and children arrived in Australia before July 2013 and were now applying for visas while living in the country. The husband, however, arrived later, after a change to Australia’s refugee policy, and was taken to Manus.

“He will never see his children,” Mr. de Kretser said.

Mr. Dutton said the government was working to find third countries that would accept those living on Manus Island and Nauru. Mr. de Krester said that around 1,200 men, women and children were being held in Nauru and 900 men on Manus Island. New Zealand had offered to take in refugees, but the Australian government declined that offer, believing that lenient migration laws between the countries would allow refugees to eventually resettle in Australia.

The Australian government has a harsh policy of turning boats laden with asylum seekers back at sea, towing them into international waters. Mr. Turnbull said that in 800 days, no asylum seeker had successfully arrived by boat, and there had been no deaths at sea.

Follow Michelle Innis on Twitter @MichelleInnis.

\* Australia’s Stranded Refugee Prisoners [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/opinion/australias-stranded-refugee-prisoners.html]

\* Australia Will Close Detention Center on Manus Island, but Still Won’t Accept Asylum Seekers [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/18/world/australia/manus-detention-center-papua-new-guinea.html]

\* Refugee Held on Nauru Dies After Self-Immolation to Protest Australian Policy [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/30/world/australia/nauru-refugee-dies.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The 2016 U.S. presidential campaign as experienced by four writers originally from somewhere else.

Don’t Kiss My Baby. Just Fix My Health Care.By ANU PARTANEN

The first thing I noticed about Americans when I moved to the United States eight years ago was the passion they bring to politics. People I’d meet would both worship and hate their politicians, as though they were celebrity athletes. At the same time, as the cliché goes, Americans want their representatives to be people they’d like to have a beer with. In Finland, where I come from, most voters like their representatives to be people they’d never want to have a beer with, mainly because of the risk of slow death by boredom. The more dull and engineer-like the politician, the better. That could be the Finnish motto. Don’t kiss my baby. Go fix my health care.

From my Nordic point of view, however, what is most surprising about American politics is that the issue that elicits more passion than just about any other, except perhaps sex, is a rather unsexy one: taxes.

In the United States it is almost a patriotic duty for citizens to despise taxes with a vengeance. This presents American voters right now with a problem: what to make of a flamboyantly wealthy presidential candidate who may have escaped paying federal income taxes for nearly two decades? Is he a hero or a villain?

A good number of Americans seem furious at this injustice. But a good number also seem to applaud Donald J. Trump ’s prowess at tax avoidance, proof that he is a true red-blooded American. There is another peculiarly American twist, too: the excitement over actually trying to find out what Mr. Trump paid or didn’t pay in taxes in the first place.

The United States lets the wealthy avoid paying their fair share in taxes, and then allows them to keep it a secret how much taxes they have — or more likely have not — paid. I know it can sound astonishing to Americans, but the taxable income of every person in Finland, and the taxes they’ve paid, are all public information [http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19991346.pdf]. Any citizen can stroll into a Finnish tax office and use one of the public computer terminals to check anyone’s taxable income and taxes paid. Whole tax returns are not available, but a tax rate can be easily calculated.

Is this an invasion of privacy? Some Finns certainly think so. But most think it is a way to secure the fundamental social contract that underlies all Western democracies and that helps prevent us from becoming corrupt banana republics: Everyone contributes. Not just that, but everyone contributes fairly, which means in proportion to ability and according to the same rules. If the actual amounts that the wealthy pay can’t be known, no trust in fairness can be had.

Watching the American election right now makes me downright nostalgic for the kind of political excitement I enjoyed as a journalist back in Finland. Every November when the nation’s annual tax data is released, the media rushes to publish long lists of the incomes of the most powerful, wealthy and famous citizens, and the taxes they paid. The combined income [http://www.hs.fi/verokone/henkilo/1961Sipil%C3%A4%20Juha%20Petri] from wages and capital gains in 2014 for the current prime minister of Finland, Juha Sipila: $239,000. Tax rate: 35 percent. Back in 1999, when he was still a private businessman, Mr. Sipila earned $2 million. Tax rate: 31 percent. (Capital gains are taxed at lower rates than wages in Finland, too.) I looked this up just now in less than a minute from my desk in New York, on a website maintained by a Finnish newspaper.

With instant access to tax data, Finns can go to town celebrating the successful rich who pay. In 2013, the heroes of the day were the founders of the phenomenally successful Finnish mobile game company Supercell, maker of Clash of Clans and Hay Day. Supercell’s founders earned more taxable income that year in Finland than anyone else. The chief executive of the company, Ilkka Paananen, pulled in $231 million in wages and capital gains. He paid out $74 million in taxes — 32 percent. He also made a public statement. He was happy, he said, to be able to pay back to the society that had made his success possible.

It’s the turn of my American friends to be bewildered when they hear all this. Why are Finns so willing to pay taxes, they ask. I always have the same answer: It’s not what you pay, it’s what you get in return. Finns get real value for their taxes: 10-month paid parental leaves, affordable high-quality day care, top-notch K-12 education, free college, universal health care and last but not least, a reasonably simple and fair tax code, a smoothly working tax agency and easy-to-use online services and tax forms. It’s amazing what taxes can buy you if your country puts its mind to it — and when the wealthy pay their share.

This year will be the first time I’m eligible to vote in the American presidential election, since I’m now an American citizen. I will do my best to fill inside the lines of that little oval on the voting sheet, even though everyone else in this election seems to be coloring outside all the lines I’ve ever known.

Anu Partanen is the author of “The Nordic Theory of Everything: In Search of a Better Life.”

\_\_\_\_\_

Hating Myself for Fearing HateBy SAYED KASHUA

CHAMPAIGN, Ill. — “Dad,” my daughter said to me a few weeks ago, “I’m pretty sure my biology teacher thinks I’m Jewish.”

“What do you mean? Why?”

“I don’t know. At the beginning of the year when he asked me where I was from, I said Jerusalem. He must have assumed I was Jewish, because once he asked if my being vegetarian has to do with keeping kosher, and this month he wished me happy Rosh Hashana.”

“And you didn’t correct him? You have to!”

“But why? I didn’t say anything wrong, why should I start apologizing? Anyway, it’s too complicated to try and explain about Palestinian Israelis.”

Since my daughter adamantly refused to correct her teacher’s mistake, I decided — over her protestations and threats to boycott homework — that I would go see him and explain that we’re Muslim citizens of Israel.

“Are you sure?” my wife asked, before I left for the meeting. “Shouldn’t you wait until after the elections?”

On the way to school, I looked out for election signs on the immaculately mowed lawns. Based on what I saw, I predict that Re/Max is going to win. Apart from one giant sign made of wooden planks nailed together to form the letters T-R-U-M-P, I saw no evidence of the impending elections.

“It’s unusual,” a friend from the university who has lived here for decades told me. “Usually, at this stage of the campaign, there are signs and bumper stickers everywhere, and people voice support for their candidate.”

The town is considered conservative and has a Republican majority. This time, perhaps because of the sensitive situation, most residents prefer not to publicly proclaim support for their nominee. After all, there is a large community of foreigners and **immigrants** in this college town, and supporting a candidate who openly condemns that community could be considered antagonistic. Clinton supporters, conversely, might be hesitant to put up signs for fear of provoking anger in the opposing camp.

There is cause for concern among the foreign population, and when it comes to Muslims, like us, there is genuine dread about what might be in store. The fear is so intense that I’m no longer sure which result we should be hoping for.

Would a Trump victory actually placate his more extreme supporters? Would his loss be a signal to racists to take action against those he accuses of having stolen their country? Or should we prefer a Democratic administration, which would safeguard diversity and the basic values of the Constitution?

The destructive force embodied in incitement against foreigners and minorities is a frightening thing. Perhaps my daughter is right and we should be hiding our identity until we see how things turn out. We do, after all, have Israeli passports that we can brandish if things get bad.

“Oh, come on,” I found myself saying to assuage my fears while driving to school: Am I really going to claim I’m Jewish because a presidential candidate marks me as an enemy? It’s absurd to think that Jewishness, which has endured the harshest suffering because of xenophobia, could protect us from that very same sentiment.

How cruel these elections are, bringing such deep-seated fears to the surface, leading me to be suspicious of my neighbors, of my children’s teachers, of patrons at the local bar, people I laugh with and watch baseball games with (although I never understand the rules). It made me feel sad and guilty to realize that I had begun to question the integrity of the people I live among. I hated myself for accepting the rules of the game dictated by politicians — rules that set up racial divisions and turn innocent people into potential enemies.

I live in a wonderful place, I reminded myself on my way to the staff room.

“Shalom!” the biology teacher exclaimed with a grin — yet more evidence of the locals’ kindheartedness.

“Shalom,” I answered. And then we had a pleasant conversation about my daughter’s academic accomplishments and acclimatizing.

Even so, just to be on the safe side, I didn’t say a word about us being Muslims. When we said goodbye, I shook his hand and wished him “Shabbat Shalom,” even though it was a Monday.

Sayed Kashua is a visiting professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the author, most recently, of “Native: Dispatches From an Israeli-Palestinian Life.” This essay was translated by Jessica Cohen from the Hebrew.

\_\_\_\_\_

Ideology Can Generate as Much Hatred as TribalismBy CHIGOZIE OBIOMA

LINCOLN, Neb. — As my country, Nigeria, unravels — thanks to what only die-hard optimists and the news media euphemistically refer to as a “recession” — I find myself living in America, witnessing what might be the most vicious election in the country’s history.

I began following American politics closely in 2008, when Barack Obama , considered at the time by most Nigerians as our African brother, became president. As a strong proponent of restoring black people’s dignity by action not just grievance, I was moved to tears by that milestone. Then came the 2012 elections just two months after I arrived in the United States, and Mr. Obama won me over again when he stood against Mitt Romney .

Now that four years have passed, and I have studied, lived and worked in the United States, my views about the nation’s politics have changed. I now believe America’s greatest problem today is its political polarization.

In Nigeria, and across most of black Africa, what divides us is mostly tribalism and religion. We are not, as yet, divided by ideology. But here, the left-right ideological divide is tearing the country apart. Ideology can generate the same amount of hatred as religion and tribalism, and as is the case with places where the other two dominate, it is dangerous when a group acquires any appearance of absolute power. As American culture lurches toward the liberal left, I fear that it may be seeking such power.

The left has developed a potent strategy against which the right simply cannot contend: characterizing those who do not embrace liberal values as morally bankrupt, using labels like “bigot,” among the worst of insults to Americans. I have observed that the default dynamic of public interaction here is for people to try to parse the group’s consensus, and for everyone — every single person — to navigate toward that. Most people will not say what they truly feel. This is what has confounded me most about America in the time I have been here: The fear of being labeled with a disparaging term — often simply for articulating a perspective that does not align with liberal political values — causes many to remain silent. Freedom of speech is being severely curtailed throughout the country.

I am even more troubled because I can trace the unraveling of my country to a similar type of authoritarianism. In the past, the West designated Africans as “barbaric,” “uncivilized” and “crude,” among other terms. It did not matter, for example, that the Igbo tribe in West Africa practiced a leaderless egalitarian system while Britain was governed by monarchs; the labels stuck nevertheless, and they helped lead to the slave trade and colonialism, among other negative practices that African people are still recovering from today.

Chigozie Obioma is a professor of literature and creative writing at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln , and the author of the novel “The Fishermen.”

\_\_\_\_\_

Is Trump China’s Soul Mate?By YIYUN LI

OAKLAND, Calif. — I moved from China to the United States in 1996, arriving in Iowa when signs for Clinton-Gore and Dole-Kemp dotted people’s lawns. I remember being surprised that Americans would announce their political views without fear.

Subsequent elections all remained memorable in one way or another, but one thing has not changed: the narrative about China, that perennial target.

Donald J. Trump is the loudest critic of China this election season. Global warming, according to him [https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/265895292191248385?ref\_src=twsrc%5Etfw], is a Chinese hoax. His criticism of United States trade policy with China — “they’re devaluing their currency,” he said, and “using our country as a piggy bank” — is based on outdated data and a misunderstanding of international trade.

I was a scientist before I became a writer. For both professions, questioning is essential, conviction dangerous. Questions beget questions. Convictions beget convictions, posing as indisputable truths.

One of the strongest convictions this year is the distinction between Americans and others, the latter including **immigrants**, minorities and people from minority religious backgrounds. The racism in a Fox News segment [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/business/media/fox-reporter-accused-of-racism-for-chinatown-interviews-on-trump-clinton-and-china.html] in New York City’s Chinatown caused a public outcry. Xenophobia has become a trumpeted weapon to defend America from without and within.

And then there is China, the most evil other, allowed to “rape our country,” according to Mr. Trump. His conviction reminds me of what we learned in elementary and secondary schools in 1970s and ’80s China: “American imperialism has never stopped trying to annihilate us.” The same rhetoric is used to cultivate fear and hatred until they become indistinguishable.

One would think Mr. Trump would further unsettle the United States-China relationship, but he has thousands of fans [http://fortune.com/2016/05/30/donald-trump-popular-china/] in China.

In an admittedly unscientific investigation, I resorted to Zhihu, a Chinese equivalent of Quora [https://www.quora.com/], several other internet forums and readers’ comments in the Chinese media to try and understand Mr. Trump’s appeal. I found that the ratio of Trump supporters to opponents is 10 to one.

In Chinese social media, Mr. Trump is called manly, earthy, charismatic and honest. He is compared fondly to stinky tofu, a kind of fermented tofu with such an unbearable odor that it can’t be consumed indoors (think of the funkiest French cheese). And enough with the British prime minister, Theresa May , and the German chancellor, Angela Merkel : America needs a man.

“The Democratic Party is the enemy of China. Trump is the enemy of the Democratic Party. Ergo, he is our friend,” said a commenter on Zhihu, under the thread “Why become a Chinese fan of Donald Trump ?”

After a long history of natural and political disasters, states another person on Zhihu under the same thread, China has nothing to rely on but utilitarianism; Mr. Trump, a profit-chasing businessman, shares this utilitarianism. “Perhaps we all see our own selves in Donald Trump . He’s a soul mate for every lonely Chinese heart.”

Also shared on many Chinese forums is this view: “If Trump is bad, don’t we want him to win so he can lead America downhill more quickly?” Rational, yet most ominous.

America and China are not natural enemies, but the narrative perpetuating the animosity suits those with a self-appointed status of superiority or righteousness. The American woman on a New York street who told a Chinese-American editor at The New York Times and his family to go back to China [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/nyregion/to-the-woman-who-told-my-family-to-go-back-to-china.html] could be the same woman who, in the early 1970s, organized the neighborhood proletariat to raid our apartment in Beijing after midnight, looking for American spies.

Anyone setting his heart to turn people into others will find ways to do so, sometimes with chilling violence. Even if Mr. Trump does not become president, the fears his campaign feeds on and the fears it provokes will go on poisoning American democracy.

Yiyun Li’s is the author of the forthcoming “Dear Friend, from My Life I Write to You in Your Life,” which will be published in February.

\_\_\_\_\_

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook [https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter [http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] , and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/] .

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

By many measures, Chobani[http://www.chobani.com/] embodies the classic American **immigrant** success story.

Its founder, Hamdi Ulukaya, is a Turkish **immigrant** of Kurdish descent. He bought a defunct yogurt factory in upstate New York, added a facility in Twin Falls, Idaho, and now employs about 2,000 people making Greek yogurt.

But in this contentious election season, the extreme right has a problem with Chobani: In its view, too many of those employees are refugees.

As Mr. Ulukaya has stepped up his advocacy — employing more than 300 refugees in his factories, starting a foundation to help migrants, and traveling to the Greek island of Lesbos to witness the crisis firsthand — he and his company have been targeted with racist attacks on social media and conspiratorial articles on websites including Breitbart News[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/27/business/media/breitbart-news-presidential-race.html].

Now there are calls to boycott Chobani. Mr. Ulukaya and the company have been taunted with racist epithets on Twitter and Facebook. Fringe websites have published false stories claiming Mr. Ulukaya wants “to drown the United States in Muslims.” And the mayor of Twin Falls has received death threats, partly as a result of his support for Chobani.

Online hate speech is on the rise, reflecting the rising nationalism displayed by some supporters of Donald J. Trump, who has opposed resettling refugees in the United States.

“What’s happening with Chobani is one more flash point in this battle between the voices of xenophobia and the voices advocating a rational **immigration**policy,” said Cecillia Wang, director of the **Immigrants**’ Rights Project at the American Civil Liberties Union.

Chobani and Mr. Ulukaya declined to comment for this article. The Trump campaign did not reply to a request for comment.

Mr. Ulukaya arrived in upstate New York in the 1990s to attend school. By 2002, he was making and selling feta cheese inspired by a family recipe. A few years later, he learned that a local yogurt and cheese factory that had closed was for sale. He received a loan of $800,000 from the Small Business Administration[https://www.sba.gov/] to purchase the factory, and started selling Chobani yogurt in 2007.

As the business grew, Mr. Ulukaya needed more help. When he learned there was a refugee resettlement center in a nearby town, he asked if any of the newcomers wanted jobs at Chobani. Mr. Ulukaya provided transportation for the new hires, and he brought in translators to assist them. He paid the refugee workers salaries above the minimum wage, as he did other workers at the factory.

When Chobani opened its factory in Twin Falls, Mr. Ulukaya once again turned to a local resettlement center. The company now employs resettled refugees from Iraq, Afghanistan and Turkey, among other countries.

“The minute a refugee has a job, that’s the minute they stop being a refugee,” Mr. Ulukaya said in a talk he gave this year.

Today, Chobani has annual yogurt sales of around $1.5 billion. Last year, Mr. Ulukaya signed the Giving Pledge[https://givingpledge.org/], promising to give away a majority of his fortune to assist refugees.

Chobani and the other companies working with refugees are not exploiting them, said Jennifer Patterson, project director for the Partnership for Refugees[http://www.partnershipforrefugees.org/], a federal program.

“It’s the exact opposite,” Ms. Patterson said. “These companies are looking to provide resettled refuges with the ability to live happy and productive lives.”

Chobani’s work with refugees went largely unnoticed until this January, when Mr. Ulukaya spoke at the World Economic Forum[https://www.weforum.org/] in Davos, Switzerland. His message — that corporations needed to do more to assist refugees — broke through the high-minded rhetoric.

“He was quite a sensation there,” said Kenneth Roth, executive director of Human Rights Watch, who attended the event. “Here was someone who went beyond the well-meaning chatter of Davos and was walking the walk.”

Cisco[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/company/cisco-systems-inc?inline=nyt-org], IBM, Salesforce and more joined others in pledging assistance to refugees. Those companies and others began working with the Tent Foundation[http://www.tent.org/#situation], which Mr. Ulukaya founded last year. Chobani has pledged to help other companies learn how to effectively integrate refugees into a work force.

But while an alliance of well-known companies was now working together on the issue, the online critics zeroed in on Chobani. Shortly after Mr. Ulukaya spoke in Davos, the far-right website WND published a story originally titled “American Yogurt Tycoon Vows to Choke U.S. With Muslims.”

Then this summer, Breitbart, the conservative news website whose former executive chairman, Stephen K. Bannon, is now running the Trump campaign, began publishing a series of misleading articles about Chobani.

One drew a connection[http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/08/26/tb-spiked-500-percent-twin-falls-2012-year-chobani-opened-local-plant/] between Chobani’s hiring of refugees and a spike in tuberculosis cases in Idaho. Another linked Chobani[http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/08/05/twin-falls-refugee-crisis-clinton-appointee] to a “Twin Falls Crisis Imposed by Clinton-Era Pro-Refugee Advocates.” A third conflated Chobani’s hiring practices[http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/08/10/twin-falls-refugee-rape-special-report-refugees/] with a sexual assault case in Twin Falls involving minors.

As Breitbart began publishing its articles, the online attacks grew more intense. On Twitter and Facebook, users called for a boycott of Chobani. An image was widely shared on social media that claimed Mr. Ulukaya was “going to drown the United States in Muslims and is importing them to Idaho 300 at a time to work in his factory.” And bloggers fabricated stories claiming that Chobani was pressuring local officials “to facilitate their multitude of Muslim friendly/Islamification requests.”

Soon the mayor of Twin Falls, Shawn Barigar, found himself at the center of a conspiracy theory.

“It got woven into a narrative that it’s all a cover-up, that we’re all trying to keep the refugees safe so that Chobani has its work force, that I personally am getting money from the Obama administration to help Chobani hire whoever they want, that it’s part of this Islamification of the United States,” he said. “It’s crazy.”

As the online comments escalated this summer, Mr. Barigar and his wife received death threats.

Breitbart said it was simply covering the news.

“Breitbart has been a leader in delivering important and breaking news on refugee crises throughout the Western world, which pose both national security and financial risks,” Alex Marlow, editor in chief, said in a statement. “Mr. Ulukaya hasn’t merely involved himself in this issue, he’s been one of the leaders in expanding refugee resettlement in the United States. Breitbart’s explosive growth is due in large measure to the mainstream media’s refusal to cover vital topics like this one.”

But civil rights advocates said they believed it was no mystery why Mr. Ulukaya was targeted while other chief executives had been spared. “It’s because he’s an **immigrant** himself,” Ms. Wang of the A.C.L.U. said.

Mr. Roth of Human Rights Watch attributed some of the xenophobia directed at Chobani to the election season.

“Some people are feeling left behind, and some people are concerned about terrorists,” he said. “But Trump has given a voice to these sentiments.”

Mr. Barigar, a Democrat, concurred. “Donald Trump really fueled a sentiment about **immigration** that is shared by a very small part of our community,” he said. “We are an agricultural center. We’ve depended on **immigrants** for a half-century or more.”

Mr. Ulukaya appears undeterred. In September, he participated in a round-table discussion with President Obama and business leaders on how corporations could do more to help refugees.

And his work with refugees is part of a broader suite of initiatives. He recently gave 10 percent of Chobani [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/27/business/a-windfall-for-chobani-employees-stakes-in-the-company.html] shares[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/27/business/a-windfall-for-chobani-employees-stakes-in-the-company.html] to his employees, and he is offering paid parental leave to all employees.

“He’s the xenophobe’s nightmare,” Mr. Roth said. “Here’s an **immigrant** who isn’t competing for jobs, but is creating jobs big time. It runs completely counter to the far-right narrative.”

Correction: November 4, 2016, Friday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An article on Tuesday about criticism of Hamdi Ulukaya, founder of the yogurt maker Chobani, because of his hiring of refugees misstated the timing of a round-table discussion Mr. Ulukaya participated in with President Obama and business leaders. It was in September, not “last month.”

\* At Chobani, Now It’s Not Just the Yogurt That’s Rich[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/27/business/a-windfall-for-chobani-employees-stakes-in-the-company.html]

\* In Albany, Hopes of Making New York State a Yogurt Empire[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/16/nyregion/in-albany-hopes-of-making-new-york-a-yogurt-empire.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AMSTERDAM — Geert Wilders[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/geert-wilders], the far-right politician whose tirades against Islam, **immigration** and the European Union have made him one of the most divisive figures in Dutch politics, went on trial on Monday on charges of hate speech.

But even as prosecutors opened their case against him, focusing on denunciations of the Moroccan community that he made in The Hague in 2014, they found themselves upstaged by Mr. Wilders. He refused to attend the trial — under Dutch law, he does not have to — and issued a series of inflammatory posts on Twitter denouncing the proceedings.

The Netherlands[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/netherlands/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] has a “huge problem with Moroccans,” Mr. Wilders wrote in one post[https://twitter.com/geertwilderspvv/status/793004200401760256]. “To be silent about it is cowardly. 43% of Dutch want fewer Moroccans. No verdict will change that.” (His source was a 2014 poll commissioned by his party, the Freedom Party.)

The trial has exposed deep fissures in Dutch society[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/12/world/europe/dutch-voters-may-point-way-for-rest-of-europe.html], long known for its traditions of religious tolerance. The country has a fraught relationship with its recent history: More than three-quarters of Dutch Jews were deported and killed during the Nazi occupation in World War II[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/w/world\_war\_ii\_/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

The Netherlands was one of the six founding states of what became the European Union, but skepticism toward the bloc has been rising. In April, Dutch voters rejected a trade and cooperation agreement between the European Union and Ukraine[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/07/world/europe/dutch-voters-reject-european-union-deal-with-ukraine.html], and after the British referendum on June 23 to leave the bloc, Mr. Wilders proposed that the Dutch hold a referendum on [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/16/world/europe/netherlands-new-front-for-a-politician-known-for-anti-muslim-statements.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FWilders%2C%20Geert] withdrawal[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/16/world/europe/netherlands-new-front-for-a-politician-known-for-anti-muslim-statements.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FWilders%2C%20Geert] as well.

On Friday, Mr. Wilders, announced[https://youtu.be/W4Qzy\_enfk0] that he would not attend the trial — held in a secure courtroom near Schiphol Airport, which serves Amsterdam — because it was a “travesty” and a “political trial” that targeted “freedom of speech.” Mr. Wilders called himself “a politician who says what the politically correct elite do not want to hear.”

Mr. Wilders, 53, faces trial on two charges: offending members of a group based on their race, and hate speech and discrimination.

If convicted, he would face up to two years in prison, though people convicted of such offenses are more commonly given a fine or sentenced to community service. A conviction would certainly affect his career in Parliament, where he has been the leader of his party since 2006.

The case revolves around two sets of remarks made near the time of municipal elections in The Hague in 2014. On March 12 of that year, Mr. Wilders addressed crowds at a market; a week later, he addressed a rally in a catering establishment.

Mr. Wilders said at the rally: “I’m asking you, do you want more or fewer Moroccans in this city and in the Netherlands?” The public responded by chanting: “Fewer, fewer!” Mr. Wilders responded: “Well, we’ll arrange that then.”

After the comments, more than 6,400 Dutch citizens filed complaints, mostly through local police offices. About 60 of those complainants requested damages, as they are allowed to do under Dutch law. Some of those demands were thrown out for various reasons — including claims for excessive reimbursement — but 35 of the complaints have been discussed in court.

The primary judge of the three overseeing the case, Hendrik Steenhuis, said that it was unfortunate that Mr. Wilders had declined to attend. “We would like to have heard the answers from Wilders, because we would have liked to ask him if what he said in the market matched the policy of his political party,” he said. Whether the comments reflected the party’s views or Mr. Wilders’s own opinions could be legally significant.

“There were so many complaints that police were worried that they would lose too much capacity over it,” said Elianne van Rens, one of the other judges, who presented the facts of the case. The cities of The Hague and Amsterdam got involved, as did the Justice Ministry, she said.

After Mr. Wilders made the comments, about 13 of the 100 elected members of his party quit national and local assemblies in protest at his remarks.

Mr. Wilders was acquitted on [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/24/world/europe/24dutch.html] charges of hate speech [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/24/world/europe/24dutch.html] in 2011[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/24/world/europe/24dutch.html], after complaints about his fierce criticisms of Islam.

There are some significant differences between that case and the current proceedings. The earlier case focused on hate speech against individuals; this time, the target was a population group, according to a spokesman for the public prosecutor’s service, Frans Zonneveld.

“Islam is an idea, a religion, but according to the public prosecution service, you have a lot of room to criticize ideas, but when it comes to population groups, it’s a whole different matter,” Mr. Zonneveld said. “His remarks touched the very being of this population group.” He added, “You cannot choose to be part of a population group or not; it’s a group that’s decided by birth, so it’s a whole different matter.”

As Mr. Zonneveld put it, the case is about “the conflict between freedom of speech and the freedom from discrimination. These are two essential rights in the Dutch rule of law, and it’s clear that these two rights are conflicting in this case.”

On Friday, Mr. Wilders denounced the proceedings against him as a violation of his right to free speech.

“It is a travesty that I have to stand trial because I spoke about fewer Moroccans,” he said. “Not because they despise all Moroccans or want all Moroccans out of the country, but because they are sick and tired of the nuisance and terror caused by so many Moroccans.”

He added, “If speaking about this is punishable, then the Netherlands is no longer a free country but a dictatorship.”

In response, Mr. Zonneveld said, “The fact that the politician has to appear before a court doesn’t make it a political trial. The public prosecution service has to maintain the law in the Netherlands.” He added, “The whole of Dutch society and the people who have made complaints on this issue, as well as Mr. Wilders, have a right to have a court verdict on this matter.”

Judge Steenhuis suggested that Mr. Wilders’s motivations might factor into the legal considerations. “He claims that his comments have to do with crime rates, and criminal Moroccans, but he doesn’t take back his more broad statements about all Moroccans. How does this match? What does Wilders think about all this commotion? Would he have liked to use other words?”

One of the chief prosecutors, Sabina van der Kallen, expressed irritation that Mr. Wilders had failed to inform them that he would not be showing up.

“We would have appreciated if we had heard about his absence from the defense and not from the newspaper,” she said. “We would have found that courteous. He was present during the pretrial hearings. Now that it’s for real, he sneaks out the back door.”

Follow Nina Siegal on Twitter @NinaSiegal.

\* Geert Wilders: Let the Dutch Vote on **Immigration** Policy[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/20/opinion/geert-wilders-the-dutch-deserve-to-vote-on-immigration-policy.html]

\* Right Wing’s Surge in Europe Has the Establishment Rattled[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/09/world/europe/right-wings-surge-in-europe-has-the-establishment-rattled.html]

\* Dutch Voters May Point Way for Rest of Europe[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/12/world/europe/dutch-voters-may-point-way-for-rest-of-europe.html]

\* Amid Rise of Multiculturalism, Dutch Confront Their Questions of Identity[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/14/world/europe/14dutch.html]

\* Dutch Opponent of Muslims Gains Ground[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/06/world/europe/06dutch.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Wangs vs. the World

By Jade Chang

354 pages. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. $26.

A riches-to-rags story, an **immigrant** story and a quixotic road trip are bundled into Jade Chang’s sharply funny first novel. Charles Wang, a self-made millionaire, loses his Bel-Air estate and everything else in the 2008 economic collapse. Until then, Charles, a cosmetics mogul, was accustomed to getting his way — whether cheating in business or on his second wife: “Money made everything easy to indulge.” Now, unable to pay his children’s tuitions, he pulls his teenage daughter, Grace, out of private school, and his son, Andrew, from college. Then he demands that the family join him on what proves to be a hellish cross-country journey in an old powder-blue Mercedes station wagon. They’ll seek refuge at the Catskills farmhouse of his elder daughter, Saina, a Conceptual artist with plenty of her own problems. Charles is already planning his grand comeback scheme, reclaiming valuable ancestral land in China. He’s disillusioned and angry, dismissing America as “a great deceptor,” because “all it could do was destroy — fortunes, families, lives.” This novel is overstuffed with subplots and detours, but Charles — with an ego larger than his homeland and a relentless determination to “wrestle America to the ground and take her milk money” — makes the ride worthwhile, as does the author’s savage takedown of the American dream.

The Comet Seekers

By Helen Sedgwick

290 pages. Harper. $25.99.

At a research station on earth’s remotest continent, Roisin and François find love. Both are haunted by trauma. She is an Irish astronomer studying comets in Antarctica, having fled a messy, intense (and sexual) relationship with her cousin Liam: “This is what she needs. Somewhere wild and inhospitable and brutal where she can try to understand what has happened.” François, a French chef working at the base, has reluctantly abandoned his troubled mother, Severine, who raised him alone in Bayeux and never left. As a child, François used to stargaze and watch comets with Severine as she told stories of magic and ghosts. He never understood his mother’s refusal to travel, but more inexplicable was her habit of talking with a rotating cast of family ghosts — quarreling with them, confiding in them, consoling them. What was a necessary attachment for Severine became a shameful secret for her son. “Do you think it’s strange to love something you don’t understand?” François asks Roisin as he’s falling for her. It’s one of the great questions of this exquisitely layered, thrilling novel, which leaps across centuries and continents to delve into the role of destiny and the elusiveness of perception and memory. These characters are as awe-struck by the intimate moments of everyday life (“the taste of his skin where she once licked fresh water from the crease inside his elbow”) as they are by the vast night sky. A less gifted writer might have made this material too whimsical or sentimental. Ms. Sedgwick wisely takes a laconic approach to the supernatural and a romantic approach to the scientific.

The Invisibility Cloak

By Ge Fei, translated from the Chinese by Canaan Morse

126 pages. New York Review Books. $14.

The avant-garde writer Ge Fei (the pen name of Liu Yong) is one of China’s most celebrated authors, yet until now his fiction had never been translated into English. In this enigmatic 2012 novel, the middle-aged Mr. Cui lives in Beijing with his sister and her husband, who want him out. He has nowhere to go. His wife divorced him, promptly married her boss and became pregnant. He has one friend, whom he has known since childhood, but their interactions tend to leave him humiliated. He spends his days in solitude, building and installing custom amplifiers for a rarefied, dwindling group of hi-fi enthusiasts. “It’s probably the most insignificant industry in China today,” he says. An obsessive oddball, he occupies “the same rung of the social ladder as beggars.” Yet he’s also a snob who despises his clients’ middlebrow musical tastes and mocks their banal and pretentious conversations: “He liked to use the phrase ‘in point of fact’ a lot,” Cui says of one client. “I couldn’t say why.” Cui is indifferent to love, family and ambition, but his grim life becomes decidedly more intriguing when, through bizarre circumstances, he encounters a woman whose **alienation** matches his own.

The Mothers

By Brit Bennett

278 pages. Riverhead Books. $26.

Suicide, abortion, grief, religion, female friendship and first love are bold themes to tackle in a debut novel, but 26-year-old Brit Bennett seems admirably repelled by caution. In a Southern California town, the Upper Room Chapel is the center of a close-knit African-American community. Nadia Turner, a high school senior, is the congregation’s first member to earn a university scholarship, and she’s headed to Michigan in the fall. But she’s grief-struck, recovering from the death of her mother, who shot herself in the head, and dealing with a genial but distant father. Nadia has also lost her virginity to Luke Sheppard, the pastor’s son, and decided to have an abortion: “She couldn’t let this baby nail her life in place when she’d just been given a chance to escape.” (The devastating scene in which she undergoes the procedure occurs in the first chapter.) Nadia finds the aftermath lonely: “She’d had a mother and now she didn’t, and she’d been pregnant but now she wasn’t.” Her promising future (she hopes to become a civil rights lawyer) might be in jeopardy, as well as her close friendship with Aubrey Evans, another motherless girl and, unlike Nadia, a devout Christian. Luke’s future may be threatened, too. As his stern mother notes, “Black boys couldn’t afford to be reckless.” Told partly in first-person plural by a group of judgmental busybodies known as the Mothers (“church folk can gossip”), the story follows the ways in which these three teenagers are drawn together and wrenched apart. Ms. Bennett allows her characters to follow their worst impulses, and she handles provocative issues with intelligence, empathy and dark humor. Her risk-taking pays off.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It’s only a mild spoiler to reveal that the main characters of the new TBS comedy “People of Earth”[http://www.tbs.com/videos/people-of-earth/season-1/extras/1735102/people-of-earth-trailer.html?sr=people%20of%20earth] — members of an Alcoholics Anonymous-like support group for **alien** abductees — are actual **alien** abductees. They’ve seen the bright lights overhead and been sucked up into the hovering ship. And they all agree on one peculiar aspect of their experience: Before sending their captives back to Earth, the **aliens** took the trouble to tell them “You. Are. Special.”

And they are. The slight but appealing “People of Earth,” which begins on Monday, is a contemporary anti-comedy or semi-comedy with a traditional sitcom core. The misfits who meet at a church to share their abduction stories are special in the same way as the drivers and mechanics of “Taxi” or the barflies of “Cheers” or the superannuated students of “Community.” They’re especially, comically delicate.

David Jenkins, who created the show and wrote the pilot (Greg Daniels of “Parks and Recreation” is an executive producer), has fleshed out a premise with multiple nodes for humor. There’s the support group, StarCrossed, which is as defensive as you’d imagine and prone to internecine sniping. It also provides the opportunity for abduction flashbacks for each member. There are the **aliens**, a squabbling group who scorn humans but don’t seem to be making much progress in their mission to dominate the planet.

And then there’s the protagonist, Ozzie Graham (Wyatt Cenac), a reporter who comes to do an exposé of StarCrossed and finds himself joining the group. It turns out that his frequent conversations with talking deer may be a sign of a past abduction.

The overall result is pleasant, even beguiling, but it feels a little inconsequential in a season that has brought us new comedies like “Atlanta,” “Insecure” and “Fleabag.” Mr. Jenkins gets good mileage out of the Stooge-like threesome of **aliens** — one of each major variety, reptilian, gray and white — in their antiseptic ship. And he has fun with the insecurities of the support group, whose members insist on being called “experiencers” rather than abductees, because it gives them more “agency.”

Through the first four episodes, though, the human characters don’t really come into their own in comic terms, except for Brian Huskey (“Veep”) as Richard, who’s the most conspiracy-minded of the group. His abduction broke up his marriage, and now he sees **aliens** everywhere — when he waves a document that he says is a clever communication from the “reptilian council,” the rest of the group has to point out that it’s a divorce summons. (Amy Landecker of “Transparent” pops up as his long-suffering wife.) Mr. Cenac, with his sleepy rhythms and general air of disbelief, is a good fit for Ozzie, but he doesn’t get to do a lot besides react to the eccentricities of everyone around him.

“People of Earth” provides a funny line or detail just often enough to keep you watching, however, like the Segway-mounted desk of Ozzie’s digital-honcho editor or the fact that the **aliens**’ headquarters on Earth is in the back room of a doughnut shop. Bjorn Gustafsson, who gives the show’s most distinctive performance as an overly emotional **alien**, also has one of its best, if simplest lines: Having been dragged into bed by a libidinous abductee, he looks down at her and says of the unfamiliar human activity, “Man, this is really hard work.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Bracero Program, which drew hundreds of thousands of Mexican laborers to toil in American fields from 1942 to 1964, left a searing memory of injustice. The program has been blamed for depressing farm wages and abusing **immigrant** workers.

So I wasn’t surprised that some critics took a dim view of the proposal I wrote about[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/26/business/economy/if-immigration-cant-be-stopped-maybe-it-can-be-managed.html] in last week’s column, which suggests that an improved version of the Bracero Program might help manage **immigration** by low-skilled workers into the United States and curtail illegal **immigration**.

Critics argue that the Bracero Program did not stop illegal **immigration**. And they cite some evidence that farm wages rose after it ended. Other studies, however, suggest otherwise. There is no historical census of illegal **immigrants**, so the numbers will remain in dispute.

Today, undocumented **immigrants** make up about half the agricultural labor force; guest workers under the H-2A visa program make up a much smaller share. Wages are hardly great. As more Mexican **immigrants** leave the United States than arrive, wages for field laborers average less than $12 an hour. That’s about one-third less than the average pay in the notoriously low-wage retail sector.

With Washington expected to return next year to the issue of illegal **immigration**, the debate deserves even greater attention. David Bacon, a journalist and author, and Philip Martin, an expert on **immigration** an the University of California, Davis, offer critical views of the proposal for a new guest worker program. Michael Clemens of the Center for Global Development — the main author of the new blueprint to regulate migration from Mexico — and Edward Alden of the Council on Foreign Relations, another author, respond. Their letters were lightly edited.

“Spread California’s laws giving farm workers a legal process for forming unions.”

From David Bacon

The column by Eduardo Porter proposing a new Bracero Program contains significant misstatements of fact. They dramatize the reasons civil rights leaders of the 1960s, including Ernesto Galarza, Cesar Chavez, Bert Corona and Larry Itliong, opposed the old Bracero Program and persuaded Congress to end it in 1964.

Porter says apprehensions of people crossing the border dropped to zero during the 1950s. In fact, over a million people were deported in the notorious Operation Wetback operation in 1954. Anti-**immigrant** enforcement increases during periods of large guest worker programs, because those workers are needed to force migration into those channels.

Porter says farmworker wages hardly soared after the Bracero Program ended. In fact, the period in which farmworker wages rose the fastest was during the two decades afterward. Itliong and Filipino workers, whose strikes were broken by growers bringing in braceros, struck in 1965, the year after the program was abolished. When Mexican workers under Chavez joined that strike, the United Farm Workers union was born. The contracts achieved at the union’s height in the 1970s and early ‘80s gave farmworkers the highest wages, taking inflation into account, that they have ever had.

Porter suggests that a bracero program could be made palatable if employers were “encouraged” to hire workers in the United States first and had to apply for certification, and if workers were protected by United States labor law. Those requirements already exist for current guest worker programs. They have failed completely to protect workers’ rights, as documented by the Southern Poverty Law Center report “Close to Slavery[https://www.splcenter.org/20130218/close-slavery-guestworker-programs-united-states].”

Porter proposes that part of workers’ wages be withheld and paid only after the harvest and their return to Mexico. Withholding wages like this is illegal for workers in this country. To this day, growers, banks in Mexico and the United States, and the Mexican government all blame each other for millions of dollars of withheld wages that have “disappeared,” and braceros are still fighting to reclaim them.

If the purpose of Porter’s proposal is not to provide labor at low wages, then I have a counterproposal. Spread California’s laws giving farm workers a legal process for forming unions and requiring growers to negotiate union contracts when they do to every other state. When workers have unions, higher wages and more protections, growers will find it easier to attract people to fill those jobs.

David Bacon is the author of “Communities Without Borders: Images and Voices from the World of Migration” (Cornell University/ILR Press, 2006), “Illegal People: How Globalization Creates Migration and Criminalizes **Immigrants**” (Beacon Press, 2008), and “The Right to Stay Home: How U.S. Policy Drives Mexican Migration” (Beacon Press, 2013).

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

“The era of border enforcement has cost taxpayers tens of billions of dollars.”

From Edward Alden

In the summer of 2005, I visited then Representative, now Senator Jeff Flake on his parents’ ranch in Snowflake, Ariz. When he was a kid, the ranch hired dozens of Mexicans each year to tend crops that would feed the cattle when the winter snows came. Nearly all were unauthorized migrants; they simply followed the work and better wages, as their fathers had done before them.

The Southwestern United States and Northern Mexico were long part of a single labor market, with a line drawn by their governments in between. If the governments wanted to regulate what Douglas Massey of Princeton called this “circular migration,” there were only two choices — legalize the flow or criminalize it and impose harsh consequences.

The United States has tried both. In the 1940s, it worked with Mexico to create the badly flawed Bracero Program, which nonetheless helped reduce illegal migration to a trickle. The data are clear — as bracero quotas expanded, reaching 400,000 annually in 1954, illegal migration fell sharply. With the elimination of the program in 1964, accompanied by new quotas in 1965 that for the first time restricted legal Mexican migration to the United States,[https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/09/25/how-a-1965-immigration-reform-created-illegal-immigration/?utm\_term=.45df65c62c7f] illegal migration soared.

For the last two decades, the United States has tried the opposite approach — a fierce border clampdown. The number of Border Patrol agents grew from a few thousand in the early 1990s to more than 21,000 today, nearly 700 miles of fences were built, and drones and other sensors now drape the border. Illegal migration from Mexico has fallen to its lowest level since the early 1970s[http://bigstory.ap.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/3ac60b8a76594caeb784145c8a6786d3/apnewsbreak-barely-half-illegal-border-crossers-caught].

Each of these approaches, however, has been very costly. Under Bracero, poorly designed rules and lax enforcement led to abuses of workers’ rights and unfair wage competition for United States workers. The era of illegal migration that followed was no better for Mexican or United States workers, and it led to the collapse of the American public’s confidence in the **immigration** system. The era of border enforcement has cost taxpayers tens of billions of dollars, enriched coyote smugglers and led to hundreds of migrants dying each year in dangerous desert crossings.

Our report “Shared Border, Shared Future[http://www.cgdev.org/publication/sharedfuture?callout=1-2]” argues that the two countries can do better. A well-designed bilateral labor agreement would require employers to pay a significant premium for Mexican workers; allow workers to switch employers freely; apply all United States labor laws to migrants and permit unions to organize; and give migrants the choice of returning home or seeking permanent residence.

These requirements go far beyond the current H-2 programs and would address head-on the legitimate criticisms of many past temporary worker plans. And sustained enforcement would be needed to ensure that illegal paths do not again become more attractive than the legal ones for migrants and for employers.

Much has been learned since the Bracero Program was ended more the 50 years ago. It is time to apply those lessons and regulate Mexico-United States migration to better serve the interests of Mexican workers, American workers and employers.

Edward Alden is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and an author of the study Managing Illegal **Immigration** to the United States: How Effective is Enforcement?[http://www.cfr.org/immigration/managing-illegal-immigration-united-states/p30658]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

“The farm labor market today is responding to rising wages as economics predicts.”

From Philip Martin

Rather than substituting for illegal migration, the Bracero Program set the stage for large scale illegal Mexico-United States migration via two major channels. First, the availability of braceros combined with water projects and the Interstate System of highways allowed labor-intensive agriculture to expand far away from consumers, so that California replaced New Jersey as the nation’s garden state. Second, Mexican workers and United States farmers gained experience working with one another, a mutual dependence they were reluctant to end.

Nevertheless, there was not an immediate upsurge in illegal migration after the Bracero Program ended. Instead, farm wages jumped 40 percent, from $1.25 to $1.75 an hour in the United Farm Worker grape contracts of 1966. The lack of braceros prompted a wave of labor-saving mechanization, including forklifts in the fields to move 1,000-pound bins of produce, and the mechanization of the tomato harvest. Modern personnel management, such as scheduling work carefully and identifying and retaining the best workers, permitted fewer workers to do the work.

There are three important lessons from developments in the farm labor market after the Bracero Program. First, economic principles worked, as a reduced supply of labor led to higher wages that primarily reduced the demand for farm workers. Second, farm employers began to treat more expensive workers better, adding benefits such as health insurance and pensions to retain experienced workers. Third, farmers anticipating ever-higher wages sponsored research on labor-saving mechanization, so that one major study predicted there would soon be no hand-labor jobs on farms.

Rising unauthorized migration in the 1970s reversed these trends. One example tells the story. In the late 1960s, the citrus industry supported 70-odd projects aimed at harvesting oranges mechanically; by 1980, this industry support ended. Increases in unauthorized migration stabilized labor costs and reversed grower incentives to treat farm labor as an ever-rising cost.

Today we are at another farm labor inflection point, and farm employers are responding with the four strategies[http://www.migrationpolicy.org/events/farm-table-role-immigrants-us-farm-labor-2016] expected by rising labor costs: satisfy current workers to retain them on the farm work longer, stretch their productivity with mechanical aids that raise productivity, substitute machines for workers where possible and supplement the aging work force with younger H-2A guest workers. Just as in the mid-1960s, the farm labor market today is responding to rising wages as economics predicts, making it hard to understand the call for new and untested guest worker programs.

Philip Martin is chairman of the Comparative **Immigration** and Integration Program at the University of California, Davis, and editor of the newsletters Migration News and Rural Migration News.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

“It is time to move past the failed policies and fossilized positions of the previous generation.”

From Michael Clemens

I write to correct several statements by David Bacon and Phil Martin regarding Eduardo Porter’s discussion of a proposed United States-Mexico labor migration agreement by the “Shared Border, Shared Future” working group.

Bracero visas obviously substituted for illegal migration. Immediately after the United States vastly raised the number of visas to an adequate 400,000 in 1954, illegal migration collapsed to near zero for the duration of the program. This outcome required both the adequate legal pathway and stronger enforcement, as Kelly Lytle Hernandez documents in her groundbreaking book, “Migra! A History of the U.S. Border Patrol.”

Substantial illegal migration occurred exclusively in the early years of the program, when the number of visas — around 100,000 a year — was insufficient. But the end of this legal channel in 1965 was followed by unprecedented illegal migration in the 1970s and ’80s.

Mr. Bacon and Professor Martin misrepresent the labor-market effects[http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/stable/42860675?seq=1#page\_scan\_tab\_contents] of excluding bracero workers. They are right that farm wages rose in the states that excluded braceros in the late 1960s. They do not mention that farm wages rose by the same amount, in the same years, in states that did not exclude any braceros (because they never had any). Farmers’ response to bracero exclusion was to quickly adopt labor-saving technologies — particularly in cotton, tomatoes and sugar beets — in perfect accordance with “economic principles.” That actually harmed United States farm workers by eliminating many of their own jobs.

Mr. Bacon mentions the unacceptable abuses of workers under the existing seasonal work visa. That is why this new proposal departs sharply from that tainted model. The proposal prevents workers from being tied to a single employer, and it eliminates unscrupulous recruiters the only way it can be done: bilaterally. He also mentions that many braceros’ wages were stolen. No one knows that better than this group, which includes Alejandro Poiré, a former director of the Mexican government’s program to restitute those losses. Thus the group insists on a 21st century system to transfer any withheld wages from the United States government securely and directly to individual workers.

Professor Martin suggests that the Mexican migration of the 1970s to 1990s was somehow created by the bracero agreements in the 1950s. But Mexican migration networks are far older; the Mexican-born fraction of the labor force in Texas, Arizona and New Mexico was higher in 1920 than 1990[http://www.nber.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/chapters/c0098.pdf].

The policy decision of 1965 was to outlaw those longstanding, generational traditions of temporary mobility across the border. The dark consequence of that decision is today’s giant black market in labor that has immeasurably harmed United States and Mexican workers. It is time to move past the failed policies and fossilized positions of the previous generation, and the “Shared Border, Shared Future” report offers a specific vision of how to do that.

Michael Clemens is a senior fellow at the Center for Global Development. He was the lead author of “Shared Border, Shared Future: A Blueprint to Regulate U.S.-Mexico Labor Mobility.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

History offers strange consolation: No matter how alarming current events (or a presidential election) may be, historians can usually point to analogous episodes we survived in the past.

So who better to consult about our imminent election than the Pulitzer-winning presidential historian and biographer Doris Kearns Goodwin[http://www.doriskearnsgoodwin.com/index.html] and the MSNBC host and political commentator Rachel Maddow[http://www.rachelmaddow.com/]?

Ms. Goodwin, 73, has written five critically acclaimed and best-selling presidential biographies, including “Team of Rivals[http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/06/books/review/team-of-rivals-friends-of-abe.html]: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln,” the basis, in part, for Steven Spielberg’s film “Lincoln”; “No Ordinary Time[http://www.nytimes.com/1994/09/19/books/books-of-the-times-a-monumental-presidency-and-the-telling-details.html]: Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt: The Home Front in World War II”; and “Lyndon Johnson and the American Dream[http://www.nytimes.com/1976/06/06/archives/lyndon-johnson-and-the-american-dream-lyndon-johnson.html],” which grew out of Ms. Goodwin’s tenure as a White House fellow at age 24. She worked directly with President Johnson in his last year in office and later assisted him with his memoirs. Ms. Goodwin received her Ph.D. in government from Harvard.

Ms. Maddow, 43, has hosted “The Rachel Maddow Show[http://www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow-show]” weeknights on MSNBC since 2008. It is currently the network’s highest-rated program. Like other shows on MSNBC, it leans liberal. But Ms. Maddow has been praised by many for the civility with which she treats all guests, prioritizing information and context over the hysteria so often evident on cable news.

She is the author of the best-selling book “Drift: The Unmooring of American Military Power[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/15/books/review/drift-by-rachel-maddow.html].” Ms. Maddow earned a doctorate in politics from Oxford University, where she was a Rhodes scholar.

Over an early lunch of eggs and toast at the Gotham Lounge in the Peninsula Hotel in Midtown Manhattan, a few days before the final presidential debate this month, the pair discussed the coming election in historical terms: the temperamental forebears of Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per] among our presidential ranks, the ambitions of candidates and their skills for the job.

Philip Galanes: So, in terms of crazy, does this election have an historical peer?

Rachel Maddow[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/rachel\_maddow/index.html?inline=nyt-per]: For sure. It’s not like we’ve never had a figure like Donald Trump in public life before.

PG: Really?

RM: There’s some Huey Long[http://www.hueylong.com/] there, and some P. T. Barnum. Some George Wallace[http://www.biography.com/people/george-wallace-9522367].

Doris Kearns Goodwin[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/g/doris\_kearns\_goodwin/index.html?inline=nyt-per]: We’ve had plenty of populist figures in our past, but they had a different degree of substance than Mr. Trump. William Jennings Bryan[http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/monkeytrial/peopleevents/p\_bryan.html] [the Democratic nominee for president in 1896, 1900 and 1908] came out of a period like today. The industrial revolution was like our tech revolution and globalization. The pace of life had sped up and made people anxious. Telegrams and telephones were fast. **Immigration** was huge. And Bryan’s supporters, like Trump’s, were fearful about the way the country was changing.

RM: I’m more interested in whether there are parallels for political parties falling apart. As Doris wrote in “The Bully Pulpit,” our democracy unofficially depends on two major parties that can carry their own weight.

DKG: This is where history can give us solace. When parties split up, as the Whigs did in the 1850s, over slavery, we got the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] and Abraham Lincoln, our greatest leader.

PG: I feel better already.

DKG: But then you have 1912, when Teddy Roosevelt decided to run against Taft. He knew that Taft had the Republican delegates, so he created the primary system: “Let the people rule!” It was democratic, no doubt about it. But the race was so vitriolic, it sounds like today. Taft calls Teddy a dictator; Teddy calls Taft a pinhead. And The New York Times says, “If this is the first attempt at the primary system, we sincerely hope it’s the last.”

PG: Has the temperament of a candidate ever been so center stage before?

RM: In 1964, for sure. The bead on [Barry] Goldwater was that he was a nut. L.B.J. successfully characterized him as someone who couldn’t be trusted with the nuclear codes.

DKG: But it’s come to the surface more today.

RM: Maybe because we get more access to the president as a human being than we used to. With the White House photographer posting all those moments on Instagram. And so much attention on his family.

DKG: Good point. Before, the candidates were leaders of one party or the other. The parties had platforms, and you were voting on what they promised you. You didn’t really know them as human beings.

PG: And is temperament just code for hotheaded?

DKG: No, temperament is your basic orientation toward life. The Elizabethans boiled it down to four types: You were choleric or sanguine or melancholy or aggressive. You can be a good leader from any of them. Lincoln was melancholy, but what a president! It’s more to do with how you grow, how you learn from your mistakes.

PG: How do you feel about Hillary’s guarded temperament?

RM: I think it’s a form of emotional maturity. It takes intellectual stamina to stay open, as a leader and a mind, to absorb information and adversity.

DKG: And criticism. That’s what Eleanor Roosevelt decided. When people were against her, it meant they were against her ideas, not against her personally. True or not, it gave her enormous leeway not to take criticism personally.

RM: That’s a form of strength.

DKG: Where Trump goes wrong is when he says, “I have the best temperament of anyone who’s ever run for president — a winning temperament.” That’s completely a-historical. Our best presidents have all gone through adversity. Whether it’s Lincoln’s suicidal depression, or Teddy Roosevelt losing his wife and his mother on the same day in the same house, or F.D.R. getting polio, they all went through trials by fire and emerged stronger for it. Nobody wins all the time.

RM: It’s also too on the nose. You can never say, “I am humble.” You have disproved the assertion by saying it. Same with “best temperament ever.”

PG: Which president does Hillary most remind you of?

RM: Fascinating! It’s so hard not to factor gender. Which dude is she most like?

DKG: It would have to be someone who had a lot of experience in different forms. Teddy Roosevelt probably came to the presidency with most experience: police commissioner, Civil Service commissioner, state legislator, governor, vice president, president. Bush Sr. also had a lot of title positions and brought an array of experiences.

RM: But there’s often an **alienation** factor when people — like Hillary or Bush Sr. — come to you with all those experiences. They’re no longer seen as a person to have a beer with. It makes it harder for people to empathize with them. I think George H. W. Bush suffered from that enormously.

DKG: They become personages rather than people.

PG: Have you met the candidates?

RM: I met Hillary in a professional capacity. I interviewed her. But what happened off-camera was almost more interesting. I don’t think of her as an extrovert, but when we were done, she met every single person on set, my entire staff, the whole floor, including the cleaning crew. Shook hands, took pictures. She was being kind to people who had an interest in her. But to see her do that, willingly, at the end of her 11th event of the day, that surprised me.

PG: And Trump?

RM: I’ve only spoken to Trump on the phone. He was warm and charming. I enjoyed talking to him. But a funny thing happened when I was negotiating with his staff. They insisted that the conversation was off the record. I could never even refer to the fact that it had happened. But at the end of it, Mr. Trump said: “Well, this has been a good conversation. You can run it.” I said: “I’m not taping it. Your people said I couldn’t even refer to it.” And he said, “This wasn’t on TV?”

PG: I bet you’re a go-to person for candidates, Doris, with your presidential patina?

DKG: I was on the radio when my Roosevelt book came out, talking about how most of the action takes place on the second floor of the White House. Roosevelt invited all these people to live with them during World War II: His foreign policy adviser moved in and never left; Lorena Hickok, who had a crush on Eleanor; Princess Martha from Norway. Winston Churchill would stay for weeks at a time. So, I said, “I’m obsessed with all the great conversations they must have had in their bathrobes.”

It turned out that Hillary was listening. She was in the White House then. And she called me up at the radio station and said: “Come stay overnight at the White House, and we can figure out where everyone slept.” And she followed up on her promise. So, the president and Mrs. Clinton and my husband and I go through every room on the second floor with my map, and we figure it out. Bill and Hillary were sleeping where F.D.R. was. And my husband and I are in Winston Churchill’s room. No way could I sleep — with Churchill in the corner, drinking his brandy and smoking his cigar.

RM: Have you stayed in touch with Hillary over the years?

DKG: Not for a while. I went to see her after they won the race in 1996. Chelsea was going off to school, and my kids had gone to college. We talked about missing them. And she told a funny story about Jackie Kennedy telling her which designers to wear. Hillary said, “Clearly, I’m never figuring that out.” She was very open.

RM: Does she seem different to you now?

DKG: Oh, I don’t know. Maybe a little more defensive. But my guess is that if she’s able to win, knowing: “I’m the first female president of this country,” that is such a huge thing. It’s been totally overshadowed in this election. That would give her the confidence to say, “I’m going to be like F.D.R. and meet the press twice a week.” She could get out of that insular world.

PG: Let’s stick with that: ambition and evolution. Most of us can track our ambitions in life to some childhood hurt: chilly parents, poverty. We work to overcome it. But when I talked with Jimmy Carter[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/26/fashion/jimmy-carter-and-jacqueline-woodson-on-race-religion-and-rights.html] for this series[http://www.nytimes.com/column/table-for-three], he spoke about a transformational moment — a political defeat and deep depression — that galvanized his desire to help all Americans. Does that happen with the great presidents?

RM: You mean, they stop thinking about themselves and start thinking of the world?

DKG: Without question. Lincoln was rare. He had it from the beginning. When he’s 23 years old, he’s already talking about leaving the world a better place for having lived in it. Franklin Roosevelt may have been president without polio. But once polio happened, he identified more with people whom fate had dealt an unkind hand. He was more empathetic than he would have been. Even L.B.J., who always had this strain of caring about ordinary people. He went for power after he lost the first senate race. Then he has an almost fatal heart attack in ’55 and comes all the way back to his New Deal ambitions. He was more ready than we knew to be the liberal president.

PG: How about your ambitions?

DKG: My parents died when I was young — my mother of a heart attack when I was 15, my father when I was in my 20s. I think it made me want to tell stories of people who were dead to somehow bring them back to life. I didn’t think about it at the time. But it is stories that keep people alive. That’s where my ambition for history came from.

RM: My ambitions were scattershot. I’ve never been a planner. I find myself with an opportunity and decide if I want to take it. Then I dig in. I just want to be good at it. And I’m more motivated by fear of failure than ambition to succeed.

PG: But that makes sense for someone who started as an AIDS activist.

RM: I grew up in the Bay Area, which was the epicenter of the AIDS epidemic. And when I came out, it was a community that was fighting for survival. People my age and immediately older were dying. There aren’t many circumstances in life, unless you’re in the military, when you know a lot of people in your marching order who die before you’re 25. That’s humbling in terms of ambition.

DKG: It does what Teddy Roosevelt did: It makes you want to do well whatever you’re doing at that moment.

RM: Because you don’t know if there’s going to be another.

PG: It’s the empathic crisis that Jimmy Carter talked about. Do you see that in Hillary or Trump?

DKG: I see it in her. There’s a doubleness of purpose there. That’s what you’re looking for in a good politician. Of course they want power. But you also hope that they want to do something with it. That’s what L.B.J. said when he first got in: “I’m not just going to strut to ‘Hail to the Chief.’ I want to do something for poor people, for black people.” And when you look at what Hillary’s done through her career, it’s been there, too. She needs to communicate that: not just what she did for children, but what she wants to do for all of us.

PG: For a long time, I put irrational hatred of Hillary down to sexism.

RM: There’s some of that.

PG: But hasn’t it gotten worse? “Lock her up! Lock her up!”

DKG: Hatred of “the other” has grown exponentially. It started with the Clinton impeachment, then the hatred of Bush, then the hatred of Obama. I agree, it’s of a different level when you say, “Put her in jail.” But once I was on “Meet the Press,” and they put up this demographic map that showed that people don’t even want to live near people who think differently than they do.

RM: That’s a profound way to look at it. But there’s a simpler way: We saw the partisan hatred directed towards Bill and also Hillary Clinton when he was president. Now she’s getting Round 2. Nobody else gets Round 2.

PG: At the beginning of the Trump phenomenon, I thought he was going to play it very “Morning in America”: “I’ve got a zillion dollars and a million friends with a thousand ideas to make things better.” But it didn’t go that way.

DKG: Because he’s so vulnerable underneath.

RM: And it’s turned very dark now that he’s talking about Hillary Clinton and the cabal of global elites. I heard that speech before. It was translated.

PG: And now the election rigging ——

RM: But let’s imagine Trump wins. Anything can happen. Is there anything about him that could be a good building block for a leader?

DKG: You just have to hope. The worrisome thing is that we keep imagining that he’s going to become presidential at some point, that he’ll put behind him all the things he says about people, that he won’t react so personally. Then he keeps doing it.

RM: One thing that’s underappreciated about Trump is his sense of humor.

DKG: Where do you see this?

RM: When he talks about how great he is, sometimes I think he’s doing it in a self-deprecating way. And that makes me worry less about what seem to be his toxic insecurities.

DKG: Well, he has been a master at breaking news.

RM: Which is a kind of political genius, orchestrating coverage the way he has, if you don’t care about seeming offensive or hurting your party.

PG: Really?

RM: Look, I’m not persuading you. I’m just trying to imagine him as president and prepare for it as a country.

DKG: There’s something about the office. In 2000, there was a fear that George W. Bush would never be a legitimate president. But he was, despite that incredible election and how it looked like it would shadow him. Something happens when they get in the presidency.

RM: And the worry with George W. was not just legitimacy. It was whether he was mature enough and intelligent enough to do the job. Then he got in there and did it.

DKG: He was a fuller person, we now know. Whether or not we agree with the decisions he made, he did fill the presidency. I guess that’s what you have to hope if Trump wins.

PG: But look at how everyone is gripping the table.

Continue following our fashion and lifestyle coverage on Facebook (Styles[https://www.facebook.com/nytimesstyles] and Modern Love[https://www.facebook.com/modernlove]), Twitter (Styles[https://twitter.com/nytstyles], Fashion[https://twitter.com/nytfashion] and Weddings[https://twitter.com/nytimesvows]) and Instagram[https://instagram.com/nytimesfashion].

This interview has been edited and condensed.

Correction: November 6, 2016, Sunday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: The Table for Three interview last Sunday featuring Doris Kearns Goodwin and Rachel Maddow misstated the surname of the Democratic nominee for president in 1896, 1900 and 1908. He is William Jennings Bryan, not Bryant.

\* Elizabeth Warren and Tracee Ellis Ross on the Road to Activism[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/fashion/table-for-three-elizabeth-warren-tracee-ellis-ross.html]

\* When Washington Met Hollywood: At Lunch With Cory Booker and Susan Sarandon[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/27/fashion/when-washington-met-hollywood-at-lunch-with-cory-booker-and-susan-sarandon.html]

\* Alice Walker and Colm Toibin, and Their Trail of Words[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/24/fashion/the-color-purple-brooklyn-alice-walker-colm-toibin.html]

\* Barack Obama and Bryan Cranston on the Roles of a Lifetime[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/08/fashion/barack-obama-bryan-cranston-table-for-three.html]

\* Audra McDonald and Zachary Quinto on Public, and Private, Drama[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/fashion/table-for-three-audra-mcdonald-zackary-quinto.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In one of the most emotionally wrenching presidential races in living memory, Donald J. Trump’s support is as level as a pond. In polls, it is holding steady around 41 percent, right where it was after the first debate in late September. This plateau has persisted through the second and third debates with his opponent, Hillary Clinton, and the revelation of his recorded boasts of sexual assault. Even the stunning public rebuke of Mr. Trump by the parents of the Iraq war hero Capt. Humayun Khan in late July was followed by a swing of just a few percentage points, quite small by historical standards. Why has Mr. Trump’s support not collapsed further in the face of some fairly damning revelations?

Such high stability in polls is not new. It started several decades ago[http://prospect.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/hardened-divide-american-politics-0]. One measure of the stasis of modern campaigns is how much each party’s support in polls changes over the course[http://prospect.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/hardened-divide-american-politics-0] of a campaign. From 1952 to 1992, the average range — the difference between maximum and minimum levels of support — was 17 percentage points. Since 1996, the range has dropped to 8 points. Mr. Trump’s range is 4 points, from 39 to 43 percent.

At his lowest point, Mr. Trump still had more support than George McGovern, who got the smallest percentage of the popular vote by a major party candidate in the postwar era in 1972, with 38 percent. Mrs. Clinton’s average margin over Mr. Trump of five points has been enough to make her the first candidate to maintain a durable lead in an open presidential race since Dwight D. Eisenhower defeated Adlai Stevenson in 1952. So the bigger question is not about Mr. Trump, but why the last six presidential campaigns became so stable[http://prospect.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/hardened-divide-american-politics-0].

The answer is polarization. The same forces that propel a radical candidate to a party’s nomination also provide a floor through which he is unlikely to fall. Mr. Trump’s ascent is the culmination of trends that began in the 1990s, when Newt Gingrich introduced the Contract With America, and adopted tactics like government shutdowns and impeachment. More than any national figure since Sarah Palin, Mr. Trump embodies these attitudes.

The founders thought that a physically far-flung Republic would avoid such “mischiefs of faction.” In The Federalist No. 10, James Madison suggested[http://avalon.law.yale.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/18th\_century/fed10.asp] that the slowness of communication between distant states would prevent the formation of organized factions inflamed “with mutual animosity.” But modern communication has rendered Madison’s point of view obsolete. At the same time that voting patterns stabilized in the 1990s, instant long-distance communication allowed the coordination of message and ideology across long distances — and Republicans are more likely to be found in sparsely populated areas.

Madison thought that even if a faction shared common motives, physical distance would make it difficult “to discover their own strength, and to act in unison with each other.” Partisan media is not new, of course — in the 1800s, the chief funding for newspapers came from political parties — but talk radio, Fox News and Breitbart can reach like-minded voters with tremendous speed. Social media intensifies the segregation of voters by providing channels of communication tailored to specific preferences. When cable news organizations often seem unwilling to call out falsehoods, wrong information can cause tremendous damage. Technology has made Madison’s vast republic virtually small.

Communication goes two ways, and Mr. Trump takes this to an extreme. A reality TV star and a leader in the birther movement, he quickly became the first choice[http://election.princeton.edu/2016/01/05/what-december-polls-can-tell-us-about-the-gop-nomination/] of a plurality of Republican voters from the start of his candidacy in 2015. He is adept at using Twitter to send messages to his nearly 13 million followers. Mr. Trump’s success with Republican voters at odds with the party establishment can be explained by the fact that he is one of them, raised up to be their nominee. They will not abandon him, any more than they would abandon themselves.

Voter entrenchment is maintained in part by negative feelings about the opposition. Such warfare takes a toll. The approval ratings of both major nominees have declined steadily over the last 20 years, and Mr. Trump is the most negatively viewed nominee that Gallup[http://www.gallup.com/poll/193376/trump-leads-clinton-historically-bad-image-ratings.aspx] has ever recorded. Democratic-leaning voters and many college-educated Republicans[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/15/educational-divide-in-vote-preferences-on-track-to-be-wider-than-in-recent-elections/] find it unthinkable to support Mr. Trump given his appeals to racial and anti-**immigrant** resentment. In 2012, Mitt Romney came with the baggage of his party; in 2016, Mr. Trump is baggage personified.

For this reason, Mrs. Clinton’s support is unlikely to flag even as her email has again attracted the attention of the F.B.I. Likewise, for committed Republicans, support for Mrs. Clinton is out of the question. In a Florida survey, 84 percent of Trump voters said that Mrs. Clinton[http://www.publicpolicypolling.com/main/2016/10/clintons-florida-lead-continues-to-grow.html] should be in prison, and 40 percent said she was a demon.

With polarization, many voters’ preferences have become predictable[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/politics/archive/2016/05/an-election-in-negative/483905/] from their social and cultural characteristics. Even so-called undecided voters are more decided[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/28/opinion/28wang.html?\_r=0] than they realize. It has been suggested that the Republican Party is motivated today not by political conservatism, but a reaction against contemporary life[http://www.newyorker.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/magazine/2016/10/31/hillary-clinton-and-the-populist-revolt]. Trump voters resemble Romney and McCain voters. They are whites who are more likely to be evangelicals[http://www.people-press.org/2016/09/13/party-identification-trends-1992-2016/#religion] who did not graduate from college[http://www.prri.org/spotlight/change-and-continuity-among-white-voters-with-no-college-degrees/]. Tensions between these groups and elites[http://www.newyorker.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/magazine/2016/10/31/hillary-clinton-and-the-populist-revolt] and minorities limits the range of support that either side’s candidate will receive.

Partisan geography has become more fixed, too. In terms of patterns of relative strength and weakness, the electoral map is more stable than it has been in 50 years[http://prospect.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/hardened-divide-american-politics-0]. For this reason, talk of Mrs. Clinton’s winning Texas is overblown. If that happens, I promise to eat a bug.

Mr. Trump’s candidacy has revolved almost entirely around emotionally powerful issues like race, **immigration** and anti-Muslim sentiment. The more you feel a decision in your gut, the less likely it is that you will change your mind. White nationalists think white nationalism is great, but others are repelled. And in a Raycom/Mason-Dixon poll of the Louisiana Senate race, supporters of the white supremacist David Duke favored Mr. Trump over Mrs. Clinton by a margin of 81 percent to 6 percent.

Voter polarization translates easily to extreme legislative bodies. In any district dominated by one party, representatives are determined mainly in primary elections[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-political-process-isnt-rigged-it-has-much-bigger-problems/], when turnout is low and the most likely voters are motivated partisans, fulfilling Madison’s fear that “a common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority.” By numerical measures[http://voteview.com/political\_polarization\_2014.html] of ideological intensity, from the 1970s to the 1990s, centrism steadily disappeared from the House Republican caucus. Single-party domination has expanded since 2012 because of increased partisan gerrymandering[https://www.stanfordlawreview.org/print/article/three-tests-for-practical-evaluation-of-partisan-gerrymandering/], which eliminated dozens of competitive districts. These trends suggest that partisan gridlock will continue long after Election Day.

Although technology has contributed to polarization, it may also help rescue us. For example, Facebook has automated story selection for its custom news feed; for political news this tends to foster an echo-chamber effect. However, Facebook data scientists have found a better source of diversity[https://research.facebook.com/blog/exposure-to-diverse-information-on-facebook/]: almost 30 percent of hard-news reports originating from friends reflect opposing views. Even better, individuals are likelier to engage with information like this when it is presented in a social context[http://www.dartmouth.edu/~seanjwestwood/papers/CRsocialNews.pdf].

For now, we are stuck with an intensely emotional campaign that has been a significant source of stress for more than half of adults[http://www.apa.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/news/press/releases/stress/2016/presidential-election.pdf]. The American Psychological Association has, for the first time, issued tips on dealing with election-related stress[http://www.apa.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/news/press/releases/2016/10/presidential-election-stress.aspx]. Strong emotional experience reduces mental flexibility[https://www-ncbi-nlm-nih-gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/pubmed/17335395], suggesting that when tempers run high, as they have for many voters this season, entrenched support for a party or candidate is more likely. So if you wonder whether there is anyone left to persuade, the answer is probably no[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/28/opinion/28wang.html?\_r=0]. We’re too freaked out.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Sam Wang is a professor of neuroscience and molecular biology at Princeton and a founder of the Princeton Election Consortium.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Earlier this month, the United States hit a new benchmark in an already historic presidential campaign: For the first time in the country’s history, 200 million[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/how-many-registered-voters-are-in-america-2016-229993] Americans are registered to vote. Over the past eight years, more than 50 million people have registered. That could mean that more Americans are voting for the first time this year than ever before.

Your first time voting — waiting in line, taking a possibly illegal selfie[http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2016/10/26/us/ap-us-ballot-selfies-states.html] with your ballot, getting an “I Voted” sticker — is as American a fall pastime as watching grown men run at each other headfirst for hours at a time. And voting is habit-forming: Research shows that your first election can have a strong impact[http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/diff-reg-bias.pdf] on how you think about politics for the rest of your life.

This has been a weird election for everyone, but especially for people who are voting for the first time. In conversations I had with more than 50 first-time voters, the same word came up again and again when I asked what they thought about their options this year: “Disappointing.” While a large share of voters I talked to said they would be voting for Hillary Clinton, many saw their vote as more of a bulwark against a President Trump than anything else.

One of the most striking stories to come out of this election may be the number of **immigrants** Donald J. Trump inspired to earn their United States citizenship so they could vote against him. Idania Barousse, 36, is a pastoral associate at a Catholic church in San Jose, Calif., that serves a congregation of Hispanic **immigrants**. She **immigrated** to the United States from Nicaragua when she was 14 and obtained her green card shortly after. Despite living in the United States for more than two decades, she has never voted.

“I feel like I wasted 20 years plus, and now I feel like my eyes opened up,” she said.

In July, Ms. Barousse started the process of becoming a United States citizen and officially became one in September. She said she would be voting for Mrs. Clinton.

“My spiritual life is connected to my neighbor, and I have to act by my actions,” she told me. “I cannot just cross my arms and pretend nothing’s happening. I have to defend my neighbor.”

Anya Mironets, 31, is a clinical pharmacist in Fort Collins, Colo. She became a United States citizen after emigrating from Ukraine more than 10 years ago, but hasn’t exercised her right to vote. Ms. Mironets said she worried that if Mr. Trump became president, the United States would start to resemble the former Soviet Union, where she grew up.

“My mother, brother and other relatives still live in Ukraine. I worry about their safety every day, and Trump’s praise of Putin and ignorance about Ukraine frightens me,” she wrote in an email.

She added that she regretted not voting sooner, but said that when she was growing up overseas few people bothered to vote because rampant corruption made it unclear whether your vote would be counted.

“It took me a decade of living in the United States to leave that mind-set behind,” she said.

Abhi Singh, a 39-year-old filmmaker in San Francisco, became a citizen in 2015 and will be voting for Mrs. Clinton. Despite his reservations about Mrs. Clinton’s foreign policy and her private email server, he sees voting against Mr. Trump as a civic duty this year.

“To say that you are not voting because you are disappointed with the candidates is an arrogant display of privilege,” he said. “I’ve seen grandmas in India wait in line for hours to cast their vote, and I can safely tell you that the candidates and prospects were not any better than what we are faced with today.”

Paola Anez-Kikendall, a 47-year-old mother of three in North Carolina, moved to the United States from Venezuela as a child, but “felt an urgency” to become a citizen only this year. She identifies as a Republican, but said she could not stomach the party’s nominee.

“As a woman, as a Hispanic woman, as a mother of a grown child who happens to also be gay,” she said, “I just cannot do it.” She voted early for Gary Johnson, the Libertarian Party candidate.

Mr. Trump’s candidacy has politically mobilized the Hispanic community in ways that no other modern candidate appears to have done. This fall, Enrico Trevisani, 19, a junior at the University of Arizona, started a chapter of Voto Latino on campus to register fellow Hispanic voters. He recalled registering an older woman to vote at a taco stand in Tucson — a symbolic location, he said, since a Trump supporter had warned[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/us/politics/taco-trucks-on-every-corner-trump-supporters-anti-immigration-warning.html] of “taco trucks on every corner.”

“You could tell there was something different about this election to her,” Mr. Trevisani said, referring to the woman. “You could tell it was personal.”

The young Muslim voters I talked to have also taken Mr. Trump’s candidacy personally. Aisha Bhoori is a junior at Harvard, and while she feels safe on campus, she worries about her parents when they attend Friday Prayer at their mosque in New Jersey.

“If Trump wins, it’s not a stretch to say that my entire religion will be under attack and Islamophobic incidents will increase,” she said.

Ms. Bhoori supported Senator Bernie Sanders in the Democratic primary and said she has come to accept Mrs. Clinton “with the same measured enthusiasm that I do ‘Hamilton,’ the musical: She has her flaws, and I don’t wholeheartedly agree with all of her policies, but she’s cracked the glass ceiling, goddamn it, and done so in a competent and confident and composed way that makes me proud.”

Imani Khan, a freshman at St. Louis University, said she hoped American Muslims like herself would exercise their right to vote. Many see voting as a morally impure act, she said, especially if the politician they elect ends up contributing to more Muslim suffering overseas.

“It’s about time we start joining a conversation that includes us,” she said.

Ms. Khan plans to vote for Jill Stein, the Green Party candidate. Her reasoning: Missouri is not a swing state, and if the Green Party wins 5 percent of the popular vote this year, it will qualify for federal election funding in 2020.

“Two parties do not cover the wide spectrum of Americans’ political views,” she said. “Other countries have three, four, five, six parties. Why are we still stuck at two?”

Mr. Trump and his supporters often say they represent the silent majority — voters forgotten by the American political elite who aren’t telling pollsters they support Mr. Trump, but will turn out in droves. That idea has not held up[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/trump-supporters-probably-arent-lying-to-pollsters/] under scrutiny. (Instead of the silent majority, Mr. Trump’s supporters might be called the “vocal plurality.”)

Mr. Trump’s supporters don’t see their vote as a vote for a hateful agenda; quite the opposite. Tyler Rice, 20, a plumber in Kentucky, said he was “extremely excited” to cast his first ballot for Mr. Trump.

“He is representing a class of people who have been long forgotten by the federal government,” he wrote in an email. “Soaked in dirty politics and pay to play scenarios. I’m voting for Donald Trump because he will strengthen America back into what she has always been, The Best.”

Other young Republicans are more reticent in their support for Mr. Trump. Charlie Kolean, a senior at Michigan State University, said Mr. Trump had “obvious flaws,” but “understands what drives the economy and will do what it takes to get the economy going.”

Laura Schmitt, a junior at the University of Wisconsin, identifies as a conservative but will be voting for Mrs. Clinton.

“I wish I were more optimistic about this election like lots of young people were when Obama took office,” she said. “I am unable to support Donald Trump because he does not represent my values or what I believe the Republican Party truly represents.”

That excitement gap is something Edgeri Hudlin, a senior at Duke University, tried to close. He worked with Rock the Vote on a rap video[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6tUzmHrpMzA] to encourage millennials to vote. “Even through the apathy, we have to understand that our vote — even if you think it doesn’t make a big change — it does something.” he said.

Young female voters, especially young white ones, said their reaction to the prospect of the first female president surprised even them. Kiley Delaney, a junior at Macalester College in Minnesota, said she was excited to cast her first vote for Mrs. Clinton. When Mrs. Clinton accepted the Democratic nomination in July, Ms. Delaney — to her own surprise — started crying.

“I know it’s not cool to be excited to vote for Hillary, and that we’re supposed to preface every positive remark about her with, ‘Well, she’s certainly not perfect, but …,’ but I would be excited to vote for her even if Donald Trump wasn’t her opponent,” she said. “I hope that I will cry again at her inauguration.”

Ellie Herman, a junior at the University of Wisconsin, persuaded her 87-year-old grandmother — a staunch Republican who despises the Clintons — to mail in her ballot for Mrs. Clinton.

“The more I time I spend with my grandma, the more I think my liberal vibes are rubbing off on her,” Ms. Herman said. “Thankfully, her hatred of Trump and availability to vote from home were enough reasons for her to vote for Hillary.”

American voters — students, teachers, farmers, nurses, hedge fund managers, mechanics, bus drivers, government pencil pushers, working moms, stay-at-home dads, tech titans and the baristas that serve them — all have a chance to make their voices heard on Nov. 8. Many have already exercised their voice in the political process. I am thinking of the heavily tattooed man in Cleveland who prayed over me for my safety at the Republican National Convention, or the young man at a Trump rally[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/26/opinion/campaign-stops/pennsylvania-where-everyone-is-furious.html] in Harrisburg, Pa. who gave me the finger, unprovoked.

Now there’s just one more thing for them to do.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Emma Roller (@EmmaRoller), a former reporter for National Journal, is a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This election’s most dire priority is averting a national and planetary calamity (two words: President Trump). But Nov. 8 is also about good government at all levels. Here are some congressional and state races in New York [http://www.elections.ny.gov/district-map/district-map.html] and New Jersey[http://njgin.state.nj.us/state/NJ\_CongressionalDistricts/] where voters can make a difference.

THE SENATE, FROM NEW YORK

New Yorkers should re-elect Chuck Schumer[http://www.chuckschumer.com/] , a three-term Democrat being challenged by Wendy Long, a Republican lawyer from Manhattan. Mr. Schumer, who could become majority leader if the Senate goes Democratic this year, has a long list of accomplishments for New York. He championed a $60 billion disaster relief package that included billions for Hurricane Sandy victims. He helped set up the corporation to fund and manage the crucial Gateway rail tunnel[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/17/opinion/build-a-new-hudson-river-tunnel.html] between New York and New Jersey and pushed to restore $600 million in antiterrorism funds critical for the New York area. Ms. Long says she was inspired[http://www.silive.com/news/index.ssf/2016/10/senate\_candidate\_wendy\_long\_tr.html] to run by Mr. Trump; enough said.

THE HOUSE, FROM NEW YORK

In New York’s First District[http://www.latfor.state.ny.us/maps/2012c/CD\_map\_rep\_01.pdf], in eastern Long Island, Anna Throne-Holst[http://www.annathrone-holst.com/] , a Democrat who was Southampton town supervisor, is challenging the incumbent Republican, Lee Zeldin[https://zeldinforcongress.com/].

Mr. Zeldin has zealously pursued a narrow right-wing agenda poorly suited to his diverse district. He wants to defund Planned Parenthood and repeal the Affordable Care Act[https://zeldin.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/first-time-ever-congress-send-obamacare-repeal-bill-president-s-desk], among other terrible ideas. But his worst recent behavior has been in staunchly defending his party’s unseemly presidential nominee, at one point suggesting that if Mr. Trump is racist, then President Obama is, too.

Ms. Throne-Holst avoids such divisiveness. She has worked well with Republicans locally and has promised to fight for gun control, climate-change legislation and vocational training for high-school graduates. She would be a thoughtful member of Congress, something this district now lacks.

Tom Suozzi[http://suozziforcongress.com/], a Democrat, is running to succeed Representative Steve Israel in the Third District[http://www.latfor.state.ny.us/maps/2012c/CD\_map\_rep\_03.pdf] that cuts across Queens, Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

Mr. Suozzi, as county executive, saved Nassau from near bankruptcy. He has an impressive record fighting corruption, and he ran a lonely but principled campaign against Eliot Spitzer in 2006 for the gubernatorial nomination. He has been a national leader in the battle to limit urban sprawl and revitalize aging suburbs. He would be a strong, articulate advocate for his district and party.

Mr. Suozzi’s opponent is a three-term Republican state senator, Jack Martins, a loyal party member in Albany who says he wants to promote Mr. Trump’s issues. That’s bad news.

In the sprawling 19th District[http://www.latfor.state.ny.us/maps/2012c/CD\_map\_rep\_19.pdf], in the Hudson Valley and Catskills, Zephyr Teachout[http://www.zephyrteachoutforcongress.com/], a Democrat, is running against John Faso[https://johnfaso.com/new-york-future/jobs-and-growth-for-upstate/], a Republican who was the Assembly minority leader. Ms. Teachout, a Fordham law professor[https://www.fordham.edu/info/23186/zephyr\_teachout] and author, is an expert on political corruption and the corrosive influence of money in politics. She gained national attention as a political novice for her surprisingly potent bid to unseat Gov. Andrew Cuomo in the 2014 Democratic primary. Her campaign is focused on fighting corporate monopolies and dirty money, protecting the environment and cutting red tape for small businesses and farms. Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont, a kindred spirit, has endorsed her.

Mr. Faso, well known and respected in this district, has a lifetime “A” rating[https://johnfaso.com/new-york-future/defending-your-rights/] from the National Rifle Association. He wants to support the local economy by speeding up environmental reviews of big projects and cutting corporate taxes. Mr. Faso says he disagrees with Mr. Trump on several issues but refuses to say whether or not he will vote for him. Ms. Teachout is the better candidate for this era of gridlock and disillusionment. She promises to be the strong voice for change in Washington that so many angry voters are demanding.

The race in the 24th District[http://www.latfor.state.ny.us/maps/2012c/CD\_map\_rep\_24.pdf], in Syracuse and surrounding areas, pits a one-term Republican, John Katko[https://katko.house.gov/] , against Colleen Deacon[https://colleendeacon.com/], a Democrat and former aide to Senator Kirsten Gillibrand. Ms. Deacon has strong endorsements, including from President Obama and Emily’s List. But Mr. Katko deserves re-election. He is a rare breed of Republican, an independent thinker who has bucked his party[http://www.syracuse.com/politics/index.ssf/2016/10/rep\_john\_katko\_ranks\_as\_8th\_most\_independent\_republican\_in\_congress.html] in crucial ways. He opposed its efforts to undo President Obama’s administrative actions protecting young **immigrants** from deportation and its reckless campaign to destroy the Affordable Care Act. He acknowledges that climate change is real and caused by humans. Congressional Quarterly recently called him the eighth most independent House Republican.

He’s wrong on some issues — he tried to stall the funding of Planned Parenthood, stopped short of offering unauthorized **immigrants** a path to citizenship and opposed the nuclear deal with Iran. But — and this is important — he passes the Trump test; that is, he finds Mr. Trump’s remarks about women “offensive, disgusting and inexcusable” and says he won’t vote for him. Asked by the Syracuse.com[http://Syracuse.com] editorial board how he felt about being on the same ballot line as Mr. Trump and Ms. Long, Mr. Katko said, “That’s why God made Scotch.” Washington needs more Republicans like him.

THE HOUSE, FROM NEW JERSEY

New Jersey’s Fifth District[http://garrett.house.gov/5th-district/map-of-the-district], covering parts of Bergen, Passaic, Sussex and Warren Counties, has had the misfortune of being represented for nearly 14 years by a founding member of the ultraconservative, antigovernment Freedom Caucus, Scott Garrett. He voted recently against helping 9/11 first responders. He infuriated fellow Republicans by refusing to contribute to the National Republican Congressional Committee because it backed gay candidates. He opposes abortion rights and same-sex marriage.

His Democratic opponent, Josh Gottheimer[http://josh4congress.com/], was a Microsoft executive and a speechwriter for President Bill Clinton. He says he wants to work for more civility and productivity in Congress, for comprehensive tax reform, for better constituent services and for government investment in the district, something his opponent often rejects on ideological grounds. Mr. Gottheimer would serve the district far better than Mr. Garrett.

NEW YORK STATE SENATE

The Ninth District[http://www.latfor.state.ny.us/maps/2012s/SD\_map\_rep\_09.pdf], in Nassau County, was dominated for years by Dean Skelos, the former Senate leader, and now a convicted felon and living symbol of all that is rotten in Albany. Todd Kaminsky[http://toddkaminsky.com/], a Democratic member of the Assembly and a former prosecutor, won the seat in a special election this spring, narrowly beating a Republican lawyer, Chris McGrath. Mr. McGrath, who is running again, said he would oppose limits on outside income for legislators, a practice that too easily creates conflicts between public and private interests. We recommended Mr. Kaminsky in the special election and believe he should remain in that seat.

The Seventh District[http://www.latfor.state.ny.us/maps/2012s/SD\_map\_rep\_07.pdf], also in Nassau County, is an open seat. Adam Haber[http://www.haber4newyork.com/], a school board member and businessman (real estate and restaurants), is the Democrat running against Elaine Phillips[http://www.elainephillips.org/] , the Republican mayor of the tiny village of Flower Hill. Both are worthy candidates, but Ms. Phillips gets extra credit for her environmental efforts, working after Hurricane Sandy to combat erosion and groundwater pollution and to protect the area from flooding. The League of Conservation Voters has endorsed Ms. Phillips, and so do we.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The volunteers worked busily in a campaign office for Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per] in Manhattan decorated with Trump posters and other campaign materials. One worker was reading Mr. Trump’s book “The Art of the Deal.”

Over the next two hours, the candidate could heard bragging about his “remarkably successful” business career, complaining that his unpolished orations “are held against me” and that “the press treats me like dirt.”

This was not a real Trump campaign office, but a church basement, and the campaign volunteers were actors in Lyra Theater’s production of a 1941 play written in German with no script modifications but infused with modern touches culled from Mr. Trump’s campaign.

As the action unfolded onstage, there were audio clips of Mr. Trump, and other campaign coverage, playing in the background, and some actors wore red baseball caps resembling Mr. Trump’s “Make America Great Again” hats.

The play, “The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui” was the playwright Bertolt Brecht’s cautionary tale about the rise of Hitler.

It was not Brecht’s best known play, but it has gained sudden popularity this election season with not just one but three downtown theater companies independently staging productions, all within a few blocks of one another in the East Village.

The companies see the Arturo Ui character — a mobster and populist demagogue in Prohibition-era Chicago — as strikingly similar to Mr. Trump and call their productions warnings against the prospect of a Trump presidency.

In fact, the Trump campaign has become a cultural muse of sorts, inspiring a flurry of work from New York’s performing arts community, a sector of the city that traditionally votes Democratic.

Musical offerings around town playing off Mr. Trump’s candidacy include a Wagnerian opera, a violin concerto and another opera that echoes Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per]’s bitter battle with Mr. Trump.

The Lyra ensemble decided to stage the play early on during Mr. Trump’s bid for the presidency, said Noam Shapiro, one of Lyra’s artistic directors.

“We all had same impulse: This is a play for our time,” he said of the production, which runs through Nov. 5, at St. George’s Episcopal Church on East 16th Street.

Mr. Shapiro said the parallels between Mr. Trump and the Arturo Ui character, a charismatic but dishonest outsider, were uncanny.

“We didn’t change a single word of text from the play,” Mr. Shapiro said. “We didn’t have to.’’

Arturo Ui is a gangster seeking control of the cauliflower market by killing competitors. He commandeers a political party and wins over the public as he rises to power and pits himself as the savior of Chicago who has cleaned up crime.

“Arturo brags about his incredible success in business, or his love of the police, or how he hates **immigrants**,” Mr. Shapiro said.

The theater companies have not conferred with one another, he said, but, “in a way, all three productions are a team. We aren’t working together, but we all share the same goal, speaking out against hate speech.”

The Trump campaign declined to discuss its role as creative inspiration.

A few blocks away on St. Marks Place, the Cave Theatre Company [http://www.cavetheatre.org/]recently ended a two-week run of the play. Between scenes producers showed video clips of Mr. Trump and afterward played the Queen anthem “We Are the Champions,” which has been a staple at Trump rallies.

The Cave company used campaign-style promotional posters depicting a man in a Trump-like suit with a cauliflower in his lapel. One of their social media hashtags was #makecauliflowergreatagain.

Farther downtown, at the Wild Project, a theater on East Third Street, the Phoenix Theatre Ensemble’s[http://www.phoenixtheatreensemble.org/] version of the Brecht play runs through Nov. 13. A nearby Two Boots pizza franchise named a cauliflower-topped pizza after Arturo Ui and, as it happens, Sebastian Brecht, 53, a grandson of the playwright, is opening a handmade chocolate shop nearby.

In a vacated space in an office building on East 46th Street in Manhattan, a short satirical opera, “The Drumf and the Rhinegold,’’ is scheduled for Sunday and Monday, as part of an immersive installation that includes an inflatable pool.

The piece, a parody of Wagner’s Ring Cycle, tells the story of Drumf, a sinister overlord who has stolen a magic ring granting world domination, but who runs into resistance from the Rhinemaidens — Ivana, Marla and Melania — who reclaim the gold ring hidden in his hair, which itself is a singing character.

The performance is a production of the Floating Tower[http://www.floatingtower.com/the-drumf] theater company, and the opera’s composer, Matti Kovler, said Mr. Trump “has such a dramatic persona that is perfect for opera.’’

On election night, “Trump — a Theatrical Concerto[http://lpr.com/lpr\_events/trump-theatrical-concerto-gene-pritsker-november-8th-2016/]” will be performed at Le Poisson Rouge on Bleecker Street.

The violin concerto is “a 45-minute exploration into the mind of the Republican nominee,” and will feature recorded snippets from Trump speeches played alongside a live chamber ensemble, said the piece’s composer, Gene Pritsker.

Mr. Pritsker said his desire to write a piece about Mr. Trump grew as the candidate gained momentum, an ascent he called “bad for people, but good for my idea.”

Another musical production, a 2001 opera called “Mrs. President[http://www.victoriabond.com/artist.php?view=news&nid=8029],” reflects the race between Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump.

The opera, scenes of which were scheduled to be performed on Friday night at the National Opera Center in Manhattan, is based on the story of Victoria Woodhull, the first woman to run for president, in 1872. She was fiercely criticized by a Brooklyn minister, Henry Ward Beecher.

“He was kind of a Trump-like person, a bit of a bully who said all the right things,” the composer, Victoria Bond, said.

Mr. Beecher labeled Ms. Woodhull Satan and claimed she belonged in jail, while she criticized him over his infidelities. The vitriol is “almost replaying itself” in the current presidential race, said Ms. Bond, who added that the two candidates in the performance were made to look like their real-life counterparts.

Brecht, who fled Germany in 1933, shortly after Hitler became chancellor, wrote “Arturo Ui” in Finland before moving to the United States. The play has been performed twice on Broadway, including a production that opened in 1963 with Christopher Plummer. It was produced Off Broadway in 1991 with John Turturro playing Ui and in 2002 with Al Pacino in the lead role.

Mr. Shapiro, of Lyra Theater, said Brecht would be both “horrified and delighted” by the play’s sudden resurgence.

“He would be pleased that ‘Arturo Ui’ was getting produced, but saddened that the dangers he wrote about are so present in the United States today,” he said.

The Cave company decided not to force the parallels. “We didn’t want to spoon-feed it to them, in that way,” said James Masciovecchio, the production’s director, especially because in the play, “certain lines were almost scarily similar” to Mr. Trump’s campaign rhetoric, including hard-line positions on **immigration** and law and order.

“Instead of having our Ui be Trump, we let him be this crazy ridiculous character, and let the audience get it on their own,” he said.

There are no direct references to Mr. Trump in the Phoenix production of the Brecht play. His estate, in granting performance rights, forbids amending the script, said Craig Smith, who plays Arturo Ui.

“We didn’t need to change a thing,” Mr. Smith said. “It’s astonishingly relevant to 2016 without doing a thing to it.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Within a few decades of founding New Amsterdam, the Dutch built a wall, first to keep out the Indians, then the British. But because the Dutch came to the New World to make money — rather than to proselytize or escape religious persecution — they let in just about everybody else.

Call it tolerance or indifference, that reception distinguished New York. Coupled with the wall, though, it also symbolized the city’s enduring ambivalence about **immigration**.

Tyler Anbinder’s “City of Dreams: The 400-Year Epic History of **Immigrant** New York” (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, $35) reviews this legacy and the continuing tale of the city’s unique demographic upheaval. It’s a welcome addition in a campaign season when, it seems, many Americans need reminding of how most of us got here.

The author admittedly gives short shrift to some earlier **immigrant** groups (Greeks and Indians) and to newcomers (as a historian he prizes the perspective of hindsight). But while Dr. Anbinder, who teaches history at George Washington University, offers no sweeping revelations or revolutionary doctrine, his exhaustive narrative provides a timely overview richly flecked with fascinating nuggets and enlightening profiles.

“City of Dreams” opens in 1892 when an Irish teenager, Annie Moore, and her brothers became the first arrivals on Ellis Island. (The first- and second-class passengers went directly to Pier 38 at West Houston Street.) He fleshes out a familiar story with enriching factoids.

Annie was ferried past the new Statue of Liberty[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/statue\_of\_liberty/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], which, despite its later symbolism as an **immigrant** beacon, actually began as a celebration of Civil War emancipation. (It was all the more ironic since Emma Lazarus was commissioned to write the poem that would define the statue’s mission by a fellow author, Constance Cary Harrison, an unrepentant Confederate who was married to Jefferson Davis’s secretary and who, with her sisters, sewed the first Stars and Bars battle flag.)

Rather than migrating to Texas and dying in a railroad accident as had long been assumed, Annie married the son of a Manhattan baker who patented a peanut-and-fig-filled macaroon and lived and died on the Lower East Side (where the most crowded precincts were more densely populated than the most congested neighborhoods in Mumbai today).

Annie and her brothers “truly became prototypical New Yorkers, with lives and families inextricably linked to the New York **immigrant** experience,” Dr. Anbinder writes. “Today, the descendants of Annie and her brothers include representatives from all the other leading New York City **immigrant** groups — Italians, Eastern European Jews, Chinese, Dominicans.”

By World War I, 17 million foreigners had followed in her footsteps in “a movement of people without precedent in human history.”

The city’s share of foreign-born is nearing its 20th century peak of about 40 percent, but far below the 55 percent in 1855, not long after Samuel F. B. Morse ran for mayor on the Native American ticket (warning that Catholic **immigrants** were organizing sleeper cells to strike a blow for Rome when the time was ripe).

**Immigrants** still come for the same reasons they did four centuries ago. Today, about nine in 10 of the city’s cabdrivers, garment workers, dishwashers and tile setters are foreign-born. On Sept. 11, 2001, none of the 19 terrorists were **immigrants**; about one in five of the victims were.

New York, a 1909 edition of Life magazine concluded, was “a pocket edition of Babel, a digest of the United States, with fewer Americans and more Americanism than any spot between Calais, Me., and the Kingdom of Heaven.”

Dr. Anbinder writes, “The story of **immigrant** New York changes constantly on its surface yet not at all at its heart.” This is still a city of dreams that foreigners, depending on the political climate, hope to fulfill. The epic history of their struggle was captured by U2 on the soundtrack to the film “Gangs of New York”:

Of all of the promises

Is this one we can keep?

Of all of the dreams

Is this one still out of reach?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Nearly a quarter-century into his career as a late-night host, Conan O’Brien isn’t about to set his cruise control and coast. “In some ways, I’m much more active than I was 10 years ago,” the 53-year-old Mr. O’Brien said. “I’m very fortunate that I can still be discovering things and feeling like a kid again.”

His latest gig: an executive producer of “People of Earth[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NWNNo8GeXWM],” debuting at 9 p.m. on Monday, Oct. 31, on TBSand starring Wyatt Cenac, formerly of “The Daily Show,” as a New York reporter who checks out an upstate support group for **alien** abductees — only to discover that he may be one himself. That same night, at 11, Mr. O’Brien will bring “Conan” and guests including Louis C. K., Ryan Reynolds and Tracy Morgan to the Apollo Theater in Harlem for four episodes. And at 10 p.m. on Dec. 7, he’ll explore Berlin subcultures with help from a dominatrix in his latest travel special.

In a phone interview from Northern California, where he was vacationing with his wife, Liza Powel O’Brien, the cheeky Mr. O’Brien mused about extraterrestrial life and why he doesn’t mind being the butt of a joke. These are edited excerpts from the conversation.

So you’re on a romantic getaway.

Yeah, we have a 13-year-old daughter and a boy who’s going to be 11 in a couple of weeks, and this is the first time that we’ve left them for more than two nights in a row. It’s a huge milestone event, so let’s make the story about that. It’s going to get a lot of clicks, I’m telling you.

How did you come to “People of Earth”?

I’ve had a production company, Conaco, for a number of years for projects that I really am passionate about — kind of a TV equivalent of Trump University. It’s a tax dodge, and we’re really bilking the public. A lot of times we read a script, and it feels like homework. But this was an absolute delight. The other key piece of the puzzle, aside from TBS, was Greg Daniels [an executive producer of “The Office”], who has a genius for very subtle comedy that’s based on personality.

Do you believe in **aliens**?

I do think **alien** life exists. But I think when we do encounter life on other planets it’s going to be extremely disappointing. I just don’t think it’s going to be the spaceship and these creatures with giant heads and huge eyes. It’s going to be some sort of three-celled organism that grows on a rock and is really into pornography.

What’s it like to work with Wyatt Cenac?

He’s brilliant, and has incredible integrity. A fantastic added delight is getting to know Wyatt, who I’d admired from afar, and I mean that in a creepy way.

Why “Conan” at the Apollo?

This is a bucket-list thing. Just stepping up on that stage and walking around, a chill goes up your spine. I was there a week ago, shooting pieces in Harlem and going on adventures. When 30 women pull you into their salon and say, “We’re going to weave your hair,” you say yes.

Is there anything left in this presidential campaign to mine for humor?

There’s been a lot of good comedy about Trump, but he also presents a real challenge. He’s a very hard person to satirize, because he’s so outrageous to begin with. Myself, I’m eager for this election to be over. It got to a certain point where sadness started to creep in.

After travel specials in Cuba and South Korea, you’re going to Berlin.

I’ve always loved being a fish out of water and having the locals laugh at me. I play in an avant-garde club with a band that’s in crazy makeup and dresses. Probably my favorite part is when we went to Tempelhof Airport, where refugees are living until they can be given more permanent residence. It’s almost comedy as diplomacy.

I’ll let you get back to your wife now.

Please — she grows weary of me very quickly. You’re probably going to get a bunch of flowers that say, “Thank you for taking care of my husband for half an hour so I can go and enjoy myself.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Senate race in New Hampshire is the only one this year in which both incumbent and challenger are women (the first such race was in 1960, next door in Maine). Senator Kelly Ayotte, a Republican, is struggling to close a widening gap with Maggie Hassan, the state’s popular Democratic governor. The seat is a beachhead in the battle for the Senate, with Democrats, Republicans and special-interest groups pouring upward of $102 million into the race, or about $114 for each registered voter.

Earlier this month, Ms. Hassan stood beside Michelle Obama as the first lady said that the 2005 tape in which Donald Trump boasted about sexual assault “has shaken me to my core.” Just days before the tape emerged, Ms. Ayotte issued the most damaging of her many strangled testimonials to Mr. Trump, suggesting that he could serve as a role model, before taking that back.

Ms. Ayotte, who is 48, has contorted herself to accommodate her party’s presidential nominee, saying she was “supporting” but wouldn’t endorse him, a position that impressed no one, including Mr. Trump; he called it “weak.” Ms. Ayotte, sinking in most polls, now says she made “a mistake.” But her come-lately rejection has combined with her record to **alienate** independents and conservatives.

Ms. Hassan, 58, entered politics in 1999 to fight for affordable education for disabled people like her son, Ben, who has cerebral palsy. She was elected governor in 2012 and re-elected in 2014, when Democrats were shellacked across the nation. She would have been tough competition even without the Trump millstone around her rival’s neck.

Ms. Ayotte glided into office in 2010 as a tough-minded former state attorney general, billed as one of her party’s rising Young Turks. In the Senate she made impressive independent stands in favor of **immigration** reform, limits on power-plant emissions and other efforts to combat climate change, and extending expiring unemployment benefits.

But many of her other positions are less appealing. While she stood up to Senator Ted Cruz’s efforts to shut down the government in the battle over Obamacare, she voted repeatedly to repeal the law. She voted to defund Planned Parenthood and ban abortions after 20 weeks. She opposes increasing the federal minimum wage. She joined in the recklessly partisan move to block consideration of Merrick Garland for the Supreme Court. In 2013, in the aftermath of the Sandy Hook shooting, she voted against strengthening background checks for gun buyers.

Ms. Hassan says she’s running to protect the gains New Hampshire has made during her governorship. In a state with no personal income tax or sales tax, she helped to lower the cost of community college and contain state university tuition, expand Medicaid, cut business taxes and achieve a 3 percent jobless rate. She takes a far harder line on **immigration** than liberals in her party. She would have supported **immigration** reform legislation, as Ms. Ayotte did, and like Ms. Ayotte, she opposes President Obama’s plan to close the prison at Guantánamo Bay. She stands with her party in supporting Obamacare, abortion rights and efforts to mitigate climate change. On gun safety, she says strengthening background checks and preventing people on the government no-fly list from buying guns “is the very least we should be doing.”

Campaigning at a breakfast forum in her hometown, Nashua, last Sunday, Ms. Ayotte described her Senate record as “finding common ground.” Some in the crowd called it a betrayal. “It seems like every day a child is killed by guns, and yet she hasn’t taken a stand against them,” one woman said. “How do you vote for someone who breaks your heart?”

One answer: You don’t. In Ms. Hassan, Granite State voters have the chance to elect a pragmatist who is more attuned to their needs than to party politics.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At least one of my siblings, and some of my friends from high school, will be among the 50 million or so Americans waking up on Nov. 9 after giving their vote to a man who thinks very little of them, and even less of the country he wants to lead.

Allow me one last attempt to help you avoid a hangover that will stay with you the rest of your life.

If you ignored every blast of hatred from Donald Trump, every attempt to defraud people or stiff those who worked for him, every bellow from the bully, consider his low view of humanity in general. “For the most part you can’t respect people,” he has said, “because most people aren’t worthy of respect.”

This is the credo of a loveless man in a friendless world. He also says he has no heroes — not a Lincoln or Mandela, a Jackie Robinson or a Capt. Chesley Sullenberger.

If you’re an evangelical Christian, you’re about to cast your lot with someone who goes against nearly everything you believe. I have a sister in this category. Her preacher told her that electing Trump is “part of God’s plan.” I’m not sure if the plan is apocalyptic, but that sounds like a deity who’s given up on all of us.

I would tell my sister and all like-minded souls to look at whether Trump has tried to live by the Ten Commandments. He’s consistently violated at least eight of them, from worshiping the God of Mammon to running up the biggest “pants on fire” liar score of any presidential candidate in history. As for adultery and coveting others, he’s bragged about cheating on the mother of his children in one interview, and outlined his methods for hitting on married women in another.

True, he hasn’t committed murder, but he did say he could shoot someone in the middle of Fifth Avenue, “and I wouldn’t lose any supporters.” If that’s who you want your children looking up to, those kids will be, like Trump, bereft of heroes.

If you’re a member of the white working class, “the poorly educated” that Trump once professed to love, your sense of dislocation is real. The economic gap between the wealthiest cities and the rest of the country has widened. So has the divide between college-educated workers and those who never went beyond high school. More than 20 percent of American men under age 65 had no paid work last year.

But a trade war, which Trump proposes, and his tax and **immigration** policies would bring widespread pain, and do nothing to help the most economically troubled of his supporters. Trump likes to remind people that he took business classes at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania. Well then, let’s listen to a report from his alma mater: It predicts that Trump’s policies could cost the United States four million lost jobs.

His tax plan, a giveaway to the rich and a budget buster, would likely lead to another recession. His overall economic proposals could cost the United States economy $1 trillion over the next five years, according to a report from Oxford Economics, a forecasting firm.

Building a wall, of concrete on the southern border, or though tariffs coming from Washington is not going to bring steel mills back to Pennsylvania, or thousands of coal jobs to West Virginia. Even from a blunt, xenophobic perspective, the wall makes no sense. For over the last 10 years, more people have **immigrated**from the United States to Mexico than vice versa. Trump never mentions that.

I should add that 15 million new jobs have been added under President Obama’s watch, and that incomes grew across the board last year, especially at the bottom. Trump never mentions that, either.

Vice President Joe Biden has made it one of his final missions to ensure that Democrats don’t forget those living in places like his hometown, Scranton, Pa. One solution is to put people to work on roads, bridges, airports and other “big stuff.” Hillary Clinton has at least put forth a $275 billion infrastructure jobs plan. Trump promises nothing more than a slogan on a silly hat and a pipe dream of a plan with no way to pay for it.

Finally, if you’re a true deplorable, I have nothing to say to you by way of persuasion. You should follow the endorsements of neo-Nazis, and current and former members of the Ku Klux Klan who say Trump is the embodiment of their beliefs. A vote for anyone but Trump, as the former Klansman David Duke says, is “treason” to your heritage. He’s talking about a lineage that goes directly back to slavery.

For the rest of the Trump supporters, remember that resentment is not a political philosophy and hatred is not a sustainable force for governing. Remember, also, the words of a global citizen — Bono. “America is like the best idea the world ever came up with,” he said, “but Donald Trump is potentially the worst idea that ever happened to America.”

I invite you to follow me on Twitter [https://twitter.com/nytegan](@nytegan[https://twitter.com/nytegan]).

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — Federal prosecutors brought charges on Thursday against dozens of people accused of taking part in a giant international crime ring that relied on Indian telephone call centers to bilk thousands of Americans out of more than $300 million.

While service calls routed to phone banks in India have become a frequent annoyance for American consumers — as well as comic inspiration for late-night television hosts — the Justice Department revealed a darker side to the operations in an 81-page indictment unsealed in federal court in Houston.

The operators of the scheme at five call centers in India would pose as tax collectors from the Internal Revenue Service, or as American customs agents, loan officers, police officers or other authority figures in calling “targets,” officials said. The victims were then threatened with arrest or deportation if bogus debts were not paid, according to the charges.

Nearly two dozen accomplices arrested inside the United States on Thursday were accused of working as “runners,” or managers to collect and then launder the money by using prepaid debit cards, Western Union transfers and informal money exchanges to funnel money back to India.

In one case, an 85-year-old woman in San Diego turned over $12,300 after she was threatened with arrest over a supposed unpaid tax bill, officials said, and in another case a California resident paid over $136,00 through prepaid debit cards after a caller contacted him repeatedly over the course of three weeks about a tax bill.

Some 15,000 victims in all were bilked, the officials said; while many of the people targeted were **immigrants** from India or across South Asia, large numbers were not.

“This case is massive,” said John Roth, the inspector general of the Department of Homeland Security, and “the investigation touched every part of the United States.”

Although most of the people charged Thursday reside in India, Justice Department officials said they would seek to have the authorities there extradite defendants to the United States to stand trial on fraud, money laundering and other charges.

Earlier this month, the Indian authorities arrested 70 people[http://nyti.ms/2dvkSg3] there who were also accused of taking part in call-center schemes to defraud Americans by posing as I.R.S. agents.

But American officials said on Thursday that the investigation here was unconnected to the one in India and involved a separate ring of call centers.

Taken together, the separate investigations 7,500 miles apart indicated the wide scope of the problem, and the American authorities warned people to be on guard for scam callers.

“If you get one of these calls, it is not the U.S. government calling you,” Leslie R. Caldwell, the head of the criminal division at the Justice Department, said in announcing the charges at a news conference in Washington.

“Even if your caller ID says, as it did in many of these instances, ‘U.S. government,’ ‘I.R.S.’ or some other government agency, it is not the U.S. government; it is a scam,” she said. “Don’t pay any money, and instead report the call to law enforcement.”

The callers used personal information about their targets culled from social media postings and other sources of data to make their demands seem genuine.

They were brazen, persistent and “ruthless” — and “willing to go to frightening lengths” to extort money, said Bruce Foucart, an assistant director at the United States **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agency.

He cited a case this year in Colorado Springs, in which a man faced repeated demands from callers to pay fours years of supposed back taxes.

After the man refused, one of the suspects called 911 posing as the man to say he was armed and wanted to “kill cops,” Mr. Foucart said. More than a dozen police officers arrived at the home, where the man’s daughter was home alone. “Fortunately, no one was hurt,” he said.

Ms. Caldwell said it might be very difficult for the victims to get back much, if any, of the money they lost in an international case like this one.

“The sad thing about these scams is, often, once the money’s paid, it’s gone,” she said.

\* Call Centers in India Posed as I.R.S. to Cheat U.S. Taxpayers, Authorities Say[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/world/asia/india-call-centers-phone-scam-irs.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**IF such events can be said to have an upside, the Inquisition had one for Spanish and Portuguese Jews: It propelled them to the Americas, where they largely found the tolerance and opportunities denied them in Europe.

The story of the havens Jews established in the New World is the focus of an exhibition opening on Friday at the New-York Historical Society. With rare manuscripts, Bibles, prayer books, paintings, maps and ritual objects, “The First Jewish Americans: Freedom and Culture in the New World[http://www.nyhistory.org/exhibitions/first-jewish-americans-freedom-and-culture-new-world],” chronicles how Jews, expelled from Spain and Portugal after being driven out in earlier centuries from England and France, established thriving communities in New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, Newport and, even earlier, on Caribbean islands and in South America.

In the United States, they, like their fellow Americans, were tossed about in history’s currents, finding themselves on both sides during the American Revolution, the movement to abolish slavery and the Civil War. And their welcome was sometimes short-lived or illusory.

The exhibition’s most arresting artifact is a threadbare 4-inch-by-3-inch, 180-page memoir and prayer book handwritten by Luis de Carvajal the Younger in colonial Mexico in 1595, where the Inquisition had extended its sinister reach of torture and execution.

De Carvajal was a converso, forced to adopt Catholicism but suspected of clandestinely practicing Jewish rituals. At trial, he was pressured to denounce 120 Jews who secretly followed their faith, including his relatives. Then he was burned at the stake.

“They broke him down,” said Debra Schmidt Bach, a curator of the show.

The de Carvajal book mysteriously disappeared from Mexico’s national archives in the 1930s. Not long ago, however, Leonard L. Milberg, an American businessman with a major Judaica collection, learned that the document was for sale at Swann Auction Galleries in Manhattan, and he arranged to have it returned to Mexico. It is on loan for the show.

The exhibition features documents chronicling the vagaries of early Jewish settlements: an edict expelling Jews from France’s American colonies; a rabbinical paper certifying as kosher food shipped to Barbados; an 18th-century service for the biblically mandated circumcision of slaves and a list of circumcisers in Curaçao and Suriname; and a Christian missionary’s treatise speculating that Native Americans were the Lost Tribes of Israel. There are two nostalgic paintings of Caribbean scenes by Camille Pissarro, the French Impressionist who was born on St. Thomas to a Jewish mother. Seventy-two of the 170 items in the show are from Mr. Milberg’s collection.

Though the Dutch colony in New Amsterdam, now New York, became a significant haven, its embrace of Jews was stinting. The outpost’s flinty governor, Peter Stuyvesant, recoiled when 23 refugees from Portuguese-ruled Brazil arrived in 1654. But the Dutch West Indies Company told Stuyvesant that business was business and Jews should remain as long as they could contribute to the outpost’s commercial well-being.

Those Jews established the first North American congregation, Shearith Israel — Remnant of Israel — and built a synagogue in 1730 on what is now South William Street in Lower Manhattan. The congregation endures on Central Park West, where it moved in 1897.

Shearith Israel lent the exhibition a charred Torah scroll rescued from a fire set by British soldiers in 1776 and a pair of exquisitely crafted silver rimonim — belled ornaments for a Torah scroll — fashioned by the esteemed silversmith Myer Myers. There is also a ketubah — a marriage contract — illustrated with a bride and groom under a chuppah.

Abigaill Levy Franks, a prominent woman of old New York, is saluted with a portrait. Her letters, the exhibition text informs visitors, confided her upset at her daughter’s marriage to a Christian, Oliver Delancey. Interestingly, he was a scion of the family for whom Delancey Street was named; the street later became the spine of the Lower East Side’s Jewish quarter.

Like other colonists, Jews were conflicted about ending British rule. Haym Salomon, a Polish **immigrant**, helped finance the Revolution. But Abraham Gomez and 15 other Jews were among 932 signers of allegiance to King George III.

Other documents chronicle the tug of war over slavery. Account books record the purchase of five slaves by Matthias Lopez in 1787, while Jacob Levy Jr. is mentioned in an abolitionist society’s papers as having freed four slaves in 1817.

There are also sections of the exhibition devoted to the communities in Philadelphia; New Orleans; Charleston, S.C.; and Newport, R.I. The show does not have George Washington’s famous letter to the Newport congregation expressing the hope that everyone “shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig-tree[http://www.mountvernon.org/digital-encyclopedia/article/vine-and-fig-tree/].” But it has letters from congregations in Newport and Savannah, Ga., thanking the new president for being so welcoming.

Alexander Hamilton, the lionized founding father of today’s Broadway, makes an appearance too. The show tells us that his mother had been married to a Jew and that he was fluent in Hebrew and maintained close professional ties with Jews.

Several documents establish that it was at Congregation Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim in Charleston where the American version of Reform Judaism took root in 1824 through young mavericks who “wanted to modernize Judaism so it wouldn’t die,” said Dale Rosengarten, director of the Center for Southern Jewish Culture at the College of Charleston. Ms. Rosengarten was a curator of a similar exhibition at Princeton.

“It didn’t spring out of whole cloth but sprang out of our native soil,” she said.

Jews made important contributions to 19th-century science and culture, along with other fields, but as the exhibition says, “despite the nation’s ostensible commitment to religious tolerance, stereotypes of Jews persisted on the American stage.” One gallery has a portrait and the sword and scabbard of Commodore Uriah Phillips Levy, a naval hero of the War of 1812, and paintings by Solomon Nunes Carvalho, who accompanied John C. Frémont, the explorer, on a cross-country expedition.

Inevitably, said Louise Mirrer, the New-York Historical Society’s president, the story of the New World’s Jews has resonance for **immigrants**, refugees and religious minorities today. “Seeds had been planted early on for a place where you could practice your religion,” Ms. Mirrer said, because the New World had drawn Europeans like the Puritans seeking religious freedom.

But at times, she added, there were anomalies: “In the exhibit, we see the kind of religious fervor that promotes a kind of violence against certain groups.”

“The First Jewish Americans” runs through Feb. 26 at the New-York Historical Society, 170 Central Park West, at 77th Street; 212-873-3400, nyhistory.org.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For decades, Democratic presidential candidates have been making steady gains among upper income whites and whites with college and postgraduate degrees. This year, however, is the first time in at least six decades[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/trump-may-become-the-first-republican-in-60-years-to-lose-white-college-graduates/] that the Democratic nominee is positioned to win a majority of these upscale voters.

According to the Oct. 20 Reuters-IPSOS[http://polling.reuters.com/#poll/TM651Y15\_DS\_13/filters/LIKELY:1/dates/20160901-20161021/type/week] tracking survey, Hillary Clinton now leads Donald Trump by 5.6 points among all whites earning $75,000 or more. This is a substantial improvement on the previous Democratic record of support[http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#val=USP00p1] among upscalee white voters, set in 2008 when Barack Obama lost to John McCain among such voters by 11 points.

According to an Oct. 23 ABC News poll, Clinton also leads among all white college graduates, 52-36. She has an unprecedented gender gap among these voters, leading 62-30 among college-educated white women and tying among college educated white men, 42-42.

What these figures suggest is that the 2016 election will represent a complete inversion of the New Deal order among white voters. From the 1930s into the 1980s and early 1990s, majorities of downscale whites voted Democratic and upscale whites voted Republican. Now, looking at combined male and female vote totals, the opposite is true.

As recently as 2012, Mitt Romney won among well-educated whites[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/15/educational-divide-in-vote-preferences-on-track-to-be-wider-than-in-recent-elections/] by 14 points. In 2008[https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/ObamaCoalition-5.pdf], McCain won college-educated whites by four points.

The data reflects an ongoing evolution in the composition of the two parties.

In 1992, according to a September 2016 Pew study[http://www.people-press.org/2016/09/13/the-parties-on-the-eve-of-the-2016-election-two-coalitions-moving-further-apart/], Democratic voters with high school diplomas or less far outnumbered Democrats with college degrees, 55-21, and the remaining 24 percent had some college but no degree.

By 2016, the percentage of Democratic voters with college degrees or better outnumbered those with high school degrees or less, 37-32, while 31 percent had some college but no degree. Among Republicans, the share with college degrees rose modestly from 28 to 31 percent, but remained smaller than those with high school diplomas or less, 34 percent in 2016.

These shifts in education and income have contributed to sharp changes, at least for the moment, in the outlook of Democrats and Republicans.

Democrats, including the party’s elite, remain decisively liberal, and have become more cosmopolitan — more readily accepting of globalization, more welcoming of **immigrants**, less nationalistic — and more optimistic about the future.

The Pew Research Center[http://www.people-press.org/2016/04/26/a-wider-ideological-gap-between-more-and-less-educated-adults/] found in April 2016 that:

Highly educated adults – particularly those who have attended graduate school – are far more likely than those with less education to take predominantly liberal positions across a range of political values. And these differences have increased over the past two decades.

From 1994 to 2014, the percentage of voters with postgraduate degrees holding “consistently liberal” views grew fourfold, from 7 to 31 percent, and fivefold among those with college degrees, 5 to 24 percent.

Whites remain the majority[http://www.people-press.org/2016/09/13/the-parties-on-the-eve-of-the-2016-election-two-coalitions-moving-further-apart/] in both political parties, 57 percent of Democratic voters and 86 percent of Republicans. White Democrats share a high level of optimism with the two largest Democratic minority constituencies, African-Americans and Hispanics.

Working class African-Americans and Hispanics are, like their white counterparts without degrees, on the low end of the income distribution. When blacks and Hispanics compare their situations to those of their parents, they see their circumstances improving, in contrast to low income, non-college whites, who see a downward trajectory.

As Andrew Cherlin, a professor of sociology at Johns Hopkins, wrote in February[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/22/opinion/why-are-white-death-rates-rising.html?ref=opinion] in these pages, African-Americans

may look back to a time when discrimination deprived their parents of equal opportunities. Many Hispanics may look back to the lower standard of living their parents experienced in their countries of origin. Whites are likely to compare themselves to a reference group that leads them to feel worse off. Blacks and Hispanics compare themselves to reference groups that may make them feel better off.

For many whites, Cherlin writes,

their main reference group is their parents’ generation, and by that standard they have little to look forward to and a lot to lament

Less well-educated blacks and Hispanics have not experienced the income gains of the college-educated of all races, but they do see their lives improving when their parents are the reference point.

This is reflected in responses in an August 2016 Pew report[http://www.people-press.org/2016/08/18/3-views-of-the-country-and-feelings-about-growing-diversity/] to the question “compared with 50 years ago, life for people like you in America today is worse, better or the same?”

The optimists: Clinton supporters (59 better, 19 worse), Democrats (55-23), white college grads (43-39), African-Americans (51-20), voters with post graduate degrees (51-29). A separate June 2016 Pew survey[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/06/08/latinos-increasingly-confident-in-personal-finances-see-better-economic-times-ahead/] of Hispanic voters found that 81 percent of Clinton supporters expect their family’s finances to improve in the near term, and 72 percent said they expect their children to be better off than they are.

The pessimists: Trump supporters (81 worse, 11 better), Republicans (72-17) and whites without college degrees (60-28).

Among well-educated whites, there are clear reasons for optimism. What is a primary marker of likely success in the contemporary American economy? The answer in one word is education.

Alan Berube and Natalie Holmes, a senior fellow and a research analyst at Brookings, provided me with data from 2015 demonstrating that education is a key determinate of income. For whites with a high school diploma or less, median annual income is $30,038; with some college, it’s $36,047; with a bachelor’s degree, $51,064; and with a postgraduate degree, $68,086.

Overall, high earners who have postgraduate or college degrees are in the Democratic camp. In the Pew August survey[http://www.people-press.org/2016/08/18/1-voters-general-election-preferences/], postgraduate voters favored Clinton over Trump by 59-21; college grads favor her 47-34.

Three recent studies of the American electorate illuminate the upheaval in the two political parties: the first[http://www.iasc-culture.org/survey\_archives/VanishingCenter.pdf], published on Oct. 12 by the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture[http://iasculture.org/] at the University of Virginia, the other two published Oct. 19[http://www.prri.org/research/prri-brookings-october-19-2016-presidential-election-horserace-clinton-trump/] and Oct. 25[http://www.prri.org/research/divide-americas-future-1950-2050/] by the Public Religion Research Institute[http://www.prri.org/research/prri-brookings-october-19-2016-presidential-election-horserace-clinton-trump/].

The UVA-IASC survey highlighted the political and cultural gulf between upscale, predominately Democratic whites and downscale, predominately Republican whites.

The first group, “the Social Elite” in UVA-IASC’s terminology, is made up of whites with advanced degrees. They are 49 percent Democratic, 16.8 percent Republican. 87.5 percent say the Democratic Party represents their views very or fairly well, compared to zero percent who say the Republican Party represents them very well and 24.2 percent who say that it does so “fairly well.” They plan to vote for Clinton over Trump by 74.3 to 14.1 percent.

The second group, termed “the Disinherited” in the UVA-IASC survey, comprises religiously conservative whites without college degrees. Republicans outnumber Democrats 52.3 to 11.1, and 60.9 percent say the Republican Party represents their views very or fairly well. They plan to vote for Trump by 74.3 to 13.5 percent.

James Davison Hunter, a professor of religion, culture and social theory at UVA, and Carl Desportes Bowman, director of survey research at the IASC, write that half of the Disinherited

live on less than $50,000 per year compared to 10 percent of the Social Elite. The majority of the Disinherited (58%) describe their family’s current financial situation as “only fair” or “poor,” with half (52%) seeing their prospects in the future as worse, 21 percent seeing their prospects as “much worse.”

“Conversely, six out of ten (58%) of the Social Elite have family incomes that are $100,000 or over, compared to 13 percent of the Disinherited. The Social Elite are aware of their good fortune: 73 percent describe their current financial situation as “good” or “excellent” and an even stronger majority (79%) see their future as staying the same (36%) or getting better (43%).

More affluent and well-educated white voters have substantially different policy agendas from their less affluent and less well-educated fellow citizens.

First, the downscale whites.

Nearly half say they feel **alienated** from contemporary America (“a stranger in their own land”), that they have little or no power to change the course of events — 84.4 percent believe public officials do not care “what people like me think.” 83.5 percent agreed that “in general, Americans lived more moral and ethical lives 50 year ago.”

These voters are convinced (72.6 percent) that they can no longer get ahead in America through hard work, and that the government in Washington threatens the freedom of “ordinary Americans” (75.3 percent). In a nation where same-sex marriage has gained public acceptance and gays routinely appear in television and movies, 54.9 percent of these voters say their own “beliefs and values” are different from those of gays and lesbians, and 66.2 percent oppose requiring every state to permit same-sex marriages.

Then the “Social Elite.”

74.2 percent say the economy is holding steady or improving; 71.1 percent say that 25 years from now “people like you” will be doing the same or better; 66 percent disagree with the statement that “people like me” have no say in government; 68.8 percent say that in America you still get ahead by working hard; 56.7 percent are personally in agreement with the values and beliefs of the cultural elite. 57 percent disagree with the statement that “people like me don’t have any say in what the government does.”

These upscale white liberals like government. 52.5 percent have “some” or “a lot” of confidence that public officials will tell the truth, compared with 17.1 percent of the Disinherited. 68.7 percent of “the Social Elite” disagree with the statement “the best government governs least,” compared with the 75.3 percent of the Disinherited.” 74.4 percent disagree with the statement that the government in Washington threatens the freedom of ordinary Americans.

There is, in addition, a significant difference in the attitudes toward the poor coming from voters in the “social elite” and those from “the disinherited.” Asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement “Most Americans who live in poverty are there because of their own bad habits and choices,” the social elite sharply disagreed, 81-19, while the disinherited were split (47.2 percent agree, 52.8 percent disagree).

The two PRRI surveys use more traditional terminology, but the findings reinforce those of the UVA-IASC study.

PRRI shows how much the Trump wing of the Republican Party sees itself as the underdog, while Clinton supporters recognize their privileged position in today’s economy:

About seven in ten likely voters supporting Donald Trump (72%) say American society and way of life has changed for the worse since the 1950s, while seven in ten likely voters supporting Hillary Clinton (70%) say things have changed for the better.

These patterns are repeated in the pronounced class differences among whites:

A majority (56%) of white college-educated Americans say American society is generally better now than it was in the 1950s, while nearly two-thirds (65%) of white working-class Americans say things are now worse.

White evangelical Protestants have the bleakest view of all: “Nearly three-quarters (74%) say American culture has changed for the worse since the 1950s.”

The rise of the social elite constituency in the Democratic Party and the disinherited in the Republican Party has contributed to a shift in partisan views of free trade agreements — part of a larger split on globalism, **immigration**, and multiculturalism.

There is an argument that the divided preferences of white voters — with the better off linked to an upscale Democratic Party and the less well off to a downscale Republican Party — is a unique reflection of this year’s presidential race pitting Donald Trump against Hillary Clinton.

But these trends have been increasingly evident over the past five decades and are not a 2016 aberration. The origins lie in the bitter social and cultural conflicts of the 1960s and 1970s[http://www.pbs.org/opb/thesixties/timeline/timeline\_text.html] and were evident in the movement of the “silent majority,”[http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/nixon-calls-on-the-silent-majority] Reagan Democrats[http://www.nytimes.com/2000/02/22/opinion/reagan-democrats-gone-but-not-forgotten.html] and “angry white men”[http://articles.latimes.com/2010/mar/22/opinion/la-oe-kuhn22-2010mar22] to the Republican column.

The shift of working class whites over the past half-century from the Democratic to Republican Party gained momentum after Pat Buchanan and Pat Robertson were granted prime time spots at the 1992 Republican convention to give fire-breathing speeches celebrating social conservatism[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/30/us/politics/from-the-fringe-in-1992-patrick-j-buchanans-words-now-seem-mainstream.html] that drove many suburbanites out of the Republican Party into the Democratic Party.

Looking now at the changing composition of the Republican electorate, what stands out is the failure of party leaders to anticipate the discontent of their own primary voters.

Preliminary indications are that the traditional top levels of the Republican Party hierarchy — heavily populated by the affluent and the wealthy — will face major hurdles retaining control after the coming election. The Trump campaign has demonstrated that many Republican voters are deeply critical of their own party establishment, to put it mildly. In the Florida Republican primary, 60 percent of the voters said they felt “betrayed by Republican politicians”; in Michigan, 58 percent; Pennsylvania, 59 percent. The disaffection of the Republican electorate from the party leadership is palpable everywhere.

Democrats would appear to face problems trying to stabilize an affluent white and disadvantaged minority coalition with starkly different economic interests. Divisions over environmental and energy policies, trade and taxes are potentially areas of disagreement. In practice, this may prove easier than expected.

The largely white upscale wing of the Democratic Party is far more liberal on economic policy than its self-interest would suggest. In the UVA-IASC survey, the social elite is not only sympathetic to the poor and to pro-government intervention, but, by 3 to 1, believes that the “system is rigged in favor” of the wealthy; by nearly 6 to 1 believes that Wall Street and big business “profit at the expense of ordinary Americans;” and believes, by better than 2 to 1, that the government “should do more to improve the lives of ordinary Americans.”

If Clinton wins, she should have less difficulty holding Democratic factions together than previous Democratic presidents, including her husband. She will, however, face a more hostile and obdurate Republican opposition than her predecessors — an opposition already signaling[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/house-republicans-are-already-preparing-for-years-of-investigations-of-clinton/2016/10/26/e153a714-9ac3-11e6-9980-50913d68eacb\_story.html?hpid=hp\_rhp-top-table-main\_battlelines-1230pm%3Ahomepage%2Fstory] its unwillingness to compromise[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2016/10/17/supreme-court-is-an-issue-again-after-mccain-suggests-clinton-blockade/] with a second Clinton White House.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NORFOLK, Va. — With the polish of a seasoned politician, Khizr Khan strode through the door of a seafood restaurant to the serenade of clicking cameras, clasped hands with cheering Democratic lawmakers and, as he has become famous for doing, unflinchingly argued that Donald J. Trump must not be president.

To the naked eye, Mr. Khan, whose son was an American soldier killed in Iraq and who skewered Mr. Trump at the Democratic National Convention[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/d/democratic\_national\_convention/index.html?inline=nyt-org], could have been mistaken for someone running for office. But as he made his first appearance on the campaign trail for Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per] on Wednesday, he said his mission was greater than politics.

“Donald Trump as a candidate has proven himself to be temperamentally unfit to be the commander in chief of this great nation,” Mr. Khan said, his voice shaking. “There are no second chances.”

Mr. Khan emerged as one of the Clinton campaign’s most effective weapons after he made an impassioned plea for tolerance at the convention in July[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/us/elections/khizr-humayun-khan-speech.html] and accused Mr. Trump of not understanding the Constitution or personal sacrifice. When Mr. Trump responded by insinuating that Mr. Khan’s wife, Ghazala, had not spoken at the convention because she was muzzled by her Muslim faith, he faced intense backlash[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/01/us/politics/khizr-khan-ghazala-donald-trump-muslim-soldier.html] for attacking the grieving mother of a fallen soldier.

In the final weeks of the race, the Clinton campaign is deploying Mr. Khan as part of a closing argument that Mr. Trump would usher in a new era of intolerance. In an emotional ad released last week, Mr. Khan spoke about the death of his son, Capt. Humayun Khan, and tearfully asked Mr. Trump, “Would my son have a place in your America?”

Although Mrs. Clinton is already polling well in Virginia, the campaign sent Mr. Khan here because of his strong appeal to veterans.

Virginians who came out to see him on Wednesday said he embodied an authenticity that had been lacking in a campaign marked by caustic personal attacks. With Islamophobia on the rise, attendees said Mr. Khan was a beacon of hope that a time for healing was ahead.

For Khayriyya Azeez, whose son was just chosen to be the chaplain at the local naval base, the way Mr. Khan publicly stood up to Mr. Trump made him a hero in his own right.

“He’s a revolutionary, fighting for the cause,” she said.

Some wondered how they should feel about Mr. Trump, and they listened when Mr. Khan said it was time to move on in spite of Mr. Trump’s initial proposal to bar Muslim **immigrants**[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/12/07/donald-trump-calls-for-banning-muslims-from-entering-u-s/] from entering the United States.

“Our great religion forgives Mr. Trump for his acts, even though he doesn’t apologize to us,” said Mourad Amer, of Yorktown, who came to pray with Mr. Khan at Masjid William Salaam, a mosque in Norfolk.

But not everyone who came to meet Mr. Khan was Muslim, showing that his calls for inclusiveness have broad appeal. Terrance Afer-Anderson, a Christian, said he had been captivated by Mr. Khan’s raw emotions at the convention and wanted to see him in person.

“He has a genuine voice because he speaks with great clarity and passion,” Mr. Afer-Anderson said.

Gaylene Kanoyton, the first vice chairwoman of the Democratic Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/d/democratic\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] of Virginia, said that Mr. Khan took her back to the civil rights movement of the 1960s, comparing his message to that of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.

“There was a deep divide then, and African-Americans were trying to get their civil rights and be equal,” she said.

American Muslims have intensified their political activism in response to Mr. Trump’s candidacy. His proposals to increase surveillance of mosques and ban Muslim **immigration** have stirred fear within the community and motivated many to help register new voters who support Mrs. Clinton. Mr. Khan has become a prominent messenger for that cause because many voters view him as being above politics.

“Khan’s message is also largely nonpolitical in the sense that he is not attacking Trump over partisan issues,” said Kyle Kondik of the University of Virginia Center for Politics. “Rather, he’s attacking Trump over matters of decency.”

Still, as Mr. Khan made the rounds at the Croaker’s Spot restaurant, it appeared that he had quickly become comfortable with the basics of political gamesmanship. He made close eye contact with the residents who turned out to see him, effortlessly squeezing elbows. At one point, he stepped away to listen to himself in an interview he had recorded earlier with CNN’s Jake Tapper. And he masterfully turned away queries about his own political future, pivoting to attacks on Mr. Trump.

“This has nothing to do with celebrity,” Mr. Khan said, dressed in a black pinstriped suit and wearing a Gold Star family lapel pin. “The fundamental values of pluralism are under attack.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Washington — After Nov. 8, Donald J. Trump will at least have one claim to property on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Thirteen days out from the presidential election, the Republican nominee spent Wednesday morning in Washington, overseeing the ribbon-cutting at his new Trump International Hotel. The hotel, in the city’s Old Post Office building, is just five blocks from the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue.

As Mr. Trump prepared to tell the crowd inside how spectacular his new property was, protesters marched outside. Two people held up a huge American flag, with Mr. Trump’s infamous “Access Hollywood” comments painted on the flag’s stripes in neon yellow.

Washington’s residents seemed befuddled at the Republican candidate’s presence here, of all places, with him lagging behind Hillary Clinton in the polls and time running out.

Is Washington the least useful place for the Republican nominee to be two weeks before Election Day? Probably. Certainly there are more valuable things Mr. Trump could be doing with his time — like polishing his collection of gold-plated TRUMP signs, hiking the Appalachian Trail, on the red carpet for the premiere of “Trolls, ”or seeing the Britney Spears “Piece of Me” show in Las Vegas.

He must see some value in making a quick ribbon-cutting stop in the midst of the campaign homestretch. The Trump brand is also at stake in the election. It’s possible that Mr. Trump wants to use the final weeks of the campaign spotlight to promote his brand[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/us/politics/donald-trump-brand-promotions.html], despite the fact that the more controversial Mr. Trump appears under campaign scrutiny, the more customers may be fleeing[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/18/us/politics/donald-trump-brand-reaction.html]. If there’s anything Mr. Trump is good at, it’s manipulating controversy for personal gain while making someone else foot the bill. The Trump campaign has stopped holding high-dollar fund-raisers[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/10/25/trump-halts-big-money-fundraising-cutting-off-cash-to-the-party/] in the crucial final days of the campaign, leaving that work largely to the Republican National Committee.

Mr. Trump was probably not looking for votes in Washington. He finished third in the city’s G.O.P. primary, behind Marco Rubio and John Kasich, and there is a very real possibility he could finish third or even fourth in the general election here. But the District, with its measly three Electoral College votes, is hardly a must-win for either candidate.

Away from the picket line, Theresa Hill was sitting on a concrete planter wearing a Make America Great Again hat. She had driven down to Washington for the day from Pennsylvania in hopes of seeing “another historic moment” in the Trump campaign.

“Mr. Trump is not against **immigrants**,” she said, explaining that he is specifically against illegal **immigration** “He just wants everybody to get legal. And we’re dealing with a very serious problem here with ISIS, and he is a very strong man, and he’ll stand up to the enemy,” she said.

And what did she think of Hillary Clinton?

“I don’t think of Hillary Clinton,” Ms. Hill said, and chuckled. “I’m very optimistic that Mr. Trump will win by a landslide.”

Hannah Jacks and Ariel Gomez are sophomores at American University in Washington, and said they came down to the Trump hotel to protest what they viewed as the candidate’s bigotry.

“I come from **immigrant** parents, so I think the rhetoric he’s spreading about **immigrant** families in general is something that I simply can’t allow,” Mr. Gomez said.

“If nothing else, he’s united people against him and against hate, and I guess if you’re looking for a silver lining, we’re all out here protesting hate and racism and bigotry,” Ms. Jacks said.

Mr. Gomez added he was “a little naïve” to think at first that Mr. Trump’s ideas were too outdated to find popularity among American voters.

“Obviously, we’ve been proven wrong,” he said.

Across the street from the hotel, workers came out of their office buildings to watch the spectacle and take photos on their phones. “Donald Trump’s having a bad opening, huh?” a man walking by commented. “He’s really in there?”

When asked what he thought of Mr. Trump, the man paused, gave me some wicked side-eye and smirked. “You don’t got that much time.”

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Emma Roller (@EmmaRoller), a former reporter for National Journal, is a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GARDEN CITY, Kan. — The newest pioneers in western Kansas arrive from Somalia and Myanmar, Mexico and Sudan: thousands of **immigrants** and refugees chasing work in the cattle yards and packing plants where pay starts at $16 an hour and little English is needed to saw through meat and bone.

Even as Donald J. Trump and other politicians talk about deporting **immigrants**, blocking refugees and building border walls[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/24/us/donald-trump-wall-immigration-ranchers.html], many in this conservative corner of Kansas have come to embrace their growing diversity. Pho is a lunchtime staple downtown. The old Kwik Shop on Spruce Street became a Buddhist prayer space. Students in the local schools speak 35 languages.

But then came a plot to attack all of that.

This month, federal prosecutors announced that three white members of a militia from western Kansas had been accused of planning [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/kansas-bomb-plot-arrest-somali.html] to bomb the apartments and makeshift mosque[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/kansas-bomb-plot-arrest-somali.html] where Somali residents of Garden City live and pray. The three men called themselves “the Crusaders,” prosecutors said. They called their targets “cockroaches.”

“I don’t know why these people hate,” Abdulkadir Mohamed, 68, a community leader in Garden City, said one recent afternoon. “We are not terrorists.”

“We are not ISIS,” he added, referring to the Islamic State. “We come here for a better life.”

Prosecutors say the three men held “antigovernment, anti-Muslim and anti-**immigrant** extremist beliefs,” and researchers say their arrest came as the number of anti-Muslim crimes in the United States is soaring.

Hate crimes in the United States against Muslims and people perceived as Arab have reached the highest level[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/us/politics/hate-crimes-american-muslims-rise.html] since just after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, new data shows. Researchers say the increase is a backlash against terrorist attacks in places like Paris[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/attacks-in-paris] and San Bernardino, [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/03/us/san-bernardino-shooting.html] Calif.[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/03/us/san-bernardino-shooting.html], and the result of anti-**immigrant** and anti-Muslim language by politicians.

The arrests have unnerved the Somalis of Garden City, leaving many worried about their safety. People in this city of about 28,000 have held rallies and vigils in a show of unity, and the police have held meetings with Somali leaders. But not everyone feels comforted.

“I don’t know why they hate us,” said Abdirisaq Hassan, 36, who works at a meatpacking plant.

Like many Republican-controlled legislatures, officials in Kansas have resisted efforts to resettle Syrian refugees in the state. Gov. Sam Brownback, a Republican, cited “unacceptable” safety risks in an executive order last year forbidding state agencies to aid in relocating Syrian refugees. In April, the governor withdrew Kansas entirely from the federal government’s refugee resettlement program.

After the arrests of the three men were announced on Oct. 14, Mr. Brownback said that “hate and violence” had no place in the state.

In Garden City, Mr. Mohamed said his instinct after he learned of the plot was to pack up and leave. Like many others here, he had fled unrest and extremist militants in Somalia. Mr. Mohamed’s brother had been killed by the extremist group the Shabab, and his wife and children moved to Uganda.

Mr. Mohamed said he had been one of the first Somalis to settle in Garden City, about seven years ago, crossing the plains in a caravan of minivans with other Somalis after their old meatpacking plant in Nebraska shut down.

Somali residents spend Thanksgivings and Halloweens in the houses of lifelong Garden City families, and they welcome their non-Somali neighbors over for Muslim holidays.

To Mr. Mohamed, this is home. But now, he says, he feels unsettled.

“Like a walking dead,” he said, as he sipped a cup of sweet Kenyan tea at the African Shop, one of two Somali-run businesses in Garden City.

The growth of the Somali community has further changed the face of a region that was already increasingly less white. Here in Finney County, white residents made up 70 percent of the population in 1990. Now, they represent 43 percent, according to census figures. In schools, 79 percent of children are nonwhite, and notices to parents are sent home in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Burmese.

The federal investigation into the militia from western Kansas began in February and relied heavily on an undercover F.B.I. agent who met with at least one of the defendants, and on a paid informant who went to Crusaders meetings and sometimes recorded what was discussed there, investigators wrote in an affidavit.

The three men charged in the case — Patrick Stein, Curtis Allen and Gavin Wright — were longtime Kansans who lived and worked about an hour’s drive from Garden City. All are being held without bond. Lawyers for the men either declined to comment on the case or did not return telephone messages.

A brief statement from Mr. Stein’s mother, Hattie, said, “We do not support discrimination of any sort and have never advocated or condoned violence.”

According to prosecutors, the men met at Mr. Wright’s mobile-home business to discuss possible targets, dropping virtual pins on a Google Map of the area. They planned to pack four vehicles with explosives, leave them at the one-story apartments where many Somali and Burmese families live, and detonate them using a cellphone.

After the men were arrested, the authorities said they found guns, nearly a metric ton of ammunition, possible bomb-making components and a copy of “The Anarchist Cookbook,” which includes instructions on making explosives.

“We’re going to talk about killing people and going to prison for life,” Mr. Allen said during one meeting, according to federal authorities. “Less than 60 days, maybe 40 days until something major happens.”

Later, Mr. Stein added, “When we go on operations, there’s no leaving anyone behind, even if it’s a 1-year-old; I’m serious.”

As laid out in the criminal complaint, the brown-brick apartments on Mary Street were a hated target to the three defendants, “full of goddamn cockroaches.” But to the **immigrant** families living there, they are the ground floor in an American journey.

Somali and Burmese children play soccer together in the parking lots. Donated beds are delivered to new families, though some are so accustomed to sleeping on the thin mats of a refugee camp that they forgo the box springs and bed frames.

The mosque is little more than a small apartment where Somali men slip off their shoes to pray before or after eight-hour shifts at the beef plant. For the past two weeks, since he arrived in Garden City, Abdishakur Mohamed Noor, 55, has been sleeping there under a borrowed blanket because he does not have the paperwork required to get a job at the plant.

People here have tried to show unity since the news of the plot broke, holding vigils and standing together — white residents next to Somali women in colorful abayas — on the sidewalks with posters that praise their town and the local police.

“It’s like an attack against the whole of who we are,” said Sister Janice Thome, a Roman Catholic nun who spends many of her days fielding phone calls from **immigrant** families looking for help paying the utilities or a dentist bill, or for a ride to the doctor’s office, 370 miles away.

But for some Somali residents, the arrests raised a chance to discuss the smaller ways they can feel unwelcome in their adoptive home. They say they feel curious stares at the Walmart. The African Shop, with its shelves stocked with goat’s milk ghee, black currant syrup and Ethiopian chile powder, has been looking for a new location.But Halima Farah, 26, who works there, said that every time she goes to speak with a landlord about a vacant property, it mysteriously seems to be unavailable.

But mostly, she said, Garden City is welcoming and safe.

“We live in a small town,” Ms. Farah said, where nobody ever expected to be discussing explosives and domestic terrorism. “We were like: Of all places, Garden City?”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It’s taken me a while to put my finger on exactly what political label best describes Donald Trump as his presidential campaign snarls and spits to a finish. I think I’ve finally got it: Donald Trump is a “legal **alien**.”

That’s right, the man who has spent the last year railing against those dastardly “illegal **aliens**” supposedly wreaking havoc on our country turns out to be a legal **alien** — someone born in America but whose values are completely **alien** to all that has made this country great.

Who do you know who has denigrated **immigrants**, the handicapped, Muslims and Mexicans; trashed all our recent trade agreements; mounted a fraudulent campaign claiming our president was not born in this country; insulted the whole presidential selection process by running for the highest office without doing a shred of homework; boasted of grabbing women by their genitals; disparaged our NATO allies; praised the dictatorial president of Russia and encouraged him to hack Democratic Party emails; vowed to prosecute his campaign rival if he got elected; threatened to curb the freedom of the press; suggested that gun rights advocates might take the law into their own hands if Hillary Clinton won; insulted the parents of a slain Iraq war hero; been accused by 11 women of sexual assault or other unwelcome physical advances; sought to undermine America’s electoral system by claiming, without a shred of evidence, that it is so “rigged” he can’t promise to concede if he loses; and been cited for lying about more things more times in more ways on more days than any presidential aspirant in history?

This cocktail of toxic behaviors and attitudes is utterly **alien** to anyone who has ever run for president — and for good reason. But that is who Trump is. The big question now is, who are the rest of us?

1) The American people. Who are we? Hopefully, an overwhelming majority will crush Trump at the polls and send the message that he is the one who needs to be morally deported, with a pathway back to the American mainstream only if he changes his ways.

If Trump loses and decides to start a media company — a kind of “Trump Ink” — to keep injecting his conspiratorial venom into the veins of U.S. politics and terrorize moderate Republicans, he will pay dearly. Trump Ink will blacken Trump Inc.

Already there are myriad reports of people avoiding Trump hotels and golf courses, because of his poisonous behavior. The PGA Tour recently moved its longstanding tournament from Trump’s Doral course in Miami to a course in … Mexico!

2) The Republican Party. Whose party is this? Almost all of the G.O.P.’s leaders have chosen to stand with Trump because they love their jobs (and the party that sustains them) more than their country. If Trump loses, will the G.O.P. leadership try to chase that big chunk of its base that went with Trump and become an alt-right party, or will this G.O.P. fracture and the decent conservatives go off and form a new, healthy Republican Party?

The country desperately needs a healthy center-right party that embraces the full rainbow of American society, promotes market-based solutions for climate change, celebrates risk-taking over redistribution, pushes for smaller government, expands trade that benefits the many but takes care of those hurt by it, invests in infrastructure, offers tax and entitlement reforms — and liberates itself from right-wing thought police like Fox News, Rush Limbaugh and Grover Norquist, who have prevented the G.O.P. from compromising and being a governing party.

3) The Democratic Party. Whose party is this? In truth, Bernie Sanders’s movement fractured the Democratic Party almost as much as Trump did the G.O.P., but that fissure has been temporarily plastered over by the overriding need to defeat Trump.

If Clinton wins, that fissure will quickly reopen and some basic questions will have to be answered: Do Democrats support any trade expansion? Do Democrats believe in the principled use of force? Do they believe that America’s risk-takers who create jobs are a profit engine to be unleashed or a menace only to be regulated and taxed? Do they believe we need to expand safety nets to catch those being left behind by this age of accelerating change but also control entitlements so they will be sustainable?

How does the Democratic Party process the fact that while Trump is a legal **alien**, his supporters are not. They are our neighbors. They need to be heard, and where possible they need to be helped. But they also need to be challenged to learn faster and make good choices, because the world is not slowing down for them.

Bottom line: We’re in the middle of a massive technological shift. It’s changing every job, workplace and community. Government can help, but there is no quick fix, and a lot more will depend on what Reid Hoffman, a co-founder of LinkedIn, calls “the start-up of you[http://www.thestartupofyou.com/].” You need a plan to succeed today.

To the extent that the center-left and the center-right can come together on programs to help every American get the most out of this world and cushion the worst, we’ll all be better off. But the more we get tribally divided, the more the American dream will become an **alien** concept to us all.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

“Obama to Declare MARTIAL LAW If Trump Wins Election.” That was the teaser text that recently popped up on my Facebook news feed. It directed me to a post from a page called Nation in Distress, one of the many hyperpartisan Facebook pages[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/magazine/inside-facebooks-totally-insane-unintentionally-gigantic-hyperpartisan-political-media-machine.html] that have gained in popularity this year.

The post linked to a website called americasfreedomfighters.com[http://americasfreedomfighters.com], which linked to[http://www.americasfreedomfighters.com/2016/10/20/martial-law-declared-trump/] a video blog called The Daily Sheeple, which cited a National Enquirer story claiming that Hillary Clinton had a lesbian tryst in a Beverly Hills, Calif., hotel in the 1990s. I wasn’t able to find the evidence that President Obama would declare martial law if Donald J. Trump won the presidential election.

The next time I opened Facebook, another Nation in Distress post showed up at the top of my news feed — this time with a story about how the size of Mr. Trump’s campaign plane HUMILIATED the Clinton plane. (Dr. Freud was unavailable for comment.)

In 2005, Stephen Colbert coined[http://www.cc.com/video-clips/63ite2/the-colbert-report-the-word—-truthiness] the term “truthiness”: the instinctive feeling that something is or isn’t true. At the time, he was skewering right-wing talking heads including Rush Limbaugh, Bill O’Reilly and Glenn Beck, all of whom still exert significant influence in Republican politics. But in this election, truthiness has become fully weaponized by social media, with Facebook awarding coveted blue check marks to partisan accounts on the right and left, and lending them an air of credibility despite the fact that they have no responsibility to separate truth from fiction.

A recent BuzzFeed analysis[https://www.buzzfeed.com/craigsilverman/partisan-fb-pages-analysis] found that roughly 38 percent of posts from three “hyperpartisan right-wing Facebook pages” contained false information, compared with 19 percent of hyperpartisan left-wing pages. BuzzFeed’s conclusion: “The best way to attract and grow an audience for political content on the world’s biggest social network is to eschew factual reporting and instead play to partisan biases using false or misleading information that simply tells people what they want to hear.”

If share-baiting Facebook posts are the junk food of the political internet, then fact-check journalism is steamed spinach. As a journalistic tool, fact-checking has been on the rise for years. A study conducted by the American Press Institute found[https://www.americanpressinstitute.org/fact-checking-project/new-research-on-political-fact-checking-growing-and-influential-but-partisanship-is-a-factor/] that the number of fact-checking stories tripled between 2008 and 2012. This election has given us a barrage of dubious claims that need to be verified or debunked.

The study also found broad support for political fact-checking — or at least the concept of it. Eight in 10 Americans view political fact-checking favorably. But reconcile that statistic with the fact that, according to a CNN poll from 2015, 29 percent of Americans, and 43 percent of Republicans, think[http://time.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/4033161/obama-foreign-born/] President Obama is Muslim. The implication seems to be that Americans like the concept of fact-checking, as long as those facts confirm their point of view.

Before this inflamed political rhetoric was on Facebook, it was broadcast to millions of listeners on talk radio. On a recent episode of Mr. Limbaugh’s radio show, which draws roughly 13 million[http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/05/is-rush-limbaugh-in-trouble-talk-radio-213914] weekly listeners, he argued that there was no such thing as “fact checking,” since the news outlets that did the checking were irredeemably partisan.

“The idea that it is a fact-checked story is designed to say to you that it is objective and analytically fair, and all it is a vehicle for them to do opinion journalism under the guise of fairness, which if you fall for it, gives it even more power,” Mr. Limbaugh told his listeners.

This automatic distrust of the press, long a bastion of conservative thought, took on a darker tone this year. At a rally in Cleveland on Saturday, a pair of Trump supporters called[https://www.buzzfeed.com/rosiegray/the-alt-right-has-adopted-an-old-nazi-term-for-reporters?utm\_term=.xszNYWlox%23.fe9L5EM7W] the press “lügenpresse,” or “lying press” — a term used in Nazi Germany that has recently been resurrected[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/international/archive/2015/01/the-worst-german-word-of-the-year/384493/] by the German anti-**immigrant** group known as Pegida.

Daniel Dale is the Toronto Star’s Washington correspondent, and since last September, he has fact-checked as many of Mr. Trump’s statements as he can. It’s a daunting task, what he calls “an unprecedented daily avalanche of falseness.”

“Shoehorning him into a normal coverage pattern conveys the impression that he is a normal political liar,” he said. “He requires something different.”

During the debates, Mr. Dale fact-checked both Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton, and found that, over the course of the debates, Mr. Trump made 104 false claims, while Mrs. Clinton made 13 false claims.

He has seen a lot of interest — his list of fact-checks, which he tweets out daily, regularly get more than 1,000 retweets — but also a lot of animosity.

“On the positive side: Nothing I’ve ever done has been this popular online,” he said. “On the negative side: Nothing I’ve ever done has so infuriated people.”

Many people will be doing some soul-searching after this election, but perhaps no one more than conflicted conservative talk radio hosts. Charlie Sykes, a popular radio host in Milwaukee, has been candid about conservative media’s complicity in the rise of Trump.

“We’ve basically eliminated any of the referees, the gatekeepers. There’s nobody,” he told Business Insider[http://www.businessinsider.com/conservative-media-trump-drudge-coulter-2016-8] in August.

He added at the time: “We have spent 20 years demonizing the liberal mainstream media. And by the way, a lot of it has been justifiable. There is real bias. But at a certain point you wake up and you realize you have destroyed the credibility of any credible outlet out there,” he said “And I have to look in the mirror and ask myself, ‘To what extent did I contribute?’ ” (Mr. Sykes announced this month[http://www.jsonline.com/story/entertainment/television-radio/2016/10/04/charlie-sykes-leave-wtmj-radio-show-december/91542572/?from=global&sessionKey=&autologin=] that he will be leaving his radio show at the end of the year.)

A big part of the problem is not just Republicans’ willingness to say untrue things, but more of a willingness to let other people in their party say crazy and untrue things without pushing back. After Mr. Trump spread a racist lie about the first African-American president, that did not stop Mitt Romney from accepting his endorsement in his 2012 race. Conservative politicians and media personalities are stuck in a double bind now, where they are too afraid of comeuppance to tell their audience the truth.

Jay Rosen, a journalism professor at New York University, said Republican elites trapped themselves by telling their supporters not to believe mainstream outlets, even though they still relied on those outlets.

“When they preached, ‘Don’t believe the mainstream media,’ they were still reading The New York Times and The Washington Post every morning and using it to set their baseline for their political reality,” he said. “They didn’t take the advice they gave to base voters.”

Fact-free thinking isn’t just for the right. The anti-vaccine movement is a perfect example of far-right paranoia wrapping around to the far-left fringe. At a rally last month[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/opinion/campaign-stops/the-bernie-bump.html?\_r=0] in upstate New York with Senator Bernie Sanders and Zephyr Teachout, I talked to a woman who calmly segued from talking about climate change (real) to chemtrails and the Illuminati (not real). But while the Republican nominee is dabbling in conspiracy theories, no Democratic officeholder is holding hearings about chemtrails.

The strongest bias in American politics is not a liberal bias or a conservative bias; it is a confirmation bias, or the urge to believe only things that confirm what you already believe to be true. Not only do we tend to seek out and remember information that reaffirms what we already believe, but there is also a “backfire effect,”[http://www.cjr.org/behind\_the\_news/the\_backfire\_effect.php] which sees people doubling down on their beliefs after being presented with evidence that contradicts them.

So, where do we go from here? There’s no simple answer, but the only way people will start rejecting falsehoods being fed to them is by confronting uncomfortable truths. Fact-checking is like exposure therapy for partisans, and there is some reason to believe in what researchers call an “affective tipping point,”[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00772.x/abstract] where “motivated reasoners” start to accept hard truths after seeing enough claims debunked over and over.

Some facts are equally inconvenient for both sides. President Obama has deported more people[http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/obamas-deportation-policy-numbers/story?id=41715661] than any president before him. That fact doesn’t sit well with the president’s supporters, who think of Democrats as the party of kindness toward **immigrants**, and it doesn’t sit well with Mr. Trump’s supporters, who think the president is a weak and feckless leader.

“President Obama has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it. Nobody talks about it. But under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country. They’ve been deported,” Mr. Trump said[http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2016/oct/21/donald-trump/trump-right-deportation-numbers-wrong-talks-about-/] at the third and final debate.

This criticism was bizarre — after building his campaign on a southern border wall and a “deportation force” that would round up undocumented **immigrants** by the millions — but it was true all the same.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Emma Roller (@EmmaRoller), a former reporter for National Journal, is a contributing opinion writer.

Correction: October 27, 2016, Thursday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An earlier version of this article incorrectly referred to Pegida, an anti-**immigrant** group in Germany. It is a movement, not a formal political party.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Can anything be done about illegal **immigration**?

Donald J. Trump’s proposal to end illegal **immigration** — to build a supposedly impregnable wall — is a fake solution. For all intents and purposes, the wall is already there: a fence across large stretches of the southwestern border complemented by drones, sensors and a small army of agents.

It has already failed. The federal government spent more than $200 billion[http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/immigration-enforcement-united-states-rise-formidable-machinery] in the last 20 years on **immigration** enforcement. And the population of unauthorized **immigrants** swelled to 11 million over the period.

Maybe the answer, instead, lies in another direction. Rather than building a bigger wall, it consists of opening a door in the wall we have. The best way to stop illegal **immigration**, might be for Mexico and the United States to create a legal path for low-skill Mexicans seeking work in the United States.

“When I hear ‘Secure the border,’ I think that’s great, but it’s not the solution,” said Carlos Gutierrez, who was commerce secretary under President George W. Bush. “We need laws that enable us to get the **immigrant** workers we need for the economy to work and do it in a legal way that doesn’t require employers to resort to a black market.”

This might sound like a giveaway to employers seeking to undercut American workers with cheap foreign labor. Neither major party presidential nominee, Hillary Clinton nor Mr. Trump, is likely to embrace the approach in the homestretch of the presidential campaign. And yet it deserves a hearing. In more than half a century, it is the only strategy that has worked.

The idea has been tested before, from the 1940s to the 1960s, under what came to be known as the Bracero Program, named for a Spanish term for laborer who works with his arms. At its peak in the late 1950s, it provided more than 400,000 temporary work visas a year to people from Mexico, most of them employed on farms. Not coincidentally, from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s, apprehensions of Mexicans crossing the border unlawfully — a rough measure of rises and falls in illegal **immigration** — plummeted to near zero.

Now a group of scholars and policy makers that includes Mr. Gutierrez; Ernesto Zedillo, a former president of Mexico; Eliseo Medina, a Mexican union leader; Silvestre Reyes, a former congressman from Texas and Border Patrol chief; and Doris Meissner, a former commissioner of the **Immigration** and Naturalization Service have come together to pitch a similar framework as the only viable strategy to end illegal **immigration** for good.

Their essential point is laid out in a “Blueprint to Regulate US-Mexico Labor Mobility[http://www.cgdev.org/publication/sharedfuture?callout=1-2],” just published by the Center for Global Development. Flows of Mexican migrants to the United States have been driven since our grandparents’ day, they note, by the supply and demand for work on either side of the border, regardless of walls and other obstacles thrown in their way.

History suggests that the United States cannot eliminate **immigration** of low-skilled workers. But the nation can choose what kind of low-skilled **immigration** it will have, legal or illegal. The former seems undoubtedly better. Legal flows can be managed to the maximum advantage of the economies and workers of Mexico and the United States. Unauthorized flows cannot.

Consider what happened in 1964, when the Labor Department ended the Bracero Program over concern that **immigrant** farmworkers were depressing agricultural wages. Farm wages hardly soared[https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/stable/42860675?seq=1#page\_scan\_tab\_contents]. Unauthorized **immigration** did.

Then came the next big **immigration** law change, during the Reagan administration in 1986. Some 28 million **immigrants** had arrived illegally in the United States since the end of the Bracero Program, and 23.5 million had left, leaving a net undocumented population of some 4.5 million.

After legalizing three million of them, the **Immigration** Control and Reform Act also tried to close the border to future flows by threatening to fine employers who hired unauthorized workers. But by 1990, more unauthorized **immigrants** were in the United States than had been before the change in 1986.

Critics of guest workers have a point. The Bracero Program was deeply flawed. Abuses by employers who routinely violated agreements on wages, safety, housing and the like were widespread. Workers were helpless, bound to a single employer. Though theoretically they could complain of mistreatment, in practice the procedure was useless.

Today, workers on H-2A and H-2B temporary visas, which are granted to somewhat more than 100,000 seasonal workers every year, still report many abuses[http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/413249-Understanding-the-Organization-Operation-and-Victimization-Process-of-Labor-Trafficking-in-the-United-States.PDF].

As the Blueprint points out, though, these problems can be fixed, especially in a bilateral program managed jointly by Mexico and the United States. It proposes a long list of provisions: Employers in the United States and labor recruitment companies in Mexico would have to apply for certification from their respective governments. **Immigrant** workers would be protected by American labor law, free to change employers within broad sectors of the economy. Jobs and workers would be matched transparently in a public database managed by American **immigration** authorities.

Employers would have to pay a fee to recruit Mexican migrants, which would encourage them to hire American workers first. Part of workers’ pay would be withheld in a saving account to be drawn from after they returned to Mexico. And the visa quota for migrant workers would vary annually to fit changing labor market conditions.

These ideas do not amount to comprehensive **immigration** reform. The authors say nothing of what to do about 11 million undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States. Nor do they deal with illegal **immigrants** from other countries.

But they suggest that, as the number of Mexican migrants seeking work in the United States has decreased from its peak[http://www.cgdev.org/publication/unauthorized-mexican-workers-united-states-inflows], this could be an auspicious time to bundle their proposal into a broader reform effort.

Proposing a large new program for guest workers might sound crazy in the current political environment. Just hear the roar of approval that greets Mr. Trump’s proposal for a “big and beautiful wall.” Many labor unions remain highly skeptical that the United States needs any guest workers at all. Temporary migrant workers, they argue, are devices used by employers to undercut wages.

This criticism seems off the mark, though. Opponents judge the effects of visa programs for migrant workers by comparing them with an alternative reality with no migration, rather than by comparing it with large-scale unlawful migration. “History since has given reason to question that perspective,” the Blueprint states.

“It is a difficult political lift, but we’ve tried other ways for half a century,” said Michael Clemens of the Center for Global Development, the chief writer of the Blueprint. Barring legal **immigrant** workers will not protect American workers. But it will ensure that illegal **immigration** persists.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At the climax of the Broadway musical “Hamilton,” Aaron Burr and Alexander Hamilton exchange a series of increasingly hostile letters in the song “Your Obedient Servant.” Burr enumerates a litany of perceived insults: Hamilton has called him “amoral” and “a dangerous disgrace” and blocked his political aspirations. “Burr, your grievance is legitimate,” Hamilton replies dismissively. “I stand by what I said, every bit of it/You stand only for yourself/It’s what you do/I can’t apologize because it’s true.” An outraged Burr feels he has been doubly wronged — first he is bad-mouthed and then his complaint is answered with a shrug. These irreconcilable differences came to a head on July 11, 1804, in a fatal duel in Weehawken, N.J.

The genius of “Hamilton,” which opened in February 2015, four months before Donald Trump announced his presidential campaign, was the way in which it made the stuff of history textbooks feel unexpectedly vivid, even contemporary. A year and a half later, the prospect of two political adversaries drawing pistols at dawn over unforgivable insults is perhaps not nearly so remote as we might wish. Trump is “unfit, and he proves it every time he talks,” Hillary Clinton said in the third presidential debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/third-debate-transcript.html?\_r=0] on Oct. 19. “No, you are the one that’s unfit,” Trump fumed. There was no handshake afterward. When the “Hamilton” creator Lin-Manuel Miranda hosted “Saturday Night Live” last month, he acknowledged the convergence in his rapped opening monologue:[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AsupmN90wBk] “And, yes, I’m right in my element/Who knew that ‘Hamilton’ would be so topically relevant?/The way that these grandstanding candidates be talking/They’re just a tweet away from facing off in Weehawken!”

Grievance is the animating theme of this election and the natural state of at least one of the candidates; Trump is a public figure whose ideology, such as it is, essentially amounts to a politics of the personal grudge. It has drawn to him throngs of disaffected citizens all too glad to reclaim the epithet “deplorable.” But beyond these aggrieved hordes, it can seem at times as if nearly everyone in the country is nursing wounds, cringing over slights and embarrassments, inveighing against enemies and wishing for retribution. Everyone has someone, or something, to resent — and often rightfully so.

Americans tend to think of rights and grievances in completely different ways — one as a near-mystical birthright and the other as an unjustice that demands a response — but they are each part of our political origin story. In 1774, the First Continental Congress sent a Declaration of Rights and Grievances to King George III, protesting that Americans had “a right peaceably to assemble, consider of their grievances, and petition the King; and that all prosecutions, prohibitory proclamations, and commitments for the same, are illegal” — a missive that set the stage for revolt and the Declaration of Independence two years later. A grievance was understood to be a wrong so grave, so serious, that it must be in violation of its twinned opposite, a right. It was the other inalienable principle claimed by the new nation.

Since then our politics, and our evolving constitutional rights, have been shaped by the articulation and settling of grievances writ large. Slavery was listed as one of the “grievances” in Jefferson’s draft of the Declaration of Independence, but struck from the final version; it would take the 13th Amendment to begin to right that wrong. And half the population didn’t appear in the founding documents at all. Abigail Adams, the wife of John Adams and a future first lady, wrote to her friend Mercy Otis Warren in 1776 that she had sent “a List of Female Grievances” to her husband in Philadelphia, where he was working with the Continental Congress to draft the laws of the new nation. “I even threatened fomenting a Rebellion in case we were not considered,” Adams wrote, “and assured him we would not hold ourselves bound by any Laws in which we had neither a voice, nor representation.”

What had been established in those founding documents was a blueprint for how a grievance could be transmuted, through democratic institutions, into a right. In a February 1965 speech[http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/pds/maai3/community/text10/malcolmxworldproblem.pdf] in Rochester, Malcolm X reframed the strategy for addressing the persecution and second-class citizenship of black Americans. “Anyone who classifies his grievances under the label of ‘human rights’ violations, those grievances can then be brought into the United Nations and be discussed by people all over the world,” he said. “For as long as you call it ‘civil rights,’ your only allies can be the people in the next community, many of whom are responsible for your grievance.” It was a kind of vision test: Enough people with enough power had to be able to see the problem clearly in order to have it corrected.

But as more rights were secured by some, they were resented by others, who saw these gains as their own dispossession. Over the next decades, grumblings arose over government programs, from welfare to affirmative action, intended to target the effects of earlier wrongs. In 2003, the former Democratic governor of Colorado, Richard Lamm, gave a Swiftian three-minute speech[https://youtu.be/rsuA22V\_zpw?t=2m] at a dinner given by the anti-**immigration** Federation for American **Immigration** Reform. “I would like to share with you my plan to destroy America,” he said. As the clinking of forks grew silent, he recited a checklist that ran from bilingualism to high-school dropout rates. “I would invest in ethnic identity and victimology. I would get them to think that their lack of success was only the fault of the majority. I would start a grievance industry.”

Lamm’s speech went viral in the far-right reaches of the internet, where it lives on today: a dystopian vision in which the sort of redress demanded by Malcolm X is an engine for the destruction of American society, a redistribution of privilege and prosperity from whites to blacks and a rising tide of **immigrants** all permanently changing the “we” that once defined the nation — and those who got to rule it.

Trump likes to tell his roaring crowds that “we won’t have a country anymore” if he isn’t elected. The country he warns against losing is, of course, the very country that Lamm warned against losing; Trump’s candidacy takes that complaint to its logical conclusion. The good old days. Populism. Nationalism. Nativism. All of these are more palatable ways of serving up the same dish: “The issue of white grievance,” Bill O’Reilly said on his Fox News show in April, discussing Trump’s supporters, “is not going away.”

This us-against-them movement found its willing avatar in Trump, a man whose motivations — even to run for president — are personal animus, personal gain, a flouting of the rules of engagement and civility, equal-opportunity insults for all. “We have a bunch of babies running our country, folks,” Trump said at a rally in North Carolina on Oct. 21, referring to President Obama and the first lady. “We have a bunch of losers.” It’s a grudge match with no aim higher than his own standing. “It’s him or me!” Aaron Burr howls in the song “The World Was Wide Enough,” near the end of “Hamilton,” in which he narrates the duel and its aftermath. Grievance begets grievance. The personal is political. And history can be hijacked by the consequences.

Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Jessica Lustig is a deputy editor for the magazine.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Gail Collins: Two weeks, Arthur, two weeks! I’m not sure what the world will be like when this election is over. Unless, of course, we’re defending ourselves against a mutiny from the right, the revolt of Donald’s Deplorables. Although he doesn’t really strike me as a guy who has much taste for the barricades. What do you think of all the “rigged election” drama?

Arthur Brooks: It was a line that worked at rallies but played poorly in front of the whole country. I agree with you that there’s less to the outrage than meets the eye, but it does sound pretty bad for a candidate to pre-announce that he might choose to be an epically sore loser. Not exactly a confident sprint to the finish.

Gail: Don’t know that anything like this has ever happened before. I seem to be saying that so frequently these days. It used to be, no matter how weird things got, I could always tell people things were worse when Grover Cleveland ran.

Arthur: What has the country come to when we can no longer take consolation in Grover Cleveland?

Speaking of rejecting political realities, I heard someone from the Trump campaign react to the news that he is now trailing in Arizona by alleging it was never really a Republican state to begin with. That reminds me of a scene from “This Is Spinal Tap.” The band manager tries to console the musicians after a concert is canceled in Boston by saying it’s not much of a college town.

Gail: When it’s over maybe Trump will say he never wanted to win anyway. This was all a sophisticated plan to launch Trump TV. Or maybe a chain of down-home fast-food restaurants that specialize in orange food.

Arthur: The most terrible part of this election is how humorless it has become. Seriously, did you watch any of the Al Smith charity dinner last Thursday? That’s usually a respite in an election year because the candidates always attend and tell jokes in good humor — whether it comes naturally to them or not.

Gail: To be honest, I’m obsessed with the Al Smith dinner. It was one of my first assignments when I came to New York as a reporter. While the serious journalists were listening to the speeches, my job was to watch the dignitaries eating onstage, many of them rather elderly, and make sure nobody died.

Arthur: One step up from writing obituaries, right?

At the Al Smith dinner in 2012, both President Obama and Mitt Romney were hilarious and self-deprecating. But this year, holy cow, it was brutal. Hillary Clinton’s routine was a crime against humor. She actually called the audience a “basket of adorables.”

Gail: Let me admit it, I kinda liked “basket of adorables.”

Arthur: No, Gail, no!

Worse, though, Trump earned some well-justified boos when he dropped this knee-slapper: “Here she is in public, pretending not to hate Catholics.” Ha. Ha. I hope he stiffed the staffer who wrote that joke.

Gail: Yeah, Trump was terrible, Hillary un-terrific. On the plus side, it’ll probably be the last time they’re together until after the election — if ever. Which reminds me that I haven’t asked what you thought of the final debate.

Arthur: For once, I thought the debate showed some initial promise. Trump articulated fairly sound, conventional conservative arguments on abortion, taxes and the Second Amendment. Clinton gave standard liberal arguments. I was almost lulled into the false consciousness that things were maybe, almost, kind of normal.

Gail: I can see you in your shoes and slippers, faithful dog at your feet, nodding happily. And then … and then …

Arthur: Record scratch. My reverie ended abruptly when they snapped back to insults and ad hominem arguments. I could go on all day with my policy complaints, but you know what I actually disliked the most? The obvious unhappiness in both the candidates. They seem ungrateful to be running for president. Both of them chose to run, now millions and millions of Americans are going to vote for each of them, and yet they both look like they are doing forced labor. There’s neither hope nor optimism. Just bitterness.

In the end, that may be the obituary of this election. Two candidates who had no interest in being happy warriors for the country, who expressed contempt and hatred for each other and who were both disliked by the majority of Americans. Sad!

Gail: Arthur, Arthur, cheer up! Nobody has ever liked running for president — except maybe Bill Clinton. Barack Obama was always complaining about how ridiculous the whole thing was.

Arthur: I never trust people who have glamorous jobs they say they hate. And personally, I think there is nothing more fun than traveling around the country speaking to groups of people. But I confess to being out in the tail of the extroversion curve. Your mileage may vary.

Gail: You always do seem to be having fun. But of course there’s nobody trailing you around telling people that you’re going to destroy the country.

Arthur: Tell that to my Twitter mentions.

Gail: Although I find myself increasingly unable to speak for whatever reality Trump is living in, Hillary does look forward to becoming president. She thinks she can make the country better. And you know, it’s really a modern phenomenon to want a president who seems to be having a good time. Nobody thought Andrew Jackson was enjoying himself. Or Calvin Coolidge.

Arthur: My friend Martin Seligman, who is a psychology professor at Penn, did a famous study of optimism in presidential candidates that earned front-[http://www.nytimes.com/1988/05/08/us/for-presidential-candidates-optimism-appears-a-winner.html] page coverage in T[http://www.nytimes.com/1988/05/08/us/for-presidential-candidates-optimism-appears-a-winner.html] he Times back in 1988[http://www.nytimes.com/1988/05/08/us/for-presidential-candidates-optimism-appears-a-winner.html]. His basic finding: The more optimistic candidate had almost always won. Amazingly, Marty’s study itself appeared to change that effect because it immediately became conventional wisdom among politicians that they had to be optimistic and fake it if necessary.

Gail: Wow, I wonder if Ronald Reagan was really sitting in the basement every night, mulling dark thoughts.

Arthur: I would guess that Reagan was a true optimist through and through. His darkest private moments were probably still sunnier than your typical public speech from Jimmy Carter. But I digress. After everyone read the Seligman study, optimism stopped being so predictive because everybody started adopting the same language.

Weirdly, this year has been the complete opposite. For better or worse, both these candidates have shed any pretense of joy or optimism. Their core value propositions are identical: “I am the only one standing between you and a candidate you see as the apocalypse.” This might seem like a good strategy given the public’s sour mood, but I think it’s shortsighted. One 2013 study[http://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/07/26/opinion/sunday/arthur-c-brooks-we-need-optimists.html?\_r=0&referer=] found that happy leaders are perceived to be 132 percent more effective than unhappy leaders.

But back to business. Give me your take on the debate.

Gail: A few weeks ago I’d have agreed that the issues argument at the beginning was a great change of pace. But to tell the truth, I don’t care any more whether we ever get around to issues. The choice is between Hillary Clinton and the potential destruction of the planet.

Arthur: It’s my job to note that partisans on the right are saying approximately the inverse: The choice is between Trump and the end of America. Personally, I don’t really believe either argument. I will comfortably predict that America will survive either presidency. And hey, weren’t you trying to cheer me up?

Gail: If I’m right and this election actually is about character and personality, the debates have done their job. There’s nothing anybody could say about issues now that would change the trajectory. So we might as well sit back and watch the melodrama.

Arthur: Not exactly a ringing endorsement. The Clinton campaign was probably toasting the last debate with lukewarm glasses of tap water. “Here’s to a job … done.”

Gail: I was sort of imagining them hopping around slapping one another on the back and yelling, “Oh, wow, did you hear what he just said?”

Arthur: “Finally,” they assured one another, “she’ll be up by 50 points!” Uh-huh.

Just for fun, let’s end on a positive note. You and I were talking the other day, and we landed on the subject of what makes us hopeful about our country. So tell our readers what that is.

Gail: Well, for all the current anti-**immigrant** hysteria, there’s still no place that’s better at accepting diversity. And Americans are fair. Once you convince them that something is unfair you have instantly won your argument. Although getting to that point, of course, can take a lot of time.

If you look at our national elections, I think you’ll find that in general when our people go to the polls they make reasonable decisions based on very sound, larger principles — do we want major change? Does the candidate have the most basic necessary qualifications?

That second one doesn’t generally come up that often, but this year is — in oh so many ways — an exception.

What about you?

Arthur: Speaking of **immigrants**, I was on the road recently and met a driver who moved here from West Africa. He started talking to me about politics, complaining about Trump and insisting he’s surrounded by dangerous advisers who want to kick out all the **immigrants**. I was just listening quietly. After a few minutes, he stopped and reflected: “But you know what? I’m from Ivory Coast, where Donald Trump would look like Thomas Jefferson.” We agreed that this is truly a great country.

Enjoy your week in our great country, Gail, and we’ll talk next week and see where we stand.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Nov. 1, 2006, I found my wife, Adrienne Shelly, dead in her West Village office. Adrienne, an actor and filmmaker, had been brutally murdered by a 19-year-old undocumented Ecuadorean construction worker; he later said they were having an argument and, fearing she would report him and have him deported, he killed her and staged her death so it would appear to be a suicide. Our daughter was just 2 years old at the time.

Given the anger and grief I still feel, I could easily be seduced by Donald J. Trump’s anti-**immigrant** rhetoric that is the cornerstone of his presidential run. “They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists,” he said as he began his campaign in 2015. And in these final weeks before the election, rather than tacking to the middle, he seems to be doubling down. “We’ve got some bad hombres,” he said in last week’s debate, referring to **immigrants** who commit crimes.

And it’s not just Mr. Trump. In the years since Adrienne’s murder I’ve received several offers from prominent members of the conservative media, including Fox News’ Bill O’Reilly and Megyn Kelly, to speak out on this issue and give legitimacy to right-wing anti-**immigrant** sentiment. Who better than a Democrat to attack an entire segment of our population, right?

But Adrienne was not murdered by an illegal **immigrant**, per se. She fell victim to a depraved killer who simply happened to be an undocumented **immigrant**. It is an obvious distinction, almost too obvious, but it’s an important one to consider as the country goes further down the dangerous path of demonizing those not born here.

At his rallies and during the debates, Mr. Trump has painted a dark picture of an America overrun by foreign criminals who come here to rape, pillage and murder our innocent civilians. He opposes any form of amnesty for the estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States, taking a hard-line law-and-order stand that has brought millions of voters to his camp.

He uses murders like Adrienne’s — though never hers specifically, fortunately — as political props. His “solution” includes a deportation force that would separate people from their families and “send them back to wherever they came from.”

Adrienne’s killer, Diego Pillco, plea-bargained a murder conviction that sentenced him to 25 years with no parole and no ability to appeal. It was a tough case. He had no clear motive, and there were no witnesses to the crime. The district attorney’s office advised me to accept the deal rather than go to trial. It was an agonizing decision: roll the dice for a life sentence or possibly end up with a manslaughter conviction, with her killer receiving a meager three to five years in prison.

We took the deal. It was, simply, a business decision, albeit one with a hefty emotional price tag. Her killer will be deported upon his release, walking this earth a free man at 44 years old, while Adrienne’s vibrant life was snuffed out at 40.

His reason for killing Adrienne, and the relatively lenient sentence he received, certainly feeds Mr. Trump’s xenophobic, fear-mongering narrative. But beyond the rhetoric, there’s no clear cause and effect. His rationale was no different from that of an American citizen who in the act of a crime kills his “witness” to avoid prosecution and imprisonment. Attributing his heinous act to his **immigration** status dilutes the more relevant truth that he lacked the ability to know right from wrong and had zero respect for human life.

Yes, we have an **immigration** problem that is in desperate need of reform. Yes, some illegal **immigrants** commit crimes, some of them violent. But so do blacks, whites, Asians, Christians and Jews. Mr. Trump often claims that two million undocumented **immigrants** have been convicted of crimes, but in fact the figure is actually 176,000, according to **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement. The reality is, Americans have appreciably more to fear from their fellow citizens than from undocumented **immigrants**.

It’s politically expedient for xenophobic agitators like Mr. Trump to scapegoat the millions of foreigners who have come to the United States in search of a better life. But his malevolence toward **immigrants** runs counter to the principles on which our great nation was founded. It’s disheartening to see so many people being swept out to sea in a riptide of ignorance and hate.

America was created by, is governed by and — with the exception of Native Americans — is inhabited by **immigrants** and their descendants, generations of whom came here to escape religious and ethnic persecution. That millions of people face a similar fate on our soil is deplorable. We should be thanking them, as America’s greatness is attributed to their blood, sweat, vision, perseverance, dedication and brilliance.

While I believe that the country must do more to secure its borders, deport noncitizencriminals and protect Americans from foreign terrorists, I also believe we must find a realistic, humane path to citizenship for the millions of decent, hard-working **immigrants** who love this country as much as I do, regardless of whether they are documented or not. We need the kind of compassionate reform that Democrats have been advocating for decades in the face of persistent Republican obstructionism.

That is what Adrienne would want.

Andy Ostroy is a marketing entrepreneur and political blogger.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARIBAULT, Minn. — For half a dozen years, Republicans have swept into statehouses across the nation, winning more legislative chambers than at any time in history and pushing states to the right on issues such as abortion, voting rights, labor unions and gender identity.

But with Donald J. Trump’s stumbles[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/us/politics/hillary-clinton-campaign.html] raising alarms for Republicans down the ballot, Democrats hope that a resounding win at the presidential level will translate to significant gains in capitals in Minnesota, Colorado, Nevada, New Hampshire and beyond. President Obama[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack\_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per], who has endured gridlock in Washington as Republicans in the states took direct aim at his vision and legacy, is stepping in to assist more than 150 state legislative candidates, by far his biggest effort to bolster local Democrats since he took office.

“You are going to see a level of engagement down to the state representative level that I don’t think you’ve seen too many presidents engage in,” said David Simas, the White House political director.

Still, Democrats have a long way to go. Republicans effectively control 68 of the nation’s 99 statehouse chambers, compared with 36 at the start of 2010. For years, Democrats complained that Mr. Obama and his political operation paid too little attention to the health of the party, and during his tenure, more than 800 Democratic state lawmakers have been voted out of office, among the worst[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/13/us/politics/obama-legacy-in-state-offices-a-shrinking-democratic-share.html] losses[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/13/us/politics/obama-legacy-in-state-offices-a-shrinking-democratic-share.html] for the party[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/13/us/politics/obama-legacy-in-state-offices-a-shrinking-democratic-share.html] under any president in more than 100 years.

Republicans control at least 22 capitals entirely, holding governors’ offices as well as legislatures. Seven years ago, they had complete control of nine.

Matt Walter, the president of the Republican State Leadership Committee, acknowledged that his party was facing a challenge. “When you’re at an all-time-high number in the legislatures, naturally you have a lot more ground to defend,” he said.

The volatile state of the presidential election has also muddied predictions about who will go to the polls on Nov. 8 and what that will mean for races to elect more than 5,900 state lawmakers and 12 governors.

“This is an opportunity year for the Democrats, and that’s more true now than it was two weeks ago,” said Tim Storey, an elections expert with the National Conference of State Legislatures[http://www.ncsl.org/] who tracks state legislative contests. “But the question mark is turnout. The presidential race has made it really hard to know what’s going to get people to the polls or what’s going to keep them away.”

Here in Faribault, an hour south of the Twin Cities, Patti Fritz, a Democrat, has seen the puzzle over turnout up close. Ms. Fritz, whose effort to win back a seat in the Minnesota House of Representatives could help her party retake full control of the capital, recalled meeting a woman at a grocery store who said she was so disillusioned by the presidential election that she was considering not voting. Maybe she would vote for Jesus, she said.

“Well, write him in for president,” Ms. Fritz said she urged the woman, “and then go down further and vote for me.”

Democrats hope Mr. Obama’s involvement, which began in earnest last week, broadens their chances. Dozens of candidates for state posts were getting word of the support only last week. In Minnesota, Mr. Obama is backing Jamie Becker-Finn in her campaign for a different State House seat. José Javier Rodríguez, a state representative in Florida, hopes Mr. Obama can help him move to the State Senate. And in Georgia, Mr. Obama recorded an automated telephone call to support keeping Kimberly Alexander in the State House seat she won in 2012.

“This is Barack Obama, urging you to get to the polls to vote for the candidate who has my back, and yours: Kimberly Alexander,” he says in the call. “Thanks. Go vote!”

Mr. Simas, the White House political director, said Mr. Obama was motivated in part by a deepening frustration with conservative legislation passed in statehouses. In North Carolina, lawmakers restricted bathroom use by transgender people[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/24/us/north-carolina-to-limit-bathroom-use-by-birth-gender.html]. Republican-led states across the country have passed hundreds of restrictive abortion laws[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/02/29/us/why-the-abortion-clinics-have-closed.html]. Many Republican-led legislatures have sought to toughen voter identification[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/us/some-republicans-acknowledge-leveraging-voter-id-laws-for-political-gain.html] laws[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/us/some-republicans-acknowledge-leveraging-voter-id-laws-for-political-gain.html]. And the Republicans’ sweep into power has led to redrawn political maps, often creating tougher challenges for Democrats.

Even after Mr. Obama leaves the White House, officials said, he will lend support to Eric H. Holder Jr., his former attorney general, who is leading a new group aimed at helping Democrats win redistricting fights in 2020. Democrats hope to avoid a repeat of 2010, when Republicans’ control of legislatures put them in a position to reshape districts in their favor for a decade.

In addition to statehouses, a surprisingly large number of governors’ races — as many as seven — are seen as up for grabs, including some that could alter control of capitals. If John Gregg, a Democrat, wins a tight race to replace Mike Pence as governor of Indiana, that state’s Republican-controlled Legislature will face roadblocks to its agenda. The same will be true in North Carolina if Attorney General Roy Cooper, another Democrat, wins.

In Missouri, a victory for Eric Greitens, the Republican nominee for governor, would end divided rule in Jefferson City, potentially easing Republican lawmakers’ efforts to pass measures such as “right to work” legislation. If Phil Scott, a Republican, becomes governor of Vermont, Democrats will no longer have total control of Montpelier and will most likely be derailed in their push for paid family leave and renewable energy development.

But the far larger number of state legislative contests could have a broader effect. At least 20 chambers are seen as highly competitive in the election, and a majority of those are now controlled by Republicans. Democrats are setting their sights on chambers not only in Minnesota but also in states like Maine, New Mexico and New York. Republicans hope to hold control and extend their reach in places like Iowa, Kentucky and Washington.

Such races are often decided by a few hundred votes or fewer, so turnout is essential — and, this year, a muddle. Democrats say their state candidates will benefit if Republicans appalled by Mr. Trump stay home. Republicans, though, say Mr. Trump’s core supporters are more motivated to vote than others, particularly given negative views of Hillary Clinton.

“In a lot of our areas where we are going on offense, he is extremely popular and Hillary Clinton is extremely unpopular,” said Jonathan Shell, a state representative from Kentucky, where Republicans have not held a majority in the House since the 1920s. Mr. Shell, a farmer who has worked to recruit Republican candidates, believes frustration over lost coal mining jobs and enthusiasm for Mr. Trump may finally help change that.

Democrats anticipate a different Trump effect. They have begun demanding that Republican opponents take stances on Mr. Trump and address his lewd remarks[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/donald-trump-tape-transcript.html] about women and allegations that he sexually assaulted women[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html].

“Do these Republicans step away from him and hold on to their socially conservative base, or do they double down on Trump and stay with him?” said Jessica Post, the executive director of the Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee.

The pressure is intensifying for them to make a decision. In some legislative districts, voters are getting recorded phone calls insisting that local Republicans must either reject Mr. Trump or be considered in support of him. In Washington State, where Republicans need two additional seats to win control of the House, Lynnette Vehrs issued a blunt question to her Republican opponent: “Do you condone the words and actions of Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], and how can you continue to stand by him?”

Risks for Republicans, even at the bottom of the ticket, are clear: **Alienate** Mr. Trump’s voters or **alienate** those perturbed by his behavior. “At this point, you really are trying to run out the clock,” said David Flaherty, a Republican pollster and the chief executive of Magellan Strategies[http://magellanstrategies.com/], based in Colorado, where Republicans are trying to hold or expand a one-seat majority in the Senate. “You’re damned if you do, and you’re damned if you don’t.”

With control of the Minnesota House at stake, radio ads are nearly constant in Faribault. Politicians from far-flung districts drive in to help. And Ms. Fritz, who faces a rematch with Brian Daniels, the Republican who defeated her two years ago by 221 votes, is calling on volunteers from this small city’s growing Somali and Hispanic populations to knock on doors.

This month, Mr. Daniels explained his feelings about Mr. Trump this way: “He wasn’t one of my first dozen choices, but what gives me hope is he picked a really good vice-presidential candidate.”

In a bitter wind, Mr. Daniels drove a golf cart around a subdivision to talk to voters. At one door, he spoke of his time in office — two years when a newly Republican-held State House at times blocked Democrats, who control the rest of the capital, from rushing ideas through. He told the resident that his colleagues had slowed state spending increases. He said they had prevented a gas tax increase.

He did not mention Mr. Trump.

Monica Davey reported from Faribault, and Michael D. Shear from Washington. Mitch Smith contributed reporting from Chicago.

\* With Statehouse Victories, Republicans Are Poised to Enact Changes[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/06/us/politics/with-statehouse-victories-republicans-are-poised-to-enact-changes.html]

\* A National Strategy Funds State Political Monopolies[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/12/us/politics/a-national-strategy-funds-state-political-monopolies.html]
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\* After Flurry of Changes, Some States Ease Up[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/15/us/politics/after-flurry-of-changes-some-states-ease-up.html]

\* One-Party Control Opens States to Partisan Rush[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/23/us/politics/one-party-control-opens-states-to-partisan-rush.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HOUSTON — It was a brief but telling glimpse of the new Texas.

On a visit to Dallas in March, President Obama[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/barack-obama] stood in a country and western club, Gilley’s, and jokingly plucked a black-felt cowboy hat off the head of an exuberant supporter and tried it on. The hat in question belonged to someone who evoked Texas’ future as much as its past, a Mexican-American man named David Espinosa, a native Texan and school board member from the Dallas suburb of Grand Prairie.

Yet here, under the surface, was the old Texas, too. Mr. Espinosa’s Grand Prairie school district is 65 percent Latino, but the seven-member school board is majority white. Mr. Espinosa is the board’s lone Latino.

Only one thing about Latino political power in Texas is certain: It’s complicated.

Texas has the second-largest Hispanic population of any state — roughly 10 million of the state’s 27 million residents are Latino, second only to California’s 15 million Hispanics. There are more Latino elected officials in Texas than in any other state — 2,536 at the local, state and federal levels, nearly double the number in California, the state with the second-largest amount.

In both states, a majority of Latinos are Democrats, but Texas Hispanics find themselves in an overwhelmingly Republican state. The Latino electorate in Texas fails to vote in large numbers, and many who are poor and uneducated are disconnected from politics.

Yet at the same time, generations of Mexican-American families have built political dynasties in parts of Texas. The Velas of Brownsville are but one: Filemon B. Vela Sr. was a federal judge there; his wife, Blanca Sanchez Vela, became the mayor; and their son, Filemon B. Vela Jr., now represents Brownsville in Congress. Latinos have plenty of power in Texas — it just depends on who, what, when, where and how.

To become a Latino elected official in Texas — to win a seat, to keep a seat, to simultaneously appeal to fellow Latinos and white voters — there are unspoken rules. There are ways of politically navigating a majority-minority state that struggles to fully embrace its Hispanic identity and is split along racial, ethnic, party, geographic, economic, urban and rural lines.

Rule No. 1: No Spanish? No problem

In today’s partisan world, what do two of Texas’ top Hispanic Democrats have in common with its most powerful Hispanic Republican? Spotty Spanish, for starters.

The Castro twins[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/16/us/politics/texas-twins-campaign-but-they-arent-sure-for-what.html] — Julián Castro, the youngest member of Mr. Obama’s cabinet and the former mayor of San Antonio, and his brother, Joaquin Castro, a San Antonio congressman — are not fluent in Spanish. Neither is Senator Ted Cruz[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/ted-cruz]. There are, of course, vast differences in style, policy and ideology between the Castro brothers and Mr. Cruz. The twins — who were raised by a single mother and their grandmother, an **immigrant** from Mexico who worked as a maid and a cook — appeal to and inspire Mexican-Americans in Texas. Mr. Cruz, meanwhile, is regarded as a conservative firebrand who happens to be Hispanic.

But all three are products of Harvard Law School and all three are symbolic of the Texas Latino political bench these days. It is packed with post-Hispanic Hispanics — academic, ambitious, lawyerly superstars who identify with their party first and their ethnicity second. Some of the most influential Hispanic Democrats and Hispanic Republicans are the Texas-born sons and daughters of **immigrants**, or the grandsons and granddaughters of them, but they themselves do not embody the Latino **immigrant** experience so much as serve as a bridge to it.

State Representative Rafael Anchia, a Dallas Democrat, is a corporate-finance lawyer who was appointed by Mr. Obama to a trade-policy advisory committee. State Representative Jason Villalba, a Dallas Republican, is a corporate-finance lawyer as well, and his majority-white district includes one of the wealthiest neighborhoods in Texas, Preston Hollow, which is home to former President George W. Bush. Vince Perez, a Democratic county commissioner in El Paso, studied at Georgetown University and was the communications director for former Texas congressman Silvestre Reyes, a Democrat.

Some of them speak perfect Spanish, while others have had to take lessons since getting elected. Perhaps there was a time when not speaking Spanish was a liability for a Texas Latino politician, but that time is gone. Maybe it ended in San Antonio around 2011, when Julián Castro won re-election as mayor with nearly 82 percent of the vote. Or maybe it ended in El Paso that same year, when a county commissioner’s race was heating up.

Mr. Perez, the Georgetown graduate, was seeking the commissioner’s seat held by Willie Gandara Jr., who criticized Mr. Perez’s lack of fluency in Spanish. Mr. Gandara told reporters that Mr. Perez failed to fit the area’s “criteria” and that voters wanted a Spanish-speaking commissioner. “There’s a difference,” Mr. Gandara told ABC-7, “between living it and not living it.”

Mr. Perez won the election and was later named the 2016 National County Leader of the Year for his work overhauling the local criminal justice system.

Rule No. 2: Houston is behind the curve

The state’s biggest city — the cosmopolitan, left-leaning metropolis that is 44 percent Hispanic and crammed with wealth, traffic, museums and megachurches — has one Hispanic on the 16-member City Council. Houston voters have never sent a Hispanic to Congress. The school district, the largest in Texas, is majority-Latino, but only two of the nine school board members are Hispanic.

“My office gets calls from Hispanics from other council districts asking for assistance,” said Robert Gallegos, the sole Latino on the City Council.

If Mr. Gallegos ever wants to run for mayor, one glass ceiling has been broken for him, but the other remains intact. Mr. Gallegos is gay, and it was back in 2009 that Houston became the largest city in the United States to elect an openly gay or lesbian mayor. Yet Houston, founded in 1836, has never had a Latino mayor, although San Antonio has had three since 1981.

Black Houston voters have rallied behind black mayoral candidates as an energized bloc, and the city has had two black mayors in the last 18 years as a result. But Latino voters have not done the same for Latino mayoral candidates, and Hispanics make up only about 19 percent of registered voters, a far lower percentage than blacks.

“I am worried about stunted growth,” said Adrian Garcia, the former Harris County sheriff who unsuccessfully ran for mayor last year. “For me, taking chances is what we ought to be doing.”

Rule No. 3: It gets ugly

In 2014, Ramon Romero Jr. became the first Latino elected to the Texas Legislature from Fort Worth’s majority-white Tarrant County. For the first time, the Fort Worth Stockyards — a tourist attraction with cattle drives and rodeos that is home to the Texas Cowboy Hall of Fame — is represented in Austin by the son of Mexican **immigrants**.

On a recent drive through his majority-Latino district, Mr. Romero, a wealthy businessman and Democrat, had something on his mind.

“I was in a little buggy with an old rancher the other day, and we were going to go up to a campfire,” Mr. Romero said. “And one of them joked — and I don’t even think he even realized he said it — he said, ‘Where’s my Mexican?’ We were on the buggies and we needed to open up a gate. I hear it all the time in the pool business. We’re building somebody a pool and they’ll say something like, ‘No, you don’t need to do that. I’ll just have my Mexicans do that.’ They don’t even have names.”

Latino politicians in Texas have some of the thickest skins in the business. Bigotry, discrimination and slurs fester, overtly and subtly. Some ignore it. Some speak out. But they push on, keeping their feet planted in two worlds — a Latino culture that prizes assimilation and a white culture that believes that bigotry is a thing of the past.

In 2010, a prominent Hispanic Republican, Victor G. Carrillo, was the chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, which regulates the oil and gas industry. With support from then-Gov. Rick Perry[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/rick-perry] and other Republicans, he was expected to easily win re-election. But Mr. Carrillo lost the Republican primary to a little-known white opponent, David Porter.

In a letter to supporters, Mr. Carrillo blamed his loss on his Hispanic surname.

“Given the choice between ‘Porter’ and ‘Carrillo’ — unfortunately, the Hispanic surname was a serious setback from which I could never recover although I did all in my power to overcome this built-in bias,” Mr. Carrillo wrote.

A number of Republican officials disagreed, saying he lost because of a lackluster campaign. They pointed to the Hispanic Republicans who have won similar Republican primaries for statewide seats, including Eva Guzman, a justice on the Texas Supreme Court. But others sided with Mr. Carrillo.

“They saw the Latino name,” said Jason P. Casellas, an associate professor at the University of Houston and an expert on Latino representation. “He had all the support of Gov. Perry and all the establishment, but he had to face a Republican primary with mostly Anglo voters.”

Rule No. 4: Don’t assume Latino districts vote for Latinos

Consider the 10 most Latino congressional districts in the country. Five are in Texas, three are in California and two are in Florida. The percentage of Hispanics in those districts ranges from 70 percent to 87 percent. There is the 34th Congressional District in South Texas, which is nearly 84 percent Hispanic and includes Brownsville. There is the 40th Congressional District in Southern California, which is nearly 87 percent Latino and includes East Los Angeles.

Now picture a room, and put the 10 lawmakers who represent those heavily Hispanic districts inside. It would, not surprisingly, be populated by Hispanic men and Hispanic women, with two exceptions. Eight of the 10 most Hispanic congressional districts in America are represented by Hispanics, but two are represented by white Democrats from El Paso and Houston.

That is how Latino politics operates in the state. A total of six congressional districts in Texas that are majority Hispanic have non-Latino representatives: four whites and two African-Americans.

There is no clear-cut answer as to why. To some, it shows the sophistication of the Latino vote. To others, it is proof the Republican-dominated Legislature weakened Hispanic voting strength, through its redrawing of political district maps and its voter ID law, which required government-issued ID at the polls. To those non-Latino representatives, it is absurd to suggest they cannot represent Latino-majority districts as well as a Latino can.

“Having grown up in a predominantly Mexican-American community, I felt like I understood the values, the family, the faith,” said Representative Gene Green, the white, Democratic congressman from Houston’s 29th Congressional District, which is 77 percent Hispanic. “I don’t think I just walked into it.”

Rule No. 5: Be reddish. Be bluish.

It is not just red or blue in Texas. For many Latino politicians, it is reddish-blue or bluish-red.

Latino Democrats openly talk about their guns and their church. Nobody blinked in 2014, when a prominent Latina Democrat from San Antonio who was running for lieutenant governor, Leticia Van de Putte, spoke of her nuanced stance on gun rights. She opposed open carry but supported concealed carry. “Pete and I have guns,” Ms. Van de Putte, referring to her husband, said at a Texas Tribune event. “Several.”

When the Legislature passed some of the toughest restrictions on abortion in the country in 2013, there were six Democratic state lawmakers who voted for the bill. Five of the six were Latinos from South Texas. “Latinos in my district are predominantly Catholic and in so doing are pro-traditional family, pro-life and pro-business,” said State Senator Eddie Lucio Jr., a Brownsville Democrat who voted for the abortion-restrictions bill. “I’m one of those.”

Mr. Villalba, the Hispanic Republican from Dallas, has at times angered liberals as well as conservatives.

“The right and the left have a hard time with me,” Mr. Villalba said, “but the people who I go to church with and the people I sit on the sidelines with at soccer games are supportive of me, which is why I’ve been successful at winning elections.”

\* Google Searches for Voter Registration Have Surged in Hispanic Areas[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/upshot/trump-effect-voter-registration-may-be-surging-in-hispanic-areas.html]

\* 27 Million Potential Hispanic Votes. But What Will They Really Add Up To?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/27-million-potential-hispanic-votes-but-what-will-they-really-add-up-to.html]

\* Federal Court Rules Texas’ ID Law Violates Voting Rights Act[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/us/federal-court-rules-texas-id-law-violates-voting-rights-act.html]

\* Whatever Happened to Latino Political Power?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/03/opinion/sunday/whatever-happened-to-latino-political-power.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

On Oct. 26, 1967, John McCain’s A-4 Skyhawk was shot down over North Vietnam. Over the next five and a half years, Lieutenant Commander McCain was tortured by North Vietnamese guards seeking to force him to confess his “air piracy”; twice, he tried to commit suicide rather than give in. As a stunt intended to embarrass his father — Adm. John McCain, commander of American forces in the Pacific — his captors at the Hanoi Hilton offered to free the younger McCain. Rather than desert his mates, he refused.

Nearly 50 years later, Mr. McCain, during what will most likely be his last run for the Senate, faces another reproach to his core values, this time in the unlikely form of his party’s presidential nominee, Donald J. Trump.

Like his party, Mr. McCain has been caught between his self-interest and his principles, between his instinct to survive and his instinct to sacrifice for the greater good. How the senator deals with an increasingly toxic Trump campaign will do much to determine how he’s remembered — and may well signal how the Republican Party goes about trying to pick up the pieces.

Mr. McCain was among Mr. Trump’s earliest targets. In July 2015, Mr. Trump declared that Mr. McCain, who had chided him for vowing to deport all illegal **immigrants**, “was not a war hero,” then amended his remarks to absurdly state: “He’s a war hero because he was captured. I like people that weren’t captured, O.K.?” Mr. McCain, whose temper is well known, might have lashed back, but he mostly simmered.

Later, he chastised Mr. Trump for cozying up to President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia and for besmirching the Gold Star family of an Army captain, Humayun Khan. After Mitt Romney excoriated Mr. Trump as unqualified for office, Mr. McCain seconded his remarks from the Senate floor. Mr. McCain even declined to attend the Republican National Convention, in an obvious snub to his party’s nominee.

At the same time, in May he endorsed Mr. Trump for president. “I support the Republican Party, and the Republicans have chosen the nominee for the party,” he said. At the time, Mr. McCain was locked in a primary fight against a right-wing opponent who was popular among Trump supporters, and Mr. Trump’s subsequent endorsement of Mr. McCain helped him survive the challenge.

More recently, Mr. McCain has soured on Mr. Trump; the day after the “Access Hollywood” tape was released, he withdrew his endorsement. “I have daughters, I have friends,” he explained. After the debate Wednesday night, he gave Mr. Trump — and all of us — a needed civics lesson by reminding him that graciously accepting the voters’ choice in a presidential race is “the American way.” Still, Mr. McCain seems to feel a need to tread lightly around Mr. Trump.

“He is in the middle of a re-election race,” explains an aide, “and it’s a fairly competitive one.” (“Competitive” is relative; he leads his Democratic opponent, Representative Ann Kirkpatrick, by double digits in voter surveys.) Still, by renouncing Mr. Trump, he runs the risk of **alienating** Trump voters without necessarily winning over enough Democrats to cover the loss — especially if Hillary Clinton, as seems likely, carries Arizona.

Mr. McCain’s modulation is not just political; it’s also personal. His rock-ribbed public image contrasts with a history of struggling with personal demons. “I’m a man of many failings,” he once told me. “I make no bones about it. That’s why I’m such a believer in redemption. I’ve done many, many wrong things in my life. The key is to try to improve.”

Mr. McCain once told a Navy psychiatrist that, as a teenager, he was a “rebel without a cause.” One of his high school nicknames was “McNasty.” Even today, some congressional colleagues call him “Senator Hothead”; more than a few have received letters of apology from Mr. McCain after being told off by him, sometimes loudly and profanely.

That struggle between niceness and harshness was evident during Mr. McCain’s 2008 run for president. That year, groups that were nominally independent from the Republican Party bought advertisements meant to (however subtly) stir a racist backlash against Barack Obama. Mr. McCain might have stood back and let them do his dirty work; instead he quietly, firmly let it be known he and his campaign wanted no such underhanded tactics. When a woman at a rally attacked Mr. Obama as an “Arab,” Mr. McCain responded, “No, ma’am, no, ma’am, he’s a decent, family-man citizen.”

This was the same McCain who, as he anxiously watched a nascent Tea Party movement take root in his party, chose Sarah Palin to be his running mate. In the process, he ended up sabotaging his own campaign; worse, Ms. Palin’s know-nothing rants helped set the stage for Mr. Trump. (Does Mr. McCain regret his choice? “McCain looks forward, not back,” a friend of his told me.)

Mr. McCain has had a similarly complicated record in the Senate. He has shown an ability to reach across the aisle, working with Senator Edward Kennedy on the last serious congressional attempt at **immigration** reform. He even cooperated from time to time with Senator Hillary Clinton (and in 2004, on a trip to Estonia, engaged her in a vodka-drinking contest[http://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/29/washington/29rivals.html]). But he can be extremely, immoderately partisan. Just last week, he blurted on talk radio that if Mrs. Clinton is elected, he will try to block any Supreme Court nominee she sends to Congress. (A spokesman later tried to walk back this reckless vow.)

And yet, as a defeated presidential candidate in 2008, he showed grace and respect for democracy. “This campaign was and will remain the great honor of my life,” he said on election night, “and my heart is filled with nothing but gratitude for the experience and to the American people for giving me a fair hearing before deciding that Senator Obama and my old friend Joe Biden should have the honor of leading us for the next four years.”

On his 23rd mission over North Vietnam, Captain McCain heard the beep signaling that an antiaircraft missile had locked on to his plane. He could have “jinked” — aborted the mission — to avoid the missile, but out of stubborn bravery, he flew straight on. He had just toggled the bomb-release switch when the enemy missile blew off the right wing of his plane.

With just weeks left in the campaign, Mr. McCain has the opportunity to to directly challenge Mr. Trump and use his still-lofty position in the Republican firmament to begin to rebuild his party. Or he might decide to play it safe, racking up a higher vote count and saving his fire for another day.

Mr. McCain is a survivor as well as a hero. Only he knows the true measure of his heart.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Evan Thomas is the author, most recently, of “Being Nixon: A Man Divided.”

Correction: October 30, 2016, Sunday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An Opinion essay last Sunday about John McCain misstated his rank when he was a prisoner of war in Vietnam. He was a Navy lieutenant commander, not a captain, a rank he achieved later.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

Just months ago, Senator Marco Rubio was seen by the Republican establishment as one of its best hopes for taking back the White House. Now, Representative Patrick Murphy[https://www.murphyforflorida.com/], a second-term congressman, is within striking distance[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/us/politics/widening-attack-on-gop-obama-targets-marco-rubio-in-florida.html] of defeating Mr. Rubio in the senator’s race to keep his seat.

The race is the most consequential among several in Florida in which Republican incumbents find themselves in unexpectedly tough fights. The plight of Florida Republicans — who seem largely resigned to a Clinton victory, given Hillary Clinton’s four percentage point lead in the polls — is in large measure a result of the name at the top of the ballot. But Donald Trump’s candidacy has only accelerated trends that have changed Florida’s political landscape in ways that Democrats have been more adept at seizing.

Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, the dean of Florida’s congressional delegation, is fighting more vigorously[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/30/us/politics/donald-trump-general-election-battleground.html?\_r=0] than she ever has to fend off a Democratic challenger, Scott Fuhrman[http://www.scottfuhrman.com/], a businessman who has little name recognition and is campaigning against Ms. Ros-Lehtinen’s rigid defense of the Cuban embargo. President Obama won the district by a tiny margin in 2008 and by nearly seven percentage points in 2012. This year, Mrs. Clinton is leading Mr. Trump by 17 to 23 percentage points in the district, according to polling commissioned by Mr. Fuhrman.

The changing Latino electorate is the key factor, with Cuban-Americans, who once swung reliably Republican, increasingly up for grabs, particularly younger voters who are more socially liberal than their parents and less dogmatic about the Cuban embargo. Some 58 percent of Latino voters in Florida back Mrs. Clinton, while 28 percent support Mr. Trump, according to a recent poll [http://www.univision.com/noticias/elecciones-2016/encuesta-octubre]commissioned by Univision.

This pains Rudy Fernández, one of the architects of the Republican Party’s efforts to earn Latino votes during the 2000 and 2004 campaigns, which were instrumental in George W. Bush’s Florida victories. “It was a very inclusive message, a positive message, Reaganesque,” Mr. Fernández said. In November, he said, he will unenthusiastically vote for Mrs. Clinton and hope that Mr. Trump’s defeat forces a reckoning that reboots the party’s approach toward Latinos.

What this has meant for Mr. Rubio is that he can no longer rely on Cuban-Americans as a stalwart base in a state where many voters have become **alienated**by his hard-line conservative positions on issues such as gay rights, reproductive rights, gun control and the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and by his shifting stance on **immigration** reform. Of course, the Trump factor is substantial, too. Mr. Rubio, who once called Mr. Trump a “con artist” wholly unfit to be president, now backs him. Many former Rubio supporters find that galling and indefensible.

For these reasons, Florida voters should support Mr. Murphy. But defeating Mr. Rubio, who earned a reputation on Capitol Hill as a disengaged lawmaker who skipped scores of key votes and hearings, shouldn’t be the only motive.

Mr. Murphy’s positions on climate change — an issue that Mr. Rubio [http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2016/03/marco-rubio-had-some-really-dumb-things-say-about-climate-change-last-nigh] seems deeply ignorant about[http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2016/03/marco-rubio-had-some-really-dumb-things-say-about-climate-change-last-nigh] — gay rights, gun control and comprehensive **immigration** reform make him by far a superior representative for Floridians. Mr. Murphy has also challenged Mr. Rubio’s obstinate support for the failed embargo on Cuba, which puts him on the right side of history and, increasingly, public opinion in Florida.

The senator is “someone who has put his own political ambitions ahead of what he really believes in,” Mr. Murphy said in an interview.

That is true, and a shame. If the Republican Party wants to shore up its eroding base in Florida in the post-Trump era, it will need fresh blood and forward-thinking politicians who are in step with voters on social issues and are willing to move past the Cold War.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Correction: October 25, 2016, Tuesday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An editorial on Sunday about the Senate race in Florida misstated Patrick Murphy’s tenure in the House of Representatives. He is in his second term, not his first.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GETTYSBURG, Pa. — Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] came to this historic battlefield town Saturday to offer his vision for America’s future, saying he hoped to “heal the divisions” of the country as President Lincoln tried to do[http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm] here seven score and 13 years ago.

Yet in his own Gettysburg address, Mr. Trump, who has been sliding in the polls less than three weeks before Election Day, did not offer much in the way of race-changing oratory and did not seem to embrace Lincoln’s unifying ambition.

Instead, the Republican nominee used the first third of what had been promoted as a “closing argument” speech to nurse personal grievances, grumbling about “the rigging of this election” and “the dishonest mainstream media,” and threatening to sue the women who have come forward — an 11th woman did on Saturday — to accuse him of aggressive sexual advances.

“Every woman lied when they came forward to hurt my campaign — total fabrication,” Mr. Trump said. “The events never happened. Never. All of these liars will be sued after the election is over.”

And the more substantive part of the speech, intended to outline his first 100 days in office if he were elected president, did not quite live up to its billing by campaign aides, who had promised a major policy address not unlike Newt Gingrich’s 1994 “Contract with America.” Instead, a subdued Mr. Trump — who on Friday acknowledged the possibility of electoral defeat[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/22/us/politics/donald-trump-hillary-clinton.html] — largely repeated his existing campaign promises, from renegotiating trade deals to enforcing tougher **immigration** laws.

Mr. Trump’s carefully scripted presentation on Saturday was meant to project a new level of forethought and seriousness from a man not usually associated with either. His proposals had legislative titles like the “Affordable Child Care and Elder Care Act” and the “Repeal and Replace Obamacare Act.”

The speech, given before a small, handpicked crowd in a conference room, was also a recognition that Mr. Trump needs to establish himself as someone with the discipline and temperament to lead the nation. “Hillary Clinton is not running against me, she’s running against change,” he said. “And she’s running against all of the American people and all of the American voters.”

Mr. Trump did offer specific **immigration** proposals, including an “End Illegal **Immigration** Act” that would establish mandatory minimum prison sentences for undocumented **immigrants** caught illegally re-entering the country after deportation. He also said he would stop issuing visas to any country that refused to take in citizens ordered deported from the United States, a policy that would almost certainly disrupt **immigration** and commerce with China, which is one such country.

Mr. Trump also reiterated his promise to build a border wall with Mexico and have Mexico pay for it, though he hedged his wording a bit, saying, “the country of Mexico will be reimbursing the United States for the full cost of such a wall.”

Repeating earlier pledges to “drain the swamp” in Washington, Mr. Trump promised to push through a series of new ethics laws, as well as term limits for both the House and Senate. And he called for “a hiring freeze on all federal employees to reduce the federal work force through attrition, exempting military, public safety and public health.”

On Saturday afternoon, a spokeswoman for the Clinton campaign, Christina Reynolds, called his Gettysburg remarks a preview of what a Trump State of the Union address[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/state\_of\_the\_union\_message\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] would resemble: “Rambling, unfocused, full of conspiracy theories and attacks on the media and lacking any real answers for American families.”

Mr. Trump has a long history of threatening and occasionally following though on litigation, and in raising the possibility of suing his women accusers, he may have simply been trying to stop more from coming forward.

At a news conference[http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/adult-film-actress-claims-donald-940689] on Saturday in Los Angeles, Jessica Drake, an adult film actress, claimed that, after meeting Mr. Trump at a charity golf event in Lake Tahoe, Nev., she had accepted an invitation to meet in his hotel room. Not wanting to go alone, Ms. Drake said she was accompanied by a couple of female friends. Ms. Drake, who appeared with the women’s rights lawyer Gloria Allred, added that Mr. Trump had hugged and kissed the women without permission.

After returning to her room, Ms. Drake said, Mr. Trump or a man phoning on his behalf offered her $10,000 to return to his room, which she declined.

In a statement, the Trump campaign called the accusation “another example of the Clinton campaign trying to rig the election.”

“Mr. Trump does not know this person, does not remember this person and would have no interest in ever knowing her,” it said.

At her own rally on Saturday in Pennsylvania, a confident Mrs. Clinton devoted much of her remarks to the state’s contentious Senate race, putting in an extended plug for the Democratic candidate, Katie McGinty, and attacking the Republican incumbent, Senator Pat Toomey, for not denouncing Mr. Trump for his vulgar remarks about women.

“You know, a lot of Republicans have, they have had the grit and the guts to stand up and say, ‘He does not represent me,’” Mrs. Clinton said at the rally in Pittsburgh.

A Bloomberg News poll conducted this month after the release of Mr. Trump’s “Access Hollywood” recording showed Mrs. Clinton with a nine percentage point lead over Mr. Trump in Pennsylvania and, on Saturday, she tried to offer an olive branch to the white working-class voters in the state who have gravitated to Mr. Trump’s message.

“You probably know people who are thinking about voting for Donald Trump,” she told the crowd of 1,800 gathered in a high school gymnasium. “Here’s what I want you to tell them: Tell them that I understand they need a president who cares about them, will listen to them, and I want to be their president, too.”

After his appearance in Gettysburg, Mr. Trump reverted to his trusted stump speech in Virginia Beach, Va., exciting a large crowd by attacking Mrs. Clinton and promising to bring back jobs. He was to appear later Saturday in Cleveland alongside his running mate, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana.

“You’re going to look back at this rally and you’re going to remember it for the rest of your life because this will be the beginning,” Mr. Trump said. “You’re going to remember Nov. 8 because your country is going to be a country that starts winning again.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Amy Chozick contributed reporting from Pittsburgh, and Julia Preston from New York.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the mid-1960s a young American teacher in a small central African country became involved with a group of political rebels — former government ministers mostly — who had been active in the struggle for independence. They had fallen out with the authoritarian prime minister, objecting to his dictatorial style. The country was newly independent, hardly a year old. The men advocated democratic elections and feared that the prime minister would declare himself leader for life in a one-party state.

Fluent in the local language, obscure because he was a teacher in a bush school, and easily able to travel in and out of the country on his United States passport, the American performed various favors for the rebels, small rescues for their families, money transfers, and in one effort drove a car over 2,000 miles on back roads to Uganda to deliver the vehicle to one of the dissidents in exile. On that visit he was asked to bring a message back to the country. He did so, without understanding its implications. It was a cryptic order to activate a plot to assassinate the intransigent prime minister.

Within months the plot was set in motion, but it was quickly foiled, all of the intended assassins captured and hanged; other suspects were arrested, imprisoned and tortured. The American was threatened with detention, then expelled from the country as an undesirable **alien** and prohibited **immigrant**.

I was that American. I was 24. The country was Malawi, the prime minister, Hastings Kamuzu Banda. My expulsion meant that I was kicked out of the Peace Corps (“early termination”), heavily fined by it for engaging in covert political activity (“unsatisfactory service”) and compelled to undergo an extensive interrogation (“debriefing”) at the State Department. This interrogation took place in the Bureau of African Affairs, where the scowling Jesse MacKnight scolded me before a roomful of bureaucrats, and then rather touchingly softened his tone and implored me to give him details about the underground rebel movement in Malawi.

I explained that the country was badly governed, and I felt the rebels would have provided wiser leadership and free elections. Mr. MacKnight reminded me of the assassination plot. It was obvious to the State Department, and to me, that I was in way over my head.

Within a few weeks I was back in Africa, in Uganda, with a teaching position at Makerere University, as a reward from the exiled Malawians there for my having played a part in their cause. In the event, Mr. Banda ruled Malawi for three decades longer and died peacefully at the age of 99.

I was a failure, and I was lucky in my escape. Over this past summer I read Michael Korda’s “Hero,” his excellent biography of T. E. Lawrence. Mr. Korda writes that Lawrence’s verdict for his efforts, his risk, his idealism, was that he’d failed, and that his subtitling “Seven Pillars of Wisdom” “A Triumph” was self-mockery. But “Seven Pillars” (to me a masterpiece) shows how Lawrence is a classic example of self-radicalization.

You become radicalized when you think that the world has ceased to care, and that in joining a shadowy band of zealots you might make a difference. Consider the Boston Irish who with “Noraid” helped fund the Irish Republican Army, which bombed innocent civilians in Ulster and elsewhere in Britain in the 1970s and ’80s. Or the young American Jews wishing to attach themselves to a cause, becoming passionate Zionists, going to Israel to patrol the West Bank as the so-called hilltop youth (No’ar HaGva’ot), brandishing Uzis, building illegal settlements and terrorizing Palestinians. Emboldened by his faith, Mayor Rahm Emanuel of Chicago served as a civilian volunteer in 1991 not in the United States Army, but in the Israel Defense Forces.

It was faith that induced John Walker Lindh to travel to the Islamic world. A Californian, raised as a Catholic, he converted to Islam at age 16. A year later he studied Arabic and Islam in Yemen, and subsequently, still a teenager, he relocated to Pakistan, where he studied at a madrasa. In the spring of 2001, stimulated by his faith, he volunteered for the Afghan Army. As his father, Frank Lindh, explained in The Nation in 2014: “John’s motivation was based on youthful idealism: He felt it was his religious duty to help defend civilians against Russian-backed warlords, the so-called Northern Alliance, which was seeking to displace the Taliban government. He was deeply moved by stories of horrific human rights abuses by the Northern Alliance.”

It was almost unimaginable then that the United States would declare Afghanistan an enemy. The George W. Bush administration, far from antagonistic, provided the country, which was led by the Taliban, with a $43 million grant in support of an opium growing ban in May 2001. Mr. Lindh was a foot soldier fighting the Northern Alliance when, after Sept. 11, the United States invaded Afghanistan on a punitive mission. Baffled by this turn of fortune’s wheel, Mr. Lindh fled on foot to Kunduz, was taken prisoner by the Northern Alliance, imprisoned and interrogated, and suffered severe physical harm. He was still only 20 years old when he was handed over to the United States military.

Ultimately remorseful, he accepted a plea agreement at a hearing in Alexandria, Va., in 2002, was sentenced to 20 years and is now in a federal penitentiary. He has been brutalized in prison; he spends his time studying and trying to avoid the attacks of his fellow prisoners.

His mission — like mine, like the volunteer Sinn Feiner and the ultra-Zionist — was to be useful, taking risks to help people perceived as oppressed; and like me, he did not fully understand the bigger picture, was in over his head, and was overtaken by events.

Hillary Clinton called Mr. Lindh a traitor on national television. I think that far from being traitorous, the idealism of Mr. Lindh is deep in the American grain.

A traitor, to my mind, would be someone Mrs. Clinton might be more familiar with, such as the international commodities trader Marc Rich, who defied American sanctions on Iran during the 1979 hostage crisis, making secret deals with the ayatollah, buying and selling oil on the world market and becoming a blood-money billionaire. He was wanted for income-tax evasion, wire fraud and racketeering as a fugitive by the F.B.I. But, in 2001, President Bill Clinton, whose library had received considerable funds from Mr. Rich’s ex-wife, Denise Rich, pressured by Israel, where Marc Rich was regarded as a patriot and benefactor, pardoned him on his last day in office.

“The supreme manifestation of power is the granting of a pardon at the last moment,” Elias Canetti writes in “Crowds and Power.” This puts the Clinton pardon of Mr. Rich in perspective. “A pardon has the appearance of new life.”

Dubious figures are not unknown as guests in President Obama’s White House. He has welcomed moralizing mountebanks like Al Sharpton — who along with his for-profit business was found in 2014 to [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/nyregion/questions-about-al-sharptons-finances-accompany-his-rise-in-influence.html] owe[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/nyregion/questions-about-al-sharptons-finances-accompany-his-rise-in-influence.html] more than $4.5 million in taxes — sententious celebrities and movie stars, and rappers with a history of violence. Clearly, President Obama is a forgiving man.

With that in mind, those of us who have been no nearer to this White House than a picket line would appreciate it if the president, in his last months in office, reviewed the case of John Walker Lindh with a view to commuting his sentence on compassionate grounds.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Paul Theroux is the author, most recently, of “Deep South: Four Seasons on Back Roads.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For months, Hillary Clinton’s campaign has run attack ads whose sole voice is that of Donald J. Trump. Now, the Trump campaign is flipping the script, highlighting past statements by Mrs. Clinton in a new ad titled “Predators.” The Clinton campaign has parried with “Captain Khan,” an emotional ad featuring the Muslim military father who spoke against Mr. Trump at the Democratic National Convention, then was criticized by him in the days afterward.

THE TRUMP AD A photo of two young African-Americans in a warm embrace, overlaid with a blue filter, mimics the Clinton campaign aesthetic. A text card reads “Hillary Clinton on … African-American youth.”

The image quickly fades to a black-and-white video highlighting a 1996 speech in which Mrs. Clinton referred to some young criminals as “superpredators” (a comment she later apologized for[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/02/25/clinton-heckled-by-black-lives-matter-activist/]). She is next heard in a leaked recording in which she describes supporters[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/hillary-clinton-bernie-sanders-supporters-audio-leak-228997] of Senator Bernie Sanders as “living in their parents’ basements,” followed by the now-famous clip of Mrs. Clinton describing “half of Trump’s supporters” as a “basket of deplorables.” The ad’s close: “What elitist arrogance.”

THE MESSAGE The ad accuses Mrs. Clinton of being an elitist while Mr. Trump runs on populist furor. But through creative editing, the ad also levels an unstated attack: that what Mrs. Clinton says today on the campaign trail is different from what she has said in the past or in private.

THE TAKEAWAY With Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton both saddled with high unfavorability ratings in polls, it is not surprising that they are building their attack ads around quotes from their opponent. This ad also shows how the Trump campaign plans to try to peel away voters from Mrs. Clinton: not by moderating or softening its tone, but by trying to erode the support from groups Mrs. Clinton is counting on to win in November.

THE CLINTON AD Khizr Khan walks slowly through his house, glancing at photos of his son, Capt. Humayun Khan, as he recounts the story of how his son gave his life saving his unit from a suicide bomber in Iraq.

“Only one American soldier died,” Mr. Khan says, his voice shaking with sadness. “My son was Capt. Humayun Khan, he was 27 years old, and he was a Muslim American.” A scene of Mr. Trump on the campaign trail, gesticulating from the podium, fades to Mr. Khan and his wife huddled at a table, watching a military funeral on a television screen. “I want to ask Mr. Trump,” he says, pausing as tears well in his eyes, “would my son have a place in your America?”

THE MESSAGE The ad tugs at the heartstrings, inviting “How could you?” reactions toward Mr. Trump as it seeks to paint him as a candidate for an angry few, rather than a diverse and proud country.

THE TAKEAWAY The return of Mr. Khan recalls one of Mr. Trump’s most divisive policies (his proposal to temporarily ban all Muslim **immigration**) and one of the lowest points of his campaign (his post-convention attacks on Mr. Khan and his wife). Mrs. Clinton mentioned Mr. Trump’s **immigration** proposal during their final debate, hoping it will **alienate** undecided voters.

Changing channels …

We Are The Wall

Mr. Trump may pledge to build a wall along our southern border, but a new ad[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mjtSVTAsgqE&feature=youtu.be] from the political action committee of the Service Employees International Union posits another wall: the Latino vote Mr. Trump has estranged. The ad is delivered in Spanish with English subtitles. “Because we are the wall,” one woman says; “between your hate,” a man continues; “between your disrespect for women,” says another woman.

At the end, a group of Latino men and women standing three rows deep link arms in front of the White House. A woman says: “We have 27 million votes,” and a female narrator finishes the sentence: “And together we are the wall between you and the presidency.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Many voters saw it as a historic breach of tradition when Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] refused to say[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/presidential-debate.html] this week that he would accept the result of the election if he lost.

For Maria Julia Echart, who grew up in Argentina, it felt historic in another way.

She said it reminded her of how her native country’s military ousted its democratically elected president in 1976, and how after the ruling junta began to kill activists, her family went into hiding. She remembered sleeping on the floor in a bare apartment with her mother, and being so scared that she once wet her pants.

“I never thought in a million years this country would go through this after coming from Argentina,” said Ms. Echart, 62, who moved to the United States in 1987.

Fairly or not, Mr. Trump’s critics have painted him as being unwelcoming to **immigrants**, dating back to his calls for mass deportations and for building a wall along the border with Mexico. But his most recent comments about the legitimacy of the election, with their whiff of third-world tumult, have perversely made some **immigrants** feel right at home.

“When I hear him saying he’s not sure he’s going to respect the results of the election, it makes me think of the period of dictatorship in the Dominican Republic when politicians didn’t respect the will of the people,” said Nieves Padilla, 60, an organizer with Make the Road Action, a New York-based **immigrant** advocacy group, who came to the United States in 1975.

Few would go so far as to predict mass violence or coups d’état if Mr. Trump lost and refused to concede, given the country’s loyalty to the rule of law.

But it was precisely America’s reputation as a role model for democracy that made the candidate’s comments so jarring for some naturalized citizens. In their minds, they said, questions about a president’s legitimacy were inseparable from chaos and bloodshed, and thus they could not stop themselves from thinking the worst.

“He said, ‘I will concede only if I win?’ My goodness,” said Cristina Drost, 82, a retired teacher in Henderson, Nev. She said she **immigrated** from the Philippines in 1961 after her uncle, while running for Congress there, was shot by people who did not think he should be in the race. (He survived.) “It is encouraging his supporters who could do some drastic things like killing, especially today since people have guns,” she said of Mr. Trump’s comments.

From his living room in Queens, Francois Pierre-Louis said he could hardly believe that a major-party candidate in the United States was hinting that he might question the will of voters before the results had even been announced.

But Mr. Pierre-Louis, 56, is used to such talk. He grew up in Haiti, which has cycled through dictators and contested elections for decades. Mr. Pierre-Louis said François Duvalier killed all four of his mother’s brothers and many of his male cousins because one of his uncles had openly opposed the dictator and his regime.

“Can you imagine that the United States is going to be a third-world country in the sense that the most prominent candidate of a major party is going to contest the election?” Mr. Pierre-Louis said.

Former President Jimmy Carter, whose organization the Carter Center is known worldwide for election monitoring, has gone so far as to assure people that Mr. Trump’s complaints about the American voting process should not cause worry.

“The Carter Center has observed more than 100 elections around the world, some of them quite problematic,” he said in a statement[https://www.cartercenter.org/news/pr/us-elections-101916.html] released by the organization. “However, allegations of potential rigging of U.S. elections, as well as of widespread voter fraud, are baseless, serving only to undermine confidence in our democratic processes and inflame tensions.”

Since the debate, Mr. Trump has both reinforced[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/us/politics/campaign-election-trump-clinton.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news&\_r=0] his remarks — telling a crowd in Ohio that he would accept the results “if I win” — and dialed them back, saying he would “follow and abide by all the rules and traditions.”

And if his words have jarred some foreign-born voters into wondering if they were back in their native countries, others had no problem envisioning where Mr. Trump was coming from.

Alice Backer, 42, a Brooklyn lawyer who grew up in Haiti and has been critical of Hillary Clinton’s actions in Haiti while secretary of state, did not leave her jaded view of elections behind when she came to the United States.

“I think that anyone who does not look at the results of these elections with some skepticism is probably not exercising critical thinking,” said Ms. Backer, who plans to vote for the Green Party nominee, Jill Stein. “If indeed Trump finds that there is evidence that the results of the coming election will be fraudulent, I’m not going to be particularly surprised.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Donald Trump, Somewhat Subdued, Admits He Might Lose Election[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/22/us/politics/donald-trump-hillary-clinton.html]

\* Donald Trump Says He Will Accept Election Outcome (‘if I Win’)[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/us/politics/campaign-election-trump-clinton.html]

\* Donald Trump’s Defiance Is Seen as ‘Colossal Mistake’ That Threatens U.S. Image[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/us/politics/donald-trump-election-rigging.html]

\* Donald Trump Won’t Say if He’ll Accept Result of Election[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(Race/Related[http://www.nytimes.com/newsgraphics/2016/race-related/] is a weekly newsletter exploring race and ethnicity. This week, John Leguizamo, the actor, writer and producer, is serving as guest editor. Sign-up[http://www.nytimes.com/newsgraphics/2016/race-related/].)

A well-intentioned producer once said to me, “John, you’re so talented, but too bad you’re Latin — otherwise you’d be so much further along.” When I pitched a movie about Latinos, another producer said: “Latin? People don’t want to see Latin people.” This is not just my experience but a typicalLatino person’s experience in America.

Donald J. Trump has done one good thing. He has galvanized a conflicted and diverse community.

For years, activists and politicians have struggled to get Latinos to vote and show their power. But not until Mr. Trump’s racist rhetoric shone a light on anti-Latino sentiment did we feel the need to make our voices heard on the issues that matter to us: from proper funding for our schools, better infrastructure in our communities and financial aid, to health care that doesn’t consider poverty a pre-existing condition.

There are around 56 million of us. We are the largest ethnic minority in the United States, at almost 18 percent of the country’s population. And yet Latino students drop out of high school at a higher rate than members of any other minority.

We are victims of neglect, discrimination and ignorance. We have grown up amid an entrenched disrespect for Latin culture, and we have often internalized that disrespect.

The dominant narrative is that we have just “illegally” crossed the border or are “fresh off the boat.” In fact the Spanish are evidence of America’s first original sin: We were mistreating indigenous people here long before the British brought slaves to the colonies. People forget that Latinos founded some of America’s first cities.

Latinos have been dying for America since before we were a nation. Why have our children not heard that thousands of Latino patriots fought for America in the Revolutionary War?

Bernardo de Gálvez, a Spanish general, recruited Mexicans, Cubans, Native Americans and free African-Americans to fight against the British in the South, while Cuban women donated their jewelry and money to help the patriots. Where is the Ken Burns documentary about that?

Why don’t they know about the many Latinos in the War of 1812? Or anything of the 20,000 Latinos who fought valiantly in the Civil War? Or of those who earned Purple Hearts or the Croix de Guerre in World War I? Or of the up to 500,000 who served in the military in World War II?

It’s as if our heroism and sacrifice somehow counted less, as if we didn’t exist in history at all. Without a past to glorify and uplift you, how do you propel yourself into an unknown, tenuous future?

I’m only an amateur historian. But I am an expert on my own life and career. So to bring it around to more contemporary slights: Hispanics are the most underrepresented ethnic group in film and television. “Saturday Night Live” has only just hired its first Latina comic.

Are we really to believe there are so few funny Latinos? We are similarly marginalized in business and corporate life.

This exclusion sends a painful message to every Latino child about how he is seen and judged. Latino people face a double challenge: to create our own positive self-image while battling against the way the broader society portrays us.

Without textbooks in schools that do justice to our contributions to the making of America, and without media representation expanding to include more Latin faces and voices, we are vulnerable to a demagogue like Mr. Trump claiming that we are all “drug dealers,” “rapists” and “criminals.”

But a range of studies find no link between violent crime and **immigration**. The fact is that **immigrants** as a group commit far fewer crimes than the rest of the American population. Almost every **immigrant** is just here to make a better life for himself.

That can be hard to do when the states where many **immigrants** live — Texas and Arizona in particular — gerrymander Latino communities out of political power and limit funding to their neighborhoods. Latinos aren’t uniformly liberal; some are conservative because of their religious beliefs or fiscal views. And yet if all of the eligible Latinos voted, a number of states would turn from red to blue.

We need a Latino Spring in this country. We need to demand power and equal opportunity.

A friend of mine recently did a small experiment to tease out anti-Latin sentiment. She sent out two résumés for an acting job with her picture attached. She happens to be very dark skinned (“morena,” as we say in Spanish). On one résumé she used her own traditionally Latina-sounding name, while on the other she used a traditionally white-sounding name.

The Latina name received zero callbacks while the white name received a few responses.

Where else is this racial profiling going on while we are “living while Latin”? It is going on while we are working for the promotion that doesn’t come, while we are trying to rent an Airbnb for vacation but no one will respond, while we are hoping to make our children’s lives better than our own.

Latinos need to demand our place in American history, and in corporate, political and social fields.

We must demand an equal share of the American dream, and not accept a downgraded version of it. We need to stop accepting exclusion over persecution.

In this critical election, and in the future, I urge you all to register and vote, to be counted and heard.

This essay[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/opinion/too-bad-youre-latin.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=opinion-c-col-left-region®ion=opinion-c-col-left-region&WT.nav=opinion-c-col-left-region] was published on Oct. 21 on The New York Times Op-Ed page.

—Soy Yo, That’s Me

When I saw Soy Yo[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bxWxXncl53U], the amazing music video by Bomba Estéreo[http://bombaestereo.com/] featuring Sarai Gonzalez (above), I posted it on all my social media because it was so powerful to see ourselves mirrored back. We as an ethnic group are so starved to see our own lives reflected in the media and literature, to have a sense of value and belonging.

But what’s Sarai up to now?

Annie Correal, a Times reporter here in New York, met Sarai recently and wrote about[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/arts/music/soy-yo-sarai-gonzalez-empowering-latinas.html] how the song and the music video have affected Sarai and her family. Here’s what she had to say about how the video affected her:

I’m half-Colombian, born in Bogotá and raised between cultures.

My other half is American, but like Sarai, who is only 11, I learned to navigate life in the U.S. with a different set of cultural references and with a second language in my head.

For me, the video felt important. Like we had arrived.

I tagged my Latina friends when I shared the video. It prompted conversations we’d never had. We realized that when we were little, in the 1980s, the only representation of a Latina that we saw was Maria on “Sesame Street.”

Maybe at some point soon, we’ll see more explorations of the rich variety of Latina experiences, as the country becomes more Latino, and as Latinos (like John) and Latinas gain more power and influence over who gets to tell our stories.

But for the moment, it still feels very new. And this video — which, I discovered as I reported, was created almost by accident — will certainly be part of the discussion.

Don’t miss Annie’s story[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/arts/music/soy-yo-sarai-gonzalez-empowering-latinas.html] about Sarai.

If you have other stories of Latino empowerment, or disempowerment, email racerelated@nytimes.com.

—Around The Web

Race/Related asked me to come up with a list of recommended reading – so to catch up on all things Latino, here’s what I recommend:

Latino Americans: The 500-Year Legacy that Shaped a Nation[https://www.amazon.com/Latino-Americans-500-Year-Legacy-Shaped/dp/0451238141] , by Ray Suarez. I chose this book because, facts! We fought in every war America has ever had!

The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/04/books/04diaz.html], by Junot Díaz. This is just a beautiful work of art about Latino culture, and some history! Everyone should read some Junot Díaz.

U.S. Latino Patriots: From the American Revolution to Afghanistan, An Overview[http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/17.3.pdf] , by Refugio I. Rochin and Lionel Fernandez. This report has the digits on fact checks of our contributions, with the numbers of Latinos who served in the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and other wars.

Ghetto Klown[https://www.amazon.com/Ghetto-Klown-John-Leguizamo/dp/1419715186] , by John Leguizamo. Yes, this book is mine (it was also a Broadway show[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/10/arts/dance/john-leguizamo-in-ghetto-klown-on-broadway.html]). But I put in because it captures our experience as **immigrants** and what it means to be Latino in contemporary times.

Hamilton[https://www.amazon.com/gp/product/B013JLBPGE/ref=pd\_sim\_14\_2?ie=UTF8&psc=1&refRID=7X6NGF5X4DBXA7DVE9BN] , by Lin-Manuel Miranda. Hamilton because it has the power to transport us into a world that is color blind and proves we Latin people have arrived.

—In The Times

The Times publishes many stories that touch on race. Here are a few you shouldn’t miss from this week, chosen by Race/Related editors.

• Donald Trump’s Call to Monitor Polls Raises Fears of Intimidation[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/donald-trump-voting-election-rigging.html]. The candidate has issued dark warnings about a “stolen” election and voter fraud, using language that is leading to anxiety in minority communities.

• My Asian Pussycat Parents[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/opinion/my-asian-pussycat-parents.html]. I was raised by a mom and dad who did not want me to worry about getting C’s as long as I was happy in college and beyond.

• Parent Group Seeks More Integration in New York’s Schools[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/nyregion/new-york-schools-segregation.html]. The organization challenged the New York City Education Department to take further steps to rezone schools on the Upper West Side.

• Fifty Years Later, Black Panthers’ Art Still Resonates[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/arts/fifty-years-later-black-panthers-art-still-resonates.html]. The Black Panther Party is often associated with armed resistance, but one of the most potent weapons in its outreach was its artwork.

• Fascination and Fear: Covering the Black Panthers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/us/black-panthers-50-years.html]. Fifty years after the group’s founding, a look back at The Times’s coverage reveals the influence of the F.B.I. and how reporting on race and activism has evolved.

Who else should we recruit to be a guest editor for Race/Related? Tell us at racerelated@nytimes.com.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Growing up on Long Island in the 1970s, I kept a copy of Judy Blume[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/judy\_blume/index.html?inline=nyt-per]’s “Are You There, God? It’s Me, Margaret,” in its classic lavender-tinted paperback edition, tucked away in a closet in my playroom with the vague intention of returning it to the local library, someday. As months went by and I read and reread the novel upward of a half-dozen times, it became clear that I would never give it up. I imagined thousands of dollars of fines accruing and ultimately an arrest followed by some period of detention. Wasn’t the involvement of law enforcement the only proper response to an abject refusal to relinquish something so precious?

Like Margaret Simon, I was an only child suspicious of suburban idyll. I consumed the book, as I would go on, in my 20s, to consume anything by Richard Yates or John Cheever, seeking assurances that a lawn was a poor means of generating certain existential satisfactions. The novel[http://jezebel.com/5235862/are-you-there-god-its-me-margaret-how-have-i-not-written-about-this-book-yet] begins with its heroine forced to leave Manhattan, with all of its enrichments, when her parents decide to move to the suburbs (for all of the reasons parents have always decided to move to the suburbs). “Please help me God,” Margaret implores. “Don’t let New Jersey be too horrible.”

For women who grew up in the 1970s and early ’80s — nurtured in the fictions of Ms.[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/24/magazine/judy-blume-knows-all-your-secrets.html?\_r=0] Blume[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/24/magazine/judy-blume-knows-all-your-secrets.html?\_r=0], Paul Zindel [http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/28/nyregion/paul-zindel-is-dead-at-66-prize-winning-playwright.html]and Norma Klein[http://www.nytimes.com/1989/04/27/obituaries/norma-klein-50-a-young-adult-novelist.html] among others, writers for whom an urbane brand of social realism was the only reasonable métier — the arrival of the “Twilight[http://stepheniemeyer.com/the-twilight-saga/]” franchise a decade ago, with its enormous success, signaled a gloomy period of regression for the young-adult novel. The first of the “Twilight” books appeared in 2005, two years after Arnold Schwarzenegger became the governor of California amid sexual assault allegations[http://articles.latimes.com/2003/oct/02/local/me-women2] that prompted relatively little of the outcry now bedeviling Donald J. Trump. A distinct product of Bush-era gender politics rather than a renunciation of them, the series ultimately has its heroine forfeit a chance to go to Dartmouth to stay home and tend to her half-vampire baby, one conceived after a night of violent sex that leaves her body bruised with a husband who is at least 100 years old.

Now, though, the appetite for paranormal lunacy has abated, and issue-driven fiction set very much in a universe of urbanism’s chief concerns is having a renaissance. This week, “All American Boys,” a novel by Jason Reynolds and Brendan Kiely, an outgrowth of the Black Lives Matter movement, appears on The New York Times’s best-seller list for young-adult books[http://www.nytimes.com/books/best-sellers/young-adult-hardcover/]. The story follows the beating of an innocent black child by a white police officer who thinks he has stolen a bag of chips.

In a similar vein, “The Hate U Give,” to be released early next year, chronicles the story of a 16-year-old prep-school girl who witnesses a police officer shoot her unarmed best friend. A movie version of the novel, by Angela Thomas, is already in progress. And right now, prominently displayed at Barnes & Noble in Downtown Brooklyn, is “Bright Lights, Dark Nights[http://www.teenreads.com/reviews/bright-lights-dark-nights],” a novel about racial profiling set against the backdrop of drugs and violence.

The recent upheavals in the economy stemming from the financial crisis, the rise of racial tensions and the increased animosity toward **immigrants** that the current election cycle has fed and exposed have arguably made this new catalog inevitable. The world has intruded in the lives of children in so many ugly ways. Even an amused tone does not preclude political currency. Consider the coming book “June the Sparrow and the Million-Dollar Penny,” which is meant for children between 9 and 12. In it, an orphaned girl who lives along Central Park discovers one day while she is sitting in Gray’s Papaya[https://grayspapayanyc.com/] that her fortune has been decimated in a Ponzi scheme[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/frauds\_and\_swindling/ponzi\_schemes/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]. She is then forced to move from an apartment in the Dakota to an actual Dakota (South).

Some of these books take place in unnamed cities so that they can feel universal to their readers. “The American Street,” highly anticipated and arriving this winter, is a novel set in Detroit but is meant to evoke Bushwick, Brooklyn, during the 1980s when it was a desolate and untamed place. The author, Ibi Zoboi, is Haitian and grew up in Bushwick, and she wanted to tell the story of an **immigrant** girl coming-of-age in a place where she must navigate a community plagued by crime and addiction.

“I remember my upbringing of people coming here for jobs and then not getting those jobs,” Ms. Zoboi told me. “The **immigrant**’s story is not one of rags to riches automatically.” Gentrification made it too implausible to set the story in the Bushwick of today. “The house we grew up in was on the market recently for $2 million, and that really hurt,” she said. “We tried so hard to get out.”

In some sense these new realist novels are even grittier than their predecessors from the 1970s, even though children, especially in New York where crime rates were so high, faced greater perils then. The classic young-adult novel of that period typically dealt with characters managing the fracture of American family life — divorce, a mother’s new boyfriend and so on — but those characters most often enjoyed the comforts of middle-class life. Norma Klein’s Manhattan was as sophisticated as any Woody Allen would devise. Children today may finally be resisting the elusive insulation we crave for them.

Email: bigcity@nytimes.com

\* Judy Blume Knows All Your Secrets[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/24/magazine/judy-blume-knows-all-your-secrets.html]

\* Look Homeward, Reader[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/19/fashion/a-not-so-young-audience-for-young-adult-books.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A well-intentioned producer once said to me, “John, you’re so talented, but too bad you’re Latin — otherwise you’d be so much further along.” When I pitched a movie about Latinos, another producer said: “Latin? People don’t want to see Latin people.” This is not just my experience but a typical Latino person’s experience in America.

Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] has done one good thing. He has galvanized a conflicted and diverse community. For years, activists and politicians have struggled to get Latinos to vote and show their power. But not until Mr. Trump’s racist rhetoric shone a light on anti-Latino sentiment did we feel the need to make our voices heard on the issues that matter to us: from proper funding for our schools, better infrastructure in our communities and financial aid, to health care that doesn’t consider poverty a pre-existing condition.

There are around 56 million of us. We are the largest ethnic minority in the United States, at almost 18 percent of the country’s population. And yet Latino students drop out of high school at a higher rate than members of any other minority. We are victims of neglect, discrimination and ignorance. We have grown up amid an entrenched disrespect for Latin culture, and we have often internalized that disrespect.

The dominant narrative is that we have just “illegally” crossed the border or are “fresh off the boat.” In fact the Spanish are evidence of America’s first original sin: We were mistreating indigenous people here long before the British brought slaves to the colonies. People forget that Latinos founded some of America’s first cities.

Latinos have been dying for America since before we were a nation. Why have our children not heard that thousands of Latino patriots fought for America in the Revolutionary War? Bernardo de Gálvez, a Spanish general, recruited Mexicans, Cubans, Native Americans and free African-Americans to fight against the British in the South, while Cuban women donated their jewelry and money to help the patriots. Where is the Ken Burns documentary about that?

Why don’t they know about the many Latinos in the War of 1812? Or anything of the 20,000 Latinos who fought valiantly in the Civil War? Or of those who earned Purple Hearts or the Croix de Guerre in World War I? Or of the up to 500,000 who served in the military in World War II?

It’s as if our heroism and sacrifice somehow counted less, as if we didn’t exist in history at all. Without a past to glorify and uplift you, how do you propel yourself into an unknown, tenuous future?

I’m only an amateur historian. But I am an expert on my own life and career. So to bring it around to more contemporary slights: Hispanics are the most underrepresented ethnic group in film and television. “Saturday Night Live[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/saturday\_night\_live/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]” has only just hired its first Latina comic. Are we really to believe there are so few funny Latinos? We are similarly marginalized in business and corporate life.

This exclusion sends a painful message to every Latino child about how he is seen and judged. Latino people face a double challenge: to create our own positive self-image while battling against the way the broader society portrays us. Without textbooks in schools that do justice to our contributions to the making of America, and without media representation expanding to include more Latin faces and voices, we are vulnerable to a demagogue like Mr. Trump claiming that we are all “drug dealers,” “rapists” and “criminals.”

But a range of studies find no link between violent crime and **immigration**. The fact is that **immigrants** as a group commit far fewer crimes than the rest of the American population. Almost every **immigrant** is just here to make a better life for himself.

That can be hard to do when the states where many **immigrants** live — Texas and Arizona in particular — gerrymander Latino communities out of political power and limit funding to their neighborhoods. Latinos aren’t uniformly liberal; some are conservative because of their religious beliefs or fiscal views. And yet if all of the eligible Latinos voted, a number of states would turn from red to blue.

We need a Latino Spring in this country. We need to demand power and equal opportunity. A friend of mine recently did a small experiment to tease out anti-Latin sentiment. She sent out two résumés for an acting job with her picture attached. She happens to be very dark skinned (“morena,” as we say in Spanish). On one résumé she used her own traditionally Latina-sounding name, while on the other she used a traditionally white-sounding name. The Latina name received zero callbacks while the white name received a few responses.

Where else is this racial profiling going on while we are “living while Latin”? It is going on while we are working for the promotion that doesn’t come, while we are trying to rent an Airbnb for vacation but no one will respond, while we are hoping to make our children’s lives better than our own.

Latinos need to demand our place in American history, and in corporate, political and social fields. We must demand an equal share of the American dream, and not accept a downgraded version of it. We need to stop accepting exclusion over persecution. In this critical election, and in the future, I urge you all to register and vote, to be counted and heard.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook [https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTOpinion) [http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] , and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/] .

John Leguizamo (@JohnLeguizamo) is an actor, writer and producer. This essay also appears in the Race/Related newsletter.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton, who has been in politics all her adult life, seems to have learned something from Michelle Obama, who has never run for public office. Clinton gave three masterful answers in the debate Wednesday night that were tonally different from her normal clichés.

They were about Donald Trump’s alleged assaults on women, his refusal to respect the democratic process and the contrast between his years of “Celebrity Apprentice” experience and her own governing experience. Clinton’s answers were given in a slow and understated manner, but they were marked by moral passion, clarity and quiet contempt.

They were not spoken from the point of view of a politician. They were spoken from the point of view of a parent, which is the point of view Michelle Obama frequently uses. The politician asks: What can I offer to win votes? The parent asks: What world are my children going out into when they leave the house?

The politician is focused on individual interest, but the parent is interested in the shared social, economic and moral environment.

That turns out to be a useful frame for this ugly year. It’s becoming ever clearer that the nation’s moral capital is being decimated, and the urgent challenge is to name that decimation and reverse it.

Moral capital is the set of shared habits, norms, institutions and values that make common life possible. Left to our own, we human beings have an impressive capacity for selfishness. Unadorned, the struggle for power has a tendency to become barbaric. So people in decent societies agree on a million informal restraints — codes of politeness, humility and mutual respect that girdle selfishness and steer us toward reconciliation.

This year Trump is dismantling those restraints one by one. By savagely attacking Carly Fiorina’s looks and Ted Cruz’s wife he dismantled the codes of etiquette that prevent politics from becoming an unmodulated screaming match. By lying more or less all the time, he dismantles the fealty to truth without which conversation is impossible. By refusing to automatically respect the election results he corrodes confidence in our common institutions and risks turning public life into a never-ending dogfight.

Clinton has contributed to the degradation too. As the James O’Keefe videos remind us, wherever Hillary Clinton has gone in her career, a cloud of unsavory people and unsavory behavior has traveled alongside. But she is right to emphasize that Trump is the greatest threat to moral capital in recent history and that the health of that capital is more fundamental than any particular policy position.

The sad fact is that in the realm of common life, gnats can undo the work of giants. “Moral communities are fragile things, hard to build and easy to destroy,” Jonathan Haidt writes in his book “The Righteous Mind[http://righteousmind.com/].” “When we think about very large communities such as nations, the challenge is extraordinary and the threat of moral entropy is intense.”

We are now in a country in which major presidential candidates can gibe about the menstrual cycles of their interviewers and the penis size of their opponents. We are now in a society in which the childish desires of a reality-TV narcissist can insult the inheritance that Washington and Hamilton risked their lives to bequeath. We are now in a society in which serial insults to basic decency aren’t automatically disqualifying.

Clearly, we have a giant task of moral repair ahead of us. That starts with a renunciation of the Trump style. One big lesson of 2016 is that that can only happen if people police members of their own party. If somebody is destroying the basic social and moral fabric through brutalistic rhetoric and vicious misogynistic behavior, it doesn’t really matter that he agrees with you on taxes and the Supreme Court; he has to be renounced or else he will drag the whole society to a level of degradation that will make all decent politics impossible.

It also means addressing the substantive social chasms that fueled Trump’s rise. We are clearly going to have a lot of angry populists around in the years ahead, of right and left. It should be possible to oppose them with a political movement that champions dynamism with cohesion, globalism with solidarity — a movement that supports free trade, open skilled **immigration**, ethnic diversity and a free American-led world order, but also local community building, state-fostered economic security, moral cohesion and patriotic purpose.

In other words, it should be possible to be conservative on macroeconomics, liberal on **immigration** policy, traditionalist on moral and civic matters, Swedish on welfare state policies, and Reaganesque on America’s role in the world.

The election of 2016 has exposed the staleness of the Republican and Democratic ideologies. It has also established a nihilistic, reality TV standard of conduct that will pull down the country if it is allowed to survive. The one nice thing about Trump is that he has prompted so many people to find their voice, and to turn from their revulsion to a higher alternative.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Following is a transcript of the third presidential debate [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/presidential-debate.html], on Wednesday, as transcribed by CQ Transcriptswire.

WALLACE: Good evening from the Thomas and Mack Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I’m Chris Wallace of Fox News, and I welcome you to the third and final of the 2016 presidential debates between Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump.

WALLACE: This debate is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. The commission has designed the format: Six roughly 15-minute segments with two-minute answers to the first question, then open discussion for the rest of each segment. Both campaigns have agreed to those rules.

For the record, I decided the topics and the questions in each topic. None of those questions has been shared with the commission or the two candidates. The audience here in the hall has promised to remain silent. No cheers, boos, or other interruptions so we and you can focus on what the candidates have to say.

WALLACE: No noise, except right now, as we welcome the Democratic nominee for president, Secretary Clinton, and the Republican nominee for president, Mr. Trump.

(APPLAUSE)

Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump, welcome. Let’s get right to it. The first topic is the Supreme Court.

You both talked briefly about the court in the last debate, but I want to drill down on this, because the next president will almost certainly have at least one appointment and likely or possibly two or three appointments.

WALLACE: Which means that you will, in effect, determine the balance of the court for what could be the next quarter century.

First of all, where do you want to see the court take the country? And secondly, what’s your view on how the Constitution should be interpreted? Do the founders’ words mean what they say or is it a living document to be applied flexibly according to changing circumstances? In this segment, Secretary Clinton, you go first. You have two minutes.

CLINTON: Thank you very much, Chris. And thanks to UNLV for hosting us.

You know, I think when we talk about the Supreme Court, it really raises the central issue in this election, namely, what kind of country are we going to be? What kind of opportunities will we provide for our citizens? What kind of rights will Americans have?

And I feel strongly that the Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful corporations and the wealthy. For me, that means that we need a Supreme Court that will stand up on behalf of women’s rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community, that will stand up and say no to Citizens United, a decision that has undermined the election system in our country because of the way it permits dark, unaccountable money to come into our electoral system.

I have major disagreements with my opponent about these issues and others that will be before the Supreme Court. But I feel that at this point in our country’s history, it is important that we not reverse marriage equality, that we not reverse Roe v. Wade, that we stand up against Citizens United, we stand up for the rights of people in the workplace, that we stand up and basically say: The Supreme Court should represent all of us.

That’s how I see the court, and the kind of people that I would be looking to nominate to the court would be in the great tradition of standing up to the powerful, standing up on behalf of our rights as Americans.

And I look forward to having that opportunity. I would hope that the Senate would do its job and confirm the nominee that President Obama has sent to them. That’s the way the Constitution fundamentally should operate. The president nominates, and then the Senate advises and consents, or not, but they go forward with the process.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, same question. Where do you want to see the court take the country? And how do you believe the Constitution should be interpreted?

TRUMP: Well, first of all, it’s great to be with you, and thank you, everybody. The Supreme Court: It’s what it’s all about. Our country is so, so — it’s just so imperative that we have the right justices.

Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some very, very inappropriate statements toward me and toward a tremendous number of people, many, many millions of people that I represent. And she was forced to apologize. And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made.

We need a Supreme Court that in my opinion is going to uphold the Second Amendment, and all amendments, but the Second Amendment, which is under absolute siege. I believe if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don’t think will happen, we will have a Second Amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now. But I feel that it’s absolutely important that we uphold, because of the fact that it is under such trauma.

I feel that the justices that I am going to appoint — and I’ve named 20 of them — the justices that I’m going to appoint will be pro-life. They will have a conservative bent. They will be protecting the Second Amendment. They are great scholars in all cases, and they’re people of tremendous respect. They will interpret the Constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted. And I believe that’s very, very important.

I don’t think we should have justices appointed that decide what they want to hear. It’s all about the Constitution of — of — and so important, the Constitution the way it was meant to be. And those are the people that I will appoint.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, thank you.

WALLACE: We now have about 10 minutes for an open discussion. I want to focus on two issues that, in fact, by the justices that you name could end up changing the existing law of the land. First is one that you mentioned, Mr. Trump, and that is guns.

Secretary Clinton, you said last year, let me quote, “The Supreme Court is wrong on the Second Amendment.” And now, in fact, in the 2008 Heller case, the court ruled that there is a constitutional right to bear arms, but a right that is reasonably limited. Those were the words of the Judge Antonin Scalia who wrote the decision. What’s wrong with that?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I support the Second Amendment. I lived in Arkansas for 18 wonderful years. I represented upstate New York. I understand and respect the tradition of gun ownership. It goes back to the founding of our country.

But I also believe that there can be and must be reasonable regulation. Because I support the Second Amendment doesn’t mean that I want people who shouldn’t have guns to be able to threaten you, kill you or members of your family.

And so when I think about what we need to do, we have 33,000 people a year who die from guns. I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole. There’s other matters that I think are sensible that are the kind of reforms that would make a difference that are not in any way conflicting with the Second Amendment.

You mentioned the Heller decision. And what I was saying that you referenced, Chris, was that I disagreed with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that case, because what the District of Columbia was trying to do was to protect toddlers from guns and so they wanted people with guns to safely store them. And the court didn’t accept that reasonable regulation, but they’ve accepted many others. So I see no conflict between saving people’s lives and defending the Second Amendment.

WALLACE: Let me bring Mr. Trump in here. The bipartisan Open Debate Coalition got millions of votes on questions to ask here, and this was, in fact, one of the top questions that they got. How will you ensure the Second Amendment is protected? You just heard Secretary Clinton’s answer. Does she persuade you that, while you may disagree on regulation, that, in fact, she supports a Second Amendment right to bear arms? TRUMP: Well, the D.C. vs. Heller decision was very strongly — and she was extremely angry about it. I watched. I mean, she was very, very angry when upheld. And Justice Scalia was so involved. And it was a well-crafted decision. But Hillary was extremely upset, extremely angry. And people that believe in the Second Amendment and believe in it very strongly were very upset with what she had to say.

WALLACE: Well, let me bring in Secretary Clinton. Were you extremely upset?

CLINTON: Well, I was upset because, unfortunately, dozens of toddlers injure themselves, even kill people with guns, because, unfortunately, not everyone who has loaded guns in their homes takes appropriate precautions.

But there’s no doubt that I respect the Second Amendment, that I also believe there’s an individual right to bear arms. That is not in conflict with sensible, commonsense regulation.

And, you know, look, I understand that Donald’s been strongly supported by the NRA. The gun lobby’s on his side. They’re running millions of dollars of ads against me. And I regret that, because what I would like to see is for people to come together and say: Of course we’re going to protect and defend the Second Amendment. But we’re going to do it in a way that tries to save some of these 33,000 lives that we lose every year.

WALLACE: Let me bring Mr. Trump back into this, because, in fact, you oppose any limits on assault weapons, any limits on high- capacity magazines. You support a national right to carry law. Why, sir?

TRUMP: Well, let me just tell you before we go any further. In Chicago, which has the toughest gun laws in the United States, probably you could say by far, they have more gun violence than any other city. So we have the toughest laws, and you have tremendous gun violence.

I am a very strong supporter of the Second Amendment. And I am — I don’t know if Hillary was saying it in a sarcastic manner, but I’m very proud to have the endorsement of the NRA. And it’s the earliest endorsement they’ve ever given to anybody who ran for president. So I’m very honored by all of that.

We are going to appoint justices — this is the best way to help the Second Amendment. We are going to appoint justices that will feel very strongly about the Second Amendment, that will not do damage to the Second Amendment.

WALLACE: Well, let’s pick up on another issue which divides you and the justices that whoever ends up winning this election appoints could have a dramatic effect there, and that’s the issue of abortion.

TRUMP: Right.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, you’re pro-life. But I want to ask you specifically: Do you want the court, including the justices that you will name, to overturn Roe v. Wade, which includes — in fact, states — a woman’s right to abortion?

TRUMP: Well, if that would happen, because I am pro-life, and I will be appointing pro-life judges, I would think that that will go back to the individual states.

WALLACE: But I’m asking you specifically. Would you like to...

TRUMP: If they overturned it, it will go back to the states.

WALLACE: But what I’m asking you, sir, is, do you want to see the court overturn — you just said you want to see the court protect the Second Amendment. Do you want to see the court overturn Roe v. Wade?

TRUMP: Well, if we put another two or perhaps three justice on, that’s really what’s going to be — that will happen. And that’ll happen automatically, in my opinion, because I am putting pro-life justices on the court. I will say this: It will go back to the states, and the states will then make a determination.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I strongly support Roe v. Wade, which guarantees a constitutional right to a woman to make the most intimate, most difficult, in many cases, decisions about her health care that one can imagine. And in this case, it’s not only about Roe v. Wade. It is about what’s happening right now in America.

So many states are putting very stringent regulations on women that block them from exercising that choice to the extent that they are defunding Planned Parenthood, which, of course, provides all kinds of cancer screenings and other benefits for women in our country.

Donald has said he’s in favor of defunding Planned Parenthood. He even supported shutting the government down to defund Planned Parenthood. I will defend Planned Parenthood. I will defend Roe v. Wade, and I will defend women’s rights to make their own health care decisions.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton... CLINTON: And we have come too far to have that turned back now. And, indeed, he said women should be punished, that there should be some form of punishment for women who obtain abortions. And I could just not be more opposed to that kind of thinking.

WALLACE: I’m going to give you a chance to respond, but I want to ask you, Secretary Clinton, I want to explore how far you believe the right to abortion goes. You have been quoted as saying that the fetus has no constitutional rights. You also voted against a ban on late-term, partial-birth abortions. Why?

CLINTON: Because Roe v. Wade very clearly sets out that there can be regulations on abortion so long as the life and the health of the mother are taken into account. And when I voted as a senator, I did not think that that was the case.

The kinds of cases that fall at the end of pregnancy are often the most heartbreaking, painful decisions for families to make. I have met with women who toward the end of their pregnancy get the worst news one could get, that their health is in jeopardy if they continue to carry to term or that something terrible has happened or just been discovered about the pregnancy. I do not think the United States government should be stepping in and making those most personal of decisions. So you can regulate if you are doing so with the life and the health of the mother taken into account.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, your reaction? And particularly on this issue of late-term, partial-birth abortions.

TRUMP: Well, I think it’s terrible. If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby.

Now, you can say that that’s OK and Hillary can say that that’s OK. But it’s not OK with me, because based on what she’s saying, and based on where she’s going, and where she’s been, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb in the ninth month on the final day. And that’s not acceptable.

CLINTON: Well, that is not what happens in these cases. And using that kind of scare rhetoric is just terribly unfortunate. You should meet with some of the women that I have met with, women I have known over the course of my life. This is one of the worst possible choices that any woman and her family has to make. And I do not believe the government should be making it.

You know, I’ve had the great honor of traveling across the world on behalf of our country. I’ve been to countries where governments either forced women to have abortions, like they used to do in China, or forced women to bear children, like they used to do in Romania. And I can tell you: The government has no business in the decisions that women make with their families in accordance with their faith, with medical advice. And I will stand up for that right.

WALLACE: All right. But just briefly, I want to move on to another segment...

TRUMP: And, honestly, nobody has business doing what I just said, doing that, as late as one or two or three or four days prior to birth. Nobody has that.

WALLACE: All right. Let’s move on to the subject of **immigration**. And there is almost no issue that separates the two of you more than the issue of **immigration**. Actually, there are a lot of issues that separate the two of you.

Mr. Trump, you want to build a wall. Secretary Clinton, you have offered no specific plan for how you want to secure our southern border. Mr. Trump, you are calling for major deportations. Secretary Clinton, you say that within your first 100 days as president you’re going to offer a package that includes a pathway to citizenship. The question, really, is, why are you right and your opponent wrong?

Mr. Trump, you go first in this segment. You have two minutes.

TRUMP: Well, first of all, she wants to give amnesty, which is a disaster and very unfair to all of the people that are waiting on line for many, many years. We need strong borders.

In the audience tonight, we have four mothers of — I mean, these are unbelievable people that I’ve gotten to know over a period of years whose children have been killed, brutally killed by people that came into the country illegally. You have thousands of mothers and fathers and relatives all over the country. They’re coming in illegally. Drugs are pouring in through the border. We have no country if we have no border.

Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders. The border — as you know, the Border Patrol agents, 16,500-plus ICE last week, endorsed me. First time they’ve ever endorsed a candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what’s going on. They know it better than anybody. They want strong borders. They feel we have to have strong borders.

I was up in New Hampshire the other day. The biggest complaint they have — it’s with all of the problems going on in the world, many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and by Barack Obama. All of the problems — the single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern border. It’s just pouring and destroying their youth. It’s poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people. We have to have strong borders. We have to keep the drugs out of our country. We are — right now, we’re getting the drugs, they’re getting the cash. We need strong borders. We need absolute — we cannot give amnesty.

Now, I want to build the wall. We need the wall. And the Border Patrol, ICE, they all want the wall. We stop the drugs. We shore up the border. One of my first acts will be to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones — we have some bad, bad people in this country that have to go out. We’re going to get them out; we’re going to secure the border. And once the border is secured, at a later date, we’ll make a determination as to the rest. But we have some bad hombres here, and we’re going to get them out.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, thank you. Same question to you, Secretary Clinton. Basically, why are you right and Mr. Trump is wrong?

CLINTON: Well, as he was talking, I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Las Vegas, Carla, who is very worried that her parents might be deported, because she was born in this country but they were not. They work hard, they do everything they can to give her a good life.

And you’re right. I don’t want to rip families apart. I don’t want to be sending parents away from children. I don’t want to see the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country.

We have 11 million undocumented people. They have 4 million American citizen children, 15 million people. He said as recently as a few weeks ago in Phoenix that every undocumented person would be subject to deportation. Now, here’s what that means. It means you would have to have a massive law enforcement presence, where law enforcement officers would be going school to school, home to home, business to business, rounding up people who are undocumented. And we would then have to put them on trains, on buses to get them out of our country.

I think that is an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation. I think it’s an idea that would rip our country apart.

I have been for border security for years. I voted for border security in the United States Senate. And my comprehensive **immigration** reform plan of course includes border security. But I want to put our resources where I think they’re most needed: Getting rid of any violent person. Anybody who should be deported, we should deport them.

When it comes to the wall that Donald talks about building, he went to Mexico, he had a meeting with the Mexican president. Didn’t even raise it. He choked and then got into a Twitter war because the Mexican president said we’re not paying for that wall.

So I think we are both a nation of **immigrants** and we are a nation of laws and that we can act accordingly. And that’s why I’m introducing comprehensive **immigration** reform within the first 100 days with the path to citizenship.

WALLACE: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. I want to follow up...

TRUMP: Chris, I think it’s...

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: I think I should respond to that. First of all, I had a very good meeting with the president of Mexico. Very nice man. We will be doing very much better with Mexico on trade deals. Believe me. The NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made of any kind, signed by anybody. It’s a disaster.

Hillary Clinton wanted the wall. Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts. Now, she never gets anything done, so naturally the wall wasn’t built. But Hillary Clinton wanted the wall.

WALLACE: Well, let me — wait, wait, sir, let me...

TRUMP: We are a country of laws. We either have — and by the way...

WALLACE: Now, wait. I’d like to hear from...

TRUMP: Well — well, but she said one thing.

WALLACE: I’d like to hear — I’d like to hear from Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: I voted for border security, and there are...

TRUMP: And the wall.

CLINTON: There are some limited places where that was appropriate. There also is necessarily going to be new technology and how best to deploy that.

But it is clear, when you look at what Donald has been proposing, he started his campaign bashing **immigrants**, calling Mexican **immigrants** rapists and criminals and drug dealers, that he has a very different view about what we should do to deal with **immigrants**.

Now, what I am also arguing is that bringing undocumented **immigrants** out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy will be good, because then employers can’t exploit them and undercut Americans’ wages.

And Donald knows a lot about this. He used undocumented labor to build the Trump Tower. He underpaid undocumented workers, and when they complained, he basically said what a lot of employers do: “You complain, I’ll get you deported.”

I want to get everybody out of the shadows, get the economy working, and not let employers like Donald exploit undocumented workers, which hurts them, but also hurts American workers.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: President Obama has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it, nobody talks about it. But under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country. They’ve been deported. She doesn’t want to say that, but that’s what’s happened, and that’s what happened big league.

As far as moving these people out and moving — we either have a country or we don’t. We’re a country of laws. We either have a border or we don’t.

Now, you can come back in and you can become a citizen. But it’s very unfair. We have millions of people that did it the right way. They’re on line. They’re waiting. We’re going to speed up the process, big league, because it’s very inefficient. But they’re on line and they’re waiting to become citizens.

Very unfair that somebody runs across the border, becomes a citizen, under her plan, you have open borders. You would have a disaster on trade, and you will have a disaster with your open borders.

WALLACE: I want to...

TRUMP: But what she doesn’t say is that President Obama has deported millions and millions of people just the way it is.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to...

CLINTON: We will not have open borders. That is...

WALLACE: Well, let me — Secretary...

CLINTON: That is a rank mischaracterization.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: We will have secure borders, but we’ll also have reform. And this used to be a bipartisan issue. Ronald Reagan was the last president...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, excuse me. Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: ... to sign **immigration** reform, and George W. Bush supported it, as well.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to clear up your position on this issue, because in a speech you gave to a Brazilian bank, for which you were paid $225,000, we’ve learned from the WikiLeaks, that you said this, and I want to quote. “My dream is a hemispheric common market with open trade and open borders.” So that’s the question...

TRUMP: Thank you.

WALLACE: That’s the question. Please quiet, everybody. Is that your dream, open borders? CLINTON: Well, if you went on to read the rest of the sentence, I was talking about energy. You know, we trade more energy with our neighbors than we trade with the rest of the world combined. And I do want us to have an electric grid, an energy system that crosses borders. I think that would be a great benefit to us.

But you are very clearly quoting from WikiLeaks. And what’s really important about WikiLeaks is that the Russian government has engaged in espionage against Americans. They have hacked American websites, American accounts of private people, of institutions. Then they have given that information to WikiLeaks for the purpose of putting it on the Internet.

This has come from the highest levels of the Russian government, clearly, from Putin himself, in an effort, as 17 of our intelligence agencies have confirmed, to influence our election.

CLINTON: So I actually think the most important question of this evening, Chris, is, finally, will Donald Trump admit and condemn that the Russians are doing this and make it clear that he will not have the help of Putin in in this election, that he rejects Russian espionage against Americans, which he actually encouraged in the past? Those are the questions we need answered. We’ve never had anything like this happen in any of our elections before.

WALLACE: Well?

TRUMP: That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders, OK? How did we get on to Putin?

WALLACE: Hold on — hold on, wait. Hold on, folks. Because we — this is going to end up getting out of control. Let’s try to keep it quiet so — for the candidates and for the American people.

TRUMP: So just to finish on the borders...

WALLACE: Yes?

TRUMP: She wants open borders. People are going to pour into our country. People are going to come in from Syria. She wants 550 percent more people than Barack Obama, and he has thousands and thousands of people. They have no idea where they come from.

And you see, we are going to stop radical Islamic terrorism in this country. She won’t even mention the words, and neither will President Obama. So I just want to tell you, she wants open borders.

Now we can talk about Putin. I don’t know Putin. He said nice things about me. If we got along well, that would be good. If Russia and the United States got along well and went after ISIS, that would be good.

He has no respect for her. He has no respect for our president. And I’ll tell you what: We’re in very serious trouble, because we have a country with tremendous numbers of nuclear warheads — 1,800, by the way — where they expanded and we didn’t, 1,800 nuclear warheads. And she’s playing chicken. Look, Putin...

WALLACE: Wait, but...

TRUMP: ... from everything I see, has no respect for this person.

CLINTON: Well, that’s because he’d rather have a puppet as president of the United States.

TRUMP: No puppet. No puppet.

CLINTON: And it’s pretty clear...

TRUMP: You’re the puppet!

CLINTON: It’s pretty clear you won’t admit...

TRUMP: No, you’re the puppet.

CLINTON: ... that the Russians have engaged in cyberattacks against the United States of America, that you encouraged espionage against our people, that you are willing to spout the Putin line, sign up for his wish list, break up NATO, do whatever he wants to do, and that you continue to get help from him, because he has a very clear favorite in this race.

So I think that this is such an unprecedented situation. We’ve never had a foreign government trying to interfere in our election. We have 17 — 17 intelligence agencies, civilian and military, who have all concluded that these espionage attacks, these cyberattacks, come from the highest levels of the Kremlin and they are designed to influence our election. I find that deeply disturbing.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: And I think it’s time you take a stand...

TRUMP: She has no idea whether it’s Russia, China, or anybody else.

CLINTON: I am not quoting myself.

TRUMP: She has no idea.

CLINTON: I am quoting 17...

TRUMP: Hillary, you have no idea.

CLINTON: ... 17 intelligence — do you doubt 17 military and civilian...

TRUMP: And our country has no idea.

CLINTON: ... agencies.

TRUMP: Yeah, I doubt it. I doubt it.

CLINTON: Well, he’d rather believe Vladimir Putin than the military and civilian intelligence professionals who are sworn to protect us. I find that just absolutely...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: She doesn’t like Putin because Putin has outsmarted her at every step of the way.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: Excuse me. Putin has outsmarted her in Syria.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: He’s outsmarted her every step of the way.

WALLACE: I do get to ask some questions.

TRUMP: Yes, that’s fine.

WALLACE: And I would like to ask you this direct question. The top national security officials of this country do believe that Russia has been behind these hacks. Even if you don’t know for sure whether they are, do you condemn any interference by Russia in the American election?

TRUMP: By Russia or anybody else.

WALLACE: You condemn their interference?

TRUMP: Of course I condemn. Of course I — I don’t know Putin. I have no idea.

WALLACE: I’m not asking — I’m asking do you condemn?

TRUMP: I never met Putin. This is not my best friend. But if the United States got along with Russia, wouldn’t be so bad.

Let me tell you, Putin has outsmarted her and Obama at every single step of the way. Whether it’s Syria, you name it. Missiles. Take a look at the “start up” that they signed. The Russians have said, according to many, many reports, I can’t believe they allowed us to do this. They create warheads, and we can’t. The Russians can’t believe it. She has been outsmarted by Putin.

And all you have to do is look at the Middle East. They’ve taken over. We’ve spent $6 trillion. They’ve taken over the Middle East. She has been outsmarted and outplayed worse than anybody I’ve ever seen in any government whatsoever.

WALLACE: We’re a long way away from **immigration**, but I’m going to let you finish this topic. You got about 45 seconds.

TRUMP: And she always will be.

CLINTON: I — I find it ironic that he’s raising nuclear weapons. This is a person who has been very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons. He’s...

TRUMP: Wrong. CLINTON: ... advocated more countries getting them, Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia. He said, well, if we have them, why don’t we use them, which I think is terrifying.

But here’s the deal. The bottom line on nuclear weapons is that when the president gives the order, it must be followed. There’s about four minutes between the order being given and the people responsible for launching nuclear weapons to do so. And that’s why 10 people who have had that awesome responsibility have come out and, in an unprecedented way, said they would not trust Donald Trump with the nuclear codes or to have his finger on the nuclear button.

TRUMP: I have 200 generals...

WALLACE: Very quickly.

TRUMP: ... and admirals, 21 endorsing me, 21 congressional Medal of Honor recipients. As far as Japan and other countries, we are being ripped off by everybody in the — we’re defending other countries. We are spending a fortune doing it. They have the bargain of the century.

All I said is, we have to renegotiate these agreements, because our country cannot afford to defend Saudi Arabia, Japan, Germany, South Korea, and many other places. We cannot continue to afford — she took that as saying nuclear weapons.

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: Look, she’s been proven to be a liar on so many different ways. This is just another lie.

CLINTON: Well, I’m just quoting you when you were asked...

TRUMP: There’s no quote. You’re not going to find a quote from me.

CLINTON: ... about a potential nuclear — nuclear competition in Asia, you said, you know, go ahead, enjoy yourselves, folks. That kind...

TRUMP: And defend yourselves.

CLINTON: ... of language — well...

TRUMP: And defend yourselves. I didn’t say nuclear. And defend yourself.

CLINTON: The United States has kept the peace — the United States has kept the peace through our alliances. Donald wants to tear up our alliances. I think it makes the world safer and, frankly, it makes the United States safer. I would work with our allies in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, and elsewhere. That’s the only way we’re going to be able to keep the peace.

WALLACE: We’re going to — no, we are going to move on to the next topic, which is the economy. And I hope we handle that as well as we did **immigration**. You also have very different ideas about how to get the economy growing faster. Secretary Clinton, in your plan, government plays a big role. You see more government spending, more entitlements, more tax credits, more tax penalties. Mr. Trump, you want to get government out with lower taxes and less regulation.

TRUMP: Yes.

WALLACE: We’re going to drill down into this a little bit more. But in this overview, please explain to me why you believe that your plan will create more jobs and growth for this country and your opponent’s plan will not. In this round, you go first, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, I think when the middle class thrives, America thrives. And so my plan is based on growing the economy, giving middle-class families many more opportunities. I want us to have the biggest jobs program since World War II, jobs in infrastructure and advanced manufacturing. I think we can compete with high-wage countries, and I believe we should. New jobs and clean energy, not only to fight climate change, which is a serious problem, but to create new opportunities and new businesses.

I want us to do more to help small business. That’s where two- thirds of the new jobs are going to come from. I want us to raise the national minimum wage, because people who live in poverty should not — who work full-time should not still be in poverty. And I sure do want to make sure women get equal pay for the work we do.

I feel strongly that we have to have an education system that starts with preschool and goes through college. That’s why I want more technical education in high schools and in community colleges, real apprenticeships to prepare young people for the jobs of the future. I want to make college debt-free and for families making less than $125,000, you will not get a tuition bill from a public college or university if the plan that I worked on with Bernie Sanders is enacted.

And we’re going to work hard to make sure that it is, because we are going to go where the money is. Most of the gains in the last years since the Great Recession have gone to the very top. So we are going to have the wealthy pay their fair share. We’re going to have corporations make a contribution greater than they are now to our country.

That is a plan that has been analyzed by independent experts which said that it could produce 10 million new jobs. By contrast, Donald’s plan has been analyzed to conclude it might lose 3.5 million jobs. Why? Because his whole plan is to cut taxes, to give the biggest tax breaks ever to the wealthy and to corporations, adding $20 trillion to our debt, and causing the kind of dislocation that we have seen before, because it truly will be trickle-down economics on steroids.

So the plan I have I think will actually produce greater opportunities. The plan he has will cost us jobs and possibly lead to another Great Recession.

WALLACE: Secretary, thank you. Mr. Trump, why will your plan create more jobs and growth than Secretary Clinton’s?

TRUMP: Well, first of all, before I start on my plan, her plan is going to raise taxes and even double your taxes. Her tax plan is a disaster. And she can say all she wants about college tuition. And I’m a big proponent. We’re going to do a lot of things for college tuition. But the rest of the public’s going to be paying for it. We will have a massive, massive tax increase under Hillary Clinton’s plan.

TRUMP: But I’d like to start off where we left, because when I said Japan and Germany, and I’m — not to single them out, but South Korea, these are very rich, powerful countries. Saudi Arabia, nothing but money. We protect Saudi Arabia. Why aren’t they paying?

She immediately — when she heard this, I questioned it, and I questioned NATO. Why aren’t the NATO questioned — why aren’t they paying? Because they weren’t paying.

Since I did this — this was a year ago — all of a sudden, they’re paying. And I’ve been given a lot — a lot of credit for it. All of a sudden, they’re starting to pay up. They have to pay up. We’re protecting people, they have to pay up. And I’m a big fan of NATO. But they have to pay up.

She comes out and said, we love our allies, we think our allies are great. Well, it’s awfully hard to get them to pay up when you have somebody saying we think how great they are.

We have to tell Japan in a very nice way, we have to tell Germany, all of these countries, South Korea, we have to say, you have to help us out. We have, during his regime, during President Obama’s regime, we’ve doubled our national debt. We’re up to $20 trillion.

So my plan — we’re going to renegotiate trade deals. We’re going to have a lot of free trade. We’re going to have free trade, more free trade than we have right now. But we have horrible deals. Our jobs are being taken out by the deal that her husband signed, NAFTA, one of the worst deals ever. Our jobs are being sucked out of our economy.

You look at all of the places that I just left, you go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places. We’re bringing our jobs back.

I am going to renegotiate NAFTA. And if I can’t make a great deal — then we’re going to terminate NAFTA and we’re going to create new deals. We’re going to have trade, but we’re going — we’re going to terminate it, we’re going to make a great trade deal.

And if we can’t, we’re going to do it — we’re going to go a separate way, because it has been a disaster. We are going to cut taxes massively. We’re going to cut business taxes massively. They’re going to start hiring people. We’re going to bring the $2.5 trillion... WALLACE: Time, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: ... that’s offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again, because...

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: ... right now, our country is dying at 1 percent GDP.

CLINTON: Well, let me translate that, if I can, Chris, because...

TRUMP: You can’t.

CLINTON: ... the fact is, he’s going to advocate for the largest tax cuts we’ve ever seen, three times more than the tax cuts under the Bush administration. I have said repeatedly throughout this campaign: I will not raise taxes on anyone making $250,000 or less.

I also will not add a penny to the debt. I have costed out what I’m going to do. He will, through his massive tax cuts, add $20 trillion to the debt.

Well, he mentioned the debt. We know how to get control of the debt. When my husband was president, we went from a $300 billion deficit to a $200 billion surplus and we were actually on the path to eliminating the national debt. When President Obama came into office, he inherited the worst economic disaster since the Great Depression. He has cut the deficit by two-thirds.

So, yes, one of the ways you go after the debt, one of the ways you create jobs is by investing in people. So I do have investments, investments in new jobs, investments in education, skill training, and the opportunities for people to get ahead and stay ahead. That’s the kind of approach that will work.

WALLACE: Secretary...

CLINTON: Cutting taxes on the wealthy, we’ve tried that. It has not worked the way that it has been promised.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to pursue your plan, because in many ways it is similar to the Obama stimulus plan in 2009, which has led to the slowest GDP growth since 1949.

TRUMP: Correct.

WALLACE: Thank you, sir.

You told me in July when we spoke that the problem is that President Obama didn’t get to do enough in what he was trying to do with his stimulus. So is your plan basically more — even more of the Obama stimulus?

CLINTON: Well, it’s a combination, Chris. And let me say that when you inherit the level of economic catastrophe that President Obama inherited, it was a real touch-and-go situation. I was in the Senate before I became secretary of state. I’ve never seen people as physically distraught as the Bush administration team was because of what was happening to the economy.

I personally believe that the steps that President Obama took saved the economy. He doesn’t get the credit he deserves for taking some very hard positions. But it was a terrible recession.

So now we’ve dug ourselves out of it, we’re standing, but we’re not yet running. So what I am proposing is that we invest from the middle out and the ground up, not the top down. That is not going to work.

That’s why what I have put forward doesn’t add a penny to the debt, but it is the kind of approach that will enable more people to take those new jobs, higher-paying jobs. We’re beginning to see some increase in incomes, and we certainly have had a long string of increasing jobs. We’ve got to do more to get the whole economy moving, and that’s what I believe I will be able to do.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, even conservative economists who have looked at your plan say that the numbers don’t add up, that your idea, and you’ve talked about 25 million jobs created, 4 percent...

TRUMP: Over a 10-year period.

WALLACE: ... growth is unrealistic. And they say — you talk a lot about growing the energy industry. They say with oil prices as low as they are right now, that’s unrealistic, as well. Your response, sir?

TRUMP: So I just left some high representatives of India. They’re growing at 8 percent. China is growing at 7 percent. And that for them is a catastrophically low number.

We are growing — our last report came out — and it’s right around the 1 percent level. And I think it’s going down. Last week, as you know, the end of last week, they came out with an anemic jobs report. A terrible jobs report. In fact I said, is that the last jobs report before the election? Because if it is, I should win easily, it was so bad. The report was so bad.

Look, our country is stagnant. We’ve lost our jobs. We’ve lost our businesses. We’re not making things anymore, relatively speaking. Our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world.

I’ve visited so many communities. This has been such an incredible education for me, Chris. I’ve gotten to know so many — I’ve developed so many friends over the last year. And they cry when they see what’s happened. I pass factories that were thriving 20, 25 years ago, and because of the bill that her husband signed and she blessed 100 percent, it is just horrible what’s happened to these people in these communities.

Now, she can say that her husband did well, but, boy, did they suffer as NAFTA kicked in, because it didn’t really kick in very much, but it kicked in after they left. Boy, did they suffer. That was one of the worst things that’s ever been signed by our country.

Now she wants to sign Trans-Pacific Partnership. And she wants it. She lied when she said she didn’t call it the gold standard in one of the debates. She totally lied. She did call it the gold standard. And they actually fact checked, and they said I was right. I was so honored.

WALLACE: I want you to give you a chance to briefly speak to that, and then I want to pivot to one-sixth of the economy...

TRUMP: And that will be as bad as NAFTA. WALLACE: ... which is Obamacare. But go ahead, briefly.

CLINTON: Well, first, let me say, number one, when I saw the final agreement for TPP, I said I was against it. It didn’t meet my test. I’ve had the same test. Does it create jobs, raise incomes, and further our national security? I’m against it now. I’ll be against it after the election. I’ll be against it when I’m president.

There’s only one of us on this stage who’s actually shipped jobs to Mexico, because that’s Donald. He’s shipped jobs to 12 countries, including Mexico.

But he mentioned China. And, you know, one of the biggest problems we have with China is the illegal dumping of steel and aluminum into our markets. I have fought against that as a senator. I’ve stood up against it as secretary of state.

Donald has bought Chinese steel and aluminum. In fact, the Trump Hotel right here in Las Vegas was made with Chinese steel. So he goes around with crocodile tears about how terrible it is, but he has given jobs to Chinese steelworkers, not American steelworkers.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

CLINTON: That’s the kind of approach that is just not going to work.

TRUMP: Well, let me just say — let me just say.

CLINTON: We’re going to pull the country together. We’re going to have trade agreements that we enforce. That’s why I’m going to have a trade prosecutor for the first time in history. And we’re going to enforce those agreements, and we’re going to look for businesses to help us by buying American products.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton? Go ahead, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Let me ask a simple question. She’s been doing this for 30 years. Why the hell didn’t you do it over the last 15, 20 years?

CLINTON: No, I voted.

TRUMP: You were very much involved — excuse me. My turn. You were very much involved in every aspect of this country. Very much. And you do have experience. I say the one thing you have over me is experience, but it’s bad experience, because what you’ve done has turned out badly.

For 30 years, you’ve been in a position to help, and if you say that I use steel or I use something else, I — make it impossible for me to do that. I wouldn’t mind.

The problem is, you talk, but you don’t get anything done, Hillary. You don’t. Just like when you ran the State Department, $6 billion was missing. How do you miss $6 billion? You ran the State Department, $6 billion was either stolen. They don’t know. It’s gone, $6 billion. If you become president, this country is going to be in some mess. Believe me.

CLINTON: Well, first of all, what he just said about the State Department is not only untrue, it’s been debunked numerous times.

CLINTON: But I think it’s really an important issue. He raised the 30 years of experience, so let me just talk briefly about that. You know, back in the 1970s, I worked for the Children’s Defense Fund. And I was taking on discrimination against African-American kids in schools. He was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings.

In the 1980s, I was working to reform the schools in Arkansas. He was borrowing $14 million from his father to start his businesses. In the 1990s, I went to Beijing and I said women’s rights are human rights. He insulted a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, called her an eating machine.

TRUMP: Give me a break.

CLINTON: And on the day when I was in the Situation Room, monitoring the raid that brought Osama bin Laden to justice, he was hosting the “Celebrity Apprentice.” So I’m happy to compare my 30 years of experience, what I’ve done for this country, trying to help in every way I could, especially kids and families get ahead and stay ahead, with your 30 years, and I’ll let the American people make that decision.

TRUMP: Well, I think I did a much better job. I built a massive company, a great company, some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, worth many, many billions of dollars. I started with a $1 million loan. I agree with that. It’s a $1 million loan. But I built a phenomenal company.

And if we could run our country the way I’ve run my company, we would have a country that you would be so proud of. You would even be proud of it.

And frankly, when you look at her real record, take a look at Syria. Take a look at the migration. Take a look at Libya. Take a look at Iraq. She gave us ISIS, because her and Obama created this huge vacuum, and a small group came out of that huge vacuum because when — we should never have been in Iraq, but once we were there, we should have never got out the way they wanted to get out. She gave us ISIS as sure as you are sitting there. And what happened is now ISIS is in 32 countries. And now I listen how she’s going to get rid of ISIS. She’s going to get rid of nobody.

WALLACE: All right. We are going to get to foreign hot spots in a few moments, but the next segment is fitness to be president of the United States. Mr. Trump, at the last debate, you said your talk about grabbing women was just that, talk, and that you’d never actually done it. And since then, as we all know, nine women have come forward and have said that you either groped them or kissed them without their consent.

Why would so many different women from so many different circumstances over so many different years, why would they all in this last couple of weeks make up — you deny this — why would they all make up these stories?

Since this is a question for both of you, Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump says what your husband did and that you defended was even worse. Mr. Trump, you go first.

TRUMP: Well, first of all, those stories have been largely debunked. Those people — I don’t know those people. I have a feeling how they came. I believe it was her campaign that did it.

Just like if you look at what came out today on the clips where I was wondering what happened with my rally in Chicago and other rallies where we had such violence? She’s the one and Obama that caused the violence. They hired people — they paid them $1,500, and they’re on tape saying be violent, cause fights, do bad things.

I would say the only way — because those stories are all totally false, I have to say that. And I didn’t even apologize to my wife, who’s sitting right here, because I didn’t do anything. I didn’t know any of these — I didn’t see these women.

These women — the woman on the plane, the — I think they want either fame or her campaign did it. And I think it’s her campaign. Because what I saw what they did, which is a criminal act, by the way, where they’re telling people to go out and start fist-fights and start violence.

And I’ll tell you what, in particular in Chicago, people were hurt and people could have been killed in that riot. And that was now all on tape, started by her. I believe, Chris, that she got these people to step forward. If it wasn’t, they get their 10 minutes of fame. But they were all totally — it was all fiction. It was lies, and it was fiction.

CLINTON: Well...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: At the last debate, we heard Donald talking about what he did to women. And after that, a number of women have come forward saying that’s exactly what he did to them. Now, what was his response? Well, he held a number of big rallies where he said that he could not possibly have done those things to those women because they were not attractive enough for them to be assaulted.

TRUMP: I did not say that. I did not say that.

CLINTON: In fact, he went on to say... WALLACE: Her two minutes — sir, her two minutes. Her two minutes.

TRUMP: I did not say that.

WALLACE: It’s her two minutes.

CLINTON: He went on to say, “Look at her. I don’t think so.” About another woman, he said, “That wouldn’t be my first choice.” He attacked the woman reporter writing the story, called her “disgusting,” as he has called a number of women during this campaign.

Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger. He goes after their dignity, their self-worth, and I don’t think there is a woman anywhere who doesn’t know what that feels like. So we now know what Donald thinks and what he says and how he acts toward women. That’s who Donald is.

I think it’s really up to all of us to demonstrate who we are and who our country is, and to stand up and be very clear about what we expect from our next president, how we want to bring our country together, where we don’t want to have the kind of pitting of people one against the other, where instead we celebrate our diversity, we lift people up, and we make our country even greater.

America is great, because America is good. And it really is up to all of us to make that true, now and in the future, and particularly for our children and our grandchildren.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody.

(LAUGHTER)

Nobody has more respect...

WALLACE: Please, everybody.

TRUMP: And frankly, those stories have been largely debunked. And I really want to just talk about something slightly different.

She mentions this, which is all fiction, all fictionalized, probably or possibly started by her and her very sleazy campaign. But I will tell you what isn’t fictionalized are her e-mails, where she destroyed 33,000 e-mails criminally, criminally, after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

What happened to the FBI, I don’t know. We have a great general, four-star general, today you read it in all of the papers, going to potentially serve five years in jail for lying to the FBI. One lie. She’s lied hundreds of times to the people, to Congress, and to the FBI. He’s going to probably go to jail. This is a four-star general. And she gets away with it, and she can run for the presidency of the United States? That’s really what you should be talking about, not fiction, where somebody wants fame or where they come out of her crooked campaign.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, every time Donald is pushed on something which is obviously uncomfortable, like what these women are saying, he immediately goes to denying responsibility. And it’s not just about women. He never apologizes or says he’s sorry for anything.

So we know what he has said and what he’s done to women. But he also went after a disabled reporter, mocked and mimicked him on national television.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: He went after Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the parents of a young man who died serving our country, a Gold Star family, because of their religion. He went after John McCain, a prisoner of war, said he prefers “people who aren’t captured.” He went after a federal judge, born in Indiana, but who Donald said couldn’t be trusted to try the fraud and racketeering case against Trump University because his parents were Mexican.

So it’s not one thing. This is a pattern, a pattern of divisiveness, of a very dark and in many ways dangerous vision of our country, where he incites violence, where he applauds people who are pushing and pulling and punching at his rallies. That is not who America is.

And I hope that as we move in the last weeks of this campaign, more and more people will understand what’s at stake in this election. It really does come down to what kind of country we are going to have.

TRUMP: So sad when she talks about violence at my rallies, and she caused the violence. It’s on tape.

WALLACE: During the last...

TRUMP: The other things are false, but honestly, I’d love to talk about getting rid of ISIS, and I’d love to talk about other things...

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: ... but those other charges, as she knows, are false.

WALLACE: In this bucket about fitness to be president, there’s been a lot of developments over the last 10 days since the last debate. I’d like to ask you about them. These are questions that the American people have.

Secretary Clinton, during your 2009 Senate confirmation hearing, you promised to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest with your dealing with the Clinton Foundation while you were secretary of state, but e-mails show that donors got special access to you. Those seeking grants for Haiti relief were considered separately from non-donors, and some of those donors got contracts, government contracts, taxpayer money.

Can you really say that you kept your pledge to that Senate committee? And why isn’t what happened and what went on between you and the Clinton Foundation, why isn’t it what Mr. Trump calls pay to play?

CLINTON: Well, everything I did as secretary of state was in furtherance of our country’s interests and our values. The State Department has said that. I think that’s been proven.

But I am happy, in fact I’m thrilled to talk about the Clinton Foundation, because it is a world-renowned charity and I am so proud of the work that it does. You know, I could talk for the rest of the debate — I know I don’t have the time to do that.

But just briefly, the Clinton Foundation made it possible for 11 million people around the world with HIV-AIDS to afford treatment, and that’s about half all the people in the world who are getting treatment. In partnership with the American Health Association...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: ... we have made environments in schools healthier for kids, including healthier lunches...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, respectfully, this is — this is an open discussion.

CLINTON: Well, it is an open discussion. And you...

WALLACE: And the specific question went to pay for play. Do you want to talk about that?

CLINTON: Well, but there is no — but there is no evidence — but there is...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: I think that it’s been very well...

WALLACE: Let’s ask Mr. Trump.

CLINTON: There is a lot of evidence about the very good work...

TRUMP: It’s been very well studied.

CLINTON: ... and the high rankings...

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Please let me Mr. Trump speak.

TRUMP: ... and it’s a criminal enterprise, and so many people know it.

WALLACE: Please let Mr. Trump speak.

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: It’s a criminal enterprise. Saudi Arabia giving $25 million, Qatar, all of these countries. You talk about women and women’s rights? So these are people that push gays off business — off buildings. These are people that kill women and treat women horribly. And yet you take their money.

So I’d like to ask you right now, why don’t you give back the money that you’ve taken from certain countries that treat certain groups of people so horribly? Why don’t you give back the money? I think it would be a great gesture.

Because she takes a tremendous amount of money. And you take a look at the people of Haiti. I was at a little Haiti the other day in Florida. And I want to tell you, they hate the Clintons, because what’s happened in Haiti with the Clinton Foundation is a disgrace. And you know it, and they know it, and everybody knows it.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, very quickly, we at the Clinton Foundation spend 90 percent — 90 percent of all the money that is donated on behalf of programs of people around the world and in our own country. I’m very proud of that. We have the highest rating from the watchdogs that follow foundations. And I’d be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people and bought a six- foot portrait of Donald. I mean, who does that? It just was astonishing.

But when it comes to Haiti, Haiti is the poorest country in our hemisphere. The earthquake and the hurricanes, it has devastated Haiti. Bill and I have been involved in trying to help Haiti for many years. The Clinton Foundation raised $30 million to help Haiti after the catastrophic earthquake and all of the terrible problems the people there had.

We have done things to help small businesses, agriculture, and so much else. And we’re going to keep working to help Haiti...

WALLACE: All right.

CLINTON: ... because it’s an important part of the American experience.

TRUMP: They don’t want you to help them anymore.

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: I’d like to mention one thing. Trump Foundation, small foundation. People contribute, I contribute. The money goes 100 percent — 100 percent goes to different charities, including a lot of military. I don’t get anything. I don’t buy boats. I don’t buy planes. What happens — the money goes to them.

WALLACE: Wasn’t some of the money used to settle your lawsuits, sir?

TRUMP: No, it was — we put up the American flag. And that’s it. They put up the American flag. We fought for the right in Palm Beach to put up the American flag.

WALLACE: Right. But there was a penalty that was imposed by Palm Beach County, and the money came from your foundation...

TRUMP: There was. There was. And, by the way...

WALLACE: ... instead of Mar-a-Lago or yourself, sir.

TRUMP: ... the money — the money went to Fisher House, where they build houses — the money that you’re talking about went to Fisher House, where they build houses for veterans and disabled vets.

WALLACE: I want to get into one...

CLINTON: But, of course, there’s no way we can know whether any of that is true, because he hasn’t released his tax returns. He is the first candidate ever to run for president in the last 40-plus years who has not released his tax returns, so everything he says about charity or anything else, we can’t prove it. You can look at our tax returns. We’ve got them all out there.

But what is really troubling is that we learned in the last debate he has not paid a penny in federal income tax. And we were talking about **immigrants** a few minutes ago, Chris. You know, half of all **immigrants** — undocumented **immigrants** in our country — actually pay federal income tax. So we have undocumented **immigrants** in America who are paying more federal income tax than a billionaire. I find that just astonishing.

WALLACE: I want...

TRUMP: So let me just tell you very quickly, we’re entitled because of the laws that people like her passed to take massive amounts of depreciation on other charges, and we do it. And all of her donors — just about all of them — I know Buffett took hundreds of millions of dollars, Soros, George Soros, took hundreds of millions of dollars...

WALLACE: We...

TRUMP: Let me just explain.

WALLACE: But, no, we heard this...

TRUMP: Most of her donors have done the same thing as I do.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, we — OK.

TRUMP: You know what she should have done?

WALLACE: Folks, we heard this...

TRUMP: And you know, Hillary, what you should have done, you should have changed the law when you were a United States senator...

WALLACE: Folks, we heard this...

TRUMP: ... because your donors and your special interests are doing the same thing as I do, except even more so.

CLINTON: Well, you know...

TRUMP: You should have changed the law. But you won’t change the law, because you take in so much money. I mean, I sat in my apartment today on a very beautiful hotel down the street known as Trump...

CLINTON: Made with Chinese steel.

TRUMP: But I will tell you, I sat there...

(LAUGHTER)

... I sat there watching ad after ad after ad, false ad. All paid for by your friends on Wall Street that gave so much money because they know you’re going to protect them. And, frankly, you should have changed the laws.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: If you don’t like what I did, you should have changed the laws.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, I want to ask you about one last question in this topic. You have been warning at rallies recently that this election is rigged and that Hillary Clinton is in the process of trying to steal it from you.

Your running mate, Governor Pence, pledged on Sunday that he and you — his words — “will absolutely accept the result of this election.” Today your daughter, Ivanka, said the same thing. I want to ask you here on the stage tonight: Do you make the same commitment that you will absolutely — sir, that you will absolutely accept the result of this election?

TRUMP: I will look at it at the time. I’m not looking at anything now. I’ll look at it at the time.

What I’ve seen — what I’ve seen is so bad. First of all, the media is so dishonest and so corrupt, and the pile-on is so amazing. The New York Times actually wrote an article about it, but they don’t even care. It’s so dishonest. And they’ve poisoned the mind of the voters.

But unfortunately for them, I think the voters are seeing through it. I think they’re going to see through it. We’ll find out on November 8th. But I think they’re going to see through it.

WALLACE: But, sir, there’s...

TRUMP: If you look — excuse me, Chris — if you look at your voter rolls, you will see millions of people that are registered to vote — millions, this isn’t coming from me — this is coming from Pew Report and other places — millions of people that are registered to vote that shouldn’t be registered to vote.

So let me just give you one other thing. So I talk about the corrupt media. I talk about the millions of people — tell you one other thing. She shouldn’t be allowed to run. It’s crooked — she’s — she’s guilty of a very, very serious crime. She should not be allowed to run.

And just in that respect, I say it’s rigged, because she should never...

WALLACE: But...

TRUMP: Chris, she should never have been allowed to run for the presidency based on what she did with e-mails and so many other things.

WALLACE: But, sir, there is a tradition in this country — in fact, one of the prides of this country — is the peaceful transition of power and that no matter how hard-fought a campaign is, that at the end of the campaign that the loser concedes to the winner. Not saying that you’re necessarily going to be the loser or the winner, but that the loser concedes to the winner and that the country comes together in part for the good of the country. Are you saying you’re not prepared now to commit to that principle?

TRUMP: What I’m saying is that I will tell you at the time. I’ll keep you in suspense. OK?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, let me respond to that, because that’s horrifying. You know, every time Donald thinks things are not going in his direction, he claims whatever it is, is rigged against him.

The FBI conducted a year-long investigation into my e-mails. They concluded there was no case; he said the FBI was rigged. He lost the Iowa caucus. He lost the Wisconsin primary. He said the Republican primary was rigged against him. Then Trump University gets sued for fraud and racketeering; he claims the court system and the federal judge is rigged against him. There was even a time when he didn’t get an Emmy for his TV program three years in a row and he started tweeting that the Emmys were rigged against him.

TRUMP: Should have gotten it.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: This is — this is a mindset. This is how Donald thinks. And it’s funny, but it’s also really troubling.

WALLACE: OK.

CLINTON: So that is not the way our democracy works. We’ve been around for 240 years. We’ve had free and fair elections. We’ve accepted the outcomes when we may not have liked them. And that is what must be expected of anyone standing on a debate stage during a general election. You know, President Obama said the other day when you’re whining before the game is even finished...

(APPLAUSE)

WALLACE: Hold on. Hold on, folks. Hold on, folks.

CLINTON: ... it just shows you’re not up to doing the job. And let’s — you know, let’s be clear about what he is saying and what that means. He is denigrating — he’s talking down our democracy. And I, for one, am appalled that somebody who is the nominee of one of our two major parties would take that kind of position.

TRUMP: I think what the FBI did and what the Department of Justice did, including meeting with her husband, the attorney general, in the back of an airplane on the tarmac in Arizona, I think it’s disgraceful. I think it’s a disgrace.

WALLACE: All right.

TRUMP: I think we’ve never had a situation so bad in this country.

(APPLAUSE)

WALLACE: Hold on, folks. This doesn’t do any good for anyone. Let’s please continue the debate, and let’s move on to the subject of foreign hot spots.

The Iraqi offensive to take back Mosul has begun. If they are successful in pushing ISIS out of that city and out of all of Iraq, the question then becomes, what happens the day after? And that’s something that whichever of you ends up — whoever of you ends up as president is going to have to confront.

Will you put U.S. troops into that vacuum to make sure that ISIS doesn’t come back or isn’t replaced by something even worse? Secretary Clinton, you go first in this segment. You have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, I am encouraged that there is an effort led by the Iraqi army, supported by Kurdish forces, and also given the help and advice from the number of special forces and other Americans on the ground. But I will not support putting American soldiers into Iraq as an occupying force. I don’t think that is in our interest, and I don’t think that would be smart to do. In fact, Chris, I think that would be a big red flag waving for ISIS to reconstitute itself.

The goal here is to take back Mosul. It’s going to be a hard fight. I’ve got no illusions about that. And then continue to press into Syria to begin to take back and move on Raqqa, which is the ISIS headquarters.

I am hopeful that the hard work that American military advisers have done will pay off and that we will see a real — a really successful military operation. But we know we’ve got lots of work to do. Syria will remain a hotbed of terrorism as long as the civil war, aided and abetted by the Iranians and the Russians, continue.

So I have said, look, we need to keep our eye on ISIS. That’s why I want to have an intelligence surge that protects us here at home, why we have to go after them from the air, on the ground, online, why we have to make sure here at home we don’t let terrorists buy weapons. If you’re too dangerous to fly, you’re too dangerous to buy a gun.

And I’m going to continue to push for a no-fly zone and safe havens within Syria not only to help protect the Syrians and prevent the constant outflow of refugees, but to, frankly, gain some leverage on both the Syrian government and the Russians so that perhaps we can have the kind of serious negotiation necessary to bring the conflict to an end and go forward on a political track.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, same question. If we are able to push ISIS out of Mosul and out of Iraq, will — would you be willing to put U.S. troops in there to prevent their return or something else?

TRUMP: Let me tell you, Mosul is so sad. We had Mosul. But when she left, when she took everybody out, we lost Mosul. Now we’re fighting again to get Mosul. The problem with Mosul and what they wanted to do is they wanted to get the leaders of ISIS who they felt were in Mosul.

About three months ago, I started reading that they want to get the leaders and they’re going to attack Mosul. Whatever happened to the element of surprise, OK? We announce we’re going after Mosul. I have been reading about going after Mosul now for about — how long is it, Hillary, three months? These people have all left. They’ve all left.

The element of surprise. Douglas MacArthur, George Patton spinning in their graves when they see the stupidity of our country. So we’re now fighting for Mosul, that we had. All she had to do was stay there, and now we’re going in to get it.

But you know who the big winner in Mosul is going to be after we eventually get it? And the only reason they did it is because she’s running for the office of president and they want to look tough. They want to look good. He violated the red line in the sand, and he made so many mistakes, made all the mistakes. That’s why we have the great migration. But she wanted to look good for the election. So they’re going in.

But who’s going to get Mosul, really? We’ll take Mosul eventually. But the way — if you look at what’s happening, much tougher than they thought. Much, much tougher. Much more dangerous. Going to be more deaths that they thought.

But the leaders that we wanted to get are all gone because they’re smart. They say, what do we need this for? So Mosul is going to be a wonderful thing. And Iran should write us a letter of thank you, just like the really stupid — the stupidest deal of all time, a deal that’s going to give Iran absolutely nuclear weapons. Iran should write us yet another letter saying thank you very much, because Iran, as I said many years ago, Iran is taking over Iraq, something they’ve wanted to do forever, but we’ve made it so easy for them.

So we’re now going to take Mosul. And do you know who’s going to be the beneficiary? Iran. Oh, yeah, they’re making — I mean, they are outsmarting — look, you’re not there, you might be involved in that decision. But you were there when you took everybody out of Mosul and out of Iraq. You shouldn’t have been in Iraq, but you did vote for it. You shouldn’t have been in Iraq, but once you were in Iraq, you should have never left the way.

WALLACE: Sir, your two minutes are up.

TRUMP: The point is, the big winner is going to be Iran.

CLINTON: Well, you know, once again, Donald is implying that he didn’t support the invasion of Iraq. I said it was a mistake. I’ve said that years ago. He has consistently denied what is...

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... a very clear fact that...

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... before the invasion, he supported it. And, you know, I just want everybody to go Google it. Google “Donald Trump Iraq.” And you will see the dozens of sources which verify that he was for the invasion of Iraq.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: And you can actually hear the audio of him saying that. Now, why does that matter? Well, it matters because he has not told the truth about that position. I guess he believes it makes him look better now to contrast with me because I did vote for it.

But what’s really important here is to understand all the interplay. Mosul is a Sunni city. Mosul is on the border of Syria. And, yes, we do need to go after Baghdadi, and — just like we went after bin Laden, while you were doing “Celebrity Apprentice,” and we brought him to justice. We need to go after the leadership.

But we need to get rid of them, get rid of their fighters. There are an estimated several thousand fighters in Mosul. They’ve been digging underground. They’ve been prepared to defend. It’s going to be tough fighting. But I think we can take back Mosul, and then we can move on into Syria and take back Raqqa.

This is what we have to do. I’m just amazed that he seems to think that the Iraqi government and our allies and everybody else launched the attack on Mosul to help me in this election, but that’s how Donald thinks. You know, he always is looking for some conspiracy.

TRUMP: Chris, we don’t gain anything.

CLINTON: He has all the conspiracy theories...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Iran is taking over Iraq.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, it’s...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Iran is taking over Iraq. We don’t gain anything.

CLINTON: This conspiracy theory, which he’s been spewing out for quite some time.

TRUMP: If they did it by surprise...

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Wait, wait, wait, Secretary Clinton, it’s an open discussion.

CLINTON: He says...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: We could have gained if they did it by surprise.

WALLACE: Secretary, please let Mr. Trump speak.

CLINTON: ... unfit, and he proves it every time he talks.

TRUMP: No, you are the one that’s unfit. You know, WikiLeaks just actually came out — John Podesta said some horrible things about you, and, boy, was he right. He said some beauties. And you know, Bernie Sanders, he said you have bad judgment. You do.

And if you think that going into Mosul after we let the world know we’re going in, and all of the people that we really wanted — the leaders — they’re all gone. If you think that was good, then you do. Now, John Podesta said you have terrible instincts. Bernie Sanders said you have bad judgment. I agree with both.

CLINTON: Well, you should ask Bernie Sanders who he’s supporting for president. And he has said...

TRUMP: Which is a big mistake.

CLINTON: ... as he has campaigned for me around the country, you are the most dangerous person to run for president in the modern history of America. I think he’s right.

WALLACE: Let’s turn to Aleppo. Mr. Trump, in the last debate, you were both asked about the situation in the Syrian city of Aleppo. And I want to follow up on that, because you said several things in that debate which were not true, sir. You said that Aleppo has basically fallen. In fact, there — in fact, there are... TRUMP: It’s a catastrophe. I mean...

WALLACE: It’s a catastrophe, but there...

TRUMP: ... it’s a mess.

WALLACE: There are a quarter of...

TRUMP: Have you seen it? Have you seen it?

WALLACE: Sir...

TRUMP: Have you seen what’s happening to Aleppo?

WALLACE: Sir, if I may finish my question...

TRUMP: OK, so it hasn’t fallen. Take a look at it.

WALLACE: Well, there are a quarter of a million people still living there and being slaughtered.

TRUMP: That’s right. And they are being slaughtered...

WALLACE: Yes.

TRUMP: ... because of bad decisions.

WALLACE: If I may just finish here, and you also said that — that Syria and Russia are busy fighting ISIS. In fact, they have been the ones who’ve been bombing and shelling eastern Aleppo, and they just announced a humanitarian pause, in effect, admitting that they have been bombing and shelling Aleppo. Would you like to clear that up, sir?

TRUMP: Well, Aleppo is a disaster. It’s a humanitarian nightmare. But it has fallen from the — from any standpoint. I mean, what do you need, a signed document? Take a look at Aleppo. It is so sad when you see what’s happened.

And a lot of this is because of Hillary Clinton, because what’s happened is, by fighting Assad, who turned out to be a lot tougher than she thought, and now she’s going to say, oh, he loves Assad, she’s — he’s just much tougher and much smarter than her and Obama. And everyone thought he was gone two years ago, three years ago. He — he aligned with Russia.

He now also aligned with Iran, who we made very powerful. We gave them $150 billion back. We give them $1.7 billion in cash. I mean, cash. Bundles of cash as big as this stage. We gave them $1.7 billion.

Now they have — he has aligned with Russia and with Iran. They don’t want ISIS, but they have other things, because we’re backing — we’re backing rebels. We don’t know who the rebels are. We’re giving them lots of money, lots of everything. We don’t know who the rebels are. And when and if — and it’s not going to happen, because you have Russia and you have Iran now. But if they ever did overthrow Assad, you might end up with — as bad as Assad is, and he’s a bad guy, but you may very well end up with worse than Assad.

If she did nothing, we’d be in much better shape. And this is what’s caused the great migration, where she’s taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees, who probably in many cases — not probably, who are definitely...

WALLACE: Let me...

TRUMP: ... in many cases, ISIS-aligned, and we now have them in our country, and wait until you see — this is going to be the great Trojan horse. And wait until you see what happens in the coming years. Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, you have talked about — and in the last debate and again today — that you would impose a no-fly zone to try to protect the people of Aleppo and to stop the killing there. President Obama has refused to do that because he fears it’s going to draw us closer or deeper into the conflict.

And General Joseph Dunford, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says you impose a no-fly zone, chances are you’re going to get into a war — his words — with Syria and Russia. So the question I have is, if you impose a no-fly zone — first of all, how do you respond to their concerns? Secondly, if you impose a no-fly zone and a Russian plane violates that, does President Clinton shoot that plane down?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, first of all, I think a no-fly zone could save lives and could hasten the end of the conflict. I’m well aware of the really legitimate concerns that you have expressed from both the president and the general.

This would not be done just on the first day. This would take a lot of negotiation. And it would also take making it clear to the Russians and the Syrians that our purpose here was to provide safe zones on the ground.

We’ve had millions of people leave Syria and those millions of people inside Syria who have been dislocated. So I think we could strike a deal and make it very clear to the Russians and the Syrians that this was something that we believe was in the best interests of the people on the ground in Syria, it would help us with our fight against ISIS.

But I want to respond to what Donald said about refugees. He’s made these claims repeatedly. I am not going to let anyone into this country who is not vetted, who we do not have confidence in. But I am not going to slam the door on women and children. That picture of that little 4-year-old boy in Aleppo, with the blood coming down his face while he sat in an ambulance, is haunting. And so we are going to do very careful, thorough vetting. That does not solve our internal challenges with ISIS and our need to stop radicalization, to work with American Muslim communities who are on the front lines to identify and prevent attacks. In fact, the killer of the dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando, the Pulse nightclub, was born in Queens, the same place Donald was born. So let’s be clear about what the threat is and how we are best going to be able to meet it.

And, yes, some of that threat emanates from over in Syria and Iraq, and we’ve got to keep fighting, and I will defeat ISIS, and some of it is we have to up our game and be much smarter here at home.

WALLACE: Folks, I want to get into our final segment.

TRUMP: But I just have to...

WALLACE: Real quick.

TRUMP: It’s so ridiculous what she — she will defeat ISIS. We should have never let ISIS happen in the first place. And right now, they’re in 32 countries.

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: We should have — wait one second. They had a cease-fire three weeks ago. A cease-fire, the United States, Russia, and Syria. And during the cease-fire, Russia took over vast swatches of land, and then they said we don’t want the cease-fire anymore.

We are so outplayed on missiles, on cease-fires. They are outplayed. Now, she wasn’t there. I assume she had nothing to do with it. But our country is so outplayed by Putin and Assad, and by the way — and by Iran. Nobody can believe how stupid our leadership is.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, Secretary Clinton — no, we need to move on to our final segment, and that is the national debt, which has not been discussed until tonight.

Our national debt, as a share of the economy, our GDP, is now 77 percent. That’s the highest since just after World War II. But the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget says, Secretary Clinton, under your plan, debt would rise to 86 percent of GDP over the next 10 years. Mr. Trump, under your plan, they say it would rise to 105 percent of GDP over the next 10 years. The question is, why are both of you ignoring this problem? Mr. Trump, you go first.

TRUMP: Well, I say they’re wrong, because I’m going to create tremendous jobs. And we’re bringing GDP from, really, 1 percent, which is what it is now, and if she got in, it will be less than zero. But we’re bringing it from 1 percent up to 4 percent. And I actually think we can go higher than 4 percent. I think you can go to 5 percent or 6 percent. And if we do, you don’t have to bother asking your question, because we have a tremendous machine. We will have created a tremendous economic machine once again. To do that, we’re taking back jobs. We’re not going to let our companies be raided by other countries where we lose all our jobs, we don’t make our product anymore. It’s very sad. But I’m going to create a — the kind of a country that we were from the standpoint of industry. We used to be there. We’ve given it up. We’ve become very, very sloppy.

We’ve had people that are political hacks making the biggest deals in the world, bigger than companies. You take these big companies, these trade deals are far bigger than these companies, and yet we don’t use our great leaders, many of whom back me and many of whom back Hillary, I must say. But we don’t use those people. Those are the people — these are the greatest negotiators in the world. We have the greatest businesspeople in the world. We have to use them to negotiate our trade deals.

We use political hacks. We use people that get the position because they gave — they made a campaign contribution and they’re dealing with China and people that are very much smarter than they are. So we have to use our great people.

But that being said, we will create an economic machine the likes of which we haven’t seen in many decades. And people, Chris, will again go back to work and they’ll make a lot of money. And we’ll have companies that will grow and expand and start from new.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, first, when I hear Donald talk like that and know that his slogan is “Make America Great Again,” I wonder when he thought America was great. And before he rushes and says, “You know, before you and President Obama were there,” I think it’s important to recognize that he has been criticizing our government for decades.

You know, back in 1987, he took out a $100,000 ad in the New York Times, during the time when President Reagan was president, and basically said exactly what he just said now, that we were the laughingstock of the world. He was criticizing President Reagan. This is the way Donald thinks about himself, puts himself into, you know, the middle and says, “You know, I alone can fix it,” as he said on the convention stage.

But if you look at the debt, which is the issue you asked about, Chris, I pay for everything I’m proposing. I do not add a penny to the national debt. I take that very seriously, because I do think it’s one of the issues we’ve got to come to grips with.

So when I talk about how we’re going to pay for education, how we’re going to invest in infrastructure, how we’re going to get the cost of prescription drugs down, and a lot of the other issues that people talk to me about all the time, I’ve made it very clear we are going where the money is. We are going to ask the wealthy and corporations to pay their fair share.

And there is no evidence whatsoever that that will slow down or diminish our growth. In fact, I think just the opposite. We’ll have what economists call middle-out growth. We’ve got to get back to rebuilding the middle class, the families of America. That’s where growth will come from. That’s why I want to invest in you. I want to invest in your family.

And I think that’s the smartest way to grow the economy, to make the economy fairer. And we just have a big disagreement about this. It may be because of our experiences. You know, he started off with his dad as a millionaire...

TRUMP: Yeah, yeah, we’ve heard — we’ve heard this before, Hillary.

CLINTON: I started off with — my dad was a small-business man.

TRUMP: We’ve heard this before.

CLINTON: And I think it — you know, it’s a difference that affects how we see the world and what we want to do with the economy.

WALLACE: Time.

TRUMP: Thank you, Hillary. Could I just respond?

WALLACE: Well, no, sir, because we’re running out of time...

TRUMP: Because I did disagree with Ronald Reagan very strongly on trade. I disagreed with him. We should have been much tougher on trade even then. I’ve been waiting for years. Nobody does it right.

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: And frankly, now we’re going to do it right.

WALLACE: All right. The one last area I want to get into with you in this debate is the fact that the biggest driver of our debt is entitlements, which is 60 percent of all federal spending. Now, the Committee for federal — a Responsible Federal Budget has looked at both of your plans and they say neither of you has a serious plan that is going to solve the fact that Medicare’s going to run out of money in the 2020s, Social Security is going to run out of money in the 2030s, and at that time, recipients are going to take huge cuts in their benefits.

So, in effect, the final question I want to ask you in this regard is — and let me start with you, Mr. Trump, would President Trump make a deal to save Medicare and Social Security that included both tax increases and benefit cuts, in effect, a grand bargain on entitlements?

TRUMP: I’m cutting taxes. We’re going to grow the economy. It’s going to grow at a record rate of growth.

WALLACE: That’s not going to help in the entitlements.

TRUMP: No, it’s going to totally help you. And one thing we have to do: Repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare. It’s destroying our country. It’s destroying our businesses, our small business and our big businesses. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

You take a look at the kind of numbers that that will cost us in the year ’17, it is a disaster. If we don’t repeal and replace — now, it’s probably going to die of its own weight. But Obamacare has to go. It’s — the premiums are going up 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent. Next year they’re going to go up over 100 percent.

And I’m really glad that the premiums have started — at least the people see what’s happening, because she wants to keep Obamacare and she wants to make it even worse, and it can’t get any worse. Bad health care at the most expensive price. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

WALLACE: And, Secretary Clinton, same question, because at this point, Social Security and Medicare are going to run out, the trust funds are going to run out of money. Will you as president entertain — will you consider a grand bargain, a deal that includes both tax increases and benefit cuts to try to save both programs?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, I am on record as saying that we need to put more money into the Social Security Trust Fund. That’s part of my commitment to raise taxes on the wealthy. My Social Security payroll contribution will go up, as will Donald’s, assuming he can’t figure out how to get out of it. But what we want to do is to replenish the Social Security Trust Fund...

TRUMP: Such a nasty woman.

CLINTON: ... by making sure that we have sufficient resources, and that will come from either raising the cap and/or finding other ways to get more money into it. I will not cut benefits. I want to enhance benefits for low-income workers and for women who have been disadvantaged by the current Social Security system.

But what Donald is proposing with these massive tax cuts will result in a $20 trillion additional national debt. That will have dire consequences for Social Security and Medicare.

And I’ll say something about the Affordable Care Act, which he wants to repeal. The Affordable Care Act extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund. So if repeals it, our Medicare problem gets worse. What we need to do is go after...

TRUMP: Your husband disagrees with you.

CLINTON: ... the long-term health care drivers. We’ve got to get costs down, increase value, emphasize wellness. I have a plan for doing that. And I think that we will be able to get entitlement spending under control by with more resources and harder decisions.

WALLACE: This is — this is the final time, probably to both of your delight, that you’re going to be on a stage together in this campaign. I would like to end it on a positive note. You had not agreed to closing statements, but it seems to me in a funny way that might make it more interesting because you haven’t prepared closing statements.

So I’d like you each to take — and we’re going to put a clock up, a minute, as the final question in the final debate, to tell the American people why they should elect you to be the next president. This is another new mini-segment. Secretary Clinton, it’s your turn to go first.

CLINTON: Well, I would like to say to everyone watching tonight that I’m reaching out to all Americans — Democrats, Republicans, and independents — because we need everybody to help make our country what it should be, to grow the economy, to make it fairer, to make it work for everyone. We need your talents, your skills, your commitments, your energy, your ambition.

You know, I’ve been privileged to see the presidency up close. And I know the awesome responsibility of protecting our country and the incredible opportunity of working to try to make life better for all of you. I have made the cause of children and families really my life’s work.

That’s what my mission will be in the presidency. I will stand up for families against powerful interests, against corporations. I will do everything that I can to make sure that you have good jobs, with rising incomes, that your kids have good educations from preschool through college. I hope you will give me a chance to serve as your president.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: She’s raising the money from the people she wants to control. Doesn’t work that way.

But when I started this campaign, I started it very strongly. It’s called “Make America Great Again.” We’re going to make America great. We have a depleted military. It has to be helped, has to be fixed. We have the greatest people on Earth in our military. We don’t take care of our veterans. We take care of illegal **immigrants**, people that come into the country illegally, better than we take care of our vets. That can’t happen.

Our policemen and women are disrespected. We need law and order, but we need justice, too. Our inner cities are a disaster. You get shot walking to the store. They have no education. They have no jobs. I will do more for African-Americans and Latinos than she can ever do in 10 lifetimes.

All she’s done is talk to the African-Americans and to the Latinos, but they get the vote, and then they come back, they say, we’ll see you in four years. We are going to make America strong again, and we are going to make America great again, and it has to start now. We cannot take four more years of Barack Obama, and that’s what you get when you get her.

WALLACE: Thank you both.

(APPLAUSE)

Secretary Clinton — hold on just a moment, folks. Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump, I want to thank you both for participating in all three of these debates.

That brings to an end this year’s debates sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. We want to thank the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and its students for having us. Now the decision is up to you.

While millions have already voted, Election Day, November 8th, is just 20 days away. One thing everyone here can agree on: We hope you will go vote. It is one of the honors and obligations of living in this great country. Thank you, and good night.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race [http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook [https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter [https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump said on Wednesday that he might not accept the results of the presidential election if he felt it was rigged against him — a stunning statement from a major party nominee and one that Hillary Clinton called “horrifying” — in a final debate that swung wildly between civil and caustic.

“I will look at it at the time,” Mr. Trump said of the election result. “I will keep you in suspense.”

Mr. Trump, under enormous pressure to halt Mrs. Clinton’s steady rise in opinion polls, came across as frustrated and sarcastic at several points as he tried to rally conservative voters with hard-line stands on illegal **immigration** and abortion rights yet kept finding himself drawn onto perilous political territory by Mrs. Clinton and the debate’s moderator, Chris Wallace.

He sputtered when Mrs. Clinton charged that he would be “a puppet” of President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia if elected. He lashed out repeatedly, saying that “she’s been proven to be a liar on so many different ways” and that “she’s guilty of a very, very serious crime” over her State Department email practices. And by the end of the debate, when Mrs. Clinton needled him over Social Security [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social\_security\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], Mr. Trump lost his cool and snapped, “Such a nasty woman.”

Mrs. Clinton was rarely rattled, and made a determined effort to rise above Mr. Trump’s taunts while making overtures to undecided voters. She particularly sought to appeal to Republicans and independents who have doubts about Mr. Trump, arguing that she was not an opponent of the Second Amendment as her opponent claimed, and promising to be tougher and shrewder on national security than Mr. Trump.

She zeroed in on Russia, arguing that Mr. Trump was too complimentary to Mr. Putin and had failed to condemn Russian espionage against her campaign’s internal email.

If Mrs. Clinton was laying bait, Mr. Trump took it.

“I don’t know Putin — he said nice things about me — if we got along well, that would be good,” Mr. Trump said. “Look, Putin — from everything I see — has no respect for this person.”

“That’s because he’d rather have a puppet as president of the United States,” Mrs. Clinton shot back in one of the toughest lines of the night.

“No puppet, no puppet,” Mr. Trump sputtered. “You’re the puppet.” He quickly recovered and said, “She has been outsmarted and outplayed worse than anybody I’ve ever seen in any government, whatsoever.”

With 20 days left before Election Day and early voting already underway in Florida, Ohio and several other key states, the debate felt less like an argument between equals than a last-ditch attempt by a fading candidate, Mr. Trump, to save himself.

Mr. Trump sought throughout the debate to recover from a politically damaging three weeks. He has been unable to gain traction in the polls from his strategy of assailing the Clintons as corrupt and immoral; the news media as biased and bent on rigging the election against him; and the nine women who have come forward to accuse him of unwanted sexual advances as liars and, in some cases, unattractive — language that has **alienated** many female voters and made others question Mr. Trump’s temperament.

Mr. Trump said, in response to a question from the debate moderator, Chris Wallace of Fox News, that the claims of the women had been “debunked” and that they had been put forward by Mrs. Clinton’s campaign.

But after he denied ridiculing the looks of the women accusing him of sexual harassment — “I did not say that,” he repeated three times — Mrs. Clinton repeated nearly verbatim his two comments from last week about the appearances of a pair of his accusers.

“Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger,” she said. “He goes after their dignity, their self-worth; there’s not a women anywhere who doesn’t know what that feels like.”

After Mrs. Clinton finished an extended condemnation, Mr. Trump said only: “Nobody has more respect for women than I do, nobody.”

On **immigration**, Mr. Trump argued that Mrs. Clinton wanted to give illegal **immigrants** “amnesty” and that “she wants to have open borders.”

“We have to have strong borders, we have to keep the drugs out of our country — right now we’re getting the drugs, they’re getting the cash,” he added. “We have some bad hombres here, and we’re going to get them out.”

Mrs. Clinton recalled meeting a young girl in Las Vegas whose parents had been threatened, and noted that Mr. Trump has said that every illegal **immigrant**would ultimately be subject to deportation.

“I don’t want to rip families apart,” Mrs. Clinton said. “I don’t want to see the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country.” She added that Mr. Trump’s focus on deportation would “rip our country apart.”

At several points, Mrs. Clinton tried to bait Mr. Trump into an outburst, such as when she said that he “choked” during his meeting this summer with the president of Mexico when he did not press him on Mexico paying to build a border wall.

But Mr. Trump pivoted to attack former President Bill Clinton’s administration for supporting the North American Free Trade Agreement and assailed Mrs. Clinton for her past comments supporting “open borders” in the Western Hemisphere.

The two candidates also tangled over abortion rights. After initially declining to flatly say whether he would support overturning Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion, Mr. Trump conceded that the justices he would appoint to the court would do just that.

“If we put another two or perhaps three justices on, that’s really what will happen,” he said. “That’ll happen automatically in my opinion.”

Mrs. Clinton responded with a full-throated defense of Roe and abortion rights.

“The government has no business in the decisions that women make,” she said.

Mr. Trump retorted, “If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby.”

Mrs. Clinton appeared visibly angry. “You should meet with some of the women I’ve met with,” she said, accusing him of using “scare rhetoric.”

Mrs. Clinton used the opening question about the Supreme Court to make a broad appeal to voters to consider the future of the United States under her presidency or a Trump administration. “What kind of country are we going to be? What kind of opportunities are we going to provide for our citizens, what kind of rights will Americans have?”

Mr. Trump asserted that if Mrs. Clinton won, the Second Amendment would become “a very, very small replica of what we have now.” He also said he would appoint justices who “will interpret the Constitution the way the founders want it interpreted.”

Mrs. Clinton quickly tried to undercut Mr. Trump on guns.

“I support the Second Amendment,” she said, noting that she had lived in Arkansas and represented upstate New York where many gun owners lived. “When I think about what I need to do, we have 33,000 people a year who die from guns. I think we need comprehensive background checks” and to close loopholes that make it easier for Americans to obtain guns.

Mr. Trump would not drop the issue, though, and portrayed Mrs. Clinton as overly emotional in her reaction to the Supreme Court decision in the case that allowed an individual right to bear arms.

“She was extremely angry about it,” Mr. Trump said. “Hillary was extremely upset.”

But Mrs. Clinton said that her reaction was based on deep concern that even toddlers would be in jeopardy under the ruling. She then pivoted and argued that Mr. Trump was doing the bidding of “the gun lobby,” noting that “Donald has been strong supported by the N.R.A.”

Mr. Trump has intensified his hard-edged comments in the final weeks of the campaign, instead of focusing on broadening his appeal and wooing swing voters. In the face of widespread condemnation for vulgar and demeaning comments toward women, he has mocked his accusers while turning his fire toward the news media and Speaker Paul D. Ryan and insisting, without evidence, that the election is being “rigged” against him.

He has even veered into the realm of the conspiratorial, inveighing against global bankers who he claims are, with Mrs. Clinton’s consent, determined to destroy America’s sovereignty.

Mr. Trump’s conduct has alarmed mainstream Republicans who have long thought Mrs. Clinton was likely to win but had been hoping their controversial standard-bearer could at least run a competitive race through Election Day to avoid undermining the rest of the party’s candidates.

Mrs. Clinton, seemingly intent not only on soundly beating Mr. Trump but also on humiliating him, has responded to Mr. Trump’s campaign misfortunes by launching an offensive into a handful of conservative-leaning states, including Arizona.

The first lady, Michelle Obama, perhaps the campaign’s most treasured surrogate, was set to speak at a rally in Phoenix on Thursday and the campaign announced this week that it would be directing over $2 million into the state.

Clinton aides are also eyeing Georgia, which has not voted for a Democrat for president since 1992, and even Utah, where Mormon contempt for Mr. Trump has created perhaps the unlikeliest battleground in recent presidential history.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race [http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook [https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter [https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Presidential Debate: What You Missed [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A 61-year-old Brooklyn resident from China was walking on the street one day in April when a woman approached her and struck up a friendly conversation in Cantonese. She claimed to be a clairvoyant, and then she delivered a dire warning. “You or a family member will die soon because of a curse,” she said.

That, according to an indictment unsealed in New York State Supreme Court on Thursday, was the hook in a ruse known as the “blessing scam.” The scammer, a 44-year-old woman from China, told the older woman that the only way to reverse the curse was with a blessing — over her life’s savings and jewelry.

The victim returned with $140,000 worth of cash and pieces of 24-karat gold jewelry in a bag, which she was told not to open immediately, in order to preserve the blessing. She was distracted, the bag was switched with another, and her property was stolen, though she did not realize it until later, when she opened the bag.

The scheme, the authorities say, was carried out by Chinese nationals who, for the last several years, have been entering the United States to target Chinese **immigrants** in neighborhoods across New York as well as in cities across the country.

On Thursday, the Brooklyn district attorney’s office arraigned Xuekun Su, 44, on eight counts, including grand larceny as a hate crime.

According to the police, two months after taking advantage of the Brooklyn woman, Ms. Su victimized another in Sunset Park, Brooklyn, for $19,000. She also committed the scheme in Manhattan and Flushing, Queens, stealing more than $400,000, they said.

The authorities said she worked with two associates, who have not been arrested.

The arrest was the result of a rather busy summer in the blessing scam business. Deputy Chief Joseph V. Dowling of the New York Police Department[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/new\_york\_city\_police\_department/index.html?inline=nyt-org]’s grand larceny division said there had been seven cases of this type of fraud in the city since the beginning of the year, most of them over the summer.

So far, the authorities said, they had arrested four of eight suspects, including three suspects indicted in Brooklyn in September and charged with stealing $85,000 from one 62-year-old woman.

The police believe the other four fled back to China. The perpetrators, Chief Dowling said, all came from the southwestern city of Maoming, in Guangdong province. They entered the United States through Canada or via a tourist visa.

The profits from the crimes were substantial: more than $600,000 in cash and jewelry. The police have been able to recover only $11,000, they said.

Ms. Su pleaded not guilty. Her court-appointed lawyer, Morris Shamuil, said that Ms. Su, herself, was a victim, akin to a woman forced into prostitution. “She informed me she was smuggled into this country and promised citizenship, legal residency and a job doing housekeeping,” Mr. Shamuil said. “She was told that if she wanted to stay in this country, she would have to do what she was told, or be thrown out on the street.”

Mr. Shamuil said that Ms. Su flew from China to Canada and then was smuggled into the United States and that she had told him she did not receive any of the money.

Judge Danny Chun set bail at $250,000.

Chinese **immigrant** associations in New York are aware of the blessing scheme, and over the last two years have conducted education workshops[http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/06/27/with-tote-bags-police-try-to-combat-a-blessing-scam/] with older people, providing tip sheets. So, too, have elder abuse and **immigrant** fraud divisions of the Manhattan district attorney’s office and the Brooklyn district attorney’s office, which created the **Immigrant** Fraud Unit in 2014.

“It’s very dangerous,” said Tim Law, 69, the chief executive adviser for the Chinese-American Social Services Center[https://www.facebook.com/casscenter/] in Gravesend, Brooklyn. “The people who scam people are very smart. They pick up their targets in the supermarket, or the doctor’s office or at the bakery, listening in on their conversations.”

Dr. Law conducts workshops everywhere, from his center to churches to tai chi classes at Seth Low Park. On Wednesday, he gathered a group of nine women, many of whom said they knew victims in the neighborhood.

Chan Hua Tang, 77, said in Cantonese, with Dr. Law interpreting, that a friend from her village was victimized two years ago.

Ms. Chan said the woman had been approached on the street by a woman who told her that “her grandchildren have an evil spirit.” The scammer, according to Ms. Chan, told her friend that to get rid of the evil spirit, “you have to go home, get your money and jewelry.” The woman “had hid the money in her basement,” Ms. Chan said. “She got $40,000 to $50,000, and her jewelry.”

Older **immigrants** tend to be targets for reasons that go beyond their age or their isolation, prosecutors and social scientists say. Blessings, superstitions and notions of karma are embedded in Chinese culture, extending from rituals in Buddhist temples to local fortune tellers.

Peter Kwong, a professor of Asian-American studies at Hunter College, said that many people had probably carried their traditions with them to the United States: It was common in rural Chinese communities, he said, to check in with a fortune teller before making decisions.

“You consult a soothsayer regularly, almost as if you consult a shrink regularly,” Mr. Kwong said.

Shame can complicate investigations, since many victims are afraid to come forward, prosecutors say. The victims in Thursday’s case were not named in the indictment, and efforts to reach previous victims were unsuccessful.

Often, according to prosecutors in Brooklyn and Manhattan, victims do not report the crime because they do not speak English, or because they lack legal status or are worried they would forfeit government benefits if they revealed they had been holding large amounts of cash.

Chief Dowling said that while the crime seemed to be on the upswing now, its high point[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/08/nyregion/in-chinese-blessing-scam-suspects-become-the-victims.html] was in 2012 and 2013. “We were getting hit to a larger degree; there was probably 70 cases back then,” he said.

But the cases are unlikely to end, authorities said. “As long as there’s money to be made, it will continue,” said Kin Ng, an assistant district attorney in Brooklyn and the chief of the **Immigrant** Fraud Unit. “These types of crimes are just too lucrative.”

\* Telling Fortunes, and, From Time to Time, Also Taking Them[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/06/nyregion/in-new-york-fortunes-told-and-too-often-taken.html]

\* Scam Suspects Become the Victims[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/08/nyregion/in-chinese-blessing-scam-suspects-become-the-victims.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The three presidential debates had no shortage of discussion about groping, beauty queens and Twitter habits. A question on energy policy this month was memorable only because it gave rise to a meme about the red sweater sported by the voter, Ken Bone, who asked it. Even on Wednesday, when the moderator made policy a priority, the discussion between Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] remained skin deep.

Lost in the bluster and bombast has been the kind of detailed policy talk that traditionally consumes candidates this time of year. While onstage stalking and shimmying kept body-language experts busy, many who care about tax policy, **immigration**, health care and climate change[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] were left with little to chew on.

Undecided voters curious where the candidates stood on American relations with Israel or their views on the Keystone XL[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/k/keystone\_pipeline/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] oil pipeline were left to look elsewhere. But even the subjects that did come up didn’t result in robust discussions of how the nation’s most pressing problems should be solved.

Following are some of the issues that got short shrift.

Taxes

Debate audiences have heard much jousting over how little Mr. Trump has paid in income taxes, but far less about how much voters will have to pay if he or Mrs. Clinton is elected.

Mr. Trump accused her of wanting a big tax increase; Mrs. Clinton said his tax plan would send the country spinning into a recession. A minor tussle about the future of “carried interest” was pretty much it: more finger food than main course.

“It’s been largely lacking,” said Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform[http://www.atr.org/]. “He says, ‘I want to cut taxes, she wants to raise them.’ They haven’t focused on the specifics.”

Mr. Norquist, who prefers Mr. Trump’s tax plan, has been clamoring to hear more about how it will help businesses and spur economic growth. And why was no attention paid to the taxation of companies in the “sharing economy,” like Uber and Airbnb?

**Immigration**

The construction of a wall along the United States’ border with Mexico has been a centerpiece of Mr. Trump’s campaign, and an **immigration** overhaul is an important priority for Mrs. Clinton, yet the topic received scant attention.

Mr. Trump promised to get “bad hombres” out of the country. But little light was shed on how he or Mrs. Clinton would prioritize the removal of undocumented **immigrants**, or what must be done differently to secure the border beyond existing measures.

“Voters are owed a detailed description of how we should move toward comprehensive **immigration** reform,” said Michael Dear[http://ced.berkeley.edu/ced/faculty-staff/michael-dear], a University of California at Berkeley professor who has researched the feasibility of a border wall.

The Supreme Court

The future of the Supreme Court is one of the biggest concerns among Republicans and Democrats, but only cursory commentary was given to the sorts of questions that the court, and any new justices the next president appoints, may have to consider.

“Of all the issues, this is the one place where the election can have a clear and instant effect,” said Julian [http://www.princeton.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/~jzelizer/] E. [http://www.princeton.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/~jzelizer/] Zelizer[http://www.princeton.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/~jzelizer/], a history professor at Princeton University.

Mrs. Clinton has said that Judge Merrick Garland, President Obama’s pick to fill the current vacancy, should be approved by the current Congress, but she still has not been clear about how she would handle his nomination if she is elected and he has not yet been confirmed. On Wednesday night, she spoke only generally about how she would appoint judges who would stand up for the American people.

Mr. Trump has offered little detail about what he prizes in potential Supreme Court justices, other than to say that he would fill the court with jurists in the mold of Antonin Scalia and those who are likely to overturn Roe v. Wade.

Health Care

Republicans have been fighting to repeal the Affordable Care Act since President Obama signed it into law, but in 2016 it has become something of an afterthought.

Mr. Trump wants to replace the health law with something, he says, that “works.” Mrs. Clinton has acknowledged that parts of the law need fixing, but said nothing specific about how she would curb rising health care costs.

“The surprise has been the nonexistent discussion of how to contain prescription drug prices,” said John Rother, president of the National Coalition on Health Care[http://www.nchc.org/].

Still, Mr. Rother said he sympathized with the desire to keep things simple. “Hillary has to be cautious given her history and her wonk tendencies,” he said, “and Trump is uninformed on health policy.”

Entitlements

With so little focus on deficits, the national debt[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/n/national\_debt\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and funding for Social Security[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social\_security\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], the U.S. Chamber of Commerce wrote to Chris Wallace, the moderator of Wednesday’s debate, imploring him to press the candidates about their plans.

“We have heard very little to this point,” the chamber wrote, adding that “what we have heard has been distressing, with the candidates proposing to either do nothing or actually expand (rather than reform) these programs.”

At the debate, Mr. Trump said that his tax cuts would stimulate economic growth and finance entitlement programs. Mrs. Clinton said that she would tax the rich and reduce entitlement spending by making “harder decisions.” But the discussion ran aground when Mrs. Clinton, in an aside, poked at Mr. Trump over his tax avoidance, and he called her a “nasty woman.”

Climate Change

Climate change might be one of the most consequential issues facing the planet, but it barely got a mention in the three 90-minute presidential debates: Fewer than five and a half minutes all told, according to the environmental website Grist[http://grist.org/election-2016/climate-airtime-presidential-debate/].

Mrs. Clinton hit Mr. Trump for suggesting that global warming was a “hoax” perpetrated by the Chinese, yet she offered few solutions beyond the deployment of more solar panels. Mr. Trump underscored his support for domestic drilling and burning coal, and in the second debate he dismissed alternative energy sources by saying the United States could not be powered by wind and solar energy[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/solar-energy/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] alone.

So little attention was paid to climate change that some activists took matters into their own hands. The Yale School of Environmental Studies published a [https://twitter.com/YaleE360/status/788908849709260800] guide [https://twitter.com/YaleE360/status/788908849709260800] on social media[https://twitter.com/YaleE360/status/788908849709260800] about what Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump have said about energy and the environment to help voters judge for themselves.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In one corner, we had “bad hombres.” In the other, “nasty woman.”

The phrases were both uttered by Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] during the third and final debate against Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] on Wednesday night in Las Vegas, in the bitter race for the White House.

And the internet pounced, adding them to its meme factory and its profiteering assembly line, even as the terms drew mocking comments and disgust from social media users.

Within hours, dozens of sellers on Etsy had whipped up merchandise — T-shirts and buttons — bearing both slogans. The comedian Chelsea Handler tossed out a poll to [https://twitter.com/chelseahandler/status/788932074333876224] T[https://twitter.com/chelseahandler/status/788932074333876224] witter users[https://twitter.com/chelseahandler/status/788932074333876224]: “Are you a bad hombre or a nasty woman?” After about 12 hours, “nasty woman” was winning with 60 percent of the vote.

Mr. Trump, the Republican nominee, unfurled the “hombre” line when he took on a question about **immigration** from the moderator, Chris Wallace.

“And once the border is secured, at a later date, we’ll make a determination as to the rest. But we have some bad hombres here, and we’re going to get them out,” he said.

Critics howled that the phrase was racist and in line with his previous description[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/17/us/politics/donald-trump-runs-for-president-this-time-for-real-he-says.html] of undocumented Mexican **immigrants** as criminals, drug dealers and “rapists,” though he allowed at the time that some of them were “good people.”

Later in the debate, as Mrs. Clinton, the Democratic nominee, was explaining her plan to improve the Social Security[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social\_security\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] program, Mr. Trump muttered, “Such a nasty woman.”

That set off a fierce reaction on Twitter, as women sought to reclaim and embrace a label[https://twitter.com/JillFilipovic/status/789109631977132036] that many saw as another in a long line of sexist insults unleashed by Mr. Trump at women.

“From one #NastyWoman to another, you were an inspiration last night,” Nancy Pelosi, the former speaker of the House, tweeted[https://twitter.com/TeamPelosi/status/789106866391515136] on Thursday.

“RT if you’re a nasty woman and it’s made your life a freakin’ pleasure,” the actress and creator of “Girls” Lena Dunham posted on Twitter. Within an hour, it had 1,300 retweets.

At Vox, the writer Liz Plank[http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/10/20/13341416/nasty-woman-feminist-rallying-cry-hillary-clinton] said, the phrase was “the feminist rallying cry that Hillary Clinton needed.”

A Janet Jackson fan immediately went into action and spliced footage of the debate into a video[http://www.ew.com/article/2016/10/20/trump-nasty-woman-janet-jackson?xid=entertainment-weekly\_socialflow\_twitter] of her 1986 song “Nasty.”

Mrs. Clinton herself brushed off the comment. “I just didn’t pay any attention to that,” she said[http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/301944-clinton-on-being-called-a-nasty-woman-i-didnt-pay-any] after the debate.

Merriam Webster said[http://www.merriam-webster.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/news-trend-watch/confusion-after-trumps-bad-hombres-comment-led-to-a-spike-in-lookups-for-ombre-20161019] “hombre” and “nasty” both topped its list[https://twitter.com/MerriamWebster/status/789112861075406848] of the most-searched words during the debate — as did “ombre,” an old card game, and “ombré,” a type of hair style that involves colors fading into each other. The dictionary cited uses of the phrase “bad hombre” as far back as the 19th century.

The memes also quickly gained steam on the online marketplace. Some of the craftspeople who sell merchandise on Etsy were primed to take advantage of an election that tends to offer up memes on a daily basis.

Ginger Knight of Philadelphia, who described herself as “not really that political,” said she was more focused on the Republican nominee, reading Facebookstatuses to see which of Mr. Trump’s phrases were catching on with other users. “And I just started making word buttons,” she said.

She made a “bad hombres” button, a “nasty woman” button and a “rigged” button, among others. They’ve been selling “every couple of minutes” she said.

Laura Brittain, another Etsy user and a Democrat from North Carolina, said that her source for quotes most likely to sell well on Etsy came from her teenage daughter.

“If we’re watching the debate and something comes up and our 17-year-old daughter keeps bringing it up, we usually make a shirt or make something,” she said.

“Last night she just kept saying, ‘He reminds me of an angry Cheetoh,’ ” she said of Mr. Trump.

While she was planning to vote for Mrs. Clinton, Ms. Brittain said, she wasn’t particularly enthusiastic.

Others saw their use of Mr. Trump’s comments as a form of political expression. Erin Boyd of Bellingham, Wash., who has been on Etsy for about a decade, made her own version of the “nasty woman” T-shirt.

“I don’t usually make meme-type shirts,” she said. “But in this election, you just can’t not. It’s so easy because there have been so many amazing quotes from Mr. Trump.”

Ms. Boyd, a registered Democrat, sold out of the shirts overnight and re-listed them Thursday morning, interrupting a phone conversation to remark that she had just sold another one.

“They’re selling like literal hot cakes,” she said. “It’s insane.”

She said this was a particularly compelling election for women given the contrast between the two candidates, and that she planned on voting for Mrs. Clinton.

“We have a woman running for president. Her opponent is a man from whom we can get quotes like” this [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html] and “ ‘such a nasty woman,’ ” she said, before pausing to think.

“It’s sort of like the high and low of being a woman in America,” she added.

\* Hillary Clinton, Mocking and Taunting in Debate, Turns the Tormentor[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump.html]

\* Who Won the Debate? Hillary Clinton, the ‘Nasty Woman’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/21/us/politics/who-won-the-third-debate.html]
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Tel Aviv Museum of art isa somber slab of concrete built in the no-fuss brutalist style of the late ’60s. The architect who planned the museum also designed Israel’s nuclear reactor; such is the overlap between culture and political exigency in the country. One Sunday in March, a throng of artists, actors and writers clustered in the museum’s main auditorium. They were awaiting the arrival of Miri Regev, Israel’s culture and sports minister, of the ruling Likud Party. A year earlier, Benjamin Netanyahu, Israel’s prime minister and the chairman of Likud, secured a fourth term in office and swore in his ministers, a coalition widely regarded as the most right-wing in Israeli history.

In that time, Regev has done just about everything she can to **alienate** and enrage those she considers the elites, or the “cultural junta,” of Israel. Leftists. Secularists. Tel Avivians. Ashkenazim — Jews of European origin. People who, as she told me recently, think that “classical music is better than the Andalusian music” of Morocco, or that “Chekhov is more important than Maimonides.”

Regev, who is 51, grew up in Kiryat Gat, a development town in Israel’s south, which — like many other towns in Israel’s peripheria, or periphery, the areas outside the country’s urban center — was set up in the 1950s to house the influx of Jewish **immigrants** from Muslim countries. In person she is warm; after two minutes of conversation she will call you kapara (“sweetheart” in Jewish Moroccan dialect) or neshama (“soul” in Hebrew). Yet in public life she comes across as crass and hotheaded. That afternoon in the museum, she was venturing into hostile territory. She had agreed to speak at an arts-and-culture conference organized by the liberal newspaper Haaretz to address the interplay of state funding and cultural production. Many of those in attendance wondered if Regev had come to make amends: Shortly after her appointment, at a meeting with stage actors and guild representatives, Regev all but acknowledged being driven by a sense of political vendetta. “We got 30 seats” — in the Knesset — “you got only 20,” she told those present. She later gave an interview in which she called the Israeli creative class “tight-assed” and “ungrateful.”

When at last Regev materialized, wearing an all-black ensemble and crimson lipstick, a murmur swept through the auditorium. She is a striking, fiery presence with wide-set eyes, prominent lips and dark hair streaked with reddish highlights. Standing in front of the audience, her expression set between a smirk and a scowl, she clutched the lectern with one hand. “I was always told to start a speech with a quote; it makes for a cultured impression,” she began. “So here goes. As the famed Chinese philosopher Sun Tzu once put it” — she switched to accented English — “Cut the bullshit! Cut the bullshit!”

Stunned silence fell over the crowd. Then people began to jeer. Someone cried out, “The minister of occupation!”

“We will expose the hypocrisy and the greed,” Regev continued, her voice rising. “We will guarantee loyalty to the laws of the country!”

People rose from their seats and booed. “Shame on you!” a voice rang out.

Since joining Likud in 2008, Regev has become known for her provocations no less than for her nationalist fervor. The columnist Nahum Barnea called her “a walking graffiti wall.” There was the time she described migrant workers from Africa as “cancer in our body.” And the time she lashed out at an Arab member of the Knesset: “Go to Gaza, you traitor!” She sometimes unfurls an Israeli flag during speeches and has on occasion taken reporters to pray at the Western Wall before an interview. In 2013, she introduced a bill to annex the Jordan Valley, a move that would all but foreclose the prospect of a two-state solution.

Now she continued on a familiar course, stating that the ministry would stop serving “as an A.T.M.” and calling to divert money away from “powerful institutions.” At one point she paused. “Let’s admit it,” she said. “Your culture demands exclusive funding, while another culture has been silenced for years.”

That other culture is Mizrahi, or “Eastern.” It’s a catchall term that includes Jewish communities from Muslim countries in the Middle East and North Africa, as well as the Sephardic Jews, whose origins can be traced to Spain and Portugal, who settled there. These communities **immigrated** to Israel in mass waves after its founding in 1948 and into the early 1950s, upending its demographic makeup: The Jewish population, almost exclusively Ashkenazi, became more than 40 percent Mizrahi. But it wasn’t just the country’s ethnic composition that changed. The Jewish population that predated the founding of the state was primarily young, secular and idealistic; it was also heavily male. By contrast, the new Mizrahi arrivals tended to be large families from traditional societies. In their ethnic garb, often with no knowledge of Hebrew, they struck the native-born Israeli sabras and the European Ashkenazim as provincial and uneducated. Zalman Shazar, a future president of Israel, warned that these new **immigrants** “never knew the taste of high school.” This sense of superiority was heightened by the economic plight of the Mizrahim: Having no real accommodation or employment for them, the government of David Ben-Gurion placed them in overcrowded transit camps, where squalor and hunger became the norm.

The socioeconomic gap between Ashkenazim and Mizrahim has since narrowed, spurred by a rise in interethnic marriage (about a third of Jewish Israeli children born today are ethnically mixed). But it hasn’t disappeared altogether. Mizrahim earn roughly 25 percent less per capita than Ashkenazim, according to Momi Dahan, a professor of public policy at Hebrew University. Social and cultural tensions still percolate. In a 2007 poll, more than half of respondents characterized relations between Ashkenazim and Mizrahim in the country as “not good.”

For Regev, “not good” is an understatement. To her, the public discourse in Israel is rife with ethnically charged condescension. Derogatory terms like ars (“thug” in Hebrew slang) and freha (“bimbo”) have come to connote a kind of garish shallowness and are applied almost exclusively to Mizrahim. For too long, she argues, the Israeli establishment — the news media, academia, the Supreme Court — has been closed off to large sectors of society, the same sectors she has cultivated as her base: women, Mizrahim and residents of Israel’s development towns. In other words, people like her.

“It was all planned,” Regev told me this summer of her speech. We were in the back seat of her ministerial car, driving north on the Yitzhak Rabin Highway to attend a ceremony in her honor. It was a scorching day, and she had kicked off her stilettos and wedged her bare feet between passenger seat and window. “I knew that if I went to the Haaretz conference, there was no way I was going to be nice and say, ‘Thank you for inviting me.’ You know those invitations to high society? You tell yourself, I have to look pretty and be nice and wear my high heels? No way. No way. I was there to tell them what I thought of them. To tell them: ‘You talked enough. Now you listen.’ ”

It is a testament to the hopelessness of peace efforts today that the most-talked-about politician in Israel is its culture minister, traditionally a marginalized figure overseeing a relatively minuscule budget. But with the peace process effectively frozen, Israelis have increasingly turned their sights inward. These days, there is much talk of homegrown enemies. Chief among the instigators is an ultranationalist organization called Im Tirtzu, or “If You Will It,” named after the famous first phrase of Herzl’s Zionist maxim, “If you will it, it is no dream.” Im Tirtzu released a video last year labeling leaders of Israeli human rights organizations “foreign agents” and suggesting that they abet terrorists. The group, which had its start on university campuses, then began a campaign to call out prominent left-wing authors — Amos Oz, David Grossman, A.B. Yehoshua — and other artists and actors as “moles in culture.”

Netanyahu has tried to distance himself from many of the more flagrant displays of such McCarthyism. And yet similar measures are routinely promulgated on the Knesset floor. One recent bill calls for enshrining Israel’s legal status as “the national home of the Jewish people.” A newly passed law requires nongovernmental organizations that receive more than half their funding from foreign governments to disclose this in all their official communications; an earlier version went so far as to demand that representatives of these organizations wear a special badge while in the Knesset. The law is widely seen as targeting the left because it affects most human rights organizations in the country, which typically receive money from foreign governments, but not most pro-settler groups, whose funding comes largely from private donors.

The politicians peddling those bills represent a new vanguard of far-right activism. Younger and more unabashedly anti-democratic than Netanyahu’s cohort of Likudniks, they do not feel the need to pay lip service to the idea of the occupation as a temporary necessity. Some — like Naftali Bennett, the education minister, and Ayelet Shaked, the justice minister — belong to a smaller party in Likud’s coalition that ensures its continued drift rightward. Their platform includes “fighting anyone who acts to turn Israel into ‘a state of its citizens.’ ” Others are the Likud’s own. Earnest, dour politicians like Yariv Levin and Ze’ev Elkin make up the maximalist camp of the party, its rough equivalents of Ted Cruz and Darrell Issa. Likud today “holds the worldview that historic rights are superior to natural, human rights,” says the political scientist Zeev Sternhell. “What they’re saying in effect is, ‘We are the majority, and we can do whatever we want.’ ”

Regev is often placed in the maximalist camp. Like them, she doesn’t believe in the “illusion of peace” and has spoken out vehemently against a Palestinian state. She argues that Jews should be allowed to pray on the Temple Mount, which goes against Israel’s security arrangements with the Islamic council that has administered the site since the 12th century. And she is unapologetic about seeking to cement her party’s power. She told me: “There’s a new group on the right that says: We’re unwilling to bow our heads any longer. We’re unwilling to let the left decide for us if we’re in charge.”

But unlike other politicians in the maximalist camp, for whom the territorial question remains central, Regev has decided to set her sights elsewhere. Regev’s goal is to dislodge the “elites” in order to elevate previously marginalized groups. To do so, she has issued new criteria for the allocation of state funds for cultural institutions. These include a clause that gives the government the power to punish acts of “delegitimization of the state” — burning the Israeli flag during a play, for example — and provides financial incentives to troupes that perform in Jewish settlements in the West Bank.

For the country’s diminishing liberal base, Regev represents not a culture war so much as a war on culture. As Daniel Ben Simon, a former Labor politician, put it, “She’s a commissar of culture.” But 59 percent of Israeli Jews support her agenda, according to an Israel Democracy Institute poll. She is often called “colorful,” a charitable description of her internal contradictions. She has amassed considerable political clout but views herself as a perpetual underdog. She rails against Ashkenazi and leftist elites yet is married to an Ashkenazi man who used to vote left. She uses a well-worn phrase to characterize Israel as “a villa in the jungle,” assailing the Palestinians, but speaks in glowing terms about Arab Israelis who “respect the laws of the country.” She identifies as conservative but sees herself as a champion of gay rights. She grew up in a traditional family — “ ‘feminist’ is a word I can’t relate to,” she has said — but spent 25 years in the Israeli military, rising through the ranks to become chief censor and then spokeswoman for the Israel Defense Forces. It’s time, she says, for Israel to have a female defense minister. (Preferably her.)

In her first primary contest, in 2008, Regev rounded off the party’s list for the Knesset — “No one gave a damn about her,” as a colleague of hers put it. But by the latest Likud primary, at the end of 2014, she had clinched a top-five position, the highest for a woman in the party. Forbes Israel named her the most influential woman in the country. Given her impressive finish, it was clear that she would get a ministerial position. She wanted the welfare ministry and says she prayed for it at the Western Wall before meeting with Netanyahu to learn of her assignment. When she went by his office before the swearing-in of the new government, she says, he promised her the job. But a few hours later he called her at home and rescinded the offer, having given the welfare portfolio to another Likud politician. He suggested a few alternatives, including the culture and sports ministry, “and as he’s saying this, tears start streaming down my face,” she told me. It took her a few days to realize that this was her chance to break out. “I wanted to bring the Mizrahi issue to center stage and not run away from it. And the peripheria. To not be afraid. To not accept the statement that we’re beasts, that we’re nothing but mezuza kissers.”

Her timing was fortuitous. A Mizrahi group called the Black Panthers, founded in the early 1970s to protest what it saw as the state’s systemic discrimination against Eastern Jews, has had a renaissance of sorts, thanks to social media and growing cultural movements that seek to recast the negative image of Mizrahim. “I’m the Mizrahi/You don’t know/I’m the Mizrahi/You don’t mention,” begins a poem by Adi Keissar, who founded Ars Poetica, a reading series featuring young Mizrahi poets; the name, taken from Horace, reclaims the pejorative ars. As Maor Zaguri, a television writer and director, told me, “We’re practically a majority, and yet the feeling is that nothing in culture is for us.”

Whether out of a genuine sense of purpose or as a way to score political points, Regev has managed to tap into these age-old antagonisms. She has threatened to divert state funding away from places like the Israeli Opera and the canonical theaters of Tel Aviv and prioritize smaller operations working out of underprivileged areas, including the peripheria, which is overwhelmingly Mizrahi. She has tried to overhaul the Israeli arts council, the government’s advisory body on culture, by nominating only people of Mizrahi origin who openly share her agenda. At times, she seems to exert more influence than Netanyahu, who has recently been dogged by scandals, including charges that he received illegal contributions from foreign donors and that his wife pocketed thousands of shekels from recycling fees. (Netanyahu has dismissed the accusations as “a lot of hot air.”)

Opinions on Regev’s motives — as with every subject in Israel — are split. In the media, Regev is often portrayed as an unwitting crusader for a cause more sophisticated than she is. She is a recurring character in a popular satirical Israeli show, in which a male actor plays her as a primitive loudmouth. “The way they see it, Miri Regev is the ultimate freha,” says Ron Cahlili, a documentary filmmaker and self-described Mizrahi leftist who supports Regev’s agenda. “In the fact that she’s a woman, first of all; in the fact that she’s Mizrahi; that she comes from Kiryat Gat. In the fact that every Friday she posts pictures of herself making pots of spicy fish. That she lights candles with a head scarf on, and kisses mezuzas, and talks about the Temple Mount and about tradition. And is right wing! Really right wing. This combination releases all the possible stereotypes. The white Zionist left can’t take it.”

For Mizrahi activists like Cahlili, Regev is an unequivocal good. “For once in 67 years, a culture minister is speaking the truth,” Cahlili says. “Even if she does one-tenth of what she has set out to do, we’ll have a historic correction of injustice.” But others see her as hurting the Mizrahi cause. “The danger of the Mizrahi struggle is that it will fall to a place of unjustified hatred, where there’s no grace and no compassion, and where there’s an inability to accept a multiplicity of voices,” says Mati Shemoelof, a Mizrahi writer and editor. And many on the left see an inherent hypocrisy in the gap between Regev’s words and her actions. Ayman Odeh, the leader of the Joint List, an alliance of Arab political parties, told me: “You can’t reconcile this seemingly liberal and egalitarian approach with an attack on Arabs, which is what she’s doing.”

“All of this is new,” Regev said late one morning. We were in Kiryat Gat, less than 20 miles from the Gaza border. She pointed to where the housing project she grew up in once stood; it was demolished last year. “We slept four in a room, in bunk beds. My grandmother had the bottom bed.” Her eyes brightened; her smile widened. Despite her talk of hardship, she was in her hometown, and it felt as though she were taking a victory lap of sorts — while making sure it wouldn’t be lost on me just how far she had come.

From her old neighborhood, we drove to the wealthier part of town, where her husband, Dror, was raised and where his parents still live. Dror is an engineer in the aerospace industry. They met when Miri was 16 and he was in his early 20s — he spotted her at the city’s central bus station — and they now have three grown children. Dror’s grandparents **immigrated** from Russia and Poland, and at first Miri felt intimidated by them and their European ways. “They were all teachers and spoke high Hebrew, and I was afraid that I wouldn’t fit in. But everything was O.K. It was all in my head. Because I came from a culture that hugs and touches and kapara and ‘What do you want to eat?’ and huge pots of food. And at his house things were different. There was less touching and less — it’s not that there isn’t love, there is — but it’s different. The combination between the cultures isn’t an easy one.” Nevertheless, she added, she and Dror are proud that their children are now “really Israeli” and “have both the Eastern and Western in them.”

Regev’s driver stopped, and we stepped into the thick heat of the day. She was dressed for an event that evening: high heels and a short black dress that flattered her recently slimmed-down figure. Her neck was burdened with heavy necklaces, one a blend between a Star of David and a sheriff’s star.

“Shalom!” a neighbor stopped her. “What did we do to deserve this?”

“Shh, don’t tell Dror’s parents I’m here,” Regev laughed before enveloping the woman in a hug.

In her hometown, Miri Regev is better known as Miriam Siboni, her maiden name. Her mother, Mercedes, **immigrated** from Spain as a teenager in 1957 and still watches Spanish entertainment news every afternoon. Her father, Felix, who is from Morocco, worked for years as a welder; he lost two fingers in a work accident. Among themselves, the Sibonis usually converse in Spanish and like to listen to Julio Iglesias and Mercedes Sosa. They brought up Miri and her three younger brothers in a household that was neither secular nor religious but masorti — traditional. This is commonplace for Mizrahim in Israel: an adherence to certain Jewish commandments but not to all. It may mean keeping kosher and saying the Kiddush, but turning on the television after the Shabbat meal. Or walking to synagogue on Friday and refraining from lighting the gas, but still driving to meet friends on a Friday night. It’s a form of observance that is heavy on ritual and sits somewhere between the two poles of Ashkenazi life: staunch secularism (the kibbutzniks; the sushi eaters of Herzliya) and strict religiosity (the kipa-wearers and the ultra-Orthodox).

That afternoon we sat in the snug, well-lit living room of the Sibonis. Regev had swapped her heels for a pair of worn flip-flops and piled up her hair with a clip. The news was on in the background. I asked her parents about politics. “I grew up among the progressives, the Labor Party,” Felix said. “When my daughter joined Likud, as a father I had to support her, so I switched.” This came as something of a shock. As far as I knew, Regev had never before spoken about growing up in a Laborite home.

Later I would learn that despite her hard-line positions, Likud might not have been Regev’s first choice. In 2008, after retiring from the military, she considered her options. She wanted to enter politics but wasn’t sure which party to join. “She was debating,” recalls Daniel Ben Simon, who ran in the Labor primaries that year. “She told me, ‘If there’s an opportunity at Labor, I’ll go with Labor.’ ” She met with Ehud Barak, then the chairman of the Labor Party, but he refused to guarantee her a top spot on the party roster. Realizing she stood a better chance of being elected under Likud, which was riding high in the polls, Regev scheduled a meeting with Netanyahu. Nitza Friedman, a close friend of Regev’s for nearly 20 years, remembers being “surprised” when Regev joined Likud. (Regev acknowledges meeting with Barak. But she says that they didn’t talk of her joining the party and that her preference was always to be a member of Likud.)

When Regev joined the Knesset, she wasn’t given any significant assignments. Despite her military bona fides, she barely managed to get on the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee. She struggled to find a voice in the party. Then, in 2009, she objected to a tax on fruits and vegetables proposed by Netanyahu and made a name for herself as a populist hero of sorts when she appeared on the cover of a newspaper chopping salad. “Unacceptable,” Netanyahu fumed at the time. Gradually, she also began to align herself with the coalition’s more hard-line elements, making headlines for her outrageous statements in the Knesset. In 2010, an Arab lawmaker participated in a flotilla protesting the Israeli blockade of Gaza. Regev publicly yelled at her, calling her a traitor in Arabic and a Trojan horse. “She gave the show of her life,” Ben Simon said, morosely. “That day, Miri Regev was born.”

One evening, I joined Regev for a Ramadan visit to her Arab supporters at a private home in the northern town of Ma’alot-Tarshiha. It was an airless night. An enlarged print of the Dome of the Rock, the holy site in Jerusalem, hung in the entryway. Every table inside the carpeted house was laden with watermelon wedges, puff pastries and silver carafes of black coffee, even though the fast wouldn’t be broken for another couple of hours. Regev was the guest of honor, and a line of men with their young sons formed to greet her and her aides.

She shook each of their hands, hugging the men she recognized and pinching the boys’ cheeks. “They killed you with this heat, huh?” she said. She turned to one of the men, who wore a white button-down shirt. “You look like a groom today! Come, neshama. Join us.” She glanced at the tables, feigning disbelief. “What’s all this food for if you can’t eat?”

“It’s for you,” the host replied warmly.

The atmosphere was festive, but the gathering itself seemed unlikely, surreal even, considering Regev’s past rebukes of Arab lawmakers — “Betrayers! Terrorists!” she fulminated in 2014 — and the fact that Arab Israelis rarely vote for Likud (the party garnered about 1 percent of the Arab vote in the last election). I was told that the evening’s host was a veteran Likudnik — he referred to Regev as being “like family” — but I wondered how many of the other men present actually voted for her.

Then one of the town’s deputy mayors, a genial lawyer named Ayman Shanati, spoke. “I’m not a man of Likud,” he said. But with Regev, “we are seeing real change and a lot of new projects in the Arab sector.” He praised Regev’s reallocation of funds, which has benefited Arab towns much as it has the peripheria and ultra-Orthodox communities, but complained that his town still didn’t meet certain budget criteria.

Regev nodded. “Write it down,” she told an aide.

The evening began to take on the distinct feel of electioneering, of a quid pro quo exchange. Regev has perfected the craft. A staggering amount of her time is spent shuttling to events of potential voters, where she schmoozes and canvasses in equal measure: “We can’t be complacent,” she was seen telling guests at a bar before the last primary. It isn’t only supporters whom she showers with attention. She kisses everyone: the strangers who ask to take selfies with her, the traffic cop who lets her entourage pass through, the bleary-eyed cook catering a work lunch that she attends. She doesn’t see a disconnect between her radical statements against the Palestinians and her attempt to promote Arab culture or woo Arab Israeli voters, many of whom identify as Palestinian. Arab Israelis want to “raise their children in peace,” she says, while members of the Palestinian leadership “sanctify death.” (Arab municipalities are used to such double speak from government ministers but often decide to swallow the insult in order to maintain working relations.)

She stood up and thanked Shanati. “The cultural revolution that I am leading is to give voice to the Arab sector,” she said at a volume more suitable for a conference hall. “My office is your home. Every problem, every issue.” Yet earlier she ventured a qualifier by way of hyperbole: “Whoever is loyal to the state, we’ll bring him the moon.”

One morning in June, the heads of theaters, dance companies and orchestras across Israel received an official letter from the culture ministry. It required them to state, among other things, whether they had “refrained from performing” for Israelis in Judea and Samaria — the West Bank. Though the letter was cloaked in bureaucratic language, the issue is explosive in Israel. For the Israeli left and for the country’s Arab population, the Jewish settlements in the West Bank are the engine of Israel’s entrenchment in the Palestinian territories. Some artists, particularly Arab Israelis, refuse to perform for settlers in the occupied territories on moral grounds. And yet the money that cultural institutions receive from the state each year is based partly on the number of production runs they mount. Because Israel is geographically small and has limited audiences, these institutions can’t afford to perform only in their home base. And so they go on the road, touring the country and appearing wherever they can, including in West Bank settlements.

A few years ago a quiet agreement was reached: Artists who objected to performing in the West Bank were to be substituted during those productions. But Regev imperiled this delicate compromise. When the Arab-Israeli actor Norman Issa refused to perform in the Jordan Valley last year, Regev threatened to pull funding from a Jewish-Arab children’s theater he helped found. The statement letter, which has become known in the Israeli news media as the “loyalty form,” drew fire not just from a handful of personal objectors; some 1,500 artists signed a petition objecting to Regev’s moves. Stage directors worried that in order to mount shows that would appeal to the tastes of settlement councils, theaters would have to adopt, as the journalist Israel Harel, who himself lives in a settlement, wrote earlier this year, “a repertoire that is homophobic, nationalistic, even religious, resembling Iran under Khomeini.”

Many who oppose Regev’s stipulations say her approach to culture is colored by her stint as chief military censor. In a recent government meeting to discuss the establishment of a new public broadcaster, Regev excoriated the prospect of an independent broadcasting authority. “It’s inconceivable that we’ll establish a corporation that we can’t control,” she said. “What’s the point?” Regev doesn’t deny that the role of censor has shaped her thinking, but she seems to have learned that to advocate censorship outright is bad form. Instead, when liberals complain of her curbs on freedom of speech, she counters with what she calls the state’s “freedom of funding.” As Regev told me, her voice rising with each sentence: “If, as a cultural institution, you decide not to perform in Judea and Samaria, to boycott an entire population that lives there, that’s fine. But you won’t get all of your funding. … If you put on a play about a terrorist who says he supports killing soldiers, then you won’t get funding. Not from me.”

When I asked heads of cultural institutions what they made of this notion, they all noted that the funding in question isn’t Regev’s to distribute but comes from taxpayer money. “There’s no such thing as ‘freedom of funding,’ ” one added. “Citizens have freedoms; states have duties. In a fascist state, the state has freedoms and the citizens have duties. Without funding, cultural production can’t take place.”

To stroll through the complex that houses the Tel Aviv Museum, the Israeli Opera and the Cameri Theater is to get a glimpse of the institutions that Regev is beleaguering. The Cameri Theater in Tel Aviv was founded in 1944, four years before the founding of Israel itself. It was the first theater to feature a young generation of sabra actors who spoke conversational Hebrew, unlike the more established actors of the city’s Habima Theater who **immigrated** from Russia and were classically trained. The Cameri was known as secular, political and often defiant.

Noam Semel has been the Cameri general director for the last 24 years. He is 70, slight of build, with a smooth face and the booming voice of someone who likes to hear himself speak.

“There is huge unrest,” he said as soon as I sat down in his office, a modest room whose walls were crowded with framed posters, including one of him shaking hands with Yitzhak Rabin. Like most of the heads of the cultural institutions I spoke to, who have dozens of employees on their payroll, Semel was quick to point out that he was on good personal terms with Regev, though, he added, “professionally, or intellectually, we have a disagreement.” Semel believes that Regev’s war on the cultural elites, and especially on Tel Aviv, is misplaced. He named as his inspiration the longtime French minister of culture, Jack Lang, who concentrated France’s artistic talent in Paris, creating a hub of cultural vibrancy. This could be Tel Aviv, Semel argued.

What about Regev’s oft-voiced complaint that a focus on Tel Aviv would neglect the peripheria, I asked. Semel turned his computer screen to face me. “Where are we today?” he parried. He pointed to the Cameri production runs for the day. “We’re in Jerusalem, Afula, Kiryat Haim and Beersheba.” In other words: the peripheria.

“And that’s regardless of Miri,” a colleague of his interjected.

“That’s a typical day,” he said. “That’s ‘Tel Aviv elite’ for you.”

There is a parable that Regev likes to trot out to demonstrate her tenacity. It’s one that appears in many articles about her, to her evident delight. It concerns a colony of frogs trapped at the bottom of a well. One day one of the frogs tries to escape. The other frogs all call out to her that it’s impossible: She won’t make it. But she manages to scale the wall anyway. Dumbfounded, the other frogs ask her how she did it. “What?” She calls down to them. “I can’t hear you!” Turns out she was deaf all along.

Regev isn’t deaf, but her ability to mute her critics and forge ahead is indeed remarkable. There are many who believe that Netanyahu has watched her rise not only with awe but also with trepidation. She has more than hinted at coveting Israel’s highest office. “I don’t know if he feels intimidated, but there’s no doubt that today I’m a force,” Regev told me.

She spends a good part of every morning standing on the front porch of her home, in a small city near Tel Aviv, taping video messages for supporters who request them on Facebook. “Ready?” an aide asked on a recent day, holding her phone to the minister’s face. Regev was framed by greenery; an Israeli flag fluttered from a nearby fence. “Now we have Oren, who’s turning 51,” the aide said. Something inside Regev switched on. She smiled her famous smile. “Oren, kapara! Fifty-one! You’re so handsome! You’re so young! What does the age matter?” She signed off: “Love you, mazel tov, Miri,” cupping her hands into a heart shape.

As Regev’s professed cultural revolution continues, she seems increasingly to revert to her old role as censor, demanding that culture march in lock step with the state. In July, she caused controversy when she called to withdraw public funds from Army Radio for airing a segment about the Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish. She blamed the station for “sanctifying the anti-Israeli narrative” and threatened to remove it from the army altogether. In September, she stormed out of a film-awards ceremony during the performance of a duo rapping a Darwish poem. “If you’re not loyal to the country, then you should be punished,” she told me in no uncertain terms.

“What is this loyalty?” Ayman Odeh, the leader of the Joint List, said when asked about Regev’s ultimatum. “A person who is against the settlements: Is he loyal to the state of Israel or not? A person who is against the occupation: Is he loyal to the state of Israel or not? A person who is against Arab discrimination, who is against antidemocratic laws: Is he loyal or not? When you demand loyalty from an entire Arab population, is that not collective condescension? Who is this higher being who demands loyalty from us?”

Regev’s answer to that question would most likely be: the new right, the military, the ruling majority. Back on her front porch, she began taping a video for a coming race to honor an Israeli soldier who was killed in 2014. “Dear residents of the Golan Heights,” she said, finding her stride as she squinted against the rising morning sun. “I want to salute you!”

Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Ruth Margalit is an Israeli writer living in New York. This is her first article for the magazine.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**“Are you a citizen?” the woman standing in front of my apartment building in Manhattan asked me this summer. She had a clipboard with a sign-up sheet in one hand, which she extended to me as I walked toward her. “I’m looking for registered voters who would like to sign a petition to ——” I took the clipboard before she was done explaining. “Are you an American?” she asked again. Smiling, I unhooked a pen as I told her, “Yes, I’m an American.”

It’s unlikely the woman understood my eagerness to sign that petition, whose purpose I now barely remember. After living in America for over a decade, I could finally sign such a legislative document, thanks to my recent naturalization. It was the first time I got to have a say in America’s future. In that moment, I was no longer a Cameroonian **immigrant** only — I was an **immigrant** and a citizen. This country, which used to be other people’s country, was now my country, too.

On Nov. 8, when I cast the first vote of my life, it will be in this adopted country of mine. I’ll be a citizen and an **immigrant** voting in an anti-**immigrant** age when, around the world, citizens and **immigrants** are clashing over who belongs where. In the United States, millions are cheering the idea of building a wall and barring Muslim **immigrants**. In the Dominican Republic, the government has deported[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/17/magazine/haitians-in-exile-in-the-dominican-republic.html] countless Haitian **immigrants** and their native-born children, telling them to go find a new home. In Europe, protesters have carried placards proclaiming, “Refugees Not Welcome.” At the bottom of the Mediterranean, there’s a graveyard filled with aspiring **immigrants**.

The language is unpleasant, but the sentiments expressed are not baseless. Even in the richest of countries, resources are limited. Millions of Americans have to compete for jobs with **immigrants** willing to take less pay. According to Sonia Nazario, in her book “Enrique’s Journey[http://www.enriquesjourney.com/],” in some parts of the United States, “the crush of **immigrants** has contributed to a decline of many public services, namely schools, hospitals and state jails and prisons.” She adds: “Classrooms are crowded. Hospital emergency rooms have been forced to close, in part because so many poor, uninsured, nonpaying patients, including **immigrants**, are provided with free care.”

This notwithstanding, dozens of studies have revealed that **immigration** has helped make America the superpower it is today. A 2002 article[http://www.cato.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/publications/commentary/immigrants-have-enriched-american-culture-enhanced-our-influence-world] by the conservative Cato Institute presented evidence that **immigrants** have “added to our productive capacity as a nation, enhancing our influence in the world.”

Despite my pride in my new citizenship, I’m an **immigrant** first. If I were to wake up one morning forgetting that, by the end of the day I’d surely meet someone who, upon hearing my name or my accent, would say to me, kindly or unkindly, “Where are you from?” to which I might respond with stories about the beauties and complexities of my homeland. Then I’d carry on working toward the goals that brought me here.

In this pursuit, I share a bond with millions of my fellow **immigrants** — regardless of whether we’re naturalized citizens, green-card holders, visa holders or undocumented; regardless of our race, culture or religion. We all arrived here bearing dreams.

While the citizen in me agrees that we must do something about the 11 million **immigrants** living in the country without legal documents, the **immigrant** in me is stunned by the branding of such **immigrants** as lowlifes. While the citizen in me recognizes that America cannot offer every **immigrant** the opportunity he seeks, and that America should take care of Americans first, the **immigrant** in me cannot help but hope for policies that will keep America, in the words of Langston Hughes, “the dream the dreamers dreamed[https://www.poets.org/poetsorg/poem/let-america-be-america-again].”

Having been born in a country where the same man has been president since 1982 and voters laugh as they walk to polling stations because they believe their elections are a charade, I know what a privilege and responsibility it is to vote. I know of the great distance that separates a dictatorship masquerading as a democracy from a true, albeit flawed, democracy. Considering this, and considering the sacrifices others have made so that I can live freely in this country, I do not take my right to vote lightly.

I’ve seen the best of America during my time here. When I was considering dropping out of graduate school because of financial constraints, an American professor helped me get a scholarship so I could complete my master’s degree. Twice, I had an American co-worker give me hand-me-downs because I couldn’t afford to buy clothes. An American employer once said to me, at a time when I was questioning who I was, “You are a breath of fresh air.” Being black, female and an **immigrant** — and for a good portion of my life here, low-income, too — I’ve weathered my share of prejudice. But the empathy Americans have shown me far outweighs the unkindness. That is why on Election Day, I’ll be voting for empathy.

Imbolo Mbue is the author of the novel “Behold the Dreamers.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There were no handshakes or pleasantries[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/melania-trump-bill-clinton.html] between Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump in their final debate, which moved quickly from a discussion of policy to a flurry of personal attacks.

She called him a “puppet” of Russia, he called her “a nasty woman.” While Mr. Trump appeared sharp and steady in the early moments of the debate, his refusal to say he would accept the results of the election[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/presidential-debate.html] and his meandering answers on foreign policy led many commentators and critics to declare that Mrs. Clinton was the clear winner.

Here is a sampling of post-debate reaction:

“Clinton really is doing well tonight. Again and again, she’s taken Trump apart.”

James Astill, Washington bureau chief of The Economist[https://twitter.com/JamesMAstill/status/788925331734401025]

“Though his temper slipped a few times, he was generally less of a boorish oaf this time than he typically is. In that way, he certainly gave people holding out some modicum of shelter to consider him.”

Caleb Howe, writer for the conservative blog Red State[http://www.redstate.com/absentee/2016/10/19/winners-losers-tonight%E2%80%99s-last-presidential-debate]

“This was the Democratic nominee’s best debate performance. She finally figured out the right calibration of ignoring and engaging Trump.”

Chris Cillizza, writer for the Washington Post blog “The Fix”[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/19/winners-and-losers-from-the-final-presidential-debate-2/]

“What’s the Trump dictionary definition of a woman who is prepared, earnest, ambitious and ready to move past mistakes? Oh yes, nasty.”

Rituparna Chatterjee, deputy editor of Huffington Post India[https://twitter.com/MasalaBai/status/788939054804971520]

“Hillary is nasty. Good that Trump pointed it out.”

Ann Coulter, conservative commentator and author[https://twitter.com/AnnCoulter/status/788930939208470529]

“Trump won. Hillary spun.”

Michelle Malkin, senior editor of Conservative Review[https://twitter.com/michellemalkin/status/788935142026776576]

“It’s completely heartbreaking to see Hillary Clinton so outclass a Republican nominee across 3 debates.”

Rich Lowry, editor of the conservative National Review[https://twitter.com/RichLowry/status/788932979737423872]

“He should have said he would accept the results of the election. There is no other option unless we’re in a recount again.”

Laura Ingraham, editor in chief of the conservative website LifeZette[https://twitter.com/IngrahamAngle/status/788928551248547844]

“His only use of Spanish in election was to further nasty stereotypes against Latino **immigrants** — and ONLY Latino **immigrants**.”

Van Jones, Democratic commentator for CNN[https://twitter.com/VanJones68/status/788917293132554240]

“She devastated him. He melted down. His refusal to accept the results of this election disqualifies him automatically from any office in the United States. There were several areas where he was utterly incoherent, grasping at ‘facts,’ without any understanding of policy. His personal foulness emerged.”

Andrew Sullivan, blogger for New York Magazine[http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/10/andrew-sullivan-liveblogs-the-final-presidential-debate.html]

“Chris Wallace is the real winner of this debate. America is the loser. At least this one was substantive and stayed on topic.”

Meghan McCain, host of America Now Radio[https://twitter.com/MeghanMcCain/status/788930324105424897]

“The Emmys are NOT rigged.”

Julia Louis-Dreyfus, the actress who played Elaine on “Seinfeld[https://twitter.com/OfficialJLD/status/788928529958264832]”

“Debate 1: Dying of excitement

Debate 2: We’re all going to die

Debate 3: Kill me already.”

James Poniewozik, television critic for The New York Times[https://twitter.com/poniewozik/status/788898960048095232]

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**She mansplained him. “Let me translate that if I can,” Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] said dryly after Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] talked up his tax plan.

She interrupted him. When Mr. Trump boasted of the gilded Las Vegas hotel that bears his name, Mrs. Clinton leaned into her microphone. “Made with Chinese steel,” she quipped with a smile.

She mocked him. After Mr. Trump said President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia had “no respect” for her, Mrs. Clinton slyly posited why Mr. Putin seemingly preferred Mr. Trump: “He’d rather have a puppet as president of the United States,” she said.

In the third and final presidential debate, Mrs. Clinton outmaneuvered Mr. Trump with a surprising new approach: his.

Flipping the script, she turned herself into his relentless tormentor, condescending to him repeatedly and deploying some of his own trademark tactics against him.

The relatively subdued and largely defanged Republican nominee who showed up onstage in Las Vegas was a different figure from the candidate America has watched for the past 16 months.

Mr. Trump was, for much of the night, oddly calm and composed. He minimized his name-calling. His interruptions were relatively rare.

In a debate that his allies and aides had predicted would represent 90 minutes of scorched-earth verbal warfare, Mr. Trump seemed deserted by his most bellicose instincts.

He repeatedly gave up chances to respond to pointed taunts from Mrs. Clinton, who dominated the confrontation from its opening moments, needling and baiting him over and over.

During a back-and-forth about **immigration**, Mrs. Clinton landed a hard jab, asserting[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/10/19/us/elections/fact-check-debate.html] that Mr. Trump had used undocumented workers to build Trump Tower — even threatening such workers, she said, with deportation.

Mr. Trump, who until Wednesday had seldom let a critique go by unanswered, did not respond.

In the night’s biggest surprise, he allowed Mrs. Clinton to avoid entirely a question from the moderator, Chris Wallace of Fox News, about allegations of sexual misconduct against former President Bill Clinton and what role she might have played in trying to discredit the women who came forward to accuse her husband.

At times, Mr. Trump was inexplicably polite. As he replied to a question about the Second Amendment, Mr. Trump observed that his rival might have paid him a backhanded compliment by mentioning his endorsement from the National Rifle Association.

“I don’t know if Hillary was saying it in a sarcastic manner,” he said, with uncharacteristic mildness.

At the moments when Mr. Trump did revert to his old, familiar self, he seemed unsteady and defensive.

When Mrs. Clinton called Mr. Trump a puppet of Mr. Putin, Mr. Trump offered a limp interruption.

“No puppet. No puppet,” he said. “You’re the puppet,” he added, emptily. He never explained what he might have meant.

After two historically acrid debates, Mrs. Clinton finally got the policy discussion she has craved. But in between expounding on her proposals to make college affordable and raise the minimum wage, she lustily savaged Mr. Trump’s career, his finances and his sensitivities, portraying him as a lightweight with the temperament of a spoiled child.

On his experience: “On the day when I was in the Situation Room monitoring the raid that brought Osama bin Laden to justice, he was hosting ‘The Celebrity Apprentice,’” Mrs. Clinton said.

On his charitable giving, compared with the work of the Clinton Foundation: “I’d be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people and bought a six-foot portrait of Donald,” Mrs. Clinton said witheringly.

“I mean, who does that?” she added.

On Mr. Trump’s famed negotiating skills: “He went to Mexico. He had a meeting with the Mexican president,” Mrs. Clinton said, bitingly. “He choked and then he got into a Twitter war because the Mexican president said we’re not paying for that wall.”

Mr. Trump struggled to keep pace. “Excuse me,” he complained. “My turn,” he stomped.

“The one thing you have over me is experience,” Mr. Trump said at one point.

And yet it seemed clear through this last confrontation that there was a gap in knowledge, or at least in command of the material that candidates seeking to be president are expected to master.

“Take a look at the Start-Up,” Mr. Trump said at one point, apparently referring to the Start nuclear arms reduction treaty.

Pressed on **immigration**, Mrs. Clinton detailed her plan to overhaul the current system, identifying a daughter of undocumented parents who feared they would be deported. Mr. Trump’s response seemed far less certain: After reiterating his plan to build a wall on the Mexican border, he summoned a line straight out of a Hollywood western. “We have some bad hombres here, and we’re going to get them out,” he said.

Asked about a 2008 Supreme Court decision on gun control, District of Columbia vs. Heller, Mr. Trump displayed a loose command of the subject, focusing his answer on Mrs. Clinton’s emotions after the ruling. “Hillary was extremely upset, extremely angry,” he said.

As the debate wore on, Mrs. Clinton kept finding opportunities to make Mr. Trump seem smaller and smaller, or at least more puerile.

She noted that after a stretch without an Emmy for his reality TV show, Mr. Trump had claimed that the awards show was rigged against him — just as he now says about the election[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/donald-trump-voting-election-rigging.html].

Mr. Trump did not disappoint. “Should have gotten it,” he said bitterly.

And it became clear that the candidate who relishes his role as a bully had little patience for being bullied.

Mrs. Clinton implied that Mr. Trump would find a way to weasel out of paying his fair share of taxes for Social Security[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social\_security\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

“My Social Security payroll contribution will go up, as will Donald’s — assuming he can’t figure out how to get out of it,” Ms. Clinton said, fully aware she was provoking him.

And provoked he was.

“Such a nasty woman,” Mr. Trump grumbled.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Donald Trump Won’t Say if He’ll Accept Result of Election[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

\* Presidential Debate: What You Missed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

\* Chris Wallace, Mixing Humor With Scolding, Guides Final Debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/politics/chris-wallace-moderator.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Few artists have known the roller coaster of fame and shame that the French painter Bernard Buffet experienced during his life. Buffet, who was once hailed as the artistic successor to Picasso only to be reviled later as vulgar and the epitome of poor taste, was an immensely popular artist before falling into near oblivion. He committed suicide in 1999 at the age of 71.

Now, Buffet’s work is undergoing a surprising revival. His first major retrospective in France opened on Oct. 14 at the Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris, a new Buffet biography was released in the United States last month, and a Buffet painting was sold for over 1 million pounds, or about $1.2 million, in auction last June.

“There is a recent and well-deserved resurgence of market interest in this artist,” said Jay Vincze, head of Impressionist and Modern Art at Christie’s London. “A very global audience is looking at high quality Western art today, and buyers respond to Buffet’s bold, graphic style and expressive colors.”

Fabrice Hergott, director of the Musée d’Art Moderne, decided to put on the Buffet exhibition. Through about 100 paintings — a small sampling of the 8,000 or more this prolific painter and illustrator produced — the show examines the evolution of an artist who, while a household name in France, has for the past half-century been mostly the subject of derision here.

“We are the first museum in France to dare exhibit Buffet,” Mr. Hergott said, acknowledging that it was a gamble and it took him awhile to overcome his reluctance. He said that for years, like his colleagues in professional art circles, he considered Buffet as the “ultimate in bad taste.”

He said he changed his view of Buffet “because I have looked closely at his work and had conversations with artists with a sharper eye than mine.”

Mr. Hergott now sees in Buffet, who killed himself after he was diagnosed with Parkinson’s disease and could no longer work, a rare mastery of technique, an inventive approach to subject matter and the striking intensity of his paintings that can, he said, eclipse any other art in the room. “Buffet has painted hundreds of masterpieces,” he said. “His œuvre is one of the greatest of the 20th century.”

Buffet was born in Paris in 1928 and grew up during the Nazi occupation, enduring the war and years of deprivation, and the experience inspired much of the glum imagery in his work. He excelled in painting and drawing, winning prestigious prizes and attracting attention with a signature style recognizable by thick, angular black lines that outlined his somber themes.

“Buffet is an Expressionist, a style that was not in vogue in his time, so critics viewed him as anachronistic,” Mr. Hergott said.

Buffet painted many different subjects, such as scenes of misery, crucifixion, **alienation**, wartime violence or sexual ambiguity, in the same miserabilist style that he used to depict ashtrays, table lamps, flowers, clowns, bullfighters, cross-dressers and household utensils. He used an almost total lack of depth of field to increase both the frontal impact and the underlying existential malaise in his work.

Buffet managed to parlay his talent and prolific production into not just financial success, but a broad grass-roots popularity that even Picasso, his contemporary, never achieved.

People related to him, Mr. Hergott said. “No artist anywhere has ever been as popular in his lifetime as Buffet,” he said. “His work was seen and recognized around the world. Today, we could compare him to Jeff Koons or Takashi Murakami, but neither has achieved Buffet’s universal popularity.”

While he grew in popularity, Buffet was rejected by the proponents of Modernity. He staunchly adhered to figurative painting at a time when Abstraction, Minimalism and Conceptual art were seen as avant-garde.

Within a few years, Buffet managed to also **alienate** much of his popular fan base. In postwar France, success had a moral dimension. His early success coupled with his ostentatious lifestyle in the mid-1950s contributed to his demise, according to Nicholas Foulkes, author of the biography “Bernard Buffet: The Invention of the Mega-Artist,” released in the United States last September. In the book, Mr. Foulkes examines the life of the man and the mechanisms of fame that created the Buffet phenomenon.

“The story around Buffet is remarkable: He was a child prodigy, a bisexual, an alcoholic recluse and a socialite in the age of color television,” Mr. Foulkes said. “His was the era of celebrities made for public consumption, and Buffet quickly became a part of the same pack of young, successful artists that included Françoise Sagan, Yves Saint Laurent, Roger Vadim and Brigitte Bardot.”

According to Mr. Foulkes, Buffet was castigated for his lifestyle and the pleasure he seemed to take in his material opportunities.

“Buffet was a superstar at 20,” Mr. Foulkes said. “He bought a castle, a Rolls-Royce, a boat and an island by age 30, all from the proceeds of his painting. Postwar European society did not appreciate such a display of wealth.”

A watershed moment came in 1956 when the society magazine Paris Match interviewed him at his mansion outside Paris and photographed him with his car.

“Buffet suddenly became the artist with the Rolls-Royce and not the painter of those miserable, depressive paintings,” Mr. Foulkes said. “The perception was of a creative hypocrisy between what he painted and how he lived.”

“Overnight, he became a cultural one-night stand that the French intellectual elite would rather forget,” he said.

Against those who were abandoning Buffet because of his success, he found a tenacious devotee in the art dealer Maurice Garnier. Garnier, who died in 2014, first met Buffet in 1948 and immediately began showing his work. In 1977, he decided to devote his Parisian gallery exclusively to Buffet. For over 50 years, the gallery held a show of Buffet’s paintings on the first Thursday in February, continuing today to show only Buffets.

“Mr. Garnier’s dream was to build a museum for Buffet,” said Céline Lévy, director of the Bernard Buffet Endowment, set up by Garnier, which holds some 350 oils and other works earmarked for the future museum.

While a museum in France may still be far off (a private Buffet museum exists in Japan, set up by a local collector in 1973), the art market has already rehabilitated Buffet. A work titled “Les Clowns Musiciens, le Saxophoniste” (1991) sold last June for £1,022,500 at Christie’s in London, a world record for the artist.

“There has been a change of taste, and the new generation of buyers is not looking at Buffet with the same disdain,” said Bruno Jaubert, director of Impressionist and Modern Art at Artcurial, the French auction house that sold Buffet’s “Le Cri du Clown” (1970) for 3.15 million Hong Kong dollars, or $410,000, three times its estimate, in Hong Kong in 2015. “Buyers appreciate his sharp, almost ‘street art’ edge.”

Despite the noteworthy market rise, Buffet’s prices still lag behind those of his contemporaries, namely top-selling artists like Andy Warhol or Gerhard Richter.

“Buffet, along with Picasso, was seen as a titan of the postwar period,” Mr. Vincze of Christie’s said. “He is considered good value in the market with a lot of room to move.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Right Now: Here’s how we analyzed in real time[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/10/19/us/elections/donald-trump-hillary-clinton-debate.html] and fact checked[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/10/19/us/elections/fact-check-debate.html] the last presidential debate between Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per].

Donald J. Trump refused to say on Wednesday night that he would accept the results of the presidential election, rejecting American political norms and growing pressure from his own party by claiming that the political process is extensively rigged against him.

Mr. Trump said he would decide only on Nov. 8 whether to respect the election returns. He accused the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the media of conspiring in Mrs. Clinton’s favor, and brushed off a reminder from Chris Wallace, the debate moderator, that the peaceful transfer of power is “one of the prides of this country.”

Hillary Clinton called Mr. Trump’s answer “horrifying,” and accused him of “talking down our democracy” out of frustration with his flagging campaign.

The exchange was the closest thing to a climactic moment in which Mrs. Clinton aggressively branded Mr. Trump as a dangerous candidate, calling him a “puppet” of Vladimir V. Putin of Russia and urging voters not to entrust him with nuclear weapons[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/atomic\_weapons/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

Mr. Trump’s broad criticism of the democratic system overshadowed his own insistent efforts to put Mrs. Clinton on the defensive over her record at the State Department and her status as a political insider. And he did little to address the multiplying accusations of sexual harassment and assault against him, asserting falsely that those charges had largely been discredited.

Here are the highlights:

• Asked if he would accept the results of the election, Mr. Trump — who has repeatedly predicted a “rigged” system could doom him — refused to commit. “I will look at it at the time,” he said, before suggesting without evidence that wide-scale voter fraud and a media conspiracy could affect the outcome. Mrs. Clinton called these remarks “horrifying.” She noted that Mr. Trump had a long history of claiming that forces were aligned against him, recalling his complaint when he did not receive an Emmy award for his television show, among other gripes. “Should have gotten it,” Mr. Trump said.

• The moderator cited estimates that both candidates’ plans would increase the national debt[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/n/national\_debt\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]. Mr. Trump rejected that analysis, saying he could “create tremendous jobs” and construct “an economic machine” to power growth. Mrs. Clinton likewise said she would “not add a penny to the national debt.” Asked next about entitlement spending, Mr. Trump switched to a discussion of the Affordable Care Act, which he said he wanted to repeal. When Mrs. Clinton tweaked her opponent for evading taxes, Mr. Trump interjected: “Such a nasty woman,” he said.

• Mrs. Clinton, speaking about her support for some gun control measures, said she saw “no conflict between saving people’s lives and defending the Second Amendment.” She added that the National Rifle Association was running “millions of dollars of ads against me.” Mr. Trump said he was unsure if Mrs. Clinton had referenced the group’s support for him “in a sarcastic manner,” but that he was “very proud” of it.

• Asked about the role of the Supreme Court, Mrs. Clinton said she expected the court to “represent all of us,” citing the importance of marriage equality and abortion rights. She added that she hoped that “the Senate would do its job and confirm the nominee that President Obama has sent to them.” Mr. Trump, answering the same question, said, “The Supreme Court, that’s what it’s all about,” before suggesting Mrs. Clinton would hope to steer the court away from adherence to the Second Amendment.

• Mrs. Clinton focused attention on Mr. Trump’s past comments that, if abortion were outlawed, there should be “some form of punishment” for the women involved. After Mrs. Clinton was pressed on her support for late-term abortions under certain circumstances — she cited the health of prospective mothers — Mr. Trump said he thought it was “terrible.” “If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother,” he said.

• Mr. Trump held forth on his signature issue — **immigration** — suggesting that the heroin crisis in some pockets of the country owed to insufficient border security. “We have to have strong borders,” he said, adding, “We have some bad hombres.” Mrs. Clinton said that while her **immigration** plan “of course includes border security,” she did not want to see “the deportation force that Donald has talked about.”

• Mrs. Clinton suggested Mr. Trump was a hypocrite on the issue of **immigration**, saying he had “used undocumented labor to build the Trump Tower.” When the moderator, Chris Wallace, quoted from a paid Clinton speech — citing an excerpt revealed by WikiLeaks in which she said she dreamed of “open trade and open borders” — Mrs. Clinton said she was “talking about energy.”

• Mrs. Clinton said a more pressing issue from the leaked documents was the specter of the Russian government engaging in “espionage against Americans,” suggesting that Russian President Vladimir V. Putin has a “clear favorite in this race.” “That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders,” Mr. Trump said, adding, “I don’t know Putin.” Mrs. Clinton said Mr. Putin would prefer “a puppet as president of the United States.” Mr. Trump shot back, “You’re the puppet.”

• After Mr. Trump said Mr. Putin had “outsmarted and outplayed” Mrs. Clinton on the international stage, Mrs. Clinton moved to cast Mr. Trump as too unstable to be president, saying he had been distressingly cavalier about the use of nuclear weapons. “Wrong,” Mr. Trump interjected, reprising an interruption from the first debate.

• As the discussion turned to the economy, Mrs. Clinton said Mr. Trump’s plans amounted to “trickle-down economics on steroids.” Mr. Trump, after taking credit for more active participation from international trade partners — “all the sudden they’re paying,” he said — suggested he would produce national prosperity by renegotiating trade deals.

• After Mrs. Clinton said President Obama did not get the credit he deserved for improving economic conditions since taking office, she allowed that Americans were “standing, but we’re not yet running.” Mr. Trump, placing blame for many Americans’ financial struggles on trade policy under Bill Clinton, said the country was “stagnant.” Mrs. Clinton accused Mr. Trump of crying “crocodile tears” about the American work force despite using Chinese steel on construction projects.

• Addressing the many accusations of sexual assault against him, Mr. Trump said, “I don’t know those people,” calling the accounts “totally false.” “I didn’t even apologize to my wife, who’s sitting right here, because I didn’t do anything,” he said, accusing Mrs. Clinton of stoking the claims. Mrs. Clinton seized on Mr. Trump’s recent insinuations that he could not have assaulted some of the women because they were not attractive enough. “Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger,” she said. “I don’t think there’s a woman anywhere who doesn’t know what that feels like.”

• When Mr. Trump sought to pivot to a discussion of Mrs. Clinton’s use of a private email server when she was secretary of state, Mrs. Clinton accused him of dodging responsibility for his own actions. “He never apologizes or says he’s sorry for anything,” she said, noting his insults of a Gold Star family, a reporter with a physical disability and a judge with Mexican heritage, among others. “It’s not one thing, this is a pattern,” she said.

• Mr. Trump accused Mrs. Clinton of misdeeds at the Clinton Foundation, asking her to return donations from countries with a record of human rights abuses. Mrs. Clinton said she would be “happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation,” recalling the use of Trump Foundation funds to purchase a large portrait of its namesake. “Who does that?” she asked. When Mr. Trump said the foundation’s money was dedicated to charitable giving, Mrs. Clinton noted that his claims were impossible to verify because he had not released his tax returns.

• After Mr. Trump accused Mrs. Clinton of helping to destabilize the Middle East, citing her vote for the Iraq war, among other decisions, Mrs. Clinton reminded voters that Mr. Trump had expressed support for the invasion. “Google, ‘Donald Trump Iraq,’” she said. Mr. Trump repeatedly cut in to say, “Wrong.”

• The candidates sparred over refugee policy, with Mr. Trump predicting security crises if Mrs. Clinton were elected. “This is going to be the great Trojan horse,” Mr. Trump said, discussing Syrian refugees. “Lots of luck, Hillary.” Mrs. Clinton said she would not allow anyone into the country without appropriate vetting but added, “I am not going to slam the door on women and children.”

• Offered a chance to give closing remarks, the candidates hewed closely to their campaign trail messages. Mrs. Clinton spoke about improving the lives of families, saying she hoped Americans would “give me a chance to serve as your president.” Mr. Trump began, “She’s raising the money from the people she wants to control. Doesn’t work that way.” He said he would “make America great,” touching on what he called a “depleted military” and urban conditions where “you get shot walking to the store.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Chris Wallace’s Debate Role Is a Bright Spot in a Dark Year for Fox[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/business/media/new-energy-at-fox-as-chris-wallace-prepares-to-moderate-a-presidential-debate.html]

\* Guiding Trump, an Ex-General Who Shakes His Fist at Washington[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/michael-flynn-donald-trump.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Just before the final debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/presidential-debate.html] between Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] kicks off in Las Vegas on Wednesday night with **immigration** as a focus, a group will gather in New York to celebrate “Nuevo New York[http://www.artbook.com/9788862084956.html],” a book about creative professionals of Latin American descent. Included in it are well-known figures like Carolina Herrera, Maria Cornejo, Carlos Campos, Francisco Costa and Nina Garcia.

The book, released last month, is a passion project of Gabriel Rivera-Barraza, a publicist from Durango, Mexico, who **immigrated** to the United States at 13, and Hans Neumann, a photographer from Lima, Peru, who arrived here when he was about 23. Mr. Rivera-Barraza and Mr. Neumann spent four years interviewing and photographing nearly 80 subjects.

“It’s a celebration of Latin Americans,” Mr. Neumann said. “It’s about happiness and laughter and freedom. A different point of view.”

Mr. Rivera-Barraza and Mr. Neumann insist it’s a coincidence that on the night of the final debate they are celebrating Latinos, a group that has found itself targeted during this election cycle. But they emphasized the importance of doing so anyway.

“We’re the biggest minority in the U.S.,” Mr. Rivera-Barraza said. “It’s time for us to talk about the nice side of our culture.”

Narciso Rodriguez, a Cuban-American designer who appears in the book, is also the focus of an exhibition[https://thefrost.fiu.edu/exhibitions/2016/narciso-rodriguez.html] that opened last weekend at the Patricia & Phillip Frost Art Museum at Florida International University in Miami.

“It is very important to incorporate the accomplishments of Latin American artists, architects, and designers into the canon of history,” Jordana Pomeroy, the director of the museum, wrote in an email.

When the political conversation turned last year to suggestions of building a wall, deporting **immigrants** and barring Muslims from entry, Mr. Rivera-Barraza and Mr. Neumann thought it was even more important to finish the book despite running low on funds. But they were concerned some of their subjects might back out from fear of being in the spotlight. Instead, they were surprised by how many additional people wanted to participate; they ended up extending their deadline and adding more than two dozen portraits.

Both men have noticed a change in tone in the conversation about **immigrants** during the last year.

“My nephew came to me the other day and said: ‘Uncle, it’s bad to be Mexican. At school they’re saying this or that,’” Mr. Rivera-Barraza said. “That really hurt. That really scared me. I don’t want my niece and nephew to be ashamed because someone is saying they’re less than.”

For him, the need to provide role models in the creative industry for a younger generation of Latin American descent became a particularly important goal.

“A lot of these kids don’t know where to look,” Mr. Rivera-Barraza said. “They’re the first generation who are going to get educated. We want to tell them, ‘Don’t give up.’”

Dr. Pomeroy of the Frost Museum noted that showing young people what they can aspire to is part of the work of an exhibition like the one about Mr. Rodriguez. “It is imperative that children of Latin American descent living in the U.S. are exposed to a spectrum of futures through places like museums,” she said.

And what of the book’s subjects? Ms. Cornejo, a fashion designer whose story of leaving Chile when she was 11 as a political refugee, then moving to London, then Paris and finally New York appears in “Nuevo New York,” said she loved the sense of community participating in the book gave her.

“It’s amazing the amount of Latinos who are in the business of fashion and the arts,” she said. Joining their ranks gave her a sense of place after being unmoored for many years.

“I was a bit countryless,” she said. “New York is where I found my own way. This is the one place I’ve lived the longest. My family has grown here, my children grew up here, I built my business here.”

Reflecting on the election, Mr. Neumann expressed disappointment that he will not be able to vote because he is a resident, not a citizen, but was also hopeful that those who can will make their voice count.

“In the end, America is full of **immigrants**, and it has been for centuries,” he said. “You can’t deny that about a country full of Irish people, Russian people, English people, Latin people. Who’s not an **immigrant**, really?”

Continue following our fashion and lifestyle coverage on Facebook (Styles[https://www.facebook.com/nytimesstyles] and Modern Love[https://www.facebook.com/modernlove]), Twitter (Styles[https://twitter.com/nytstyles], Fashion[https://twitter.com/nytfashion] and Weddings[https://twitter.com/nytimesvows]) and Instagram[https://instagram.com/nytimesfashion].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The term “Canadian values” is normally a harmless cliché — a reminder that the planet’s second largest country by land mass is a Boy Scout-like bastion of tolerance and fairness. This trope regained some of its luster with last fall’s election of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, who might as well be the country’s Boy Scout in chief.

“We’re Canadian, and we’re here to help,” the youthful 44-year-old said in an address to the United Nations General Assembly recently.

Were it up to Kellie Leitch, Canadian values would take a distinctly different turn. Ms. Leitch, a member of Parliament and one of seven registered candidates for leader of the Conservative Party, wants to screen **immigrants** for what she calls “anti-Canadian values.”

Ms. Leitch has intimated that would-be **immigrants** who are against “hard work,” “generosity” and (yes) “tolerance” shouldn’t be allowed entry into the country.

“Right now, we screen people for security reasons. You know we ask individuals what their income is. So why would we not ask some simple questions with regards to whether you believe in equality of rights?” she told the CBC.

The other leadership candidates were quick to condemn Ms. Leitch, including Deepak Obhrai, a Tanzanian émigré who has been a member of Parliament for 20 years. “You make us feel unwelcome,” Mr. Obhrai said of her on CBC Radio.

Yet Ms. Leitch’s gambit has struck a chord with the public. An Angus Reid poll in October suggested 67 percent of Canadians feel “minorities should do more to fit in better with mainstream Canadian society.”

Perhaps Canadians aren’t quite so Canadian as the cliché suggests.

But from its beginnings, Canada[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/canada/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] has taken an attitude toward **immigration** that was born of both necessity and idealism; the country needed more able bodies for its work force than the traditional stream of old-stock Europeans could provide.

German, Scots and Irish **immigrants** supplanted their French brethren following the end of the Seven Years War in 1763. Later and more reluctantly, the country took in Ukranians, Poles, Italians, Greeks, Jews, Syrians, Asians and blacks from the Caribbean. It’s a big country to fill.

Canada’s modern-day love affair with **immigration** began in 1971, when the country, under Justin Trudeau’s father, Pierre, became the first in the world to adopt multiculturalism as official policy. But despite Canada’s reputation as a welcoming harbor for **immigrants** and refugees, the issue has always divided Canadians themselves, mainly on economic grounds, according to polls.

In 1979, for example, the right wing think tank National Citizens Coalition reacted to Canada’s acceptance of 50,000 Vietnamese refugees by predicting it would lead to “at least 750,000 in the not too distant future.”

Today, there are roughly 190,000 Vietnamese in Canada, according to the most recent census numbers. The integration of Vietnamese refugees into Canadian society has served as a blueprint for the country’s welcoming of 31,000 Syrian refugees. (The United States, which is nearly nine times the size of Canada’s population, has pledged to take in only 10,000.)

The most recent obstacle has been terrorism on home soil. In 2014, in the space of two days, two members of the Canadian military were killed by Islamic terrorists in separate attacks in the military town of St.-Jean-Sur-Richelieu and on Ottawa’s Parliament Hill.

That the perpetrators were self-radicalized Canadian-born men was seemingly immaterial, as fear trumped common sense. The arrival of Syrian refugees has only increased that fear.

“Stagnation and security fears have produced a closing of the Canadian mind when it comes to the three pillars of globalization: **immigration**, free trade and foreign direct investment,” says Frank Graves, the president of the Ottawa-based EKOS Research Associates polling firm. “We are not ‘closed,’ but we are much less open than we were at the outset of the century.”

In Quebec, **immigration** has always raised tensions, in large part because it is often seen as a threat to the culture of the French-speaking province. In 2013, the province of Quebec’s governing Parti Québécois introduced the “Quebec values charter,” which sought to prohibit the wearing of any “conspicuous” religious garb by the province’s public service, in the interests of state secularism.

One of its architects, Jean-François Lisée, compared it to Thomas Jefferson’s separation of church and state. Now a frontrunner for the Parti Québécois leadership, Mr. Lisée recently mused that burqas must be banned from Quebec “before a jihadist uses one to hide his movements.”

Ms. Leitch’s turn toward values has given her campaign a shot in the arm, but her own political history suggests that it’s a mug’s game. The previous Conservative government, in which Ms. Leitch was a minister, played the values card in last election — and lost, to Mr. Trudeau’s Liberals. Similarly, the Parti Québécois campaigned almost exclusively on its values charter in 2014, and suffered one of the worst defeats in party history as a result.

Long on bombast and short on details, Ms. Leitch’s Canadian values proposition has a certain Donald Trump-like whiff to it. And much like Mr. Trump’s various utterings, it might play well for a segment of her party’s base but hasn’t yet proven to be successful with the voting public at large.

Even so, that she sees dividends in exploiting Canadian values says more about that old cliché than many would care to admit. If Ms. Leitch’s campaign gains support, it would, as is the case with Mr. Trump’s candidacy, make Canadians acknowledge the level of their hostility toward the very kind of people who built the country in the first place.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Martin Patriquin is the Quebec bureau chief for Maclean’s.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] will meet on Wednesday night at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for their final debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/presidential-debate.html] of the presidential election. The moderator, Chris Wallace of “Fox News Sunday,” has divided the hour-and-a-half event into six 15-minute segments, to cover **immigration**, the Supreme Court[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/supreme\_court/index.html?inline=nyt-org], entitlements and debt, the economy, foreign policy and fitness for office.

Here are the questions New York Times correspondents would like to hear:

Entitlements

Do you favor increasing or reducing Social Security[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social\_security\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] benefits? If so, how would you do it?

More than 60 million people each month receive Social Security benefits totaling more than $74 billion. Polls show that retirement security is a top concern for Americans. Fewer people can count on traditional pension benefits, and some people do not have retirement savings.

Mr. Trump has said he would not cut Social Security benefits. Mrs. Clinton wants to make Social Security more generous for widows and for those who take time out of the paid work force to care for a child or a sick family member. She has said she would require the wealthiest Americans to pay higher taxes.

But an aging population is a driver of rising government debt and of a budget deficit that climbed last fiscal year after several years of decline.

What three steps would you take to improve Medicare[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/medicare/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]?

The aging of baby boomers and the increase of medical costs will squeeze the health insurance program, which now covers 57 million older Americans. Medicare trustees say the hospital insurance trust fund could be exhausted in 2028 if no changes are made to existing law.

Both Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump say Medicare should be able to negotiate prices with pharmaceutical companies. Mrs. Clinton has proposed allowing people ages 55 to 64 to buy into Medicare, but has not said how the government or the new beneficiaries would pay for the coverage. ROBERT PEAR

**Immigration**

Since 2012, hundreds of thousands of illegal **immigrants** who were brought to the United States as children have registered with the government under President Obama’s executive order that gives them work permits and guarantees they will not be deported. Will you honor those guarantees?

Frustrated by Republicans’ refusal to overhaul the nation’s **immigration** system, Mr. Obama used executive authority to provide opportunities for millions of law-abiding **immigrants** who are in the country illegally. But the Supreme Court has blocked some of his plan, and the next president will have the power to reverse the rest.

The war in Syria has created a huge migrant crisis. What is the appropriate level of migration from Syria that the United States should allow, and how would you guarantee that those coming into our country from a region struggling with terrorism do not mean us harm?

The United States has confronted these questions throughout its history: How open should its borders be to those fleeing oppression and violence? Mr. Trump dramatically proposed barring all Muslims, and later amended his idea to propose “extreme vetting” for anyone from countries like Syria or Libya, where extremism is rampant. Mrs. Clinton has accused her rival of xenophobia. She has said the United States should expand the number of Syrians allowed entry. The future flows of migrants from Syria and other hot spots will probably be determined by the outcome of the presidential contest. MICHAEL D. SHEAR

The Economy

The economy has grown slowly in recent years, and one reason is a prolonged slump in productivity growth. What steps would your administration take to encourage innovation and investment?

Modern prosperity was created by a huge increase in worker productivity. As the output of the average worker increases, so does the standard of living. But in recent years, that engine has been sputtering. Since the deep recession of 2008, labor productivity in the United States has increased by just 1 percent a year — less than half the annual pace since 1947. At the current pace, our standard of living will double once every 70 years, instead of doubling once every 30 years.

The government can improve productivity by encouraging the creation and diffusion of new technologies through changes in taxation and regulation. It can also play a more direct role, by improving the quality of public education or by making its own investments. Federal research and development funding fell to 0.78 percent of gross domestic product last year[https://www.aaas.org/page/historical-trends-federal-rd], down from 1 percent in 2009.

Around seven million men ages 25 to 54 are neither working nor looking for work. How would you help prime-age men who are sitting on the sidelines of the American economy?

The unemployment rate stood at 5 percent in September, a healthy number that concealed a host of deeper problems. One of the most perplexing: the rise of nonworking men[https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/page/files/20160620\_cea\_primeage\_male\_lfp.pdf]. About 15 percent of prime-age men do not have jobs, up from about 5 percent in the 1960s. Most of them are not looking for work, so they are not counted in the unemployment rate. But they are a drag on the economy: They do not produce, but they continue to consume.

In an earlier generation, they might have found jobs in factories or other blue-collar occupations. Now they spend, on average, almost six hours a day watching television.

Economic growth is an incomplete corrective. Many nonworking men are ill equipped for the jobs that are available. Federal regulations, or restrictions on **immigration**, might induce employers to offer better pay and benefits. Restrictions on the availability of federal benefits might induce men to look for work. BINYAMIN APPELBAUM

Supreme Court

On Monday, Senator John McCain of Arizona said[http://www.npr.org/2016/10/17/498328520/sen-mccain-says-republicans-will-block-all-court-nominations-if-clinton-wins] Republicans “will be united against any Supreme Court nominee that Hillary Clinton, if she were president, would put up.” What are the Senate’s obligations to consider presidential nominations to the Supreme Court?

A spokeswoman for Mr. McCain later tried to soften his remarks, but the suggestion that the current Supreme Court vacancy could last indefinitely was startling. In its last term, the court, down a justice since Antonin Scalia’s death in February, deadlocked in major cases on **immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/supreme-court-immigration-obama-dapa.html] and public unions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/30/us/politics/friedrichs-v-california-teachers-association-union-fees-supreme-court-ruling.html], and it issued a muddled compromise ruling in a religious challenge to contraception coverage requirements[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/17/us/supreme-court-contraception-religious-groups.html].

And the next president will very likely face additional vacancies, as Justice Stephen G. Breyer is 78, Justice Anthony M. Kennedy is 80 and Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg is 83.

Mrs. Clinton, if you are elected, will you urge the Senate to confirm Mr. Obama’s Supreme Court nominee, Judge Merrick B. Garland, in its lame-duck session? Will you renominate him?

Mrs. Clinton’s support for Judge Garland has been notably mild. At the last debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/politics/transcript-second-debate.html], she said only that “I regret deeply that the Senate has not done its job and they have not permitted a vote,” adding that Judge Garland was “a highly qualified person.”

Mrs. Clinton’s statements may reflect a strategic calculation in a game of constitutional chicken. By hinting that she would nominate someone more liberal and younger than Judge Garland, who is 63 and generally viewed as a moderate, she may be prodding the Senate to act.

Or perhaps she thinks the court could use a forceful liberal voice from a younger nominee. In a radio interview, she said[http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2016-09-15/hillary-clinton-hints-she-may-not-renominate-garland-for-court] she would “look broadly and widely for people who represent the diversity of our country.” Judge Garland is a white man. ADAM LIPTAK

International Hot Spots

How would you respond to Russia’s recent aggression, from Ukraine to Syria to the hacking of the Democratic Party?

The United States and the European Union have already imposed significant economic sanctions on people and businesses close to President Vladimir V. Putin in retaliation for Russia’s annexation of Crimea and its role in destabilizing Ukraine. Mr. Obama gambled that Mr. Putin’s adventurism in Ukraine and Syria would eventually backfire for Russia. But there is little evidence that Russia’s military entanglements have eroded Mr. Putin’s popularity.

Mr. Obama has argued, with some justification, that confronting Russia militarily in Ukraine would be a losing battle, since Ukraine means much more to Russia than it does to the United States. In Syria, a more aggressive American military presence would risk a clash with Russian warplanes. The Obama administration has hinted that it will respond to Russia’s hacking with covert action, potentially a cyberattack of its own. But it is not clear that this would be enough to stop the Russians from a strategy they believe has produced dividends.

How would you differ from Mr. Obama in your handling of the Syrian war?

Both Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton have criticized Mr. Obama’s inaction in Syria, although they differ radically on the proper prescription for a war that has lasted more than five years and caused hundreds of thousands of deaths. Part of the problem is setting priorities: Should the United States continue to call for the ouster of President Bashar al-Assad when it is also trying to uproot the Islamic State from Iraq and Syria?

Syria has become a proxy war for a multitude of players — Russia, Iran, Turkey and the Persian Gulf states — each with its own competing and overlapping interests. The trick for the next president is to find a solution that will end the killing and somehow win the support, or at least the acquiescence, of the many actors with interests in Syria. MARK LANDLER

Fitness for Office

Mr. Trump, you have repeatedly made false claims during the campaign. Mrs. Clinton, you have been less than forthright about classified emails. How do you assure Americans that you will be honest and truthful?

Many Americans have already concluded that both candidates are liars. Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton need to show that they have strategies for moving beyond that deeply held impression.

Both of you have a demonstrated record of putting your personal financial concerns first — Mrs. Clinton, with your speaking fees and accusations over suspect commodities trades, and Mr. Trump, with your trail of business failures that left others with the bill. How can people be assured that you can separate your own interests from the decisions a president must make?

Both candidates are extremely wealthy, with a web of family finances that could be influenced by executive branch decisions. They need to explain to the public how they can separate the two and make decisions without consideration to themselves. CARL HULSE

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Presidential Debate: What to Watch For[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

\* Chris Wallace’s Debate Role Is a Bright Spot in a Dark Year for Fox[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/business/media/new-energy-at-fox-as-chris-wallace-prepares-to-moderate-a-presidential-debate.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was a Friday afternoon at Mike Lanza’s house in Menlo Park, Calif., and the boys were going crazy. There were boys playing ball in the street, while in the backyard, boys were skittering along the top of the fence while others were wrestling on the trampoline. The house itself is nothing special — a boxy contemporary, haphazardly furnished — but even by the elevated standards of Silicon Valley, the Lanzas’ play space is extraordinary. It boasts a map of the neighborhood painted on the driveway, a fabulous 24-foot-long play river — an installation art piece, designed for children’s museums — and a two-story log-cabin playhouse with a sleeping loft, whiteboard walls inside for coloring and really good speakers, blasting Talking Heads.

Leo Lanza, who was 5 at the time, was taunting my kids, claiming they were too scared to climb 12 feet to the playhouse roof, using the toe holds, and then leap onto the trampoline, which has no surrounding netting. My daughter, Violet, the only girl there, continued to decorate the playhouse walls with a purple marker. “I don’t care if you get hurt,” she responded airily. Her twin brother, Kieran, scrunched up his round face, turning pink. “That’s not true!” he wailed. “I am not scared.”

My kids were in a prekindergarten program with Leo, the youngest of the three Lanza boys. I had heard a lot about Mike’s house, a few miles from our own, but that Friday-afternoon pizza party, a year and a half ago, was the first time I had gone there.

Through the glass doors of the kitchen, I could see Mike opening a bottle of wine for some guests. Mike is a well-known, if polarizing, figure in our community. An entrepreneur in his early 50s, he has a boyish grin, large hazel eyes and curly salt-and-pepper hair, and wears jeans and sneakers, like all the other middle-aged tech guys. After acquiring three Stanford degrees (a B.A., an M.B.A. and a master’s in education) and selling a handful of modestly successful start-ups, Mike decided to focus on his ideas about parenting. He began writing a blog and giving talks and eventually self-published a book entitled “Playborhood[http://playborhood.com/],” a phrase he coined to describe the environment he wanted for his kids. (He kept a hand in the tech world as well — an app he created, a map-based photo-sharing service called Streetography, is being released next week.)

Mike is a deep believer in the idea that “kids have to find their own balance of power.” He wants his boys to create their own society governed by its own rules. He consciously transformed his family’s house into a kid hangout, spreading the word that local children were welcome to play in the yard anytime, even when the family wasn’t home. Discontented with the expensive, highly structured summer camps typical of the area, Mike started one of his own: Camp Yale, named after his street, where the kids make their own games and get to roam the neighborhood.

“Think about your own 10 best memories of childhood, and chances are most of them involve free play outdoors,” Mike is fond of saying. “How many of them took place with a grown-up around? I remember that when the grown-ups came over, we stopped playing and waited for them to go away. But moms nowadays never go away.”

In Mike’s worldview, boys today (his focus is on boys) are being deprived of masculine experiences by overprotective moms, who are allowed to dominate passive dads. Central to Mike’s philosophy is the importance of physical danger: of encouraging boys to take risks and play rough and tumble and get — or inflict — a scrape or two. Central to what he calls mom philosophy (which could just be described as contemporary parenting philosophy) is just the opposite: to play safe, play nice and not hurt other kids or yourself. Most moms are not inclined to leave their children’s safety up to chance. I certainly am not.

Mike had invited me to drop the kids off — not to hover. But I could see Leo brandishing a long rubber tube, as if he were about to whack my son, who looked worried. Beneath the pleasantries, it was clear that Mike thought I was putting my son at risk of turning into what used to be called a sissy — a concept whose demise he regrets. And I was of the opinion that Mike was putting his son at risk of being a bully, a label Mike thinks is now used to pathologize normal, healthy, boyish aggression.

Mike came out to the yard, his wineglass in one hand and a piece of cheese in another. His wife, Perla Ni, a lawyer who directs a nonprofit, was working late. Where Mike has a loud, large and boisterous presence (a neighbor once compared him to a Labrador retriever, happily trampling everyone’s shrubbery), Perla is quiet, petite, deliberate and self-contained. The only child of Chinese **immigrants**, she wants her sons to have considerably more fun than she had.

“Uh, can you keep an eye on them?” I asked Mike, reluctantly gathering my stuff to leave. “The society of 5-year-olds is fragile and may fall into savagery!”

“Yeah, yeah,” he replied affably. “I’m a believer in that Rousseau theory — what’s it called?”

“Something about a Noble Savage?” I said. “I’m more a believer in the truth of ‘Lord of the Flies.’ ” My smile was thin and conveyed, For the love of God, can you please put your drink down and watch the kids?

His smile told me he wanted me to leave already.

In 2006, when their oldest son, Marco, was 2, Mike and Perla began what proved to be a two-year house search in Menlo Park and neighboring Palo Alto. They were yearning for the kind of classic neighborhood that Mike recalled from his childhood on the East Coast in Scott Township, a suburb of Pittsburgh. They were living in San Francisco, but they wanted to move out of the city to a playborhood — a version of American kid life featured in shows like “The Little Rascals” and “Leave It to Beaver,” in which kids build forts and ride bikes outside, unsupervised — free, skirting danger, but ultimately always lucky. (The oddness of needing a neologism for what so recently would simply have been considered a “neighborhood” only reinforces his point.) Mike drove around deserted street after street: The kids were off at Lego robotics classes, Kumon learning centers or diving practice or squirreled away with their screens.

Despite having achieved a higher socioeconomic status for his family than he had as a kid, Mike felt his sons were at risk of having a worse childhood. Growing up in a middle-class Italian-American family in the 1960s and ’70s, Mike rated school as boring-to-O.K., whereas after-school play time with the gang was awesome.

Like many places, Silicon Valley is sports-crazy, with kids participating in year-round travel clubs and working with private coaches. But Mike feels that organized team sports fail to teach the critical life skills that he and his friends learned in pickup games they had to referee themselves. They were forced to resolve their own disputes, because if they didn’t, the game would end. Their focus was not on winning and losing, as when adults are in charge, he says, but simply on keeping the game going.

Mike recalls how his gang was often short of a quorum for games. There were two other boys their age, but one was deaf and the other, he says, was “whatever the P.C. way to describe what used to be called ‘mentally retarded.’ ” Since they didn’t want to “stoop all the way to girls,” he says, giving me a smile, they found ways to change the rules to accommodate the two boys with special needs in their game — “not because a grown-up forced” them to be inclusive, Mike says, but because they were motivated to be.

Then, when Mike was in seventh grade, his family moved to a better house in an upscale development nearby, and the fun ended. Though the new house wasn’t far from the old one — all Mike would have had to do was walk up the hill to play with his old friends — he instead spent his afternoons watching TV, drinking Coke and munching on saltines. He didn’t blame his parents; it was bad luck — an unpredictable anomaly — that the new development wasn’t a playborhood. But today it would simply be the norm. Playborhoods have all but disappeared.

“Everyone complains about kids not having enough free time, and being addicted to technology,” Mike says. “There are a million studies documenting the negative effects of lack of free play in children. Well, we know the harms. I asked myself: What am I going to do about it for my kids?”

He analyzed the problem like an entrepreneur, by thinking of children as consumers and seeing their time as a scarce resource. Playing outside has to compete with screen time. (A typical 2-to-10-year-old child spends at least a couple of hours a day on screens; tweens spend more than four.) Parents who limit screen time, as local families often do, tend to compensate by piling on extracurricular activities and tutors.

Even if a boy wanted to play outside, Mike explains, with whom would he play? At any given hour, there might be a 30 percent chance that some kid was playing outside. But the so-called network effect, in which children influence one another’s behavior, means that 30 percent might as well be zero, because it is low enough that no boy can count on it and so will default to his screen — causing the percentage to drop lower. That is, kids don’t play outside because other kids don’t play outside. Playing outside becomes like Betamax — it’s just obsolete. But in the case of a playborhood, the vicious circle transforms into a virtuous one: When there’s always another kid to play with, most kids want to play.

As part of Mike’s quest for a playborhood, he began doing research and visiting neighborhoods in different parts of the country that he thought might fit his vision. The first place he visited was N Street in Davis, Calif., a cluster of around 20 houses that share land and hold regular dinners together. Children wander around freely, crossing backyards and playing in the collective spaces: Ping-Pong table, pizza oven and community garden. Mike told me the story of Lucy, a toddler adopted from China by a single mom who lived on N Street. When Lucy was 3, her mother died of cancer. But before she died, her mother gave every house a refrigerator magnet with a picture of Lucy on it. While the founders of N Street formally adopted Lucy, the entire community supported her. Mike pointed out that the childhood Lucy was having on N Street may be akin to one she might have enjoyed in a village in rural China, but it was extraordinary in suburban America. Lucy could wander around fearlessly, knowing she had 19 other houses where she could walk right in and expect a snack.

Mike spent some time in the Lyman Place neighborhood in the Bronx, where grandmothers and other residents organized to watch the streets — so dangerous that children were afraid to play outside — and block them off in the summer to create a neighborhood camp, staffed by local teenagers and volunteers. Mike also found his way to Share-It Square in Southeast Portland, Ore., a random intersection that became a community when a local architect mobilized neighbors to convert a condemned house on one corner into a “Kids’ Klubhouse”: a funky open-air structure that features a couch, a message board, a book-exchange box, a solar-powered tea station and toys.

Mike was aware of limits to the analogies. Those playborhoods were in lower- and middle-class communities; he and Perla had settled on a house in the Allied Arts area of Menlo Park, where the median home price is $2 million. (And the houses in neighboring North Palo Alto and Atherton cost even more.) Mike found himself up against the fact that in America, the ethos of wealth and the ethos of community are often in conflict: Part of what the wealthy feel they are buying is privacy and the ability to be choosy about whom they socialize with. Mike was determined that his kids would not only know their neighbors but would also see them, every day.

In order to achieve this, Mike decided he had to corral his neighbors to sign on to his platform. He designed big neon-yellow plastic signs like those used to warn of wet floors, emblazoned with an icon of children playing and the word Playborhood. He invited kids to parties and gave the signs to their parents, to put in their yards and on the road in front of their houses so their children could “reclaim the streets from cars.” (We had the sign in our driveway, but my husband accidentally ran over it, and the shards of yellow plastic remained there for months — a good reminder, he said, of what happens to children who play in the street.)

Mike also made another simple-but-radical move: In a neighborhood in which front yards are for admiration only, Mike installed a picnic table, close to the sidewalk, where he and his family often sat, so that people walking by would have to talk to them. Mike put a white board on the fence and started projecting videos and slide shows onto it, in hope of luring neighborhood children. And it worked: Dogs stop to drink at a fountain made from a large, flat millstone in the shape of a hockey puck, children wander over to the play river and people pause to read the quotes on the mosaics he had an artist design. One is from the children’s book “The Big Orange Splot”: “Our street is us and we are it. Our street is where we like to be, and it looks like all our dreams.”

Mike has influenced our family as well. My kids and I made friends on our block by playing a game from Camp Yale in which we asked neighbors to contribute one ingredient to what turned out to be an apple-pear-blueberry-strawberry cobbler; when it was baked, we brought each​ ​​of them a piece. My daughter liked the game so much, she recently asked to make her birthday cake that way. Then, when our next-door neighbors generously passed along their trampoline, I spread the word that other children were welcome to play in our yard anytime. Sometimes visitors will be surprised when my children aren’t home and they hear shrieks of laughter coming from our yard, as neighborhood kids bounce and squirt water guns they filled in our fountain, and I feel grateful to Mike for his vision.

Mike always talks about just wanting his boys to have a normal childhood, while complaining that his idea of normal is no longer normal. His free-time-is-for-goofing-around ethos is particularly anomalous in Silicon Valley. With all due respect to Westchester, Silicon Valley may have the densest concentration in the country of former engineers, executives and other highly educated women who have renounced work in favor of what they call uber-parenting — and they want results. Just as Silicon Valley leads the way in smartphones, Silicon Valley parents think they should be producing model kids, optimized kids, kids with extra capacity and cool features: kids who have start-ups (or at least work at one); do environmental work in the Galápagos; speak multiple languages; demonstrate a repeatable golf swing; or sing arias. To a comical extent, parents here justify the perverted ambition through appeals to research (enlarging the language center of the brain and so forth) while ignoring research on the negative effects on children of being micromanaged.

“What strikes me is that there is this extraordinary level of anxiety,” Mike told me. “Parents don’t have fundamental faith in their offspring.” He dislikes the vast expansion of the role of parenting into every aspect of children’s lives, including curating their children’s hobbies with excruciating care, and he says he aspires to be “the opposite of a tiger parent.” “As a libertarian, one of the biggest problems we have in American society is that children don’t have enough freedom” — children thrive on benign neglect. “Look, there is always a power struggle between children and adults,” he says. “One way to see the present is that the children have been decimated. It’s not good for children that adults have so much control over them.”

Local parents often talk about the rash of suicides among Palo Alto high school students in recent years. “It’s been pretty clear to me since I moved here eight years ago that kids are just not happy here,” Mike says, and “the suicides are just the extreme examples of the broader problem.” He believes “the poor quality of children’s lives around here” stems from their lack of autonomy. Basic developmental psychology posits that if children develop a fundamental sense that they (not their parents) are masters of their own destiny, they will be successful adults, and that without that belief they will flounder: It’s easy to want to rid yourself of a life that doesn’t feel truly your own.

Research suggests that students with controlling “helicopter” parents are less flexible and more vulnerable, anxious and self-conscious, as well as more likely to be medicated for anxiety or depression. Similarly, children whose time is highly structured — crammed with lessons and adult-supervised activities — may have more difficulty developing their own “executive function” capabilities, the ability to devise their own plans and carry them out. Conversely, the more time children spend in free play, the better they develop these capabilities.

Mike says he often feels **alienated** when he’s talking to other parents. The common currency of conversation — rather than sports, politics or weather — is the achievements of your children. “I have exactly nothing to say in these conversations,” Mike says. “Am I going to brag my kids are jumping on their trampoline, or went to the store by themselves? Parents don’t measure themselves according to their kids’ independence, as they used to, but according to accomplishments. To me, that’s part of how I judge myself.”

Reactions to Mike in the neighborhood are mixed. When the Lanzas first moved in, Mike had the idea that the neighbors on both sides should take down the fences between their yards to facilitate play. But unlike on N Street, none of them agreed. Mike complained to me that a neighbor asked Marco to stop climbing into her yard to see her son, even though her son wanted to see Marco. Many neighbors disapprove of boys playing pickup games in the streets and of the younger kids biking alone. Leo was allowed to ride around the neighborhood on his own when he was 5, and two years ago, when Nico was in first grade, he was allowed to bike a mile and a half to school alone.

Mike believes his children have grown by taking risks. “Marco is naturally physically cautious, and now he is working on a back flip onto the trampoline,” Mike tells me. “I’m proud of that. He’s worked his way up. Other kids learn to take risks at our house.”

In the spring of last year, Mike installed 10-foot ladders in each of his sons’ bedrooms so they could climb through a hole in their ceilings into the finished attic. Perla was not enthusiastic. (“She’s not into the man-cave stuff,” Mike says.) She was worried they would fall. And indeed, once, when Leo was playing in the attic, he tumbled down the hatch and hit his head. “To me, it was a bump on the head, which is a normal part of being a kid,” Mike said. But Perla saw it as a head injury and took him to the hospital for a scan. “He was fine,” Mike said, rolling his eyes.

Mike tells me that people sometimes ask him if he is afraid of lawsuits in the event of an injury on his property. He would never let fear of being sued dictate how he lives his life, he says.

What about second-degree manslaughter, I asked: an accident enabled by negligence, if, say, another child — or even one of his own — broke his neck leaping from the playhouse onto the trampoline. (Unenclosed trampolines are a staple of personal-injury law; an estimated 85,000 children under 14 were hurt on trampolines last year.) Does he ever worry about that?

He flashed me a look, then snorted with laughter.

One day last February, Peter Gray, a professor of psychology at Boston College and a fan of Mike’s ideas, spent a day observing the Lanza boys at play. Gray says that when he gives talks on the critical importance of free play in normal development, audience members point out that they are sold on the idea, but that all the kids are on their screens. He always tells them about Mike’s playborhood to show how parents can change their local culture.

As part of Gray’s research, he accompanied Mike to meet the kids at school. Mike biked home with the younger kids while Gray and I biked after Marco and a friend as they rode their skateboards to the park. They amused themselves en route by doing tricks on strangers’ stoops. At the park, they wobbled down steep cement curves with older and more skilled skaters as dusk set in.

“All mammals engage in dangerous play,” Gray told me. “Dangerous play is how kids learn how to titrate fear. Not everyone has to learn quadratic equations” — which, he points out, most people forget the minute they leave school anyway — “but at some point in our lives, we will all be in stressful situations and we need to be able to keep our cool. Sometimes there are accidents,” he added, “kid goats fall off cliffs while playing, or whatever, but they’re rare. If the instinct wasn’t of evolutionary benefit, the behavior would have been rooted out.”

“Well, mother goats don’t die of heartbreak the way we do,” I said peevishly.

He conceded that among humans, mothers in many societies have a tendency to worry. “But there were no helicopter hunter-and-gatherer moms!” he said pointedly. “Kids were with their moms until they were 4, and then they were on their own with the other kids, practicing through play the intricate skills they need to survive: finding their way through the jungle, making weapons and identifying food sources.”

I still recall the visceral shock I felt after I picked my kids up at the Lanzas’ house at the end of the pizza party, having left them alone for all of an hour and a half. On the way home, Kieran announced that he and Leo had climbed out on the roof together — twice, in fact, once at the party and once at a previous play date.

“The roof? The Lanzas’ roof? Is there a railing? Were you with a grown-up?”

The Lanzas have multistory house, with a sloped top and a narrow, flat area perhaps 25 feet off the ground. If you tumbled off the back, you’d land on the grass or perhaps on the stone patio. Falling from either side, you would be impaled on the fence or fall into the neighbor’s yard. From the front you’d hit the concrete driveway, car, picnic table or fountain.

“We climbed up through a window in the attic!” Kieran said with a mixture of pride and wonder. “With no grown-up!”

I was so certain it was a tall tale that I was embarrassed to ask Mike when I saw him at school drop-off.

“I’m sorry you were uncomfortable with it,” he replied flatly, as we stood outside preschool. “But as you know, I don’t worry about things like that.”

Perla was more equivocal, and last spring, when she invited us to play at the house, she assured me that the hatch to the roof — a skylight that opens — had been closed. In June we went to the Lanzas’ for an all-day party celebrating Leo’s seventh birthday in the morning and Marco’s 12th in the afternoon. At one point I went looking for Kieran and wandered up to the attic. Kieran wasn’t there, but I found a cluster of small boys in the process of climbing down from the roof through the open hatch. The youngest seemed to be about 4. They looked at me as if I were about to scold them.

I already knew Mike’s perspective. “What are the chances of falling off the roof?” he argued vociferously when we tried previously to hash it out. Have I ever known anyone who has fallen off a roof? Anyway, he said, it’s not as if he doesn’t give his kids any limits: They are not allowed to play ball or tag up there.

“You trust them?” I asked.

“I want to trust them,” he replied. “I’m O.K. with things happening that I don’t want to happen. My oxygen is when my kids are having fun. I’ve ingrained it in their minds not to run on the roof. It’s a constant struggle for me, but I feel I am reaching a higher level of parenting if I can honestly trust them. And I believe they care about keeping my trust.”

It was clear that we conceived of risk in entirely different ways. He thinks of risk in terms of probability: How likely is it that any given child will plummet to his death? Google has an answer to that question (about 150 children in the United States die from falls from roofs, windows and balconies annually), but I know we would regard that number quite differently. Mike’s decisions aren’t curtailed by statistics, anyway. There’s a quirky, utopian libertarian quality to Mike’s philosophy; he is a man guided above all by his theory of how life should be. For him, low-probability events are very unlikely and therefore dismissible; for me, they are tragedies that befall someone. I think of playing on the roof more like entering a lottery in which, if everyone’s kid plays on the roof, someone’s kid won’t grow up — and I don’t want a ticket. The real question is: Do you believe that the child who falls could be yours?

At the end of the party, I decided I should check out the roof. I found Kieran, and we climbed out of the attic and stepped onto the roof. I spent the first few seconds evaluating the chance that someone would survive the drop (remote), but then I succumbed to the heady feeling of power of looking down on the world. It was like being in the spire of a castle in a children’s book: the quilt of houses, yards and streets, dotted with green lawns and light blue swimming pools — the neighborhood transformed into a picture of itself, like the maps on Mike’s walls. Down below I saw the play river, the fountain and the mosaics in the driveway and, in the street, the kids kicking a ball, forcing cars to make way for them. I saw the animation in the boys’ slender bodies: the power of making the grown-up world momentarily bend around them.

I held Kieran’s hand tightly and decided never to play there again.

Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Melanie Thernstrom is the author, most recently, of ‘‘The Pain Chronicles.’’ She last wrote for the magazine about a family deciding when to stop treating their child with cancer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Is it too late for Hillary Clinton to surrender to Donald Trump’s demand that she take a drug test before this last presidential debate?

I think she should — if he agrees to a few tests of his own. He can choose any three of the following:

CITIZENSHIP TEST This is what the **immigrants** he feels so warm and fuzzy about must master to become full-fledged Americans and, for example, vote in presidential elections against the likes of Trump.

But would he himself pass one?

He’d surely be able to say who the current speaker of the House of Representatives is, given that he spends much of his time sticking pins in his personal Paul Ryan voodoo doll.

But the exact count of voting representatives in the House? That’s also on the test.

We could give him hints: your number of wives plus 432. The amount of federal income taxes you paid in 1995 plus 435.

The test[https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Office%20of%20Citizenship/Citizenship%20Resource%20Center%20Site/Publications/100q.pdf] has questions about the dynamics of the federal government and the contents of the Constitution. Neither is Trump’s strong suit.

He demonstrated staggering ignorance of what the judiciary branch does with an emphatic reference[http://www.weeklystandard.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/trump-on-the-separation-of-powers-judges-sign-bills/article/2001315] to a “bill” that several federal judges had “signed.” He seems to believe that the president can jail a political foe, hire and fire[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/09/08/its-not-clear-that-donald-trump-understands-the-relationship-between-the-president-and-the-military/] generals at will, and command the military to break the law.

He’s clueless about free speech. He threatened to sue Ted Cruz for showing a video of his actual, undisputed pro-abortion comments from the past. After the conservative journalist Rich Lowry assessed his candidacy unkindly, Trump suggested[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/09/23/donald-trump-wants-the-fcc-to-fine-a-critical-fox-news-pundit/] that the Federal Communications Commission fine him.

The history portion of the exam could be trickiest of all. To the question of who Susan B. Anthony is, the answer is not: “A total liar. Never happened. Look at her. She would not be my first choice.”

HEARING TEST The conventional wisdom is that Trump refuses to listen to his advisers. Maybe he just can’t make out what they’re saying. Perhaps it’s an excess of hair spray in the ear canals.

CREDIT CHECK His businesses have filed[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2016/live-updates/general-election/real-time-fact-checking-and-analysis-of-the-first-presidential-debate/fact-check-has-trump-declared-bankruptcy-four-or-six-times/] for Chapter 11 bankruptcy six times. He has a thoroughly documented habit[http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/06/09/donald-trump-unpaid-bills-republican-president-laswuits/85297274/] of stiffing vendors. He and his companies have been defendants[http://www.usatoday.com/pages/interactives/trump-lawsuits/] in more than 1,000 lawsuits. Does he qualify for so much as a Discover card with a $50 limit?

RORSCHACH Imagine the fun. Trump is shown an inkblot that looks to most people like a melting pumpkin.

“You’re using my picture without my consent. My lawyers will be in touch about a licensing fee.”

Trump is shown an inkblot that resembles a misshapen crab.

“It’s an illegal **immigrant** disguised as a crustacean.”

DRIV ING TEST What are the chances that he cedes the right of way to anyone, ever?

MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY This psychological profile makes assessments about such traits as paranoia (check!), hypomania (check!) and more.

Interpreted by the right psychiatrist, it might help tell us what ails Trump in addition to arrested development (he and Billy Bush were essentially “teenage boys,” Melania just told[http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/10/17/melania-trump-compares-donald-to-teenage-boy-on-cnn.html] Anderson Cooper, in her husband’s defense) and a plague of malfunctioning microphones.

Is his case a classic one of narcissistic personality disorder? Does he fit the criteria for borderline personality disorder, which can include outbursts, obsessions and a primitive ego structure?

Or is it something more esoteric? I’m no Freud and I’m no longer Jung, but I detect a mix of auditory hallucinations (he experiences wild applause even when there isn’t any), erotomania (the delusional certainty that other people lust for you) and rosiephobia (a pathological fear of mouthy female talk-show hosts).

VISION TEST Are cataracts the explanation for looking in the mirror and seeing a desirable hairstyle?

SAT Highfalutin vocabulary doesn’t factor quite as prominently into this test as it once did, but a command of language remains bigly essential. Mar-a-Lago, we have a problem.

PRESIDENTIAL FITNESS TEST If only this were as comprehensive as its name suggests. It’s what grade-school students were once required to do: situps, pull-ups and such in front of censorious, fat-shaming peers.

Donning swimwear instead of his mercifully roomy suits, Trump can perform this for an audience of all the beauty-pageant contestants he has ever barged in on. They’ll get to see, in the man who actually regaled[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/trump-clinton-debate-walk-not-impressed-229810] his supporters with a derisive appraisal of Clinton’s backside, what all those cheeseburgers have wrought.

EKG There has been no evidence to date that he has a heart. Confirmation would be nice.

LIE-DETECTOR TES T Preferably during the debate. I imagine smoke billowing from the overtaxed wires before the whole contraption bursts into flames.

I invite you to follow me on Twitter (@FrankBruni)[http://twitter.com/frankbruni] and join me on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/frankbruninyt].

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — Before leading chants of “Lock her up![https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UFBAjhxjQ90]” and endorsing the “extreme vetting[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/16/us/politics/donald-trump-terrorism.html]” of Muslim **immigrants**, Lt. Gen. Michael T. Flynn, a retired career intelligence officer and registered Democrat who is advising Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], was already denouncing what he saw as the Obama administration’s failure to tackle Islamist militancy and the many faults of Hillary Clinton.

But if few people were listening before this year’s presidential campaign, many are now.

General Flynn, 57, took a star turn at the Republican convention[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/us/politics/hillary-clinton-rnc-attacks.html] in July, and no matter who wins in November, he appears likely to emerge from the campaign as the angry voice of what could best be described as the alternative right of the American national security establishment.

For now, though, his focus is on getting Mr. Trump elected. General Flynn talks to his candidate multiple times a week, has sat in on the two intelligence briefings that the Republican nominee has received, and is part of the team that is helping to prepare Mr. Trump, as much as it can, for the third and final presidential debate on Wednesday[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/us/politics/donald-trump-hillary-clinton-drug-test.html], when national security is supposed to be one of the night’s six topics.

In an election year filled with strange and jarring turns, General Flynn’s entry into politics may be one of the most unusual. He has gone from being one of the most respected military officers of his generation to one of its most openly partisan, loudly inveighing against what he sees as a corrupt Washington elite that has left the United States weak and vulnerable.

No one else on Mr. Trump’s national security team comes with the pedigree of General Flynn, who was director of the Defense Intelligence Agency[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/d/defense\_intelligence\_agency/index.html?inline=nyt-org] until 2014, and no one has brought the same level of vitriol.

“What’s happening with the U.S.? Where’s the leadership? That’s what I want to see change,” he said in an interview. “Am I angry or frustrated? Yeah. Who wouldn’t be?”

He is angry about the “political correctness” that makes President Obama and Mrs. Clinton shy from even uttering the phrase “radical Islamic terrorism” — a phrase the general makes a point of using, often — never mind tackling the very real threat he believes it poses. He is angry about what he sees as the lack of accountability represented by Mrs. Clinton and her emails. He is angry that the United States, under both Republicans and Democrats, keeps blundering into wars that seem only to make enemies of what should be natural allies, like Russia, in the fight against Islamist militancy.

It has left friends and critics alike wondering where General Flynn’s ideas end and Mr. Trump’s begin.

“I wasn’t surprised to hear him being outspoken when he retired,” David Hall, a retired Navy Reserve officer and federal prosecutor, said of General Flynn, with whom he worked in the Pentagon. “He was always willing to speak up when he was frustrated or the process wasn’t going well.”

“But going overtly political really surprised me,” Mr. Hall said. “I’d never heard him make any political remarks, or even a remark that I could view as a disguised political remark.”

General Flynn said he had become involved in the Trump campaign out of the same patriotic duty that led him to a 33-year career in the military. But for all the harsh talk, he can strike surprisingly bipartisan notes. He said, for example, that he would have advised Mrs. Clinton had she reached out to him.

“Whatever the outcome of this election, I would like to think that people would still say, ‘Look, this guy has some expertise,’” he said.

Unless Mr. Trump wins, that is unlikely to happen. General Flynn these days is as much of an outcast as one can be in the Washington national security establishment, much of which has lined up behind Mrs. Clinton.

That seems just fine with General Flynn. He has little patience for the Republican neoconservatives who led the United States into Iraq during the George W. Bush administration — “they’ve gotten us into mess after mess for the wrong reasons” — and he sees the Democratic national security establishment as no better.

“Hillary Clinton pushed to get us into Libya. Is she a neocon on the Democratic side?” he said. “We’re in too many conflicts that just seem to be perpetual.”

He is also not uncritical of the Republican nominee. He called the recording of Mr. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/donald-trump-tape-transcript.html] talking about grabbing and kissing women “disgusting,” and he said he and others had advised Mr. Trump to take a tougher line with Russia before the previous debates, especially when it came to the hacking of the Democratic National Committee[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/us-formally-accuses-russia-of-stealing-dnc-emails.html] and Clinton campaign staff members[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/us/politics/wikileaks-hack-hillary-clinton-emails.html].

The United States should be cultivating Russia as an ally to fight Islamist militancy, he said, but “do I want Russia to influence our election? Absolutely not.” He added, “They need to be told in no uncertain terms to knock it off.”

But General Flynn is dismissive of former colleagues in the military who have privately and publicly urged him to dial back his support for Mr. Trump.

“They’re saying, ‘You’re using your title in politics.’ So? You’re not using your titles, admirals and generals, to get on corporate boards?” General Flynn said.

“I care deeply about this country,” he continued. “I actually found it very disrespectful that those guys would come out and counsel me publicly.”

In any case, General Flynn never saw himself as part of their club. He did not come to the military with the West Point pedigree of many of his peers — he graduated from the Army’s Reserve Officers Training Corps program at the University of Rhode Island — and his roots were scrappier than those of most generals, he said, describing his family as “definitely lower middle class.”

During his time in the Army, General Flynn earned a reputation for being outspoken and unconventional and, in the years after the Sept. 11 attacks, for being unusually good at taking apart terrorist networks. He helped reshape the Joint Special Operations Command at the height of the war in Iraq, ran military intelligence in Afghanistan during the Obama administration’s troop surge and was named director of the Defense Intelligence Agency by Mr. Obama in 2012.

But his term at the agency was cut short after two years. His detractors say that he lacked the experience to manage an operation with 20,000 employees, and that his efforts to overhaul what he saw as an ineffective bureaucracy left the agency a chaotic mess. His proponents say he was done in by an old guard that was being sidelined.

General Flynn maintains that he was fired for insisting that Al Qaeda and other militant Islamists were regrouping in the Middle East and for refusing to fall in line with an administration that wanted to bask in the glow of having killed Osama bin Laden[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/02/world/asia/osama-bin-laden-is-killed.html]. His view of the threat posed by Islamist militancy has hardened in the two years since he was forced into retirement.

Yet General Flynn also talks of the need to strengthen relationships with predominantly Muslim countries and to better understand their cultures. Muslim countries are eager to play a bigger role in the fight against Islamist militancy, he said. What they are lacking is American leadership, he said, and Mr. Trump can provide it.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Donald Trump’s Terrorism Plan Mixes Cold War Concepts and Limits on **Immigrants**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/16/us/politics/donald-trump-terrorism.html]

\* From Links to Lucifer to Calls for Execution, Republicans Seethe at Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/us/politics/hillary-clinton-rnc-attacks.html]

\* ‘We Should Take a Drug Test’ Before Debate, Donald Trump Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/us/politics/donald-trump-hillary-clinton-drug-test.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A thorough moral and political indictment of Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County, Ariz., would spill far beyond this page. It would catalog the years of racial profiling, the tormenting of **immigrants** and Latinos, the physical mistreatment and humiliation of inmates and defendants, the beatings and neglect and deaths behind bars, the abuses of office — withholding records, harassing and persecuting elected officials and journalists, failing to investigate hundreds of unsolved sex crimes[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/10/us/sheriff-joe-arpaio-criticized-over-handling-of-sex-crimes-cases.html], squandering taxpayer funds on crime sweeps and “posses” and looney-tune vendettas, like the mission to expose President Obama’s supposedly forged birth certificate[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3HSO3abzpzU].

The actual criminal indictment that he faces is a lot simpler. On Monday, federal officials charged him[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/18/us/sheriff-joe-arpaio-arizona.html] with contempt of court. If the sheriff is found guilty at a misdemeanor level, he could go to prison for six months.

The federal judge in a long-running racial-profiling lawsuit had told Sheriff Arpaio and his chief deputy in 2011 to stop abusing Latinos by pulling them over on suspicion of being in the country illegally, in the absence of any other charges. That is, for the sheriff to stop acting as a federal **immigration** agency unto himself.

This the sheriff did not do, according to the indictment.

Sheriff Arpaio, who is running for a seventh term, says he is innocent. He insists he won’t give up, won’t take a plea deal, won’t resign. In an unsurprising play at victimhood, he accused[https://twitter.com/meganrcassidy/status/785974117124026368?ref\_src=twsrc%5Etfw] the feds of “a blatant abuse of power,” of applying a different standard of justice to a lonely lawman who, in his words, “dares enforce the rule of law.”

Does he think the government is that stupid? Sheriff Arpaio’s record of lawlessness speaks for itself; to grasp its enormity visit the website of the American Civil Liberties Union[https://www.aclu.org/cases/ortega-melendres-et-al-v-arpaio-et-al], a party to the racial-profiling lawsuit, or review the reporting[http://www.pulitzer.org/winners/ryan-gabrielson-and-paul-giblin] by the newspaper in Mesa, Ariz., that won a Pulitzer Prize in 2009. “Contempt” is a fitting word for this long-overdue prosecution — not just contempt for the court, but for the people, for civil order, for justice.

That is the reason Sheriff Arpaio is a hero to Donald Trump, who is running to rid the country of Mexican “rapists” and refugee “terrorists.” Mr. Trump has promised a regime of racist policing that terrorizes **immigrants** and their families. What Mr. Trump envisions, Sheriff Arpaio embodies.

The Arpaio trial is to begin in December, after the election. If Maricopa County’s voters finally wake up — and a recent poll[http://www.fox10phoenix.com/news/arizona-news/211310492-story] hints at the possibility — the sheriff will be voted out of office. If convicted, he will be punished, but probably not as harshly as he has punished and demeaned those in his custody. He will not be marched in shackles and prison stripes through the streets of Phoenix, for TV cameras; he will not be issued pink underwear and fed rancid meat. He will not be confined outdoors in suffocating heat. For his many thousands of victims, his humiliation in court will have to be enough.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PAOLI, Pa. — Since the election of Ronald Reagan, white Catholics have flocked to Republican nominees for a raft of reasons, including their stances on social issues like abortion and same-sex marriage[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/same\_sex\_marriage/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

But this year, something seems different.

“Trump is the exception to the rule,” Carol Robinson, 67, said as she left an afternoon prayer meeting in this a Philadelphia suburb with other enthusiastic supporters of Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]. “He’s a loose cannon.”

Roman Catholics are the country’s second-largest religious group after evangelical Protestants, and they are as diverse as the country itself, with young liberals, cultural conservatives and, increasingly, Democratic-leaning Hispanics.

But now, the Clinton campaign senses a rare opportunity to block Mr. Trump’s narrow path to victory by making inroads with a core part of the church: white Catholics, a prized group of voters who have defied predictions this year.

Though a string of polls had shown Mr. Trump opening a lead among white Catholics, a new poll released last week by the Public Religion Research Institute showed Mr. Trump hemorrhaging support. The five-day poll, which ended two days after the release of a recording[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html] in which Mr. Trump joked about groping women, and before several women came forward to say he had forcibly kissed or touched them, showed him effectively tied with Mrs. Clinton. The poll showed 42 percent of white Catholics supported him, and 46 percent backed her, with a margin of sampling error of plus or minus four percentage points.

“That’s not where Trump wants to be in the homestretch, particularly with a core constituency in Midwestern battleground states,” said Robert Jones, a Public Religion Research Institute pollster. He added that white Catholics, much more than the white evangelicals who have largely remained loyal to Mr. Trump, seemed to be defying the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org]’s gravitational pull.

Both campaigns see openings: Mr. Trump in hacked emails released last week in which members of the Clinton campaign spoke critically about Catholic conservatism, and Mrs. Clinton in Mr. Trump’s un-churchmanlike behavior and his tussling with Pope Francis[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/f/francis\_i/index.html?inline=nyt-per].

The pope, on his way home from Mexico in February, suggested that Mr. Trump “is not Christian”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/19/world/americas/pope-francis-donald-trump-christian.html] if he preferred building barriers over bridges. Mr. Trump, not one to turn the other cheek, responded that Francis’ remarks were “disgraceful.”

The episode did not hurt Mr. Trump’s standing in the Republican primaries; in fact, many Catholics believed the pope was improperly meddling in American politics.

But Francis may be more quietly influencing the Catholic vote in other ways. He has moved the church to emphasize inclusion and the welfare of the poor over divisive issues like abortion and homosexuality. And his personnel changes have effectively left Mr. Trump’s conservative backers without much support from prominent Catholic clergy members.

“It’s a concern among a lot of Catholics that maybe we’re not going to hear the kind of strong message that we heard in past elections,” said Frank Pavone, a Catholic priest who runs an anti-abortion group and is advising Mr. Trump.

In 2004, a powerful group of Catholic archbishops publicly advocated the re-election of President George W. Bush[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/george\_w\_bush/index.html?inline=nyt-per]. Archbishop Raymond Burke of St. Louis said that if given the chance, he would deny communion to Mr. Bush’s opponent, Senator John Kerry, because of his abortion stance.

Pope Benedict XVI[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/benedict\_xvi/index.html?inline=nyt-per] elevated Archbishop Burke to the rank of cardinal, but Francis has since essentially demoted him from his Vatican[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/roman\_catholic\_church/index.html?inline=nyt-org] position. And when Cardinal Francis George, a combative voice on social issues from his high perch as the leader of the Chicago Archdiocese, took ill in 2014 (he died the next year[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/18/us/cardinal-francis-e-george-who-urged-zero-tolerance-in-abuse-scandal-dies-at-78.html]), Pope Francis replaced him with the more inclusive Blase Cupich, who has focused his energies on climate change[http://chicago.suntimes.com/opinion/opinion-we-have-a-moral-obligation-on-climate-change/], gun control[http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/commentary/ct-gun-violence-cupich-laws-general-assembly-perspec-1011-jm-20151009-story.html] and **immigration** reform.

The pope announced this month that he would elevate Archbishop Cupich[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/world/europe/vatican-pope-francis-cardinals.html] to the rank of cardinal, while passing over the United States’ reigning conservative heavyweight, Archbishop Charles J. Chaput of Philadelphia, who has remained outspoken in his criticism of Catholic politicians who support abortion rights.

Prominent Catholic lawmakers are now targeting voters on behalf of the Clinton campaign. This month, Senator Richard J. Durbin, Democrat of Illinois, held a round-table discussion with nuns in Dubuque, Iowa. The campaign has also created “heritage” outreach programs to try to appeal to voters with **immigrant**backgrounds, such as Irish and Italian, who are often Catholic.

The director of the Clinton campaign’s Catholic outreach program, John McCarthy, said that lay Catholic leaders he met with in Dubuque repeatedly said they were uncomfortable with Mr. Trump. “The divisive rhetoric is what is really pushing people away,” Mr. McCarthy said.

But the Trump campaign has done its own outreach.

“I have a message for Catholics: I will be there for you,” Mr. Trump wrote in an open letter to the Annual Catholic Leadership Conference meeting this month in Denver. “I am, and will remain, pro-life. I will defend your religious liberties and the right to fully and freely practice your religion, as individuals, business owners and academic institutions.”

In March, Joseph Cella, a founder of Fidelis, a Catholic advocacy organization, added his name to an open letter calling Mr. Trump “unfit to be president” because his “demagoguery” and “appeals to racial and ethnic fears and prejudice are offensive to any genuinely Catholic sensibility.”

But he said he had undergone a “sincere change of heart and mind” to Mr. Trump’s mission since then, and today, he is the campaign’s liaison to a group of Catholic advisers. On Tuesday, he released a statement calling on Catholics to pray the rosary daily until the election for unity, peace and a Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] victory.

Mr. Cella said he was sticking by Mr. Trump despite the recent revelations of his vulgar comments about women and accusations from several women that he had forcibly touched or kissed them.

On “Face the Nation” on Oct. 9, Rudolph W. Giuliani[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/g/rudolph\_w\_giuliani/index.html?inline=nyt-per], a former mayor of New York and a Catholic, who is one of Mr. Trump’s closest confidants, asked the host, John Dickerson, “Ever read ‘The Confessions of St. Augustine’?”

“Men can change, people can change,” Mr. Giuliani said.

Even Catholics who have found Mr. Trump’s language and ideas abhorrent are not necessarily abandoning him. “He’s a child, rude,” said Rose Benner, 85, after she emerged from Mass at St. Patrick Church in Malvern, Pa., one recent morning. “He doesn’t understand other people and he sees women as play toys.”

But, she added, “I’m a Catholic and I’m pro-life. I have to vote for Trump because he will appoint Supreme Court[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/supreme\_court/index.html?inline=nyt-org] justices. That’s the only reason. My whole family will vote for Trump because of that.”

The Trump campaign is also courting Catholic conservatives by highlighting a recent comment from Mrs. Clinton’s running mate Tim Kaine — himself an observant Catholic — that the church will one day support gay marriage. And it is making the most of every mention of Catholicism in the hacked Clinton campaign emails being released by WikiLeaks.

In one 2011 conversation about Rupert Murdoch in particular and prominent Catholics in general, Jennifer Palmieri, who later became the communications director of the Clinton campaign, wrote: “I imagine they think it is the most socially acceptable politically conservative religion. Their rich friends wouldn’t understand if they became evangelicals.”

The Trump campaign has also highlighted a 2012 email urging John D. Podesta, a former president of the Center for American Progress, to “plant the seeds of the revolution” against “Middle Ages dictatorship” within the Catholic church. Mr. Podesta, who is now Mrs. Clinton’s campaign chairman, responded by writing that he and his allies had created groups for just such a purpose.

Veteran church observers have noted that those emails spoke to a longstanding rift within the church between social conservatives who emphasize abortion and liberal Catholics more concerned about social justice.

But at a campaign rally last week in Ocala, Fla., Mr. Trump portrayed the emails as an attack on religion. “They attack Catholics and evangelicals,” he said. “Viciously.”

Mr. Trump himself was not so sensitive to Catholic feelings while on “The Howard Stern Show” in 2013, shortly after Pope Benedict announced he would resign.

“He should just give up and die,” Mr. Trump said, according to a recording obtained by The Washington Post[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/10/14/new-clips-show-trump-talking-about-sex-rating-womens-bodies-reminiscing-about-infidelity-on-howard-stern-show/]. “He looks so bad.”

The Clinton campaign, noting the silence of many bishops in this election and the candidate’s improving poll numbers, hopes Mr. Trump is so off-putting to white Catholics that they will overlook the emails and Mrs. Clinton’s stances on abortion and other social issues.

Outside Paoli’s Daylesford Abbey, where paintings on the walls for a coming art show include a $10,000 oil of Pope Francis, Ms. Robinson, the Clinton supporter, said she thought Francis had made it easier for her fellow Catholics to turn away from Mr. Trump.

And Tony Prosperi, a sheet metal worker who attended an event last week featuring Senator Tim Kaine, Mrs. Clinton’s running mate, at his union hall in Philadelphia, said Mr. Trump’s fight with the pope had crossed a sacred line.

“It doesn’t matter if you are Catholic,” he said. “There are a few people who you have to respect.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Donald Trump Reveals Evangelical Rifts That Could Shape Politics for Years[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/us/donald-trump-evangelicals-republican-vote.html]

\* Haiti and Africa Projects Shed Light on Clinton’s Public-Private Web[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/us/hillary-clinton-cheryl-mills.html]

\* Specter of Trump Loosens Tongues, if Not Purse Strings, in Silicon Valley[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/technology/specter-of-trump-loosens-tongues-if-not-purse-strings-in-silicon-valley.html]

\* Ripples From the ‘How Low Can They Go’ Campaign[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/us/politics/presidential-election-voters.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — In the last two decades, London has forged a reputation as the technology capital of Europe and as a global capital of the fashion technology sector — a competitor to New York and Silicon Valley, where creative, commercial and digital talent thrives in a single cosmopolitan place. Some of the biggest names in the fashion industry, especially in e-commerce — such as Asos, Farfetch, Lyst and Yoox Net-a-Porter — have headquarters in the British capital.

But in the wake of Britain’s vote [http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/britain-brexit-european-union] in June to leave the European Union[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/britain-brexit-european-union], a development that raised the possibility of an **immigration** crackdown, a drop in foreign investment and economic uncertainty, London’s high-ranking position has come into question.

Taavet Hinrikus, the Estonian co-founder of the money-transfer company TransferWise, which says it has a valuation of more than $1 billion — has told T[https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/sep/03/transferwise-brexit-london-tech-centre-europe] he Guardian[https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/sep/03/transferwise-brexit-london-tech-centre-europe] that his company is unlikely to continue hiring at its London headquarters. Peter Smith, chief executive of the financial technology company Blockchain, said [http://uk.businessinsider.com/blockchain-ceo-peter-smith-says-tech-entrepreneurs-furious-about-post-brexit-immigration-policy-2016-10] this month[http://uk.businessinsider.com/blockchain-ceo-peter-smith-says-tech-entrepreneurs-furious-about-post-brexit-immigration-policy-2016-10] that many non-British tech entrepreneurs in London were “deeply offended” by the British government’s stance on **immigration** since the vote.

And while the fashion community has stayed relatively silent on the subject, there is little doubt that businesses have been mulling their options as European capitals on the Continent position themselves as worthy alternatives. Venture capital investments in Britain plummeted 40 percent in the second quarter this year compared with the first quarter, as uncertainty before the vote held investors back, according to data published this week by CB Insights.

Given that climate, an announcement this week from the Yoox Net-a-Porter Group about plans to centraliz[http://www.ynap.com/news/yoox-net-a-porter-group-strengthens-commitment-to-london-with-cutting-edge-tech-hub/] e [http://www.ynap.com/news/yoox-net-a-porter-group-strengthens-commitment-to-london-with-cutting-edge-tech-hub/] its Britain[http://www.ynap.com/news/yoox-net-a-porter-group-strengthens-commitment-to-london-with-cutting-edge-tech-hub/] -based technology operations[http://www.ynap.com/news/yoox-net-a-porter-group-strengthens-commitment-to-london-with-cutting-edge-tech-hub/] in the BBC’s former headquarters in West London has been a welcome vote of confidence.

Yoox Net-a-Porter, a British-Italian company, said on Monday[http://www.ynap.com/news/yoox-net-a-porter-group-strengthens-commitment-to-london-with-cutting-edge-tech-hub/] that it planned to accommodate about 600 staff members in its new technology hub by March, taking two floors — about 70,000 square feet of state-of-the-art (and expensive) office space — in the new MediaWorks building at White City Place. That represents a 20 percent increase in the size of the group’s technology team, which the company says will have as many as 1,000 employees in Britain and Italy.

Although a majority of London’s technology headquarters are in the east of the city, Alex Alexander, chief information officer of Yoox Net-a-Porter, said the company wished to stay in the west to be close to its other operational base, above the Westfield shopping center. Other big names in the local creative sphere said to be setting up offices in the White City development include the fashion label Stella McCartney and the Royal College of Art.

“We were keen to show our commitment to the U.K.,” Mr. Alexander said by telephone from New York, “and felt that bringing all of our technology talent into a single hub was an important step in terms of bringing our five-year plan, which is based on outpacing our competition on mobile, to fruition.”

He brushed off suggestions that London’s reputation had been tarnished by the country’s decision to leave the European Union.

“We continue to have real confidence in London, regardless of the decision to leave the E.U., and see this investment as an opportunity to reaffirm that,” Mr. Alexander said. “We don’t see any side effects in terms of talent being drawn here. We are expecting to see a steady flow continue and think the city will remain a world-leading tech hub.”

Fashion companies are not alone in doubling down on the British capital. Facebook and Google, among other American tech giants, also have plans to expand their London operations, investing in development and sales teams to fuel their European activities.

Predictably, signs of major technology and fashion companies taking steps to expand its presence in London was met with open arms.

“I am delighted that there will be yet more new tech jobs coming to the capital,” said Rajesh Agrawal, London’s deputy mayor for business and enterprise. “This highlights once again that London is open for business, new investment and global talent.”

For now, the signs for Britain are encouraging. Of Europe’s technology unicorns — private companies with a valuation of more than $1 billion — almost 40 percent are based in the country. Nearly a third of all European venture capital funding comes to Britain.

But it is still early. There is no certainty that Europeans working in Britain will be forced to leave once the withdrawal from the bloc is final, and a report by Balderton Capital shows that while engineers in Berlin or Paris earned on average almost 18 percent less than their London counterparts do, the devaluation of the pound was fast closing that gap.

Whether entrepreneurs looking to start the next billion-dollar fashion technology business might favor Berlin, Dublin or Stockholm — which have established technology sectors and benefit from the European Union’s free flow of labor — remains to be seen.

Continue following our fashion and lifestyle coverage on Facebook (Styles[https://www.facebook.com/nytimesstyles] and Modern Love[https://www.facebook.com/modernlove]), Twitter (Styles[https://twitter.com/nytstyles], Fashion[https://twitter.com/nytfashion] and Weddings[https://twitter.com/nytimesvows]) and Instagram[https://instagram.com/nytimesfashion].

\* ‘Brexit’ May Hurt Britain Where It Thrives: Science and Research[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/18/business/international/brexit-may-hurt-britain-where-it-thrives-science-and-research.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Last year, Louisiana lawmakers considered a handful of bills that sought to make the state as inhospitable as possible to new **immigrants**. Local law enforcement officials helped defeat one that would have penalized cities like New Orleans and Lafayette for their policies that limit cooperation between local police departments and federal **immigration** authorities.

But one bill [http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2016/10/louisiana\_immigrants\_marriage.html]championed by State Representative Valarie Hodges[http://www.valariehodges.com/], a Republican, passed by a broad margin. Under that measure, which went into effect in January, noncitizens in Louisiana are required to produce a copy of their birth certificate and an unexpired visa to get a marriage license. Ms. Hodges claimed the law would curb fraud and terrorism. “We don’t want terrorists obtaining green cards and citizenship through marriage,” she told a radio station[http://louisianaradionetwork.com/blogs/marriage-fraud-law#.WAUekpMrIcl].

There is no evidence that Louisiana courthouses have become gateways for foreign-born fraudsters or terrorists. But in recent months, county clerks have had [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/louisiana-isnt-letting-immigrants-get-married/2016/10/10/f8d408ba-8f25-11e6-a6a3-d50061aa9fae\_story.html?utm\_term=.470c0effd84e] to turn away couples who were ready to marry, forcing some to come up with expensive backup plans, like traveling out of state. This is discriminatory and violates the legal principle that marriage licenses can’t be denied because of a person’s **immigration** status, authorized or not.

Beyond deterring undocumented people from obtaining marriage licenses, the law has also prevented refugees and other lawful **immigrants** from marrying. Many **immigrants** come from countries where births are not automatically registered; others cannot easily obtain a copy of their original birth certificate. Even those who do have the document must spend money to get it translated.

Louisiana appears to be the first state to have enacted a law that makes it harder for **immigrants** to marry. A federal judge in 2008 ruled[https://www.aclu.org/news/federal-court-ends-county-officials-policy-denying-marriage-licenses-based-immigration-status] that a similar policy in Luzerne County, Pa., was unconstitutional. In recent weeks, local and national **immigrant** advocacy groups have been working with prospective plaintiffs to challenge the constitutionality of the Louisiana law in court.

**Immigrants** in Louisiana are singled out and “subjected to different requirements when they want to get married,” said Alvaro Huerta, a lawyer with the National**Immigration** Law Center. This law is a cruel affront to their dignity and should be struck down.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Nigel Farage had one of the great personal victories in British politics this year, pushing Britain, through his U.K. Independence Party, into voting in June to leave the European Union[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/britain-brexit-european-union-referendum.html?action=click&contentCollection=Europe&module=RelatedCoverage®ion=Marginalia&pgtype=article].

Yet having accomplished his goal, Mr. Farage quit as leader[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/05/world/europe/nigel-farage-ukip-brexit.html] of the party, known as UKIP, which has experienced a comedy of errors ever since, damaging its reputation and calling its very survival into question.

The favorite to lead the party, known for its populist denunciations of **immigrants**, Steven Woolfe, was disqualified from the leadership race when he got his application in too late, blaming a faulty PayPal connection. Diane James[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/world/europe/britain-brexit-ukip-farage-james.html], who won, lasted only 18 days before resigning and causing Mr. Farage to come back as temporary leader.

Then, this month, an argument during a meeting of UKIP members of the European Parliament[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_parliament/index.html?inline=nyt-org] in Strasbourg, France, got out of control, and Mr. Woolfe wound up in a hospital[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/world/europe/ukip-steven-woolfe.html] for three days. He said he had been hit by another party member, reportedly after saying that with the referendum won, he was considering quitting UKIP and rejoining the Conservative Party. His opponent, a former soldier named Mike Hookem, has denied throwing a punch.

After the resignation of Ms. James, Mr. Woolfe put his name forward again for the leadership, but on Monday, he quit altogether, telling the BBC that UKIP is “in a death spiral” and that there is “something rotten” in the party, which is riven with “infighting.”

The party had “no future” without Mr. Farage, who held it together, he said. But Mr. Farage, who has helped advise Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/25/us/politics/nigel-farage-brexit-donald-trump.html] in the United States, has said he has no intention of returning to run UKIP.

Mr. Woolfe said that he would remain a member of the European Parliament, representing northwest England as an independent, and that he had made a complaint to the police against Mr. Hookem, who he said had given him “a blow to the face,” knocking him backward.

Mr. Hookem has acknowledged a “scuffle” but said he “categorically did not” throw a punch at his colleague and has threatened legal action for defamation.

Mr. Woolfe said that the two men had exchanged heated words at the party meeting in Strasbourg and that he had told Mr. Hookem, “Let’s go outside and discuss this man-to-man” — insisting that he meant verbally. Asked what happened next, Mr. Woolfe said: “He rushed at me. A blow to my face forced me back through the door,” and he fell and hit his head.

He recovered, though doctors kept him in the hospital for observation after he suffered two seizures.

Mr. Woolfe was the favorite to lead UKIP, with the backing of a major donor, Arron Banks, who has spoken about starting a different party to appeal to working-class Labour voters who have been attracted to UKIP’s nationalism and campaign against high numbers of **immigrants**.

\* Facing ‘Brexit,’ Lawmakers Ask How to ‘Make Britain Great Again’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/world/europe/uk-britain-tories-hard-brexit.html]

\* ‘Brexit’ Talks Will Start by End of March, Theresa May Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/brexit-talks-march-theresa-may-britain.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton’s campaign is planning its most ambitious push yet into traditionally right-leaning states, a new offensive aimed at extending her growing advantage over Donald J. Trump while bolstering down-ballot candidates in what party leaders increasingly suggest could be a sweeping victory for Democrats at every level.

Signaling extraordinary confidence in Mrs. Clinton’s electoral position and a new determination to deliver a punishing message to Mr. Trump and Republicans about his racially tinged campaign, her aides said Monday that she would aggressively compete in Arizona, a state with a growing Hispanic population that has been ground zero for the country’s heated debate over **immigration**.

Mrs. Clinton is “dramatically expanding” her efforts in Arizona, her campaign manager, Robby Mook, told reporters on Monday, pouring more than $2 million into advertising and dispatching perhaps her [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/us/politics/michelle-obama-hillary-clinton.html?\_r=0] most potent surrogate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/us/politics/michelle-obama-hillary-clinton.html?\_r=0], Michelle Obama, for a rally in Phoenix on Thursday.

In Indiana and Missouri, Mr. Mook said, the campaign will spend a total of $1 million to drive voter turnout, despite what he acknowledged as an “uphill battle” for Mrs. Clinton in two states that could determine control of the Senate.

The maneuvering speaks to the unexpected tension facing Mrs. Clinton as she hurtles toward what aides increasingly believe will be a decisive victory — a pleasant problem, for certain, but one that has nonetheless scrambled the campaign’s strategy weeks before Election Day: Should Mrs. Clinton maximize her own margin, aiming to flip as many red states as possible to run up an electoral landslide, or prioritize the party’s congressional fortunes, redirecting funds and energy down the ballot?

Thanks to an infusion of contributions in recent weeks, and what aides describe as a war chest they had maintained in case the opportunity arose, Mrs. Clinton is in effect trying to do both.

After nearly eight years in which Democrats on Capitol Hill grumbled about a lack of attention from President Obama, Mrs. Clinton has taken care to stay in frequent contact with Senator Chuck Schumer, her former New York colleague, about down-ballot races.

Mr. Schumer, poised to be the incoming Senate Democratic leader, and the current leader, Harry Reid of Nevada, met with Mrs. Clinton’s top campaign aides in Washington last month and pressed them to offer financial support for the Senate races, according to a Democratic official briefed on the meeting. And Mr. Schumer has not been shy since about his hope that if Mrs. Clinton clearly appeared on her way to winning the race, she would redirect some money to congressional races.

“This is one of many things that the Clinton campaign is doing to help us win a majority in a Senate,” Mr. Schumer said through a spokesman.

While party strategists are glad to have the money Mrs. Clinton is directing from the Democratic National Committee to voter-turnout efforts in Indiana and Missouri, they have little appetite for Mrs. Clinton to visit those states, where she is likely to lose, because that would make it easier for Republicans to tie Democratic Senate candidates to her.

Democrats are also attempting to unseat Senator John McCain of Arizona from the seat he was first elected to in 1986, but Mrs. Clinton’s late decision to swoop into that state is not related to his race, which few Democratic leaders believe they can win. Her incursion there is about her own campaign — and the Democrats’ desire to focus attention on the damage Mr. Trump has done to Republicans with Hispanics.

In particular, Democrats hope to make an example of Sheriff Joe Arpaio, an ardent Trump supporter, by defeating the Phoenix lawman, whose incendiary comments about Hispanics and aggressive tactics with **immigrants** have garnered attention far beyond his jurisdiction in Maricopa County.

“If Democrats were going to win in Arizona in 2016, you’d need a Republican who turns off Republican women, who really energizes Latinos, and you’d need other races on the ground that can really drive engagement — and we have all that,” said Andrei Cherny, a former state Democratic chairman.

Alexis Tameron, the current state Democratic chairwoman, said Republican stumbles had allowed local Democrats to “jump our own timeline” for when officials expected to make the state competitive on the presidential level.

“I give credit where credit is due,” Ms. Tameron said. “And I have been thanking a lot of people, including Donald Trump.”

Mrs. Clinton’s team had weighed for weeks how seriously to look beyond core battlegrounds like Pennsylvania, Florida and North Carolina, another state that Republicans carried in 2012.

Eager to torment Mr. Trump, and the Republicans straining to navigate his erratic bid, her team has also planned at least faint, attention-grabbing plays in other states with little history of Democratic success.

In Texas, the campaign has prepared an ad highlighting Mrs. Clinton’s endorsement from T[http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/2016/09/07/recommend-hillary-clinton-us-president] he Dallas Morning News[http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/2016/09/07/recommend-hillary-clinton-us-president]. And Mrs. Clinton’s running mate, Tim Kaine, has begun sitting for local media interviews in Utah, where Mr. Trump has struggled to break away from Mrs. Clinton and an independent candidate, Evan McMullin[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/politics/evan-mcmullin-campaign-utah.html], in recent polls. (On a conference call with reporters on Monday, Mr. Mook mentioned Mr. McMullin by name.)

The most brazen push, though, is in Arizona, where the campaign has also scheduled appearances on Mrs. Clinton’s behalf from her daughter, Chelsea, and Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont.

“Donald Trump’s hateful rhetoric and deeply disrespectful remarks about Senator John McCain have made Arizona more competitive,” Mr. Mook said.

He added that Mrs. Clinton may appear there herself in short order. “We certainly hope to get her there,” he said.

The moves come as Mrs. Clinton has more conspicuously emphasized congressional and state races during campaign appearances, taking particular care to mention Senate and even House candidates on the stump and highlighting states that typically receive scant attention from Democrats.

“If you’ve got friends in Utah or Arizona, make sure they vote, too!” she told voters during a stop in Colorado last week. “We are competing everywhere.”

The campaign’s emphasis has strayed, at least somewhat, from its treatment of Mr. Trump and the wider Republican Party over the summer. During the Democratic convention and in the weeks that followed, Mrs. Clinton’s team sought to cast Mr. Trump as a menacing anomaly, at odds with the history of his party and its leaders.

More recently, as several Republican candidates have been forced into contortions — distancing themselves from Mr. Trump’s comments about women and the integrity of American elections, but often leery of renouncing their support outright — Mrs. Clinton and other Democrats have pounced.

“For months, G.O.P. members put their party ahead of the good of the country by refusing to take the step of condemning Donald Trump’s outrageous and insulting rhetoric,” Mr. Mook said. “Voters are now seeing through G.O.P. candidates who made last-minute conversions and tried to save themselves politically. And voters continue to be outraged that some of these candidates are choosing to stick with Donald Trump.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX — Federal prosecutors on Monday charged Sheriff Joe Arpaio[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/a/joseph\_m\_arpaio/index.html?inline=nyt-per] of Maricopa County with criminal contempt of court, saying he willfully defied a judge’s orders to stop targeting Latinos — including citizens and legal **immigrants** — in traffic stops and other law enforcement efforts, behavior the judge said showed a pattern of discriminatory policing.

If convicted, Sheriff Arpaio, 84, who has made a name for himself as an unapologetic pursuer of illegal **immigrants**, could face up to six months in jail. The authorities were still weighing a charge of obstruction of justice, which could carry more severe punishment.

Sheriff Arpaio is seeking re-election in November to his seventh term. The most recent poll[http://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/laurieroberts/2016/10/12/roberts-new-poll-shows-penzone-leading-arpaio/91950916/], taken before prosecutors signaled last week that charges would be filed, put Sheriff Arpaio behind his Democratic challenger, Paul Penzone, a former Phoenix police sergeant.

Sheriff Arpaio has not backed down[http://kjzz.org/content/381809/sheriff-joe-arpaio-talks-criminal-contempt-case-donald-trump-allegations]. At an event on Saturday, he told reporters, “I am going to fight this. I’m not going to resign like some of my critics want me to do. And I am going to be re-elected, and I will continue serving this county.”

Sheriff Arpaio’s lawyer, Mel McDonald, said that the sheriff would plead not guilty by a court filing and that he hoped to prevail before a jury.

The court set a tentative trial date[http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/phoenix/2016/10/11/department-justice-charge-arpaio-criminal-contempt/91901204/] of Dec. 6.

Here are milestones in the long-running case.

December 2007 A Mexican citizen legally in the United States sued[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/14/us/14brfs-arizona.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FArpaio%2C%20Joseph%20M.&action=click&contentCollection=timestopics®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=159&pgtype=collection] Mr. Arpaio and his Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office deputies, claiming to have been unlawfully detained for nine hours after a traffic stop because of his ethnicity. Others joined the lawsuit, and the allegations were expanded to include several other examples of treatment plaintiffs said unfairly singled out Latinos.

Judge G. Murray Snow of United States District Court in Phoenix eventually gave the lawsuit class-action status, allowing any Latino stopped by Sheriff Arpaio’s deputies since Jan. 1, 2007, to be represented in the case.

December 2011 Judge Snow issued a ruling prohibiting[http://www.phoenixnewtimes.com/news/joe-arpaio-can-be-sued-by-detained-hispanics-judge-grants-class-status-in-lawsuit-to-hispanics-stopped-by-arpaios-deputies-orders-halt-to-human-smuggling-enforcement-in-current-form-6633606] the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office from stopping and detaining Latinos based only on the suspicion that they were in the country illegally, and barring deputies from using only such suspicions to report a vehicle’s Latino occupants to the federal **immigration** authorities.

June 2012 The Supreme Court upheld one aspect of Arizona’s **immigration** law[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/26/us/supreme-court-rejects-part-of-arizona-immigration-law.html], requiring officers to inquire about the **immigration** status of the people they stop for other reasons. But it overturned provisions that would have allowed officers to arrest people whose only offense was violating federal **immigration** laws.

July 2012 A series of discriminatory-policing accusations against Sheriff Arpaio and his deputies were argued during a seven-day trial[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/20/us/sheriff-joe-arpaio-trial-opens-in-phoenix.html]. An expert witness who analyzed racial and ethnic information culled from traffic stops made by the sheriff’s office concluded that the length of such stops increased by 21 percent to 25 percent if at least one of the people stopped was Latino.

November 2012 Sheriff Arpaio faced a tough re-election fight. Latinos organized[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/03/us/politics/arizona-latinos-urged-to-oust-sheriff-joe-arpaio.html], using the trial to increase voter registration and drum up opposition to him at the polls. In the end, Sheriff Arpaio, who was running for his sixth term, won, though by his narrowest margin ever, six percentage points.

Judge Snow issued another corrective order, telling the sheriff to implement sweeping changes at his office to prevent discriminatory policing. Among the changes were cameras to record traffic stops, updated training to explicitly define the limits of deputies’ authority and an independent monitor to oversee compliance.

May 2016 Judge Snow found[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/14/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio-ruling.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FArpaio%2C%20Joseph%20M.&action=click&contentCollection=timestopics®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=10&pgtype=collection] Sheriff Arpaio and three of his top deputies in civil contempt of court.

In a 162-page decision, Judge Snow wrote that for 17 months, Sheriff Arpaio and three of his top deputies purposely ignored his orders, in part because he wanted to maintain his hard-line stance against illegal **immigration** to score votes among his base of staunch conservative supporters.

The sheriff’s office wrongfully detained and turned over for deportation at least 157 **immigrants**[http://kjzz.org/node/308856#six] during those 17 months, the judge found. All will be compensated by Maricopa County. The case has already cost county taxpayers more than $50 million[http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/phoenix/2016/05/12/taxpayer-costs-sheriff-joe-arpaios-profiling-case-another-13m-top-41m/84293950/], The Associated Press has reported.

August 2016 Judge Snow referred[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FArpaio%2C%20Joseph%20M.&action=click&contentCollection=timestopics®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=6&pgtype=collection] Sheriff Arpaio and the top deputies for criminal prosecution, saying, “The court has exhausted all of its other methods to obtain compliance.”

October 2016 The criminal case is being handled by another federal judge, Susan R. Bolton, who was selected by lottery. During a status hearing last Tuesday, John D. Keller, a lawyer for the Justice Department, announced that he would file the criminal charges.

JUST IN: Feds to file criminal contempt-of-court charges against Sheriff Joe Arpaio for disobeying orders to stop **immigration** patrols. — Fernanda Santos (@fernandaNYT) October 11, 2016[https://twitter.com/fernandaNYT/status/785915049038622720]

Sheriff Arpaio issued a defiant response. He said the announcement, coming a day before early voting was to start in Arizona, was “no coincidence” and blamed “the corrupt Obama Justice Department” for trying to influence the election.

Full @RealSheriffJoe[https://twitter.com/RealSheriffJoe] statement re #criminalcontempt[https://twitter.com/hashtag/criminalcontempt?src=hash] charge: pic.twitter.com/sDzeZdShVG[https://t.co/sDzeZdShVG] — Megan Cassidy (@meganrcassidy) October 11, 2016[https://twitter.com/meganrcassidy/status/785974117124026368]

Meanwhile, a new group called Bazta Arpaio has vowed to mobilize tens of thousands of voters against Arpaio on Election Day.

Arpaio's guilty as hell- it's just a matter of whether the courts or the people get to kick him out first. #BaztaArpaio[https://twitter.com/hashtag/BaztaArpaio?src=hash] #PeopleVsArpaio[https://twitter.com/hashtag/PeopleVsArpaio?src=hash] pic.twitter.com/inLMWh566r[https://t.co/inLMWh566r] — Bazta Arpaio (@BaztaArpaio) October 11, 2016[https://twitter.com/BaztaArpaio/status/785888683429761024]

Follow Fernanda Santos @fernandaNYT[https://twitter.com/fernandaNYT] on Twitter.

For breaking news and in-depth reporting, follow @NYTNational[https://twitter.com/NYTNational] on Twitter.

\* Contempt Ruling Rebukes Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Arizona[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/14/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio-ruling.html]

\* Latinos Urged to Oust Sheriff Over Deportations[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/03/us/politics/arizona-latinos-urged-to-oust-sheriff-joe-arpaio.html]

\* Arizona Sheriff’s Trial Begins With Focus on Complaints About Illegal **Immigrants**[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/20/us/sheriff-joe-arpaio-trial-opens-in-phoenix.html]

\* Arizona: Sheriff Sued Over Possible Profiling[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/14/us/14brfs-arizona.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Morrie Gold is not a placard-waving political protester. He is a 69-year-old retired doctor in Pennsylvania.

But he recently participated in a quiet act of rebellion: He and 11 golfing buddies canceled their annual trip to a Florida resort owned by Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] to express their disgust with his remarks about women, **immigrants** and minorities.

“For me,” Mr. Gold said, “it’s an ethical statement.”

Political demonstrations are **alien** to Margaret Riordan, too. “I’m just an old, white lady from Illinois,” she said. But when friends invited the 60-year-old and her husband to dinner inside Chicago’s Trump International Hotel and Tower, a one-woman boycott was born.

“Pick another place,” Ms. Riordan firmly told her friends. “By crossing that threshold, I’m saying Donald Trump’s O.K. I won’t do that.”

The reservation was canceled.

Across the country, voters alarmed by the tenor of Mr. Trump’s campaign and the emerging accounts of his personal conduct are engaging in spontaneous, unorganized and inconspicuous acts of protest that take direct aim at perhaps his most prized possession: his brand name.

In more than two dozen interviews, they described creative methods of punishing his economic empire and expunging the once-esteemed reminders of him from their lives, closets, golf bags and bookshelves over the past few months. They have thrown out — or cut up — Trump ties, called off stays at Trump hotels, even stopped imbibing Trump wines.

Gary Berry, a military veteran and Gold Star father whose son died while serving in the Army, used to love Mr. Trump’s sparkling wines. He bought the ornate bottles, stamped with the candidate’s heavily serifed surname, near his hometown, Charlottesville, Va., for special occasions like the birth of a grandchild and wedding anniversaries.

That stopped the moment Mr. Trump mocked the parents of Capt. Humayun Khan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/31/us/politics/donald-trump-khizr-khan-wife-ghazala.html], an Army captain who was killed in Iraq.

“I am sorry, that’s just not what you do,” Mr. Berry said from inside a Veterans of Foreign Wars[http://www.vfw.org/?cookieCheck=true] hall, where he was chatting with fellow veterans. “Trump is despicable in my mind. I’m not buying Trump anymore.”

Organized, noisy demonstrations are a fixture of election seasons, and they have bedeviled both Mr. Trump and Hillary Clinton throughout the presidential campaign. But the scattered retail rebukes of Mr. Trump are something new: independent acts of protest by everyday consumers who feel that voting against Mr. Trump would not be a sufficient reproach.

They are animated, they said, not just by his inflammatory statements or allegations of predatory behavior toward women[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/politics/donald-trump-campaign.html?ref=politics] — which he has denied — but by the belief that the wealth that powers his candidacy was in many ways amassed on their backs, one best-selling book, dress shirt or hotel stay at a time.

“There’s never been a presidential candidate that’s had a product that I had bought before,” said Nadav Ullman, 26, an entrepreneur who has a standing coffee meeting with his business partner in the food court of Trump Tower in Midtown Manhattan.

Or at least he used to. As Mr. Trump marched toward the Republican nomination, Mr. Nadav was startled by what he saw as Mr. Trump’s strategy of “bigotry and racism.” He moved his weekly meeting outside to a bench in Central Park, grabbing coffee from a Wafels & Dinges vendor on the sidewalk.

“It kind of came down to the idea that going to Trump Tower — in a very small way, no doubt, but in some capacity — would support him,” Mr. Ullman said.

Besides, he added, the coffee at Trump Tower was never very good. “It was a win on multiple levels,” he said.

It is difficult to measure the economic impact of such protests on Mr. Trump’s far-flung businesses. His holdings are privately controlled, and he has a well-documented history of exaggerating his financial performance. Amanda Miller, the vice president of marketing for the Trump Organization, said in a statement on Sunday that the Trump brand “remains incredibly strong, and we are seeing tremendous success across business units.”

The nonstop exposure provided by the presidential campaign has its upsides: Sales at Mr. Trump’s winery in Charlottesville are up 55 percent, said Kerry Woolard, its general manager. A few customers have headed there straight from his political rallies, she said.

But there are signs of a strain: An online travel company, Hipmunk[https://www.hipmunk.com/], has found that bookings for Trump hotels on its site fell 58 percent during the first half of 2016, compared with the same period a year ago. Eric Danziger, the chief executive of Trump Hotels, said that data from sites like Hipmunk “does not provide an accurate representation of our performance.”

In interviews, though, several small-business owners said they were avoiding Trump hotels. Elonide Semmes, the president of a Chicago branding company, has turned her anger at Mr. Trump into company policy: Expenses incurred at Trump properties shall not be reimbursed. “The one thing you can do is vote with your feet,” she said.

Employees at Art&Motion, a New York agency that represents commercial photographers and illustrators, have done the same. They used to routinely book rooms at Trump hotels in New York and Chicago. But in response to what they saw as Mr. Trump’s factual distortions and ignorance of global affairs, the firm’s partners gave their travel agent a firm decree: “Don’t even think of booking us at Trump hotels,” recalled Billy Diesel, a co-founder.

“It’s a small amount of money, but it’s a way to make our voices heard,” Mr. Diesel said.

The amount of money is not always small. Before they rebooked at a rival golf resort nearby, Mr. Gold and his friends had planned to spend about $18,000 on a multiday stay at Mr. Trump’s Doral golf resort in Miami. They had played there for about 14 years, he said, long before Mr. Trump purchased and upgraded the property in 2012. “It’s a beautiful place,” Mr. Gold said with a sigh.

The rejection has extended to brands controlled by Mr. Trump’s children, whom these consumers see as aiding and abetting the candidate that they increasingly revile.

A few weeks ago, Natalie Davis, 50, bought a navy blue sundress from an Ivanka Trump line of clothing at Lord & Taylor in Midtown Manhattan. “It fit me really nicely,” she said.

But soon after, she heard Mr. Trump grimly and inaccurately describe the economic and social status of African-Americans[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/25/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters.html]: “You’re living in your poverty, your schools are no good, you have no jobs,” he said.

Ms. Davis, who lives in New Jersey, was appalled. “The way he talked about black people — it’s like we are not human,” she said.

Ms. Trump had not uttered the offending words, but Ms. Davis had watched her speak for her father[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/22/us/politics/rnc-convention-highlights.html] at the Republican National Convention. That was enough. “I feel,” Ms. Davis said, “like she’s a puppet to her dad.”

Ms. Davis marched back into Lord & Taylor, handed a cashier her perfectly fitting sundress and asked for a refund.

“There’s no way one penny of my money is going to anything with the Trump name on it,” Ms. Davis said. The cashier, she said, did not seem surprised. Ms. Davis got her $120 back. Retail workers, it seems, have grown accustomed to such interactions.

Ryan Whitacre said he was simply following company policy at a Marshalls clothing store in central Ohio when he asked a woman why she was returning an Ivanka Trump shirt this summer. “She told me she didn’t want to support that name,” he recalled.

“They want to get that name away from them as much as they can,” Mr. Whitacre added.

The campaign spotlight is not all bad for Ms. Trump’s brands: The pink dress she wore at the convention quickly sold out, her aides said.

For some seething voters, returning Trump products is no longer feasible: They sit, well worn, inside their closets and dressers.

So they are taking creative measures.

After hearing Mr. Trump rail against the loss of American manufacturing jobs to lower-paid foreign workers, Brian Betteridge, 33, a teacher outside Philadelphia, checked the label on his Trump Signature Collection button-down dress shirt.

“Made in Indonesia,” it read, according to Mr. Betteridge.

“I tossed it right into the garbage,” he said. “At that point, it represented all of these things about him that I could not stand.”

The shirt had been a gift from his grandmother. “I haven’t told her,” he said.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Silicon Valley believes in the future. It invents it, it invests in it. Just not so much when the future is a few weeks away.

As David Streitfeld writes[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/technology/specter-of-trump-loosens-tongues-if-not-purse-strings-in-silicon-valley.html], that is starting to change. Most of the world capital of technology has in the last few weeks started paying some lip service to the presidential election. Donations have been picking up, but, relative to the vast wealth in the Valley, remain modest.

Much of what action there has been has favored Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] — or at least, been against Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]. Not universally, however: As Mr. Streitfeld wrote, Peter Thiel, a co-founder of both PayPal and Palantir and early investor in Facebook, is giving Mr. Trump’s campaign[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/technology/peter-thiel-donald-j-trump.html] $1.25 million.

Mr. Thiel, a gay, self-made billionaire **immigrant** libertarian, also spoke at the Republican convention in July. While much of this would seem at odds with Mr. Trump’s usual supporters, Mr. Thiel has also said his secret to success is believing something very few people believe is true.

In this case, he would be doubly at odds with the Valley, where some are backing Mrs. Clinton and most are markedly silent. It is notable that the vocal minority are, like Mr. Thiel, wealthy investors and venture capitalists. Tech corporations seem remarkably wary of offending somebody by having a political opinion, even compared with other American companies.

Part of that may be a general **alienation** of tech from government. Tech ignores the reality that Silicon Valley was largely built on military contracts, and favors a future[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/02/technology/american-tech-giants-vs-the-nation-state.html] where government plays an ever-smaller role.

The difficulty may be one of orientation. Tech is aimed largely at people and companies of means, who are interested in gaining more power and autonomy. Many of government’s obligations are to the poor, the elderly and children. In other words, people with little power.

President Obama, speaking Thursday at a White House Technology conference[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BikQFWNYct4] in Pittsburgh, identified the problem. One part of his speech, starting at the 1:09:20 mark in the video, is worth quoting at length.

“Government will never run the way Silicon Valley runs because, by definition, democracy is messy,” he said. “Part of government’s job, by the way, is dealing with problems that nobody else wants to deal with.

“So sometimes I talk to C.E.O.s, they come in and start telling me about leadership, and here’s how we do things. And I say, well, if all I was doing was making a widget or producing an app, and I didn’t have to worry about whether poor people could afford the widget, or I didn’t have to worry about whether the app had some unintended consequences — setting aside my Syria and Yemen portfolio — then I think those suggestions are terrific.”

That’s not the way people think about things in Silicon Valley, where an investment is supposed to remake the world, returning the money ten- or a hundredfold. It’s not about maybe getting a few more votes, with an uncertain return.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**COPENHAGEN — An exchange in a recent debate on national TV was emblematic of changing times in Danish politics. An 18-year-old high school student named Jens Philip Yazdani was pitted against[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZX8WaKjddDs] Martin Henriksen, a member of Parliament for the far-right Danish People’s Party who is the chairman[http://www.thedanishparliament.dk/Members/dfmahr.aspx] of an important parliamentary committee on **immigration**, integration and housing. When Mr. Yazdani asserted his Danish identity as someone born and brought up in Denmark, Mr. Henriksen interrupted him.

“This is not how one becomes Danish,” he said, starkly forcing to the fore the old question of what is “Danishness.” In that moment, the nationalist politician signaled an end to the uneasy truce that has long defined the **immigration** debate in Denmark. By rejecting the very possibility of ever “becoming” Danish, even down several generations, he effectively shelved the political project of integration of **immigrants**.

“One can’t say that just because one brings the whole world to Denmark,” Mr. Henriksen went on, “and they then get some children, that those children become Danish. This is a simplification of the debate, and one that is insulting to those generations that have built this land.”

What surprised many viewers is that in an earlier era, Mr. Yazdani would have been considered a poster boy for successful integration. Born to a Danish mother and an Iranian father, he speaks Danish fluently and is the chairman[http://cphpost.dk/news/danish-high-school-categorising-pupils-based-on-ethnicity.html] of his school council. Being a meaningful contributor to society was once deemed valuable in Denmark, enough to provide a sense of belonging. But now, apparently, it’s the bloodline that matters.

Some hear in this an ominous echo of Germany’s late-19th-century romance with “blut und boden” (blood and soil) as the marker of national identity. Martin Krasnik, a columnist with the newspaper Weekendavisen, noted how this biological identification of “the people” can be used to erase the rights and legalities of formal citizenship. He recalled how Karl Lueger, the mayor of Vienna at the turn of the 20th century, claimed[https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/judaica/ejud\_0002\_0013\_0\_12844.html] that “I decide who is a Jew.” This time, Mr. Krasnik wrote ruefully, what has come to define Danish **immigration** politics today is the phrase “I decide who is a Dane.”

The new brashness in **immigration** politics has been emboldened by the widespread talk of a “migrant crisis” said to be choking Europe. This, despite the fact that Denmark’s intake of refugees[http://www.oecd.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/els/mig/keystat.htm] is one of the lowest among the European member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and markedly lower than its neighbors Germany and Sweden.

The migrant, nevertheless, is the new figure of loathing. At the recent convention of the Danish People’s Party, one of its rising stars, Cheanne Nielsen, made headlines[http://en.news-front.info/2016/09/22/danish-politician-who-said-migrants-steal-rape-and-kill-in-speech-probed-by-police/] when she told an applauding audience that foreigners are welfare moochers who “spread filth, they cheat, they steal, they rape and they kill.” Another speaker, Marlene Harpsoe, a member of Parliament, said[http://universitypost.dk/article/ucph-student-fighting-xenophobia-shoes] that asylum seekers should be given a pair of sneakers: “If they can walk all the way up here, they can also walk back home.”

The party chairman, Kristian Thulesen Dahl, admitted that some of the speakers had perhaps gone a bit far[https://www.neweurope.eu/article/denmarks-biggest-coalition-partner-embroiled-police-racism-investigation/], but he explained away their excesses as humor. Others are calling it the “Trump effect,” but anti-**immigrant** far-right politics in Denmark predates the arrival of Donald J. Trump on the global stage by several decades. The difference this time is that xenophobia is no longer a dark art practiced by an unpredictable fringe; it has moved center stage in Danish political life.

An anti-**immigrant** stance in Denmark is now neither masked in clumsy euphemisms nor accompanied by halfhearted gestures of conciliation toward the “New Danes,” as the old assimilationist term put it. The message is now delivered rough and raw by a new generation of outspoken politicians.

Humor has been weaponized. The ability to joke and deploy sarcasm is increasingly claimed as a sign of essential Danishness. But there’s nothing self-deprecating about this joking; it is hostile mocking, aimed at the most vulnerable in society, a way of putting migrants in their place.

That anti-**immigration** politics is more influential than ever is borne out by the emergence, just weeks ago, of a new far-right party[https://sputniknews.com/europe/201605251040210018-denmark-new-conservatives-radicalism/] called the New Conservatives. Among other hard-line policies, it advocates a ban on head scarves worn by Muslim women who work in the public sector and in schools and colleges, and a halt to granting asylum to refugees. The party has not only secured the degree of support required by law for it to contest parliamentary elections, but has also already seen a surge in opinion polls.

With the boundaries of acceptable discourse constantly prodded and pushed, Danish society is becoming ever more inured to xenophobia, says Brian Arly Jacobsen[http://ccrs.ku.dk/staff/?pure=en%2Fpersons%2Fbrian-arly-jacobsen(ad035c25-6285-4df3-aa55-2bca49b9e924).html], a sociologist who studies the role of religion in the public sphere. Part of the explanation is the muted response of the center-left parties that have traditionally championed progressive policies. The decision by the Social Democrats to collaborate[http://www.nybooks.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/articles/2016/03/10/liberal-harsh-denmark/] with the Danish People’s Party on a package of welfare programs has weakened its ideological position: The unsavory compromise it has accepted is to be willing to turn a blind eye to the far right’s xenophobia in order to safeguard the rights of the poor.

If there is a silver lining in the new political reality, it is that it has forced much more public discussion about what it means to be Danish. Perhaps the best response to this debate was captured in a satirical online test[http://www.erjegdansker.dk/] called “Am I Danish?” and devised by a young photographer named Magnus Kristoffersen. The questionnaire invites people to evaluate themselves by choosing from a variety of options. But whatever you click, the result is the same: You can never be Danish.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Ravinder Kaur is an associate professor of modern South Asian studies at the University of Copenhagen.

\* ‘I’ve Become a Racist’: Migrant Wave Unleashes Danish Tensions Over Identity[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/denmark-migrants-refugees-racism.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I pass this spot every day. It’s a nexus between two lives, shuttling people to family, businesses and dreams on the other side of the border.

DENVER[http://travel.nytimes.com/travel/guides/north-america/united-states/colorado/denver/overview.html?inline=nyt-geo] — The $65 bus to Mexico[http://travel.nytimes.com/travel/guides/north-america/mexico/overview.html?inline=nyt-geo] rolled into a parking lot here recently, belching exhaust into the Colorado night as a river of people — crying, kissing — thrust belongings into the belly of the vehicle and climbed aboard.

Frank Torres, 64, a driver in black slacks, descended from his perch above it all.

“This is true drama,” he said, surveying the scene. A boy wailed to his left. Travelers burdened by packages passed on his right. Mr. Torres, snacking on a coconut Popsicle, took a meaty bite. “Separation. You see a lot of that. The mother leaving her child. The child leaving the mother. This is how it goes.”

Nearly every night I pass this lot off a main thoroughfare in the heart of Denver. From here, Autobuses los Paisanos[http://lospaisanosautobuses.com/] — “the buses of the people” — ferry Colorado’s **immigrants** to dreams and dramas on the other side of the border. They are mothers off to visit deported children, single men in cowboy hats bound for weddings and funerals, grandparents moving home after years of work in factories and fields in the United States.

Sometimes I stop to chat. And I’ve come to see this place as a window into a deeply American feature: The **immigrant**’s split soul.

“Part of my heart stays here,” said Paty Ruelas, 50, who lives in Torreón, Mexico, and had come here last month to watch the birth of a granddaughter, Bella. Now, she was headed back to a restaurant she owns some 1,190 miles away. “I have a business there,” she said. “I have to go back. I have no choice.”

Across the lot, Alicia Perez, 70, stood in a sea of suitcases, boxes and carefully bundled consumer electronics. Her travel partner was her consuegra, her daughter’s mother-in-law, who also happened to be named Alicia Perez.

They live here. They were off to visit children on the other side.

The first Ms. Perez said she came to the United States 38 years ago. “I worked in the fields. Onions, vegetables, potatoes. I worked so many years that I can barely walk or hold a thing,” she laughed, hobbling forward with a cane. “But I am happy now, because my children are fulfilled, my grandchildren are on the right path.”

Five of her children live in Colorado, she said. Two live in Mexico. And so twice a year she makes the 36-hour bus journey to her home city of Durango, risking bus robberies or worse for a chance to see her family.

“Hellos and goodbyes, sorrows and joys, much has passed through this place,” she said. “Children here, children there. All of us are broken into pieces.”

Ms. Perez climbed into her seat with the help of two daughters and a granddaughter. A once teeming parking lot had turned quiet.

With the beep of a horn, the white vehicle dipped into the Denver night. And Ms. Perez, her eyes locked on her family, peered out the window, making the sign of the cross, over and over.

The bus would pass brightly lit cities, carpets of sagebrush and abandoned farms, before hitting El Paso, where passengers would cross the border.

From there, each would find a new bus to his or her destination.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LOS ANGELES — The students gathered around the tables at Cahuenga Elementary School in Koreatown and exchanged descriptions of their mothers in Korean. She works hard, one student offered: yeol shim hee. She is funny: woo kin dah. The teacher walked around offering help as they began to compose essays. In the Korean portion of this dual-language class, not a word of English could be heard. Teachers and parents here speak of trilingual aspirations, and the sounds of Spanish, Korean and English can be heard throughout the playground.

In 1998, voters in California passed a law that severely restricted[http://www.nytimes.com/1998/08/08/us/california-schools-toddle-as-bilingualism-ends.html] bilingual education in public schools, arguing that students were languishing in their native language and that requiring English-only instruction would speed up the time it took children to learn English.

Now, voters are being asked to overturn the measure in November, allowing school districts to implement more programs like those at Cahuenga, where students often learn in their native language. In a state where **immigrants** now make up roughly 25 percent of the population, the initiative is yet another test of how California’s attitude toward **immigrants**[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/23/us/turmoil-over-immigration-status-california-has-lived-it-for-decades.html] has changed over the past two decades.

“This is long overdue in a place as global as California, where we really need a multilingual society,” said Ricardo Lara, a state senator who sponsored the legislation to put the measure on the ballot. “We have waiting lists at the small fraction of schools that offer dual language. Why would we not want to give them the chance to expand that? What we know now about teaching and learning language is vastly different than it was a generation ago.”

The Los Angeles Unified School District, the state’s largest school system, has already begun expanding dual-language programs in an effort to shore up its flagging enrollment. For the first time this year, the district is offering an Armenian dual-language program in Tujunga, a neighborhood near the San Gabriel Mountains intended to attract students who would otherwise attend private religious schools, where learning the language is part of the curriculum.

The ballot measure, known as Learn — Language Education, Acquisition and Readiness Now — has attracted the support of the state’s teachers’ union and school boards association in addition to the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce and a host of Democratic elected officials, including Gov. Jerry Brown.

Under the current law, students who do not speak English must spend one year in an English-only class before moving to mainstream classes in English at their grade level. Parents seeking other options, including the programs at Cahuenga, must sign a waiver to allow their children to participate in programs that also use instruction in their native language.

At Cahuenga, Spanish speakers can enroll in what is known as a transitional bilingual education program, in which students learn all subjects in their native language beginning in kindergarten, with the goal of transferring to mainstream English classes by fourth grade. Korean-speaking students have a similar option, or they can enroll in the school’s dual-language program, in which teachers spend half the day teaching in Korean, including in subjects like math and science. In lower grades, some teachers wear shirts of different colors depending on the language they are using, to help students differentiate between the two.

Cahuenga is just one of a few dozen schools that offer such programs in the district — roughly 400 schools statewide offer a dual-language program. And the vast majority of the state’s 1.4 million English language learners spend their days in classrooms that use only English.

More than 200 languages are spoken in the state, and roughly 40 percent of residents older than 5 speak a language other than English. While Spanish is the most common, there are sizable populations of Tagalog, Chinese and Vietnamese speakers. And more Koreans live in Los Angeles than any other city in the country.

“There was no question for us we wanted them to learn Korean and English,” said Ju Kim, who has sent three children to Cahuenga’s dual-language program, where students sing in a Korean choir and spend their day switching between languages. When her son transferred out of the school to an English-only honors program, he quickly lost his ability to write and speak in Korean and urged his mother keep the family’s youngest child enrolled at Cahuenga. “He went through a phase of ‘you’re American, speak English,’ but now he tells me people expect him to speak Korean.”

Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, the executive director of Californians Together, a group that favors the ballot measure, said the waiver required for parents to enroll their children in bilingual programs had had a chilling effect and that more parents would be inclined to have their children in bilingual programs if they were more widely available.

“The type of education we offer now is a one-size-fits-all program for all kids learning English,” Ms. Spiegel-Coleman said. “What we want is for individual schools to be able to decide what they think is best for the students, whether that’s dual language or some other way. A student’s native language does not have to be sacrificed for learning English. Our whole perspective has changed.”

In one sign of the changed approach already unfolding, the state now offers a seal of biliteracy for high school graduates who can prove through exams that they are fluent in two languages. But just a tiny fraction of the state’s students receive the seal, with most not beginning to learn a foreign language until high school.

A generation ago the ballot measure restricting bilingual education proved divisive, drawing roughly $6 million in political ads and generating scores of newspaper editorials. This year’s measure has attracted far less attention, with proponents spending roughly $1 million.

The leading opposition has come from Ron Unz, the Silicon Valley entrepreneur behind [http://www.nytimes.com/1998/06/14/us/the-california-entrepreneur-who-beat-bilingual-teaching.html] the 1998 measure[http://www.nytimes.com/1998/06/14/us/the-california-entrepreneur-who-beat-bilingual-teaching.html]. Mr. Unz and his supporters said at the time that Spanish speakers were not fully integrating into society and were being failed by an education system that allowed them to spend years in the classroom without learning English. More than 60 percent of voters backed the measure, entrenching the notion that English was the language of the state and that speaking it was the best way to assimilate.

“It would be a tremendous symbolic step backwards because the whole issue had been dead and forgotten by everyone but the few activists,” Mr. Unz said. “We have an entire generation of students who learned English now entering college and the work force. There is not going to be any appetite to return to days of students languishing.”

Much of the interest in dual-language programs comes from white parents who want their children to learn Spanish, Mr. Unz said, arguing that native Spanish speakers are unlikely to want to enroll in classes that do not rapidly teach their children English. “There is a tremendous amount of enthusiasm from a small portion of parents, but I am very skeptical that will translate into a wholesale increase of these programs,” Mr. Unz said.

While it is impossible to predict parent demand if the measure passes, Hilda Maldonado, the executive director of multilingual and multicultural education in the Los Angeles school district, said she expected many more students to enroll in dual-language classes and other programs that allowed them to retain their native language if the measure passed. She points to job postings in the region that routinely require Spanish or some other foreign language.

“The world is a lot smaller, and we have parents who come in wanting their children to be able to talk with their cousins and grandparents,” Ms. Maldonado said. “We see that the entire world is a lot more accessible to our kids. The way we do business has changed, and the way we communicate with the world requires more of us to know more, not less.”

\* California’s Midlife Crisis[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/27/opinion/californias-midlife-crisis.html]

\* Debate Erupts in California Over Curriculum on India’s History[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/06/us/debate-erupts-over-californias-india-history-curriculum.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I’m a baby boomer, which means that I’m old enough to remember conservatives yelling “America — love it or leave it!” at people on the left who criticized racism and inequality. But that was a long time ago. These days, disdain for America — the America that actually exists, not an imaginary “real America” in which minorities and women know their place — is concentrated on the right.

To be sure, progressives still see a lot wrong with the state of our society, and seek change. But they also celebrate the progress we have made, and for the most part the change they seek is incremental: It involves building on existing institutions, not burning everything down and starting over.

On the right, however, you increasingly find prominent figures describing our society as a nightmarish dystopia.

This is obviously true for Donald Trump, who views the world through blood-colored glasses. In his vision of America — clearly derived largely from white supremacist and neo-Nazi sources — crime is running wild, inner cities are war zones, and hordes of violent **immigrants** are pouring across our open border. In reality, murder is at a historic low[http://www.factcheck.org/2016/07/dueling-claims-on-crime-trend/], we’re seeing a major urban revival and net **immigration**from Mexico[http://www.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/articles/mexican-immigration-to-u-s-reverses-1447954334] is negative. But I’m only saying that because I’m part of the conspiracy.

Meanwhile, you find almost equally dark visions, just as much at odds with reality, among establishment Republicans, people like Paul Ryan, speaker of the House.

Mr. Ryan is, of course, a media darling. He doesn’t really command strong support from his own party’s base; his prominence comes, instead, from a press corps that decided years ago that he was the archetype of serious, honest conservatism, and clings to that story no matter how many times the obvious fraudulence[http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/ryans-mystery-meat-budget] and cruelty[http://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-budget/house-gop-budget-gets-62-percent-of-budget-cuts-from-low-and-moderate-income] of his proposals are pointed out. If the past is any indication, he will quickly be forgiven for his moral spinelessness in this election, his unwillingness to break with Mr. Trump — even to condemn him for questioning the legitimacy of the vote — no matter how grotesque the G.O.P. nominee’s behavior becomes.

But for what it’s worth, consider the portrait of America Mr. Ryan painted last week, in a speech to the College Republicans[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/paul-ryan-democratic-washington-229822]. For it was, in its own way, as out of touch with reality as the ranting of Donald Trump (whom Mr. Ryan never mentioned).

Now, to be fair, Mr. Ryan claimed to be describing the future — what will happen if Hillary Clinton wins — rather than the present. But Mrs. Clinton is essentially proposing a center-left agenda, an extension of the policies President Obama was able to implement in his first two years, and it’s pretty clear that Mr. Ryan’s remarks were intended as a picture of what all such policies do.

According to him, it’s very grim. There will, he said, be “a gloom and grayness to things,” ruled by a “cold and unfeeling bureaucracy.” We will become a place “where passion — the very stuff of life itself — is extinguished.” And this is the kind of America Mrs. Clinton “will stop at nothing to have.”

Does today’s America look anything like that? No. We have many problems, but we’re hardly living in a miasma of despair. Leave government statistics (which almost half of Trump supporters completely distrust[http://www.marketplace.org/2016/10/13/economy/americans-economic-anxiety-has-reached-new-high]) on one side; Gallup finds that 80 percent[http://www.well-beingindex.com/standard-of-living-ratings-rise-during-obama-presidency] of Americans are satisfied with their standard of living, up from 73 percent in 2008, and that 55 percent consider themselves to be “thriving[http://www.well-beingindex.com/americans-life-evaluations-improve-during-obama-era],” up from 49 percent in 2008. And there are good reasons for those good feelings: recovery from the financial crisis was slower than it should have been, but unemployment is low, incomes surged last year, and thanks to Obamacare more Americans have health insurance than ever before.

So Mr. Ryan’s vision of America looks nothing like reality. It is, however, completely familiar to anyone who read Ayn Rand’s “Atlas Shrugged” as a teenager. Nowadays the speaker denies being a Rand devotee[http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2014/09/what-ryans-latest-answer-about-rand-means.html], but while you can at least pretend to take the boy out of the cult, you can’t take the cult out of the boy. Like Ms. Rand — who was basically writing about America in the Eisenhower years! — he sees the horrible world progressive policies were supposed to produce, not the flawed but hopeful nation we actually live in.

So why does the modern right hate America? There’s not much overlap in substance between Mr. Trump’s fear-mongering and Mr. Ryan’s, but there’s a clear alignment of interests. The people Mr. Trump represents want to suppress and disenfranchise you-know-who; the big-money interests that support Ryan-style conservatism want to privatize and generally dismantle the social safety net, and they’re willing to do whatever it takes to get there.

The big question is whether trash-talking America can actually be a winning political strategy. We’ll soon find out.

Read my blog, The Conscience of a Liberal[http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/], and follow me on Twitter, @PaulKrugman. [https://twitter.com/PaulKrugman]

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It sure does get exhausting working for the global corporate media conspiracy.

The hours are horrible (my kingdom for a weekend off). You never know what the puppet masters are going to order up next. (I wish that guy from Mexico, What’s-His-Face Slim, would get off my back.) And there’s no extra combat pay when, at this point, there clearly should be.

I probably shouldn’t joke (and yes, Twitter, that’s what I’m doing). The anger being directed at the news media[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/politics/trump-media-attacks.html?ref=politics&\_r=0] has become dangerous enough that some news organizations are providing security for staff members covering Trump rallies. “Someone’s going to get hurt” has become a common refrain in American newsrooms.

On Thursday, Jim Acosta of CNN held up a sign left[http://www.mediaite.com/tv/cnns-acosta-sees-swastika-sign-at-trump-rally-says-things-are-getting-scary/] in the press section of Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s rally in West Palm Beach that featured a swastika next to the word “Media.” Later, in Cincinnati, the crowd met reporters with sustained boos, curses and chants of, “Tell the truth, tell the truth.”

It was as tense as anyone had seen it since the candidacy of George Wallace[http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/03/trump-rallies-parallel-68-wallace-rallies.html], and yet it was almost understandable given what Mr. Trump had been telling them: The news media was trying to “poison the minds” of voters with “lies, lies, lies.” All of it, he said, is part of a “conspiracy against you, the American people” that also includes “global financial interests.”

The idea that the press is part of some grand conspiracy against the people, presented in such incendiary terms, goes well beyond the longstanding Republican complaints about liberal bias. You’d more expect to hear it from Lenin[http://soviethistory.msu.edu/1917-2/organs-of-the-press/organs-of-the-press-texts/decree-on-the-press/] or the pages of the anti-Semitic publication American Free Press[https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2010/05/06/anti-semitic-pub-cribs-copy-%E2%80%98elite-controlled-big-media-monopoly%E2%80%99] than from the standard-bearer of the Republican Party.

But it is resonating with a large portion of the American electorate. There are many reasons, some of which should cause the news media to make good on its promises to examine its own disconnect from the cross section of Americans whose support for Mr. Trump it never saw coming.

We can debate whether the “corporate” news media is as left-leaning as critics claim. The answer, as I see it, is more than they’ll admit to themselves and less than conservatives claim.

But there is little question that it is out of step with Mr. Trump’s die-hards on the issues upon which Mr. Trump won them over, especially **immigration** and trade. And this tracks across the ideological divide in the mainstream media.

For all their many differences, the right-leaning editorial board of The Wall Street Journal and the left-leaning editorial boards of The New York Times and The Washington Post[https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/a-president-trump-could-destroy-the-world-economy/2016/10/05/f70019c0-84df-11e6-92c2-14b64f3d453f\_story.html?utm\_term=.83d6383204ca] share the beliefs that global free trade is generally beneficial [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/opinion/sunday/the-rage-against-trade.html?\_r=0] and that the United States needs to create ways to legalize the undocumented **immigrant** work force[http://www.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/articles/the-deportation-party-1439853705].

The newsrooms of The Times, The Journal and The Post operate independently from their editorial pages. But their coverage certainly does not start from the premise that an **immigration** overhaul would unduly reward the original sin of illegal border crossing or that free trade deals threaten our national sovereignty.

Then there are big attitudinal differences that come from the fact that the biggest American newsrooms are in major cities.

“One of the reasons the national media initially missed the rise of Trump was because so much of it is based on the coasts,” said Joanne Lipman, editor in chief of the USA Today Network, which Gannett formed in December, in part, to combine the sensibilities of the 110 newspapers it owns throughout red-state and blue-state America.

There also tends to be a shared sense of noble mission across the news media that can preclude journalists from questioning their own potential biases.

“The people who run American journalism, and who staff the newsrooms, think of themselves as sophisticated, cosmopolitan, and, culturally speaking, on the right side of history,” Rod Dreher[http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/], a senior editor at The American Conservative, told me. “They don’t know what they don’t know and they don’t care to know it.”

Mr. Dreher lives in Louisiana and has worked at five major city newspapers across the country. He does not support Mr. Trump but says he understands why his supporters are so frustrated. As far as he’s concerned, mainstream journalists are “interested in every kind of diversity, except the kind that would challenge their own prejudices.” Those include, “bigotry against conservative religion, bigotry against rural folks and bigotry against working-class and poor white people.”

It’s a pretty sweeping generalization. But a considerable percentage of the country believes it. An even larger percentage of Mr. Trump’s voters do.

No matter what happens on Nov. 8, the notion isn’t going away. American newsrooms will be making a big mistake — and missing a huge continuing story — if they fail to adjust their coverage to better illuminate the concerns of Mr. Trump’s supporters well beyond Election Day.

Doing so might begin to build up trust in the news media, which the Gallup Organization reported[http://www.gallup.com/poll/195542/americans-trust-mass-media-sinks-new-low.aspx] as hitting a new low in September.

But there is something else that will help: a far more assertive defense from the news media, of what it does well and honestly, and against the sustained attempts to impugn its motives through the many false and misleading political-style attacks that too often are mixed in with the valid criticism.

Just look at this past week, starting with the trove of Clinton campaign emails released by WikiLeaks — possibly aided by Russian-sponsored hackers, according to United States intelligence officials. Mr. Trump seized upon them as proof of media bias favoring Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per].

Citing their provenance — purloined from the personal account of Mrs. Clinton’s adviser John Podesta — campaign officials have refused to verify them publicly. But they have not disputed emails that lay bare the back-channel communication between reporters and political operatives.

An email chain that purported to show the Democratic Party official Donna Brazile sharing with the Clinton campaign a question from a coming primary season town hall was particularly disturbing. (CNN has denied[http://www.politico.com/blogs/on-media/2016/10/roland-martin-cnn-email-donna-brazile-wikileaks-229673] sharing any questions with Ms. Brazile, who denied having access to them.)

But most of the emails show reporters, including some at The Times, trying to: Get permission to use quotations[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/magazine/anatomy-of-a-media-conspiracy.html?mtrref=undefined] from an off-the-record interview; run details in a coming story past political aides to make sure they are correct (called fact-checking), or alert Mr. Podesta that his name was to come up in a critical article (the opposite of which is to ambush). That’s standard interplay between reporters and political aides.

It isn’t always pretty. Reporters can make mistakes, become overly chummy with sources and fall into traps that give the campaigns too much power over their reporting. Much as they should resist it, that happens on a bipartisan basis. It is not evidence that the news media, including The New York Times, is working in tandem with “globalists” and Mrs. Clinton’s campaign to deliver her the presidency.

In the case of The Times, Mr. Trump has made its largest individual shareholder, Carlos Slim, of Mexico[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/10/world/americas/mexicos%2Dcarlos%2Dslim%2Dhelu.html], part of the conspiracy. The Times’s publisher, Arthur O. Sulzberger Jr. — whose family controls the company’s voting shares [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/02/opinion/nocera-how-punch-protected-the-times.html]— said in a statement that Mr. Slim “has never sought to influence[http://www.cnbc.com/2016/10/14/donald-trump-to-claim-mexican-billionaire-carlos-slim-behind-nyt-sex-assault-stories-wsj.html] what we report.” The Times’s executive editor, Dean Baquet, recently told me that he had never even met Mr. Slim.

Mr. Trump apparently had no problems doing media business with Mr. Slim — “a good guy,” he had called him on David Letterman’s show — before the election. It was just 2015 when a production company Mr. Slim controls, Ora TV, announced it was canceling a television project it said it had in the works[http://www.forbes.com/forbes/welcome/?toURL=http://www.forbes.com/sites/doliaestevez/2015/06/30/carlos-slims-ora-tv-severs-ties-with-donald-trump-calling-his-remarks-about-immigrants-racist/&refURL=https://www-google-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/&referrer=https://www-google-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/] with Mr. Trump, citing his comments about Mexicans.

Previously, I had mostly noticed suggestions of a Slim-Times conspiracy on sites like Breitbart[http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/02/19/new-york-times-uses-papal-visit-as-stick-to-beat-conservatives/] and alt-right Twitter accounts.

In giving those allegations prominence, the standard-bearer of the Republican Party is adding a sinister, false twist to his press criticism that arguably puts the reporters covering his rallies in danger. In effect, he is painting them as traitors.

Now, who’s poisoning the minds of the electorate?

\* Partisan Crowds at Trump Rallies Menace and Frighten News Media[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/politics/trump-media-attacks.html]

\* Officials Fight Donald Trump’s Claims of a Rigged Vote[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/us/politics/donald-trump-election-rigging.html]

\* Peter Thiel to Donate $1.25 Million in Support of Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/16/technology/peter-thiel-donald-j-trump.html]

\* Martha Raddatz and Anderson Cooper Steered Debate With Sharp Questions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/politics/anderson-cooper-martha-raddatz.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AUBERVILLIERS, France — A Chinese tailor, Zhang Chaolin, emigrated to France[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/france/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] with his wife and two sons in 2006 in search of a better life. They settled in Aubervilliers, a working-class suburb of Paris, where a decade of striving finally put that life within reach.

His sons, now in their 20s, work and have their own families. Last year, the younger son had his first child, making Mr. Zhang a grandfather.

But those dreams of stability came to an abrupt end this year under a pleasant August sun. A group of young men, barely old enough to drive, assaulted Mr. Zhang, who was 49, as he walked in Aubervilliers with two friends he had known since childhood.

Shouting racist slurs, the youths took a small bag from one of the men, and savagely beat them, leaving Mr. Zhang and his friends crumpled and bloodied on the sidewalk. The bag contained only candy and cigarettes. Mr. Zhang died five days later.

The death was the culmination of months, even years, of racial tensions in Paris and its suburbs that intensified this summer, fueled by long-held stereotypes of the Chinese as weak yet unusually successful residents of economically disadvantaged, **immigrant**-heavy suburbs. Often the tensions stem from rivalries between **immigrant** groups themselves.

While the death surprised few Franco-Asians, it did reveal a volatile racial landscape in France that is far more complex than the country’s French majority and large Muslim minority, whose struggle for integration[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/25/world/europe/france-burkini.html?ref=topics] has received the most attention.

In early September, 60,000 demonstrators of Chinese or other Asian origin marched in Paris to denounce violence and discrimination and to press the government for more vigorous action to ensure the safety of all French citizens, no matter their race. They waved French flags, wore T-shirts emblazoned with the tricolor, and sang “La Marseillaise.”

Racial discrimination and violence, many in the community lament, is a problem that has long defied remedy. Six years ago, people of Chinese origin similarly protested racial violence aimed at them in Paris’s Belleville neighborhood, in the 10th Arrondisement, an area with a large Chinese community.

“In 2010, there were lots of thefts and beatings,” said Frédéric Zhou, Mr. Zhang’s former landlord, who recounted his own instances of verbal abuse and physical threats. “We protested, and the authorities said they would try to stop these attacks. But in six years, it’s gotten worse, and now there’s a death.

“One death isn’t nothing,” he added. “We’re not dogs.”

While conditions in Belleville did improve, violence against people of Asian descent in some other areas appears to have increased. Mr. Zhang’s death followed a steady uptick of violence in Aubervilliers, residents say.

Joelle Huy, the president of the owners’ cooperative of La Résidence du Parc, a majority Chinese housing complex in La Courneuve, a suburb adjacent to Aubervilliers, described an attack on the night of July 13.

“A group of about 10 kids started shooting fireworks at our cars,” she recalled. Residents of the housing complex chased the youths away and called the police. “When the police arrived,” Ms. Huy said, “we told them that this couldn’t go on, and they told us it was nothing.”

A few minutes after the police left, the youths emerged from the darkness with pistols. “They were firing in all directions,” Ms. Huy said, still clearly shocked. “Four people were wounded by bullets.”

During the first seven months of 2016, the police recorded 105 violent thefts targeting Aubervilliers’s residents of Chinese origin, who number 3,000 in a town of more than 77,000 inhabitants. The reported assaults were probably only a fraction of the actual total, because many in the community feel it is useless to go to the police.

“To file a complaint, it takes three hours, the police say they don’t understand the Chinese people, or they say they’re not taking complaints,” said Ms. Huy, who blames government indifference as much as the perpetrators for the violence. “What’s the point? You try to file a complaint, you are rejected.”

The attack at La Courneuve prompted such concern that Chinese in France wrote to the Interior Ministry warning that the situation was growing dire.

“In the letter, they said, ‘What will it take for the government to react?’” recounted Tamara Lui, the president of the Chinese of France-French of China[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/china/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] Association. “‘Does someone need to die?’”

A few weeks later, Mr. Zhang did.

The threat has grown so bad, and the lack of government response so enraging, that some Chinese have taken their security into their own hands.

“They organize groups that can accompany people when they leave their homes,” said Sun Lay Tan, a municipal councilor in Mitry-Mory, a suburb of Paris, and the author of a Change.org petition denouncing anti-Asian violence that garnered more than 15,000 signatures. “It’s going to continue because when they call the police, they don’t come.”

Sabrina Goldman, the vice president of the International League Against Racism and Anti-Semitism, said the lack of response had engendered “a sense of fatalism” among Chinese. But she also noted that since Mr. Zhang’s death, the problem of anti-Asian violence had gained more recognition. “Racism against the Chinese and Asian communities has long been ignored, and now society is waking up to its existence,” she said.

In September, a court in Bobigny, another Paris suburb, sentenced three young men implicated in the violent mugging of a Chinese family and, for the first time, recognized the crime’s racially motivated character as an “aggravating circumstance.”

The same month, former Prime Minister Alain Juppé, a candidate in the 2017 presidential election, visited Aubervilliers and urged Franco-Chinese associations to keep hope for the possibility of “harmony between communities.”

Bernard Cazeneuve, the minister of the interior, has promised to send police reinforcements to Aubervilliers, and Meriem Derkaoui, the mayor of Aubervilliers, pledged to expand video surveillance.

A few months before Mr. Zhang was killed, the Aubervilliers Police Department hired a part-time translator to assist with the filing of complaints on a biweekly basis in an effort to improve relations with residents of Chinese origin. Still, some, including the CGT Police Ile-de-France — the Paris region’s branch of the national police union — say more police officers cannot solve the problem.

“We need a police force that is closer to the local population, one that can anticipate problems in the community,” Axel Ronde, the group’s general secretary, said. “We’ve abandoned this kind of work over the years, so it’s not going to change overnight.”

Others say the solution lies in building better understanding between citizens themselves. “I think we need to create opportunities for mediation and intercommunity exchanges,” said Mr. Sun, the municipal councilor. “I don’t expect much from the state.”

\* From Bikinis to Burkinis, Regulating What Women Wear[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/world/europe/france-burkini-bikini-ban.html]

\* Attack in Nice Turns Spotlight on City’s Religious Divisions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/18/world/europe/muslims-nice-france-terrorism.html]

\* From Refugee Chefs, a Taste of Home[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/06/dining/refugees-chefs-paris.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Britain and the European Union may be getting over the initial shock of the British demand for a divorce. Now comes the bitter fight. Already, both sides have staked out very different positions on **immigration**, an issue that promises to be the most contentious in the separation proceedings.

Germany, France and other union members have argued that Britain must maintain open borders if it is to enjoy favorable access to Europe’s single market. Many British voters who chose to leave the bloc in June would like to see those borders more tightly regulated by the British government. However this issue is resolved, both sides have an obligation to find ways to minimize the economic damage to Britain and the rest of the union that a new relationship could bring. Formal negotiations are expected to start by the end of March[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/brexit-talks-march-theresa-may-britain.html].

The British prime minister, Theresa May, wants unfettered access to the European market, the world’s largest. Under her vision, Britain’s manufacturers would be able to sell products to customers in the bloc without paying duties, and bankers in London could serve businesses and investors anywhere in the union. But she and her colleagues insist on restricting **immigration** from other European Union countries.

Those demands are unacceptable to leaders like Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany and President François Hollande of France who insist that the union can accept the free movement of goods, services and capital only with countries that also accept the free movement of people. “There will be no compromises in this regard,” Donald Tusk, the president of the European Council said on Thursday[http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/10/13-tusk-speech-epc/]. The union’s agreements with three nonmember countries — Iceland, Lichtenstein and Norway[http://www.efta.int/eea] — include all four freedoms. Those countries also abide by the union’s regulations and contribute to its budget.

A common market cannot function properly if people are not allowed to move without having to obtain visas. Imagine how much more difficult it would be to do business in the United States if companies could not easily relocate employees to different states or if people could not freely move to take advantage of job opportunities.

The indivisibility of the four freedoms is also necessary to send a clear message to politicians and voters in France, Italy and other countries in the bloc who argue that their countries should also leave the union. Allowing Britain to cherry-pick its membership rules would encourage these separatists, greatly undermining the European project and making the region less stable, less prosperous and less tolerant. It would also set a dangerous example for other, non-European countries, the United States included, where politicians have demonized **immigrants** at a time when many people have seen incomes stagnate and are increasingly fearful of terrorism.

Interestingly, polls show that many Britons would accept a deal that kept the country’s borders open to other Europeans. In July, after the referendum, two-thirds of respondents[http://www.comresglobal.com/polls/bbc-news-brexit-expectations-poll/] said access to the European market should be a priority in negotiations while only 31 percent said the same about restricting free movement. There are 2.9 million people[http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-uk-leaves-the-eu-36745584] from other European Union countries living in Britain, making up 4.6 percent of the country’s population. About 1.2 million Britons live elsewhere in the union.

Even if it refuses to budge on **immigration**, Britain might still be able to negotiate a trade agreement with the union that gives it some modest economic benefits, like duty-free access for certain products. But the union is highly unlikely to give British banks and companies “passporting rights” to operate throughout the bloc. Losing these privileges would be a big blow to the economy, which is one reason the pound has fallen nearly 18 percent against the dollar since the referendum. That should be reason enough for Mrs. May to compromise on **immigration**.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — He didn’t see it coming.

Speaker Paul D. Ryan[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/r/paul\_d\_ryan/index.html?inline=nyt-per] was in a hotel room in Cincinnati last May when he learned that Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] — a man he barely knew, with no institutional ties to his party and a mouth that had already clacked his nerves — had secured the Republican nomination for president.

Mr. Trump had recently lost the Wisconsin primary, which Mr. Ryan and other Republicans in the state thought would presage the reality television star’s demise. Senator Ted Cruz of Texas had made strides, and Mr. Ryan thought the campaign would snake into the summer.

But he badly miscalculated. The ensuing path, [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/us/politics/donald-trump-gop-hillary-clinton.html]from Mr. Trump’s securing the nomination to Mr. Ryan’s decision not to have the nominee appear with him at a rally in Wisconsin a month before Election Day, has been jagged and treacherous, marked by brief moments of hope that Mr. Trump could be controlled, followed by the sinking realization that he could not.

Mr. Ryan heard the persistent — at times desperate — appeals of Reince Priebus, chairman of the Republican National Committee[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_national\_committee/index.html?inline=nyt-org] and a fellow Wisconsinite, and the angry calls from his rank and file, and neither could move him closer to Mr. Trump.

Now, Mr. Ryan finds himself in a singular abyss, desperate to maintain the voter enthusiasm needed to preserve Republican control of Congress, yet unable to defend his party’s presidential nominee.

If Mr. Trump is defeated on Nov. 8 — as Mr. Ryan has all but conceded — but Republicans maintain their House majority, it will fall largely to Mr. Ryan to piece the rubble of his party back together.

There is, of course, the question of whether House members would let him do so. The Republicans’ crisis would have an early reckoning with the House decision on whether the speaker should be Mr. Ryan — whose beliefs in free trade, tolerance toward **immigration**, changes to entitlement programs and conservative governance have long been Republican orthodoxy — or a new brand of leader who embodies Trumpism.

Democrats have moved quickly to paint Mr. Ryan as spineless and calculating for not outright rescinding his endorsement of Mr. Trump, while the right flank in his own party has taken a polar opposite view, saying Mr. Ryan should not publicly criticize the nominee.

For his part, Mr. Trump has been unsparing in his disparagement of Mr. Ryan. As recently as last week in a series of Twitter messages[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/politics/donald-trump-paul-ryan.html], he called Mr. Ryan “our very weak and ineffective leader,” who was lending “zero support” and “should spend more time on balancing the budget, jobs and illegal **immigration** and not waste his time on fighting Republican nominee.”

For now, the speaker spends his days treating Mr. Trump like a disgruntled former employee bent on Twitter revenge, essentially ignoring him. Instead, he gives speeches about the earned-income tax credit and the evils of Hillary Clinton, while furiously raising money for suddenly endangered House Republicans.

“Right now his objective is crystal clear,” said Representative Tom Cole, Republican of Oklahoma, “to retain the Republican majority in the House. In that effort he has helped members of the Freedom Caucus as well as those in the Tuesday Group and everyone in between,” he said, referring to the most conservative and most moderate members. “We will worry about our internal differences after the election. Right now we are in a bar fight and every Republican is worth saving.”

That Mr. Ryan and Mr. Trump were never natural allies is understandable. They had met only once before the business tycoon decided to run for the White House, an encounter at a fund-raiser in New York during the 2012 campaign. Mr. Ryan was Mitt Romney’s running mate.

Their paths would not cross again. “Trump really wasn’t on Paul’s radar screen,” said A. Mark Neuman, a Ryan friend for two decades. “Before this presidential race, there was almost no intersection in their lives,” he said, noting that Mr. Trump did not share Mr. Ryan’s passions for the Green Bay Packers, hunting, church, intense workouts and Midwest life with children.

The relationship showed strains[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/04/us/politics/paul-ryan-donald-trump.html] from the start, with Mr. Ryan alarmed by Mr. Trump’s anti-Muslim rhetoric and nationalistic appeals. The speaker decided to offer a policy agenda with no connection to Mr. Trump for other Republicans to embrace, a move almost unheard-of during a presidential campaign.

“If we try to play our own version of identity politics and try to fuel ourselves based on darker emotions, that’s not productive,” he said. He made calls to several of the Republican presidential candidates to outline the agenda; Mr. Trump feigned mild interest but they did not speak again. (The Trump campaign did not return emails with questions for this article. Mr. Ryan also declined to be interviewed.) Mr. Ryan had hoped that Mr. Trump would eventually embrace his plan.

When Mr. Trump clinched the nomination in May, Mr. Ryan was rattled, said several people who talked to him that day.

“The conventional wisdom among the people we talked to here was, ‘Don’t worry, this will end,’” said Charlie Sykes, a former conservative talk radio host in Milwaukee and a friend of Mr. Ryan’s. “So it was a huge shock. I think a lot of us here believed we were going be the firewall in Wisconsin, that there would be an outbreak of rationality.”

With campaign rhetoric getting increasingly contentious, Mr. Ryan made the unusual choice of announcing that he was not ready to endorse [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/06/us/politics/paul-ryan-donald-trump.html]Mr. Trump. None of this pleased Mr. Priebus, who prided himself on building the modern Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] in Wisconsin and longed for unity going into the race against Mrs. Clinton.

In text messages and phone calls, Mr. Priebus tried to persuade Mr. Ryan — who was relishing his independence — to accept Mr. Trump, said numerous officials with knowledge of the exchanges who requested anonymity to discuss internal party matters. Mr. Trump would yell at Mr. Priebus and in turn Mr. Priebus would needle Mr. Ryan.

When that didn’t work, Mr. Trump claimed Mr. Ryan had agreed to endorse him before a visit to Capitol Hill to try and woo fellow Republicans, a claim Mr. Ryan viewed as a serious breach. “That was the first realization that Trump wasn’t just a public persona,” said a Republican involved in planning the meeting, who insisted on anonymity so as not to **alienate** Mr. Trump. “but that his staff does not deal in good faith.”

Mr. Trump did meet with congressional Republicans, and listened to their policy messages with a smile and slightly glazed eyes, said several people who were there.

In June, after a period of relative silence on Mr. Trump’s part, Mr. Ryan finally felt comfortable enough to endorse him. Staff members of both men began to coordinate for the Republican National Convention[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/r/republican\_national\_convention/index.html?inline=nyt-org]. But days later Mr. Ryan aggressively criticized Mr. Trump [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/08/us/politics/paul-ryan-donald-trump-gonzalo-curiel.html]for his remarks about a Hispanic judge.

Another outburst, and another brick on the wall was laid. “He was genuinely just outraged after all those comments,” Mr. Sykes said.

A bright spot came in July, when Mr. Trump chose Indiana’s governor, Mike Pence[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/17/us/politics/mike-pence-donald-trump.html], who has long been close to Mr. Ryan, as his running mate. Privately, Mr. Pence tried to assure skeptical Republicans that he would impose Mr. Ryan’s policy agenda if he and Mr. Trump captured the White House. Then in August, Mr. Trump toyed with endorsing Mr. Ryan’s opponent in a primary[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/03/us/politics/donald-trump-refuses-to-endorse-paul-ryan-and-john-mccain.html].

Mr. Ryan, for his part, went on with his summer, serving as the chairman at the convention, where his role was unusually diminished. He watched Mr. Trump’s acceptance speech from a sky box.

Mr. Trump called Mr. Ryan a handful of times after the convention, once to tell him about his choice of Mr. Pence, and to seek debate advice, which Mr. Ryan said focused on preparation. (Not heeded.)

By the fall, Mr. Ryan had basically stopped speaking Mr. Trump’s name. The nominee made a request through the R.N.C. to campaign with Mr. Ryan, whose team agreed to invite Mr. Trump and Mr. Pence to an event this month in Wisconsin.

Then came the tape of Mr. Trump making vulgar and lewd comments[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/donald-trump-tape-transcript.html] about women in 2005.

Mr. Sykes let Mr. Priebus know via text that Mr. Trump was no longer welcome in Wisconsin. Mr. Sykes said Mr. Priebus responded: “I am the guy trying to fix this! I am in tears over this.’” (A spokeswoman for Mr. Priebus acknowledged that he was upset, but denied any tears.)

Mr. Ryan agonized over his options. Ultimately, he chose not to withdraw his endorsement to keep Republicans motivated to vote, which still made some of his conference angry. “I think they ask far too much of the speaker,” said Representative Jason Chaffetz, Republican of Utah, who has renounced Mr. Trump. “His job is to help House Republicans. Period.”

Mr. Ryan will soon find out if those members of his party who support Mr. Trump might come after him in the next speaker election. “We knew they had extreme views and you kind of rolled your eyes and said they were on our team,” Mr. Sykes said. “How much damage could they do?”

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/nytpolitics], and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics/].

\* House Republicans in Close Races Worry Trump’s Problems May Hurt Them[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/us/politics/house-elections-republican-barbara-comstock.html]

\* Donald Trump Berates Paul Ryan and ‘Disloyal’ Republicans[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/politics/donald-trump-paul-ryan.html]

\* Paul Ryan Turns Focus From Donald Trump to House Races, Roiling G.O.P.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/us/politics/donald-trump-gop-hillary-clinton.html]

\* The Rocky Relationship of Donald Trump and Paul Ryan, a History[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/04/us/politics/paul-ryan-donald-trump.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Here are the top 10 comments of the week on our digital platforms, as selected by our readers and the journalists who moderate nearly every comment.

Women Say Donald Trump Groped Them

1. I’m an 18-year-old college freshman, and in February I attended the Republican debate at Saint Anselm College in New Hampshire with my AP Government and Politics class.

I went up to the stage during a commercial break and shook hands with several candidates. When I put my hand out to Trump, in a fashion that very clearly intended a handshake, he reached past my hand and touched my cheek, saying, “So beautiful.”

It was disturbing and inappropriate, especially since I was obviously a student. (I was surrounded by a group of my peers and do not look particularly old for my age.) I was in shock and I didn’t say anything, but I regret not standing up to him for that small but unacceptable act.

— Madeline in Minnesota, reacting to[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html?comments#permid=20117295] an article about two women who told The New York Times that Donald J. Trump had touched them inappropriately.

This comment received more than 5,300 reader recommendations, the most of any comment this week, and more than 70 reader responses.

2. As a woman in corporate America I have seen so much abuse of power just like this. Frequently women are blamed for these incidents while the men retain, and even gain, respect, admiration and even more power.

This is an illness in our society that will not be easily cured. It is persistent and pervasive.

Yes, we now have legislation, training, hotlines and HR departments on the lookout for this kind of behavior. But the reality is that today’s workplace is not so different from that which these women experienced.

These two women are brave to come forward and we owe them a huge debt of gratitude. What we are witnessing right now is history in the making — these women pushing through the lies and excuses to say, “This is real, and it happened to me.”

— Fay in California[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html?comments#permid=20115736].

3. Where were all of these alleged sex abuse victims during Trump’s television career, during the primaries, or any time during the time period that any actual civil or criminal charges could have been filed against Trump?

No one with a brain believes in this day and age that women are defenseless pawns of men — in fact to continue to perpetuate this myth about women is in and of itself denigrating of the strength of modern women.

These allegations are transparent attempts to distract voters from the actual issues in this election — taxes and income inequality, border and homeland security, the dangerous instability in the Middle East, and other important issues.

The contents of [Hillary Clinton’s] emails are infinitely more important to the fitness of the candidates than any of the sexual comments and alleged sexual behavior of Trump.

— John Q. Public in Los Angeles[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html#permid=20121119].

This comment received more than 40 reader responses.

Bob Dylan Wins the Nobel Prize in Literature

4. I started listening to Dylan in 1964. I was 13 or 14. It wasn’t the so-called protest songs that impressed me the most. It was the songs about relationships, both loving and revengeful, that got me hooked: “She Belongs to Me,” “Love Minus Zero No Limit,” “Visions of Johanna,” “Idiot Wind” and more recently, “Girl From the Red River Shore” and so many others thru the decades.

Love songs are probably one of our oldest forms of literature, and it’s high time Bob was recognized like this.

— R.F. in Shelburne Falls, Mass., reacting to[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/arts/music/bob-dylan-nobel-prize-literature.html?comments#permid=20122977] an article about Bob Dylan receiving the Nobel Prize in Literature.

This comment received more than 230 reader recommendations.

5. I’m sorry, but this is a slap in the face to literary writers everywhere, many of whom toil in relative obscurity all their lives, and some of whom literally risk their lives to write and publish their work.

I can see now why the Nobel committee took an extra week to announce this decision — likely some members vehemently disagreed with the choice. I would’ve been one of them.

Dylan is already a millionaire many times over, so he doesn’t need the money, and you can’t argue that his work needs the spotlight the Nobel shines.

Has he been an important influence on American poetry? Nope. (Music, sure, but not poetry, per se.) Are there better poets in the world, even in America? You bet. And today they are feeling something the Nobel Prize in Literature should never cause: discouragement.

— G. in New York[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/arts/music/bob-dylan-nobel-prize-literature.html?comments#permid=20122988].

This comment received more than 300 reader recommendations.

‘Go Back to China’

6. A large segment of the white population feels deeply uncomfortable with the demographic shift that has been, quite frankly, shoved down their throats. When the floodgates to **immigration** were opened in the ’60s, they were promised that the very essence of their country will not change. But it did.

Now, you could walk in some parts of the U.S. and not hear or read a single word of English. They, perhaps rightly, feel angry and frustrated by that.

Does that justify verbally assaulting your family? Nope, not in a million years. But I think it provides context to the tribalism we all feel.

— James in New York[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/nyregion/to-the-woman-who-told-my-family-to-go-back-to-china.html?comments#permid=20082032], reacting to a first-person article by a Times editor, Michael Luo. Mr. Luo, an Asian-American born in the United States, wrote of his encounter with a woman who yelled at his family to “go back to China.”

This comment received more than 250 reader recommendations and more than 80 reader responses.

7. I am first-generation American born of **immigrants**. But no one ever tells me to go back to where I came from. You see, I am Swedish-American, tall, blonde, and blue eyed.

My father, with his Swedish accent, never once was told to go back to Sweden. So, it’s not really **immigration**, is it? It’s racism through and through — and a pox on America.

— Lilla Victoria in Grosse Pointe, Mich.[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/nyregion/to-the-woman-who-told-my-family-to-go-back-to-china.html?comments#permid=20081722]

This comment received more than 1,900 reader recommendations.

Thai King Dies After 7-Decade Reign

8. Grieving with Thailand. I moved to Thailand at age 10 and I grew up respecting and admiring the King. He was benevolent, kind, always serving, generous, ambitious and caring.

I grew up knowing and believing, because of his great example, that leaders can be respected role models.

— Tessa Lyn Shockey on The Times’s Facebook page,[https://www.facebook.com/nytimes/posts/10150926902789999?comment\_id=10150926995899999&comment\_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R9%22%7D] reacting to an article about the death of King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand, who died Thursday at 88. He reigned for 70 years.

Teenager Skews Presidential Polls

9. This is inspiring: You see, kids, one person CAN make a difference!

— Ed in Old Field, N.Y.[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/upshot/how-one-19-year-old-illinois-man-is-distorting-national-polling-averages.html?comments#permid=20112859], reacting to an article about a 19-year-old African-American man from Illinois whose support for Donald J. Trump in a presidential poll has made that poll an outlier.

This comment received more than 390 reader recommendations.

Ken Bone’s Sweater

10. Red Izod quarter-zip bought to see “Phantom of the Opera.”

Worn again at the most unbelievable Presidential debate in history to cover ripped pants.

All of early 21st-century U.S. sociological commentary summarized in a single garment.

— Lane Packwood on The Times’s Facebook page,[https://www.facebook.com/nytimes/posts/10150925365789999?comment\_id=10150925481674999&comment\_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R9%22%7D] responding to an article about the red Izod sweater worn by Ken Bone, who asked the candidates a question at Sunday’s presidential debate and became an internet sensation. The sweater sold out in several locations.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a packed federal courtroom in Brooklyn on Friday, it was one-stop shopping for 262 New Yorkers: They became American citizens and registered to vote — all from their seats and just before the deadline.

“Today is the last day you can register to vote in New York,” Magistrate Judge Vera M. Scanlon told the new citizens from 55 countries immediately after they recited the Naturalization Oath of Allegiance to the United States[https://www.uscis.gov/us-citizenship/naturalization-test/naturalization-oath-allegiance-united-states-america]. “That is one of the special privileges you have that you didn’t have three minutes ago.”

Voter registration forms were distributed inside the courtroom, and Judge Scanlon promptly directed the people to mail them at the post office next door. But Fryda Guedes, a staff member from the advocacy group Hispanic Federation,[http://hispanicfederation.org/] made it even easier. Ms. Guedes went through the aisles and collected the forms, saying she would hand-deliver them to the Board of Elections[http://vote.nyc.ny.us/html/home/home.shtml].

That made Beverly Greig’s day. A native of Guyana and a 30-year Queens resident, Ms. Greig, 67, wondered for weeks whether she would have enough time to register.

“I was asking everybody: ‘Can I vote, can I vote? I have to vote,’ Ms. Greig said. Thrilled, she handed her form to Ms. Guedes.

In three ceremonies in New York City on Friday, 685 people became American citizens, the latest in a national wave preceding the presidential election.

For many, the campaign of Republican presidential candidate Donald J. Trump was motivation. Humera Qayyum, 25, a medical assistant from Coney Island by way of Pakistan, said she had experienced discrimination as a Muslim wearing a hijab, and was displeased with Mr. Trump’s call to bar Muslims from the United States.

“I want to vote Democratic because they have respect for all religions, respect for everything,” Ms. Qayyum said. She added: “I have been here for five years. I worked really hard to be in this country and I don’t want to get kicked out.”

A Muslim student from Bangladesh, Nazmus Sakib Choudhury, 25, said he was afraid of a Trump presidency and intended to vote Democratic. “We don’t have an option,” he said.

Not everybody agreed. An older man from Canada, who did not want to give his name, said he wanted to use his citizenship to vote for Mr. Trump.

Maria Ester Lopez, 34, a Bronx resident from Mexico[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/08/us/trumps-rise-spurs-latino-immigrants-to-naturalize-to-vote-against-him.html], said she felt both lucky and blessed to get her citizenship on the last day to register to vote by mail.

“It’s kind of a miracle,” she said. “Just in time.”

But not everybody made it.

In line with a national trend, applications for citizenship rose over the last 12 months in the New York metropolitan area, which includes New York City and Long Island, with 110,895 people trying to become citizens, compared with 88,627 over the previous 12-month period, according to the federal Citizenship and **Immigration** Services. And applicants [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/01/us/thousands-eager-to-vote-wont-become-citizens-in-time.html]faced significant waits[http://partnershipfornewamericans.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/NPNA-Report-USCIS-Backlogs-Create-Disenfranchisement-Danger-Zones-Sept-2016-FINAL-1.pdf]. As of June 30, 72,595 applications were pending. (By comparison, 52,953 applications were pending at the same point the previous year.)

The federal Citizenship and **Immigration** Services, which processes the applications,[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/18/us/white-house-campaign-legal-immigrants-citizenship.html] denied that those numbers represented delays. “We are monitoring the situation and managing resources to address disparities in processing times,” Katie Tichacek, a spokeswoman for the agency, said.

But the Northern Manhattan Coalition for **Immigrant** Rights,[https://www.immigrationadvocates.org/nonprofit/legaldirectory/organization.393203-Northern\_Manhattan\_Coalition\_for\_Immigrant\_Rights] which helped prepare 600 applications for citizenship[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/28/nyregion/with-legal-aid-immigrant-advocates-turn-focus-to-citizenship.html] over the last year, has noticed a substantial lag time in processing in 2016, which has resulted in some people not being naturalized in time to vote, Angela Fernandez, the group’s executive director, said. It took only three months to process applications in New York at this time last year, but now took longer than five months, she said.

“My understanding was that because of the election, things would be moving more quickly,” said Sergia Ramos, 68, a client of the coalition who came to the office on Thursday to plead for intervention. She had been waiting five months just to get an interview, she said.

Ms. Fernandez said it was too late for this election, and referred Ms. Ramos to her local elected officials.

For applicants who have naturalization ceremonies in New York scheduled up until Oct. 28, there is one last, little known resort: New York State allows them to bring their application in person to a Board of Elections office.

Raymundo Nelio Read Pinedo, a boiler mechanic who lives in the Bronx, was among those who became a citizen with the Northern Manhattan Coalition’s help. At the federal court in Manhattan on Friday, he was dressed for the occasion, wearing a red velvet blazer and bright red loafers. On his briefcase he displayed a small American flag, a gift from his 12-year-old daughter.

Mr. Read, 55, moved to the United States from the Dominican Republic in 1988, he said, but had always been so busy with work that he hadn’t made time to apply for citizenship until this year.

He said he planned to celebrate Friday night by having dinner with his 82-year-old mother, who has been a United States citizen for 15 years.

“It means a lot to her,” Mr. Read said. “For the first time, a woman has the opportunity to govern this country.”

In Manhattan, workers for Dominicanos USA[http://dominicanosusa.org/] and the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund[http://www.aaldef.org/] were handing out registration forms in the federal courthouse hallways and outside the building on Friday.

Inside the courtroom, District Judge Richard J. Sullivan encouraged the 167 new citizens to vote, but spent more time talking to them on a personal level about his children, his Irish ancestry and the significance of the moment.

“I know I’m going to celebrate today,” he said. “I’m going to have an ice cream cone on your behalf. I’ll raise it up like the Statue of Liberty[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/statue\_of\_liberty/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and I’ll think of you.”

Samantha Schmidt contributed reporting

\* With Legal Aid, **Immigrant** Advocates Turn Focus to Citizenship[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/28/nyregion/with-legal-aid-immigrant-advocates-turn-focus-to-citizenship.html]

\* More Latinos Seek Citizenship to Vote Against Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/08/us/trumps-rise-spurs-latino-immigrants-to-naturalize-to-vote-against-him.html]

\* **Immigrants** Eager to Vote Obeyed All the Rules. It Didn’t Pay.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/01/us/thousands-eager-to-vote-wont-become-citizens-in-time.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Three militia members plotted to detonate a bomb at a housing complex in western Kansas where Somali **immigrants** lived and worshiped, federal investigators said Friday.

The men, who were arrested Friday morning on domestic terrorism charges, scouted out the apartments in Garden City, Kan., stockpiled guns and composed a manifesto about their anti-Muslim motives, prosecutors said.

“Their rhetoric and their speech have revealed a hatred for Muslims, Somalis and **immigrants**,” an F.B.I.[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/f/federal\_bureau\_of\_investigation/index.html?inline=nyt-org] agent wrote in affidavit related to the case.

The plotters planned to carry out their attack on Nov. 9, the day after the presidential election, the authorities said.

The three men are Curtis Allen and Gavin Wright, both 49 and from Liberal, Kan., about 65 miles from Garden City, and Patrick Stein, 47, of Wright, Kan.

According to the F.B.I. agent’s affidavit, the men referred to Muslims as “cockroaches” and met frequently to discuss the plot.

Officials said that the apartment complex they targeted housed about 120 people, including many Somalis who work at a nearby meatpacking plant, and that one of the units was used as a mosque.

Eric Jackson, the special agent in charge of the F.B.I’s Kansas City office, said that agents infiltrated the militia months ago, and that the men planned to wait until the presidential campaign was over before carrying out the plot.

He did not specify which candidate the militia members were supporting.

Prosecutors said Mr. Stein became worried this week that the plan could be foiled after Mr. Allen was arrested on domestic violence charges.

“These individuals had desire, the means and the capability, and were committed to carrying out this act of domestic terrorism,” Mr. Jackson said.

The Council on American-Islamic Relations called Friday for state and federal law enforcement agencies to increase protection of mosques across the country.

The council’s Kansas board chairman, Moussa Elbayoumy, said Garden City counted several hundred Muslims among its roughly 27,000 residents.

Mr. Elbayoumy said there was one mosque in the city, which served a mixture of long-established American Muslims and recent **immigrants**.

“I am personally not aware of any tensions between the Muslim community and the surrounding community,” said Mr. Elbayoumy, who lives in another part of Kansas. “Most of them are getting along very well, and there have been contacts with interfaith groups.”

Investigators said the plotters were part of a group called the Crusaders that had militia and so-called sovereign citizen ties.

The authorities learned of the attack from a paid informant, the affidavit said.

In the affidavit, the F.B.I. agent wrote, “They chose the target location based on their hatred of these groups, their perception that the people represent a threat to American society, a desire to inspire other militia groups, and a desire to ‘wake people up.’ ”

Mayor Chris Law of Garden City said in a statement that he was “shocked, but at the same time extremely proud of and grateful for the efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement.”

The Garden City police chief, Michael Utz, said his department had been aware of the investigation and was assured that all suspects were in custody.

Mr. Jackson, the F.B.I. official, said he was confident the plot was fully foiled.

It would have had a significant impact not only on the state of Kansas, this community, but also this nation,” Mr. Jackson said. “This would have been picked up not only nationally, but internationally.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Your typical Trump rally this was not.

First there was the ritual Hindu fire, a yagna, which burned in his honor. Then there were the posters[http://www.prokerala.com/news/photos/hindu-sena-activists-perform-yagna-for-donald-trump-s-victory-112322.html], standard Donald J. Trump head shots except for a touch of artistic interpretation: a tilak, the red dot symbolic of the spiritual third eye in Hindu culture, smudged on his forehead.

This celebration of Mr. Trump in New Delhi in May, and others like it in India this year, are the work of a small, devoted and increasingly visible faction of Hindu nationalists in India and the United States who see Mr. Trump as the embodiment of the cocksure, politically incorrect, strongman brand of politics they admire.

That some of Mr. Trump’s most passionate followers are Indian may seem, at first, somewhat strange, given how fond he is of scorning Asian countries where cheap labor saps demand for American workers. A poll on Asian-Americans’ political leanings conducted in August and September found that just 7 percent of Indian-Americans[http://naasurvey.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/NAAS2016-Oct5-report.pdf] said they would vote for Mr. Trump.

But in one of the more peculiar pairings of this most peculiar political season, Mr. Trump has unwittingly fashioned a niche constituency in the overlap between the Indian right and the American right, which share a lot of the same anxieties about terrorism, **immigration** and the loss of prestige that they believe their leaders have been too slow to reverse.

“There’s a lot of parallels there,” said Shalabh Kumar, the founding chairman of the Republican Hindu Coalition[http://www.rhcusa.com/about.html]. “Mr. Trump is all about development, development, development; prosperity, prosperity, prosperity; tremendous job growth. And at the same time, he recognizes the need to control the borders.”

As one of Mr. Trump’s biggest Hindu financial backers, Mr. Kumar, who runs an electronics manufacturing company in Illinois and grew up in the state of Punjab along the Pakistani border, has helped organize a speech by the Republican nominee in Edison, N.J., at a Bollywood-themed charity concert on Saturday[http://rhchat.org/]. The proceeds will benefit terrorism victims.

“It will be an incredible evening,” Mr. Trump said[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2LgFOAuOvfI] in a video promoting it, one of the few ethnic events he has agreed to do during this campaign.

Mr. Trump may be largely indifferent to the reasons behind his Hindu loyalists’ fervor, but his most senior advisers are not. The campaign’s chief executive, Stephen K. Bannon[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/18/us/politics/stephen-bannon.html], is a student of nationalist movements. Mr. Bannon is close to Nigel Farage[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/05/world/europe/nigel-farage-ukip-brexit.html], a central figure in Britain’s movement to leave the European Union, and he is an admirer of India’s prime minister, Narendra Modi[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/09/world/asia/narendra-modi-congress.html], a Hindu nationalist Mr. Bannon has called “the Reagan of India.”

It may be pure coincidence that some of Mr. Trump’s words channel the nationalistic and, some argue, anti-Muslim sentiments that Mr. Modi stoked as he rose to power. But it is certainly not coincidental that many of Mr. Trump’s biggest Hindu supporters are also some of Mr. Modi’s most ardent backers.

At times, the similarity of Mr. Trump’s and Mr. Modi’s political vocabulary is striking. Mr. Modi fed the perception that India’s feckless leaders had failed to allow the country to reach its full potential. And he campaigned as the only one capable of fixing that.

“I will make such a wonderful India that all Americans will stand in line to get a visa for India,” he said once. A centerpiece of his agenda is the “Make in India” program, which is aimed at stimulating economic growth by encouraging more manufacturing in the country.

“It’s all about India first, or ‘Make India Great,’ ” said Sujeeth Draksharam, a civil engineer from Houston who supports Mr. Trump and planned to attend Saturday’s event. “Look at Donald Trump. It’s the same thing. ‘Make American Great Again’ — strong again.”

Another similarly powerful sentiment that both leaders have harnessed is grievance. Mr. Trump has seized on how the working class feels out of place and left behind in a country that is changing demographically and economically.

Even if Mr. Modi’s appeals were never as crass as Mr. Trump’s, his followers say he always understood that many Hindus felt their concerns were ignored by India’s secular and, in their minds, deeply corrupt government, which Mr. Modi vowed to clean up.

“One of the things that Modi very subtly articulated, but was very clear about, was something which nobody wanted to say,” said Subramanian Swamy, a longtime Indian politician and Hindu nationalist who is often a thorn in the side[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/02/world/asia/india-subramanian-swamy.html] of the country’s political elite. “And that is that Hindus, despite being 80 percent of the population, feel like they got a raw deal.”

There are important differences: Mr. Modi has maintained good relations with President Obama and is a proponent of free trade. Still, Mr. Swamy said, when nationalist-minded Hindus hear Mr. Trump, “they think that this guy talks the same language.”

And Mr. Trump’s Hindu admirers accept him, controversies and all. How can he be anti-**immigrant** when two of his three wives have been **immigrants**, as one recently told India Abroad[http://www.indiaabroad-digital.com/indiaabroad/20161007?pg=24#pg24]. Why should he be punished for singling out Muslim terrorism when, as Mr. Draksharam said, “you’ve got to call a spade a spade.”

Manu Bhagavan[http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/history/faculty/manu-bhagavan], who teaches South Asian history at Hunter College, said the Hindu nationalist movement in India and its devotees in the United States shared a belief that what was once pure and virtuous about Indian life has been tainted.

“They locate this in a grand Hindu past,” he said. “If you go before Muslims entered India, before all these foreigners came in and messed things up, Hindus could do this, Hindus could do that.”

The response, Mr. Bhagavan said — whether in India, the United States, Britain or any of the countries experiencing a convulsion of antiglobalism right now — is “let’s barricade ourselves in.”

“These problems are all stemming from these **immigrants**, these different people, so let’s get rid of them,” he said. “And it’s easy answers to not such easy problems.”

But perhaps the strongest link between Mr. Trump’s speech and the Hindu nationalists who find his politics so comforting is the issue of terrorism and how bluntly Mr. Trump is willing to confront Muslim communities about it. Terrorism committed by Islamic extremists is a scourge that has rattled India as well, from the 2008 attacks in Mumbai[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/27/world/asia/27mumbai.html] that left 172 dead to the ambush killings of 20 Indian soldiers last month[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/world/asia/17-indian-soldiers-killed-by-militants-in-kashmir.html] at an army base near the border with Pakistan.

Mr. Trump’s brand of tough talk, scholars said, gives some Indians a sense that he would be much harder on the country’s longtime adversary, Pakistan.

“What Donald Trump articulates has given them some food for thought,” said Harsh V. Pant[http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/dsd/people/dsd-a-to-z/pant.aspx], a professor of international relations at King’s College London. “If there is a Trump presidency, then there might be a stronger Washington policy vis-à-vis Pakistan.”

When Mr. Trump arrives at the Hindu charity gala in New Jersey on Saturday, the estimated 10,000 guests will be taking in a performance with Bollywood stars, a Hindu art temple and exhibitions honoring the contribution of Hindus to math and science.

Mr. Kumar, the Republican Hindu Coalition founder, said neither he nor Mr. Trump was naïve about the fact that most Indian-Americans vote for Democrats. But there could be a few, he said, who hear Mr. Trump on Saturday and discover his message is not all that unfamiliar.

What Mr. Trump should probably not expect is the kind of fawning reception he has gotten from his small bands of followers in New Delhi. There was the time in June when a right-wing group known as the Hindu Sena decided to celebrate his 70th birthday. Absent Mr. Trump, who was in North Carolina that day, they improvised and fed a [http://www.indiawest.com/news/india/hindu-sena-celebrates-donald-trump-s-birthday/article\_e69ebed6-325c-11e6-8dab-8346de4b415b.html] life-size[http://www.indiawest.com/news/india/hindu-sena-celebrates-donald-trump-s-birthday/article\_e69ebed6-325c-11e6-8dab-8346de4b415b.html] Trump cutout [http://www.indiawest.com/news/india/hindu-sena-celebrates-donald-trump-s-birthday/article\_e69ebed6-325c-11e6-8dab-8346de4b415b.html]a piece of cake.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Cut Ties to Donald Trump, Big Donors Urge R.N.C.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/us/politics/republican-donors-trump.html]

\* Donald Trump Calls Allegations by Women ‘False Smears’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html]

\* Donald Trump, Slipping in Polls, Warns of ‘Stolen Election’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/us/politics/trump-election-rigging.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE WANGS VS. THE WORLD

By Jade Chang

354 pp. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. $26.

The best moment of “The Wangs vs. the World” comes when young Andrew Wang attempts his first stand-up open mike. He talks honestly about his family, privilege and Chinese-American identity, but it’s only when he does an impression of his father’s broken English that he finally gets “a single shout of laughter.” The entire scene is hilariously cringeworthy, especially when Andrew becomes ashamed mid-act for imitating his father. “You know what white people really, really, really love?” he asks the audience. “When Asian comedians make fun of their parents. Yep, because you guys just want an excuse to laugh at Asian accents.” The crowd is uncomfortable; as a reader, I was overjoyed. “The Wangs vs. the World” is not a book where you laugh at Asian accents — you laugh at the people who would laugh at Asian accents.

Jade Chang is unendingly clever in her generous debut novel about the comedy of racial identity. If there is a stereotype that Asian-Americans kids are quiet, unpopular and studious, that their parents are strict disciplinarians (think Tiger Mom), then Chang has conjured up the Wangs to prove otherwise. All the Wang kids are creative and popular: There’s Andrew, the sensitive jock and wannabe comedian who is beloved by women but wants to save his virginity for his future first love; the older sister, Saina, a conceptual artist who is humiliatingly dumped by her artist boyfriend; and the younger sister, Grace, a precocious teenager and fashion blogger. At the center of it all is the patriarch Charles, the owner of an extremely lucrative cosmetics business. His embrace of American ideals extends to his parenting: He’s not a dad who wants his kids to master the violin or study for the SATs; he instead urges them to “play the guitar and get laid,” a parody of what he believes America stands for.

That is until a combination of his own hubris and bad timing (the 2008 financial crisis) causes the Wangs to lose everything — from rags to riches to rags again. Having lost their Bel-Air estate and newly disillusioned by the American dream, Charles decides to pull his kids out of school and drive them to Saina’s home in upstate New York. As much as “The Wangs vs. the World” is about Asian-American identity, it is also a sprawling family adventure compressed into a road trip novel. The result is a manic, consistently funny book of alternating perspectives as the Wangs make various cross-country stopovers in their ’80s station wagon. The teasing-but-loving dynamic of all three kids on the phone together illustrates Chang’s aptitude for writing dialogue and characters; as in the stand-up scene, she is at her finest when playing with the different expectations of an Asian audience and a white one.

It’s just too bad the end of the novel is such a mess. Unsatisfying resolutions for all of the Wang children feel forced when they are sent to the other end of the earth. The one plotline that is convincingly finished is Charles’s, as he tackles the book’s strongest idea: “Every **immigrant** is the person he might have been and the person he is, and his homeland is at once the place it would have been to him from the inside and the place it must be to him from the outside.” It’s in this moment that we understand the novel’s title more clearly: Even as the Wangs have defied the traditional arc of the **immigrant** story, there is no one place for them in the world. To be a first- or second-generation **immigrant** means wrestling with the reality that no place is ever truly home. In Chang’s compassionate and bright-eyed novel, she proves that struggling with that identity can at least be funny and strange, especially when you struggle together with family.

Kevin Nguyen is the digital deputy editor of GQ.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This article is part of the Opinion Today newsletter. You can sign up here[http://p.nytimes.com/email/re?location=4z5Q7LhI+KVBjmEgFdYACIRluBsZfcDaRjyYJL3A/v4Olsbjewu/um/F4M0Mu6GIYeyKvnoK8cRrHmbozfsmoSiBA42dOMf3kaZjaWII+sp5jfgmpV7jnipGgXzYMh64&user\_id=d95126ca4f92c44ecb942ecae7e52168&email\_type=20160927%20Opinion%20Today&task\_id=1474979014859490®i\_id=0] to receive more briefings and a guide to the section daily in your inbox.

Last summer, in the innocent time before sexist comments from Donald Trump had become a near daily occurrence, he vulgarly insulted Megyn Kelly of Fox News, with a reference to “blood coming out of her wherever.”

Hours later, the conservative activist Erick-Woods Erickson disinvited[http://www.redstate.com/erick/2015/08/07/i-have-disinvited-donald-trump-to-the-redstate-gathering/] Trump from the annual gathering that Erickson hosts. He invited Kelly (with whom he had previously clashed[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ufacEg6Yi2A]) in Trump’s place.

The reason was simple, Erickson said: Decency.

It is a standard that few Republican leaders have met this year. Even as Trump has unfurled one form of hateful language after another — even as he has bragged about sexually assaulting women — most Republican leaders have stood with him.

In today’s Times, Erickson has written an Op-Ed calling out those leaders, including pastors, and noting the personal price his family has paid for his willingness to confront Trump. In the article, Erickson also charts a post-Trump path for the party.

It’s a serious one, organized around school choice, market-based economics, religious freedom and local communities. But I think it’s also missing at least one big item: equality of all Americans.

Today’s Republican Party is built in part on fear of people who are not white. There’s no other way to say it. The party is committed to reducing voting rights for African-Americans. It has a history of **alienating** African-Americans that long predates Trump, stretching through Richard Nixon[http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-12-04/birth-of-the-southern-strategy], Ronald Reagan[http://www.salon.com/2014/01/11/the\_racism\_at\_the\_heart\_of\_the\_reagan\_presidency/], George H.W. Bush[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Io9KMSSEZ0Y], George W. Bush[http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2004/11/mccain200411] and Mitt Romney[http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/271967-romney-plays-defense-on-2012-trump-endorsement].

Lately, it has begun **alienating** Asian-Americans and Latinos as well. Obama won[http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/results/president/exit-polls] at least 70 percent of each group in 2012. I’m willing to guess Hillary Clinton will do even better this year.

I understand that many conservatives see themselves as inherently supportive of equality for all Americans — so supportive that they don’t like to mention race (or gender) and foster divisions in the process. But their party is not starting from scratch. It needs to overcome[http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/809606-the-way-to-stop-discrimination-on-the-basis-of-race] a long history of discrimination. And in 2016, it seems to be losing more ground every week.

Thoughtful conservatives, like Erickson, need to start pushing for a radically different approach.

You can join me on Twitter (@DLeonhardt)[https://twitter.com/DLeonhardt] and Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/DavidRLeonhardt/]. I am also writing a daily email newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/opinion/campaign-stops/trumps-second-debate-in-brief.html] until the election and invite you to subscribe[http://nytimes.com/opiniontoday].

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS — If you want a lively dinner party conversation in Paris these days, just mention “les voies sur berges” — the express car lanes that run along the Seine — and your guests will soon be at one another’s throats.

Ignoring the advice of an experts’ committee, Mayor Anne Hidalgo last month imposed a permanent ban on traffic on a central section of the drive[https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2016/sep/26/paris-council-approves-ban-vehicles-right-bank-seine-road], which was built in the 1970s, when motorists ruled the city. Today is a different era, of bikers and shared electric cars[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/e/electric\_vehicles/index.html?&inline=nyt-classifier]. Ms. Hidalgo, a Socialist elected in 2014 with the support of ecologists, wants clean air in the City of Light and the riverside express lanes turned into pedestrian walkways. She has declared war on private cars. Parisian drivers feel trapped in a dark plot to eliminate them. And it hurts.

The Socialist mayor is betting on a phenomenon called “evaporation of traffic.” The experience of other cities shows that when streets are permanently closed to traffic, drivers tend to alter their habits: They change their itinerary when possible, or choose another means of transportation. What is not evaporating, though, in the first weeks of the experiment on the “voies sur berges,” is the anger of motorists stuck in rush-hour traffic on parallel streets, still stubbornly clinging to their steering wheels.

So when the government announced, in the same week, that it was planning to make room somewhere in Paris for a nudist camp[http://www.france24.com/en/20160926-paris-hidalgo-greens-naturism-nudist-camp-park] — hardly a priority in a city struggling with terrorist threats and refugees, not to mention Kim Kardashian’s travails[http://www.nydailynews.com/entertainment/gossip/video-kim-kardashian-paris-robbery-investigation-article-1.2829022] — tempers flared. Ms. Hidalgo was derided as “Notre-Drame de Paris” (“our drama queen”) by a business magazine, Challenges, and branded “Queen of the Bobos” (bourgeois bohemians) by conservative opponents who accuse her of catering to the left-leaning yuppie voters of a gentrified French capital. They mock her “authoritarian” management style: “She wants to make happiness compulsory.”

Unperturbed, the earnest Ms. Hidalgo is racing ahead. Her quiet determination to enforce her agenda on air pollution, social diversity in housing and transit centers for migrants has made her a distinctive voice in a discredited political establishment. The daughter of an electrician and a seamstress who **immigrated**from Spain in the 1960s, Ms. Hidalgo, 57 and a mother of three, was herself born in Cádiz, did not speak French when she moved to Lyon, and became a French citizen as a teenager. She made her way to law school and worked as a labor relations inspector until getting involved in politics. In her fierce mayoral battle in 2014 against a shining star of the right, Nathalie Kosciusko-Morizet, she often looked like the underdog, having spent 13 years in the shadow of her charismatic mentor, Mayor Bertrand Delanoë.

Two years later, she is still no firebrand, but she is emerging as a solid, relevant figure on the national political scene, inviting some comparisons with Angela Merkel’s methodic rise. “Could it be her?” one recent headline asked, betraying the yearning for fresh leadership amid a French presidential campaign crowded with worn-out politicians. So far, Ms. Hidalgo shows no interest in national office next year. She has found a much safer power base than the nation-state: the global city.

Picking up on the theme of a 2013 book by the American political scientist Benjamin Barber, “If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities,” Ms. Hidalgo has made the political dynamics of global cities into a personal cause. “We mayors,” she recently told the French magazine Society, “are more agile because our governance is more horizontal, we are closer to people, we can enforce best practices of other cities. In France, the government is being engulfed by bureaucracy.” (This from the mayor of a city with nearly 50,000 employees.)

Shrewdly, she prefers to been seen in the company of Sadiq Khan, the new mayor of London, than with President François Hollande, a fellow Socialist, whom she doesn’t mind confronting on hot-button issues like France’s new labor law[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/world/europe/proposed-changes-to-french-labor-law-bring-workers-to-streets.html]. Ms. Hidalgo was the first foreign mayor to visit Mr. Khan after his election, making a point, as an **immigrant** herself, to congratulate the first Muslim mayor of a European capital. They have published two post-Brexit op-ed essays together, one of them in The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/opinion/our-immigrants-our-strength.html?\_r=0] with Mayor Bill de Blasio; they showcased cities that are open to **immigrants**, green technologies and innovation — one way to point out that even when states divorce, cities can stay close.

Other mayors she likes to cite are Karin Wanngard of Stockholm, Manuela Carmena of Madrid and Ada Colau of Barcelona. Ms. Hidalgo is a firm believer in the virtues of exercising power through persuasion, which she sees as a feminine characteristic, rather than by “putting a gun on the table,” her view of the male technique.

She has been working hard at raising her international profile. She wants the French capital to prevail over Los Angeles to host the Olympic Games in 2024. In Rio de Janeiro in August, she was elected president of C40, a network of cities with “climate ambitions” that represents 85 global cities and, she likes to point out, 650 million people.

The world is her stage. Last December, when Paris hosted the United Nations conference on climate change[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/u/united\_nations\_framework\_convention\_on\_climate\_change/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], she proudly posed next to Michael Bloomberg, the former mayor of New York, among 1,000 mayors from across the planet on the grand staircase of the Hôtel de Ville, the city hall. Like her, those mayors know that more than half of humankind now live in cities and that by 2030 the ratio will have risen to two-thirds, according to the United Nations. They also know that cities consume 75 percent of the earth’s resources and generate 80 percent of greenhouse gas emissions. Smart cities are where solutions have to be found.

According to opinion polls, Ms. Hidalgo has yet to convince nearly half of Parisians — and most people who drive in from the suburbs — that this starts with banning cars on the express lanes along the Seine. Maybe she should try her feminine way of persuasion. The challenge is definitely worth it.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Sylvie Kauffmann, the editorial director and a former editor in chief of Le Monde, is a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Op-Doc “Paraíso[http://www.nytimes.com/video/opinion/100000002426198/paraso.html]” (Paradise) reveals the beauty and danger of three **immigrant**window cleaners’ work on Chicago’s skyscrapers.

The film connects to themes as varied as the **immigrant** experience, the American dream and dangerous ways to make a living. Students might consider: What sacrifices would they be willing to make to try to create a better life for their family?

Students

1. Watch the 10-minute film above. While you watch, you might take notes using our Film Club Double-Entry Journal[https://static01.nyt.com/images/blogs/learning/pdf/2015/FilmClubDoubleEntryJournalLN.pdf] (PDF) to help you remember specific moments.

2. After watching, think about these questions:

• What moments in this film stood out for you? Why?

• Were there any surprises? Anything that challenged what you know — or thought you knew?

• What messages, emotions or ideas will you take away from this film? Why?

3. Next, join the conversation by clicking on the comment button and posting in the box that opens on the right. (Students 13 and older are invited to comment, although teachers of younger students are welcome to post what their students have to say.)

4. After you have posted, try reading back to see what others have said, then respond to someone else by posting another comment. Use the “Reply” button or the @ symbol to address that student directly.

5. To learn more, read what the filmmaker, Nadav Kurtz, writes[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/09/opinion/paraiso.html] about the film:

I first got the idea for this film (whose title, “Paraíso,” is the Spanish word for “Paradise”) when I was living in Chicago working as a film editor. One morning, as I sat at my desk in a high-rise downtown, a man dropped down inches from my window, cleaned it, and disappeared to the next floor. This momentary interaction seemed a perfect metaphor for life in many multiethnic American cities where the work of **immigrants** often goes unnoticed. I hoped to find out more about what motivated these men to spend their working days dangling hundreds of feet in the air.

Soon after I began filming, I met two brothers, Sergio Polanco and Jaime Polanco, and their cousin, Cruz Guzman. The Polanco brothers came to the United States from García de la Cadena, a small town in Zacatecas, Mexico, and the birthplace of a surprisingly large number of Chicago’s window washers and their families. The brothers and Mr. Guzman are employed by Corporate Cleaning Services, a well-established Chicago window cleaning company that, according to its president, Neal Zucker, requires all of its employees to be in compliance with federal and state guidelines governing employment eligibility. Window washers at this company receive health and life insurance benefits through membership in a union, SEIU Local 1, and can typically earn anywhere between $45,000 and $65,000 a year, depending on their skill level and speed.

My subjects work as many days a week as they can, assessing weather conditions on a daily if not hourly basis to determine the risk of injury from high winds. Fortunately, because of these precautions and other safety standards, window-washing-related fatalities are few. (According to the International Window Cleaning Association, in the United States, there were a total of 39 deaths between 2002 and 2012.) Work continues throughout the year, and even at temperatures just above freezing.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

More?

• See all the films in this series[http://www.nytimes.com/column/learning-film-club].

• Read our list of practical teaching ideas[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/8-compelling-mini-documentaries-to-teach-close-reading-and-critical-thinking-skills/], along with responses from students and teachers, for how you can use these documentaries in the classroom.

• Our next Film Club will take place on Friday, Oct. 21.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html] has lashed out at fellow Republicans, calling them “disloyal” and “far more difficult” than Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per].

He has griped openly about a “rigged” political system, saying Wednesday that he has “no respect” for the nonpartisan Commission on Presidential Debates, and previously complaining about a “defective” microphone in the first debate.

And on Monday, at a rally in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., he worried that the election could be “stolen” from him and singled out Philadelphia, a city with a large African-American population, warning, “We have to make sure we’re protected.”

Mr. Trump’s ominous claims of a “stolen election” — which he often links to black, urban neighborhoods — are not entirely new. But in recent days, he has been pressing the theme with a fresh intensity, citing everything from the potential for Election Day fraud to news media bias favoring Mrs. Clinton to rigged debates.

The assertions — which coincide with Mr. Trump’s decline in the polls after a shaky performance in the first debate and accusations that he forced himself on women[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/us/politics/sexual-assault-survivor-reaction.html] — highlight concerns that he may not accept a Clinton victory, breaking from the traditional decorum of defeated presidential candidates and undermining the legitimacy of the election result.

At rallies in recent days, Mr. Trump has become a candidate full of excuses, perhaps the clearest manifestation of his frustration with his current standing in the polls and the growing alarm in his campaign that a White House victory is slipping away.

On Monday, on a trip through Pennsylvania, Mr. Trump began the day urging the almost entirely white crowd outside Pittsburgh to show up to vote, warning about “other communities” that could hijack his victory.

“So important that you watch other communities, because we don’t want this election stolen from us,” he said. “We do not want this election stolen.”

Later, at the evening rally in Wilkes-Barre, Mr. Trump raised more concerns about voting fraud. “I just hear such reports about Philadelphia,” he said. “I hear these horror shows, and we have to make sure that this election is not stolen from us and is not taken away from us.”

He added for emphasis: “Everybody knows what I’m talking about.”

The crowd chanted an anti-CNN epithet as Mr. Trump attacked the “crooked media.”

At a rally in West Palm Beach, Fla., on Thursday, Mr. Trump said that, “This election will determine whether we remain a free nation or only the illusion of democracy,” suggesting that the system was “in fact controlled by a small handful of global special interests, rigging the system.” He continued, “And our system is rigged.”

The country has not had a presidential candidate from one of the two major parties try to cast doubt on the entire democratic process and system of government since the brink of the Civil War, said Douglas Brinkley, a presidential historian at Rice University.

“I haven’t seen it since 1860, this threat of delegitimizing the federal government, and Trump is trying to say our entire government is corrupt and the whole system is rigged,” Mr. Brinkley said. “And that’s a secessionist, revolutionary motif. That’s someone trying to topple the apple cart entirely.”

Roger J. Stone Jr., a close confidant and informal adviser to Mr. Trump, has also highlighted fears of election rigging. In an August column in The Hill, he wrote of voting machine manipulation[http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/presidential-campaign/291534-can-the-2016-election-be-rigged-you-bet]. And during a panel Saturday at this year’s New Yorker Festival, as he discussed the possibility of such tampering, Mr. Stone hedged when asked whether he would advise Mr. Trump — should he lose in November — to concede the election and accept its legitimacy.

“As long as there is no irrefutable evidence of fraud, yes,” he told his questioner. “He should — unless there is any refutable evidence to the contrary.”

Mr. Stone is one of the people behind Stop The Steal, a movement of 500 volunteers who plan to stand outside what they believe could be “suspect precincts” on Election Day and conduct their own exit polls to compare against voting machine results.

“In an election in which Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per] has made it pretty clear that the Clintons are going to prison, I think they would do anything to make sure they win it, even steal it,” Mr. Stone said. But, he added, “Trump cannot just lose and say, ‘They stole it.’ He has to have some tangible evidence — and that’s exactly what we’re trying to collect.”

Democrats fear that Mr. Trump’s accusations, in the short term, will lead to voter suppression — and, in the long term, could encourage huge swaths of Americans to view Mrs. Clinton as an illegitimate president if she is elected.

“He’s using phrases like ‘rigged election’ to incite his followers to rig the election by using tactics like voter intimidation, and I don’t think it’s particularly subtle, and I don’t think he cares about the integrity of our elections,” said Stacey Abrams, the Democratic minority leader of the Georgia House of Representatives.

Ms. Abrams, who is African-American and has worked on voting-rights issues, is also the founder of the New Georgia Project, a voter registration and engagement effort in the state. She said Mr. Trump was employing a “voter intimidation model.”

“Just scare them away from the polling place,” she said. “That’s his crude form of voter suppression — not particularly artful, but effective.”

The Clinton campaign is stressing to supporters that they expect voter participation to be higher and easier than in previous elections — but it has also begun recruiting election lawyers to help with voter protection efforts.

“We are prepared for anything in terms of how he chooses to conduct himself in the closing weeks of this campaign, and that includes what is increasingly looking like a scorched-earth approach,” said Brian Fallon, a spokesman for the Clinton campaign. “He is clearly trying to lay a foundation for challenging the legitimacy of the potential next president, just as he sought to do with the nation’s first African-American president.”

With less than a month until the election, Mr. Trump’s grievances has come fast and furious as he has begun to slip again in the polls.

On Thursday, Mr. Trump also asserted, without offering evidence, that the Obama administration was allowing illegal **immigrants** to enter the country to vote in November, another example of how he claimed the election was being rigged. “They’re letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote,” Mr. Trump said at a meeting in New York with the National Border Patrol Council, the union of border patrol agents.

There has been no evidence that the administration is delaying deportations of — or intentionally letting in — **immigrants** so they can vote. (Illegal **immigrants** are barred from voting in federal elections.)

Mr. Trump’s claims seem to be resonating among his supporters. At a campaign stop in Iowa on Tuesday, a woman stood up and, her voice quavering, said she feared “voter fraud” before offering a stark call to action to Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, Mr. Trump’s running mate.

“If Hillary Clinton gets in, I myself, I’m ready for a revolution because we can’t have her in,” the woman said.

Mr. Pence has emerged as Mr. Trump’s most loyal defender. But the call to revolt was a step too far for him. “Yeah, don’t say that,” he said, shaking his right hand as if to try to brush away her comment.

He then tried for a more positive spin: “There’s a revolution coming on November the 8th,” he said. “I promise you.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Nick Corasaniti contributed reporting.

Correction: October 13, 2016, Thursday

An earlier version of this article incorrectly referred to the day of the week that Donald J. Trump had a rally in West Palm Beach. It was Thursday, not Friday.

\* Some in G.O.P. Who Deserted Donald Trump Over Lewd Tape Are Returning[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/gop-reaction-donald-trump.html]

\* Two Women Say Donald Trump Touched Them Inappropriately[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html]

\* Donald Trump Finds Improbable Ally in WikiLeaks[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/us/politics/wikileaks-hillary-clinton-emails.html]

\* Split Over Donald Trump Threatens to Tilt Republican States[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/politics/donald-trump-gop.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For almost a decade, Brandon Finnigan, a conservative blogger and elections data enthusiast, had obsessed about Republican failures in Pennsylvania in presidential races. The state had been a white whale[https://www.cliffsnotes.com/literature/m/mobydick/critical-essays/major-symbols-in-mobydick] of sorts for the G.O.P., and capturing it would mean a way back to the White House.

He wrote about a winning path in a National Review article last year[http://www.nationalreview.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/419876/how-win-2016-brandon-finnigan]. But just when it seemed that Pennsylvania was within reach this past spring, he began to wonder about the cost of victory[http://www.nationalreview.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/438269/donald-trump-pennsylvania-path-white-house]. The reason? Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] was set to become the Republican nominee.

Mr. Finnigan, a 31-year-old Baltimore native, reached another crossroads this year. He had been working for 10 years as a truck dispatcher[https://www.buzzfeed.com/bensmith/a-right-wing-truck-dispatcher-is-americas-fairest-new-electi?utm\_term=.fjaypZ2wd#.xcR8qa7lX] in Rancho Cucamonga, Calif., writing in his spare time for the conservative blog Ace of Spades. Four years ago, he created Decision Desk HQ[http://www.decisiondeskhq.com/], rounding up a volunteer army of the blog’s readers to give an alternative to The Associated Press in reporting election results. (The project is nonpartisan in its aims to deliver accurate results.)

One of the volunteers, Varad Mehta[https://twitter.com/varadmehta], a historian who lives in suburban Philadelphia and who also writes about the great Pennsylvania quest[http://thefederalist.com/2016/06/07/why-trump-wont-win-pennsylvania/], described via Twitter one of the attractions of joining besides the camaraderie and “fun”: “A lot of us are dissatisfied with how the G.O.P. and conservative establishment handle data operations. There’s a sense that the establishment and donor class don’t take analytics seriously.”

Mr. Finnigan also saw the project as a way to increase election transparency, perhaps even to debunk claims of “rigged elections,”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/22/us/politics/donald-trump-a-rigged-election-and-the-politics-of-race.html] a warning that Mr. Trump has sounded repeatedly in recent days.

Mr. Finnigan took what he called a leap of faith last week and quit his truck dispatcher job to “immerse” himself in Decision Desk HQ, hoping he could find major funding to expand operations.

I recently chatted with him about the significance of Pennsylvania and some of his other passions, including his family and astronomy. This is a condensed and lightly edited transcript of our email conversation.

Toni Pennsylvania has been a fixation for a subset of politics fans (me among them). The state has been trending slowly red, and Mitt Romney came within five percentage points of victory there in 2012 despite not investing much in campaign resources.

It was setting up as a decisive state[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/upshot/why-the-whole-trump-clinton-election-could-probably-just-be-held-in-pennsylvania.html] this year, which meant that Pennsylvania could decide things like who controlled the Supreme Court, which Americans would receive health insurance, questions of war and peace. Now the latest polling shows Pennsylvania — and the election — slipping out of the Republicans’ reach.

Brandon Pennsylvania was the canary in the coal mine for Mr. Trump’s candidacy, reflecting both his opportunities (with noncollege whites who were skeptical of Romney) and his serious disadvantages (his demeanor and statements driving away suburban moderates, particularly women). If he couldn’t carry Pennsylvania because either a) he couldn’t turn out enough noncollege whites to outweigh losses in the suburbs or b) he couldn’t persuade enough college-educated whites he’s not nuts, then he wasn’t going to win the presidency. It was a matter of math and voting blocs.

You could have gotten Trump to 266 electoral votes with Iowa, Nevada, Ohio, Florida, all of the Romney states, and Maine’s Second District, but without Pennsylvania, where could he hit 270? He’s not winning Colorado, which has a Democratic plurality in voter registration for the first time in decades — and its Denver suburbs rejected Cory Gardner[https://www.gardner.senate.gov/] in a wave year. He’s not winning Wisconsin, where Republicans rejected him strongly back in April and barely favor him over Clinton in the Milwaukee suburbs[http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/09/07/trump-clinton-waukesha-wisconsin-republicans/89724308/]. New Hampshire has plenty of independents but many of them are moderates, and his polling there was worse than it was in Pennsylvania. There was no alternative.

More college-educated voters, wealthy voters and suburban voters are drifting away from the Republican Party, while noncollege whites and residents of rural and exurban areas are moving toward it. Diversity has hit the suburbs themselves: Once overwhelmingly white, the inner suburbs of Philadelphia, in Delaware and Montgomery and Bucks, have seen an explosion in nonwhite residents, just like they have in Virginia, California, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, heck, nearly everywhere.

Toni Do you think someone like John Kasich, who could have been more acceptable to suburban women in the state, could have reached the Republican holy grail in Pennsylvania?

Brandon Republicans needed to turn out disgruntled white voters and needed to improve their numbers with suburban ones. There are trade-offs: Different candidates turn on or off different groups, but I cannot imagine a single alternative Republican candidate who could have blown things this badly in a state already moving in their direction. John Kasich, Marco Rubio, Jeb Bush, Rand Paul, and I’d even say Ted Cruz here — any of them would be outperforming Trump right now.

Toni You’d like to be known as a “nonreactionary conservative[http://www.mtv.com/news/2942361/trumpian-conservatism-took-over-the-world-and-lost-me/].” Can you explain the mixed feelings you had about the possibility that Trump could win Pennsylvania?

Brandon I’ve had a longtime back-and-forth with my Decision Desk partner Andrew McCoy about the “untapped” voters in Pennsylvania. (He and John Ekdahl helped develop the Decision Desk website and business). I argued that those voters could be persuaded to vote Republican, and because of their numbers, it could be enough to tip the balance. He asked me if they aren’t motivated to vote already, would I really want to see what does push them into the ballot box?

Well, when I watched the changes in registration, and I saw Trump’s surprising strength in the state, it was encouraging because I felt vindicated: It’s happening. But the “why” for a lot of these voters concerned me. A lot of these people are desperate, their communities riddled with prescription drug addiction and stunted incomes, and their family structure has broken down. Nobody, regardless of what catchy sound bite or big smile, is going to fix their problems for them. If Trump gets elected, their lives aren’t going to improve. Once he’s out of office, they’ll end up even more jaded and disconnected than they already are.

Toni I suspect one of the reasons that Trump is being rejected in Pennsylvania is that many moderate voters don’t want to be associated with appeals to racism. Trump can hem and haw[http://www.cnn.com/2016/02/28/politics/donald-trump-white-supremacists/] before disavowing David Duke, but the issue of white supremacy has run aground before in Pennsylvania (on a much, much larger scale, at Gettysburg[http://www.history.com/topics/american-civil-war/battle-of-gettysburg]).

Your wife is African-American, and you have a cute baby boy. I know this because of the pictures you proudly display on your entertaining Twitter feed[https://twitter.com/b\_m\_finnigan]. How has the personal affected the political for you — if at all?

Brandon My wife and I don’t think of race when we see each other, but we aren’t blind to the reality that we, and our son, get looks. Ninety percent of Americans are fine with interracial marriage, which is quadruple the number it was when we were born in the mid-1980s. As long as people want something, anything, to blame on others, or to make themselves feel superior to others, you are going to encounter racism and racial resentment.

Trump’s campaign strategy mirrors a parody of conservatism: angry, afraid, racially motivated, terrified of inevitable change. This is clearly turning off moderates and even conservative suburbanites, and not just in Pennsylvania. Unchecked, it will reverse the impressive gains Republicans had enjoyed recently in many purple and blue states like Wisconsin and Maryland.

As the overseer of the Decision Desk, I have to separate the personal from the political with regards to operations, but from my own Twitter account, I’ve made it clear how I feel about the blatant racism expressed by the alt-right. But my greatest animosity isn’t targeted at them, because you will always have a small contingent of people with radical beliefs that won’t gain lasting traction outside of forums and anonymous trolling. My disappointment is saved for the websites and institutions that employed a lot of these writers, linked a lot of their material, even promoted some of it, and only became outraged when they themselves became the target.

Toni Some conservative right-wing radio talkers and Trump himself have stoked the fear of a brown nation — saying this is the last race the Republican Party can win because of the future population changes from **immigration**. Within that thought, of course, is the deeply pessimistic notion that blacks and Hispanics could never be persuaded to vote for Republicans. You live in California, which already has the diverse demographic that many on the alt-right view as a nightmare. What’s your view on the Republicans’ prospects for broadening their base?

Brandon Republicans effectively have no choice but to adapt: My son was born the year when annual white births were a plurality, no longer the majority. Even if you halted **immigration** completely, my generation is having kids, and it is the most diverse of any the nation has seen. Barring a massive population growth initiative within the alt-right yielding turn-of-the-last-century-size families, the era of a majority-white population is ending.

The changing makeup of the country isn’t the real problem the Republicans face. They must have a very clear set of unifying goals. What’s the goal for the party these days? One wing wants no amnesty, the other wants an open border. Social conservatism is seeing uneven success and was outright rejected in many ways in favor of a New Yorker’s populism. What does the party, as a whole, even believe in anymore?

Perhaps instead of either writing off minorities or blatantly pandering to them, the party needs to examine itself carefully and ask what it really wants to achieve. Look at state-level successes: Arguably the most popular governor in the nation is Larry Hogan. He ran against runaway taxation and government excesses coming at the expense of suburban Marylanders, won, and is the favorite next year in no small part because of the way he has governed since. People of all stripes will be more attracted to a party with a clear goal, making the party less vulnerable to the inevitable changes occurring in this country.

Toni Tell me a bit about Decision Desk HQ. It reads a bit like a Disney movie: A ragtag volunteer team takes on the mighty Associated Press. What is the goal?

Brandon Decision Desk HQ provides a stream of election results collected via fax, email, phone and in-person contacts, across all 50 states and D.C. I’ve long felt that there are ways to improve the process and coverage with regard to election returns, and we utilized the rise of social media to amass a network of volunteers and election enthusiasts from both sides of the aisle to do just this. Initially, we focused on competitive races, and worked to obtain the data rapidly, report it accurately, and call the winners ahead of traditional outlets. With our new team, database and API[http://www.computerworld.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/2593623/app-development/application-programming-interface.html], we can now provide these numbers for all of the races making up the meat of election night: presidential, Senate, governor and the House. All of this was done through incredible dedication and financial sacrifice on the part of its core members and followers, as we still lack any major benefactor.

The Associated Press already provides numbers for 99 percent of the media, but our work matters for several reasons. First, there is an overreliance on a single source for reporting that, despite its solid track record, can still fail: The Voter News Service debacle in Florida[https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2002/11/06/voter-news-service-meltdown-halts-flow-of-exit-poll-data/279f9492-150a-4f03-924c-45d325b5cef9/] was only four elections ago.

Second, the public’s growing obsession about “stolen this” and “fraud that” gets squashed with an independent real-time count. During the Democratic presidential primary in Kentucky, we had numbers out of Jefferson and Fayette before The A.P. did, so our tally had Mrs. Clinton ahead of Bernie Sanders nearly the entire night, while The A.P. had the reverse. In the end, the final numbers were identical.

Third, we are very open about our gathering and reporting process, frequently utilizing Periscope[https://www.periscope.tv] to give a peek behind the curtain and openly discussing the oddities we encounter when results are reported.

Fourth, when you are basically powered by election junkies, your group notices things along the way: inconsistencies in the process, flat-out wrong historical results (that we’ve forwarded to Derek Willis’s Open Elections Project[https://twitter.com/openelex]).

We’re America’s second pair of eyes on election night, and feel that with enough support, we can give the public a more comprehensive understanding of how their vote is counted.

Toni How are you able to organize people to do this for free? And you have to admit there have been some growing pains: You’ve been criticized for some premature calls. In one case, you wrote[http://www.decisiondeskhq.com/2014/11/why-we-called-virginia-so-early/] a post explaining why “we should wait just a tick on future races.”

Brandon The lure for many is this: They are part of a new project that they believe in. For others, it connects them to an aspect of the election process long locked away. And for still others it’s an opportunity to hitch their wagon and get their own analysis, visualizations[http://www.decisiondeskhq.com/2015/05/2014-governors-races-by-cd-part-iii-the-great-lakes/] and thoughts on the races out there. Even those who started with a rather indifferent “Well, he writes for a blog I like, so I’ll help him out this weekend” catch the bug: We have a volunteer in central Illinois who drove for hours up into Wisconsin to conduct a survey. We’ve been at this for just a few years, and we’re extremely proud of what has been produced. Our focus these days is on the stream of data, rather than the calls. But all throughout, when there is a close or wrong call, we don’t pretend it away[https://twitter.com/DecisionDeskHQ/status/707425874891530241], but publicize it and work to improve our methods to avoid repeating the errors. Our inbox then fills up with another dozen people saying, “Hey, I’m a retired X or I’m a grad student with a background in X.” More volunteers flood in to make things even better.

Toni You said earlier that you lack a major benefactor. How can you continue to do this after the election without money coming in?

Brandon We have pushed hard to get our database and API up and running for the general election, so that we can provide an election feed to interested media and private groups. We have to cover development costs and servers, and ultimately we want to share a little something with the folks who have been participating in Decision Desk HQ over the long haul. So to answer your question bluntly: We can’t continue this project without the money to support it. We have a few prospective clients for the feed. But I can’t let the post-11/8 world affect me too much: There’s work to do! Our general election coverage will be great, and that night memorable regardless of the outcome.

Toni The other passion that you share on your Twitter feed is astronomy, and it helps put things in perspective. I mean, Pennsylvania is meaningful, but nothing in the grand scheme of the cosmos and …

Wait, who am I kidding — Pennsylvania is the sun and the moon and stars. It’s everything, right?

Let me close with these two questions:

1) In what year will Republicans win Pennsylvania?

2) What’s the best astronomical metaphor for Donald Trump and this 2016 election campaign?

Brandon

1) 2020 or 2024. Democrats win this time, but eventually the desire for change will outlast even their favorable demographics. When the Republicans win the White House back, they carry Pennsylvania with them. Ahab will get his whale.

2) Trump is Eta Carinae A[https://www-scientificamerican-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/fact-or-fiction-the-explosive-death-of-eta-carinae-will-cause-a-mass-extinction/] entering the silicon-[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BRtH3-3plM8] burning process[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BRtH3-3plM8], and the Republican Party is its binary companion.

Toni That silicon-burning process doesn’t sound so good.

Brandon With a star the size of Trump? Buy a welder’s mask and sunscreen.

The Upshot[http://www.nytimes.com/upshot/] provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/upshot] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/UpshotNYT]. Sign up for our newsletter.[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/upshot/]

\* Why the Whole Trump-Clinton Election Could Probably Just Be Held in Pennsylvania[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/upshot/why-the-whole-trump-clinton-election-could-probably-just-be-held-in-pennsylvania.html]

\* How One 19-Year-Old Illinois Man Is Distorting National Polling Averages[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/13/upshot/how-one-19-year-old-illinois-man-is-distorting-national-polling-averages.html]

\* 50 Years of Electoral College Maps: How the U.S. Turned Red and Blue[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/upshot/50-years-of-electoral-college-maps-how-the-us-turned-red-and-blue.html]

\* Questions to Consider if Your Trump-Clinton Vote Doesn’t Really Count[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/upshot/if-your-vote-doesnt-really-count-is-there-anything-you-can-do.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**You have a somewhat different approach than your predecessors at the Southern Baptist Convention. Your tenure has been marked by your advocacy for working with others with whom you can find common cause, particularly in regard to racial reconciliation, which you worked with Obama on. What influenced you to break the tradition? Growing up in Mississippi shaped my life in all sorts of ways, including seeing a Bible Belt, cultural Christianity that was often very tolerant of racism and bigotry. Much of the New Testament has to do with breaking down divisions. As time has gone on, the more I see my identity within the global church and the global body of Christ, so what hurts my African-American brother or sister hurts me.

Do you endorse the concept that black lives matter? Yes. I don’t necessarily endorse everything that any institution or organization by that name might endorse, but I certainly endorse the concept that black lives matter.

Have you had much luck, professionally and personally, changing your coreligionists’ minds on this kind of thing? Yes, actually. The Bible speaks so directly to these issues that, really, in order to avoid questions of racial unity, one has to evade the Bible itself. One of the problems we have on the race issue is that so few churches talk about it at all. Increasingly, I hear congregations starting to ask, “How do we change so that our churches actually reflect the kingdom of God?”

You’ve been an advocate for the church to be involved in issues that have some crossover across party lines: criminal-justice reform, racial reconciliation, **immigration**. That, combined with #NeverTrump, has created bipartisan collaboration in a way I haven’t seen before. Do you think that will continue after the election? I hope so. One of the places of common ground that I’ve found between people on the right and the left is a common commiserating about how bad both of these candidates are. If we can move past the sense that our identity is bound up in our political party or our political ideology, that will be a step forward.

Very early in the campaign season, you said that evangelicals shouldn’t support Trump for president. At first, it seemed as if he might not win them over, but now they seem to have come on board. Do you have an explanation for that? Part of the explanation is the recent alliance between the Republican Party and American evangelicalism. I think many evangelicals believe that they face a binary choice and they have no option but to support one of the two. When I talk to pro-Trump evangelicals, the Supreme Court is the primary concern for them.

Do you find their arguments personally persuasive? No, but I understand why people across the religious and political spectrum would conclude that they have to wrestle with their consciences and vote for one of these candidates. I’m pro-life, pro-family, pro-racial reconciliation, pro-**immigrant** and pro-character in office, so no matter what happens in November, I lose.

Between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, which one do you think you might find more common cause with if he or she were elected? I don’t know. I think that it would vary from issue to issue. It’s been a fairly contentless election or at least a shifting kaleidoscope of content, and so I have no way to predict.

I could pretty safely predict to you that Hillary Clinton is going to be working on criminal-justice reform and sentence reform, sex trafficking, racial reconciliation. We could go down a menu of issues you might potentially be invited to the White House to talk about with her. Name something you could find common causeon with Donald Trump. I don’t know where the points of commonality would be because I don’t actually know where he would stand in office. But I agree with him on Mike Pence and La Guardia Airport, for sure.

Sign up for our newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Interview has been condensed and edited.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HAZLETON, Pa. — Thousands of Dominicans have poured into this little city in eastern Pennsylvania since 2001 to work in the food plants and warehouses on the edge of town, where the highway to New York meets the highway to Philadelphia.

Hazleton’s population is growing for the first time in more than half a century. Landlords, doctors and shopkeepers are learning to love their new customers.

But the city’s economic evolution has left behind its previous, non-Hispanic working class, and the presidential election has crystallized its frustrations. Many of those losing ground economically, including lifelong Democrats, say they plan to vote for Donald J. Trump, the Republican nominee. Many of those who are prospering, including lifelong Republicans, say they will vote for the Democrat, Hillary Clinton.

For both sides, how to deal with **immigration** has become a defining political issue, one that is likely to transcend the contretemps over Mr. Trump’s treatment of women that has cost him so much support among elected Republicans. This city was built by European **immigrants** who flocked here a century ago to work in the coal mines. Their children found better jobs in the factories. Now their grandchildren are struggling against economic decline and cultural displacement.

“I don’t care for this town no more because of the Hispanics,” said Lewis Beishline, 70, as he sat drinking at 11 a.m. on a Friday at Cusat’s Cafe, a bar owned by the mayor of Hazleton, who lives upstairs. Mr. Beishline, a retired welder, said he moved from Hazleton to a nearby town last year because he no longer felt safe.

He plans to vote for Mr. Trump, he said, “because of the **immigration**.”

The Hispanic community, meanwhile, is eager to establish its own political power in the face of what many describe as persistent and painful discrimination. Community leaders in this city of 25,000 say they have registered more than 800 Hispanic voters in recent months, expanding the voting rolls by almost 10 percent.

“I tell my kids, if someone asks where you are from, you say ‘Hazleton,’” said Guillermo Lara, 49, who moved here from Mexico in the early 1990s and whose two daughters were born here. “We’re here, and we don’t go nowhere. We want more.”

That sharp divide is mirrored by the candidates seeking the Oval Office. Beyond his promised wall and deportations, Mr. Trump has denigrated **immigrants**repeatedly, at times without distinguishing between legal and illegal **immigration**.

“Donald Trump’s position on illegal **immigration** plays a big role in his support not only in Hazleton but in northeast Pennsylvania,” said Lou Barletta, a Republican who represents the region in Congress and has stood by his nominee as other Republicans in Congress have fled. In 2006, as Hazleton’s mayor, Mr. Barletta championed a first-in-the-nation ordinance[http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/02/us/02hazelton.html] penalizing employers and landlords for dealing with illegal **immigrants**. The courts blocked it from taking effect, but Mr. Barletta said Mr. Trump’s popularity reflected the continued demand for stronger government action. “He’s going to win here, and win big,” Mr. Barletta said.

Mr. Barletta introduced Mr. Trump at a rally in nearby Wilkes-Barre on Monday night, declaring that voters in northeastern Pennsylvania would propel Mr. Trump to the White House.

Mrs. Clinton, by contrast, has celebrated **immigrants**, both legal and illegal, as important contributors to American society. Her campaign describes her plan to create a pathway to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants** as one of her most important ideas for increasing economic growth.

“Comprehensive **immigration** reform will grow our economy and keep families together — and it’s the right thing to do,” Mrs. Clinton said in accepting the party’s presidential nomination in Philadelphia, about 100 miles southeast of Hazleton.

The Hispanic population grew faster in Luzerne County, which includes Hazleton, than almost any other county between 2000 and 2011, according to the Pew Research Center.[http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2013/08/latino\_populations\_in\_the\_states\_counties\_and\_cities\_FINAL.pdf] While **immigration** has slowed since the 2008 recession, Hispanics continue to move here from larger cities like New York and Paterson, N.J.

In the 2000 census, just 4.9 percent of Hazleton’s population identified as Hispanic. A decade later, that figure was 37 percent. By 2014, the most recent data available, 46 percent of the population said it was Hispanic. In all likelihood, Hazleton is now a majority-Hispanic city, just like the nearby cities of Reading and Allentown.

The Hispanic ascendence emerged from seismic economic shifts, said Jamie Longazel, a professor of sociology at the University of Dayton who grew up just outside Hazleton and wrote a book, “Undocumented Fears[http://www.temple.edu/tempress/titles/2370\_reg.html],” about the city’s struggles with **immigration**.

When the local coal mines began to close in the 1950s, Hazleton residents raised money to build an industrial park that attracted factories to the region. When the factories began to leave in the 1990s, the city mobilized again. Local officials won state permission to create one of Pennsylvania’s largest tax-free Keystone Opportunity Zones. A Cargill meat processing and distribution plant arrived in 2001. Other distribution businesses have followed, including an Amazon.comwarehouse.

Many residents claim that city officials advertised for low-cost **immigrant** labor on billboards in New York or New Jersey, but Mr. Longazel said there was no evidence that ever happened. The truth is that the **immigration** was unanticipated but most likely inevitable.

“The new jobs don’t pay as much as the old jobs did, and the reality is that native-born folks were just not interested,” Mr. Longazel said.

The city also was also aging. Almost a quarter of the population was over 65 in 2000, roughly twice the national average.

And nature abhors a vacuum — especially in a work force.

Many of the new arrivals trace their roots to one Dominican city, San José de Ocoa. Hazleton’s old shopping streets, nearly abandoned in the 1990s, are now lined with Dominican bakeries, barbershops, travel agencies and Mexican restaurants. The Italian restaurants are now run by Mexican families. The city has two Spanish radio stations and a television station that broadcasts six hours of local programming a day.

Stephen M. Schleicher, a dermatologist, said Hispanic residents now made up a third of his patients. He has hired a bilingual receptionist and is looking for a bilingual nurse. He has started placing ads in the local Spanish-language newspaper.

Dr. Schleicher, a lifelong Republican, said that Mr. Trump’s views on **immigration** had persuaded him, albeit reluctantly, to vote for Mrs. Clinton. “We’re seeing a total revitalization despite the government trying to keep the **immigrants** out,” he said. “It would have been a ghost town of older white people.”

Yet it is easy to overstate Hazleton’s recovery. Many of the new jobs pay poorly. Almost 29 percent of the population lived in poverty in 2014, almost twice the national average.

And Hazleton’s evolution has inspired deep resentment. Many residents complain bitterly about the new arrivals not speaking English, about loud music late at night, about people walking in the street and driving without regard for traffic rules.

Wana Bostic, 45, scrapes by on $11.50 an hour as a home health aide. She said that she was not paid nearly enough, but that employers can squeeze workers because of the ready availability of **immigrant** labor.

“No one talks about white Americans and what we really need,” she said.

Crime has increased, as has drug use. The police force, meanwhile, has shrunk with declining tax revenue. Many residents are convinced that illegal **immigration** is to blame.

“If you come into the country breaking the law, that’s not a good way to get your foot in the door,” said Nick Zapatocky, 31, who now has three deadbolt locks on the door of his home. “That says you’re willing to break the law again.”

He voted for President Obama in 2008. In 2012, he did not vote. And this year, he said he will vote for Mr. Trump.

Francisco Torres-Aranda said people were blinded by their fear of change, unable to see the benefits that **immigration** is bringing to Hazleton. Mr. Torres-Aranda, whose father was Mexican, runs a company that makes caps for old wells. He employs 30 people in the summer, only a few of them Hispanic. And he noted that some of the largest employers in the area are now Mexican companies, including Bimbo Bakeries, which has a plant nearby that makes millions of Thomas’ English Muffins.

Mr. Torres-Aranda said he had always voted Republican, loyal to his pocketbook. But he plans to vote for Mrs. Clinton, he said.

“They fear they’re losing what they remember,” he said. “But what can you do? The United States is in evolution. Apple pie came after the Germans arrived. Maybe it will now be ‘As American as salsa.’ So what?”

Hazleton still has no Hispanic elected officials. The city just added its first Hispanic police officer. The public school system, which has very few Hispanic teachers, was ordered by the federal Department of Education in 2014 to improve efforts to teach English to **immigrants**, and to communicate with parents.

But a second generation of Hispanic Americans in Hazleton may force change.

Mr. Lara worked three jobs to pay private school tuition so his daughters could avoid Hazleton’s high school. After 12-hour days in a factory, he washed dishes at night and cleaned offices on weekends. Two years ago, his eldest daughter, Amanda, graduated from Ithaca College in upstate New York with a degree in psychology and came home.

She teaches after-school classes for Hispanic children in the building that was once her elementary school. It has become a community center thanks in large part to Joe Maddon, a Hazleton native who manages the Chicago Cubs.

Ms. Lara, who is studying for a master’s degree at the University of Scranton, said racial tensions had increased. At the city’s annual Funfest, she noticed an empty space between the Hispanic vendors and the Polish and Italian vendors.

“And I hear it from my kids,” she said of her students. “They’re not dumb. They can tell when they’re not liked or they’re not welcome.”

But she said she was not sure she wanted to move away. “People say, ‘Why would you want to stay there?’” she said. “Well, for one thing, this is my hometown.”

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/nytpolitics], and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics/].

\* Why the Whole Trump-Clinton Election Could Probably Just Be Held in Pennsylvania[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/upshot/why-the-whole-trump-clinton-election-could-probably-just-be-held-in-pennsylvania.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Good morning.

(Want to get California Today by email? Here’s the sign-up [http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/07/04/us/100000004502101.app.html] .)

Let’s turn it over the Adam Nagourney, our Los Angeles bureau chief.

Santa Ana is a quick eight miles from Disneyland and 40 miles from Los Angeles City Hall — in the heart of Orange County, once a symbol of white, suburban, Republican California. If you want to understand how California is changing, indeed, how the nation is changing, this city of 334,000 people is a good place to start.

And Santa Ana is the anchor for the second installment of a New York Times series[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/california-latino-voters.html] on rising Latino power in America. The city is 78 percent Latino. All seven members of the City Council, including the mayor, are Latino.

It’s worth remembering that three decades ago, Republicans posted uniformed guards at polling places to keep Latino voters away. By contrast, most of the signs in this city’s handsome downtown are in Spanish, and the sounds of Spanish can be heard on the street.

“There’s no attempt to whitewash the city anymore,” Aurelia Rivas, 26, a student, told us.

And Santa Ana may well be the future of California — not to mention much of the United States. Across California 40 percent of the population is now Latino, a number that keeps growing. Both leaders of the State Legislature are Latino, as is the mayor of Los Angeles and secretary of state. There is a reason Donald J. Trump, who has attacked Mexicans in denouncing illegal **immigration**, isn’t even in the running in California.

“We are well past the tipping point — everywhere,” the mayor of Los Angeles, Eric Garcetti, told us when we visited him at his official residence. “The shift within 20 years from being the most anti-**immigrant** state to being the most embracing state for the integration of **immigrants** has been pretty breathtaking.”

In our story[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/california-latino-voters.html] we explore if this has translated into advances for Latinos. Kevin de León, the Democratic leader of the Senate, captured that well.

“Latino political power is not the panacea nor does it equate to instant gains overall or lifting people out of poverty,” he told our Jenny Medina. “The fact that we have political power I think means we’ve started that journey.”

November Ballot Countdown: 27 Days

See reporting in The Times on the Nov. 8 ballot initiatives: Proposition 51[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/12/us/california-today-school-construction-bond-measure.html] (school bond) | Proposition 53[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/us/california-today-proposition-53-revenue-bonds.html] (megaprojects) | Proposition 56[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/us/california-today-proposition-56-cigarette-tax.html] (cigarette tax) | Proposition 60[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/us/california-today-condoms-adult-films.html] (condoms in adult film) | Propositions 62 and 66[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/us/california-voters-face-choice-end-death-penalty-or-speed-it-up.html] (death penalty) | Propositions 65 and 67[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/us/california-today-plastic-bags-voters.html] (plastic bag ban).

And dig into analyses of all 17 statewide measures by the Legislative Analyst’s Office[http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/en/propositions/], CALmatters[https://calmatters.org/elections/], KQED[http://elections.kqed.org/], and Ballotpedia[https://ballotpedia.org/California\_2016\_ballot\_propositions].

California Online

• The Giants season is over. With a remarkable four-run rally in the ninth inning, the Cubs advanced to the National League Championship Series. [The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/sports/baseball/chicago-cubs-san-francisco-giants-nlds.html]]

• The Cubs will now face either the Dodgers or the Nationals, whose division series was forced to a decisive Game 5. [The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/sports/baseball/la-dodgers-washington-nationals-nlds-kershaw.html]]

• Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the Supreme Court justice, said Colin Kaepernick’s national anthem protest is “dumb and disrespectful.” [The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/ruth-bader-ginsburg-calls-colin-kaepernicks-national-anthem-protest-dumb.html]]

• The Los Angeles Police Commission approved a sweeping set of proposals aimed at reducing lethal use of force. [KPCC[http://www.scpr.org/news/2016/10/11/65533/la-police-commission-approves-reforms-designed-to/]]

• For more than a decade, Wells Fargo workers registered complaints about misdeeds at the San Francisco-based bank. [The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/business/dealbook/at-wells-fargo-complaints-about-fraudulent-accounts-since-2005.html]]

• So little water is flowing from the rivers that feed San Francisco’s estuary that its ecosystem is collapsing, a major study said. [SFGate.com[http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/SF-Bay-ecosystem-collapsing-as-rivers-diverted-9953776.php]]

• Two ruptures in an East Bay oil pipeline in the past two years have raised concerns about its oversight. [KQED[https://ww2.kqed.org/news/2016/10/10/state-outsources-east-bay-pipeline-spill-investigation-to-oil-company/]]

• Brit Bennett, known for essays about racial injustice, is causing a stir with a novel modeled after the town she grew up in: Oceanside. [The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/books/the-mothers-brit-bennett.html]]

• “Miss You Like Hell,” set to begin at La Jolla [http://www.lajollaplayhouse.org/] Playhouse[http://www.lajollaplayhouse.org/], is one of the most anticipated musicals of the season to not have its premiere in New York. [The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/theater/daphne-rubin-vega-miss-you-like-hell.html]]

• Theodore W. Anderson, a statistician whose work brought a new rigor to economics and social science, died in Stanford. He was 98. [The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/theodore-anderson-mathematician-who-advanced-data-analysis-dies-at-98.html]]

And Finally ...

If your mind is already made up, you don’t have to wait till Election Day on Nov. 8.

Early voting kicked off this week in California, as a limited number of polling places opened and the state began sending out millions of mail-in ballots to voters who requested them.

Elections officials have encouraged people to take advantage of the mail option. For one thing, it helps keep lines shorter on Election Day, a heightened concern with a record 18-plus million registered voters[http://www.scpr.org/news/2016/10/05/65383/california-reaches-highest-number-of-registered-vo/].

It also allows voters plenty of time to make their way through the ballot’s thicket of choices. (The ballot must be returned with a postmark on or before Nov. 8).

California has been a pioneer in the use of vote-by-mail option.

Michael McDonald, an associate professor at the University of Florida whose research focuses on elections, said that in 1980 California became the first state to lift the requirement that voters provide an excuse — such as travel or illness — to get an absentee ballot.

Other states took similar steps and the proportion of Americans who vote early rose steadily — from less than a tenth in the early 1990s to roughly a third in 2012, according to Mr. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-p-mcdonald/a-brief-history-of-early\_b\_12240120.html] McDonald[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-p-mcdonald/a-brief-history-of-early\_b\_12240120.html], who is also founder of the Elections Project[http://www.electproject.org/home], which tracks turnout.

Today, 27 states and the District of Columbia allow early, no-excuse voting by mail, according to National Conference of State Legislatures[http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/absentee-and-early-voting.aspx].

In states that continue to require a justification, in part because of concerns over potential voter fraud, early voting tends to hover in the single digits, said Mr. McDonald.

By contrast, he said, more than half of California’s votes in the November election are expected to be cast by mail.

Voters have until Nov. 1 to request a mail ballot. California’s Elections Division website[http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/voter-registration/vote-mail/] has the details.

California Today goes live at 6 a.m. Pacific time weekdays. Tell us what you want to see: CAtoday@nytimes.com[mailto:CAtoday@nytimes.com].

The California Today columnist, Mike McPhate, is a third-generation Californian — born outside Sacramento and raised in San Juan Capistrano. He lives in Davis. Follow him on Twitter[https://twitter.com/mmcphate].

California Today is edited by Julie Bloom, who grew up in Los Angeles and attended U.C. Berkeley.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As we head into the final month of this unpredictable, unprecedented presidential election, news about the candidates and their campaigns will be everywhere.

We invite you to use the news to help your English-language learners understand the United States’ system of government, develop critical thinking skills and acquire greater English proficiency via any or all of the suggestions below. They are loosely designed to be done in order, but they can also stand on their own as individual lessons.

And for many more ideas and resources, check out:

• The Learning Network’s full collection of materials found on Election 2016: Our Teaching and Learning Homepage[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/03/30/election-2016-our-teaching-and-learning-homepage/]

• Our list of Great Free Resources for Teaching Election 2016[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/02/10/great-free-resources-for-teaching-election-2016/]

• The New York Times Politics Page[http://www.nytimes.com/pages/politics/index.html], with the latest articles, photos, videos and interactives.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Craft Biographical Essays for Each Candidate

A good place to start teaching this election is to ask students: What do they already know — or think they know — about the backgrounds of the two major candidates running for president in the 2016 election? Students can write a few ideas on paper or share them with a partner, and then have a quick share-out with the class.

Next, students can conduct research so they can write a short biographical essay about one or both major candidates. Students can use Scholastic’s “Meet the Candidates[http://election.scholastic.com/election-central/meet-the-candidates/]” feature to gather basic information. To go deeper, they can use the resources suggested in the Learning Network’s Election Unit[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/election-2016-unit-part-1-who-are-the-candidates/], such as the BBC News profiles of Hillary Clinton[http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-20874451] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-35318432].

Students can take notes using this [https://static01.nyt.com/images/blogs/learning/pdf/2016/CandidateResearch2016LN.pdf] graphic organizer[https://static01.nyt.com/images/blogs/learning/pdf/2016/CandidateResearch2016LN.pdf] (PDF). Or they can use this planning sheet[http://www.readwritethink.org/files/resources/interactives/cube\_creator/media/planning\_bio.pdf] in conjunction with ReadWriteThink’s Bio Cube[http://www.readwritethink.org/files/resources/interactives/cube\_creator/] interactive. Once they are ready to write their essay, they can read this as a model[http://www.timeforkids.com/files/2011-07/biosampler.pdf].

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Research What the Candidates Believe

Explain to students that they are going to research where Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump stand on important issues. Assign half the class to the Clinton campaign and half to the Trump campaign. Providing students with the power of choice[http://larryferlazzo.edublogs.org/2010/12/21/the-best-posts-articles-about-providing-students-with-choices/] is very motivating so, ideally, students could have some role in deciding which candidate they “get.” There just should be an equal number of students assigned to each campaign.

The Learning Network’s Election Unit lists a variety of websites that provide side-by-side comparisons of what positions the candidates support[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/08/24/election-2016-unit-part-2-what-are-the-issues/], such as ProCon[http://2016election.procon.org/view.source-summary-chart.php] and The Washington Post[https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/political-issues/].

Tell students that they are going to choose three issues in which they have the most interest and — in their own words (this should be emphasized) — summarize the position of “their” candidate on this graphic organizer[https://static01.nyt.com/images/blogs/learning/pdf/2016/IssuesChartLN2.pdf] (PDF). Students should stick to the facts and not write whether they agree with the candidate; they will get to do that in a later lesson. Explain that they are ultimately going to have to teach what they learned to a partner.

Next, students should be divided into groups of three or four with other students who have also researched the same candidate. Each student should share what he or she wrote and make improvements based on what was learned from the other students in the group.

Finally, pair “Trump” students with “Clinton” students and ask them to take turns teaching their partner what they learned about their candidate’s positions.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Analyze Campaign Photos Using Bloom’s Taxonomy

Students will be shown a photo (or two or three) from each of the Times slide shows about Mrs. Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/slideshow/2016/06/07/nyregion/hillary-clintons-road-to-the-democratic-nomination/s/08CLINCH-ss-slide-IJ6A.html] and Mr. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/slideshow/2015/10/01/blogs/photographing-donald-trump-1/s/20151001-lens-damon-slide-EABM.html] (or other images found in this collection[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/presidential-campaign-in-pictures.html]) and answer several questions about each one. In an exercise borrowed from one developed by Learn North Carolina[http://www.learnnc.org/lp/media/articles/bloom0405-3/bloompix.html], students will then answer these questions that use Bloom’s taxonomy to move students from basic knowledge to more sophisticated evaluation:

1. Knowledge: What items or people can you name with the vocabulary you know?

2. Comprehension: What is happening in the photo?

3. Application: What is a one-sentence caption you could write about the photo?

4. Synthesis: What do you think the person or people in the photo are thinking?

5. Evaluate: If the only thing someone knew about this person was this photo, do you think he or she would like or dislike that person? Why?

Students can share their answers in pairs after each question, followed by one or two being called on to tell the entire class what they wrote and why they wrote it.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Consider Political Advertisements

Choose two television or video ads — one from each campaign or from a group sympathetic to the candidate — to show to the class. Here are possible choices:

Pro-Trump commercials: “The Enemy[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fcqx1CGex1A],” “Two Americas: **Immigration**[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3mKzYPt0Bu4],” “It Takes Two[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gOK4i35BcXA]” and “The Difference[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tYTuyKo3WTM]”

Pro-Clinton commercials: “Absolutely[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qmF2Yi4yuT4],” “Dante[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I1wQ0ToQDtU],” “Presidential[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kgWJRjA-nIY]” and “Role Models[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mrX3Ql31URA]”

Then provide this Learning Network television commercial analysis chart[https://static01.nyt.com/images/blogs/learning/pdf/2012/TelevisionCommercialAnalysisChart.pdf] or Frank Baker’s political ad analysis work sheet[http://www.frankwbaker.com/adanalysisworksheet.htm]. Be sure to review whichever handout you decide to use with students to make sure it is a good fit for the commercial you’ll need to show multiple times as students fill in the chart. (You might also want to add another column titled “New Words” where students can list English words that are new to them.)

Afterward, students can use the information they have learned about the candidates to create their own political ad, either as skits performed in English in front of the class or as videos. This Learning Network Storyboard[https://static01.nyt.com/images/blogs/learning/pdf/activities/Storyboard\_NYTLN.pdf] organizer is designed to interpret a newspaper article, but it can easily be modified for students to use and map out their commercial with images and text. It would be best to have a mix of both Clinton and Trump ads. If there are local candidates in your community or local questions on the ballot, students could even do further research and make their own commercials about them.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Share Student Hopes, Fears and Frustrations

The Times asked voters to share either their hopes for their lives or their fears or frustrations for this interactive[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/portraits/voters-of-the-people]. In other words, what would they like the candidates to hear.

Students can complete similar sentence frames:

I would like the candidates to know that my hope is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and I would like them to do \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to help my hope come true.

I would like the candidates to know that I worry about \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and I would like them to do \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to help.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Write Compare and Contrast Essays on **Immigration**

Students can practice writing compare-and-contrast essays using the topic of **immigration**, a central issue in this year’s election. Below are two different possible assignments: comparing walls from history and comparing the candidates’ **immigration** plans. Option one is intended for E.L.L. students with less language proficiency, and the other is intended for students who have more advanced English proficiency.

Students using either option could first use this Venn diagram[http://www.nytimes.com/learning/teachers/studentactivity/Venn\_Diagram.pdf] to plan their essay and then, if individual computers are available, could use this ReadWriteThink interactive[http://www.readwritethink.org/files/resources/interactives/compcontrast/map.html] to plan it further (they should put a check mark next to “Similarities-to-Differences” at the ReadWriteThink site). Students could also be shown these two[http://www.timeforkids.com/files/2011-07/comparecontrastsampler.pdf] compare-contrast essays as models[http://www.admc.hct.ac.ae/hd1/english/compare/malaysia.htm].

Option One: Comparing Mr. Trump’s Wall With a Wall From History

Students could revisit what they learned about Mr. Trump’s plans for a wall in the “Researching What the Candidates Believe” activity above. Next, have students go to the Times interactive “What History Teaches Us About Walls[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/28/upshot/what-history-teaches-us-about-walls.html].” Students should review the different walls described there and choose one to compare and contrast with the wall Mr. Trump wants to build. After using the graphic organizers for taking notes and reviewing one or both of the essay models, students can write their essay. In their final paragraph they should say if they think building walls between people and/or countries is a good idea or not. Their final sentence could use this sentence frame:

Based on what I learned comparing these two walls, I think building walls between countries and people (is/is not) a good idea because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Option Two: Comparing Mr. Trump’s **Immigration** Plans With Mrs. Clinton’s Plans

Students can go to the Times article “What Would It Take for Donald Trump to Deport 11 Million and Build a Wall[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/20/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html]” and take notes on Mr. Trump’s plans for **immigrants**. They can then go to the Times article “A Path to Citizenship, Hillary Clinton Says, ‘Is at Its Heart a Family Issue’ ”[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/05/05/a-path-to-citizenship-clinton-says-is-at-its-heart-a-family-issue/] and take notes on her plans. Student can use the graphic organizers to organize their notes, and then write an essay using one of the models. Their final paragraph should use this sentence frame:

Based on what I learned comparing the **immigration** positions of the two candidates, I support the position of (Mr. Trump/Mrs. Clinton) because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Finally, students might use what they learned to join The Learning Network’s Civil Conversation Challenge[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/learning/our-civil-conversation-challenge-for-teenagers.html] on the topic of **immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/learning/civil-conversation-challenge-for-teenagers-issue-one-immigration.html] by posting their own positions, or by replying to the thoughts of others.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Take a Position

Now that students have done research on both candidates, it is time for them to decide which one they support, if any. Students will write a one-paragraph response to this question:

Which candidate do you think would be a better president?

Students will use the “ABC” format to respond:

· Answer the question.

· Back it up with evidence (a quotation from something they have read, seen or heard about the candidate).

· Make a Comment or Connection, possibly to a previous experience or a previous text they have read. Or they can simply choose to elaborate on why they made their choice.

You can access models for these types of paragraphs at previous[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/10/17/ideas-for-ells-civics-and-citizenship/] Learning Network posts for E.L.L. students[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/04/04/e-l-l-practice-prompt-presidential-debates/?module=BlogPost-Title&version=Blog%20Main&action=Click&pgtype=Blogs®ion=Body&\_r=0]. Showing a model could be helpful to students using this format for the first time.

Students also have the option to say they don’t support either candidate as long as they use the same writing frame to support their position.

After students have written their paragraphs, they can share their paragraphs, both orally and in writing, with a partner for peer review. Their partner can check to see if they followed the ABC format correctly. After revisions are made, students can break into groups of four or five to read their paragraphs to each other.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Have A Final Vote

End your election “unit” by having a model election. Have students write down on a sheet of paper who they would vote for, making sure that they showed no one else what they wrote down. Have them fold the paper, collect the ballots in a hat or other container, and have two students count them and announce the vote totals.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

And finally...

Here is an extra activity to do with your class if you like.

Reflect on Being First

Show students this Times interactive of “political firsts”[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/07/25/us/politics/political-firsts.html] by women and minorities. Then ask students to take a moment to think about whether they would like to be the “first person” (first from their family, first from their school, first from their neighborhood, etc.) to do something (it doesn’t have to be limited to the political arena). Ask students to complete this sentence frame:

I would like to be the first from my \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Have students use their sentence to create a poster that they illustrate, share with the class and tape to the classroom walls.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

SANTA ANA, Calif. — Vicente Sarmiento remembers when the local Republican Party here posted uniformed guards at polling stations in a closely fought State Assembly race three decades ago and they hoisted signs in English and Spanish warning that noncitizens were prohibited from voting. The guards were removed after state elections officials threatened legal action.

Such tactics would never take place today in this city 35 miles southeast of Los Angeles, where Mr. Sarmiento is now the mayor pro tem. All seven members of the City Council, including Mr. Sarmiento, are Latino, as are 78 percent[http://www.ci.santa-ana.ca.us/facts/] of the 343,000 people who live here.

(Leer en español) » [http://www.nytimes.com/es/2016/10/11/santa-ana-la-ciudad-a-la-vanguardia-de-la-transformacion-latina-de-california/]

These days, Santa Ana stands as the face of a new California, a state where Latinos have more influence in everyday life — electorally, culturally and demographically — than almost anywhere else in the country.

There are limits to the transformation here, both in economics, where Latinos still lag far behind the state as a whole, and in politics, where remarkable gains in Latino power have not yet translated to the most powerful statewide offices. But the Latino progress in this state offers a glimpse of how much of the country will probably look in coming decades.

**Immigrants** living illegally in California are entitled to driver’s licenses. Their children can receive state-funded health insurance. Local law enforcement officials generally do not provide information to federal **immigration** authorities, as they do in many other parts of the country. On a smaller, if no less symbolic, level, the first thing the Santa Ana City Council did when it went all-Latino in 2006 was pass a law requiring simultaneous translation of all of its meetings to Spanish.

“There is now — unlike before — a comfort level with knowing there’s a lot of Latinos living here and Latino leadership here,” said Mr. Sarmiento, 52, sitting in the law office he keeps in his house.

The signs of demographic and political change are everywhere in a city that is an easy 15-minute drive from Disneyland. The historic downtown is clustered around what the official city map calls “Fourth Street,” but everyone here knows as “Calle Cuatro.”

A twirl of the dial on a car radio reveals a choice of Spanish-language stations. The sidewalks of Calle Cuatro are lined with stands selling churritos and tostilocos.

“There’s no attempt to whitewash the city anymore,” said Aurelia Rivas, 26, a student working at her parents’ fruit and snack stand one afternoon. Referring to the annual Day of the Dead celebration, she added, “It’s like everyone knows that Día de los Muertos is going to be just as big and important of a celebration as the Fourth of July.”

The power and presence of Latinos in this community in Orange County — itself once a bastion of Republicanism — is echoed up and down the California coast. Latinos now make up just under 40 percent of the state’s population, projected to increase to 47 percent by 2050. The leaders of both houses of the Legislature are Latino, as is the secretary of state, the current mayor of Los Angeles and the previous mayor.

More than 25 percent of Latino voters in the nation live in California, said Mark Hugo Lopez, the director of Hispanic research at the Pew Research Center. There are 1,377 Latinos holding state, local and federal office in California, second only to Texas. But Hispanics in Texas are overwhelmingly Democrats in a state dominated by Republicans. In California, the Democrats are solidly in control, and Hispanics are a crucial and growing part of their base and help explain why Hillary Clinton has a huge advantage over Donald J. Trump.

“Over the last 10 years, we have really solidified the power, especially in the Legislature,” said Lorena Gonzalez, a Democratic member of the State Assembly from San Diego. “People are more afraid of being seen as not supporting Latinos than supporting them. You see this most clearly with the rhetoric of Republicans here — they are falling all over themselves to support Latino candidates.”

The limits to the gains can be glaring, too.

The Latino unemployment rate[http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/specialreports/CA\_Employment\_Summary\_Table.pdf] in California was at 6.7 percent in August, compared to 5.5 percent overall. More than 23 percent of Latinos in the state live below the poverty level[http://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/14\_5YR/S1701/0400000US06], significantly higher than the 16 percent overall.

The disparities are shown in education, as well: 8 percent of Latinos 25 years old or older have bachelor’s degrees, compared to 20 percent overall. And 42 percent of Latino households own their home, well below the statewide homeownership figure of 54 percent.

“Latino political power is not the panacea nor does it equate to instant gains overall or lifting people out of poverty,” said Kevin de León, a Democrat and the leader of the State Senate. “The fact that we have political power, I think, means we’ve started that journey.”

Prominent Latinos say that even though the climate has changed markedly, they still encounter reminders of lingering prejudice: in the way some feel they are treated by the police or are scrutinized as they travel through wealthier and whiter parts of Orange County.

Anthony Rendon, the Democratic Assembly speaker, said that prejudice can include dismissive stereotypes about Latinos in politics.

“There’s a tendency to think that I am only going to focus on certain types of issues, that I am only going to focus on certain types of population,” Mr. Rendon said. “It’s sometimes a surprise that I am concerned about environmental issues.”

And the political successes have their limits. There have only been two Latinos elected to statewide office in California’s modern history, including the current secretary of state, Alex Padilla.

Mr. Padilla said the absence of Latinos in statewide elected posts reflected the challenges of running in a state as large as California, rather than evidence of anti-Latino sentiment.

“We’re past that,” he said. “California is a big state. It’s a populous state. It’s difficult and expensive to run in.”

One lingering issue is voting rules. Although Santa Ana has an all-Latino City Council, there are no Latino Council members in neighboring Anaheim, even though the city is almost half Latino. Anaheim, like several other communities, elects its Council at large, rather than by district, which tends to put Latinos, who turn out smaller numbers than the general electorate, at a disadvantage.

Still, job postings across California routinely require applicants to speak Spanish. Mayor Eric Garcetti of Los Angeles, who is fluent in Spanish, said he makes a point at news conferences of setting aside time to speak to Spanish-language media.

“We are well past the tipping point — everywhere,” Mr. Garcetti said. “The shift within 20 years from being the most anti-**immigrant** state to being the most embracing state for the integration of **immigrants** has been pretty breathtaking.”

When Cruz Bustamante, a former lieutenant governor, ran for governor in 2003, he came under fire because he would not renounce ties to a Chicano student group, Mecha, or Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Atzlan. “That would just not happen now,” Ms. Gonzalez of the State Assembly said.

In Santa Ana, the change has stirred debate over what Latino lawmakers should do with their power, and the challenges of dealing with a new minority — non-Hispanics. About 9 percent of residents here are white, 10 percent are Asian and 1 percent are African-American.

“We also have to be sensitive to non-Latino voters,” said Miguel Pulido, the mayor, whose family **immigrated** from Mexico City in 1961. “We have a case now when the majority became the minority.’’

But Michele Martinez, a Santa Ana councilwoman since 2007, said the City Council has not done enough to promote the city’s Latino identity.

“A lot of my friends, my colleagues, they grew up here in a time when they weren’t allowed to speak Spanish,” she said. “Well, now we’re more than allowed, but we don’t throw it in your face. We’re a little reluctant to be seen as too Latino, and I don’t get that.”

She has tried without success to persuade her colleagues to funnel more money to a local Mexican cultural and art center and help fund the center’s annual Día de los Muertos celebration.

This year, local activists pressed the Council to end a longstanding contract with federal **immigration** authorities to house **immigrants** who entered the country illegally in the city jail. While the Council voted to phase the contract out over years, Ms. Martinez was the only Council member who voted to end the contract immediately.

Mr. Sarmiento argued that one sign of Latinos’ growing power is that elected officials are moving on to broader issues. “We as an all-Latino City Council are probably no different from an all-Anglo Council in that sense that we both want good things for our communities,” he said. “We all want better schools. We all want improved public safety.”

Many date the beginnings of California’s political transformation to a 1994 initiative, pressed by the Republican governor at the time, Pete Wilson, to cut off benefits to **immigrants** here illegally. The tone of that campaign — which many Democrats and Republicans say has been echoed by the appeal of Mr. Trump in this year’s presidential race — had the effect of energizing Latino voters and placing this state decisively in the Democratic column.

“California has come a long way since then,” Mr. Padilla said. “Political opinion has come a long way since then. Public policy has come a long way from there. I hope the rest of the country will follow that soon.”

Follow Adam Nagourney @adamnagourney[https://twitter.com/adamnagourney] and Jennifer Medina @jennymedina[https://twitter.com/jennymedina] on Twitter. For breaking news and in-depth reporting, follow @NYTNational.[https://twitter.com/NYTNational]

Kitty Bennett contributed research.

Correction: October 14, 2016, Friday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An article on Wednesday about the influence of Latinos in Santa Ana, Calif., misstated the year in which the family of Miguel Pulido, who is the city’s mayor, **immigrated** from Mexico. It was 1961 — not 1984, which was the year they became citizens.

\* California Gives Expanded Rights to Noncitizens[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/21/us/california-leads-in-expanding-noncitizens-rights.html]

\* Police Shootings in Anaheim Highlight Deep Rifts in a Community[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/28/us/police-shootings-in-anaheim-highlight-deep-rifts-in-a-community.html]

\* New Faces and a Contentious Revival[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/31/us/in-santa-ana-new-faces-and-a-contentious-revival.html]

\* Orange County Is No Longer Nixon Country[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/30/us/politics/30orange.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WILKES-BARRE, Pa. — The line to see Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] snaked back and forth on itself hours before his arrival. There was a carnival atmosphere with people in costumes, including one prison-striped man with a sign, “Don’t let the government-run media elect crooked Hillary.” A cavalcade of motorcycles roared up, and there were cheers and laughter for a man shouting, “Donald Trump is going to make America great! He hasn’t paid taxes in 20 years!”

A day after Mr. Trump defended himself at the second presidential debate for making vulgar comments about women, amid a wave of polls showing an increasing lead for Hillary Clinton, thousands of Trump supporters turned out with undimmed fervor for the Republican nominee and optimism about his electoral prospects.

They echoed nearly verbatim Mr. Trump’s defense that his lewd comments about women on a 2005 recording[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html] were merely “locker room talk,” calling them harmless words compared with the far-worse actions Mrs. Clinton and her husband had taken to shame women.

They reiterated Mr. Trump’s claim that national polls showing him behind by double digits[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/polls.html] were “rigged” and that he was heading to victory in November.

In the campaign’s last weeks, at such rallies, Mr. Trump is sealed in a hermetic bubble with his most fervent supporters. They are people passionate enough to wait hours to attend a rally where the candidate and the crowds draw energy and affirmation from each other, while dismissing any discouraging information.

His supporters routinely pointed, as the nominee did, to the huge crowds still flocking to see him as evidence that his campaign remains strong.

“I don’t believe anything the media says,” said Brad Chilson, 47, a truck driver from Bradford County, Pa., who waited hours with his wife outside the 8,000-seat Mohegan Sun Arena in Wilkes-Barre for Mr. Trump. “Look at the turnout we’ve got here.”

Mr. Trump was in high spirits on Monday night in northeastern Pennsylvania, in the heart of a largely white, blue-collar region that he has visited regularly, running a campaign sustained by a visceral feel for his audience while ignoring abstractions like data and research.

“I think the state of Pennsylvania, we’re going to win so big,” he said. A New York Times polling average shows Mrs. Clinton 7.2 percentage points ahead in the state.

“Everybody in Pennsylvania wants Trump, you know,” he said. “We get crowds like this everywhere.” He boasted of a rally planned for Florida with an expected 25,000 people.

As he spoke, Katie Packer, a strategist for Mitt Romney in 2012, posted[https://twitter.com/katiepack/status/785617853873467396] a photograph [https://twitter.com/katiepack/status/785617853873467396] on Twitter[https://twitter.com/katiepack/status/785617853873467396] of 30,000 people at an Ohio rally four years ago a week before Mr. Romney’s defeat. “None of the Trump crowds so far in the general election surpass what we regularly had in ’12,” Ms. Packer wrote. “They are so naïve.”

Yet Mr. Trump whipped the crowd to anger at the news media and its “crooked” polls. At one point, he falsely claimed that CNN had turned off its live coverage as he was accusing the network of manipulating a debate-night focus group. The crowd then chanted an anti-CNN epithet.

He also read the results of unscientific, opt-in online surveys.

“Trump 70, Clinton 30,” Mr. Trump quoted from a reader survey by the Drudge Report on which candidate had won the second debate. “Oh, listen to this,” he said, reading from an iPhone. “Time magazine. You think Time magazine likes me?” He cited the result: 89 for Trump, 11 for Clinton. “Oh, here’s a good one,” he added. “Well, they’re slightly conservative — Breitbart. 93 to 7,” he read.

Mr. Trump’s supporters who were waiting to hear him speak cited alternative sources of information they preferred, dismissing even Fox News in favor of emails from far-right commentators like Allen B. West, a former congressman, and Dennis Lynch, who makes films about illegal **immigration**.

They also repeated conspiracy theories that flourish online. “A lot of people affiliated with Hillary have died over the years, and nobody says nothing about it,” said Eric Bulger, a retired police officer with the Port Authority for New York and New Jersey.

There were equal numbers of women and men at the rally, and many dismissed as insignificant Mr. Trump’s private comments, caught on the 2005 recording, about being able to grab women by their genitals because he was a “star.”

“When all this baloney came out about Trump, I understand it’s a scandal,” said Brenda Stchur, 56, a Democrat from Hudson, Pa., who supports Mr. Trump. “But John F. Kennedy wasn’t innocent, either, and everyone loves John F. Kennedy.”

Marilyn Sevigny, a retiree from Lake Ariel, Pa., said that “as a woman, I don’t like what he said, I’m not defending it.” But she added that there was a double standard at work. “If a Democrat says it, it’s just words. If a Republican says it, it’s an assault,” she said.

Before Sunday’s town hall-style debate, David Quinn, an electronics engineer, told his wife that Mr. Trump should drop out, as some senior elected Republicans were calling on the candidate to do. But Mr. Quinn changed his mind, he said, after Mr. Trump’s apology for his comments from 11 years ago. “The only thing that tape shows is he’s a healthy heterosexual,” he said.

Those at the rally agreed that Mr. Trump had won the debate. Many cited as their favorite moment Mr. Trump’s retort that Mrs. Clinton would “be in jail” if he were president.

They dismissed the F.B.I.’s recommendation that Mrs. Clinton should not be prosecuted over her use of a private email server as secretary of state. They faulted the news media for not highlighting that Mrs. Clinton had deleted thousands of emails after receiving a congressional subpoena, as Mr. Trump charged in the debate.

Mike Pisano, 65, a factory worker, echoed Mr. Trump’s contention that Mrs. Clinton had escaped indictment because Bill Clinton had met privately with[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/01/us/politics/meeting-between-bill-clinton-and-loretta-lynch-provokes-political-furor.html] Attorney General Loretta Lynch.

“He was on the plane with her fixing that,” Mr. Pisano said.

Still, outside the bubble of such devoted followers, Mr. Trump’s prospects in northeastern Pennsylvania are less certain.

On Wilkes-Barre’s Public Square, whose sidewalks filled during lunch hour on Monday, several Republicans and Republican-leaning Democrats said they were appalled by Mr. Trump and would skip the election, or vote for a third-party candidate.

“I just think he’s a pig,” said Janice Kontur, 44, a registered Republican, who manages an apartment complex. She said she could not bring herself to vote for Mrs. Clinton and planned to sit out Election Day. “As a matter of fact, if he’s elected, me and my daughter will be moving to a different country,” she said of Mr. Trump.

Melinda Thompson, a controller for an insurance company, said she would vote for Gary Johnson, the Libertarian candidate. She said of Mr. Trump, “I think his temperament would backfire on the United States.”

Paul Galante, a lawyer on a smoking break across from a statue of Christopher Columbus, said he was a registered Democrat but had consistently voted for Republican presidential nominees. Not this year. “All people want is a reason to like the man, and he doesn’t give them a reason,” he said of Mr. Trump.

He called the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] “a joke” for nominating Mr. Trump from a field of 17. In the primary, Mr. Galante wrote in a protest candidate, and he is considering voting for Mrs. Clinton in November. “She’s a sneak and a liar,” he said. “But so what at this point? He’s worse.”

The Trump campaign is counting on doing well in the Wilkes-Barre region, where factories have closed and the presence of Spanish-speaking **immigrants** has caused tensions.

But Mr. Galante, a longtime resident, was deeply skeptical of Mr. Trump’s prospects. “He’s going to get slaughtered,” he said.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Donald Trump Berates Paul Ryan and ‘Disloyal’ Republicans[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/politics/donald-trump-paul-ryan.html]

\* Split Over Donald Trump Threatens to Tilt Republican States[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/politics/donald-trump-gop.html]

\* Early Voting Could Point to Hillary Clinton Victory Well Before Nov. 8[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/politics/early-voting-registration.html]

\* Al Gore, With Hillary Clinton, Reminds Florida: ‘Every. Single. Vote. Counts.’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/12/us/politics/hillary-clinton-al-gore.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — The Supreme Court[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/supreme\_court/index.html?inline=nyt-org] agreed on Tuesday to decide whether high-ranking George W. Bush administration[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/george\_w\_bush/index.html?inline=nyt-per] officials — including John Ashcroft[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/a/john\_ashcroft/index.html?inline=nyt-per], the former attorney general, and Robert S. Mueller III[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/robert\_s\_iii\_mueller/index.html?inline=nyt-per], the former F.B.I. director — may be held liable for policies adopted after the Sept. 11 attacks.

The case began as a class action in 2002 filed by **immigrants**, most of them Muslim, over policies and practices that swept hundreds of people into the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn on **immigration** violations in the weeks after the attacks. The plaintiffs said they had been subjected to beatings, humiliating searches and other abuses.

The roundups drew criticism from the inspector general of the Justice Department, who in 2003 issued reports saying that the government had made little or no effort to distinguish between genuine suspects and Muslim **immigrants** with minor visa violations.

A divided three-judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, in New York, let the case proceed last year.

“The suffering endured by those who were imprisoned merely because they were caught up in the hysteria of the days immediately following 9/11 is not without a remedy,” Judges Rosemary S. Pooler and Richard C. Wesley wrote in a joint opinion[http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/15-1359-opinion-below.pdf].

“Holding individuals in solitary confinement 23 hours a day with regular strip searches because their perceived faith or race placed them in the group targeted for recruitment by Al Qaeda violated the detainees’ constitutional rights,” the judges said.

In dissent, Judge Reena Raggi said the majority had erred in allowing a lawsuit against “the nation’s two highest-ranking law enforcement officials” for “policies propounded to safeguard the nation in the immediate aftermath of the infamous Al Qaeda terrorist attacks.”

“It is difficult to imagine,” she wrote, “a public good more demanding of decisiveness or more tolerant of reasonable, even if mistaken, judgments than the protection of this nation and its people from further terrorist attacks.”

The full Second Circuit divided, 6 to 6, over the government’s request to rehear the case.

In its petition[http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/15-1359-Ashcroft-Mueller-Pet.pdf] seeking Supreme Court review, the Obama administration urged the justices to put an end to the litigation.

“The Court of Appeals concluded,” the petition said, “that the nation’s highest ranking law-enforcement officers — a former attorney general of the United States and former director of the F.B.I. — may be subjected to the demands of litigation and potential liability for compensatory and even punitive damages in their individual capacities because they could conceivably have learned about and condoned the allegedly improper ways in which their undisputedly constitutional policies were being implemented by lower-level officials during an unprecedented national security crisis.”

Rachel Meeropol, a lawyer with the Center for Constitutional Rights, which represents the plaintiffs, said the cases, Ashcroft v. Turkmen, No. 15-1359 and two others, involved fundamental principles.

“No one is above the law,” she said. “To suggest that the most powerful people in our nation should escape liability when they violate clearly established law defies the most fundamental principle of our legal system.”

“At a time when racial and religious profiling are put forward as serious policy proposals for dealing with everything from **immigration** to terrorism, it is more important than ever that the high court affirm that government officials, especially those at the highest levels, can be held accountable when they break the law,” she said.

Unless the Senate confirms a new justice in time for arguments, the cases will be heard by just six justices, as Justices Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan have recused themselves. They did not say why, but Justice Sotomayor used to be a judge on the Second Circuit and Justice Kagan was formerly United States solicitor general. They had presumably been involved in the cases in those capacities.

Follow Adam Liptak on Twitter @adamliptak[https://twitter.com/adamliptak].

\* On 9/11 Anniversary, Somber Reflections on Lives, and a World, Changed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/12/nyregion/15th-anniversary-9-11-september-11.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX — Prosecutors said Tuesday that they would charge Sheriff Joe Arpaio with criminal contempt of court for defying a judge’s orders to end his signature **immigration** patrols in Arizona, raising the possibility of jail time.

The announcement in federal court sets in motion criminal proceedings against the sheriff, of Maricopa County, less than a month before Election Day as he seeks a seventh term.

A judge previously recommended criminal contempt charges[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio.html] against Sheriff Arpaio but left it up to federal prosecutors to bring the case. The prosecutor, John Keller, said in court that the government would bring charges, with the next step being a court filing akin to a criminal complaint, possibly in the next day.

Sheriff Arpaio, 84, could face up to six months in jail if convicted of misdemeanor contempt.

His lawyer, Mel McDonald, said that the sheriff would plead not guilty by a court filing and that he hoped to prevail before a jury.

“We believe the sheriff, being an elected official, should be judged by his peers,” Mr. McDonald said.

The move is yet another setback for the sheriff, who became a national political figure over the last decade by aggressively carrying out **immigration** patrols and attention-getting endeavors, including making prisoners wear pink underwear.

After complaints by Latino drivers about racial profiling, a judge demanded that Sheriff Arpaio stop the enforcement efforts. He was later found to have violated the order, causing it to morph into a contempt-of-court case.

Sheriff Arpaio has acknowledged violating the order to stop the **immigration** patrols, but insists that his disobedience was not intentional.

Maricopa County taxpayers have paid $48 million so far in the case, and the costs are expected to reach $72 million by next summer.

\* Judge Refers Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio for Criminal Prosecution[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio.html]

\* Speak Up or Stay Hidden? Undocumented **Immigrants** Cautious After Court Ruling[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/27/us/speak-up-or-stay-hidden-undocumented-immigrants-cautious-after-court-ruling.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HAMBURG, Germany — Progress, luckily, is often a self-accelerating force. But what about regression? I’m not alone in worrying about the self-perpetuating cycle of social setbacks; across Europe and America, I encounter more and more people concerned that today’s minor tension or flawed election might become tomorrow’s crisis.

I felt it most strongly on a recent trip to Northern Ireland. The once war-torn region has profited significantly from a series of mutually enforcing developments in the past 20 years. The peace agreement of 1998, growing economic ties to both the Republic of Ireland and the wider European Union and now-ubiquitous technology have all helped cut the jobless rate and create new, previously unthinkable, opportunities.

There is a new energy to Belfast today, a spirit that is in stark contrast to a troubled past. Bars that make you feel you’re in Greenwich Village; seaside lofts along the old gritty shipyard canals; a state-of-the-art Titanic Museum that attracts thousands of tourists who continue on to the tours of “Game of Thrones” film locations[https://www.discovernorthernireland.com/gameofthrones/]. In Belfast, Winterfell is just around the corner.

But so is the real old troubled world of tribes, clans and a yawning sectarian divide. In West Belfast, the Peace Wall barrier continues to segregate parts of the pro-British Protestant from the pro-Irish Catholic working-class communities. If the absence of political violence is peace, then yes, there is peace. But this doesn’t mean that the society is at ease with itself. Groupthink and mistrust of the other have softened, but linger.

Then came the Brexit referendum.

On the morning of June 24, the day after the vote, the colors on the electoral map for Northern Ireland very much resembled the pattern of the conflicting camps known from the Troubles. Most Catholics voted to remain in the European Union; most Protestants wanted to leave. And although the Remain vote won over all with 56 percent, that majority will now be dragged out of the union by the government in London.

This means that a European Union border will run between Northern Ireland and the Republic, most probably with checkpoints and customs controls. Psychologically, this would be a dangerous throwback to an era most thought had passed. For Northern Ireland’s radical fringe, on both sides, it might even reactivate well-rehearsed stimulus-response patterns of decades past — of violent attacks and counterattacks. If the remnants of the Irish Republican Army needed a provocation to take up the fight again, British officials along the border might be just the ticket.

Brian John Spencer is a model citizen of post-Troubles Belfast — the “forward Northern Ireland,” as he calls it. A self-declared Protestant atheist, he is as passionate about his hometown as he is fearful for it. A painter and political blogger[http://www.brianjohnspencer.com/] turned lawyer with a hipster beard, the 29-year-old took me on a stroll through his city: the Lisburn Road with its gourmet shops and art galleries, and the Cathedral Quarter with its thriving night life.

He stopped me in front of an engraving that hangs next to a pub wall. This stone plate, Brian said, carried his favorite poem, by Maurice Craig: “It’s to hell with the future and live on the past/May the Lord in his mercy be kind to Belfast.”

Why is this prayer-poem so important to him? Because, Brian replied, he is anxious about the re-emergence not so much of widespread violence but of social regression. The forces of “backward Northern Ireland,” he said, still have the unfair advantage of ferocious temper over the new, cool Belfast: “There are these deep ancestral passions of Orange versus Green. Like many Trump supporters in the U.S., many disaffected people here believe their way of life is in lethal danger. What they have is their flag and the vanity of small differences. When they shriek, they shriek very loudly, when they lash out, they lash out very violently, in a way the cool cannot engage.”

Brexit has reinforced these anachronistic passions. At its base lies the promise of a strong sense of identity (we, the British, against them, the **immigrants**). People like Brian fear a vicious cycle: The growing legal uncertainties under Brexit could make many companies move from Belfast to Dublin; a rise in unemployment would increase frustration, catalyze a brain drain, radicalize society and endanger the social and political progress achieved over so many years.

Unfortunately, many politicians in Northern Ireland don’t seem to understand these concerns. “The details need to be worked out,” one member of the governing, pro-Brexit Democratic Unionist Party told me.

It’s a staggering understatement to call a new inner-Irish border a “detail.” But it is just one of many similar statements that betray the vast gulf between the carefree Brexit campaign and the grave consequences of its success.

Brexit is perhaps the most compelling example of the unfair advantage enjoyed in modern democracies by “shriek” scaremongering issues over sober interest politics. True, limiting **immigration** can be in the national interest. But it is also an identity issue, one that can swamp everything else — even an achievement as historic as the Northern Ireland peace process.

The Brexit fallout in Belfast and elsewhere in Northern Ireland should serve as a warning against the wider trend toward post-empirical, tribalist politics. The tendency to replace arguments with feelings makes one think of the tragic parable delivered by the Titanic, once Belfast’s proudest export. It was rationality, the hard work of many over years, that built it. It was emotion, the lust of a few for power and speed, that destroyed it in minutes.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Jochen Bittner is a political editor for the weekly newspaper Die Zeit and a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**China, with its largely cash economy, has a huge problem with tax evasion. Not just grand tax evasion, but the everyday “no receipt, please” kind, even though there have been harsh penalties: Before 2011, some forms of tax evasion were even punishable by death.

The country needed a different approach. So what did it do to get people to pay sales tax?

A. Hired a force of inspectors to raid restaurants and stores to catch people skipping the receipt, accompanied by big fines and prison terms.

B. Started an “It’s a citizen’s duty to denounce” exhortation campaign.

C. Installed cameras to photograph every transaction.

D. Turned receipts into scratch-off lottery games.

One of these things is not like the other, and that’s the answer: D. Instead of punishing under-the-table transactions, China wisely decided to encourage legal transactions by starting a receipt lottery. Many places have done this — Brazil, Chile, Malta, Portugal, Slovakia and Taiwan, among others. In Taiwan, for example, every month the tax authorities post lottery numbers; match a few numbers for a small prize, or all of them to win more than $300,000[http://www.etax.nat.gov.tw/etwmain/front/ETW183W7?id=1575fbffaa500000aff11a0c8f74577a&site=en].

China took it further. Customers need not store their receipts and wait until the end of the month to see if they’ve won money. Gratification is instant: Each receipt, known as a fapiao, is a scratch-off lottery ticket. People still game the system, but much less. The fapiao system has greatly raised collections of sales tax, business income tax and total tax. And it’s cheap to administer: one study found that new tax revenue totaled 30 times[http://www.econ.fukuoka-u.ac.jp/researchcenter/workingpapers/WP-2009-014.pdf] (PDF) the cost of the lottery prizes.

When a receipt is a lottery ticket, people ask for a receipt. They hope to get money, but just as important, they like to play games. Those axioms apply around the globe.

“We have groups that say: we can give out an incentive to our customers worth $15,” said Aron Ezra, chief executive of OfferCraft[http://www.offercraft.com], an American company that designs games for businesses. “They could do that and have everyone get an incentive for $15. But they’d get better results for the same average price by having variability — some get $10, some get $100.” The lottery makes it exciting.

The huge popularity of lotteries shows this. Another example is the Save to Win[http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/01/15/playing-the-odds-on-saving/] program, which credit unions are using in seven states. Microscopic interest rates weren’t enough to get low-income customers to save. So instead, for every $25 they put into a savings account, depositors get one lottery entry[http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/01/15/playing-the-odds-on-saving/?\_r=0]. They can win a grand prize — in some states, $10,000 — or $100 prizes every month.

What else could lotteries do?

Los Angeles and Philadelphia have been the sites of experiments to increase dismal voter turnout in local elections by choosing a voter at random to win a large cash prize. In May 2015, the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project in Los Angeles offered $25,000 to a random voter in one district during a school board election, in a project named Voteria.

What effect did Voteria have? (More than one can apply)

A. The idea created a lot of outrage.

B. It increased turnout by 46 percent among residents who had heard of it.

C. It decreased turnout; offering money made people less willing to do their civic duty.

D. The idea was declared illegal by the courts.

The answers are A and B.

Many commenters hated Voteria. “This gimmick perverts the motivation to vote,” said The Los Angeles Times[http://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-voteria-vote-to-win-cash-lottery-20150421-story.html]. But it had a large effect on turnout among residents who knew of it, according to a study led by Fernando Guerra of the Center for the Study Of Los Angeles at Loyola Marymount University. Oh, and it made a very startled Ivan Rojas, a security guard, $25,000 richer.

Guerra told a local radio program that Voteria was unique among nonpartisan efforts to increase turnout. “We don’t have anything that’s been as successful as this, at least that political science literature has been able to capture,” he said.

After Los Angeles conducted Voteria, The Philadelphia Citizen, a newspaper that publishes a column titled “Ideas We Should Steal,” stole it. The paper got a $10,000 grant from the foundation of its chief investor to create a Philly Voteria for the mayor’s race. “Yes, we’re that desperate,” said The Citizen[http://thephiladelphiacitizen.org/it-pays-to-vote/]. Among people who were aware of the idea, turnout increased by 5 percent.

Voteria raised a lot of issues. In Los Angeles it was selectively applied in a largely Latino district. It is a gimmick — it draws attention to voter **alienation**, but offers no real solution. And were the lottery-motivated voters informed voters, or did they pull a random lever?

A counterargument is that millions of dollars are spent in elections — including public money in many places — in ways that **alienate** and misinform voters. Why is a lottery worse?

Sweden’s Speed Camera Lottery, instead of just ticketing speeders, also rewarded drivers going at or below the speed limit. They could enter a lottery with a grand prize of $3,000 — prize money culled from the proceeds of speeding tickets.

[Video: The Speed Camera Lottery - The Fun Theory Watch on YouTube.[http://youtube.com/embed/iynzHWwJXaA]]

What were the results?

A. The accident rate went up, as drivers slowed down too suddenly.

B. Average speed in a 30 k.p.h. (18.6 m.p.h.) zone dropped from 32 k.p.h. (20 m.p.h.) to 25 k.p.h. (15.5 m.p.h.).

C. It had no effect.

D. The average speed dropped and stayed down, even after the lottery ended.

It’s B.

The idea came from Kevin Richardson, an American entertainment industry executive and game producer. The concept itself was the result of a game: Richardson had won a contest, sponsored by Volkswagen[http://www.thefuntheory.com], to devise enjoyable methods to help people change their behavior.

But even though the average speed dropped while the camera was up, the effect quickly vanished when the experiment ended. Sweden tried the camera in five other places. On average, speed was reduced by 8 percent, which would cut fatal accidents by 32 percent. Swedish traffic officials concluded that while the lottery was effective, it would have to be in use continuously.

But Sweden didn’t expand or continue the speed lottery, and no one else has used it. Richardson has a theory about why: “Sweden was very open to it because their goal is to achieve zero traffic deaths,” he said. “While in the U.S.A. and other countries, giving tickets is a revenue-generating thing and the idea of getting rid of it would be abhorrent to somebody.”

Like any scheme to pay people to do things they should be doing anyway, lotteries have their critics.

One fear is that enforcing norms with money could make things worse: if people are rewarded for good behavior, they tend to think of it as an economic choice and not a moral one. That can weaken the social norms that are often a more powerful enforcer of rules.

On the other hand, people are fined for bad behavior all the time. Rewarding them for good behavior is essentially the same action, in reverse. Insurance companies have good driver discounts, for example. That’s just a more pleasant way to say that they charge bad drivers more.

One big market for lotteries is in promoting health. Such lotteries have been used to get people to:

A. Be screened for tuberculosis.

B. Have safer sex.

C. Keep their medical appointments.

D. All of the above.

It’s D, of course.

Health-related lotteries aren’t new. In 1957, Glasgow held a mass X-ray campaign to diagnose tuberculosis. Health officials aimed to X-ray 250,000 people and in the end got three times that many. One reason for the enthusiasm: a weekly prize draw. A lovely vintage newsreel[http://www.britishpathe.com/video/mass-assault-on-t-b] reported on the campaign.

More than 50 years later, researchers set up a lottery among young adults in Lesotho, designed to promote safe sex practices. Every four months the subjects were tested for two sexually transmitted diseases, syphilis and trichonomiasis. A negative test got them entered into a lottery to win either $50 (equivalent to a week’s average salary) or $100. The idea was to see if incentives to reduce the spread of syphilis would also protect against HIV.

The results[http://papers.ssrn.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2580589] were significant — a 21.4 percent reduction in the rate of new H.I.V. infections, and a 3.4 percent lower prevalence rate of HIV in the treatment group after two years. And the effect was lasting — the gains persisted a year after the experiment ended. The lottery worked in large part because it was most attractive to those most at risk: many people who take sexual risks also enjoy taking monetary risks, and might be eager to play a lottery.

The authors wrote in a blog post[https://blogs.worldbank.org/impactevaluations/risk-sex-and-lotteries-can-lotteries-be-used-incentives-prevent-risky-behaviors]: “To the best of our knowledge, this is the first H.I.V. prevention intervention focusing on sexual behavior changes (as opposed to medical interventions) to have been demonstrated to lead to a significant reduction in H.I.V. incidence, the ultimate objective of any H.I.V. prevention intervention.”

Back in America, almost every medical clinic has a big no-show problem. All patients suffer, because to compensate for no-shows, clinics book multiple patients for the same slot — hence the 12-minute doctor’s appointment.

OfferCraft worked with one clinic where the no-show rate was 50 percent, said Ezra. The clinic had tried fining people when they didn’t come to their appointments. This increased attendance slightly, but patients hated it, and it was very difficult to collect the fines.

So the clinic set up a lottery. When patients checked out and made their follow-up appointment, they were invited to play a Spinning Wheel game. A prize was certain, but they didn’t know if they’d won a $10, $50 or $150 gift card. To find out and receive their prize, they had to keep their appointment.

The no-show rate dropped to below 30 percent.

Why not just hold a lottery for $150? “In a traditional lottery system lots of people assume, well, I’m not going to win,” said Ezra. “The results are stronger when you know you’ve won something.”

Games can provide powerful incentives for just about any behavior. (And perhaps the quizzes in this column kept you reading to the end.) So let’s play one more game: Tweet your best ideas for using a lottery, using #GameMyFix.

Could a lottery for graduates reduce school dropout? Would a chance at a big prize get people into the gym? Could it keep ex-offenders from falling back into crime? How about a lottery for carpoolers? People who reduce their home water consumption by 15 percent?

We’d love to be able to enter those tweets in a prize lottery, but that’s against Times rules. So we’ll choose the best ideas, publish them, and put them in front of people who might use them. Maybe, as with the speed camera, someone will take your idea out for a low-speed spin.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Tina Rosenberg won a Pulitzer Prize for her book "The Haunted Land: Facing Europe’s Ghosts After Communism." She is a former editorial writer for The Times and the author, most recently, of "Join the Club: How Peer Pressure Can Transform the World" and the World War II spy story e-book " D for Deception." She is a co-founder of the Solutions Journalism Network, which supports rigorous reporting about responses to social problems. Join Fixes on Facebook and follow updates on twitter.com/nytimesfixes. To receive e-mail alerts for Fixes columns, sign up here.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In New York politics, the city’s district attorneys have long been the edifices of elective office: legal lions presiding for years — often decades — over courthouse fiefs beyond the influence even of City Hall.

Robert M. Morgenthau[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/robert\_m\_morgenthau/index.html?inline=nyt-per], Manhattan’s district attorney from 1975 to 2009, was the classic example, his tenure spanning the terms of five mayors and his imprint on New York so lasting that for some residents, the letters “D.A.” still call to mind an image of his face. But there have, of course, been others: Charles J. Hynes[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/h/charles\_j\_hynes/index.html?inline=nyt-per] spent 23 years as Brooklyn’s district attorney. Robert T. Johnson served 26 years as the district attorney in the Bronx. And Richard A. Brown, the last remaining fixture of the old guard, is now in his 25th year as the top prosecutor in Queens[http://nyti.ms/1mdrGBo].

With his death on Sunday [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/nyregion/ken-thompson-brooklyns-first-black-district-attorney-dies-at-50.html] from cancer, Ken Thompson, a Democrat who was until this weekend Brooklyn’s district attorney, will never achieve the longevity of some who have held the same position. And though he was in the job for only three years, his agenda — a more selective, less reflexively law-and-order approach to prosecution — may endure.

While it is impossible to predict his legacy, Mr. Thompson, 50, took office at an opportune time in the consciousness of the city and the country. His pledge to restore a sense of racial justice to his constituents in Brooklyn came at a time of heightened tension between law enforcement officers and minority communities. And he arrived in the district attorney’s office amid slow but steady change in how prosecutors across the country view their role in the criminal justice system — a shift that Mr. Thompson both embraced and advanced.

“It’s likely that had he been in office longer, he could have made these changes even bigger,” said John Pfaff, a professor at Fordham Law School who has studied the role of district attorneys in the criminal justice system. “He had the right attitude and right position, as the D.A. of the second- or third-largest county in America, but he didn’t have the time. In some sense, he ends up being more of a reflection of the change than a cause.”

In recent years, much of the debate about reforming law enforcement has centered on the police. Activist movements like Black Lives Matter and governmental efforts like the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing[http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/policingtaskforce] have concentrated on effecting change within police departments and among street-level officers, if only because the most visible examples of misconduct have been carried out by those in uniform — many of them captured, viscerally, on video.

But district attorneys wield enormous power, too, and it is frequently overlooked or is cloaked in a kind of institutional invisibility. They decide not only whom to prosecute, but also how aggressively to prosecute, and play a crucial role in determining what sentences some defendants will eventually receive.

“There’s not really a full understanding of the important role that prosecutors play in the system and the scope of their powers,” said Meg Reiss, the executive director of the Institute for Innovation in Prosecution[https://nnscommunities.org/our-work/iip] at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. “But prosecutors have the utmost discretion in the process, and the repercussions of that discretion extend beyond individual cases into families and communities.”

Though he could be a prickly manager and was recently fined[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/25/nyregion/ken-thompson-brooklyn-district-attorney-conflict-of-interest-case.html] for using taxpayer money to buy his daily meals, Mr. Thompson instinctively grasped the broader implications of his work, Ms. Reiss and others said, and established policies that sought to mitigate the damaging effects of overprosecution. He is perhaps best known for announcing early in his term that he would no longer prosecute many low-level marijuana cases[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/09/nyregion/brooklyn-district-attorney-to-stop-prosecuting-low-level-marijuana-cases.html], a decision that occasioned a fight with the New York Police Department[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/new\_york\_city\_police\_department/index.html?inline=nyt-org]. He also expanded Mr. Hynes’s Conviction Review Unit, transforming it into a national model that in the last two years alone has exonerated more than 20 people found guilty of crimes they did not commit. Then there was his program called Begin Again[http://brooklynda.org/begin-again/], which allowed Brooklyn residents with summonses and warrants for many small offenses to easily clear their names.

“Many prosecutors — Thompson, among them — have recognized that they need to pick more carefully the cases where they use the full force of the state,” Ronald Wright, a professor at the Wake Forest University School of Law, said. “They’re beginning to treat the big cases like they’re big cases, but the small cases like they’re small cases.”

Mr. Thompson was not alone in this approach. Cyrus R. Vance[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/cyrus-r-vance-jr] Jr.[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/cyrus-r-vance-jr], who succeeded Mr. Morgenthau as the Manhattan district attorney, has been praised for his holistic view of prosecution, as have new top prosecutors in Chicago, Milwaukee and Wilmington, N.C.

“All over the country, in big cities especially, crime prevention has become a crime-fighting strategy,” Mr. Vance said. “At the end of the day, you want to keep the gun out of the kid’s hand, not prosecute him if you can. There’s been a real focus in many offices on outreach to communities and prosecution strategies designed to do more than simply process cases in the courtroom.” Mr. Thompson, he added, “immediately embraced that philosophy and set out to place his mark on it.”

Mr. Thompson’s biography was notable for his roles as an ally and an adversary of the police. He was the son of a police officer and a former federal prosecutor who made his name by working on the team that prosecuted Justin A. Volpe[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/v/justin\_a\_volpe/index.html], a New York City police officer who pleaded guilty to torturing Abner Louima, a Haitian **immigrant**, with a broken broomstick in a Brooklyn station house in 1997.

Mr. Thompson’s desire to hold the police accountable while remaining sympathetic to the unique challenges that officers face was evident in his handling of the complicated case of Peter Liang, a former officer who was convicted in February[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/12/nyregion/officer-peter-liang-convicted-in-fatal-shooting-of-akai-gurley-in-brooklyn.html] of fatally shooting an unarmed black man, Akai Gurley.

Given the traditionally close working relationship between the police and district attorneys, it was not an easy decision to prosecute Mr. Liang, a rookie officer who by all accounts fired the lethal shot accidentally as he and his partner patrolled a stairwell in a Brooklyn housing project. But similarly difficult was Mr. Thompson’s subsequent decision to seek no time in prison for Mr. Liang, a move that enraged Mr. Gurley’s family and drew bitter protest[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/17/nyregion/ken-thompson-liberal-brooklyn-prosecutor-faces-unlikely-foes-liberal-activists.html] from criminal justice activists.

Just six days ago, Mr. Thompson announced in a public statement[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/nyregion/ken-thompson-brooklyn-district-attorney-cancer.html] that his chief assistant, Eric Gonzalez, would be taking over the office as he sought treatment for his illness. Now that he is dead, Mr. Gonzalez will assume the role of interim district attorney.

Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo of New York, a Democrat, has the power to name a permanent replacement, though his aides said on Monday that the governor had not yet decided whether to appoint someone. “The options are being reviewed,” Rich Azzopardi, a spokesman for the governor’s office, said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The arsonists appear to operate with little deference to class, equally at ease scorching a shiny new BMW or Mercedes as they are setting a battered old van ablaze.

And they almost always follow a pattern — smashing a window and dousing the interior of the vehicle with gasoline before setting it on fire.

At least 185 cars have been set ablaze in Copenhagen, the Danish capital, so far this year, the police say, with a sudden and mysterious increase over the past two months or so, when about 80 automobiles were burned.

Car burning has long been a potent and extreme example of urban revolt in some countries — France in 2005[http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/04/world/europe/rioting-spreads-in-paris-suburbs-as-angry-youths-burn-more.html], in particular. But it is particularly jarring for Danes, who have long taken pride in their country’s social harmony and in being ranked among the happiest people[http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p026jgt9] on the planet.

“It is a mystery why this is happening, and there has been a big increase over the last few months and that is worrying,” said Jens Moller Jensen, a detective inspector with the Copenhagen police, charged with investigating the attacks. He said that he had expected a roughly 40 percent increase in car burnings this year compared with the previous year, and that the police had created a special unit to investigate them and had ratcheted up patrols. “I am working on several hypotheses,” he added.

The cars are always empty, so no one has been hurt or killed. In late September, the police arrested a 17-year-old male, but provided no further details.

As the motives and identities of the attackers remain a mystery, speculation is growing. Violent nihilism or rage? **Immigrant** angst? Simple boredom or, perhaps, large-scale insurance fraud?

One theory is that cars in Denmark[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/denmark/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] are being burned by individuals from an angry underclass in a country where far-right groups have organized bitter protests against **immigration**, calling it a threat to the nation’s identity. The government has recently clamped down on migration, introducing a law requiring recently arrived asylum seekers to hand over valuables[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/27/world/europe/denmark-asks-refugees-for-valuables.html], like jewelry or gold, to help pay for their stay in the country.

“It is a bit like an infection that has spread,” said Frank Hvilsom[https://twitter.com/frankhvilsom], a crime reporter for Politiken, a leading Danish newspaper. “At a time when we have a toxic debate about **immigration** in this country and **immigrants** are being told, ‘You are not Danish,’ this could be the work of attention seekers who are trying to disturb society and are saying, ‘Let us show you what we can do.’ ”

Even after the Danish police arrested a 21-year-old man[https://www.thelocal.dk/20160825/21-year-old-man-arrested-for-copenhagen-car-fires] in August in relation to the arson, cars continued to burn. Mr. Moller Jensen said that both of the men who were arrested came from a working-class neighborhood in Amager, a Danish island. Playing down the idea that the burnings could be related to **immigration**, he said that one suspect was an ethnic Dane, while the other was not.

Mr. Moller Jensen said the car burning[http://www.citylab.com/crime/2016/09/car-fires-sweden-denmark/499997/] may have spread from neighboring Sweden[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/sweden/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], where more than 70 cars have been burned in the city of Malmo since early July. Dozens of cars have also been set on fire in Stockholm, and Goteborg, on the west coast of the country. Car burning has become such a scourge there that the Swedish authorities have turned to drones[https://www.thelocal.se/20160818/malmo-police-deploy-drone-to-catch-fire-starters] to try to catch the arsonists.

He said that he had his theories of what was behind the car fires, but that he did not want to undermine his investigation by divulging too much. “I’d be a bad cop if I put money on one of them,” he said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(Want to get this briefing by email? Here’s the sign-up[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/nyt-now-evening-briefing].)

Good evening. Here’s the latest.

1. The presidential race grew more tumultuous the day after a debate our TV critic described as beyond rock bottom[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/arts/television/donald-trump-hillary-clinton-second-debate.html].

The top elected Republican leader, House Speaker Paul Ryan, said he would no longer defend the party’s candidate, Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/us/politics/donald-trump-gop-hillary-clinton.html].

Mr. Ryan’s effective concession of the race to Hillary Clinton set off a furious backlash among the party’s Trump supporters, and Mr. Trump tweeted, “Paul Ryan should spend more time on balancing the budget, jobs and illegal **immigration** and not waste his time on fighting Republican nominee.”

And a new set of leaked emails from Mrs. Clinton’s campaign chairman[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/politics/hillary-clinton-emails-wikileaks.html] reveals bitter disputes within her team over Bernie Sanders and other points.

\_\_\_\_

2. Hurricane Matthew’s death toll in the U.S. climbed to at least 21[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/hurricane-matthew.html]. In South Carolina, above, Gov. Nikki Haley lifted the last evacuation orders, allowing some residents to begin returning to their homes.

The death toll has been difficult to track in Haiti, the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. In Jérémie, a small coastal city that had finally begun to prosper[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/world/americas/jeremie-haiti-hurricane-matthew.html] in recent years, the grim work of counting the bodies and assessing the damage is just beginning.

\_\_\_\_

3. In Yemen, airstrikes on a funeral killed more than 100 people in Sana[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/world/middleeast/yemen-saudi-arabia-military.html], the capital, on Saturday. Officials and witnesses blamed the military coalition led by Saudi Arabia[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/world/middleeast/us-navy-ship-attacked-near-yemen.html] for the attacks.

The U.S. said it would conduct “an immediate review” of its support for the Saudi-led coalition fighting against Houthi rebels.

\_\_\_\_

4. Coca-Cola and PepsiCo have given millions of dollars to health groups in recent years. They have also spent millions trying to stop laws aimed at reducing how much soda people drink.

A new study in the American Journal of Preventive Medicine documents[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/well/eat/coke-and-pepsi-give-millions-to-public-health-then-lobby-against-it.html] the beverage industry’s strategy to silence health critics and win over unlikely allies against soda regulations.

\_\_\_\_

5. Samsung halted production and sales of its Galaxy Note 7[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/business/samsung-galaxy-note-fires.html] amid reports that the smartphones sometimes catch fire. It said consumers who own them “should power down and stop using the device.”

The company is the world’s largest smartphone manufacturer and had been counting on the Galaxy to help it close the gap with Apple, its biggest rival, which has a strong hold on the more expensive end of the market.

.\_\_\_\_

6. The Nobel Prize in economics went to two professors for their insights into how best to write contracts

Oliver Hart and Bengt Holmstrom[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/business/nobel-economics-oliver-hart-bengt-holmstrom.html], above, professors at Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, have sought to show how contracts can ensure that the parties are bound by mutual interest.

The Nobel Prize in Literature will be awarded Thursday.

\_\_\_\_

7. With Colombia’s peace deal in doubt, a small town that lost dozens of residents in the war fears a return to violence.

Fourteen years ago, a mortar fired by FARC rebels landed on a church in Bojayá, above, killing 79, more than half of them children.

But 96 percent of the town voted in favor[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/world/americas/colombia-peace-deal.html] of the peace deal in a referendum this month, showing the deep desire — almost desperation — for an end to the war.

“In order to live in peace, you have to disassemble your heart,” one resident said.

\_\_\_\_

8. “Go back to China!” That was the ugly phrase yelled at a Times editor and his family on the New York City street above after church on Sunday morning.

Michael Luo was born in the U.S., the child of Chinese **immigrants**. His open letter to the woman who screamed the phrase[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/nyregion/to-the-woman-who-told-my-family-to-go-back-to-china.html] has gone viral.

After the incident, his 7-year-old daughter asked why the woman said that when they’re not from China. “No, we’re not, my wife said,” he wrote. “We’re from America, she told my daughter. But sometimes people don’t understand that.”

\_\_\_\_

9. Don’t worry about the five-second rule at home — but do wash your hands often.

That’s according to a pediatrician who was a co-author of a book on medical myths, and who flouts the rule himself.

“Things get dirty when lots of hands touch them and when we don’t think about it,” Aaron Carroll writes[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/upshot/im-a-doctor-if-i-drop-food-on-the-kitchen-floor-i-still-eat-it.html].

\_\_\_\_

10. Say you’re a star soccer player and you want the latest cellphone, or someone to do your Christmas shopping, or to propose to your girlfriend.

There’s a guy for that: Charles Porter.

To hundreds of players in English soccer over the last 20 years, Mr. Porter is the ultimate purveyor of the Premier League lifestyle. And while he could easily write a salacious memoir, breaking the omertà of his trade would be anathema to him.

“We live and die by our discretion,” he said in his first-ever newspaper interview[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/sports/soccer/premier-league-lifestyle-fixer.html].

Your Evening Briefing is posted at 6 p.m. Eastern.

And don’t miss Your Morning Briefing, posted weekdays at 6 a.m. Eastern, and Your Weekend Briefing, posted at 6 a.m. Sundays.

Want to look back? Here’s the Weekend B[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/briefing/donald-trump-florida-nobel-prize.html] riefing[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/briefing/donald-trump-florida-nobel-prize.html].

What did you like? What do you want to see here? Let us know at briefing@nytimes.com[mailto:briefing@nytimes.com].

Karen Workman contributed reporting.

\* Donald Trump, Florida, Nobel Prize: Your Weekend Briefing[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/briefing/donald-trump-florida-nobel-prize.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — Outside, a ribbon of lights swept up Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Capitol, and there was not a protester in sight. Inside the month-old Trump International Hotel, a Romanesque Revival structure just as grand, the second presidential debate had begun.

About 150 people — Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] supporters mostly — had come Sunday night to watch the Fox News strain of the event, broadcast on four screens behind Benjamin’s Bar & Lounge, which occupies about a third of the vast lobby floor.

It was an odd assemblage of out-of-town tourists and locals out for a lark. But the Pilsner Urquell was ice-cold. A distinctive rosé from Lebanon, resembling a pinot noir, could be had for $15 a glass. To eat, there was the surprisingly good smashed avocado on toast (a happy hour bargain, $5!) the East and West Coast oysters ($38 a dozen) and the four-shrimp cocktail ($24).

All could be enjoyed while nestling in high-back bar stools of navy blue tufted velvet. Channing DeVoueroix came early to claim one, and to sip Trump sparkling wine, approvingly. Ms. DeVoueroix, a retired teacher and interior designer from Virginia, splits her time between Coronado, Calif., and the Kalorama neighborhood of Washington. Like many of the other patrons in the bar, she was not staying at the hotel but thought its bar would be a good place to watch the candidates clash.

Before that schoolyard brawl even started, she had already grown weary of the Trump campaign’s latest controversy, she said, generated by the Republican candidate’s “hot mike” moment on a bus shared with Billy Bush, who was egging him on.

“American women are far too interested in how they’re treated, and are too quick to say, ‘So and so shouldn’t have done or said that to her,”’ Ms. DeVoueroix said. “Women today are always stomping our feet. We should sit back and relax and be in our own bodies and not somebody else’s.”

Ms. DeVoueroix, who is divorced and has four children, said she counted Ronald Reagan as a friend, and met Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] at a first ladies luncheon, when Bill Clinton occupied the Oval Office. “I hope Hillary says something different tonight, something specific, about how she’s going to deal the national debt[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/n/national\_debt\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], North Korea or the Middle East, not just those empty slogans about the environment and education,” she said.

Then, Ms. DeVoueroix turned her attention to her oysters.

Those not seated at the bar milled about, bewildered, like spectators at a rock concert in a high school gym: happy to be there, but not quite sure what to expect. Sturdy carts of cheese and charcuterie trundled past, pushed by unsure waiters making infrequent stops.

Already, the place seemed like a tourist attraction, where spectacle could be had, with two kids in tow, for the cost of a David Burke dry-aged burger. As for said burger, a bartender waved off one ordered medium-rare, mindful of out-of-town tastes, and instead it arrived medium, dry and dull.

Working on his second margarita, Steven Brignoli, a bearded former Special Forces officer, thrust his fists into the air and thundered, “Yes!” as Mr. Trump declared himself “a gentleman,” and, if elected, promised to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate Hillary Clinton’s emails. “Yes!” Mr. Brignoli yelled back at the screen.

“O.K., he’s not perfect,” Mr. Brignoli said. “But I look at this election in terms of playing a game of Russian roulette. Do we play it with a revolver or an automatic rifle? We need separation from the liberal policies we’ve been dealing with for the past 20 to 30 years. We need to recapture the American dream.”

Mr. Brignoli thumbed open his dark blue sport coat to reveal a custom T-shirt: “Trump/Brignoli.” No more Mike Pence. Asked his current occupation, Mr. Brignoli went quiet. Sporting a cashmere cape and four-inch heels that sparkled in the light cast by crystal chandeliers hung overhead, his girlfriend, who works in retail, interjected, “Just say badass.”

Nearby, Magalie Durot, a young woman originally from Metz, France, who was wearing workout gear, settled in. She said she is the owner of a Chicago-based company that imports natural hair and skin care products and was five weeks away from receiving her American citizenship. Ms. Durot said she came “more for the entertainment value than to hear any serious policy discussion.”

Her friend Stuart Levine, a real estate developer, had already shrugged off the 11-year-old tape, as Mr. Trump repeated his rare (and somewhat unconvincing, to those in the room) apology. “That thing happened in 2005, so it’s old news,” Mr. Levine said. “It won’t be a big deal tonight, and Trump will blow right through it.”

Why support Mr. Trump? “We’ve never had a businessman as president,” he said. “We need one now, and Republicans finally voted against the establishment.”

Mindful of the bizarre appearance before the debate of Mr. Trump and the women who had accused Bill Clinton of sexual assault, Ms. Durot reached for her glass of Medoc and tilted her head toward the television. “Trump is going very low,” she said. “He had to dig far down to find them. Everything he does moves further away from the real purpose of having a presidential debate. Hillary is for the smart people. Trump is for the dumb people.”

Bill McCarthy, a former union executive just in from Boston, was eager to add an Ethiopian perspective. “Obama deserted the Ethiopian people, according to my taxi driver on the way in from the airport, and Hillary didn’t support Ethiopia, either,” he said. “So, the guy said, 2,000 D.C. cabdrivers are going to vote for Trump.”

An indefatigable golfer and frequent visitor to Trump golf courses, Mr. McCarthy beamed when asked about their facilities. “There’s always an American flag flying,” he said. “Mr. Trump is a true patriot.” And, on **immigration**: “Hillary’s interpretation of **immigration** policy is too porous,” he said. “Trump is the only one who can bring back law and order.”

As has been widely reported[http://www.usatoday.com/story/travel/roadwarriorvoices/2016/09/12/donald-trump-washington-dc-hotel/90249246/], Mr. Trump spent $200 million transforming the building, the Old Post Office Pavilion, the city’s main post office until 1914. During the debate, very few guests checked in. During the debate, very few guests checked in, and only a handful of people descended the elevators. The hotel’s steakhouse, BLT Prime by David Burke, sat virtually empty. With the exception of one man at the bar wearing a football sweatshirt, the only African-Americans were staff members.

As the debate neared its close, Mrs. Clinton talked renewable energy. “Bring back coal!” blurted out a young guy in hipster dress or something as close to that as Washington can muster, to loud applause. A middle-age woman wearing a standard Washington-issue strand of pearls said: “We’re being asked to support a liar or a rogue. Go rogue!” She drew whoops of endorsement.

“I respect the Second Amendment,” Mrs. Clinton said.

“You do not,” two young men in plaid shirts and drinking white wine hollered in unison.

Asked their main reason for supporting Mr. Trump, they demurred: “We’re individuals, and we don’t speak to the media. Have a nice night. Go away.”

When Mr. Trump said, “Hillary is the devil!” Benjamin’s Bar shuddered in agreement, and Mr. Brignoli shot his arms into the air, like a victorious prizefighter, shouting, “She is!”

Looking glum, Anderson Cooper and Martha Raddatz signed off, as the bartenders in Benjamin’s passed around free glasses of Trump sparkling wine, which were quickly drained.

Mr. Levine leaned over to his skeptical friend from France and smiled in triumph. “Magalie, my dear,” he said, “are you still sure you want to become an American citizen?”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

House Speaker Paul D. Ryan dealt a hammer blow to Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s presidential candidacy Monday, dashing any remaining semblance of party unity and inviting fierce backlash from his own caucus by announcing that he would no longer defend Mr. Trump’s candidacy.

Mr. Ryan’s stance drew an immediate rebuke from Mr. Trump, who posted on Twitter that Mr. Ryan should focus on governing instead of feuding with him.

Paul Ryan should spend more time on balancing the budget, jobs and illegal **immigration** and not waste his time on fighting Republican nominee — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) October 10, 2016[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/785530928256933888]

But Mr. Ryan informed Republican lawmakers on a morning conference call that he would never again campaign alongside Mr. Trump and would dedicate himself instead to defending the party’s majority in Congress, according to five lawmakers who participated in the call and spoke on condition of anonymity.

Effectively conceding defeat for his party in the presidential race, Mr. Ryan said his most urgent task was ensuring that Hillary Clinton did not enter the White House with Democratic control of the House and Senate, two lawmakers said.

The reaction from hard-liners was swift and angry: Over the course of an hour, a stream of conservative lawmakers spoke up to urge their colleagues not to give up on Mr. Trump, and chided Mr. Ryan for surrendering prematurely in the presidential race.

One member, Representative Dana Rohrabacher of California, attacked Republicans stepping away from Mr. Trump as “cowards,” three lawmakers said. Another, Representative Trent Franks of Arizona, used graphic language to describe abortion and said allowing Mrs. Clinton into the White House would end with fetuses being destroyed “limb from limb.”

In an effort to quiet the uproar, Mr. Ryan chimed back in after about 45 minutes to assure members that he was not withdrawing his endorsement of Mr. Trump, but rather doing what he considered to be in the best interests of the House.

Mr. Trump appeared indifferent to the distinction, lashing back at Mr. Ryan with a belittling message on Twitter.

“Paul Ryan should spend more time on balancing the budget, jobs and illegal **immigration** and not waste his time on fighting Republican nominee,” Mr. Trump wrote in his Twitter post.

AshLee Strong, a spokeswoman for Mr. Ryan, confirmed that his sole priority for the remainder of the election would be defending congressional Republicans.

“The speaker is going to spend the next month focused entirely on protecting our congressional majorities,” Ms. Strong said.

Ms. Strong said there was “no update” regarding Mr. Ryan’s endorsement of Mr. Trump.

The breach between Mr. Ryan and Mr. Trump concluded five months in which the two men have alternated between friction and courtship, eventually forging an uneasy working relationship only to see it collapse in the final weeks of the race.

The consequences for both men are enormous. Mr. Ryan and other Republican leaders fear that Mr. Trump’s flagging campaign could unwind their majorities in the House and Senate, while Mr. Trump can ill afford rejection from more prominent Republicans.

Mr. Trump’s candidacy was already in a dire condition before Mr. Ryan’s announcement. A poll[http://graphics.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/wsjnbcpoll/] published Monday by NBC News and The Wall Street Journal found him trailing Mrs. Clinton by a wide margin and drawing less than 40 percent of the vote. The survey was taken before Sunday night’s debate.

Representative Scott Rigell of Virginia, a Republican who has long been opposed to Mr. Trump, said there was a general sense in the House that more humiliating disclosures about Mr. Trump were likely to come before Nov. 8, Election Day.

“There’s a consensus, even among supporters, that the likelihood of something else breaking in a very embarrassing and negative fashion, is certainly better than 50-50,” said Mr. Rigell, who joined the call on Monday. “The conference, members, et cetera, are bracing themselves for another salvo of this.”

Speaking to reporters aboard Mrs. Clinton’s campaign plane on Monday, Jennifer Palmieri, her communications director, made it clear the campaign intended to tie down-ballot Republicans to Mr. Trump with a new fervor — after months of casting his candidacy as a dangerous anomaly.

“There was a time where they could have stopped Donald Trump. There was a time where they could have spoken out against him,” Ms. Palmieri said of senior Republicans like Mr. Ryan. “That time was this summer. Obviously it is too late now.”

Mr. Trump’s campaign had hoped that the debate would halt an exodus of fellow Republicans from his candidacy, and it publicly implored members of the party on Monday morning to hang with him through Election Day.

In an effort at reassurance, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, Mr. Trump’s running mate, toured the morning television shows to tamp down speculation that he might leave the ticket. At a campaign stop in North Carolina, Mr. Pence said he was “proud to stand with Donald Trump.”

But in a potentially ominous sign for the party, Kellyanne Conway, Mr. Trump’s campaign manager, also offered a note of warning for Republicans fleeing Mr. Trump. Mr. Ryan, she noted on television, had been booed by Trump fans over the weekend in Wisconsin after asking Mr. Trump not to attend a political event in his home state.

Ms. Conway also repeatedly indicated that she was aware of Republican lawmakers who had behaved inappropriately toward young women, and whose criticism of Mr. Trump was therefore hypocritical.

Mr. Ryan’s huddle with House Republicans was the first of multiple war councils in Washington on Monday, as Republicans weighed how to handle a nominee whose campaign has appeared to unravel in recent days.

The Republican National Committee, which has been fiercely loyal to Mr. Trump, was to hold a conference call with its members later in the afternoon. In contrast to the mounting defections from Mr. Trump’s campaign among Republican elected officials, the party chairman, Reince Priebus, has remained close to Mr. Trump and flew with him to the debate in St. Louis over the weekend.

As telling as the fury from outspoken conservatives in the House was the silence from so many mainstream Republicans in the chamber, who showed little appetite to argue for or with their embattled nominee.

Few anti-Trump voices spoke up on the call with Mr. Ryan. Representative Martha Roby of Alabama, a defector from Mr. Trump on Saturday, said she would contribute significant funds to help Republicans hold the House majority. But she said she would speak with colleagues in private about her decision to withdraw her endorsement in the presidential race.

Representative Charlie Dent of Pennsylvania, a vocal critic of Mr. Trump, asked his colleagues if they were truly confident that there would be no more damaging disclosures about Mr. Trump. In any case, Mr. Dent argued that the presidential race was now effectively over for Mr. Trump.

No new prominent Republicans have withdrawn their endorsements from Mr. Trump since the end of the debate, but there was a palpable fear throughout the party that Mr. Trump had already been damaged beyond repair.

Representative Greg Walden of Oregon, chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, urged members on the conference call to take new polls in their districts to gauge the impact of Mr. Trump’s political slide.

Mr. Walden said they should brace for a steep erosion of support for Mr. Trump and acknowledged the falloff could undermine congressional candidates, too. He asked the entire caucus to contribute quickly to the party’s campaign arm, making it clear they needed to bolster their defenses across the country.

Still, many members were pointed in their expressions of dismay, warning Mr. Ryan of grave consequences, in November and beyond, if Mr. Trump’s campaign collapses altogether. Representative Billy Long of Missouri spoke up in Mr. Trump’s defense, citing the danger of losing the Supreme Court in the event of a Clinton victory.

“Many of us commented that if Hillary picks the next two to four judges, it will change the fabric of our country of 40, 50 years,” Mr. Long said of the call. “Abortion and the Second Amendment, also, and lots of Supreme Court concerns.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Matt Flegenheimer contributed reporting.

Correction: October 10, 2016, Monday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An earlier version of this article misstated the number of women Donald J. Trump held a news conference with to accuse Bill Clinton of sexual misdeeds. It was three, not four. A fourth woman at the event criticized Hillary Clinton for providing legal representation for a man accused of raping a child.

\* In Second Debate, Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Spar in Bitter, Personal Terms[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

\* Debate Takeaways: Clinton Is Still Standing, and Trump Isn’t Going Away[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/us/politics/debate-highlights.html]

\* Donald Trump Talks at Debate, but Many Women Hear Only a 2005 Tape[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/politics/donald-trump-women-hillary-clinton.html]

\* Donald Trump Acknowledges Not Paying Federal Income Taxes for Years[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/politics/donald-trump-taxes.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Watching Republican leaders and talking heads spin themselves dizzy over the second presidential debate would be entertaining if the situation was not so tragic.

Here’s what we are supposed to believe happened: Donald Trump won the debate because he’s not dropping out or getting forced out by his own party, because his running mate, Mike Pence, did not quit the race and because the speaker of the House, Paul Ryan, did not withdraw his endorsement.

Yes, a growing number of Republican officials are now denouncing Trump. And Ryan told his fellow Republican lawmakers in a conference call on Monday that he wasn’t going to campaign for Trump – as if Trump cares. But all of that is too little, too late.

The Republicans who say they changed their minds about Trump because of the 2005 video in which he brags about sexually assaulting women are particularly galling. The video was disgusting, but it showed us nothing new about Trump. He’s been insulting women all year, along with Mexican **immigrants**, Muslims, gay Americans and people with disabilities.

On Sunday, Trump showed once again that this race is and has always been about his ego, and about sexism, racism, isolationism, fear and anger. It is about hating President Obama, mostly because he is African-American. It is about the hard right trying to seize control of Washington so it can roll back half a century of economic, racial and social progress.

I’ve never believed that the Republican leadership really disagreed with Trump’s fringe views. They just didn’t like the way he expressed them, because it exposed some powerful and disturbing currents in their party. Even Ryan’s rather tepid denunciation of Trump provoked howls of outrage[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/11/us/politics/donald-trump-gop-hillary-clinton.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=a-lede-package-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] from some of the more extreme Republicans in Congress.

So it was not in the least surprising that Pence was back to prais[https://twitter.com/mike\_pence/status/785310165327151104] ing Trump[https://twitter.com/mike\_pence/status/785310165327151104] after the debate, or that right-wing commentators were trying to help the nominee repair whatever damage that 2005 video may have caused.

Guy Benson, political editor of the conservative website Townhall, said[https://twitter.com/guypbenson/status/785309276721950721]: “He improved, exceeded expectations, decisively won several exchanges.”

When expectations are somewhere below rock bottom, it’s not hard to exceed them. And to think Trump “won” his exchanges with Clinton, you’d have to give him points for getting the audience to hoot derisively when he said he wanted to put her in jail.

Pence said Trump “was able to move beyond that controversy” over the 2005 tape. “He expressed genuine contrition for the words he used on the video that became public,” Pence said on Fox News on Monday.

Maybe Pence should be excused for living in an alternate reality. After all, he agreed to run with Trump. But Trump did not show contrition, genuine or not. He tossed off his comments about groping women as locker-room banter (a sadly familiar excuse for men’s bad behavior). And he doubled down on attacking Hillary Clinton over Bill Clinton’s sordid behavior, holding a photo op ] right before the debate with three of Bill’s accusers, and then trying to get them seated in his family box at the debate.

(By the way, if Hillary Clinton is supposed to be ashamed for standing by her man and believing the best of him, what are we supposed to think about Melania Trump, who did the same thing? And if we are supposed to excuse Trump’s comments 11 years ago, why are we still talking about Bill Clinton’s decades ago?)

Trump showed last night that he knows next to nothing about foreign policy, claiming that Russia was beating the United States because Obama had done nothing to modernize the American nuclear forces. In the real world, Obama has supported a plan to spend about $1 trillion over the next three decades on modernizing nuclear weapons.

He never backed off his proposal to ban all Muslim **immigration**. He just called it “extreme vetting,” sort of like President George W. Bush called torture “enhanced interrogation.” Then he went on to lecture Muslim-Americans about informing on their neighbors.

And Trump said that if he is elected, he will appoint a special prosecutor to indict Clinton over her emails. In fact, Trump said, if he were president, she “would be in jail” now. Apparently Trump would have overruled the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s finding that no crime was committed and tossed Clinton behind bars (a power the president, thankfully, does not have).

Trump was mean and angry, hovering behind Clinton when she talked to make her look small, interrupting her constantly and berating the debate moderator Martha Raddatz when she tried to get him to stop filibustering and answer a question.

Clinton said too often that viewers could find all the facts on her website, but she showed admirable restraint in dealing with someone who will tell you the sun is shining when it’s midnight.

I don’t think last night’s debate changed many minds. Melania Trump said the man in the 2005 video is not the man she knows. But he is the man the rest of us know. To vote for him, you have to pretend you don’t know who he really is — or choose not to care.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Paula Barche Rupnik, a Republican from Scottsdale, Ariz., was planning to vote for Senator John McCain[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/john\_mccain/index.html?inline=nyt-per] in his re-election campaign this year. But she changed her mind this weekend, after he rescinded his support for Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/09/us/politics/donald-trump-campaign.html].

Instead, she plans to split her ticket, voting for Mr. Trump, the Republican presidential nominee, but for Mr. McCain’s Democratic challenger, Representative Ann Kirkpatrick.

She has never voted for a Democrat before.

“I want to send a message to John McCain,” said Ms. Rupnik, 58, a consultant for an essential oils company. “If he doesn’t get elected, the American people that support Trump are going to blame it on those Republicans who didn’t support him.”

Ms. Rupnik’s punitive impulse captures the dilemma confronting Republican leaders as they head into the final four weeks of the campaign.

Sticking by Mr. Trump after the surfacing of a 2005 [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html] recording[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html] in which he could be heard speaking about women in vulgar terms and bragging about being able to get away with sexual assault would subject Republican candidates to devastating and, quite possibly, career-ending attack.

But disavowing Mr. Trump, whose supporters make up the largest share of the Republican base, risks **alienating** those voters, potentially a no less lethal choice for Senate candidates in key races. And if Mr. Trump loses to Hillary Clinton, as polls now indicate is likely, the loss of those Senate contests could be crushing for a party that was already teetering and counting on a chance to rebuild after the election. An NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll[http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/first-read/poll-after-trump-tape-revelation-clinton-s-lead-double-digits-n663691] conducted just before the debate showed Mr. Trump’s support cratering, with Mrs. Clinton assuming an 11-point lead nationally.

Still, Mr. Trump has die-hard supporters who have shown they will stay with him through every controversy he has sparked or endured. His populist, outsider message may be at odds with his background and even with some of his policy proposals, but it has taken hold with many voters, particularly working-class Republicans who are disenchanted with the party’s elite and deeply unhappy with President Obama’s stands on health care and **immigration**.

“The establishment is trying to hold on to their power, and McCain is one of them,” Ms. Rupnik said.

That was a common theme in interviews with Trump supporters on Sunday in Arizona and New Hampshire, two states with close Senate contests. Many spoke witheringly of incumbent Republican lawmakers who have renounced their support for the party’s presidential nominee.

Stephen Cotta, 61, a Navy veteran who owns a cannabis testing lab in Tempe, described Mr. McCain as a “traitor” and echoed Mr. Trump’s view that he was “not a hero.” Mr. Cotta said he, too, planned to vote for Ms. Kirkpatrick, the Democratic Senate candidate.

“If you can see McCain and Hillary aren’t that far apart on their philosophies, O.K., that’s why they can stand up so adamantly to Trump,” Mr. Cotta said.

Vera Anderson, 75, of Phoenix, said she had voted for Mr. McCain before, but made up her mind to oppose him when she learned of his rejection of Mr. Trump on Saturday.

“I was really on the fence of voting for McCain,” she said. “I don’t want to, didn’t want to, but this made up my mind: I will not vote for him in the general election.”

She was dismissive of the outrage over the 2005 recording that surfaced on Friday.

“Nobody likes to hear anything like that, but to me that’s not the important issue, so I absolutely, just — I’m not paying attention to it,” Ms. Anderson said. “You know, to me, that is men’s locker-room talk. And I’m sure that if anybody wants to criticize that, let them look at themselves first.”

There was similar disgust among Mr. Trump’s supporters in New Hampshire, where Senator Kelly Ayotte[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/a/kelly\_a\_ayotte/index.html?inline=nyt-per] — locked in a tight re-election battle against Gov. Maggie Hassan, a Democrat — became the first senator to disavow Mr. Trump after the recording’s publication.

“I think the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] is out for itself,” said Buddy Greene, a 48-year-old stonemason from Center Harbor, N.H., who said he supported Mr. Trump in the Republican primary in February. “They are not looking at issues of regular folk in the country.”

As he watched the New England Patriots play on television at the Frog Rock Tavern in Meredith, N.H., Mr. Greene said Ms. Ayotte had lost his support. But he said he had already come to see her as overly politically motivated.

“It does not surprise me with her,” Mr. Greene said. He said he planned to leave his ballot blank for the Senate contest on Election Day.

As Mr. Trump becomes more isolated from the Republican Party, elected officials risk being isolated from their own voters.

Mr. Greene said he admired Mr. Trump’s speaking style and trusted that there would be “checks and balances” to prevent him from doing anything rash as president.

“I don’t believe any president has absolute control,” he said. “It’s not his fingers on the bomb.”

When a young boy listening pointed out that Mrs. Clinton had more political experience, Mr. Greene smiled. “That’s why I like Trump,” he said. “Because he has no experience. I want change.”

For Mr. McCain, the decision to break with Mr. Trump is cushioned by the knowledge that he is on course to win re-election. Ms. Ayotte is in a tight race with Ms. Hassan, and her choice was fraught with more peril.

Some Trump supporters in New Hampshire said they still planned to vote for Ms. Ayotte, but grudgingly, and more out of dislike for Ms. Hassan.

One of them was Eric Granfors, a 44-year-old truck driver from Nashua, who had harsh words for Ms. Ayotte and her reasoning.

“To see Kelly Ayotte coming out and saying that she doesn’t endorse him now? I think she’s a sellout,” Mr. Granfors said. “You know he’s said a lot of bad things along the way. And now with another sound bite, she says this is the one where she isn’t going to endorse him?”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Rebekah Zemansky, Dina Kraft and Ted Siefer contributed reporting.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EUGENE, Ore. — It’s a cliché about the classroom that your students teach you as much, if not more, than you teach them.

“Where I come from, the girls have only three choices,” one of my students, in her early 20s, told me of her hometown in Eastern Oregon. “You get married, you go to beauty school, or you join the Army.” She was herself a veteran of Afghanistan.

Compared with other places I’ve lived (Los Angeles, Mexico City), Oregon is very “white.” (It’s a term so loaded, I feel I should use quotation marks at least once.) Listening to my journalism students at the University of Oregon and reading their assignments have given me many insights into the hurt, confusion and fortitude of people who could be called “white.”

I thought I knew about white people already. In the 1960s and ’70s, I grew up as a Latino (a term we didn’t use then) in the multiethnic Hollywood neighborhood of Los Angeles. My grade-school friends included an Armenian kid, an Eastern European émigré and a guy from Arkansas, all of whom were white. In class and on TV, I was fed a steady diet of stories featuring people with skin paler than mine: the Pilgrims, Abraham Lincoln, “The Great Gatsby,” “The Grapes of Wrath,” “The Godfather,” “Patton” and so forth.

Since then, the study of white identity has become an intellectual vogue resulting in some important work. The book “White Trash[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/22/books/review-white-trash-ruminates-on-an-american-underclass.html]: The 400-Year Untold Story of Class in America” is a New York Times best seller. As was the 2010 book by the African-American historian Nell Irvin Painter, “The History of White People[http://books.wwnorton.com/books/The-History-of-White-People/].”

Now, with the presidential election just weeks away, every other news report tells me it’s “white people” and their anger that will determine the outcome between two candidates of Anglo-Saxon and German heritage.

Eugene is 82 percent “white alone, not Hispanic or Latino,” as the Census Bureau[http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/4123850] puts it. I commute to Eugene by bus from neighboring Springfield, a blue-collar town sometimes disparagingly referred to as “Springtucky.” It’s a nickname tinged with racism toward the “rednecks” who supposedly live there.

As relatively affluent students get off at the university stops, I look at the people who stay on, almost all of them white, and I think, “There’s not much ‘white privilege’ left on this bus now.” A white author friend with whom I shared this observation disagreed.

“It’s the right to carry a gun in your car and not get shot,” he said. “And you can screw up your life more often as a white person.”

I tell my students that stereotypes and generalizations are the enemy of good writing. And mostly, their tales of central Oregon are nuanced and complex. They report about old lumber towns, county fairs, homeless people, students grappling with rising tuition costs, and irascible old hippies determined to hold on to their independence.

Running through this reporting, there is often an unspoken theme. The notion of class struggle lost currency in America decades ago. Every once in a while, though, I feel compelled to name this taboo subject — perhaps because class underpins my sense of Latino identity. When I say, “I am the son of Latino **immigrants**,” it’s a shorthand for the experience of people who have fought their way out of poverty and who remained linked, through ties of blood and cultural affinity, to others who still live with deprivation.

“This is a story that’s really about social class,” I’ll say. But that sense of community seems no longer available to my white students. As one explained in response: “You’re supposed to be able to make yourself rich, and if you can’t, it’s your own fault.”

These days, economic forces are conspiring to make the stories of many of my white Oregon students more similar to those of my Latino students. Both tell tales of small towns and overworked parents, about feeling like outsiders and battling class discrimination. I’ve found the same themes in other student writing from Central California, upstate New York and rural Wisconsin.

If social mobility isn’t what it used to be, it may be a reality that Latino people have adapted to more readily. In my humble, nonwhite opinion, white America has not yet found a constructive language to talk about this shared experience of the 21st century. I find hope, however, in the young people in my classes who roundly reject the idea that nonwhite people are to blame for their struggles.

With these students, I share the ideas that have kept me centered as an American-born son of Latino **immigrants**: Be proud of your roots, understand the history that has shaped your community and respect the history of others. Do these things, I tell them, and you will be better writers — and good citizens, too.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Héctor Tobar, the author of “Deep Down Dark: The Untold Stories of 33 Men Buried in a Chilean Mine, and the Miracle That Set Them Free,” teaches writing at the University of Oregon and is a contributing opinion writer.
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RADDATZ: Ladies and gentlemen the Republican nominee for president, Donald J. Trump, and the Democratic nominee for president, Hillary Clinton.

(APPLAUSE)

COOPER: Thank you very much for being here. We’re going to begin with a question from one of the members in our town hall. Each of you will have two minutes to respond to this question. Secretary Clinton, you won the coin toss, so you’ll go first. Our first question comes from Patrice Brock. Patrice?

QUESTION: Thank you, and good evening. The last debate could have been rated as MA, mature audiences, per TV parental guidelines. Knowing that educators assign viewing the presidential debates as students’ homework, do you feel you’re modeling appropriate and positive behavior for today’s youth?

CLINTON: Well, thank you. Are you a teacher? Yes, I think that that’s a very good question, because I’ve heard from lots of teachers and parents about some of their concerns about some of the things that are being said and done in this campaign.

And I think it is very important for us to make clear to our children that our country really is great because we’re good. And we are going to respect one another, lift each other up. We are going to be looking for ways to celebrate our diversity, and we are going to try to reach out to every boy and girl, as well as every adult, to bring them in to working on behalf of our country.

I have a very positive and optimistic view about what we can do together. That’s why the slogan of my campaign is “Stronger Together,” because I think if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness that sometimes sets Americans against one another, and instead we make some big goals — and I’ve set forth some big goals, getting the economy to work for everyone, not just those at the top, making sure that we have the best education system from preschool through college and making it affordable, and so much else.

If we set those goals and we go together to try to achieve them, there’s nothing in my opinion that America can’t do. So that’s why I hope that we will come together in this campaign. Obviously, I’m hoping to earn your vote, I’m hoping to be elected in November, and I can promise you, I will work with every American.

I want to be the president for all Americans, regardless of your political beliefs, where you come from, what you look like, your religion. I want us to heal our country and bring it together because that’s, I think, the best way for us to get the future that our children and our grandchildren deserve.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, thank you. Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

TRUMP: Well, I actually agree with that. I agree with everything she said. I began this campaign because I was so tired of seeing such foolish things happen to our country. This is a great country. This is a great land. I’ve gotten to know the people of the country over the last year-and-a-half that I’ve been doing this as a politician. I cannot believe I’m saying that about myself, but I guess I have been a politician.

TRUMP: And my whole concept was to make America great again. When I watch the deals being made, when I watch what’s happening with some horrible things like Obamacare, where your health insurance and health care is going up by numbers that are astronomical, 68 percent, 59 percent, 71 percent, when I look at the Iran deal and how bad a deal it is for us, it’s a one-sided transaction where we’re giving back $150 billion to a terrorist state, really, the number one terror state, we’ve made them a strong country from really a very weak country just three years ago.

When I look at all of the things that I see and all of the potential that our country has, we have such tremendous potential, whether it’s in business and trade, where we’re doing so badly. Last year, we had almost $800 billion trade deficit. In other words, trading with other countries. We had an $800 billion deficit. It’s hard to believe. Inconceivable.

You say who’s making these deals? We’re going the make great deals. We’re going to have a strong border. We’re going to bring back law and order. Just today, policemen was shot, two killed. And this is happening on a weekly basis. We have to bring back respect to law enforcement. At the same time, we have to take care of people on all sides. We need justice.

But I want to do things that haven’t been done, including fixing and making our inner cities better for the African-American citizens that are so great, and for the Latinos, Hispanics, and I look forward to doing it. It’s called make America great again.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump. The question from Patrice was about are you both modeling positive and appropriate behavior for today’s youth? We received a lot of questions online, Mr. Trump, about the tape that was released on Friday, as you can imagine. You called what you said locker room banter. You described kissing women without consent, grabbing their genitals. That is sexual assault. You bragged that you have sexually assaulted women. Do you understand that?

TRUMP: No, I didn’t say that at all. I don’t think you understood what was — this was locker room talk. I’m not proud of it. I apologize to my family. I apologize to the American people. Certainly I’m not proud of it. But this is locker room talk.

You know, when we have a world where you have ISIS chopping off heads, where you have — and, frankly, drowning people in steel cages, where you have wars and horrible, horrible sights all over, where you have so many bad things happening, this is like medieval times. We haven’t seen anything like this, the carnage all over the world.

And they look and they see. Can you imagine the people that are, frankly, doing so well against us with ISIS? And they look at our country and they see what’s going on.

Yes, I’m very embarrassed by it. I hate it. But it’s locker room talk, and it’s one of those things. I will knock the hell out of ISIS. We’re going to defeat ISIS. ISIS happened a number of years ago in a vacuum that was left because of bad judgment. And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS.

COOPER: So, Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: And we should get on to much more important things and much bigger things.

COOPER: Just for the record, though, are you saying that what you said on that bus 11 years ago that you did not actually kiss women without consent or grope women without consent?

TRUMP: I have great respect for women. Nobody has more respect for women than I do.

COOPER: So, for the record, you’re saying you never did that?

TRUMP: I’ve said things that, frankly, you hear these things I said. And I was embarrassed by it. But I have tremendous respect for women.

COOPER: Have you ever done those things?

TRUMP: And women have respect for me. And I will tell you: No, I have not. And I will tell you that I’m going to make our country safe. We’re going to have borders in our country, which we don’t have now. People are pouring into our country, and they’re coming in from the Middle East and other places.

We’re going to make America safe again. We’re going to make America great again, but we’re going to make America safe again. And we’re going to make America wealthy again, because if you don’t do that, it just — it sounds harsh to say, but we have to build up the wealth of our nation.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Right now, other nations are taking our jobs and they’re taking our wealth.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: And that’s what I want to talk about.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, do you want to respond?

CLINTON: Well, like everyone else, I’ve spent a lot of time thinking over the last 48 hours about what we heard and saw. You know, with prior Republican nominees for president, I disagreed with them on politics, policies, principles, but I never questioned their fitness to serve.

Donald Trump is different. I said starting back in June that he was not fit to be president and commander-in-chief. And many Republicans and independents have said the same thing. What we all saw and heard on Friday was Donald talking about women, what he thinks about women, what he does to women. And he has said that the video doesn’t represent who he is.

But I think it’s clear to anyone who heard it that it represents exactly who he is. Because we’ve seen this throughout the campaign. We have seen him insult women. We’ve seen him rate women on their appearance, ranking them from one to ten. We’ve seen him embarrass women on TV and on Twitter. We saw him after the first debate spend nearly a week denigrating a former Miss Universe in the harshest, most personal terms.

So, yes, this is who Donald Trump is. But it’s not only women, and it’s not only this video that raises questions about his fitness to be our president, because he has also targeted **immigrants**, African- Americans, Latinos, people with disabilities, POWs, Muslims, and so many others.

So this is who Donald Trump is. And the question for us, the question our country must answer is that this is not who we are. That’s why — to go back to your question — I want to send a message — we all should — to every boy and girl and, indeed, to the entire world that America already is great, but we are great because we are good, and we will respect one another, and we will work with one another, and we will celebrate our diversity.

CLINTON: These are very important values to me, because this is the America that I know and love. And I can pledge to you tonight that this is the America that I will serve if I’m so fortunate enough to become your president.

RADDATZ: And we want to get to some questions from online...

TRUMP: Am I allowed to respond to that? I assume I am.

RADDATZ: Yes, you can respond to that.

TRUMP: It’s just words, folks. It’s just words. Those words, I’ve been hearing them for many years. I heard them when they were running for the Senate in New York, where Hillary was going to bring back jobs to upstate New York and she failed.

I’ve heard them where Hillary is constantly talking about the inner cities of our country, which are a disaster education-wise, jobwise, safety-wise, in every way possible. I’m going to help the African-Americans. I’m going to help the Latinos, Hispanics. I am going to help the inner cities.

She’s done a terrible job for the African-Americans. She wants their vote, and she does nothing, and then she comes back four years later. We saw that firsthand when she was United States senator. She campaigned where the primary part of her campaign...

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Mr. Trump — I want to get to audience questions and online questions.

TRUMP: So, she’s allowed to do that, but I’m not allowed to respond?

RADDATZ: You’re going to have — you’re going to get to respond right now.

TRUMP: Sounds fair.

RADDATZ: This tape is generating intense interest. In just 48 hours, it’s become the single most talked about story of the entire 2016 election on Facebook, with millions and millions of people discussing it on the social network. As we said a moment ago, we do want to bring in questions from voters around country via social media, and our first stays on this topic. Jeff from Ohio asks on Facebook, “Trump says the campaign has changed him. When did that happen?” So, Mr. Trump, let me add to that. When you walked off that bus at age 59, were you a different man or did that behavior continue until just recently? And you have two minutes for this.

TRUMP: It was locker room talk, as I told you. That was locker room talk. I’m not proud of it. I am a person who has great respect for people, for my family, for the people of this country. And certainly, I’m not proud of it. But that was something that happened.

If you look at Bill Clinton, far worse. Mine are words, and his was action. His was what he’s done to women. There’s never been anybody in the history politics in this nation that’s been so abusive to women. So you can say any way you want to say it, but Bill Clinton was abusive to women.

Hillary Clinton attacked those same women and attacked them viciously. Four of them here tonight. One of the women, who is a wonderful woman, at 12 years old, was raped at 12. Her client she represented got him off, and she’s seen laughing on two separate occasions, laughing at the girl who was raped. Kathy Shelton, that young woman is here with us tonight.

So don’t tell me about words. I am absolutely — I apologize for those words. But it is things that people say. But what President Clinton did, he was impeached, he lost his license to practice law. He had to pay an $850,000 fine to one of the women. Paula Jones, who’s also here tonight.

And I will tell you that when Hillary brings up a point like that and she talks about words that I said 11 years ago, I think it’s disgraceful, and I think she should be ashamed of herself, if you want to know the truth.

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Can we please hold the applause? Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, first, let me start by saying that so much of what he’s just said is not right, but he gets to run his campaign any way he chooses. He gets to decide what he wants to talk about. Instead of answering people’s questions, talking about our agenda, laying out the plans that we have that we think can make a better life and a better country, that’s his choice.

When I hear something like that, I am reminded of what my friend, Michelle Obama, advised us all: When they go low, you go high.

(APPLAUSE) And, look, if this were just about one video, maybe what he’s saying tonight would be understandable, but everyone can draw their own conclusions at this point about whether or not the man in the video or the man on the stage respects women. But he never apologizes for anything to anyone.

CLINTON: He never apologized to Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the Gold Star family whose son, Captain Khan, died in the line of duty in Iraq. And Donald insulted and attacked them for weeks over their religion.

He never apologized to the distinguished federal judge who was born in Indiana, but Donald said he couldn’t be trusted to be a judge because his parents were, quote, “Mexican.”

He never apologized to the reporter that he mimicked and mocked on national television and our children were watching. And he never apologized for the racist lie that President Obama was not born in the United States of America. He owes the president an apology, he owes our country an apology, and he needs to take responsibility for his actions and his words.

TRUMP: Well, you owe the president an apology, because as you know very well, your campaign, Sidney Blumenthal — he’s another real winner that you have — and he’s the one that got this started, along with your campaign manager, and they were on television just two weeks ago, she was, saying exactly that. So you really owe him an apology. You’re the one that sent the pictures around your campaign, sent the pictures around with President Obama in a certain garb. That was long before I was ever involved, so you actually owe an apology.

Number two, Michelle Obama. I’ve gotten to see the commercials that they did on you. And I’ve gotten to see some of the most vicious commercials I’ve ever seen of Michelle Obama talking about you, Hillary.

So, you talk about friend? Go back and take a look at those commercials, a race where you lost fair and square, unlike the Bernie Sanders race, where you won, but not fair and square, in my opinion. And all you have to do is take a look at WikiLeaks and just see what they say about Bernie Sanders and see what Deborah Wasserman Schultz had in mind, because Bernie Sanders, between super-delegates and Deborah Wasserman Schultz, he never had a chance. And I was so surprised to see him sign on with the devil.

But when you talk about apology, I think the one that you should really be apologizing for and the thing that you should be apologizing for are the 33,000 e-mails that you deleted, and that you acid washed, and then the two boxes of e-mails and other things last week that were taken from an office and are now missing.

And I’ll tell you what. I didn’t think I’d say this, but I’m going to say it, and I hate to say it. But if I win, I am going to instruct my attorney general to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation, because there has never been so many lies, so much deception. There has never been anything like it, and we’re going to have a special prosecutor.

When I speak, I go out and speak, the people of this country are furious. In my opinion, the people that have been long-term workers at the FBI are furious. There has never been anything like this, where e-mails — and you get a subpoena, you get a subpoena, and after getting the subpoena, you delete 33,000 e-mails, and then you acid wash them or bleach them, as you would say, very expensive process.

So we’re going to get a special prosecutor, and we’re going to look into it, because you know what? People have been — their lives have been destroyed for doing one-fifth of what you’ve done. And it’s a disgrace. And honestly, you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, I want to follow up on that.

(CROSSTALK)

RADDATZ: I’m going to let you talk about e-mails.

CLINTON: ... because everything he just said is absolutely false, but I’m not surprised.

TRUMP: Oh, really?

CLINTON: In the first debate...

(LAUGHTER)

RADDATZ: And really, the audience needs to calm down here.

CLINTON: ... I told people that it would be impossible to be fact-checking Donald all the time. I’d never get to talk about anything I want to do and how we’re going to really make lives better for people.

So, once again, go to HillaryClinton.com. We have literally Trump — you can fact check him in real time. Last time at the first debate, we had millions of people fact checking, so I expect we’ll have millions more fact checking, because, you know, it is — it’s just awfully good that someone with the temperament of Donald Trump is not in charge of the law in our country.

TRUMP: Because you’d be in jail.

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton...

COOPER: We want to remind the audience to please not talk out loud. Please do not applaud. You’re just wasting time.

RADDATZ: And, Secretary Clinton, I do want to follow up on e- mails. You’ve said your handing of your e-mails was a mistake. You disagreed with FBI Director James Comey, calling your handling of classified information, quote, “extremely careless.” The FBI said that there were 110 classified e-mails that were exchanged, eight of which were top secret, and that it was possible hostile actors did gain access to those e-mails. You don’t call that extremely careless? CLINTON: Well, Martha, first, let me say — and I’ve said before, but I’ll repeat it, because I want everyone to hear it — that was a mistake, and I take responsibility for using a personal e-mail account. Obviously, if I were to do it over again, I would not. I’m not making any excuses. It was a mistake. And I am very sorry about that.

But I think it’s also important to point out where there are some misleading accusations from critics and others. After a year-long investigation, there is no evidence that anyone hacked the server I was using and there is no evidence that anyone can point to at all — anyone who says otherwise has no basis — that any classified material ended up in the wrong hands.

I take classified materials very seriously and always have. When I was on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I was privy to a lot of classified material. Obviously, as secretary of state, I had some of the most important secrets that we possess, such as going after bin Laden. So I am very committed to taking classified information seriously. And as I said, there is no evidence that any classified information ended up in the wrong hands.

RADDATZ: OK, we’re going to move on.

TRUMP: And yet she didn’t know the word — the letter C on a document. Right? She didn’t even know what that word — what that letter meant.

You know, it’s amazing. I’m watching Hillary go over facts. And she’s going after fact after fact, and she’s lying again, because she said she — you know, what she did with the e-mail was fine. You think it was fine to delete 33,000 e-mails? I don’t think so.

She said the 33,000 e-mails had to do with her daughter’s wedding, number one, and a yoga class. Well, maybe we’ll give three or three or four or five or something. 33,000 e-mails deleted, and now she’s saying there wasn’t anything wrong.

And more importantly, that was after getting a subpoena. That wasn’t before. That was after. She got it from the United States Congress. And I’ll be honest, I am so disappointed in congressmen, including Republicans, for allowing this to happen.

Our Justice Department, where our husband goes on to the back of a airplane for 39 minutes, talks to the attorney general days before a ruling is going to be made on her case. But for you to say that there was nothing wrong with you deleting 39,000 e-mails, again, you should be ashamed of yourself. What you did — and this is after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

COOPER: We have to move on.

TRUMP: You did that. Wait a minute. One second.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you can respond, and then we got to move on.

RADDATZ: We want to give the audience a chance.

TRUMP: If you did that in the private sector, you’d be put in jail, let alone after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you can respond. Then we have to move on to an audience question.

CLINTON: Look, it’s just not true. And so please, go to...

TRUMP: Oh, you didn’t delete them?

COOPER: Allow her to respond, please.

CLINTON: It was personal e-mails, not official.

TRUMP: Oh, 33,000? Yeah.

CLINTON: Not — well, we turned over 35,000, so...

TRUMP: Oh, yeah. What about the other 15,000?

COOPER: Please allow her to respond. She didn’t talk while you talked.

CLINTON: Yes, that’s true, I didn’t.

TRUMP: Because you have nothing to say.

CLINTON: I didn’t in the first debate, and I’m going to try not to in this debate, because I’d like to get to the questions that the people have brought here tonight to talk to us about.

TRUMP: Get off this question.

CLINTON: OK, Donald. I know you’re into big diversion tonight, anything to avoid talking about your campaign and the way it’s exploding and the way Republicans are leaving you. But let’s at least focus...

TRUMP: Let’s see what happens...

(CROSSTALK)

COOPER: Allow her to respond.

CLINTON: ... on some of the issues that people care about tonight. Let’s get to their questions.

COOPER: We have a question here from Ken Karpowicz. He has a question about health care. Ken?

TRUMP: I’d like to know, Anderson, why aren’t you bringing up the e-mails? I’d like to know. Why aren’t you bringing...

COOPER: We brought up the e-mails.

TRUMP: No, it hasn’t. It hasn’t. And it hasn’t been finished at all.

COOPER: Ken Karpowicz has a question.

TRUMP: It’s nice to — one on three.

QUESTION: Thank you. Affordable Care Act, known as Obamacare, it is not affordable. Premiums have gone up. Deductibles have gone up. Copays have gone up. Prescriptions have gone up. And the coverage has gone down. What will you do to bring the cost down and make coverage better?

COOPER: That first one goes to Secretary Clinton, because you started out the last one to the audience.

CLINTON: If he wants to start, he can start. No, go ahead, Donald.

TRUMP: No, I’m a gentlemen, Hillary. Go ahead.

(LAUGHTER)

COOPER: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think Donald was about to say he’s going to solve it by repealing it and getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. And I’m going to fix it, because I agree with you. Premiums have gotten too high. Copays, deductibles, prescription drug costs, and I’ve laid out a series of actions that we can take to try to get those costs down.

But here’s what I don’t want people to forget when we’re talking about reining in the costs, which has to be the highest priority of the next president, when the Affordable Care Act passed, it wasn’t just that 20 million got insurance who didn’t have it before. But that in and of itself was a good thing. I meet these people all the time, and they tell me what a difference having that insurance meant to them and their families.

But everybody else, the 170 million of us who get health insurance through our employees got big benefits. Number one, insurance companies can’t deny you coverage because of a pre-existing condition. Number two, no lifetime limits, which is a big deal if you have serious health problems.

Number three, women can’t be charged more than men for our health insurance, which is the way it used to be before the Affordable Care Act. Number four, if you’re under 26, and your parents have a policy, you can be on that policy until the age of 26, something that didn’t happen before.

So I want very much to save what works and is good about the Affordable Care Act. But we’ve got to get costs down. We’ve got to provide additional help to small businesses so that they can afford to provide health insurance. But if we repeal it, as Donald has proposed, and start over again, all of those benefits I just mentioned are lost to everybody, not just people who get their health insurance on the exchange. And then we would have to start all over again.

Right now, we are at 90 percent health insurance coverage. That’s the highest we’ve ever been in our country. COOPER: Secretary Clinton, your time is up.

CLINTON: So I want us to get to 100 percent, but get costs down and keep quality up.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

TRUMP: It is such a great question and it’s maybe the question I get almost more than anything else, outside of defense. Obamacare is a disaster. You know it. We all know it. It’s going up at numbers that nobody’s ever seen worldwide. Nobody’s ever seen numbers like this for health care.

It’s only getting worse. In ’17, it implodes by itself. Their method of fixing it is to go back and ask Congress for more money, more and more money. We have right now almost $20 trillion in debt.

Obamacare will never work. It’s very bad, very bad health insurance. Far too expensive. And not only expensive for the person that has it, unbelievably expensive for our country. It’s going to be one of the biggest line items very shortly.

We have to repeal it and replace it with something absolutely much less expensive and something that works, where your plan can actually be tailored. We have to get rid of the lines around the state, artificial lines, where we stop insurance companies from coming in and competing, because they want — and President Obama and whoever was working on it — they want to leave those lines, because that gives the insurance companies essentially monopolies. We want competition.

You will have the finest health care plan there is. She wants to go to a single-payer plan, which would be a disaster, somewhat similar to Canada. And if you haven’t noticed the Canadians, when they need a big operation, when something happens, they come into the United States in many cases because their system is so slow. It’s catastrophic in certain ways.

But she wants to go to single payer, which means the government basically rules everything. Hillary Clinton has been after this for years. Obamacare was the first step. Obamacare is a total disaster. And not only are your rates going up by numbers that nobody’s ever believed, but your deductibles are going up, so that unless you get hit by a truck, you’re never going to be able to use it.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, your time...

TRUMP: It is a disastrous plan, and it has to be repealed and replaced.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, let me follow up with you. Your husband called Obamacare, quote, “the craziest thing in the world,” saying that small-business owners are getting killed as premiums double, coverage is cut in half. Was he mistaken or was the mistake simply telling the truth?

CLINTON: No, I mean, he clarified what he meant. And it’s very clear. Look, we are in a situation in our country where if we were to start all over again, we might come up with a different system. But we have an employer-based system. That’s where the vast majority of people get their health care.

And the Affordable Care Act was meant to try to fill the gap between people who were too poor and couldn’t put together any resources to afford health care, namely people on Medicaid. Obviously, Medicare, which is a single-payer system, which takes care of our elderly and does a great job doing it, by the way, and then all of the people who were employed, but people who were working but didn’t have the money to afford insurance and didn’t have anybody, an employer or anybody else, to help them.

That was the slot that the Obamacare approach was to take. And like I say, 20 million people now have health insurance. So if we just rip it up and throw it away, what Donald’s not telling you is we just turn it back to the insurance companies the way it used to be, and that means the insurance companies...

COOPER: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: ... get to do pretty much whatever they want, including saying, look, I’m sorry, you’ve got diabetes, you had cancer, your child has asthma...

COOPER: Your time is up.

CLINTON: ... you may not be able to have insurance because you can’t afford it. So let’s fix what’s broken about it, but let’s not throw it away and give it all back to the insurance companies and the drug companies. That’s not going to work.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, let me follow up on this. TRUMP: Well, I just want — just one thing. First of all, Hillary, everything’s broken about it. Everything. Number two, Bernie Sanders said that Hillary Clinton has very bad judgment. This is a perfect example of it, trying to save Obamacare, which is a disaster.

COOPER: You’ve said you want to end Obamacare...

TRUMP: By the way...

COOPER: You’ve said you want to end Obamacare. You’ve also said you want to make coverage accessible for people with pre-existing conditions. How do you force insurance companies to do that if you’re no longer mandating that every American get insurance?

TRUMP: We’re going to be able to. You’re going to have plans...

COOPER: What does that mean?

TRUMP: Well, I’ll tell you what it means. You’re going to have plans that are so good, because we’re going to have so much competition in the insurance industry. Once we break out — once we break out the lines and allow the competition to come...

COOPER: Are you going — are you going to have a mandate that Americans have to have health insurance?

TRUMP: President Obama — Anderson, excuse me. President Obama, by keeping those lines, the boundary lines around each state, it was almost gone until just very toward the end of the passage of Obamacare, which, by the way, was a fraud. You know that, because Jonathan Gruber, the architect of Obamacare, was said — he said it was a great lie, it was a big lie. President Obama said you keep your doctor, you keep your plan. The whole thing was a fraud, and it doesn’t work.

But when we get rid of those lines, you will have competition, and we will be able to keep pre-existing, we’ll also be able to help people that can’t get — don’t have money because we are going to have people protected.

And Republicans feel this way, believe it or not, and strongly this way. We’re going to block grant into the states. We’re going to block grant into Medicaid into the states...

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: ... so that we will be able to take care of people without the necessary funds to take care of themselves.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

RADDATZ: We now go to Gorbah Hamed with a question for both candidates.

QUESTION: Hi. There are 3.3 million Muslims in the United States, and I’m one of them. You’ve mentioned working with Muslim nations, but with Islamophobia on the rise, how will you help people like me deal with the consequences of being labeled as a threat to the country after the election is over?

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, you’re first.

TRUMP: Well, you’re right about Islamophobia, and that’s a shame. But one thing we have to do is we have to make sure that — because there is a problem. I mean, whether we like it or not, and we could be very politically correct, but whether we like it or not, there is a problem. And we have to be sure that Muslims come in and report when they see something going on. When they see hatred going on, they have to report it.

As an example, in San Bernardino, many people saw the bombs all over the apartment of the two people that killed 14 and wounded many, many people. Horribly wounded. They’ll never be the same. Muslims have to report the problems when they see them.

And, you know, there’s always a reason for everything. If they don’t do that, it’s a very difficult situation for our country, because you look at Orlando and you look at San Bernardino and you look at the World Trade Center. Go outside. Look at Paris. Look at that horrible — these are radical Islamic terrorists.

And she won’t even mention the word and nor will President Obama. He won’t use the term “radical Islamic terrorism.” Now, to solve a problem, you have to be able to state what the problem is or at least say the name. She won’t say the name and President Obama won’t say the name. But the name is there. It’s radical Islamic terror. And before you solve it, you have to say the name.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton? CLINTON: Well, thank you for asking your question. And I’ve heard this question from a lot of Muslim-Americans across our country, because, unfortunately, there’s been a lot of very divisive, dark things said about Muslims. And even someone like Captain Khan, the young man who sacrificed himself defending our country in the United States Army, has been subject to attack by Donald.

I want to say just a couple of things. First, we’ve had Muslims in America since George Washington. And we’ve had many successful Muslims. We just lost a particular well-known one with Muhammad Ali.

CLINTON: My vision of America is an America where everyone has a place, if you’re willing to work hard, you do your part, you contribute to the community. That’s what America is. That’s what we want America to be for our children and our grandchildren.

It’s also very short-sighted and even dangerous to be engaging in the kind of demagogic rhetoric that Donald has about Muslims. We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lines. I’ve worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America. I’ve met with a lot of them, and I’ve heard how important it is for them to feel that they are wanted and included and part of our country, part of our homeland security, and that’s what I want to see.

It’s also important I intend to defeat ISIS, to do so in a coalition with majority Muslim nations. Right now, a lot of those nations are hearing what Donald says and wondering, why should we cooperate with the Americans? And this is a gift to ISIS and the terrorists, violent jihadist terrorists.

We are not at war with Islam. And it is a mistake and it plays into the hands of the terrorists to act as though we are. So I want a country where citizens like you and your family are just as welcome as anyone else.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton.

Mr. Trump, in December, you said this. “Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what the hell is going on. We have no choice. We have no choice.” Your running mate said this week that the Muslim ban is no longer your position. Is that correct? And if it is, was it a mistake to have a religious test?

TRUMP: First of all, Captain Khan is an American hero, and if I were president at that time, he would be alive today, because unlike her, who voted for the war without knowing what she was doing, I would not have had our people in Iraq. Iraq was disaster. So he would have been alive today.

The Muslim ban is something that in some form has morphed into a extreme vetting from certain areas of the world. Hillary Clinton wants to allow hundreds of thousands — excuse me. Excuse me..

RADDATZ: And why did it morph into that? No, did you — no, answer the question. Do you still believe... TRUMP: Why don’t you interrupt her? You interrupt me all the time.

RADDATZ: I do.

TRUMP: Why don’t you interrupt her?

RADDATZ: Would you please explain whether or not the Muslim ban still stands?

TRUMP: It’s called extreme vetting. We are going to areas like Syria where they’re coming in by the tens of thousands because of Barack Obama. And Hillary Clinton wants to allow a 550 percent increase over Obama. People are coming into our country like we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is, and she wants 550 percent more. This is going to be the great Trojan horse of all time.

We have enough problems in this country. I believe in building safe zones. I believe in having other people pay for them, as an example, the Gulf states, who are not carrying their weight, but they have nothing but money, and take care of people. But I don’t want to have, with all the problems this country has and all of the problems that you see going on, hundreds of thousands of people coming in from Syria when we know nothing about them. We know nothing about their values and we know nothing about their love for our country.

RADDATZ: And, Secretary Clinton, let me ask you about that, because you have asked for an increase from 10,000 to 65,000 Syrian refugees. We know you want tougher vetting. That’s not a perfect system. So why take the risk of having those refugees come into the country?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I will not let anyone into our country that I think poses a risk to us. But there are a lot of refugees, women and children — think of that picture we all saw of that 4-year-old boy with the blood on his forehead because he’d been bombed by the Russian and Syrian air forces.

There are children suffering in this catastrophic war, largely, I believe, because of Russian aggression. And we need to do our part. We by no means are carrying anywhere near the load that Europe and others are. But we will have vetting that is as tough as it needs to be from our professionals, our intelligence experts and others.

But it is important for us as a policy, you know, not to say, as Donald has said, we’re going to ban people based on a religion. How do you do that? We are a country founded on religious freedom and liberty. How do we do what he has advocated without causing great distress within our own county? Are we going to have religious tests when people fly into our country? And how do we expect to be able to implement those?

So I thought that what he said was extremely unwise and even dangerous. And indeed, you can look at the propaganda on a lot of the terrorists sites, and what Donald Trump says about Muslims is used to recruit fighters, because they want to create a war between us.

And the final thing I would say, this is the 10th or 12th time that he’s denied being for the war in Iraq. We have it on tape. The entire press corps has looked at it. It’s been debunked, but it never stops him from saying whatever he wants to say.

TRUMP: That’s not been debunked.

CLINTON: So, please...

TRUMP: That has not been debunked.

CLINTON: ... go to HillaryClinton.com and you can see it.

TRUMP: I was against — I was against the war in Iraq. Has not been debunked. And you voted for it. And you shouldn’t have. Well, I just want to say...

RADDATZ: There’s been lots of fact-checking on that. I’d like to move on to an online question...

TRUMP: Excuse me. She just went about 25 seconds over her time.

RADDATZ: She did not.

TRUMP: Could I just respond to this, please?

RADDATZ: Very quickly, please.

TRUMP: Hillary Clinton, in terms of having people come into our country, we have many criminal illegal **aliens**. When we want to send them back to their country, their country says we don’t want them. In some cases, they’re murderers, drug lords, drug problems. And they don’t want them.

And Hillary Clinton, when she was secretary of state, said that’s OK, we can’t force it into their country. Let me tell you, I’m going to force them right back into their country. They’re murderers and some very bad people.

And I will tell you very strongly, when Bernie Sanders said she had bad judgment, she has really bad judgment, because we are letting people into this country that are going to cause problems and crime like you’ve never seen. We’re also letting drugs pour through our southern border at a record clip. At a record clip. And it shouldn’t be allowed to happen.

ICE just endorsed me. They’ve never endorsed a presidential candidate. The Border Patrol agents, 16,500, just recently endorsed me, and they endorsed me because I understand the border. She doesn’t. She wants amnesty for everybody. Come right in. Come right over. It’s a horrible thing she’s doing. She’s got bad judgment, and honestly, so bad that she should never be president of the United States. That I can tell you.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Mr. Trump. I want to move on. This next question from the public through the Bipartisan Open Debate Coalition’s online forum, where Americans submitted questions that generated millions of votes. This question involves WikiLeaks release of purported excerpts of Secretary Clinton’s paid speeches, which she has refused to release, and one line in particular, in which you, Secretary Clinton, purportedly say you need both a public and private position on certain issues. So, Tu (ph), from Virginia asks, is it OK for politicians to be two-faced? Is it acceptable for a politician to have a private stance on issues? Secretary Clinton, your two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, right. As I recall, that was something I said about Abraham Lincoln after having seen the wonderful Steven Spielberg movie called “Lincoln.” It was a master class watching President Lincoln get the Congress to approve the 13th Amendment. It was principled, and it was strategic.

And I was making the point that it is hard sometimes to get the Congress to do what you want to do and you have to keep working at it. And, yes, President Lincoln was trying to convince some people, he used some arguments, convincing other people, he used other arguments. That was a great — I thought a great display of presidential leadership.

But, you know, let’s talk about what’s really going on here, Martha, because our intelligence community just came out and said in the last few days that the Kremlin, meaning Putin and the Russian government, are directing the attacks, the hacking on American accounts to influence our election. And WikiLeaks is part of that, as are other sites where the Russians hack information, we don’t even know if it’s accurate information, and then they put it out.

We have never in the history of our country been in a situation where an adversary, a foreign power, is working so hard to influence the outcome of the election. And believe me, they’re not doing it to get me elected. They’re doing it to try to influence the election for Donald Trump.

CLINTON: Now, maybe because he has praised Putin, maybe because he says he agrees with a lot of what Putin wants to do, maybe because he wants to do business in Moscow, I don’t know the reasons. But we deserve answers. And we should demand that Donald release all of his tax returns so that people can see what are the entanglements and the financial relationships that he has...

RADDATZ: We’re going to get to that later. Secretary Clinton, you’re out of time.

CLINTON: ... with the Russians and other foreign powers.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Well, I think I should respond, because — so ridiculous. Look, now she’s blaming — she got caught in a total lie. Her papers went out to all her friends at the banks, Goldman Sachs and everybody else, and she said things — WikiLeaks that just came out. And she lied. Now she’s blaming the lie on the late, great Abraham Lincoln. That’s one that I haven’t...

(LAUGHTER)

OK, Honest Abe, Honest Abe never lied. That’s the good thing. That’s the big difference between Abraham Lincoln and you. That’s a big, big difference. We’re talking about some difference.

But as far as other elements of what she was saying, I don’t know Putin. I think it would be great if we got along with Russia because we could fight ISIS together, as an example. But I don’t know Putin.

But I notice, anytime anything wrong happens, they like to say the Russians are — she doesn’t know if it’s the Russians doing the hacking. Maybe there is no hacking. But they always blame Russia. And the reason they blame Russia because they think they’re trying to tarnish me with Russia. I know nothing about Russia. I know — I know about Russia, but I know nothing about the inner workings of Russia. I don’t deal there. I have no businesses there. I have no loans from Russia.

I have a very, very great balance sheet, so great that when I did the Old Post Office on Pennsylvania Avenue, the United States government, because of my balance sheet, which they actually know very well, chose me to do the Old Post Office, between the White House and Congress, chose me to do the Old Post Office. One of the primary area things, in fact, perhaps the primary thing was balance sheet. But I have no loans with Russia. You could go to the United States government, and they would probably tell you that, because they know my sheet very well in order to get that development I had to have.

Now, the taxes are a very simple thing. As soon as I have — first of all, I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. Many of her friends took bigger deductions. Warren Buffett took a massive deduction. Soros, who’s a friend of hers, took a massive deduction. Many of the people that are giving her all this money that she can do many more commercials than me gave her — took massive deductions.

I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. But — but as soon as my routine audit is finished, I’ll release my returns. I’ll be very proud to. They’re actually quite great.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

COOPER: We want to turn, actually, to the topic of taxes. We have a question from Spencer Maass. Spencer?

QUESTION: Good evening. My question is, what specific tax provisions will you change to ensure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share in taxes?

COOPER: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

TRUMP: Well, one thing I’d do is get rid of carried interest. One of the greatest provisions for people like me, to be honest with you, I give up a lot when I run, because I knock out the tax code. And she could have done this years ago, by the way. She’s a United States — she was a United States senator.

She complains that Donald Trump took advantage of the tax code. Well, why didn’t she change it? Why didn’t you change it when you were a senator? The reason you didn’t is that all your friends take the same advantage that I do. And I do. You have provisions in the tax code that, frankly, we could change. But you wouldn’t change it, because all of these people gave you the money so you can take negative ads on Donald Trump.

But — and I say that about a lot of things. You know, I’ve heard Hillary complaining about so many different things over the years. “I wish you would have done this.” But she’s been there for 30 years she’s been doing this stuff. She never changed. And she never will change. She never will change.

We’re getting rid of carried interest provisions. I’m lowering taxes actually, because I think it’s so important for corporations, because we have corporations leaving — massive corporations and little ones, little ones can’t form. We’re getting rid of regulations which goes hand in hand with the lowering of the taxes.

But we’re bringing the tax rate down from 35 percent to 15 percent. We’re cutting taxes for the middle class. And I will tell you, we are cutting them big league for the middle class.

And I will tell you, Hillary Clinton is raising your taxes, folks. You can look at me. She’s raising your taxes really high. And what that’s going to do is a disaster for the country. But she is raising your taxes and I’m lowering your taxes. That in itself is a big difference. We are going to be thriving again. We have no growth in this country. There’s no growth. If China has a GDP of 7 percent, it’s like a national catastrophe. We’re down at 1 percent. And that’s, like, no growth. And we’re going lower, in my opinion. And a lot of it has to do with the fact that our taxes are so high, just about the highest in the world. And I’m bringing them down to one of the lower in the world. And I think it’s so important — one of the most important things we can do. But she is raising everybody’s taxes massively.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes. The question was, what specific tax provisions will you change to ensure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share of taxes?

CLINTON: Well, everything you’ve heard just now from Donald is not true. I’m sorry I have to keep saying this, but he lives in an alternative reality. And it is sort of amusing to hear somebody who hasn’t paid federal income taxes in maybe 20 years talking about what he’s going to do.

But I’ll tell you what he’s going to do. His plan will give the wealthy and corporations the biggest tax cuts they’ve ever had, more than the Bush tax cuts by at least a factor of two. Donald always takes care of Donald and people like Donald, and this would be a massive gift. And, indeed, the way that he talks about his tax cuts would end up raising taxes on middle-class families, millions of middle-class families.

Now, here’s what I want to do. I have said nobody who makes less than $250,000 a year — and that’s the vast majority of Americans as you know — will have their taxes raised, because I think we’ve got to go where the money is. And the money is with people who have taken advantage of every single break in the tax code.

And, yes, when I was a senator, I did vote to close corporate loopholes. I voted to close, I think, one of the loopholes he took advantage of when he claimed a billion-dollar loss that enabled him to avoid paying taxes.

I want to have a tax on people who are making a million dollars. It’s called the Buffett rule. Yes, Warren Buffett is the one who’s gone out and said somebody like him should not be paying a lower tax rate than his secretary. I want to have a surcharge on incomes above $5 million.

We have to make up for lost times, because I want to invest in you. I want to invest in hard-working families. And I think it’s been unfortunate, but it’s happened, that since the Great Recession, the gains have all gone to the top. And we need to reverse that.

People like Donald, who paid zero in taxes, zero for our vets, zero for our military, zero for health and education, that is wrong.

COOPER: Thank you, Secretary.

CLINTON: And we’re going to make sure that nobody, no corporation, and no individual can get away without paying his fair share to support our country.

COOPER: Thank you. I want to give you — Mr. Trump, I want to give you the chance to respond. I just wanted to tell our viewers what she’s referring to. In the last month, taxes were the number-one issue on Facebook for the first time in the campaign. The New York Times published three pages of your 1995 tax returns. They show you claimed a $916 million loss, which means you could have avoided paying personal federal income taxes for years. You’ve said you pay state taxes, employee taxes, real estate taxes, property taxes. You have not answered, though, a simple question. Did you use that $916 million loss to avoid paying personal federal income taxes for years?

TRUMP: Of course I do. Of course I do. And so do all of her donors, or most of her donors. I know many of her donors. Her donors took massive tax write-offs.

COOPER: So have you (inaudible) personal federal income tax?

TRUMP: A lot of my — excuse me, Anderson — a lot of my write- off was depreciation and other things that Hillary as a senator allowed. And she’ll always allow it, because the people that give her all this money, they want it. That’s why.

See, I understand the tax code better than anybody that’s ever run for president. Hillary Clinton — and it’s extremely complex — Hillary Clinton has friends that want all of these provisions, including they want the carried interest provision, which is very important to Wall Street people. But they really want the carried interest provision, which I believe Hillary’s leaving. Very interesting why she’s leaving carried interest.

But I will tell you that, number one, I pay tremendous numbers of taxes. I absolutely used it. And so did Warren Buffett and so did George Soros and so did many of the other people that Hillary is getting money from. Now, I won’t mention their names, because they’re rich, but they’re not famous. So we won’t make them famous.

COOPER: So can you — can you say how many years you have avoided paying personal federal income taxes?

TRUMP: No, but I pay tax, and I pay federal tax, too. But I have a write-off, a lot of it’s depreciation, which is a wonderful charge. I love depreciation. You know, she’s given it to us.

Hey, if she had a problem — for 30 years she’s been doing this, Anderson. I say it all the time. She talks about health care. Why didn’t she do something about it? She talks about taxes. Why didn’t she do something about it? She doesn’t do anything about anything other than talk. With her, it’s all talk and no action.

COOPER: In the past...

TRUMP: And, again, Bernie Sanders, it’s really bad judgment. She has made bad judgment not only on taxes. She’s made bad judgments on Libya, on Syria, on Iraq. I mean, her and Obama, whether you like it or not, the way they got out of Iraq, the vacuum they’ve left, that’s why ISIS formed in the first place. They started from that little area, and now they’re in 32 different nations, Hillary. Congratulations. Great job.

COOPER: Secretary — I want you to be able to respond, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, here we go again. I’ve been in favor of getting rid of carried interest for years, starting when I was a senator from New York. But that’s not the point here.

TRUMP: Why didn’t you do it? Why didn’t you do it?

COOPER: Allow her to respond.

CLINTON: Because I was a senator with a Republican president.

TRUMP: Oh, really?

CLINTON: I will be the president and we will get it done. That’s exactly right.

TRUMP: You could have done it, if you were an effective — if you were an effective senator, you could have done it. If you were an effective senator, you could have done it. But you were not an effective senator.

COOPER: Please allow her to respond. She didn’t interrupt you.

CLINTON: You know, under our Constitution, presidents have something called veto power. Look, he has now said repeatedly, “30 years this and 30 years that.” So let me talk about my 30 years in public service. I’m very glad to do so.

Eight million kids every year have health insurance, because when I was first lady I worked with Democrats and Republicans to create the Children’s Health Insurance Program. Hundreds of thousands of kids now have a chance to be adopted because I worked to change our adoption and foster care system. After 9/11, I went to work with Republican mayor, governor and president to rebuild New York and to get health care for our first responders who were suffering because they had run toward danger and gotten sickened by it. Hundreds of thousands of National Guard and Reserve members have health care because of work that I did, and children have safer medicines because I was able to pass a law that required the dosing to be more carefully done.

When I was secretary of state, I went around the world advocating for our country, but also advocating for women’s rights, to make sure that women had a decent chance to have a better life and negotiated a treaty with Russia to lower nuclear weapons. Four hundred pieces of legislation have my name on it as a sponsor or cosponsor when I was a senator for eight years.

I worked very hard and was very proud to be re-elected in New York by an even bigger margin than I had been elected the first time. And as president, I will take that work, that bipartisan work, that finding common ground, because you have to be able to get along with people to get things done in Washington.

COOPER: Thank you, secretary.

CLINTON: I’ve proven that I can, and for 30 years, I’ve produced results for people.

COOPER: Thank you, secretary.

RADDATZ: We’re going to move on to Syria. Both of you have mentioned that.

TRUMP: She said a lot of things that were false. I mean, I think we should be allowed to maybe...

RADDATZ: No, we can — no, Mr. Trump, we’re going to go on. This is about the audience.

TRUMP: Excuse me. Because she has been a disaster as a senator. A disaster.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, we’re going to move on. The heart-breaking video of a 5-year-old Syrian boy named Omran sitting in an ambulance after being pulled from the rubble after an air strike in Aleppo focused the world’s attention on the horrors of the war in Syria, with 136 million views on Facebook alone.

But there are much worse images coming out of Aleppo every day now, where in the past few weeks alone, 400 people have been killed, at least 100 of them children. Just days ago, the State Department called for a war crimes investigation of the Syrian regime of Bashar al-Assad and its ally, Russia, for their bombardment of Aleppo.

So this next question comes through social media through Facebook. Diane from Pennsylvania asks, if you were president, what would you do about Syria and the humanitarian crisis in Aleppo? Isn’t it a lot like the Holocaust when the U.S. waited too long before we helped? Secretary Clinton, we will begin with your two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, the situation in Syria is catastrophic. And every day that goes by, we see the results of the regime by Assad in partnership with the Iranians on the ground, the Russians in the air, bombarding places, in particular Aleppo, where there are hundreds of thousands of people, probably about 250,000 still left. And there is a determined effort by the Russian air force to destroy Aleppo in order to eliminate the last of the Syrian rebels who are really holding out against the Assad regime.

Russia hasn’t paid any attention to ISIS. They’re interested in keeping Assad in power. So I, when I was secretary of state, advocated and I advocate today a no-fly zone and safe zones. We need some leverage with the Russians, because they are not going to come to the negotiating table for a diplomatic resolution, unless there is some leverage over them. And we have to work more closely with our partners and allies on the ground.

But I want to emphasize that what is at stake here is the ambitions and the aggressiveness of Russia. Russia has decided that it’s all in, in Syria. And they’ve also decided who they want to see become president of the United States, too, and it’s not me. I’ve stood up to Russia. I’ve taken on Putin and others, and I would do that as president.

I think wherever we can cooperate with Russia, that’s fine. And I did as secretary of state. That’s how we got a treaty reducing nuclear weapons. It’s how we got the sanctions on Iran that put a lid on the Iranian nuclear program without firing a single shot. So I would go to the negotiating table with more leverage than we have now. But I do support the effort to investigate for crimes, war crimes committed by the Syrians and the Russians and try to hold them accountable.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: First of all, she was there as secretary of state with the so-called line in the sand, which...

CLINTON: No, I wasn’t. I was gone. I hate to interrupt you, but at some point...

TRUMP: OK. But you were in contact — excuse me. You were...

CLINTON: At some point, we need to do some fact-checking here.

TRUMP: You were in total contact with the White House, and perhaps, sadly, Obama probably still listened to you. I don’t think he would be listening to you very much anymore.

Obama draws the line in the sand. It was laughed at all over the world what happened.

Now, with that being said, she talks tough against Russia. But our nuclear program has fallen way behind, and they’ve gone wild with their nuclear program. Not good. Our government shouldn’t have allowed that to happen. Russia is new in terms of nuclear. We are old. We’re tired. We’re exhausted in terms of nuclear. A very bad thing.

Now, she talks tough, she talks really tough against Putin and against Assad. She talks in favor of the rebels. She doesn’t even know who the rebels are. You know, every time we take rebels, whether it’s in Iraq or anywhere else, we’re arming people. And you know what happens? They end up being worse than the people.

Look at what she did in Libya with Gadhafi. Gadhafi’s out. It’s a mess. And, by the way, ISIS has a good chunk of their oil. I’m sure you probably have heard that. It was a disaster. Because the fact is, almost everything she’s done in foreign policy has been a mistake and it’s been a disaster.

But if you look at Russia, just take a look at Russia, and look at what they did this week, where I agree, she wasn’t there, but possibly she’s consulted. We sign a peace treaty. Everyone’s all excited. Well, what Russia did with Assad and, by the way, with Iran, who you made very powerful with the dumbest deal perhaps I’ve ever seen in the history of deal-making, the Iran deal, with the $150 billion, with the $1.7 billion in cash, which is enough to fill up this room.

But look at that deal. Iran now and Russia are now against us. So she wants to fight. She wants to fight for rebels. There’s only one problem. You don’t even know who the rebels are. So what’s the purpose?

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Mr. Trump, your two minutes is up.

TRUMP: And one thing I have to say.

RADDATZ: Your two minutes is up.

TRUMP: I don’t like Assad at all, but Assad is killing ISIS. Russia is killing ISIS. And Iran is killing ISIS. And those three have now lined up because of our weak foreign policy.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, let me repeat the question. If you were president...

(LAUGHTER)

... what would you do about Syria and the humanitarian crisis in Aleppo? And I want to remind you what your running mate said. He said provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength and that if Russia continues to be involved in air strikes along with the Syrian government forces of Assad, the United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike the military targets of the Assad regime.

TRUMP: OK. He and I haven’t spoken, and I disagree. I disagree.

RADDATZ: You disagree with your running mate?

TRUMP: I think you have to knock out ISIS. Right now, Syria is fighting ISIS. We have people that want to fight both at the same time. But Syria is no longer Syria. Syria is Russia and it’s Iran, who she made strong and Kerry and Obama made into a very powerful nation and a very rich nation, very, very quickly, very, very quickly.

I believe we have to get ISIS. We have to worry about ISIS before we can get too much more involved. She had a chance to do something with Syria. They had a chance. And that was the line. And she didn’t.

RADDATZ: What do you think will happen if Aleppo falls?

TRUMP: I think Aleppo is a disaster, humanitarian-wise.

RADDATZ: What do you think will happen if it falls?

TRUMP: I think that it basically has fallen. OK? It basically has fallen. Let me tell you something. You take a look at Mosul. The biggest problem I have with the stupidity of our foreign policy, we have Mosul. They think a lot of the ISIS leaders are in Mosul. So we have announcements coming out of Washington and coming out of Iraq, we will be attacking Mosul in three weeks or four weeks.

Well, all of these bad leaders from ISIS are leaving Mosul. Why can’t they do it quietly? Why can’t they do the attack, make it a sneak attack, and after the attack is made, inform the American public that we’ve knocked out the leaders, we’ve had a tremendous success? People leave. Why do they have to say we’re going to be attacking Mosul within the next four to six weeks, which is what they’re saying? How stupid is our country? RADDATZ: There are sometimes reasons the military does that. Psychological warfare.

TRUMP: I can’t think of any. I can’t think of any. And I’m pretty good at it.

RADDATZ: It might be to help get civilians out.

TRUMP: And we have General Flynn. And we have — look, I have 200 generals and admirals who endorsed me. I have 21 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients who endorsed me. We talk about it all the time. They understand, why can’t they do something secretively, where they go in and they knock out the leadership? How — why would these people stay there? I’ve been reading now...

RADDATZ: Tell me what your strategy is.

TRUMP: ... for weeks — I’ve been reading now for weeks about Mosul, that it’s the harbor of where — you know, between Raqqa and Mosul, this is where they think the ISIS leaders are. Why would they be saying — they’re not staying there anymore. They’re gone. Because everybody’s talking about how Iraq, which is us with our leadership, goes in to fight Mosul.

Now, with these 200 admirals and generals, they can’t believe it. All I say is this. General George Patton, General Douglas MacArthur are spinning in their grave at the stupidity of what we’re doing in the Middle East.

RADDATZ: I’m going to go to Secretary Clinton. Secretary Clinton, you want Assad to go. You advocated arming rebels, but it looks like that may be too late for Aleppo. You talk about diplomatic efforts. Those have failed. Cease-fires have failed. Would you introduce the threat of U.S. military force beyond a no-fly zone against the Assad regime to back up diplomacy?

CLINTON: I would not use American ground forces in Syria. I think that would be a very serious mistake. I don’t think American troops should be holding territory, which is what they would have to do as an occupying force. I don’t think that is a smart strategy.

I do think the use of special forces, which we’re using, the use of enablers and trainers in Iraq, which has had some positive effects, are very much in our interests, and so I do support what is happening, but let me just...

RADDATZ: But what would you do differently than President Obama is doing?

CLINTON: Well, Martha, I hope that by the time I — if I’m fortunate...

TRUMP: Everything.

CLINTON: I hope by the time I am president that we will have pushed ISIS out of Iraq. I do think that there is a good chance that we can take Mosul. And, you know, Donald says he knows more about ISIS than the generals. No, he doesn’t.

There are a lot of very important planning going on, and some of it is to signal to the Sunnis in the area, as well as Kurdish Peshmerga fighters, that we all need to be in this. And that takes a lot of planning and preparation.

I would go after Baghdadi. I would specifically target Baghdadi, because I think our targeting of Al Qaida leaders — and I was involved in a lot of those operations, highly classified ones — made a difference. So I think that could help.

I would also consider arming the Kurds. The Kurds have been our best partners in Syria, as well as Iraq. And I know there’s a lot of concern about that in some circles, but I think they should have the equipment they need so that Kurdish and Arab fighters on the ground are the principal way that we take Raqqa after pushing ISIS out of Iraq.

RADDATZ: Thank you very much. We’re going to move on...

TRUMP: You know what’s funny? She went over a minute over, and you don’t stop her. When I go one second over, it’s like a big deal.

RADDATZ: You had many answers.

TRUMP: It’s really — it’s really very interesting.

COOPER: We’ve got a question over here from James Carter. Mr. Carter?

QUESTION: My question is, do you believe you can be a devoted president to all the people in the United States?

COOPER: That question begins for Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Absolutely. I mean, she calls our people deplorable, a large group, and irredeemable. I will be a president for all of our people. And I’ll be a president that will turn our inner cities around and will give strength to people and will give economics to people and will bring jobs back.

Because NAFTA, signed by her husband, is perhaps the greatest disaster trade deal in the history of the world. Not in this country. It stripped us of manufacturing jobs. We lost our jobs. We lost our money. We lost our plants. It is a disaster. And now she wants to sign TPP, even though she says now she’s for it. She called it the gold standard. And by the way, at the last debate, she lied, because it turned out that she did say the gold standard and she said she didn’t say it. They actually said that she lied. OK? And she lied. But she’s lied about a lot of things.

TRUMP: I would be a president for all of the people, African- Americans, the inner cities. Devastating what’s happening to our inner cities. She’s been talking about it for years. As usual, she talks about it, nothing happens. She doesn’t get it done.

Same with the Latino Americans, the Hispanic Americans. The same exact thing. They talk, they don’t get it done. You go into the inner cities and — you see it’s 45 percent poverty. African- Americans now 45 percent poverty in the inner cities. The education is a disaster. Jobs are essentially nonexistent.

I mean, it’s — you know, and I’ve been saying at big speeches where I have 20,000 and 30,000 people, what do you have to lose? It can’t get any worse. And she’s been talking about the inner cities for 25 years. Nothing’s going to ever happen.

Let me tell you, if she’s president of the United States, nothing’s going to happen. It’s just going to be talk. And all of her friends, the taxes we were talking about, and I would just get it by osmosis. She’s not doing any me favors. But by doing all the others’ favors, she’s doing me favors.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, thank you.

TRUMP: But I will tell you, she’s all talk. It doesn’t get done. All you have to do is take a look at her Senate run. Take a look at upstate New York.

COOPER: Your two minutes is up. Secretary Clinton, two minutes?

TRUMP: It turned out to be a disaster.

COOPER: You have two minutes, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, 67 percent of the people voted to re-elect me when I ran for my second term, and I was very proud and very humbled by that.

Mr. Carter, I have tried my entire life to do what I can to support children and families. You know, right out of law school, I went to work for the Children’s Defense Fund. And Donald talks a lot about, you know, the 30 years I’ve been in public service. I’m proud of that. You know, I started off as a young lawyer working against discrimination against African-American children in schools and in the criminal justice system. I worked to make sure that kids with disabilities could get a public education, something that I care very much about. I have worked with Latinos — one of my first jobs in politics was down in south Texas registering Latino citizens to be able to vote. So I have a deep devotion, to use your absolutely correct word, to making sure that an every American feels like he or she has a place in our country.

And I think when you look at the letters that I get, a lot of people are worried that maybe they wouldn’t have a place in Donald Trump’s America. They write me, and one woman wrote me about her son, Felix. She adopted him from Ethiopia when he was a toddler. He’s 10 years old now. This is the only one country he’s ever known. And he listens to Donald on TV and he said to his mother one day, will he send me back to Ethiopia if he gets elected?

You know, children listen to what is being said. To go back to the very, very first question. And there’s a lot of fear — in fact, teachers and parents are calling it the Trump effect. Bullying is up. A lot of people are feeling, you know, uneasy. A lot of kids are expressing their concerns.

So, first and foremost, I will do everything I can to reach out to everybody.

COOPER: Your time, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Democrats, Republicans, independents, people across our country. If you don’t vote for me, I still want to be your president.

COOPER: Your two minutes is up.

CLINTON: I want to be the best president I can be for every American.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, your two minutes is up. I want to follow up on something that Donald Trump actually said to you, a comment you made last month. You said that half of Donald Trump’s supporters are, quote, “deplorables, racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic.” You later said you regretted saying half. You didn’t express regret for using the term “deplorables.” To Mr. Carter’s question, how can you unite a country if you’ve written off tens of millions of Americans?

CLINTON: Well, within hours I said that I was sorry about the way I talked about that, because my argument is not with his supporters. It’s with him and with the hateful and divisive campaign that he has run, and the inciting of violence at his rallies, and the very brutal kinds of comments about not just women, but all Americans, all kinds of Americans.

And what he has said about African-Americans and Latinos, about Muslims, about POWs, about **immigrants**, about people with disabilities, he’s never apologized for. And so I do think that a lot of the tone and tenor that he has said — I’m proud of the campaign that Bernie Sanders and I ran. We ran a campaign based on issues, not insults. And he is supporting me 100 percent.

COOPER: Thank you.

CLINTON: Because we talked about what we wanted to do. We might have had some differences, and we had a lot of debates...

COOPER: Thank you, Secretary.

TRUMP: ... but we believed that we could make the country better. And I was proud of that.

COOPER: I want to give you a minute to respond.

TRUMP: We have a divided nation. We have a very divided nation. You look at Charlotte. You look at Baltimore. You look at the violence that’s taking place in the inner cities, Chicago, you take a look at Washington, D.C.

We have an increase in murder within our cities, the biggest in 45 years. We have a divided nation, because people like her — and believe me, she has tremendous hate in her heart. And when she said deplorables, she meant it. And when she said irredeemable, they’re irredeemable, you didn’t mention that, but when she said they’re irredeemable, to me that might have been even worse.

COOPER: She said some of them are irredeemable.

TRUMP: She’s got tremendous — she’s got tremendous hatred. And this country cannot take another four years of Barack Obama, and that’s what you’re getting with her.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, let me follow up with you. In 2008, you wrote in one of your books that the most important characteristic of a good leader is discipline. You said, if a leader doesn’t have it, quote, “he or she won’t be one for very long.” In the days after the first debate, you sent out a series of tweets from 3 a.m. to 5 a.m., including one that told people to check out a sex tape. Is that the discipline of a good leader?

TRUMP: No, there wasn’t check out a sex tape. It was just take a look at the person that she built up to be this wonderful Girl Scout who was no Girl Scout.

COOPER: You mentioned sex tape.

TRUMP: By the way, just so you understand, when she said 3 o’clock in the morning, take a look at Benghazi. She said who is going to answer the call at 3 o’clock in the morning? Guess what? She didn’t answer it, because when Ambassador Stevens...

COOPER: The question is, is that the discipline of a good leader?

TRUMP: ... 600 — wait a minute, Anderson, 600 times. Well, she said she was awake at 3 o’clock in the morning, and she also sent a tweet out at 3 o’clock in the morning, but I won’t even mention that. But she said she’ll be awake. Who’s going — the famous thing, we’re going to answer our call at 3 o’clock in the morning. Guess what happened? Ambassador Stevens — Ambassador Stevens sent 600 requests for help. And the only one she talked to was Sidney Blumenthal, who’s her friend and not a good guy, by the way. So, you know, she shouldn’t be talking about that.

Now, tweeting happens to be a modern day form of communication. I mean, you can like it or not like it. I have, between Facebook and Twitter, I have almost 25 million people. It’s a very effective way of communication. So you can put it down, but it is a very effective form of communication. I’m not un-proud of it, to be honest with you.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, does Mr. Trump have the discipline to be a good leader?

CLINTON: No.

TRUMP: I’m shocked to hear that.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: Well, it’s not only my opinion. It’s the opinion of many others, national security experts, Republicans, former Republican members of Congress. But it’s in part because those of us who have had the great privilege of seeing this job up close and know how difficult it is, and it’s not just because I watched my husband take a $300 billion deficit and turn it into a $200 billion surplus, and 23 million new jobs were created, and incomes went up for everybody. Everybody. African-American incomes went up 33 percent.

And it’s not just because I worked with George W. Bush after 9/11, and I was very proud that when I told him what the city needed, what we needed to recover, he said you’ve got it, and he never wavered. He stuck with me.

And I have worked and I admire President Obama. He inherited the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. That was a terrible time for our country.

COOPER: We have to move along.

CLINTON: Nine million people lost their jobs.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we have to...

CLINTON: Five million homes were lost.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we’re moving.

CLINTON: And $13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out. We are back on the right track. He would send us back into recession with his tax plans that benefit the wealthiest of Americans.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we are moving to an audience question. We’re almost out of time. We have another... TRUMP: We have the slowest growth since 1929.

RADDATZ: We’re moving to an audience question.

TRUMP: It is — our country has the slowest growth and jobs are a disaster.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Secretary Clinton, we want to get to the audience. Thank you very much both of you.

(LAUGHTER)

We have another audience question. Beth Miller has a question for both candidates.

QUESTION: Good evening. Perhaps the most important aspect of this election is the Supreme Court justice. What would you prioritize as the most important aspect of selecting a Supreme Court justice?

RADDATZ: We begin with your two minutes, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Thank you. Well, you’re right. This is one of the most important issues in this election. I want to appoint Supreme Court justices who understand the way the world really works, who have real-life experience, who have not just been in a big law firm and maybe clerked for a judge and then gotten on the bench, but, you know, maybe they tried some more cases, they actually understand what people are up against.

Because I think the current court has gone in the wrong direction. And so I would want to see the Supreme Court reverse Citizens United and get dark, unaccountable money out of our politics. Donald doesn’t agree with that.

I would like the Supreme Court to understand that voting rights are still a big problem in many parts of our country, that we don’t always do everything we can to make it possible for people of color and older people and young people to be able to exercise their franchise. I want a Supreme Court that will stick with Roe v. Wade and a woman’s right to choose, and I want a Supreme Court that will stick with marriage equality.

Now, Donald has put forth the names of some people that he would consider. And among the ones that he has suggested are people who would reverse Roe v. Wade and reverse marriage equality. I think that would be a terrible mistake and would take us backwards.

I want a Supreme Court that doesn’t always side with corporate interests. I want a Supreme Court that understands because you’re wealthy and you can give more money to something doesn’t mean you have any more rights or should have any more rights than anybody else.

So I have very clear views about what I want to see to kind of change the balance on the Supreme Court. And I regret deeply that the Senate has not done its job and they have not permitted a vote on the person that President Obama, a highly qualified person, they’ve not given him a vote to be able to be have the full complement of nine Supreme Court justices. I think that was a dereliction of duty.

I hope that they will see their way to doing it, but if I am so fortunate enough as to be president, I will immediately move to make sure that we fill that, we have nine justices that get to work on behalf of our people.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. Thank you. You’re out of time. Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Justice Scalia, great judge, died recently. And we have a vacancy. I am looking to appoint judges very much in the mold of Justice Scalia. I’m looking for judges — and I’ve actually picked 20 of them so that people would see, highly respected, highly thought of, and actually very beautifully reviewed by just about everybody.

But people that will respect the Constitution of the United States. And I think that this is so important. Also, the Second Amendment, which is totally under siege by people like Hillary Clinton. They’ll respect the Second Amendment and what it stands for, what it represents. So important to me.

Now, Hillary mentioned something about contributions just so you understand. So I will have in my race more than $100 million put in — of my money, meaning I’m not taking all of this big money from all of these different corporations like she’s doing. What I ask is this.

So I’m putting in more than — by the time it’s finished, I’ll have more than $100 million invested. Pretty much self-funding money. We’re raising money for the Republican Party, and we’re doing tremendously on the small donations, $61 average or so.

I ask Hillary, why doesn’t — she made $250 million by being in office. She used the power of her office to make a lot of money. Why isn’t she funding, not for $100 million, but why don’t you put $10 million or $20 million or $25 million or $30 million into your own campaign?

It’s $30 million less for special interests that will tell you exactly what to do and it would really, I think, be a nice sign to the American public. Why aren’t you putting some money in? You have a lot of it. You’ve made a lot of it because of the fact that you’ve been in office. Made a lot of it while you were secretary of state, actually. So why aren’t you putting money into your own campaign? I’m just curious.

CLINTON: Well...

(CROSSTALK)

RADDATZ: Thank you very much. We’re going to get on to one more question.

CLINTON: The question was about the Supreme Court. And I just want to quickly say, I respect the Second Amendment. But I believe there should be comprehensive background checks, and we should close the gun show loophole, and close the online loophole. COOPER: Thank you.

RADDATZ: We have — we have one more question, Mrs. Clinton.

CLINTON: We have to save as many lives as we possibly can.

COOPER: We have one more question from Ken Bone about energy policy. Ken?

QUESTION: What steps will your energy policy take to meet our energy needs, while at the same time remaining environmentally friendly and minimizing job loss for fossil power plant workers?

COOPER: Mr. Trump, two minutes?

TRUMP: Absolutely. I think it’s such a great question, because energy is under siege by the Obama administration. Under absolutely siege. The EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, is killing these energy companies. And foreign companies are now coming in buying our — buying so many of our different plants and then re-jiggering the plant so that they can take care of their oil.

We are killing — absolutely killing our energy business in this country. Now, I’m all for alternative forms of energy, including wind, including solar, et cetera. But we need much more than wind and solar.

And you look at our miners. Hillary Clinton wants to put all the miners out of business. There is a thing called clean coal. Coal will last for 1,000 years in this country. Now we have natural gas and so many other things because of technology. We have unbelievable — we have found over the last seven years, we have found tremendous wealth right under our feet. So good. Especially when you have $20 trillion in debt.

I will bring our energy companies back. They’ll be able to compete. They’ll make money. They’ll pay off our national debt. They’ll pay off our tremendous budget deficits, which are tremendous. But we are putting our energy companies out of business. We have to bring back our workers.

You take a look at what’s happening to steel and the cost of steel and China dumping vast amounts of steel all over the United States, which essentially is killing our steelworkers and our steel companies. We have to guard our energy companies. We have to make it possible.

The EPA is so restrictive that they are putting our energy companies out of business. And all you have to do is go to a great place like West Virginia or places like Ohio, which is phenomenal, or places like Pennsylvania and you see what they’re doing to the people, miners and others in the energy business. It’s a disgrace.

COOPER: Your time is up. Thank you.

TRUMP: It’s an absolute disgrace. COOPER: Secretary Clinton, two minutes.

CLINTON: And actually — well, that was very interesting. First of all, China is illegally dumping steel in the United States and Donald Trump is buying it to build his buildings, putting steelworkers and American steel plants out of business. That’s something that I fought against as a senator and that I would have a trade prosecutor to make sure that we don’t get taken advantage of by China on steel or anything else.

You know, because it sounds like you’re in the business or you’re aware of people in the business — you know that we are now for the first time ever energy-independent. We are not dependent upon the Middle East. But the Middle East still controls a lot of the prices. So the price of oil has been way down. And that has had a damaging effect on a lot of the oil companies, right? We are, however, producing a lot of natural gas, which serves as a bridge to more renewable fuels. And I think that’s an important transition.

We’ve got to remain energy-independent. It gives us much more power and freedom than to be worried about what goes on in the Middle East. We have enough worries over there without having to worry about that.

So I have a comprehensive energy policy, but it really does include fighting climate change, because I think that is a serious problem. And I support moving toward more clean, renewable energy as quickly as we can, because I think we can be the 21st century clean energy superpower and create millions of new jobs and businesses.

But I also want to be sure that we don’t leave people behind. That’s why I’m the only candidate from the very beginning of this campaign who had a plan to help us revitalize coal country, because those coal miners and their fathers and their grandfathers, they dug that coal out. A lot of them lost their lives. They were injured, but they turned the lights on and they powered their factories. I don’t want to walk away from them. So we’ve got to do something for them.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: But the price of coal is down worldwide. So we have to look at this comprehensively.

COOPER: Your time is up.

CLINTON: And that’s exactly what I have proposed. I hope you will go to HillaryClinton.com and look at my entire policy.

COOPER: Time is up. We have time for one more...

RADDATZ: We have...

COOPER: One more audience question.

RADDATZ: We’ve sneaked in one more question, and it comes from Karl Becker.

QUESTION: Good evening. My question to both of you is, regardless of the current rhetoric, would either of you name one positive thing that you respect in one another?

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, would you like to go first?

CLINTON: Well, I certainly will, because I think that’s a very fair and important question. Look, I respect his children. His children are incredibly able and devoted, and I think that says a lot about Donald. I don’t agree with nearly anything else he says or does, but I do respect that. And I think that is something that as a mother and a grandmother is very important to me.

So I believe that this election has become in part so — so conflict-oriented, so intense because there’s a lot at stake. This is not an ordinary time, and this is not an ordinary election. We are going to be choosing a president who will set policy for not just four or eight years, but because of some of the important decisions we have to make here at home and around the world, from the Supreme Court to energy and so much else, and so there is a lot at stake. It’s one of the most consequential elections that we’ve had.

And that’s why I’ve tried to put forth specific policies and plans, trying to get it off of the personal and put it on to what it is I want to do as president. And that’s why I hope people will check on that for themselves so that they can see that, yes, I’ve spent 30 years, actually maybe a little more, working to help kids and families. And I want to take all that experience to the White House and do that every single day.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Well, I consider her statement about my children to be a very nice compliment. I don’t know if it was meant to be a compliment, but it is a great — I’m very proud of my children. And they’ve done a wonderful job, and they’ve been wonderful, wonderful kids. So I consider that a compliment.

I will say this about Hillary. She doesn’t quit. She doesn’t give up. I respect that. I tell it like it is. She’s a fighter. I disagree with much of what she’s fighting for. I do disagree with her judgment in many cases. But she does fight hard, and she doesn’t quit, and she doesn’t give up. And I consider that to be a very good trait.

RADDATZ: Thanks to both of you.

COOPER: We want to thank both the candidates. We want to thank the university here. This concludes the town hall meeting. Our thanks to the candidates, the commission, Washington University, and to everybody who watched.

RADDATZ: Please tune in on October 19th for the final presidential debate that will take place at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Good night, everyone.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As the backlash increases over a recording of Donald J. Trump speaking of women in vulgar sexual terms, some activists have said the fury may be particularly intense because Mr. Trump, who has previously offended a number of minorities, is now being perceived as demeaning a target historically more valued in American society: white women.

Mr. Trump has been accused of belittling women before. He has battled the Fox News anchor Megyn Kelly and publicly feuded with Rosie O’Donnell. But in the recording released on Friday[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html], Mr. Trump says he can have access to any woman’s body because of his fame and moments later is shown arm in arm with a white actress, Arianne Zucker. That seemed to resonate powerfully with Republican leaders, who perhaps could imagine Ms. Zucker as one of their own family members.

Many of the Republicans who withdrew their support from Mr. Trump or increased their criticism released statements citing their daughters, wives and mothers in explaining why the comments were so objectionable.

“As the grandfather of two precious girls, I find that no apology can excuse away Donald Trump’s reprehensible comments degrading women,” Jeb Bush said on Twitter[https://twitter.com/JebBush/status/784530223605903360].

Senator Dan Sullivan of Alaska said he was “inspired by my three wonderful teenage daughters, and my wise and gracious wife” as he called on Mr. Trump to “step aside.”

Representative Jason Chaffetz of Utah withdrew support from Mr. Trump by telling a local television station, “My wife and I, we have a 15-year-old daughter, and if I can’t look her in the eye and tell her these things, I can’t endorse this person.”

But some activists, experts and party strategists say that display of empathy illustrates that the lives of minorities are not as valued as those of white women.

Hours after the release of the video, Symone Sanders, the former national press secretary for the presidential campaign of Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont, took to Twitter: “You apparently can say whatever you want about Mexicans, Hispanics & Black people, but the Republican Party draws the line on white women,” she said on Friday night.

In an interview on Saturday, Ms. Sanders said many Republicans asking for Mr. Trump to withdraw from the race and referring to their families were illustrating that they could not empathize when others were targeted.

“We are still measuring folks by standards of whiteness, and it took for Donald Trump to essentially speak poorly about white women in this country en masse — it took Donald Trump to do something and say something where white people could put themselves in that position to say, ‘Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. You’ve gone too far, buddy. This is too much,’” she said.

Many of the Republicans calling on Mr. Trump to step aside [http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/29/us/politics/at-least-110-republican-leaders-wont-vote-for-donald-trump-heres-when-they-reached-their-breaking-point.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=b-lede-package-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] or withdrawing their support[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/29/us/politics/at-least-110-republican-leaders-wont-vote-for-donald-trump-heres-when-they-reached-their-breaking-point.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=b-lede-package-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] are in tight races of their own, and the political motivations for the outcry are clear, with many leaders focused on saving down-ballot races and on pushing back against recordings that condone sexual harassment.

But some say the political reasons for the reaction do not explain why previous comments from Mr. Trump were not met with the same response. Mr. Trump has faced criticism in varying degrees throughout his campaign from Republicans over his comments that some Mexican **immigrants** are rapists and criminals, for his initial proposal to bar Muslims from entering the United States and for his attacks on a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, for gaining weight. But those incidents did not prompt the same kind of widespread and intense condemnation.

Alida Garcia, the coalitions and policy director at FWD.us, an **immigration** overhaul group, said she was as angry the day Mr. Trump began his campaign by describing undocumented Mexican **immigrants** as criminals as she was about the recording on Friday.

“As a Mexican-American woman, the very first day of Donald Trump’s campaign crossed a line, and it did not feel like the broader political community took that seriously,” Ms. Garcia said. “I do feel that this country still looks at Mexicans and Latinos as an invisible work force in the United States that is not deserving of the same humanization as white people.”

Johnetta Elzie, 27, a Black Lives Matter activist based in St. Louis, echoed the sentiment.

“It’s like everything is to save and protect white women. And it’s like, what about everyone else?” Ms. Elzie said.

“It makes me wonder: Do you not have any Muslim friends? Do you not know any black people? Do you not know any Mexicans? Why is it this thing where you can look inside your household, like why do you have to make that kind of connection to have empathy for someone?”

For Angela Rye, chief executive of Impact Strategies, a political advocacy firm in Washington, the responses come down to implicit bias, the idea that everyone filters situations and events through their own experiences, race and gender.

“Sometimes you don’t realize how bad something is until it hits you really close to home,” she said. “And this time it hit them in their homes instead of next door to their homes because he is literally talking about groping a white woman and then goes up and gives her a hug on the video.”

Whatever the prime motivation for the outcry from Republican officials, Ms. Sanders said she thought it was about more than their wives and daughters.

“White women are part of a strategic base in the Republican Party, and folks, I don’t think they felt this offended just because they have daughters and mothers,” Ms. Sanders said. “I have to believe, as a strategist, that folks thought this is absolutely bad for the party and we can’t win down-ballot races if he’s out here speaking like this and there are more tapes that surface. We have to distance ourselves to save what’s left of our party.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In his 26 years, Martin Batalla Vidal has been many things: a Mexican citizen, a New York City resident, a high school graduate, a nursing student, a caterer, a health club janitor and an undocumented **immigrant**.

Recently, however, he took on another role: a plaintiff suing the federal government.

In August, Mr. Batalla Vidal filed a lawsuit in Brooklyn claiming that officials of the United States Citizenship and **Immigration**Services[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/c/citizenship\_and\_immigration\_services\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-org] had illegally revoked his work permit by adhering to a 2015 ruling by a federal judge in Texas that halted an expansion of President Obama[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack\_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per]’s signature **immigration** plan called Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals known as DACA. Mr. Batalla Vidal was the first — and so far only — person in the country to challenge the decision, which was upheld by the United States Supreme Court[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/supreme\_court/index.html?inline=nyt-org] in June. And he has embarked on his battle with the fighting spirit of his adopted hometown, arguing that a ruling by a Texas judge simply has no bearing on people in New York.

“Texas has their own laws,” Mr. Batalla Vidal, who lives in Ridgewood, Queens, said recently. “But other states, like New York and California, we’re different. I just thought it wasn’t fair for myself and millions of other people that a judge somewhere else could affect our lives.”

A bit of background: In November 2014, Mr. Obama used his executive powers to expand the DACA program[http://iamerica.org/expanded-daca], increasing the length of work permits for eligible children of undocumented **immigrants** to three years from two years. At the same time, he established a corollary program known as DAPA[https://www.uscis.gov/immigrationaction], or Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, which allowed as many as five million unauthorized **immigrants** who were the parents of citizens or of lawful permanent residents to obtain work permits and avoid deportation.

A month after the executive orders were signed, Texas, among other states, sought a court order to the stop the programs. In February 2015, a federal judge in Texas, Andrew S. Hanen, ruled in their favor[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/18/us/obama-immigration-policy-halted-by-federal-judge-in-texas.html]. Judge Hanen’s decision was upheld this summer by a deadlocked Supreme Court[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/supreme-court-immigration-obama-dapa.html], which was evenly split on the case, leaving the ruling intact. Last Monday, the Supreme Court declined to reconsider[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/us/politics/supreme-court-immigration-obama.html] the case.

Mr. Batalla Vidal found himself caught up in this contentious litigation. With the help of Make the Road New York[http://www.maketheroad.org/], an **immigrant**advocacy group in Brooklyn, he received his three-year work permit from the government in February 2015 — one day after Judge Hanen issued his injunction. Three months later, however, **immigration** officials demanded the return of the permit, saying that because of the ruling he could work in the country for only two years.

“When I first got the letter, I didn’t understand what was going on,” Mr. Batalla Vidal said. “I had just received my permit, so how were they going to revoke it?”

Mr. Batalla Vidal came to New York from Mexico at 7, settling with his parents and three younger brothers in Jackson Heights, Queens. When the family moved to Bushwick, Brooklyn, Mr. Batalla Vidal attended the Bushwick Leaders’ High School for Academic Excellence. “Mr. Batalla Vidal considers New York his home,” his lawsuit says, “as it is the only place he has lived as an adult.”

When Mr. Batalla Vidal’s work status was altered by the government, he was working two jobs: at a catering company and as a desk clerk and housekeeper at a New York Sports Club. He eventually enrolled in ASA College in Brooklyn, pursuing a medical assistant degree. Although he received a scholarship specifically designed for DACA students, the revocation of his three-year permit has jeopardized his ability to support himself and to pay the remainder of his tuition.

And so over the summer, with the help of his lawyer, Vanessa Dell, he got in touch with Michael J. Wishnie, a professor at Yale Law School. On Aug. 25, Mr. Wishnie filed a lawsuit on behalf of Mr. Batalla Vidal in Federal District Court in Brooklyn, asking a judge to declare that the Texas injunction “does not apply to New York residents.”

“I think the potential impact here could affect millions of people,” Mr. Wishnie said. He estimated that about 2,600 DACA recipients nationwide had their three-year work permits revoked because of the Texas ruling. But if Mr. Batalla Vidal’s lawsuit spares New Yorkers from the ruling, hundreds of thousands of people in the state could be eligible again not only for the expanded DACA privileges, but also for those that were available under DAPA. That number, Mr. Wishine said, could increase even more if plaintiffs in other states like California and Illinois also sue and win.

Though a decision in the case is months away, Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis, who is considering the suit, seemed to look upon it favorably at a hearing in Brooklyn last month. Adam Kirschner, a lawyer for the federal government, told Judge Garaufis that the Obama administration had strenuously fought the Texas ruling, but that, because it had been upheld, **immigration** officials were now in the “untenable position” of having to enforce it in New York.

Judge Garaufis said he sympathized with the government’s position, but he refused to be “hamstrung,” as **immigration** officials were, “in dealing with an issue involving individual rights.”

“I don’t know what’s going on out there in Texas on the border, but I know what’s going on in New York,” he continued. “And I’m very concerned about it, and I have absolutely no intention of simply marching behind in the parade that’s going on out there in Texas, if this person has rights here.”

The next hearing is scheduled for January.

Mr. Batalla Vidal, who said he had been afraid to sue the government at first, now feels optimistic. “It just felt great to hear the judge,” he said. “At the end of the day, I’m not really fighting for myself — I’m fighting for my community.”

Though he said he harbored no animosity toward Texas, he was clearly happy to live in New York.

“I’ve never been to Texas,” Mr. Batalla Vidal said, “and honestly, I’m not interested in going.”

\* Supreme Court Tie Blocks Obama **Immigration** Plan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/supreme-court-immigration-obama-dapa.html]

\* For **Immigrants**, Fear Returns After a Federal Judge’s Ruling[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/21/us/for-immigrants-fear-returns-after-a-federal-judges-ruling.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Pope Francis[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/f/francis\_i/index.html?inline=nyt-per] on Sunday named 17 new cardinals, including three Americans, adding prelates from developing countries[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/13/world/europe/pope-looks-south-in-appointing-cardinals.html] to give them a greater voice in selecting the next pope. Francis’ American appointments elevate moderates in the church hierarchy, bypassing doctrinal conservatives from large archdioceses.

The three Americans, the most Francis named from any one country, are Archbishops Blase J. Cupich[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/us/vaticans-new-direction-gains-a-voice-in-chicago.html] of Chicago and Joseph Tobin of Indianapolis and a former Dallas bishop, Kevin Farrell, whom Francis recently reassigned to the Vatican[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/roman\_catholic\_church/index.html?inline=nyt-org] to lead a new department for family, laity and life. Francis had skipped over the United States in two previous rounds of appointments.

The pope announced the new cardinals from the steps of St. Peter’s Basilica at the end of a special Mass on Sunday, saying their diversity represents “the universality of the church” and “the mercy of God in every corner of the world.” He said he will elevate the cardinals on Nov. 19.

The group includes men from five countries that had never before had a cardinal: Bangladesh, the Central African Republic, Lesotho, Malaysia and Papua New Guinea. Francis also named as cardinal the Vatican envoy to Syria, a signal of the church’s concern for that war-ravaged country. Other appointees are from Venezuela, Brazil, Spain, Belgium, Mauritius, Mexico, Italy and Albania.

Thirteen of the new cardinals, including the Americans, are under 80 and therefore eligible to vote in a conclave to elect the next pope. Francis has now selected about 40 percent of the 120 cardinals who are currently eligible to choose his successor.

American electoral politics is never a determining factor in the selection of cardinals. But all three American picks have been outspoken opponents of Republican Party positions at a time when the United States church hierarchy is often seen as an ally of the party because of mutual opposition to abortion and same-sex marriage[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/same\_sex\_marriage/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

Archbishop Tobin insisted that his archdiocese would continue to resettle Syrian refugees in Indiana, despite attempts to bar them[http://www.npr.org/2016/10/03/496466007/federal-court-blocks-gov-pences-attempt-to-block-syrian-refugees-from-indiana] by Gov. Mike Pence, Donald J. Trump’s running mate on the Republican ticket.

Bishop Farrell is among the few prelates in the United States to issue emphatic pleas for gun control, a surprising move for a bishop based in the open-carry state of Texas. And Archbishop Cupich, in an archdiocese populated with **immigrants** from many countries, has become a prominent advocate of overhauling **immigration** law, a position held by the United States bishops’ conference.

On internal church matters, all three American appointees have indicated they support Francis’ efforts to set a tone that is more pastoral than judgmental toward women, gays and Catholics who have divorced and remarried.

Alejandro Bermúdez, a journalist from Peru who is the executive director of the Catholic News Agency, a conservative-leaning outlet, said, “The pope is making sure that his successor follows his line of thought.”

Mr. Bermúdez said the pope was promoting prelates from many smaller dioceses — not only in the United States, but also in Venezuela and Mexico — who are “the classic Pope Francis-type of bishops.”

“They aren’t so interested in leading cultural battles, but more in doing pastoral work,” Mr. Bermúdez said. “The pope is convinced that the cultural wars are not going to bring anything but further misunderstanding and defeats for the Catholic Church,” especially since even many practicing Catholics do not share the church’s positions on abortion and same-sex marriage.

Archbishop Tobin, who previously served in the Vatican, became known there as a supporter of American nuns being investigated by other Vatican officials on claims of deviating from church doctrine — an inquiry some American bishops had encouraged. At a Catholic women’s conference in Indiana this weekend[https://www.ncronline.org/blogs/ncr-today/deacons-millennials-part-bishops-conversation-womens-conference], Archbishop Tobin said he was “hopeful” that women could become deacons, a possibility now being studied by a Vatican committee appointed by the pope.

The selection of Archbishop Tobin surprised church observers, and apparently the bishop himself. In a Twitter message[https://twitter.com/joetobin] posted on Sunday, Archbishop Tobin said: “I’m shocked beyond words by the decision of the Holy Father. Please pray for me.”

Francis bypassed archdioceses accustomed to having cardinals eligible to vote in a conclave, including Venice, Philadelphia and Los Angeles.

With Cardinal Roger Mahony, the retired archbishop of Los Angeles, having turned 80 in February, many had expected Francis to elevate Archbishop José Gomez of Los Angeles, an **immigrant** from Mexico who is a strong advocate for **immigrants**. He would have been the only Latino cardinal in a church with a growing Latino presence.

Philadelphia had hosted a festive and successful visit for Francis last year. But its archbishop, Charles J. Chaput, has been an uninhibited critic of Francis on doctrinal matters, expressing concern that his leadership has confused the church by leaving open the prospect that priests may give communion to divorced and remarried Catholics.

\* Vatican’s New Tone Gains a Voice in Chicago as Blase Cupich Becomes Archbishop[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/us/vaticans-new-direction-gains-a-voice-in-chicago.html]

\* Pope Francis May Find Wariness Among U.S. Bishops on Climate Change[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/14/us/pope-francis-may-find-wariness-among-us-bishops-on-climate-change.html]

\* Pope With the Humble Touch Is Firm in Reshaping the Vatican[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/14/world/europe/pope-with-the-humble-touch-is-firm-in-reshaping-the-vatican.html]

\* Francis Looks to the Developing World in Appointing New Cardinals[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/13/world/europe/pope-looks-south-in-appointing-cardinals.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AUSTIN, Tex. — Attorney General Ken Paxton of Texas, who is fighting criminal charges of personally duping wealthy investors before taking office, has won a major court victory after a judge dismissed a nearly identical civil case brought against him by the federal government.

A federal judge on Friday gave the Securities and Exchange Commission[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/securities\_and\_exchange\_commission/index.html?inline=nyt-org] two weeks to refile charges against Mr. Paxton, but for now, he has shed one of two cases that have marred his political rise.

Mr. Paxton, a Republican, has spent most of his 20 months on the job under felony indictment. He has pleaded not guilty in the criminal case while trying to preserve a high profile nationally, leading lawsuits against the Obama administration over **immigration**, transgender rights and Syrian refugees.

The collapse of the civil case gives Mr. Paxton a long-sought court victory over allegations that he deceived investors in a high-tech start-up called Servergy Inc. by not disclosing that the company was paying him. He has twice failed in his attempts to have the July 2015 criminal indictments against him thrown out and is trying again before the state’s highest criminal court.

The federal district judge, Amos L. Mazzant III, who “conditionally granted” the dismissal of the civil suit barring a second effort by the S.E.C., said federal regulators lacked enough facts to keep their case moving forward.

Mr. Paxton had been accused of raising $840,000 in 2011 by betraying friends and using high-pressure tactics to secure investors. At the time, he was a state legislator from suburban Dallas, and one investor he was accused of misleading was a fellow Republican lawmaker.

“Paxton did not have a legal obligation to disclose his financial arrangement,” Judge Mazzant wrote.

Mr. Paxton now hopes for a similar outcome in the state’s highest criminal court. The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, which this year dismissed a felony abuse-of-power case against former Gov. Rick Perry, has not yet decided if it will hear Mr. Paxton’s appeal.

Special prosecutors in the criminal case against Mr. Paxton said the federal ruling would have no bearing on their case.

The felony securities fraud charges against Mr. Paxton carry a possible sentence of five to 99 years in prison. He is likely to stand trial in 2017 unless the charges are thrown out.

At the heart of Judge Mazzant’s decision was his assertion that the S.E.C. failed to prove that Mr. Paxton had a “fiduciary relationship” with the investors he recruited and was obliged to tell them that he was being paid by Servergy in the form of 100,000 shares.

\* Court Filing Accuses Texas of Misleading Voters Without IDs[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/08/us/court-filing-accuses-texas-of-misleading-voters-without-ids.html]

\* Federal Transgender Bathroom Access Guidelines Blocked by Judge[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/transgender-bathroom-access-guidelines-blocked-by-judge.html]

\* Grand Jury Indicts Texas Attorney General, Ken Paxton, on Felony Charges[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/02/us/grand-jury-indicts-texas-attorney-general-ken-paxton-on-felony-charges.html]

\* Texas Attorney General Faces Federal Securities Fraud Lawsuit[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/12/us/texas-attorney-general-ken-paxton-faces-federal-securities-fraud-lawsuit.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Chicago — For eight years, I worked as a housecleaner for a millionaire who lived in the Gold Coast neighborhood of Chicago. I took the bus across town three times a week, often to work in an empty house because my employer was frequently away, traveling for business.

That also meant I got paid only when I saw him — in lump sums, often months apart. At first, I didn’t mind this setup, but soon, months would pass. By the end of 2008, my employer owed me $10,000 — and had stopped returning my calls.

I was frantic. It wasn’t just that these were wages for weeks and weeks of work I’d already done, but I had bills to pay and my son’s tuition at a special high school.

I went over to my employer’s place one day, hoping to confront him, and finally found him home. I asked when I’d get paid what I was owed. He didn’t answer, but instead offered[http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/35732-immigrant-women-lead-efforts-to-transform-conditions-for-domestic-workers-in-illinois] a one-off payment of $1,000 to settle the debt. When I refused that, he told me to leave and, obviously assuming I was undocumented, threatened to have me deported. (In fact, I had legal status as a permanent resident on grounds of political asylum.)

It wasn’t the first time I’d been treated like this. I’d been a housekeeper for more than a decade, after coming to Chicago from Guatemala in 1989 to escape the civil war. In general, the work wasn’t bad, though it was hard on my joints as I got older. I often felt I was learning new things, and I always took pride in maintaining clean and tidy homes for people.

But I soon found out how some employers tried to take advantage of an **immigrant** with the broken English I spoke at the time. One woman wanted to pay me $60 for two full days of work — after we’d previously agreed on a higher amount. Another employer liked to leave pornographic magazines lying around after I started working for him.

In any regular workplace, this type of behavior wouldn’t be tolerated. But for domestic workers like me, who do their jobs in the privacy of people’s homes, there isn’t much we can do. If we say something, we get fired.

Which is why the Gold Coast millionaire probably thought I would just go away. But he was wrong. I took him to court.

When I filed my wage theft lawsuit, I was shocked to learn how few rights I had under Illinois law. There are about two million[http://www.epi.org/publication/in-home-workers/] domestic workers in the United States — people like me, who clean homes or care for children and seniors. Many of us are minority or **immigrant** women, and many work for less than minimum wage — either because domestic work is not covered by the federal labor laws or because domestic workers are also excluded from state protections and benefits.

Fighting my lawsuit gradually turned me into an activist, and I began to speak out about my case. The more I did, the more I met other domestic workers who told me their stories; many had suffered worse mistreatment than I had. Taking inspiration from efforts in other states like California and New York to pass laws that protect the rights of domestic workers, we began campaigning for similar legislation in Illinois.

It took awhile, but we won. In August, Illinois became[https://www.domesticworkers.org/illinois-bill-of-rights] the seventh state to adopt a law to protect our rights, joining Massachusetts, California, New York, Oregon, Hawaii and Connecticut.

Under the Domestic Workers Bill of Rights[http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/fulltext.asp?DocName=&SessionId=88&GA=99&DocTypeId=HB&DocNum=1288&GAID=13&LegID=85770&SpecSess=&Session=], more than 35,000 housecleaners, nannies and home care workers in Illinois are fully covered by labor and human rights laws for the first time in the state’s history. Whether you’re paid in cash, or are undocumented, as a domestic worker you are now guaranteed a state minimum wage, protection from discrimination and sexual harassment, a meal break in every shift and a day of rest each week.

The day of my final court date, my employer met me outside the courtroom and tried to make a final settlement. He raised his offer to $1,500. I said no, out of dignity for myself and for my work. Fortunately, I was vindicated because, a few minutes later, the judge ruled in my favor. But it had taken five long, grinding years to get justice. No one should have to go through that.

That was why the day that Gov. Bruce Rauner signed[http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-rauner-signs-domestic-workers-bill-0816-biz-20160815-story.html] the domestic workers bill into law meant so much to me. Housecleaners and care workers will no longer have to live in the shadows, enduring abusive situations, in Illinois.

Employers will know that our work deserves respect, dignity and protection. And workers will know that the law is on our side.

My job now is to see that every state in the country adopts a bill of rights like Illinois’.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Isabel Escobar is a housecleaner, a board member of the advocacy group Arise Chicago and a member of the National Domestic Workers Alliance.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — For those blithely inclined toward the view that Britain would somehow find a way to sever its relationship with the European Union[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org] free of drama or financial consequences — like canceling a car rental reservation, with a tad more paperwork — Friday was a sobering day of reckoning.

As the British pound plunged some 6 percent against the American dollar in the span of two minutes in early trading in Asia, the markets offered a reminder that divorce tends to be messy, expensive and laced with uncertainties. It rarely ends happily.

The selling was so frenzied and swift that those who swap currencies for a living spoke of computerized transactions going haywire, rogue algorithms at work or a data entry error. The drop in the value of the pound appeared excessive, and it soon recovered some losses, though the British currency was down about 17 percent — around 25 cents — since June 23, the day Britain voted to abandon Europe.

More than anything, though, the precipitous drop seemed to attest to an increasingly unmistakable reality: Britain’s vote to exit the European Union — Brexit, in common parlance — has put its commercial relationships with the world on uncertain and potentially perilous ground. That poses risks for the British economy, making its money less attractive to hold.

“The world believes that the U.K. is going to be poorer in the future, and find it more expensive to trade,” said Paul Johnson, the director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies, an independent research institution in London. “Essentially, the world is betting against the pound.” And against the British economy.

The immediate cause of the plunge appeared to be a speech [https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/oct/07/uk-must-pay-price-for-brexit-says-francois-hollande] by the French president, François Hollande[https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/oct/07/uk-must-pay-price-for-brexit-says-francois-hollande], on Thursday evening in Paris, in which he endorsed the view that Britain must be forced to swallow unpalatable terms of departure to discourage other European Union members from eyeing the exits.

“The U.K. has decided to do a Brexit, I believe even a hard Brexit,” Mr. Hollande said. “Well, then, we must go all the way through the U.K.’s willingness to leave the E.U. We have to have this firmness.

“If not,” he continued, “we would jeopardize the fundamental principles of the E.U. Other countries would want to leave the E.U. to get the supposed advantages without the obligations.”

Hard Brexit, Soft Brexit, Brexit Over Easy. No one really knows what these terms mean (and the last one is made up). But, crudely, they divide potential outcomes into the ones in which Britain maintains effective inclusion within Europe’s single market — a realm sprawling from Ireland to Romania, holding some 500 million people — and the ones in which Britain winds up outside.

Mr. Hollande’s line echoed a speech given by [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/10/06/german-industry-cannot-save-britain-from-hard-brexit-warns-merke/] Chancellor Angela Merkel[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/10/06/german-industry-cannot-save-britain-from-hard-brexit-warns-merke/] of Germany earlier that day.

The week began with an admission from Britain’s new Conservative prime minister[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/brexit-talks-march-theresa-may-britain.html], Theresa May, that access to the European market is likely to be a casualty of Britain’s pursuit of a primary aspiration expressed in the Brexit vote: imposing limits on **immigration**.

European leaders have been resolute that free movement of people across the borders of member nations is a nonnegotiable cost of admission in the common market.

But Brexiteers had steadfastly maintained the illusion that Britain could have it both ways — that it could retain access to the European market while still controlling **immigration**. In destroying that idea, the prime minister’s admission badly rattled the markets.

The stakes are considerable. Britain ships nearly half its exports to other European Union members. The giants of global banking have turned London into a financial center rivaling New York, using hubs here to extend their reach across the rest of the European market.

Investment has poured into Britain from around the world, as major manufacturers have set up factories so they can sell their wares across Europe without incurring tariffs.

To one degree or another — and no one really knows how much — Brexit puts all of this in play.

Negotiations between Britain and Europe are expected to commence sometime early next year. Whatever settlement results must be ratified by the remaining members of the European Union, meaning that Britain’s economic prospects are now tethered to the vagaries of domestic politics in 27 other countries.

None of these risks were unforeseen. During a fractious campaign leading up to the referendum, great reams of paper were released sketching out the potential effects on the British economy should voters opt to leave. Reports varied on details and degree, but they nearly unanimously concluded that Brexit would entail economic pain.

The British Treasury surveyed the trading arrangements the government might strike with Europe after a Brexit vote and concluded it could lop some 6.2 percent off the gross domestic product by 2030. That would leave the average household worse off by about 4,300 pounds a year (at the current, depressed exchange rate, about $5,300).

But those campaigning to leave dismissed such talk as fearmongering. They described a swashbuckling and reinvigorated Britain that would break free from a stagnating Europe — the land of unemployed children moving in with their parents — to instead focus on improving trade with faster-growing countries like China, India and the United States.

Since the vote, those who urged leaving Europe have pointed to the facts that the sun still rises and the earth still spins to declare validation.

Even as the pound has fallen against the dollar, consumer spending has generally held up along with employment. Economic growth has yet to be hit. Boutiques and high-end restaurants in London remain packed.

Some have focused on the upsides of a declining pound, which makes British exports cheaper on world markets and renders Britain a more affordable tourist destination.

But this misses the fact that nearly one-third of the goods and services consumed in Britain are imported. In dollar terms, the price of those goods and services is spiking. Eventually, economists assume, this inflation will work its way through the economy, further depressing growth by crimping consumer spending and potentially sowing unemployment.

During the campaign, those in favor of leaving offered assurance that, whatever resulted, Britain would ultimately secure a beneficial trade deal with Europe. Germany sells vast quantities of cars to British consumers, giving it every incentive to keep trade flowing unimpeded by tariffs. As the largest economy in the union, Germany would hold the cards.

But in her speech on Thursday, Ms. Merkel took direct aim at that argument, telling a gathering of industry leaders that any wavering on the principle of free movement of people would pose “a systemic challenge for the entire European Union.”

The sudden plummeting of the pound appeared to signal that investors were absorbing the intricacies of this dynamic, and seeing through the Brexiteers’ claims that Britain could impose limits on **immigration** while also negotiating a settlement with Europe that would maintain access to the common market.

Boris Johnson, the former London mayor who campaigned for leaving the European Union and is now foreign secretary, managed last week to maintain the government line while simultaneously making fun of the charade.

“Our policy is having our cake and eating it[https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/1889723/boris-johnson-joins-forces-with-liam-foxand-declares-support-for-hard-brexit-which-will-liberate-britain-to-champion-free-trade/],” he told the British tabloid, The Sun.

But on Sunday, as Prime Minister May addressed a gathering of her governing Conservative Party in Birmingham, she essentially dumped the cake in the bin.

“We have voted to leave the European Union and become a fully independent, sovereign country,” Mrs. May declared. “We will do what independent, sovereign countries do. We will decide for ourselves how we control **immigration**.”

In short, a “hard Brexit” appeared to be in Britain’s future.

“Somehow, a whole combination of people were in denial up until now,” said Adam S. Posen, a former member of the rate-setting committee at the Bank of England, and now president of the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington.

“There were the people who thought Brexit would be reversed,” he continued. “There were the people who delusionally thought there would be a soft Brexit, and all the northern Europeans would be nice to them. And there were people who believed that this crew in charge of the British negotiations were somehow going to strike a good deal. All of the delusions have run out of material.”

Follow Peter S. Goodman on Twitter: @petersgoodman

\* Theresa May, British Premier, Urges Conservatives to Claim ‘New Center Ground’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/world/europe/theresa-may-conservative-party-convention.html]

\* Hammond Addresses ‘Brexit’ Turbulence With Hints of Policy Shift[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/world/europe/brexit-uk-economy.html]

\* ‘Brexit’ Talks Will Start by End of March, Theresa May Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/brexit-talks-march-theresa-may-britain.html]

\* Why Referendums Aren’t as Democratic as They Seem[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/world/americas/colombia-brexit-referendum-farc-cameron-santos.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Conservatives are deeply split over the rise of Donald J. Trump. Some see it as apocalyptic; others as refreshing. But two pieces of conventional wisdom are largely unchallenged by either side.

First, Mr. Trump’s populist takeover of the Republican Party was shocking and unforeseeable. Second, love Trump or hate him, he has revealed important realities about the electorate, and Republicans must move toward more populist positions on issues such as trade and **immigration** or be left behind.

Both of these beliefs are mistaken.

The first false assumption is that Trumpist populism is unprecedented. In truth, what we see today has happened many times before. Indeed, political populism has often followed economic meltdowns like the one America has endured over the past eight years.

Financial crises have occurred throughout history, and they follow predictable patterns. The economists Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff, whose 2010 book, “This Time Is Different,” offers a comprehensive study of financial crises around the world, find that they often take much longer to resolve than ordinary recessions — about eight years on average.

In Japan, the financial crisis of 1992 touched off the “lost decade.” Smaller crises such as Black Monday in 1987 or the dot-com collapse in 2001 generally rebound in just two or three years.

This is not to say that nobody prospers for a decade after a severe financial crisis. Indeed, after the Great Recession of 2008-9, the wealthy came roaring back quickly. This gave the illusion of widespread prosperity but hid the fact that the recovery was wildly uneven, with a majority of Americans seeing little or any economic improvement.

Census Bureau data show that from 2009 through 2014, only about the top fifth of the population saw any income growth while the bottom 80 percent have averaged no income growth at all.

Some scholars like Robert Barro, my colleague at the American Enterprise Institute, see the malaise not as the inevitable result of the crisis, but as the product of bad public policy. Whichever account you find persuasive, the financial crisis and the long, uneven recovery sowed the seeds for the current populism.

In an article in The European Economic Review, German economists look at the effect of financial crises on politics, reviewing 800 elections over 140 years across 20 advanced economies. They found that, after a financial crisis, nationalistic populist parties and politicians, using language that often attributes blame to minorities and foreigners, typically increase their vote share by about 30 percent. There is no such effect after ordinary recessions.

Consider moderate, tolerant Sweden, where a 1991 parliamentary election came amid a financial crisis. Swedish voters rewarded a brand-new “New Democracy” party that focused heavily on law and order issues and proposed stringent restrictions on **immigration**.

With no simple solution for reviving equal opportunity, conventional politicians struggle with increasingly angry voters. Into this gap walk populists who specialize in identifying culprits: rich elites who are ripping you off; **immigrants** who want your job; free trade that’s killing our nation’s competitiveness. Their proposed solutions usually involve some combination of increased redistribution, protectionism and restrictionism.

Today, some conservative leaders take these populist claims at face value, leading to the second piece of incorrect conventional wisdom: No matter what one thinks of Mr. Trump personally, one must concede that mainstream positions on issues such as trade and **immigration** must be fundamentally rethought. Right?

Wrong. Trade and **immigration** are the lightning rods, but these issues are not the real triggers of our political moment. The illegal **immigrant** population was 8 percent lower in 2014 than in 2007, and our trade deficit was lower in 2015 than before the Great Recession.

The real issue is weak, unevenly shared growth. If we addressed this issue, and if people felt their lives improving, the appetite for invective on secondary issues such as trade and **immigration** would dissipate. So walking away from free enterprise principles on trade and **immigration** is not the solution.

But merely returning to the narrow economic strategies of past decades will not work, either. Conservatives love to emphasize the need for higher economic growth, but have often missed the importance of more widely distributed growth. Leaders should set their focus on a system with more opportunity in the middle and bottom of the economy.

This requires a generational strategy to build an education system based on innovation, school choice and an emphasis on vocational training. It means rewriting tax and regulatory law to stop discouraging domestic investment and squelching job creation, while also attacking the corporate cronyism that gives special treatment to wealthy and entrenched interests. It demands authentic compassion for people on the periphery of society.

These should be the core positions of conservative reformers. Throwing away free enterprise will neither solve our nation’s problems nor create enduring political victories. Only strong growth, evenly distributed, will do the trick.

Arthur C. Brooks is the president of the American Enterprise Institute and a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

THE POPULIST EXPLOSION

How the Great Recession Transformed American and European Politics

By John B. Judis

182 pp. Columbia Global Reports. Paper, $12.99.

In November, the fate of the Republic will turn on one question: How popular is the populism of Donald Trump? If aggrieved and motivated Trumpists turn out heavily, we could yet have our own Brexit moment. But before knowing whether a big white wave will break over the electorate, it helps to understand what “populism” means, where it comes from and why it is advancing on both sides of the Atlantic.

These are the questions John B. Judis ­tackles in “The Populist Explosion,” his cogent and exceptionally clarifying guide to a political phenomenon that is at once elusive and, yes, explosive. Judis is personally sympathetic to left-wing populism, but he keeps his analysis free of ax-grinding.

In “The Populist Persuasion,” published in 1995, the historian Michael Kazin described populism as “a language” that ordinary people — and the often-wealthy politicians who claim to speak for them — use to organize themselves against elites they see as “self-serving and undemocratic.” The fevered logic of this worldview frequently transcends the usual categories of left, right and center, as the sociologist Donald I. Warren argued in his 1976 study, “The Radical Center: Middle Americans and the Politics of **Alienation**,” an obscure but important examination of George Wallace voters, many of whom went on to be known as Reagan Democrats.

Judis extends this unified theory of populism to the present day, when stagnant wages, corporate desertions and widespread fear of being cast adrift in the global economy have brought Bernie Sanders and Trump together in their contempt for trade deals. But he is eager to distinguish the left-wing economic populism of Sanders and the anti-elite Podemos Party in Spain, which champion “the people” against the 1 percent, from the right-wing cultural populism of Trump and the ­anti-Muslim Danish People’s Party. The difference is that right-wing populists accuse the elite of coddling an ever-shifting third group — **immigrants**, blacks, terrorists, welfare recipients or all of the above. This demagoguing of the scapegoat du jour is what gives right-wing populism its current potency, especially in Europe, which is facing more severe economic, **immigration** and terrorism problems than the United States.

Populism, Judis explains, is an American creation, with roots in the American Revolution and Andrew Jackson’s fight against the Bank of the United States in the 1830s. The name dates back to the early 1890s, when Farmers Alliances across the West and South linked up with the Knights of Labor to form the short-lived People’s Party. The goal was radical democratic reform, not class revolution. In 1896, the Democrats nominated the fiery William Jennings Bryan on a “free silver” platform in opposition to Wall Street, the beginning of a long tradition of major parties co-opting populist ideas. With the help of middle-class progressives in both parties, much of the People’s Party platform (monetization of silver, a graduated income tax, regulation of railroads, direct election of senators) became law. Similarly, the threat posed to Franklin Roose­velt’s re-election by Huey Long and his “Share Our Wealth” movement may have ended in 1935 with Long’s assassination, but Roosevelt had already moved left in response to populist fervor by ramming through Social Security and other legislation. Long’s base, like Trump’s, was not the poor, but middle-class voters who feared slipping lower amid economic dislocation.

When Barack Obama took office in 2009, many expected he would forge a new and enduring Democratic majority out of the wreckage left by an irresponsible financial elite. But instead of being pushed from the left, as Roosevelt was, Obama looked behind him and saw no one there. Even the auto bailouts, which the White House hoped would be popular with working people, were resented. Instead, within days of taking office, Obama felt pressure from a new populist movement on the right — soon to be called the Tea Party — that drew strength from voters who had once flocked to Ross Perot and Pat Buchanan in the 1990s.

In his abbreviated account, Judis underplays how often left-wing economic populism has curdled into right-wing racist populism. Though he mentions Tom Watson, he ignores C. Vann Woodward’s “Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel” (1938), which chronicles how the brilliant Georgia reformer — the foremost turn-of-the-century populist — became a bitter bigot. And while citing Alan Brinkley’s “Voices of Protest” (1982) in his discussion of Father Charles Coughlin, the anti-Semitic “Radio Priest,” he ignores the fact that Coughlin was at first a strong supporter of the New Deal. Judis does better with Wallace, who railed against integration and “pointy-headed intellectuals” when he was governor of Alabama but was far less strident and racist in his presidential campaigns. Many of Trump’s non-college-­educated white supporters are the direct political descendants of Wallace voters (just as Sanders’s voters are connected to George McGovern’s). In 1968, Wallace, running as a third-party candidate, seemed to threaten the Democratic nominee, Hubert Humphrey, polling 21 percent to Humphrey’s 28 percent at one point in September, an impressive performance for a populist candidate that far into the campaign season.

After Richard Nixon won, he absorbed the Wallace base into the Republican Party by moving right on “law and order,” busing and other issues Wallace had stressed.

Parliamentary systems offer a different role for populists. Judis offers a fresh survey of the 10 European countries where, after the Great Recession, populist candidates have either won elections or become part of governing coalitions. Northern tier nations, besieged by **immigrants** who are allowed freedom of movement by the E.U., have shifted right. The United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) led Britain’s exit from Europe with an older, less educated constituency that looks a lot like Trump’s. But southern European nations like Spain, Italy and Greece, with economies mired in depressions every bit as bad as the one the United States experienced during the 1930s, went left, which nowadays means resistance to E.U. elites, not socialism.

One quibble: Judis echoes left-wing political scientists who have twisted the word “neoliberal.” In the United States, it refers to Clintonian Democrats who believe in the old goals of liberalism but question some of the means of achieving them. In Europe, neoliberals are free-­market capitalists who impose rigid and — judging by the sluggish European economy — unsuccessful austerity measures on debtor nations. Using the word almost interchangeably is confusing, not to mention unfair to American neoliberals, who may have gone overboard on financial deregulation in the 1990s but have staunchly opposed Republican austerity measures.

In the end, Judis has a surprisingly benign attitude toward even right-wing populism. He thinks Trump and the European right-wing populists are nasty nationalists, but not fascists, insisting that even those with authoritarian streaks believe in working within the democratic system and lack the territorial ambitions that were central to German and Italian fascism. Instead, Judis writes, Trump resembles the former Italian prime minister Silvio Berlusconi, the buffoonish media baron.

While careful not to make predictions, Judis suggests that Brexit might be contagious on the Continent. And his description of how the presentable Marine Le Pen has sidelined the haters in the National Front (including the founder of the party, her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, who described the gas chambers of the Holocaust as a “detail”) indicates that she may be elected the first populist president of France next year.

At home, Sanders’s success showed that some left-wing populist ideas — incubated in the failed but symbolically important Occupy Wall Street movement — are in ascendancy inside the Democratic Party. That means a President Hillary Clinton — like Roosevelt and Nixon — would most likely try to co-opt a few of them. But neither Clinton nor Trump wants to nationalize banks or greatly redistribute wealth (unless one includes Trump’s plan to slash taxes again for the wealthy, further enriching the top 1 percent). So we won’t see much classic economic populism in the White House next year, even as trans-­Atlantic populist scapegoating continues apace.

Jonathan Alter, the author of two books on Barack Obama and one on Franklin D. Roosevelt, is now working on a biography of Jimmy Carter.

Correction: October 23, 2016, Sunday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: A review on Oct. 9 about “The Populist Explosion: How the Great Recession Transformed American and European Politics,” by John B. Judis, overstated George Wallace ’s performance in presidential polls when he was a third-party candidate in 1968. He drew close to the Democratic nominee, Hubert H. Humphrey, in late September (21 percent to Humphrey’s 28 percent, according to the Gallup Organization), but he did not lead Humphrey in the polls “ until October” (or at any time).

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump faced extraordinary censure from Republican leaders on Friday night after the disclosure of a 2005 recording of Mr. Trump speaking in vulgar terms about pushing himself on women.

In a three-minute recording, which was obtained by The Washington Post, Mr. Trump recounts to the television personality Billy Bush of the program “Access Hollywood,” how he once pursued a married woman and “moved on her like a bitch, but I couldn’t get there,” expressing regret that they did not have sex.

He brags of a special status with women: Because he was “a star,” he said, he could “grab them by the pussy” whenever he wanted.

“You can do anything,” Mr. Trump says.

Mr. Trump, in a statement, sought to minimize the lewdness of his remarks — and even implicate Mrs. Clinton’s husband, Bill, in his behavior.

“This was locker room banter, a private conversation that took place many years ago. Bill Clinton has said far worse to me on the golf course — not even close,” Mr. Trump said in a statement[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/statement-from-donald-j.-trump]. “I apologize if anyone was offended.”

Leaders of both parties heaped criticism on the Republican Party presidential nominee, and Speaker Paul D. Ryan withdrew his invitation to appear alongside Mr. Trump this weekend,

Mr. Trump’s remarks seemed more troubling than boys-will-be-boys banter. He said he was compulsively drawn to kissing beautiful women “like a magnet” — “I don’t even wait” — and talked about plotting to seduce the married woman by taking her furniture shopping.

Mr. Trump, who was 59 at the time, went on to disparage the woman, whom he did not name, saying, “I did try and fuck her. She was married,” and, “She’s now got the big phony tits and everything.”

Mr. Ryan described himself as “sickened” by Mr. Trump’s remarks.

Senator Mitch McConnell, the majority leader, went a step further than many elected Republicans, issuing a statement late Friday night calling on Mr. Trump to express contrition — and potentially offering other Senate Republicans cover to disavow the nominee if he refuses to apologize.

“As the father of three daughters, I strongly believe that Trump needs to apologize directly to women and girls everywhere, and take full responsibility for the utter lack of respect for women shown in his comments on that tape,” said Mr. McConnell.

While neither Mr. Ryan nor Mr. McConnell immediately withdrew their formal support for Mr. Trump, Republican leaders in Washington held anguished discussions throughout the evening about how the party should proceed with a badly wounded and potentially toxic nominee. They cannot remove their nominee from the ticket, though some hoped that Mr. Trump would decide on his own to step down.

Meanwhile, at Trump Tower, the candidate and his jolted advisers debated whether he should take further action to try to undo the damage from the tape, according to a person briefed on the discussions who was granted anonymity to describe internal deliberations. Mr. Trump did not recall making the comments initially, and sought assurance from aides that the story would pass, but they were candid that the tape was a grave and potentially catastrophic problem.

Mr. Trump, seeking to minimize the import of the disclosure despite the public rebuke by Mr. Ryan, announced late Friday evening that he would no longer travel to Wisconsin as planned, and would send his running mate, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, in his stead. Mr. Trump said he would spend Saturday preparing for his second debate with Hillary Clinton, set to take place Sunday in St. Louis.

People in contact with Mr. Trump’s inner circle described the campaign as being in a state of paralysis, as top aides held a conference call lasting over an hour to discuss their options. Several Republicans outside the campaign said they had been unable to reach Mr. Trump’s team even in the midst of a critical moment for the entire party.

Mr. Trump has not yet elaborated on his first, dismissive response to the recording, in which he described it merely as “locker room banter” and “a private conversation that took place many years ago.”

Mr. Trump, who has repeatedly attacked and mocked Mrs. Clinton’s marriage in recent weeks, even sought to implicate Bill Clinton in his coarse conduct.

“Bill Clinton has said far worse to me on the golf course — not even close,” Mr. Trump said in a statement[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/statement-from-donald-j.-trump]. “I apologize if anyone was offended.”

It is unlikely that such a terse and even grudging statement of regret will be enough to stabilize Mr. Trump’s candidacy. The disclosure of the audio tape comes at the end of a punishing two weeks, during which Mr. Trump has faced intense backlash over his treatment of women and intensifying scrutiny of his personal finances and views on national security.

Mrs. Clinton’s campaign condemned Mr. Trump forcefully for the comments captured on the recording. Her running mate, Senator Tim Kaine of Virginia, said in response to the remarks, “It makes me sick to my stomach.”

More Republicans joined in the denunciation, including Gov. Gary Herbert of Utah, who had said this summer he would vote for Mr. Trump.

“Donald Trump’s statements are beyond offensive & despicable,” Mr. Herbert wrote on Twitter. “While I cannot vote for Hillary Clinton, I will not vote for Trump.”

Mitt Romney, the former presidential candidate who has vocally opposed Mr. Trump, spoke out again to rebuke Mr. Trump on Friday night.

“Hitting on married women? Condoning assault? Such vile degradations demean our wives and daughters and corrupt America’s face to the world,” Mr. Romney said.

Mr. Trump had already been on the defensive on Friday after telling CNN that he still believed the exonerated defendants known as the Central Park Five were guilty of a 1989 rape of a female jogger despite DNA evidence to the contrary that later overturned their convictions. Earlier in the day, he also asserted, again without evidence, that the Obama administration was allowing illegal **immigrants** to enter the country in order to vote in November.

And also in the last week, The New York Times reported that Mr. Trump had declared a $916 million loss on his 1995 income tax returns, a tax deduction so substantial it could have allowed him to legally avoid paying any federal income taxes for up to 18 years.

With Friday’s attacks on **immigrants**, African-Americans and women — remarkable even for Mr. Trump — Democrats wasted no time before pouncing with email and Twitter blasts.

One Republican senator, Kelly Ayotte of New Hampshire, whose re-election prospects this November were damaged when she called Mr. Trump a role model for children this week, said in a statement, “His comments are totally inappropriate and offensive.” Ms. Ayotte, one of the most prominent women in the party, was facing immense pressure Friday night from other Republicans to disavow Mr. Trump entirely, and was said to be considering it.

Another Republican to turn his back on Mr. Trump on Friday was Jon M. Huntsman, the former governor of Utah, who just a week ago said he planned to vote for Mr. Trump. He told The Salt Lake Tribune[http://www.sltrib.com/news/4444721-155/after-video-huntsman-says-it-is] that the nominee should withdraw from the race.

“In a campaign cycle that has been nothing but a race to the bottom — at such a critical moment for our nation — and with so many who have tried to be respectful of a record primary vote, the time has come for Governor Pence to lead the ticket,” Mr. Huntsman told the newspaper.

Mr. Trump’s behavior has at times startled and unnerved women in his life, from employees at his company to the contestants in his beauty pageants, The Times found after interviewing dozens of them for an article [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/15/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html] in May[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/15/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html]. They described unwanted romantic advances and unending commentary on the female form.

Temple Taggart, Miss Utah in 1997, was uncomfortable with how forward Mr. Trump was with young contestants like her in his first year as the owner of Miss USA, a branch of the beauty pageant organization. As she recalls it, he introduced himself in an unusually intimate manner.

“He kissed me directly on the lips. I thought, ‘Oh, my God. Gross.’ He was married to Marla Maples at the time,” she said. “I think there were a few other girls that he kissed on the mouth. I was like, “Wow, that’s inappropriate.”

Democrats in competitive races were quick to pounce on the Friday report. Gov. Maggie Hassan of New Hampshire, who is running against Ms. Ayotte, seized on Mr. Trump’s remarks to continue hammering her for saying that Mr. Trump was a role model. (Ms. Ayotte quickly said she misspoke.)

“These vile comments from Donald Trump cannot be excused,” Ms. Hassan said. “It is beyond comprehension how Senator Ayotte could continue to support this man for the highest office in the land, let alone call him a role model.”

Dawn Laguens, the executive vice president of the Planned Parenthood Action Fund, went even further, suggesting Mr. Trump had discussed committing a violent crime.

“What Trump described in these tapes amounts to sexual assault,” said Ms. Laguens. “Trump’s behavior is disgusting and unacceptable in any context, and it is disqualifying for a man who is running for president of this country.”

The recording of Mr. Trump talking to Mr. Bush was made as they sat on a bus on the set of a soap opera where Mr. Trump was making a cameo appearance. The conversation was recorded after he had married Melania Trump, his third and current wife. At one point, the conversation in the video was interrupted when an actress arrived to take Mr. Trump and Mr. Bush to the set. Mr. Trump seemed excited.

“You know I’m automatically attracted to beautiful — I just start kissing them,” Mr. Trump says. “It’s like a magnet. Just kiss. I don’t even wait.”

Ms. Trump was pregnant at the time that Mr. Trump’s remarks were filmed in mid-September 2005; their son, Barron, was born the next March.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Reporting was contributed by Nick Corasaniti, Jonathan Martin, Maggie Haberman, Michael Barbaro and Thomas Kaplan.

\* The Sleaziness of Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/opinion/the-sleaziness-of-donald-trump.html]

\* Donald Trump, Groper in Chief[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/09/opinion/sunday/donald-trump-groper-in-chief.html]

\* Crossing the Line: How Donald Trump Behaved With Women in Private[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/15/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS — For a film that makes use of long silences, Gianfranco Rosi’s documentary “Fire at Sea,” about the tiny Italian island of Lampedusa — for years the European point of arrival for boatloads of North African migrants — has made some noise.

Paolo Sorrentino, the Oscar-winning director, stirred controversy recently when he said it was “useless and masochistic” for Italy to have chosen a documentary, and not a feature film, as its submission for the foreign-language-film Academy Award, however much he admired the work.

But his was a rare note of dissent. The film — in which Lampedusa becomes a metaphor for how Italy and the rest of Europe are handling the influx of migrants — has struck a nerve this year. After it won the top prize at the Berlin Film Festival in February, at a moment when the arrival of Syrian refugees had been reshaping Germany[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/22/movies/berlin-film-festival-refugee-influx-in-germany.html], institutions began to take notice.

Prime Minister Matteo Renzi of Italy gave DVDs to 27 of his European counterparts, a reminder of how Italy, whose Coast Guard routinely rescues rickety boats of migrants, could use more help from other countries. And it was screened for Pope Francis and for the European Parliament.

“When I go to different screenings, people come up to me very moved, and they hug me, and they say, ‘What can I do?’ ” Mr. Rosi said in a recent interview in Paris, where the film was released last month. “It’s hard to answer that.”

The film presents Lampedusa as a clash of two worlds: that of the 6,000 islanders, who have lived off fishing for millenniums, and that of the hundreds of thousands of migrants, most from sub-Saharan Africa, who reach the island before being sent to other holding centers in Italy.

Lampedusa is “a metaphor for Europe, for these two worlds which do not encounter each other,” Mr. Rosi said.

The film is anchored by two figures: a boy, Samuele Pucillo, now 14, who clambers around the island with his homemade slingshot; and Dr. Pietro Bartolo, who for years was the only doctor on Lampedusa and had to examine the bodies of every migrant who died at sea.

“There was a need for me to change the point of view, because every time Lampedusa was narrated from the media, from the TV, it was always linked to a tragedy, to death,” Mr. Rosi said.

Dr. Bartolo is the film’s conscience, Mr. Rosi said, and Samuele its unconscious. At the Berlin Film Festival, Dr. Bartolo recalled a shipwreck[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/20/world/europe/italy-migrants-capsized-boat-off-libya.html?\_r=0] off Lampedusa in 2013, in which the death toll rose by two, to 368. “I saw them one by one, and I had to count them,” Dr. Bartolo said[http://artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/02/15/documentary-on-migrants-wins-praise-at-berlin-film-festival/?\_r=0] at an emotional news conference. “Two isn’t a number. They’re two people.”

The film will be shown at the New York Film Festival on Saturday and opens in the United States on Oct. 21. It has received glowing reviews[http://abonnes.lemonde.fr/cinema/article/2016/09/27/fuocoammare-a-cache-cache-avec-la-normalite-a-lampedusa\_5003913\_3476.html] in France, Germany and Britain, with critics praising[http://www.tagesspiegel.de/kultur/seefeuer-fuocoammare-im-kino-zweimal-lampedusa-zwei-welten/13929504.html] its “aesthetic morality,” “political awareness” and lack of melodrama. (In Europe, the film has done best at the box office in Germany, followed by Britain, where it opened during the heated debate ahead of the Brexit vote. The film did less well in Greece and Turkey.)

The director had rare access to an **immigrant**-holding center on Lampedusa. There, the camera settles on a Nigerian man. “When I asked one of them, ‘What gives you the desire to cross the sea with the risk that maybe you will die?,’ he said, ‘It’s the word “maybe,”’ ” Mr. Rosi recalled. “‘Because here we will certainly die. Crossing the sea, maybe we’d die.’”

Born in Eritrea and raised in Italy, Mr. Rosi is drawn to people on the margins. His documentary “Sacro GRA” — about people who live around Rome’s ring road, known as the G.R.A. — won the Golden Lion at the Venice Film Festival in 2013. His 2010 film, “El Sicario, Room 164,” is about a killer turned informer from a Mexican drug cartel. (The Brooklyn Academy of Music will feature a retrospective[http://www.bam.org/film/2016/gianfranco-rosi] of Mr. Rosi’s films from Oct. 28 through Nov. 3.)

Mr. Rosi declined to comment on Mr. Sorrentino’s criticism, beyond noting that Bernardo Bertolucci had supported the choice. The film was also submitted in the documentary category. (The academy will announce its nonfiction shortlist later this year.)

Mr. Rosi said he liked removing as much as possible in his films, so that only the outlines of the story and the strongest emotions remained.

He sketched some wavy lines in his notebook, showing how Italy had expanded its territorial waters farther south, to allow the Coast Guard to intercept boats of migrants closer to Libya, following a tragic accident[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/04/world/europe/scores-die-in-shipwreck-off-sicily.html] in 2015 that left more than 500 people dead.

The film isn’t only about Lampedusa, it’s also about borders, Mr. Rosi said. “These people die in the sea by boat, but thousands of people die in the desert, crossing to reach freedom,” he said of **immigrants** trying to get to the United States. “In the end these tragedies are universal.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Gloria Steinem[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/gloria\_steinem/index.html?inline=nyt-per] started her career as a C.I.A. operative, got her break as a Playboy Bunny, married Christian Bale’s father and now produces a show for the cable television channel Viceland, the home of “Balls Deep” and “Action Bronson Watches Ancient **Aliens**.” Beyond that, there are some gaps in her resume.

On a recent afternoon in her Upper East Side apartment, she addressed one of those gaps. She was wearing a Toledo Mud Hens T-shirt and moving gingerly because of back pain. The gap concerned Stephen Sondheim, and the time Ms. Steinem asked him to create crossword puzzles for New York magazine.

“How do you know that?” she asked. “Nobody knows that.”

It was 1968, as the magazine was just starting. Ms. Steinem knew Mr. Sondheim was a fiend for British-style crossword puzzles. Mr. Sondheim, who is now 86, did end up writing puzzles[http://nymag.com/anniversary/40th/crosswords/45747/] for the magazine in its first year, until quitting to write the musical “Company.”

Ms. Steinem, now 82, went on to other pursuits as well.

At an age when many are happy to slow down, Ms. Steinem still keeps a rock star’s schedule, promoting her most recent book, “My Life on the Road[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/11/books/review-my-life-on-the-road-gloria-steinems-journey-as-a-traveling-feminist.html],” stumping for Hillary Clinton, and raising money for causes like Planned Parenthood and a proposed “Women’s Building[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/11/realestate/commercial/former-prison-for-women-to-become-a-place-that-serves-them.html]” in New York City.

Rolling into breakfast recently, after a weekend in North Carolina promoting her book and the candidacy of Deborah Ross, a Democrat, for the United States Senate, Ms. Steinem said she had been up until 5 a.m. revising a piece for The Boston Globe about her opposition to a proposed oil pipeline on tribal lands in North Dakota.

Next up, she has “two or three” books she wants to write, and another season of “Woman[https://www.viceland.com/en\_us/show/woman],” the documentary series she produced for Viceland, which was nominated for an Emmy[http://www.vulture.com/2016/08/gloria-steinem-viceland-series-hillary-clinton-young-feminists.html].

“I can’t imagine not working,” she said. “It’s not even working; well, it’s an addiction, really, but I can’t imagine not doing it.” She added, “It’s possible that more people are requesting me to speak because they think I’m going to die, given that I’m 82.”

Ms. Steinem has a disarming laugh that seems to say, “Can you believe the silly thing Gloria Steinem just said?” After she has spent so much time in the public eye, I asked how she would write her job description.

“I don’t know,” she said. “When I have to put down something on a form I say writer, because that came first.” She hunted around for another word. “And organizer. I don’t know how else to say it.”

Ms. Steinem would also call herself a New Yorker, a fact that sometimes gets lost amid her well-traveled biography. She has lived in the same apartment for nearly 50 years, since she and a friend rented the parlor floor of what is now a duplex for $300 a month. In 1969, when she was writing for New York magazine, she considered running for city comptroller on a ticket with Norman Mailer and Jimmy Breslin, whose platform included building a monorail around Manhattan.

It was, she said, a literary lark.

“Nobody ever imagined being in office,” she said. “It was out of love of New York and imagining what it could be. I think somebody asked Jimmy what he would do if he won, and he said, ‘Demand a recount.’”

“I couldn’t live anywhere else,” she said.

Like a true New Yorker, she has never learned to drive.

In the living room where she held the first meetings for what would become Ms. magazine in 1971, she recalled the day she fell in love with the city, on a visit from Smith College in the mid-1950s.

“I was walking in the theater district, and I stopped by a delicatessen,” she said, “and there were three or four showgirls from some Broadway show, and they were in full regalia and headdresses and makeup, and they were standing there and ordering pastrami sandwiches, and nobody gave it a second thought. And I thought, Oh, I want to live here.”

Later, when she moved here, she made a list of things New Yorkers did that scared her. “One was that they said things three times that we in the Midwest wouldn’t say even once,” she said. “One was that they told you terrible things that were wrong with them, but then didn’t do anything about it. In the Midwest if you say it, you have to do something about it. One was they didn’t eat standing up out of the refrigerator. One was they ate red meat. I had seen pot roast, but not red meat.”

She has outlived or outlasted or out-niced many of her critics, including the newscaster Harry Reasoner, who famously said of Ms. magazine, “I’ll give it six months before they run out of things to say,” or feminist contemporaries who accused her of hijacking the movement away from its more radical founders.

“I don’t know how she does it,” said Susan Brownmiller, author of the landmark feminist work “Against Our Will,” who has traded barbs with Ms. Steinem for four decades. “And she is still so totally beautiful. When women went to see her, they were just relieved, because she was so calm, and she could be funny. She made a lot of women feel, ‘Oh, that’s what the women’s movement looks like. I can be part of that.’”

Still, Ms. Brownmiller said, there were matters of feminist history to set straight. “Guys in the media chose Gloria as our leader,” she said. “A lot of us, our hope is that eventually history will straighten this all out and say, no, Gloria came in a little later, and her very loyal supporters have backtracked that history.”

In “My Life on the Road,” newly out in paperback, Ms. Steinem describes a rootlessness at odds with her steadfast devotion to New York. In one 20-year span, she never went a week without being on an airplane.

In her childhood, her father used to shuttle the family around the country in a trailer, buying and selling antiques along the way to support them. The closest they had to a home base was Clarklake, Mich., where her father ran a summer dance pavilion, until the fall weather chased them south toward Florida or California.

“Living in trailer parks is sobering, let’s put it that way,” Ms. Steinem said. She came to ground only after her parents split up when she was 10, and she became caretaker for her mentally ill mother in East Toledo, Ohio. She did not attend school regularly until about seventh grade.

Her travels took her to Smith and then a two-year fellowship in India. When she arrived in New York for good in 1960, it was to be a journalist, as her mother once was.

For women, New York in the early 1960s was “very much the way it’s depicted in ‘Mad Men,’” said Valerie Paley, director of the Center for Women’s History[http://www.nyhistory.org/womens-history] at the New-York Historical Society. “Even educated women were relegated to roles as wives and mothers. But there was also a groundswell for change, radical change.”

Ms. Steinem rode that groundswell, writing about the culture of the then-new birth control pill for Esquire, and going undercover as a Bunny[http://dlib.nyu.edu/undercover/bunnys-tale-gloria-steinem-show-magazine] at the then-new Playboy club for Show magazine. “To this day when people don’t like me they introduce me as a former Bunny, as a put-down,” she said. “On the other hand, I did improve the working conditions for those women.”

She also became a notable person-about-town. Time magazine, in 1969, called her “one of the best dates to take to a New York party these days — or, failing such luck, one of the most arresting names to drop,” adding that she had “legs worthy of her miniskirts, and a brain that keeps conversation lively without getting tricky.”

Ms. Steinem recalled those years in a less glamorous light. “If we spent $10 on a night out, we’d say, ‘Where are we going to get $10?’” she said. At parties, if things got too high-hat, she would say she was feeling the effects of her malaria and excuse herself.

There were years of second-acting plays, then staying up with the actors because they were all full of adrenaline, and having breakfast at the Automat.

“I remember that we once stole groceries from a store in the Village, because we were all broke,” she said. “Later on I went back to pay the old guy who was running the grocery, and that was my mistake, because it meant that he was admitting that someone could steal from him. I didn’t understand that. Dignity is sometimes more important than money.”

As a young freelance writer, she said, “we didn’t even have a word then for sexual harassment. It was just called life. It was just your job to avoid attention without **alienating** the editor. So there was an editor who always gave me a choice as I was leaving. I could either do something like mail his letters or I could go to a hotel room with him in the afternoon. Needless to say I mailed his letters.”

Her introduction to the women’s liberation movement came secondhand, through a public television special and a 1969 speakout on abortion organized by Redstockings[http://www.redstockings.org/], a radical feminist group. The movement itself was split into factions[http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/Leadership.html] like New York Radical Women, New York Radical Feminists and the Feminists, along with Betty Friedan’s more mainstream National Organization for Women. Ms. Steinem brought a journalist’s ability to navigate different worlds. “Steinem was brilliant and younger than Friedan, and used her charisma in a different approach, where she was able to work with men,” Ms. Paley said.

When Ms. Steinem gathered some of the movement’s best writers for Ms. magazine, she was accused by Ms. Friedan of “ripping off the movement for private profit” and by radical feminists of creating a shadow movement to undermine their own.

“I really feel that she’s not a lion of feminism, but a lamb of feminism,” said Kathie Sarachild[http://www.womensliberation.org/priorities/overthrowing-the-double-day/51-kathie-sarachild-of-redstockings-of-the-women-s-liberation-movement-speaks-on-the-feminist-radio-show-joy-of-resistance], a member of Redstockings who is often associated with coining the phrase “Sisterhood is powerful.” In the mid-1970s, as Ms. took off, Redstockings criticized Ms. Steinem for having once worked for a C.I.A.-financed organization[http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9D06EEDC103BE63ABC4951DFB466838C679EDE&legacy=true] that recruited Americans to attend Communist-run youth festivals in Vienna and Helsinki in 1959 and 1962. The group’s backing was first exposed in 1967 in Ramparts[http://www.unz.org/Pub/Ramparts-1967mar-00029] magazine, then in The Washington Post and The New York Times.

Ms. Steinem paints the chapter as an innocent one, saying that no one in the C.I.A. ever asked her to do or say anything, and that she did not report back to the agency. “It’s so interesting now, because the initials C.I.A. will make people believe anything,” she said. “It just wasn’t like that. It just was so uncontrolled. As I remember saying at the time, if this was our grandmother’s money we’d be doing the same thing.”

The criticism by other feminists was especially wounding. “They never called to ask me what I did,” she said. “That hurt more than anything.” She added, “If anybody still cares about what happened so long ago, I’m happy to answer any questions.”

These are lively times to be Gloria Steinem, with the possibility of the first woman elected president and the word “feminist” — seen in bus-size letters on the Beyoncé concert stage — again finding currency among young women. Her recent friends include some, like Lena Dunham and the playwright and performer Sarah Jones, who were not yet born when she started Ms. In speeches, Ms. Steinem quotes the three women who started the Black Lives Matter movement. “They are so far ahead of where we were, it’s staggering,” she said of the younger women she meets. “The only way I’ve managed to express this is, I just had to wait for some of my friends to be born.”

Her age has made her more strategic and also freer, she said: “Fifty was hardest for me, because it’s the end of the center of life, especially a gendered center of life. But by the time I got to be 60, it was like a new world. Society has given up because it’s all about having or raising children, really, and by 60 society doesn’t care that much, so you’re free. Seventy was certainly about mortality. And 80 even more so.” She cited a Native American observation that old age is like childhood, a time of wonder, because both are near to the unknown.

She is especially excited about a plan to turn the former Bayview Correctional Facility in Chelsea into a hub for organizations[http://womensbuildingnyc.org/] serving women and girls, a dream since the 1970s of the Ms. Foundation and other groups. “There is nothing I’m prouder of in this city,” Ms. Steinem said. The building is being redesigned by female architects, for a female real estate developer, and is expected to open around 2020, said Pamela Shifman, executive director of the NoVo Foundation, a partner in the project.

“Gloria has been an advocate and visionary of this for decades,” Ms. Shifman said. “One thing about Gloria, quintessential Gloria, is that she sees herself in community with diverse groups of women, including formerly incarcerated women. Her purpose is to ask questions and listen.”

On a beautiful fall morning, Ms. Steinem seemed to lose interest in sitting still and answering questions. “Want to see my bench?” she said. For her 80th birthday, friends had presented her with a log bench in Central Park, near the Metropolitan Museum of Art. On the short walk over, a young woman stopped Ms. Steinem to thank her for being an inspiration. A man in a taxi yelled, “Love you, Gloria,” and flashed a “V” sign. Ms. Steinem gave him a thumbs up and strode purposefully across Park Avenue.

As Ms. Steinem climbed the hill toward her bench, the man sitting there appeared to know who she was.

“Go away, crackers,” he said. Ms. Steinem continued to smile, assuring him she did not want him to move. He cursed at her and said, “That Steinem died a long time ago.”

Down the hill, she seemed visibly shaken, but unwilling to criticize the man, who was black. “When you’re treated as a group, you treat others as a group,” she said. “So I’m ‘cracker.’”

She had things to do. There was a Yazidi woman, Nadia Murad Basee Taha[http://freedomfund.org/blog/5380/], who was trafficked by the Islamic State, to interview for Viceland, and a promo for a Ms. Foundation fund-raiser[http://www.womensmediacenter.com/] to tape. She had to prepare for a talk at the United Jewish Appeal and a local news segment about the Women’s Media Center[http://www.womensmediacenter.com/]. She continued on her way.

A few days later, she emailed to say that the encounter with the man on the bench was “part of the reason I’m not about to leave New York. At least we see each other and have a chance to talk and absorb what someone else is experiencing. We’re not isolated in a tin can of a car or behind highways and gates.” There was also the novelty of being called a cracker; a first, she wrote.

In a lifetime of activism, that may be her signature. Any encounter, even hostile, could be an opportunity. It was a philosophy to live by, and perhaps, eventually, to die by. Why dwell on conflict or loss?

“My funeral,” she said, “will be a fund-raiser.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A small but distinct tendency within the Hollywood New Wave of the late 1960s and early 1970s was the dark, sometimes daringly tasteless comedy featuring urban neurotic protagonists and ethnic themes, often directed by a Jewish comedian.

Mike Nichols’s “The Graduate” (1967) presaged the trend; “The Heartbreak Kid” (1972), by Mr. Nichols’s onetime partner Elaine May, capped it. In between came Woody Allen’s early features; Mel Brooks’s calculated outrage “The Producers” (1968); and the no less programmatically offensive “Where’s Poppa?” (1970), directed by Mr. Brooks’s former partner in comedy Carl Reiner.

Adapted from a novel by Robert Klane, “Where’s Poppa?,” new on Blu-ray from Kino Lorber, is a burlesque of mother-son relations with affinities to the early work of Jewish American writers like Philip Roth, Wallace Markfield and Bruce Jay Friedman. The nostalgic references to 1940s popular culture made in the movie’s opening theme are rendered discomfortingly literal when the 30-something protagonist, Gordon Hocheiser (George Segal), awakens in what is his clearly his boyhood room. The slapstick ferocity of Mr. Reiner’s family drama is soon apparent when Gordon puts on a Halloween[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/halloween/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] gorilla costume in a feeble attempt at scaring his mother (Ruth Gordon) to death.

Mrs. Hocheiser is barely startled by her son’s ploy. She simply wonders, for the first of many times, where her dead husband is and demands her morning breakfast (Pepsi over Lucky Charms). That Mrs. Hocheiser has dementia is the movie’s first and greatest blasphemy. With her inimitable line readings and face-scrunching expressions, Ms. Gordon — who was in her mid-70s when “Where’s Poppa?” was made — is one of the most ruthless clowns to ever appear before the camera. Her imperiously addled Mrs. Hocheiser is one of the period’s great comic creations, as well as one of the most disturbing.

Gordon, who promised his father he would never put her in a nursing home, is bowed under the weight of his “ancient, terrible, senile mother,” as the New York Times critic Vincent Canby described her. With Louise, a nurse in a Florence Nightingale cloak and micro-miniskirt (Trish Van Devere, barely keeping a straight face), Gordon finds an instant, if painfully frustrated, rapport. In a vain attempt to prevent his jealous mother from terrorizing Louise, Gordon recruits his equally neurotic brother, Sidney (Ron Leibman), who suffers his own form of repetition compulsion, running back and forth across Central Park, regularly accosted by the same jovial gang of muggers.

A loosely connected series of set pieces, “Where’s Poppa?” prompted outrage in its day, Mr. Canby’s approval notwithstanding. Variety called it “an insane movie” and reported that a stampede of middle-aged theater owners made for the exit during a trade screening. The movie’s climactic punch line was repeatedly expurgated and reinstated during previews. (Kino Lorber’s disc offers the original ending — essential to the movie’s meaning — as an extra.)

Nothing if not transgressive, “Where’s Poppa?” is persistently scatological and casually anti-authoritarian, full of psychosexual hyperbole and rife with racial stereotypes, featuring a rape joke as potentially offensive to gay men and police officers as it is to women. Still, it was the character of Mrs. Hocheiser that critics found most unsettling. In his book “Hollywood’s Image of the Jew,” published in 1982, the film historian Lester D. Friedman refers to “Where’s Poppa?” as “the most unsavory portrait of a Jewish mother in the history of Jewish-American cinema.”

Perhaps — although why the restriction to Jewish or Jewish American? The movie is as universal as Freud’s notion of the Oedipus complex, but it is also a sustained comic nightmare that comes as close to Kafka or to Freud’s “Interpretation of Dreams” as any Hollywood entertainment ever has. The unconscious, after all, is a realm beyond political correctness.

“Papirosen,” a family documentary chronicle by the young Argentine director Gastón Solnicki (out on disc from Film Movement), is more circumspect but no less fraught with trauma. Combining old home movies of vacations, weddings and bar mitzvahs with a decade’s worth of observational footage, Mr. Solnicki documents the weight of history on four generations of Polish-Argentine Jews.

The filmmaker is largely invisible. The central figures are Mr. Solnicki’s grandmother Pola, a Holocaust survivor, and his father, Victor, born in Poland just after World War II[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/w/world\_war\_ii\_/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]. In the late 1940s, the family made its way to Czechoslovakia and then to Buenos Aires (perhaps as not fully documented **immigrants**), where Mr. Solnicki’s grandfather committed suicide. Mr. Solnicki’s two siblings and a young nephew are supporting players, as is his mother, Mirta, a cheerful woman who at one point tells Victor that he needs “more psychoanalysis.”

Robust yet fragile, Victor seems the most emotionally complicated member of the family — obsessed with his own childhood and the father who abandoned him. On a trip to Prague, he searches for toys he might have owned; the movie’s title refers to his favorite song, a sentimental Yiddish ballad about a Jewish war orphan who survives by selling individual cigarettes on the street. The title’s literal meaning (“papers”) is suggestive of Victor’s attempt to give his identity a legal basis, as well as the ephemeral material Mr. Solnicki uses to present his family’s story.

“Papirosen” is not so much a narrative as an immersion. Reviewing the movie in 2014, the New York Times critic Jeannette Catsoulis wrote[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/24/movies/papirosen-is-a-road-into-more-than-50-years-of-shadows.html] that sequences “accumulate without a connecting narration, and daily dramas play out in quarrelsome bursts of un-self-conscious intimacy.” Further conflict arises from the breakup of the marriage of Mr. Solnicki’s sister and his brother’s sullen **alienation**.

Ultimately, the histrionics are subsumed by the movie’s mysterious structure and fluid chronology. Ranging over decades and continents, “Papirosen” offers the dreamlike spectacle of Mr. Solnicki’s family aging, de-aging and re-aging before our eyes — and his.

NEWLY RELEASED

THE ADVENTURE OF SHERLOCK HOLMES’ SMARTER BROTHER Gene Wilder directed himself in this 1975 spoof of Victorian detection, newly released on Blu-ray. Less a mystery than a mildly bawdy musical, the movie provides a splendid showcase for Mr. Wilder’s co-star Madeline Kahn, who, Vincent Canby wrote in his New York Times review, “may possibly be the funniest woman in films today.” (Kino Lorber)

THE IN-LAWS Brought together by their children’s marriage, Peter Falk and Alan Arkin make an unlikely pair of adventurers, particularly once the movie, from 1979, now on Blu-ray, relocates from suburban New Jersey to Central America. Arthur Hiller directed from Andrew Bergman’s screenplay, which the Times critic Janet Maslin compared to “The Producers” and called “one of those rare comedy scripts that escalate steadily and hilariously, without faltering or even having to strain for an ending.” (Criterion)

THE MEMBER OF THE WEDDING Julie Harris and Ethel Waters recreated their Broadway roles in Fred Zinnemann’s 1952 film version of the play Carson McCullers adapted from her novel, the story of an adolescent girl who longs to be part of her brother’s marriage. New on Blu-ray. (Twilight Time)

NO HOME MOVIE Chantal Akerman’s last film, a documentary portrait of her relationship with her aged mother, offers a key to her distinguished oeuvre — and is heart-rending in its own right. “You need to meet Ms. Akerman on her terms, although even when you do, her work may not completely open itself up to you,” Manohla Dargis wrote in her March 2016 review for The Times. Available on DVD and Amazon Video. (Icarus Films)

WHO’S AFRAID OF VIRGINIA WOOLF? Mike Nichols inaugurated a brilliant career as a director ofscreen actors in his first feature, from 1966, now on Blu-ray. Adapted from Edward Albee’s most celebrated Broadway play, it features Elizabeth Taylor and Richard Burton as miserably marriedspouses, with George Segal and Sandy Dennis as the younger couple who stray into their web. (Warner Archive)

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Mario Chasi stood in the middle of one of the 45 corrugated steel stalls that line the former warehouse in the Hunts Point section of the Bronx where he hopes to re-establish his body shop.

Mr. Chasi, a heavyset auto mechanic, is a refugee from Willets Point, Queens, a ramshackle colony of auto repair, muffler, glass and tire shops next to Citi Field. In 2013, he was among a group of business owners and mechanics evicted from the area, with its broken streets and potholes as big as a bathtub, to make way for a planned redevelopment.

While the project has been stalled in court, Mr. Chasi and more than three dozen other former inhabitants of Willets Points have struggled for more than two years to convert the warehouse where he was standing last week into an auto mart of sorts called the Sunrise Cooperative.

But with the construction nearly complete, Sunrise ran out of money, and filed for bankruptcy protection on Sept. 23. The cooperative’s last, best chance is that New York City will come to the rescue with additional financing.

“I find it hard to think about what will happen if Sunrise doesn’t open,” said Mr. Chasi, who **immigrated** from Ecuador 15 years ago and started Cuenca Auto Body, with three employees. “I want to open as fast as possible. I’m ready to work. It’s the last hope.”

City officials said that Sunrise, which has already received more than $7 million in relocation funds, had asked for another $3 million to pay old bills, finish construction and cover its initial operating costs. But the officials were noncommital about whether more money would be forthcoming.

“We have worked in good faith for years to help the co-op get onto firm footing,” said Anthony Hogrebe, a spokesman for the city’s Economic Development Corporation. “We are staying in close contact with them to understand their needs, and the cause of the overruns.”

It would be a shame to let the Sunrise cooperative fail when it is so close to opening, Harvey Epstein said, associate director of the Urban Justice Center[http://www.urbanjustice.org/], which represents Sunrise.

“We’re hopeful that the city’ll continue to work with Sunrise to have a worker-owned cooperative in the Bronx,” he said. “It will set the model for keeping low wage businesses together, even after their neighborhood has been rezoned.”

In 2007, Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg first announced plans[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/01/nyregion/01cnd-willets.html] to turn Willets Point, also known as the Iron Triangle, into the “next great neighborhood” with 5,500 apartments, a convention center and office space.

City officials regarded the 62-acre auto repair enclave as an eyesore whose dusty streets flooded when it rained, but Willets Point was home to about 225 mostly Latino-owned businesses and 1,700 workers who earned anywhere from $80 to $140 a day.

Those kinds of industrial, blue-collar jobs have not fared well amid the city’s rising tide of luxury housing and gentrification over the past 20 years.

“There’s no institutional commitment in the city to preserving industry,” said Tom Angotti, a professor of urban affairs and planning at Hunter College. “But it’s been shown time and again that diverse economies are more resilient.”

In the case of Willets Point, city officials said the shops would have to move. There were protests[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/16/nyregion/citi-fields-neighbors-to-protest-evictions-before-all-star-game.html] and sit-ins, but in 2013, the City Council approved a $3 billion Willets Point redevelopment plan, which called for a hotel and a 1 million-square-foot mall next to the stadium. The developers — the Related Companies and Sterling Equities, whose principals own Citi Field and the Mets — were required to build 2,500 apartments, 875 for low and moderate-income tenants, beginning in 2025, although they had the option of paying the city $35 million to get out of the obligation.

A lawsuit filed by the City Club of New York[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/03/sports/baseball/near-citi-field-plans-for-willets-west-are-ruled-illegal.html], a civic group, and some business and property owners has slowed any progress. The developers so far have lost in court, and have appealed, although the city declined to join the appeal. But under Mayor Bill de Blasio, a Democrat, the city has continued to buy land in Willets Point and to evict businesses in the area. The city has already spent $264 million of a $474 million budget for land, demolition, cleaning up toxic materials and building highway ramps.

The Sunrise Cooperative also sued the city, settling in 2015, after the city agreed to provide the group with $5.8 million to move collectively to the Bronx warehouse.

Marco Neira, president of Sunrise, said the group wanted to replicate the critical mass of auto-related businesses at Willets Point that had attracted customers who knew they could find a good deal by hunting from shop to shop for the best price.

Mr. Neira said he wanted to avoid what happened to printers in Manhattan, many of which failed after being forced to leave the printing district around Canal and Hudson Streets in the 1990s. Some relocated to Long Island City, where they are being forced out by development again.

“All the printers in the buildings around me have been told to get out in the next year,” said Howard Weinstein, president of Candid Litho Printing, which moved to Long Island City 10 years ago and is moving again, possibly out of the city. “The number of apartment buildings going up here is out of control.”

Members of the Sunrise Cooperative said that their building in Hunts Point — and industrial section close to the Interstate 278 that is home to the city’s produce and fish markets — is unlikely to face the same sort of gentrification.

The price of converting the property has soared because of delays and the cost of constructing in accordance with building and fire codes. Sunrise has exhausted its own money as well as $7.6 million in city relocation financing. Sunrise estimates that it needs another $2 million to pay outstanding bills and finish construction and $1 million more for operating costs in the first year.

Former Willets Point business owners like Mr. Chasi and Jorge Molina, who owned the House of Shocks, often set up shop in front of the now-vacant Iron Triangle shops with compressors, tool bags and spare parts piled into the back of pickup trucks or vans.

“I have some customers, maybe 100, waiting for the shop to open,” said Robert Aguilar, who **immigrated** to New York from Mexico and owned Veterans Auto Repair. “In a good year, I made $70,000. I had been looking to buy a house. But now: nothing. What money there is goes for food and rent.”

\* De Blasio’s Dilemma: Fight for a Mall Near Citi Field or Disavow It[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/09/nyregion/de-blasios-dilemma-fight-for-willets-west-or-disavow-deal-to-develop-citi-field-lot.html]

\* The End of Willets Point[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/24/nyregion/the-end-of-willets-point.html]

\* Uncertainty Clouds Future of Willets Point and Its Oil-Stained Streets[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/28/nyregion/uncertainty-clouds-future-of-willets-point-and-its-oil-stained-streets.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Obama administration is delaying deportation proceedings for recent **immigrants** in cities across the United States, allowing more than 56,000 of those who fled Central America since 2014 to remain in the country legally for several more years.

The shift, described in interviews with **immigration** lawyers, federal officials and current and former judges, has been occurring without public attention for months. It amounts to an unannounced departure from the administration’s widely publicized pronouncements that cases tied to the so-called surge of 2014 would be rushed through the **immigration** courts in an effort to deter more Central Americans from entering the United States illegally.

The delayed cases are those of nearly half of the Central Americans who entered the United States as families since 2014, and close to a quarter of the total number of Central Americans who entered during that period.

The delays are being made as a cost-saving measure, according to federal officials, because of a lapse in enforcement that allowed **immigrants** who were supposed to be enrolled in an electronic monitoring program to go free. Some of those affected had failed to report to government offices to be fitted with G.P.S. ankle bracelets, according to a February memo[https://www.justice.gov/eoir/file/819736/download] from the chief **immigration** judge, Print Maggard, in Arlington, Va.

Now that the government will not have to pay the daily fee of $4 to $8 a person that it costs to monitor such bracelets, the **immigrants**’ cases have been pushed back for years, some until 2023, judges and federal officials said. The cases of those who met their reporting obligations are still being expedited, with some cases moving faster than lawyers and judges had expected.

“The whole thing is docket chaos,” said Paul Schmidt, who retired in June after a 30-year career working for federal **immigration** agencies, the last 13 years as an **immigration** judge.

It was not clear whether the **immigrants**’ failure to report was intentional or the result of unclear instructions. Deportations are carried out by two separate government agencies — the Department of Homeland Security[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/h/homeland\_security\_department/index.html?inline=nyt-org], which arrests people charged with violating **immigration** laws, and the Executive Office for **Immigration** Review, a branch of the Justice Department that adjudicates deportations. It is common, lawyers and judges said, for **immigrants** who do not realize that the two agencies are distinct to betray their obligations out of confusion.

“You’re coming into the country and you’ve got one reporting requirement for D.H.S. and another for the **immigration** court,” Judge Schmidt said. “Most people don’t understand that.”

Federal officials acknowledged that many of the affected **immigrants** might not appear for their court dates.

Along with the cases being postponed, other cases are being catapulted forward, sometimes by years, onto the dockets of judges who were recently hired to address the **immigration** system’s backlog of cases, which has reached record levels. And yet, lawyers say, even this attempt to speed things along could lead to more delays.

“In all of these cases, I’m going to go into the court date and say I was not given any chance to say whether or not I was available, so you have to adjourn this,” said Bryan S. Johnson, a private **immigration** lawyer in New York.

Many **immigrants** whose cases will now move faster and who would have sought pro bono counsel may also have to go to court unrepresented.

“We can’t take on someone else who is on a waiting list because someone we thought was going to be completed is now still our case for four years,” said Eleni Wolfe-Roubatis[http://centrolegal.org/about-us/staff-board/], the **immigration** program director at the Centro Legal de la Raza in Oakland, Calif., a legal services agency for **immigrants**. She said dozens of her cases had been pushed to as late as 2020.

The **immigrants** affected by the delay are primarily families who entered the United States illegally since 2014, when record numbers of Central American migrants crossed the southern border, many seeking asylum status because of gang violence and lawlessness in their home countries.

Deportation proceedings for unaccompanied minors who entered the United States during that time are still being expedited.

But despite these deterrent efforts, the number of Central American families that will come into the country illegally this year is expected to exceed that of 2014, according to data[https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/southwest-border-unaccompanied-children/fy-2016] released by the Department of Homeland Security.

Follow Caitlin Dickerson on Twitter @itscaitlinhd

\* U.S. to Admit More Central American Refugees[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/27/us/politics/obama-refugees-central-america.html]

\* U.S. Will Step Up Deportations, Focusing on Central Americans[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/14/us/us-will-step-up-deportations-focusing-on-central-americans.html]

\* U.S. Continues to Deport Central American Migrants[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/us/us-continues-to-deport-central-american-migrants.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Trump campaign appeared to disavow one of its most provocative policy proposals on Thursday, as Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana said explicitly that Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] no longer wants to impose a temporary ban on Muslim **immigration** to the United States.

In a round of television interviews in which he was asked to clarify once and for all where the campaign stands on the proposal, Mr. Pence, who opposed the ban before becoming Mr. Trump’s running mate, declared the idea dead. The reversal is a significant one for the Trump campaign, which was accused of promoting a policy that was discriminatory and likely unconstitutional when Mr. Trump unveiled it[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/12/07/donald-trump-calls-for-banning-muslims-from-entering-u-s/] in the name of national security last year.

Asked on CNN about why he will not condemn the Muslim ban now, Mr. Pence said, “Because that’s not Donald Trump’s position now.”

Why isn't Mike Pence condemning Trump's past call for a Muslim ban? "Because it's not Donald Trump's position now" https://t.co/9fAIpGXCd4[https://t.co/9fAIpGXCd4] — New Day (@NewDay) October 6, 2016[https://twitter.com/NewDay/status/784014344958930944]

In recent months, Mr. Trump has changed how he has talked about the ban, saying that “extreme vetting” of **immigrants** should be focused on people coming from countries that have been compromised by terrorists. But that idea led to more confusion, because it was not clear if it was an expansion of the Muslim ban or a shift away from it.

Mr. Pence appeared to imply in August that he would be open to broadening the ban[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/11/us/politics/mike-pence-muslim-ban.html] to other religions, but the emphasis was placed on geography.

“That’s what Donald Trump and I are calling for now, is to have a temporary suspension of **immigration** from countries or territories compromised by terrorism, and I believe that’s an appropriate action given the horrendous, horrendous violence that we see,” Mr. Pence told Charlie Sykes[https://soundcloud.com/620-wtmj/gov-mike-pence-joins-charlie-sykes-aug-8-2016], a Wisconsin talk radio host, at the time.

Historians have compared Mr. Trump’s Muslim ban with some of the darkest moments in American history[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/12/09/idea-behind-donald-trumps-plan-to-bar-muslims-has-some-deep-roots/], likening it to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the use of internment camps for Japanese-Americans during World War II.

The timing of Mr. Pence’s latest remarks may not be a coincidence. Polls have shown[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/12/10/poll-finds-republican-support-for-donald-trumps-ban-on-muslims-coming-to-u-s/] that a majority of Americans oppose the concept of barring Muslims, while Republicans remain divided about it. The retreat on Thursday was the latest example of the Trump campaign changing a position as the general election approaches.

Mr. Trump recently softened his position on **immigration**, foregoing his calls for mass deportation in favor of a focus on “criminal **aliens**.” Mr. Pence was also one of the first members of the campaign to publicly acknowledge that President Obama was born in the United States, paving the way for Mr. Trump to finally end his [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/us/politics/donald-trump-birther-obama.html] false [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/us/politics/donald-trump-birther-obama.html] conspiracy theory[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/us/politics/donald-trump-birther-obama.html] about Mr. Obama’s birthplace last month.

During the vice-presidential debate this week, Mr. Pence brushed off many of Mr. Trump’s startling comments from the campaign, disregarding some as reflecting a lack of political polish and denying that others were ever said.

But critics of Mr. Trump are not letting his campaign off the hook for the Muslim ban so easily.

“Governor Pence’s flagrant attempts to mislead voters on his running mate’s positions aren’t fooling anyone,” said Zara Rahim, a spokeswoman for the Clinton campaign. “Not only has Trump proposed an unconstitutional **immigration** ban on an entire religion, but he’s suggested creating a database that tracks Muslims in this country.”

She added, “Pence has not disavowed anything, he’s just lied to the American people once again.”

Nihad Awad, executive director of the Council on American-Islamic Relations[https://www.cair.com/], said that Mr. Trump could not simply turn the page on the Muslim ban.

“Whatever the Trump campaign claims is the current version of its Muslim ban, the original absolutist language of a ‘total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States’ — along with other bigoted statements — reflect a systematic and toxic use of Islamophobia that has had a tremendously harmful impact on the lives of ordinary American Muslims and on the unity of our nation,” Mr. Awad said.

Despite efforts to quietly backtrack on the proposal, the Trump campaign has continued to face questions about the ban because the press release from last December[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/donald-j.-trump-statement-on-preventing-muslim-immigration] announcing the proposal has not been removed from Mr. Trump’s website.

“Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what is going on,” the release said.

But in a separate interview on MSNBC on Thursday, Mr. Pence made clear that the Muslim ban was no longer on the table. Such a proposal, he seemed to suggest, would be absurd.

“So not a ban on all Muslims?” Joe Scarborough, the host of “Morning Joe,” asked Mr. Pence.

“Of course not,” Mr. Pence replied.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The sign above the Chinese Club[http://thechineseclubnyc.com/]’s scarlet storefront in Williamsburg, Brooklyn, says “Est. 1914,” although its doors opened only in March. More than a century and 7,500 miles separate it from its ancestor, the Chinese Club of Darjeeling, in the Himalayan foothills of eastern India.

According to “A Concise History of the Darjeeling District Since 1835[https://books-google-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/books/about/A\_Concise\_History\_of\_the\_Darjeeling\_Dist.html?id=UadAAAAAMAAJ],” published in 1917 by a British expatriate, the original club was built on the town’s Jail Road. There, Chinese migrant workers would “congregate every night indulging in potations of much chow and a little harmless gambling.”

The club’s founder was Lo Fung Foo, an **immigrant** from southern China and great-grandfather to Stacey Lo, who oversees the Brooklyn outpost with her husband, Salil Mehta. Relics of “harmless gambling” hang on a wall up front: mah-jongg tiles passed down by Ms. Lo’s grandmother.

To passers-by, the place may appear to be a straightforward (if self-consciously kitschy) Chinese restaurant, with its tumbling water fountain, happy-cat mural and red paper lanterns. But the food is as Chinese as General Tso’s chicken. This is diaspora cuisine, adapted by **immigrant** chefs for outsiders’ palates and slowly filtered through another nation’s consciousness.

So here are hon-shimeji mushrooms, battered, deep-fried and lashed with butter, salt, pepper and warming Chinese five-spice powder. More five-spice adorns nubs of soft-shell crab, alongside Indian chaat masala, whose sour-sweet vectors include amchoor (green mango powder), oniony asafetida and black cumin with its soul of smoke.

Chicken wings, slit at the narrow end so the meat can be peeled back and gathered into fat lollipop heads, emerge coppery from the fryer, with a gloriously shaggy crust. They taste of sesame oil, white pepper and an under-scorch of deggi mirch (Kashmiri chile powder).

One menu item comes with the warning — or enticement — “Not what you think.” This could apply to almost every dish, like mapo paneer, which bears no kinship to its Sichuan counterpart despite the ostensible presence of fermented black beans and Sichuan peppercorn. (Still, paneer is a worthy rival to tofu, giving as much flavor as it takes.)

Likewise estranged is kung pao chicken, the meat steeped in deggi mirch, fennel, paprika and sulfur-tinged kala namak (black salt) and baked tandoori-style, then quickened in a wok with more traditional kung pao ingredients. What tilts the balance is an unfortunate slug of ketchup.

The use of ketchup may be true to Indian-Chinese cooking, but it raises the question: Is authenticity enough? I can’t say that the American-Chinese food I ate so happily as a child was good; I know only that I loved it, and that I’ll never taste its like again. These, too, may be dishes that require the halo of nostalgia.

Then again, my companions, who grew up eating Indian-Chinese food in India, were as puzzled as I was. Perhaps compromises are being made for local diners.

Desserts are crowd-pleasers: coconut ice cream armored in fried noodles, crunchy and creamy, earthy and sweet, or styled as a parade float, atop a Chinese bubble waffle speared with Pocky sticks and littered with Fruity Pebbles, lychee, candied fennel and spongy translucent palm seeds — ridiculous and delicious.

Ms. Lo, 29, was born in Darjeeling and raised in Calcutta and New York; Mr. Mehta, 30, grew up in New Delhi and studied design at Parsons. For them, food is a kind of inheritance: His family once owned a Punjabi sweets shop, and her family runs two Indian-Chinese restaurants in Queens.

They married straight out of college, and in 2010 took over the acclaimed Malaysian restaurant Laut[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/29/dining/reviews/29brief-002.html] in Union Square, signing the contract the day after their first child was born.

I wish I could have tasted Mr. Mehta’s cooking. He was absent from the kitchen when I visited (he spends half his time at Laut), and whoever was in charge had an unsteady hand. One night, paneer was fried to the point of desiccation; on another, orbs of Manchurian fritters were icy cold at the center.

Service was drifty, too. On each visit, at least one dish I ordered was forgotten. When I asked what “velvet” sauce was, the waitress said, “Nobody has ever ordered that.” (It turned out to be a simple union of white wine and egg whites, Cantonese cooking at its mildest.)

One dish, a tangle of maifun noodles with masala, evolved from a recipe that Mr. Mehta improvised for his wife at home. If only that version were available. For the restaurant, he explained, he omits shrimp paste and adds ketchup.

“Oh, no,” I wanted to say. “Don’t go easy on us.”

The Chinese Club

208 Grand Street (Driggs Avenue), Williamsburg, Brooklyn; 718-487-4576; thechineseclubnyc.com

Recommended Butter salt and pepper mushrooms; volcano crab; mapo paneer; sizzling chile steak; egg waffle.

Drinks and Wine Beer and wine.

Prices $6.95 to $20.95.

Open Nightly for dinner, Saturday and Sunday for brunch.

Reservations Accepted.

Wheelchair Access The entrance is level with the sidewalk. The restroom is spacious but does not have a handrail.

\* The Chinese Club Is Reborn in Brooklyn[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/30/dining/chinese-club-williamsburg-restaurant.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Every day this week, as part of our Civil Conversation Challenge[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/learning/our-civil-conversation-challenge-for-teenagers.html], we will open a new Student Opinion forum on one of the big issues dividing Americans this campaign season. Here are our other forums so far, on **immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/learning/civil-conversation-challenge-for-teenagers-issue-one-immigration.html], guns[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/learning/civil-conversation-challenge-for-teenagers-issue-2-guns.html] and climate change[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/learning/civil-conversation-challenge-for-teenagers-issue-3-climate-change.html].

We invite teenagers from around the country and the world to practice the skills of respectful, informed conversation[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/learning/lesson-plans/talking-across-divides-10-ways-to-encourage-civil-classroom-conversation-on-difficult-issues.html] across ideological and demographic divides not only by posting their own t houghts on these issues , but also by reading the r esponses of others and replying to them.

As we moderate, we’ll be looking for exchanges between students tha t...

1. Follow Times commenting standards[http://www.nytimes.com/content/help/site/usercontent/usercontent.html] and are civil and respectful.

2. Advance the conversation about an issue, whether by introducing a new idea or perspective, asking useful questions, making connections to other issues, finding themes or commonalities among comments, presenting new evidence or anything else.

3. Are grounded in fact and buttressed by sources. This is not to say that everything you post must be footnoted sentence by sentence, but commenters should provide reliable sources for any controversial claims.

4. Show evidence of “listening” and trying to understand other points of view.

Learn more about the Challenge[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/learning/our-civil-conversation-challenge-for-teenagers.html], which continues t hrough Nov. 7 , and find a lesson plan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/learning/lesson-plans/talking-across-divides-10-ways-to-encourage-civil-classroom-conversation-on-difficult-issues.html] to help .

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Some background on the issues:

As a recent Op-Ed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/opinion/campaign-stops/how-to-build-a-democratic-majority-that-lasts.html] points out, “People of color have grown to 38 percent of the population today[https://www-census-gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00] from 12 percent in 1966[https://www-census-gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/popest/data/national/asrh/pre-1980/tables/PE-11-1966.pdf], and that metamorphosis paved the path to electing the first African-American president.” But, as this article reports[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/09/us/shootings-further-divide-a-nation-torn-over-race.html], racial tensions are clearly rising.

A June survey by the Pew Research Center[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/28/us/more-americans-say-race-relations-are-bad-and-a-survey-explores-why.html] found that only 46 percent of whites surveyed thought that race relations were generally good, a sharp drop from the 66 percent who held that opinion in June 2009, shortly after Mr. Obama took office. For blacks, the corresponding decline — to 34 percent last month from 59 percent in 2009 — was even steeper.

Police accountability and racial bias have been at the center of the civic debate since August 2014, when a black teenager was killed by a white officer in Ferguson, Mo. In July, the country saw the killings of two black men by Louisiana and Minnesota police officers and the retaliatory murders of five Dallas officers in the space of three days. An article that week[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/09/us/shootings-further-divide-a-nation-torn-over-race.html] noted, “police officers and sociologists alike say that racial tension is approaching a point last seen during the street riots that swept urban American in the late 1960s.”

At the same time, after Hillary Clinton’s historic nomination[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/27/us/politics/dnc-speakers-sanders-clinton.html], another poll[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/us/politics/president-poll-women-hillary-clinton.html] found that, while women think more progress has been made toward ending sexism than racism in society, there are still challenges. Women think sexual harassment is a significant issue in the workplace, and feel the greatest problem facing American women is inequality in pay and career opportunities. And on issues of gender and sexuality, the two party positions are starkly at odds, as clashes over transgender bathrooms[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/22/us/transgender-bathroom-obama-schools.html] and gay rights[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/16/us/after-orlando-a-political-divide-on-gay-rights-still-stands.html] have shown.

Both presidential candidates, The Times writes[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/us/politics/clinton-trump-issues.html], are increasingly staking their fortunes on these cultural issues that are “convulsing the nation.” The article[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/us/politics/clinton-trump-issues.html], written just before the first debate, notes that “Even in other times of social unrest, few if any presidential candidates have constructed their political arguments around themes of race, gender and cultural diversity as much as Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump.”

The article continues:

In a campaign that has veered from traditional policy arguments toward a battle over national identity and values, Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump are more sharply opposed over racial and gender issues than any two presidential opponents in decades. Rather than play it safe with milquetoast positions, Mrs. Clinton wants to increase turnout among African-Americans and women by tackling issues of bias and respect. Mr. Trump is positioning himself at the vanguard of white men.

... Many Democrats believe Mrs. Clinton has an edge: Her party is energized around these issues and seems eager for a fight, while some Republicans sound fatigued about racism in law enforcement.

... Yet Republicans see electoral advantages for Mr. Trump. He won the nomination largely by appealing to the resentments of whites, especially working-class voters who say they are tired of debating racism and appreciate Mr. Trump’s message of law and order.

What do you think? Why are issues of race, gender, sexuality and identity — issues that are roiling hi[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/trigger-warnings-safe-spaces-and-microaggressions-teaching-questions-of-freedom-of-speech-on-campus/] gh[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/trigger-warnings-safe-spaces-and-microaggressions-teaching-questions-of-freedom-of-speech-on-campus/] school and college campuses[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/trigger-warnings-safe-spaces-and-microaggressions-teaching-questions-of-freedom-of-speech-on-campus/] as well as the nation at large — so central to this election? What, as a nation, can or should we do to heal those divides?

We hope you’ll use this forum as a place to have a respectful discussion about these sensitive issues, and raise related topics and questions beyond the scope of this brief overview.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Where to learn more:

• Hillary Clinton’s position on racial justice[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/racial-justice/], on women’s rights and opportunities[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/womens-rights-and-opportunity/] and on L[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] .[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] G[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] .[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] B[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] .[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] T[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] .[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/] rights and equality[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/]

• The Republican Party platform on “Great American Families, Education, Health Care and Criminal Justice[https://www.gop.com/platform/renewing-american-values/]”

• ProCon’s 2016 issues page[http://2016election.procon.org/], which puts the candidates’ positions side by side.

• A Times article from September, “First Clinton-Trump Debate Is Framed by Rifts Over Race and Gender[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/us/politics/clinton-trump-issues.html].”

• A 2015 Times Magazine piece, “The Year We Obsessed Over Identity[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/11/magazine/the-year-we-obsessed-over-identity.html]”

• Our lesson plan, “Equality Under the Law? Investigating Race and the Justice System[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/01/06/equality-under-the-law-investigating-race-and-the-justice-system/]”

• A winner of our 2016 Summer Reading Contest on “Gender, Race and Shifting Perceptions of Identity[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/06/30/summer-reading-contest-winner-week-1-gender-race-and-shifting-perceptions-of-identity/]”

• A collection from our 2016 Student Council: “Gender Studies | 25 Teenagers Recommend Readings for Women’s History Month[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/03/03/gender-studies-25-teenagers-recommend-readings-for-womens-history-month/]”

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Possible questions to address:

— Why do these topics interest you? How have your experiences shaped your opinions? What questions or concerns do the issues raise for you?

— Over all, as a society, do you think we talk about issues of race, gender, identity and diversity enough? Or, do you think we talk about them too much, and that these kinds of “identity politics” breed “[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/opinion/identity-politics-run-amok.html] suspicion, cynicism and distrust”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/opinion/identity-politics-run-amok.html]?

—Mrs. Clinton has cast herself as a champion of diversity and inclusion, The Times writes[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/us/politics/clinton-trump-issues.html]. She spoke out quickly after the fatal police shooting[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/us/tulsa-officer-charged-in-fatal-shooting-of-black-driver.html] of a black man in Tulsa, Okla., to denounce “systemic racism” against blacks. And after the bombings in New York and New Jersey, she rushed to make the case that Mr. Trump had endangered the country with his oratorical attacks on Muslims. She also gave a speech criticizing Mr. Trump for having shown disrespect to people with disabilities. Her commercial about Mr. Trump and women[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/25/us/politics/donald-trumps-movement-ad-positive-message-subtle-dig.html] ends with a powerful question: “Is this the president we want for our daughters?” And at the first debate, in response to a question about race and policing, she said[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/us/politics/hillary-clinton-black-voters.html], “I think implicit bias is a problem for everyone, not just police. I think, unfortunately, too many of us in our great country jump to conclusions about each other.”

Do you believe, like Mrs. Clinton, that there is systemic racism and sexism that foster inequality? Do you believe that implicit bias[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/upshot/were-all-a-little-biased-even-if-we-dont-know-it.html] is a problem for us all? If so, where and how do you see these issues in our world? What can we do about them?

— In contrast to Mrs. Clinton, as this July article sums up[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/us/politics/donald-trump-white-identity.html], “Defying modern conventions of political civility and language, Mr. Trump has breached the boundaries that have long constrained Americans’ public discussion of race. Mr. Trump has attacked Mexicans[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/03/world/americas/donald-trump-gains-infamy-in-mexico-for-comments-on-immigrants.html] as criminals. He has called for a ban[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/09/us/politics/donald-trump-muslims.html] on Muslim **immigrants**. He has wondered aloud[http://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-immigration-reform-a-suicide-mission-for-gop/] why the United States is not ‘letting people in from Europe.’ ” The article goes on to note that “In a country where the wealthiest and most influential citizens are still mostly white, Mr. Trump is voicing the bewilderment and anger of whites who do not feel at all powerful or privileged.”

Do you agree with Mr. Trump that we are too “politically correct” and should all be freer to say what we feel? Or, do you think Mr. Trump has “opened the door to assertions of white identity and resentment” that are “mainstreaming hate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/14/opinion/sunday/donald-trump-is-making-america-meaner.html]” in dangerous ways?

— Do you agree that, as many have speculated, our nation’s demographics help explain why Mr. Trump appeals to many white, working-class male voters? That is, as an article from May[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/24/us/politics/donald-trump-white-males-anxiety.html] on “the anxiety of American white males” put its, “Mrs. Clinton wins majorities of groups that have seen their freedoms and share of the nation’s resources grow in recent decades — women, African-Americans, Hispanics. Mr. Trump wins majorities of groups that have experienced a relative decline — whites and men.” The article posits that there is “a feeling among many white men of being shoved aside: A sense that society is growing more feminine, increasing numbers of people speak a different language, **immigrants** are pouring in unchecked, and the government is more concerned about other demographic groups.” Do you think this is true?

— Our national debate over race and policing has come up over and over this election season, and this summer the Black Lives Matter movement began spurring fierce opposition[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/how-blacklivesmatter-came-to-define-a-movement.html] under banners like All Lives Matter, White Lives Matter and Blue Lives Matter. In response to a question about the issue [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7yYCtIsx6tg] during the v[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7yYCtIsx6tg] ice-p[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7yYCtIsx6tg] residential debate, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7yYCtIsx6tg] Gov. Mike Pence, the Republican running mate, said “I just think what we ought to do is we ought to stop seizing on these moments of tragedy... Enough of this seeking every opportunity to demean law enforcement broadly by making the accusation of implicit bias every time tragedy occurs.” Do you think that is what the Obama administration and others on the left are doing? The Republican Party platform on the issue[https://www.gop.com/platform/renewing-american-values/] states:

The men and women of law enforcement — whether patrolling our neighborhoods or our borders, fighting organized crime or guarding against domestic terror — deserve our gratitude and support. Their jobs are never easy, especially in crisis situations, and should not be made more difficult by politicized second-guessing from federal officials. The current Administration’s lack of respect for them, from White House intervention in local arrests to the Attorney General’s present campaign of harassment against police forces around the country, has been unprecedented. With all Americans, we mourn those whom we have lost to violence and hatred. To honor their sacrifice, we recommit ourselves, as individuals and as a party, to the rule of law and the pursuit of justice.

— In contrast, the Democratic Party’s platform[https://www.demconvention.com/platform/] states, “We will push for a societal transformation to make it clear that black lives matter and that there is no place for racism in our country.” It also says:

We will rebuild the bonds of trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. Across the country, there are police officers inspiring trust and confidence, honorably doing their duty, deploying creative and effective strategies, and demonstrating that it is possible to prevent crime without relying on unnecessary force. They deserve our respect and support, and we should learn from those examples and build on what works. We will work with police chiefs to invest in training for officers on issues such as de-escalation and the creation of national guidelines for the appropriate use of force. We will encourage better police-community relations, require the use of body cameras, and stop the use of weapons of war that have no place in our communities. We will end racial profiling that targets individuals solely on the basis of race, religion, ethnicity, or national origin, which is un-American and counterproductive. We should report national data on policing strategies and provide greater transparency and accountability. We will require the Department of Justice to investigate all questionable or suspicious police-involved shootings, and we will support states and localities who help make those investigations and prosecutions more transparent, including through reforming the grand jury process.

— Where do you stand on the role of police in our society? On racial profiling[http://2016election.procon.org/view.answers.election.php?questionID=002095]? The Black Lives Matter movement[http://2016election.procon.org/view.answers.election.php?questionID=002038]?

— On gender and sexuality issues, the two parties also frame the issues differently. The Democratic platform[https://www.demconvention.com/platform/] states:

We are committed to ensuring full equality for women. Democrats will fight to end gender discrimination in the areas of education, employment, health care, or any other sphere. We will combat biases across economic, political, and social life that hold women back and limit their opportunities and also tackle specific challenges facing women of color.

It continues:

Guaranteeing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Rights Democrats applaud last year’s decision by the Supreme Court that recognized that L.G.B.T. people — like other Americans — have the right to marry the person they love. But there is still much work to be done. L.G.B.T. kids continue to be bullied at school, restaurants can refuse to serve transgender people, and same-sex couples are at risk of being evicted from their homes. That is unacceptable and must change. Democrats will fight for the continued development of sex discrimination law to cover L.G.B.T. people. We will also fight for comprehensive federal nondiscrimination protections for all L.G.B.T. Americans, to guarantee equal rights in areas such as housing, employment, public accommodations, credit, jury service, education, and federal funding. We will oppose all state efforts to discriminate against L.G.B.T. individuals, including legislation that restricts the right to access public spaces.

— The Republican party, by contrast, states that “Our laws and our government’s regulations should recognize marriage as the union of one man and one woman and actively promote married family life as the basis of a stable and prosperous society.” It continues:

We emphatically support the original, authentic meaning of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. It affirmed that “no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” That language opened up for girls and women a world of opportunities that had too often been denied to them. That same provision of law is now being used by bureaucrats — and by the current President of the United States — to impose a social and cultural revolution upon the American people by wrongly redefining sex discrimination to include sexual orientation or other categories. Their agenda has nothing to do with individual rights; it has everything to do with power. They are determined to reshape our schools — and our entire society — to fit the mold of an ideology **alien** to America’s history and traditions. Their edict to the states concerning restrooms, locker rooms, and other facilities is at once illegal, dangerous, and ignores privacy issues. We salute the several states which have filed suit against it.

— What do you think? Where do you stand on the role of women in the world and the family[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/13/us/politics/republican-convention-issues.html]? On same-sex marriage[http://2016election.procon.org/view.answers.election.php?questionID=002026] and other gay rights issues[http://2016election.procon.org/view.answers.election.php?questionID=002081]? On transgender bathrooms[http://2016election.procon.org/view.answers.election.php?questionID=002093]?

— What more would you like to say? What issues did we miss? Start a conversation, or join one, by posting a comment.

Please Note: Students 13 and older are invited to comment. We ask that adults respect the intent of the Student Opinion question and refrain from posting here. There are many other places on NYTimes.com[http://NYTimes.com] for adults to post, while this is the only place that explicitly invites the voices of young people.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**More than twice as many Asian-Americans now identify as Democrats than as Republicans, and they hold strongly unfavorable views of Donald J. Trump, a new national survey found, emphasizing the Republican Party’s continued struggle to appeal to minority groups.

The figures, published on Wednesday[http://naasurvey.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/NAAS2016-Oct5-report.pdf] by the nonpartisan National Asian-American Survey, suggested that the political allegiances of Asians might be hardening in a way that could harm Republicans with the fastest-growing minority group well beyond 2016.

“Over the past 20 years,” the report said, “Asian-American support for Democratic presidential candidates has increased more dramatically than among any other racial group.”

Fifty-seven percent of Asians identify with or lean toward the Democratic Party today, compared with 24 percent who do for the Republican Party, the survey said.

Mr. Trump’s numbers are far worse. Mrs. Clinton leads him among all Asian registered voters, 55 percent to 14 percent.

And while the Asian vote has never been monolithic — it includes a vast array of ethnicities, nationalities and religious affiliations — the distaste for Mr. Trump extends far and deep into all groups. Seventy-nine percent of Indian-Americans surveyed said they had an unfavorable view of Mr. Trump. So did 84 percent of Koreans, 67 percent of Chinese and 62 percent of Filipinos.

The only bright spot were Vietnamese-Americans, who were split more or less evenly: 43 percent unfavorable, 45 percent favorable for Mr. Trump.

In 1992, George H.W. Bush won Asian-Americans by an overwhelming 24-point margin. Bob Dole, the Republican nominee in 1996, won them as well, but by a smaller margin. The Democratic nominee has won Asians ever since.

Many Republicans have started to raise the alarm that Mr. Trump is only **alienating** Asians further[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/us/politics/trump-asian-american-voters.html]. He has suggested cutting off **immigration** from the Philippines, citing fears that the longtime American ally poses the same national security threat as countries like Afghanistan and Syria. He has pilloried the Chinese repeatedly while campaigning, sometimes doing so in a mocking accent. And his proposals to ban Muslims from **immigrating** to the United States and to deport millions of undocumented **immigrants** have stirred up painful memories of discriminatory policies that have targeted Asians in the past, like the internment of the Japanese during World War II.

The survey asked its participants — who were interviewed in 10 languages — whether they supported Mr. Trump’s Muslim ban. Sixty-two percent said no, while 20 percent said yes.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Good morning.

Here’s what you need to know:

• Possible new theft of N.S.A. records.

Details are still emerging about the secret arrest of [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/nsa-leak-booz-allen-hamilton.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] Harold T. Martin III[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/nsa-leak-booz-allen-hamilton.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news], a former National Security Agency contractor. The F.B.I. is investigating whether Mr. Martin stole and disclosed classified computer code that is used to hack into the networks of foreign governments.

Mr. Martin, 51, a Navy veteran, was arrested in August and is in federal custody. Like Edward J. Snowden, he was also a contractor for the consulting firm Booz Allen Hamilton.

• What we know about the case.

According to a criminal complaint unsealed on Wednesday, Mr. Martin admitted that he was not authorized[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/harold-martin-nsa-contractor.html] to remove the materials. But there is no public evidence so far that Mr. Martin passed classified information to anyone else.

“Has he made attempts to hand over the information and chickened out, or is he a collector of information and never intended to do anything with it?” asked a senior Obama administration official. “There are a ton of what-ifs at this point.”

• On the campaign trail.

The debate on Sunday between Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump could determine whether Republicans trying to maintain control of Congress try to distance themselves from Mr. Trump’s campaign[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/donald-trump-campaign.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news]. Recent polls have shown him slipping in some swing states.

After revelations that Mr. Trump declared an operating loss of more than $900 million in 1995, we reviewed roughly 60 b[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/us/politics/donald-trump-business-deals.html] usiness ventures [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/us/politics/donald-trump-business-deals.html] started or promoted by Mr. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/us/politics/donald-trump-business-deals.html] in the years since. A third did not work out, a third had some success and some problems, and a third met expectations.

• Hurricane nears U.S.

After pummeling Haiti this week, the storm is expected to remain at Category 3 or higher when it hits southern Florida late Thursday, and Georgia by late Friday. The governors of those states have already declared emergencies, as have South Carolina and North Carolina.

Check back for the latest developments on the storm’s path here[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/hurricane-matthew-us.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=second-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news].

• “These people were in panic.”

Those were the words of Aris Messinis, a photographer aboard a rescue boat in the Mediterranean this week who witnessed the dramatic rescue of hundreds of migrants[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/world/europe/migrants-mediterranean.html?ref=world]. His powerful photographs capture the daily struggle migrants face trying to reach Europe.

• Nobel Prizes.

The Nobel Peace Prize is scheduled to be awarded on Friday morning. We don’t know who will win this year, but here is a look back at its previous recipients[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/world/nobel-peace-prize-timeline.html].

Business

• Yahoo aided a U.S. email[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/technology/yahoo-email-tech-companies-government-investigations.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] surveillance program[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/technology/yahoo-email-tech-companies-government-investigations.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news], according to several sources. They say the company used a system built to scan emails for spam, child pornography and malware to search for a terrorist organization’s “signature” in an effort to satisfy a secret court order.

• Workers at call centers near Mumbai were directed to pose as Internal Revenue Service employees[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/world/asia/india-call-centers-phone-scam-irs.html?ref=business] and demand money from American taxpayers, according to Indian authorities.

The scheme, which had been operating for a year, collected an estimated $90,000 to $150,000 a day.

• A master’s degree program that costs only $7,000 is being hailed as a breakthrough in online education[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/upshot/an-online-education-breakthrough-a-masters-degree-for-a-mere-7000.html?ref=business].

• U.S. stocks finished higher[http://markets.on.nytimes.com/research/markets/usmarkets/usmarkets.asp] on Wednesday. Here’s a snapshot of global markets[http://markets.on.nytimes.com/research/markets/worldmarkets/worldmarkets.asp].

Noteworthy

• Disputes over museums.

The permanent opening of a museum dedicated to Prince’s [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/arts/music/prince-paisley-park-museum-delayed.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fmusic&action=click&contentCollection=music®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=4&pgtype=sectionfront] music[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/arts/music/prince-paisley-park-museum-delayed.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fmusic&action=click&contentCollection=music®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=4&pgtype=sectionfront], to be housed at his recording lair, Paisley Park in Chanhassen, Minn., may be delayed for months because of a zoning vote. But some lucky fans will be able to tour the studio this week.

And in Winnipeg, Manitoba, the Canadian Museum for Human Rights[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/world/americas/winnipeg-canadian-museum-for-human-rights.html] has been criticized by members of some indigenous groups who say it could do more to address the oppression they have faced from the government. “It’s the Great Canadian Myth on display,” one activist said.

• M.L.B. division series are set.

The San Francisco Giants beat the New York Mets, 3-0[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/sports/baseball/new-york-mets-san-francisco-giants-nl-wild-card.html?ref=sports], in a wild-card game and will now face the Chicago Cubs in the National League division series. The Los Angeles Dodgers play the Washington Nationals in the other N.L. matchup.

The American League’s two division series begin today. The Toronto Blue Jays play the Texas Rangers (4:38 p.m. Eastern, TBS), and the Boston Red Sox play the Cleveland Indians (8:08 p.m., TBS).

• Good news … maybe.

Is there a ceiling to how old humans can live? Yes, it is 115 years[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/science/maximum-life-span-study.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fhealth&action=click&contentCollection=health®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=2&pgtype=sectionfront], according to a new study. The finding has drawn strong — and opposing — reactions.

• Recipe of the day.

This quinoa and rice bowl with kale, kimchi and egg[http://cooking.nytimes.com/recipes/1016855-quinoa-and-rice-bowl-with-kale-kimchi-and-egg] is a great way to use leftovers. While cooking, check out our magazine story on the fight over transparency in the meat industry[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/10/09/magazine/meat-industry-transparency-fight.html?ref=dining].

Back Story

Guten Tag, and happy German-American Day!

More than 45 million people in the U.S. claimed in 2015 to have German ancestry[http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS\_10\_1YR\_B04006&prodType=table], the U.S. Census reported, more than any other group from Europe.

German **immigrants** began settling in North America in the 1600s, primarily in Pennsylvania, North Carolina and New York[http://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1890/10/06/106043533.html?pageNumber=4]. They formed churches, shaped the free press[http://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1890/10/07/103269889.html?pageNumber=5] and influenced politics.

At a German-heritage celebration in 1890 in Baltimore, a speaker announced that “all of us, foreign and native-born citizens, belong to the great republican family of the New World, and are all inspired by the same love, attachment, and fidelity for our country.”

World War I, though, changed everything[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/23/opinion/whatever-happened-to-german-america.html].

Angry mobs turned on residents with German roots. Some were accused of being spies. Books by German authors were banned, and sheets of music by composers including Beethoven were burned. Sauerkraut was temporarily called “liberty cabbage[http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9D02EEDB1031E03ABC4D51DFB2668383609EDE].”

German identity began to come with a degree of shame, and many people changed their names. The stigma continued during and after World War II.

In 1987, Congress sought to change that by designating Oct. 6 German-American Day[https://reaganlibrary.archives.gov/archives/speeches/1987/100287d.htm].

“I urge all Americans to learn more about the contributions of German **immigrants**,” President Ronald Reagan wrote at the time, “and to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”

Amy Padnani contributed reporting.

Your Morning Briefing is published weekdays at 6 a.m. Eastern and updated on the web all morning[http://www.nytimes.com/morningbriefing].

What would you like to see here? Contact us at briefing@nytimes.com[mailto:briefing@nytimes.com].

You can sign up here[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/nyt-now-morning-briefing] to get the briefing delivered to your inbox.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

Following is a transcript of the vice-presidential debate [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/politics/vice-presidential-debate.html] on Tuesday, as transcribed by the Federal News Service.

QUIJANO: Good evening. From Longwood University in Farmville, Virginia, and welcome to the first, and only, vice presidential debate of 2016, sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates.

QUIJANO: I’m Elaine Quijano, anchor at CBSN, and correspondent for CBS News. It’s an honor to moderate this debate between Senator Tim Kaine and Governor Mike Pence. Both are longtime public servants who are also proud fathers of sons serving in the U.S. Marines.

The campaigns have agreed to the rules of this 90-minute debate. There will be nine different segments covering domestic and foreign policy issues. Each segment will begin with a question to both candidates who will each have two minutes to answer. Then I’ll ask follow-up questions to facilitate a discussion between the candidates. By coin toss, it’s been determined that Senator Kaine will be first to answer the opening question.

QUIJANO: We have an enthusiastic audience tonight. They’ve agreed to only express that enthusiasm once at the end of the debate and right now as we welcome Governor Mike Pence and Senator Tim Kaine.

(APPLAUSE)

Gentlemen, welcome. It truly is a privilege to be with both of you tonight.

QUIJANO: I’d like to start with the topic of presidential leadership. Twenty-eight years ago tomorrow night, Lloyd Bentsen said the vice presidential debate was not about the qualifications for the vice presidency, but about how if tragedy should occur, the vice president has to step in without any margin for error, without time for preparation, to take over the responsibility for the biggest job in the world.

What about your qualities, your skills, and your temperament equip you to step into that role at a moment’s notice? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Elaine, thank you for being here tonight, and, Governor Pence, welcome. It is so great to be back at Longwood University in Farmville, Virginia.

This is a very special place. Sixty-five years ago, a young, courageous woman, Barbara Johns, led a walkout of her high school, Moton High School. She made history by protesting school segregation. She believed our nation was stronger together. And that walkout led to the Brown v. Board of Education decision that moved us down the path toward equality.

I am so proud to be running with another strong, history-making woman, Hillary Clinton, to be president of the United States. I’m proud because her vision of stronger together, building an economy that works for all, not just those at the top, being safe in the world not only with a strong military, but also strong alliances to battle terrorism and climate change, and also to build a community of respect, just like Barbara Johns tried to do 65 years ago. That’s why I’m so proud to be her running mate.

Hillary told me why she asked me to be her running mate. She said the test of a Clinton administration will not be the signing of a bill or the passage of a bill. It’ll be whether we can make somebody’s life better, whether we can make a classroom better learning environment for schoolkids or teachers, whether we can make a safer — it’s going to be about results.

And she said to me, you’ve been a missionary and a civil rights lawyer. You’ve been a city councilman and mayor. You’ve been a lieutenant governor and governor and now a U.S. senator. I think you will help me figure out how to govern this nation so that we always keep in mind that the success of the administration is the difference we make in people’s lives.

And that’s what I bring to the ticket, that experience having served at all levels of government. But my primary role is to be Hillary Clinton’s right-hand person and strong supporter as she puts together the most historic administration possible. And I relish that role. I’m so proud of her.

KAINE: I’ll just say this: We trust Hillary Clinton, my wife and I, and we trust her with the most important thing in our life. We have a son deployed overseas in the Marine Corps right now. We trust Hillary Clinton as president and commander-in-chief, but the thought of Donald Trump as commander-in-chief scares us to death.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: Well, first off, thank you, Elaine, and thank you to — thank you to Norwood University for their wonderful hospitality and the Commission on Presidential Debates. It’s deeply humbling for me to be here, to be surrounded by my — my wonderful family.

And, Senator Kaine, it’s an honor to be here with you, as well. And I just — I also want to say — I want to say thanks to everyone that’s looking in tonight, who understands what an enormously important time this is in the life of our nation.

For the last seven-and-a-half years, we’ve seen America’s place in the world weakened. We’ve seen an economy stifled by more taxes, more regulation, a war on coal, and a failing health care reform come to be known as Obamacare, and the American people know that we need to make a change. And so I want to thank all of you for being — being with us tonight.

PENCE: I also want to thank Donald Trump for making that call and inviting us to be a part of this ticket. I have to tell you, I’m a — I’m a small-town boy from a place not too different from Farmville. I grew up with a cornfield in my backyard. My grandfather had **immigrated** to this country when he was about my son’s age. My mom and dad built a — everything that matters in a small town in Southern Indiana. They built a family and — and a good name and a business. And they raised a family. And I dreamed some day of representing my home town in Washington, D.C., but I — honestly, Elaine, I never imagined — never imagined I’d have the opportunity to be governor of the state that I love, let alone be sitting at a table like this in this kind of a position.

So to answer your question, I would say I — I would hope that if — if the responsibility ever fell to me in this role, that I would meet it with the way that I’m going to meet the responsibility should I be elected vice president of the United States. And that’s to bring a lifetime of experience, a lifetime growing up in a small town, a lifetime where I’ve served in the Congress of the United States, where — where I’ve led a state that works in the great state of Indiana, and whatever other responsibilities might follow from this, I — I would hope and, frankly, I would pray to be able to meet that moment with that — that lifetime of experience.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, on the campaign trail, you praised Secretary Clinton’s character, including her commitment to public service, yet 60 percent of voters don’t think she’s trustworthy. Why do so many people distrust her? Is it because they have questions about her e-mails and the Clinton Foundation?

KAINE: Elaine, let me tell you why I trust Hillary Clinton. Here’s what people should look at as they look at a public servant. Do they have a passion in their life that showed up before they were in public life? And have they held onto that passion throughout their life, regardless of whether they were in office or not, succeeding or failing?

Hillary Clinton has that passion. From a time as a kid in a Methodist youth group in the suburbs of Chicago, she has been focused on serving others with a special focus on empowering families and kids. As a civil rights lawyer in the South, with the Children’s Defense Fund, first lady of Arkansas and this country, senator, secretary of state, it’s always been about putting others first. And that’s a sharp contrast with Donald Trump.

Donald Trump always puts himself first. He built a business career, in the words of one of his own campaign staffers, “off the backs of the little guy.” And as a candidate, he started his campaign with a speech where he called Mexicans rapists and criminals, and he has pursued the discredited and really outrageous lie that President Obama wasn’t born in the United States.

It is so painful to suggest that we go back to think about these days where an African-American could not be a citizen of the United States. And I can’t imagine how Governor Pence can defend the insult- driven selfish “me first” style of Donald Trump.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, let me ask you, you have said Donald Trump is, quote, “thoughtful, compassionate, and steady.” Yet 67 percent of voters feel he is a risky choice, and 65 percent feel he does not have the right kind of temperament to be president. Why do so many Americans think Mr. Trump is simply too erratic?

PENCE: Well, let me — let me say first and foremost that, Senator, you and Hillary Clinton would know a lot about an insult- driven campaign. It really is remarkable. At a time when literally, in the wake of Hillary Clinton’s tenure as secretary of state, where she was the architect of the Obama administration’s foreign policy, we see entire portions of the world, particularly the wider Middle East, literally spinning out of control. I mean, the situation we’re watching hour by hour in Syria today is the result of the failed foreign policy and the weak foreign policy that Hillary Clinton helped lead in this administration and create. The newly emboldened — the aggression of Russia, whether it was in Ukraine or now they’re heavy-handed approach...

KAINE: You guys love Russia. You both have said...

PENCE: ... their heavy-handed approach.

KAINE: You both have said — you both have said Vladimir Putin is a better leader than the president.

PENCE: Well...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Well, we’re going to get to Russia in just a moment. But I do want to get back to the question at...

PENCE: But in the midst — Elaine, thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Senator, I’ll...

KAINE: These guys have praised Vladimir Putin as a great leader. How can that...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Yes, and we will get to that, Senator. We do have that coming up here. But in the meantime, the questions...

PENCE: Well, Senator, I must have hit a...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: I must have hit a nerve here.

QUIJANO: Why the disconnect?

PENCE: Because at a time of great challenge in the life of this nation, where we’ve weakened America’s place in the world, stifled America’s economy, the campaign of Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine has been an avalanche of insults.

Look, to get to your question about trustworthiness, Donald Trump has built a business through hard times and through good times. He’s brought an extraordinary business acumen. He’s employed tens of thousands of people in this country.

KAINE: And paid few taxes and lost a billion a year.

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: And why the disconnect with your running mate?

PENCE: But there’s a — there’s a reason why people question the trustworthiness of Hillary Clinton. And that’s because they’re paying attention. I mean, the reality is, when she was secretary of state, Senator, come on. She had a Clinton Foundation accepting contributions from foreign governments.

KAINE: You are Donald Trump’s apprentice. Let me talk about this...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Senator, I think I’m still on my time.

KAINE: Well, I think — isn’t this a discussion?

QUIJANO: This is our open discussion.

KAINE: Yeah, let’s talk about the state of...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Well, let me interrupt — let me interrupt you and finish my sentence, if I can.

KAINE: Finish your sentence.

PENCE: The Clinton Foundation accepted foreign contributions from foreign governments and foreign donors while she was secretary of state.

KAINE: OK, now I can weigh in. Now...

PENCE: She had a private server...

KAINE: Now, I get to weigh in. Now, let me just say this...

PENCE: ... that was discovered...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: ... Senator, you have an opportunity to respond.

PENCE: ... keep that pay to play process out of the reach of the public.

KAINE: Governor Pence — Governor Pence doesn’t think the world’s going so well and he, you know, is going to say it’s everybody’s fault.

PENCE: Do you?

KAINE: Let me tell you this. When Hillary Clinton became secretary of state, Governor Pence, did you know that Osama bin Laden was alive?

PENCE: Yes.

KAINE: Do you know that we had 175,000 troops deployed in the battlefield in Iraq and Afghanistan? Do you know that Iran was racing toward a nuclear weapon and Russia was expanding its stockpile?

Under Secretary Clinton’s leadership, she was part of the national team, public safety team that went after and revived the dormant hunt against bin Laden and wiped him off the face of the Earth. She worked to deal with the Russians to reduce their chemical weapons stockpile. She worked a tough negotiation with nations around the world to eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program without firing a shot.

PENCE: Eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program?

KAINE: Absolutely, without firing a shot. And instead of 175,000 American troops deployed overseas, we now have 15,000.

PENCE: Right and...

KAINE: These are very, very good things.

PENCE: And Iraq has been overrun by ISIS, because Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate...

KAINE: Well, if you want to put more American troops in Iraq, you can propose that.

PENCE: Hillary Clinton — Hillary Clinton — Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate a status of forces agreement...

KAINE: No, that is incorrect. That’s incorrect.

PENCE: And so we removed — we removed all of our...

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, we’ll get to...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: ... troops from Iraq, and ISIS was able to be conjured up in that vacuum.

KAINE: But I’d like to correct...

PENCE: ... and overrun vast areas of Iraq.

KAINE: Governor, President Bush said we would leave Iraq at the end of 2011. And, Elaine, Iraq didn’t want our troops to stay, and they wouldn’t give us the protection for our troops. And guess what? If a nation where our troops are serving does not want us to stay, we’re not going to stay without their protection.

PENCE: It was a failure of the secretary of state...

QUIJANO: We need to move on to the next topic, gentlemen.

KAINE: If Governor Pence wants to put more troops back in Iraq, that’s...

QUIJANO: There are a lot of people wondering in this country about the economy. Let’s turn to the issue of the economy.

KAINE: OK.

QUIJANO: According to the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, neither of your economic plans will reduce the growing $19 trillion gross national debt. In fact, your plans would add even more to it.

Both of you were governors who balanced state budgets. Are you concerned that adding more to the debt could be disastrous for the country. Governor Pence?

PENCE: I think the fact that — that under this past administration was of which Hillary Clinton was a part, we’ve almost doubled the national debt is atrocious. I mean, I’m very proud of the fact that — I come from a state that works. The state of Indiana has balanced budgets. We cut taxes, we’ve made record investments in education and in infrastructure, and I still finish my term with $2 billion in the bank.

That’s a little bit different than when Senator Kaine was governor here in Virginia. He actually — he actually tried to raise taxes by about $4 billion. He left his state about $2 billion in the hole. In the state of Indiana, we’ve cut unemployment in half; unemployment doubled when he was governor.

PENCE: But I think he’s a very fitting running mate for Hillary Clinton, because in the wake of a season where American families are struggling in this economy under the weight of higher taxes and Obamacare and the war on coal and the stifling avalanche of regulation coming out of this administration, Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want more of the same. It really is remarkable that they actually are advocating a trillion dollars in tax increases, which I get that. You tried to raise taxes here in Virginia and were unsuccessful.

But a trillion dollars in tax increases, more regulation, more of the same war on coal, and more of Obamacare that now even former President Bill Clinton calls Obamacare a crazy plan. But Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to build on Obamacare. They want to expand it into a single-payer program. And for all the world, Hillary Clinton just thinks Obamacare is a good start.

Look, Donald Trump and I have a plan to get this economy moving again just the way that it worked in the 1980s, just the way it worked in the 1960s, and that is by lowering taxes across the board for working families, small businesses and family farms, ending the war on coal that is hurting jobs and hurting this economy even here in Virginia, repealing Obamacare lock, stock, and barrel, and repealing all of the executive orders that Barack Obama has signed that are stifling economic growth in this economy.

We can get America moving again. Put on top of that the kind of trade deals that’ll put the American worker first, and you’ve got a prescription for real growth. And when you get the economy growing, Elaine, that’s when you can deal with the national debt. When we get back to 3.5 percent to 4 percent growth with Donald Trump’s plan will do, then we’re going to have the resources to meet our nation’s needs at home and abroad, and we’re going to have the ability to bring down the national debt.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Elaine, on the economy, there’s a fundamental choice for the American electorate. Do you want a “you’re hired” president in Hillary Clinton or do you want a “you’re fired” president in Donald Trump? I think that’s not such a hard choice.

Hillary and I have a plan that’s on the table that’s a “you’re hired” plan. Five components. First thing we do is we invest in manufacturing, infrastructure, and research in the clean energy jobs of tomorrow. Second thing is we invest in our workforce, from pre-K education to great teachers to debt-free college and tuition-free college for families that make less than $125,000 a year.

Third, we promote fairness by raising the minimum wage, so you can’t work full-time and be under the poverty level, and by paying women equal pay for equal work.

Fourth, we promote small business growth, just as we’ve done in Virginia, to make it easier to start and grow small businesses. Hillary and I each grew up in small-business families. My dad, who ran an iron working and welding shop, is here tonight.

And, fifth, we have a tax plan that targets tax relief to middle- class individuals and small businesses and asks those at the very top who’ve benefited as we’ve come out of recession to pay more.

KAINE: The Trump plan is a different plan. It’s a “you’re fired” plan. And there’s two key elements to it. First, Donald Trump said wages are too high. And both Donald Trump and Mike Pence think we ought to eliminate the federal minimum wage.

Mike Pence, when he was in Congress, voted against raising the minimum wage above $5.15. And he has been a one-man bulwark against minimum wage increases in Indiana.

The second component of the plan is massive tax breaks for the very top, trillions of dollars of tax breaks for people just like Donald Trump. The problem with this, Elaine, is that’s exactly what we did 10 years ago and it put the economy into the deepest recession — the deepest recession since the 1930s.

Independent analysts say the Clinton plan would grow the economy by 10.5 million jobs. The Trump plan would cost 3.5 million jobs. And Donald Trump — why would he do this? Because his tax plan basically helps him. And if he ever met his promise and he gave his tax returns to the American public like he said he would, we would see just how much his economic plan is really a Trump-first plan.

QUIJANO: On that point, Governor Pence, recently the New York Times released part of Mr. Trump’s 1995 tax return and reported that he could have avoided paying federal income taxes for years. Yesterday, Mr. Trump said he brilliantly used the laws to pay as little tax as legally possible. Does that seem fair to you?

PENCE: Well, first, let me say, I appreciated the “you’re hired,” “you’re fired” thing, Senator. You use that a whole lot. And I think your running mate used a lot of pre-done lines.

Look, what — what you all just heard out there is more taxes, $2 trillion in more spending, more deficits, more debt, more government. And if you think that’s all working, then you look at the other side of the table. I mean, the truth of the matter is, the policies of this administration, which Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine want to continue, have run this economy into a ditch. We’re in the...

KAINE: Fifteen million new jobs?

PENCE: ... slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression.

KAINE: Fifteen million new jobs?

QUIJANO: Governor... (CROSSTALK)

PENCE: There are millions more people living in poverty today than the day that Barack Obama with Hillary Clinton at his side...

KAINE: And the poverty level and the median income...

PENCE: ... stepped into the Oval Office.

KAINE: ... improved dramatically between 2014 and 2015.

PENCE: You — honestly, Senator, you can roll out the numbers and the sunny side, but I got to tell you, people in Scranton know different. People in Fort Wayne, Indiana, know different. I mean, this economy is struggling. The answer to this economy is not more taxes.

KAINE: But it’s not the giveaway tax relief to the folks at the top.

PENCE: It’s not more spending...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: I am interested to hear whether he’ll defend his running mate’s not releasing taxes and not paying taxes.

PENCE: Absolutely I will.

QUIJANO: Governor, with all due respect, the question was about whether it seems fair to you that Mr. Trump said he brilliantly used the laws to pay as little tax as legally possible.

PENCE: Well, this is probably the difference between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine. And, I mean, Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine — God bless you for it, career public servants, that’s great — Donald Trump is a businessman, not a career politician. He actually built a business.

Those tax returns that were — that came out publicly this week show that he faced some pretty tough times 20 years ago. But like virtually every other business, including the New York Times not too long ago, he used what’s called net operating loss. We have a tax code, Senator, that actually is designed to encourage entrepreneurship in this country.

KAINE: But why won’t he release his tax returns?

PENCE: Well, we’re answering the question about — about a business thing, is he...

KAINE: I do want to come back to that, but...

PENCE: His tax returns — his tax returns showed he went through a very difficult time, but he used the tax code just the way it’s supposed to be used. And he did it brilliantly. KAINE: How do you know that? You haven’t seen his tax returns.

PENCE: He created a runway — because he’s created a business that’s worth billions of dollars today.

KAINE: How do you know that?

PENCE: And with regard to paying taxes, this whole riff about not paying taxes and people saying he didn’t pay taxes for years, Donald Trump has created tens of thousands of jobs. And he’s paid payroll taxes, sales taxes, property taxes...

KAINE: Elaine, let me talk about something.

QUIJANO: Senator, I’m going to give you about 30 seconds to respond, and I have question on Social Security for you.

KAINE: OK.

PENCE: The only issue on taxes — Hillary Clinton is going to raise taxes, and Donald Trump and I are going to cut them.

KAINE: Donald Trump started this campaign in 2014 and he said, “If I run for president, I will absolutely release my taxes.” He’s broken his first...

PENCE: And he will.

KAINE: He’s broken his first promise. Second, he stood on the stage...

PENCE: He hasn’t broken his promise. He said he’s...

KAINE: He stood on the stage last week and when Hillary said, you haven’t been paying taxes, he said, “That makes me smart.” So it’s smart not to pay for our military? It’s smart not to pay for veterans? It’s smart not to pay for teachers? And I guess all of us who do pay for those things, I guess we’re stupid. And the last thing I’ll say is this...

PENCE: Senator, do you take all the deductions that you’re entitled to?

KAINE: The last thing — the last thing I want to ask Governor Pence is...

PENCE: I do.

KAINE: Governor Pence had to give Donald Trump his tax returns to show he was qualified to be vice president. Donald Trump must give the American public his tax returns to show that he’s qualified to be president. And he’s breaking his promise.

PENCE: Elaine, I have to respond to this.

QUIJANO: You get very little time, 20 seconds.

PENCE: I’ll be — I’ll be very respectful.

QUIJANO: Governor?

PENCE: Look, Donald Trump has filed over 100 pages of financial disclosure, which is what the law requires.

KAINE: But he said he would release his tax returns.

QUIJANO: All right, Gentlemen...

PENCE: The American people can review that. And he’s going — Senator, he’s going to release his tax returns when the audit is over...

QUIJANO: ... I need to ask you about Social Security...

KAINE: Richard Nixon released tax returns when he was under audit.

PENCE: They’re going to raise your taxes. We’re going to cut your taxes.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen...

KAINE: If you can’t meet Nixon’s standard...

QUIJANO: The people at home cannot understand either one of you when you speak over each other. I would please ask you to wait until it is that the other is finished.

KAINE: All right. We’re having fun up here.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, on the issue of Social Security, in 18 years, when the Social Security Trust Funds run out of money, you’ll be 76. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget estimates your benefits could be cut by as much as $7,500 per year. What would your administration do to prevent this cut?

KAINE: First, we’re going to protect Social Security, which is one of the greatest programs that the American government has ever done. It happened at a time when you would work your whole life, your whole life, raising your kids, working, being a Little League coach or a Sunday school teacher, and then you would retire into poverty. And Social Security has enabled people to retire with dignity and overwhelmingly not be in poverty.

We have to keep it solvent. And we will keep it solvent. And we’ll look for strategies like adjusting the payroll tax cap upward in order to do that.

Here’s what Hillary and I will not do. And I want to make this very plain. We will never, ever engage in a risky scheme to privatize Social Security. Donald Trump wrote a book and he said Social Security is a Ponzi scheme and privatization would be good for all of us.

And when Congressman Pence was in Congress, he was the chief cheerleader for the privatization of Social Security. Even after President Bush stopped pushing for it, Congressman Pence kept pushing for it. We’re going to stand up against efforts to privatize Social Security. And we’ll look for ways to keep it solvent going forward, focusing primarily on the payroll tax cap.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, I’ll give you an opportunity to respond.

PENCE: Well, thanks, Elaine. There they go again. OK...

KAINE: Go read — go read the book.

PENCE: All Donald Trump — all Donald Trump and I have said about Social Security is we’re going to meet our obligations to our seniors. That’s it.

KAINE: Go read the book.

PENCE: We’ve said we’re going to meet the obligations of Medicare. That’s what this campaign is really about, Senator. And I get, this is — this is the old scare tactic that they roll out...

KAINE: But — but you have a voting record, Governor.

PENCE: And I get all of that. I just, look...

KAINE: I...

PENCE: There’s a question that you asked a little bit earlier that I want to go back to.

KAINE: I can’t believe that you won’t defend your own voting record.

PENCE: I have to go back to.

QUIJANO: We...

PENCE: Well, look, I — you’re running with Hillary Clinton, who wants to raise taxes by $1 trillion, increase spending by $2 trillion, and you say you’re going to keep the promises of Social Security. Donald Trump and I are going to cut taxes. We’re going to — we’re going to — we’re going to...

KAINE: You’re not going to cut taxes. You’re going to raise taxes on the middle class.

PENCE: ... reform government programs so we can meet the obligations of Social Security and Medicare.

QUIJANO: All right. PENCE: Stay on the path that your party has us on, we’re going to be in a — in a mountain range of debt. And we’re going to face hard choices and...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Gentleman, I want to move on now.

KAINE: You did ask this question about debt, and the debt explosion on the Trump plan is much, much bigger than anything on the Clinton side.

QUIJANO: All right. Let me move on now...

PENCE: Three hundred and five (ph) economists said your plan is bad for the economy.

QUIJANO: ... to the issue of law enforcement and race relations. Law enforcement and race relations. After the Dallas police shooting, Police Chief David Brown said, quote, “We’re asking cops to do too much in this country. Every societal failure we put it off on the cops to solve. Not enough mental health funding, not enough drug addiction funding, schools fail, let’s give it to the cops.”

Do we ask too much of police officers in this country? And how would you specifically address the chief’s concerns? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Elaine, I think that’s a very fair comment. I think we put a lot on police shoulders. And this is something I got a lot of scar tissue and experience on.

I was a city councilman and mayor in Richmond. And when I came in, we had one of the highest homicide rates in the United States. We fought very, very hard over the course of my time in local office with our police department, and we reduced our homicide rate nearly in half.

And then when I was governor of Virginia, we worked hard, too. And we did something we had really wanted to do. For the first time ever, we cracked the top 10, 10 safest states, because we worked together.

Here’s what I learned as a mayor and a governor. The way you make communities safer and the way you make police safer is through community policing. You build the bonds between the community and the police force, build bonds of understanding, and then when people feel comfortable in their communities, that gap between the police and the communities they serve narrows. And when that gap narrows, it’s safer for the communities and it’s safer for the police.

That model still works across our country, but there are some other models that don’t work, an overly aggressive, more militarized model. Donald Trump recently said we need to do more stop-and-frisk around the country. That would be a big mistake because it polarizes the relationship between the police and the community.

So here’s what we’ll do. We’ll focus on community policing. We will focus on — and Hillary Clinton has rolled out a really comprehensive mental health reform package that she worked on with law enforcement professionals, and we will also fight the scourge of gun violence in the United States.

I’m a gun-owner. I’m a strong Second Amendment supporter. But I’ve got a lot of scar tissue, because when I was governor of Virginia, there was a horrible shooting at Virginia Tech, and we learned that through that painful situation that gaps in the background record check system should have been closed and it could have prevented that crime, and so we’re going to work to do things like close background record checks. And if we do, we won’t have the tragedies that we did.

One of those killed at Virginia Tech was a guy named Liviu Librescu. He was a 70-plus-year-old Romanian Holocaust survivor. He had survived the Holocaust. Then he survived the Soviet Union takeover of his country. But then he was a visiting professor at Virginia Tech, and he couldn’t survive the scourge of gun violence.

We can support the Second Amendment and do things like background record checks and make us safer, and that will make police safer, too.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: You know, my uncle was a cop, a career cop, on the beat in downtown Chicago. He was my hero when I was growing up. And we’d go up to visit my dad’s family in Chicago. My three brothers and I would marvel at my uncle when he would come out in his uniform, sidearm at his side.

Police officers are the best of us. And the men and women, white, African-American, Asian, Latino, Hispanic, they put their lives on the line every single day. And let my say, at the risk of agreeing with you, community policing is a great idea. It’s worked in the Hoosier state. And we fully support that.

Donald Trump and I are going to make sure that law enforcement have the resources and the tools to be able to really restore law and order to the cities and communities in this nation. It’s probably — probably why the 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police endorsed Donald Trump as the next president of the United States of America, because they see his commitment to them. They see his commitment to law and order.

But they also — they also hear the bad mouthing, the bad mouthing that comes from people that seize upon tragedy in the wake of police action shootings as — as a reason to — to use a broad brush to accuse law enforcement of — of implicit bias or institutional racism. And that really has got to stop.

I mean, when an African-American police officer in Charlotte named Brentley Vinson, an all-star football player who went to Liberty University here in the state, came home, followed his dad into law enforcement, joined the force in Charlotte, joined the force in Charlotte in 2014, was involved in a police action shooting that claimed the life of Keith — Keith Lamont Scott, it was a tragedy. I mean, I — we — we mourn with those who mourn. We — we grieve with those who grieve. And we’re saddened at the loss of life.

But Hillary Clinton actually referred to that moment as an example of implicit bias in the police force, where — where she used — when she was asked in the debate a week ago whether there was implicit bias in law enforcement, her only answer was that there’s implicit bias in everyone in the United States. I just think...

KAINE: Can I — can I explain...

PENCE: ... I just think what we ought to do is we ought to stop seizing on these moments of tragedy. We ought to assure the public that we’ll have a full and complete and transparent investigation whenever there’s a loss of life because of police action. But, Senator, please, you know, enough of this seeking every opportunity to demean law enforcement broadly by making the accusation of implicit bias every time tragedy occurs.

KAINE: Elaine — Elaine, people shouldn’t be afraid to bring up issues of bias in law enforcement. And if you’re afraid to have...

PENCE: I’m not afraid to bring that up.

KAINE: And if — if you’re afraid to have the discussion, you’ll never solve it. And so here’s — here’s an example, heartbreaking. We would agree this was a heartbreaking example.

The guy, Philando Castile, who was killed in St. Paul, he was a worker, a valued worker in a local school. And he was killed for no apparent reason in an incident that will be discussed and will be investigated.

But when folks went and explored this situation, what they found is that Philando Castile, who was a — they called him Mr. Rogers with Dreadlocks in the school that he worked. The kids loved him. But he had been stopped by police 40 or 50 times before that fatal incident. And if you look at sentencing in this country, African-Americans and Latinos get sentenced for the same crimes at very different rates.

PENCE: We need criminal justice reform.

KAINE: Well, we do.

PENCE: Indiana has passed criminal justice reform.

KAINE: But I just want to say, those who say that we should not...

PENCE: But that’s not what you’re talking about.

KAINE: ... we should not be able to bring up and talk about bias in the system, we’ll never solve the problem...

QUIJANO: Governor Pence...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor Pence...

PENCE: Senator, when African-American police officers involved in a police action shooting involving an African-American, why would Hillary Clinton accuse that African-American police officer of implicit bias?

KAINE: Well, I guess I can’t believe you are defending the position that there is no bias and it’s a topic we don’t even...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, I have a question on that point.

PENCE: I did not make that statement. I...

QUIJANO: Your fellow Republican, Governor Pence, Senator Tim Scott, who is African-American, recently spoke on the Senate floor. He said he was stopped seven times by law enforcement in one year.

KAINE: A U.S. senator.

QUIJANO: He said, “I have felt the anger, the frustration, the sadness, and the humiliation that comes with feeling like you’re being targeted for nothing more than being just yourself.” What would you say to Senator Scott about his experiences?

PENCE: Well, I have the deepest respect for Senator Scott, and he’s a close friend. And what I would say is that we — we need to adopt criminal justice reform nationally. I — I signed criminal justice reform in the state of Indiana, Senator, and we’re very proud of it.

I worked when I was Congress on a second chance act. We have got to do a better job recognizing and correcting the errors in the system that do reflect on institutional bias in criminal justice. But what — what — what Donald Trump and I are saying is let’s not have the reflex of assuming the worst of men and women in law enforcement. We truly do believe that law enforcement is not a force for racism or division in our country...

KAINE: Elaine, can I...

QUIJANO: So what would you say to Senator Scott, Governor?

PENCE: Law enforcement in this country is a force for good. They are the — they truly are people that put their lives on the line every single day. But I would — I would suggest to you, what we need to do is assert a stronger leadership at the national level to support law enforcement. You just heard Senator Kaine reject stop-and-frisk. Well, I would suggest to you that the families that live in our inner cities that are besieged by crime...

KAINE: Elaine, let me — let me...

QUIJANO: Governor, the question is about Senator Scott. What would — what would you tell Senator Scott?

KAINE: Elaine, if I could — if I could jump in. I’ve heard Senator Scott make that eloquent plea. And look, criminal justice is about respecting the law and being respected by the law. So there is a fundamental respect issue here.

And I just want to talk about the tone that’s set from the top. Donald Trump during his campaign has called Mexicans rapists and criminals. He’s called women slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting. I don’t like saying that in front of my wife and my mother. He attacked an Indiana-born federal judge and said he was unqualified to hear a federal lawsuit because his parents were Mexican. He went after John McCain, a POW, and said he wasn’t hero because he’d been captured. He said African-Americans are living in Hell. And he perpetrated this outrageous and bigoted lie that President Obama is not a U.S. citizen.

If you want to have a society where people are respected and respect laws, you can’t have somebody at the top who demeans every group that he talks about. And I just — again, I cannot believe that Governor Pence will defend the insult-driven campaign that Donald Trump has run.

QUIJANO: All right. I want to turn to our next segment now, **immigration**. Your running mates have both said that undocumented **immigrants** who have committed violent crimes should be deported. What would you tell the millions of undocumented **immigrants** who have not committed violent crimes? Governor Pence?

PENCE: Donald Trump’s laid out a plan to end illegal **immigration** once and for all in this country. We’ve been talking it to death for 20 years. Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to continue the policies of open borders, amnesty, catch and release, sanctuary cities, all the things that are driving — that are driving wages down in this country, Senator, and also too often with criminal **aliens** in the country, it’s bringing heartbreak.

But I — Donald Trump has a plan that he laid out in Arizona, that will deal systemically with illegal **immigration**, beginning with border security, internal enforcement. It’s probably why for the first time in the history of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement their union actually endorsed Donald Trump as the next president of the United States, because they know they need help to enforce the laws of this country.

And Donald Trump has laid out a priority to remove criminal **aliens**, remove people that have overstayed their visas. And — and once we have accomplished all of that, which will — which will strengthen our economy, strengthen the rule of law in the country and make our communities safer once the criminal **aliens** are out, then we’ll deal with those that remain.

But I have to tell you, I just — I was listening to the avalanche of insults coming out of Senator Kaine a minute ago. KAINE: These were Donald’s — hold on a second, Governor.

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: It’s my time, Senator.

QUIJANO: It is, in fact, the governor’s time.

KAINE: I apologize. It’s your two minutes. I apologize.

PENCE: Thanks. I forgive you. He says ours is an insult-driven campaign. Did you all just hear that? Ours is an insult-driven campaign?

I mean, to be honest with you, if Donald Trump had said all of the things that you’ve said he said in the way you said he said them, he still wouldn’t have a fraction of the insults that Hillary Clinton leveled when she said that half of our supporters were a basket of deplorables. It’s — she said they were irredeemable, they were not American.

I mean, it’s extraordinary. And then she labeled one after another “ism” on millions of Americans who believe that we can have a stronger America at home and abroad, who believe we can get this economy moving again, who believe that we can end illegal **immigration** once and for all. So, Senator, this — this insult-driven campaign, I mean...

QUIJANO: Governor...

PENCE: That’s small potatoes compared to Hillary Clinton...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

PENCE: .... calling half of Donald Trump’s supporters a basket of deplorables.

KAINE: Hillary Clinton said something on the campaign trail, and the very next day, she said, you know what, I shouldn’t have said that.

PENCE: She said she shouldn’t have said half.

QUIJANO: Governor, this is Senator Kaine’s two minutes, please.

KAINE: Yeah, that’s right, so now we’re even.

PENCE: Yeah.

(LAUGHTER)

KAINE: Look for Donald trump apologizing to John McCain for saying he wasn’t a hero...

PENCE: Oh...

KAINE: ... to Donald Trump apologizing for calling women slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting.

PENCE: She apologized for saying “half.”

QUIJANO: Governor. It is his two minutes, please.

KAINE: Did Donald Trump apologize for taking after somebody in a Twitter war and making fun of her weight? Did he apologize for saying African-Americans are living in Hell? Did he apologize for saying President Obama was not even a citizen of the United States? You will look in vain to see Donald Trump ever taking responsibility for anybody and apologizing.

**Immigration**. There’s two plans on the table. Hillary and I believe in comprehensive **immigration** reform. Donald Trump believes in deportation nation. You’ve got to pick your choice. Hillary and I want a bipartisan reform that will put keeping families together as the top goal, second, that will help focus enforcement efforts on those who are violent, third, that will do more border control, and, fourth, that will provide a path to citizenship for those who work hard, pay taxes, play by the rules, and take criminal background record checks.

That’s our proposal. Donald Trump proposes to deport 16 million people, 11 million who are here without documents. And both Donald Trump and Mike Pence want to get rid of birthright citizenship. So if you’re born here, but your parents don’t have documents, they want to eliminate that. That’s another 4.5 million people.

These guys — and Donald Trump have said it — deportation force. They want to go house to house, school to school, business to business, and kick out 16 million people. And I cannot believe...

PENCE: That’s nonsense. That’s nonsense.

KAINE: I cannot believe that Governor Pence would sit here and defend his running mate’s claim that we should create a deportation force to — so that they’ll all be gone.

PENCE: Senator, we have a deportation force. It’s called **Immigrations** and Customs Enforcement. And the union for **Immigrations** and Customs Enforcement for the first time in their history endorsed Donald Trump to be the next president of the United States of America.

KAINE: So you like the 16 million deportations?

PENCE: Senator, that’s — that’s nonsense. Look, what you just heard is they have a plan for open borders, amnesty. That’s...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: Our plan is like Ronald Reagan’s plan from 1986.

PENCE: They call it comprehensive **immigration** reform — they call it comprehensive **immigration** reform on Capitol Hill. We all know the routine. It’s amnesty. And you heard one of the last things he mentioned was border security.

PENCE: That’s how Washington always plays it.

KAINE: No, I...

PENCE: They always say we’re going to do this, we’re going to do that, we’ll eventually get the border...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: ... border security three years ago, and Governor Pence was against it.

QUIJANO: Governor, Mr. Trump has said...

PENCE: Ronald Reagan said a nation without borders is not a nation. Donald Trump is committed to restoring the borders of this nation and securing our nation, enforcing our laws.

QUIJANO: So, Governor, how would these millions of undocumented **immigrants** leave? Would they be forcibly removed?

PENCE: Well, I think Donald Trump laid out a series of priorities that doesn’t ends with border security. It begins with border security. And after we secure the border, not only build a wall, but beneath the ground and in the air, we do internal enforcement.

But he said the focus has to be on criminal **aliens**. We just — we just had a conversation about law enforcement. We just had a conversation about the — the violence that’s besetting our cities. The reality is that there’s heartbreak and tragedy that has struck American families because people that came into this country illegally are now involved in criminal enterprise and activity. And we don’t have the resources or the will to deport them systemically.

Donald Trump has said we’re going to move those people out, people who’ve overstayed their visas. We’re going to enforce the law of this country. We’re going to strengthen **Immigrations** and Customs Enforcements with more resources and more personnel to be able to do that. And then Donald Trump has made it clear, once we’ve done all of those things, that we’re going to reform the **immigration** system that we have...

KAINE: I just have to correct Governor Pence....

PENCE: ... where people can come into this country.

KAINE: I have to...

PENCE: That’s the order that you should do it. Border security, removing criminal **aliens**, upholding with law, and then — but then, Senator, I’ll work you when you go back to the Senate, I promise you, we’ll work you to reform the **immigration** system.

KAINE: I look forward to working together in whatever capacities we serve in. But I just want to make it very, very clear that he’s trying to fuzz up what Donald Trump has said. When Donald Trump spoke in Phoenix, he looked the audience in the eye and he said, no, we’re building a wall, and we’re deporting everybody. He said, quote, “They will all be gone.” “They will all be gone.” And this is one of these ones where you can just go to the tape on it and see what Donald Trump has said. And to add...

PENCE: He’s talking about criminal **aliens**.

KAINE: And to add to it, and to add to it, and to add to it, we are a nation of **immigrants**. Mike Pence and I both are descended from **immigrant** families. Some things, you know, maybe weren’t said so great about the Irish when they came, but we’ve done well by absorbing **immigrants**, and it’s made our nation stronger.

When Donald Trump says Mexicans are rapists and criminals, Mexican **immigrants**, when Donald Trump says about your judge, a Hoosier judge, he said that Judge Curiel was unqualified to hear a case because his parents were Mexican, I can’t imagine how you could defend that.

QUIJANO: Gentleman, I’d like to shift now to the threat of terrorism. Do you think the world today is a safer or more dangerous place than it was eight years ago? Has the terrorist threat increased or decreased? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: The terrorist threat has decreased in some ways, because bin Laden is dead. The terrorist threat has decreased in some ways because an Iranian nuclear weapons program has been stopped. The terrorist threat to United States troops has been decreased in some ways because there’s not 175,000 in a dangerous part of the world. There’s only 15,000.

But there are other parts of the world that are challenging. Let me tell you this: To beat terrorism, there’s only one candidate who can do it, and it’s Hillary Clinton. Remember, Hillary Clinton was the senator from New York on 9/11. She was there at the World Trade Center when they were still searching for victims and survivors. That’s seared onto her, the need to beat terrorism.

And she’s got a plan to do it. She was part of the national security team that wiped out bin Laden. Here’s her plan to defeat ISIL. First, we’ve got to keep taking out their leaders on the battlefield. She was part of the team that got bin Laden, and she’ll lead the team that will get Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the head of ISIS.

Second, we’ve got to disrupt financing networks, third, disrupt their ability to recruit on the Internet, in their safe havens. But, fourth, we also have to work with allies to share and surge intelligence. That’s the Hillary Clinton plan; she’s got the experience to do it.

Donald Trump. Donald Trump can’t start a Twitter war with Miss Universe without shooting himself in the foot. Donald Trump doesn’t have a plan. He said, “I have a secret plan,” and then he said, “Um, I know more than all the generals about ISIL.” And then he said, “I’m going to call the generals to help me figure out a plan.” And finally he said, “I’m going to fire all the generals.” He doesn’t have a plan.

But he does have dangerous ideas. Here’s four. He trash talks the military. The military is a disaster, John McCain’s no hero, the generals need all to be fired, and I know more than them. He wants to tear up alliances. NATO is obsolete, and we’ll only work together with Israel if they pay “big league.”

Third, he loves dictators. He’s got kind of a personal Mount Rushmore, Vladimir Putin, Kim Jong-un, Moammar Gadhafi...

PENCE: Oh, please. Come on.

KAINE: ... and Saddam Hussein. And last and most dangerously, Donald Trump believes — Donald Trump believes that the world will be safer if more nations have nuclear weapons. He’s said Saudi Arabia should get them, Japan should get them, Korea should get them. And when he was confronted with this, and told, wait a minute, terrorists could get those, proliferation could lead to nuclear war, here’s what Donald Trump said, and I quote: “Go ahead, folks, enjoy yourselves.”

I’d love to hear Governor Pence tell me what’s so enjoyable or comical about nuclear war.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: Did you work on that one a long time? Because that had a lot of really creative lines in it.

KAINE: Well, I’m going to see if you can defend any of it.

PENCE: Well, look, I can defend — I — I — I can — I can make very clear to the American people, after traveling millions of miles as our secretary of state, after being the architect of the foreign policy of this administration, America is less safe today than it was the day that Barack Obama became president of the United States. It’s absolutely inarguable.

We’ve weakened America’s place in the world. It’s been a combination of factors, but mostly it’s been a lack of leadership. I mean, I will give you — and I was in Washington, D.C., on 9/11. I saw the clouds of smoke rise from the Pentagon.

KAINE: I was in Virginia where the Pentagon’s...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: I know you were. We all lived through that day as a nation. It was heartbreaking. And I want to give this president credit for bringing Osama bin Laden to justice.

But the truth is, Osama bin Laden led Al Qaida. Our primary threat today is ISIS. And because Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate a status of forces agreement that would have allowed some American combat troops to remain in Iraq and secure the hard fought gains the American soldier had won by 2009, ISIS was able to be literally conjured up out of the desert, and it’s overrun vast areas that the American soldier had won in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

My heart breaks for the likes of Lance Cpl. Scott Zubowski. He fell in Fallujah in 2005. He fought hard through some of the most difficult days in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and he paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend our freedom and secure that nation. And that nation was secured in 2009.

But because Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama failed to provide a status of forces agreement and leave sufficient troops in there, we are back at war. The president just ordered more troops on the ground. We are back at war in Iraq. And Scott Zubowski, whose mom would always come to Memorial Day events in Newcastle, Indiana, to see me, and I’d give her a hug and tell her we’re never going to forget her son and we never will, Scott Zubowski and the sacrifices the American soldier made were squandered in Iraq because this administration created a vacuum in which ISIS was able to grow.

And a reference to the Iranian deal, the Iranian deal that Hillary Clinton initiated, $150 billion to the radical mullahs in Iran.

KAINE: Stopping a nuclear weapons program without firing a shot?

PENCE: You didn’t stop the nuclear weapons program.

KAINE: Yes, we did.

PENCE: You essentially...

KAINE: Even the Israeli military says it stopped.

PENCE: ... guaranteed that Iran will someday become a nuclear power, because there’s no limitations once the period of time of the treaty comes off.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, Mr. Trump has proposed extreme vetting of **immigrants** from parts of the world that export terrorism. But that does not address many of the recent terrorist attacks in the United States, such as the Orlando nightclub massacre and the recent bombings in New York and New Jersey. Those were homegrown, committed by U.S. citizens and legal residents. What specific tools would you use to prevent those kinds of attacks?

PENCE: Well, I think it’s — I think it’s a great question, Elaine, but it really does begin with us reforming our **immigration** system and putting the interests, particularly the safety and security of the American people, first.

I mean, Donald Trump has called for extreme vetting for people coming into this country so that we don’t bring people into the United States who are hostile to our Bill of Rights freedoms, who are hostile to the American way life.

But also, Donald Trump and I are committed to suspending the Syrian refugee program and programs and **immigration** from areas of the world that have been compromised by terrorism. Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to increase the Syrian refugee program by 500...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: Elaine, I want to...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor, the question was about homegrown.

PENCE: Yeah, and so — but first, you know, let’s make sure we’re putting the safety and security of the American people first instead of Hillary Clinton expanding the Syrian refugee program...

KAINE: Or instead of you violating the Constitution by blocking people based on their national origin rather than whether they’re dangerous.

PENCE: That’s not — that’s absolutely false.

KAINE: That’s what the Seventh Circuit decided just — here’s the difference, Elaine.

PENCE: The Seventh Circuit...

KAINE: We have different views on — on refugee issues and on **immigration**. Hillary and I want to do enforcement based on, are people dangerous? These guys say all Mexicans are bad.

PENCE: That’s absolutely false.

KAINE: And with respect to refugees, we want to keep people out if they’re dangerous. Donald Trump said keep them out if they’re Muslim. Mike Pence...

PENCE: Absolutely...

KAINE: ... put a program in place to keep them out if they’re from Syria. And yesterday an appellate court with three Republican judges struck down the Pence plan...

PENCE: Right. Right.

KAINE: ... and said it was discriminatory...

PENCE: And those judges — those judges said...

KAINE: We should focus upon danger, not upon discrimination.

QUIJANO: Governor?

PENCE: Elaine, to your point, those judges said it was because there wasn’t any evidence yet that — that ISIS had infiltrated the United States. Well, Germany just arrested three Syrian refugees that were connected to ISIS.

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: But they told you there’s a right way and a wrong way to do it.

PENCE: But, look, if you’re going to be critical of me on that, that’s fair game. I will tell you, after two Syrian refugees were involved in the attack in Paris that is called Paris’ 9/11, as governor of the state of Indiana, I have no higher priority than the safety and security of the people of my state.

KAINE: But, Governor Pence...

PENCE: So you bet I suspended that program.

KAINE: But, Governor Pence, I just...

PENCE: And I stand by that decision. And if I’m vice president of the United States or Donald Trump is president, we’re going to put the safety and security of the American people first.

KAINE: Sure. Can we just be clear — Hillary and I will do **immigration** enforcement and we’ll vet refugees based on whether they’re dangerous or not. We won’t do it based on discriminating against you from the country you come from or the religion that you practice.

PENCE: But the problem with that...

KAINE: That is completely antithetical to the Jeffersonian values of...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Elaine, the director of the FBI, our homeland security, said we can’t know for certain who these people are coming from Syria.

KAINE: Yes, we can, and when we don’t let them know, we don’t let them in.

PENCE: So — the FBI...

KAINE: When we don’t know who they are, we don’t let them in.

PENCE: The FBI and homeland security said we can’t know for certain. You’ve got to err on the side of the safety and security of the American people, Senator. I understand the...

KAINE: By trashing all Syrians or trashing all Muslims?

PENCE: ... the U.N. wants us to expand the Syrian refugee program...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, let me ask you this. Secretary Clinton...

PENCE: We’re going to put the safety and security of the American people first.

QUIJANO: ... has talked about an intelligence surge.

KAINE: Yes.

QUIJANO: What exactly would an intelligence surge look like? And how would that help identify terrorists with no operational connection to a foreign terrorist organization?

KAINE: Intelligence surge is two-thirds, Elaine. It’s two things. It’s, first, dramatically expanding our intelligence capacities by hiring great professionals, but also we’ve got some of the best intel and cyber employees in the world right here in the United States working for many of our private sector companies.

So it involves increasing our own workforce, but striking great partnerships with some of our cyber and intel experts in the private sector so that we can, consistent with constitutional principles, gather more intelligence.

But the second piece of this is really, really important. It also means creating stronger alliances, because you gather intelligence and then you share your intelligence back and forth with allies. And that’s how you find out who may be trying to recruit, who may be trying to come to one country or the next. Alliances are critical.

That’s why Donald Trump’s claim that he wants to — that NATO is obsolete and that we need to get rid of NATO is so dangerous.

PENCE: That’s not his plan. KAINE: Well, he said NATO is obsolete. And, look, if you put aside — push aside your alliances, who you’re going to share intelligence with? Hillary Clinton is the secretary of state who knows how to build alliances. She built the sanctions regime around the word that stopped the Iranian nuclear weapons program. And that’s what an intelligence surge means. Better skill and capacity, but also better alliances.

QUIJANO: All right. I’d like to turn now to the tragedy in Syria. Two hundred fifty thousand...

PENCE: Can I speak about the cybersecurity surge at all?

QUIJANO: You can — you can have 30 seconds, Governor, quickly, please.

PENCE: First, Donald Trump just spoke about this issue this week. We have got to bring together the best resources of this country to understand that cyber warfare is the new warfare of the asymmetrical enemies that we face in this country. And I look forward if I’m privileged to be in this role of working with you in the Senate to make sure that we resource that effort.

KAINE: We will work together in whatever roles we inhabit.

PENCE: We have an intelligence, sir (ph). But I will also tell you that it’s important in this moment to remember that Hillary Clinton had a private server in her home that had classified information on it...

QUIJANO: And I don’t — 30 seconds is on up.

PENCE: ... about drone strikes, e-mails from the president of the United States of America were on there.

QUIJANO: Right.

PENCE: Her private server was subject to being hacked by foreign...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: I’d like to ask you about Syria, Governor.

PENCE: We could put cybersecurity first if we just make sure the next secretary of state doesn’t have a private server.

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: And all investigation concluded that not one reasonable prosecutor would take any additional step. You don’t get to decide the rights and wrongs of this. We have a justice system that does that. And a Republican FBI director did an investigation and concluded that...

(CROSSTALK) QUIJANO: All right, we are moving on now. Two hundred fifty thousand people...

PENCE: If your son or my son handled classified information the way Hillary Clinton did...

QUIJANO: ... one hundred thousand of them children — Governor...

PENCE: ... they’d be court martialed.

KAINE: That is absolutely false and you know that.

PENCE: Absolutely true.

KAINE: And you know that, Governor.

QUIJANO: Governor...

PENCE: It’s absolutely true.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, please.

KAINE: Because the FBI did an investigation.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen.

KAINE: And they concluded that there was no reasonable prosecutor who would take it further. Sorry.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, Governor Pence, please.

KAINE: Syria.

QUIJANO: I want to turn now to Syria. Two hundred fifty thousand people, 100,000 of them children, are under siege in Aleppo, Syria. Bunker buster bombs, cluster munitions, and incendiary weapons are being dropped on them by Russian and Syrian militaries. Does the U.S. have a responsibility to protect civilians and prevent mass casualties on this scale, Governor Pence?

PENCE: The United States of America needs to begin to exercise strong leadership to protect the vulnerable citizens and over 100,000 children in Aleppo. Hillary Clinton’s top priority when she became secretary of state was the Russian reset, the Russians reset. After the Russian reset, the Russians invaded Ukraine and took over Crimea.

And the small and bullying leader of Russia is now dictating terms to the United States to the point where all the United States of America — the greatest nation on Earth — just withdraws from talks about a cease-fire while Vladimir Putin puts a missile defense system in Syria while he marshals the forces and begins — look, we have got to begin to lean into this with strong, broad-shouldered American leadership.

It begins by rebuilding our military. And the Russians and the Chinese have been making enormous investments in the military. We have the smallest Navy since 1916. We have the lowest number of troops since the end of the Second World War. We’ve got to work with Congress, and Donald Trump will, to rebuild our military and project American strength in the world.

But about Aleppo and about Syria, I truly do believe that what America ought to do right now is immediately establish safe zones, so that families and vulnerable families with children can move out of those areas, work with our Arab partners, real time, right now, to make that happen.

And secondly, I just have to tell you that the provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength. And if Russia chooses to be involved and continue, I should say, to be involved in this barbaric attack on civilians in Aleppo, the United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike military targets of the Assad regime to prevent them from this humanitarian crisis that is taking place in Aleppo.

There’s a broad range of other things that we ought to do, as well. We ought to deploy a missile defense shield to the Czech Republic and Poland which Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama pulled back on out of not wanting to offend the Russians back in 2009.

QUIJANO: Governor, your two minutes are up.

PENCE: We’ve just got to have American strength on the world stage. When Donald Trump becomes president of the United States, the Russians and other countries in the world will know they’re dealing with a strong American president. QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Hillary and I also agree that the establishment of humanitarian zones in northern Syria with the provision of international human aid, consistent with the U.N. Security Council resolution that was passed in February 2014, would be a very, very good idea.

And Hillary also has the ability to stand up to Russia in a way that this ticket does not. Donald Trump, again and again, has praised Vladimir Putin. And it’s clear that he has business dealings with Russian oligarchs who are very connected to Putin.

The Trump campaign management team had to be fired a month or so ago because of those shadowy connections with pro-Putin forces. Governor Pence made the odd claim, he said inarguably Vladimir Putin is a better leader than President Obama. Vladimir Putin has run his economy into the ground. He persecutes LGBT folks and journalists. If you don’t know the difference between dictatorship and leadership, then you got to go back to a fifth-grade civics class.

I’ll tell you what offends me...

PENCE: Well, that offended me.

KAINE: Governor Pence just said — Governor Pence just said that Donald Trump will rebuild the military. No, he won’t. Donald Trump is avoiding paying taxes. The New York Times story — and we need to get this — but the New York Times suggested that he probably didn’t pay taxes for about 18 years starting in 1995. Those years included the years of 9/11.

So get this. On 9/11, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump’s hometown was attacked by the worst terrorist attack in the history of the United States. Young men and women — young men and women signed up to serve in the military to fight terrorism. Hillary Clinton went to Washington to get funds to rebuild her city and protect first responders, but Donald Trump was fighting a very different fight. It was a fight to avoid paying taxes so that he wouldn’t support the fight against terror.

QUIJANO: The question was about Aleppo, Senator.

KAINE: He wouldn’t support troops. He wouldn’t — he wouldn’t support — this is important, Elaine. When a guy running for president will not support the troops, not support veterans, not support teachers, that’s really important.

QUIJANO: Right.

KAINE: And I said about Aleppo, we do agree the notion is we have to create a humanitarian zone in northern Syria. It’s very important.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, you had mentioned no-fly zone. Where would you propose setting up a safe zone specifically? How would you keep it safe?

PENCE: Well, first and foremost, Donald Trump supports our troops. Donald Trump supports our veterans.

KAINE: He won’t pay taxes.

PENCE: Donald Trump has paid all the taxes that he’s — do you not take deductions? How does that work?

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, this is about Syria. I’d like to...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Honestly, Senator. Honestly, Senator.

KAINE: It is about our troops. It is about our troops.

PENCE: I understand why you want to change — I understand why you want to change the subject.

KAINE: How can you support the troops if you won’t pay taxes?

PENCE: I understand why you want to change the subject. And let me be very clear on this Russian thing. The larger question here...

KAINE: Do you think Donald Trump is smart to not pay taxes?

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, we’re going to have time to get to Russia here.

PENCE: What we’re dealing with is the — you know, there’s an old proverb that says the Russian bear never dies, it just hibernates. And the truth of the matter is, the weak and feckless foreign policy of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama has awakened an aggression in Russia that first appeared a few years ago with their move in Georgia, now their move into Crimea, now their move into the wider Middle East.

And all the while, all we do is fold our arms and say we’re not having talks anymore. To answer your question, we just need American strength. We need to — we need to marshal the resources of our allies in the region, and in the immediate, we need to act and act now to get people out of harm’s way.

QUIJANO: And exactly how would those safe zones work? How would they remain safe?

PENCE: The — the safe zones would have to be — as the senator said, there’s already a framework for this that’s been recognized by the international community. The United States of America needs to be prepared to work with our allies in the region to create a route for safe passage and then to protect people in those areas, including with a no-fly zone.

But, look, this is very tough stuff. I served on the Foreign Affairs Committee for a decade. I traveled in and out of that region for 10 years. I saw what the American soldier won in Operation Iraqi Freedom. And to see the weak and feckless leadership that Hillary Clinton was the architect of and the foreign policy of the Obama administration...

KAINE: Well, let me — let me come back...

PENCE: ... is deeply troubling to me. That will all change the day Donald Trump becomes president of the United States.

KAINE: ... and talk about — let me talk about the things that Governor Pence doesn’t want to acknowledge, Elaine. He doesn’t want to acknowledge that we stopped the Iranian nuclear weapons program. He doesn’t want to acknowledge...

PENCE: We didn’t.

KAINE: ... that Hillary was part of a team that got bin Laden. He doesn’t want to acknowledge...

PENCE: I just did. KAINE: ... that it’s a good thing, not a bad thing, that it’s a good thing — not a bad thing — that we’re down from 175,000 troops deployed overseas to 15,000.

But let me tell you what will really make the Middle East dangerous. Donald Trump’s idea that more nations should get nuclear weapons, Saudi Arabia, Japan, South Korea. Ronald Reagan said something really interesting about nuclear proliferation back in the 1980s. He said the problem with nuclear proliferation is that some fool or maniac could trigger a catastrophic event. And I think that’s who Governor Pence’s running mate is, exactly who Governor Reagan warned us about.

PENCE: And come on. Senator. Senator, that was even beneath you and Hillary Clinton. And that — that’s pretty low.

KAINE: But do you — do you think — do you think we should have — more nuclear weapons in the world will make us safer?

PENCE: Senator, the...

KAINE: That’s what Donald Trump thinks.

PENCE: Ronald Reagan also said nuclear war should never be fought because it can never be won. And the United States of America needs to make investments in modernizing our nuclear force for both deterrence...

KAINE: But can you defend Donald Trump’s claim that more nations should get nuclear weapons?

PENCE: ... and assurance to our allies. But let me go back to this Iran thing. I mean, he keeps saying that they prevented — that Hillary Clinton started the deal with the Iranians prevented Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: That’s what the Israeli joint chiefs of staff is saying right now.

PENCE: Well, that’s not what — that’s not what Israel thinks.

KAINE: Gadi Eizenkot, you can go check it.

PENCE: You wouldn’t necessarily know that.

KAINE: Go to the tape.

PENCE: I know you boycotted Prime Minister Netanyahu’s speech when he came before the Congress.

KAINE: No, I visited him in his office. I visited him in his office.

PENCE: You boycotted the speech. The point is, what this Iran — so-called Iran deal did was essentially guarantee — I mean, when I was in Congress, I fought hard on a bipartisan basis with Republican and Democrat members to move forward the toughest sanctions, it — literally in the history of the United States, against Iran.

KAINE: And then Hillary used them to get a deal.

PENCE: We were bringing them to heel, but the goal was always that we would only lift the sanctions if Iran permanently renounced their nuclear ambitions.

KAINE: Elaine, let me just mention one thing.

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: They have not — Elaine, let me finish a sentence. They have not renounced their nuclear ambitions. And when the deal’s period runs out, there’s no limitation on them obtaining weapons. That...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: And very quickly, Senator.

KAINE: Elaine...

PENCE: ... and the fact that they got $1.7 billion in a ransom payment...

QUIJANO: We need to talk about Russia. Very quickly, though, Senator, please.

PENCE: ... is astonishing to the American people.

KAINE: Six times tonight, I have said to Governor Pence I can’t imagine how you can defend your running mate’s position on one issue after the next. And in all six cases, he’s refused to defend his running mate.

PENCE: Well, let’s — no, no, don’t put words in my mouth.

QUIJANO: All right.

PENCE: He’s going...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: And yet he is asking everybody to vote for somebody that he cannot defend. And I just think that should be underlined.

PENCE: No, I’m — look...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: All right, gentlemen, let’s talk about Russia. This is a topic that has come up.

PENCE: I’m very, very happy to defend Donald Trump. If he wants to take these one at a time, I’ll take them one at a time.

QUIJANO: I will give you an opportunity to do that.

KAINE: More nations should get nuclear weapons. Try to defend that.

PENCE: Don’t put words in my mouth. Well, he never said that, Senator.

KAINE: He absolutely said it. Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Japan.

PENCE: Most of the stuffy you’ve said, he’s never said.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, Russia. Russian President Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine, annexed Crimea, and has provided crucial military support to the Assad regime. What steps, if any, would your administration take to counter these actions? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: You’ve got to be tough on Russia. So let’s start with not praising Vladimir Putin as a great leader. Donald Trump and Mike Pence have said he’s a great leader. And Donald Trump has business...

PENCE: No, we haven’t.

KAINE: ... has business dealings — has business dealings with Russia that he refuses to disclose. Hillary Clinton has gone toe-to- toe with Russia. She went toe-to-toe with Russia as secretary of state to do the New START Agreement to reduce Russia’s nuclear stockpile. She’s had the experience doing it.

She went toe-to-toe with Russia and lodged protests when they went into Georgia. And we’ve done the same thing about Ukraine, but more than launching protests, we’ve put punishing economic sanctions on Russia that we need to continue.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, didn’t know that Russia had invaded the Crimea.

PENCE: Oh, that’s nonsense.

KAINE: He was on a TV show a couple months back, and he said, “I’ll guarantee you this, Russia’s not going into the Ukraine.” And he had to be reminded that they had gone into the Crimea two years before.

PENCE: He knew that.

KAINE: Hillary Clinton has gone toe-to-toe with Russia to work out a deal on New START. She got them engaged on a meaningful way to cap Iran’s nuclear weapons program. And yet she stood up to them on issues such as Syria and their invasion of Georgia. You’ve got to have the ability to do that, and Hillary does.

On the other hand, in Donald Trump, you have somebody who praises Vladimir Putin all the time. America should really wonder about a President Trump, who had a campaign manager with ties to Putin, pro- Putin elements in the Ukraine, who had to be fired for that reason. They should wonder — when Donald Trump is sitting down with Vladimir Putin, is it going to be America’s bottom line or is it going to be Donald Trump’s bottom line that he’s going to be worried about with all of his business dealings?

Now, this could be solved if Donald Trump would be willing to release his tax returns, as he told the American public that he would do. And I know he’s laughing at this, but every president...

PENCE: But what’s it got to do with Russia?

KAINE: Every president since Richard Nixon has done it, and Donald Trump has said I’m doing business with Russia. The only way the American public will see whether he has a conflict of interest...

PENCE: No, he hasn’t said that.

KAINE: He has, actually.

QUIJANO: Senator, your time is up. Governor?

PENCE: Well, thanks. I’m just trying to keep up with the insult-driven campaign on the other side of the table.

KAINE: You know, I’m just saying facts about your running mate.

PENCE: Yeah.

KAINE: And I know you can’t defend.

QUIJANO: Senator, please. This is the governor’s two minutes.

PENCE: I’m happy to defend him, Senator. Don’t put words in my mouth that I’m not defending him.

KAINE: You’re not.

PENCE: I’m happy to defend him. Most of what you said is completely false, and the American people know that.

KAINE: I’ll run through the list of things where you won’t defend...

PENCE: This isn’t the old days where you can just say stuff and people believe it.

QUIJANO: Senator, please. This is Governor Pence’s two minutes.

PENCE: Look, this is the alternative universe of Washington, D.C., versus reality. Hillary Clinton said her number-one priority was a reset with Russia. That reset resulted in the invasion of Ukraine, after they’d infiltrated with what are called little green men, Russian soldiers that were dressing up like Ukrainian dissidents, and then they moved all the way into Crimea, took over the Crimean Peninsula. Donald Trump knew that happened. He basically was saying it’s not going to happen again. The truth of the matter is that what you have in the rise of aggressive Russia, which has had — increased its influence in Iran, that’s now — now because of this deal is on a pathway in the future to obtain a nuclear — the leading state sponsor of terror in the world in Iran now has a closer working relationship with Russia because of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama’s foreign policy and $150 billion and sanctions all being lifted.

And then, of course, Syria, I mean, it really is extraordinary that — Syria is imploding. You just asked a very thoughtful question about the disaster in Aleppo. ISIS is headquartered in Raqqa. It is — ISIS from Raqqa has overrun vast areas that at great sacrifice the American soldier won in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and yet Senator Kaine still sits here, loyal soldier — I get all that — in saying that the foreign policy of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama somehow made the world more secure. I mean, it really is astonishing that on the day...

KAINE: We even wiped out the leader of Al Qaida.

PENCE: ... on the day that Iran released four American hostages...

KAINE: We stopped Iran from getting nuclear weapons.

QUIJANO: Governor...

PENCE: ... we delivered $400 million in cash as a ransom payment for Americans held by the radical mullahs in Tehran.

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor, yesterday, Mr. Trump said...

KAINE: And we stopped a nuclear weapons program without a shot.

QUIJANO: ... quote, “Putin has no respect for Hillary Clinton and no respect for Obama.” Why do you think he’ll respect a Trump- Pence administration?

PENCE: Strength. Plain and simple.

KAINE: Business dealings.

PENCE: Donald Trump — that’s nonsense. Donald Trump is a strong leader...

KAINE: Donald Trump’s son says that the Trump organization...

PENCE: ... who is going to lead with American strength.

QUIJANO: Please, Senator, I’ll give you a chance to respond.

PENCE: We’re going to rebuild our military. And let me — let me — this whole Putin thing. Look, America is stronger than Russia. Our economy is 16 times larger than the Russian economy. America’s political system is superior to the crony, corrupt capitalist system in Russia in every way.

When Donald Trump and I observe that, as I’ve said in Syria, in Iran, in Ukraine, that the small and bullying leader of Russia has been stronger on the world stage than this administration, that’s stating painful facts. That’s not an endorsement of Vladimir Putin. That’s an indictment of the weak and feckless leadership...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

PENCE: ... of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama.

KAINE: Well, this is one where we can just kind of go to the tape on it. But Governor Pence said, inarguably, Vladimir Putin is a better leader than President Obama.

PENCE: That is absolutely inaccurate.

KAINE: And — and — and I just think a guy who praises...

PENCE: He said he’s stronger — he’s been stronger on the world stage.

KAINE: No, he said leader. And if — and I’ll just say this, Governor.

PENCE: You just said better.

KAINE: If you mistake leadership for dictatorship, and you can’t tell the difference, a country that’s running its economy into the ground...

PENCE: Yeah, here we go. This is the grade school thing again?

KAINE: ... persecuting journalists...

PENCE: Right, this is grade school.

KAINE: ... if you can’t tell the difference, you shouldn’t be commander-in-chief.

PENCE: Yeah. KAINE: And with Donald Trump — Donald Trump’s sons say that they have all these business dealings with Russia. Those could be disclosed with tax returns, but they refuse to do them. Americans need to worry about whether Donald Trump will be watching out for America’s bottom line or his own bottom line.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, what went wrong with the Russia reset?

KAINE: Vladimir Putin. Vladimir Putin is a dictator.

QUIJANO: And what would do you differently?

KAINE: Vladimir Putin is a dictator. He’s not a leader. Anybody who thinks otherwise doesn’t know Russian history and they don’t know Vladimir Putin. Hillary Clinton knows exactly who this guy is. John McCain said, I look in his eyes and I see KGB. And Hillary kind of has that same feeling.

PENCE: Right.

KAINE: So how do deal with him? You’ve got to — we do have to deal with Russia in a lot of different ways. There are areas where we can cooperate. So it was Hillary Clinton who worked with Russia on the New START Treaty to reduce their nuclear weapons stockpile. It was Hillary Clinton that worked with Russia to get them engaged in a community of nations to stop the Iranian nuclear weapons without firing a shot.

She’s not going around praising Vladimir Putin as a great guy. But she knows how to sit down at a table and negotiate tough deals. This is a very challenging part of the world, and we ought to have a commander-in-chief who is prepared and done it, rather than somebody who goes around praising Vladimir Putin as a great leader.

QUIJANO: All right, I’d like to ask now about North Korea, Iran and the threat of nuclear weapons. North Korea recently conducted its fifth and most powerful nuclear test.

PENCE: Right.

QUIJANO: What specific steps would you take to prevent North Korea from developing a nuclear-armed missile capable of reaching the United States? Governor Pence?

PENCE: Well, first, we need to — we need to make a commitment to rebuild our military, including modernizing our nuclear forces. And we also need — we also need an effective American diplomacy that will marshal the resources of nations in the Asian Pacific Rim to put pressure on North Korea, on Kim Jong-un, to abandon his nuclear ambitions. It has to remain the policy of the United States of America the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, plain and simple.

And when Donald Trump is president of the United States, we’re — we’re not going to have the — the kind of posture in the world that has Russia invading Crimea and Ukraine, that has the Chinese building new islands in the South China Sea, that has literally the world, including North Korea, flouting American power. We’re going to — we’re going to go back to the days of peace through strength.

But I have to tell you that — that all this talk about tax returns — and I get it, you know, you want to keep bringing that up. It must have — must have...

KAINE: Until he...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: ... done well in some focus group. But here — Hillary Clinton and her husband set up a private foundation called the Clinton Foundation. While she was secretary of state, the Clinton Foundation accepted tens of millions of dollars from foreign governments and foreign donors.

Now, you all need to know out there, this is basic stuff. Foreign donors, and certainly foreign governments, cannot participate in the American political process. They cannot make financial contributions. But the Clintons figured out a way to create a foundation where foreign governments and foreign donors could donate millions of dollars. And then we found, thanks to the good work of the Associated Press, that more than half her private meetings when she was secretary of state were given to major donors of the Clinton Foundation. When you talk about all these — all these baseless rumors about Russia and the rest, Hillary Clinton — you asked the trustworthy question at the very beginning — the reason...

QUIJANO: Governor, your two minutes are up.

PENCE: ... the reason the American people don’t trust Hillary Clinton is because they are looking at the pay to play politics that she operated with the Clinton Foundation through a private server...

QUIJANO: Governor, please.

PENCE: ... while she’s secretary of state.

QUIJANO: Your two minutes are up, Governor.

PENCE: And they’re saying enough is enough.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

KAINE: I’m going to talk about the foundation, and then I’ll talk about North Korea. So, on the foundation. I am glad to talk about the foundation. The Clinton Foundation is one of the highest- rated charities in the world. It provides AIDS drugs to about 11.5 million people. It helps Americans deal with opioid overdoses. It gets higher rankings for its charity than the American Red Cross does. The Clinton foundation does an awful lot of good work.

Hillary Clinton as secretary of state took no action to benefit the foundation. The State Department did an investigation, and they concluded that everything Hillary Clinton did as secretary of state was completely in the interest of the United States. So the foundation does good work. And Hillary Clinton as secretary of state acted in the interests of the United States.

But let’s compare this now with the Trump organization and the Trump Foundation. The Trump organization is an octopus-like organization with tentacles all over the world whose conflict of interests could only be known if Donald Trump would release his tax returns. He’s refused to do it.

His sons have said that the organization has a lot of business dealings in Russia. And remember, the Trump organization is not a non-profit. It’s putting money into Donald Trump’s pockets and into the pockets of his children, whereas the Clinton Foundation is a non- profit and no Clinton family member draws any salary.

PENCE: The Trump Foundation is non-profit.

KAINE: In addition, Donald Trump has a foundation. The foundation was just fined for illegally contributing foundation dollars to a political campaign of a Florida attorney general. They made an illegal contribution, and then they tried to hide it by disguising it to somebody else. And the person they donated to was somebody whose office was charged with investigating Trump University.

This is the difference between a foundation that does good work and a secretary of state who acted in accordance with American interest and somebody who is conflicted and doing work around the world and won’t share with the American public what he’s doing and what those conflicts are.

QUIJANO: Governor, I will give you 30 seconds to respond, because I know you want to, but, again, I would remind you both this was about North Korea.

(LAUGHTER)

PENCE: Well, Thank you. Thank you. The Trump Foundation is a private family foundation. They give virtually every cent in the Trump Foundation to charitable causes.

KAINE: Political contributions?

PENCE: Less than ten cents on the dollar in the Clinton Foundation has gone to charitable causes.

KAINE: A $20,000 portrait of Donald Trump? PENCE: Less than 10 cents on the dollar of the Clinton Foundation has gone to charitable causes.

KAINE: Ninety percent.

PENCE: It has been a platform for the Clintons to travel the world, to have staff. But honestly, Senator, we would know a lot more about it if Hillary Clinton would just turn over the 33,000 e-mails...

QUIJANO: All right, let’s turn back to North Korea...

PENCE: ... that she refused to turn over in her private server...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine...

PENCE: ... and we’d have a much better picture of what the Clinton Foundation was about.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, if you had intelligence that North Korea was about to launch a missile, a nuclear-armed missile capable of reaching the United States, would you take preemptive action?

KAINE: If we — look, a president should take action to defend the United States against imminent threat. You have to. A president has to do that. Now exactly what action, you would have to determine what your intelligence was, how certain you were of that intelligence, but you would have to take action.

You asked the question about how do we deal with a North Korea. I’m on the Foreign Relations Committee. We just did an extensive sanctions package against North Korea. And interestingly enough, Elaine, the U.N. followed and did this — virtually the same package. Often China will use their veto in the Security Council to veto a package like that. They’re starting to get worried about North Korea, too. So they actually supported the sanctions package, even though many of the sanctions are against Chinese firms, Chinese financial institutions.

So we’re working together with China, and we need to. China’s another one of those relationships where it’s competitive, it’s also challenging, and in times like North Korea, we have to be able to cooperate. Hillary understands that very well. She went once famously to China and stood up at a human rights meeting and looked them in the eye and said, “Women’s rights are human rights.” They didn’t want her to say that, but she did.

But she’s also worked on a lot of diplomatic and important diplomatic deals with China. And that’s what it’s going to take.

The thing I would worry a little bit about is that Donald Trump owes about $650 million to banks, including the Bank of China. I’m not sure he could stand up so tough to the people who have loaned him money.

QUIJANO: All right. I’d like to turn to our next segment now. And in this, I’d like to focus on social issues. You have both been open about the role that faith has played in your lives. Can you discuss in detail a time when you struggled to balance your personal faith and a public policy position? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Yeah, that’s an easy one for me, Elaine. It’s an easy one. I’m really fortunate. I grew up in a wonderful household with great Irish Catholic parents. My mom and dad are sitting right here. I was educated by Jesuits at Rockhurst High School in Kansas City. My 40th reunion is in 10 days.

And I worked with Jesuit missionaries in Honduras, now nearly 35 years ago, and they were the heroes of my life. I try to practice my religion in a very devout way and follow the teachings of my church in my own personal life. But I don’t believe in this nation, a First Amendment nation, where we don’t raise any religion over the other, and we allow people to worship as they please, that the doctrines of any one religion should be mandated for everyone.

For me, the hardest struggle in my faith life was the Catholic Church is against the death penalty and so am I. But I was governor of a state, and the state law said that there was a death penalty for crimes if the jury determined them to be heinous. And so I had to grapple with that.

When I was running for governor, I was attacked pretty strongly because of my position on the death penalty. But I looked the voters of Virginia in the eye and said, look, this is my religion. I’m not going to change my religious practice to get one vote, but I know how to take an oath and uphold the law. And if you elect me, I will uphold the law.

And I was elected, and I did. It was very, very difficult to allow executions to go forward, but in circumstances where I didn’t feel like there was a case for clemency, I told Virginia voters I would uphold the law, and I did.

That was a real struggle. But I think it is really, really important that those of us who have deep faith lives don’t feel that we could just substitute our own views for everybody else in society, regardless of their views.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: Well, it’s a wonderful question. And my Christian faith is at the very heart of who I am. I was also raised in a wonderful family of faith. It was a church on Sunday morning and grace before dinner.

PENCE: But my Christian faith became real for me when I made a personal decision for Christ when I was a freshman in college. And I’ve tried to live that out however imperfectly every day of my life since. And with my wife at my side, we’ve followed a calling into public service, where we’ve — we’ve tried to — we’ve tried to keep faith with the values that we cherish.

And with regard to when I struggle, I appreciate, and — and — and — I have a great deal of respect for Senator Kaine’s sincere faith. I truly do.

KAINE: That’s shared.

PENCE: But for me, I would tell you that for me the sanctity of life proceeds out of the belief that — that ancient principle that — where God says before you were formed in the womb, I knew you, and so for my first time in public life, I sought to stand with great compassion for the sanctity of life.

The state of Indiana has also sought to make sure that we expand alternatives in health care counseling for women, non-abortion alternatives. I’m also very pleased at the fact we’re well on our way in Indiana to becoming the most pro-adoption state in America. I think if you’re going to be pro-life, you should — you should be pro- adoption.

But what I can’t understand is with Hillary Clinton and now Senator Kaine at her side is to support a practice like partial-birth abortion. I mean, to hold to the view — and I know Senator Kaine, you hold pro-life views personally — but the very idea that a child that is almost born into the world could still have their life taken from them is just anathema to me.

And I cannot — I can’t conscience about — about a party that supports that. Or that — I know you’ve historically opposed taxpayer funding of abortion. But Hillary Clinton wants to — wants to repeal the longstanding provision in the law where we said we wouldn’t use taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

So for me, my faith informs my life. I try and spend a little time on my knees every day. But it all for me begins with cherishing the dignity, the worth, the value of every human life.

KAINE: Elaine, this is a fundamental question, a fundamental question. Hillary and I are both people out of religious backgrounds, from Methodist church experience, which was really formative for her as a public servant.

But we really feel like you should live fully and with enthusiasm the commands of your faith. But it is not the role of the public servant to mandate that for everybody else.

So let’s talk about abortion and choice. Let’s talk about them. We support Roe v. Wade. We support the constitutional right of American women to consult their own conscience, their own supportive partner, their own minister, but then make their own decision about pregnancy. That’s something we trust American women to do that.

And we don’t think that women should be punished, as Donald Trump said they should, for making the decision to have an abortion.

Governor Pence wants to repeal Roe v. Wade. He said he wants to put it on the ash heap of history. And we have some young people in the audience who weren’t even born when Roe was decided. This is pretty important. Before Roe v. Wade, states could pass criminal laws to do just that, to punish women if they made the choice to terminate a pregnancy.

I think you should live your moral values. But the last thing, the very last thing that government should do is have laws that would punish women who make reproductive choices. And that is the fundamental difference between a Clinton-Kaine ticket and a Trump- Pence ticket that wants to punish women who make that choice.

PENCE: No, it’s really not. Donald Trump and I would never support legislation that punished women who made the heartbreaking choice to end a pregnancy.

KAINE: Then why did Donald Trump say that?

PENCE: We just never would.

KAINE: Why did he say that?

PENCE: Well, look, it’s — look, he’s not a polished politician like you and Hillary Clinton. And so...

KAINE: Well, I would admit that’s not a polished...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: You know, things don’t always come out exactly the way he means them.

KAINE: Well, can I say...

PENCE: But I’m telling you what the policy of our administration would be.

KAINE: Great line from the — great line from the gospel of Matthew. From the fullness of the heart, the mouth speaks.

PENCE: Yeah. KAINE: When Donald Trump says women should be punished or Mexicans are rapists and criminals...

PENCE: I’m telling you...

KAINE: ... or John McCain is not a hero, he is showing you who he is.

PENCE: Senator, you’ve whipped out that Mexican thing again. He — look...

KAINE: Can you defend it?

PENCE: There are criminal **aliens** in this country, Tim, who have come into this country illegally who are perpetrating violence and taking American lives.

KAINE: You want to — you want to use a big tar brush against Mexicans on that?

PENCE: He also said and many of them are good people. You keep leaving that out of your quote. And if you want me to go there, I’ll go there.

But here’s — there is a choice, and it is a choice on life. I couldn’t be more proud to be standing with Donald Trump, who’s standing for the right to life. It’s a principle that — Senator Kaine — and I’m very gentle about this, because I really do respect you — it’s a principle that you embrace.

And I have appreciated the fact that you’ve supported the Hyde amendment, which bans the use of taxpayer funding for abortion, in the past, but that’s not Hillary Clinton’s view. People need to understand, we can come together as a nation. We can create a culture of life. More and more young people today are embracing life because we know we are — we’re better for it. We can — like Mother Teresa said at that famous national prayer breakfast...

KAINE: This is important —

PENCE: ... bring the — let’s welcome the children into our world. There are so many families around the country who can’t have children. We could improve adoption...

KAINE: But, Governor...

PENCE: ... so that families that can’t have children can adopt more readily those children from crisis pregnancies.

KAINE: Governor, why don’t you trust women to make this choice for themselves? We can encourage people to support life. Of course we can. But why don’t you trust women? Why doesn’t Donald Trump trust women to make this choice for themselves?

That’s what we ought to be doing in public life. Living our lives of faith or motivation with enthusiasm and excitement, convincing other, dialoguing with each other about important moral issues of the day...

PENCE: Because there are...

KAINE: ... but on fundamental issues of morality, we should let women make their own decisions.

PENCE: Because there is — a society can be judged by how it deals with its most vulnerable, the aged, the infirm, the disabled, and the unborn. I believe it with all my heart. And I couldn’t be more proud to be standing with a pro-life candidate in Donald Trump.

QUIJANO: I do have one final question for you both tonight. It has been a divisive campaign. Senator Kaine, if your ticket wins, what specifically are you going to do to unify the country and reassure the people who voted against you?

KAINE: That’s a really important one. That may be the $64,000 question, because it has been a divisive campaign. And again, Hillary is running a campaign about stronger together, and Donald Trump — and this is — this is not directed at this man, except to the extent that he can’t defend Donald Trump — Donald Trump has run a campaign that’s been about one insult after the next.

But we do have to bring the country together. So here’s what we’ll do. Hillary Clinton was first lady, then senator for eight years and secretary of state. And I served in the Senate. And I’m really amazed, Elaine, as I talk to Republican senators, how well they regard and respect Hillary Clinton.

She was on the Armed Services Committee. She was on other committees. She worked across the aisle when she was first lady to get the CHIP program passed so that 8 million low-income kids have health insurance in this country, including 150,000 in Indiana.

She worked across the aisle after 9/11 to get health benefits for the first responders who bravely went into the towers and into the Pentagon. She worked to get benefits for — TRICARE benefits for National Guard members, including Hoosiers and Virginians in the National Guard.

She has a track record of working across the aisle to make things happen. And, you know, Elaine, I have the same track record. I was a governor of Virginia with two Republican houses. And in the Senate, I have good working relationships across the aisle.

Because I think it’s fine to be a Democrat or Republican or independent, but after Election Day, the goal is work together. And Hillary Clinton has a track record of accomplishment across the aisle that will enable her to do just that when we work with the new Congress in January.

QUIJANO: Governor, how will you unify the country if you win?

PENCE: Well, thank you, Elaine, and thanks for a great discussion...

KAINE: Absolutely.

PENCE: ... tonight. Thank you, Senator.

This is a very challenging time in the life of our nation. Weakened America’s place in the world after the leadership of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama on the world stage has been followed by an economy that is truly struggling, stifled by an avalanche of more taxes, more regulation, Obamacare, the war on coal, and the kind of trade deals that have put American workers in the back seat. I think the best way that we can bring people together is through change in Washington, D.C.

You know, I served in Washington, D.C., for 12 years in the Congress of the United States. And I served with many Republicans and Democrats, men and women of goodwill. The potential is there to really change the direction of this country, but it’s going to take leadership to do it.

The American people want to see our nation standing tall on the world stage again. They want to see us supporting our military, rebuilding our military, commanding the respect of the world, and they want to see the American economy off to the races again. They want to see an American comeback.

And Donald Trump’s entire career has been about building. It’s been about — it’s going through hardship just like a businessperson does and finding a way through smarts and ingenuity and resilience to fight forward and — when Donald Trump becomes president of the United States, we’re going to have a stronger America.

When you hear him say he wants to make America great again, when we do that, I truly do believe the American people are going to be standing taller. They’re going to see that real change can happen after decades of just talking about it. And when that happens, the American people are going to stand tall, stand together, and we’ll have the kind of unity that’s been missing for way too long.

QUIJANO: All right, gentlemen, thank you so much.

This concludes the vice presidential debate. My thanks to the candidates, the commission, and to you for watching. Please tune in this Sunday for the second presidential debate at Washington University in St. Louis and the final debate on October 19th at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

From Farmville, Virginia, I’m Elaine Quijano of CBS News. Good night.
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Correction: October 5, 2016, Wednesday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An earlier version of this article, transcribed and provided by the Federal News Service, quoted incorrectly from an exchange between Senator Tim Kaine of Virginia and Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana over comments from Donald J. Trump. Mr. Kaine said, “you want to use a big tar brush against Mexicans on that?,” not “you want to use a big broad brush against Mexicans on that?”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The vice-presidential debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/politics/vice-presidential-debate.html] may be in the books, but the post-debate spin goes on.

The Trump and Clinton campaigns both declared victory on Wednesday morning.

Kellyanne Conway, Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s campaign manager, accused Senator Tim Kaine of Virginia [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/vice-presidential-debate-mike-pence-tim-kaine.html?partner=rss&emc=rss]of having an “obsession” with Mr. Trump.

For his part, Mr. Trump, who repeatedly interrupted Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] during the first debate, said that Mr. Kaine’s constant interruptions of Mr. Pence should not have been allowed[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/783660227530862592] but that his running mate “won big” anyway.

Mrs. Clinton’s team seized on Mr. Pence’s strategy of appearing to forget much of what Mr. Trump has said on the campaign trail and criticized Mr. Pence with a video mash-up featuring him denying statements that his running mate has made publicly.

While pundits generally agreed [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/who-won-debate.html?smid=tw-share]that Mr. Pence was the winner of the debate, he was careful on Wednesday not to take too much of the limelight, and he took to Twitter to dispel concerns that he had not sufficiently defended Mr. Trump.

Some think I won last night's debate. I'll leave that to others. From where I sat, @realDonaldTrump[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump]'s vision for America was the real winner — Mike Pence (@mike\_pence) October 5, 2016[https://twitter.com/mike\_pence/status/783703867359956993]

‘That Mexican thing’ might have been the line of the night.

The early favorite for most memorable debate moment[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/us/politics/vp-debate-history.html?smid=tw-share] was Mr. Pence’s use of the phrase “that Mexican thing.”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/that-mexican-thing.html]

In a rare moment of frustration at Mr. Kaine’s barrage of attacks on Mr. Trump’s contentious statements on Hispanic **immigrants**, Mr. Pence shot back, “Senator, you’ve whipped out that Mexican thing again.”

The line #ThatMexicanThing quickly became a popular hashtag on social media, where Mr. Pence was criticized for showing a lack of sensitivity.

#ThatMexicanThing[https://twitter.com/hashtag/ThatMexicanThing?src=hash] is my abuelita who moved to San Antonio without speaking English & slept in a barn while picking lettuce every summer. — Matthew Duarte (@matthew\_duarte) October 5, 2016[https://twitter.com/matthew\_duarte/status/783499769771458561]

Mr. Pence went on to make the case that Mr. Trump’s focus has been on **immigrants** who are in the United States illegally.

Yes, Ohio is still up for grabs.

Recent polls of Ohio voters have shown that the Buckeye State might be slipping away from Mrs. Clinton’s grasp, but a[https://www.monmouth.edu/polling-institute/reports/MonmouthPoll\_OH\_100516/] Monmouth University survey[https://www.monmouth.edu/polling-institute/reports/MonmouthPoll\_OH\_100516/] released on Wednesday shows that the Democratic nominee still has a chance there.

A poll of likely voters showed that 44 percent back Mrs. Clinton and 42 percent support Mr. Trump. Mrs. Clinton had a four-point advantage in August. (The poll had a margin of error of plus or minus 4.9 percentage points.)

After showing signs of struggling in Ohio, it appeared that Mrs. Clinton might be giving up in the crucial swing state. However, she is making another push and plans to campaign with President Obama in Cleveland on Friday.

According to the Monmouth poll, she is not doing as well as Mr. Obama did in 2012 with minority voters, so their joint appearance could help her solidify that base of support.

But Trump’s wobbles are worsening elsewhere

The next pivotal moment in the race arrives on Sunday night, when Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton hold their second debate.

Republicans have been on edge since Mr. Trump’s uneven first debate and his erratic behavior in the aftermath of that performance. The Times reported on Wednesday evening[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/donald-trump-campaign.html] that Mr. Trump is slipping in several swing state polls and that members of his party could start to distance themselves from him if he falters again on Sunday out of concern that their hopes of maintaining control in Congress could be on shaky ground.

Independents, in particular, have been especially turned off by Mr. Trump in the last week and there is growing concern about an exodus of female voters.

And what about that Russian romance?

Mr. Trump has heaped praise on Vladimir V. Putin for months, calling him a strong leader and a potential ally.

Mr. Pence struck a different note on Tuesday night, describing the Russian president as a “small and bullying” leader who the United States should not hesitate to confront.

The remarks made it appear that the Republican ticket might not be on the same page when it comes to Russian policy, and in an interview Wednesday with CNN, Jason Miller, a spokesman for Mr. Trump, was careful not to shed much light on the campaign’s official line on the matter.

“We have to be able to stand up to foreign leaders,” Mr. Miller said. “There’s also no reason why we can’t work with foreign leaders, for example to defeat ISIS.”

The Kaine and Pence show was not must-see TV.

New data from Nielsen showed that the vice-presidential debate drew 37 million television viewers[http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2016/37-million-viewers-tune-in-to-kaine-pence-vice-presidential-debate.html?cid=socSprinklr-Nielsen], the smallest audience since Dick Cheney and Joe Lieberman debated in 2000.

Although that does not capture people who viewed the proceedings online, it paled when compared to the first presidential debate between Donald J. Trump and Hillary Clinton. That drew 84 million viewers, according to Nielsen.

Mr. Pence and Mr. Kaine are both relatively mild-mannered candidates who are not overly combative and their showdown lacked the fanfare that the top of the ticket has received.

The most watched vice-presidential debate [http://www.adweek.com/tvnewser/vice-presidential-tv-debate-ratings-by-the-numbers/306445]remains the one from 2008, when Sarah Palin took on then Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr.

In the meantime, Russia appears to be taking advantage of the period of uncertainty before the American presidential election to deepen its presence in Syria [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/world/middleeast/syria-russia-us-election.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=a-lede-package-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news]and its support of President Bashar al-Assad[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/a/bashar\_al\_assad/index.html?inline=nyt-per]’s government.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* After Clash of No. 2s, Both Campaigns Say, ‘We’re No. 1’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/vice-presidential-debate-mike-pence-tim-kaine.html]

\* Debate Takeaways: Tim Kaine Presses Mike Pence on Russia, but Not Gay Rights[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/vp-debate-highlights.html]

\* Syria Draws a Rare Source of Accord in Debate Between Kaine and Pence[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/syria-vice-presidential-debate.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On a sunny Southern California day in the spring of 2015, a full house showed up to attend not a play, but a reading of a play: “Vietgone” by Qui Nguyen. It was the last day of the Pacific Playwrights Festival[http://www.scr.org/plays/pacific-playwrights-festival/2015-pacific-playwrights-festival], hosted by the local South Coast Repertory theater. “Vietgone” was the final presentation, a two-and-a-half-hour piece about a complicated event: the Vietnam War.

“Mamas, don’t let your babies grow up to be cowboys…,” sang two actors, who were playing a Vietnamese father and his son.

End of play.

Immediately, the audience — a mix of industry professionals, subscribers and members of the Vietnamese community — stood up in applause. Among them was Elizabeth Rothman, director of play development at Manhattan Theater Club[http://manhattantheatreclub.com/]. Right after the reading, she called the theater’s artistic director, Lynne Meadow, with the words: “We must do this play.”

A year and several other productions later (including a current run at Oregon Shakespeare Festival[https://www.osfashland.org/]), “Vietgone” began performances Oct. 4 at Manhattan Theater Club[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/m/manhattan\_theater\_club/index.html?inline=nyt-org]’s 300-seat space Off Broadway at New York City Center.

Even now, Mr. Nguyen, 40, can’t believe it. “They’re nutbags,” he said, jokingly, about the prestigious theaters who have given a prime slot to a writer best known for low-budget, action-packed plays about superheroes and samurai.

He was speaking over a dinner of bacon and pineapple pizza, jet-lagged after having flown into New York at 5 that morning for “Vietgone” rehearsal.

After 13 years in Brooklyn, he moved to Los Angeles six months ago, to write for television. His credits include the PBS children’s show “Peg + Cat”[http://pbskids.org/peg/] and the coming Syfy series “Incorporated,”[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6nv1m1FZuGY] produced by Ben Affleck and Matt Damon.

His week is largely taken up with his new job: screenwriter for Marvel Studios. In typical Marvel fashion, Mr. Nguyen is quiet about what he’s working on, except to say: “Things seem to be going O.K. for me right now!”

If Mr. Nguyen could be described in only four words, it would be “not the model minority,” as he puts it. Talking to him is to be showered with a steady stream of jokes and the occasional expletive — more like a playful 20-something than the father of two children that he is.

But Mr. Nguyen doesn’t consider his new day job different from what he had been doing in New York. He is a co-founder of the Obie-winning downtown theater company Vampire Cowboys[http://www.vampirecowboys.com/index2.htm], which drew a passionate following thanks to plays with titles like “Soul Samurai,” “Fight Girl Battle World” and “Alice in Slasherland.”[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/01/theater/reviews/01alice.html] His best-known play, “She Kills Monsters,”[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/19/theater/reviews/she-kills-monsters-by-qui-nguyen-at-the-flea-review.html] has received almost 300 productions nationwide since 2013.

It was that work that also drew notice from Marvel, which Mr. Nguyen calls “kind of a dream job.” He added: “It’s a weird evolution from doing downtown superheroes, creating theater, and suddenly, writing actual superheroes.”

“Vietgone” may seem to be a drastic departure. The playwright calls it a “romantic comedy” about how his parents met at a refugee camp in Arkansas in 1975, having **immigrated** right after the Vietnam War. It’s a story that Mr. Nguyen grew up hearing and knows well, but it has also been filtered through his pop-culture-filled and irreverent sensibility.

“When my parents told me stories about Vietnam, they told me the real stories, what actually happened,” he explained. “But what I imagined was kung fu movies. Because the only things I ever saw [growing up] that had a lot of Asian people in it, were kung fu movies.”

So there is kung fu in “Vietgone,” and ninjas. As in Mr. Nguyen’s other works, everyone speaks in a modern voice and raps — and no one speaks with “an Asian accent,” part of his fight against minority stereotypes.

“This play is still very much him,” the director, May Adrales, said by phone during a rehearsal break. “There’s genre-bending, it’s bawdy, it’s slick and it’s humorous.” (A critic for The Los Angeles Times[http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/arts/la-et-cm-vietgone-review-south-coast-rep-20151013-column.html] called it “a riotous theatrical cartoon [that] won me over with its simple honesty.”)

Mr. Nguyen, he oldest of three sons, said he always knew he would be a storyteller. He was born and raised in El Dorado, Ark. His parents — Quang Nguyen, a pilot for the South Vietnam Air Force, and Tong Nguyen, who worked at the United States Embassy in Saigon — had grown accustomed to Arkansas while in the camp and didn’t want to move. They were one of only two Asian families in town and lived in a primarily African-American neighborhood.

Along with family stories, Mr. Nguyen consumed comic books (Spider-Man was his favorite superhero), studied martial arts (Bruce Lee was an idol) and participated in freestyle rap battles. He joined the drama club in high school because “there are cute girls in theater,” he said with a laugh.

But he stuck with it, eventually majoring in theater at Louisiana Tech University, with an emphasis on acting. It was there that he started writing plays. “I don’t want to play a stereotype,” he recalled thinking. “How do I get those roles? I’ll just write them.” He eventually earned a master’s degree in playwriting from Ohio University.

Creating substantial roles for minority actors became a touchstone of Vampire Cowboys, which Mr. Nguyen co-founded in 2002 with the director and fellow comic-book lover Robert Ross Parker. The troupe specialized in what became known as “geek theater,” a term coined by a producer, Abby Marcus, who eventually became Mr. Nguyen’s wife.

The genre proved popular; their shows regularly sold out, and they had their own performance space called the Battle Ranch and a regular booth at New York Comic Con[http://www.newyorkcomiccon.com/].

“One of the missions of Vampire Cowboys was always to make heroes out of women, people of color, lesbian, gay, transgender characters — those people who generally don’t get to be heroes,” Mr. Parker said by phone.

Though the company is on hiatus, its essence lives on in Mr. Nguyen. In “Vietgone,” he wanted to tell a story he had never seen growing up, a story about people like his parents, South Vietnamese who fought for their country.

Movies like “Rambo” and “Platoon,” and even the musical “Miss Saigon,” provided a narrow view that turned the Vietnamese into supporting characters in their own stories, Mr. Nguyen said.

“It always made me go: ‘Oh no, you’re the other! You’re either the other we’re killing or the other we’re saving!’” he added. “‘You’re never going to be the lead character.’”

Not in “Vietgone.” In a world where leading roles for Asian-American men and women are still rare[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/29/movies/asian-american-actors-are-fighting-for-visibility-they-will-not-be-ignored.html] and Asian-American characters are sometimes whitewashed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/23/opinion/why-wont-hollywood-cast-asian-actors.html], it was important for Mr. Nguyen to create “strong Asian-American characters,” he said. “They’re cool, and they’re sexy, and they’re not exotic. They can be feminist, strong women, and they can be sexy men.”

And Ms. Adrales, whose parents were **immigrants** from the Philippines, thinks the relevance of “Vietgone” goes even beyond Asian-Americans, especially when the presence of new generations of **immigrants** is being fiercely debated.

“When he’s writing about people that are displaced,” she said, “it makes me think of the Hmong[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/hmong\_tribe/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and now the Syrians, who have that same story.”

“Vietgone” is the first in a five-play cycle about Mr. Nguyen’s family. Manhattan Theater Club and South Coast Rep have commissioned the second play, which will be about his parents acclimating to life in Arkansas. As for the real Quang and Tong Nguyen, who still live in El Dorado, Mr. Nguyen said that they haven’t seen “Vietgone.” And they don’t plan to.

“A lot of people who come from a tumultuous situation — whether it’s the Holocaust or the Vietnam War or the Syrian crisis — I think it’s hard for them to revisit it,” he said. But that doesn’t mean they’re not proud of him.

Though it wasn’t the awards the play has won or its productions that made them realize that Mr. Nguyen had written something special. “What made them think it was a big deal,” he said with a chuckle, “was when someone wrote about it in a Vietnamese newspaper.”

\* Review: ‘Six Rounds of Vengeance,’ in Vegas, No Actual Boxers Necessary[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/04/theater/review-six-rounds-of-vengeance-in-vegas-no-actual-boxers-necessary.html]

\* The Pains of Evisceration and Unrequited Love[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/19/theater/reviews/she-kills-monsters-by-qui-nguyen-at-the-flea-review.html]

\* Zombies, Lucifer, a Little Bonnie Tyler[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/01/theater/reviews/01alice.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BIRMINGHAM, England — Prime Minister Theresa May of Britain[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] capped the Conservative Party’s convention on Wednesday by breaking with the domestic agenda of her predecessor, courting working-class voters and promising to use the power of government to rein in abuses by big business.

Addressing delegates in Birmingham, England, at a conference that had been dominated by the issue of Britain’s relationship with the European Union, Mrs. May sought to redefine the profile of her party by claiming a “new center ground.”

With parties on the left and right in disarray, Mrs. May moved to capture disaffected working-class supporters of the Labour Party, as well as those sympathetic to the populist right-wing U.K. Independence Party, which has long demanded stricter control of **immigration** — one of the crucial issues in the June vote to withdraw from the 28-member bloc[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/britain-brexit-european-union-referendum.html].

Mrs. May’s speech suggested that her government would protect hard-pressed families who have struggled in the globalized economy that her predecessor, David Cameron, embraced enthusiastically.

“It wasn’t the wealthy who made the biggest financial sacrifices after the financial crisis,” Mrs. May said, adding that “change is going to come” and pledging to pursue firms that fail to pay their share of tax.

“Too many people in positions of power behave as though they have more in common with international elites than the people down the road,” she said.

Conservative leaders have sought for years to reduce state intervention, but Mrs. May struck a different tone, saying that her government would tackle injustice and create an economy that benefited ordinary working people.

Amid uncertainty from the unexpected decision by voters to leave the European Union, Mrs. May has sought to steady British politics, and she received an enthusiastic reception from delegates on Wednesday.

Her speech underscored her determination to differentiate herself from Mr. Cameron[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/world/europe/britain-david-cameron-legacy.html], who was born into a wealthy family, educated at the exclusive Eton College[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/08/world/europe/britain-brexit-elite-politics.html] and whom critics saw as detached from the concerns of ordinary people.

By contrast, Mrs. May, the daughter of a provincial clergyman[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/world/europe/theresa-may-profile.html], studied at a state school, and she has emphasized that she is on the side of working-class people who struggle to get by.

“Just listen to the way a lot of politicians and commentators talk about the public,” Mrs. May said at the convention. “They find your patriotism distasteful, your concerns about **immigration** parochial, your views about crime illiberal, your attachment to your job security inconvenient.”

She continued, “They find the fact that more than 17 million voters decided to leave the European Union simply bewildering.”

Mrs. May supported continued membership in the European Union during the referendum campaign, though tepidly, but she has since embraced the cause of withdrawal, known as Brexit. She has given strong indications that she is willing to make a clean break from the bloc, even if that curtails the access of British businesses to Continental markets.

In some respects, Mrs. May is unlikely to find a better time to assert herself. The opposition Labour Party is badly split[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/world/europe/in-battle-for-soul-of-britains-labour-party-a-leftist-group-is-winning.html], with many lawmakers hostile to their left-wing leader, Jeremy Corbyn. The U.K. Independence Party has also been plunged into crisis after the unexpected resignation on Tuesday of Diane James as leader.

Ms. James, who quit after only 18 days on the job[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/world/europe/britain-brexit-ukip-farage-james.html], cited professional and personal reasons for her decision. With no deputy in place, it was unclear who was running the party, leaving open the possibility that the former leader, Nigel Farage, might technically still be in charge.

The centrist Liberal Democrats, meanwhile, have just eight lawmakers in Parliament.

As part of the Conservatives’ effort to attract working-class voters, the home secretary, Amber Rudd, defended proposals that could require British companies to publish the number of foreign workers they employ.

“There is still one in 10 18- to 24-year-olds in the U.K. who are unemployed,” Ms. Rudd told the BBC[http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-37561035]. “I want businesses to think first about locally training people where possible.”

The proposal, which first became known on Tuesday, was criticized by at least one business federation, the British Chambers of Commerce[http://www.britishchambers.org.uk/], as well as by the Labour Party.

Mr. Corbyn accused the Conservatives of xenophobia and of blaming foreigners “for their own failures,” adding that “drawing up lists of foreign workers won’t stop unscrupulous employers undercutting wages in Britain.”

The measure also appears to be at odds with the views of some of Ms. Rudd’s cabinet colleagues, who have expressed concern about the risks to the economy if access to employees from the Continent is restricted.

Despite Mrs. May’s efforts to broaden the discussion, the party’s convention was dominated by the debate over Britain’s future relationship with [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/europe/britain-brexit-eu.html] the [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/europe/britain-brexit-eu.html] European Union[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/europe/britain-brexit-eu.html], an issue that looks certain to determine the success or failure of the government.

In the bars and corridors of the convention center in Birmingham, the debate focused on whether Britain would make compromises in an effort to maintain close economic ties with the European Union. Mrs. May’s comments in the first of two speeches delivered on Sunday suggested that a “hard Brexit,” with fewer concessions, was more likely.

The British economy has not suffered the grievous damage many supporters of European Union membership had feared would follow a vote for withdrawal, and the stock market is buoyant.

But Britain remains a full member of the bloc, and it will almost certainly continue to be one until the spring of 2019. This means that the effect on many parts of the economy have yet to be felt, and there are ominous signs.

Perhaps most significant, the pound has dropped to its lowest level against the dollar in more than three decades, as currency markets continue to express concern that Britain may ultimately find itself outside the European Union’s tariff-free market of around 500 million consumers.

When formal negotiations on the British withdrawal begin, expected no later than the end of March[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/brexit-talks-march-theresa-may-britain.html], the clock will start ticking on a two-year deadline to reach a deal or risk an exit without any preferential trade arrangements.

Unless that process is very carefully managed, investment decisions are likely to be postponed, and British business confidence could erode. That worry was reflected in a speech by Philip Hammond[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/world/europe/brexit-uk-economy.html], the chancellor of the Exchequer, at the conference on Monday.

Britain’s financial services sector, which accounts for almost 12 percent of economic output and 1.1 million jobs, is particularly worried that it will lose the right to operate freely throughout the bloc, under a system known as “passporting.”

Mrs. May has given no indication that she is willing to make trade-offs with European partners to smooth market access for banks. Such concessions could include allowing the free movement of people across European frontiers and paying budget contributions to the bloc.

Instead, the comments by Mrs. May and Ms. Rudd suggested that controlling **immigration** would be a higher priority than placating bankers.

Follow Stephen Castle on Twitter @\_StephenCastle.

\* ‘Brexit’ Talks Will Start by End of March, Theresa May Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/brexit-talks-march-theresa-may-britain.html]

\* Theresa May Makes Her Debut as the Voice of Britain[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/world/europe/theresa-may-britain-unga-2016-united-nations.html]

\* Theresa May, Britain’s Prime Minister, Plays the ‘Brexit’ Waiting Game[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/world/europe/theresa-may-britain-brexit.html]

\* 5 Things to Know About Theresa May, Britain’s Next Prime Minister[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/13/world/europe/5-things-to-know-about-theresa-may-britains-next-prime-minister.html]

\* Theresa May’s Style: Put Your Head Down and Get to Work[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/world/europe/theresa-may-profile.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the grand digital tradition of American presidential debates, the audience tends to seize upon singular phrases[https://www.theguardian.com/world/us-news-blog/2012/oct/23/horses-and-bayonets-presidential-debate] or gestures[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/trump-sniffles-first-2016-debate.html] that, at least for a few hours, seem to define the evening’s discussion.

After Tuesday evening’s vice-presidential debate between Senator Tim Kaine[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/k/tim\_kaine/index.html?inline=nyt-per] of Virginia and Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, it was clear “that Mexican thing” had become a phrase of choice.

“When Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] says women should be punished, that Mexicans are rapists and criminals, or John McCain’s not a hero, he is showing you who he is,” Mr. Kaine said, after repeated efforts trying to persuade Mr. Pence to explain or defend Donald J. Trump’s past comments about **immigrants** during the 90-minute date.

“Senator, you’ve whipped out that Mexican thing again,” Mr. Pence replied, according to the transcript.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/vice-president-transcript.html] “He — look ...”

“Can you defend it?” Mr. Kaine said.

.@mike\_Pence[https://twitter.com/mike\_pence] to @timkaine[https://twitter.com/timkaine]: "You whipped out that Mexican thing again" https://t.co/9zgosSHNKa[https://t.co/9zgosSHNKa] #debates[https://twitter.com/hashtag/debates?src=hash] https://t.co/L0A9bh237W[https://t.co/L0A9bh237W] — ABC News Politics (@ABCPolitics) October 5, 2016[https://twitter.com/ABCPolitics/status/783495894259802113]

“There are criminal **aliens** in this country, Tim, who have come into this country illegally who are perpetrating violence and taking American lives,” Mr. Pence said.

“You want to — you want to use a big broad brush against Mexicans on that?”

“He also said and many of them are good people,” Mr. Pence said. “You keep leaving that out of your quote. And if you want me to go there, I’ll go there.” But he then turned back to the question, which was about abortion.

Naturally, the Internet did go there.

Mexican-Americans adopted the hashtag to share stories about their relatives.

#ThatMexicanThing[https://twitter.com/hashtag/ThatMexicanThing?src=hash] is my abuelita who moved to San Antonio without speaking English & slept in a barn while picking lettuce every summer. — Matthew Duarte (@matthew\_duarte) October 5, 2016[https://twitter.com/matthew\_duarte/status/783499769771458561]

#thatmexicanthing[https://twitter.com/hashtag/thatmexicanthing?src=hash] is my mom who **immigrated** to this country, pays her taxes and put two kids through college while managing a business ❤️ — Frank Ramirez (@frankemilio) October 5, 2016[https://twitter.com/frankemilio/status/783635870129745920]

Some also reminded Twitter about which way they would vote.

#ThatMexicanThing[https://twitter.com/hashtag/ThatMexicanThing?src=hash] being proud of my heritage, becoming a citizen, & showing up to vote against hate this November #ImWithHer[https://twitter.com/hashtag/ImWithHer?src=hash] — Maria ML (@CoffeandTequila) October 5, 2016[https://twitter.com/CoffeandTequila/status/783648170555441152]

And one enterprising individual bought the domain name ThatMexicanThing.com[http://thatmexicanthing.com]. That web address redirects to Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s campaign website. According to a report from Wired[https://www.wired.com/2016/10/that-mexican-thing-website-stunt/], it wasn’t the work of Ms. Clinton’s campaign, but of a Portland-based man named Danilo Alfaro.

“I registered the domain and pointed it at hillaryclinton.com[http://hillaryclinton.com] on my own, without any contact with the campaign beforehand,” Mr. Alfaro said. (He did add that Mrs. Clinton’s campaign reached out to thank him.)

An email request for further comment from the Trump campaign was not immediately returned on Wednesday, but it was clear that Mr. Pence had the support of his running mate.

“Mike Pence won big. We should all be proud of Mike!” Mr. Trump wrote[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump] on Twitter, before sending another tweet that criticized Mr. Kaine for frequently interrupting Mr. Pence.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Tim Kaine and Mike Pence Clash Sharply Over Their Running Mates[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/politics/vice-presidential-debate.html]

\* Mike Pence’s Defense Strategy: Dodge and Deflect Donald Trump’s Words[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/politics/mike-pence-donald-trump-tim-kaine.html]

\* Transcript of the 2016 Debate Between the Running Mates[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/vice-president-transcript.html]

\* Who Won the Debate? Commentators Give Edge to Mike Pence[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/06/us/politics/who-won-debate.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HONG KONG — Joshua Wong[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/world/asia/hong-kong-occupy-verdicts.html], who was a prominent leader of the 2014 pro-democracy rallies in Hong Kong[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/hongkong/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], was detained at the international airport in Bangkok early Wednesday while trying to enter Thailand[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/thailand/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], he said after being put on a plane and flown back home.

In a brief news conference at Hong Kong International Airport, Mr. Wong, 19, said that more than 20 police and **immigration** officers met him on arrival in Bangkok, where he had been invited to speak at two universities. He said that his passport was confiscated and that he was detained with little explanation from the Thai authorities, who he said “mentioned a blacklist.”

“I’m disappointed in the Thai government,” he said. “I’m grateful now that I’m back in Hong Kong.” He said he felt lucky not to have met the fate of several Hong Kong booksellers who disappeared[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/17/world/asia/hong-kong-bookseller-lam-wing-kee.html] last year and later turned up in custody in mainland China[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/china/index.html?inline=nyt-geo].

News of Mr. Wong’s detention in Thailand had been reported Wednesday morning by a political party he recently helped establish, Demosisto. The party said he had arrived in Thailand at 11:45 p.m. on Tuesday on an Emirates flight.

The party said it had been unable to get any word about his whereabouts until several hours later, when a Thai student who was expecting to meet with him said that Mr. Wong had been detained at the airport.

The student, Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal, said in an interview that the Thai authorities had told him that they had received a letter from the Chinese government asking that Mr. Wong not be allowed into the country. China’s Foreign Ministry was closed on Wednesday for a holiday and could not be reached for comment.

“This is blocking our education,” Mr. Netiwit said. “He was supposed to be here to speak about the future of politics and his experience in the movement. But it turns out this matter is not open for discussion. How will the new generation live in the future if we still act like this?”

A spokesman for Thailand’s ruling military junta, Col. Winthai Suvaree, was quoted in Thai news reports as saying that the junta had no information about a request from China to bar Mr. Wong. He said that the **immigration** police were responsible for screening people on arrival and that they were free to refuse entry for a number of reasons.

Jeremy Laurence, a spokesman for the United Nations Human Rights Office in Asia, expressed concern about the Thai authorities’ actions. “Preventing Mr. Wong from attending an event at a Thai university raises further concerns about restrictions on peaceful freedom of expression and assembly in Thailand,” he said.

Mr. Wong drew international attention as one of the leaders[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/02/world/asia/hong-kong-china-democracy-protests-students.html] of the so-called Umbrella Revolution protests[http://sinosphere.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/09/25/hong-kong-umbrella-revolution-anniversary/?\_r=0] in 2014, which called for more democratic elections in Hong Kong, a former British colony that reverted to Chinese control in 1997[http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/0630.html] but has its own legal system and civil liberties not available in mainland China. During the protests, thousands of students and other demonstrators blocked major thoroughfares[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/30/world/asia/hong-kong-protests.html] in Hong Kong for months[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/15/world/asia/three-months-of-protests-end-quietly-in-hong-kong.html].

Mr. Wong had been invited to speak Thursday to mark the 40th anniversary of a bloody crackdown on student demonstrators[http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2016/10/04/world/asia/ap-as-ap-was-there-thailand-massacre.html] in Bangkok.

It was not the first time that he had been barred from an Asian country where fellow student activists had invited him to speak. Malaysia denied him entry in May of last year because the country did not want Mr. Wong to “jeopardize our ties with China[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/27/world/asia/malaysia-rejects-entry-by-joshua-wong-hong-kong-democracy-activist.html],” the police inspector general said at the time. Mr. Wong had been invited to forums hosted by Malaysian youth activist groups.

Mr. Wong has spoken at dozens of schools around the world, including universities in Japan, Taiwan and the United States.

Though the Hong Kong protests did not win any immediate political concessions from Beijing, they gave rise to a new generation of political activists[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/asia/hong-kong-election.html] who went on to win seats in local elections. Nathan Law, 23, another leader of the protests and a founder of the Demosisto party, will become the youngest ever legislator in Hong Kong when he is inaugurated next week.

Agnes Chow, the deputy secretary general of Demosisto, said, “The Chinese government doesn’t want Hong Kong’s pro-democracy voices to be heard outside.”

“But the harder it tries to suppress us,” Ms. Chow added, “the louder we’d be heard.”

Thailand’s military junta, which seized power[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/23/world/asia/thailand-military-coup.html] from an elected government in 2014, has a record of complying with security requests from the Chinese government. It has deported scores of Uighur refugees[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/10/world/asia/thailand-deports-uighur-migrants-to-china.html] back to China in response to demands by the Chinese authorities, and it allowed men representing Beijing’s interests to track down a Hong Kong bookseller[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/01/world/asia/hong-kong-bookseller-gui-minhai.html], one of those who later emerged in Chinese custody, at a Thai resort.

Peter Dahlin[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/world/asia/china-ned-ngo-peter-dahlin.html], a Swedish legal rights advocate who was detained and expelled from China[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/26/world/asia/china-to-expel-swedish-human-rights-advocate.html] in January, said Chinese security officers or their representatives had recently been conducting surveillance on Chinese rights lawyers undergoing training on a Thai island. Mr. Dahlin now lives in Chiang Mai, Thailand.

Sophie Richardson, director of China research for Human Rights Watch[https://www.hrw.org/], said: “Thailand’s arrest of Joshua Wong, a well-known pro-democracy activist in Hong Kong, sadly suggests that Bangkok is willing to do Beijing’s bidding.”

Follow Edward Wong on Twitter @comradewong. Alan Wong reported from Hong Kong and Edward Wong from Beijing. Poypiti Amatatham contributed reporting from Bangkok.

\* Hong Kong Protest Leaders Sentenced to Community Service[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/15/world/asia/hong-kong-occupy-sentences-joshua-wong.html]

\* Taking Back Hong Kong's Future[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/30/opinion/joshua-wong-taking-back-hong-kongs-future.html]

\* Hong Kong Students Who Protested Government Now Seek to Take Part in It[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/17/world/asia/hong-kong-joshua-wong-elections.html]

\* China Labels Protesters ‘Radical Separatists,’ and They Agree[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/21/world/asia/hong-kong-indigenous-separatism.html]

\* At 17, Setting Off Protests That Roil Hong Kong[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/02/world/asia/hong-kong-china-democracy-protests-students.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Mike Pence defended Donald J. Trump by scarcely defending him at all.

For 90 minutes on Tuesday night, Mr. Pence, the Republican vice-presidential candidate, was asked, over and over, to carry out perhaps the most unenviable, thankless and futile task in American politics: answering for Mr. Trump’s cruel insults, factual distortions and radical proposals.

Instead, he dodged, deflected and demurred — deciding, it seemed, that all of the fires that Mr. Trump has set in the past year could not be doused in a single night.

When his Democratic rival, Senator Tim Kaine[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/k/tim\_kaine/index.html?inline=nyt-per] of Virginia, delivered a scathing assault on Mr. Trump’s affection for autocrats like Vladimir V. Putin and Saddam Hussein, both of whom he has praised, Mr. Pence, the governor of Indiana, looked over, weighed the message and promptly changed the subject.

“Did you work on that one a long time?” Mr. Pence mischievously asked his rival. “Because that had a lot of really creative lines in it.”

Here is what he did not do: defend Mr. Trump’s warm words for those much-maligned foreign leaders.

In Mr. Pence’s telling, it was the Democratic presidential nominee, Hillary Clinton, not Mr. Trump, who was running the “insult-driven campaign.”

Mr. Kaine, who was compelled to spend much of his time defending Mrs. Clinton, seemed at times bewildered by Mr. Pence’s coolly effective performance. “He is trying to fuzz up what Donald Trump has said,” Mr. Kaine said.

And he was right. Pressed on Mr. Trump’s startling and unsubstantiated claim that Mexico was sending rapists and criminals to the United States, Mr. Pence protested that his running mate had called some of those **immigrants** “good people.”

Time and again, Mr. Pence directly beseeched Mr. Pence to explain or justify Mr. Trump’s behavior.

Time and again, Mr. Pence found a way not to.

Did Mr. Trump apologize, Mr. Kaine wondered, for mocking a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, because she had gained weight? Did Mr. Trump apologize for describing black people as living in a dystopian war zone? Did Mr. Trump apologize for stoking doubts about President Obama’s place of birth?

“You will look in vain,” Mr. Kaine said, “to see Donald Trump ever taking responsibility for anybody and apologizing.”

Mr. Pence did not take the opportunity to apologize for Mr. Trump. Instead, he pivoted to Mrs. Clinton, reminding the audience that she had dismissed half of Mr. Trump’s supporters as belonging in a “basket of deplorables.”

“She said they were irredeemable — they were not American,” Mr. Pence said. “I mean, it’s extraordinary.”

All running mates eventually play the role of human shield, sacrificing a measure of dignity and putting their future political prospects in jeopardy to protect the person at the top of the ticket. But in most cases, the slings and arrows originate with their rivals.

From the moment he was named to the Republican ticket, however, Mr. Pence has struggled to salve the wounds and minimize the damage that Mr. Trump has inflicted on himself.

It is a painful task, and one that Mr. Pence has gamely tried to laugh off with self-deprecating jokes about bringing a dose of sobriety to an amply colorful candidacy. In almost every conceivable way, he is Mr. Trump’s polar opposite: deeply religious, instinctively civil and conspicuously cautious — as at ease quoting from Scripture as Mr. Trump is mocking a woman’s physique.

On Tuesday night, Mr. Pence reminded Americans of his faith in prayer. “I try to spend a little time on my knees every day,” he said.

For all their bruising clashes, Mr. Kane and Mr. Pence have much in common: Both have experience as governors of large states. Both were raised Roman Catholic — though Mr. Pence later became an evangelical Christian — in middle-class Midwestern families of Irish ancestry. Both have sons serving in the Marines.

But the similarities end there. Mr. Kaine was chosen for his political compatibility and his chemistry with Mrs. Clinton. Mr. Pence was chosen as a conservative counterweight who could stick up for Mr. Trump with all manner of doubters.

Mr. Pence has eagerly embraced that challenge on the campaign trail. But his previous attempts to translate and recast Mr. Trump’s statements have at times tipped over into parody.

Why did Mr. Trump invite Russian hackers to illegally break into Mrs. Clinton’s email? “He’s just simply saying, ‘Gosh, if they’re out there somewhere, I would like to see them,’” Mr. Pence explained.

At times, Mr. Pence, a former altar boy, has simply thrown up his hands and conceded that Mr. Trump was flat-out wrong, as he did when he was asked about Mr. Obama’s birthplace.

On Tuesday night, Mr. Pence made no such concessions.

Was it wrong that Mr. Trump may have avoided paying federal income taxes[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/us/politics/donald-trump-taxes.html] for up to 18 years, by using a nearly $1 billion loss that he declared in 1995?

“Do you take all your deductions, Senator?” Mr. Pence batted back, with a smile. “I do.”

Throughout the debate, Mr. Kaine, a onetime civil rights lawyer, played prosecutor, framing the night as a series of demands for accountability from Mr. Pence.

When Mr. Kaine reminded Mr. Pence, once again, of Mr. Trump’s denigrating description of **immigrants** from Mexico, Mr. Pence could hardly muster a reply. “You whipped out that Mexican thing again,” he observed, sounding more like an analyst than a participant in the debate.

Mr. Kaine frequently took notes, sipped water or merely grinned as Mr. Pence spoke. Eventually he made clear what he had been jotting down.

“Six times tonight I have said to Governor Pence, I can’t imagine how you can defend your running mate’s position on one issue after the next,” Mr. Kaine said. “And in all six cases, he’s refused to defend his running mate. And yet he is asking everybody to vote for somebody that he cannot defend.”

Mr. Pence shot him a chilly look. “I’m happy to defend him, Senator,” he said of Mr. Trump. “Don’t put words in my mouth.”

But it was Mr. Trump’s words that loomed largest throughout the night.

In fact, Mr. Trump has relentlessly upstaged Mr. Pence from the start of their partnership. At the news conference introducing his running mate, Mr. Trump ignored tradition and droned on for 28 minutes, focusing on himself, not on Mr. Pence. The campaign’s emasculating initial logo did not help matters: An oversize T seemed to skewer a smaller P.

That design was scrapped, but Mr. Pence has been eclipsed, nonetheless, ever since.

On Tuesday, Mr. Trump overshadowed him in a different way, by forcing Mr. Pence to absorb the consequences of Mr. Trump’s pronouncements and to defend his business record.

It was left to Mr. Kaine to define this new, awkward role, with a sneering allusion to Mr. Trump’s reality-TV past.

“You,” he told Mr. Pence, “are Donald Trump’s apprentice.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Tim Kaine and Mike Pence Clash on the Merits of Their Tickets[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/politics/vice-presidential-debate.html]

\* Vice-Presidential Debate: What You Missed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/us/politics/vice-presidential-debate.html]

\* Messaging With Mondale: Real-Time Reactions From an Ex-Vice President[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/05/us/politics/walter-mondale-reaction.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SAN FRANCISCO — One of the **immigrants** appearing before Judge Dana Marks in a crowded court here was a boatworker from the former Soviet Union who stared in silence as a prosecutor asked about his criminal history. Another was a mother who started praying after testifying that she had fled Honduras because her husband beat her. She sought divine rather than judicial intervention.

In all, 336 people from 13 countries and even more ethnic backgrounds appeared in San Francisco’s **immigration** court recently over three days. All of them were facing possible deportation, because they either were in the United States illegally or had committed crimes serious enough to jeopardize their legal presence as noncitizens. One challenge facing Judge Marks was deciding whether to deport some of them immediately after they had testified. Another challenge was her own biases.

“You have to go through some hypotheticals in your brain,” said Judge Marks, wrestling with the weighty decisions she must make, the little time she has to make them and all the impressions she and her judicial colleagues form from the bench about the **immigrants** before them.

“Would I treat a young person the same way I’m treating this old person?” she said. “Would I treat a black person the same way I’m treating this white person? This situation of rush, rush, rush as fast as we can go, it’s not conducive to doing that.”

Keeping implicit biases out of **immigration** court decisions is both critical and daunting. Claims often rise and fall on testimony alone. Cultural and linguistic misunderstandings are common.

Now, as the country struggles with how these instinctive judgments shape our lives, the Justice Department is trying to minimize the role of bias in law enforcement and the courts. More than 250 federal **immigration** judges attended a mandatory anti-bias training session in August, and this summer the Justice Department announced that 28,000 more employees would go through a similar exercise.

Several current and former **immigration** judges said they thought the sessions were badly needed. But they doubted it would be enough.

Few other areas of the law involve as much discretion — judges approve and deny cases at vastly different rates. And **immigration** judges handle more than 700 cases a year, twice as many as Federal District Court judges.

While there are 277 **immigration** judges today, more than ever before, their combined backlog peaked this summer at over half a million cases, the most in history. For years, the judges union has lobbied Congress, with limited success, for more law clerks and other support staff to offset their burden.

Experts say the conditions that **immigration** judges work under — fast paced, high pressure and culturally charged — make some misjudgments all but inevitable.

“If we have a high cognitive load, you tend to make more mistakes,” said Kelly Tait, who led the judges’ training session.

When the brain has to process large volumes of information quickly, there is a tendency to rely on past experiences rather than on unique details in the present. In judging people, for instance, this can mean falling back on generalizations about race, age, country of origin, religion or gender.

**Immigration** judges suffer higher burnout rates than hospital workers and prison wardens, according to a 2008 study[http://naij-usa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Burnout-and-Stress-Among-United-States-Immigration-Judges\_01-01-08.pdf]. And since that study was published, many of the same courtroom pressures have held strong.

The result means judges often must decide the fate of foreign families in the time it takes to consume a fast-food lunch, wondering whether they are making the right decisions on who deserves to stay and who should go.

Judge Marks, who spoke as president of the National Association of **Immigration** Judges because judges are otherwise barred from speaking to the news media, tends to be more lenient than some of her colleagues. But she said decisions were frequently far from clear-cut.

For example, Jose Roberto, who asked that his last name not be used because of his legal predicament, looked every bit like the hard-working patriarch of a Guatemalan-American family that he is, sitting tall on the witness stand, wearing a sharp gray suit jacket.

He said he was a loyal employee, working the same job at a San Francisco hotel for 31 years, dutifully filing his taxes each year. But he had also been convicted in 2005 of assaulting a lover, which sent him to jail for eight months. Since then, he explained to the judge, he had reconciled with his disabled wife, whom he pledged to care for if he were allowed to stay in the United States.

It was not clear whether his downcast eyes were a sign of contrition or evasion. Still, Judge Marks ended up ruling in his favor.

An **immigrant**’s ability to persuade a judge that the testimony given is true is “the most important factor in any case,” she said later. “That, of course, can be one of the most difficult things to convince someone of when you can’t corroborate with documentation.”

Adding to the confusion, deportation hearings are many **immigrants**’ first experience in a formal legal setting.

“I think it’s almost overwhelming or insurmountable for many of them,” said Eliza Klein, who retired as a federal **immigration** judge in 2015 after more than 20 years. “The stakes are incredibly high. It’s a foreign system.”

More than 40 percent of **immigrants** come to court without a lawyer, but even when lawyers are involved, they say **immigrants** who are educated, articulate and white have an easier time winning the court’s sympathy.

“Something that is familiar is going to feel right even if it’s not,” Ms. Tait, from the judges’ training session, said.

Groups that oppose illegal **immigration** argue that judges spend too much time on weak claims. “The judges are allowing too many cases to be dragged out for too long, which clogs the system,” said Jessica M. Vaughan, director of policy studies at the Center for **Immigration** Studies, which supports giving border patrol and other **immigration** enforcement officers the power to order deportations to alleviate pressure on the courts. “It’s a self-inflicted problem,” she said.

In court, where most testimony is filtered through interpreters, even simple questions can lead to unexpected delays.

The boatworker appearing before Judge Marks, who said he had never become a citizen of any country after the Soviet collapse, interrupted the proceedings at one point because he did not understand a question from several minutes earlier about his arrest.

Down the hall, Judge Rebecca Jamil called Frankly Vasquez-Perez, a 1-year-old boy from Guatemala, for his preliminary deportation hearing.

Frankly’s mother, Esmeralda Perez-Roblero, stepped forward with him on her hip. But when Judge Jamil asked her through an interpreter about her **immigration** status — the mother and child appeared to have crossed the Mexican border together — she stayed silent.

“At home, what language do you speak?” the judge asked.

When she failed to respond again, a lawyer who volunteers to help **immigrants** in preliminary hearings shuffled through her documents. “Her family is probably of indigenous ancestry,” said the lawyer, Marco Ambron.

Judge Jamil continued the hearing, but it was unclear if Ms. Perez-Roblero knew what was going on.

In August, at the judges’ training session, Ms. Tait went over strategies to counteract bias, like focusing on something as innocuous as the color of an **immigrant**’s shirt to prevent cases from bleeding together.

She explained that people who know they are biased against a particular group can try to picture an exemplar of that group whom they hold in high esteem. One of the judges she taught said that when he had felt himself tensing up next to a large African-American man on the witness stand, he pictured President Obama. Another judge said that under similar circumstances he had thought of Nelson Mandela.

The simplest and most effective way to combat bias, however, is to avoid rushing and take breaks, Ms. Tait said. But with more than 500,000 cases pending, **immigration** judges say that slowing down is not an option.

Instead, they will have to resign themselves to cutting corners to get through their work, according to Judge Klein, as she had to do during her career.

“Over time, I think you just get used to those pressures,” she said. “So then the quality of justice erodes over time as well.”

Follow Caitlin Dickerson on Twitter at @itscaitlinhd

\* **Immigrants** Aren’t Taking Americans’ Jobs, New Study Finds[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/22/us/immigrants-arent-taking-americans-jobs-new-study-finds.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This article is part of the Opinion Today newsletter. You can sign up here[http://p.nytimes.com/email/re?location=4z5Q7LhI+KVBjmEgFdYACIRluBsZfcDaRjyYJL3A/v4Olsbjewu/um/F4M0Mu6GIYeyKvnoK8cRrHmbozfsmoSiBA42dOMf3kaZjaWII+sp5jfgmpV7jnipGgXzYMh64&user\_id=d95126ca4f92c44ecb942ecae7e52168&email\_type=20160927%20Opinion%20Today&task\_id=1474979014859490®i\_id=0] to receive more briefings and a guide to the section daily in your inbox.

If you told me that I could change one thing about American politics, I would choose for the country to have a well-functioning conservative party.

I realize that some liberals see that notion as a contradiction. I don’t. There are serious, substantive arguments – even if you don’t agree with them – in favor of reducing the role of government in many areas of life and expanding the role of the market.

There are similarly serious arguments in favor of **immigration** restrictions, abortion restrictions, a more hawkish Syria policy, more competition in education and any number of other conservative positions.

Unfortunately, today’s Republican party doesn’t revolve around these substantive positions. Its leaders often care more about making Democrats look incompetent[http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/10/barack-obama-on-5-days-that-shaped-his-presidency.html], and thus easier to beat, than about policy substance[http://content.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1895706,00.html].

Along the way, they cause government shutdowns, paralyze Washington – and regularly deny basic facts.

Donald Trump has made blatant the party’s current problem with lying. But Trump is more of a reflection of the problem than the cause of it. Remarkably, every Republican presidential candidate this year was untruthful more often than every Democratic candidate, according to the watchdog PolitiFact[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/13/opinion/campaign-stops/all-politicians-lie-some-lie-more-than-others.html] (which was trying so hard to be neutral that it didn’t point out the pattern!).

Keep an eye out for the truth gap at tonight’s vice-presidential debate. Mike Pence, the Republican governor of Indiana, is a likeable, often sunny conservative[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/17/us/politics/mike-pence-ambitious-outsider-gets-the-gop-to-come-around.html], according to those who know him. He is the kind of politician who could make the real conservative arguments I wish we heard more often.

Instead, he is prone to falsehoods.

He’s called[http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2016/sep/04/mike-pence/pence-says-trump-has-been-consistent-immigration-v/] Trump’s back-and-forth **immigration** positions “completely consistent.” He claimed[http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2010/nov/09/mike-pence/mike-pence-says-raising-taxes-lowers-tax-revenues/] that raising income taxes reduced federal revenue. He said[http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2009/may/19/mike-pence/120-million-deprived-health-care-not-correct/] that President Obama’s health law would “deprive roughly 120 million Americans of their current health care coverage.” And Pence lied[http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2016/jul/21/mike-pence/mike-pences-false-claim-about-clintons-role-and-re/] about Hillary Clinton’s actions during the Benghazi attacks.

No politician is perfectly honest – including Tim Kaine[http://www.politifact.com/personalities/tim-kaine/], Pence’s opponent tonight. But Pence and his party have earned an extra degree of skepticism. When he says something, you should check it out.

I invite you to follow me on Twitter (@DLeonhardt[https://twitter.com/DLeonhardt]) and join me on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/DavidRLeonhardt/].

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The voters of the world have had quite a year: They rejected Colombia’s peace deal[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/colombia-peace-deal-defeat.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news]; split Britain from the European Union[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/britain-brexit-european-union-referendum.html]; endorsed a Thai Constitution[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/09/world/asia/thailand-junta-constitution-opposition.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FThailand&action=click&contentCollection=world®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=collection] that curtails democracy; and, in Hungary, backed the government’s plan to restrict refugees, but without the necessary turnout for a valid result.

Each of these moves was determined by a national referendum. Though voters upended their governments’ plans, eroded their own rights and ignited political crises, they all accomplished one thing: demonstrating why many political scientists consider referendums to be messy and dangerous.

When asked whether referendums were a good idea, Michael Marsh, a political scientist at Trinity College Dublin, said, “The simple answer is almost never.”

“I’ve watched many of these in Ireland, and they really range from the pointless to the dangerous,” he added.

Though such votes are portrayed as popular governance in its purest form, studies have found that they often subvert democracy rather than serve it. They tend to be volatile, turning not just on the merits of the decision but also on unrelated political swings or even, as may have happened in Colombia[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/colombia/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], on the weather. Voters must make their decisions with relatively little information, forcing them to rely on political messaging — which puts power in the hands of political elites rather than those of voters.

“This is a tool that’s risky, but politicians keep using it because they think that they’ll win,” said Alexandra Cirone, a fellow at the London School of Economics. But often they do not win, and instead of resolving political problems, the referendums create new ones. Looking over the research on these votes, it becomes clear why many experts are skeptical.

‘Short cuts’ to hard answers

Voters face a problem in any referendum: They need to distill difficult policy choices down to a simple yes or no, and predict the outcome of decisions so complex that even experts might spend years struggling to understand them.

Voters typically solve this problem by finding what the political scientists Arthur Lupia and Mathew D. McCubbins have termed “short cuts[http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam034/97018130.pdf].” The voters follow the guidance of trusted authority figures or fit the choice within a familiar narrative.

When a referendum is put forward by the government, people often vote in support if they like the leadership and vote in opposition if they dislike it, according to research by Lawrence LeDuc, a political scientist and professor emeritus at the University of Toronto.

“A vote that is supposed to be about an important public issue ends up instead being about the popularity or unpopularity of a particular party or leader, the record of the government, or some set of issues or events that are not related to the subject of the referendum,” Professor LeDuc wrote in a 2015 paper[http://www.sciencedirect.com.sci-hub.cc/science/article/pii/S0261379415000384].

In Colombia, for example, most regions that voted for President Juan Manuel Santos in 2014 also voted for[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/oct/02/colombia-referendum-rejects-peace-deal-with-farc] the peace deal, and vice versa.

Voters may also cope with complex issues by shoehorning them into existing ideological beliefs.

This dynamic plays out in virtually every referendum — especially those with higher stakes.

Imposing a narrative

Politicians or other powerful actors will often reframe the referendum into simplistic, straightforward narratives. The result is that votes become less about the actual policy question than about contests between abstract values, or between which narrative voters find more appealing.

In Britain’s debate over whether to leave the European Union, or “Brexit,” neither side emphasized the specifics of membership in the bloc, instead framing the vote as a choice about which values to emphasize. The “Remain” campaign presented membership as a matter of economic stability. The “Leave” campaign emphasized **immigration**.

It worked. People who voted to remain expressed great concern about the economy, but not much about **immigrants**. People who voted to leave said they were very concerned about **immigration**, and less so about the economy.

In Colombia, Mr. Santos presented the referendum as a vote on peace, but the opposition presented it as a decision on whether the country’s largest rebel group, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/revolutionary\_armed\_forces\_of\_colombia/index.html?inline=nyt-org], known as the FARC[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/revolutionary\_armed\_forces\_of\_colombia/index.html?inline=nyt-org], was entitled to leniency. Neither narrative fully portrayed the question of whether the peace deal would be worthwhile.

Colombia, Ms. Cirone said, also highlighted that “in contexts where the referendum addresses a historical political issue, it may be hard for voters to separate past experiences with what is best for the country in the future.”

In Thailand, the military-led government held a referendum in August to approve a new Constitution that would entrench its power and curtail elements of democracy. But the military also promised elections only after the Constitution passed, in effect selling an anti-democratic document as the pro-elections choice. The measure passed.

Democracy as a tool for the powerful

Though presented as putting power in the hands of the people, referendums are often intended to put a stamp of popular legitimacy on something leaders have already decided to do.

“It doesn’t have a lot to do with whether this should be decided by the people,” Ms. Cirone said. “It has to do with whether a politician can gain an advantage from putting a question to the people.”

For example, David Cameron, until July the British prime minister, held the vote on whether to depart the European Union expecting that it would bolster his decision to stay in the bloc and would thus silence British politicians who wanted to leave.

The Thai military restricted news coverage of the draft Constitution, ensuring that there was no counternarrative that might portray it as a threat to democracy. By giving the appearance of popular input, the military in fact dampened it.

Prime Minister Viktor Orban of Hungary most likely devised his country’s referendum[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/hungary-to-vote-on-accepting-more-migrants-as-europe-watches.html] — on whether to reject European Union requirements for accepting refugees — to pre-empt inevitable objections in the bloc to his anti-migrant policies and to bolster his political standing at home. In both cases, it was about using the vote as an instrument to strengthen himself.

High-risk, high-reward votes for peace

This stamp of popular legitimacy, though, can sometimes be a good thing, settling contentious national disputes that might otherwise lead to political turmoil or even to armed conflict. But it is precisely because the stakes are so high that the risks are, as well.

Northern Ireland’s Good Friday[https://www-britannica-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/topic/Good-Friday-Agreement] peace deal in 1998 was followed by two referendums, one in Northern Ireland and one in the Republic of Ireland. That gave communities a sense of having been included, and marginalized anyone who wanted to keep fighting, making a relapse into conflict less likely.

This shows an important way referendums are different from regular elections: They succeed only when the nation perceives the vote as reflecting popular will. That works best if turnout is high and one side wins in a landslide, as happened in Northern Ireland’s 1998 vote.

But in Colombia, turnout was just 38 percent, and the vote was split almost perfectly down the middle, meaning a few thousand people swung the outcome. Even if the referendum had passed, it would have failed to give the peace deal popular legitimacy.

That problem can be solved by requiring high turnout and a landslide victory for a referendum to be binding, Ms. Cirone said. But in a puzzling decision, neither Colombia nor Britain required more than 50 percent of the vote for either side to win.

A low-turnout, close result like Colombia’s can risk deepening political disputes rather than bridging them. Leaders have to choose whether to accept a result that does not demonstrably reflect popular will, or reject the result and risk a political backlash or a constitutional crisis.

‘Russian roulette for republics’

National referendums can also be extremely volatile, driven by factors unrelated to the issue’s merits and outside anyone’s control.

Opinion polls are often misleading, because people do not form their opinions until immediately before the vote. Tellingly, they often abandon those views just as quickly.

Professor Marsh of Trinity College Dublin said he had found, in some cases, that “most people can’t remember any arguments for — this is about a week later — they can’t remember any arguments against, and they’re not really quite sure why they voted yes or no.”

He added, “That doesn’t inspire me, really, with referendums.”

The ambient noise of politics can also distort popular will: Whether one party is up or down in the polls, whether intraparty infighting over the vote spills into public, and how the news media portrays related issues all play a role.

Votes are also subject to random factors, including the weather. In Colombia, turnout for the referendum may have been depressed by a hurricane that hit the day before, forcing evacuations in some areas.

“The idea that somehow any decision reached anytime by majority rule is necessarily ‘democratic’ is a perversion of the term,” Kenneth Rogoff, an economics professor at Harvard, wrote after Britain’s vote[https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/brexit-democratic-failure-for-uk-by-kenneth-rogoff-2016-06] to leave the European Union.

“This isn’t democracy; it is Russian roulette for republics,” he added.

Follow Amanda Taub @amandataub and Max Fisher @Max\_Fisher on Twitter.

\* ‘Brexit’ Talks Will Start by End of March, Theresa May Says[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/03/world/europe/brexit-talks-march-theresa-may-britain.html]

\* Thai Leader Links Attacks on Tourist Sites to Constitution Change[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/13/world/asia/thai-leader-links-attacks-on-tourist-sites-to-constitution-change.html]

\* Making Sense of ‘Brexit’ in 4 Charts[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/world/europe/making-sense-of-brexit-in-4-charts.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It’s safe to say Tuesday’s vice-presidential debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/us/politics/tim-kaine-mike-pence-debate.html] won’t rival the Hillary Clinton-Donald Trump rumble for great television moments. It features two middle-aged, white, Midwest-raised politicians who call themselves “boring” (Tim Kaine) and “B-list” (Mike Pence). And running mates play an even smaller role than usual in 2016, given the outsized personalities at the top of the tickets. But if these two men are willing to seriously engage the issues (and the rest of us are willing to stay awake), they could provide useful insights into their sharply contrasting plans for the future.

Such an exchange would be particularly illuminating on the Republican side.

Even to many in his own party, Mr. Pence, a former congressman and the sitting Indiana governor, struck a Faustian bargain by joining the Trump ticket. But he has tried to articulate a different set of principles, in contrast to dead-enders like Rudolph Giuliani, Newt Gingrich and Chris Christie. If Mr. Trump loses, Mr. Pence will likely be part of a rump of Republican leaders left to pick up the pieces and focus the party in a more positive direction.

Left largely on his own while the Trump inner circle fights fires (and each other), Mr. Pence has been trying to reassure conservatives and evangelicals that he’ll represent them. A social conservative, his anti-abortion, anti-gay stances are deeply at odds with many Americans’ views. At the same time, he has rejected Mr. Trump’s attacks on the family of an American Muslim soldier killed in Iraq, and distanced himself from Mr. Trump’s “birther” campaign.

Though he says he’s against Obamacare, as governor he backed the Medicaid expansion that was central to it. He has waffled on the legal fate of 11 million undocumented **immigrants**, but he has not come out in favor of deporting them. He can legitimately claim firsthand experience and some successes confronting the hollowing-out of the American manufacturing economy. Mr. Pence may in fact be in a better position than Mr. Trump to reinforce the ticket’s appeal to working-class voters, given Mr. Trump’s recent preoccupation with personal attacks and bizarre tweets.

Mr. Kaine, the junior senator from Virginia and its former governor, will field the first question of the debate from Elaine Quijano of CBS News, the moderator. At some point he’ll surely attack Mr. Trump’s income tax filings. But it might be more interesting, given his fluent Spanish and service as a missionary in Honduras, to hear a clearer articulation of the Clinton campaign’s vague promise of “comprehensive **immigration** reform.” What would that legislation contain, and how could it succeed?

Mr. Kaine could also spell out more fully why Mrs. Clinton reversed her position on the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement. The campaign says it had to do with specific weaknesses in the agreement, but her turnabout still mystifies many voters.

The debate is set in Mr. Kaine’s home state, Virginia, known for weak laws on influence peddling. What are Mr. Kaine’s ideas for fulfilling a pledge to carry out tougher campaign finance laws?

This is the only time the vice-presidential nominees will debate before the election. Compared with the flaming barbecue that was last week’s presidential debate, this one seems like boiled cauliflower. But a helping of policy substance might be good for everybody.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — A short-handed Supreme Court[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/supreme\_court/index.html?inline=nyt-org] on Monday turned down a request from the Obama administration to reconsider a major **immigration** decision, dooming for now President Obama[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack\_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per]’s plan to spare millions of undocumented **immigrants** from deportation.

The court also declined to hear more than 1,000 petitions seeking review in cases that had piled up during the justices’ summer break. Among them were ones concerning what college athletes may earn, the Washington Redskins’ trademarks and a campaign finance investigation in Wisconsin. Adhering to its custom, the court did not give reasons for turning down the cases.

The request that the justices rehear the **immigration** case came after a deadlock in the case[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/supreme-court-immigration-obama-dapa.html?\_r=0] in June. The 4 to 4 tie left in place an appeals court ruling that had blocked Mr. Obama’s plan, which also would have allowed the undocumented **immigrants** to work legally in the United States.

The Supreme Court has been without its standard nine members since Justice Antonin Scalia died in February. The tie vote in the case, United States v. Texas, No. 15-674, set no precedent. The court did not disclose how the justices had voted.

The administration’s petition seeking rehearing[http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/15-674-Petition-for-Rehearing.pdf] said a matter of such importance should be resolved by a nine-member Supreme Court, which “should be the final arbiter of these matters through a definitive ruling.”

The administration acknowledged that the **immigration** case was at an early stage and could again reach the court in a later appeal. But the petition said there was a “strong need for definitive resolution by this court at this stage.”

The Supreme Court also declined to hear a case about whether the N.C.A.A. violated federal antitrust laws by restricting what college athletes can earn.

Last year, the federal appeals court in California issued a decision[http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/ncaa-op-below.pdf] that managed to make both sides unhappy. The court ruled against the association, saying its amateurism rule violated the antitrust laws.

But the court went on to say that the association may restrict colleges from compensating athletes beyond offering scholarships and a few thousand dollars for “the cost of attendance.”[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/18/sports/ncaas-top-conferences-to-allow-aid-for-athletes-full-bills.html] The appeals court rejected a trial judge’s proposed alternative[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/08/09/sports/09obannondoc.html] that colleges be allowed to pay athletes up to $5,000 a year in deferred compensation.

Both sides sought Supreme Court review in N.C.A.A v. O’Bannon, No. 15-1388 and O’Bannon v. N.C.A.A., No. 15-1167.

The case was brought by Ed O’Bannon[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/10/sports/ncaabasketball/understanding-ed-obannons-suit-against-the-ncaa.html], a former basketball star at the University of California, Los Angeles, and other current and former college football and basketball players. They sought compensation for the commercial use of their names and images in video games, archival recording and the like.

The N.C.A.A. responded that college athletes were amateurs and that the distinctive nature of college sports would be destroyed by turning a scholastic model into a professional one.

The association also sought review of a related appeals court ruling. The association said the First Amendment allowed use of the athletes’ names and likenesses without compensation. The lower courts are divided[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/02/sunday-review/between-the-first-amendment-and-right-of-publicity.html?smid=tw-share] on the legal standards for when commercial uses of celebrities’ images require payments to them.

The Supreme Court also turned down a petition from the Washington Redskins, who sought review of a decision denying them federal trademark protection. But the basic question in that case — whether a federal law on disparaging trademarks violates the First Amendment — is already before the justices in a case they agreed to hear on Thursday[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/us/politics/supreme-court-trademarks-redskins.html], Lee v. Tam, No. 15-1293.

On Monday, the justices refused to hear the Redskins case, Pro-Football Inc. v. Blackhorse, No. 15-1311, probably because it is still pending before a federal appeals court.

The Supreme Court also declined to hear a campaign finance case arising from an investigation into campaign spending in Wisconsin.

Last year, the Wisconsin Supreme Court shut down an investigation[https://www.wicourts.gov/sc/opinion/DisplayDocument.pdf?content=pdf&seqNo=144525] into spending to oppose a 2012 effort to recall Gov. Scott Walker, a Republican. The court also ordered prosecutors to destroy the documents they had gathered.

The Guardian recently disclosed[https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/ng-interactive/2016/sep/14/john-doe-files-scott-walker-corporate-cash-american-politics] about 1,500 pages of the documents, which seemed to show substantial coordination between candidates and ostensibly independent groups.

The public version[https://www.scribd.com/doc/310939038/John-Doe-Cert-Redacted] of the prosecutors’ request for United States Supreme Court review was heavily redacted but appeared to address two main questions: whether the Wisconsin Supreme Court had been too lax in policing coordination between candidates and independent groups, and whether two State Supreme Court justices who had benefited from campaign spending should have recused themselves.

In a brief[https://www.doj.state.wi.us/sites/default/files/news-media/John%20Doe%20Brief%20in%20Opposition.pdf] urging the United States Supreme Court not to hear the case — Chisholm v. Two Unnamed Petitioners, No. 15-1416 — the state’s attorney general, Brad D. Schimel, said the Wisconsin Legislature had codified the state Supreme Court’s interpretation of the law, meaning that there was nothing to review.

“The people of Wisconsin thus made as clear as they possibly could that they wish to put this unfortunate chapter behind them,” Mr. Schimel wrote.

He added that there had been no need for the two justices, Michael J. Gableman and David T. Prosser, to disqualify themselves. A 2009 Supreme Court decision[https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/08pdf/08-22.pdf] that required a West Virginia Supreme Court justice to recuse himself from a case involving a campaign supporter, Mr. Schimel wrote, concerned a more extreme potential conflict.

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/nytpolitics], and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics/].

\* Supreme Court Tie Blocks Obama **Immigration** Plan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/supreme-court-immigration-obama-dapa.html]

\* Supreme Court Faces Volatile, Even if Not Blockbuster, Docket[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/us/politics/supreme-court-faces-volatile-even-if-not-blockbuster-docket.html]

\* Law on Disparaging Trademarks Gets Supreme Court Review[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/us/politics/supreme-court-trademarks-redskins.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Every day this week, as part of our Civil Conversation Challenge, we will open a new Student Opinion forum on one of the big issues dividing Americans this campaign season.

We invite teenagers from around the country and the world to practice the skills of respectful, informed conversation[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/learning/lesson-plans/talking-across-divides-10-ways-to-encourage-civil-classroom-conversation-on-difficult-issues.html] across ideological and demographic divides not only by posting their own t houghts on these issues , but also by reading the r esponses of others and replying to them.

As we moderate, we’ll be looking for exchanges between students tha t...

1. Follow Times commenting standards[http://www.nytimes.com/content/help/site/usercontent/usercontent.html] and are civil and respectful.

2. Advance the conversation about an issue, whether by introducing a new idea or perspective, asking useful questions, making connections to other issues, finding themes or commonalities among comments, presenting new evidence, or anything else.

3. Are grounded in fact and buttressed by sources. This is not to say that everything you post must be footnoted sentence by sentence, but commenters should provide reliable sources for any controversial claims.

4. Show evidence of “listening” and trying to understand other points of view.

Learn more about the Challenge, which continues t hrough Nov. 7 , and find a lesson plan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/learning/lesson-plans/talking-across-divides-10-ways-to-encourage-civil-classroom-conversation-on-difficult-issues.html] to help .

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Some background on the issue:

Though many Democrats and Republicans agree that the United States’ **immigration** system is “broken,”[http://www.businessinsider.com/immigration-data-charts-reform-illegal-2013-1?op=1] the two parties, and their candidates, hold sharply different views on why it is broken and how it should be fixed.

Republicans are more likely to say that **immigrants** have a negative effect on American society, crime and the economy, while Democrats are more likely to say that **immigrants** coming to the United States make American society better in the long run, a Pew Research Center study found[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/09/30/on-views-of-immigrants-americans-largely-split-along-party-lines/].

Right now, an estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** live, work and raise families in the United States. Should they have a path to citizenship[http://www.democrats.org/issues/immigration-reform]? Or should America “oppose any form of amnesty[https://www.gop.com/platform/reforming-government/] for those who, by breaking the law, have disadvantaged those who have obeyed it”? And with the world facing the largest refugee crisis since World War II[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/06/09/world/migrants-global-refugee-crisis-mediterranean-ukraine-syria-rohingya-malaysia-iraq.html], should the United States welcome [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/22/world/asia/refugees-must-not-be-turned-away-obama-says.html] Syrian refugees and other migrants[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/22/world/asia/refugees-must-not-be-turned-away-obama-says.html] — or are they too great[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/transcript-trump-immigration-speech.html] a threat to safety[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/transcript-trump-immigration-speech.html] because of the possibility of terrorism?

This isn’t a new problem. Go back in history to the Chinese Exclusion Act[http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=47] (1882), the National Origins Act[https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act] (1924) and the **Immigration** and Nationality Act of 1965, and it’s clear that the United States has been wrestling with **immigration** issues for a long time.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Where to learn more:

• Hillary Clinton’s position[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/immigration-reform/]

• Donald J. Trump’s position[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/policies/immigration/?/positions/immigration-reform]

• ProCon’s 2016 issues page[http://2016election.procon.org/], which puts the candidates’ positions side by side

• Our lesson plan, Border Politics: Debating **Immigration** Policy[http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/12/10/border-politics-debating-immigration-policy/], which provides much more detail and links to related articles

• A Times article from September, “Explaining What Donald Trump Wants to Do Now on **Immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-far-from-softening-lays-out-tough-immigration-plans.html]”

• A Times article from May, “A Path to Citizenship, Hillary Clinton Says, ‘Is at Its Heart a Family Issue’[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/05/05/a-path-to-citizenship-clinton-says-is-at-its-heart-a-family-issue/]”

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Possible questions to address:

— Why does this topic interest you? How have your experiences shaped your opinions? What questions or concerns does this topic raise for you?

— How do you see current **immigration** trends? In general, how would you answer the Pew Research Center’s question[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/09/30/on-views-of-immigrants-americans-largely-split-along-party-lines/] about whether **immigrants** coming to the United States make American society better or worse in the long run? Why?

— Mr. Trump has made building a wall[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/20/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html] along the entire border between the United States and Mexico a central promise of his campaign to tighten border security. He has also insisted that the Mexican government must pay for that wall. Do you think building such a wall would be good public policy as it would prevent undocumented **immigrants** from entering the United States and stop cross-bordercrossborder illegal activity, or do you think it would cause more problems than it would solve?

— Mr. Trump repeatedly called for mass deportations[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/19/us/politics/with-tough-immigration-talk-gop-again-risks-losing-latinos.html] to remove the millions of undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States, though his position on this issue has shifted[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html] since the end of the primaries. Do you support this policy? Do deportations “break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**,” as Mr. Trump has said[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/transcript-trump-immigration-speech.html]? If so, how would the government find and deport these 11 million people, many of whom have children who were born here? And what would be the consequences[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/20/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html] for families, communities and the American economy if that happened?

Or do you support President Obama’s position, that as long as Congress remains unwilling or unable to act on **immigration** reform, he would like to shield[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/21/us/obama-immigration-speech.html] millions of undocumented **immigrants** from deportation and allow many to work in the United States legally? What do you think of the idea that undocumented **immigrants** with no criminal record should be allowed to live and work in the United States without fear of being deported?

— Instead of forcibly removing undocumented **immigrants** from the United States, should the government offer them a clear path to citizenship? Some argue that this would be unfair to **immigrants** who have legally applied for citizenship and are waiting their turn. Others argue that unskilled workers with no family in the United States have almost no chance[http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5404217] of obtaining a green card, according to current law[http://reason.org/files/a87d1550853898a9b306ef458f116079.pdf]. What do you think? Should Congress and the president give **immigrants** a pathway to full and equal citizenship, a position that Hillary Clinton supports[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/05/05/a-path-to-citizenship-clinton-says-is-at-its-heart-a-family-issue/]?

— Millions of refugees have fled the civil war ravaging Syria. Three countries alone — Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan — together have taken in over four million Syrian refugees[http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php]. The White House announced at the end of August that it had accepted nearly 12,000 Syrian refugees[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/30/us/syrian-refugees-in-the-united-states.html] since the civil war began five years ago. Some argue that the Syrian situation is “the most pressing humanitarian crisis of our time[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/31/us/politics/as-us-admits-migrants-in-a-trickle-critics-urge-obama-to-pick-up-the-pace.html]” and that the United States has a moral responsibility to continue to open its doors to these refugees. Others, such as Mr. Trump and many Republican leaders[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/17/us/politics/gop-governors-vow-to-close-doors-to-syrian-refugees.html], say the United States should close its borders to Syrian refugees since they may pose a terrorist threat. What do you think?

— No matter who wins the presidential election, **immigration** issues will not go away. “Nearly 60 million people have been driven from their homes by war and persecution,” The Times reported in June[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/18/world/60-million-people-fleeing-chaotic-lands-un-says.html]. In “a world where new conflicts are erupting and old ones are refusing to subside,” how should the United States think long-term about the **immigration** questions raised this election season? Why?

— What more would you like to say? Start a conversation, or join one, by posting a comment.

Please Note: Students 13 and older are invited to comment. We ask that adults respect the intent of the Student Opinion question and refrain from posting here. There are many other places on NYTimes.com[http://NYTimes.com] for adults to post, while this is the only place that explicitly invites the voices of young people.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MIAMI — For decades, being Latino in Florida almost always meant being Republican. Miami was the undisputed capital of Cuban exiles who had fled the Communist government — they were most of the state’s Latinos — and by the 1980s a large majority had registered with the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org].

But a glimpse at the state voter rolls these days, where the names Samuel Del Valle, Maria Flores and Oswaldo Muñoz all appear as Democrats or independents, makes clear how much has changed in one of the nation’s most important swing states, one that will be important for Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] in November.

In March, Mr. Del Valle, newly arrived from Puerto Rico, stood in front of a voter registration table, staring at the four relatively unfamiliar choices in front of him: Florida Democratic Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/d/democratic\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org], Republican Party of Florida, No Party Affiliation, Minor Party.

Back home, major political parties go by different names and their differences hinge on the island’s status as an American commonwealth: Should Puerto Rico seek statehood, remain a commonwealth or opt for independence from the United States? But here, he had a new choice to make.

“I chose Democrat,” said Mr. Del Valle, 34, who lives in St. Cloud, in the Orlando area, and who represents one big reason Florida’s Latinos are no longer a predictably Republican vote: the fast-growing Puerto Rican population.

When Ms. Flores, the American-born daughter of Cuban refugees, arrived at her new junior high school in Miami from New Orleans three decades ago, the city’s Cubanía — its Cuban sensibility — jolted her.

But she adapted quickly. Spanglish soon became her third language. She mastered the Cuban greeting — an air kiss doled out as abundantly as, well, air, even if you just met the person. Then, at 18, she participated in another Miami Cuban rite of passage: She registered to vote as a Republican.

“My parents were Republican, and they were happy with it,” Ms. Flores said in her living room, the smell of rice and beans floating in from the kitchen.

But in 2008, Ms. Flores, 43, a legal secretary and single mother, did what was once unthinkable. She re-registered as a Democrat, another sign Republican candidates can no longer count on Florida’s Latinos.

From his offices in Doral, a suburb of Miami, Mr. Muñoz, an entrepreneur from Venezuela, commands an empire of newspapers and websites that stretches across Florida to Panama and Spain. Mr. Muñoz, 64, is one of the Latin American **immigrants** who have contributed to the diversity and growth of Doral, which is now 80 percent Latino. Many, like Mr. Muñoz, arrived with means, while others started with nothing, drawn by the pull of American opportunity.

When he came here two decades ago, Doral was a warren of cargo warehouses. But as Venezuelans fled the economic depredations of a socialist president, Hugo Chávez[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/hugo\_chavez/index.html?inline=nyt-per], and his successor, Nicolás Maduro, Mr. Muñoz gained readers for his publications, which are known as El Venezolano[http://elvenezolanonews.com/]. A restaurant serving arepas, Venezuela’s signature corn pancakes, became a social center of Doral.

Cubans, Colombians and Dominicans also moved in, building walled, palm-lined golf course communities. More than 200 companies based their headquarters in Doral. And Mr. Muñoz sold lots of ads.

In his columns, Mr. Muñoz rails against the leftist government that has reduced Venezuelans to hunger[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/20/world/americas/venezuelans-ransack-stores-as-hunger-stalks-crumbling-nation.html]. But in regard to American politics, Mr. Muñoz, a naturalized citizen, is a registered independent who votes Democratic — yet another reason the vote in Florida may be so competitive.

Ten years ago, Republicans had a registration edge among the state’s Latinos — 37 percent were Republicans, 33 percent were Democrats and 28 percent independents, according to official figures. This year, the party lags among Latinos, with 26 percent registered as Republicans, 37 percent as Democrats and 35 percent as independents. And the independents increasingly lean Democratic, particularly among new **immigrants** and Puerto Ricans.

“The Hispanic vote in Florida was reliably conservative and now is becoming reliably Democrat,” said Fernand R. Amandi, a pollster who has extensively surveyed Latinos in this crucial swing state[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/09/19/upshot/florida-poll-clinton-trump.html] whose 29 electoral votes are very much up for grabs, and could determine the outcome of the presidential race.

Still, much remains up in the air. Strong Latino candidates who are Republicans, like Senator Marco Rubio[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/marco-rubio-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], still command loyal votes. And in Miami, Representative Carlos Curbelo, a Cuban-American Republican, and Joe Garcia, a Cuban-American Democrat, are in close duel in which Mr. Garcia is trying to retake the congressional seat Mr. Curbelo won from him two years ago.

There are few places in America where Latino voting power is as fluid as in Florida. Here are three snapshots.

Lured by Change

MIAMI — Ms. Flores was never enamored of politics. But the more she heard her bosses, a group of lawyers, talk, the more she realized she had a kinship with Democrats on issues that affected her. As with so many people who switch parties, her decision was also driven by the top of the ticket, Barack Obama, in 2008.

“I was a single mom with two kids, and he represented change, and helping people like me, and equality,” she said.

She worried about getting laid off. She worried about how she could afford to get her son a car and pay for college. Yet, she said, the Republican Party didn’t speak to her. Instead, it fumed about abortion and religious rights and **immigration**. “It was ‘God says this and God says that,’” she said.

Her father and son, in different ways, are moving in similar directions.

Her father, Rolando Bocos, a former yacht builder who once served five years in a Cuban prison after the government charged his brother with carrying a weapon, is no Democrat. “I think they are Communists,” Mr. Bocos said. But now, he will not vote for Republicans, either. “It doesn’t matter Republican, Democrat, to me anymore,” said Mr. Bocos, 77. At his age, he said, “I’m only interested in Medicare[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/medicare/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and Social Security[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social\_security\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].” He said he would not vote this year.

Ms. Flores’s 21-year-old son, Alex, a student at Florida International University, drifted toward the Democrats because of social issues — gay rights (his godfather and some of his cousins are gay), religious tolerance, female empowerment. “I knew which side fit my moral compass,” he said. Last year, he became president of the university’s College Democrats.

Ms. Flores laughed at the unexpected turn in her life. “It’s funny that I came to Miami and became a Democrat.”

The Exile Experience

DORAL, Fla. — The transformation of Doral reflects the broader changes across South Florida. Cuban-Americans no longer dominate, but are now part of a Hispanic mix that includes a wave of **immigrants** from Latin America. Although many Venezuelans, Colombians and Brazilians have escaped leftist politics at home, once they become Americans they typically become Democrats.

Their voting power is limited, but growing. Many **immigrants** in Doral have not been here long enough to become naturalized, so there are only about 20,000 registered voters among 56,000 residents. But the trend away from Republican dominance is clear: 29 percent are Democrats and 46 percent are registered as independents. Only 24 percent are Republicans.

Mr. Muñoz said Cubans have welcomed Venezuelans to Miami, seeing in them a similar exile experience. The feeling is mutual. “We live close to their pain, so we understand it,” he said.

But there are differences. Venezuelans reject anything that reminds them of Mr. Chávez’s authoritarian rule, but they still favor the expansive government role in health care and education that Democrats support. Many Venezuelans are suspicious of the back-room politics they see in the entrenched Miami Republican establishment.

Unlike Cuban exiles, who benefit from special entry to the United States, Venezuelans — and other Latin **immigrants** — have no easy path. Some Doral residents are undocumented.

“We are **immigrants**, and we will always be **immigrants**,” Mr. Muñoz said.

This year’s race for mayor of Doral reflects the changes. The incumbent, Luigi Boria, is a self-made businessman from Venezuela. A registered independent, he is a Republican in practice and a conservative Christian pastor whose priority has been to promote and bring order to the city’s frenetic growth.

He is facing a challenge from Sandra Ruiz, a Democrat and popular Mexican-American councilwoman who moved here years ago from San Diego. She zips around town in a car decorated with her photograph. Ms. Ruiz says Mr. Boria is too partial to developers and has failed to include lower-income residents in city programs.

Even though Mr. Boria is a compatriot, Mr. Muñoz and his newspapers are supporting Ms. Ruiz. Warily recalling Mr. Chavez’s multiterm rule in Venezuela, he thinks one term for Mr. Boria is enough.

But in Doral — as among Florida Latinos overall — the person pushing Latinos toward the Democrats this year is the Republican nominee, Mr. Trump. The owner of a golf course here, Mr. Trump persuaded Doral to host the Miss Universe beauty pageant in January 2015. The taxpayers ended up paying $1.1 million to Mr. Trump’s organization, Mr. Boria confirmed. But the exposure was a boon to local businesses, and Mr. Boria proposed giving Mr. Trump a key to the city.

But when Mr. Trump began his campaign[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/17/us/politics/donald-trump-runs-for-president-this-time-for-real-he-says.html] last year attacking Mexican **immigrants** as criminals, it cast a shadow on Doral. Ms. Ruiz was offended.

“I felt Doral lost the city’s entire investment the moment he opened his mouth regarding Hispanics,” Ms. Ruiz said.

The feeling of insult was heightened after Mr. Trump waged a relentless Twitter assault on Alicia Machado, a former Miss Universe who is Venezuelan, whose story was highlighted by Mrs. Clinton last week’s presidential debate. Mr. Trump called her “disgusting” because she had gained weight after her pageant victory.

In an interview in Mr. Muñoz’s publications, Ms. Machado, who became an American citizen this year, exhorted Latino voters to learn from her experience: “We can’t risk having such a violent, bad-tempered, macho person as Trump as our president.”

Mr. Muñoz explained that Mr. Trump, although a Republican, reminds him and many other Venezuelans of their leftist nemesis, Mr. Chávez. “It’s his arrogance, his intolerance, the way he insults people who disagree with him,” Mr. Muñoz said.

Speaking His Language

ST. CLOUD, Fla. — When Samuel Del Valle became a Democrat, he joined a huge influx of American citizens streaming into Central Florida — Puerto Ricans, who are helping reshape the party’s political identity. Their growing presence along the state’s Interstate 4 corridor is a chief reason Florida’s Latino vote has veered away from Republicans.

For Mr. Del Valle, a teacher and college graduate, the choice this election season is easy. He liked the Clintons. He also liked President Obama. He even liked Jeb Bush[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/jeb-bush-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], but Mr. Bush dropped out of the race. Ultimately, though, he knew enough about the Democratic Party to know it spoke his language, he said.

“They are super on minorities, and women and gays,” said Mr. Del Valle as his wife, Verónica Rivera, unloaded boxes inside the small apartment they rented recently in St. Cloud. “They support the Arabs, the Indians, the Latinos — all of us are different and have different cultures.”

For the Republican Party, though, the thousands of Puerto Ricans who have fled the island’s economic collapse remain within reach. Like many Latinos, they tend to hold conservative values; new to the mainland and without strong partisan preconceptions, they are open to Republican ideas in ways that Puerto Ricans in the North are not. With the right candidate, Puerto Ricans here are open to Republican courtship.

Despite the Latino firestorm over Mr. Trump and his talk of border walls, Mr. Del Valle says he finds traces of redemption in him.

“I like some Republican ideas,” he said. The party, he added, stands for patriotism, law and order, discipline in government and a strong military. These ideas are appealing to many Puerto Ricans who have confronted high murder rates and deep-rooted government corruption, but who also boast high levels of military service.

“Trump does mention things that are true,” Mr. Del Valle said. “It’s a big border and people are coming illegally.”

So far, though, that is not enough to sway Puerto Rican voters. Their growing alliance with Democrats is strongly rooted in the candidates’ words and attitudes, and the signals they send about whether Latinos are welcome here as equals.

“I see myself as a Latino who wants to contribute to the United States,” Mr. Del Valle said. “And the Democrats are saying things that I want to hear about Latinos.”

\* New Hillary Clinton Ads Look to Expand Lead With Hispanic Voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/us/politics/new-hillary-clinton-ads-look-to-expand-lead-with-hispanic-voters.html]

\* Google Searches for Voter Registration Have Surged in Hispanic Areas[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/upshot/trump-effect-voter-registration-may-be-surging-in-hispanic-areas.html]

\* 27 Million Potential Hispanic Votes. But What Will They Really Add Up To?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/27-million-potential-hispanic-votes-but-what-will-they-really-add-up-to.html]

\* How Republicans Lost Their Best Shot at the Hispanic Vote[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/how-republicans-lost-their-best-shot-at-the-hispanic-vote.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is American politics in 2016: the normalization of the deeply abnormal, the collapse of customs of behavior and respect, and the creation of an environment so toxic and polarized that the nation’s leaders struggle to carry out the most basic tasks of government.

In this chaotic climate, it can be easy to forget that the Supreme Court, which begins a new term on Monday, remains without a ninth justice nearly seven months after President Obama nominated Merrick Garland[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/17/opinion/merrick-garland-for-the-supreme-court.html] to fill the vacancy created by the death of Justice Antonin Scalia in February. That seat is likely to stay empty until well into 2017, and depending on which party wins the White House and controls the Senate, possibly long beyond that.

This is entirely contrary to the workings of a constitutional government, and it is inflicting damage on the court and the country. But the Senate Republicans care nothing about that as they continue their unprecedented stonewalling of Judge Garland’s nomination in the hopes of preserving the court’s conservative majority.

Meanwhile, the eight justices have split evenly in several major cases, which puts off any final judgment on lawsuits that affect millions of Americans. These include challenges to the right of public-sector unions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/30/us/politics/friedrichs-v-california-teachers-association-union-fees-supreme-court-ruling.html] to charge collective bargaining fees to nonmembers, to religious exemptions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/17/us/supreme-court-contraception-religious-groups.html] from the Affordable Care Act’s birth-control mandate and to the legality of President Obama’s executive actions on **immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/us/supreme-court-immigration-obama-dapa.html].

The inability to issue precedent-setting rulings appears to have led the justices to grant review on fewer new cases[http://www.scotusblog.com/statistics/] than usual[http://www.scotusblog.com/statistics/]. So far, the new term’s docket includes cases involving, among other things, the use of race[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/bethune-hill-v-virginia-state-board-of-elections/] in redrawing state legislative districts[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/mccrory-v-harris/], a free-speech challenge[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/us/politics/supreme-court-trademarks-redskins.html] to a federal law that denies protection to disparaging trademarks, a challenge to the secrecy of jury deliberations[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/us/politics/supreme-court-to-hear-case-on-juror-racial-bias.html] when there is evidence that a juror was racially biased against the defendant and Texas’s unscientific standard[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/politics/supreme-court-to-consider-legal-standard-drawn-from-of-mice-and-men.html] for determining whether someone is intellectually disabled enough to be spared from execution.

Meanwhile, some of the nation’s most pressing legal issues are awaiting substantive rulings by the court. Most urgent among these are lawsuits against the efforts of Republican legislatures to suppress voting by minorities, young people and others who tend to vote Democratic.

For example, in July a federal appeals court panel struck down[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/30/us/federal-appeals-court-strikes-down-north-carolina-voter-id-provision.html] a 2013 North Carolina law that one election-law scholar called “possibly the largest rollback of voting rights”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/02/opinion/campaign-stops/turning-the-tide-on-voting-rights.html] since 1965. That court found the law had been enacted intentionally to reduce black voter turnout.

North Carolina appealed that ruling to the Supreme Court, which split 4-to-4[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/north-carolina-supreme-court-voting-rights-act.html] without issuing any explanation, meaning that the lower court’s decision was upheld. While that was the right result, a full court could have set a legal standard on voter suppression efforts that would have applied nationwide.

Other high-profile cases that demand attention from a full court include a challenge to a Virginia school’s refusal to allow a transgender boy to use the boys’ bathroom (the court in August temporarily blocked[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/04/us/politics/supreme-court-blocks-order-allowing-transgender-student-restroom-choice.html] a lower court’s order in the boy’s favor, but has not yet agreed to hear the case); a 28-state lawsuit[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/opinion/a-flimsy-legal-attack-on-clean-air.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=opinion-c-col-left-region®ion=opinion-c-col-left-region&WT.nav=opinion-c-col-left-region] against the Obama administration’s effort to reduce pollution from coal-fired power plants; and the cases on **immigration**, birth-control access, and public-sector union dues that the deadlocked justices failed to resolve last term.

The court, particularly after it decided the outcome of the 2000 presidential election by a 5-to-4 vote[http://www.nytimes.com/2000/12/13/us/bush-prevails-single-vote-justices-end-recount-blocking-gore-after-5-week.html], has struggled to overcome the growing public perception that it is little more than another political body, no less ruled by partisanship than the other two branches. The Senate Republicans’ insistence that no hearing can be held for the next justice until after the new president takes office only serves to reinforce that notion.

Conservative apologists pretend this is all just standard political gamesmanship, but nothing like it has ever happened before. Even when Democrats strongly opposed Republican nominees, like Robert Bork or Clarence Thomas, they still respected the president’s right to make a nomination, and they held hearings and had a full vote. In contrast, the Republicans have shut down the process entirely out of fear that the near half-century of conservative control of the court could come to an end.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BIRMINGHAM, England — Outlining a timetable for Britain [http://www.nytimes.com/topic/destination/great-britain?8qa] to leave the European Union [http://www.nytimes.com/topic/organization/european-union?8qa] in the spring of 2019, Prime Minister Theresa May on Sunday put **immigration** at the center of her strategy for withdrawal, suggesting that Britain could be headed for a “hard Brexit,” or clean break, from the bloc.

In a speech at the start of the Conservative Party’s annual convention here, Mrs. May said Britain would formally initiate exit negotiations by the end of March. Those talks will be governed by a two-year deadline unless all members of the bloc agree to prolong them.

Previously, Mrs. May had said [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/world/europe/theresa-may-britain-brexit.html]only that the talks, under Article 50 [http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-European-union-and-comments/title-6-final-provisions/137-article-50.html] of a European Union [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org] treaty, would not begin before the end of this year — a delay designed to buy time for the government to work out its negotiating stance.

On Sunday, Mrs. May also began to lay down her priorities for a deal on withdrawal, known as Brexit, including the power to control **immigration** and reject European Union rules that allow people to move and settle across national frontiers.

“We have voted to leave the European Union and become a fully independent, sovereign country,” Mrs. May said to applause from delegates. “We will do what independent, sovereign countries do. We will decide for ourselves how we control **immigration**. And we will be free to pass our own laws.”

That position strikes at the heart of the usual trade-off by countries that have unfettered access to Europe’s internal market of about 500 million people, but that also accept the freedom of Europeans to cross frontiers and live and work in any member state.

While Mrs. May said she wanted the “maximum” scope for British companies to trade inside the European Union ’s single market, she added that Britain would not accept the right of European Union law to trump national legislation — another pillar of the single market.

Mrs. May also spoke of striking free-trade deals with new partners, suggesting that Britain would leave Europe’s Customs Union, which lays down common tariffs but prevents member states from striking independent arrangements with other countries.

Her speech left many details unclear and undoubtedly represents a tough opening bid before next year’s talks, which are likely to be complex and fraught with disagreement.

She argued that the country’s new relationship with the European Union would be unique, and rejected the idea that there was a clear division between a “hard” Brexit and a “soft” one with closer economic ties, although there are signs of deep differences within her cabinet on the issue.

Ideally, Mrs. May would like to regain the ability to curb migration from the Continent while keeping full access to the European Union ’s single market.

In an interview in The Sun published on Saturday, Boris Johnson, the foreign secretary, argued that Britain’s policy was “ having our cake and eating it. [https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/1889723/boris-johnson-joins-forces-with-liam-foxand-declares-support-for-hard-brexit-which-will-liberate-britain-to-champion-free-trade/]”

Yet across the English Channel, there has been no sign of compromise, and European politicians have made it clear that a trade-off is required from Britain.

Over all, Mrs. May’s speech suggested that she would emphasize the right to curb **immigration** even if that meant securing less favorable access to European markets.

David Davis, the minister responsible for negotiating Brexit, underscored the position that trading arrangements were not the only — or even the most important — part of the British equation.

“We want to maintain the freest possible trade between us, without betraying the instruction we have received from the British people to take back control of our own affairs,” Mr. Davis told the convention.

Mrs. May insisted in her speech — the first of two to the convention — that Scotland would leave the European Union , too, and had “no opt-out from Brexit.” In the referendum that determined Britain’s exit from the union, the majority of Scots voted to remain.

She also announced plans to start the domestic legislative process for Brexit next year by asking Parliament to repeal the 1972 European Communities Act, which allowed Britain to join the European Union ’s predecessor.

Although this new legal step would not come into effect until Britain left the bloc, it would transfer European legislation — including laws to protect labor rights — into British law. Parliament would then be able to decide at a later point which laws to keep.

In a statement, Carolyn Fairbairn , the director general of the nation’s main business lobby group, the Confederation of British Industry , welcomed that development but highlighted the anxieties of many companies.

“With a rapid timetable pointing to an exit from the E.U. in spring 2019, businesses need to know the government’s ambition on the fundamental issues of skills and barrier-free access to E.U. markets as soon as possible,” she said.

“Businesses cannot continue to operate in the dark,” she added, because “the decisions they face today are real and pressing.”

There have been warnings in recent week from manufacturers, including carmakers that fear they may face tariffs, and from financial services companies that worry about their ability to do business across Europe from London.

Carlos Ghosn [https://www.theguardian.com/business/2016/sep/30/nissan-hard-brexit-compensation-new-uk-investment-tariffs], the chief executive of Nissan, said last week that he would be unable to make investment decisions in Britain unless the government guaranteed compensation for any tariffs that might be imposed after Brexit.

Still, the outcome of the June referendum was interpreted by many politicians, including Mrs. May, as a rejection of the European Union ’s policy of free movement of people, which has allowed hundreds of thousands from Southern and Eastern Europe to settle in Britain.

Mrs. May served as home secretary for six years and devoted much of that time to an ultimately ineffective attempt to cut **immigration**.

Normally, there would be no high-profile speeches on the opening Sunday of a Conservative convention, but party leaders hope to get the European Unionissue out of the way so they can focus on less contentious subjects during the rest of the gathering, which will conclude on Wednesday.

The European Union aims to guarantee the free movement of goods, capital, services and people across its frontiers, and for many of Europe’s policy makers it would be a betrayal to allow Britain to enjoy the economic benefits while rejecting free movement of people.

In a recent interview with the BBC , Prime Minister Matteo Renzi of Italy said it would be “impossible” to give British people more rights than others outside the European Union .

The president of the European Central Bank, Mario Draghi , has said that Britain should not be granted any special favors on single-market access and that “any outcome should ensure that all participants are subject to the same rules.”

\* ‘Brexit’ Places the Unity of Europe’s Ryder Cup Team in Doubt [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/sports/golf/ryder-cup-brexit-europe.html]

\* As Britain Confronts ‘Brexit,’ a Canadian Takes Center Stage: Mark Carney [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/business/international/bank-of-england-brexit-carney.html]

\* ‘Brexit’ Vote Gave Me a Harsh, Belated Wake-Up Call [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/03/world/europe/brexit-vote-gave-me-a-harsh-belated-wake-up-call.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

BRENTWOOD, N.Y. — Four dead teenagers. Two weeks. One town. And a ruthless gang, the authorities say, was most likely responsible for the toll. Again.

On Sept. 13, Nisa Mickens, 15, and her best friend, Kayla Cuevas, 16, were murdered, their battered bodies found near an elementary school[http://pix11.com/2016/09/14/teenage-girls-body-found-on-road-in-brentwood-police/] here. A week later and just two miles away, the skeletal remains of two more teenagers — identified as Oscar Acosta, 19, and Miguel Garcia-Moran, 15 — were found in the woods near a psychiatric hospital. Oscar had been missing since May, Miguel since February. Their deaths have been ruled homicides.

Brentwood, a hardscrabble town of nearly 60,000 on Long Island, 40 miles east of Manhattan, has reached another crisis point. For nearly two decades, MS-13, a gang with roots in Los Angeles and El Salvador, has been terrorizing the town, the authorities say, especially its young people. Since 2009, its members have been accused of at least 14 murders, court and police records show.

School officials are scrambling. Police officers are searching. Students are frightened. Parents are anguished.

“It’s so hard, I’m hurting,” Evelyn Rodriguez, Kayla’s mother, said last week. “I wish I could hold my daughter again.”

In her first interview since Kayla’s funeral, Ms. Rodriguez spoke measuredly about how her daughter had been bullied by gang members inside and outside her high school.

“To me, it’s worse than it was before; it’s everywhere,” said Ms. Rodriguez, a 1987 graduate of Brentwood Ross High School, where her daughter was a student. “This is ridiculous,” she added. “We need some type of assistance to help our police officers here and see if they can come together to figure out a plan to make things better for the kids now.”

The path to such a plan, however, runs through a fractured Suffolk County. Its former police chief[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/04/nyregion/ex-suffolk-county-police-chiefs-arrest-hints-at-broader-federal-inquiry.html] is headed to jail, its district attorney[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/03/nyregion/thomas-spota-suffolk-county-district-attorney-on-the-defensive-as-federal-inquiry-expands.html] is under federal investigation and a Justice Department settlement[https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/united-states-agrees-comprehensive-settlement-suffolk-county-police-department-resolve] mandated changes in the Police Department in 2013 after findings of bias against Latino residents.

Tensions simmer here because some residents say they believe an increase in Central American migrants to town has led to the increase in gang violence. According to 2014 census figures compiled by Queens College, Brentwood’s population is 68 percent Latino or Hispanic, with more than 17,000 residents claiming to be from El Salvador.

Timothy Sini, who became the Suffolk County police commissioner 11 months ago, after his predecessor, James Burke, pleaded guilty to civil rights violations and obstruction of justice, has vowed to eradicate the gangs.

“The only people in Brentwood who have anything to fear are the criminals,” Mr. Sini said. “That’s because there is a tsunami of law enforcement officers at their doorsteps.”

The department has increased uniformed patrols and door-to-door canvassing, and rejoined the eight-member Long Island Gang Task Force of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Sini said he met recently with dozens of agencies including Homeland Security Investigations and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

“It’s not a good time to be a gang member in Brentwood,” he said.

One gang member was arrested and was in federal custody for questioning, Mr. Sini added, although a motive for the murders was still unclear. The F.B.I. confirmed it was assisting the police.

The Brentwood School District held a community forum last month with elected officials and parents that ran for four hours.

There, according to Ms. Rodriguez, school officials said some students had been “red-flagged” for having possible gang affiliations.

“So if they are red-flagged, why are they in the school?” Ms. Rodriguez said. “Kids are being targeted. They’re trying to find some type of safe way to even go to school,” she added. “Being in school, they always have to look over their shoulder to see who’s walking.”

Brentwood has 4,400 high school students divided into two schools, and administrators say the environment is safe.

“Gang members rarely present themselves in the schools,” Richard Loeschner, the principal of Brentwood Ross High School, said. “If they do, we take care of that pretty quickly.”

But ultimately, he said, after acknowledging that the administration knew of about 20 to 25 students in the district with possible gang affiliations, there is only so much officials can do.

“We can’t exclude a kid because we suspect they are in a gang,” Mr. Loeschner said. “That’s state and federal law that they are entitled to an education.”

Even before the girls’ murders, students were subject to random screenings with metal detectors, which have increased over the past few weeks, he added. There are no detectors at the entrances of either high school, however.

Some parents were concerned that the school’s response to the violence was not proactive enough. Levi McIntyre, the school superintendent, sent an email to parents warning their children not to wear royal blue, the color identified with MS-13, or clothes displaying the Salvadoran flag. A student on the way to school, he wrote, recently had his blue shirt torn off by gang members and burned.

MS-13 was formed in Los Angeles in the 1980s by **immigrants** from El Salvador escaping civil war. The abbreviation stands for Mara Salvatrucha, which roughly translates to “Salvadoran street posse.”

The authorities say the gang has been in Suffolk County since around 1998, and is organized in cliques bearing names like the Brentwood Locos Salvatruchas. Leaders gather to discuss their lines of business — extortion, prostitution, robbery, drug dealing — and to authorize the killings of chavalas, or members of rival gangs like the Bloods and the Crips, court papers say.

In 2009, a 15-year-old boy, Christopher Hamilton[http://www.newsday.com/long-island/suffolk/teen-shot-killed-at-brentwood-gathering-1.1614970], was fatally shot in the head after an MS-13 crew in search of chavalas opened fire with rifles and handguns on a house party on American Boulevard here.

Two years later, an 18-year-old Brentwood man was fatally shot in his driveway, and a 22-year-old local leader of MS-13 was convicted of the killing.

“In the past, it used to be like rival gangs on each other,” Dr. McIntyre said. “But now it has taken another turn. When it goes after all kids, it’s a whole new realm. It’s tearing the fabric of our community apart.”

Noel Vega’s son was a classmate of the murdered girls, who wondered whether he could be next.

“He’s more upset about the fact that they keep finding bodies,” Mr. Vega said, standing outside a Brentwood funeral home for Kayla’s wake with fellow members of the Christian Motorcyclists Association. They are not the only group offering unofficial security to the town; he noted that the crisis even brought the Guardian Angels to Brentwood.

Of his son, Mr. Vega added: “He actually wants to move out of Brentwood; he wants to move out of state. He’s upset and he fears for the loss of his friends and himself. It gets me upset; we all get upset.”

The recent murders have exacerbated disputes in the town over **immigration** policy, which Donald J. Trump, the Republican candidate for president, fueled during last week’s debate by saying that the gangs roaming the streets were made up of illegal **immigrants**.

“There’s been a huge influx, to be honest with you,” said Ray Mayo, the president of the Brentwood Association of Concerned Citizens, who added that he was upset over undocumented **immigrants** crowding rental properties. “It seems like a whole new set of gang members who have stirred the pot up.”

Two law enforcement authorities, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the continuing murder investigation, said that over the last several years the gang has sought to enlist recent **immigrants** from Central America because they are often more vulnerable to recruitment.

But some recently settled families are just as worried about their own children’s safety.

“I am afraid, as a Salvadoran,” said Ana, 38, a mother of two girls, one in high school. She fled El Salvador in 2006 and has since become a member of Make the Road New York, an **immigrant** activist group. She did not want to give her full name for fear of retribution.

“It makes me feel bad that people think this of all Salvadorans,” she said. “Violence was the reason I left — when they killed my brother. And now we are experiencing the same violence.”

Distrust of the Suffolk County police among Latinos is palpable and long documented[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/30/nyregion/latinos-file-class-action-case-accusing-suffolk-police-of-bias-and-harassment.html]. Residents said they were dismayed by a dearth of Spanish-speaking officers, and undocumented **immigrants** in particular often worry that if they report information, the authorities will turn them over to **immigration** officials.

Mr. Sini said that would not happen, and that he was trying to reassure **immigrant** communities to work with the police.

Ms. Rodriguez, whose parents came from Puerto Rico, said that two years ago, when gang members threatened Kayla on a friend’s block, she went to the police.

“I got attitude like they were talking to somebody off the street,” Ms. Rodriguez said. “They wouldn’t even report it,” she added. “They told me to tell her: ‘Don’t go on the block.’”

The feeling of helplessness is spreading among the teenagers.

At a vigil held for the murdered girls before a football game, some students held signs: “Help Us!” “Stop the Violence!” Others shook their heads when Mr. Sini told students to call a hotline for investigative tips.

“We’re the ones out here, dealing with it all,” said a 16-year-old boy who would give only his nickname, Tiny T. “They think they can do something, but they’re just fooling. They can’t do nothing.”

At Kayla’s wake, a 17-year-old student too afraid of MS-13 to give his name said: “You don’t know who’s watching you, who’s following you. Just yesterday, a group of guys in a car with blue bandannas followed a girl home in Brentwood.”

He, his mother and his cousin wore T-shirts that read “Justice for Kayla,” which they had printed at the mall. “Afraid?” his cousin, a 19-year-old woman, said. “There’s not even a limit to afraid.”

At memorials for both Kayla and Nisa, on the cul-de-sac near where their bodies were found, basketballs sat among the glass candles and deflated balloons. Kayla, a tenacious athlete, was going to try out for the varsity basketball team this year. Instead, her mother was starting a scholarship fund called Ball Is My Life.

Ms. Rodriguez hoped her daughter’s death would at least stop the cycle. “It can’t go on anymore,” she said.

Correction: October 2, 2016, Sunday

An earlier version of this article misspelled the given name of the mother of Kayla Cuevas, one of the girls who was killed in what the authorities said was a gang-related homicide. Her name is Evelyn Rodriguez, not Eveylyn. The error was repeated in a picture caption.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BUDAPEST — Hungarians handed the country’s autocratic prime minister, Viktor Orban[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/viktor\_orban/index.html?inline=nyt-per], a partial victory on Sunday by overwhelmingly voting “no” in a national referendum on whether to accept more migrants, but without giving him the turnout for a valid result. What Mr. Orban intends to do now, however, remains a mystery.

The referendum — on which the government spent at least 10 billion Hungarian forint, or about $36 million — included no specifics about legislation or government action.

“What will happen after the referendum will depend partly on the results themselves, but also on what is happening on the international scene,” said Zoltan Kovacs, Mr. Orban’s chief international spokesman, who declined to provide any more details.

With 99 percent of the vote counted Sunday night, 98 percent of voters had chosen to refuse to allow the European Union[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org] to force the country to accept refugees. But the turnout was 43 percent, well below the 50 percent required for a referendum to be considered valid under Hungarian law. (Three percent of the votes cast were invalid, and did not count toward the turnout threshold.)

Despite the failure to meet the turnout threshold, Mr. Orban said he considered the vote a mandate for the government to pursue its anti-**immigrant** policies.

“We can be proud to be the first E.U. state to let its people express their own views on the issue of **immigration**,” Mr. Orban said in a speech at his victory party on Sunday night. “We are facing the most important question for years to come: It’s about the future of Hungary[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/hungary/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], with whom we live, what will be our culture, our lifestyle and our Christian roots.”

In 2015, Mr. Orban made a name for himself by building a heavily guarded, razor-wire fence a[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/25/world/europe/migrants-push-toward-hungary-as-a-border-fence-rises.html] cross the country’s southern borders[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/25/world/europe/migrants-push-toward-hungary-as-a-border-fence-rises.html] to stem the flood of migrants into Hungary. He is the leader of one of a growing number of nationalistic, right-wing parties spreading across Europe[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/05/22/world/europe/europe-right-wing-austria-hungary.html], fueled by fear of migrants and resentment about the centralization of the European Union’s power.

Leaders across the Continent were closely watching the outcome of the vote and what actions Mr. Orban would take afterward.

Poland’s foreign minister, Witold Waszczykowski, recently echoed Mr. Orban’s call for restructuring the European Union to return more power to individual nations. “Our proposals are quite radical,” Mr. Waszczykowski said.

The Czech Parliament has also discussed proposals to emulate Hungary by building border fences and beefing up border security. In Austria, a right-wing candidate has a solid chance of becoming the next president[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/13/world/europe/austria-president-election.html]. And support for nationalist parties is surging in France and Denmark.

“Far-right movements are on the rise everywhere, and there are reasons for that,” said Gabor Fodor, the head of the Hungarian Liberal Party. “The E.U. is very slow. Look at the 2008 financial crisis, the subsequent euro crisis and now the refugee crisis. People can feel it. There is nothing happening.”

Further fueling populist leaders, Mr. Fodor said, is the reality that Europe’s economy is less robust than it was in the 1990s.

“The middle class doesn’t have as much. The economy is not as strong,” Mr. Fodor said. “The welfare state is on the way down, and this has an impact on people’s lives.”

Even Europe’s most powerful leader, Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany, is in real danger[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/world/europe/nationalist-partys-challenge-to-merkel-moves-to-berlin-state-elections.html?\_r=0] of falling to this nationalist tide in next year’s elections.

“We are in the midst of a backlash against globalization, and it is a widespread phenomenon,” said Stefan Lehne, a visiting scholar at Carnegie Europe in Brussels. “The general perception is that things have spiraled out of control. There is an increasing resistance to international business agreements. And this phenomenon has led to renationalization of individual states and rediscovery of national identity.”

Marta Pardavi, a chairwoman of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, a refugee rights group, said Mr. Orban insisted that “he needs the demonstrated support of the Hungarian people in the referendum so he can take courageous and bold steps.”

But Mr. Orban has not been specific about what those steps will be. Instead, rumors swirl: There is talk of an amendment to Hungary’s Constitution preventing the European Union from imposing rules on the country without the approval of Parliament. Some say Mr. Orban is likely to hold early elections to take advantage of the referendum’s momentum.

Mr. Orban wants more autonomy from the European Union, but he also does not want to threaten the flow of desperately needed aid from the bloc’s headquarters in Brussels.

Whether Mr. Orban will storm up the Danube and lay siege to Brussels, or whether this was just a very expensive exercise in rallying domestic support, is the subject of much debate here.

“Most of the effort, I would say, is for domestic political purposes,” said Csaba Toth, the director of strategy for the Republikon Institute, a research and advocacy group that has been critical of the government. “Whenever the migration issue is on the table, the government’s popularity goes up. When something else is on the agenda, the government’s popularity goes down.”

But as the flow of migrants into Hungary has slowed in recent months — largely because of Mr. Orban’s border fence — the issue has slipped from public consciousness.

“Last year, it was easy to keep the migration issue on the agenda,” Mr. Toth said. “We had a real refugee crisis. It was evident everywhere. Now, we don’t, so they have to make it a political initiative to keep the migration issue in the public’s mind.”

Mr. Orban was aided by a lack of unity among the opposition, mainly because there is little popular support anywhere for admitting more migrants.

Most left-wing parties had urged their supporters to stay home on Sunday, hoping to deny Mr. Orban the turnout he needed for a valid vote — although there remained questions about what that meant for a referendum that demanded no specific actions by the government other than opposing European Union refugee policies.

“When a question doesn’t make sense, why take part?” Timea Szabo, a chairwoman of the left-wing Dialogue for Hungary Party, said before Sunday’s voting. “Orban is purposely misleading the Hungarian people in a villainous way. All of this focus on migrants takes attention away from government corruption cases, the terrible state of public health and education.”

In failing to meet the legal threshold, Mr. Orban’s government found itself hoisted by its own petard. In 2011, the government raised the level of voter turnout necessary for a referendum to be considered valid to 50 percent, from 25 percent. Critics said the move was intended to stifle popular efforts to overturn Mr. Orban’s policies.

The prankster Two-Tailed Dog Party, which has fought the government with irreverent humor, had urged people to purposely cast an invalid ballot, which, in sufficient numbers, they hoped would deny the government its 50 percent threshold.

Voting on Sunday morning in Budapest, Mr. Orban said that while a valid result was certainly better than an invalid one, there would be “legal consequences” in either event, as long as there were more “no” votes than “yes” votes.

“According to us, only the Hungarian Parliament can decide with whom Hungarians want to live,” he said. “We will make sure this is enshrined in our legal system if it is valid or invalid.”

Jobbik, a far-right party, had reluctantly urged its members to support the government and vote “no.”

Only Mr. Fodor’s tiny Liberal Party urged citizens to vote “yes,” arguing that the referendum should be seen as a measure of support for the European Union.

Helene Bienvenu contributed reporting from Budapest, and Joanna Berendt from Warsaw.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**VANCOUVER, British Columbia — Seattle and Vancouver are like fraternal twins separated at birth. Both are bustling Pacific Northwest coastal cities with eco-conscious populations that have accepted the bargain of dispiriting weather for much of the year in exchange for nearby ski slopes and kayaking and glorious summers.

Yet 140 miles of traffic-choked roads and an international border divide the two cities, keeping them farther apart than their geographic and cultural identities would suggest.

Now the political, academic and tech elite of both cities are looking for ways to bring them closer together, with the aim of continuing the growth of two of the most vibrant economies in North America.

“Vancouver has a lot more in common with Seattle than we do with Calgary, Montreal, Toronto, anywhere else in our country,” Christy Clark, the premier of British Columbia, said in an interview. “We should make the most of those cultural commonalities.”

Whether their grand vision of a “Cascadia innovation corridor” — which borrows its name from the region’s Cascade mountain range — ever materializes, leaders on both sides of the border have motives for getting cozier immediately. American tech icons like Microsoft, with voracious needs for global engineering talent, are expanding their Vancouver offices, partly because of Canada’s smoother **immigration** process.

For its part, Vancouver wants to bring more American technology companies to the city in hopes of spinning out future entrepreneurs who will expand its comparatively small base of technology companies.

One serious obstacle to Vancouver’s tech ambitions is its head-spinning housing costs. The median price for a detached home in the metropolitan area in August was 1.4 million Canadian dollars (about $1.06 million), a 27.8 percent increase from a year earlier, according to the Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver. In the San Francisco metropolitan area[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/technology/no-for-sale-sign-silicon-valley-buyers-arent-deterred.html], the median single family home price was about $848,000, according to Zillow[http://www.zillow.com/san-francisco-metro-ca\_r395057/home-values/].

But while median pay for tech-related jobs is $112,000 a year in the San Francisco Bay Area, it is just under $49,000 in Vancouver, according to an analysis by PayScale, a compensation data firm. (Some of that discrepancy is due to a drop in the value of Canada’s currency relative to the United States dollar.)

“We have San Francisco real estate prices with the incomes of somewhere between Reno and Nashville,” said Andy Yan, acting director of the city program at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver.

On the thrumming streets of downtown Vancouver, signs of the Seattle region’s growing economic ties to the city are hard to miss. A rectangular glass and steel office building with a large Microsoft sign occupies nearly an entire city block, sitting atop a large Nordstrom store (another Seattle brand).

Microsoft says it invested $120 million in its new offices in Vancouver, which opened in June, and expects to spend $90 million more annually on wages and other operating costs. It plans to employ nearly 750 people in the city.

Microsoft is hiring Canadians for the facility, but the country’s more open **immigration** policies were an important factor in its investment, Brad Smith, Microsoft’s president, said in an interview. Microsoft and other tech companies have long complained that the United States education system does not produce enough computer science graduates, forcing them to rely on **immigrants** from India, China and elsewhere.

Foreign workers in the United States can wait about three times as long for a work visa as those in Canada do, the Boston Consulting Group estimates. And the prospect of Donald J. Trump winning the presidency has raised concerns among tech companies, because of the Republican candidate’s comments about further restricting **immigration** to the United States.

“Right now, there’s just a lot of uncertainty about open **immigration**,” Mr. Smith said.

Last month, officials and executives from both cities huddled in a Vancouver hotel to discuss how to enable people, ideas and capital to flow more freely between them, as heedless of the international border separating the cities as a pod of orcas swimming in the sea.

At the Cascadia conference, Ms. Clark and Jay Inslee, the governor of Washington, signed an agreement to deepen the ties between Vancouver and Seattle, including more research collaboration between the University of British Columbia and the University of Washington. Bill Gates, co-founder of Microsoft, and Satya Nadella, its current chief executive, talked about globalization and education.

One proposal to deal with traffic between Vancouver and Seattle was for a high-speed rail[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/high\_speed\_rail\_projects/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] line that would whisk travelers at more than 200 miles an hour between the cities in 57 minutes (it can take four hours or more by car). The details on financing the project — which could cost an estimated $30 billion or more — have not been worked out.

A group of Seattle techies proposed[http://www.madrona.com/i-5/] a cheaper alternative: a dedicated lane for autonomous vehicles on Interstate 5, the highway connecting Seattle to the Canadian border. The plan — which relies on autonomous vehicles that still need a lot of work — would not shave much time off the commute between the cities, but could make the ride less tedious by letting travelers work or watch a movie, said Tom Alberg, a managing director at Madrona Venture Group, a Seattle venture capital firm, and an author of the proposal.

With roots in timber and shipping, Vancouver’s economy has diversified in recent decades with the growth of film and video game production. The city claims a tech “unicorn” — a start-up valued at over $1 billion — in Hootsuite, which makes social media tools.

But Vancouver remains a relative small fry in tech, with about $1.78 billion in venture capital flowing into local tech start-ups in the last decade, compared with about $8.9 billion in Seattle, the research firm Pitchbook estimates.

Still, the city’s hoped-for tech boom may hit a wall if it cannot address its cost-of-living issues, which are by some standards more acute than those plaguing other thriving cities. Vancouver was ranked the third most unaffordable city in the world, after Hong Kong and Sydney, in a study[http://www.demographia.com/dhi.pdf] published this year by Demographia, a consulting firm.

Mr. Yan has spent years analyzing his hometown’s soaring real estate values and concluded that a surge in foreign capital[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/13/world/americas/canada-vancouver-chinese-immigrant-wealth.html?\_r=0], primarily from mainland China, has decoupled Vancouver home prices from the local economy. British Columbia recently imposed a 15 percent tax on new home purchases in the Vancouver area by foreign buyers, a move now facing legal challenges.

The housing market is showing signs of cooling off, though it is not yet clear how much of that is because of the tax. The total number of homes sold in the area in August dropped 26 percent from a year earlier and price growth has slowed, according to the Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver.

Dennis Pilarinos, chief executive of Buddybuild, a Vancouver maker of developer tools for mobile apps, says affordability has been less of a problem for young tech workers, who may be willing to rent smaller apartments and live with roommates. But when start-ups get bigger, many struggle to recruit senior executives with families, said Mr. Pilarinos, who previously worked for Microsoft and Amazon in Vancouver.

“Companies tend to run into scaling issues,” he said. “You end up with fewer Microsofts or Amazons.”

\* Bay Area Start-Ups Find Low-Cost Outposts in Arizona[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/22/business/economy/bay-area-start-ups-find-low-cost-outposts-in-arizona.html]

\* Ireland Doesn’t Want Apple’s Back Taxes, but the Irish Aren’t So Sure[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/12/business/international/ireland-doesnt-want-apples-back-taxes-but-the-irish-arent-so-sure.html]

\* Chattanooga’s Innovation District Beckons to Young Entrepreneurs[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/17/realestate/commercial/chattanoogas-innovation-district-beckons-to-young-entrepreneurs.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

LAS VEGAS — On paper at least, Asian-Americans seem like perfect Republicans. Many are small-business owners. Their communities tend to be more culturally conservative. And a lot of them, having fled oppressive Communist governments, found comfort in the Republican Party’s aggressive anti-Communist policies.

But in what could be a significant realignment of political allegiance, Asian-Americans are identifying as Democrats at a quicker pace than any other racial group. And many Republicans worry this election will only accelerate that trend, damaging their party for years to come with what is now the fastest-growing[http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-latino-asians-20160908-snap-story.html] minority in the country.

The Republican presidential nominee, Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?inline=nyt-per], is not helping. His attacks on the Chinese — which he has sometimes delivered in a crude, mocking accent[http://www.scmp.com/news/world/article/1852785/we-want-deal-trump-fakes-asian-accent-mock-chinese-japanese-businessmen] — are a feature of his populist campaign. He has suggested cutting off **immigration** from the Philippines[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/13/world/asia/philippines-trump-terrorist-nation.html], citing fears that the longtime American ally poses the same national security threat as countries like Syria and Afghanistan.

Mr. Trump’s talk of deporting millions of undocumented **immigrants** has also stirred up painful memories among a group that has been singled out under American law before, whether by the Chinese Exclusion Act, which barred the **immigration** of Chinese laborers[http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/chinese-immigrants-united-states] until 1943, or by the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/w/world\_war\_ii\_/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

“It’s like we’re going back in time,” said Marc Matsuo of Las Vegas, who grew up in Hawaii with parents of Japanese ancestry and recalled how his family used to feel uncomfortable expressing their heritage, to the point they would not speak Japanese. He now helps register Asian-Americans to vote. “I was always brought up that you don’t talk about religion, you don’t talk about politics. Not anymore.”

Though Asian-Americans are still just 4 percent of the overall eligible voting population[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/02/03/2016-electorate-will-be-the-most-diverse-in-u-s-history/], their political power is concentrated in important swing states like Nevada and Virginia, where both parties have been building on their efforts to reach out.

In and around Las Vegas, home to one of the country’s largest Asian populations, this means printing campaign leaflets in Korean, having a Vietnamese translator on standby at speeches, publishing op-ed articles in the local Filipino newspaper and hiring employees who know enough Mandarin to recruit voters at the Chinatown seafood market.

Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?inline=nyt-per]’s campaign has a resident staff member in Las Vegas dedicated to Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders. Staff members and volunteers here speak Chinese, Korean, Hindi and Tagalog, the Filipino language. The campaign has recently been conducting native language training on how to use voting machines in a local Chinese cultural center. Volunteers are sent to court supporters in Buddhist temples.

Though Mr. Trump’s campaign announced a new Asian Pacific American Advisory Committee[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/trump-campaign-announces-asian-pacific-american-advisory-committee] last week, a Republican National Committee spokesman, Ninio Fetalvo, said Mr. Trump’s outreach to Asian-American voters had been coordinated until now mainly through two staff members at the party’s Washington headquarters. The party, he added, has also printed materials in a variety of Asian languages in cities like Las Vegas.

Republicans’ difficulties with Asian-Americans are similar to those the party has faced with most minority groups. A sense that the party is hostile to **immigrants** and minorities has driven more Asian-American voters into the Democratic Party lately, political scientists and community leaders said. And if Republicans do not make more of an effort, those voting shifts could harden, just as Hispanics’ voting patterns have.

“What we see now are some early indications that people who either leaned toward the Democratic Party or did not identify with either party are now starting to identify as Democrats,” said Karthick Ramakrishnan, a professor of political science at the University of California, Riverside. “This is still a group that is making up its mind,” he added, “but it should be concerning to the Republican Party that you’re starting to see this crystallization.”

A national survey in the spring by Asian and Pacific Islander American Vote, a nonpartisan research group, showed “a significant leftward shift[http://www.apiavote.org/sites/apiavote/files/Inclusion-2016-AAVS-final.pdf]” since 2012 among Asian-American registered voters, with 47 percent now identifying with the Democratic Party, compared with 35 percent in 2012. Fifteen percent identified as Republican.

In 1992, the year national exit polls started reporting Asian-American sentiment, the group leaned Republican, supporting George Bush over Bill Clinton 55 percent to 31 percent[http://ropercenter.cornell.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/polls/us-elections/how-groups-voted/how-groups-voted-1992/]. But by 2012, that had reversed. Asian-Americans overwhelmingly supported President Obama over Mitt Romney — 73 percent to 26 percent, almost the same margin by which Hispanics favored Mr. Obama.

A Pew Research Center report released last month[http://www.people-press.org/2016/09/13/party-identification-trends-1992-2016/] showed that Asian-Americans have since 2008 embraced the Democratic Party at a faster rate than any other ethnic group.

Still, many Republicans believe that the damage is reversible and see Asian-Americans’ political identity as still very young and malleable. For example, among many Asian-Americans, there is a tendency to be less forgiving on illegal **immigration**, which is sometimes seen — unfairly or not — as an issue specific to Latinos.

Lanhee Chen, who was Mitt Romney’s policy director in 2012, said the effect of Mr. Trump’s harsh talk on **immigration** could be more muted with Asian-Americans than it is with other minorities. “Trump has not been helpful,” Mr. Chen said. “Now is it as directly harmful as it would be to Latinos? I don’t think so.”

As Asian-Americans have replaced Hispanics as the nation’s fastest growing racial group, Nevada has become the center of their emerging political class. Asian-Americans are now about 7 percent of the electorate in the state, a figure that is expected to double by 2060.

Democrats and Republicans have concluded that winning in closely divided Nevada requires performing strongly among Asian-Americans: The state’s Republican senator, Dean Heller, carried Asian-Americans[http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/results/senate/exit-polls?state=nv] when he narrowly won in 2012. And Harry Reid, the state’s long-serving Democratic senator who is retiring, performed even better with them than he did among Hispanics in his 2010 election[http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/results/senate/exit-polls#nevada].

None of which is lost on the two candidates vying to succeed Mr. Reid: Representative Joe Heck, the Republican, employs an aide who speaks Mandarin and has made Kamayan dinners — traditional Filipino banquets — as much a campaign staple as marching in parades. And Catherine Cortez Masto, the Democrat, grew up in the Las Vegas neighborhood that has since become the city’s Chinatown, with Korean barbecue restaurants, Vietnamese noodle bars, foot spas and Chinese arches. When she attended a lunar celebration last month, she spoke in English as someone translated her words into Vietnamese.

As much as Mr. Trump’s positions seem to be driving Asian-Americans into the Democratic Party, the group defies easy political categorization. Many Koreans are evangelical Christians. Filipinos overwhelmingly belong to the Roman Catholic Church. Many Vietnamese who emigrated during the war identify closely with the Republican Party’s anti-Communism.

“In general, Asian values are very much in line with Republican values: family, education, the country needs to be stable,” said James Yu, a member of the Las Vegas Asian Chamber of Commerce, which has endorsed Mr. Heck in the Senate race. Notably, it has not backed Mr. Trump.

By November, about 9.3 million Asian-Americans will be able to vote nationally, or 4 percent of the eligible voting population. That is up from eight million in 2012. And that growth has spawned new civic organizations, like the nonpartisan Asian Community Development Council in Las Vegas, which aims to boost the group’s low voter turnout. Only 47 percent of eligible Asian-Americans voted in 2012.

Vida Chan Lin, the group’s founder, said that her message each time she goes out to register Asian-Americans to vote — in casinos’ employee lunchrooms, in Chinatown shopping malls and at employee orientations for businesses like the Panda Express fast-food chain — is that they have to harness the power of their growing numbers.

“We’ve got to get them to vote,” Ms. Lin said in her office, which was humming with volunteers planning registration drives, as well as follow-up calls as reminders to vote.

One positive consequence of Mr. Trump’s divisiveness, she said, was that interest in the election is like nothing she has ever seen. And the chatter about it follows her everywhere, she added: “When I went to China, they were talking about it.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Correction: October 1, 2016, Saturday

An earlier version of this article misspelled the surname of a Las Vegas man of Japanese ancestry. He is Marc Matsuo, not Matuso.

\* New Hillary Clinton Ads Look to Expand Lead With Hispanic Voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/us/politics/new-hillary-clinton-ads-look-to-expand-lead-with-hispanic-voters.html]

\* After Trump-Clinton, Vice-Presidential Debate Isn’t Exactly ‘the Return of Elvis’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/us/politics/mike-pence-tim-kaine-vp-debate.html]

\* Donald Trump Opens New Line of Attack on Hillary Clinton: Her Marriage[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/01/us/politics/donald-trump-interview-bill-hillary-clinton.html]

\* In Deposition, Donald Trump Says Illegal **Immigration** Led to Nomination[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/01/us/politics/video-trump-deposition-washington-chefs.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If ever there was a year for Latinos in the United States to exercise their right to vote, 2016 is it.

Donald Trump, the Republican nominee, has made “Build a wall!” and deporting 11 million people central promises of his presidential campaign. At his rallies, Latino **immigrants** are cast as an invasion that needs to be stopped because it is transforming the face of America too profoundly, too quickly.

The implicit point of his campaign theme — “Make America Great Again” — is that America was great when it was a less diverse nation and that resurrecting that era will require drastic measures. While this has resonated with some white Americans, disaffected by social changes and an uneven economic recovery, it has offended and frightened Latinos, one of the fastest-growing segments of the electorate.

Whether stoking xenophobia turns out to be a genius or a disastrous move by a presidential candidate who has defied all the laws of political gravity will depend on how many of the 27 million eligible Hispanic voters turn out in November.

In a tight race, a resounding Latino showing could flip battleground states for the Democratic nominee, Hillary Clinton, and change how political parties perceive and engage with Hispanic voters in the future. That would affirm that Latinos are shaping the destiny of a nation that has always become stronger by embracing newcomers.

Presidential campaigns have been courting Latino voters since John F. Kennedy made a strong effort to woo Mexican-Americans during his 1960 White House run, which he narrowly won. Since then, Latinos, an electorate that is rapidly diversifying as it grows, have continued to lean Democratic in presidential elections, but have turned out in low numbers.

George W. Bush made notable gains in 2004, getting roughly 40 percent[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2005/06/27/hispanics-and-the-2004-election/] of the Latino vote. After he left office, the Republican Party’s position on **immigration** hardened considerably. In a shortsighted move, party leaders have since sought to suppress minority voting power through a combination of redistricting and tactics like voter ID laws. Mitt Romney’s loss in 2012, when he received only 27 percent of the Latino vote, caused Republican strategists to talk seriously about remaking the party’s relationship with Latinos.

Mr. Trump obliterated any chance that would happen by making the demonization of Mexican **immigrants** a centerpiece of a campaign that has catapulted white supremacy into the mainstream of American politics. He has also vilified Muslims and spoken ignorantly and contemptuously about African-Americans.

Latino grass-roots organizers hope that Mr. Trump’s nastiness will unlock the potential of the Latino electorate. That may well happen. They have made an ambitious push to get Hispanics to become naturalized citizens and to register to vote this year, particularly in swing states. The crush of applications for citizenship has overwhelmed the government[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/01/us/thousands-eager-to-vote-wont-become-citizens-in-time.html].

In addition to defeating a bully, Latinos have plenty of reasons to enthusiastically support Mr. Trump’s main rival.

Mrs. Clinton has coherent, well-thought-out plans to address the matters that Latinos say they care about most[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/07/15/the-economy-is-a-top-issue-for-latinos-and-theyre-more-upbeat-about-it/]. These include the economy, affordable access to health care, national security and education. Her record on **immigration** policy is not consistently progressive; as a senator in 2007, she opposed allowing unauthorized **immigrants** to get New York driver’s licenses. But she has changed her position on that issue and has promised to make the long overdue overhaul of America’s broken **immigration** system a priority. She also has vowed to continue, and expand, the program President Obama established to temporarily shield from deportation millions of unauthorized young **immigrants** with deep roots in the United States.

While **immigration** reform will no doubt entail a tough political fight, Latinos could make the prospect of an overhaul more likely by going to the polls in November. Low turnout among these voters would increase the likelihood of a Trump victory, which could mean mass deportations and more attacks on **immigrants**.

America’s 56 million Latinos — one third of whom are under 18 — are helping to shape America’s future in classrooms, workplaces and neighborhoods. It is only a matter of time before their mark on the nation’s politics matches their contributions in other spheres.

That moment should start now.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Leer en español (Read in Spanish)

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As the race between Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] teeters on a razor’s edge in Florida, their campaigns are scuffling over business that Mr. Trump may have conducted in Cuba while American companies were barred from operating there.

The issue has already started to percolate among the state’s large Cuban-American population and could have the potential to undo some of the progress that Mr. Trump — a pariah to many Hispanics — had been making there.

The revelations come as both sides are dumping considerable resources and time into the state, which is seen as critical to Mr. Trump’s hopes of winning the White House. Mr. Trump visited the Little Havana section of Miami this week. Mrs. Clinton just began running a Spanish-language television ad in Florida that attacks Mr. Trump on **immigration** and includes a 19-year-old Cuban-American saying that he will vote for her. In an attempt to further bolster Mrs. Clinton, her campaign announced on Friday that President Obama would visit Miami next week on her behalf.

The report that Mr. Trump’s corporation [http://www.newsweek.com/2016/10/14/donald-trump-cuban-embargo-castro-violated-florida-504059.html] spent $68,000 on a 1998 trip to explore business opportunities in Cuba fit neatly into a line of attack the Clinton campaign has been pursuing recently. During the first presidential debate on Monday, and as she travels the country talking to voters, Mrs. Clinton has been arguing that, throughout his career, Mr. Trump has continually put his own interests above everyone else’s — whether the small contractors he has refused to pay or the taxes she says he still owes the federal government.

For his part, Mr. Trump denied trying to invest in Cuba, telling a New Hampshire television station[http://www.wmur.com/politics/trump-denies-violating-cuban-embargo/41887354] on Thursday, “I was not involved in doing business in Cuba.” Whatever the purpose of the $68,000 trip was, Mr. Trump said his companies never entered into any agreement to do business on the island.

The question of whether Mr. Trump sought business opportunities in Fidel Castro’s Cuba is explosive not only because of how loathed the Castro government is among Cuban-Americans in the Miami area, but also because Mr. Trump has taken such a hard line against the Obama administration’s policy of normalizing relations[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/21/world/americas/cuba-obama-visit-havana-dissidents.html] with the island nation.

As far back as 1999, in public at least, Mr. Trump called efforts to restore relations with Cuba “pure lunacy.”

As a sign of just how damaging Democrats believe the news could be for Mr. Trump, Mrs. Clinton wasted little time jumping on the article when Newsweekpublished it late this past week. The day the piece appeared, Mrs. Clinton addressed it from her campaign plane, saying that it fit a pattern of Mr. Trump’s poor judgment.

“This adds to the long list of actions and statements that raise doubts about his temperament and qualification to be president and commander in chief,” she said on Thursday.

The news media in South Florida has been especially fixated on the report, with Spanish-language broadcasts running story after story headlined “Cuba Connection” and “Embargo Violation?”

Senator Marco Rubio, Republican of Florida, asked about the report at a news conference on Friday in Miami, said that while he was concerned, he was still waiting to learn all of the facts.

“The article makes some pretty serious accusations that deserve a response,” Mr. Rubio said, “but I’m not going to base my opinion or make a statement on the basis of an article — one article by one journalist alone without more information available to me.”

Though the Cuban vote has been historically Republican, the political allegiances of younger Cubans have been shifting, making the group far less reliable for Republican candidates than it used to be. According to the Pew Research Center, less than half[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/06/24/after-decades-of-gop-support-cubans-shifting-toward-the-democratic-party/] of Cuban-American registered voters nationwide — 47 percent — say they identify with or lean toward the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org]. A decade ago, nearly two-thirds of them did.

Mr. Trump’s allies in Florida have dismissed the Newsweek report. His campaign chairman in Miami-Dade County, Lorenzo Palomares, told the Spanish-language newspaper Diario Las Americas[https://translate-google-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/translate?hl=en&sl=es&u=http://www.diariolasamericas.com/&prev=search] that the article was a political ad[http://www.diariolasamericas.com/eeuu/campana-trump-miami-dade-defiende-al-candidato-articulo-newsweek-n4104133] “paid for by Hillary Clinton.”

But the Clinton campaign has been relentless in trying to keep the story alive. After Mr. Trump’s campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, appeared on “The View” and seemed not to know much of the details of the $68,000 — “I think they paid money, as I understand from the story, they paid money in 1998,” she said — the Clinton campaign took that as an admission of guilt.

Jake Sullivan, Mrs. Clinton’s senior policy adviser, issued a statement[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/briefing/statements/2016/09/29/statement-from-jake-sullivan-on-trumps-reported-violation-of-the-u-s-embargo-against-cuba/] that accused Mr. Trump of lying about his real intentions in Cuba.

“Trump’s business with Cuba appears to have broken the law, flouted U.S. foreign policy, and is in complete contradiction to Trump’s own repeated, public statements that he had been offered opportunities to invest in Cuba but passed them up,” Mr. Sullivan said.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* In Deposition, Donald Trump Says Illegal **Immigration** Led to Nomination[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/01/us/politics/video-trump-deposition-washington-chefs.html]

\* Keep the Tax Returns, Trump; Just Give Us a Few Figures[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/business/2-numbers-can-answer-the-donald-trump-tax-question.html]

\* Letter From Former Officials Urges Donald Trump to Detail Foreign Dealings[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/us/politics/donald-trump-business-reaction.html]

\* Why So Many Business Leaders Are Tiptoeing Around Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/business/dealbook/why-so-many-business-leaders-are-tiptoeing-around-donald-trump.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE Republican Party’s politicians have mostly surrendered to Donald Trump. The Republican Party’s entertainers have mostly been enthusiastic about his candidacy. But the conservative intelligentsia — journalists, think-tankers and academics — has been conspicuous in its resistance.

Now, though, we have “Writers and Scholars for America” — a collection of prominent signatories[http://scholarsandwritersforamerica.org/] to the proposition that given the available options, “Donald J. Trump is the candidate most likely to restore the promise of America.”

The list of names is an interesting mix: There are hacks of the sort who inevitably flutter toward Trump’s flame, but there are also writers I’ve admired for many years. And while there is no unifying manifesto, it’s possible to piece together the arguments that attract these thinkers to Trump’s candidacy.

Those arguments seem at first blush to be in tension. On the one hand, many of the pro-Trump thinkers[http://amgreatness.com/2016/09/28/conservatives-for-trump-a-symposium-featuring-writers-and-scholars-for-trump/] seem to believe that for all his distinctive vices, Trump would probably end up governing largely as a conventional Republican. Believing as they do that liberal ideas are dangerous or destructive, these conservatives see the 2016 election as a straightforward lesser of two evils situation, in which the Republican nominee’s indecency is preferable to the damage that a Hillary Clinton presidency would all but guarantee.

But then you also have others who are attracted to Trump precisely because he isn’t a conventional Republican. Reagan-era conservatism had its time and failed, these Trump-supporting intellectuals suggest, and the time has come to roll the dice, to embrace a change agent even if he seems gross and seedy and bigoted, because the alternative is staying on a fatal course[http://amgreatness.com/2016/09/05/flight-93-election/].

Some of these writers feel that the American republic has already gone under[http://www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/after-the-republic/], we’re just choosing between elected emperors, and you might as well gamble on a Caesar who’s willing to flay the empire’s ruling class. Others take the more modest view that Trump is correct on particular issues (**immigration**, foreign policy, the importance of the nation-state) where the bipartisan consensus is often wrong[http://nationalinterest.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/feature/trump-forced-washington-confront-its-failures-17851], and his candidacy is a chance to vote against an elite worldview[https://www-firstthings-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/web-exclusives/2016/03/what-trump-teaches-us] that desperately needs to be chastened and rebuked.

I said that these two perspectives seem to be in tension, but it’s actually pretty easy to combine them. If Trump gets restrained by his advisers, he’ll be a typical Republican, this combination would go, and if he stays true to his own essential Trumpiness, he’ll be the scourge our rotten system needs.

If ideas were all, this would be a plausible argument. Trump is too mercurial to be fully trusted on judicial appointments or any other issue that matters to the right. But it’s reasonable to think that the way he’s campaigned — on a mix of standard-issue Republican ideas and populist-nationalist heresies — is the way that he will try to govern.

But the problem comes in with that one word, “try.”

Set aside for a moment Trump’s low character, his penchant for inflaming racial tensions, his personal corruptions. Assume for the sake of argument that all that can be folded into a “lesser of two evils” case.

What remains is this question: Can Donald Trump actually execute the basic duties of the presidency? Is there any way that his administration won’t be a flaming train wreck from the start? Is there any possibility that he’ll be levelheaded in a crisis — be it another 9/11 or financial meltdown, or any of the lesser-but-still-severe challenges that presidents reliably face?

I think we have seen enough from his campaign — up to and including his wretchedly stupid conduct since the first debate — to answer confidently, “No.” Trump’s zest for self-sabotage, his wild swings, his inability to delegate or take advice, are not mere flaws; they are defining characteristics. The burdens of the presidency will leave him permanently maddened, perpetually undone.

Even if that undoing doesn’t lead to economic or geopolitical calamity (yes, Virginia, there are worse things than the Iraq War), which cause or idea associated with Trumpism is likely to emerge stronger after a four-year train wreck? Not populism or **immigration** restrictionism. Not evangelical Christianity. Not economic conservatism. They’ll all be lashed to the mast of a burning ship whose captain is angrily tweeting from the poop deck.

Months ago, I worried that Trump was too authoritarian to be entrusted with the presidency. That worry has receded a bit, because authoritarianism requires a ruthless sort of competence that Trump cannot attain.

But fecklessness in the presidency can be as destructive as malice, and not just to the country: A disastrous chief executive can do devastating damage to his own political ideas.

In this sense the intellectuals’ case for Donald Trump fails because it cannot shake free of those ideas and see the personal element here clearly.

What Trump believes, what he intends to do in office — those questions are ultimately secondary to the problem of the man himself, and the near-certainty that he will fail, and in failing, betray anyone who has lent him their support.

I invite you to follow me on Twitter (@DouthatNYT)[http://twitter.com/DouthatNYT].

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s campaign and the main group supporting it, Priorities USA[http://prioritiesusaaction.org/], hit the airwaves this week with new Spanish-language ads as they look to increase their lead among Hispanic voters in key swing states. An ad called “Disappear,”[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A0GFB\_ACdlA] from Priorities, focuses on deportation.

THE AD A Hispanic family smiles and shares a box of cereal around a table, but they quickly fade from the scene, leaving an unswept table and dirty dishes. “This is a country where we speak English,” Mr. Trump is heard saying, with subtitles in Spanish. The disappearance motif builds through the spot: A woman working at her laptop fades away, her computer screen still flashing; a family reading a book in bed vanishes, followed by a woman studying on the lawn.

“Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] wants to see us disappear,” the narrator says in Spanish. Spliced between each disappearance are quotes from Mr. Trump, discussing his deportation plans: “I want everybody out.”

THE MESSAGE Mr. Trump’s hard-line **immigration** policies, which experts have estimated would lead to the deportation of millions of unauthorized **immigrants** in the country, would lead to the loss of friends, family members and neighbors in Hispanic communities.

TAKEAWAY The Clinton team has made Hispanic outreach a cornerstone of its advertising efforts, spending more than $2.5 million on Spanish-language advertising on broadcast alone, according to Kantar Media/CMAG. This ad, combined with an ad from the Clinton campaign highlighting Hispanic residents proudly proclaiming that they are voting in their first election, seeks to harness that energy just as early voting is beginning. Immediately after the first debate, Google searches for “voter registration” surged in Hispanic communities[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/upshot/trump-effect-voter-registration-may-be-surging-in-hispanic-areas.html?rref=collection%2Fbyline%2Fnate-cohn&action=click&contentCollection=undefined®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=collection], where high turnout is essential for Mrs. Clinton to win in states crucial to her victory, like Colorado and Florida.

A recent Mason-Dixon poll[http://www.politico.com/states/f/?id=00000157-79b0-de4f-a777-79fb8c9c0001] found Mr. Trump down 35 points to Mrs. Clinton among Hispanics in Florida. These ads, coming as Mr. Trump escalated his feud[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/alicia-machado-donald-trump.html] with a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, who is Hispanic, have made for a tough week for Mr. Trump among Hispanic voters.

Changing channels ...

Asked and Answered

Mrs. Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/hillary-rodham-clinton?8qa] just discovered the dangers of a rhetorical question, courtesy of a new Trump ad. Not long after she said this month in Florida, “Why aren’t I 50 points ahead, you might ask?” the Trump campaign quickly offered an answer [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v8qwzBbFyYU&feature=youtu.be]in a new ad featuring a list of grievances. “Maybe it’s because the director of the F.B.I. said you lied about your emails,” a narrator says. “Or maybe it’s because you call Americans ‘deplorable,’” he continues, as the now infamous clip plays of Mrs. Clinton deriding some of the Trump supporters. The ad closes as it opened, and adds a rhetorical question: “Do you really need to ask?”

Beer Politics

There’s the “Trump Wall,” a towering 55-foot barricade of best-in-the-world concrete, and then there’s the Tecate Beer Wall[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bev4NZEFsCQ], waist high and the perfect place to rest an ice-cold, glistening brew. In a rare political ad from a commercial enterprise, Tecate poked fun at the central tenet of the Trump appeal, envisioning a wall that “brings us together,” described with Trumpian hyperbole, like “tremendous” and “the best wall.” Stretching for miles across a desert landscape, four men from Mexico and four men from California meet at the wall, sharing a cooler of beers and at one point hopping over from the California side to the Mexican. The ad concludes, “This wall may be small, but it will be huge.”

Toilet Humor

Getting attention in a down-ballot local race can be tough, driving candidates to get more creative in their ad making. John DiSanto[http://disantoforsenate.com/], a candidate for State Senate in Pennsylvania, went with not one, not two, but three toilet humor jokes in his new ad[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m8NOkLR9Sh0]. “As a businessman and farmer, I’ve had to deal with a lot of crap,” he says, as a shot of him spearing manure with a pitchfork pans across the screen. Pivoting to his opponent, Mr. DiSanto comes right out with it, saying, “He’s spreading a lot of —” before going to a bleeped-out, four-letter word. The ad then traces over his record, before going for one more joke: “These career politicians produce a lot of manure, so it’s good I’ve got some big equipment.”

Numbers

$18.4 million spent on the Florida Senate general election.

$56.8 million spent on the presidential election in Florida.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — The Supreme Court, awaiting the outcome of a presidential election that will determine its future, returns to the bench this week to face a volatile docket studded with timely cases on race, religion and **immigration**.

The justices have been shorthanded since Justice Antonin Scalia died in February[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/14/us/antonin-scalia-death.html], and say they are determined to avoid deadlocks. That will require resolve and creativity.

“This term promises to be the most unpredictable one in many, many years,” said Neal K. Katyal[https://www.hoganlovells.com/en/neal-katyal], a former acting United States solicitor general in the Obama administration now with Hogan Lovells.

There is no case yet on the docket that rivals the blockbusters of recent terms addressing health care[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/26/us/obamacare-supreme-court.html], abortion[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/28/us/supreme-court-texas-abortion.html] or same-sex marriage[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/27/us/supreme-court-same-sex-marriage.html]. But such cases are rare, whether there are eight justices or nine.

“This term’s cases are not snoozers,” said Elizabeth B. Wydra[https://theusconstitution.org/about/people/director-staff/elizabeth-b-wydra], the president of the Constitutional Accountability Center, a liberal group. “This term features important cases about racial bias in the criminal justice system, voting rights and redistricting, **immigration** and detention, and accountability for big banks that engaged in racially discriminatory mortgage lending practices.”

There are, moreover, major cases on the horizon, including ones on whether a transgender boy may use the boys’ restroom in a Virginia high school and on whether a Colorado baker may refuse to serve a same-sex couple.

“If either of these cases is taken, it will almost immediately become the highest profile case on the court’s docket,” said Steven Shapiro[https://www.aclu.org/bio/steven-r-shapiro], the legal director of the American Civil Liberties Union.

There is also the possibility that a dispute over the outcome of the presidential election could end up at the Supreme Court, as it did in 2000 in Bush v. Gore[http://www.nytimes.com/2001/02/20/us/bush-v-gore-a-special-report-election-case-a-test-and-a-trauma-for-justices.html].

“That is the doomsday scenario in some respects of having an eight-member court,” said Carter G. Phillips[http://www.sidley.com/people/carter-phillips], a lawyer with Sidley Austin. A deadlocked Supreme Court would leave in place the lower court ruling and oust the justices from their role as the final arbiters of federal law.

Race figures in many of the new term’s most important cases, including two to be heard in October, and that seems to be part of a new trend. “The court hasn’t had a lot of cases recently dealing with race in the criminal justice system,” said Jeffrey L. Fisher[https://law.stanford.edu/directory/jeffrey-l-fisher/], a law professor at Stanford.

In June, a dissent[https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/15pdf/14-1373\_83i7.pdf] from Justice Sonia Sotomayor brought a new perspective to the issue.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/05/us/politics/in-dissents-sonia-sotomayor-takes-on-the-criminal-justice-system.html] Citing James Baldwin’s “The Fire Next Time” and Ta-Nehisi Coates’s “Between the World and Me,” she insisted that the brutal history and contemporary reality of racism in the United States must play a role in the court’s analysis.

That dissent may prove influential, said Justin Driver[http://www.law.uchicago.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/faculty/driver], a law professor at the University of Chicago. “One item to keep an eye on this term,” he said, “is the extent to which the Black Lives Matters movement makes its presence felt on the court’s docket.”

On Wednesday, the court will hear arguments in Buck v. Davis, No. 15-8049. It arose from an extraordinary assertion by an expert witness in the death penalty trial of Duane Buck, who was convicted of the 1995 murders of a former girlfriend and one of her friends while her young children watched. The expert, presented by the defense, said that black men are more likely to present a risk of future danger.

The justices will decide whether Mr. Buck, who is black, may challenge his death sentence based on the ineffectiveness of the trial lawyer who presented that testimony.

“The Buck case raises questions that could not be more relevant to ongoing conversations sparked by police shootings about implicit bias and stereotyping of African-American men as violent and dangerous,” Ms. Wydra said. “The Roberts court, and particularly the chief justice himself, has often been reluctant to acknowledge the reality of systemic racism in this country, but the egregious facts of the Buck case make it impossible to avoid.”

On Oct. 11, the court will consider another biased statement, this one ascribed to a juror during deliberations in a sexual assault trial. “I think he did it because he’s Mexican, and Mexican men take whatever they want,” the juror said of the defendant, according to a sworn statement from a second juror.

The question in the case, Peña Rodriguez v. Colorado[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/us/politics/supreme-court-to-hear-case-on-juror-racial-bias.html], No. 15-606, is how to balance the interest in keeping jury deliberations secret against the importance of ridding the criminal justice system of racial and ethnic bias.

Race also figures in cases on redistricting,[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/bethune-hill-v-virginia-state-board-of-elections/] fair housing[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/wells-fargo-co-v-city-of-miami/] and malicious prosecution[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/manuel-v-city-of-joliet/].

On Thursday, the court agreed to decide another charged case, Lee v. Tam[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/us/politics/supreme-court-trademarks-redskins.html], No. 15-1293, which asks whether the government may deny federal protection to a trademark said to disparage Asian-Americans. The case will probably effectively decide a separate one concerning the Washington Redskins football team.

The court will also decide, in Moore v. Texas, No. 15-797, whether Texas may use an idiosyncratic standard[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/politics/supreme-court-to-consider-legal-standard-drawn-from-of-mice-and-men.html?\_r=0] in deciding who must be spared execution because of intellectual disability. The state relies in part on what one judge there called the “Lennie standard,” which exempts defendants who resemble Lennie Small, the dim, hulking farmhand in John Steinbeck’s “Of Mice and Men.”

At some point this term, the court will hear a significant religion case, Trinity Lutheran Church v. Pauley, No. 15-577. It poses the question of whether states must provide aid to churches in at least some circumstances even if their state constitution forbids such assistance.

The court agreed to hear the case on Jan. 15, about a month before Justice Scalia died. Other cases granted that day were argued and decided by the end of the last term in June. In the ordinary course, the religion case would have been scheduled for argument in the last term or in October, and certainly not later than November.

But the case has yet to be scheduled. “The most logical inference,” said Paul D. Clement[https://www.kirkland.com/sitecontent.cfm?contentID=230&itemId=12393], a former solicitor general in the Bush administration now with Kirkland & Ellis, “is that this is a case where the court is going to take its time scheduling this in the hopes that they will have nine justices to decide the case in the end because this is a case that could be closely divided.”

The case started when officials in Missouri rejected an application from a Lutheran church for a grant to use recycled tires to resurface a playground.

The Missouri Constitution bars spending public money “in aid of any church,” and the State Supreme Court has called for “a very high wall between church and state.”

The church argues that the State Constitution violates equal protection principles and the First Amendment’s guarantee of free exercise of religion.

The court has three **immigration** cases on its docket, involving detentions[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/jennings-v-rodriguez/], deportations[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/lynch-v-dimaya/] and how children born abroad to an American parent may obtain citizenship[http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/lynch-v-morales-santana/].

The court has already granted a stay[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/04/us/politics/supreme-court-blocks-order-allowing-transgender-student-restroom-choice.html] in Gloucester County School Board v. G.G., No. 16-273, temporarily barring Gavin Grimm, a transgender boy, from using the boys’ bathroom in a Virginia high school. The justices are scheduled to decide whether to hear the case on Oct. 14, and the stay suggests that they may be ready to enter the national debate over transgender rights.

Later this term, in Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission, No. 16-111, the justices will decide whether to take up a baker’s contention that he should not be compelled to create a cake for a same-sex wedding.

Mr. Clement, at a briefing at the Heritage Foundation[http://www.heritage.org/events/2016/09/supreme-court-preview-of-the-2016-term?mkt\_tok=eyJpIjoiTURabFlXTTBaR1UwTVRrMiIsInQiOiIrejVRZWVBZm9UUU1EV1ZVY0Z5bmtFXC85NGs0dGMrREd2dDJrVW9NUUNRMkthdTg4RCtUYlhVTjVlRmI5eG5QY09kNkNaRmVHZ0ZPbHZoY2pDVlZxRUE9PSJ9], a conservative group, said the justices will most likely be cautious in granting contentious cases until they are back at full strength.

“The court seems to be reluctant,” he said, “to add cases to their docket that they think in advance may well divide them 4 to 4.”

But the court may feel it has to try to resolve a dispute arising from the presidential election.

“Would they take the case?” Mr. Phillips mused at the same briefing, referring to one along the lines of Bush v. Gore. “My guess is they might. Whether they would ultimately decide anything, who knows?”

Follow Adam Liptak on Twitter @adamliptak[https://twitter.com/adamliptak].

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/nytpolitics], and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics/].

\* In Dissents, Sonia Sotomayor Takes On the Criminal Justice System[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/05/us/politics/in-dissents-sonia-sotomayor-takes-on-the-criminal-justice-system.html]

\* Supreme Court to Consider Legal Standard Drawn From ‘Of Mice and Men’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/politics/supreme-court-to-consider-legal-standard-drawn-from-of-mice-and-men.html]

\* Antonin Scalia, Justice on the Supreme Court, Dies at 79[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/14/us/antonin-scalia-death.html]

\* Supreme Court Strikes Down Texas Abortion Restrictions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/28/us/supreme-court-texas-abortion.html]

\* Supreme Court Ruling Makes Same-Sex Marriage a Right Nationwide[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/27/us/supreme-court-same-sex-marriage.html]

\* Supreme Court Allows Nationwide Health Care Subsidies[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/26/us/obamacare-supreme-court.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump is often seen at rallies or on reality television or across from a journalist. But on Friday, a Washington judge made public video showing Mr. Trump in a far more subdued setting: the deposition room.

The video shows Mr. Trump, in a black suit and blue tie, sitting in an nondescript law office in June answering questions in his suit against Geoffrey Zakarian, a celebrity chef who backed out of Mr. Trump’s new hotel development at the Old Post Office Pavilion in Washington. Mr. Trump is also suing another chef, José Andrés, who backed out of another restaurant.

The chefs pulled out[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/10/dining/donald-trump-dc-hotel-project-loses-geoffrey-zakarian.html] after Mr. Trump made incendiary comments[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/17/us/politics/donald-trump-runs-for-president-this-time-for-real-he-says.html?hp] last year about Mexican **immigrants** as he announced his presidential campaign. Mr. Trump said Mexico was sending people with “problems” — “They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.”

He is suing the companies associated with Mr. Zakarian and Mr. Andrés for breach of contract.

In the deposition, Mr. Trump sat for about 100 minutes, often with his arms folded and sometimes swaying in his chair. He answered questions about the contracts with the chefs and about his remarks on Mexicans, telling Mr. Zakarian’s lawyer, Deborah Baum, that he had been misinterpreted by the news media, which he called “very dishonest.”

“All I’m doing is bringing up a situation which is very real, about illegal **immigration**,” he said during the deposition. “And I think, you know, most people think I’m right.”

He explained that his raising the topic of illegal **immigration** “led to my nomination in a major party in the country.”

“I’ve tapped into illegal **immigration**,” he said. “I’ve tapped into other things, also. But, you know, when you get more votes than anybody in the history of the party, history of the party by far — more than Ronald Reagan, more than Richard Nixon, more than Dwight D. Eisenhower who won the Second World War — you know, that’s pretty mainstream, when you think about it.”

The judge in the Zakarian case ordered the release of the deposition video, as well as those of two of Mr. Trump’s children, in response to requests from news organizations, including BuzzFeed News, which posted the footage[https://www.buzzfeed.com/danielwagner/trump-video-depositions?utm\_term=.mwnzPm39Y#.rq5wdA6L2] online.

A federal court judge hearing a separate fraud case pertaining to Trump University recently decided not to make public the video of Mr. Trump’s deposition in the case.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**They stayed up late studying for civics tests. They went to classes, paid hefty fees and underwent background checks.

During the last year, nearly a million legal **immigrants** applied to become American citizens, many of them hoping to take the oath of citizenship in time to cast their first ballots on Nov. 8 in a presidential race where **immigration** has been fiercely debated.

But as the number of aspiring citizens grew this year, the backlog at the federal agency that approves naturalizations swelled. With the agency now reporting that it takes up to seven months to complete the process, Obama administration officials are reluctantly admitting that many — perhaps most — of the **immigrants** in the backlog will not become citizens in time to vote.

“I’ve been checking my mail every day, but I haven’t heard anything,” said Francisca Fiero, 73, a Mexican **immigrant** in Las Vegas. “I’m starting to get very worried.”

Ms. Fiero, who has had a green card for a decade, applied in January and gave her fingerprints in June. Since then, nothing. The voter registration deadline in Nevada is Oct. 18.

In the last year almost 940,000 legal **immigrants** applied to become citizens, a 23 percent surge over the previous year. As of June 30, more than 520,000 applications were waiting to be examined, a pileup that increased steadily since last year.

**Immigration** officials “anticipated that there would be a spike in applications this year, but the increase has exceeded expectations,” said Jeffrey T. Carter, a spokesman for the United States Citizenship and **Immigration**Services[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/c/citizenship\_and\_immigration\_services\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-org], the agency in charge of naturalizations.

The official figures[https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20S] revealing the backlog, published in late September, came as a shock to **immigrant** groups that put on a nationwide push early this year to help eligible **immigrants** to naturalize. Some of the biggest increases in applications came in battleground states where they had focused their efforts, including a 30 percent increase over a year earlier in Colorado, a 40 percent increase in Florida and a 53 percent increase in Nevada.

“The agency has developed an acute case of the slows, and it could not be a more critical moment,” said Tara Raghuveer, deputy director of the National [http://partnershipfornewamericans.org/] Partnership for New Americans[http://partnershipfornewamericans.org/], a coalition of 37 groups that held citizenship workshops around the country. The groups scrambled to file applications before May 1, she said, after the **immigration** agency originally advised them that the process would take four to six months.

This year for the first time the naturalization drive also had high-profile backing from the White House, which sponsored ad campaigns, gave $10 million to community groups and made fixes to make it easier to apply. But officials said the White House was not monitoring the results to confirm that the **immigration**agency was completing naturalizations in a timely way.

In the presidential race between Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump, the **immigrant** vote could be pivotal, especially in states with large numbers of Latino **immigrants**.

The naturalization backlogs are bad news for Mrs. Clinton because polls in those states show Latinos favoring her over Mr. Trump by gaping margins. In Florida, for example, more than 66,000 potential new voters stuck in the backlog could be enough to affect the outcome of a race that polls show is a virtual tie.

Citizenship applications generally surge during presidential election cycles. In 2007 and 2008, more than 1.4 million **immigrants** became citizens, stirred by a combination of an impending fee increase and the historic candidacy of Barack Obama.

This year, **immigrant** groups set a goal of one million naturalizations, and the application numbers were on track to reach it. In May, the Obama administration announced another fee increase for later this year, which could have moved some latecomers to apply. Then the backlogs emerged.

Many **immigrants** decided to become citizens because they just wanted to vote, without being drawn to a particular candidate.

“I want to put in my voice to be heard just like everybody else,” said Geraldine Rolle, a 65-year-old **immigrant** from the Bahamas, who has been a legal resident since 1991 and now lives in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. She worked for years as a housekeeping supervisor in Miami hotels.

She applied in February. After having her photograph taken in April, she heard nothing more. “They keep telling me you have to be a citizen to vote, and now it doesn’t look like I’m going to get that before the elections,” Ms. Rolle said sadly.

Ms. Fiero, in Las Vegas, has had a rocky time. She came to the United States as a legal resident and has always kept her green card up to date. A cafeteria worker in an elementary school, she applied to naturalize in January. But the agency rejected her application as incomplete.

When many similar rejections were reported in Nevada, the Culinary Workers Union, which helped Ms. Fiero and many others to apply, appealed to Senator Harry Reid. **Immigration** officials acknowledged to Mr. Reid that the applications had been denied by mistake. Ms. Fiero was allowed to apply again a month later.

Like many Latino **immigrants**, Ms. Fiero said she was eager to vote because she does not like Mr. Trump and is a fan of Mrs. Clinton’s. “She seems like the right person to help poor families get better houses,” Ms. Fiero said.

Officials at the citizenship agency said they shifted employees to offices where the workload had mounted and authorized overtime for many offices. But Mr. Carter, the spokesman, said that nationwide the agency was “still within our normal processing times.”

Internal emails from the **immigration** agency’s Houston office, which were recently leaked by Republican leaders in the Senate, show it was working to pick up the pace. A message on July 21 exhorted employees to finish as many naturalizations as possible before Oct. 1 “due to the election year needs.” The Houston office opened on two Saturdays that month to try to address the backlog.

But in New York, citizenship groups have heard from anxious **immigrants** who have waited as long as a year with no end in sight. In Nashville, city officials had to cancel a swearing-in ceremony planned to take place this weekend during a festival. The judge scheduled to conduct it reported no **immigrants** were ready. **Immigration** officials said other demands on agency employees’ time got in the way.

The agency is also facing pressure to slow down. In a letter last week, Senators Charles E. Grassley of Iowa and Ron Johnson of Wisconsin, both Republicans, cited a recent case[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/us/flaws-in-fingerprint-records-allowed-hundreds-to-become-us-citizens.htm] in which more than 800 **immigrants** who had been ordered deported were granted citizenship because of gaps in the agency’s vetting.

Rather than speeding up, the agency “should instead be putting on the brakes,” the senators wrote.

But at the Culinary Workers Union in Las Vegas, **immigrants** are fuming. “It really is outrageous that people can do everything right and still be denied an important right as a citizen,” Yvanna Cancela, a union official, said.

\* More Latinos Seek Citizenship to Vote Against Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/08/us/trumps-rise-spurs-latino-immigrants-to-naturalize-to-vote-against-him.html]

\* Hillary Clinton Struggles to Gain Traction in Florida, Despite Spending[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/us/politics/hillary-clinton-florida-voters.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**RE: FIRST WORDS[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/who-gets-to-be-called-a-patriot.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fmagazine&action=click&contentCollection=magazine®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=10&pgtype=sectionfront]

Wesley Morris wrote about Colin Kaepernick and the question of who gets to be called a “patriot.”

The near requirement that a person stand for the national anthem is a peculiarly American notion. What should be more meaningful and profound are the freedoms and liberties that the anthem represents, including the right to protest injustice against you or others. Colin Kaepernick has been excoriated by many for not being grateful or patriotic enough. I’d say that the conversation he is helping to inspire is about as patriotic as a person can get. Edwin Andrews, Malden, Mass.

Historically, it has always been the patriot willing to challenge the status quo who has effected the most meaningful change. It is difficult and sometimes dangerous to do so, and for this reason, these people have my utmost admiration. There is something genuinely sad about the “love it or leave it” crowd, who are seemingly incapable of doing an independent analysis of what is happening in their country, but who are so desperate to seem worthy of praise that they engage in a symbolic one-upmanship of nationalistic fervor. Destined to serve as political pawns, they actually do more harm than good to their country, as they help to stifle meaningful review of military or government policy.

This is a fine essay that explores how the ignorant fears of the knee-jerk “patriot” overlap with the ignorant fears at the root of racism and xenophobia. That these fears are still rampant in 21st-century American life is a bleak testimony to the failings of both the education system and what poses as political leadership these days. May future generations find a way to better celebrate the challengers of the status quo. Philip Conrad, Montreal

When it’s just a lapel pin, which seems to have become a required piece of jewelry for every official or candidate for an elected position, it’s easy to be “patriotic.” It’s much harder to be a patriot and serve the country or be a patriot and pay your taxes because those taxes support the country. It’s actually quite unpatriotic to hide money in offshore accounts, outsource jobs to avoid hiring, training and paying Americans or encourage deliberately underpaid employees to apply for food stamps and welfare.

Patriotism can mean disagreeing with your country or protesting. It can mean standing up for your country, celebrating its traditions, welcoming new citizens and respecting others who are different. But every time someone tells me that it’s unpatriotic to say that there are things I don’t like about America or tells me how to be patriotic, I wonder how fragile that person’s patriotism is. Wrapping yourself in the flag is not patriotism. Applying and understanding the Constitution is. So is defending the rights of someone to make statements you find unpleasant. Andrea L. Alterman, Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.

RE: **IMMIGRATION**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/how-republicans-lost-their-best-shot-at-the-hispanic-vote.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fmagazine&action=click&contentCollection=magazine®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=9&pgtype=sectionfront]

Alec MacGillis wrote about the failure of the Republican-led House to reach a compromise on **immigration**.

It is pretty clear that the House of Representatives could have passed **immigration**-reform legislation if John Boehner would have had the courage to break the undemocratic and highly partisan “Hastert rule,” which blocks a floor vote unless a majority of the majority party supports the bill, and would have put forth for a vote the bipartisan legislation passed by the Senate.

As President Andrew Jackson has been credited with saying, “One man with courage makes a majority.” Boehner, the speaker of the House, was not a man of courage. He missed the opportunity to pass historic legislation and to gain his place in history. He has done irreparable damage to the country and to the Republican Party. He is one of the individuals most responsible for the rise of Donald Trump. Jorge D. Fraga, on nytimes.com[http://nytimes.com]

Clearly, the only question on our legislators’ minds in considering legislation is “What’s in it for me?” We need to bring back earmarks — a few bridges to nowhere would be a cheap price to pay for getting a functioning legislature again.

How can these people admit that they failed to even vote on legislation that they believe is in the best interest of the country? Isn’t that a violation of their oaths of office? And as Christians, how do they sleep at night knowing the fear that pervades so many homes in our country as children go to bed hoping they will wake up to an alarm clock and not armed federal officers bursting in? I guess “Christian” doesn’t mean what I thought it meant. Paula, on nytimes.com

Send your thoughts to magazine@nytimes.com[mailto:magazine@nytimes.com].

Sign up for our newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

In recent years, one of the most important events on a prospective Republican presidential candidate’s calendar was the RedState Gathering, a summer convention for conservative activists from across the nation. Its host was Erick Erickson, a round-faced, redheaded former election lawyer and city councilman in Macon, Ga., who began blogging in 2004 on a site called RedState.com[http://www.redstate.com/].

Erickson, who is now 41, is a conservative absolutist who made his name in the mid-2000s by “blowing up” — in the Twitter parlance he jovially employs — Republican leaders he viewed as insufficiently principled. In 2005, he played a role in torpedoing the Supreme Court nomination of the White House counsel Harriet Miers, publishing damaging admissions from White House sources that Miers had not been properly vetted. Five years later, he chided the National Rifle Association for being too willing to compromise, labeling it “a weak little girl of an organization[http://www.redstate.com/erick/2010/06/14/yet-again-the-nra-sells-out-to-democrats/].” He was a sharp-tongued critic of John McCain and Mitt Romney during their presidential runs, characterizing the former as “an angry old jackass” and the latter as “the Harriet Miers of 2012.”

Along the way, Erickson became one of the new kingmakers of the Tea Party-era G.O.P. A little-known Florida legislator and Senate hopeful named Marco Rubio reached out to him in 2009 when he was at 3 percent in the polls. A former Texas solicitor general, Ted Cruz, did the same in 2011. Rick Perry announced his 2012 presidential candidacy at Erickson’s gathering. By 2015, a number of the coming cycle’s aspirants — Rubio, Cruz, Perry and Bobby Jindal — had given him their personal cellphone numbers, and he had traded emails with Jeb Bush. And two months before that August’s convention in Atlanta, a New York-based Republican consultant named Sam Nunberg reached out to Erickson to ask if he could accommodate one more speaker: Donald Trump.

Erickson watched coverage of Trump’s stream-of-consciousness announcement at Trump Tower on June 16 and was not particularly impressed. On the syndicated radio show he broadcasts from Atlanta, he offered his assessment with a dismissive chuckle: “I guess he’s ready to be spoiler, not president.” He had met Trump once before, in July 2011, when he visited the 26th floor of Trump Tower to interview[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fQFfiQglbHA] the businessman and reality-TV-show star. Trump had spent the past few months flirting with a presidential run only to decide, as he told Erickson that day, “I have a great show that’s a big success, and it’s hard to say, ‘I’m gonna leave two hours of prime-time television in order to get beat up by people that don’t know what they’re doing.’ ”

The hourlong conversation struck Erickson as pleasant but unmemorable. What did stick with him was their exchange as he was leaving Trump Tower. “Trump asked me if I played golf,” Erickson told me recently. “And I said, ‘Yeah, I’m terrible.’ ” Then, he said, Trump asked if he would be interested in coming to Trump’s golf-club in West Palm Beach, Fla., to play. “I’m very flattered — I’ve never been to West Palm Beach before,” Erickson recalled. “Several times, his office reached out. So finally I asked my wife, ‘What do you think this is about?’ She said, ‘He wants to own your soul.’ So I never went.”

Erickson did not see much of a political future for Trump, but he imagined that he might be good for ticket sales, if nothing else, at the RedState Gathering. He informed Nunberg that Trump could have a slot on the convention’s second day.

The evening before he was to speak in Atlanta, Trump went on CNN and denounced the Fox News host Megyn Kelly[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M28z9y4yT6Y] for her sharp questioning of him during a recent debate, speculating that Kelly had “blood coming out of her wherever.” When Erickson saw the footage that evening, he called Trump’s campaign manager, Corey Lewandowski, and rescinded Trump’s invitation on the grounds that he would be too much of a distraction. “And that was that,” Erickson would later recall with a sheepish grin. “Until the next day, when he’s blowing me up.”

On Twitter, Trump called Erickson “a major sleaze and buffoon[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/630223393774825472]” and said that the “small crowds” at the gathering were due to his absence. Trump’s supporters soon piled on. This was to be expected, but what surprised Erickson were the attacks from people he regarded as his fellow bomb-throwers in the conservative revolution. On Twitter, the talk-radio host and Fox News commentator Laura Ingraham mocked “JebState.” The author and right-wing provocateur Ann Coulter brought up some of Erickson’s own crass utterances, like his characterization of the former Supreme Court justice David Souter in 2009 as a “goat-[expletive] child molester.” The next week, 30,000 readers of Erickson’s email newsletter canceled their subscriptions.

Erickson dug in, writing that Trump was “out of his depth” and lacking in “common decency.” But he was drowned out by Trump sympathizers with even bigger audiences than his own, like The Drudge Report and the online outlet Breitbart. It was one of the first salvos in what would open up in the year that followed into a civil war within the conservative media, dividing some of the loudest voices on the right. Days earlier, Erickson had unimpeachable credentials in the conservative movement. But by crossing Trump, he was now, in the eyes of his former allies, “a tool of the establishment.”

The conservative media has always been a playground for outsize personalities with even more outsize political ambitions. The National Review founder William F. Buckley fashioned much of the intellectual genetic code of the Reagan Revolution, while also writing fringe groups like the John Birch Society out of the conservative movement and, for good measure, running for mayor of New York against the liberal Republican John Lindsay. In 1996, the former Nixon media consultant Roger Ailes brought his attack-dog ethos to Rupert Murdoch’s Fox News channel and built the network into a transformational power in Republican politics before his fall this year amid accusations of sexual harassment.

But alongside the institution-builders like Buckley and Ailes, the conservative-media landscape has also produced a class of rowdy entrepreneurs who wield their influence in more personal, protean ways. The godfathers mostly came to power in the 1990s: Clinton-administration antagonists like Rush Limbaugh, who began broadcasting nationally in 1988 and became talk radio’s hegemonic power in the Clinton years, and Matt Drudge, who started his pioneering Drudge Report online in 1996.

If these figures defied the stuffy ceremony of the East Coast think tanks, opinion journals and bow-tied columnists who traditionally defined the conservative intelligentsia, they rarely challenged the ideological principles of conservatism as they had existed since the Reagan era: small government, low taxes, hawkish foreign policy and traditional social values. What they mostly did was provide the Republican Party with a set of exceptionally loud megaphones, which liberals have often envied and tried unsuccessfully to emulate. Conservative talk radio and Fox News now collectively reach an audience of as many as 50 million — most of them elderly white Republicans with a high likelihood of turning out in election years. And this isn’t even counting the like-minded online outlets that have flourished during the Obama years, thanks to a growing internet-media economy and a presidency, particularly in the case of the Affordable Care Act, that gave conservatives common cause.

Then came Trump. In a sense, the divide that he has opened up among conservative media figures is simply a function of the heartburn his ascent has caused among Republicans more generally, pitting voter against voter, congressman against congressman, Bob Dole against the Bushes. Some conservative media outlets threw themselves behind Trump from the beginning, explaining away his more radioactive statements and his uneven-at-best record as a conservative. Breitbart, whose former chairman, Steve Bannon, is now Trump’s chief strategist, was an ardent early supporter, breathlessly covering Trump’s ascent in the polls and his smackdowns of “low energy” Jeb Bush and “little Marco” Rubio. But as Trump expanded into more sacrosanct targets — Fox News’s Kelly, George W. Bush’s performance in the war on terror and Cruz — the dissenting chorus among conservatism’s dons grew louder. The Washington Post columnist Charles Krauthammer warned[https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/why-take-the-trump-stunt-seriously/2015/12/10/7e00b794-9f72-11e5-8728-1af6af208198\_story.html?utm\_term=.ce4a3056a5cf] in December that Trump “has managed to steer the entire G.O.P. campaign into absurdities.” His Post colleague George Will predicted[https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/a-conservative-party-jeopardized-by-trump/2015/12/23/3335339c-a8e2-11e5-8058-480b572b4aae\_story.html?utm\_term=.8b3f2d09af8d] that a Trump nomination would mean the loss of conservatism “as a constant presence in U.S. politics.” The Weekly Standard editor William Kristol floated the idea[https://twitter.com/billkristol/status/681241773407121409] of a new “non-Trump non-Clinton party.” And on the eve of the Iowa caucus, National Review devoted an entire issue[http://www.nationalreview.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/430137/donald-trump-conservative-movement-menace] to a single topic: “Against Trump.”

Since Trump clinched the nomination, the dividing lines have become starker, the individual dilemmas more agonizing. Mark Levin, an influential talk-radio host, complains that among conservative commentators, Trump’s message is endlessly repeated by what he derisively refers to as “the Rockettes.” But Levin, too, recently announced to his listeners that he intends to vote for Trump, if only to prevent another Clinton presidency. As he put it to me, “I’m not going to be throwing confetti in the air if Trump wins,” adding that he viewed the candidate as “a liberal with some conservative viewpoints that he’s not terribly reliable at sticking to.”

Others — Sean Hannity, Ingraham, the former Reagan official and “The Book of Virtues” author William Bennett — have thrown in for Trump with a brio that strikes some in the business as unseemly. “Look, we’re in the opinion business, but there’s a distinction between that and being a Sean Hannity fanboy,” the Milwaukee-based talk-radio host Charlie Sykes told me. “It’s been genuinely stunning to watch how they’ve become tools of his campaign and rationalizing everything he’s done.”

“For 20 years I’ve been saying how it’s not true that talk radio is all about ratings and we don’t believe what we say,” he went on. “Then you watch how the media types rolled over for him. Obviously Donald Trump is very good for ratings, and at some point it’s hard not to conclude they decided the Trump train was the gravy train. I’ve been thoroughly disillusioned, and I’m not alone in that. It’s like watching ‘Invasion of the Body Snatchers’: Oh, my God, they got another one!”

When Trump declared his candidacy in June 2015, the part of his announcement speech that most clearly foreshadowed the campaign to come had to do with **immigration**. “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best,” he told the crowd at Trump Tower. “They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.”

The line struck Sykes as awfully familiar when he heard it. A month before, he had run a segment with Ann Coulter, who had just published her 11th book, an anti-**immigration** screed titled “¡Adios, America!” Sykes was well aware of Coulter’s views, but he was taken aback when she began a riff on Mexican rapists surging into the United States (a subject that takes up an entire chapter of “¡Adios, America!”). “I remember looking at my producer and going, ‘Wow, this is rather extraordinary,’ ” he told me. “When Trump used that line, I instantly recognized it as Ann Coulter’s.”

In fact, Corey Lewandowski had reached out to Coulter for advice in the run-up to Trump’s announcement speech. The address Trump delivered on June 16 bore no resemblance to his prepared text, which contained a mere two sentences about **immigration**. Instead, he ad-libbed what Coulter today calls “the Mexican rapist speech that won my heart.” When Trump’s remarks provoked fury, Lewandowski called Coulter for backup. Three days later, she went on HBO’s “Real Time With Bill Maher” and, amid shrieks of laughter from the audience, predicted that Trump was the Republican candidate most likely to win the presidency.

One evening this past March, Trump received Coulter at Mar-a-Lago, his estate-turned-club in Palm Beach. Though in recent years the two had developed a rapport on Twitter, she had met him face to face only once before he declared his candidacy, a lunch date at Trump Tower in 2011. Over lunch, Trump gave Coulter the impression that he had read her books. He also gave her a few items from his wife’s line of costume jewelry and told Coulter, who keeps a house in Palm Beach, that she was welcome to use the pool at Mar-a-Lago anytime.

The golf resort was the chief staging ground for Trump’s charm offensives against the conservative media. Many of its members have visited at Trump’s invitation in recent years, joining the resident Gatsby for steak and lobster on the patio, where Trump squints and appears to listen intently while his guests dispense political wisdom — though it is never clear whether he is actually interested in it, simply flattering his guests or sizing them up. When I dined with him on the patio this spring, Trump asked me eagerly about how I liked his odds in the election. Later, on the campaign trail, I watched him solicit the same counsel from random stragglers on the rope line.

Coulter, at any rate, appeared immune to the whole routine. A week earlier, Trump bragged during a Republican presidential debate in Detroit that “there’s no problem” with the size of his penis. On the patio, Coulter told the candidate that no one wanted to hear about his endowment. She told Lewandowski that he should buy a dozen teleprompters and put them in every room of Trump’s house until he learned how to use them. Reminding Trump that she had been his earliest and most dedicated advocate, she told him: “I’m the only one losing money trying to put you in the White House. You’re going to listen to me.”

This appeal to the bottom line seemed to tweak Trump’s conscience. He gave Coulter an open invitation to Mar-a-Lago, waiving the $100,000 membership fee. The following evening at the next Republican debate, he exhibited considerably more restraint, for which Coulter, with characteristic modesty, claims credit. “Coulter delivers!” she told me.

Some of Trump’s supporters within the conservative media are attracted to his actual positions on issues. One is his trade policy, on which many media personalities on the right are considerably more populist and protectionist than Republican Party leaders and Chamber of Commerce boosters. Throughout Obama’s presidency, Laura Ingraham has warned of China’s predations: “The trade war is on, and we’re losing it,” she has often said. For others, Trump’s assurance that he will appoint Antonin Scalia-like conservatives to the Supreme Court is reason enough for their support.

But Trump also simply fulfills the ineffable urge many have to, as Michael Needham, the chief executive of the conservative policy group Heritage Action for America, puts it, “punch Washington in the face.” This is true for Coulter, who, in her newly published paean to the candidate, “In Trump We Trust,” writes that Trump is fit for the presidency not in spite of his crudeness but because of it: “Only someone who brags about his airline’s seatbelt buckles being made of solid gold would have the balls to do what Trump is doing.”

But what really sold Coulter on Trump, she told me, was his hard line on **immigration**. Coulter told me that she had never given the issue much thought during her childhood in New Canaan, Conn., and her student days at Cornell. Then in 1992, the British-American journalist Peter Brimelow wrote a 14,000-word essay for National Review titled “Time to Rethink **Immigration**?[http://www.vdare.com/articles/peter-brimelow-s-time-to-rethink-immigration-the-twenty-year-anniversary-edition]” which would later become a sort of ur-text for today’s alt-right, the ascendant white-nationalist movement that has found its champion in Trump. Brimelow cast the current wave of American **immigrants** in dismal terms: less skilled, less European, less assimilated, less law-abiding and less Republican than the previous newcomers. Coulter, who was 31 and a law clerk at the time, remembers reading it and thinking, “Oh, my gosh, I’ve been completely lied to!”

Twenty-four years later, Coulter helped formulate Trump’s **immigration**-policy position, which she hailed on Twitter[https://twitter.com/anncoulter/status/632987034320261120] as “the greatest political document since the Magna Carta.” (Her additional tweet[https://twitter.com/anncoulter/status/632954040675078144] on the subject — “I don’t care if @realDonaldTrump wants to perform abortions in the White House after this **immigration** policy paper” — prompted Mark Levin to tweet back[https://twitter.com/marklevinshow/status/633302440226496513], “These have to be among the most pathetic comments of anyone in a long time.”)

Coulter has not always gotten her way with the candidate. At Mar-a-Lago that evening in March, she lobbied unsuccessfully for him to pick as his running mate Kris Kobach, the secretary of state of Kansas, who is credited with selling Mitt Romney on “self-deportation.” And her book tour for “In Trump We Trust” hit a momentary snag when Trump told Sean Hannity that he would be open to “softening” his **immigration** stance, though Coulter chose to believe that, as she told me, “it was Hannity badgering him.”

Still, she has become the Trump campaign’s most unrepentant brawler. When Khzir Khan, the Pakistani-American father of a U.S. Army captain who was killed in combat in Iraq, spoke critically of Trump at the Democratic National Convention, Coulter wrote on Twitter[https://twitter.com/anncoulter/status/758834407931203584]: “You know what this convention really needed: An angry Muslim with a thick accent like Fareed Zacaria[sic].”

That tweet provoked disgust from fellow conservatives, among them Erick Erickson, who tweeted[https://twitter.com/ewerickson/status/758847018127065088]: “What a terrible thing to say about a man whose son died for this country.” When I reminded Coulter of Erickson’s scolding, she let out a hearty laugh. “I always hated him,” she said. “This is one of the fantastic things. In any political movement, there are many people you think are losers and dorks, but your friends talk you into liking them, because they’re on our side. Now all of those people are out.”

Sighing, she said, “Trump has made my life better in so many ways.”

You will not find copies of “¡Adios, America!” or “In Trump We Trust” on any of the many bookshelves in the home of the Washington Post columnist George Will. A week after Ted Cruz dropped out of the Republican presidential race in early May, Will and his wife, Mari, a Republican political consultant, gave a catered dinner party for Cruz and his wife, Heidi. The other guests were conservative donors, activists and journalists, along with their spouses. The Wills have been hosting these off-the-record encounters with political celebrities at their Maryland home for decades. In early 2009, Will’s fellow conservative columnists gathered there to meet Obama a week before his inauguration.

Among the guests that evening in May was Laura Ingraham. Ingraham is of proudly working-class heritage — her mother was a waitress for almost 30 years and her father owned and operated a Coin-a-Matic carwash — and does not share Will’s reverence for decorum. She was an early defender of Trump’s willingness to say things “no one else is saying.” While interviewing Cruz on her radio show six weeks before the Wills’ party, she interrupted him to mock his Harvard Law degree. Still, Cruz knew that his political future relied on conservative opinion-makers like Ingraham, and it was at his request that the Wills included her in the party.

Over cocktails, the Cruzes spoke fondly of their experiences on the campaign trail, and the other guests listened politely, mindful of Cruz’s recent humiliating defeat. Then midway through dinner, at a table set with glasses once used by Abraham Lincoln, Ingraham insisted that Cruz needed to throw his weight behind the man who had branded him “Lyin’ Ted.” “If you don’t endorse him, where does that leave you?” she said. “You don’t have the public and you don’t have the establishment. How can you be a leader of the conservative movement?”

Cruz amiably replied that such a decision did not have to be made right away. Others at the table joined in to defend him, but Ingraham would hear nothing of it. “You can’t want Hillary Clinton elected,” she goaded him.

Will sat fuming silently. “She was quite animated,” he would later recall. Cruz refused to offer his support to Trump that night or in the weeks to follow. Speaking at the Republican convention on July 20 moments before Cruz was to do the same, Ingraham taunted him: “We should all, even all you boys with wounded feelings and bruised egos — and we love you, we love you — but you must honor the pledge to support Donald Trump now, tonight!” The following morning on her radio show, Ingraham declared that Cruz’s refusal to endorse had “effectively ended his political career.”

Will was no more persuaded by Ingraham than Cruz was. The first and only time Will met Trump was in March 1995, when, at Trump’s invitation, he gave a speech at Mar-a-Lago. Years later on Twitter, Trump would ascribe Will’s harsh view of him to Will’s having “totally bombed” with his performance that night. Will told me: “He started telling this story: ‘The reason Will doesn’t like me is I invited him to give a speech at Mar-a-Lago, and I knew it was going to be boring, so I waited out on the patio.’ Which raises two questions. First, if he knew it was going to be that boring, why did he invite me? And second, who would be the guy with the orange hair sitting in the front row?”

Will said on ABC’s “This Week” in 2012 that Trump was “a bloviating ignoramus” and he has spent much of the past year predicting the candidate’s imminent political demise. “I thought even an entertaining bore could be a bore after a while,” he told me. By late December of last year, however, his contempt had given way to alarm. “Conservatives’ highest priority,” he wrote in a Post column, “must be to prevent Trump from winning the Republican nomination” — even if it meant Hillary Clinton’s election.

Then on June 2, three weeks after his dinner party for Cruz, Will learned that his friend and fellow Republican Paul Ryan, the House speaker, had endorsed the nominee. Will considered the matter over martinis at home that evening. The next morning, he walked into his office and told his assistant: “Go change my registration. This is not my party anymore.”

Recently I visited Will at his office, a three-story Georgetown brick rowhouse erected in 1811. Its walls are covered with framed photographs, several of them depicting the writer in his youth alongside Reagan and other titans of his former party. The dean of conservative pundits, now 75, wore a crisp pinstripe shirt and gray slacks, his customary owlish Mona Lisa expression a bit tighter than usual, owing to the subject matter. Will told me that he cast his first vote in 1964, for Barry Goldwater. He voted for the Republican candidate in every succeeding presidential election, until now.

“I don’t use the word ‘frightening’ often,” he told me. “But it’s frightening to know this person” — Trump — “would have the nuclear-launch codes. The world is getting really dangerous. His friend Mr. Putin is dismantling a nation in the center of Europe. Some trigger-happy captain of a Chinese boat with ship-to-ship missiles might make a mistake in the next three years near the Spratly Islands. All kinds of things can go wrong. And the idea that this guy will be asked to respond in a sober, firm way? My goodness.”

He seemed genuinely despondent. “Given that, could you see yourself urging your readers to vote for Hillary Clinton?” I asked.

Will’s lips pursed slightly. “Well,” he said, “it’s clear from everything I’ve written that I think she’d be a better president. That said, I’m not going to vote for her. First of all, I’m a Maryland voter. She couldn’t lose Maryland if she tried.”

“Then. ...”

“I haven’t decided,” he said. “You can imagine — I get tons of emails: ‘I, too, have left the Republican Party. What should I do?’ Well, there are a number of legitimate options. Not voting is a legitimate expression of opinion.”

Ingraham and other conservative media personalities hailed Trump for having “tapped into” a shared and seething disquiet among predominantly white, non-college-educated voters. “What I don’t understand on the part of those being tapped into,” Will told me, “is: What exactly do they want? I can think of nothing the American people have wanted intensely and protractedly that they didn’t get. Took a while, but they got it.”

With a resigned half-smirk, he looked at the ground and intoned, in the manner of a hostage-video monologue: “It’s gonna be yuge. And it’s all gonna get fixed. And we’re all gonna be winners.”

“If he doesn’t build that wall, I’m pissed,” Sean Hannity told me, reflecting on the prospects of a Trump presidency in the office of his radio show in Midtown Manhattan. “If he doesn’t repeal Obamacare, I’m gonna be pissed. If he appoints a liberal jurist to the Supreme Court, I’m gonna lose my mind. And by the way: I’ll be screaming. Not talking — screaming about it. But in fairness, if Trump doesn’t keep his promises, you can also blame me, because I believed him.”

Although Coulter was Trump’s earliest cheerleader among prominent conservative-media personalities, Hannity’s stake in the election perhaps runs deepest of all, if only because of the size of his audience. He hosts the second-highest-rated show (after Limbaugh) on talk radio and the third-highest-rated program (after Bill O’Reilly and Megyn Kelly) on cable news. More than 2.4 million weekly viewers and 13 million listeners have witnessed Hannity sticking his neck out on behalf of a first-time politician and sometime Republican who has voiced support for Planned Parenthood while vowing to limit America’s military footprint and shred trade deals that the G.O.P. has backed for decades.

Hannity’s critics on the right have accused him of essentially running hourlong daily Trump infomercials. When I asked him about this, Hannity responded with a well-rehearsed litany of sins perpetrated by the Republican establishment in concert with Obama: perilously low labor participation and homeownership rates, soaring national debt, Obamacare and so on. A Clinton presidency, he warned, would be “Obama on steroids.” These were his motivations. “My conscience is clear. And I feel like Donald Trump would be a great president.”

Hannity told me that he had in fact never stayed at a Trump hotel property, played on a Trump golf course or visited Mar-a-Lago. “I have my own place — on the other Florida coast, in Naples,” he said. “I don’t need his place. I always got the sense people were asking him for something. I don’t believe in asking for free stuff.”

Nonetheless, the two men have a mutual affinity that has spanned at least two decades. The MSNBC “Morning Joe” host and former Republican congressman Joe Scarborough theorized to me that their relationship has a psychological underpinning: “Donald Trump, Sean Hannity, Bill O’Reilly all share the same resentment that they will never be accepted into Manhattan’s polite society no matter what they do.” (Trump is from Queens; Hannity and O’Reilly are from Long Island.) Trump, in a recent phone conversation, offered me a somewhat simpler explanation: “Sean likes having me on his show, and that has to do with ratings more than anything else.”

No presidential candidate in history, Hannity told me, understands television better than Trump — “not even close.” On this score, I couldn’t disagree. One evening this past spring, on his plane after a campaign event in Buffalo, Trump told me that at rallies, he always made a point of finding the TV cameras at the back of the media pen and noticing whether a red light was flickering. “That means they’re airing it live,” he explained. “So I make sure to say something new” — by which he meant newsworthy, the better to own the next news cycle.

Trump was a TV star for more than a decade before he became a politician; he watches TV news incessantly and understands the medium intimately. He knows the optimal time slots on the morning shows. He stage-manages the on-set lighting. He is not only on speaking terms with every network chief executive but also knows their booking agents. He monitors the opinions of hosts and regular guests more avidly than most media critics do and works them obsessively, often directly.

Scarborough told me that Trump’s family — particularly Ivanka Trump’s husband, Jared Kushner — sometimes asked him for advice, and more than once “called me and asked me to get him off the ledge. I’ve said, ‘I can do that, but six hours later he’s going to revert to form.’ I told Jared at one point: ‘Jared, your father-in-law listens to me more when I’m attacking him on television than when I’m trying to convince him to be rational for the sake of the party.’ I think he’s a creature of TV.”

TV networks, in the mainstream as well as conservative media, have profited handsomely from Trump’s election-season theatrics, but some of their on-air personalities like Hannity are drawn to him for reasons apart from ratings. The prospect of getting in on the ground floor of a Trump administration that is short on policy ideas and disdainful of old Washington hands amounts to a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. By employing the Breitbart publisher Steve Bannon, and by including both Ingraham and Roger Ailes in his debate preparations, Trump has implicitly encouraged the conservative media to consider itself part of the campaign team.

I asked Hannity if it was true that, as a Trump confidant had told me, he wished to be considered as a potential Trump White House chief of staff. “That’s news to me,” he insisted, adding a politician’s practiced nondenial denial: “I have radio and TV contracts that I will honor through December 2020.” Nonetheless, Hannity’s service to the Trump campaign well exceeds that of ritually bashing Clinton and giving Trump free airtime. He has offered private strategic advice to the campaign. The same Trump confidant told me of at least one instance in which Hannity drafted an unsolicited memo outlining the message Trump should offer after the Orlando nightclub shooting in June. In public, Hannity has made it his mission to warn fellow conservatives — naming names, like the columnist Jonah Goldberg and the National Review editor in chief Rich Lowry — that if they do not soon climb aboard the Trump train they will, as the hashtag threatens, #OwnIt: Clinton’s picks for the Supreme Court, her response to the Islamic State, her trade deals, all of it.

Hannity maintains that his scolding of Trump’s conservative dissenters derives from his fear of a Clinton presidency. “It’d be pretty much over,” he said. Taken alone, George Will or even National Review might have little impact on Trump’s standing in the race, Hannity argued, but “cumulatively they do. I can look at the poll numbers. If you go back to a month ago, he was garnering 73 percent of the Republican vote. The most recent, I think he had 88 percent. He needs to get to 93.” And the key to the last 5 percent might very well lie with the noisy holdouts, like Erick Erickson.

On Sept. 16, Erickson showed up at the National Press Club in Washington to participate in a debate[https://www.c-span.org/video/?415379-1/evangelical-leaders-discuss-2016-presidential-election] sponsored by the National Religious Broadcasters. Erickson left RedState at the end of last year to concentrate on his radio show and his online opinion journal, The Resurgent, but he has remained influential among conservatives who do not support Trump. In July, when he learned that Ted Cruz was about to have a private meeting with the nominee on the eve of the convention, Erickson texted the senator: “Don’t endorse! Don’t endorse!” Later that evening, Erickson says, Cruz texted back: “Didn’t endorse! Didn’t endorse!” (Cruz finally announced that he would vote for Trump on Sept. 23.)

The subject of the debate, inevitably, was Trump: specifically, whether evangelical Christians should support him. Being a lifelong evangelical himself, Erickson had some thoughts on the matter. Over the years, he had been condemned for his own offensive words, like the time he called the Texas gubernatorial candidate Wendy Davis “Abortion Barbie.” But he had recently apologized for many (though not all) of these statements and had called upon Trump to affect a similar posture of Christian humility. “1 Corinthians is very explicit,” he told me. “If someone holds one’s self out to be a Christian and doesn’t behave that way, Christians are supposed to judge him. This is a guy who’s bragged about his affairs.”

This was Erickson’s principal argument during the debate. Trump was not merely a sinner, he said, but a gleefully unrepentant one. Erickson’s debate opponent, the Christian talk-show host and fervent Trump supporter Janet Parshall, responded by reciting a litany of sinners in chief — from Thomas Jefferson with the out-of-wedlock child he fathered with a slave, to Warren G. Harding with his multiple liaisons, to Richard Nixon with his foul language memorialized on the White House tapes. “We are not electing a messiah,” Parshall said. “Last time I checked, he was appointed to office and he is not term-limited.”

Erickson’s debating partner, the conservative activist Bill Wichterman, argued that Trump appealed to the worst in America: His bullying, his lying and his bigotry were “corrosive to our national character.” Erickson could testify to this. At one point, he was receiving as many as 300 emails a day from Trump supporters. Some of them referred to him as a “cuck” or “cuck-servative.” The word — a masculinity-insulting derivative of “cuckold” — was new to Erickson, as were its originators in the white-nationalist alt-right.

More than one of the emails predicted that Erickson would be shot to death. At the local grocery store, a man walked up to Erickson’s two young children “and told them they needed to know their father was destroying this country by supporting Hillary Clinton,” Erickson told me. And one evening, two people showed up on the Ericksons’ doorstep to deliver a threat — Erickson would not tell me what it was — explicit enough that he later hired security guards. “I’ve never had Obama or Romney or McCain or Clinton supporters come to my home or send me nasty letters,” he said.

Did Trump beget all of this? If so, what begot Trump? Erickson argued that the fault lay with Beltway Republicans. “They’ve broken so many promises,” he said. “They promised to defund the president’s **immigration** plan. They promised to defund Obamacare. They promised to fight the president on raising the debt limit. At some point, the base of the party just wants to burn the house down and start over.”

But even Erickson did not seem convinced that this alone explained what he saw as a nihilistic turn among Republican voters. “I do think there are a lot of people that have just concluded that this is it — that if we don’t get the election right, the country’s over,” he said. As to where they might have gotten that idea, Erickson knew the answer. It was the apocalyptic hymn sung by talk-radio hosts like his friend and mentor Rush Limbaugh, whose show Erickson once guest-hosted, though in the time of Trump, it seemed unlikely he would receive another invitation.

This February, Limbaugh, who has applauded Trump without endorsing him outright, posed to Erickson the question of whether a commentator should try to act as “the guardian of what it means to be a conservative.” In effect, the legend of talk radio was laying down an unwritten commandment of the trade, which applies as well to cable TV: Do not attempt to lead your following.

This was simple enough for an avowed Trump supporter like Ingraham. “Laura’s never missed an opportunity to build her career on the backs of others,” Erickson told me. He counted Hannity as another mentor and admired his entrepreneurial cunning, saying: “Sean reflects his audience. He’s not going to leave his audience.” On his own radio show, Erickson found that the more he denounced Trump, the more female listeners he picked up. But most of the 300,000 people who tuned in weekly during rush hour were men. While Erickson refused to abandon his principles, he did not wish to go broke, either.

On Sept. 20, Erickson wrote a long post for The Resurgent titled “Reconsidering My Opposition to Donald Trump.” He made no effort to disguise his moroseness. “I see the election of Hillary Clinton as the antithesis of all my values and ideas on what fosters sound civil society in this country,” he wrote, and described his manifold objections to her at great length. But, he went on, “I have to admit that while I may view Hillary Clinton’s campaign as anti-American, I view Donald Trump’s campaign as un-American. ... While I see Clinton as having no virtue, I see Donald Trump corrupting the virtuous and fostering hatred, racism and dangerous strains of nationalism.” The election left him adrift. “I am without a candidate. I just cannot vote for either one.”

And so Erickson’s conscience led him back to where he was 13 months ago. Nowadays, he told me, he was doing all he could to avoid discussing Trump and the election altogether — a tall order for a talk-radio host. Responding to my look of bewilderment, he said, “Why dwell on the train wreck?”

Erickson believed he was not alone. “People know where we’re headed, don’t like where we’re headed and would rather talk about something else,” he said. Erickson had won many fights. This one was the biggest yet, and he had lost. There was nothing left to do but step back from his megaphone, dwell on happier matters and wait for the next righteous cause.

Sign up for our newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Robert Draper is a writer at large. He last wrote about whether Republican candidates could survive Donald Trump’s presidential campaign.

Correction: October 16, 2016, Sunday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An article on Oct. 2 about the conservative media’s reaction to Donald Trump’s presidential candidacy misstated the rank of Sean Hannity’s Fox News show among the highest-rated cable news shows. It is the third-highest, not the second. The article also misidentified the location in Florida of Mar-a-Lago, Trump’s estate-turned-club. It is Palm Beach, not West Palm Beach. (The Trump International Golf Club is in West Palm Beach.) And the article referred incorrectly to Ann Coulter’s book “¡Adios, America!” It is her 11th book, not her 10th.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EL CAJON, Calif. — The federal authorities have tried twice to deport the man fatally shot by the police in this suburb of San Diego, but Uganda, the victim’s native country, refused to take him. That resulted in his release.

Officials with the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement said that the man, Alfred Olango, stopped reporting to them in February 2015. Virginia Kice, an agency spokeswoman, said she did not know if officers had tried to find him after that.

Mr. Olango, 38, was shot and killed Tuesday by the police in El Cajon. They said that Mr. Olango had pulled a vape pen, a type of electronic cigarette, from his pocket and pointed it at an officer, who then shot him.

A family lawyer said that Mr. Olango had been having an emotional breakdown over the recent death of his best friend.

Mr. Olango arrived as a refugee from Uganda in 1991 and was ordered to be deported in 2002 after being convicted on drug charges. He was released under a Supreme Court ruling banning the detention of foreign nationals after six months if deportation is unlikely.

The **immigration** authorities took Mr. Olango into custody in 2009 after a firearms conviction in Colorado, but were unable to deport him then because of a lack of documents.

A former agency director, John Sandweg, said Mr. Olango that could not be held for more than six months on suspicion of not reporting to the **immigration**authorities last year because failing to do so is not a crime.

“The officers knew that they were not going to be able to hold this guy,” Mr. Sandweg said.

Since coming to the United States, Mr. Olango has run afoul of the law several times: He was arrested on charges of selling cocaine, driving drunk, and of illegally possessing a 9-millimeter semiautomatic handgun when he was arrested in Colorado in 2005 with marijuana and the drug ecstasy in his car, according to court records. He pleaded guilty in federal court and was sentenced to nearly four years in jail for being a felon in possession of a gun.

The investigation of his death centers on a video taken by a bystander. The police have produced a single frame from the cellphone video to support their account, saying that it showed Mr. Olango in a “shooting stance.”

\_\_\_

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ATHENS, Ohio — After decades as one of America’s most reliable political bellwethers, an inevitable presidential battleground that closely mirrored the mood and makeup of the country, Ohio is suddenly fading in importance this year.

Hillary Clinton has not been to the state since Labor Day[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/clinton-trump-labor-day-campaign.html], and her campaign has yet to schedule a return visit, effectively acknowledging that Donald J. Trump will be hard to beat here. Ohio has failed to keep up with the demographic changes transforming the United States, growing older, whiter and less educated than the nation at large.

And the two parties have made strikingly different wagers about how to win the White House in this election: Mr. Trump, the Republican nominee, is relying on a demographic coalition that, while well tailored for Ohio even in the state’s Democratic strongholds, leaves him vulnerable in the more diverse parts of the country where Mrs. Clinton is spending most of her time.

It is a jarring change for political veterans here, who relish being at the center of the country’s presidential races: Mrs. Clinton can amass the 270 electoral votes required to win even if she loses Ohio.

“Their map is a little different, and Ohio is not as crucial as it once was,” conceded James Ruvolo, a former chairman of the Ohio Democratic Party[https://ohiodems.org/] who lives in the Toledo area, a Democratic bulwark that Mrs. Clinton has not visited once this year. “They’ll keep putting in money, but I don’t think they’re going to put a lot of her time in here.”

Ohio has long basked in the presidential spotlight. Every four years, fall would bring frequent candidate visits, ceaseless television commercials and breathless, county-by-county tallies of its voting returns late into election night. Democrats in the state got used to rock concert-style rallies, like the ones John Kerry staged in Cleveland and Columbus with Bruce Springsteen in 2004 and President Obama held at Ohio State to kick off his 2012 re-election campaign. Mr. Obama held five events over three trips to Ohio in September 2012 alone.

And it was all for good reason: No candidate of either party has won the White House without carrying Ohio since John F. Kennedy in 1960.

But its Rust Belt profile, Mr. Trump’s unyielding anti-trade campaign and Mrs. Clinton’s difficulty energizing Ohio’s young voters have made it a lesser focus for Democrats this year. As Mrs. Clinton’s aides privately note, the demographic makeup of Florida, Colorado and North Carolina, which have a greater percentage of educated or nonwhite voters, makes those states more promising for Democrats in a contest in which the electorate is sorted along bright racial and economic lines.

And with a once-competitive Senate race in Ohio turning into a rout for Rob Portman, the Republican incumbent, Democrats can quietly pull back from the state with little fear of down-ballot consequences.

As the place where Appalachia meets the Midwest, and where industrial centers arose not far from a vast farm belt, Ohio has prided itself on being a version of America writ small. Its **immigration** patterns reflected that, with New Englanders resettling here, followed by Germans and eventually Eastern Europeans. At the same time, Southerners, white and black, crossed the Ohio River in search of freedom and opportunity.

But even some of the state’s proudest boosters acknowledge that Ohio, which is nearly 80 percent white, is decreasingly representative of contemporary America.

“Ohio, like a melting iceberg, has slowly been losing its status as the country’s bellwether,” said Michael F. Curtin, a Democratic state legislator and former Columbus Dispatch editor who is co-author of the state’s authoritative “Ohio Politics Almanac[http://www.kentstateuniversitypress.com/2010/the-ohio-politics-almanac/].”

He continued: “It’s a slow melt. But we have not captured any appreciable Hispanic population, and there has been very little influx of an Asian population. When you look at the diversity of America 30 to 40 years ago, Ohio was a pretty close approximation of the country. It no longer is.”

What is less clear than the racial trends is whether the state will continue to grow more forbidding for Democrats in future presidential races. That could be determined by the choices the national parties make after the election, particularly whether Republicans continue Mr. Trump’s project of shifting from a business-friendly to a more populist approach on **immigration** and trade.

“If the Republican Party looks more like the Trump coalition and the Democratic Party looks more like the Obama coalition, then the states Democrats must win will no longer be Ohio and Iowa,” said David Wilhelm, a manager of Bill Clinton’s first presidential campaign and a former Democratic national chairman who lives in suburban Columbus. “They will be Virginia, North Carolina, Arizona and Georgia.”

Yet that same Obama coalition was enough to hand the president a two-point victory in Ohio in 2012, when the state’s demographics were no less challenging for Democrats. The difference now, Ohio voters and strategists from both parties say, is in the two candidates and the issues at hand.

Facing Mitt Romney, who was easily caricatured as a country club Republican, Mr. Obama battered him as a handmaiden for the wealthy and criticized his opposition to the auto bailout, which lifted Mr. Obama with white union Democrats in car-making communities around Youngstown and Toledo.

But this year, Republicans have put forward a candidate whose views on trade are indistinguishable from, if not more hard-line than, the A.F.L.-C.I.O.’s.

“Republicans used to run on God and guns,” Mr. Ruvolo said. “Well, Trump added a third element: trade.”

Paired with Mr. Trump’s jeremiads about **immigrants**’ taking American jobs, it makes for a powerful combination in a state that has suffered from the decline of manufacturing. Though he lost the Ohio primary to Gov. John Kasich, Mr. Trump still carried a stretch of counties along the eastern spine of the state, its most economically depressed region, where thousands of industrial and coal-mining jobs have been lost. Mr. Trump is expected to pile up significant margins in those counties in November.

Some political veterans speak with wonder about private polls showing Mr. Trump leading even in bedrock Democratic communities. “I see, at best, lack of enthusiasm in traditional Democratic areas,” said Dennis E. Eckart, a former Democratic congressman from suburban Cleveland.

Mike Dawson, a Republican strategist who runs a website on Ohio’s political history[http://ohioelectionresults.com/], said Mr. Trump would be competitive in two counties in Youngstown’s Mahoning Valley that the Democratic presidential candidate has carried in every election for 60 years with the exception of 1972.

It is no coincidence that the same region kept re-electing Representative James A. Traficant Jr. from 1985 to 2002, despite his routine flouting of ethics. Mr. Traficant, a longtime Democrat who died in 2014[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/28/us/politics/james-a-traficant-jr-who-was-expelled-from-congress-after-bribery-conviction-dies-at-73.html], was known for mixing inflammatory rhetoric, a squirrel-like toupee and a hard-edge populism.

“There is not a dime’s worth of difference, as George Wallace once said, between Jim Traficant and Donald Trump,” said Mr. Eckart, whose district abutted Mr. Traficant’s. “They say anything, do anything, just act outrageous, and people just kind of like that.”

Mrs. Clinton remains strongest in the more affluent and educated areas around Ohio’s population centers — Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati — where some voters who backed Mr. Romney four years ago are appalled by Mr. Trump.

Emily Huber, a 29-year-old evangelical Christian and loyal Republican in Columbus, is one of them. As she sold candles and jewelry made by victims of sex trafficking at a farmer’s market in the shadow of the state capitol, Ms. Huber said she and her husband were unsure whether they could back Mr. Trump because of offensive comments that she said “show his true character.”

What will determine who wins Ohio, said Representative Steve Stivers, a Republican, is if “Hillary can pick up a bunch of voters in the suburbs to offset the rural and some of the industrial areas.” Mrs. Clinton has an organizational advantage, with 60 offices across the state, and is flooding Ohio with surrogates: Bill Clinton is expected in the state on a bus tour next week.

But a Clinton victory in Ohio may also require rousing younger voters, which is in doubt[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/us/politics/hillary-clinton-millennials-third-party.html]. When a group of Democratic Ohio mayors campaigned recently for Mrs. Clinton in Athens — home of Ohio University and seat of the county with the state’s largest percentage of millennials — they drew little interest.

As students stopped at sidewalk A.T.M.s to prepare for parents weekend, they expressed only lukewarm support for Mrs. Clinton. Paula Atfield, a freshman from Cleveland, said she was voting for Mrs. Clinton because “she’s not Trump,” but added that the election was seen as “a joke” on campus.

“Neither of them are suitable,” she said. “Most people aren’t even voting.”

At a news conference earlier in the day, the Dayton mayor, Nan Whaley, had buoyantly declared that the state would send Mrs. Clinton to the White House. “Ohio is the decider of presidents,” she said.

But now, Ms. Whaley sounded less bullish. “I think it’s crucial,” she said of a Clinton victory in Ohio, before quickly adding of Mr. Trump, “It’s just not as crucial as his.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — A sudden shift in American **immigration** policy has divided scores of Haitian families trying to enter the United States from Mexico, **immigrants** and advocates say.

The policy change, announced last week[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/world/americas/haiti-migrants-earthquake.html], has separated wives from husbands and children from their fathers, stranding the men in Mexico after their families were allowed to cross into the United States.

“I’m hoping God makes miracles,” said Sandra Alexandre, who was allowed into the United States last week ahead of her boyfriend and gave birth three days later. The new policy went into effect right before the child’s father could cross.

The family separations appear to be an unintended consequence of the Obama administration’s effort to tighten the border against the arrival of thousands of Haitians[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/24/world/americas/haitians-mexico-brazil-deport-united-states.html] streaming north from Brazil[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/07/world/americas/brazils-boom-absorbs-haitis-poor-for-now.html], mostly to seek employment in the United States.

Until the change, the United States had been allowing Haitians without visas to enter under a temporary humanitarian parole, a special concession[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/14/world/americas/14deport.html] owing to the social, economic and political troubles facing Haiti[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/haiti/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] after the devastating 2010 earthquake. But last Thursday, amid a surge in Haitians from Brazil, the Obama administration announced that it was resuming the deportation of Haitians who presented themselves at border crossings without **immigration** documentation.

The policy change effectively shut the door on newly arriving undocumented Haitians, including men whose partners and children had already been admitted.

**Immigrant** advocates in San Diego said they had identified more than 50 families in that city alone who had been separated by the policy change, and they have appealed to Homeland Security officials to help reunite the families in the United States.

“The bottom line is that this was not a well-conceived policy,” said Andrea Guerrero, executive director of Alliance San Diego, a group that has been helping Haitians who have arrived from Brazil in recent months. “It seemed to have come down from one day to the next without a clear understanding of what was going on and what kind of impact it would have.”

The Department of Homeland Security did not immediately reply to written questions about the effect of the policy change.

Amid the surge, the American border authorities had been using an appointment system to process arriving Haitians. They had been giving priority to women and children, who received earlier dates rather than being forced to spend weeks in the overcrowded shelters. Men, no matter if they were traveling with their partners and children, usually had to wait for later appointments.

Ms. Alexandre, 24, arrived in the border city of Mexicali with her boyfriend, Volcy Dieumercy, 29, on Sept. 20 after a 10-week trip from Curitiba, Brazil. She was pregnant and nearing her due date.

Because of her pregnancy, Mexican officials, who have been scheduling the migrants’ appointments with American border officials, granted Ms. Alexandre an appointment for last Thursday, but they denied the couple’s request that Mr. Dieumercy be processed on the same day, the couple said. Instead, he was given an appointment for Sept. 30, forcing him to wait in Mexicali.

Ms. Alexandre entered under a three-year humanitarian parole, and she made her way to a migrant shelter in San Diego. She soon learned that Mr. Dieumercy had been barred from entering under the new policy.

On Sunday, she went into labor and was admitted to the hospital. A volunteer working with Alliance San Diego called Mr. Dieumercy so the couple could speak. The volunteer remained in touch with Mr. Dieumercy throughout the birth using WhatsApp, updating him on Ms. Alexandre’s progress.

The couple had intended to travel together to Orlando, Fla., and live with Mr. Dieumercy’s relatives. Ms. Alexandre said she had no idea what she would do if Mr. Dieumercy was not allowed into the country.

“I haven’t thought that far ahead,” she said from the hospital earlier this week before being discharged. “Right now, I’m only thinking positively.”

Mr. Dieumercy is equally uncertain. He knows that if he tries to cross at an official American port of entry, he will probably be deported.

“I need my family,” he said in a text message from Mexicali. “I can’t wait any longer. I’m very sad.”

Among the families that have been divided since the policy took effect, more than a dozen include pregnant women separated from their partners, Ms. Guerrero said. There are even cases of mothers’ being separated from their teenage sons, she said.

Sinskya Cetoute, a Haitian **immigrant**, said that she, her husband and their 4-year-old daughter had gone to the San Ysidro border crossing between Tijuana and San Diego last Friday, a day after the new policy went into effect. **Immigration** officials quickly separated them, with Ms. Cetoute, 33, and her daughter taken in one direction and her husband in another.

Ms. Cetoute and her daughter were allowed into the United States on humanitarian parole, with permission to stay for three years, but she has not heard from her husband since she last saw him. “We don’t know what we’re going to do,” she said. “I can’t live without the father of my daughter.”

In announcing the policy change last week, American **immigration** officials said they hoped it would discourage Haitians from making the grueling trek to the United States border. But shelter administrators and migrant advocates along the route report that many Haitians continue to move north through the Americas, undeterred by news of the full resumption of deportations in the United States.

Marcelo Pisani, the International Organization for Migration’s regional director for Central America, North America and the Caribbean, said that migrants from outside the region were arriving at the Panama-Costa Rica border at an average rate of 90 to 110 per day. He said “a significant percentage” were Haitians.

Mr. Pisani said it was “very probable” that with the humanitarian door closed, more Haitians arriving at the United States’ southern border would seek asylum.

In Tijuana, which has received thousands of Haitian migrants this year, a steady stream of Haitians are still arriving each day. Many of them, though aware of the policy change, are presenting themselves at the border only to be put immediately into fast-track deportation proceedings, advocates said.

“They believe that the United States will not turn their back on them,” Ms. Guerrero said. “They believe that the United States understands what the situation is in Haiti, and they believe that the United States would never send them back.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Last week, as soon as the National Academy of Sciences issued “The Economic and Fiscal Consequences of **Immigration**[https://www.nap.edu/catalog/23550/the-economic-and-fiscal-consequences-of-immigration],” its 509-page report, interest groups on the left and right immediately claimed vindication.

“National Academy of Sciences Study Confirms **Immigrants** Benefit America,” America’s Voice[http://americasvoice.org/press\_releases/national-academy-sciences-study-confirms-immigrants-benefit-america/], a liberal advocacy group, declared from the pro-**immigration** side. Frank Sharry, the group’s executive director, issued a statement assessing the study:

On the fringes of the **immigration** debate, you have Donald Trump and his small band of nativists peddling fears and falsehoods. For those of us who inhabit a fact-driven reality, you have a growing body of credible research demonstrating the benefits of **immigrants** and the burdens of following Trump’s radical proposals.

Conservatives calling for more restrictions on **immigration** read the same report but had a very different interpretation. “National Academy of Sciences Study of **Immigration**: Workers and Taxpayers Lose, Businesses Benefit,” the Center for **Immigration** Studies[http://cis.org/NAS-Study-Workers-and-Taxpayers-Lose-Businesses-Benefit] wrote. Steven Camarota, director of research at the center, said that the report demonstrated that **immigration** lowers the wages of American workers, to the benefit of **immigrants** themselves and of corporations:

**Immigration** is primarily a redistributive policy, transferring income from workers to owners of capital and from taxpayers to low-income **immigrant** families.

These opposing views demonstrate the complexity of the core findings in the academy’s report, which is multifaceted enough to allow for competing interpretations. The report suggests that **immigration** is not a clear-cut issue in which one side is right and the other wrong, but that there are both costs and benefits.

The crux of the problem is that the plusses and minuses are not distributed equally. The academy found, for example, that the willingness of less-skilled **immigrants** to work at low pay reduced consumption costs — the costs to consumers of goods and services like health care, child care, food preparation, house cleaning, repair and construction — for millions of Americans. This resulted in “positive net benefits to the U.S. economy during the last two decades of the 20th century.” These low-wage workers simultaneously generated “a redistribution of wealth from low- to high-skilled native-born workers.”

The frequent harshness of these trade-offs in real life is masked by the academic language of the report, which points out that native-born workers who are substitutes for **immigrants** “will experience negative wage effects” — in other words, lower wages.

The report continues:

In summary, the **immigration** surplus stems from the increase in the return to capital that results from the increased supply of labor and the subsequent fall in wages. Natives who own more capital will receive more income from the **immigration** surplus than natives who own less capital, who can consequently be adversely affected.

While acknowledging these conflicts, the academy comes down decisively on the pro-**immigration**side[http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?RecordID=23550] of the debate:

**Immigration** is integral to the nation’s economic growth. The inflow of labor supply has helped the United States avoid the problems facing other economies that have stagnated as a result of unfavorable demographics, particularly the effects of an aging work force and reduced consumption by older residents. In addition, the infusion of human capital by high-skilled **immigrants** has boosted the nation’s capacity for innovation, entrepreneurship, and technological change.

The academy’s report provides ammunition to both sides in the contentious debate over whether **immigrants** raise state and local tax burdens for education, health care and other welfare benefits or whether those costs are more than compensated for though taxes paid by **immigrants**:

For the 2011-2013 period, the net cost to state and local budgets of first generation adults is, on average, about $1,600 each. In contrast, second and third-plus generation adults create a net positive of about $1,700 and $1,300 each, respectively, to state and local budgets. These estimates imply that the total annual fiscal impact of first generation adults and their dependents, averaged across 2011-13, is a cost of $57.4 billion, while second and third-plus generation adults create a benefit of $30.5 billion and $223.8 billion, respectively.

In its analysis, the liberal group America’s Voice[http://americasvoice.org/press\_releases/national-academy-sciences-study-confirms-immigrants-benefit-america/] cited the academy’s statement almost verbatim. The conservative Center for **Immigration** Studie[http://cis.org/NAS-Study-Workers-and-Taxpayers-Lose-Businesses-Benefit]s, on the other hand, interpreted the data to mean that

**immigrants** do not pay enough in taxes to cover their consumption of public services at the present time.

This ideological schism has shaped the current presidential election as well as ongoing congressional debates. Democrats have become increasingly pro-**immigration** while Republican voters and many members of Congress generally stand in opposition. It is this split that lies at the core of the contest between Hillary Clinton[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/immigration-reform/] and Donald Trump[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/positions/immigration-reform].

Clinton described the principles underlying her position on **immigration** in a speech[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/candidate-speech-series-h\_b\_7814688.html] she gave in North Las Vegas last year:

If we claim we are for family, then we have to pull together and resolve the outstanding issues around our broken **immigration** system. The American people support comprehensive **immigration** reform not just because it’s the right thing to do — and it is — but because they know it strengthens families, strengthens our economy, and strengthens our country.

The principles underlying Trump’s position[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/positions/immigration-reform] are diametrically opposed to those of Clinton. On his website, Trump declares:

When politicians talk about “**immigration** reform” they mean: amnesty, cheap labor and open borders. The Schumer-Rubio **immigration** bill was nothing more than a giveaway to the corporate patrons who run both parties. Real **immigration** reform puts the needs of working people first – not wealthy globetrotting donors. We are the only country in the world whose **immigration** system puts the needs of other nations ahead of our own.

Trump supporters, who are 87 percent white, are substantially more hostile to **immigrants** than the general public. A Pew study[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/08/25/5-facts-about-trump-supporters-views-of-immigration/] in August found that two thirds of Trump loyalists describe **immigration** as a “very big problem.” Half of Trump voters believe **immigrants** “are more likely than American citizens to commit serious crimes,” a figure that rises to 59 percent among his strongest supporters. In terms of work, 35 percent of Trump voters say **immigrants** take jobs from Americans, compared with 24 percent of all voters.

A March 2016 Pew poll[http://www.people-press.org/2016/03/31/2-views-on-immigration-diversity-social-issues/section2\_1] found that a majority of all voters, 57 percent, said **immigrants** strengthen the country through hard work, compared with 20 percent of Trump voters. Thirty-five percent of all voters said **immigrants** burden the country “by taking jobs, housing and health care,” compared with 69 percent of Trump supporters.

The accompanying chart from the book “Polarized America” by the political scientists Nolan McCarty[https://www-princeton-edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/~nmccarty/], Keith T. Poole[http://spia.uga.edu/faculty-member/keith-poole/] and Howard Rosenthal[http://politics.as.nyu.edu/object/HowardRosenthal] illustrates the linkage between **immigration** and political polarization. The chart shows that over the period from 1879 to 2013, divisions between House Democrats and Republicans rose when the level of **immigration** was high and dropped when the level fell.

The intensity of the conflict over **immigration** is on view in the contrasting arguments of pro- and anti- **immigration** forces on a relatively obscure issue, remittances sent by **immigrants** to their families in their native countries.

Conservative organizations seeking to reduce **immigration** levels argue that remittances are a drain on the American economy. Limits To Growth[http://www.limitstogrowth.org/articles/2013/11/15/remittances-to-latin-america-americas-loss-in-billions-of-dollars/], for example, describes remittances as money “strip-mined from the United States by foreign workers” that could have been used for productive investment in this country.

The academy’s report disputes that claim, citing studies showing that very small adverse economic consequences result from remittances, and numerous benefits, including

having a substantial and important role in moving funds from rich to poor countries, which is needed to speed up global growth and reduce cross-country inequality and possibly also international migration.

The views of Pia Orrenius[http://www.dallasfed.org/research/economists/orrenius.cfm], vice president and senior economist at the Dallas Federal Reserve, reveal the complications of the politics of **immigration**. Orrenius served on the National Academy of Sciences panel that produced the report and she makes the case that the “Benefits of **Immigration** Outweigh the Costs[http://www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/north-american-century/benefits-of-immigration-outweigh-costs.html]:”

**Immigration** fuels the economy. When **immigrants** enter the labor force, they increase the productive capacity of the economy and raise GDP.” In addition, she continued, “**immigrants** grease the wheels of the labor market by flowing into industries and areas where there is a relative need for workers — where bottlenecks or shortages might otherwise damp growth. When **immigrants** enter the labor force, they increase the productive capacity of the economy and raise GDP.

But, Orrenius acknowledges there are downsides. **Immigration**

lowers the wages of competing workers, while raising the return to capital and the wages of complementary workers. In other words, the **immigration** surplus does not accrue equally to everyone. It goes primarily to the owners of capital, which includes business and landowners and investors.

Orrenius points out where the disadvantages of **immigration** primarily accrue:

Competing workers’ wages fall, at least in the initial transition period as the economy adjusts to the new labor inflow. Research suggests that previous **immigrants** suffer more of the adverse wage effects than do natives. Research also suggests any negative wage effects are concentrated among low-skilled — not high-skilled — workers.

This conclusion, which is supported by many of the empirical studies included in the report, goes to the heart of a Democratic dilemma, which the party rarely addresses publicly.

On one hand, support for liberalized **immigration** policies, including a path to legal status and citizenship for the undocumented, is crucial to winning support from Hispanic voters. A majority of Latino voters[http://www.latinodecisions.com/files/1913/6357/1744/Latino\_Consortium\_Toplines\_-\_March\_18\_Release.pdf] have relatives, friends and co-workers who are in this country illegally and who live in fear of deportation.

Among Democrats of all ethnicities and races, support for **immigration** and **immigrants** has risen steadily.

Pew Research[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/15/americans-views-of-immigrants-marked-by-widening-partisan-generational-divides/] found in August that 78 percent of Democrats agreed with the statement that **immigrants** “strengthen the country through hard work,” a view shared by 35 percent of Republicans. 88 percent of Democrats said undocumented **immigrants** should be granted legal status to stay in the United States.

At the same time, however, the costs of liberal **immigration** policies are borne most heavily by two key Democratic constituencies. Both are current targets of voter registration and get-out-the-vote drives: recent **immigrants** to this county and all workers without high school degrees, a group that is majority minority[https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015015.pdf], 29.5 percent African-American and 35.2 percent Hispanic.

The economic winners from rising **immigration** levels are closely associated with the establishment wing of the Republican Party: “businesses and landowners and investors,” as Orrenius noted. It is just this wing that Trump ran against during the primaries.

The National Academy notes the tension between winners and losers throughout the report:

The arrival of **immigrants** raises the overall income of the native population that absorbs them: the **immigration** surplus. This surplus is directly related to the degree to which **immigration** changes wages and returns to capital. In the simplest models, the more wages decline, the larger the surplus.

There is, however, no agreement on the scope or size of the lost wages resulting from **immigration**.

Jennifer Hunt, a professor of economics at Rutgers and a member of the academy panel, wrote in an email that “what we did not come to a consensus about was a number for the wage decrease experienced by native high school dropouts.”

Not only was there no consensus on the academy panel on the size of the wage loss among native-born high school graduates, among **immigration** scholars there is a sharp debate over whether there is any loss at all.

George Borjas[https://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/gborjas/], an economist at Harvard and also a member of the academy panel, is a leading proponent of the argument that **immigration** produces substantial wage losses for native-born American workers, especially high school dropouts.

In a 2007 paper, “The Evolution of the Mexican-born Workforce in the United States[http://www.nber.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/chapters/c0098],” Borjas, writing with Lawrence Katz[http://scholar.harvard.edu/lkatz/home], also a professor of economics at Harvard, argued that:

Economic theory implies that **immigration** should lower the wage of competing workers and increase the wage of complementary workers. For example, an influx of foreign-born laborers reduces the economic opportunities for laborers — all laborers now face stiffer competition in the labor market. At the same time, high-skill natives may gain substantially. They pay less for the services that laborers provide, such as painting the house and mowing the lawn, and natives who hire these laborers can now specialize in producing the goods and services that better suit their skills.

Borjas separately concluded that all high-school dropouts experience a substantial wage loss from **immigration** of 6.3 percent in the short run and 3.1 percent over the long haul as labor markets adjust to the increased number of workers.

Katz said in an email exchange that his more recent work with Claudia Goldin, also a Harvard economist, has convinced him “that **immigration** is at most a small contributor to the awful real and relative wage performance of U.S. high school dropouts,” whose relative wages “fell by 40 percent compared to college graduates” from 1980 to the early 2000s.

Katz’s bottom line:

The effects of **immigration** range from 0 to a few percentage points and are swamped by the impacts of slowdown in U.S. education supplies, technological change, and eroding labor market institutions (unions, minimum wages, rising outsourcing/fissuring of the workplace).

David Card[https://www.econ.berkeley.edu/faculty/808], an economist at the University of California-Berkeley, disputes Borjas’s argument and contends that **immigration** inflicts little or no wage penalty on American workers and may in fact boost wages.

In an email exchange, Card wrote that his own research suggests that the effect of **immigration** on native-born workers without high school degrees “is zero.”

While the most common assumption is that a larger work force drives down wages, in practice, “when you look at the evidence, larger population normally increases productivity,” Card wrote.

For the immediate future, this and other issues involving **immigration** will not be resolved within academia, but litigated in the political arena. Governments everywhere will be challenged to better steer the transnational flow of populations[http://www.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/articles/what-we-learned-in-scandinavia-about-migrants-1474932369]. Still, I believe the future direction of **immigration** is clear.

If the anti-**immigration** forces gain ground in this election, such victories will prove short-lived. For one thing, the rise in global trade and financial transactions has been steady over the past 35 years.

Robert Shiller[http://www.econ.yale.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/~shiller/], the Nobel Prize-winning economist at Yale, maps out the probable future in his Sept. 19 essay, “The Coming Anti-National Revolution[https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/coming-anti-national-revolution-by-robert-j--shiller-2016-09]”:

For the past several centuries, the world has experienced a sequence of intellectual revolutions against oppression of one sort or another. These revolutions operate in the minds of humans and are spread – eventually to most of the world – not by war (which tends to involve multiple causes), but by language and communications technology. Ultimately, the ideas they advance – unlike the causes of war – become noncontroversial.

“As technology reduces the cost of transportation and communications to near the vanishing point, achieving this equalization is increasingly feasible. But getting there requires removing old barriers and preventing the erection of new ones,” Shiller writes, concluding that

Ultimately, the next revolution will likely stem from daily interactions on computer monitors with foreigners whom we can see are intelligent, decent people – people who happen, through no choice of their own, to be living in poverty.

Before we get there, though, this year’s candidates have made irreconcilable proposals on **immigration**.

Trump[http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/tag/immigration?page=3], in “Crippled America: How to Make America Great Again”:

I want good people to come here from all over the world, but I want them to do so legally. We can expedite the process, we can reward achievement and excellence, but we have to respect the legal process. And those people who take advantage of the system and come here illegally should never enjoy the benefits of being a resident — or citizen — of this nation. So I am against any path to citizenship for undocumented workers or anyone else who is in this country illegally. They should — and need to — go home and get in line.

Clinton[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/speeches/remarks-plan-strengthen-immigrant-families-national-immigrant-integration-conference-brooklyn/] was more succinct:

If you work hard, if you love this country, if you contribute to it, and want nothing more than to build a good future for yourselves and your children, we should give you a way to come forward and become a citizen. And you know what? The majority of Americans agree. They know it’s the right thing to do.

The outcome on Nov. 8 will not settle this dispute, but it will give us some indication of where those who support[http://escholarship.org/uc/item/1m58x0z3#page-3] what they see as enlightened **immigration** policies stand as they face those who seek to restore a lost past.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE FIX

How Nations Survive and Thrive in a World in Decline

By Jonathan Tepperman

307 pp. Tim Duggan Books. $28.

The timing of this book could not be better. Big Think has run into a ditch. No one appears to agree on fundamental ideas about governing anymore, and we’re not even sure what we’re arguing about. The grand ideological debates of the 20th and early 21st centuries — capitalism versus socialism, democracy versus authoritarianism — today seem too broad, tired and pointless, and little has come along to replace them. Globalization, the economic paradigm of our era, has become an epithet in the mouths of insurgent politicians exploiting middle-class discontent on both right and left (that would be you, Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders). The people in power on both sides of the aisle and the Atlantic, the so-called establishment, still seem surprised by the magnitude of the backlash — by Trump, by Sanders, by Brexit, by the deepening anger — and confused about how to respond. And with no one pointing a way through the paralysis, either in Washington or Western capitals like Brussels, democracy itself has seemed to curdle, especially with the Arab Spring degenerating into something close to civilizational collapse.

We are in other words utterly adrift, ideologically speaking. It’s hardly a surprise the vacuum of ideas is being filled, in the political arena, by atavistic impulses like nationalism, racism and xenophobia.

Jonathan Tepperman’s smart and agile answer to this “gathering darkness,” as he calls it, is to take a giant step back from the larger, paralyzed debate. In “The Fix: How Nations Survive and Thrive in a World in Decline,” Tepperman sets aside Big Think to serve up a smorgasbord of small think: practical, microcosmic solutions to big problems in sometimes surprising ­places from Brazil to Botswana to New York City. Tepperman, the managing editor of Foreign Affairs, offers what he calls “a ­data-driven case for optimism” at a time when “most of us have glumly concluded that our governments are broken and our domestic and international problems are insurmountable.” He divides his “good news book” into chapters on what he describes as “the Terrible Ten” problems: inequality, **immigration**, Islamic extremism, civil war, corruption, the “resource curse,” energy, the “middle-­income trap” (the difficulty countries have in making the leap from developmental success to wealthy-nation status) and two kinds of political gridlock: what’s not working worldwide, and American-style. Then he travels to 10 places around the world to highlight successful local or national solutions to these problems.

Almost to a tale, they are stories of gutsy political pragmatism in the midst of crisis, often involving battlefield conversions by unusually adaptable and able leaders unfettered by “ideological handcuffs.” In Brazil, the business community and economists were initially horrified when Lula da Silva, a rough-hewn labor leader who had experienced extreme poverty as a child, was elected president. But the ­“rabble-rouser metamorphosed into the Great Conciliator,” Tepperman writes, and to address Brazil’s terrible income inequality Lula launched Bolsa Família, an innovative and relatively inexpensive cash-transfer program that didn’t just give people handouts but required “counterpart responsibilities,” including government demands to use some of the money to send one’s kids to school and ensure they are immunized and get regular checkups (along with their mothers). Lula ended up winning over even conservatives in his country and dramatically reducing poverty, leading the former World Bank expert Nancy Birdsall to conclude that Bolsa Família is “as close as you can come to a magic bullet in development.” More than 60 countries sent experts to Brazil to study the program, and then-Mayor Michael Bloomberg based his Opportunity NYC program on Lula’s idea.

Tepperman devotes a separate chapter to Bloomberg’s own innovative approach to breaking through Washington gridlock to secure his prime-target city in the face of terrorist threats. Elected two months after 9/11, Bloomberg had cause to despair over Washington’s ineptitude in counter­terrorism. His response was to “work around the federal government and do something no modern American city had ever attempted: try to defend itself, by itself,” Tepperman writes. Bloomberg reappointed a no-nonsense career N.Y.P.D. officer, Ray Kelly, as police commissioner, and Kelly rose to the challenge, becoming the city’s “secretary of defense, head of the C.I.A. and . . . chief architect all rolled into one,” in the words of the New York University urban studies professor Mitchell Moss. Kelly in turn hired David Cohen, a C.I.A. veteran who created a raft of new response teams and used his knowledge of Washington’s byzantine ways to force the feds into sharing intelligence. Ignoring the Justice Department’s qualms, Kelly sent officers to 11 foreign cities to foster cop-to-cop cooperation, and deployed 100 more to “muscle their way” onto the ­federal Joint Terrorism Task Force to demand full access to F.B.I. files.

Under Bloomberg’s brash leadership, this all happened with admirable swiftness and efficiency: By 2002 the Police Department had 60 fluent Arabic speakers on staff, almost double the number the F.B.I. could claim three years later, Tepperman writes. And by the time Bloomberg left office in 2013, the F.B.I., C.I.A., Secret Service and Defense Intelligence Agency had all asked New York for advice.

Tepperman finds successful leadership stories in some unlikely places. Among them is Mexico, which despite its reputation north of the border (especially this election season) for runaway corruption and drug violence has begun to recover under President Enrique Peña Nieto, who impressively exploited the despair of Mexico’s political elites to forge unprecedented cooperation. In just the first 18 months after his July 2012 election, Peña Nieto “managed to bust open Mexico’s smothering monopolies and antiquated energy sector, restructure the country’s education system and modernize its tax and banking laws,” Tepperman writes (though he may have lost some of that political capital after his widely criticized August meeting with Donald Trump). Across the world in Bot­swana, the “cleaner than a hound’s tooth” Seretse Khama lifted his country beyond its dependence on the “resource curse” of diamonds, building what was considered, for a time, one of the best-governed countries in the developing world — a system so structured against corruption that it is, for now, resisting the alleged abuses of his far less capable son, Ian Khama.

Though the book is not long, Tepperman goes into impressive detail in each case study and delivers his assessments in clear, pared-down prose, careful to describe most of his success stories as experiments that could still fail. “The Fix” is no clip job either: Tepperman spent considerable time flying around the globe for his own research, including interviews with Lula, Rwanda’s Paul Kagame, Indonesia’s Joko Widodo and other leaders.

Perhaps the biggest question about Tepperman’s thesis is one he addresses but doesn’t fully answer: whether many of these programs are readily transferable to other places, or are unique to the political culture whence they sprang. In the end, for example, Bloomberg’s version of Bolsa Família failed to gain traction in New York, and there are indications it may work better in rural than in urban areas. And it’s somewhat easier to embrace large-scale **immigration** if you’re Canada (another case study Tepperman looks at), and you enjoy the world’s ­second-largest state by landmass (after Russia) with something like one-tenth the population of the United States. Perhaps what scholars call the “Canadian exception” — its avoidance of anti-**immigrant** ­backlashes — has as much to do with these peculiar conditions as anything its leaders have done. Tepperman’s answer to the ­energy/climate problem is also not terribly persuasive: He cites the shale revolution as a rare American success story (these days anyway), but that seems more an example of geological luck and greed than inspired leadership. Tepperman may also be too sanguine about some of his political heroes: Brazil’s Lula is under investigation for graft, and his handpicked successor has just been impeached.

But to answer these larger questions adequately, perhaps what we need most is a renewal of Big Think — a deeper reconsideration of the outdated ideologies of our day. In the meantime, Tepperman has produced an indispensable handbook on ways to work around the problem.

Michael Hirsh is the national editor of Politico Magazine and the author of “Capital Offense: How Washington’s Wise Men Turned ­America’s Future Over to Wall Street.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX — “Donald!” cried a woman in the front row at the Arizona Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] headquarters on Monday night. On the large TV screen before her, Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] strode out to do battle [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]with Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per].

Among the 84 million people[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/business/media/at-nearly-84-million-viewers-debate-may-be-the-most-watched-ever.html] tuned in to the first presidential debate of the general election, the crowd in Phoenix was primed for a gladiatorial contest.

They played their role with gusto: hissing, guffawing or cackling when Mrs. Clinton spoke; whooping and air-punching for Mr. Trump. Ronald Reagan, the patron saint of modern Republicanism, grinned from a framed portrait in the corner. Pizza was served.

It seemed as good of a place as any to ask a question that has baffled so many observers outside the United States: Why do so many Americans support Mr. Trump?

Readers emailing from abroad are surprised by the campaign’s bluster, insults and prevarications. They don’t understand how a race for the American presidency can be dominated by arguments over missing emails, “birtherism”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/us/politics/donald-trump-obama-birther.html] and beauty queens[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/alicia-machado-donald-trump.html].

Across the United States, though, the campaign is about much more than that. I’ve spent the past 10 days talking to Trump supporters, looking for answers.

Arizona, with its searing deserts and saw-toothed mountains, has long been a Republican bastion, a place of conservative-leaning politics and liberal gun laws. The state’s most prominent Trump advocate is Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County, who became notorious for his intolerance of unauthorized **immigrants**and making prison inmates wear pink underwear.

At the debate party in Phoenix, the largely white crowd was seized by a palpable air of anticipation. After a sharp dip in August, Mr. Trump was suddenly riding high again in the polls. Could he pull ahead of Mrs. Clinton?

The first thunderclap of applause erupted when Mr. Trump said that Mrs. Clinton has been “doing this for 30 years,” with little to show for her efforts. But as the debate wore on, and Mr. Trump’s energy started to flag, so too did the atmosphere in the room. Onscreen, Mrs. Clinton grew in confidence[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/arts/television/presidential-debate-donald-trump-hillary-clinton.html], unleashing a volley of attack lines. As Mr. Trump struggled to respond, the crowd in Arizona lapsed into ever longer silences.

A supporter of Mr. Trump in the crowd who refused to be identified, citing unspecified threats from Clinton loyalists, said he didn’t expect his candidate to be as polished as a professional politician. He was willing to take the brash Mr. Trump as is, he said.

Others at the viewing party said they were worried by Mr. Trump’s performance. Kathy Manie, wearing a red “Make America Great Again” hat, said she was disappointed that Mr. Trump appeared ill-prepared for Mrs. Clinton’s rehearsed barbs. “He could have spoken more eloquently,” she said. “Hillary knew exactly how to taunt him, and he fell for the bait. He gave as much as he got, but I wish his words were stronger.”

Ms. Manie was not the prototypical Trump supporter. Born in Trinidad, she **immigrated** to the United States more than two decades ago, at 21. She is a social worker and a committed Christian, and she said that she was praying for Mr. Trump to win.

“I can’t stand another four years of a Democrat running this country,” she said, but she worried the forces of history were pulling against her preference. “We’re at a time when the world seems to want a woman president.”

Some Trump supporters are less forthcoming. Last week in Houston, I was ejected from a Trump event hosted by an anti-**immigration** group that objected to my attempts to interview their supporters. Before I was asked to leave, a Trump supporter sidled up, making pointed comments to me about “snakes in the grass that bite people.”

Days later, at a county fair in southern Arizona, representatives of a local gun club refused point blank to speak to me. The only quote came from their T-shirts, which read: “Hillary For Prison.”

Yet many other voters were more thoughtful about their support for Mr. Trump. On Sunday, I went to see Dan Bell, a cattle rancher who lives on the Arizona border with Mexico, and whose land is frequently trespassed by migrants and drug smugglers. Mr. Bell was a classic rancher: a burly man with blue eyes, in a cowboy hat, quietly forthright. For him, Mr. Trump represents urgently needed change.

“Sure, there’s been things I wish he hadn’t said,” he told me as we bumped along the border in his Jeep, rain spitting against the windshield. “But this country needs a course correction. He’s been successful in business. We need to get the career politicians out.”

That is a common sentiment among Trump supporters: Their man fuses a potent anti-establishment vim with a certain brand of American authenticity. They may not agree with all of his more lurid attacks — although some clearly do — but they see in him the archetype of a successful if boastful businessman. To them he is someone whose words are to be taken with a pinch of salt.

Mr. Trump seems to have been stung by Monday’s debate, which was widely seen as a victory for Mrs. Clinton. Lashing out, he has blamed his performance on the debate moderator’s bias and a defective microphone[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-debate.html], and threatened to turn Bill Clinton’s marital infidelity into an issue in the next debate, scheduled for Oct. 9 in St. Louis.

Convention political wisdom has it that Mr. Trump’s mercurial debate performance, while pleasing to his core supporters, did little to persuade other demographics, like women and college-educated whites, whose support he desperately needs. Mainstream Republicans are shunning him.

On Tuesday, The Arizona Republic, which has never endorsed a Democrat for president since it started publishing in 1890, formally declared for Mrs. Clinton[http://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/editorial/2016/09/27/hillary-clinton-endorsement/91198668/]. “The 2016 Republican candidate is not conservative and he is not qualified,” the paper said.

But the conventional wisdom has been wrong so many times in this election that only the foolish would dismiss Mr. Trump.

As people filed out of the debate party on Monday night in Phoenix, Phil Lovas, a member of the Arizona House of Representatives who heads the state Trump campaign, urged them to take home a Trump yard sign. “We’ve got 43 days until we elect President Trump,” he said. “We need your help.”

The man seated beside me, who had been silent for much of the debate, piped up. “President Trump,” he repeated, speaking the words in a low murmur, as if testing them out to see how they might sound.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* New Debate Strategy for Donald Trump: Practice, Practice, Practice[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/us/politics/donald-trump-debate.html]

\* Explaining the U.S. Presidential Election to China: It’s Not Really Like ‘House of Cards’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/29/world/asia/china-united-states-presidential-election.html]

\* Would Donald Trump Ever Use Nuclear Arms First? He Doesn’t Seem Sure[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/donald-trump-hillary-clinton-nuclear-policy-cyber.html]

\* Trump Scores Points on Trade in Debate, but Not So Much on Accuracy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-trade-tpp-nafta.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LIVERPOOL, England — Jackie Walker, a prominent left-wing activist, was in full flow. “We’re part of the biggest political moment in the last 50 years!” she cried. “The seeds we are sowing, who knows what fruit they will bring?”

The packed audience in a former Congregational chapel turned arts center here cheered with the fervor of a religious gathering, reflecting a kind of reverence for the man they had shown up to support: Jeremy Corbyn , the hard-left leader of Britain [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s Labour Party. At the party conference in Liverpool just minutes away, he had just defeated what his supporters called a “coup attempt” by more centrist Labour members of Parliament.

Many Labour legislators fear that Mr. Corbyn, 67, is dragging the party so far from the political and ideological mainstream that he will lead it to another devastating political defeat at the hands of the Conservative Party in the next general election, which is not due until 2020 but is possible earlier.

Despite Labour’s significant growth in grass-roots members, some fear successive defeats. Janan Ganesh, a Financial Times columnist, wrote that “ there is a reasonable chance [https://www.ft.com/content/bf4bd252-83cd-11e6-a29c-6e7d9515ad15], and it becomes stronger by the day, that Gordon Brown will turn out to have been the last Labour prime minister.” (Mr. Brown left office in 2010.)

But if the mood of the Labour conference itself the last few days was resigned in the face of Mr. Corbyn’s re-election [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/25/world/europe/jeremy-corbyn-labour-party-leader.html] on Saturday as party leader, the atmosphere at this parallel conference, held by the hard-left group Ms. Walker [http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/staggers/2016/09/interview-momentum-s-vice-chair-jackie-walker-unity-antisemitism-and] helps run, Momentum, verged on ecstasy.

In the battle for Labour’s direction, Momentum is winning. Seen by critics as a softer successor to the Trotskyist Militant movement, which Labour banned from the party as too extreme in the 1980s, Momentum has flowered into a powerful organizing vehicle for Mr. Corbyn. It has helped him register and mobilize passionate supporters intent on substituting unapologetic socialism for politics as usual.

“People are fed up with a so-called free market system that has produced grotesque inequality, stagnating living standards for the many, calamitous foreign wars without end and a political stitch-up,” Mr. Corbyn said on Wednesday in remarks to the party conference.

In many ways, Momentum’s success is the culmination of the backlash on the left to the centrism of Labour under Tony Blair in the 1990s and the first years of this century. Its detractors view Momentum as naïve at best and dangerous at worst. Its supporters feel they are building a movement less concerned about the next election cycle than with bringing true socialism to Britain. Either way, the group has solidified Mr. Corbyn’s hold on the party’s leadership.

“We’re heading in the right direction, which is the left direction,” said Emine Ibrahim, a member of the Haringey Council in London. Grass-roots membership in the local Labour Party has gone up to 5,500 now from 1,300 before Mr. Corbyn’s election last year, she said, mirroring a tripling of national membership.

Daniel Cooper, 26, joined the Labour Party in 2009. Then, he said, “I realized that it wasn’t for me, left and joined the Communist Party, then under Jeremy Corbyn came back to support Labour.”

“I feel this is the natural time and moment,” he said, when asked about his support for Momentum. “The financial crisis is deeper than it was in the 1930s, and we need radical revolutionary ideas to overcome the problems of capitalism.”

Momentum has helped Mr. Corbyn take over the party from inside, intimidating and isolating center-left members. Mr. Corbyn and the movement appeal to an electorate that is angry about inequality, globalization and unemployment, and is seeking clearer, simpler choices. While Mr. Corbyn is trying to address them from the left, those same issues are motivating supporters of populist candidates on the right, including Donald J. Trump in the United States and Marine Le Pen of the National Front in France.

“Momentum has remarkable energy,” said Mark Wickham-Jones, a professor of political science at the University of Bristol. “But it is clearly energy that is coming from many directions, and it is going to be hard to channel it.”

As the Labour Party moves to the left and grows, to become one of the largest in Western Europe, it also seems to slip further from power in a country that has historically disliked extremes.

Mr. Wickham-Jones said Labour faced an “existential crisis,” having lost its traditional Scottish heartland to the left-leaning Scottish National Party and under challenge from the right in working-class districts by the populist U.K. Independence Party.

There is now a clear split between grass-roots party members, he said, and its more pragmatic lawmakers. Of the current 230 Labour members of the House of Commons, 172 voted against Mr. Corbyn in a no-confidence vote [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/29/world/europe/jeremy-corbyn-labour-party-brexit.html] in June.

In his remarks on Wednesday, Mr. Corbyn seemed to underscore his apparent lack of interest in vote chasing. At time when limiting **immigration** is Britain’s most prominent political issue — it was widely seen as the driving force in the nation’s vote to leave the European Union — Mr. Corbyn pointedly did not promise to impose limits. Instead, he vowed to give extra resources to regions where population increases put pressure on public services and said he would crack down on exploitation of migrant labor to help protect the pay of workers.

The British news media largely interpreted these views as naïve, while senior Labour legislators were already weighing methods of curbing **immigration** to appeal to disenchanted Labour voters who favored leaving the European Union .

This kind of conventional political analysis holds little water among the members of Momentum, who believe that with enough rallies, speeches and street campaigning they can win Britain over to their version of socialism.

“People see in Jeremy Corbyn the chance to change things, the belief that things can be different,” said Ian Hodson, the head of the Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union .

Many of their own party’s elected members of Parliament are regarded by newly empowered leftists as closet Conservatives, traitors and worse. “The M.P.s should be the servants of the party members, not the masters,” said Matt Wrack, the general secretary of the Fire Brigades Union.

The Momentum supporters have a hero in John McDonnell, the shadow chancellor of the Exchequer and a close Corbyn ally, who persuaded him to fight on against the leadership challenge. Mr. McDonnell grew up poor here in Liverpool and is considered an enforcer, channeling the enthusiasm and passion of the new Labour members and of Momentum.

Mr. McDonnell won huge cheers for telling the conference: “In this party you no longer have to whisper it. It’s called socialism.” He began his remarks to Momentum by lifting his fist and saying, “Thanks a lot, comrades,” praising their passion and support for Mr. Corbyn.

But for Steven Fielding, a political scientist at Nottingham University , “it’s difficult to overstate how utterly irrelevant are the speeches and policy debates at this Labour conference.”

“It’s political science fiction,” he said.

The novelist Will Self summed up the dilemma of a party caught between old socialist dreams and the revolutionary dreams of the youth of 1968. In the modern digital world “with its free flows of capital and most critically labor,” he said, “there’s really no place for a political party with an 1887 heart and a 1968 head.”

Follow Steven Erlanger @StevenErlanger and Stephen Castle @\_StephenCastle on Twitter .

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

ROTTERDAM, the Netherlands — For as long as ships have ventured across water, laborers like Patrick Duijzers have tied their fortunes to trade.

He is a longshoreman here at Europe’s largest port, and his black Jack Daniel’s T-shirt, hoop earrings and copious rings give Mr. Duijzers the look of a bohemian pirate. His wages put him solidly in the Dutch middle class: He has earned enough to buy an apartment and enjoy vacations to Spain.

Lately, though, Mr. Duijzers has come to see global trade as a malevolent force. His employer — a unit of the Maersk Group, the Danish shipping conglomerate — is locked in a fiercely competitive battle around the world.

He sees trucking companies replacing Dutch drivers with **immigrants** from Eastern Europe. He bids farewell to older co-workers reluctantly taking early retirement as robots capture their jobs. Over the last three decades, the ranks of his union have dwindled to about 7,000 members, from 25,000.

“More global trade is a good thing if we get a piece of the cake,” Mr. Duijzers said. “But that’s the problem. We’re not getting our piece of the cake.”

Far beyond the docks of the North Sea, such laments now resonate as the soundtrack for an increasingly vigorous rejection of free trade.

For generations, libraries full of economics textbooks have rightly promised that global trade expands national wealth by lowering the price of goods, lifting wages and amplifying growth. The powers that emerged victorious from World War II championed globalization as the antidote to future conflicts. In Asia, Europe and North America, governments of every ideological persuasion have focused on trade as their guiding economic force.

But trade comes with no assurances that the spoils will be shared equitably. Across much of the industrialized world, an outsize share of the winnings have been harvested by people with advanced degrees, stock options and the need for accountants. Ordinary laborers have borne the costs and suffered from joblessness and deepening economic anxiety.

These costs have proved overwhelming in communities that depend on industry for sustenance, vastly exceeding what economists anticipated. Policy makers under the thrall of neoliberal economic philosophy put stock in the notion that markets could be trusted to bolster social welfare.

In doing so, they failed to plan for the trauma that has accompanied the benefits of trade. When millions of workers lost paychecks to foreign competition, they lacked government supports to cushion the blow. As a result, seething anger is upending politics in Europe and North America.

In the United States, the Republican presidential aspirant Donald J. Trump has tapped into the rage of communities reeling from factory closings, denouncing trade with China and Mexico[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/24/opinion/joe-nocera-dont-blame-nafta.html] as a mortal threat to American prosperity. The Democratic nominee, Hillary Clinton, has done an about-face, opposing an enormous free-trade deal spanning the Pacific[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/business/tpp-explained-what-is-trans-pacific-partnership.html] that she supported while secretary of state.

In Britain, the vote in a June referendum[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/britain-brexit-european-union-referendum.html] to abandon the European Union was in part a rebuke of the establishment, from laborers who blame trade for declining pay. Across the European Union, populist movements have gained adherents as an outraged response to globalization, imperiling the future of major trade deals, including a pact[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/03/world/europe/ttip-greenpeace-leak-trade-deal.html] with the United States and another with Canada[http://ec.europa.eu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/trade/policy/in-focus/ceta/].

“The trade policy of the European Union is paralyzed,” said the Italian minister of economic development, Carlo Calenda, during a recent interview in Rome. “This is a tragic situation.”

The anti-trade backlash, building for years, has become explosive because the global economy has arrived at a sobering period of reckoning. Years of investment manias and financial machinations that powered the job market have lost potency, exposing longstanding downsides of trade that had previously been masked by illusive prosperity.

This tide of animosity may prove nearly impossible to reverse, given that technological disruption and economic upheaval are now at work in an era of scarcity. Today, many major nations are grappling with weak growth, tight credit and a gnawing sense that a lean future may persist indefinitely.

The worst financial crisis since the Great Depression has left banks in Europe and the United States reluctant to lend. Real estate bonanzas from Spain to Southern California gave way to a disastrous wave of foreclosures, eliminating construction jobs. China’s slowdown has diminished its appetite for raw materials, sowing unemployment from the iron ore mines of Brazil to the coal pits of Indonesia.

Trade did not cause the breakdown in economic growth. Indeed, trade has helped generate what growth remains. But the pervasive stagnation has left little cover for those set back by globalization.

The North American Free Trade Agreement, or Nafta, exposed workers in the United States to competition with Mexico[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/07/us/twenty-years-later-nafta-remains-a-source-of-tension.html], but its passage came in the mid-1990s, just as investment was pouring into the web, creating demand for a range of manufactured goods — office furniture for Silicon Valley coders, trucks for the couriers delivering e-commerce wares. China’s entry into the World Trade Organization in 2001 unleashed a far larger shock, but a construction boom absorbed many laid-off workers.

The dot-com boom is now a distant memory. The housing bubble burst. Much of the global economy is operating free of artificial enhancements. Lower-skilled workers confront bleak opportunities and intense competition, especially in the United States. Even as recent data shows middle-class Americans are finally st[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/business/economy/us-census-household-income-poverty-wealth-2015.html] a[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/business/economy/us-census-household-income-poverty-wealth-2015.html] rting to share in the gains[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/business/economy/us-census-household-income-poverty-wealth-2015.html] from the recovery, incomes for many remain below where they were a decade ago.

“The debates that we are having about globalization and the adjustment cost, these are the conversations that we should have been having when we did Nafta, and when China entered the W.T.O.,” said Chad P. Bown, a trade expert at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington. “There were people talking about these things, but they weren’t taken very seriously at the time. There’s a lot of policy regret.”

“We do need to have these trade agreements,” Mr. Bown said, “but we do need to be cognizant that there are going to be losers, and we need to have policies to address them.”

The extent of the damage suffered by these “losers” has accelerated an erosion of faith in the wealth-creating powers of free trade. A profound skepticism has taken root in some of the largest trading powers, notably the United States, France, Italy and Japan.

Successive administrations in the United States, led by Democrats and Republicans alike, have embraced liberalized trade as a central component of the nation’s foreign policy. Yet only 19 percent of American voters said trade with other countries created more jobs[http://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/07/15/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-poll.html] in the United States, according to a New York Times/CBS News poll released in July.

Even among those who support trade, doubts are growing about its ability to deliver on crucial promises. A 2014 Pew Research Center survey[http://www.pewglobal.org/2014/09/16/faith-and-skepticism-about-trade-foreign-investment/] of people in 44 countries found that only 45 percent of respondents believed trade raised wages. Only 26 percent believed that trade lowered prices.

Volumes of economic data tell a different story.

Workers employed in major export industries earn higher wages[https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/ec201504a.pdf] than those in domestically focused sectors.

Americans saw their choice of products expand by one-third in recent decades, the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas[https://www.dallasfed.org/assets/documents/research/eclett/2010/el1015.pdf] found. Trade is how raspberries appear on store shelves in the dead of winter.

Lower-income households have benefited from better prices on basic goods. As imports surged, the cost of baby and toddler clothes in the United States dropped by 10 percent from 1999 to 2013, according to an analysis by Pietra Rivoli, a trade expert at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University. The price of shoes went up much more slowly than the overall cost of living.

But the fear and anger over trade are well founded.

Vast numbers of laborers have lost jobs as imported goods from low-wage countries arrived. Mills have closed, while strip malls fill with dollar stores and payday lenders.

In the fallout, the United States maintained limits on unemployment benefits, leaving American workers vulnerable to plummeting fortunes. Social welfare systems have limited the toll in Europe, but economic growth has been weak, so jobs are scarce.

All the while, automation has grown in sophistication and reach. From 2000 to 2010, the United States lost some 5.6 million manufacturing jobs, by the government’s calculation. Only 13 percent of those job losses can be explained by trade, according to an analysis[http://conexus.cberdata.org/files/MfgReality.pdf] by the Center for Business and Economic Research at Ball State University in Indiana. The rest were casualties of automation or the result of tweaks to factory operations that enabled more production with less labor.

American factories produced more goods last year than ever, by many indications. Yet they did so while employing about 12.3 million workers — roughly the same number as in 2009, when production was roughly three-fourths what it is today.

At APM Terminals, where Mr. Duijzers works, a symphony of motion greets every arriving container ship. Cranes rev, lifting containers. But people are scarce. “Robots Running Things in Rotterdam,” proclaims an article on the company website[http://www.maersk.com/en/the-maersk-group/about-us/publications/group-annual-magazine/robots-running-things-in-rotterdam]. “Of the 74 machines operating in the yard, 63 run on their own with no human intervention.”

Yet if robots are a more significant threat to paychecks, they are also harder to blame than hordes of low-wage workers in overseas factories.

“We have a public policy toward trade,” said Douglas A. Irwin, an economist at Dartmouth College. “We don’t have a public policy on automation.”

The China Syndrome

When Michael Morrison took a job at the steel mill in the center of Granite City, Ill., in 1999, he assumed his future was ironclad.

He was 38, a father with three young children.

“I felt like I had finally gotten into a place that was so reliable I could retire there,” he said.

The mill had been there — just across the Mississippi River from St. Louis — since the end of the 19th century. It had changed hands, ultimately landing in the portfolio of United States Steel. But the basics held. For those willing to sweat, the mill was a reliable means of supporting a family.

Mr. Morrison began by shoveling slag out of the furnaces, working his way up to crane driver. From inside a cockpit tucked in the rafters of a cavernous building, he manned the controls, guiding a 350-ton ladle that spilled molten iron.

It was a difficult job requiring finesse and perpetual focus. He was compensated accordingly, earning $24.62 an hour.

He worked overtime shifts, amassing savings to send his children to college. Last year, he took home $86,000.

His eldest daughter recently finished her master’s in epidemiology. His son completed his sophomore year at McKendree University in nearby Lebanon.

But events playing out on the other side of the world would soon upend his life.

China’s relentless development was turning farmland into factories, accelerated by a landmark in the history of trade: the country’s inclusion in the World Trade Organization.

The W.T.O. was born out of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a compact forged in 1947 that lowered barriers to international commerce in an effort to prevent a repeat of global hostilities.

In the first four decades, tariffs on manufactured wares plunged to nearly 6 percent from about 35 percent, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago[https://www.chicagofed.org/publications/economic-perspectives/2003/4qeppart4]. By 2000, the volume of trade among members had swelled to 25 times that of a half-century earlier.

Most of this trade took place between wealthy countries with similar wages and labor standards. But the rollout of Nafta in the 1990s put American workers in direct competition with counterparts in Mexico, where wages were much lower and labor rights and environmental standards were minimal.

A washing machine maker with factories in the United States now had a ready way to cut costs: set up a plant in Mexico.

Still, Mexico — home to about 123 million people — was not big enough to refashion the terms of trade. When China joined the W.T.O. in 2001, that added a country of 1.3 billion people to the global trading system.

China targeted crucial industries for domination, lavishing favored companies with sweetheart credit terms while investing aggressively in ports, highways and electrical generation. Anyone with ideas about organizing Chinese labor risked landing behind bars.

In the first 13 years after China entered the W.T.O., its exports of goods swelled to nearly $2.3 trillion in 2014 from $266 billion, according to the World Bank.

The beneficiaries of this surge include anyone who has bought practically anything touched by human hands — an iPhone, a car, a Christmas ornament. Corporations that used China to cut costs raised their value, enriching executives and ordinary investors.

The casualties of China’s exports are far fewer, but they are concentrated. The rugged country of western North Carolina suffered mass unemployment as Chinese-made wooden furniture put local plants out of business. So did glassmakers in Toledo, Ohio, and auto parts manufacturers across the Midwest.

A paper published last [https://gps.ucsd.edu/\_files/faculty/hanson/hanson\_research\_china-trade.pdf] year[https://gps.ucsd.edu/\_files/faculty/hanson/hanson\_research\_china-trade.pdf] by a trio of economists — David H. Autor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, David Dorn at the University of Zurich and Gordon H. Hanson at the University of California, San Diego — concludes that Chinese imports eliminated nearly one million American manufacturing jobs from 1999 to 2011. Add in suppliers and other related industries, and the total job losses reach 2.4 million.

Mr. Trump vows to slap punitive tariffs on Chinese goods. But that would very likely just shift production to other low-wage countries like Vietnam and Mexico. It would not turn the lights on at shuttered textile plants in the Carolinas. (Even if it did, robots would probably take most of the jobs.)

Granite City sat smack in the middle of this gathering storm.

From 2005 to 2015, China’s share of global steel production swelled from just less than one-third to fully half, according to data compiled[https://piie.com/blogs/china-economic-watch/state-play-chinese-steel-industry] by the Peterson Institute for International Economics. China’s steel exports more than quadrupled.

Last fall, United States Steel began slowing production in Granite City, laying off 40 or so apprentices. As layoffs accelerated, they reached the ranks of more senior workers.

Two days before Christmas, Mr. Morrison finished his shift and went into the break room. “Everybody was standing there like zombies, looking at the bulletin board,” he said. A list of names was tacked there, along with instructions for those workers to clean out their lockers.

This is how Mr. Morrison found himself confronting a bewildering new state of affairs — joblessness.

“I’ve worked since I was 12,” he said, recalling a paper route, then a job as a cook at his brother’s taco place.

A blue Steelworkers union T-shirt hugs his burly frame. His calloused hands attest to years of physical labor. Suddenly, his $2,000 biweekly paycheck shrank to a $425-a-week unemployment check, plus some severance. In July, the unemployment checks stopped. He had reached the six-month limit.

He interviewed for a job as a supervisor at an Amazon warehouse, but it required computer skills that he lacked. So he took a position as a “fulfillment associate,” working the night shift, pulling products off warehouse shelves and putting them in boxes. It paid $13 an hour — a little more than half his United States Steel wages.

His first night on the job, his knees gave out. He took painkillers. The next morning he could barely stand up. He called in and said he would not be coming back. He has an interview coming up for a forklift driving position at a warehouse. It pays $12 an hour, another step down.

“I had to tell my son that he can’t go back to McKendree for his junior year,” Mr. Morrison says, straining to choke back tears. “He has to go to community college.”

He swallows hard. Tears emerge from the corners of his eyes.

“It just crushes you,” he says. “I didn’t get to go to college. I wanted my kids to succeed. When you see the disappointment in your kids’ eyes. …”

Falling Without a Net

When Dan Simmons started working at the mill 38 years ago, talk centered on how to make steel. These days, he spends his days at a job for which he feels little prepared — de facto social worker.

Mr. Simmons is the president of the Steelworkers Local 1899, which represents 1,250 workers at the Granite City plant. On a recent morning, only about 375 of his people are employed. He sits at his desk inside the brick union hall, greeting laid-off workers who arrive seeking help.

One man wants guidance scanning online job listings. Another has hit a snag with his unemployment benefits.

A night earlier, Mr. Simmons took a call on his cellphone from the niece of a high school classmate, a laid-off millworker. He had shot himself to death, leaving behind two children.

Trade Adjustment Assistance, a government program started in 1962 and expanded significantly a dozen years later, is supposed to support workers whose jobs are casualties of overseas competition. The program pays for job training.

But Mr. Simmons rolls his eyes at mention of the program. Training has almost become a joke. Skills often do not translate from old jobs to new. Many workers just draw a check while they attend training and then remain jobless.

A 2012 assessment of the program[https://ideas.repec.org/p/mpr/mprres/c6b34445ad854f5d8178f580f974867a.html] prepared for the Labor Department found that four years after completing training, only 37 percent of those employed were working in their targeted industries. Many of those enrolled had lower incomes than those who simply signed up for unemployment benefits and looked for other work.

European workers have fared better. In wealthy countries like Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Denmark, unemployment benefits, housing subsidies and government-provided health care are far more generous than in the United States.

In the five years after a job loss, an American family of four that is eligible for housing assistance receives average benefits equal to 25 percent of the unemployed person’s previous wages, according to data[http://www.oecd.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/els/benefits-and-wages-statistics.htm] from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. For a similar family in the Netherlands, benefits reach 70 percent.

Yet in Europe, too, the impacts of trade have been uneven, in part because of the quirks of the European Union. Trade deals are cut by Brussels, setting the terms for the 28 member nations. Social programs are left to national governments.

“You’re pursuing trade and liberalization agreements at the E.U. level, and then leaving to the individual member countries how to deal with the damage,” said Andrew Lang, a law professor at the London School of Economics.

In Granite City, the damage now dominates Mr. Simmons’s day.

Inside the union hall, a supply cabinet has been outfitted as a food pantry. He hands out plastic bags full of canned foods — yellow corn, peas, green beans. He hands one to Mr. Morrison, who initially refuses to take it.

“These are some proud steelworkers, and it’s very difficult for them to do this,” Mr. Simmons says. “These guys are used to making a living, and not asking for handouts.”

Kenneth Hahn had been working at the plant for more than 40 years when he was laid off in February. He spends most of his time in his garden, tending to vegetables.

His father lived on a Missouri farm without plumbing or electricity during the Great Depression.

“They grew everything they needed,” he said.

If the mill does not start up again soon, Mr. Hahn is thinking about doing likewise.

“Move down to the holler,” he said. “I can always eat squirrel and rabbit.”

In China, farmers whose land has been turned into factories are making more steel than the world needs[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/10/business/international/a-steel-mill-lives-again-in-a-setback-for-china.html].

In America, idled steelworkers are contemplating how to live off the land.

The Bounty of the Sea

Rotterdam has a history of looking across the water and finding things that can be turned into money.

In the 16th century, it was herring. A burgeoning fleet set sail in pursuit. Merchants began salting and drying the catch in barrels for an emerging export trade. By the 17th century, local shipyards were clattering away, constructing vessels for the Dutch East India Company as it plied the spice routes to Southeast Asia.

As waterways linking the port to the industrial communities of the Rhine were deepened and channelized, German automobiles and machinery began flowing through Rotterdam on the way to the rest of the planet. Offices filled with law firms, insurance agents and logistics companies.

“The fortunes of this country have been built on trade,” said Wouter Jacobs, a transportation economist at Erasmus University Rotterdam. “It’s our lifeline.”

Yet even here, unease has entered the conversation.

Jacob van der Vis is paid to promote trade. An adviser on international business for the Netherlands Chamber of Commerce, he advertises innovations playing out at the port. He speaks of trade with China as a golden opportunity.

But Mr. van der Vis is skeptical of the enormous trade deal being negotiated between the United States and the European Union, the Transatlantic Trade and [https://ustr.gov/ttip] Investment Partnership[https://ustr.gov/ttip], better known as T.T.I.P. He singles out a provision that would enable multinational companies to sue governments for compensation when regulations dent their profits.

Esso, a subsidiary of Exxon Mobil, the American petroleum company, has operations in the Netherlands. Suppose the government went ahead with plans to limit drilling to protect the environment?

“They could sue the Dutch state,” he fumed. “We are not so sure in the Netherlands whether we want to give the multinationals so much power. We are a trading country, but it’s not always that trade should prevail against quality of life.”

Out at the docks, the longshoremen fret about robots.

On a recent afternoon, the Mette Maersk, a Danish-flagged behemoth, sat tethered at APM Terminals. Some 18,000 shipping containers are stacked like children’s blocks on a deck longer than three football fields, bearing auto parts, scrap metal, electronics — any conceivable thing made on one continent and sold on another.

Robotic arms grip containers, lift them and deposit them on deck with thunderous rumbles. Trucks drive themselves.

Yet to absorb this scene and conclude that robots are about to render humanity jobless is to miss something vital. At offices a few miles away, coders are designing the software powering the automated port system, earning wages they distribute through the economy.

For the longshoremen still employed, automation has tamed their work.

John Arkenbout remembers working through ceaseless wind and drizzle when he started at the port 25 years ago. He lifted huge bricks from a pile and dropped them into rope sacks that a crane operator lifted skyward. He saw three people die — one crushed by a truck, two flattened by wayward containers.

Now many longshoremen sit in glass-fronted offices set back from the docks, controlling robotic arms via computer terminals.

“Before, it was physically taxing,” Mr. Arkenbout, 51, said. “Now it’s more mental.”

Most longshoremen earn about 50,000 euros a year, or $56,000. Mr. Arkenbout works a maximum of 40 hours a week.

But he sees the robots becoming more sophisticated. He hears from union leadership that as many as 800 jobs could be eliminated by 2020.

The union held a rare strike in January[https://www.portofrotterdam.com/en/news-and-press-releases/24-hour-strike-at-container-terminals-rotterdam-0], winning job guarantees while robots are phased in gradually. But labor is playing defense. The robots will win in the end, because robots never strike. Robots improve with time.

Mr. Arkenbout scoffs at the notion that automation and trade are separate. The shipping companies are deploying robots to cut costs.

Trade deals, **immigrant** labor, automation: As Mr. Arkenbout sees it, these are all just instruments wielded in pursuit of the same goal — paying him less so corporations can keep more.

“When they don’t need me anymore,” he said, “I’m nothing.”

Correction: September 28, 2016, Wednesday

An earlier version of a chart with this article mislabeled a point on the horizontal axis. The final point in a series marking five-year spans should have been labeled ’15, not ’05.

\* Trump Scores Points on Trade in Debate, but Not So Much on Accuracy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-trade-tpp-nafta.html]

\* Who Hates Free Trade Treaties? Surprisingly, Not Voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/22/us/politics/who-hates-trade-treaties-surprisingly-not-voters.html]

\* G.M. Job Shift From Mexico Tests a Trump Premise[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/business/economy/gm-jobs-move-north-at-a-price.html]

\* Why a President Trump Could Start a Trade War With Surprising Ease[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/upshot/why-a-president-trump-could-start-a-trade-war-with-surprising-ease.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**STRASBOURG, France — At the recent European Union summit meeting in Bratislava, Slovakia, the divergent approaches of member countries on how to handle the influx of migrants exposed deep divisions. Among the countries most hostile to the European Union proposals on migration was Hungary[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/hungary/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]. This comes as no surprise.

Hungary’s disengagement from human rights protections and the rule of law is not new[http://www.coe.int/en/web/commissioner/country-report/hungary/-/asset\_publisher/hKTqZqCwoY6P/content/hungary-s-response-to-refugee-challenge-falls-short-on-human-rights?inheritRedirect=false&redirect=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.coe.int%2Fen%2Fweb%2Fcommissioner%2Fcountry-report%2Fhungary%3Fp\_p\_id%3D101\_INSTANCE\_hKTqZqCwoY6P%26p\_p\_lifecycle%3D0%26p\_p\_state%3Dnormal%26p\_p\_mode%3Dview%26p\_p\_col\_id%3Dcolumn-1%26p\_p\_col\_pos%3D1%26p\_p\_col\_count%3D2]. In recent years, its government has put pressure on the news media, eroded the independence of the judiciary and obstructed the work of nonprofit groups. But it is on migration that Hungary’s departure from human rights norms is most glaring.

Over the last year, sweeping legislative changes have made it virtually impossible for migrants to achieve refugee status in the country, weakened asylum safeguards and unjustifiably criminalized **immigrants** and asylum seekers. At the height of the refugee arrivals last year, Hungary built a razor-wire fence — soon to be upgraded[http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2016/09/15/world/europe/ap-eu-hungary-migrants-new-fence.html?\_r=0] — along its borders with Serbia and Croatia, and since then, there have been numerous reports of police violence[http://www.smh.com.au/world/migrant-crisis/refugee-crisis-anger-as-police-use-violence-to-repel-migrants-at-hungary-border-20150916-gjogi1.html] against asylum seekers.

The Hungarian government’s actions have provoked harsh critiques at home and abroad. Yet the administration of Prime Minister Viktor Orban[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/viktor\_orban/index.html?inline=nyt-per] has shrugged off this criticism and pushed ahead with an agenda that can be described only as institutionalized xenophobia.

New legislation came into force in July that allows for the summary expulsion of migrants intercepted within five miles of the border. As a result, from the end of August to Sept. 12, more than 600 migrants[http://www.kormany.hu/en/news/more-than-a-hundred-illegal-border-crossers-detained-at-weekend] — including potential asylum seekers — were detained and escorted to the border. This may have deprived these people of their rights under international law to seek asylum.

As if those violations were not enough, the police are recruiting[http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-interior/news/recruitment-of-border-hunters-ongoing] an additional 3,000 members for what are officially called “border hunter action units,” which focus on patrolling the borders. Once these recruits have completed a two-month training course in “basic law enforcement duties,” and a further four months’ guard duties, they are to receive a pistol, with live ammunition, and other police equipment. The government seems not to care about the risks of allowing an inexperienced armed force to deal with vulnerable people like refugees and victims of human trafficking.

These worrying developments have come amid a campaign to demonize refugees that has been orchestrated by the government since 2015, when it promoted a “national consultation on **immigration** and terrorism” that portrayed migrants as a danger to Hungarian society. This propaganda effort has reached a new pitch of intensity in the run-up to an Oct. 2 referendum on any future European Commission[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_commission/index.html?inline=nyt-org] proposal to relocate refugees more evenly among European Union countries. A government-sponsored poster campaign on billboards around the country is promoting deceptive messages, such as that sexual harassment of women has risen sharply across Europe since the beginning of the migrant crisis, or that the Paris terrorist attacks[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/attacks-in-paris?inline=nyt-classifier] were committed by **immigrants**.

Such smear campaigns against refugees are sadly not new to Europe: The U.K. Independence Party in Britain, the National Front in France and Italy’s Northern League have all exploited similar xenophobic messages. But in Hungary, it is the government itself that’s pushing such falsehoods.

Hungary’s government defends its policy by accusing[http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-interior/news/the-ministry-of-interior-rejects-the-claims-of-human-rights-watch] its critics of getting their facts wrong. It invokes a duty “to ensure the safety of Europe’s people[http://www.kormany.hu/en/news/hungary-is-doing-everything-possible-to-ensure-europe-s-safety]” to justify its stance on migration. No one doubts that with nearly 400,000 migrants passing through the country in 2015, Hungary was confronted with a huge challenge and that it has received little help from its European Union partners. But this is no excuse to throw refugee protection out the window.

States have the right to set their own **immigration** policies, but those policies cannot contravene the European Convention on Human Rights and the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, even in times of crisis. Hungary’s approach to the issue has already led to violations of human rights and unnecessary suffering. It has also undermined the values of solidarity and tolerance embodied in the Council of Europe and the European Union.

Worse, Hungary’s contemptuous populist approach to migration is tempting neighboring countries to follow a similar path.

If Hungary persists in its defiant policy that flouts human rights law, it will meet with further international criticism and possible legal sanctions. The European Commission has already begun “infringement procedures[http://ec.europa.eu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/eu-law-and-monitoring/infringements\_by\_country\_hungary\_en.htm]” against Hungary for breaching European Union law on asylum. The commission also has the power to bring a case before the European Court of Justice, if a member state fails to conform to European Union law. In addition, citizens can bring cases to the European Court of Human Rights, which has already condemned[http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-113936] Hungary for unlawful detention of asylum seekers.

To avoid deepening the rift, Hungary and European organizations must pursue dialogue and avoid further inflaming an already tense situation. This is why it is crucial that Hungary’s political leaders stop making xenophobic statements and start addressing public anxiety about migration and asylum with facts, evidence and a commitment to human rights.

The protection of refugees has always been an integral part of the human rights project, both in Europe and worldwide. Nearly 60 years ago, that was what inspired an international solidarity movement that helped about 200,000 Hungarians[http://www.cnn.com/2015/09/07/europe/hungary-refugees-1956/] find refuge abroad from the Soviet Union’s brutal repression of the Hungarian revolution.

That spirit still lies at the heart of European integration, and it is our best remedy for the anti-democratic and destructive forces of nationalism that have caused so much harm in the past. It is in Hungary’s best interest to preserve the rights of refugees.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Nils Muiznieks is the Council of Europe commissioner for human rights.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The America I know wasn’t on the television screen on Monday night. My America is about the freedom to make choices, pursue your dreams and use your skills as entrepreneurs. It is about having more choices than just red versus blue.

Americans want to be able to choose a president who is capable of reason, of learning from failures, and of telling them the truth, even when it hurts. Most of all, they want to choose a president who will adhere to the Constitution and will make government live within its means.

I’m offering that choice. I wasn’t part of the presidential debate on Monday, but as Americans listened in dismay to the so-called major parties’ candidates, Google searches for “Gary Johnson” skyrocketed.

I’m the third candidate — the leader of the Libertarian Party. My name will be on every [http://abcnews.go.com/amp/Politics/gary-johnson-november-ballot-50-states/story?id=42081756] ballot[http://abcnews.go.com/amp/Politics/gary-johnson-november-ballot-50-states/story?id=42081756] alongside that of my running mate, Bill Weld, who like me was a twice-elected Republican governor of a strongly Democratic state. Contrary to the Republican and Democratic presidential candidates, Bill and I don’t believe the United States is a polarized nation.

We don’t deny that there are very real tensions on the fringes, and we can’t simply ignore those tensions. But when it comes down to the basics, most Americans really aren’t that far apart.

Our kids are better educated than ever before. Our technology enables entrepreneurship and transparency. Our military is second to none, as it should be. But our two-party political system is an entirely different story. Hyper-partisanship may be entertaining, but it’s a terrible way to try to run a country. We’re the alternative — and we’re the only ticket that offers Americans a chance to find common ground.

People might call us fiscal conservatives. Like most Americans, I believe that government does too much and costs too much. As governor of New Mexico, I vetoed more than 750 bills[https://ballotpedia.org/Verbatim\_fact\_check:\_Did\_Gary\_Johnson\_issue\_750\_vetoes\_as\_governor\_of\_New\_Mexico%3F] and reduced government involvement in business, better known as “crony capitalism.”

Some would call us social liberals. I’ve been vocal in criticizing the disparity in the treatment of black Americans by the police. I want reform in our criminal justice and sentencing systems. “Three strikes” laws and mandatory minimums have put the United States among the world leaders in incarceration. Treating drug use and abuse as crimes, rather than health issues, has put far too many Americans behind bars.

What would government be like in a Johnson administration? First, we would begin the conversation about the size of government by submitting a real balanced budget. Every government program would have to justify its expenditures, every year. Cuts of up to 20 percent or more would be on the table for all programs, including military spending. Changes to Social Security and Medicare must also be considered.

As governors, we balanced our budgets and reduced taxes: I cut taxes 14 times; Bill Weld did so 21 times in his six years leading Massachusetts. It just requires commitment and certainty.

Hillary Clinton’s and Donald J. Trump’s proposals call for much more spending. Both parties are responsible for our unsustainable fiscal problems: President George W. Bush nearly doubled our national debt, to $10 trillion from $5.7 trillion[http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2015/apr/09/rand-paul/rand-paul-debt-has-tripled-bush-took-office/]. President Obama is on track to double it again.

Second, we would protect the Constitution and civil liberties and stop treating **immigration** as a bad thing. In the difficult case of abortion, I support a woman’s right to choose. I’ve long supported civil liberties, including marriage equality and freedom from mass surveillance.

Given the way it has served as both a launching pad and a crash-landing site for Republican presidential prospects, **immigration** was strangely absent from Monday’s debate. Neither the Republican-controlled Congress nor President Obama has done anything to fix the dysfunctional **immigration** system. Deporting millions of noncriminal undocumented **immigrants** and building a wall, as Mr. Trump proposes, are ludicrous ideas.

A majority of Americans can actually agree on a solution. We would allow those **immigrants** who are here without documents, but with otherwise clean records, to come forward, pay taxes, undergo a background check and legally reside in the United States. We’d eliminate categories and quotas on **immigration**, and border enforcement would be devoted to keeping out real criminals and would-be terrorists.

Third, we would offer free trade to all nations, but limit military intervention to when our nation is attacked. We would honor all treaty obligations and pursue strategic alliances that made our country safer.

Mrs. Clinton wants to continue a muddled mix of intervention, regime change and bombing campaigns. That approach brought us Syria, Iraq, Libya and failed nation-building in Afghanistan. Our troops and the American people deserve clear objectives, with a well-drawn distinction between defense and futile interventions. And our troops deserve authorization from Congress for their activities overseas, an important detail that has fallen by the wayside.

The same common-sense attitude applies to trade and diplomacy. Our ticket is the only one to support free trade. The goal is to enhance prosperity and peace without sending our young people to war.

Less than six weeks before Election Day, independents and, particularly, young voters are increasingly turning to Bill Weld and me as reasonable, rational and experienced candidates. We are the party that can break the partisan gridlock which for too long has kept real solutions out of reach.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Gary Johnson, the governor of New Mexico from 1995 to 2003, is the Libertarian Party nominee for president.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

Following is a transcript of the first presidential debate on Monday, as transcribed by the Federal News Service.

HOLT: Good evening from Hofstra University in Hempstead, New York. I’m Lester Holt, anchor of “NBC Nightly News.” I want to welcome you to the first presidential debate.

The participants tonight are Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. This debate is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization. The commission drafted tonight’s format, and the rules have been agreed to by the campaigns.

The 90-minute debate is divided into six segments, each 15 minutes long. We’ll explore three topic areas tonight: Achieving prosperity; America’s direction; and securing America. At the start of each segment, I will ask the same lead-off question to both candidates, and they will each have up to two minutes to respond. From that point until the end of the segment, we’ll have an open discussion.

The questions are mine and have not been shared with the commission or the campaigns. The audience here in the room has agreed to remain silent so that we can focus on what the candidates are saying.

I will invite you to applaud, however, at this moment, as we welcome the candidates: Democratic nominee for president of the United States, Hillary Clinton, and Republican nominee for president of the United States, Donald J. Trump.

(APPLAUSE)

CLINTON: How are you, Donald?

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Good luck to you.

(APPLAUSE)

Well, I don’t expect us to cover all the issues of this campaign tonight, but I remind everyone, there are two more presidential debates scheduled. We are going to focus on many of the issues that voters tell us are most important, and we’re going to press for specifics. I am honored to have this role, but this evening belongs to the candidates and, just as important, to the American people.

Candidates, we look forward to hearing you articulate your policies and your positions, as well as your visions and your values. So, let’s begin.

We’re calling this opening segment “Achieving Prosperity.” And central to that is jobs. There are two economic realities in America today. There’s been a record six straight years of job growth, and new census numbers show incomes have increased at a record rate after years of stagnation. However, income inequality remains significant, and nearly half of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck.

Beginning with you, Secretary Clinton, why are you a better choice than your opponent to create the kinds of jobs that will put more money into the pockets of American works?

CLINTON: Well, thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us.

The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we’ll build together. Today is my granddaughter’s second birthday, so I think about this a lot. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. That means we need new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes.

I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future. That means jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business, because most of the new jobs will come from small business. We also have to make the economy fairer. That starts with raising the national minimum wage and also guarantee, finally, equal pay for women’s work.

CLINTON: I also want to see more companies do profit-sharing. If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top.

And I want us to do more to support people who are struggling to balance family and work. I’ve heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you’re under. So let’s have paid family leave, earned sick days. Let’s be sure we have affordable child care and debt-free college.

How are we going to do it? We’re going to do it by having the wealthy pay their fair share and close the corporate loopholes.

Finally, we tonight are on the stage together, Donald Trump and I. Donald, it’s good to be with you. We’re going to have a debate where we are talking about the important issues facing our country. You have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency, who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. I hope that I will be able to earn your vote on November 8th.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

Mr. Trump, the same question to you. It’s about putting money — more money into the pockets of American workers. You have up to two minutes.

TRUMP: Thank you, Lester. Our jobs are fleeing the country. They’re going to Mexico. They’re going to many other countries. You look at what China is doing to our country in terms of making our product. They’re devaluing their currency, and there’s nobody in our government to fight them. And we have a very good fight. And we have a winning fight. Because they’re using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China, and many other countries are doing the same thing.

So we’re losing our good jobs, so many of them. When you look at what’s happening in Mexico, a friend of mine who builds plants said it’s the eighth wonder of the world. They’re building some of the biggest plants anywhere in the world, some of the most sophisticated, some of the best plants. With the United States, as he said, not so much.

So Ford is leaving. You see that, their small car division leaving. Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They’re all leaving. And we can’t allow it to happen anymore. As far as child care is concerned and so many other things, I think Hillary and I agree on that. We probably disagree a little bit as to numbers and amounts and what we’re going to do, but perhaps we’ll be talking about that later.

But we have to stop our jobs from being stolen from us. We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States and, with it, firing all of their people. All you have to do is take a look at Carrier air conditioning in Indianapolis. They left — fired 1,400 people. They’re going to Mexico. So many hundreds and hundreds of companies are doing this.

TRUMP: We cannot let it happen. Under my plan, I’ll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That’s going to be a job creator like we haven’t seen since Ronald Reagan. It’s going to be a beautiful thing to watch.

Companies will come. They will build. They will expand. New companies will start. And I look very, very much forward to doing it. We have to renegotiate our trade deals, and we have to stop these countries from stealing our companies and our jobs.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, would you like to respond?

CLINTON: Well, I think that trade is an important issue. Of course, we are 5 percent of the world’s population; we have to trade with the other 95 percent. And we need to have smart, fair trade deals.

We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. And the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again. In fact, it would be the most extreme version, the biggest tax cuts for the top percent of the people in this country than we’ve ever had.

I call it trumped-up trickle-down, because that’s exactly what it would be. That is not how we grow the economy.

We just have a different view about what’s best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will actually produce jobs and rising incomes.

I think we come at it from somewhat different perspectives. I understand that. You know, Donald was very fortunate in his life, and that’s all to his benefit. He started his business with $14 million, borrowed from his father, and he really believes that the more you help wealthy people, the better off we’ll be and that everything will work out from there.

I don’t buy that. I have a different experience. My father was a small-businessman. He worked really hard. He printed drapery fabrics on long tables, where he pulled out those fabrics and he went down with a silkscreen and dumped the paint in and took the squeegee and kept going.

And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we will be off and the better we’ll grow. That’s the kind of economy I want us to see again.

HOLT: Let me follow up with Mr. Trump, if you can. You’ve talked about creating 25 million jobs, and you’ve promised to bring back millions of jobs for Americans. How are you going to bring back the industries that have left this country for cheaper labor overseas? How, specifically, are you going to tell American manufacturers that you have to come back?

TRUMP: Well, for one thing — and before we start on that — my father gave me a very small loan in 1975, and I built it into a company that’s worth many, many billions of dollars, with some of the greatest assets in the world, and I say that only because that’s the kind of thinking that our country needs.

Our country’s in deep trouble. We don’t know what we’re doing when it comes to devaluations and all of these countries all over the world, especially China. They’re the best, the best ever at it. What they’re doing to us is a very, very sad thing.

So we have to do that. We have to renegotiate our trade deals. And, Lester, they’re taking our jobs, they’re giving incentives, they’re doing things that, frankly, we don’t do.

Let me give you the example of Mexico. They have a VAT tax. We’re on a different system. When we sell into Mexico, there’s a tax. When they sell in — automatic, 16 percent, approximately. When they sell into us, there’s no tax. It’s a defective agreement. It’s been defective for a long time, many years, but the politicians haven’t done anything about it.

Now, in all fairness to Secretary Clinton — yes, is that OK? Good. I want you to be very happy. It’s very important to me.

But in all fairness to Secretary Clinton, when she started talking about this, it was really very recently. She’s been doing this for 30 years. And why hasn’t she made the agreements better? The NAFTA agreement is defective. Just because of the tax and many other reasons, but just because of the fact...

HOLT: Let me interrupt just a moment, but...

TRUMP: Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years, not right now, because of the fact that we’ve created a movement. They should have been doing this for years. What’s happened to our jobs and our country and our economy generally is — look, we owe $20 trillion. We cannot do it any longer, Lester.

HOLT: Back to the question, though. How do you bring back — specifically bring back jobs, American manufacturers? How do you make them bring the jobs back?

TRUMP: Well, the first thing you do is don’t let the jobs leave. The companies are leaving. I could name, I mean, there are thousands of them. They’re leaving, and they’re leaving in bigger numbers than ever.

And what you do is you say, fine, you want to go to Mexico or some other country, good luck. We wish you a lot of luck. But if you think you’re going to make your air conditioners or your cars or your cookies or whatever you make and bring them into our country without a tax, you’re wrong.

And once you say you’re going to have to tax them coming in, and our politicians never do this, because they have special interests and the special interests want those companies to leave, because in many cases, they own the companies. So what I’m saying is, we can stop them from leaving. We have to stop them from leaving. And that’s a big, big factor.

HOLT: Let me let Secretary Clinton get in here.

CLINTON: Well, let’s stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago. We had the worst financial crisis, the Great Recession, the worst since the 1930s. That was in large part because of tax policies that slashed taxes on the wealthy, failed to invest in the middle class, took their eyes off of Wall Street, and created a perfect storm.

In fact, Donald was one of the people who rooted for the housing crisis. He said, back in 2006, “Gee, I hope it does collapse, because then I can go in and buy some and make some money.” Well, it did collapse.

TRUMP: That’s called business, by the way.

CLINTON: Nine million people — nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And $13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out.

Now, we have come back from that abyss. And it has not been easy. So we’re now on the precipice of having a potentially much better economy, but the last thing we need to do is to go back to the policies that failed us in the first place.

Independent experts have looked at what I’ve proposed and looked at what Donald’s proposed, and basically they’ve said this, that if his tax plan, which would blow up the debt by over $5 trillion and would in some instances disadvantage middle-class families compared to the wealthy, were to go into effect, we would lose 3.5 million jobs and maybe have another recession.

They’ve looked at my plans and they’ve said, OK, if we can do this, and I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs, because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy. Take clean energy. Some country is going to be the clean- energy superpower of the 21st century. Donald thinks that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. I think it’s real.

TRUMP: I did not. I did not. I do not say that.

CLINTON: I think science is real.

TRUMP: I do not say that.

CLINTON: And I think it’s important that we grip this and deal with it, both at home and abroad. And here’s what we can do. We can deploy a half a billion more solar panels. We can have enough clean energy to power every home. We can build a new modern electric grid. That’s a lot of jobs; that’s a lot of new economic activity.

So I’ve tried to be very specific about what we can and should do, and I am determined that we’re going to get the economy really moving again, building on the progress we’ve made over the last eight years, but never going back to what got us in trouble in the first place.

HOLT: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: She talks about solar panels. We invested in a solar company, our country. That was a disaster. They lost plenty of money on that one.

Now, look, I’m a great believer in all forms of energy, but we’re putting a lot of people out of work. Our energy policies are a disaster. Our country is losing so much in terms of energy, in terms of paying off our debt. You can’t do what you’re looking to do with $20 trillion in debt.

The Obama administration, from the time they’ve come in, is over 230 years’ worth of debt, and he’s topped it. He’s doubled it in a course of almost eight years, seven-and-a-half years, to be semi- exact.

So I will tell you this. We have to do a much better job at keeping our jobs. And we have to do a much better job at giving companies incentives to build new companies or to expand, because they’re not doing it.

And all you have to do is look at Michigan and look at Ohio and look at all of these places where so many of their jobs and their companies are just leaving, they’re gone.

And, Hillary, I’d just ask you this. You’ve been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you’ve been doing it, and now you’re just starting to think of solutions.

CLINTON: Well, actually...

TRUMP: I will bring — excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You can’t bring back jobs.

CLINTON: Well, actually, I have thought about this quite a bit.

TRUMP: Yeah, for 30 years.

CLINTON: And I have — well, not quite that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again...

TRUMP: Well, he approved NAFTA...

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: ... million new jobs, a balanced budget...

TRUMP: He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever approved in this country.

CLINTON: Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we’re actually going to look at the facts.

When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test. Will they create jobs in America? Will they raise incomes in America? And are they good for our national security? Some of them I voted for. The biggest one, a multinational one known as CAFTA, I voted against. And because I hold the same standards as I look at all of these trade deals.

But let’s not assume that trade is the only challenge we have in the economy. I think it is a part of it, and I’ve said what I’m going to do. I’m going to have a special prosecutor. We’re going to enforce the trade deals we have, and we’re going to hold people accountable.

When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs.

HOLT: Very quickly...

TRUMP: But you haven’t done it in 30 years or 26 years or any number you want to...

CLINTON: Well, I’ve been a senator, Donald...

TRUMP: You haven’t done it. You haven’t done it.

CLINTON: And I have been a secretary of state...

TRUMP: Excuse me.

CLINTON: And I have done a lot...

TRUMP: Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened to the manufacturing industry.

CLINTON: Well, that’s your opinion. That is your opinion.

TRUMP: You go to New England, you go to Ohio, Pennsylvania, you go anywhere you want, Secretary Clinton, and you will see devastation where manufacture is down 30, 40, sometimes 50 percent. NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country.

And now you want to approve Trans-Pacific Partnership. You were totally in favor of it. Then you heard what I was saying, how bad it is, and you said, I can’t win that debate. But you know that if you did win, you would approve that, and that will be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing will ever top NAFTA.

CLINTON: Well, that is just not accurate. I was against it once it was finally negotiated and the terms were laid out. I wrote about that in...

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard.

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard of trade deals. You said it’s the finest deal you’ve ever seen.

CLINTON: No.

TRUMP: And then you heard what I said about it, and all of a sudden you were against it.

CLINTON: Well, Donald, I know you live in your own reality, but that is not the facts. The facts are — I did say I hoped it would be a good deal, but when it was negotiated...

TRUMP: Not.

CLINTON: ... which I was not responsible for, I concluded it wasn’t. I wrote about that in my book...

TRUMP: So is it President Obama’s fault?

CLINTON: ... before you even announced.

TRUMP: Is it President Obama’s fault?

CLINTON: Look, there are differences...

TRUMP: Secretary, is it President Obama’s fault?

CLINTON: There are...

TRUMP: Because he’s pushing it.

CLINTON: There are different views about what’s good for our country, our economy, and our leadership in the world. And I think it’s important to look at what we need to do to get the economy going again. That’s why I said new jobs with rising incomes, investments, not in more tax cuts that would add $5 trillion to the debt.

TRUMP: But you have no plan.

CLINTON: But in — oh, but I do.

TRUMP: Secretary, you have no plan.

CLINTON: In fact, I have written a book about it. It’s called “Stronger Together.” You can pick it up tomorrow at a bookstore...

TRUMP: That’s about all you’ve...

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Folks, we’re going to...

CLINTON: ... or at an airport near you.

HOLT: We’re going to move to...

CLINTON: But it’s because I see this — we need to have strong growth, fair growth, sustained growth. We also have to look at how we help families balance the responsibilities at home and the responsibilities at business.

So we have a very robust set of plans. And people have looked at both of our plans, have concluded that mine would create 10 million jobs and yours would lose us 3.5 million jobs, and explode the debt which would have a recession.

TRUMP: You are going to approve one of the biggest tax cuts in history. You are going to approve one of the biggest tax increases in history. You are going to drive business out. Your regulations are a disaster, and you’re going to increase regulations all over the place.

And by the way, my tax cut is the biggest since Ronald Reagan. I’m very proud of it. It will create tremendous numbers of new jobs. But regulations, you are going to regulate these businesses out of existence.

When I go around — Lester, I tell you this, I’ve been all over. And when I go around, despite the tax cut, the thing — the things that business as in people like the most is the fact that I’m cutting regulation. You have regulations on top of regulations, and new companies cannot form and old companies are going out of business. And you want to increase the regulations and make them even worse.

I’m going to cut regulations. I’m going to cut taxes big league, and you’re going to raise taxes big league, end of story.

HOLT: Let me get you to pause right there, because we’re going to move into — we’re going to move into the next segment. We’re going to talk taxes...

CLINTON: That can’t — that can’t be left to stand.

HOLT: Please just take 30 seconds and then we’re going to go on.

CLINTON: I kind of assumed that there would be a lot of these charges and claims, and so...

TRUMP: Facts.

CLINTON: So we have taken the home page of my website, HillaryClinton.com, and we’ve turned it into a fact-checker. So if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please go and take a look. Because what I have proposed...

TRUMP: And take a look at mine, also, and you’ll see.

CLINTON: ... would not add a penny to the debt, and your plans would add $5 trillion to the debt. What I have proposed would cut regulations and streamline them for small businesses. What I have proposed would be paid for by raising taxes on the wealthy, because they have made all the gains in the economy. And I think it’s time that the wealthy and corporations paid their fair share to support this country.

HOLT: Well, you just opened the next segment.

TRUMP: Well, could I just finish — I think I...

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: I’m going to give you a chance right here...

TRUMP: I think I should — you go to her website, and you take a look at her website.

HOLT: ... with a new 15-minute segment...

TRUMP: She’s going to raise taxes $1.3 trillion.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, I’m going to...

TRUMP: And look at her website. You know what? It’s no difference than this. She’s telling us how to fight ISIS. Just go to her website. She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website. I don’t think General Douglas MacArthur would like that too much.

HOLT: The next segment, we’re continuing...

CLINTON: Well, at least I have a plan to fight ISIS.

HOLT: ... achieving prosperity...

TRUMP: No, no, you’re telling the enemy everything you want to do.

CLINTON: No, we’re not. No, we’re not.

TRUMP: See, you’re telling the enemy everything you want to do. No wonder you’ve been fighting — no wonder you’ve been fighting ISIS your entire adult life.

CLINTON: That’s a — that’s — go to the — please, fact checkers, get to work.

HOLT: OK, you are unpacking a lot here. And we’re still on the issue of achieving prosperity. And I want to talk about taxes. The fundamental difference between the two of you concerns the wealthy.

Secretary Clinton, you’re calling for a tax increase on the wealthiest Americans. I’d like you to further defend that. And, Mr. Trump, you’re calling for tax cuts for the wealthy. I’d like you to defend that. And this next two-minute answer goes to you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Well, I’m really calling for major jobs, because the wealthy are going create tremendous jobs. They’re going to expand their companies. They’re going to do a tremendous job.

I’m getting rid of the carried interest provision. And if you really look, it’s not a tax — it’s really not a great thing for the wealthy. It’s a great thing for the middle class. It’s a great thing for companies to expand.

And when these people are going to put billions and billions of dollars into companies, and when they’re going to bring $2.5 trillion back from overseas, where they can’t bring the money back, because politicians like Secretary Clinton won’t allow them to bring the money back, because the taxes are so onerous, and the bureaucratic red tape, so what — is so bad.

So what they’re doing is they’re leaving our country, and they’re, believe it or not, leaving because taxes are too high and because some of them have lots of money outside of our country. And instead of bringing it back and putting the money to work, because they can’t work out a deal to — and everybody agrees it should be brought back.

Instead of that, they’re leaving our country to get their money, because they can’t bring their money back into our country, because of bureaucratic red tape, because they can’t get together. Because we have — we have a president that can’t sit them around a table and get them to approve something.

And here’s the thing. Republicans and Democrats agree that this should be done, $2.5 trillion. I happen to think it’s double that. It’s probably $5 trillion that we can’t bring into our country, Lester. And with a little leadership, you’d get it in here very quickly, and it could be put to use on the inner cities and lots of other things, and it would be beautiful.

But we have no leadership. And honestly, that starts with Secretary Clinton.

HOLT: All right. You have two minutes of the same question to defend tax increases on the wealthiest Americans, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: I have a feeling that by, the end of this evening, I’m going to be blamed for everything that’s ever happened.

TRUMP: Why not?

CLINTON: Why not? Yeah, why not?

(LAUGHTER)

You know, just join the debate by saying more crazy things. Now, let me say this, it is absolutely the case...

TRUMP: There’s nothing crazy about not letting our companies bring their money back into their country.

HOLT: This is — this is Secretary Clinton’s two minutes, please.

TRUMP: Yes.

CLINTON: Yeah, well, let’s start the clock again, Lester. We’ve looked at your tax proposals. I don’t see changes in the corporate tax rates or the kinds of proposals you’re referring to that would cause the repatriation, bringing back of money that’s stranded overseas. I happen to support that.

TRUMP: Then you didn’t read it.

CLINTON: I happen to — I happen to support that in a way that will actually work to our benefit. But when I look at what you have proposed, you have what is called now the Trump loophole, because it would so advantage you and the business you do. You’ve proposed an approach that has a...

TRUMP: Who gave it that name? The first I’ve — who gave it that name?

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, this is Secretary Clinton’s two minutes.

CLINTON: ... $4 billion tax benefit for your family. And when you look at what you are proposing...

TRUMP: How much? How much for my family? CLINTON: ... it is...

TRUMP: Lester, how much?

CLINTON: ... as I said, trumped-up trickle-down. Trickle-down did not work. It got us into the mess we were in, in 2008 and 2009. Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn’t worked.

And a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that. And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class.

CLINTON: I don’t think top-down works in America. I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their — their debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based, inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, we’re...

TRUMP: Typical politician. All talk, no action. Sounds good, doesn’t work. Never going to happen. Our country is suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs and in terms of what’s going on.

Now, look, we have the worst revival of an economy since the Great Depression. And believe me: We’re in a bubble right now. And the only thing that looks good is the stock market, but if you raise interest rates even a little bit, that’s going to come crashing down.

We are in a big, fat, ugly bubble. And we better be awfully careful. And we have a Fed that’s doing political things. This Janet Yellen of the Fed. The Fed is doing political — by keeping the interest rates at this level. And believe me: The day Obama goes off, and he leaves, and goes out to the golf course for the rest of his life to play golf, when they raise interest rates, you’re going to see some very bad things happen, because the Fed is not doing their job. The Fed is being more political than Secretary Clinton.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, we’re talking about the burden that Americans have to pay, yet you have not released your tax returns. And the reason nominees have released their returns for decades is so that voters will know if their potential president owes money to — who he owes it to and any business conflicts. Don’t Americans have a right to know if there are any conflicts of interest?

TRUMP: I don’t mind releasing — I’m under a routine audit. And it’ll be released. And — as soon as the audit’s finished, it will be released.

But you will learn more about Donald Trump by going down to the federal elections, where I filed a 104-page essentially financial statement of sorts, the forms that they have. It shows income — in fact, the income — I just looked today — the income is filed at $694 million for this past year, $694 million. If you would have told me I was going to make that 15 or 20 years ago, I would have been very surprised.

But that’s the kind of thinking that our country needs. When we have a country that’s doing so badly, that’s being ripped off by every single country in the world, it’s the kind of thinking that our country needs, because everybody — Lester, we have a trade deficit with all of the countries that we do business with, of almost $800 billion a year. You know what that is? That means, who’s negotiating these trade deals?

We have people that are political hacks negotiating our trade deals.

HOLT: The IRS says an audit...

TRUMP: Excuse me.

HOLT: ... of your taxes — you’re perfectly free to release your taxes during an audit. And so the question, does the public’s right to know outweigh your personal...

TRUMP: Well, I told you, I will release them as soon as the audit. Look, I’ve been under audit almost for 15 years. I know a lot of wealthy people that have never been audited. I said, do you get audited? I get audited almost every year.

And in a way, I should be complaining. I’m not even complaining. I don’t mind it. It’s almost become a way of life. I get audited by the IRS. But other people don’t.

I will say this. We have a situation in this country that has to be taken care of. I will release my tax returns — against my lawyer’s wishes — when she releases her 33,000 e-mails that have been deleted. As soon as she releases them, I will release.

(APPLAUSE)

I will release my tax returns. And that’s against — my lawyers, they say, “Don’t do it.” I will tell you this. No — in fact, watching shows, they’re reading the papers. Almost every lawyer says, you don’t release your returns until the audit’s complete. When the audit’s complete, I’ll do it. But I would go against them if she releases her e-mails.

HOLT: So it’s negotiable?

TRUMP: It’s not negotiable, no. Let her release the e-mails. Why did she delete 33,000...

HOLT: Well, I’ll let her answer that. But let me just admonish the audience one more time. There was an agreement. We did ask you to be silent, so it would be helpful for us. Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think you’ve seen another example of bait-and- switch here. For 40 years, everyone running for president has released their tax returns. You can go and see nearly, I think, 39, 40 years of our tax returns, but everyone has done it. We know the IRS has made clear there is no prohibition on releasing it when you’re under audit.

So you’ve got to ask yourself, why won’t he release his tax returns? And I think there may be a couple of reasons. First, maybe he’s not as rich as he says he is. Second, maybe he’s not as charitable as he claims to be.

CLINTON: Third, we don’t know all of his business dealings, but we have been told through investigative reporting that he owes about $650 million to Wall Street and foreign banks. Or maybe he doesn’t want the American people, all of you watching tonight, to know that he’s paid nothing in federal taxes, because the only years that anybody’s ever seen were a couple of years when he had to turn them over to state authorities when he was trying to get a casino license, and they showed he didn’t pay any federal income tax.

TRUMP: That makes me smart.

CLINTON: So if he’s paid zero, that means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I think probably he’s not all that enthusiastic about having the rest of our country see what the real reasons are, because it must be something really important, even terrible, that he’s trying to hide.

And the financial disclosure statements, they don’t give you the tax rate. They don’t give you all the details that tax returns would. And it just seems to me that this is something that the American people deserve to see. And I have no reason to believe that he’s ever going to release his tax returns, because there’s something he’s hiding.

And we’ll guess. We’ll keep guessing at what it might be that he’s hiding. But I think the question is, were he ever to get near the White House, what would be those conflicts? Who does he owe money to? Well, he owes you the answers to that, and he should provide them.

HOLT: He also — he also raised the issue of your e-mails. Do you want to respond to that?

CLINTON: I do. You know, I made a mistake using a private e- mail. TRUMP: That’s for sure.

CLINTON: And if I had to do it over again, I would, obviously, do it differently. But I’m not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake, and I take responsibility for that.

HOLT: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: That was more than a mistake. That was done purposely. OK? That was not a mistake. That was done purposely. When you have your staff taking the Fifth Amendment, taking the Fifth so they’re not prosecuted, when you have the man that set up the illegal server taking the Fifth, I think it’s disgraceful. And believe me, this country thinks it’s — really thinks it’s disgraceful, also.

As far as my tax returns, you don’t learn that much from tax returns. That I can tell you. You learn a lot from financial disclosure. And you should go down and take a look at that.

The other thing, I’m extremely underleveraged. The report that said $650 — which, by the way, a lot of friends of mine that know my business say, boy, that’s really not a lot of money. It’s not a lot of money relative to what I had.

The buildings that were in question, they said in the same report, which was — actually, it wasn’t even a bad story, to be honest with you, but the buildings are worth $3.9 billion. And the $650 isn’t even on that. But it’s not $650. It’s much less than that.

But I could give you a list of banks, I would — if that would help you, I would give you a list of banks. These are very fine institutions, very fine banks. I could do that very quickly.

I am very underleveraged. I have a great company. I have a tremendous income. And the reason I say that is not in a braggadocios way. It’s because it’s about time that this country had somebody running it that has an idea about money.

When we have $20 trillion in debt, and our country’s a mess, you know, it’s one thing to have $20 trillion in debt and our roads are good and our bridges are good and everything’s in great shape, our airports. Our airports are like from a third world country.

You land at LaGuardia, you land at Kennedy, you land at LAX, you land at Newark, and you come in from Dubai and Qatar and you see these incredible — you come in from China, you see these incredible airports, and you land — we’ve become a third world country.

So the worst of all things has happened. We owe $20 trillion, and we’re a mess. We haven’t even started. And we’ve spent $6 trillion in the Middle East, according to a report that I just saw. Whether it’s 6 or 5, but it looks like it’s 6, $6 trillion in the Middle East, we could have rebuilt our country twice.

And it’s really a shame. And it’s politicians like Secretary Clinton that have caused this problem. Our country has tremendous problems. We’re a debtor nation. We’re a serious debtor nation. And we have a country that needs new roads, new tunnels, new bridges, new airports, new schools, new hospitals. And we don’t have the money, because it’s been squandered on so many of your ideas.

HOLT: We’ll let you respond and we’ll move on to the next segment.

CLINTON: And maybe because you haven’t paid any federal income tax for a lot of years. (APPLAUSE)

And the other thing I think is important...

TRUMP: It would be squandered, too, believe me.

CLINTON: ... is if your — if your main claim to be president of the United States is your business, then I think we should talk about that. You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys.

And, indeed, I have met a lot of the people who were stiffed by you and your businesses, Donald. I’ve met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, drapery installers, like my dad was, who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do.

We have an architect in the audience who designed one of your clubhouses at one of your golf courses. It’s a beautiful facility. It immediately was put to use. And you wouldn’t pay what the man needed to be paid, what he was charging you to do...

TRUMP: Maybe he didn’t do a good job and I was unsatisfied with his work...

CLINTON: Well, to...

TRUMP: Which our country should do, too.

CLINTON: Do the thousands of people that you have stiffed over the course of your business not deserve some kind of apology from someone who has taken their labor, taken the goods that they produced, and then refused to pay them?

I can only say that I’m certainly relieved that my late father never did business with you. He provided a good middle-class life for us, but the people he worked for, he expected the bargain to be kept on both sides.

And when we talk about your business, you’ve taken business bankruptcy six times. There are a lot of great businesspeople that have never taken bankruptcy once. You call yourself the King of Debt. You talk about leverage. You even at one time suggested that you would try to negotiate down the national debt of the United States.

TRUMP: Wrong. Wrong.

CLINTON: Well, sometimes there’s not a direct transfer of skills from business to government, but sometimes what happened in business would be really bad for government.

HOLT: Let’s let Mr. Trump...

CLINTON: And we need to be very clear about that.

TRUMP: So, yeah, I think — I do think it’s time. Look, it’s all words, it’s all sound bites. I built an unbelievable company. Some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, real estate assets anywhere in the world, beyond the United States, in Europe, lots of different places. It’s an unbelievable company.

But on occasion, four times, we used certain laws that are there. And when Secretary Clinton talks about people that didn’t get paid, first of all, they did get paid a lot, but taken advantage of the laws of the nation.

Now, if you want to change the laws, you’ve been there a long time, change the laws. But I take advantage of the laws of the nation because I’m running a company. My obligation right now is to do well for myself, my family, my employees, for my companies. And that’s what I do.

But what she doesn’t say is that tens of thousands of people that are unbelievably happy and that love me. I’ll give you an example. We’re just opening up on Pennsylvania Avenue right next to the White House, so if I don’t get there one way, I’m going to get to Pennsylvania Avenue another.

But we’re opening the Old Post Office. Under budget, ahead of schedule, saved tremendous money. I’m a year ahead of schedule. And that’s what this country should be doing.

We build roads and they cost two and three and four times what they’re supposed to cost. We buy products for our military and they come in at costs that are so far above what they were supposed to be, because we don’t have people that know what they’re doing.

When we look at the budget, the budget is bad to a large extent because we have people that have no idea as to what to do and how to buy. The Trump International is way under budget and way ahead of schedule. And we should be able to do that for our country.

HOLT: Well, we’re well behind schedule, so I want to move to our next segment. We move into our next segment talking about America’s direction. And let’s start by talking about race.

The share of Americans who say race relations are bad in this country is the highest it’s been in decades, much of it amplified by shootings of African-Americans by police, as we’ve seen recently in Charlotte and Tulsa. Race has been a big issue in this campaign, and one of you is going to have to bridge a very wide and bitter gap.

So how do you heal the divide? Secretary Clinton, you get two minutes on this.

CLINTON: Well, you’re right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country. Unfortunately, race still determines too much, often determines where people live, determines what kind of education in their public schools they can get, and, yes, it determines how they’re treated in the criminal justice system. We’ve just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte.

And we’ve got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police. We have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training, the best techniques, that they’re well prepared to use force only when necessary. Everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law.

CLINTON: Right now, that’s not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods. So I have, ever since the first day of my campaign, called for criminal justice reform. I’ve laid out a platform that I think would begin to remedy some of the problems we have in the criminal justice system.

But we also have to recognize, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing, there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform. So we have to bring communities together in order to begin working on that as a mutual goal. And we’ve got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African- American men, more than the next nine causes put together. So we have to do two things, as I said. We have to restore trust. We have to work with the police. We have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them. And we have to tackle the plague of gun violence, which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we’re seeing today.

HOLT: All right, Mr. Trump, you have two minutes. How do you heal the divide?

TRUMP: Well, first of all, Secretary Clinton doesn’t want to use a couple of words, and that’s law and order. And we need law and order. If we don’t have it, we’re not going to have a country.

And when I look at what’s going on in Charlotte, a city I love, a city where I have investments, when I look at what’s going on throughout various parts of our country, whether it’s — I mean, I can just keep naming them all day long — we need law and order in our country.

I just got today the, as you know, the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police, we just — just came in. We have endorsements from, I think, almost every police group, very — I mean, a large percentage of them in the United States.

We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African- Americans, Hispanics are living in he’ll because it’s so dangerous. You walk down the street, you get shot.

In Chicago, they’ve had thousands of shootings, thousands since January 1st. Thousands of shootings. And I’m saying, where is this? Is this a war-torn country? What are we doing? And we have to stop the violence. We have to bring back law and order. In a place like Chicago, where thousands of people have been killed, thousands over the last number of years, in fact, almost 4,000 have been killed since Barack Obama became president, over — almost 4,000 people in Chicago have been killed. We have to bring back law and order.

Now, whether or not in a place like Chicago you do stop and frisk, which worked very well, Mayor Giuliani is here, worked very well in New York. It brought the crime rate way down. But you take the gun away from criminals that shouldn’t be having it.

We have gangs roaming the street. And in many cases, they’re illegally here, illegal **immigrants**. And they have guns. And they shoot people. And we have to be very strong. And we have to be very vigilant.

We have to be — we have to know what we’re doing. Right now, our police, in many cases, are afraid to do anything. We have to protect our inner cities, because African-American communities are being decimated by crime, decimated.

HOLT: Your two — your two minutes expired, but I do want to follow up. Stop-and-frisk was ruled unconstitutional in New York, because it largely singled out black and Hispanic young men.

TRUMP: No, you’re wrong. It went before a judge, who was a very against-police judge. It was taken away from her. And our mayor, our new mayor, refused to go forward with the case. They would have won an appeal. If you look at it, throughout the country, there are many places where it’s allowed.

HOLT: The argument is that it’s a form of racial profiling.

TRUMP: No, the argument is that we have to take the guns away from these people that have them and they are bad people that shouldn’t have them.

These are felons. These are people that are bad people that shouldn’t be — when you have 3,000 shootings in Chicago from January 1st, when you have 4,000 people killed in Chicago by guns, from the beginning of the presidency of Barack Obama, his hometown, you have to have stop-and-frisk.

You need more police. You need a better community, you know, relation. You don’t have good community relations in Chicago. It’s terrible. I have property there. It’s terrible what’s going on in Chicago.

But when you look — and Chicago’s not the only — you go to Ferguson, you go to so many different places. You need better relationships. I agree with Secretary Clinton on this.

TRUMP: You need better relationships between the communities and the police, because in some cases, it’s not good.

But you look at Dallas, where the relationships were really studied, the relationships were really a beautiful thing, and then five police officers were killed one night very violently. So there’s some bad things going on. Some really bad things.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton...

TRUMP: But we need — Lester, we need law and order. And we need law and order in the inner cities, because the people that are most affected by what’s happening are African-American and Hispanic people. And it’s very unfair to them what our politicians are allowing to happen.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I’ve heard — I’ve heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it’s really unfortunate that he paints such a dire negative picture of black communities in our country.

TRUMP: Ugh.

CLINTON: You know, the vibrancy of the black church, the black businesses that employ so many people, the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids. There’s a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up.

But we do always have to make sure we keep people safe. There are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective. Stop-and-frisk was found to be unconstitutional and, in part, because it was ineffective. It did not do what it needed to do.

Now, I believe in community policing. And, in fact, violent crime is one-half of what it was in 1991. Property crime is down 40 percent. We just don’t want to see it creep back up. We’ve had 25 years of very good cooperation.

But there were some problems, some unintended consequences. Too many young African-American and Latino men ended up in jail for nonviolent offenses. And it’s just a fact that if you’re a young African-American man and you do the same thing as a young white man, you are more likely to be arrested, charged, convicted, and incarcerated. So we’ve got to address the systemic racism in our criminal justice system. We cannot just say law and order. We have to say — we have to come forward with a plan that is going to divert people from the criminal justice system, deal with mandatory minimum sentences, which have put too many people away for too long for doing too little.

We need to have more second chance programs. I’m glad that we’re ending private prisons in the federal system; I want to see them ended in the state system. You shouldn’t have a profit motivation to fill prison cells with young Americans. So there are some positive ways we can work on this.

And I believe strongly that commonsense gun safety measures would assist us. Right now — and this is something Donald has supported, along with the gun lobby — right now, we’ve got too many military- style weapons on the streets. In a lot of places, our police are outgunned. We need comprehensive background checks, and we need to keep guns out of the hands of those who will do harm.

And we finally need to pass a prohibition on anyone who’s on the terrorist watch list from being able to buy a gun in our country. If you’re too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. So there are things we can do, and we ought to do it in a bipartisan way.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, last week, you said we’ve got to do everything possible to improve policing, to go right at implicit bias. Do you believe that police are implicitly biased against black people?

CLINTON: Lester, I think implicit bias is a problem for everyone, not just police. I think, unfortunately, too many of us in our great country jump to conclusions about each other. And therefore, I think we need all of us to be asking hard questions about, you know, why am I feeling this way?

But when it comes to policing, since it can have literally fatal consequences, I have said, in my first budget, we would put money into that budget to help us deal with implicit bias by retraining a lot of our police officers.

I’ve met with a group of very distinguished, experienced police chiefs a few weeks ago. They admit it’s an issue. They’ve got a lot of concerns. Mental health is one of the biggest concerns, because now police are having to handle a lot of really difficult mental health problems on the street.

CLINTON: They want support, they want more training, they want more assistance. And I think the federal government could be in a position where we would offer and provide that.

HOLT: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: I’d like to respond to that.

HOLT: Please.

TRUMP: First of all, I agree, and a lot of people even within my own party want to give certain rights to people on watch lists and no- fly lists. I agree with you. When a person is on a watch list or a no-fly list, and I have the endorsement of the NRA, which I’m very proud of. These are very, very good people, and they’re protecting the Second Amendment.

But I think we have to look very strongly at no-fly lists and watch lists. And when people are on there, even if they shouldn’t be on there, we’ll help them, we’ll help them legally, we’ll help them get off. But I tend to agree with that quite strongly.

I do want to bring up the fact that you were the one that brought up the words super-predator about young black youth. And that’s a term that I think was a — it’s — it’s been horribly met, as you know. I think you’ve apologized for it. But I think it was a terrible thing to say.

And when it comes to stop-and-frisk, you know, you’re talking about takes guns away. Well, I’m talking about taking guns away from gangs and people that use them. And I don’t think — I really don’t think you disagree with me on this, if you want to know the truth.

I think maybe there’s a political reason why you can’t say it, but I really don’t believe — in New York City, stop-and-frisk, we had 2,200 murders, and stop-and-frisk brought it down to 500 murders. Five hundred murders is a lot of murders. It’s hard to believe, 500 is like supposed to be good?

But we went from 2,200 to 500. And it was continued on by Mayor Bloomberg. And it was terminated by current mayor. But stop-and- frisk had a tremendous impact on the safety of New York City. Tremendous beyond belief. So when you say it has no impact, it really did. It had a very, very big impact.

CLINTON: Well, it’s also fair to say, if we’re going to talk about mayors, that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders. So there is...

TRUMP: No, you’re wrong. You’re wrong.

CLINTON: No, I’m not.

TRUMP: Murders are up. All right. You check it.

CLINTON: New York — New York has done an excellent job. And I give credit — I give credit across the board going back two mayors, two police chiefs, because it has worked. And other communities need to come together to do what will work, as well.

Look, one murder is too many. But it is important that we learn about what has been effective. And not go to things that sound good that really did not have the kind of impact that we would want. Who disagrees with keeping neighborhoods safe?

But let’s also add, no one should disagree about respecting the rights of young men who live in those neighborhoods. And so we need to do a better job of working, again, with the communities, faith communities, business communities, as well as the police to try to deal with this problem.

HOLT: This conversation is about race. And so, Mr. Trump, I have to ask you for five...

TRUMP: I’d like to just respond, if I might.

HOLT: Please — 20 seconds.

TRUMP: I’d just like to respond.

HOLT: Please respond, then I’ve got a quick follow-up for you.

TRUMP: I will. Look, the African-American community has been let down by our politicians. They talk good around election time, like right now, and after the election, they said, see ya later, I’ll see you in four years.

The African-American community — because — look, the community within the inner cities has been so badly treated. They’ve been abused and used in order to get votes by Democrat politicians, because that’s what it is. They’ve controlled these communities for up to 100 years.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, let me...

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: Well, I — I do think...

TRUMP: And I will tell you, you look at the inner cities — and I just left Detroit, and I just left Philadelphia, and I just — you know, you’ve seen me, I’ve been all over the place. You decided to stay home, and that’s OK. But I will tell you, I’ve been all over. And I’ve met some of the greatest people I’ll ever meet within these communities. And they are very, very upset with what their politicians have told them and what their politicians have done.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, I...

CLINTON: I think — I think — I think Donald just criticized me for preparing for this debate. And, yes, I did. And you know what else I prepared for? I prepared to be president. And I think that’s a good thing.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, for five years, you perpetuated a false claim that the nation’s first black president was not a natural-born citizen. You questioned his legitimacy. In the last couple of weeks, you acknowledged what most Americans have accepted for years: The president was born in the United States. Can you tell us what took you so long?

TRUMP: I’ll tell you very — well, just very simple to say. Sidney Blumenthal works for the campaign and close — very close friend of Secretary Clinton. And her campaign manager, Patti Doyle, went to — during the campaign, her campaign against President Obama, fought very hard. And you can go look it up, and you can check it out.

TRUMP: And if you look at CNN this past week, Patti Solis Doyle was on Wolf Blitzer saying that this happened. Blumenthal sent McClatchy, highly respected reporter at McClatchy, to Kenya to find out about it. They were pressing it very hard. She failed to get the birth certificate.

When I got involved, I didn’t fail. I got him to give the birth certificate. So I’m satisfied with it. And I’ll tell you why I’m satisfied with it.

HOLT: That was...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Because I want to get on to defeating ISIS, because I want to get on to creating jobs, because I want to get on to having a strong border, because I want to get on to things that are very important to me and that are very important to the country.

HOLT: I will let you respond. It’s important. But I just want to get the answer here. The birth certificate was produced in 2011. You’ve continued to tell the story and question the president’s legitimacy in 2012, ’13, ’14, ’15...

TRUMP: Yeah.

HOLT: .... as recently as January. So the question is, what changed your mind?

TRUMP: Well, nobody was pressing it, nobody was caring much about it. I figured you’d ask the question tonight, of course. But nobody was caring much about it. But I was the one that got him to produce the birth certificate. And I think I did a good job.

Secretary Clinton also fought it. I mean, you know — now, everybody in mainstream is going to say, oh, that’s not true. Look, it’s true. Sidney Blumenthal sent a reporter — you just have to take a look at CNN, the last week, the interview with your former campaign manager. And she was involved. But just like she can’t bring back jobs, she can’t produce.

HOLT: I’m sorry. I’m just going to follow up — and I will let you respond to that, because there’s a lot there. But we’re talking about racial healing in this segment. What do you say to Americans, people of color who...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Well, it was very — I say nothing. I say nothing, because I was able to get him to produce it. He should have produced it a long time before. I say nothing.

But let me just tell you. When you talk about healing, I think that I’ve developed very, very good relationships over the last little while with the African-American community. I think you can see that.

And I feel that they really wanted me to come to that conclusion. And I think I did a great job and a great service not only for the country, but even for the president, in getting him to produce his birth certificate.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, just listen to what you heard.

(LAUGHTER)

And clearly, as Donald just admitted, he knew he was going to stand on this debate stage, and Lester Holt was going to be asking us questions, so he tried to put the whole racist birther lie to bed.

But it can’t be dismissed that easily. He has really started his political activity based on this racist lie that our first black president was not an American citizen. There was absolutely no evidence for it, but he persisted, he persisted year after year, because some of his supporters, people that he was trying to bring into his fold, apparently believed it or wanted to believe it.

But, remember, Donald started his career back in 1973 being sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination because he would not rent apartments in one of his developments to African-Americans, and he made sure that the people who worked for him understood that was the policy. He actually was sued twice by the Justice Department.

So he has a long record of engaging in racist behavior. And the birther lie was a very hurtful one. You know, Barack Obama is a man of great dignity. And I could tell how much it bothered him and annoyed him that this was being touted and used against him.

But I like to remember what Michelle Obama said in her amazing speech at our Democratic National Convention: When they go low, we go high. And Barack Obama went high, despite Donald Trump’s best efforts to bring him down.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you can respond and we’re going to move on to the next segment.

TRUMP: I would love to respond. First of all, I got to watch in preparing for this some of your debates against Barack Obama. You treated him with terrible disrespect. And I watched the way you talk now about how lovely everything is and how wonderful you are. It doesn’t work that way. You were after him, you were trying to — you even sent out or your campaign sent out pictures of him in a certain garb, very famous pictures. I don’t think you can deny that.

But just last week, your campaign manager said it was true. So when you tried to act holier than thou, it really doesn’t work. It really doesn’t.

Now, as far as the lawsuit, yes, when I was very young, I went into my father’s company, had a real estate company in Brooklyn and Queens, and we, along with many, many other companies throughout the country — it was a federal lawsuit — were sued. We settled the suit with zero — with no admission of guilt. It was very easy to do.

TRUMP: I notice you bring that up a lot. And, you know, I also notice the very nasty commercials that you do on me in so many different ways, which I don’t do on you. Maybe I’m trying to save the money.

But, frankly, I look — I look at that, and I say, isn’t that amazing? Because I settled that lawsuit with no admission of guilt, but that was a lawsuit brought against many real estate firms, and it’s just one of those things.

I’ll go one step further. In Palm Beach, Florida, tough community, a brilliant community, a wealthy community, probably the wealthiest community there is in the world, I opened a club, and really got great credit for it. No discrimination against African- Americans, against Muslims, against anybody. And it’s a tremendously successful club. And I’m so glad I did it. And I have been given great credit for what I did. And I’m very, very proud of it. And that’s the way I feel. That is the true way I feel.

HOLT: Our next segment is called “Securing America.” We want to start with a 21st century war happening every day in this country. Our institutions are under cyber attack, and our secrets are being stolen. So my question is, who’s behind it? And how do we fight it?

Secretary Clinton, this answer goes to you.

CLINTON: Well, I think cyber security, cyber warfare will be one of the biggest challenges facing the next president, because clearly we’re facing at this point two different kinds of adversaries. There are the independent hacking groups that do it mostly for commercial reasons to try to steal information that they can use to make money.

But increasingly, we are seeing cyber attacks coming from states, organs of states. The most recent and troubling of these has been Russia. There’s no doubt now that Russia has used cyber attacks against all kinds of organizations in our country, and I am deeply concerned about this. I know Donald’s very praiseworthy of Vladimir Putin, but Putin is playing a really...

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: ... tough, long game here. And one of the things he’s done is to let loose cyber attackers to hack into government files, to hack into personal files, hack into the Democratic National Committee. And we recently have learned that, you know, that this is one of their preferred methods of trying to wreak havoc and collect information. We need to make it very clear — whether it’s Russia, China, Iran or anybody else — the United States has much greater capacity. And we are not going to sit idly by and permit state actors to go after our information, our private-sector information or our public-sector information.

And we’re going to have to make it clear that we don’t want to use the kinds of tools that we have. We don’t want to engage in a different kind of warfare. But we will defend the citizens of this country.

And the Russians need to understand that. I think they’ve been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go, how much would we do. And that’s why I was so — I was so shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is just unacceptable. It’s one of the reasons why 50 national security officials who served in Republican information — in administrations...

HOLT: Your two minutes have expired.

CLINTON: ... have said that Donald is unfit to be the commander- in-chief. It’s comments like that that really worry people who understand the threats that we face.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes and the same question. Who’s behind it? And how do we fight it?

TRUMP: I do want to say that I was just endorsed — and more are coming next week — it will be over 200 admirals, many of them here — admirals and generals endorsed me to lead this country. That just happened, and many more are coming. And I’m very proud of it.

In addition, I was just endorsed by ICE. They’ve never endorsed anybody before on **immigration**. I was just endorsed by ICE. I was just recently endorsed — 16,500 Border Patrol agents.

So when Secretary Clinton talks about this, I mean, I’ll take the admirals and I’ll take the generals any day over the political hacks that I see that have led our country so brilliantly over the last 10 years with their knowledge. OK? Because look at the mess that we’re in. Look at the mess that we’re in.

As far as the cyber, I agree to parts of what Secretary Clinton said. We should be better than anybody else, and perhaps we’re not. I don’t think anybody knows it was Russia that broke into the DNC. She’s saying Russia, Russia, Russia, but I don’t — maybe it was. I mean, it could be Russia, but it could also be China. It could also be lots of other people. It also could be somebody sitting on their bed that weighs 400 pounds, OK?

TRUMP: You don’t know who broke in to DNC.

But what did we learn with DNC? We learned that Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of by your people, by Debbie Wasserman Schultz. Look what happened to her. But Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of. That’s what we learned.

Now, whether that was Russia, whether that was China, whether it was another country, we don’t know, because the truth is, under President Obama we’ve lost control of things that we used to have control over.

We came in with the Internet, we came up with the Internet, and I think Secretary Clinton and myself would agree very much, when you look at what ISIS is doing with the Internet, they’re beating us at our own game. ISIS.

So we have to get very, very tough on cyber and cyber warfare. It is — it is a huge problem. I have a son. He’s 10 years old. He has computers. He is so good with these computers, it’s unbelievable. The security aspect of cyber is very, very tough. And maybe it’s hardly doable.

But I will say, we are not doing the job we should be doing. But that’s true throughout our whole governmental society. We have so many things that we have to do better, Lester, and certainly cyber is one of them.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think there are a number of issues that we should be addressing. I have put forth a plan to defeat ISIS. It does involve going after them online. I think we need to do much more with our tech companies to prevent ISIS and their operatives from being able to use the Internet to radicalize, even direct people in our country and Europe and elsewhere.

But we also have to intensify our air strikes against ISIS and eventually support our Arab and Kurdish partners to be able to actually take out ISIS in Raqqa, end their claim of being a Caliphate.

We’re making progress. Our military is assisting in Iraq. And we’re hoping that within the year we’ll be able to push ISIS out of Iraq and then, you know, really squeeze them in Syria.

But we have to be cognizant of the fact that they’ve had foreign fighters coming to volunteer for them, foreign money, foreign weapons, so we have to make this the top priority.

And I would also do everything possible to take out their leadership. I was involved in a number of efforts to take out Al Qaida leadership when I was secretary of state, including, of course, taking out bin Laden. And I think we need to go after Baghdadi, as well, make that one of our organizing principles. Because we’ve got to defeat ISIS, and we’ve got to do everything we can to disrupt their propaganda efforts online.

HOLT: You mention ISIS, and we think of ISIS certainly as over there, but there are American citizens who have been inspired to commit acts of terror on American soil, the latest incident, of course, the bombings we just saw in New York and New Jersey, the knife attack at a mall in Minnesota, in the last year, deadly attacks in San Bernardino and Orlando. I’ll ask this to both of you. Tell us specifically how you would prevent homegrown attacks by American citizens, Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Well, first I have to say one thing, very important. Secretary Clinton is talking about taking out ISIS. “We will take out ISIS.” Well, President Obama and Secretary Clinton created a vacuum the way they got out of Iraq, because they got out — what, they shouldn’t have been in, but once they got in, the way they got out was a disaster. And ISIS was formed.

So she talks about taking them out. She’s been doing it a long time. She’s been trying to take them out for a long time. But they wouldn’t have even been formed if they left some troops behind, like 10,000 or maybe something more than that. And then you wouldn’t have had them.

Or, as I’ve been saying for a long time, and I think you’ll agree, because I said it to you once, had we taken the oil — and we should have taken the oil — ISIS would not have been able to form either, because the oil was their primary source of income. And now they have the oil all over the place, including the oil — a lot of the oil in Libya, which was another one of her disasters.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I hope the fact-checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: That is absolutely proved over and over again.

TRUMP: Wrong. Wrong.

CLINTON: He actually advocated for the actions we took in Libya and urged that Gadhafi be taken out, after actually doing some business with him one time.

CLINTON: But the larger point — and he says this constantly — is George W. Bush made the agreement about when American troops would leave Iraq, not Barack Obama.

And the only way that American troops could have stayed in Iraq is to get an agreement from the then-Iraqi government that would have protected our troops, and the Iraqi government would not give that.

But let’s talk about the question you asked, Lester. The question you asked is, what do we do here in the United States? That’s the most important part of this. How do we prevent attacks? How do we protect our people?

And I think we’ve got to have an intelligence surge, where we are looking for every scrap of information. I was so proud of law enforcement in New York, in Minnesota, in New Jersey. You know, they responded so quickly, so professionally to the attacks that occurred by Rahami. And they brought him down. And we may find out more information because he is still alive, which may prove to be an intelligence benefit.

So we’ve got to do everything we can to vacuum up intelligence from Europe, from the Middle East. That means we’ve got to work more closely with our allies, and that’s something that Donald has been very dismissive of.

We’re working with NATO, the longest military alliance in the history of the world, to really turn our attention to terrorism. We’re working with our friends in the Middle East, many of which, as you know, are Muslim majority nations. Donald has consistently insulted Muslims abroad, Muslims at home, when we need to be cooperating with Muslim nations and with the American Muslim community.

They’re on the front lines. They can provide information to us that we might not get anywhere else. They need to have close working cooperation with law enforcement in these communities, not be **alienated** and pushed away as some of Donald’s rhetoric, unfortunately, has led to.

HOLT: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: Well, I have to respond.

HOLT: Please respond. TRUMP: The secretary said very strongly about working with — we’ve been working with them for many years, and we have the greatest mess anyone’s ever seen. You look at the Middle East, it’s a total mess. Under your direction, to a large extent.

But you look at the Middle East, you started the Iran deal, that’s another beauty where you have a country that was ready to fall, I mean, they were doing so badly. They were choking on the sanctions. And now they’re going to be actually probably a major power at some point pretty soon, the way they’re going.

But when you look at NATO, I was asked on a major show, what do you think of NATO? And you have to understand, I’m a businessperson. I did really well. But I have common sense. And I said, well, I’ll tell you. I haven’t given lots of thought to NATO. But two things.

Number one, the 28 countries of NATO, many of them aren’t paying their fair share. Number two — and that bothers me, because we should be asking — we’re defending them, and they should at least be paying us what they’re supposed to be paying by treaty and contract.

And, number two, I said, and very strongly, NATO could be obsolete, because — and I was very strong on this, and it was actually covered very accurately in the New York Times, which is unusual for the New York Times, to be honest — but I said, they do not focus on terror. And I was very strong. And I said it numerous times.

And about four months ago, I read on the front page of the Wall Street Journal that NATO is opening up a major terror division. And I think that’s great. And I think we should get — because we pay approximately 73 percent of the cost of NATO. It’s a lot of money to protect other people. But I’m all for NATO. But I said they have to focus on terror, also.

And they’re going to do that. And that was — believe me — I’m sure I’m not going to get credit for it — but that was largely because of what I was saying and my criticism of NATO.

I think we have to get NATO to go into the Middle East with us, in addition to surrounding nations, and we have to knock the hell out of ISIS, and we have to do it fast, when ISIS formed in this vacuum created by Barack Obama and Secretary Clinton. And believe me, you were the ones that took out the troops. Not only that, you named the day. They couldn’t believe it. They sat back probably and said, I can’t believe it. They said...

CLINTON: Lester, we’ve covered...

TRUMP: No, wait a minute.

CLINTON: We’ve covered this ground.

TRUMP: When they formed, when they formed, this is something that never should have happened. It should have never happened. Now, you’re talking about taking out ISIS. But you were there, and you were secretary of state when it was a little infant. Now it’s in over 30 countries. And you’re going to stop them? I don’t think so.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, a lot of these are judgment questions. You had supported the war in Iraq before the invasion. What makes your...

TRUMP: I did not support the war in Iraq.

HOLT: In 2002...

TRUMP: That is a mainstream media nonsense put out by her, because she — frankly, I think the best person in her campaign is mainstream media.

HOLT: My question is, since you supported it...

TRUMP: Just — would you like to hear...

HOLT: ... why is your — why is your judgment...

TRUMP: Wait a minute. I was against the war in Iraq. Just so you put it out.

HOLT: The record shows otherwise, but why — why was...

TRUMP: The record does not show that.

HOLT: Why was — is your judgment any...

TRUMP: The record shows that I’m right. When I did an interview with Howard Stern, very lightly, first time anyone’s asked me that, I said, very lightly, I don’t know, maybe, who knows? Essentially. I then did an interview with Neil Cavuto. We talked about the economy is more important. I then spoke to Sean Hannity, which everybody refuses to call Sean Hannity. I had numerous conversations with Sean Hannity at Fox. And Sean Hannity said — and he called me the other day — and I spoke to him about it — he said you were totally against the war, because he was for the war.

HOLT: Why is your judgment better than...

TRUMP: And when he — excuse me. And that was before the war started. Sean Hannity said very strongly to me and other people — he’s willing to say it, but nobody wants to call him. I was against the war. He said, you used to have fights with me, because Sean was in favor of the war.

And I understand that side, also, not very much, because we should have never been there. But nobody called Sean Hannity. And then they did an article in a major magazine, shortly after the war started. I think in ’04. But they did an article which had me totally against the war in Iraq.

And one of your compatriots said, you know, whether it was before or right after, Trump was definitely — because if you read this article, there’s no doubt. But if somebody — and I’ll ask the press — if somebody would call up Sean Hannity, this was before the war started. He and I used to have arguments about the war. I said, it’s a terrible and a stupid thing. It’s going to destabilize the Middle East. And that’s exactly what it’s done. It’s been a disaster.

HOLT: My reference was to what you had said in 2002, and my question was...

TRUMP: No, no. You didn’t hear what I said.

HOLT: Why is your judgment — why is your judgment any different than Mrs. Clinton’s judgment?

TRUMP: Well, I have much better judgment than she does. There’s no question about that. I also have a much better temperament than she has, you know?

(LAUGHTER)

I have a much better — she spent — let me tell you — she spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an advertising — you know, they get Madison Avenue into a room, they put names — oh, temperament, let’s go after — I think my strongest asset, maybe by far, is my temperament. I have a winning temperament. I know how to win. She does not have a...

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

TRUMP: Wait. The AFL-CIO the other day, behind the blue screen, I don’t know who you were talking to, Secretary Clinton, but you were totally out of control. I said, there’s a person with a temperament that’s got a problem.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Whew, OK.

(LAUGHTER)

Let’s talk about two important issues that were briefly mentioned by Donald, first, NATO. You know, NATO as a military alliance has something called Article 5, and basically it says this: An attack on one is an attack on all. And you know the only time it’s ever been invoked? After 9/11, when the 28 nations of NATO said that they would go to Afghanistan with us to fight terrorism, something that they still are doing by our side.

With respect to Iran, when I became secretary of state, Iran was weeks away from having enough nuclear material to form a bomb. They had mastered the nuclear fuel cycle under the Bush administration. They had built covert facilities. They had stocked them with centrifuges that were whirling away.

And we had sanctioned them. I voted for every sanction against Iran when I was in the Senate, but it wasn’t enough. So I spent a year-and-a-half putting together a coalition that included Russia and China to impose the toughest sanctions on Iran.

And we did drive them to the negotiating table. And my successor, John Kerry, and President Obama got a deal that put a lid on Iran’s nuclear program without firing a single shot. That’s diplomacy. That’s coalition-building. That’s working with other nations.

The other day, I saw Donald saying that there were some Iranian sailors on a ship in the waters off of Iran, and they were taunting American sailors who were on a nearby ship. He said, you know, if they taunted our sailors, I’d blow them out of the water and start another war. That’s not good judgment.

TRUMP: That would not start a war.

CLINTON: That is not the right temperament to be commander-in- chief, to be taunted. And the worst part...

TRUMP: No, they were taunting us.

CLINTON: ... of what we heard Donald say has been about nuclear weapons. He has said repeatedly that he didn’t care if other nations got nuclear weapons, Japan, South Korea, even Saudi Arabia. It has been the policy of the United States, Democrats and Republicans, to do everything we could to reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons. He even said, well, you know, if there were nuclear war in East Asia, well, you know, that’s fine...

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... have a good time, folks.

TRUMP: It’s lies.

CLINTON: And, in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling. That is the number-one threat we face in the world. And it becomes particularly threatening if terrorists ever get their hands on any nuclear material. So a man who can be provoked by a tweet should not have his fingers anywhere near the nuclear codes, as far as I think anyone with any sense about this should be concerned.

TRUMP: That line’s getting a little bit old, I must say. I would like to...

CLINTON: It’s a good one, though. It well describes the problem.

(LAUGHTER)

TRUMP: It’s not an accurate one at all. It’s not an accurate one. So I just want to give a lot of things — and just to respond. I agree with her on one thing. The single greatest problem the world has is nuclear armament, nuclear weapons, not global warming, like you think and your — your president thinks.

Nuclear is the single greatest threat. Just to go down the list, we defend Japan, we defend Germany, we defend South Korea, we defend Saudi Arabia, we defend countries. They do not pay us. But they should be paying us, because we are providing tremendous service and we’re losing a fortune. That’s why we’re losing — we’re losing — we lose on everything. I say, who makes these — we lose on everything. All I said, that it’s very possible that if they don’t pay a fair share, because this isn’t 40 years ago where we could do what we’re doing. We can’t defend Japan, a behemoth, selling us cars by the million...

HOLT: We need to move on.

TRUMP: Well, wait, but it’s very important. All I said was, they may have to defend themselves or they have to help us out. We’re a country that owes $20 trillion. They have to help us out.

HOLT: Our last...

TRUMP: As far as the nuclear is concerned, I agree. It is the single greatest threat that this country has.

HOLT: Which leads to my next question, as we enter our last segment here (inaudible) the subject of securing America. On nuclear weapons, President Obama reportedly considered changing the nation’s longstanding policy on first use. Do you support the current policy? Mr. Trump, you have two minutes on that.

TRUMP: Well, I have to say that, you know, for what Secretary Clinton was saying about nuclear with Russia, she’s very cavalier in the way she talks about various countries. But Russia has been expanding their — they have a much newer capability than we do. We have not been updating from the new standpoint.

I looked the other night. I was seeing B-52s, they’re old enough that your father, your grandfather could be flying them. We are not — we are not keeping up with other countries. I would like everybody to end it, just get rid of it. But I would certainly not do first strike.

I think that once the nuclear alternative happens, it’s over. At the same time, we have to be prepared. I can’t take anything off the table. Because you look at some of these countries, you look at North Korea, we’re doing nothing there. China should solve that problem for us. China should go into North Korea. China is totally powerful as it relates to North Korea.

And by the way, another one powerful is the worst deal I think I’ve ever seen negotiated that you started is the Iran deal. Iran is one of their biggest trading partners. Iran has power over North Korea.

And when they made that horrible deal with Iran, they should have included the fact that they do something with respect to North Korea. And they should have done something with respect to Yemen and all these other places.

And when asked to Secretary Kerry, why didn’t you do that? Why didn’t you add other things into the deal? One of the great giveaways of all time, of all time, including $400 million in cash. Nobody’s ever seen that before. That turned out to be wrong. It was actually $1.7 billion in cash, obviously, I guess for the hostages. It certainly looks that way.

So you say to yourself, why didn’t they make the right deal? This is one of the worst deals ever made by any country in history. The deal with Iran will lead to nuclear problems. All they have to do is sit back 10 years, and they don’t have to do much.

HOLT: Your two minutes is expired.

TRUMP: And they’re going to end up getting nuclear. I met with Bibi Netanyahu the other day. Believe me, he’s not a happy camper.

HOLT: All right. Mrs. Clinton, Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, let me — let me start by saying, words matter. Words matter when you run for president. And they really matter when you are president. And I want to reassure our allies in Japan and South Korea and elsewhere that we have mutual defense treaties and we will honor them.

It is essential that America’s word be good. And so I know that this campaign has caused some questioning and worries on the part of many leaders across the globe. I’ve talked with a number of them. But I want to — on behalf of myself, and I think on behalf of a majority of the American people, say that, you know, our word is good.

It’s also important that we look at the entire global situation. There’s no doubt that we have other problems with Iran. But personally, I’d rather deal with the other problems having put that lid on their nuclear program than still to be facing that.

And Donald never tells you what he would do. Would he have started a war? Would he have bombed Iran? If he’s going to criticize a deal that has been very successful in giving us access to Iranian facilities that we never had before, then he should tell us what his alternative would be. But it’s like his plan to defeat ISIS. He says it’s a secret plan, but the only secret is that he has no plan.

So we need to be more precise in how we talk about these issues. People around the word follow our presidential campaigns so closely, trying to get hints about what we will do. Can they rely on us? Are we going to lead the world with strength and in accordance with our values? That’s what I intend to do. I intend to be a leader of our country that people can count on, both here at home and around the world, to make decisions that will further peace and prosperity, but also stand up to bullies, whether they’re abroad or at home.

We cannot let those who would try to destabilize the world to interfere with American interests and security...

HOLT: Your two minutes is...

CLINTON: ... to be given any opportunities at all.

HOLT: ... is expired.

TRUMP: Lester, one thing I’d like to say.

HOLT: Very quickly. Twenty seconds.

TRUMP: I will go very quickly. But I will tell you that Hillary will tell you to go to her website and read all about how to defeat ISIS, which she could have defeated by never having it, you know, get going in the first place. Right now, it’s getting tougher and tougher to defeat them, because they’re in more and more places, more and more states, more and more nations.

HOLT: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: And it’s a big problem. And as far as Japan is concerned, I want to help all of our allies, but we are losing billions and billions of dollars. We cannot be the policemen of the world. We cannot protect countries all over the world...

HOLT: We have just...

TRUMP: ... where they’re not paying us what we need.

HOLT: We have just a few final questions...

TRUMP: And she doesn’t say that, because she’s got no business ability. We need heart. We need a lot of things. But you have to have some basic ability. And sadly, she doesn’t have that. All of the things that she’s talking about could have been taken care of during the last 10 years, let’s say, while she had great power. But they weren’t taken care of. And if she ever wins this race, they won’t be taken care of.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, this year Secretary Clinton became the first woman nominated for president by a major party. Earlier this month, you said she doesn’t have, quote, “a presidential look.” She’s standing here right now. What did you mean by that?

TRUMP: She doesn’t have the look. She doesn’t have the stamina. I said she doesn’t have the stamina. And I don’t believe she does have the stamina. To be president of this country, you need tremendous stamina.

HOLT: The quote was, “I just don’t think she has the presidential look.”

TRUMP: You have — wait a minute. Wait a minute, Lester. You asked me a question. Did you ask me a question?

You have to be able to negotiate our trade deals. You have to be able to negotiate, that’s right, with Japan, with Saudi Arabia. I mean, can you imagine, we’re defending Saudi Arabia? And with all of the money they have, we’re defending them, and they’re not paying? All you have to do is speak to them. Wait. You have so many different things you have to be able to do, and I don’t believe that Hillary has the stamina.

HOLT: Let’s let her respond. CLINTON: Well, as soon as he travels to 112 countries and negotiates a peace deal, a cease-fire, a release of dissidents, an opening of new opportunities in nations around the world, or even spends 11 hours testifying in front of a congressional committee, he can talk to me about stamina.

(APPLAUSE)

TRUMP: The world — let me tell you. Let me tell you. Hillary has experience, but it’s bad experience. We have made so many bad deals during the last — so she’s got experience, that I agree.

(APPLAUSE)

But it’s bad, bad experience. Whether it’s the Iran deal that you’re so in love with, where we gave them $150 billion back, whether it’s the Iran deal, whether it’s anything you can — name — you almost can’t name a good deal. I agree. She’s got experience, but it’s bad experience. And this country can’t afford to have another four years of that kind of experience.

HOLT: We are at — we are at the final question.

(APPLAUSE)

CLINTON: Well, one thing. One thing, Lester.

HOLT: Very quickly, because we’re at the final question now.

CLINTON: You know, he tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs, and someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said...

TRUMP: I never said that.

CLINTON: .... women don’t deserve equal pay unless they do as good a job as men.

TRUMP: I didn’t say that.

CLINTON: And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest. He loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them. And he called this woman “Miss Piggy.” Then he called her “Miss Housekeeping,” because she was Latina. Donald, she has a name.

TRUMP: Where did you find this? Where did you find this?

CLINTON: Her name is Alicia Machado.

TRUMP: Where did you find this?

CLINTON: And she has become a U.S. citizen, and you can bet...

TRUMP: Oh, really? CLINTON: ... she’s going to vote this November.

TRUMP: OK, good. Let me just tell you...

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, could we just take 10 seconds and then we ask the final question...

TRUMP: You know, Hillary is hitting me with tremendous commercials. Some of it’s said in entertainment. Some of it’s said — somebody who’s been very vicious to me, Rosie O’Donnell, I said very tough things to her, and I think everybody would agree that she deserves it and nobody feels sorry for her.

But you want to know the truth? I was going to say something...

HOLT: Please very quickly.

TRUMP: ... extremely rough to Hillary, to her family, and I said to myself, “I can’t do it. I just can’t do it. It’s inappropriate. It’s not nice.” But she spent hundreds of millions of dollars on negative ads on me, many of which are absolutely untrue. They’re untrue. And they’re misrepresentations.

And I will tell you this, Lester: It’s not nice. And I don’t deserve that.

But it’s certainly not a nice thing that she’s done. It’s hundreds of millions of ads. And the only gratifying thing is, I saw the polls come in today, and with all of that money...

HOLT: We have to move on to the final question.

TRUMP: ... $200 million is spent, and I’m either winning or tied, and I’ve spent practically nothing.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: One of you will not win this election. So my final question to you tonight, are you willing to accept the outcome as the will of the voters? Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I support our democracy. And sometimes you win, sometimes you lose. But I certainly will support the outcome of this election.

And I know Donald’s trying very hard to plant doubts about it, but I hope the people out there understand: This election’s really up to you. It’s not about us so much as it is about you and your families and the kind of country and future you want. So I sure hope you will get out and vote as though your future depended on it, because I think it does.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, very quickly, same question. Will you accept the outcome as the will of the voters? TRUMP: I want to make America great again. We are a nation that is seriously troubled. We’re losing our jobs. People are pouring into our country.

The other day, we were deporting 800 people. And perhaps they passed the wrong button, they pressed the wrong button, or perhaps worse than that, it was corruption, but these people that we were going to deport for good reason ended up becoming citizens. Ended up becoming citizens. And it was 800. And now it turns out it might be 1,800, and they don’t even know.

HOLT: Will you accept the outcome of the election?

TRUMP: Look, here’s the story. I want to make America great again. I’m going to be able to do it. I don’t believe Hillary will. The answer is, if she wins, I will absolutely support her.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: All right. Well, that is going to do it for us. That concludes our debate for this evening, a spirit one. We covered a lot of ground, not everything as I suspected we would.

The next presidential debates are scheduled for October 9th at Washington University in St. Louis and October 19th at the University of Nevada Las Vegas. The conversation will continue.

A reminder. The vice presidential debate is scheduled for October 4th at Longwood University in Farmville, Virginia. My thanks to Hillary Clinton and to Donald Trump and to Hofstra University for hosting us tonight. Good night, everyone.

END
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Correction: September 28, 2016, Wednesday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An earlier version of this transcript, compiled and provided by the Federal News Service, omitted some sections.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] lashed out wildly on Tuesday in the aftermath of a disappointing first debate with Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], scolding the moderator, criticizing a beauty pageant winner for her physique and raising the prospect of an all-out attack on Bill Clinton’s marital infidelities in the final stretch of the campaign.

Having worked assiduously in recent weeks to cultivate a more disciplined demeanor on the campaign trail, Mr. Trump decisively cast aside that approach on Tuesday morning. As Mrs. Clinton embarked on an ebullient campaign swing through North Carolina, aiming to press her newfound advantage, Mr. Trump vented his grievances in full public view.

Sounding weary and impatient as he called into a Fox News program, Mr. Trump criticized Lester Holt, the NBC News anchor, for asking “unfair questions” during the debate Monday evening, and speculated that someone might have tampered with his microphone. Mr. Trump repeated his charge that Mrs. Clinton lacked the “stamina” to be president, a claim critics have described as sexist, and suggested that in the future he might raise Mr. Clinton’s past indiscretions.

And defying conventions of civility and political common sense, Mr. Trump leveled cutting personal criticism at a beauty pageant winner, Alicia Machado, whom Mrs. Clinton held up in Monday night’s debate as an example of Mr. Trump’s disrespect for women.

Mr. Trump insisted on Fox that he had been right to disparage the former Miss Universe because of her weight.

“She was the winner and she gained a massive amount of weight, and it was a real problem,” said Mr. Trump, who was the pageant’s executive producer at the time. “Not only that — her attitude. And we had a real problem with her.”

Mr. Trump’s setback in the debate represents a critical test in the final six weeks of the presidential race. Having drawn closer to Mrs. Clinton in the polls, Mr. Trump now faces an intensified clash over his personal temperament and his attitudes toward women and minorities — areas of grave concern for many voters that were at the center of the candidates’ confrontation on Monday.

Against Mr. Trump’s brooding, Mrs. Clinton cut a strikingly different profile on the campaign trail on Tuesday, emerging emboldened from her encounter with the Republican nominee. At a rally in Raleigh, N.C., Mrs. Clinton, brandishing her opponent’s debate stumbles, assailed Mr. Trump’s comments suggesting he avoided paying taxes and welcomed the 2008 financial crisis as a buying opportunity.

“What kind of person would want to root for nine million families losing their homes?” Mrs. Clinton asked the lively crowd. “One who should never be president, is the answer to that question.”

Having shaken at least temporarily the malaise of the past month, Mrs. Clinton must now seek to gain a durable upper hand over Mr. Trump, who has drawn close to her in the polls with a more sharply focused message on trade, **immigration** and national security.

Mr. Trump’s comportment on Tuesday threatened to forfeit his gains of the past month, and recalled his practice during the Republican primaries and much of the general election, of belittling political bystanders in language that **alienated** voters, like attacking the Muslim parents of an Army captain killed in Iraq and a Hispanic federal judge.

It remains to be seen if Mr. Trump will approach the remainder of the race with the unfiltered abandon of his comments Tuesday morning. The fear among Republicans is that Mr. Trump will confront adversity by continuing to swing impulsively at politically inopportune targets, dragging the party again into needless and damaging feuds, as he did for most of the summer.

The notion of raising Mr. Clinton’s infidelity is particularly controversial among Mr. Trump’s advisers, who have sent conflicting signals about that line of attack.

Kellyanne Conway, Mr. Trump’s campaign manager, said in a CNN interview that he deserved credit for holding back from that particular subject, saying Mr. Trump had been “polite and a gentleman.”

But Rudolph W. Giuliani, a former New York City mayor and a close confidant of Mr. Trump’s, called for a far harsher approach. Mr. Trump, he told a reporter for the website Elite Daily[http://elitedaily.com/news/politics/rudy-giuliani-asked-if-donald-trump-feminist-debate/1624520/], had been “too reserved” in his confrontation with Mrs. Clinton.

Mr. Giuliani, who like Mr. Trump is on his third marriage, recommended attacking Mrs. Clinton for having questioned Monica Lewinsky’s credibility in claiming an affair with Mr. Clinton, and he called Mrs. Clinton “too stupid to be president.”

Should Mr. Trump follow the path prescribed by Mr. Giuliani, it could transform the final six weeks of his candidacy into an onslaught of unrestricted personal vituperation — a risky course that would probably please Mr. Trump’s political base at the cost of his broader appeal.

For the moment, Mrs. Clinton answered Mr. Trump’s scattershot attacks with a dismissive shrug, telling reporters that Mr. Trump was free to run whatever kind of campaign he preferred. On board her campaign plane, she plainly relished her moment of apparent triumph, and poked fun at Mr. Trump’s morning lamentations.

“Anybody who complains about the microphone,” she said, “is not having a good night.”

But Democrats also signaled on Tuesday that they would welcome an extended battle with Mr. Trump over matters of temperament and personal character. Priorities USA Action, a “super PAC[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/campaign\_finance/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]” supporting Mrs. Clinton, released a television ad[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y7ys8bmTf5U&feature=youtu.be&app=desktop] highlighting a debate exchange in which Mr. Trump said his temperament was his “strongest asset,” along with clips of Mr. Trump using obscene and violent language.

And Mrs. Clinton’s running mate, Senator Tim Kaine of Virginia, said in television interviews that Mr. Trump had appeared “flustered” and “ran out of gas.” During a campaign stop in Orlando, Fla., Mr. Kaine said Mr. Trump was too unsteady for the White House.

“If you’re that rattled in a debate,” he said, “try being president.”

Mr. Trump’s running mate, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, also toured the morning TV programs, but with an upbeat message. Appearing on ABC’s “Good Morning America,” Mr. Pence proclaimed Monday had been a “great night” in which Mr. Trump showcased the “kind of energy” and the “kind of leadership” that had animated his campaign.

“Donald Trump took command of the stage, and I think the American people saw his leadership qualities,” Mr. Pence said.

But as has become customary for the Republican ticket, Mr. Trump’s provocative remarks are likely to overshadow his running mate’s far more cautious and conventional arguments.

And Mr. Pence joined Mr. Trump in criticizing Mr. Holt for his handling of the debate, pointing to the absence of questions for Mrs. Clinton regarding her family’s foundation and the 2012 attack on an American diplomatic mission in Benghazi, Libya, when she was secretary of state.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Thomas Kaplan and Matt Flegenheimer contributed reporting.

\* Trump Sniffles at the Debate, and the Internet Plays Doctor[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/trump-sniffles-first-2016-debate.html]

\* ‘Braggadocious?’ In Trump and Clinton Debate, Words That Sent Viewers to the Dictionary[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/braggadocio-in-trump-and-clinton-debate-words-that-sent-viewers-to-the-dictionary.html]

\* Voter Registration Deadlines, State by State[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/24/us/politics/voter-registration-deadlines.html]

\* Hillary Clinton’s Name Misspelled on Debate Ticket[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/hillary-clintons-name-misspelled-on-debate-ticket.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS — Bikini — and burkini — season is over here, but with the new school year, France’s battle over national identity has erupted on a new front: its history curriculum.

School curriculums have long been a part of culture wars, including in the United States, where there have been tussles over slavery and evolution. But in France, where the state sets school programs nationwide, the country’s understanding of its past — and how it uses education to shape young citizens[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/11/world/europe/charlie-hebdo-attack-puts-schools-under-scrutiny.html] — has become a hot-button issue in a fraught election season[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/france-nicolas-sarkozy-presidential-election.html?smid=tw-share&\_r=0].

Changes to how Joan of Arc and other touchstone historical figures are taught in elementary school, as well as changes to how French, Latin and Greek are introduced, have sparked fierce arguments between right-leaning politicians and intellectuals, who believe schools should foster national pride, and the Socialist education minister Najat Vallaud-Belkacem and her defenders, who argue that the curriculum should reflect changes in society.

In a recent campaign speech and newspaper column[http://www.lefigaro.fr/vox/societe/2016/08/31/31003-20160831ARTFIG00269-francois-fillon-enseigner-le-recit-national-a-nos-enfants.php?redirect\_premium], a former prime minister running in primaries for the right-wing Republican party, François Fillon, said France “shouldn’t have to apologize” for its history. And last week, former president Nicolas Sarkozy, also a candidate in the right-wing party primaries, upped the ante. “Once you become French, your ancestors are the Gauls,” he said, adding that students should be taught, “‘I love France, I learned the history of France, I see myself as French.’”

This increasing politicization of education is happening at a time of intense debate over **immigration**, multiculturalism and national identity, said Rachel D. Hutchins, a professor at the University of Lorraine in France and the author[https://www-routledge-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/Nationalism-and-History-Education-Curricula-and-Textbooks-in-the-United/Hutchins/p/book/9781138801578] of “Nationalism and History Education: Curricula and Textbooks in the United States and France.”

“For politicians, targeting history education provides a simple, rhetorically powerful response to public fears over **immigration**,” she said.

Mr. Fillon, who was prime minister from 2007 until 2012 under Mr. Sarkozy, said that if elected, he would insist the Education Ministry mandate a “national narrative.” His remarks were seen as a rebuke to decades of changes to textbooks that have come to cast France’s colonial exploits, particularly in North Africa, in a negative light.

“Our history has glorious moments and tragic moments, but it’s an entirety,” he said. “We should embrace it and we do not have to apologize for it.” He also lamented the removal this fall from the elementary school curriculum of Julius Caesar, Cardinal Richelieu and Voltaire.

This year’s elementary school curriculum[http://www.education.gouv.fr/pid285/bulletin\_officiel.html?cid\_bo=94708] was changed significantly — to focus more on French history and less on world history — after “a very intense debate,” said Michel Lussault, president of the Superior Council for Programs, the state-appointed independent committee of 18 experts that sets curriculums.

The debate centered on how best to teach history and the French language, and how to divide the elementary school curriculum into three-year cycles. But at a time when terrorist attacks have pushed questions of national identity and civic education to the fore, it quickly became politically charged. In the end, the committee’s decision to focus on French history was a compromise between traditionalists who wanted more of a “national narrative” and progressives who believed the curriculum should resonate more with today’s students and make them more active participants in the classroom.

Mr. Lussault, a geography professor at the University of Lyon, said that Mr. Fillon was playing politics. “This is a kind of political rhetoric that doesn’t have much to do with the reality of the curriculum,” he said.

Even if the new curriculum eliminated detailed lists of historical figures, including Joan of Arc and Caesar, teachers are still required to cover their epochs. “I imagine if you’re teaching the Roman conquest of Gaul, you would talk about Julius Caesar,” Mr. Lussault said.

After last year’s terrorist attacks in Paris[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/attacks-in-paris?inline=nyt-classifier], the Education Ministry added more hours dedicated to teaching about secularism and the republican values of liberty, equality and fraternity.

Those changes came amid a debate over what it means to be French. “So many people have a French identity card, but the question of what is France and how to transmit the knowledge or the love of France, that’s what the attacks introduced into the debate,” said Alain Finkielkraut[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/12/world/europe/once-hopeful-for-harmony-a-philosopher-voices-discord-in-france.html], a public intellectual whose 2013 book, “The Unhappy Identity,” about the strains of a multicultural society, lamented what he sees as a decline in school standards.

Ever since the French Revolution — and certainly since the French state wrested control of schools from the Roman Catholic Church in the early 20th century — education has been the government’s main method of instilling certain values of citizenship. But what kind of citizens?

“Should history be civic history? Or a way of teaching curiosity and otherness? That’s a big issue,” said Patricia Legris, a professor of contemporary history at the University of Rennes. As for the kind of citizen: “Should it be a national citizen? Or a European citizen? A world citizen?”

In “The Phantom School,” published this month, the right-wing intellectual Robert Redeker argues[http://www.lefigaro.fr/vox/societe/2016/08/26/31003-20160826ARTFIG00065-robert-redeker-l-ecole-s-applique-a-effacer-la-civilisation-francaise.php] that French youth are out of sync with French values because schools have gone downhill. “Many are of North African origin and they are in dissonance, they are like a separate people,” said Mr. Redeker, who has lived under police protection since 2006, when he wrote an opinion piece in Le Figaro calling Islam a violent religion.

“They have a hatred of the country into which they were born,” Mr. Redeker continued. “But rather than teaching love and respect for this country and its language and its history, the school since the start of the ’90s has taught them that ultimately we are mean, slave owners, colonialists, almost murderers.”

Mr. Redeker and others who emphasize Europe’s Greco-Roman past are upset that this year Latin and Greek, which are electives, were changed to focus more on ancient civilizations and less on grammar. “It’s pedagogical tourism,” he said. “Latin and Greek, like mathematics, are a school of logic, one that teaches rigor in thinking.”

Whether curriculums can help solve France’s woes is another question. “A kind of magical thinking goes on around them,” said Mark Lilla, a professor of humanities at Columbia who has written extensively[http://www.nybooks.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/contributors/mark-lilla/] on contemporary French politics. “The presumption is that if we add 15 more minutes of this or that, we’ve done something to fight the man or to fight the barbarians that are at the gate.”

“In a sense it’s testimony to their faith in the life of the mind,” Professor Lilla added, “but it’s also a way of avoiding hard political choices.”

\* Giving Voice to France’s Poorest Youth, With Rhymes and Beats[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/21/world/europe/giving-voice-to-frances-poorest-youth-with-rhymes-and-beats.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BURBANK, Calif. — Is there a more beloved character in all of science fiction than Spock, the half-human, half-Vulcan first officer from “Star Trek”? He’s superstrong — he could easily pummel Captain Kirk, his ranking officer, were the spirit to move him — and a whiz at science. He’s cool to the point of wintry, a master at tamping down his base needs (granted, Vulcans get the urge to mate only once every seven years) and human emotions. He’s skilled at martial arts but rarely fights. He can literally look into your mind.

Leonard Nimoy[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/27/arts/television/leonard-nimoy-spock-of-star-trek-dies-at-83.html] originated the role in 1966, and when his son, Adam, began asking people what they most loved about the character while filming his new documentary, “For the Love of Spock[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/movies/for-the-love-of-spock-review.html?\_r=0],” all that stuff — his big brain, his ability to peek into yours — was secondary. His most attractive trait? “Ninety percent of them were talking about the fact that he’s an outsider,” he said.

Outsider indeed. Spock is that rarest of 23rd-century beings, the only son of a Vulcan dad and a human mom. For years, he was about the closest viewers could get to a multiracial role model on American TV. “I had Spock,” the actress Jennifer Beals said[http://www.upi.com/Jennifer-Beals-I-knew-I-was-different/62921295798697/] in 2011. “And that was kind of it.” (Ms. Beals is of Irish- and African-American descent.)

In “For the Love of Spock,” a NASA engineer, Bobak Ferdowsi[https://twitter.com/tweetsoutloud?ref\_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Eauthor], describes being encouraged by the series and the role. “As someone who was from two cultures, Iranian father and an American mother, I saw in Spock the same conflict,” he said. “Which one am I? Am I both? Is there a happy medium between the two?”

The character has inspired multiracial artists, writers and scholars almost since his inception. The Los Angeles artist Kip Fulbeck[http://kipfulbeck.com/], who has created short films, museum shows and photo exhibitions about the multiracial experience, is a lifelong Spock fan. “I grew up watching ‘Star Trek,’” said Mr. Fulbeck, whose father is white and mother is Chinese. “Every time McCoy would say, you’re half-human, and Spock would say, I’m also half-Vulcan, I was like, ‘Yeah, I get that.’”

In his film “Lilo & Me” (2003), Mr. Fulbeck posits Spock as possibly the “one semi-multiracial character” on TV — then cuts to a scene in which Kirk, trying to shock his first officer out of a drug-induced haze, calls him a “mutinous, disloyal, computerized half-breed.” In “Banana Split” (1991), Mr. Fulbeck suggests Spock might have been Asian, something that plenty of hopeful Asian viewers have thought all along, given his black hair, almond eyes and yellowish skin tone. But the character has “every stereotype,” too, Mr. Fulbeck admitted: good at science, emotionally detached. Spock even had a cheongsam-wearing fiancée.

In the “Biracial and Multiracial Identity” class she teaches at California State University, Northridge, Teresa Williams-León, a professor of Asian-American studies, includes the stories of Spock; Barack Obama (a self-avowed Spock fan); and Tabitha, the half-mortal daughter on “Bewitched.” For Ms. Williams-León, there’s something telling about Spock’s need to choose one of his selves over the other, rather than integrating the two. “He had to subdue his emotional side to become more cerebral and logical,” she said. “So that’s problematic. But it’s an interesting way of looking at how biracial people have had to suppress aspects of themselves, or one part of themselves.”

On a recent afternoon here, Adam Nimoy talked about his documentary, which is in theaters and on demand as part of the 50th-anniversary celebration of the original series. In addition, in the coming months, there will be the DVD release of Justin Lin’s “Star Trek[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/22/movies/review-star-trek-beyond.html] Beyond[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/22/movies/review-star-trek-beyond.html],” a four-month series of “Trek”-related programs mounted by the Toronto International Film Festival[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/t/toronto\_international\_film\_festival/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and the compilation “Star Trek: The Original Series — The Roddenberry Vault.”

At 60, Mr. Nimoy has the strong jawline and ethnically ambiguous good looks he got from his father, who died last year. Leonard grew up in an **immigrant**Jewish family in Boston’s West End and “was desperate to get out,” his son said. “He didn’t want to be stuck there, like a townie. And he told me this not that long ago, by the same token, Spock’s objective was to overcome the fact that he was half-**alien** and integrate himself with his human crewmates.”

That wasn’t always easy, particularly when colleagues were always calling attention to your mixed heritage. In “This Side of Paradise,” Kirk dubs the Vulcans a “subhuman race” and ridicules Spock’s “gall” in going after a lovelorn white woman (played by Jill Ireland). McCoy regularly called attention to Spock’s “pointy ears” and green blood. Replace those gibes with ones about skin color or eye shape, and the show’s old-timey country doctor becomes a much different character.

Mr. Nimoy’s documentary includes a scene from the episode “Day of the Dove” in which Scotty, the Enterprise’s irascible engineer, calls Spock a “freak” and screams at him, “Keep your Vulcan hands off me!” Scotty is under the evil control of **alien** forces, but Spock doesn’t know this, so the dig had to sting, Spock’s emotionless Vulcan side notwithstanding.

But the pain had purpose. “That was the civil rights era, when so-called law enforcement officers were using fire hoses and attack dogs,” George Takei, Sulu on the show, said in a phone interview. “Gene Roddenberry was trying to use science fiction as a metaphor for the issues of the day.”

In 1968, a biracial girl wrote to “Mr. Spock,” in care of a teen magazine, explaining her trouble making friends because “my mother is Negro and my father is white.” She wrote, “I know that you are half-Vulcan and half-human and you have suffered because of this.” Mr. Nimoy wrote her a long letter back, telling her to believe in herself and not to let the bigots get her down.

That message resonates with several of those interviewed in “For the Love of Spock,” like the fan Marty Dormany, who “grew up as a skinny gay kid in the South.” Jim Parsons, who plays the uber-nerd Sheldon on “The Big Bang Theory,” talks about his (unsuccessful) attempt to take out a bully with a Vulcan nerve pinch, and Mr. Takei explains why gay viewers continue to see themselves in the (unrequited) bromance between Kirk and Spock.

“Hands down, the most popular reason that people connect to Spock is that he makes them feel like it’s O.K. to be an Other,” Adam Nimoy said. “It’s O.K. to be outside the mainstream. And Spock is cool! Spock is awesome. So that makes you feel a little better about yourself, too.”

\* Review: ‘For the Love of Spock,’ a Son’s Tribute to Leonard Nimoy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/movies/for-the-love-of-spock-review.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(Want to get this briefing by email? Here’s the sign-up[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/nyt-now-morning-briefing].)

Good morning.

Here’s what you need to know:

• An antagonistic first debate.

Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump repeatedly clashed as they promoted two very different visions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/presidential-debate.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=span-abc-region®ion=span-abc-region&WT.nav=span-abc-region] of the country Monday night. Mr. Trump delivered a pointed attack on Mrs. Clinton over her support for free trade agreements, while she pressed him on issues of gender and race, including his years of questioning whether President Obama was born in the U.S.

**Immigration** and health care were barely mentioned.

• Takeaways and analysis.

The showdown amplified Mr. Trump’s role as a political outsider[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/us/politics/debate-highlights.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=span-abc-region®ion=span-abc-region&WT.nav=span-abc-region] and reinforced Mrs. Clinton’s edge on questions about presidential temperament. Our review[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=span-abc-region®ion=span-abc-region&WT.nav=span-abc-region] looks at how the Democratic candidate’s attacks gained strength over the course of the debate.

The candidates accused each other of being untruthful; o[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/fact-check-debate.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=span-abc-region®ion=span-abc-region&WT.nav=span-abc-region] ur fact [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/fact-check-debate.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=span-abc-region®ion=span-abc-region&WT.nav=span-abc-region] check[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/fact-check-debate.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=span-abc-region®ion=span-abc-region&WT.nav=span-abc-region] shows that Mr. Trump stretched the truth more often. The next debate between the two nominees will be Oct. 9, in a town-hall-style format in St. Louis.

• Crisis in Aleppo grows more dire.

An aerial assault on[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/world/middleeast/aleppo-syria.html] the Syrian city’s rebel-held areas[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/world/middleeast/aleppo-syria.html] by government forces and their ally, Russia, is one of the worst in the five-year civil war, residents and rescue workers say.

The use of bunker-busting bombs in recent days has made the situation more desperate, according to an aid group. The U.S. ambassador to the United Nations has accused Russia of “barbarism” for its role in the bombings.

• Crime and policing.

The Charlotte, N.C., Police Department’s handling of an officer’s fatal shooting of Keith Lamont Scott has made the city’s black police chief a target of protesters. Throughout his career, Chief Kerr Putney has spoken openly about having a lifelong distrust of the police[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/kerr-putney-charlotte-police-chief.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fus&action=click&contentCollection=us®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=2&pgtype=sectionfront].

New statistics released by the F.B.I. show that the murder rate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/murder-crime-fbi.html] across the U.S. rose 10.8 percent in 2015. “It’s too early to call this an end to the crime drop, but we are facing a one-year rise in murders that is quite substantial,” a criminologist said.

• Ill-prepared health care system.

One in three Americans is obese, but the quality of treatment for overweight patients is lagging. Part of the problem is a reluctance to look [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/health/obese-patients-health-care.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fhealth&action=click&contentCollection=health®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront] past an obese person’s[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/health/obese-patients-health-care.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fhealth&action=click&contentCollection=health®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront] weight[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/health/obese-patients-health-care.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fhealth&action=click&contentCollection=health®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront], patients and doctors say.

“Our patients say: ‘Nobody has ever treated me like I have a serious problem. They blow it off and tell me to go to Weight Watchers,’ ” one doctor said.

Business

• Several nations, including the U.S. and China, support a deal that would cap greenhouse gas emissions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/business/energy-environment/aviations-paris-moment-as-nations-near-emissions-deal.html] for international flights, a potential major step toward reducing the environmental impact of air travel.

• The Labor Department is suing Palantir Technologies, a prominent data analytics start-up, claiming it discriminated[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/technology/us-accuses-tech-firm-of-bias-against-asian-software-engineers.html?ref=business] against Asian job applicants[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/technology/us-accuses-tech-firm-of-bias-against-asian-software-engineers.html?ref=business]. The move again raises questions about diversity in Silicon Valley.

• As wealth becomes more concentrated in the U.S., the gap between the national 1 percent and the local 1 percent is growing. In other words, the wealthiest people in your area may not be as rich as you think[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/25/business/your-local-1-percenters-may-not-be-as-rich-as-you-think.html].

• U.S. stocks finished down[http://markets.on.nytimes.com/research/markets/usmarkets/usmarkets.asp] on Monday. Here’s a snapshot of global markets[http://markets.on.nytimes.com/research/markets/worldmarkets/worldmarkets.asp].

Noteworthy

• New nonfiction reads.

If you’re curious about the quest to find extraterrestrial intelligent life, here are four new books[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/25/books/review/search-for-extraterrestrial-intelligence.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fbooks&action=click&contentCollection=books®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=6&pgtype=sectionfront] that look at that search, and at some of the scientists behind it.

We also review a pair of offerings that look at why we like[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/books/review/what-the-f-benjamin-k-bergen-in-praise-of-profanity-michael-adams.html] to curse[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/books/review/what-the-f-benjamin-k-bergen-in-praise-of-profanity-michael-adams.html].

• Jewish life in China.

A few hundred residents in Kaifeng have staged a lively, sometimes contentious rebirth of the city’s Jewish heritage in recent decades, with classes, services and proposals to rebuild a lost synagogue as a museum. But the authorities are cracking down on the revival[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/25/world/asia/china-kaifeng-jews.html?action=click&contentCollection=Asia%20Pacific&module=RelatedCoverage®ion=EndOfArticle&pgtype=article].

• Recipe of the day.

Try this pasta dish[http://cooking.nytimes.com/recipes/1017651-pasta-with-fresh-tomato-sauce-and-ricotta] with fresh tomato sauce and ricotta cheese. And in honor of Arnold Palmer, here’s a brief history[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/sports/golf/the-arnold-palmer-two-parts-iced-tea-one-part-lemonade.html?ref=golf&\_r=0] of the drink he made famous.

Back Story

Way before there were hashtag campaigns, televised debates and 24-hour coverage of the presidential race, there was Thomas Nast.

Nast, who was born this week in 1840, is widely considered the father of American political cartooning. As a regular contributor to Harper’s Weekly, he wielded enormous influence, skewering corrupt officials and politicians he opposed.

He introduced the Republican elephant in 1874[http://cartoons.osu.edu/digital\_albums/thomasnast/off\_year.htm], popularized the donkey as a symbol for Democrats[http://cartoons.osu.edu/digital\_albums/thomasnast/kicking\_lion.htm], and was the first to depict Uncle Sam as we know him today, with a beard, top hat and striped pants.

“He was a tremendous force in American politics for more than two decades,” The Times wrote in 1940[http://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1940/09/22/113106028.html?pageNumber=131], for the centennial of Nast’s birth. “He helped to win a war and to elect three presidents of the United States” — Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant (twice) and Rutherford B. Hayes, whom he later abandoned.

Nast also helped bring down the New York politician William M. Tweed, the boss of the rapacious Democratic machine Tammany Hall.

His tactics might seem familiar. “He did it by heaping contempt and ridicule upon the opposing forces and the rival candidates,” The Times said.

Nast, who was born in Germany, was a defender of many **immigrants** and of black Americans, and he was a confirmed foe of the Ku Klux Klan.

The Times article notes that “our ruthless pursuer of evildoers was as kindly as he was explosive. …”

After all, Nast also gave America its vision of Santa Claus[https://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/harp/1225.html].

Charles McDermid contributed reporting.

Your Morning Briefing is published weekdays at 6 a.m. Eastern and updated on the web all morning[http://www.nytimes.com/morningbriefing].

What would you like to see here? Contact us at briefing@nytimes.com[mailto:briefing@nytimes.com].

You can sign up here[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/nyt-now-morning-briefing] to get the briefing delivered to your inbox.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Across Western Europe, marriage equality is fast becoming the norm: From Scandinavia through the Netherlands and Denmark; even the Catholic countries of Ireland, France and Spain. But there’s one glaring exception: Germany[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/germany/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]. It stands out not only because it is the largest country in Western Europe, but also because on many measures, it is among the most progressive.

Germany’s outlier status (it allows “registered partnerships,” but not full marriage) is even more curious because much of the country is in favor. But not its leadership: Chancellor Angela Merkel[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela\_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per] and her party, the Christian Democratic Union, have stood athwart the Continentwide movement and yelled no.

Part of the reason is personal: Ms. Merkel, the daughter of a Protestant pastor, grew up in the former East Germany, where Communism and traditional social mores reinforced the power of the state, and she admits to being extremely conservative on this issue. She has budged on gay rights issues only when forced to do so by the Constitutional Court.

Indeed, her position on gay rights goes beyond marriage equality. Ms. Merkel has also explicitly opposed a proposal that would allow full adoption rights for homosexual couples. Such laws in other European countries are not without their share of controversy, but at least France and other countries grant the right.

Ms. Merkel has clearly decided that it’s better to shore up her support among the country’s older, more conservative voters than to make a pitch to younger Germans, who support marriage equality. In an uncomfortable interview[https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\_continue=5&v=5OemiOryt3c] on YouTube, she stunned the millennial host by telling him condescendingly that there would be no gay marriage (and also no legalization of cannabis) as long as she was in office.

Ms. Merkel has spent the last year pushing her country and neighbors on the refugee issue, and it’s easy to forget that on most issues, she is deeply skeptical of social change. Despite the influx of newcomers, she has resisted any sort of effort to codify the reality of Germany as a country of **immigrants** with a major revision of its outdated **immigration** laws. (Part of that is pragmatism, based on the fear of further fueling right-wing extremism.)

Still, whether Ms. Merkel as a person is truly against gays marrying is an open question. In March, Guido Westerwelle, a former foreign minister under Ms. Merkel who lived in a “registered partnership” and fought hard for gay rights, died of leukemia at the age of 54. Ms. Merkel gave an insightful speech at his funeral, at which his partner, Michael Mronz, was also present. Ms. Merkel may simply feel that she can’t make progress on the issue, so doesn’t try.

But it’s not just a personal matter. Ms. Merkel governs in partnership with the left-wing Social Democrats, who support marriage equality, but in populous Bavaria the conservative wing of the coalition is represented by the C.D.U.’s sister party, the Christian Social Union, which strongly celebrates its closeness to the Roman Catholic faith, the church and its religious customs. At the same time, the party is drifting ever further to the right, embracing openly xenophobic, anti-refugee ideas (to such an extent that the Catholic bishops of Bavaria and the archbishop of Cologne, among the most powerful clergymen in the country, found themselves compelled to reprimand the C.S.U. for its un-Christian conduct).

The C.D.U. is also looking to reinforce its conservative image. In recent years the party has capitulated on several key issues, which until then were considered to lie at the core of their policy: compulsory military service and nuclear energy[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/atomic-energy/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], to name just two prominent examples. There aren’t many such issues left, but marriage equality is one of them. For many in the party, giving in on gay rights would be the equivalent of selling the silverware. Several C.D.U. members have defected to the upstart, far-right Alternative for Germany Party, which upholds the biblical family model and rejects marriage for all.

With the Social Democrats stuck at around 20 percent nationwide, and despite Ms. Merkel’s own ups and downs in the polls and recent losses by the C.D.U. in elections in eastern Germany, her party is on track to win the national elections convincingly next fall. (Of course, if she decides not to run again for the top spot, and a younger, more progressive candidate steps in, the chances for marriage equality could change.)

A result, at least for now, is an odd reversal of Western Europe’s league tables for social progress. Traditionally, it is the Protestant countries of the north that have led on progressive social issues, with the Catholic south dragging behind. This time, though, it is Germany, the leading country in Protestant Europe, that lags the rest. Without a major realignment in German politics, that is unlikely to change for a long time to come.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Alexander Görlach is a visiting scholar at the Center for European Studies at Harvard.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PANTIN, France — Where I live in Pantin, a banlieue, or suburb, northeast of Paris, the brouhaha this summer in France[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/france/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] over the burkini[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/19/opinion/frances-burkini-bigotry.html] — body-covering swimwear whose name is an amalgam of burqa and bikini — seems very much at odds with the positive and inclusive changes occurring here.

In the wake[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/18/world/europe/fighting-for-the-soul-of-france-more-towns-ban-a-bathing-suit-the-burkini.html] of the Bastille Day terrorist attack in Nice that killed 86 people, about 30 French mayors banned the burkini on local beaches, saying it was a “provocation” to see women in Muslim garb when people were still grieving. Senior politicians, from the Socialist prime minister, Manuel Valls, on the left to Les Républicains candidate Nicolas Sarkozy and the National Front candidate Marine Le Pen on the right, vociferously defended the bans.

The politics are obvious. Presidential elections are coming next spring, and suspicion of Muslims is running high. Many feel the country’s culture and values are under attack and see the burkini as a sign of women’s oppression and an affront to French secularism.

The residents of Pantin, located in the department of Seine-St.-Denis, are no strangers to such fears. Radical imams have made inroads here, as elsewhere in France, among an **immigrant** Muslim population suffering from high unemployment and social exclusion. At the same time, the far-right National Front is striving to gain support among a population spooked by terrorism and joblessness. In response, many here have chosen to tackle the problems that feed extremism by encouraging broader participation in cultural and civic life.

Take Djazia Larachiche, who wears a head scarf out of religious conviction and who serves as a member of the advisory council set up by the mayor, Bertrand Kern, to give Pantin residents a voice in local decisions. On a recent visit to a community garden she helped found, she exchanged a “Salaam aleikum” greeting with a man on the street and a warm “Bonjour” with a young French and Irish couple who are part of the garden crew.

When I asked her about the burkini bans, she said: “My first reaction was: Once again, we are the scapegoat, that always focuses on veiled women, as if there were no other problems in France. Some people on the beach are topless. Some are covered. It’s a question of personal liberty.” And she warned: “It’s going to backfire. You exclude people from public life, they will just retreat. It doesn’t help us move in the direction of accepting each other.”

Ms. Larachiche participates in a dance workshop led by Delphine Cammal, a choreographer who co-directs the Compagnie La Mangrove, which uses dance to break down cultural stereotypes and encourage first-generation **immigrants** to express themselves. For Ms. Cammal, the key to living together is creating together. “When diverse people come together to create something new, that really changes the social dynamic,” she said.

A diverse community coming together to create something new is the idea behind the recent move of the French advertising giant BETC out of Paris to the Magasins Généraux, a former grain warehouse in Pantin. Relocating to the banlieue is a bold move, but, for the founding co-chairman Rémi Babinet, Paris’s banlieues represent an opportunity. The company made the choice to move, he said, “because the future of Paris will be largely determined by the banlieue, which is young, entrepreneurial, with a wealth of cultural diversity.”

The warehouse has been renovated to make the building open to the public, with a cobbled “street” running through the ground floor, a radio station, restaurants and a space to host cultural events. The point is inclusion.

Political moves like burkini bans, Mr. Babinet said, only serve to “stigmatize an entire population.” And that would undermine the effort that is underway to reinvent Paris as a metropolis that embraces its surrounding suburbs. At a time of deep anxiety, cultural diversity as it’s lived in Pantin offers an example of a way forward.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Some debates seem to transform the fundamentals of a political campaign. The first clash between Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump was not one of those events.

Rather than shifting the lines of the presidential race, this debate seems likely to deepen them — bolstering Mrs. Clinton’s advantage on questions of temperament and tolerance, and amplifying Mr. Trump’s blustery message of drastic change.

But Mrs. Clinton appeared to gain in strength over the course of the debate, ultimately routing Mr. Trump in a series of late exchanges. Here are some of our key takeaways from the night:

Clinton scored on race, gender and security

Mrs. Clinton seems to have bested Mr. Trump in the debate largely thanks to her mastery of three subjects that have defined her general election campaign: race, gender and national security.

Breaking through in an exchange on race, she battered Mr. Trump for pushing what she called a “racist lie” that President Obama was born outside the United States. Assailing Mr. Trump as sexist, Mrs. Clinton quoted him calling women “pigs, slobs and dogs.” And in a back-and-forth on national security, she accused him repeatedly of risking “another war” with his hot temper, and said he could not be trusted with nuclear weapons.

Mr. Trump struggled to answer the substance of Mrs. Clinton’s criticism, and often appeared thrown by her attacks. His response on national security consisted largely of name-checking various global problem areas, like the Islamic State and Iran, without offering a pointed critique or alternative solution.

Trump is stronger as the outsider

In an uneven and at times flailing debate performance, Mr. Trump had a few moments of strength: He was at his best when he was bringing the fight to Mrs. Clinton on trade policy and her status as a political insider, and delivering blunt calls for wholesale upheaval in Washington.

Mr. Trump hammered Mrs. Clinton early on as an avatar of the status quo. “She’s been doing this for 30 years,” Mr. Trump said repeatedly. Later, he charged: “Our country is suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions.”

But what Mr. Trump has not yet done is convince most Americans that he is the right alternative to a broken political system, and it’s not likely he accomplished that on Monday.

A clash of styles and personalities

He shouted, interrupted and sniffed. She kept a level tone and wielded prefab one-liners.

For all the policy disputes between Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton, it may be the vast difference in their personalities that leaves a deeper impression on voters. Mr. Trump, who dodged policy details, badgered Mrs. Clinton as he did his Republican primary opponents, cutting in to mock and contest her claims. He talked over Lester Holt, the moderator — a performance likely to reinforce his appeal to fans, but unlikely to dispatch doubts about his temperament.

Mrs. Clinton was far more restrained: She declined to match Mr. Trump’s volume when he yelled over her, and several times pointed viewers to the internet for fact-checking purposes, rather than going after Mr. Trump’s misstatements herself.

Notably, for a candidate who has strained to connect with voters on a gut level, Mrs. Clinton repeatedly invoked her father and granddaughter, in what seemed like an effort to cast her views in a more personal light.

Trump defied the facts again

Mr. Trump has faced intensifying scrutiny in recent weeks for his practice of spreading incorrect or misleading information. But he was undeterred on Monday evening and again peddled false claims, including some of his most thoroughly debunked fables[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/09/24/us/elections/donald-trump-statements.html].

In his leadoff answer, Mr. Trump warned that Ford was planning to slash thousands of American jobs to relocate small-car production to Mexico – a claim the company’s chief executive has denied. Mr. Trump insisted that he had not called global warming a hoax perpetrated by China, though he has said precisely that on Twitter. And Mr. Trump repeated numerous times that he was against the war in Iraq from the start, which is plainly contrary to the facts.

Mr. Holt, the staid NBC anchor moderating the debate, stepped in at one point to observe that Mr. Trump had not originally opposed the war. Perhaps surprisingly, Mrs. Clinton allowed several of Mr. Trump’s claims to go unchallenged in their specifics.

The bells that didn’t ring

There were a few glaring omissions from the list of issues covered in the debate – including, remarkably, the defining issue of Mr. Trump’s candidacy.

**Immigration** did not come up even once. Mr. Trump didn’t raise it, and neither Mrs. Clinton nor Mr. Holt challenged him on the subject. While Mrs. Clinton criticized Mr. Trump for demonizing Muslims, neither she nor anyone else mentioned a signature Trump proposal from the Republican primaries, to ban all Muslim **immigration** to the United States.

And in an oversight that would have been unthinkable for any conventional Republican candidate, Mr. Trump did not even mention the Affordable Care Act or the word “Obamacare,” effectively ignoring the defining concern of the Obama-era Republican Party.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump Press Pointed Attacks in Debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

\* How Hillary Clinton Went From Hesitant to Scorching[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump.html]

\* Presidential Debate: Here’s What You Missed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/us/politics/presidential-debate.html]

\* Our Fact Checks of the First Debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/fact-check-debate.html]

\* Lester Holt, Given a Choice Assignment, Opted for Restraint[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/lester-holt-moderator.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**“Debate” is an iffy word for an exercise in which candidates are prompted by moderators to dole out their stump speeches bit by bit under hot lights while a clock counts the seconds and every quip and jab and stumble is used to keep score and proclaim a “winner.”

But when just one candidate is serious and the other is a vacuous bully, the term loses all meaning.

Monday night’s confrontation between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton was a spectacle, for sure: the sheer reality-TV hugeness of it, the Super Bowl audience of tens of millions. “Debate of the Century,” said The Drudge Report. “America on the Brink,” said The Huffington Post. For once, the hype may have been about right, given the tightness of the polls and the nearness of the election.

There was a fundamental asymmetry to the exercise, because of the awful truth that one of the participants had nothing truthful to offer. But seeing them on the same stage distilled exactly who they have been throughout this campaign.

Standing at the lectern, interrupting and shouting, playing the invisible accordion with his open hands, filibustering, tossing his word salads — jobs and terrorism and Nafta and China and everything is terrible — Mr. Trump said a lot. But as the debate wore on, he struggled to contend with an opponent who was much more poised and prepared than any of the Republicans he faced in the primaries.

Ninety minutes was never going to be enough time for Mr. Trump to redeem his candidacy, even if by some miracle he had wanted to, if he had suddenly developed a coherent set of policies and principles, an agenda against which Mrs. Clinton’s proposals could be weighed and reviewed, and a baseline level of decency.

The moderator, Lester Holt of NBC News, announced the preset themes of “achieving prosperity,” “America’s direction” and “securing America,” then meekly retreated into silence as Mr. Trump went on the attack, blaming Mrs. Clinton for ISIS and joblessness and globalization, depicting the country as a living hell for black Americans, a land beset by illegal **immigrants** and gangs with guns, with police officers afraid to stop them. “It’s all sound bites,” he said at one point, meaning to disparage Mrs. Clinton, but unwittingly describing the emptiness of his own words.

Depending on how your lenses are polarized, Mr. Trump met/exceeded/failed to meet expectations, which were low to begin with. He has lied compulsively since he entered the race, and he was caught again on Monday night with his pants on fire (repeating, among other lies, his slander that Mrs. Clinton invented the birther slur against President Obama). But anything short of dropping his pants in the Hofstra University auditorium would still have left him with the support of a large portion of the American electorate.

Mrs. Clinton also met/exceeded/failed to meet expectations, which were different for her. She had to have just enough levity, mixed with substance, to be stern but not shrill, funny but not flippant, smart but not pedantic, able to stand up to bullying. On balance, she pulled it off, swatting his attacks aside and confidently delivering her own criticisms from higher, firmer ground.

A more appealing and competent set of primary candidates might have stopped this. A responsible Republican Party, mindful of the national interest, not obsessed with thwarting President Obama, might have stopped it. In a better political era, both parties — not just the Democrats — would have nominated qualified candidates who could answer Americans’ concerns about terrorism and war, climate and the economy, **immigration** and racial healing, education and public safety.

But not this year. The Republican field was winnowed to the worst of the worst. Which gave the debate its strange, potentially tragic dimension. It’s absurd that the fate of the race, and the future of the nation, might carom this way or that based on a 90-minute television ritual so tainted by falsehoods.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Corrections Appended

Should it come as a surprise that not one chief executive among the Fortune 100 has donated money to Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s campaign?

That was the news reported by The Wall Street Journal[http://www.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/articles/no-fortune-100-ceos-back-republican-donald-trump-1474671842] over the weekend after tabulating the latest donation disclosures through August.

Mr. Trump’s supporters trumpeted, excuse the pun, the lack of donations from the nation’s largest companies as a badge of honor. Big business, they say, has failed the country, so why would their guy want its support?

But the logic of this argument is backward. Mr. Trump has campaigned as a successful businessman, a brilliant negotiator and someone, as he said in his own words, who can “get along with people.” He has contended that his economic policies will unleash unheard-of levels of growth — as much as 6 percent. He plans to lower corporate taxes, remove regulations and allow companies to repatriate cash held overseas. Together, these policies sound like a C.E.O.’s dream.

And yet here we are: Many of the most successful business people in the country refuse to support him — or do business with him, either.

This is not an opinion. In case there is any doubt, here is a list of companies that in the last two years have publicly severed or reduced business relationships with Mr. Trump, mostly over his inflammatory rhetoric: Macy’s, Univision, Comcast’s NBCUniversal, Serta, Disney’s ESPN, the PGA Tour, Nascar and Perfumania.

Those companies, which have customer bases that include broad swaths of the nation that ostensibly look like the electorate, all said some variation of what Macy’s said: “In light of statements made by Donald Trump, which are inconsistent with Macy’s values, we have decided to discontinue our business relationship with Mr. Trump.”

As this column has noted[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/26/business/dealbook/one-thing-both-parties-want-break-up-the-banks-again.html] previously, virtually no big United States banking institution has done new business with Mr. Trump in years, in part because of his history of bankruptcies and his penchant for litigation. During orientation for new employees, Goldman Sachs specifically used to use Mr. Trump as an example of the kind of prospective client to avoid.

Still, based on Mr. Trump’s policies, you would think that companies like Apple or Nike, which have railed for lower taxes and are pining to bring tens of billions dollars stashed abroad back to the United States, would be kneeling at the altar of Mr. Trump. (Apple’s and Nike’s chief executives have contributed to Mrs. Clinton.)

Granted, there are his views on **immigration** and trade, which aren’t in sync with United States multinational companies that manufacture products abroad. But then again, Mrs. Clinton opposes the Trans-Pacific Partnership too, so that doesn’t provide much of a choice.

Jeffrey Immelt, General Electric’s chief executive, who employed Mr. Trump on “The Apprentice” when G.E. owned NBC, was asked by Vanity Fair about him over the summer. “The Donald Trump that I had a chance to work with, I found to be fun to work with,” he said. “The words? I can’t reconcile with anything I believe in, or that I think the country stands for or that the company stands for.”

By the way, this was Mr. Trump’s reply last year to businesses that stopped doing business with him: “Macy’s, NBC, Serta and Nascar have all taken the weak and very sad position of being politically correct even though they are wrong in terms of what is good for our country.” (I should note here that I co-anchor “Squawk Box” on CNBC, which is a unit of NBCUniversal.)

In fairness, it is worth pointing out that only 11 C.E.O.s of the Fortune 100 donated to Hillary Clinton, according to The Journal. Mr. Trump does have support from some businessmen like Jack Welch, Carl C. Icahn and Wilbur Ross, among others.

But for a group that has historically leaned Republican, the absence of contributions is eye-opening, particularly since at least 19 of them gave to the other Republican candidates in the primaries.

There is a good reason, wholly unrelated to political correctness, that the business community has not rallied around Mr. Trump’s economic plans. On its merits, that plan is expected to hurt the economy, according to nonpartisan economists. It is hard to find many serious economists, except a handful mostly advising his campaign, who say otherwise.

According to the Committee for a Responsible Budget, a nonpartisan think tank that includes a list of luminaries from both sides of the aisle, Mr. Trump’s economic plan would add $5.3 trillion to our national debt. That compares with $200 billion as a result of Mrs. Clinton’s plan.

“Both Clinton and Trump would increase the debt relative to current law— though Trump would increase it by an order of magnitude more, and Clinton’s plan would slightly reduce deficits if we incorporated unspecified revenue from business tax reform,” the committee wrote.

None of this column is meant to suggest that Mrs. Clinton’s economic plan will usher in a new age of stupendous growth. It won’t. It doesn’t fully address the need for corporate tax reform, and it won’t bring many companies out from under the regulatory morass that they suffer. It won’t bring trillions of dollars back from abroad. Her plan is unlikely to pump up the economy much compared with the path that we are currently on. It is very possible some of her policy measures could even slow the economy.

And finally — again — there is the issue of trade. A centerpiece of Mr. Trump’s economic agenda is renegotiating many of the country’s trade agreements. In a new report published by his campaign, Mr. Trump’s advisers suggest he would threaten, for example, to leave the World Trade Organization to get a better deal. “Without the U.S. as a member, there would not be much purpose to the W.T.O.,” the advisers wrote.

There is no question that the country would be improved by better trade pacts, but Mr. Trump’s risky approach could start a trade war that could be disastrous for the country’s largest companies. And the uncertainty of the negotiations themselves could slow the economy and rattle our foreign neighbors; just look at the resignation of Mexico’s minister of finance for helping bring Mr. Trump there to meet-and-greet with the Mexican president. Other countries will want to avoid similar situations in which they could look like they are caving in to Mr. Trump. (By the way, for those who say, “Who cares about what happens to big businesses that outsource anyway?” think about all the money in all those 401(k) plans that is invested in them.)

The Trump economic report cites the Business Roundtable, a lobbying group representing big business, and its complaints about regulatory burdens. The suggestion is that big business will back Mr. Trump, since he plans to reduce regulation. Yet it is hardly clear the Business Roundtable supports him. The organization has not endorsed either candidate, and its chief executive, John Engler, told The New York Times over the summer: “We’re just on the opposite side of Trump on trade and **immigration**.”

Mr. Trump, the self-described great negotiator, may brush aside the views of the country’s leading business executives — but perhaps that is because he hasn’t been able to strike a deal with them.

Correction: September 28, 2016, Wednesday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: The DealBook column on Tuesday, about a relative lack of support for Donald J. Trump from other businessmen, misstated, in some copies, the period of time for which The Wall Street Journal tabulated donation disclosures. It was through August, not through Aug. 11.

Correction: September 30, 2016, Friday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: The DealBook column on Tuesday, about a relative lack of support for Donald J. Trump from other businessmen, misidentified one of the organizations that has curbed ties with Mr. Trump in the last two years. It is the PGA Tour, not the PGA of America.

\* Donald Trump’s Pick for Fund-Raiser Is Rife With Contradictions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/10/business/dealbook/donald-trumps-pick-for-fund-raiser-is-rife-with-contradictions.html]

\* One Thing Both Parties Want: To Break Up the Banks Again[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/26/business/dealbook/one-thing-both-parties-want-break-up-the-banks-again.html]

\* Trump and Pence: On the Same Ticket, but Not on the Same Page[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/19/business/dealbook/trump-and-pence-on-the-same-ticket-but-not-on-the-same-page.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Donald Trump began his improbable run for president 15 months ago, he offered his wealth and television celebrity as credentials, then slyly added a twist of fearmongering about Mexican “rapists” flooding across the Southern border.

From that moment of combustion, it became clear that Mr. Trump’s views were matters of dangerous impulse and cynical pandering rather than thoughtful politics. Yet he has attracted throngs of Americans who ascribe higher purpose to him than he has demonstrated in a freewheeling campaign marked by bursts of false and outrageous allegations, personal insults, xenophobic nationalism, unapologetic sexism and positions that shift according to his audience and his whims.

Now here stands Mr. Trump, feisty from his runaway Republican primary victories and ready for the first presidential debate, scheduled for Monday night, with Hillary Clinton. It is time for others who are still undecided, and perhaps hoping for some dramatic change in our politics and governance, to take a hard look and see Mr. Trump for who he is. They have an obligation to scrutinize his supposed virtues as a refreshing counterpolitician. Otherwise, they could face the consequences of handing the White House to a man far more consumed with himself than with the nation’s well-being.

Here’s how Mr. Trump is selling himself and why he can’t be believed.

A financial wizard who can bring executive magic to government?

Despite his towering properties, Mr. Trump has a record rife with bankruptcies and sketchy ventures like Trump University, which authorities are investigating after numerous complaints of fraud. His name has been chiseled off his failed casinos in Atlantic City.

Mr. Trump’s brazen refusal to disclose his tax returns — as Mrs. Clinton and other nominees for decades have done — should sharpen voter wariness of his business and charitable operations. Disclosure would undoubtedly raise numerous red flags; the public record already indicates that in at least some years he made full use of available loopholes and paid no taxes.

Mr. Trump has been opaque about his questionable global investments in Russia and elsewhere, which could present conflicts of interest as president, particularly if his business interests are left in the hands of his children, as he intends. Investigations have found self-dealing. He notably tapped $258,000 in donors’ money from his charitable foundation to settle lawsuits involving his for-profit businesses, according to The Washington Post[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-used-258000-from-his-charity-to-settle-legal-problems/2016/09/20/adc88f9c-7d11-11e6-ac8e-cf8e0dd91dc7\_story.html?tid=pm\_pop\_b].

A straight talker who tells it like it is?

Mr. Trump, who has no experience in national security, declares that he has a plan to soundly defeat the Islamic State militants in Syria, but won’t reveal it, bobbing and weaving about whether he would commit ground troops. Voters cannot judge whether he has any idea what he’s talking about without an outline of his plan, yet Mr. Trump ludicrously insists he must not tip off the enemy.

Another of his cornerstone proposals — his campaign pledge of a “total and complete shutdown” of Muslim newcomers plus the deportation of 11 million undocumented **immigrants** across a border wall paid for by Mexico — has been subjected to endless qualifications as he zigs and zags in pursuit of middle-ground voters.

Whatever his gyrations, Mr. Trump always does make clear where his heart lies — with the anti-**immigrant**, nativist and racist signals that he scurrilously employed to build his base.

He used the shameful “birther” campaign against President Obama’s legitimacy as a wedge for his candidacy. But then he opportunistically denied his own record, trolling for undecided voters by conceding that Mr. Obama was a born American. In the process[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/17/opinion/donald-trumps-latest-birther-lie.html] he tried to smear Mrs. Clinton as the instigator of the birther canard and then fled reporters’ questions.

Since his campaign began, NBC News[http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/full-list-donald-trump-s-rapidly-changing-policy-positions-n547801] has tabulated that Mr. Trump has made 117 distinct policy shifts on 20 major issues, including three contradictory views on abortion in one eight-hour stretch. As reporters try to pin down his contradictions, Mr. Trump has mocked them at his rallies. He said he would “loosen” libel laws[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/04/us/politics/donald-trump-constitution-power.html] to make it easier to sue news organizations that displease him.

An expert negotiator who can fix government and overpower other world leaders?

His plan for cutting the national debt was far from a confidence builder: He said he might try to persuade[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/07/us/politics/donald-trumps-idea-to-cut-national-debt-get-creditors-to-accept-less.html] creditors to accept less than the government owed. This fanciful notion, imported from Mr. Trump’s debt-steeped real estate world, would undermine faith in the government and the stability of global financial markets. His tax-cut plan has been no less alarming. It was initially estimated to cost $10 trillion in tax revenue, then, after revisions, maybe $3 trillion, by one adviser’s estimate. There is no credible indication of how this would be paid for — only assurances that those in the upper brackets will be favored.

If Mr. Trump were to become president, his open doubts about the value of NATO would present a major diplomatic and security challenge, as would his repeated denunciations of trade deals and relations with China. Mr. Trump promises to renegotiate the Iran nuclear control agreement, as if it were an air-rights deal on Broadway. Numerous experts on national defense and international affairs have recoiled at the thought of his commanding the nuclear arsenal. Former Secretary of State Colin Powell privately called[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/us/politics/colin-powell-emails-hack-donald-trump.html] Mr. Trump “an international pariah.” Mr. Trump has repeatedly denounced global warming as a “hoax,” although a golf course he owns in Ireland is citing global warming in seeking to build a protective wall against a rising sea.

In expressing admiration for the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, Mr. Trump implies acceptance of Mr. Putin’s dictatorial abuse of critics and dissenters, some of whom have turned up murdered, and Mr. Putin’s vicious crackdown on the press. Even worse was Mr. Trump’s urging Russia[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/28/us/politics/donald-trump-russia-clinton-emails.html] to meddle in the presidential campaign by hacking the email of former Secretary of State Clinton. Voters should consider what sort of deals Mr. Putin might obtain if Mr. Trump, his admirer, wins the White House.

A change agent for the nation and the world?

There can be little doubt of that. But voters should be asking themselves if Mr. Trump will deliver the kind of change they want. Starting a series of trade wars is a recipe for recession, not for new American jobs. Blowing a hole in the deficit by cutting taxes for the wealthy will not secure Americans’ financial future, and **alienating** our allies won’t protect our security. Mr. Trump has also said he will get rid of the new national health insurance system that millions now depend on, without saying how he would replace it.

The list goes on: He would scuttle the financial reforms and consumer protections born of the Great Recession. He would upend the Obama administration’s progress on the environment, vowing to “cancel the Paris climate agreement” on global warming. He would return to the use of waterboarding, a torture method, in violation of international treaty law. He has blithely called for reconsideration of Japan’s commitment not to develop nuclear weapons. He favors a national campaign[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/22/us/politics/donald-trump-don-king-black-voters.html] of “stop and frisk” policing, which has been ruled unconstitutional. He has blessed the National Rifle Association’s ambition to arm citizens to engage in what he imagines[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/14/opinion/sunday/donald-trump-courts-the-gun-zealots.html] would be defensive “shootouts” with gunmen. He has so coarsened our politics that he remains a contender for the presidency despite musing about his opponent as a gunshot target.

Voters should also consider Mr. Trump’s silence about areas of national life that are crying out for constructive change: How would he change our schools for the better? How would he lift more Americans out of poverty? How would his condescending appeal to black voters — a cynical signal to white moderates concerned about his racist supporters — translate into credible White House initiatives to promote racial progress? How would his call to monitor and even close some mosques affect the nation’s life and global reputation? Would his Supreme Court nominees be zealous, self-certain extensions of himself? In all these areas, Mrs. Clinton has offered constructive proposals. He has offered bluster, or nothing. The most specific domestic policy he has put forward, on tax breaks for child care, would tilt toward the wealthy.

Voters attracted by the force of the Trump personality should pause and take note of the precise qualities he exudes as an audaciously different politician: bluster, savage mockery of those who challenge him, degrading comments about women, mendacity, crude generalizations about nations and religions. Our presidents are role models for generations of our children. Is this the example we want for them?

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

\* Hillary Clinton for President[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/25/opinion/sunday/hillary-clinton-for-president.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PINGTANG COUNTY, China — When hundreds of engineers and builders began clambering up a jagged hill in southwest China to assemble a giant telescope in a deep, bowl-shaped basin, poor villagers sometimes crept over the sheer slopes to glimpse the country’s latest technological wonder.

“We’ve never seen anything like it, never imagined it,” said one of the villagers, Huang Zhangrong, a sun-gnarled 66-year-old carpenter. “It’s a big circle, a big iron wok.”

The wok is the world’s largest single-dish radio telescope, and it officially began operating on Sunday, accompanied by jubilant national television coverage, after more than five years of construction. The “Five-hundred-meter Aperture Spherical Telescope[http://fast.bao.ac.cn/en/],” FAST for short, is intended to project China’s scientific ambitions deep into the universe, bringing back dramatic discoveries and honors like Nobel Prizes[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/nobel\_prizes/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

Maybe even messages from **aliens**.

The telescope, which is in a majestic but impoverished part of Guizhou Province, embodies China’s plans to rise as a scientific power. The dish is made of 4,450 intricately positioned triangular panels and has a collecting area of 2.1 million square feet[http://phys.org/news/2016-06-csiro-turbocharging-world-largest-radio.html], equal to almost 450 basketball courts. At 1,640 feet in diameter, it will be roughly twice as sensitive[https://theconversation.com/china-completes-worlds-largest-radio-telescope-raising-hopes-of-finding-new-worlds-and-alien-life-62237] as the world’s next-biggest single-dish radio telescope, the Arecibo Observatory[http://www.naic.edu/outreach/describe\_fset.htm] in Puerto Rico, which is 1,000 feet across.

Astronomers will use the Guizhou telescope to map the shape and formation of the universe, relying on its large size and a mobile detector suspended above the dish to explore space more quickly, deeply and thoroughly than smaller telescopes. The telescope cost $184 million, recent Chinese state media reports[http://tech.qq.com/a/20150729/009028.htm] said, although that figure seems unduly modest, given its size. To ensure the project remains undisturbed, more than 9,000 people[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/18/world/asia/china-fast-telescope-guizhou-relocation.html] are being moved by the government.

Chinese science is often seen as serving the country’s economic and military expansion, seeking ruthlessly practical dividends.

But the telescope shows the government in Beijing is also willing to spend heavily to propel China high into the big leagues in research that offers few direct payoffs, apart from knowledge and prestige.

“Astronomy is an ultimate expression of ‘pure’ science that has little immediate practical benefits,” Luis C. Ho[http://kiaa.pku.edu.cn/~lho/?q=home], the director of the Kavli Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics at Peking University, said by email. “It is a luxury that only the most advanced economies enjoy.”

China’s history of subjugation to the West in previous centuries reinforced the belief that scientific prowess is essential for any modern power. And studying the heavens was, after all, an area where China excelled in ancient times.

“Now we’re racing to catch up and want to recreate the glories of our ancestors by reviving our astronomy,” Zhang Chengmin[http://sourcedb.naoc.cas.cn/en/enaoexpert/200907/t20090706\_2000336.html], an astrophysicist at the National Astronomical Observatories of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, said in an interview. “China isn’t just an economic power; it is also becoming a scientific power.”

Astronomy, however, also depends on international cooperation. Despite Chinese hoopla about the telescope as homegrown technology, it also uses foreign equipment. The receiver, a crucial part, is Australian technology. Foreign scientists will be invited to work on research, and many of the telescope’s big projects will draw on international collaboration.

“Radio astronomy is a very international field,” said Douglas Bock[https://www.csiro.au/en/Research/Astronomy/People], a senior astronomer at Australia’s Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, which built the receiver[http://www.csiro.au/en/News/News-releases/2016/Australian-technology-behind-the-worlds-largest-telescope]. “The science collaborations naturally lead to many deeper technical collaborations on instrumentation and new telescopes.”

The soluble rock that covers this part of Guizhou has dissolved and eroded over eons into jutting hills with natural cavities. The spectacular terrain has also trapped residents in hard, isolated lives, farming corn and honeysuckle in the narrow strips of land among the hills.

But the terrain also offers a nearly ideal environment for a radio telescope. The population is sparse, and the hills are a natural barrier against radio noise and wind that could upset the delicate instruments needed to catch whispers from deep in space.

Even so, not all of the thousands of people being moved for the telescope want to go.

“I’ve lived here all my life. My ancestors arrived here in the Qing dynasty over 200 years ago,” said Mr. Huang, the carpenter, who lives in Miaoping village. He said local villagers had complained that the housing they had been offered in a town down the road was poorly built. “We don’t want to leave, but the government says it’s for the good of the country.”

In return for the farmers’ pain, Chinese scientists will have a vast and powerful scientific instrument that they hope will make breakthroughs in some of the biggest mysteries of the universe.

“We’re definitely aiming for innovative results as quickly as possible, unearthing its potential for Nobel Prize-grade discoveries,” Di Li[http://sourcedb.naoc.cas.cn/cn/naoexpert/201108/t20110829\_3328999.html], a leading scientist on the FAST project, told Xinhua[http://world.people.com.cn/n/2015/0727/c157278-27368540.html], the state news agency, last year.

The telescope is part of an array of projects to raise China’s standing as a scientific power through big, expensive feats of scientific exploration.

The space program aims to send an astronaut to the moon by 2025[http://www.china.org.cn/china/news/2009-05/24/content\_17825157.htm] or later and to land an unmanned vehicle on Mars in 2020[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2016-08/24/c\_135627828.htm]. Chinese scientists plan to build[http://english.caixin.com/2016-05-13/100943237.html] the world’s biggest particle accelerator. And there may be more radio telescopes, including in Tibet[http://news.xinhuanet.com/politics/2016-06/16/c\_1119057849.htm].

Using the new reach of the telescope in Guizhou, astronomers hope to better measure the distribution of neutral hydrogen atoms, like a telltale cosmic dust.

“Previous research could only tell us that the universe is expanding,” Zhang Tongjie[http://202.112.85.102/sites/zhangtongjie/], a professor of cosmology at Beijing Normal University who plans to use the telescope, said in an interview.

If the telescope can be used to survey electromagnetic radiation from neutral hydrogen, he said, Chinese scientists would be well positioned to gain a much more accurate grasp of how fast the universe is expanding. “That would be very significant,” he said.

Astronomers also hope to use the telescope to locate thousands more pulsars, the highly magnetized neutron stars that rotate[http://imagine.gsfc.nasa.gov/science/objects/pulsars1.html], creating a metronome-like pulse that is a boon to measurements. By better measuring pulsars, and more of them, the telescope could open up a new way to explore the long-elusive gravitational waves predicted by Einstein’s general theory of relativity.

Only early this year, an international team of scientists announced[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/12/science/ligo-gravitational-waves-black-holes-einstein.html] that they had captured evidence of gravitational waves. But the pulsar research would offer another way to make progress, perhaps confirming and refining that discovery.

“This telescope offers the first time that China will have an unsurpassed opportunity to be at the international forefront of deep space exploration,” said Mr. Zhang, the astrophysicist.

Most alluring to the public may be the search for extraterrestrial civilizations, from signals that accidentally reach Earth or from messages sent here. The new telescope opens up the possibility that the first human leader to respond to a message from **alien** life could be President Xi Jinping of China.

But **alien** life is not a focus for now. Initially, the scientists running the telescope will scan the skies to test and calibrate their equipment, and researchers involved in the international effort to explore for intelligent life on distant planets will “piggyback” to sift for signals, Dan Werthimer[http://astro.berkeley.edu/researcher-profile/2631939-dan-werthimer], the chief scientist of the SETI Research Center at the University of California, Berkeley, which engages in the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, said in a telephone interview.

“They’re very keen to collaborate,” he said. “We can use the telescope at the same time that they’re doing more traditional astronomy to look for E.T.”

But astronomers said it could take years before the telescope in Guizhou starts making breakthroughs. It could take a year or two for the scientists and technicians to tweak and debug the complex equipment so that the telescope can work at full strength, they said.

“It would be premature to want to catch up with international standards in one jump,” said Wu Xuebing[http://astro.pku.edu.cn/~wuxb/], a professor of astrophysics at Peking University. “A country’s scientific advancement requires a certain accumulation of time.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

If there was one child Mohammad Rahami had to worry about bringing shame upon the family, it was Ahmad. In the fifth grade, his teacher complained to Mr. Rahami that Ahmad acted like a king in class. In junior high, he broke a friend’s nose. Even worse was high school — after Mr. Rahami arranged for Ahmad to marry a good Afghan girl from Kabul, Ahmad dated a Dominican girl, getting her pregnant in his senior year.

The shame. They had falling-outs, so many of them. In the beginning, because Ahmad was just becoming too American for his conservative Afghan parents, who had moved to New Jersey after Mr. Rahami fought in Afghanistan against the Soviets as part of the mujahedeen in the 1980s. And then, in the last few years, they fell out over much darker fears. Ahmad spent hours watching videos on the internet espousing violent jihad, embracing some of the most prominent purveyors of that message: Bin Laden, Awlaki, Adnani, the men who in that world needed no first names. Mr. Rahami said he asked Ahmad to stop.

“This is wrong,” Mr. Rahami recalled telling his son, one of eight children. “You don’t know if they are real Muslims. You shouldn’t watch them. You have nothing to do with them.”

But nothing stopped Ahmad Khan Rahami, 28, who now stands accused of bombings in New York[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/nyregion/chelsea-explosion-new-york-city.html] and New Jersey and a string of other attempts[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/nyregion/new-york-explosion-chelsea.html]: not Mr. Rahami’s entreaties to his second-oldest son that such a fascination with jihadi videos was “a disease,” and not the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s open-and-shut investigation[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/nyregion/ahmad-khan-rahami-bombing.html] into Ahmad in 2014.

In many ways, Ahmad’s story is similar to those of the perpetrators of other recent terrorist attacks in the United States and Europe: a disaffected first-generation **immigrant**, straddling two worlds and unable to fit into either; a young man who had not yet found a meaningful path in life, easily recruited into a cause that promised divine rewards. It is particularly similar to the life of Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, the popular, outgoing high school student sentenced to death a few years after graduation for his role in the 2013 bombing of the Boston Marathon[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/b/boston\_marathon/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

But Ahmad’s story has nuances, showing how difficult it was for him to make it in America while trying to break out of his conservative family, something, for a while, he seemed to want desperately. His earliest rebellion was not against the West. It was against his father, a conservative, proud man who tried to run his family like he would have back home. And then, later, Ahmad gave up that fight for another, seemingly seeking out jihad on his own and spurning the country that had welcomed his family as refugees.

In his recent planning, Ahmad appeared to be isolated and occasionally conflicted. There was no brother to lead him, as in the case of Mr. Tsarnaev. No terrorist cell appeared to be actively helping him. No wife bent on jihad as well, as with the couple in the December shootings in San Bernardino, Calif. No group rushed to claim him or his attacks. Not Al Qaeda and not the Islamic State, despite Ahmad’s praise of figures from both groups in the notebook found on him. That notebook also showed his fear: that he would be caught before he completed his mission, the authorities said.

So what turned Ahmad, the class clown, the man who once wanted to be a police officer or a translator for the United States military, into the man now accused of orchestrating the most serious terrorist strike in New York City since the Sept. 11 attacks? Much remains unanswered, but one thing is certain from interviews with his father and friends: He found jihad on the internet, at a time when there was nothing particularly bad in his life, but nothing particularly good.

Struggling to Advance

His life was standing in place. Even as his brothers moved on, graduated from college, drove for Uber, Ahmad was stuck. He tried jobs and failed, and ultimately fell back on the one thing he knew, and wanted to get away from: his family’s fried-chicken business. Years of small indignities piled up, the minor court cases, like the one with the neighbor who allegedly conned him in a small-time bank swindle that involved transferring someone else’s money to him and paying her back. He asked her in a text message, “Yo this is solely your money tho rite.” (It was not.)

There were two main phases of Ahmad’s life — before he started watching the videos in 2013 and after, as he grew ever more radical.

As a teenager, Ahmad embraced America. To his friends, he was not Ahmad — he was Mad or Ack. He wore baggy jeans, Air Jordans and hoodies, sent slangy text messages proclaiming “na meen,” instead of “know what I mean.” He was a cutup, a clown. He had girlfriends. He wrote love poems in a spiral notebook.

Back then, Mr. Rahami’s desire to send Ahmad to Afghanistan as a way to bring him into a right way of thinking and curb his excesses was seen as a threat, as a punishment, not as a gateway to an extremist cause.

But then came the last trip.

In April 2013, Ahmad left for a nearly yearlong stay in Pakistan. While there, he took trips to Turkey and Afghanistan, according to **immigration** and law enforcement officials in Pakistan and the United States. A relative in Quetta, Pakistan, where Ahmad was staying, began to fret about what was becoming of him, his father said. Ahmad had fallen under the sway of a radical cleric in Quetta, a man called Mullah Qudri, according to a close relative in Afghanistan, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to avoid upsetting family members.

Ahmad came home, angry and violent. A few months later, he stabbed his mother, a brother and a sister. His father was so worried that he talked to the F.B.I. But then, with that investigation closed, Mr. Rahami tried to reconcile with his son. This is a tightknit Afghan family, after all — a father will forgive many things in a son.

By this year, Ahmad seemed to be doing better. He agreed to take over his father’s fried-chicken restaurant. He even moved into a room in the family apartment upstairs.

And then, over the summer, he put a lock on the door.

**Immigrant** Travails

The story of the Rahami family is a typical one for the Afghan diaspora, tracing the fallout from the wars in Afghanistan.

Mohammad Rahami, a Pashtun from Kandahar, joined the fight against the Soviet occupation in Afghanistan shortly after the Soviets invaded in 1979, when he was only 16. In the war, backed by the United States, he fought both with Hezb-i-Islami, or the Islamic Party, comprised mainly of ethnic Pashtuns, and with a faction of the Jamiat-e-Islami, or Islamic Society, led by Burhanuddin Rabbani, who would become Afghanistan’s president during the civil war in the 1990s.

Mr. Rahami would later show a prized photograph to a neighbor who served in the Marines in Afghanistan: of himself as a young man, a traditional brown pakol perched on his head, with three or four other men, all brandishing AK-47 rifles.

In 1984, Mr. Rahami moved his home base over the Pakistan border into Quetta, a city teeming with refugees, one that would later become a stronghold for militants. He settled with his wife, Najiba, and other family members.

The Rahamis started a family, first a daughter, Aziza, then a son, Mohammad Khan. Ahmad was born in 1988. Najiba was pregnant in 1989, with another son, Qasim, when Mr. Rahami left Pakistan for New Jersey to claim refugee status, about the time that the Soviets fled Afghanistan. He was all of 26 years old, and his war, his own jihad, was already behind him.

Najiba and their four children followed in 1995. Four more children would come later.

They endured the travails of so many **immigrants** with little education: hard work, a confusing legal system, limited opportunity and a sea of slights for things that would make no sense back home. Mr. Rahami moved his family from one home to the next one on the New Jersey ladder, from the sprawling Ivy Hill apartment complex in Newark to the Galloping Hill Estates subdivision in Union to the Blueberry Village apartments in Edison, names that all evoked possibility and peace. But all the while, problems piled up: the small lawsuits, his children’s run-ins with the police, and Ahmad, always Ahmad.

Mr. Rahami made his way in America like many Afghans at the time in the New York area: in fried chicken, just like the Afghans who started Kennedy Fried Chicken, the shop that has spawned hundreds of fried-chicken restaurants since the first one opened in the 1970s. When Afghans first arrived, they would work for another more-established Afghan, and then they would join together with other Afghan workers to start their own chicken restaurants, to be their own bosses, with aspirational names like Royal Fried Chicken, formerly known as Hollywood Fried Chicken.

“In the community, it’s a good way to get started,” said Mohammed El-Sioufi, who incorporated businesses in New Jersey, including one of Mr. Rahami’s first ones in Newark.

So in the 1990s, Mr. Rahami helped run Tasty Pizza & Fried Chicken. In 2002, he would open his flagship, which was really just a hole in the wall, named for the country that embraced him as a refugee: First American Fried Chicken. Within two years, he had joined a Kennedy Fried Chicken franchise in Asbury Park. Other relatives opened chicken shops. His sons would work in all of them, long hours into the night.

The family lived for nine years in Ivy Hill, a magnet for first-generation **immigrants**. Ahmad was known to neighbors as the kid who tagged along with his big brother. Mohammad, older by about two years, was tall and skinny. Ahmad was short and plump, his weight something that would continue to bother him. When they saw their elders, they would both say “salaam,” a respectful greeting. When they saw their friends, it was, “Hey, what’s up guys?” They played basketball and went to the park. With their parents, they spoke Pashto, a neighbor recalled.

The apartment complex allowed its Muslim residents to create a mosque in the basement. They put carpets down and installed air-conditioners and called it the Ivy Hills Masjid. The Rahami children wore jeans and T-shirts most of the time but traditional clothes on Fridays, for the most important Islamic prayer of the week.

“You line them up, it was like the von Trapp family, times two,” said Ken Creegan, a regular at the chicken restaurant who became friendly with the family.

Ahmad was interested in politics in his teens, said a close friend who has known him for about 15 years and who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he did not want to get swept up in the investigation. He railed against Pakistan and its main intelligence agency, the Inter-Services Intelligence directorate, better known as the ISI, which he blamed, like many Afghans, for messing up his ancestral land.

“As a teenager, he was angry at Pakistan, saying ISI created the Taliban — he was angry about it,” the friend said.

Wayward Son

Little nuisances always seemed to snowball for the Rahamis.

Some of the issues should have been simple enough to fix, like the $242 gas bill from Tasty Pizza & Fried Chicken in July 1998. The elder Mr. Rahami did not pay it. He let it haunt him for six years, until the gas company finally sued him.

Then there was the matter of being sued by a man who claimed he broke a tooth on a hamburger at Kennedy Fried Chicken. That was a minor irritant, really, but it came just days after Aziza, his eldest daughter, a high school junior, was arrested on suspicion of taking about $565 worth of jewelry and perfume from a Filene’s store. Not only that, a brief about it ran in a newspaper, although the outcome of the case is unclear.

The year 2004 was not a great one for the family: Despite all his business endeavors, Mr. Rahami said he earned only $10,000, a court filing showed. Just try raising eight children on that.

Mr. Rahami filed for bankruptcy in October 2005, a decision that for a prideful Pashtun man had to have been tough to make. He owed almost $46,000, for things like a Macy’s card and a doctor in Union, N.J., and a 1999 Chevrolet Suburban. He claimed to earn only $1,447.33 a month from his chicken restaurant, somehow feeding his family on $200 of that. He had just $100 in the bank.

Ahmad was also becoming a source of anxiety. The teenager had enjoyed his popularity with a certain group of girls, a male friend said, and the attention “sometimes puffed up his head.” His father fretted that he was absorbing too many of the negative aspects of American culture.

So off Ahmad went to relatives in Quetta in the beginning of what should have been his junior year, his first trip out of America in five years.

He stayed until January 2006, and then returned to Edison High School in Elizabeth. Imani Podhradsky sat next to him in Algebra 2, but said Ahmad spent more time socializing than solving math problems.

Maria Mena, whose family was from the Dominican Republic, became Ahmad’s sweetheart. A photograph shows the couple in a swimming pool, with another couple and three friends, a diverse group, Maria smiling broadly and hugging Ahmad from behind. Mr. Rahami was furious at the relationship. The family had arranged for Ahmad to marry a woman in Afghanistan. He told his son that he could not have a girlfriend while he was engaged to someone else.

No surprise, but Ahmad did what he wanted. By senior year, Maria was pregnant. The teenagers were excited, holding hands in the hallways, grinning and touching each other. In a prom picture, Maria is pregnant, wearing a shy smile and a white dress. Ahmad seems happy, too, wearing a shiny pink vest and a matching tie over a white shirt.

His father had had enough. One day, Ahmad came to school upset, Ms. Podhradsky said. His parents were forcing him to move back to Afghanistan after graduation.

In early July 2007, just after Ahmad graduated, he was put on a plane — to Pakistan, it turned out — leaving behind his girlfriend, who would give birth to their daughter without him.

When Ahmad came home the next March, he tried to put his life back together. He moved in with Maria’s family that year. He worked a job at Kmart, which paid him $485.69 a week, court records show. The life that he was building was small, but he was doing it on his own, and that was something. He tried to be a good father. In July 2008, when he was 20, he spent $10.68 for a modest purchase at a toy store. At the time, his bank balance was only $406.41.

The Rahami family also continued to rack up legal problems. For years, it seemed as if the family’s main encounters with the outside community were negative ones, in the courtroom, involving lawsuits over small, unpaid bills. Qasim was arrested as a juvenile. At one point, even the mother, Najiba, was arrested, charged with abusing the couple’s 7-year-old, and sent to parenting classes.

Around this time, the City of Elizabeth started coming after First American, which had become a go-to spot for local teenagers to hang out at night. They staged rap battles in the back.

The dispute became heated, with the city slapping tickets on the restaurant for staying open past 10 p.m., and the Rahamis arguing that such tickets should never have been issued. After what seemed like countless confrontations, Mohammad Khan, the eldest brother, and another sibling, Qasim, tried to record a police visit in June 2009. They complained of selective enforcement. There was a confrontation, and the two were jailed. Qasim was released; Mohammad Khan eventually pleaded guilty to a minor charge. The Rahamis then filed a federal civil rights suit, claiming in part that they were being targeted because of their faith. That lawsuit fizzled out.

Ahmad is strangely absent from those court documents. But at some point, he came back to the family, strapped with an incomprehensible $996 a month in child support, now estranged from Maria. He tried to find his footing. He enrolled in September 2010 in a criminal-justice program at Middlesex County College, but he would give it up in two years.

About the same time, he told his close friend who had known him for 15 years that he went to Washington to try to get a job as a translator in Afghanistan with the United States military. But he knew only Pashto, one of the two main languages in the country.

“They rejected him and told him to learn Dari,” the friend recalled.

Nothing was working out. He started working nights, from 6 p.m. until 3 a.m., manning the register at Royal Fried Chicken in Elizabeth. On one of the nights he had visitation rights to his daughter, he brought her to work, said Amarjit Singh, a co-worker and high school friend. He held her, refusing to let her go.

Becoming Someone Else

His life kept going in fits and starts. Ahmad finally married his fiancée on a three-month trip to Pakistan in 2011. But the next year, he was fighting with his ex-girlfriend in court. He was slapped with a restraining order — it was not clear by whom — and jailed for violating it eight days later.

By 2013, he was becoming someone else. A friend from high school, who had once watched the movie “Hellboy” with Ahmad, found out that his friend’s tastes in videos had changed. Ahmad had started watching YouTube videos of extremists, said the friend, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was afraid of repercussions. At one point, the friend said, Ahmad showed him a lecture by the leading English-speaking Qaeda propagandist Anwar al-Awlaki, killed in a C.I.A. drone strike in September 2011.

“He put his hands in this,” is the expression Mr. Rahami used to describe his son’s growing extremism, which he first saw in 2013.

So when Ahmad went to Pakistan the last time, in April 2013, he was already dabbling in extremism. Quetta, the capital of Baluchistan Province and a haven for Taliban leaders and other extremists, would have made it easy for him to be drawn in deeper. The irony was clear: As a young teenager, he had hated the Taliban and Pakistan. And now he embraced them, even though a relative had been killed by the Taliban in Afghanistan around this time, the friend of 15 years said.

His close relative in Afghanistan said Ahmad fell under the spell of a man named Mullah Qudri, whom he met through friends in California. “This Mullah Qudri has brainwashed Ahmad,” the relative said, adding that Mullah Qudri was even spending nights with Ahmad at the house where he was staying in Quetta.

Ahmad traveled to Afghanistan for several weeks early on in his trip, according to Pakistani **immigration** authorities. He also made a short detour in early 2014 to Turkey — the gateway to Syria and the Islamic State — although it is not clear what he did there, law enforcement officials said.

When Ahmad came home in March 2014, he was flagged by customs officials, who pulled him aside for a second screening and alerted a federal agency that assesses potential threats, two law enforcement officials said. It was the first time he came to the attention of federal authorities.

But nothing happened. And there Ahmad was again, living now with his brothers in an apartment in Perth Amboy, N.J., working in the chicken business, even as his brothers were moving on to other things. Only now, he favored wearing more traditional clothes. Only now, he was angry and erratic. His wife, Asia Bibi Rahami, had just given birth to their son but was having trouble getting a visa to come to the United States. When Ahmad showed up at the local congressman’s office to ask for help, he was gruff and abrupt, asking the office to mail a letter to Islamabad demanding to know why it was taking so long.

One day in August, he stabbed his brother, his sister and his mother; none of the injuries were grievous, but still. Mr. Rahami, who had seen his son watching these horrible videos, who feared what he was becoming, called the police, a difficult decision, calling in the very people who had never done his family any favors. He described his son to them as a “terrorist.” Ahmad was charged with stabbing his brother Nasim in the left leg. Mr. Rahami, in interviews last week, did not want to say much about the attack, so it is not clear why Ahmad was charged only with his brother’s stabbing.

Ahmad spent a little more than two months in jail, and Mr. Rahami said he talked to the F.B.I. about his concerns about his son’s growing extremism.

The F.B.I., which challenged Mr. Rahami’s recollection, never interviewed Ahmad. And about three weeks after the stabbing, the review was formally closed.

Getting Another Chance

Life went on. Ahmad’s wife eventually made it to the United States. Mr. Rahami and Ahmad were mostly estranged, although in an Afghan family, where family life is paramount, such estrangements are rarely forever. So then came this year, when the elder Mr. Rahami and his wife and their youngest children planned to move to Roanoke, Va., near relatives, where they would open up another fried-chicken restaurant. Ahmad’s brothers were doing well. One was driving for Uber. Another had graduated from college. So Mr. Rahami offered his wayward son a shot: If he wanted, First American was his.

The restaurant deal lasted less than six weeks. After a bitter dispute between father and son, Mohammad Rahami came back at the end of May to run the business until he could sell it. Ahmad left the restaurant and started working shifts at two other fried-chicken restaurants in the area.

But Ahmad stayed in his father’s apartment, keeping a lock on the door of his room, Mr. Rahami said. His son grew so suspicious of his father trying to get inside, even through the windows, that he changed the lock.

In June, Ahmad started ordering supplies from eBay, the slingshot steelies, the citric acid, the circuit board, according to the federal criminal complaint against him. He planned. At some point, he allegedly scrawled his thoughts in a notebook, along with thoughts of his muses, Awlaki, Bin Laden and a founder of the Islamic State. “Inshallah the sounds of the bombs will be heard in the streets,” the journal finished. “Gun shots to your police. Death To Your OPPRESSION.”

The bombs went off last weekend, but the elder Mr. Rahami was busy in his chicken restaurant, keeping it open into the wee hours, the best time to make money, after the bars let out and people were hungry.

On Monday morning, Mr. Rahami closed the business just before 3. He said his prayers, and then he went to bed. But then he heard a loud racket outside. Two law-enforcement officers burst into his apartment and told him to raise his hands, he said. They handcuffed him, he said, and put him on the floor, before marching him outside his bedroom. There, he saw three of his sons — Mohammad Khan, Qasim, Nasim — also handcuffed.

He looked from one to the next and he had one thought: “Where is Ahmad?”

Reporting was contributed by Fahim Abed, Salman Masood, Sarah Maslin Nir, Nate Schweber and Michael Schwirtz. Susan C. Beachy contributed research.

Correction: September 28, 2016, Wednesday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An article on Sunday about the bombing suspect Ahmad Khan Rahami’s formative years in New Jersey misidentified the location of Edison High School, which he attended. It is in Elizabeth, not in Union.

\* Public Defender Says Prosecutor Denied Him Access to Ahmad Rahami[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/24/nyregion/public-defender-says-prosecutor-denied-him-access-to-ahmad-rahami.html]

\* ‘In-Betweeners’ Are Part of a Rich Recruiting Pool for Jihadists[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/us/isis-al-qaeda-recruits-anwar-al-awlaki.html]

\* ‘Keep an Eye on Him,’ Ahmad Khan Rahami’s Father Says He Told F.B.I.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/nyregion/ahmad-khan-rahami-bombing.html]

\* Flagged Two Times in 2014, Ahmad Rahami Passed Scrutiny[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/22/nyregion/new-york-new-jersey-bombing.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EARLY in 2007, Barack Obama met Hillary Clinton at a candidates forum on health care in Las Vegas in one of their first encounters on a debate-like stage, in what would become one of the longest nominating battles in presidential campaign history.

When he returned to Chicago, he was glum.

“Hillary looked like a president up there, and I didn’t,” he told me.

As the senior strategist for Senator Obama, I spent the better part of two years thinking about how to deal with Hillary Clinton. Fluent in policy and crisp in delivery, Mrs. Clinton dished out all that Mr. Obama could handle in the 26 debates of that marathon campaign. We won the race, but she came out on top in many of those encounters, including one in New Hampshire that may have cost us a critical early primary victory.

Mrs. Clinton is an accomplished debater, and there is no question that she upped my candidate’s game and her own over time. But she will be facing an entirely different kind of opponent on Monday night.

There is no whiff of the Oxford Union about Donald Trump. He barreled through a spate of primary debates as an improvisational performer, long on chutzpah and borscht belt put-downs but short on facts. Yet by making it to this stage, the reality show star has ridden the unconventional to the cusp of the presidency.

Mr. Trump’s bludgeoning style and boundless bluster have frustrated opponents, moderators and media analysts all season. But what elite commentators have dismissed as boorishness has, to many **alienated** voters, signified strength, authenticity and, crucially, a willingness to defy “political correctness.”

Throughout the campaign, Mr. Trump has rewritten the rules and played a game that’s entirely his own. It is the key reason Monday’s audience is expected to be one of the largest for any show in television history. The sheer element of unpredictability and audacity Mr. Trump brings is the attraction.

It may be that he will turn in a muted performance on Monday, convinced that he needs to show presidential temperament and some mastery of substance to woo swing voters who dislike Mrs. Clinton but doubt Mr. Trump’s fitness for the job. If Mr. Trump chooses to ride the horse that got him here, however, Mrs. Clinton will confront a showman bent on turning the event into less of a debate and more of a spectacle.

As the world knows, Mr. Trump’s chief debate tactic to date is getting under the skin of his opponents by identifying perceived vulnerabilities, appending pejorative descriptors, and then making them stick.

When he gleefully attacked primary opponents on the debate stage, they generally reacted in one of two ways. Some sputtered, looking as if they had been hit in the face with a pie. Others, most notably Senator Marco Rubio, responded in kind, and looked bad doing it.

Mrs. Clinton, who has high unfavorable ratings of her own, will have to find the right tone if Mr. Trump fires at close range the kind of gibes he has hurled from afar at her honesty, her tenure as secretary of state, her vote to authorize the use of force in Iraq — even her treatment of her husband’s infidelities and the women involved.

She will be armed with an encyclopedic knowledge of Mr. Trump’s own significant vulnerabilities but, in past debates, Mr. Trump generally has benefited from nasty, personal volleys with his opponents, so she will have to decide when to defend, when to attack and when to rise above.

Instead of engaging Mr. Trump frontally in an ugly contest of insults, the best course for Mrs. Clinton may be to navigate around him. Even as she strikes contrasts, she should take her case directly to the camera and the American people, referring to Mr. Trump without engaging him.

But what if the other Trump appears on Monday? Though it’s tough for a brawler to show restraint for 90 minutes, it might make strategic sense for him to try and strike a reassuringly thoughtful and temperate pose.

This version of Mr. Trump would create a different challenge for Mrs. Clinton: She cannot allow her opponent to use the campaign’s largest audience to rehabilitate himself with voters who doubt his fitness for the office. She must hold him accountable for his most provocative comments and his utter lack of substance.

In past debates and interviews, Mr. Trump has demonstrated an appalling, almost defiant, lack of knowledge, and these debates, with long segments devoted to specific topics, will demand depth beyond oversimplified answers. Secret plans to defeat the Islamic State, for example, will not pass muster.

Mrs. Clinton cannot count on the moderators to corral Mr. Trump or perform the role of fact-checker. She will have to do this herself, choosing when and where to challenge Mr. Trump’s logic and facts without belaboring the tactic or coming off as the obnoxious smartest kid in the class.

One of Mr. Trump’s chief assets is his self-cultivated image as a business titan. Managing the economy is one of the few categories in which he has consistently outpolled Mrs. Clinton. (Mitt Romney enjoyed this same presumption over President Obama in pre-election polling.)

Mr. Trump surely will brandish his business credentials and present himself as the only “job creator” on the stage. But in doing so, he will open himself up to a strong counterattack about dubious business tactics, bankruptcies and schemes like Trump University. The Clinton team will know going in that questioning Mr. Trump’s wealth and business success is a hot button, the only one that seems to unsettle him.

Yet if some wavering voters will be watching to see if Mr. Trump appears to be a plausible president, others will tune in to discover if Mrs. Clinton, who has struggled with questions of trustworthiness, can speak in an open and authentic way that connects with them. They will be looking for what, beyond personal ambition, motivates her and where, beyond the policies of President Obama, she aims to lead.

The well-crafted Democratic convention in July, a high-water mark for Mrs. Clinton, offered a strategic road map to how best to position herself, Mr. Trump and the choice between them.

If she holds true to that successful template, she will pitch herself as a champion for economic fairness and Mr. Trump as a populist poseur, whose actual practices and policies belie his claim to advocacy for working people.

She will emphasize the sure-handedness and discretion needed in a commander in chief and contrast that with Mr. Trump’s troubling penchant for loose talk and bellicose language.

Without pretense about the challenges Americans face, she will offer a more optimistic vision of the future than Mr. Trump’s relentlessly dystopian portrait of a country on the brink — the audacity of no hope. She will embrace diversity as a strength, in contrast to his past slights on **immigrants**, Muslims, women and people with disabilities.

Finally, she will stress the need to work together to solve the nation’s problems and mock Mr. Trump’s oft-stated declaration that he will single-handedly cure America’s ills — on Day 1. Both liberals and conservatives bridle at this autocratic vision.

In the end, presidential debates are less a trial of fact than a televised final exam for the most exacting job on the planet. They offer Americans a window into how each of these candidates would deal with excruciating pressure. They are measured in revealing moments. Will the candidates react with grace, humor and unflappability, or with anger and uncertainty?

Mrs. Clinton’s history has been to rise to these occasions. She calmed unsettled Democrats last fall with her confident and steadfast 11-hour-long appearance before the congressional committee on Benghazi and a series of strong primary debate performances with a dogged challenger, Senator Bernie Sanders.

If she can handle the asymmetric challenge of the unorthodox Mr. Trump, she will have taken a big step forward to solidifying her hold on the race, but more important, she will have shown that she can handle pretty much anything.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

David Axelrod, the former senior strategist for Barack Obama, is the director of the Institute of Politics at the University of Chicago and the author of “Believer: My Forty Years in Politics.”

\* Hillary Clinton for President[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/25/opinion/sunday/hillary-clinton-for-president.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**IN the history of do-overs at The New York Times, there is one example that may seem of no large consequence but nonetheless infuriated readers. It involved an obituary about a rocket scientist named Yvonne Brill[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/science/space/yvonne-brill-rocket-scientist-dies-at-88.html]. In its first incarnation, the obit referred to 88-year-old Brill in the first paragraph as a woman who “made a mean beef stroganoff, followed her husband around from job to job and took eight years off to raise three children.” In secondary fashion, it mentioned that Brill was a pioneering scientist who invented a propulsion system that kept communications satellites in orbit.

Seven hours later, after infuriated readers let loose, that version disappeared and a new story popped up[http://www.newsdiffs.org/diff/192021/192137/www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/science/space/yvonne-brill-rocket-scientist-dies-at-88.html] with a less chauvinistic perspective emphasizing her exceptional career. No editor’s note or other explanation for the changes was given.

This was in 2013, and I raise it not because there aren’t fresher examples (there are) but because this story was a cultural touchstone in the realm of what is often criticized as “stealth editing.” It remains among the most-viewed pieces in the history of the website NewsDiffs[http://www.newsdiffs.org], the top destination for comparing versions of news articles. My predecessor, Margaret Sullivan, signaled the changes to this piece[http://publiceditor.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/04/01/gender-questions-arise-in-obituary-of-rocket-scientist-and-her-beef-stroganoff/]. She wrote about seven other such episodes. I’ve already written about two.

Times editors have thus far rejected appeals to flag readers when stories are reworked, unless it’s a correction. They argue that making such edits are a routine part of digital publishing — you edit a piece, publish it, then report more or add more context, then republish it again, on through the news cycle.

“The vast majority of readers come to a story and get the best, most complete version we have. They read it and go away,” said Phil Corbett, who oversees standards and ethics in the newsroom. Billboarding changes, he says, would be unwieldy to carry out and of no interest to most readers.

I disagree on all points. This strikes me as an ossified policy in clear need of modernizing. Readers, I believe, are far more sophisticated than they’re given credit for and want more transparency in stories that are shapeshifting before their eyes. When changes affect a story’s overall tone or make earlier facts obsolete, or when added context recasts a story, readers should be told.

Putting a note on every update is unnecessary. But giving readers insight into why some stories were substantively changed conveys openness and reduces suspicion that editors are trying to get away with something.

Many readers have strong feelings when a story gets a makeover without notice, and it’s no wonder. It seems akin to a doctor who sits a patient down to discuss troubling test results, then later rethinks that analysis and mails the patient a more accurate interpretation of the results, without highlighting the changes.

Times policy is powered by the same philosophy — proceed as if nothing happened. These stories don’t appear every day, or even every week, but they occur with some regularity. Lately, many are about politics, and the offenses range from minor to major. On the minor side, a story on Hillary Clinton earlier this month inappropriately used the phrase “politician’s-wife-turned-politician-herself,” and referred to the candidate as “hobnobbing” in the Hamptons. Later those words disappeared[http://newsdiffs.org/article-history/www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/clinton-trump-labor-day-campaign.html].

On the more memorable side, some recent Donald Trump stories received significant changes — and significant responses from readers. One involved Trump’s dueling **immigration** speeches[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/public-editor/the-news-from-trump-changed-the-main-story-was-slow-to-catch-up.html], in Mexico City and Phoenix, where hours apart he presented sharply different views of **immigration**. The story many readers saw captured only the temperate Trump and very little from the fire-breathing one.

In July, the Opinion pages recast a piece[http://publiceditor.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/07/12/michael-eric-dyson-liz-spayd-new-york-times-public-editor/] by a Georgetown University professor, Michael Eric Dyson, taking it from a blunt critique of white America to a milder one after five Dallas policeman were shot.

Then there was the post-publication editing that everyone at The Times wants to forget — a piece about Bernie Sanders[http://publiceditor.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/03/17/new-york-times-bernie-sanders-coverage-public-editor/] that was so radically changed it went from fawning to fierce in a matter of hours.

One reader, Adam Smith-Kipnis, eloquently framed the issue in an email to this office. “The kerfuffle about ‘stealth editing’ highlights a transparency problem at the intersection of journalism, ethics and user experience design,” he wrote. “This problem is not faced only by the Times, but it’s one where the Times can take the lead by automatically including links to version history.”

Actually it would be too late for The Times to take the lead — others already have. The Washington Post, Vox and BuzzFeed among others are noticeably less timid about flagging important story changes.

Cameron Barr, The Post’s managing editor, says the policy is to append an editor’s note whenever substantial changes are made. A case in point was a story on Ivanka Trump’s clothing business[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/08/08/ivanka-trump-says-she-supports-working-moms-the-women-who-design-her-fashion-line-dont-get-paid-maternity-leave/] which said her manufacturing contractor offers no paid maternity leave. What it didn’t state was that she has no managerial control over that contractor’s workplace policies. The story wasn’t wrong, just misleading. An explanatory editor’s note was attached. “We don’t want to hide that from the reader and pretend it didn’t happen,” Barr said.

BuzzFeed puts an update with explanation on any change that would affect how people might perceive a piece. “I feel no shame in putting a note on to say we updated something,” says a top editor, Shani Hilton. “Readers know it. They care.”

If The Times was to break with current orthodoxy, what might an approach look like? Calling such changes an “Editors’ Note” seems unlikely, given that this designation is generally saved only for stories with an indisputable flaw. But there are other alternatives, for example: “This story was updated to add important context” or “Updated to reflect new information clarifying the police response.”

Top editors could huddle to define what would fall into this “Updated” category, asking themselves: Has the tone of the story changed? Are there important new facts central to its takeaway? Or, the key litmus test: Would readers be agitated to discover that changes were made?

This issue of stealth editing presents larger questions for news organizations in the midst of a turn toward transparency. Should a publisher take responsibility for the life of an article? Should a publisher keep a public archive?

The Times may not be prepared to take on these next-generation issues, but a more robust update policy would be an impressive move toward that goal. What’s more, it has the potential to change what is now viewed as a conspiratorial act into one seen as a virtue — one meant to improve a story, not disappear altogether.

Follow the public editor on Twitter @spaydl[https://twitter.com/spaydl] and reach her by email at public@nytimes.com[mailto:public@nytimes.com].

\* The News From Trump Changed. The Main Story Was Slow to Catch Up.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/public-editor/the-news-from-trump-changed-the-main-story-was-slow-to-catch-up.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In any normal election year, we’d compare the two presidential candidates side by side on the issues. But this is not a normal election year. A comparison like that would be an empty exercise in a race where one candidate — our choice, Hillary Clinton — has a record of service and a raft of pragmatic ideas, and the other, Donald Trump, discloses nothing concrete about himself or his plans while promising the moon and offering the stars on layaway. (We will explain in a subsequent editorial why we believe Mr. Trump to be the worst nominee put forward by a major party in modern American history.)

But this endorsement would also be an empty exercise if it merely affirmed the choice of Clinton supporters. We’re aiming instead to persuade those of you who are hesitating to vote for Mrs. Clinton — because you are reluctant to vote for a Democrat, or for another Clinton, or for a candidate who might appear, on the surface, not to offer change from an establishment that seems indifferent and a political system that seems broken.

Running down the other guy won’t suffice to make that argument. The best case for Hillary Clinton cannot be, and is not, that she isn’t Donald Trump.

The best case is, instead, about the challenges this country faces, and Mrs. Clinton’s capacity to rise to them.

The next president will take office with bigoted, tribalist movements and their leaders on the march. In the Middle East and across Asia, in Russia and Eastern Europe, even in Britain and the United States, war, terrorism and the pressures of globalization are eroding democratic values, fraying alliances and challenging the ideals of tolerance and charity.

The 2016 campaign has brought to the surface the despair and rage of poor and middle-class Americans who say their government has done little to ease the burdens that recession, technological change, foreign competition and war have heaped on their families.

Over 40 years in public life, Hillary Clinton has studied these forces and weighed responses to these problems. Our endorsement is rooted in respect for her intellect, experience, toughness and courage over a career of almost continuous public service, often as the first or only woman in the arena.

Mrs. Clinton’s work has been defined more by incremental successes than by moments of transformational change. As a candidate, she has struggled to step back from a pointillist collection of policy proposals to reveal the full pattern of her record. That is a weakness of her campaign, and a perplexing one, for the pattern is clear. It shows a determined leader intent on creating opportunity for struggling Americans at a time of economic upheaval and on ensuring that the United States remains a force for good in an often brutal world.

Similarly, Mrs. Clinton’s occasional missteps, combined with attacks on her trustworthiness, have distorted perceptions of her character. She is one of the most tenacious politicians of her generation, whose willingness to study and correct course is rare in an age of unyielding partisanship. As first lady, she rebounded from professional setbacks and personal trials with astounding resilience. Over eight years in the Senate and four as secretary of state, she built a reputation for grit and bipartisan collaboration. She displayed a command of policy and diplomatic nuance and an ability to listen to constituents and colleagues that are all too exceptional in Washington.

Mrs. Clinton’s record of service to children, women and families has spanned her adult life. One of her boldest acts as first lady was her 1995 speech in Beijing declaring that women’s rights are human rights. After a failed attempt to overhaul the nation’s health care system, she threw her support behind legislation to establish the Children’s Health Insurance Program, which now covers more than eight million lower-income young people. This year, she rallied mothers of gun-violence victims to join her in demanding comprehensive background checks for gun buyers and tighter reins on gun sales.

After opposing driver’s licenses for undocumented **immigrants** during the 2008 campaign, she now vows to push for comprehensive **immigration** legislation as president and to use executive power to protect law-abiding undocumented people from deportation and cruel detention. Some may dismiss her shift as opportunistic, but we credit her for arriving at the right position.

Mrs. Clinton and her team have produced detailed proposals on crime, policing and race relations, debt-free college and small-business incentives, climate change and affordable broadband. Most of these proposals would benefit from further elaboration on how to pay for them, beyond taxing the wealthiest Americans. They would also depend on passage by Congress.

That means that, to enact her agenda, Mrs. Clinton would need to find common ground with a destabilized Republican Party, whose unifying goal in Congress would be to discredit her. Despite her political scars, she has shown an unusual capacity to reach across the aisle.

When Mrs. Clinton was sworn in as a senator from New York in 2001, Republican leaders warned their caucus not to do anything that might make her look good. Yet as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, she earned the respect of Republicans like Senator John McCain with her determination to master intricate military matters.

Her most lasting achievements as a senator include a federal fund for long-term health monitoring of 9/11 first responders, an expansion of military benefits to cover reservists and the National Guard, and a law requiring drug companies to improve the safety of their medications for children.

Below the radar, she fought for money for farmers, hospitals, small businesses and environmental projects. Her vote in favor of the Iraq war is a black mark, but to her credit, she has explained her thinking rather than trying to rewrite that history.

As secretary of state, Mrs. Clinton was charged with repairing American credibility after eight years of the Bush administration’s unilateralism. She bears a share of the responsibility for the Obama administration’s foreign-policy failings, notably in Libya. But her achievements are substantial. She led efforts to strengthen sanctions against Iran, which eventually pushed it to the table for talks over its nuclear program, and in 2012, she helped negotiate a cease-fire between Israel and Hamas.

Mrs. Clinton led efforts to renew diplomatic relations with Myanmar, persuading its junta to adopt political reforms. She helped promote the Trans-Pacific Partnership, an important trade counterweight to China and a key component of the Obama administration’s pivot to Asia. Her election-year reversal on that pact has confused some of her supporters, but her underlying commitment to bolstering trade along with workers’ rights is not in doubt. Mrs. Clinton’s attempt to reset relations with Russia, though far from successful, was a sensible effort to improve interactions with a rivalrous nuclear power.

Mrs. Clinton has shown herself to be a realist who believes America cannot simply withdraw behind oceans and walls, but must engage confidently in the world to protect its interests and be true to its values, which include helping others escape poverty and oppression.

Mrs. Clinton’s husband, Bill Clinton, governed during what now looks like an optimistic and even gentle era. The end of the Cold War and the advance of technology and trade appeared to be awakening the world’s possibilities rather than its demons. Many in the news media, and in the country, and in that administration, were distracted by the scandal du jour — Mr. Clinton’s impeachment — during the very period in which a terrorist threat was growing. We are now living in a world darkened by the realization of that threat and its many consequences.

Mrs. Clinton’s service spans both eras, and she has learned hard lessons from the three presidents she has studied up close. She has also made her own share of mistakes. She has evinced a lamentable penchant for secrecy and made a poor decision to rely on a private email server while at the State Department. That decision deserved scrutiny, and it’s had it. Now, considered alongside the real challenges that will occupy the next president, that email server, which has consumed so much of this campaign, looks like a matter for the help desk. And, viewed against those challenges, Mr. Trump shrinks to his true small-screen, reality-show proportions, as we’ll argue in detail on Monday.

Through war and recession, Americans born since 9/11 have had to grow up fast, and they deserve a grown-up president. A lifetime’s commitment to solving problems in the real world qualifies Hillary Clinton for this job, and the country should put her to work.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — When Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] labeled Mexican **immigrants** “rapists” in announcing his candidacy in June of last year, he lost contracts with Nascar, Macy’s, NBC Universal, Univision, even Serta mattresses. Not surprisingly, his three eldest children — Ivanka, Donald Jr. and Eric — began worrying about whether the marketability of the Trump brand could survive the campaign undamaged.

Worry they should, if Mr. Trump’s new hotel, which Mr. Trump himself opened last week, is any indication. The hotel is on Pennsylvania Avenue, a short walk from the White House, and to a lot of people, just walking through the door seems like a political act. Mr. Trump’s name festoons the key cards, the laundry bags, the bathrobes and slippers. It’s hard not to feel that a dollar spent there is a dollar for the Trump campaign.

“I don’t know who’s going to book it, because it’s so contentious,” a local convention planner said.

On Tuesday, the place seemed eerily empty. You could book a room for next weekend for less than $400. A week ago, the minimum rate was twice that.

The Trump International Hotel, Washington, D.C., occupies the Old Post Office, an 1899 Romanesque structure whose central carved-stone arch now carries a shiny gold Trump logo, like the one that appeared on the jumbotron behind Mr. Trump as he accepted the Republican nomination. Inside the cavernous atrium, there is overstuffed pastel upholstery, multiple mirrors and plentiful gilt.

I asked a waiter if the place was busy. “Not yet,” he replied. “But it’s going to be crazy if he wins. I mean, it’s going to be crazy no matter what. We are going to have, like, a thousand holiday parties booked in this place,” he said, sounding a bit like the nominee.

Are all the good holiday party dates taken? “Not yet,” he said.

The restaurant is BLT Prime by David Burke, a second choice because the Washington restaurateur José Andrés backed out of his agreement to open a Spanish-Japanese eatery after Mr. Trump’s **immigrant**-bashing campaign kickoff speech. At lunchtime on a recent weekday, 17 people were eating in a space that seats 120. Tom Sietsema, The Washington Post’s restaurant critic, titled his review “Gilded Touches on Yet Another Steakhouse.”

Drinking my iced tea, I gazed over the railing at the lobby, then looked again: There was Ivanka, leading an entourage of eager people with clipboards and notebooks.

Ms. Trump swept up the steps into the restaurant. Half the diners stood up. They weren’t customers, somebody in the entourage said, but employees.

Ms. Trump, whose name adorns the hotel spa (“The Spa by Ivanka Trump”), coolly surveyed the giant lobby. “So intimate,” one of her aides was saying.

I paid my bill and walked back to the office. There was an email from the Hillary Clinton forces, lambasting Mr. Trump for using a campaign ad to promote his new hotel. In the ad, Mr. Trump posed with smiling employees, including those I saw eating in the restaurant. There were no hotel patrons in the ad, either.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TIJUANA, Mexico — They passed the corpses of other migrants who had tried to cross the Americas. They were cheated by smugglers and fleeced by armed bandits, and they suffered long stretches of hunger.

Finally, after months of traveling across nine international borders, the Haitians made it to Tijuana, where thousands of their countrymen had already been allowed to enter the United States this year. All they had to do, they thought, was wait for their appointments with **immigration** officials and they, too, would be allowed on American soil.

Then, suddenly, they learned that their journey — and the hopes of thousands of others like them heading toward the American border — had likely come to an abrupt, crushing end.

On Thursday, the Obama administration, in an effort to halt an extraordinary wave of Haitian migrants streaming to the United States, announced that it was tightening its **immigration** policy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/world/americas/haiti-migrants-earthquake.html?ref=world] on Haitians. Those who appeared at the American border without visas would almost certainly be sent back to Haiti[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/haiti/index.html?inline=nyt-geo].

The unexpected change sowed deep disappointment and confusion among the hundreds of Haitians at the border who thought they were only days away from entering the United States. Thousands more are still on their way, risking their lives[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/08/world/americas/mexico-migrants-central-america.html] on a perilous trip, probably in vain.

“I feel bad, I feel bad,” Renard Paul, a Haitian migrant, said when told about the policy change. He struggled to digest the news, hoping it was just a rumor.

“All the misery we suffered on the way here,” he muttered.

For months, Haitians have been traveling north from Brazil[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/brazil/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], where they[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/07/world/americas/brazils-boom-absorbs-haitis-poor-for-now.html] had gone to find [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/07/world/americas/brazils-boom-absorbs-haitis-poor-for-now.html] work[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/07/world/americas/brazils-boom-absorbs-haitis-poor-for-now.html] after Haiti was devastated by [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/13/world/americas/13haiti.html] an earthquake in 2010[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/13/world/americas/13haiti.html]. At the time, Brazil, in need of low-wage workers, had welcomed many of them with humanitarian visas.

But Brazil has slipped into economic and political malaise, causing many Haitians to lose work, sink deeper into poverty and set their sights on the United States instead.

Making their way mostly by land, some found an additional incentive to head for the border because of the American election. The next president might be Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], they said, and they wanted to get into the United States before his wall went up.

The vanguard of the migratory surge arrived here in May. Since then, more than 5,000 Haitians without visas have been allowed to pass through the Southern California border crossings.

Many others — Mexican officials say as many as 1,000 — are still in Tijuana, crowding the city’s migrant shelters, budget hotels and rooms-for-rent where they have spent many days waiting for their appointments with American **immigration** officials.

And, by some estimates, more than 4,000 Haitians are still on the way, many of them quite likely unaware that the special **immigration** privileges for Haitians have been revoked.

Haitians had been entering the United States because of a change[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/14/world/americas/14deport.html] in [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/14/world/americas/14deport.html] deportation policy[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/14/world/americas/14deport.html] after the 2010 earthquake. In an acknowledgment of the special political and economic troubles in Haiti, American border officials were allowing them to enter under a humanitarian parole provision, with permission to stay in the United States for as many as three years.

But on Thursday, the Obama administration announced that it was fully resuming the deportations of undocumented Haitians, meaning that anyone who showed up at a border post without a visa would likely be put into a fast-track deportation process that is often used for migrants without visas.

The news stunned advocates on both sides of the border, who struggled to predict what might happen next.

Would Haitian migrants now stay in Mexico, or head elsewhere in Latin America? Would those heading to Tijuana heed suggestions by American officials to turn around and go back to Brazil? Would Mexico and other Latin American countries help absorb them? Would some waiting at the border, having come this far, try to cross into the United States illegally?

Mr. Paul, 40, whose wife and five children live in Haiti, said he was pretty sure of one thing: He wasn’t going back to Brazil. He had spent nearly four years there, working as a mason.

“There’s nothing there,” he said. “We’re looking for a better life. If we can’t work, we can’t feed the family.”

His journey from Brazil to Tijuana had taken 11 weeks. Thieves in Nicaragua stripped him of everything, including his shoes. Now, he said on Friday, he was totally despondent: “I have no energy now.”

The path from Brazil to Tijuana is full of hazards. Stories circulate of people being swept away as they forded fast-moving rivers. In interviews with more than 20 migrants here, they described passing advice up and down the route, mostly using cellphone messaging apps: which buses to take, the names of the good smugglers, addresses of migrant shelters, the unique perils of various border crossings.

The migrants — mostly men — have arrived in Tijuana carrying little, usually no more than a knapsack or a plastic bag. Some also carried toddlers and infants. One woman gave birth this month after crossing the border from Guatemala into Mexico. She was on a bus with her infant the next day for the three-day trip to Tijuana.

The route generally led from the Brazilian interior to Peru, through Ecuador and on to Colombia. Many then took a boat before they started walking again, sometimes for days, through the Darién Gap of Panama, always with a relay team of hired guides, each of whom charged from $10-$20 a head.

Costa Rica became a key staging ground for what many said was the most difficult stretch of the trip: crossing Nicaragua. Getting through that country required a smuggler. Guides charged from several hundred dollars to $1,500 per person and the trip took several days, some of it on foot.

But payment offered no guarantees of safe passage. Haitians here told how their smugglers abandoned their groups midway through the crossing, leaving them vulnerable to bandits or, worse, the Nicaraguan security forces, who returned the migrants to the Costa Rican border. Some migrants got stuck for weeks or even months in Costa Rica waiting for family or friends to wire them money to complete the journey.

At the Mexican border, most Haitians have masqueraded as citizens of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The collective wisdom is that the Mexican authorities treat Africans better than Haitians and are more inclined to give them 20-day transit passes. Real Africans find this masquerade laughable.

“They don’t even know there are two Congos,” scoffed Evans Demorais, 31, a Nigerian migrant here. “They are saying, ‘Please, are you from Africa? What is the capital of Congo? Who is the president?’”

By the time the migrants arrive in Tijuana, after trips that could sometimes take six months, most have spent between $3,000 and $5,000, and some as much as $7,000.

“They arrive here exhausted — in all senses of the word,” Margarita Andonaegui, the coordinator of Tijuana’s Desayunador Salesiano Padre Chava shelter, said.

The Haitians are not the only ones making the journey. Migrants from across the Americas, Africa, Europe and Asia also started coming, especially in early summer — a diversity that shelter administrators had never seen before in their dormitories.

“Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Sudan, Cuba, Pakistan, Cameroon,” Ms. Andonaegui said, reading from a log of nationalities she kept. “Bangladesh, Russia, the Dominican Republic, Iraq, Côte d’Ivoire.” More than two dozen nationalities in all, though the range has contracted in recent weeks, leaving this migrant trail populated mainly by Haitians and Latinos.

The sudden increase in people from around the world along the Brazil-to-Mexico migrant route suggested the opening of new smuggling corridors as Europe’s borders have tightened.

Homeland Security officials cited the surge in Haitians on the southwestern border as a major impetus for the policy change. They also insisted that the political and economic situation in Haiti, just over two weeks away from a highly contested presidential election, had improved enough to allow for Haitians to be safely returned.

But **immigrants**’ advocates criticized the decision, hoping to press President Obama to roll back the change.

“Tell us the facts and figures and prove that Haitians will not be deported back to an unsafe situation,” Benjamin Johnson, the executive director of the American**Immigration** Lawyers Association, said.

The Rev. Pat Murphy, the director of Casa del Migrante, a shelter in Tijuana, said that the migrants in his shelter have been recalling the pain and risks of the trip they had just endured.

“They started talking about the people who were left behind, the people who died on the path,” he said. “As if to say, ‘I can’t go back there. I’m alive.’”

\* U.S. to Step Up Deportations of Haitians Amid Surge at Border[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/world/americas/haiti-migrants-earthquake.html]

\* Poor Sanitation Persisted at U.N. Missions Long After Haiti Cholera Crisis[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/world/americas/haiti-cholera-sanitation-un-peacekeepers.html]

\* Influx of Haitians Into the Amazon Prompts **Immigration** Debate in Brazil[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/08/world/americas/brazil-limits-haitian-immigration.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In October of 1995, two Swiss astronomers announced a major discovery: They had detected, about 50 light-years from Earth, a planet orbiting a sun-like star. Scientists had long imagined there were such planets outside our solar system, but never before had one been confirmed. This extrasolar planet, or “exoplanet,” appeared to be a Jupiter-like ball of gas and liquid with a blistering atmospheric temperature of 1,700 degrees Fahrenheit. In the two decades since, astronomers have detected more than 3,000 exoplanets. No one has yet found a replica of Earth, although Proxima b, an Earth-size planet in a temperate orbit a mere 4.2 light-years away, whose discovery was announced last month, sounds as if it could be a decent place to live.

The discovery of exoplanets has been a source of special excitement to the scientists of the so-called SETI movement — the search for extraterrestrial intelligence. As the historian Lawrence Squeri notes in his engaging chronicle WAITING FOR CONTACT: The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (University Press of Florida, $26.95), the movement, which began in earnest in the 1960s, would have been “pointless” had there not turned out to be planets beyond our solar system. Where else would **alien** civilizations reside? Just as significant to SETI enthusiasts has been the very high percentage of stars that, when scrutinized, have revealed themselves to host a planet. The percentage is high enough that we can basically assume each of the 400 billion stars in our galaxy has a planetary companion. That’s a lot of potential places for **alien** life to arise, evolve and — ideally using electromagnetic signals at a frequency we’re monitoring — drop us a line.

SETI’s principal methodology was first outlined by two physicists in the journal Nature in 1959. They proposed that the radio telescope, a new technology used to “see” objects in space thanks to the radio waves they emit, could also be used to send and receive interstellar messages with **aliens** at the speed of light. The next year, at an observatory in West Virginia, an astronomer named Frank Drake conducted the first such search for **alien** broadcasts, aiming a radio telescope at two stars about 10.5 and 12 light-years away. It was a crapshoot, and it was unsuccessful: **Aliens** had not, in fact, been sending us messages from those stars 10.5 or 12 years earlier — at least not at the frequency Drake guessed **aliens** would use. The next step for the movement, as Squeri writes, was to demonstrate this was “a cutting-edge experiment rather than a lost weekend for reputable scientists who had read too much science fiction.”

The second American SETI search didn’t take place until 1971, more than a decade later. (Securing time with a radio telescope is a competitive affair.) In the interim, and indeed throughout the movement’s history, SETI scientists spent much of their time justifying and promoting their project. In this capacity, Squeri argues, SETI amounted to more than just a scientific enterprise; it was a kind of “offbeat political movement,” a utopian ideology and perhaps surrogate religion — with **aliens** serving as our more enlightened counterparts. SETI arose amid widespread fears that nuclear weapons and population growth had made the human race a threat to itself. Many of the movement’s founders were political progressives who believed that any **alien** civilization advanced enough to contact us would have survived as long as it did because it had solved such problems, presumably by mastering a system of world government. Drake, who later observed that many SETI supporters like himself were exposed in their youth to “fundamentalist religion,” entertained hopes that **alien** wisdom would help humans end war and cure cancer.

Drake’s other legacy to the movement was an equation he devised in 1961 for estimating the number of **alien** civilizations in our galaxy capable of communicating with us. The astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson, in WELCOME TO THE UNIVERSE: An Astrophysical Tour (Princeton University, $39.95), revisits the Drake equation using contemporary data. The equation holds that the number of communicating **alien** civilizations is a function of seven variables, starting with the rate at which new stars are born in our galaxy, the fraction of these stars that host planets and the number of planets per star that are habitable. In 1961, scientists could fill in only one variable; the other six were sheer guesswork. With our advanced understanding of the cosmos, Tyson — whose book is written with the astrophysicists Michael A. Strauss and J. Richard Gott — is able to work out, in some technical detail, a more sophisticated estimate. The verdict? According to his calculations, we might expect to find as many as 100 **alien** civilizations in our galaxy communicating with radio waves right now. “So,” he concludes, “we have a chance.”

In ALL THESE WORLDS ARE YOURS: The Scientific Search for **Alien** Life (Yale University, $30), a lively introduction to the field of astrobiology, the astronomer Jon Willis concurs that exoplanets are an exciting development. But because our first contact with **alien** life, he suspects, “is likely to be a meeting of microbes rather than a meeting of minds,” he is more optimistic about finding a simple organism elsewhere in our own solar system. Perhaps it will be an “extremophile” bacterium of the sort scientists have recently found on Earth living in conditions previously assumed to be fatal (like volcanic hot springs and subzero temperatures). Three of Willis’s top contenders for habitats are Mars, Jupiter’s moon Europa and Saturn’s moon Titan. But if forced to choose a single project for both feasibility and promise, he would send a spacecraft on a flyby mission to Saturn’s ice moon, Enceladus. The craft would collect (and bring back to Earth) icy particles and gases from Enceladus’s subsurface liquid ocean, whose chilly waters are regularly spouted into space via geysers. Maybe we’d find something alive in that stuff.

Do planetary scientists, with their arcane interests and occasional searches for **alien** life, strike you as an exotic tribe? Do they seem to require decoding by an anthropologist who conducted fieldwork in their midst? If so, you might consult Lisa Messeri’s study PLACING OUTER SPACE: An Earthly Ethnography of Other Worlds (Duke University, paper, $23.95). Messeri, an anthropologist whose undergraduate degree is in aeronautical and astronautical engineering, spent 15 months working with — and closely observing the customs of — several groups of planetary scientists, including astronomers at a Chilean observatory, NASAresearchers creating 3-D maps of Mars and exoplanet scientists at M.I.T. What she was trying to understand was their “pursuit of planetary place.” By this phrase she means to identify a rarely considered aspect of their professional practice: how these scientists, whose objects of study exist at distances and scales and time-frames that can defy human grasp, nonetheless manage to conceive of these uncanny things more intimately as “places” or “worlds,” thus allowing the scientists to better engage with them.

Exoplanet scientists offer the best example of what Messeri is talking about. Exoplanets are not visible from Earth, even with the assistance of the most powerful telescopes; instead, they are inferred from subtle changes in the light from the stars they orbit. A slight dimming in the light, a slight wobble in the light — it is from such fine measurements that astronomers determine an exo­planet’s existence, the radius of its orbit, its mass and its density. From its density, they extrapolate what it is made of. In practice, this means exoplanet scientists pass their days looking not at planets but at data: light curves and radial velocity graphs and theoretical models. To become an exoplanet scientist, Messeri shows (in part by undergoing some training herself), is to learn to see and convey these abstractions as something more relatable — as ­“super-Earths” or “mini-Neptunes” or such. “To excite the community about a particular visualization,” as Messeri nicely puts it, “is to convince them that the image contains a world.” And to really excite the community, presumably, is to convince them that a world contains little green men.

James Ryerson is a senior staff editor for The Times’s Op-Ed page.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**INTIMATIONS

Stories

By Alexandra Kleeman

218 pp. Harper/HarperCollins Publishers. $25.99.

Like an **alien** intent on some meticulous anthropological mission on Earth, Alexandra Kleeman seems always to be encountering the world for the first time. In “Intimations,” her first story collection, she places us in both the realm of skewed, weird-dream fables (as signaled by a title like “Fairy Tale”) and the more recognizable settings of realist stories, no less strange for it. Whether in a generic beach resort (“Jellyfish”) or an apocalyptic tundra of AstroTurf and bunnies (“Rabbit Starvation”), the world is parsed with a charming exactitude that magnifies all its latent marvels and especially horrors — the blacker and more peculiar these stories get, the funnier they are.

In “Lobster Dinner,” for instance, love blooms parodic amid the bloody ruins of cracked carapaces, “some of them with lipstick marks on their empty husks,” as the notion of a lobster dinner — that cliché of normative romance — is wickedly inverted. (“You are running toward me while the lobsters are killing us all, your hair ruffled in the breeze and the sun glistening off your smooth shoulders.”) It’s “Baywatch” meets B-movie, by way of David Foster Wallace.

Elsewhere, the humor is quieter and more unnerving. “A Brief History of Weather” constitutes a curtailed, self-generated universe, reminiscent of those in Ben Marcus’s “The Age of Wire and String.” Inside a sheltered house, a family studies and seeks to control the weather and, as in Marcus’s stories, these taxonomizing tendencies yield a curiously lucid lyricism: “The snow is what sand would be if it could forget its material”; “A cloud shaped like an anvil impends.”

Kleeman is interested in precision not just at the level of prose but as an ideal. Here this ideal appears to be purely meteorological, but by the story’s end, the house, that “single block of shatterproof plastic,” has suggested itself as a metaphor for the writer’s mind. Within, you can calibrate, analyze and log — a precise ruler of your universe. Beyond, it’s an unruly old world, one that includes the messy mystery of the body. Like the weather, it’s easily measured but not so easily marshaled.

Kleeman, a highly cerebral writer, is especially fascinated by the oddness of bodies. Her first novel, the irresistibly weird and slyly wise “You Too Can Have a Body Like Mine,”[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/06/books/review/you-too-can-have-a-body-like-mine-by-alexandra-kleeman.html] considered what it is to be an assemblage of organs, “a massed wetness pressing in on itself.” In the story “I May Not Be the One You Want, but I Am the One for You” there’s a similar shiver at what Karen, the narrator, registers as the “unbearably sensual” nature of other people. When she imagines a man’s “small, rubbery tongue twisting within the dry mouth,” that use of “the” in place of “his” makes the image even creepier. In the same story, an innocuous bottle of water in turn transfixes, confounds and finally horrifies. Karen accepts this gift from a man in a cafe and as she does, catalogs it as “a tiny diorama, heavy and plastic-cool.” Observing the tiny waterfall on its label, the “miniature mountains, shrouded in pixelated mist,” she then wonders: “But where were all the fish, the birds, the vacationing tourists with their bikinis and cameras? They’ve all drowned, Karen realized suddenly. She put the bottle down.”

The hermetic plastic water bottle of this story and the sealed weather house seem to intimate the same thing: that the world reduced to precise and wholly legible terms is the world made dead. It’s this same knowledge that makes Kleeman’s stories so brilliantly alive.

Hermione Hoby’s first novel, “Neon in ­Daylight,” will be published next year.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When a presidential campaign often inhabits the gutter it’s not easy to establish its low point.

We’ve seen Donald Trump vilify Muslims, Mexicans and women. We’ve seen him indulge airy suggestions that rifle-bearing Americans might like to shoot Hillary Clinton. We’ve seen him belabor the lie that President Obama was not born in the United States — until he recanted. For Trump, the low road to the White House is paved with boorishness. But perhaps his son Donald Trump Jr. set the nadir this week when he compared Syrian refugees to a bowl of Skittles.

A caption accompanying a photograph of the candy said: “If I had a bowl of skittles and I told you just three would kill you. Would you take a handful? That’s our Syrian refugee problem.” Trump Jr. tweeted, “This image says it all.”

Where to begin? With the fact that human beings are not Skittles? With the fact that after more than five years of war 4.8 million Syrians are refugees and 6.1 million are internally displaced and Trump Jr., even with his coddled New York existence, can surely make the calculation that this amounts to almost 2.5 million more human beings than live in the five boroughs?

With the fact that you do not flee your home because you have a choice (like choosing between Skittles and M&Ms after a Manhattan dinner party) but because you no longer have one? With the fact that, according to a Cato Institute study of refugees admitted to the United States between 1975 and 2015, the chance of an American being killed in a terrorist attack committed by a refugee is 1 in 3.64 billion? With the fact that Syrians want to work, make a living, put their kids in decent schools, and recover their dignity, just like the rest of us?

Or perhaps with the fact that comparing Syrians to Skittles carries echoes of the Nazi propagandist Julius Streicher comparing Jews to mushrooms in a popular children’s book that posited the ticklish dilemma of how to distinguish poisonous toadstools from edible fungus; and has a mother saying to her son Franz:

“Yes, my child! Just as a single poisonous mushroom can kill a whole family, so a solitary Jew can destroy a whole village, a whole city, even an entire Volk.”

We all know, even the Trumps know, that the door into the United States was closed to desperate European Jews trying to escape the Holocaust.

If I may be pardoned for extending an awful analogy, I’d suggest to the Trumps that a better caption would read: “If I had a bowl of Skittles and I told you just three of them would turn out to be Sergey Brin, Elon Musk and Pierre Omidyar, would you take a handful?”

The co-founder of Google, co-founder of Tesla, and founder of eBay were all **immigrants**. Steve Jobs’ biological father was a Syrian **immigrant**. In fact, earlier this year, the National Foundation for American Policy found that 51 percent of the country’s start-up companies valued at over $1 billion had at least one **immigrant** founder. A study by the Partnership for a New American Economy, a coalition of governors and business leaders, found that in 2013 more than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies, including seven of the world’s 10 most valuable brands, were started by **immigrants** or their children.

The strength of the United States is its creative churn. In contrast to European states, it is hard-wired to reinvention through **immigration**. When Trump traffics in fear about **immigrants**, whether Muslim or Mexican, he guts America of its greatness and turns his back on its singular idea.

The American response to the Syrian crisis has been paltry — almost 12,000 refugees admitted since the war began, or 0.25 percent of the total. Part of the slowness has come from the rigor of the vetting process. But what do the Trumps care? They are concerned with just one message: Muslim equals danger.

Let’s see now. Trump’s grandfather, Friedrich Trump, was a German **immigrant**. He arrived in the United States in October 1885. For decades, the family lied: They said he hailed from Sweden. In his book, “The Art of the Deal,” Trump says his grandfather “came here from Sweden as a child.” The family historian, John Walter, explained that Trump’s father, Fred, “had a lot of Jewish tenants and it wasn’t a good thing to be German in those days.”

Make up stories: It’s the Trump way. So here was a German-American posing as a Swedish-American opting not to rent to African-Americans.

Friedrich Trump, the **immigrant**, was young. He was penniless. He came not from Sweden but from Bismarck’s recently formed nation state in the middle of a turbulent Europe. A U.S. **immigration** officer allowed him into the United States in 1885 — not a decision without risk.

But an American decision taken in the spirit the Trumps now trample with cavalier untruth and vile innuendo.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

You can follow me on Twitter or join me on Facebook.

\* The Lying Game[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/opinion/the-lying-game.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**All our lives, Jo and I had been optimists. Almost by instinct, we both believed that the world was getting better and that it would continue to do so.

Jo, in particular, was positivity personified. With a warm smile and a ready laugh, she was a woman who constantly looked for the best in people and situations. Almost every week, I’d get a call from her apologizing for missing her train home because a constituent in trouble had come into her office and she wouldn’t leave until she had helped them find a way forward.

It wasn’t that either of us felt progress was inevitable — far from it — but we did believe that the world had entered an era when reason was on the march and tolerance and diversity were ascendant.

Earlier this year, for the first time, she and I started to doubt that. We lived on a houseboat on the Thames, by Tower Bridge in London. There, over dinners with friends, we talked at length about our fears of growing populism, a coarsening of political debate and the stoking of hatred against minority groups. Since Jo was a member of Parliament, the forces that were exploiting the Brexit referendum to sow fear were uppermost in her mind; for me, the rise in anti-migrant sentiment in Europe was at the center of my work.

We both began to worry — not about some catastrophic event that would change everything, but that a series of events, driven by feelings of insecurity and fueled by demagogues, could create a downward spiral that might soon get out of control. She particularly felt stung by the growing anti-politics mood and the violence with which people expressed themselves on social media.

A few weeks before the referendum, as we chopped wood for the stove in our houseboat, we talked about our worries for the world our two young children were growing up in. We wondered what more we could do to help prevent a slide toward extremism, but not for a moment did we imagine that political violence would hurt us.

Then, on June 16, Jo was killed. At a subsequent court appearance, the suspect said[http://www.cnn.com/2016/06/18/europe/jo-cox-suspect-tommy-mair-court/], “My name is death to traitors, freedom for Britain.” All of a sudden, a theoretical concern became all too real.

Members of Parliament don’t get murdered in Britain; this horrific event was surely an aberration. Yet it happened in a context that makes such aberrations more likely — one in which pro-Brexit posters featuring a picture of Syrian families seeking safety claimed the country was at “breaking point” and in which parts of the media routinely demonize migrants and refugees. After the referendum, there was a 42 percent increase[http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-britain-eu-hate-idUKKCN0ZO17L] in hate crimes. Last month, two Polish men were set upon[http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-essex-37227313] by a gang of youths in Harlow, Essex, and one was beaten to death.

This is not just a British problem. The rise of the populists and extremists — who tell people that the problems they face are because of some other group — is a global phenomenon. In France, the National Front leader, Marine Le Pen, smears Muslims. In Hungary, Prime Minister Viktor Orban peddles hatred of refugees. In Britain, the former leader of the U.K. Independence Party, Nigel Farage, spreads prejudice toward Romanians. And in the United States, the Republican presidential nominee, Donald J. Trump, insults Mexicans and Muslims.

Of course, it’s facile to suggest that all these instances are the same; they aren’t. Or that any of these individuals was responsible for Jo’s death; none were. But they share a strategy based on exploiting divisions between people, promoting fear and hatred on the basis of identity.

In the months since Jo’s murder, I’ve been focused on two things: first, on loving our children and giving them the security, support and reassurance they need to survive what happened. They are doing better than I could have hoped — they have their mother’s resilience and spirit.

Second, I’ve thought about what we can do to advance Jo’s beliefs. While she worried about the direction of politics in many countries, she was never despondent. She knew from a lifetime of activism that most people are good, and that human empathy is a powerful force for change.

That mission, of bringing communities together and advancing mutual understanding, is what I’m now focused on: It is the good that must come out of the horror. This week, I am attending the president’s summit meeting on refugees in New York, a much-needed effort to provide sanctuary to those in need and to challenge the demonization refugees so often endure. This meeting cannot change the world overnight, but I hope it can encourage other elected officials, many of whom have been too passive, to step up and emulate the president’s leadership.

The scapegoating of refugees is just one example of a wider problem. Elsewhere, the populists target Jews and Muslims, migrants and Mexicans, black people and gay people. Even when demagogues lose elections, the hatred they have kindled still smolders. There are no quick fixes; we need a long-term plan.

Political leaders, and people generally, must embrace the responsibility to speak out against bigotry. Unless the center holds against the insidious creep of extremism, history shows how quickly hatred is normalized. What begins with biting your tongue for political expediency, or out of social awkwardness, soon becomes complicity with something far worse. Before you know it, it’s already too late.

Campaigners like me need to get better at engaging the silent majority who deplore the incitement of hatred, but who may have real concerns about **immigration**, security or the pace of change in their communities. The last article that Jo wrote was about why politicians needed to engage with people’s worries about **immigration**, not ignore them, even as they confronted prejudice. She felt that well-meaning liberals, including in her own party, too often excluded this audience, rather than reaching out to it.

The fight against hatred and division is a defining issue of our time; no institution can afford to sit it out and hope for the best. We have powerful support, but much of it is too passive; we must build stronger coalitions. Activists need to work more effectively — whether with labor unions or the big businesses, religious groups or sports people — to unite institutions that stand for tolerance and diversity into a cohesive block.

Jo would have maintained her optimism despite all that has happened. Not out of blind faith, but because she believed that what we hold in common is more significant than our differences. It is our job to realize her vision.

Brendan Cox is a former executive director of Crisis Action, a group that works to protect civilians from armed conflict.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump visited the Detroit Economic Club last month to tell a story about a once-great city destroyed by free trade.

“The city of Detroit is the living, breathing example of my opponent’s failed economic agenda,” Mr. Trump said[http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/campaign/290777-transcript-of-donald-trumps-economic-policy-speech-to-detroit]. “She supports the high taxes and radical regulation that forced jobs out of your community, and the crime policies have made you far, far less safe.” He concluded: “She is the candidate of the past. Ours is the campaign of the future.”

In fact, Mr. Trump is the candidate of Michigan’s past, which is one reason he’s losing the state[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/president/mi/michigan\_trump\_vs\_clinton-5533.html] in almost every survey. When he talks about making Michigan great again, he is evoking the years between World War II and the 1973 oil crisis, when an auto industry job that paid for a house, two cars and a cottage Up North was, in the words of the author and automaker Ben Hamper, a “precious birthright.”

Like much of Mr. Trump’s nostalgic campaign, his promise to keep manufacturing jobs in America seems better suited for the attitudes — and the voters — of the 1980s. Back then, Michigan was in a xenophobic mood, especially toward the Japanese, who were often doing a better job of building the fuel-efficient cars Americans wanted to drive. In a suburb of Detroit, a Chinese-American man was beaten to death[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/23/opinion/why-vincent-chin-matters.html?\_r=0] in a bar brawl by a Chrysler foreman who told him, “It’s because of you we’re out of work.” In Flint, people at a United Automobile Workersfund-raising event paid $5 to whack a Toyota with a sledgehammer.

I grew up in Michigan, and even then, we were told the manufacturing jobs that Mr. Trump is now promising the state weren’t coming back. I was a sophomore at Lansing J. W. Sexton High School in 1982. In December of that year, Michigan’s unemployment rate was almost 17 percent. It was the pits of a recession that helped transform the industrial Midwest from the Arsenal of Democracy into the Rust Belt.

That fall, my physics teacher gestured toward the Fisher Body plant across the street from our school and said: “It used to be that you didn’t have to study here. You could just walk across the street and get a job in that plant. Those days are over. You guys are going to have to study and go to college.”

Mr. Trump believes he can win Michigan and other Midwestern states — some of which haven’t voted Republican since George H.W. Bush was elected president — by appealing to blue-collar workers with attacks on trade deals, especially Nafta, which he blames for exporting hundreds of thousands of middle-class manufacturing jobs to Mexico. (In some of them, like Ohio, he holds[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/president/oh/ohio\_trump\_vs\_clinton-5634.html] an advantage.)

But services and knowledge-based industries are playing a more and more significant role in Michigan’s economy. The typical Michigan worker no longer builds cars. In the 2000s, health care surpassed manufacturing as the state’s No. 1 private employment sector. There are only about 160,000 autoworkers[http://www.bls.gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/iag/tgs/iagauto.htm#iag31cessaemp.f.P] (manufacturing and parts) in the state now — 4 percent of the work force, and about half the number since 2000.

Mr. Trump has his reasons for focusing on manufacturing, though. They don’t all have to do with economics. He ignores the fact that many of Michigan’s auto industry jobs were lost to automation, or to foreign manufacturers operating in the right-to-work South, because depicting the Chinese, Japanese and Mexicans as job-stealing **alien** villains better fits his America First narrative.

Mr. Trump’s economic nationalism is inseparable from the ethno-nationalism that’s turning off so many African-Americans, Latinos, Asians and Muslims who might agree with him on trade, but understand deep down that jobs aren’t all he wants to bring back from his good old days.

Marcus Riddle is an example. I met him outside a Coney Island diner in Flint’s North End. He’s exactly the kind of dispossessed autoworker Mr. Trump was talking about when he called Nafta “a total disaster for the United States.” Mr. Riddle once held a well-paying job with an auto parts manufacturer, but was laid off when the company moved some of its operations to Costa Rica. Now he works at an adult foster-care home, earning “$9 an hour after nine years.” Mr. Riddle likes Mr. Trump’s stands on terrorism and illegal **immigration**, but he’s planning to vote for Hillary Clinton.

“He’s too racist for me,” Mr. Riddle said, citing Mr. Trump’s attacks on Mexicans. “I’m mixed: Indian and black. If he gets into office, what am I going to look like?”

Mr. Riddle is skeptical of Mr. Trump’s promises to bring manufacturing jobs back to the United States: “If other presidents couldn’t do it, how can he?”

Michigan was a key state for the Reagan Democrats: hawkish, socially conservative autoworkers who ignored the U.A.W.’s entreaties to vote for Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale. Mr. Trump is winning their heartland, Macomb County, in the blue-collar suburbs of Detroit. He’s also ahead among voters ages 50 to 70, who came of age when a factory job was still a birthright, and share his nostalgia for those years.

But the future of Michigan’s economy isn’t a new auto plant in Detroit. It’s a business like Niowave[http://www.niowaveinc.com/] in Lansing, which draws on the skills of both physicists and skilled tradesmen to manufacture particle accelerators. According to “The New Path to Prosperity[https://issuu.com/martinwaymire/docs/prosperity\_report\_2013final]: Lessons for Michigan From Two Decades of Economic Change,” a report by Michigan Future, an organization devoted to encouraging Michigan’s transition from an industrial to a knowledge-based economy, the state added about 313,000 jobs in “knowledge-based services” from 1990 to 2011 — almost exactly the same number as it lost in manufacturing.

Since the “lost decade” of the 2000s, during which Michigan lost more than half its automaking employment[http://www.annarborusa.org/sites/default/files/content-documents/auto\_industry\_update-november\_2014.pdf], and General Motors and Chryslerwere bailed out by the federal government, the state has added more than 400,000 jobs, a 10.6 percent increase[https://www.mackinac.org/21401].

Even the auto industry has been recovering, although chances are it will never return to its pre-lost-decade dominance. According to the Mackinac Center for Public Policy[https://www.mackinac.org/21401], “jobs in auto and auto-part manufacturing are up 67 percent from their recessionary trough.”

The changes in Michigan’s economy present a problem for Mr. Trump. The Republican Party’s pursuit of whites without college degrees has been offering diminishing returns since it converted the Reagan Democrats — in 1980, they were 65 percent of the electorate[http://www.npr.org/2016/01/18/462027861/republicans-white-working-class-trap-a-growing-reliance], compared with 36 percent in 2012 — but Mr. Trump has tailored his politically incorrect alpha male persona and his protectionist message specifically to them.

The Fisher Body plant across the street from my school is long gone. Most of the jobs are gone, too. As Lansing’s mayor, Virg Bernero, has noted, G.M. can build the same number of cars with 5,000 workers as it did with 25,000 in the 1950s and ’60s.

The Trump conundrum is that his campaign is about loss. His appeal is strongest among people who feel their social, economic and political influence slipping away, but he appeals to them specifically because their numbers are dwindling, thus making them less effective as an electoral coalition.

A candidate of the past can’t win the present. As my physics teacher predicted, Michigan now has more college graduates and fewer autoworkers than it did in the 1980s. Mr. Trump is promising to restore a way of life that, even then, we knew was disappearing.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Edward McClelland is the author of “Nothin’ but Blue Skies: The Heyday, Hard Times and Hopes of America’s Industrial Heartland.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Branding himself the “law-and-order candidate,” Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] has vowed to carry out a crackdown on crime and terrorism that would benefit white Americans and racial minorities alike.

But an examination of Mr. Trump’s recommendations for policing, terrorism and **immigration** enforcement reveals a series of policies that civil rights activists and national security veterans fear could have the effect of treating minorities with suspicion and singling them out for heavier government scrutiny.

Over the past few days, Mr. Trump has intensified the racial and ethnic cast to his policies. On Wednesday, he suggested stop-and-frisk[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/stop\_and\_frisk/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] policing, a tactic that has been discontinued in New York City, as a model for other cities. More than four in five people stopped by New York police under stop-and-frisk were black or Hispanic, and a federal judge ruled the policy unconstitutional as it was implemented.

Earlier in the week, Mr. Trump answered the bombings in New York and New Jersey by calling for aggressive profiling of terrorism suspects, and criticized the authorities for showing restraint toward people from “that part of the world.”

Many of the details of Mr. Trump’s proposals are sketchy and thus difficult to analyze. He has not said precisely what elements of New York’s stop-and-frisk policy he would aim to export, or which versions of profiling he would favor, offering remarks in casual television interviews unaccompanied by more extensive proposals. A spokesman said Thursday that Mr. Trump did not intend to endorse racial or ethnic profiling.

But Mr. Trump has insistently described law enforcement and security services as hemmed in by concerns about “political correctness,” and has vowed to do away with them. He claimed on Monday that the police are so skittish about being accused of inappropriate profiling that they would balk at stopping someone who “looks like he’s got a massive bomb on his back,” if the suspect appeared to be of a certain background.

Mr. Trump’s policy prescriptions have stirred concern among some experts in national security and law enforcement, including prominent Republicans who warn that Mr. Trump’s agenda could undermine public safety by generating a backlash in communities that the police and intelligence officials rely upon for cooperation.

Michael Chertoff, who served as secretary of Homeland Security under President George W. Bush, said Mr. Trump’s characterization of law enforcement as hemmed in by political correctness was entirely unfounded.

“I’ve never heard of a cop or an intelligence person saying, ‘We’re not going to look at something because we’re afraid of offending people,’” he said. “It’s a disservice to our police and to our people in the security services to argue that they’ve been inhibited in pursuing genuine leads.”

Mr. Chertoff, a former federal judge and prosecutor, said that profiling techniques not relating to ethnicity were already available to the authorities, and that ethnic profiling was counterproductive.

“Not only is it a waste of time, but you’re offending people who in many ways you want to be your allies,” he said, adding: “When you ethnically profile, you play into the hands of the enemy.”

If elected, Mr. Trump would have little direct power over local law enforcement, but presidents do set the tone at the Justice Department, which can sue municipalities that violate civil rights. Under President Obama, the Justice Department has sought to address racial unrest by scrutinizing police departments in cities like Baltimore and Cleveland. Mr. Trump has been critical of the Obama administration’s oversight of the police, raising the prospect that he would take a very different approach.

Presidents have far broader discretion in areas related to national security and **immigration**. In some instances, Mr. Trump has advocated for unprecedented measures that would be unlikely to survive legal scrutiny, such as a proposal to ban all Muslim **immigration** that he offered during the Republican primaries.

Mr. Trump has also proposed to enlist local law enforcement agencies to fulfill his promise to deport millions of people who entered the country illegally, largely from Latin America and Asia. He has pledged to “expand and revitalize” a federal program known as 287(g) which empowers local police departments to help enforce federal **immigration** law.

But like New York’s stop-and-frisk policy, this program has come under fire for its racial impact. In 2012, the Obama administration discontinued its most hotly criticized element, which allowed the police to question people about their **immigration** status on the street, following concerns that it violated the rights of American citizens of Hispanic descent.

“In some places, local law enforcement wound up picking up people who were citizens or who had legal status in the country,” said David Martin, who served as principal deputy general counsel of the Department of Homeland Security from January 2009 to December 2010. “There has been no close attention at all on the part of the Trump campaign policy people to see what’s being done right now, what is effective and what are the trade-offs that the Obama administration is making.”

Although another element of the program, which deports people who have been charged with crimes, has been kept in place, Mr. Trump contends that Mr. Obama “recklessly gutted” the 287(g) program, and has promised to revive it.

Boris Epshteyn, a campaign spokesman, said Thursday that Mr. Trump favored only policies “within the bounds of the Constitution.” He said there were versions of a stop-and-frisk policy that would pass legal muster, and that Mr. Trump favored profiling people based on their activities and nations of origin, rather than using racial and ethnic criteria.

“Donald Trump favors stop-and-frisk to be one of the many tools that are utilized by law enforcement in this country,” Mr. Epshteyn said. “He wants it to be applied by police departments where it is necessary.”

He said the 287(g) program could be re-implemented in a way that would be effective and avoid discrimination. “It does not make sense to scrap a viable and successful program just because folks complained about it,” he said.

Support for aggressive policing has long been part of Mr. Trump’s political persona, and he has been rewarded in the presidential race with support from a number of law enforcement groups, including the Fraternal Order of Police, a national union that endorsed his campaign last week.

Its executive director, Jim Pasco, cautioned that the organization did not necessarily subscribe to all of Mr. Trump’s views. The endorsement, he said, was “based on a sense that Mr. Trump is willing to listen to police officers.”

The union has long been against racial profiling, Mr. Pasco noted, adding that he had reservations about the possible use of local police departments to bring “the hammer down on the illegal **immigrants** who are otherwise not breaking laws.”

“You have to balance that need for cooperation and confidence from the community, particularly in terms of witnesses and early warnings to potential problems, against what might conceivably be a lesser problem,” Mr. Pasco said. “And that would be somebody staying over their visa, for example.”

Some of Mr. Trump’s ideas have been tried already: He said Thursday morning that his suggestion of stop-and-frisk policing was aimed mainly at Chicago, which is experiencing a spike in violent crime.

But Chicago has already attempted to curb crime by using stop-and-frisk methods, pursuing the strategy aggressively under a new police chief in 2011. By 2013, its use of the tactic was considered even more pervasive than New York City’s, according to Wesley G. Skogan, a political science professor at Northwestern University.

In the summer of 2014, the Chicago police made 250,000 stops that did not result in arrests; 72 percent were of African-Americans, according to the American Civil Liberties Union. The Chicago police dramatically reduced the number of stops after the A.C.L.U. threatened to sue and the Illinois legislature passed a law requiring more oversight of stops.

Vincent Warren, the executive director of the Center for Constitutional Rights, which challenged New York City’s stop-and-frisk policy in court, said the tactic effectively treated “race as a proxy for criminality.”

“The price of stopping every black person is intolerable to communities of color,” Mr. Warren said. “Furthermore, when those policies don’t work, they feel more like social control or collective punishment.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Donald Trump Embraces Wider Use of Stop-and-Frisk by Police[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/22/us/politics/donald-trump-don-king-black-voters.html]

\* Donald Trump Says Drugs Are ‘Big Factor’ in Urban Violence[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/us/politics/donald-trump-reaction-protests.html]

\* Keith Scott’s Killing by Police Emerges as Issue in Tight North Carolina Race[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/us/politics/presidential-race-north-carolina.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — They were young men caught between cultures, sons of **immigrant** families, feeling lost or rejected — and angry about American-led wars. Online they encountered the silver-tongued recruiters of Al Qaeda[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/a/al\_qaeda/index.html?inline=nyt-org] and the Islamic State, who said their first loyalty should be not to their nation but to Islam. Then they plotted sensational violence.

In the weekend bombings in New York and New Jersey and stabbings at a mall in Minnesota, the accused perpetrators fit the same rough pattern as in previous attacks at the Boston Marathon[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/b/boston\_marathon/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] in 2013; in San Bernardino, Calif., in 2015, and in Orlando, Fla., in June, as well as in the terrorist assaults in Paris and Brussels.

A rich recruiting pool for Al Qaeda and the Islamic State includes what psychologists call “in-betweeners,” young adults whose identities have not yet solidified. Their uncertainty makes them vulnerable, said J. Reid Meloy, a forensic psychologist and clinical professor at the University of California, San Diego. “It allows the individual to attach his identity to something that is larger and inflates his sense of himself,” he said.

The uncomfortable in-between status can be especially acute for those with recent **immigrant** roots. Living in two cultures at once is very enriching for most people but very unsettling for others, said Lorenzo Vidino, the director of the Program on Extremism at George Washington University. For some Muslim **immigrants**, he said, “You have a message at home that’s very conservative, and a completely different message from the society around you when you’re growing up.”

The full history of Ahmad Khan Rahami, 28, the naturalized American of Afghan birth who is accused of planting bombs in Manhattan and New Jersey, is not yet known. But his 2014 arrest in an alleged stabbing in a family dispute suggests a young man adrift; his scribbling in a notebook the names of Osama bin Laden, Abu Muhammad al-Adnani — an Islamic State leader — and Anwar al-Awlaki[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/a/anwar\_al\_awlaki/index.html?inline=nyt-per], the American-born Qaeda recruiter, appeared to reflect a full-blown embrace of jihadism.

Tamerlan Tsarnaev, a Chechen **immigrant** and the older of the two Boston Marathon bombers, turned to Islamist extremism when his hopes for a boxing career dimmed. He was 26 at the time of the attack. Omar Mateen, the son of an Afghan **immigrant** with outspoken political views, was 29 when he opened fire at an Orlando nightclub, killing 49 people. He had been dismissed from training as a prison guard after making disturbing remarks about weapons, and ended up as a private security guard.

Syed Rizwan Farook, 28, the Chicago-born son of **immigrants** from Pakistan, found work as a health inspector but had spent years searching for dates and a mate before meeting Tashfeen Malik online and marrying her in Saudi Arabia. Together, the couple attacked a luncheon attended by Mr. Farook’s colleagues last December, killing 14 people.

“When you dig into these cases, you find the ‘why’ is a very complex question,” said Peter Bergen, the director of the security program at New America, a research group, and author of “United States of Jihad.” Personal disappointment, perceptions of discrimination, anger about American foreign policy and the desire “to become a hero in one’s own story” are all at play in addition to jihadist ideology, he said.

“Many of them just take their grievances and dress them up in the garb of Islam,” Mr. Bergen said.

That has become easy in the age of the internet. The attackers in San Bernardino, Orlando and New York all had expressed support for the Islamic State, and they and the Boston bombers were devotees of the voluminous online work of Mr. Awlaki, who was killed in an American drone strike in 2011. He remains highly popular on the web, where he argues that Western Muslims must reject even the friendliest non-Muslim neighbors, whom he calls “Sally Soccer Mom and Joe Six-Pack.” Mr. Rahami wrote in his journal that “Sheikh Anwar,” as well as Mr. Adnani of the Islamic State, had “said it clearly”: “Attack the kuffar,” or non-Muslims, “in their backyard.”

Farhad Khosrokhavar, a sociologist at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris and the author of “Radicalization,” said Muslims in Europe more often than those in America felt “frontally rejected” by the larger society. He said he has often seen in his research individuals who felt neither French nor Arab.

“In France, they are blamed for not being French enough, and when they go to their parents’ country of origin, they are blamed for not being Arab enough,” Mr. Khosrokhavar said. “That double denial can push them to adhere to a radical version of Islam, as a kind of lifeline: Since I am neither French nor Arab, neither American nor Afghan, I am Muslim and to hell with you all,” he added.

These roots of radicalization do not make **immigrants** in general a danger. In the United States, **immigrants** have a lower rate of crime and violence than other Americans. Converts to Islam are disproportionately represented among Americans and Europeans drawn to extremism, and other ideologies also motivate mass violence — as in the case of Dylann Roof, who was 21 when he fatally shot nine black people last year at a church in Charleston, S.C., in the name of white supremacy.

“The actual content of the ideology is secondary,” said Mr. Meloy, the psychologist. “What’s important is the identification and fixation.”

But the Islamist terrorist groups target the particular anxieties of Western Muslims from **immigrant** backgrounds, posing recruitment as a religious loyalty test. They call on supporters to reject the nations where they live and embrace instead a devotion to the ummah, the global community of Muslims. The West is at war with Islam, they say, and you must strike out to defend your fellow Muslims.

That message has been delivered with particular power by Mr. Awlaki, often reinforcing the newer propaganda efforts of the Islamic State. As an imam who counseled **immigrants** at three American mosques, and as a Yemeni-American who had lived in both countries and in Britain, Mr. Awlaki understood the worries of Muslims in the West. When he joined Al Qaeda, he did his best to open a gulf between them and their non-Muslim neighbors.

“The important lesson to learn here is: Never, ever trust a kuffar,” Mr. Awlaki said in a 2003 lecture in London that was captured on video and remains a YouTube favorite. “Now, you might argue and say: ‘But my neighbor is such a nice person. My classmates are very nice. My co-workers — they’re just fabulous people, they’re so decent and honest.’” Yet these non-Muslims can never be relied upon, he said.

Later, after moving to Yemen, he spoke not only of shunning non-Muslims, but also of attacking them. In a 2010 video, he tried to shame his listeners into choosing his brand of religion over their country.

“To the Muslims in America I have this to say: How can your conscience allow you to live in peaceful coexistence with a nation that is responsible for the tyranny and crimes committed against your own brothers and sisters?” he said. “How can you have your loyalty to a government that is leading the war against Islam and Muslims?”

He has led many people down the jihadist path, and not just in English-speaking countries. The Counter Extremism Project, an advocacy group based in Washington, said Wednesday that it had counted 88 “extremists” who had been influenced by Mr. Awlaki: 54 in the United States and 34 in Europe.

Most such jihadist recruits are the children of **immigrants**, said Olivier Roy, a professor at the European University Institute in Florence, Italy, and the author of “Globalized Islam.” His research shows that 65 percent of Muslim extremists in France and Belgium are from this second generation.

“These young people have broken away from their parents, who they blame for many things — for practicing the wrong Islam, for having brought them to the West, for having failed in life,” Mr. Roy said, noting that Mr. Rahami reportedly had clashed with his father.

But such conflicts pass. Few jihadists are from the third generation, the grandchildren of **immigrants**, he said.

Scott Shane reported from Washington, Richard Pérez-Peña from New York, Aurelien Breeden from Paris.

\* Why Didn’t the F.B.I. Stop the New York Bombing?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/22/us/fbi-terror-ahmad-khan-rahami.html]

\* Americans Attracted to ISIS Find an ‘Echo Chamber’ on Social Media[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/09/us/americans-attracted-to-isis-find-an-echo-chamber-on-social-media.html]

\* Killers Were Long Radicalized, F.B.I. Investigators Say[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/08/us/fbi-says-san-bernardino-assailants-were-radicalized.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Jeremy Corbyn’s tenure since last September as leader of the Labour Party has been bumpy, to say the least: The party now has the worst poll ratings[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/09/12/jeremy-corbyns-labour-suffers-worst-opinion-poll-ratings-the-par/] in its history. Labour’s parliamentary members have complained that Mr. Corbyn cannot manage them. And his tenure has been troubled by poor decisions — he chose, for example, to go to a Cuba solidarity event on the same day that Theresa May, the new prime minister, announced the formation of her cabinet, leaving the opposition with no public response. Mr. Corbyn was widely considered a lackluster campaigner in the effort to persuade British voters that their country should remain in the European Union.

These issues, as well as Mr. Corbyn’s positions far to the left of most of the party’s members of Parliament, led to a vote of no-confidence[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/29/world/europe/jeremy-corbyn-labour-party-brexit.html] by the party’s House of Commons delegation in June. Tradition dictated that Mr. Corbyn should step down. He refused, setting off a crisis within the party[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/world/europe/britain-corbyn-labour-party.html] and another vote, with Mr. Corbyn vying with Owen Smith, another Labour member of Parliament, for the leadership.

You might expect rank-and-file Labour Party members to be angry about all of this, and to respond by getting rid of Mr. Corbyn. Instead, they are ready to re-elect[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/jeremy-corbyn-labour-party-britain.html] him. He seems likely to win by an even bigger margin than he did in 2015.

Is the Labour Party engaging in an act of collective madness? How else to explain a rush to support a guy who can’t manage his own party, much less win a general election? To understand Mr. Corbyn’s remarkable support, you need to know the party’s recent history. What we are seeing now is a corrective to what happened during the years when Tony Blair rebranded the party as “New Labour.”

Under Mr. Blair, the party became professionalized. Activists, previously an important part of Labour’s organization, were reduced to foot soldiers with little influence on policy. Trade unions were marginalized. Members of Parliament were rewarded for obedience rather than talent.

New Labour won three elections, but its focus on spin and brand management **alienated** the traditional base. The leadership ignored grass-roots supporters — the people who go to local Labour Party meetings, who canvass on its behalf, who attend party conferences.

In addition to pushing the activists to the side, Mr. Blair made the party more conservative. It’s true that Mr. Blair fulfilled some progressive agenda items as prime minister, from expanding L.G.B.T. rights to introducing a minimum wage, but at the same time the party abandoned its traditional socialist values.

One of Mr. Blair’s first acts as prime minister was to introduce university tuition fees, leading to widespread student protests. His support for the Iraq war was similarly loathed by the party’s base. So was his attitude toward capitalism in a party with deep socialist roots. In 1998, his political mentor, Peter Mandelson, declared that he was “intensely relaxed about people getting filthy rich.”

Mr. Corbyn wants to reverse many of these positions. He vehemently opposes foreign military intervention and says he wants to rein in income inequality. He has even said he would renationalize industries. He also wants to give party members power to help shape policy, and to elect his top team.

For most rank-and-file members, the no-confidence vote was not just a vote against Mr. Corbyn, but against this ideological sea change, an impression reinforced by the presence of Mr. Blair’s allies at the forefront of the attempts to unseat Mr. Corbyn. During the leadership campaign in 2015, Mr. Blair himself excoriated Mr. Corbyn and his supporters. In July 2015, he told Labour members that voting for Mr. Corbyn could lead to “annihilation” and said, “If your heart’s with Jeremy Corbyn, get a transplant.”

Thus, many Labour members have viewed challenges to the Corbyn leadership not as about competence, but as about ensuring the left does not gain a significant foothold in the party.

Many of Mr. Corbyn’s opponents are tearing their hair out because his supporters are sticking by him even though everyone seems to believe he is unelectable. But the concept of “electability” is fraught within the party. Members of Parliament and commentators hostile to Mr. Corbyn argue that winning elections should be the Labour Party’s primary goal. And to win elections, they say, the party must support policies that the party’s base opposes, like cutting welfare.

But the issue is not that the Labour base would rather lose elections and remain left-wing; it’s that capitulating to British voters’ more right-wing inclinations does not seem to have worked for the party. In the 2015 general election, Labour’s candidate for prime minister was Ed Miliband, a social democrat who promised “controls on **immigration**,” and to establish stricter welfare policies. He still lost.

So even when Labour had a moderate, allegedly electable candidate, Britain[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] still ended up with a Conservative government. Rank-and-file members therefore started to see the electability question as a cover for moving the party to the right. Mr. Blair embodied their worst fears when, in a 2015 speech on Labour’s future[http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/jul/22/tony-blairs-speech-on-the-future-of-the-labour-party-in-full], he said: “I wouldn’t want to win on an old-fashioned leftist platform. Even if I thought it was the route to victory, I wouldn’t take it.”

The Labour Party has always been an uneasy coalition, and its internal factions are much more varied than simply Blairites and Corbynites. But the attempts to get rid of Mr. Corbyn have pushed Labour’s biggest ideological clash to center stage: on one side, proponents of a professionalized, media-friendly party whose role is to win elections so it can make modest social reforms; on the other, supporters of a social movement that aims to change society starting with the grass roots — but for whom winning parliamentary power is not a goal to be pursued at any cost.

Since New Labour’s first election victory in 1997, the British left has found itself virtually excommunicated from politics. These people are not stupid or crazy. In Mr. Corbyn, they have identified an opportunity to reinsert themselves into public life and to return the Labour Party to its socialist values. They recognize this may be the only chance they have. It’s entirely reasonable that they are taking it.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Ellie Mae O’Hagan is a freelance journalist based in London.

\* Anti-Semitism and the British Left[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/12/opinion/anti-semitism-and-the-british-left.html]

\* Labour Party Is Poised to Back Jeremy Corbyn Again, Even if Britain Isn’t[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/jeremy-corbyn-labour-party-britain.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — The Obama administration, responding to an extraordinary wave of Haitian migrants seeking to enter the United States, said on Thursday that it would fully resume deportations of undocumented Haitian **immigrants**.

After an earthquake devastated parts of Haiti[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/13/world/americas/13haiti.html] in 2010, the United States suspended deportations[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/14/world/americas/14deport.html], saying that sending Haitians back to the country at a time of great instability would put their lives at risk. About a year later, officials partly resumed deportations, focusing on people convicted of serious crimes or those considered a threat to national security.

But since last spring, thousands of Haitian migrants who had moved to Brazil[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/07/world/americas/brazils-boom-absorbs-haitis-poor-for-now.html] in search of work have been streaming north, mostly by land, winding up at American border crossings that lead to Southern California.

Few have arrived with American visas, but nearly all have been allowed to enter the United States because **immigration** officials were prohibited, under the modified deportation policy, from using the so-called fast-track removal process often employed at the border for new, undocumented arrivals.

Instead, the migrants were placed in a slower deportation process and released, with an appointment to appear in **immigration** court at a later date, officials said. Since early summer, most have been given permission to remain in the country for as long as three years under a humanitarian parole provision, **immigrant** advocates said.

With the full resumption of deportations, which took effect on Thursday morning, Haitians who arrive at the border without visas will be put into expedited removal proceedings.

Jeh Johnson, the secretary of Homeland Security, said in a statement that conditions in Haiti[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/haiti/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] had “improved sufficiently to permit the U.S. government to remove Haitian nationals on a more regular basis.”

While Mr. Johnson’s statement did not mention the recent influx of Haitians along the southwestern border, Homeland Security officials, during a conference call with reporters, cited the migrant wave as the other key factor in the administration’s decision.

Since last October, officials said, more than 5,000 Haitians without visas have shown up at the San Ysidro crossing that links Tijuana, Mexico, with San Diego. By comparison, 339 Haitians without visas arrived at the San Ysidro crossing in the 2015 fiscal year.

An additional 4,000 to 6,000 Haitians were thought to be still making their way from Brazil, **immigrant** advocates in San Diego and Tijuana said, based on estimates from shelters along the Brazil-to-Mexico migration route.

The message to those Haitians from the Obama administration, however, seems clear: Turn around or go elsewhere.

An uptick in deportations might not occur immediately. Removals require the cooperation of and paperwork from the receiving country, and Homeland Security officials said they were still in negotiations with the Haitian government about the policy shift.

In the meantime, officials said, nearly all Haitians stopped at the border and scheduled for accelerated deportations would be put into detention centers.

Officials clarified, however, that asylum law would continue to apply to newly arriving Haitians. A migrant who feared returning to Haiti because of the threat of persecution or torture would be interviewed to determine whether that fear was credible. If an **immigration** officer determined it was, the **immigrant** could apply for asylum.

Haitian **immigrants** covered by temporary protected status[https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/temporary-protected-status/temporary-protected-status-designated-country-haiti] would be unaffected by the change in policy.

Over the summer, the unusual surge in Haitian migrants was accompanied by an equally unusual surge in migrants from more than two dozen other countries, nearly all traveling along the same arduous routes from South America, across as many as 10 borders.

The migratory wave has overwhelmed shelters along the way, particularly in Tijuana, where the four main shelters have been at or over capacity for much of the past four months, while also struggling with language and cultural barriers. Some migrants, because they were unable to find accommodations or wanted to avoid shelter living, have chosen to sleep on the streets.

Haitians started migrating to Brazil in large numbers after the earthquake. Haiti was reeling, but Brazil was ascendant, and it had a need for cheap labor, especially with the World Cup and the Olympics approaching. Haitians, with few prospects at home, were happy to oblige.

Thousands of them made their way to Brazil, often through Ecuador, a bordering country with a lax **immigration** policy. In Brazil, many were granted humanitarian visas that allowed them to work.

But amid Brazil’s economic and political convulsions over the last two years, many Haitians lost their jobs or sank deeper into poverty.

The migration north began in earnest during the spring, with a large influx in Tijuana in late May, and the surge has continued.

The Haitian migrant population has mainly consisted of men, though many women have made the trek, too, as have children and even newborns. They have mainly taken an elaborate series of bus rides, though migrants also had to travel at times by foot, truck and boat, and have hired smugglers to help sneak them across certain borders or avoid law enforcement officials.

They have told of highway robberies, frightening encounters with armed gangs and beatings. Some migrants have died during the trip, many being swept away while trying to ford swift-moving rivers.

The shift in American policy caught advocates in San Diego and Tijuana by surprise.

“It was a complete and utter shock,” said Ginger Jacobs, an **immigration** lawyer and the chairwoman of the San Diego **Immigrant** Rights Consortium. “We are pretty baffled by what appears to be a complete 180 in terms of policy.”

She added, “We object to a policy change that doesn’t appear to reflect any actual change in reality.”

Margarita Andonaegui, the coordinator of a main migrant shelter in Tijuana, said that on Wednesday afternoon she had received what sounded like heartening news: The American authorities were going to increase their processing capacity for the Haitians, to 150 per day from 50.

But in light of the new deportation policy, that piece of information took on another meaning.

“They’re going to receive them to deport them,” Ms. Andonaegui said. “That’s bad news.”

\* The U.N.’s Responsibility in Haiti’s Cholera Crisis[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/08/opinion/the-uns-responsibility-in-haitis-cholera-crisis.html]

\* Poor Sanitation Persisted at U.N. Missions Long After Haiti Cholera Crisis[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/world/americas/haiti-cholera-sanitation-un-peacekeepers.html]

\* Influx of Haitians Into the Amazon Prompts **Immigration** Debate in Brazil[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/08/world/americas/brazil-limits-haitian-immigration.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A wave of migrants and refugees, the largest since World War II, has strained the fabric of societies across Europe. The American presidential election, with the unusual campaign of the Republican nominee, Donald J. Trump, has focused the world’s nervous attention on strains in the United States.

To varying degrees, countries including Turkey, Poland and Hungary have clamped down on journalists and judges. Governments have struggled to respond to the challenges of religious extremism and gaping disparities in wealth and income. In the United States, Mr. Trump has scorned democratic traditions, arguing that outsourcing of jobs, **immigration** and terrorism have created a mess and vowing, “I alone can fix it.”

Among the government officials, scholars, activists, journalists and others who gathered last week for the fourth-annual Athens Democracy Forum, organized by The International New York Times, the mood was glum, if not despairing. They agreed that democracy was in danger, and liberalism — civil rights, the rule of law, the protection of minorities — even more so.

“The crisis we find ourselves in today is one in which we have started to question the very fundamentals on which our democracies have been built — our moral values of openness and equality, our fundamental freedoms, our resilience and, most importantly, what unites us, what binds us,” said Dimitris Avramopoulos, the European Union’s commissioner for migration, home affairs and citizenship.

Mr. Avramopoulos, a former foreign minister and defense minister of Greece, said the greatest threat to Europe came not from migration or terrorism but from the demons within. “What I believe can weaken us is what comes from inside: the rise of nationalism, populism, demagogy and xenophobia — the rise of dark ghosts from our recent past,” he said.

The conference itself, said Roger Cohen, a New York Times columnist who delivered the opening speech, was conceived as a “confident celebration” of democracy but instead became an “anxious interrogation.”

“I am pessimistic in the short term, optimistic in the long term, particularly as I won’t be around to see if I was right,” he said. Pessimistic, he said, because “the problems are deep, can no longer be ignored, and cannot be righted in short order.”

Mr. Cohen said there was some truth to the criticism that political and economic elites have profoundly failed their citizens. Free trade and large-scale **immigration** have produced enormous gains for those at the top of the ladder, but broad gains in prosperity have been elusive, he said.

Among the results: The anxiety that propelled Britain’s decision, in a June 23 referendum, to leave the European Union, and the ascent of anti-establishment politicians like Mr. Trump and the French far-right leader Marine Le Pen.

In the long run, though, Mr. Cohen is upbeat: “The democratic idea is stubborn.”

At the core of the conference were four panel discussions on Sept. 15, addressing the intersection of democracy with migration, authoritarianism, capitalism and religion. Below are highlights:

MIGRATION

Are democratic societies prepared to deal with large-scale movements of people fleeing persecution and violence?

“Under no circumstances do you shut the door to someone whose only crime is that they were born in a war-torn or impoverished country or region,” said Stavros Lambrinidis, the European Union’s special representative for human rights and a former foreign minister of Greece. “At the same time, you must make sure that you address the root causes of these problems.”

Mario Monti, a former prime minister of Italy and a former member of the European Commission, the executive arm of the European Union, lamented that “the short-term nature of political discourse” had made it increasingly difficult to engage in the kind of reasoned, nuanced policy debates necessary to deal with thorny issues.

Lucas Papademos, a former prime minister of Greece who is also an economist, said it was “not realistic” to “keep the doors totally open” but urged recognition of the long-term benefits of migration: replenishing an aging work force, supporting welfare and pension systems, and assisting entrepreneurship.

Just as efforts to lift people out of poverty must be balanced against the impact on the environment, the rights of migrants have to be balanced against the need to keep societies safe, Mr. Lambrinidis said. “Sustainable security, like sustainable development, has to become the new paradigm,” he said.

Mr. Papademos pronounced himself worried about the future of the European project, saying that conflicts abroad, and the resulting exodus of people, were “threatening the cohesion” of Europe and turning the “bedrock” of values upon which the European Union was built into “quicksand.”

Mr. Monti sees signs that “international integration is moving backward,” as societies turn against the free movement of goods and people.”

He pointed to a lack of leadership in Europe. “Whereas in the past, member states considered Europe a huge investment in their own long-term interest, now most leaders see Europe as a useful consumption good that you can try to squeeze in order hopefully to generate more short-term domestic political consensus,” he said.

AUTHORITARIANISM

As democracies falter, candidates promising quick fixes through sheer force of personality have captured the imagination of voters. Alison Smale, the Berlin bureau chief of The New York Times, moderated a discussion on the appeal of the “big man.” (The candidates seem invariably to be male.)

Eleni Tsakopoulos Kounalakis, who was the United States ambassador to Hungary from 2010 to 2013, recalled the rise of Viktor Orban, who became prime minister a few months after she arrived in Budapest.

The previous government, led by Socialists, was widely seen as discredited after the global financial crisis, she said, and Mr. Orban swept to power after urging voters to give his nationalist, conservative party, Fidesz, a supermajority in Parliament.

Once in office, Mr. Orban passed legislation deploring the Treaty of Trianon, which in 1920 set Hungary’s borders after World War I, while strengthening the government’s control over news outlets, the judiciary, universities and local governments. Mr. Orban even embraced the term “illiberal democracy,” arguing that his mandate from voters (he was re-elected in 2014) justified restrictions on civil rights and civil liberties.

Mr. Orban set an example that has been emulated by the far-right government that took power in Poland last year, Ms. Kounalakis said.

Christiane Amanpour, the CNN journalist, described her experiences interviewing strongmen, including Robert Mugabe, the longtime president of Zimbabwe; Hosni Mubarak, the Egyptian president who was ousted in 2011; Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi, the Libyan leader who was murdered by a mob in 2011; and Turkey’s president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, who has led an authoritarian turn in that country.

“I’ve interviewed a lot of these people who have come in as democrats and turned into authoritarians, never-ending rulers,” she said, describing Mr. Erdogan’s outrage when she asked him about his request that Germany prosecute a satirist who had mocked him. “He was shocked that I would ask him that question,” Ms. Amanpour said.

Ms. Amanpour, who grew up in Iran when it was led by an authoritarian shah, said control of the news media was the first point on the authoritarian agenda. “None of these authoritarians could have a lock on so-called success if they didn’t have a compliant media,” she said, noting crackdowns on the press in Russia, Poland, Turkey and elsewhere.

CAPITALISM

Concerns about the ability of governments to rein in capitalism were brought to the fore during the 2008 global economic crisis and continue to reverberate around the West.

At a panel moderated by Paul Krugman, the New York Times columnist and Nobel-laureate economist, Yasheng Huang, a professor of global economics at the M.I.T. Sloan School of Management, said the allure of the business strongman was unsurprising since many chief executives “rule their own companies” as unquestioned leaders.

Yanis Varoufakis, a former finance minister of Greece and one of the best-known critics of economic austerity in Europe, said there were three threats to democracy from the rising power of business: the banking sector (which helped cause the financial crisis), the news media (which has been increasingly consolidated) and monopolies (whose concentrated power defies attempts at regulation and control). “I’m afraid that the political-democratic realm is not doing very well,” he said.

Mr. Varoufakis did not blame businesses for the austerity policies, which he believes have contributed to a series of economic crises in Greece. “My experience in Europe is that business was much more progressive in demanding an end to austerity, and is to this day, than governments are,” he said.

Does economic development eventually lead to democratic reform, as Seymour Martin Lipset and other political scientists proposed in the decades after World War II?

Mr. Huang was not optimistic. “Before the current leadership,” he said, “China has had generations of leaders who were not democrats, but trending toward the liberal direction.” That has stopped with Xi Jinping, China’s paramount leader since 2012.

“This is one of the big problems with an authoritarian system because the leadership selection is a very unpredictable process,” Mr. Huang said. “Nobody knew the characteristics of this current leader before he was selected. He had a lot of room to maneuver and he decided to move backward.” Private-sector confidence in China is declining, and people are taking money out of the country, he added.

RELIGION

“The more that people of different faiths can interact to pursue some common goal, the more well-off we are as democracies,” said the Rev. Chloe Breyer, an Episcopalian minister and the executive director of the Interfaith Center of New York, reflecting a common belief in the United States.

Serge Schmemann, a member of the Times editorial board who led the discussion, said he wanted to steer clear of familiar debates about Islam in public life. He invited two men born in the Soviet Union — Natan Sharansky, a Jewish human-rights activist who is now chairman of the Jewish Agency for Israel, and Sergei Chapnin, a former editor of the official journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, the seat of the Russian Orthodox Church[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/r/russian\_orthodox\_church/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] board — to talk about the misuses of faith.

Mr. Sharansky said that during his days as a human rights dissident, religious people were “by far our strongest, best comrades in arms.”

Mr. Chapnin lamented the co-opting of the Russian Orthodox Church by President Vladimir V. Putin’s government.

As the identity of the Russian government changed from “democratic state to empire,” church officials agreed to make their faith “a church of empire,” he said. “We have a kind of post-Soviet civil religion based on Orthodox traditions — or incorporating Orthodox elements — but in fact this is not the true spiritual tradition,” Mr. Chapnin said, adding that he believed “the church is in crisis now.”

As for the threat of religious extremism to liberal democracies, Ms. Breyer said of Western societies: “We should be much less apologetic about teaching the good things about secularism, the Enlightenment, to people who are very religious and haven’t necessarily encountered those values. We should not treat traditions as though they were static.”

\* Discord Over Snooping Muted by Security Fears[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/23/world/europe/discord-over-snooping-muted-by-security-fears.html]

\* Rough Sailing for Liberal Values[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/world/europe/rough-sailing-for-liberal-values.html]

\* Reconciling the Conflicting Aims of Church and State[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/world/europe/reconciling-the-conflicting-aims-of-church-and-state.html]

\* Overcoming Cruelty in Today’s Germany[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/world/europe/overcoming-cruelty-in-todays-germany.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Reading the nonstop coverage of what may well be a close presidential election, one might be forgiven for thinking that political competition is alive and well in America.

But look at the majority of states and congressional races, and a different picture emerges: In most places, meaningful two-party electoral competition is nonexistent. Rather than being one two-party nation, we are becoming two one-party nations.

Most large cities, college towns, the Northeast and the West Coast are deep-blue Democratic. Ruby-red Republican strongholds take up most of the South, the Great Plains, the Mountain States and the suburban and rural areas in between. Rather than compete directly against each other, both parties increasingly occupy their separate territories, with diminishing overlap and disappearing common accountability. They hear from very different constituents, with very different priorities. The minimal electoral incentives they do face all push toward nurturing, rather than bridging, those increasingly wide divisions.

Consider some numbers. The House, the supposed “people’s chamber,” is a sea of noncompetition. Out of 435 seats up for election this year, just 25 are considered tossups by The Cook Political Report[http://cookpolitical.com/house/charts/race-ratings]. In 2014, 82 percent of House races were decided by at least 15 percentage points, including 17 percent that were not contested by one of the two major parties.

The Senate is only slightly better. A mere six seats out of 34 up for election are considered genuine tossups by Cook’s assessment[http://cookpolitical.com/senate/charts/race-ratings] (Florida, Indiana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina and Pennsylvania), while five are in the “lean” category.

The presidential candidates are also ignoring most of the country, instead focusing on the handful of swing states that always seem to take on outsize importance. In the 2012 presidential election[http://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/data.php?year=2012&datatype=national&def=1&f=0&off=0&elect=0], only four states were decided by five or fewer percentage points, and the median state-level margin of victory was a whopping 16.9 percent (in other words, not even close). Compare that with the 1976 presidential election[http://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/data.php?year=1976&datatype=national&def=1&f=0&off=0&elect=0], when 20 states were decided by five or fewer percentage points (and 31 were decided by eight percentage points or fewer), and the median state-level margin of victory was 5.9 percent.

While gerrymandering may explain some[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/06/opinion/sunday/let-math-save-our-democracy.html] of the noncompetitiveness of House races, it can’t explain the Senate or the Electoral College. No amount of nonpartisan redistricting can overcome the fundamental disconnect[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/opinion/sunday/its-the-geography-stupid.html] between place-based, winner-take-all elections and polarized, geographically separated parties.

Competition is even rarer these days in state legislatures, where 43 percent of candidates did not face a major party opponent[https://ballotpedia.org/2014\_state\_legislative\_elections\_analyzed\_using\_a\_Competitiveness\_Index] in 2014, and fewer than one in 20 races was decided by five percentage points or less. That made 2014 one of the most uncompetitive[https://ballotpedia.org/Competitiveness\_in\_State\_Legislative\_Elections:\_1972-2014] state-election years in decades.

These patterns are likely to continue: The current partisan geography is a natural political alignment. Around the world[http://web.stanford.edu/~jrodden/annurev.polisci.12.031607.pdf], urban areas tend to be left-leaning and cosmopolitan; rural and suburban areas tend to be conservative and populist.

This balance was thrown off for decades in the United States because the New Deal created an unlikely Democratic Party alliance between urban liberals and rural Southern conservatives (who were Democrats primarily because Republicans were the party of Lincoln and Reconstruction). This alignment could hold as long as civil rights was kept off the agenda. Yet, even after the turbulent 1960s, it took 50 years to cement the current arrangement.

One reason for the slow realignment in Congress was that in the 1970s and 1980s, many incumbent members of Congress mastered the art of constituency service, pork-barrel politics, personal self-promotion and enough fund-raising to scare off potential challengers. With weak party leadership in Congress, members were also free to “vote their districts,” even if that meant crossing party lines. This contributed to a blurring of partisan differences, which made individual candidates more important to voters than simple party labels. Partisan loyalties are also very, very sticky: Until 2010, Democrats held the majority in the Alabama [http://www.ncsl.org/documents/statevote/legiscontrol\_2002\_2014.pdf] S[http://www.ncsl.org/documents/statevote/legiscontrol\_2002\_2014.pdf] tate Legislature[http://www.ncsl.org/documents/statevote/legiscontrol\_2002\_2014.pdf].

Perhaps the clearest measure of this slow transformation was the high rate of ticket-splitting[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2014/04/22/ticket-splitting-is-the-lowest-its-been-in-92-years/] that lasted for decades. From 1956 to 1996, on average 32 percent of House districts split their tickets, backing one party in the presidential race but the other for Congress. In 2012, that measure fell to 6 percent, the lowest since 1920 (3 percent). From 1968 to 1988, roughly half of states voted for different parties for the Senate and for president; in 2012, only six of 33 (18 percent) did.

As the parties became more homogeneous, rank-and-file members began to cede more authority to their leaders to enforce party discipline within Congress, especially in the House. Particularly after the watershed election of 1994, when many longtime conservative Democratic seats turned into relatively safe Republican seats, a new generation of conservative lawmakers and a newly assertive party leadership exerted a hard-right pull on the Republican Party. That election also bled the Democratic Party of many of its conservatives, shifting its caucus to the left. The election of 2010 was the culmination of the decades-long undoing of the New Deal coalition, sweeping away the few remaining Southern conservative Democrats.

Moreover, as more of the country became one-party territory, the opposing party in these places grasped the improbability of winning and so had little incentive to invest in mobilization and party building. This lack of investment further depleted a potential bench of future candidates and made future electoral competitions less and less likely.

These trends have been especially bad news for congressional Democrats, whose supporters are both more densely concentrated into urban areas[http://www-personal.umich.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/~jowei/florida.pdf] (giving them fewer House seats) and less likely to vote in nonpresidential years (when most elections for governor are held, robbing the party of prominent state leaders). Since Republicans hold more relatively safe House seats, , Democrats might benefit from occasional wave elections when the Republican brand has been significantly weakened (e.g., 2006 and 2008). But given the underlying dynamics, such elections are far more likely to be aberrations than long-lasting realignments.

An optimistic view of a future devoid of much electoral competition is that it saves members of Congress from having to constantly worry about re-election, which critics have argued[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/magazine/archive/1997/01/running-scared/376754/] pushes members toward short-term, parochial lawmaking. Perhaps all these safe seats can finally free up members to think beyond the next electoral cycle, and become genuine statesmen again.

Perhaps. But much would have to change in the current Congress to enable that kind of activity. At the very least, Congress would need to revitalize the committee and subcommittee system[http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/marchaprilmay\_2015/features/a\_new\_agenda\_for\_political\_ref054226.php?page=all], and give individual members space to work across party lines and become long-term policy entrepreneurs.

The deeper problem is that a system without much effective two-party competition is a system that pushes entirely in the opposite direction. If a vast majority of seats are now safe for one party or the other, candidates don’t face any re-election incentive to reach out to the other party’s voters. Instead, they increasingly focus on the fear of a primary challenge. Especially on the right, this looming primary challenge (even if it is rare[http://www.vox.com/2014/6/25/5837696/is-the-tea-party-primary-surge-a-huge-myth]) means that members do not want to be seen as compromisers. This does not bode well for a functioning Congress.

By contrast, Congress was probably at its most fluid and productive during the periods of highest two-party competition, from the 1960s through the 1980s. This was partly because competition kept turnover steady enough that it brought in a relatively even flow of new members with new ideas. It also encouraged members to cut deals to bring home earmarks that would help them get elected.

Members don’t do these things anymore because they don’t have to. Whatever bipartisan bonhomie that once existed in Washington was a consequence of these underlying electoral conditions. Trying to re-establish that good will without fixing the underlying causes is like building a bridge across a river without foundations to ground the towers.

Certainly, there are some signs that we may have already hit the nadir of electoral non-competition. In presidential polling[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-polarization-of-red-and-blue-states-from-mcgovern-to-trump-in-one-chart/], for example, blue states are looking a little less blue this year than in past years, and red states are looking a little less red. Split-ticket voting will likely be up this year as well. If the Republican Party truly becomes the party of Donald J. Trump (and there is good reason[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/17/opinion/campaign-stops/trumpism-and-clintonismare-the-future.html] to think it will), and Democrats continue to court moderate pro-business Republicans **alienated** by Mr. Trump while giving up on nostalgia-minded white working-class voters (also likely[http://www.vox.com/polyarchy/2016/6/3/11843780/democrats-wealthy-party]), this may make some states and congressional districts more competitive. Changing demographics, especially in places with rising **immigrant** populations, may also change the dynamics of competition. There are also some signs that divisions within the parties are coming to undermine longstanding party unity, creating potential for new crosscutting alliances in ways that are likely to reduce polarization[http://www.vox.com/polyarchy/2016/3/24/11298808/american-politics-peak-polarization].

But we have a long way to go. These nascent trends could use a boost. Perhaps we need to rethink our electoral model of winner-take-all elections, and particularly of single-member House districts — a model that reinforces, rather than cuts against, this growing geographic polarization, and one that makes it harder for parties to reflect their internal diversity.

The single-member, winner-take-all elections we use are a relative rarity among advanced democracies. They are not mandated by the Constitution, which lets states decide how to elect their representatives. In fact, many states originally used multi[http://archive.fairvote.org/?page=526] member districts[http://archive.fairvote.org/?page=526]. Returning to this approach would make it far easier to draw competitive districts that mix urban and rural areas. It would make it easier for different wings in both parties to send members to Congress, creating more diversity within the parties. It might also allow some smaller, regional parties to emerge, since multimember allow candidates to win with far less than majority support. These developments would increase the possibilities for deal-making in Congress. The FairVote proposal[http://www.fairvote.org/rcv\_for\_congress#what\_are\_the\_benefits\_of\_the\_rcv\_act] of multimember districts with ranked choice voting seems especially promising on this front.

But the first step in electoral reform is recognizing that this country has a problem. For decades, we had reasonably robust electoral competition, so there was little obvious reason to worry about our electoral system. But that era is over.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Lee Drutman is a senior fellow at New America and the author of “The Business of America Is Lobbying.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was the awkward comment heard round the world. At a fund-raiser earlier this month, the Democratic presidential nominee, Hillary Clinton, divided the supporters of her Republican opponent Donald J. Trump into two even groups. One consisted of good, if **alienated** and dispossessed, people. But the other half goes into a “basket of deplorables,” she said. “The racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic — you name it.”

The ensuing reaction to her comments is a case study in everything wrong with our political discourse. Mr. Trump — who still hasn’t apologized for suggesting that a disproportionate share of Mexican **immigrants** are rapists and criminals — demanded an apology. Meanwhile, many on the left came to her defense: The remark might have been politically inept, many said, but it was true.

These commentators often base their arguments on polls that paint many Republicans in an unflattering light: About one-third of conservatives believe that Barack Obama is a Muslim, and more than half doubt whether he was born in the United States. According to one Reuters poll[http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-race-idUSKCN0ZE2SW], about half of Mr. Trump’s supporters say that blacks are “more violent” than whites, while approximately 40 percent see blacks as “lazier” than other races.

These views are undoubtedly deplorable, and we all have a responsibility to confront them. But if Mrs. Clinton had said that half of Mr. Trump’s supporters hold some prejudicial views and left it there, we probably wouldn’t be talking about the comment today. Her sin was to collapse millions of people — from former Klansmen like David Duke to a struggling coal miner with some unacceptable opinions — into the same group of social outcasts.

It’s difficult in the abstract to appreciate that those with morally objectionable viewpoints can still be good people. This perhaps explains why Mrs. Clinton showed considerably less charity than did Mr. Obama as a candidate in a widely praised 2008 speech on race. In one particularly personal passage, he spoke about his white grandmother — an imperfect, but fundamentally good, woman, “a woman who helped raise me, a woman who sacrificed again and again for me, a woman who loves me as much as she loves anything in this world, but a woman who once confessed her fear of black men who passed by her on the street, and who on more than one occasion has uttered racial or ethnic stereotypes that made me cringe.”

If a pollster had called Mr. Obama’s grandmother and asked her questions about race, religion and sexuality, she almost certainly would have proffered at least one prejudicial view. The data tells us that she wouldn’t be alone. In a recent poll, about 40 percent of Democratic voters supported temporarily barring Muslims from entering the country. Large shares of black voters express some uneasiness with homosexual behavior, an opinion common among religious people of all races but undoubtedly unwelcome in cosmopolitan elite circles of the Democratic Party. The same poll that found that 40 percent of Mr. Trump’s supporters viewed blacks as lazier revealed that 25 percent of Mrs. Clinton’s supporters believed the same thing. Perhaps these people should also join Mrs. Clinton’s deplorable basket.

There’s no reason to limit basket-worthiness to those with explicit prejudices. For decades, scholars have studied the ways in which implicit biases affect how we perceive other people in this multiethnic society of ours. The data consistently shows that about 90 percent of us possess some implicit prejudices — and, unsurprisingly, people typically favor their own group. Layer on top of that the many people unwilling to speak about their prejudices with a pollster, and a picture emerges of a nation where a significant majority of the country harbors some type of bias.

There are many ways to confront the people of that nation in all its complexity. We can ignore that these biases exist, and pretend that our uniquely diverse society need never address the difficult questions posed by that diversity. This is the path chosen by far too many of my fellow conservatives.

We can deem a significant chunk of our populace unrepentant bigots, which appears to be the strategy of Mrs. Clinton and much of the left.

Or we can recognize that most of us fall into another basket altogether: One where prejudice — even implicit — coexists with incredible compassion and decency. In that basket is the black preacher who may view homosexuality as a little icky even as he lovingly ministers to struggling gay members of his church. The adoptive parent of a child born in Asia, who pours her heart and soul into her child’s well-being even as she tells a pollster that she doesn’t much care about America’s experience with Japanese internment. And in that basket is a white grandmother who speaks ill of black people even as she gives her beloved African-American grandson the emotional support and love that enable him to become the president of all Americans.

We can and should recognize the bad in that basket even as we celebrate the good. We must have the courage to confront dreadful views even in the people we love the most. But that’s difficult to do when we cast large segments of our fellow citizens into a basket to be condemned and disparaged, judging them even as we ignore that many of their deplorable traits exist in us, too.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

J. D. Vance is the author of “Hillbilly Elegy” and a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HOUSTON — Texas escalated its fight with the Obama administration over refugee resettlements on Wednesday, threatening to pull out of the federal resettlement program if the state’s plan to limit the number of refugees it accepts and to receive additional security assurances is not approved.

Since the Paris terrorist attacks[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/attacks-in-paris] last year, conservative leaders in several Republican-dominated states have raised security concerns over Syrian refugees. Texas has been one of the most assertive, suing the State Department[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/17/us/federal-judge-tosses-texas-lawsuit-to-bar-syrian-refugees.html] in federal court to try to bar Syrian refugees from the state and, on Wednesday, vowing to stop assisting the thousands of refugees from around the world who resettle in Texas annually.

In a letter to the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement, the state’s refugee coordinator wrote that if the state’s plan is not approved by Sept. 30, Texas will exit the federal program and will stop providing refugee-related services and benefits starting Feb. 1. In a statement, Gov. Greg Abbott called for Washington to overhaul the federal program.

“Despite multiple requests by the State of Texas, the federal government lacks the capability or the will to distinguish the dangerous from the harmless, and Texas will not be an accomplice to such dereliction of duty to the American people,” Mr. Abbott said.

If Texas does pull out, it may have little to no effect.

The process of placing refugees in the United States is a joint effort among federal and state agencies as well as nonprofit refugee aid groups. Resettlement money comes from the federal government, but the states disburse that money by contracting with nonprofit groups that work directly with the refugees.

Refugees could continue to come to Texas even if the state withdraws, because federal officials and the local groups could bypass the state in coordinating resettlements.

At least two other states, Kansas and New Jersey, have withdrawn from the federal program over what conservatives there have said are similar security concerns. But refugees have continued to arrive in those states, as refugee groups work with federal agencies, bypassing the states. The legal and regulatory framework behind such programs is well established, with federal officials initially appointing a so-called replacement designee to step in for the state and then developing an alternative program not administered by the state.

“Texas will still resettle refugees, but the coordinating role that the state has played will be facilitated instead by a designated nonprofit organization,” said Linda Hartke, president and chief executive of Lutheran **Immigration** and Refugee Service.

The Texas warning to federal officials comes after the state’s lawsuit seeking to prohibit Syrian refugees was dismissed in federal court in June. It also comes as the Obama administration plans to increase the number of refugees admitted to the United States, calling for 110,000 in fiscal 2017, up from 85,000 in 2016.

Texas officials have said the State Department wants Texas to increase the number of refugees coming to the state by 25 percent. The state’s refugee plan says it will instead keep the number at the 2016 level in fiscal 2017. The plan also says Texas will accept only refugees who the leaders of federal intelligence agencies can certify to Congress do not pose a security threat. The governor’s office has said certification would require “national security officials to ensure that refugees do not pose a security threat to Texas.”

Refugee advocates and civil-rights lawyers called Texas’ threat to withdraw callous and politically motivated.

“Texas is continuing to play political football with the lives of refugee families,” said Cecillia Wang, the director of the **Immigrants**’ Rights Project at the American Civil Liberties Union and one of the lawyers who represented a nonprofit relief group, the International Rescue Committee, in the dismissed lawsuit.

Federal officials appeared unlikely to agree to Texas’ demands. The federal Administration for Children and Families, which is part of the federal Department of Health and Human Services[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/h/health\_and\_human\_services\_department/index.html?inline=nyt-org], said the model for refugee resettlement — including having those granted refugee status complete “stringent security screenings” — will continue in Texas.

Texas has long been a top state for refugee relocations: More than 6,700 refugees arrived in Texas between October 2015 and August 2016, the most of any state, according to State Department data.

\* Thriving in Texas Amid Appeals to Reject Syrian Refugees[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/26/us/thriving-in-texas-amid-appeals-to-reject-syrian-refugees.html]

\* Anxiety Grows in Texas With Syrians Due to Arrive Soon[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/09/us/anxiety-grows-in-texas-with-syrians-due-to-arrive-soon.html]

\* Texas Fails to Block Entry of Syrian Refugees [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/10/us/texas-fails-to-block-entry-of-syrian-refugees.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Do **immigrants** take jobs from Americans and lower their wages by working for less?

The answer, according to a report published on Wednesday by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine[http://www.nationalacademies.org/], is no, **immigrants** do not take American jobs — but with some caveats.

The question is at the heart of the furious debate over **immigration** that has divided the country and polarized the presidential race. Many American workers, struggling to recover from the recession, have said they feel squeezed out by **immigrants**.

Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], the Republican nominee, has called for a crackdown on illegal **immigrants**, saying they “compete directly against vulnerable American workers.” He promises to cut back legal **immigration**, with new controls he says would “boost wages and ensure open jobs are offered to American workers first.”

Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], his Democratic rival, takes an upbeat view, saying **immigrants** contribute to the economy whether they are here legally or not, by providing labor for American employers and opening businesses that create jobs for Americans rather than taking them.

The report[https://www.nap.edu/catalog/23550/the-economic-and-fiscal-consequences-of-immigration] assembles research from 14 leading economists, demographers and other scholars, including some, like Marta Tienda of Princeton, who write favorably about the impacts of **immigration** and others who are skeptical of its benefits, like George J. Borjas, a Harvard economist. Here’s what the report says:

•“We found little to no negative effects on overall wages and employment of native-born workers in the longer term,” said Francine D. Blau, an economics professor at Cornell University who led the group that produced the 550-page report.

•Some **immigrants** who arrived in earlier generations, yet were still in the same low-wage labor markets as foreigners just coming to the country, earned less and had more trouble finding jobs because of the competition with newer arrivals.

•Teenagers who did not finish high school also saw their hours of work reduced by **immigrants**, although not their ability to find jobs. Professor Blau said economists have found many reasons why young people who drop out of high school struggle to find work. “There is no indication **immigration** is the major factor,” she said.

•High-skilled **immigrants**, especially in technology and science, who have come in larger numbers in recent years, brought a significant “positive impact” on Americans with skills and also on working-class Americans. They spurred innovation, helping to create jobs.

“The prospects for long-run economic growth in the United States would be considerably dimmed without the contributions of high-skilled **immigrants**,” the report said. It did not focus on American technology workers, many of whom have been displaced from their jobs in recent years by **immigrants** on temporary visas.

The report asked another question Americans are debating: Do **immigrants** burden government budgets?

That answer is “more mixed,” Professor Blau said.

•The first generation of newcomers generally cost governments more than they contribute in taxes with most of the costs falling on state and local governments, mainly because of the expense of educating the children of **immigrant** families.

For those governments, total annual costs for first-generation **immigrants** is about $57 billion. But by the second generation in those families, **immigrants**, with improved education and taxpaying ability, become a benefit to government coffers, adding about $30 billion a year. By the third generation, **immigrant**families contribute about $223 billion a year to government finances.

•In the last two decades, the number of **immigrants** in the country increased by 70 percent to about 43 million people; they are now 13 percent of the population. One in every four Americans is either an **immigrant** or the child of one. And since 2001, about one million **immigrants** have come legally to the United States each year.

The report called **immigration** “integral to the nation’s economic growth” because **immigrants** bring new ideas and add to an American labor force that would be shrinking without them, helping ensure continued growth into the future.

\* House Republicans Who Favor **Immigration** Overhaul Face Potential Losses[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/us/politics/republicans-donald-trump-bob-dold-immigration.html]

\* **Immigration** Reform: Disparate Ideas, Disparate Futures[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/business/immigration-reform-disparate-ideas-disparate-futures.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Carl Sagan’s Voyager Golden Record — of sounds of Earth[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/earth\_planet/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], recorded greetings and an eclectic mix of music that was sent into space — has long been out of print and pretty much unobtainable for decades.

One copy of the record is attached to NASA’s Voyager 1 spacecraft, which has entered interstellar space, the farthest artifact ever tossed out by humanity. A second copy, on Voyager 2, is not quite as distant, just 10 billion miles away.

Both are receding from Earth at more than 35,000 miles per hour.

Not even Dr. Sagan, the Cornell astrophysicist who led the creation of the record in 1977 for the listening pleasure of any **aliens** who happened upon it, could get a copy.

He asked. NASA said no.

But now, a Kickstarter crowdsourcing project[https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/ozmarecords/voyager-golden-record-40th-anniversary-edition] begun on Wednesday is planning to reissue it, long a dream of David Pescovitz, an editor and managing partner at Boing Boing, the technology news website, and a research director at the nonprofit Institute for the Future.

“When you’re 7 years old, and you hear about a group of people creating messages for possible extraterrestrial intelligence,” Mr. Pescovitz said, “that sparks the imagination. The idea always stuck with me.”

He teamed up with Timothy Daly, a manager at Amoeba Music in San Francisco, and Lawrence Azerrad, a graphic designer who has created packaging for Sting, The Beach Boys, Wilco and other musicians.

The reissue will not exactly be like the original, which was pressed out of a gold-plated copper disk. The original was also intended to be played at 16 2/3 revolutions per minute, half of the usual speed of LP records. That was necessary to cram in a variety of sounds of Earth, spoken greetings in 55 languages, 116 images and 90 minutes of music.

The reissue will consist of three LPs pressed out of vinyl recorded at normal LP speed. The box set will cost $98 plus shipping, with the project aiming to raise $198,000.

Mr. Pescovitz aims to distribute the records next year in time for the 40th anniversary of the Voyager launches. (Voyager 2 launched first, on Aug. 20, 1977; Voyager 1 launched a couple of weeks later, on Sept. 5.)

Perhaps now the recording, meant to encapsulate thousands of years of music, will finally find an audience. The songs include a Peruvian wedding song, a Pygmy girls’ initiation song, a movement from one of Bach’s Brandenburg Concertos, and “Johnny B. Goode” by Chuck Berry.

“Isn’t it funny?” recalled Timothy Ferris, a science writer who produced the original record. “It hasn’t been heard by any **aliens** yet, and it hasn’t hardly been heard by humans.”

A CD-ROM version was issued in 1992, and NASA has since put digital versions of the greetings and sounds of Earth — but not the music — on SoundCloud[https://soundcloud.com/nasa/sets/golden-record-sounds-of]. But this is the first time it will be available as an LP.

“For us, it’s creating a physical, tangible object,” Mr. Pescovitz said.

Mr. Ferris said the song selections were done by consensus, although Dr. Sagan, who died in 1996[http://www.nytimes.com/1996/12/21/us/carl-sagan-an-astronomer-who-excelled-at-popularizing-science-is-dead-at-62.html], did not like “Johnny B. Goode” at first. Alan Lomax, a folk music archivist who was another volunteer member of the committee selecting material for the Voyager records, also disliked the song and complained to Dr. Sagan that it was adolescent.

Mr. Ferris recalled Sagan’s response: “Well, there are a lot of adolescents on Earth, too.” The song went on the record.

But Mr. Ferris added, “You can’t take it too far or you’d be doing Miley Cyrus.”

A dozen copies of the golden record were made. Afterward, Dr. Sagan wrote to NASA, asking if he and John Casani, the project manager for Voyager, could obtain copies as mementos.

Robert A. Frosch, the NASA administrator, replied that all of the copies had been distributed to various institutions, mostly NASA centers, except for one copy reserved for President Jimmy Carter.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With less than a week until the first general election debate, Donald J. Trump has used his recent rallies to sharpen the nationalist message he has embraced throughout the campaign.

The three debates will be Mr. Trump’s best chance to halt his opponent, Hillary Clinton, who has a clearer path to the nomination even as the race tightens. And with the race most likely to be decided by more than 100 million voters who did not cast ballots in either party primary, some voters will be getting their first hard look at Mr. Trump.

In a typical campaign, nominees of both parties modulate positions to appeal to independent voters. In Mrs. Clinton’s case, she has not budged on her economic proposals, which were drafted while she was still battling Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont for the Democratic nomination. On issues like national security, however, she has more to offer moderate voters.

Mr. Trump, on the other hand, has done little to adjust the underpinnings of his message. He has heightened his incendiary comments in recent days, striking notes of nationalism as he continues to call for drastic changes to the **immigration** system. In North Carolina on Tuesday, he said he wanted to see the **immigration** policies of the nation changed to reflect “American values.”

Mr. Trump’s calls for large-scale deportations are opposed by a majority of national voters. And his comments are more familiar to a brand of nationalism seen in France, by figures like Marine Le Pen.

His proposals have a harder edge than anything the American public has seen from a candidate on a general election debate stage in decades. But Mr. Trump has been determined to stick with the message that helped him vault through the primaries.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LOS ANGELES — Every day at South Park Studios is different, but Trey Parker said this particular afternoon, Monday, Sept. 12, was especially memorable.

“There are times where we go, ‘How do we tell Comedy Central we don’t have a show?’” he said with sardonic delight. “This is one of those.”

Mr. Parker and Matt Stone, the creators of “South Park,”[http://southpark.cc.com/] exuded an appearance of calm as they brainstormed in their airy offices, in a gray building on a stretch of highway at the edge of this city. But they were under considerable pressure to finish the first episode for the 20th season of this satirical animated series, which was due in less than 48 hours and would air that Wednesday.

At this stage — on the ninth draft of a script called “Member Berries”[http://southpark.cc.com/full-episodes/s20e01-member-berries#source=2b6c5ab4-d717-4e84-9143-918793a3b636:63a32034-1ea6-492d-b95b-9433e3f62f8d&position=1&sort=airdate] — they would like to have 16 minutes of a 22-minute episode; Mr. Stone and Mr. Parker said they had 12 and a half. (“That doesn’t mean that’s what we have done,” Mr. Parker cautioned. “That means that’s all we have figured out.”)

A dry-erase board in the room showed a nearly nonexistent third act, all empty ovals stacked like pancakes, as the collaborators kicked around the episode’s story elements: a new American national anthem rebooted by J. J. Abrams; a comically inept xenophobe running for president; and an addictive talking fruit[http://southpark.cc.com/clips/72bgbp/member-chewbecca-again#source=ff4daa77-43e0-4601-8fd6-21ea1daf9c19&position=3&sort=airdate] that induces nostalgia for the pop-culture of one’s youth.

How these pieces fit together wasn’t clear yet. But after two decades of making their show in this stressful, hands-on, seat-of-the-pants way, Mr. Stone and Mr. Parker were reasonably certain they would figure out something.

“I can’t believe I’m surprised by it,” Mr. Stone said. “How do we get to this point and have no story? But we just go through it again. For the eight millionth time.”

Since its debut in 1997, “South Park” has spun more than 250 tales about foul-mouthed fourth graders in a Colorado town that invariably gets swept up in whatever social crisis the nation is facing that week. What began with a show about **aliens** installing a satellite in a child’s butt[http://southpark.cc.com/full-episodes/s01e01-cartman-gets-an-anal-probe#source=57baee9c-b611-4260-958b-05315479a7fc:25eeb8de-ed8e-11e0-aca6-0026b9414f30&position=1&sort=!airdate] has evolved — sort of — into a series that, in its unapologetically crude way, can address debates over transgender bathrooms, racial discrimination or gratuitous sex and violence in “Game of Thrones.”

Even as animation technology has improved and the “South Park” staff has grown exponentially, the show is still fundamentally the work of Mr. Parker, 46, and Mr. Stone, 45, who agonize over every installment. (Mr. Parker has had sole writing and directing credit on all but a few episodes since 2001.)

The mechanics of making the show haven’t changed much, but Mr. Stone and Mr. Parker have. The wild-haired punks who were on LSD at the 2000 Academy Awards[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gSxHnsddg20] have grown up: Mr. Stone telecommutes half the week to be with his wife and children in New York, while Mr. Parker’s office is strewn with the pastel-colored toys of his 3-year-old daughter.

In its 20th year, “South Park” offers a pointed and, surprisingly, still-potent platform for commentary on current events. New episodes typically draw around two million viewers, many of them the 18- to 49-year-olds that advertisers covet, a showing that Comedy Central decidedly needs while its late-night lineup is in flux[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/16/business/media/comedy-central-cancels-larry-wilmores-late-night-show.html] and other signature franchises like “Inside Amy Schumer” are on hiatus.

“For a network that no longer has Stephen Colbert and Jon Stewart, having ‘South Park’ is extremely important to us,” said Doug Herzog, the president of Viacom’s Music and Entertainment Group, which includes Comedy Central. “With all due respect to Jon and ‘The Daily Show,’ ‘South Park’ is the foundation on which Comedy Central is built.”

If the earliest “South Park” episodes reflected a juvenile desire to see what they could get away with on television, their later work suggests Mr. Parker and Mr. Stone have honed their ability to channel their growing exasperation with a polarized world into comedy.

Vernon Chatman, a comedy writer who has worked on “South Park” for more than 15 years, said that Mr. Stone and Mr. Parker have thrived by embracing their roles in “their right-brain, left-brain relationship.”

“Matt has this sharp, analytical mind that’s focused and relentless,” he said. “Trey has the dreamy, emotional storyteller thing.”

Mr. Chatman added, “To be in such a heightened, intense relationship, with so much stakes and pressure on it — the fact that they haven’t killed each other is incredible.”

Already, Mr. Parker and Mr. Stone had spent this Monday in a multihour meeting with Mr. Chatman and Anne Garefino, an executive producer, talking through plot points for “Member Berries” and shooting them down.

“If we only have three scenes left to write, that’s a win,” Ms. Garefino said. “It’s when you still have that whole last act — ” Her voice trailed off.

In the afternoon, Mr. Stone and Mr. Parker caromed from office to office in a building decorated with their trophies — “South Park” toys and memorabilia; framed posters from their Tony Award-winning Broadway musical, “The Book of Mormon”[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/25/theater/reviews/the-book-of-mormon-at-eugene-oneill-theater-review.html] — while trying to bring “Member Berries” into focus.

For a few minutes, Mr. Parker stepped into a recording booth to perform the voices of two football announcers introducing the new national anthem, while Mr. Stone directed him to be more excitable.

Then it was off to an editing suite, where Mr. Parker reviewed a vividly vulgar montage featuring Mr. Garrison[http://southpark.cc.com/clips/2y5wyi/i-have-to-make-sure-she-wins#source=ff4daa77-43e0-4601-8fd6-21ea1daf9c19&position=2&sort=airdate], the “South Park” character who has turned into a buffoonish populist demagogue, describing exactly how he’d bring death to America’s enemies.

Mr. Parker writes in private, emerging occasionally to pull Mr. Stone from wherever he might be and ask his help.

In the writers’ room, the two creators were trying to pin down the motivations of Randy Marsh, the show’s ambivalent adult moral compass, as he grapples with a presidential race between two candidates he dislikes and decides whether he should try the narcotic member berries.

Where should Randy be introduced to the enticing fruit — at a bar or in a friend’s house? Do the berries come in boxes or grow in bunches? Mr. Parker was in constant motion as he considered each question, walking many agitated laps around a long conference table.

Together, he and Mr. Stone improvised a scene in which the exhortations of the talking berries grow more sinister: Remember “Star Wars”? Remember being a kid? Remember feeling safe? Remember no **immigrants**?

As Mr. Parker stepped away to resume his solitary work, Mr. Stone explained that his role in these moments was to be a sounding board for Mr. Parker but also to remind him that he’s just got to write something down.

“There’s no other way to do it,” Mr. Stone said. “If you don’t have that one perfect line, you can fix that later.”

In a phone interview a few days earlier, Mr. Parker explained how he and Mr. Stone had abandoned their preseason ritual of holding a writers’ retreat to drink, carouse and think up ideas.

“As soon as we’re like, ‘We could do this, this could be funny,’ we’re like, ‘Stop talking about it,’” Mr. Parker said. “Because in two months, when we’re doing the show, it won’t be funny to us anymore.”

Being more extemporaneous, he said, led to unexpected discoveries like their 19th season in 2015, presented as 10 interconnected episodes that told a broader story about gentrification, identity politics and a perceived resurgence of political correctness.

The renewed debate about sensitivity in speech and the policing of language was one that “South Park” could not avoid, for its own sake.

“This might finally be the year that we get run out of town,” Mr. Parker recalled thinking at the time. “If we’re going to, let’s make fun of the fact that we’re the old guys at the table. All those shows were an honest part of us going, ‘Should we go away?’”

Instead, the 19th season was a critical hit; in a review for The New York Times[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/09/arts/television/south-park-sketches-grander-satire-themes.html], James Poniewozik wrote that “South Park” had “gone and revitalized itself,” in part “by asserting that it takes an outrageous comedy to capture an era of outrage.”

Mr. Herzog, who has worked with Mr. Parker and Mr. Stone since the debut of “South Park,” said they have Comedy Central’s “absolute, 1,000 percent eternal trust.” As long as the show satisfies the network’s Standards and Practices department, he said, “we’re cool with the show.”

Yet that success created more angst for Mr. Stone and Mr. Parker as they approached Season 20. Were they obligated to tell a serialized narrative again? Did they have to dwell on the 2016 campaign, when their indifference to presidential politics is a well-worn subject?

All they can do, the “South Park” creators said, is continue to apply a principle that has guided them from the beginning.

No matter how serious an issue seems, Mr. Parker said, “Looking at it with a sense of humor is not only healthier for you, it actually makes you think more clearly about things — being able to make fun of either side of an issue, rather than just, ‘Trump is evil and Clinton is good.’”

“There’s always room to equally rip on both of them,” he said.

Comedy Central has signed Mr. Parker and Mr. Stone to keep making “South Park” through 2019. Ms. Garefino, who has worked on the show for 19 of its 20 years, suggested they could stick around longer still.

“They said they didn’t still want to be making ‘South Park’ when they were 40,” she said. “I think they’ll be doing it when they’re 50.”

She tried to make herself sound as confident that the current episode would be completed under deadline.

“There’s always a moment where Trey will fall in love with the show, and the pages start flowing,” she said. “Something will happen.”

“Member Berries” was broadcast at 10 p.m. on Sept. 14, but hardly without last-minute incident. That morning, South Park Studios suffered a system crash, and the episode’s audio went missing for an hour and a half.

When the episode was transmitted to Comedy Central, it had a mystery six-frame sync problem that was finally fixed and delivered one hour before airtime.

The following day, Ms. Garefino said, “Trey’s like, ‘I think from now, we should think about getting the show in earlier.’” Even “South Park” would have to bleep out Ms. Garefino’s response.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — There is nothing in Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s or Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s antiterrorism plans that would have had much chance of stopping the bombings in New York and New Jersey that Ahmad Khan Rahami is accused of carrying out.

The subject of how to prevent terrorism will almost certainly be a major topic on Monday night, when the two presidential candidates face off in their first debate. But the truth is that cases like Mr. Rahami’s fit neatly into no categories.

And his journey from childhood **immigrant** to naturalized citizen to accused terrorist shows that the debate now underway on the campaign trail is too simplistic. It fails to address the hardest and most common cause of radicalization in the United States, when personal demons morph into ideologically driven violence.

Mr. Rahami came to the United States from Afghanistan as a 7-year-old, and later became a citizen. Mr. Trump’s insistence in recent days that he has no problem with ethnic profiling might have led to tougher interrogations of Mr. Rahami when he traveled to Quetta, Pakistan, the center of Taliban power, and returned, or when he came back from there with a Pakistani wife.

The strongest indication of his leanings came in 2014 when the local police and the F.B.I. investigated Mr. Rahami’s father’s claim that his son was a terrorist. But finding no evidence, the authorities did not act. Since Mr. Rahami is an American citizen, the only way he could have been locked up without being charged was with a detention system similar to the way Japanese-Americans were placed in Japanese “internment camps” during World War II.

That was a technique, Mr. Trump told Time magazine in December, that he might or might not have supported at the time. He added that as undesirable as it would be to revive such an arrangement, in an age of terrorism, “war is tough.”

Mrs. Clinton’s approach would be to rely on countermessaging to prevent radicalization and to try to recognize early signs of extremism. But no one seems quite certain how Mr. Rahami was radicalized — on the internet, during trips to Pakistan or perhaps by his new wife. And Mrs. Clinton’s approach, even its advocates acknowledge, is no guarantee — it tries to stem the tide, rather than reverse it.

Mr. Trump, in short, has described a policy of keeping potential terrorists out of the country altogether, even if that means suspending or violating America’s longstanding principles of taking in refugees and not discriminating against **immigrants** on the basis of their religion. Mrs. Clinton, in contrast, has argued for the vetting of **immigrants** — about their history or sympathy for radical ideology — but working to counter extremists messages or behavior.

A core element of Mrs. Clinton’s counterterrorism strategy has been to build on pilot programs in four communities that, among other features, offer residents ways to report individuals who could become radicalized or otherwise exhibit troubling behavior. The four communities are Minneapolis/St. Paul; Los Angeles; Boston and Montgomery County, Md.

In the Elizabeth, N.J., neighborhood where Mr. Rahami lived and worked, such a program might — or might not — have made a difference. In recent years, for instance, some friends of Mr. Rahami’s noticed a significant change in his personality and religious devotion after a trip to Afghanistan, where he and his relatives are from. But there is no evidence that they alerted anyone, or expressed any concern.

Mrs. Clinton aims to set up an early-warning system, community by community. That builds on a growing number of programs that the Obama administration terms “countering violent extremism.” The aim is to rely not just on religious leaders such as imams to help detect the early signs of radicalization, but also to enlist teachers, coaches, physicians and others who might notice subtle changes in an individual’s behavior and, perhaps with family and friends, intervene.

Mrs. Clinton also suggested, last December, that she would accelerate work with technology companies to take radical speech off Facebook, YouTube, Snapchat and encrypted apps used by terrorists.

“You are going to hear all the familiar complaints: ‘Freedom of speech,’” she told the Brookings Institution. She suggested those complaints should be dismissed.

Her advisers acknowledge this would not constitute a complete solution — but neither would **immigration** bans, which they view as counter to American values.

“Look, we’re never going to be able to identify every potential bad actor solely through a police record or their involvement with other bad actors,” said Daniel Benjamin, a former State Department terrorism coordinator and now a scholar at Dartmouth College. “So having more eyes on this, and more awareness within communities is absolutely essential, and will have to be a key part of the solution.”

Mr. Benjamin, who is an adviser to the Clinton campaign, acknowledged Tuesday that “there’s no guarantee that such programs would have identified Rahami ahead of time.” But he said that Mr. Rahami’s case, as well as that of a Somali-American man who stabbed 10 people at a mall in St. Cloud, Minn., before he was shot and killed by an off-duty police officer, “appear to be examples of fairly dramatic changes in behavior that might have set off alarms.”

Mrs. Clinton spoke by phone for 45 minutes on Tuesday morning with a group of top national security and counterterrorism advisers about lessons learned from the most recent terrorist attacks and what additional steps a Clinton administration would need to take to prevent future strikes on American soil, according to a summary of the call that the campaign released.

They also discussed how to ensure that police and other law enforcement agencies follow up on individuals who have been previously identified as possible threats. Mrs. Clinton has called for “an intelligence surge” to improve information sharing among federal agencies and with foreign partners.

Mrs. Clinton and her advisers mulled over ways to combat so-called lone-wolf attacks and online radicalization — without specific direction or enabling from groups like the Islamic State or Al Qaeda — and “how we can best balance the right to privacy with this modern national security imperative,” according to the summary.

Finally, the group examined “the dangers of inflammatory rhetoric, generalizations, and expressions of prejudice,” all of which Mrs. Clinton and her supporters have accused Mr. Trump of in his social media comments and campaign speeches.

Mr. Trump has one word for those solutions: “Weak.”

He argued during the primaries that he would temporarily ban all Muslim **immigration**, a position that received withering criticism from his own party. (He also said he would “take out” the families of terrorists, a violation of international conventions.)

He combined that with what he maintains would be a far more relentless attack on the Islamic State, including seizing oil in areas where it operates, presumably in Iraq (although most of the oil belongs to Iraq, and the Bush administration always went to some lengths to say it would be preserved for the benefit of the Iraqi people, not sold by the United States).

Under pressure, Mr. Trump amended his approach to saying he would temporarily ban **immigration** from countries that have been breeding grounds for terrorism; he seemed to have Afghanistan and Pakistan in mind. But that definition could easily embrace Germany, France, Belgium and Britain as well.

Had that program been in effect in 1995 it might have stopped Mr. Rahami’s entry into the country as a 7-year-old, or his readmission in 2000, when he and his family were admitted as refugees.

Mr. Trump said in a rally on Tuesday that the lesson of the New York and New Jersey bombing attacks was the need for an **immigration** crackdown.

“This didn’t just happen, like, yesterday,” he said. “These attacks were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals or families coming into our country. Attack after attack — from 9/11 to San Bernardino to Orlando — we have seen how failure to screen who is entering the United States puts all of our citizens in great danger.”

He said that Mrs. Clinton is “for people pouring in from Syria,” though the 10,000 refugees who have come from there this year is a tiny fraction of what European nations have taken in. Mr. Trump called that a “massive inflow of refugees, which Hillary Clinton is trying to drastically increase.” and he predicted “she may change her mind.”

Thomas Kaplan contributed reporting from New York, and Jackie Calmes from Washington.

\* Ahmad Rahami: Fixture in Family’s Business and, Lately, a ‘Completely Different Person’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/ahmad-khan-rahami-bombing-suspect.html]

\* Ahmad Khan Rahami Is Arrested in Manhattan and New Jersey Bombings[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html]

\* After Bombing on Jersey Shore, Residents Try to Make Sense of Chaos[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/after-bombing-on-jersey-shore-residents-try-to-make-sense-of-chaos.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Last year, the actor and writer Brian Quijada proposed to his girlfriend. Diamond ring. Bended knee. White sand beach. The whole Instagram-worthy shebang.

Then he began to worry. His fiancée is half Austrian and half Swiss; he is the son of undocumented **immigrants** from El Salvador. First he wondered how the wedding D.J. might remix polka and reggaeton. Later, more substantively, he questioned how to describe this varied inheritance to future offspring. “I’m not entirely sure how I fit into this crazy world, let alone ever figuring out how to explain it to my child,” Mr. Quijada said.

Some people might go to insight-oriented therapy for help. Others might consult a spiritual adviser. Others might let those unborn children sort it out for themselves and go back to their calligraphy pens and place cards.

Mr. Quijada instead elected to write and perform a solo hip-hop show, the engaging and obliging “Where Did We Sit on the Bus?,”[http://www.ensemblestudiotheatre.org/currentseason/2016/9/10/where-did-we-sit-on-the-bus] directed by Chay Yew at the Ensemble Studio Theater. Another autobiographical monologue opening this week, Sonya Kelly’s droll “How to Keep an **Alien**,”[http://www.roughmagic.ie/productions/live-repertoire/how-to-keep-an-alien] directed by Gina Moxley at the Irish Arts Center[http://www.irishartscenter.org/], is also a tale of **immigration**. More pointedly, both pieces detail the performers’ attempts to wedge months and years of disorderly lived experience into more or less tidy narratives, to create life stories that they could live with.

The question that lends Mr. Quijada’s show its title is one that he poses to his third-grade teacher as she concludes a lesson on Rosa Parks and the Montgomery bus boycott[http://www.history.com/topics/black-history/montgomery-bus-boycott]. Where did Latinos sit? he asks. His Midwestern teacher, flustered, replies: “Oh. They weren’t around.”

In his efforts to discover who he is and where he comes from, Mr. Quijada rushes in where even confessional artists might fear to tread, acting out the coitus that led to his conception and continuing from there. (Hey, it might not be too late to see that therapist.) As he describes his Illinois upbringing, he breathes and pops into the microphone, occasionally strumming a ukulele, then looping the sounds into a backing track for his rhymes, somewhat in the style of Reggie Watts[http://reggiewatts.com/#video].

Though the show begins as an exploration of his place as a kid of “brown persuasion/a product of U.S.-bound migration,” it soon morphs into Mr. Quijada’s attempts to sell his folks on a career in the arts. His parents, who endured great hardship to arrive and thrive in America, aren’t buying it.

Ms. Kelly, as she tells it, set out to persuade an equally skeptical audience, the Garda National **Immigration** Bureau[http://www.garda.ie/controller.aspx?page=31] in Dublin. Ms. Kelly fell in love with Kate, the Australian stage manager who was in Ireland on a temporary work visa. United by a doomed Gogol adaptation, they first made eyes at each other while miming suicides. “She puts her finger in a plug socket and pretends to fry her brains and I fall out a window: Flirting, Irish style,” says Ms. Kelly.

Ms. Kelly’s earlier solo piece, “I Can See Clearly Now (The Wheelchair on My Face),”[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/18/theater/reviews/sonya-kelly-stars-in-i-can-see-clearly-now-at-59e59.html] detailed her severe myopia. Here, she’s trying to get the government to see straight (and gay), rallying friends and family to help her fashion a story of the relationship that will persuade the bureau to let them cohabitate. “Falling in love requires paperwork,” she moans.

Ms. Kelly enhances her tale with the help of a spirited stage manager, Paul Curley, and a limitless supply of one-liners, many of them delicious. Of an unhappy parting she remarks: “Life is not a movie. It is an underestimated gas bill.”

Both performers draw on abundant personal charm. Mr. Quijada seems half desperate to please his audience. His face, an appealing mix of handsome and goofy, is always ready to split into a smile, and his feet are quick to dance. (He does a killer, crowd-delighting moonwalk.)

Ms. Kelly, a more seasoned performer, sometimes brings to mind a bespectacled Holly Hughes[http://stamps.umich.edu.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/people/detail/holly\_hughes] or Deb Margolin[http://www.deb-margolin.com/]. Her comic style varies nicely from straight-faced to vivacious, from deadpan to a pan that is very much alive, especially her irresistible, maniacal grin.

Ultimately, neither show offers much drama or conflict. Were Mr. Quijada and Ms. Kelly older, the obstacles they faced might have been greater, their outcomes less predictably happy. Ms. Kelly’s greatest trial is a camping trip with her girlfriend’s family. Pretty much the worst thing that happens to Mr. Quijada is that a taunting kid calls him Brian Quesadilla. “Quesadillas are delicious!” he responds.

“Where Did We Sit on the Bus?” runs through Oct. 9 at Ensemble Studio Theater, 549 West 52nd Street, Manhattan, 866-811-4111, ensemblestudiotheatre.org. (1:30)“How to Keep an **Alien**” runs though Oct. 1 at the Irish Arts Center, 553 West 51st Street, Manhattan; 866-811-4111, irishartscenter.org.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

ELIZABETH, N.J. — A few minutes after 7 o’clock, the evening sky over the train station, which was just the color of Tang, has settled to a deep purple. The rain that fell during the day on Monday has relented, finally. But the air is still sticky. Very, very sticky.

Every so often, a flood of people descend the stairs of the station here, arriving on trains from Newark and New York City, and scatter onto the plaza underneath and into the streets, swiftly clearing away. A much smaller crowd is left hanging back. They are waiting around the platform for the next train, or sitting on benches, one group talking trash about someone they all know who is not there. Several men have sneaked off to a dark crevice to drink beer, invisible until their aluminum cans clink against the pavement, giving away their location.

It was here, 24 hours earlier, that a man accused of placing the bombs that exploded on Saturday in the Chelsea section of Manhattan and in Seaside Park, N.J., is believed to have dumped a backpack with several explosive devices in one of the trash cans around the station. The backpack was found within a couple of hours, but by that point, the man, Ahmad Khan Rahami, 28, had set off in the direction of the bar in nearby Linden, where he was found and entered into a gun battle with the police before he was captured[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html].

Investigators say Mr. Rahami, who had lived in the area for years, may have made it to the bar on foot. The trek is about three miles, give or take a few blocks depending on the route, and an effort to retrace his steps a day later shows it is a journey passing through a bustling commercial district, quiet stretches of family homes and an industrial corridor most likely barren of life after dark on a Sunday.

Below the elevated train tracks at the Elizabeth station, Salaam Ismial stood in the plaza on Monday evening looking like a politician out to press the flesh. He wore a tie and a gray suit, an American flag pinned to his lapel. He described himself as a community advocate; he was troubled that what happened would shed a negative light on his city, home to many **immigrants**, where he has lived for most of his life.

“They think this is the homeland of homegrown terrorism,” Mr. Ismial, 57, said of Elizabeth.

He repeats some details he heard about how the bag was found — “I’m hearing this on the street level,” he said, “not the news level” — and he came because he wanted to scope things out for himself and talk to people. Mr. Ismial is Muslim. He worships at a mosque a few blocks away. Mr. Rahami’s actions, he said, were “not a good representation of the Islamic community, and certainly not Islam.”

The suspect was a “young, stupid Muslim kid who got caught up in the idea of hatred of America and American ideals,” he said. “This hurts to the core.”

Under the elevated platform are several arched underpasses, one with a stone walkway that is quiet and damp, seeming almost like a catacomb. But several paces away is Broad Street, and with it comes a burst of life.

A group of friends, laughing and ribbing one another, spills out of the bodega with a storefront trimmed with neon blue light. One of them says her name is Lisa Johnson; she is 20 and has lived in Elizabeth all her life. She was around the night before. “Just mad cops,” she recalled.

It is around 8 p.m., and the day on Broad Street appears to be coming to a close for most, if not everyone. The thoroughfare is lined with businesses, many already with their doors locked — shoe stores and discount stores and the dress shop where mannequins in sequined gowns and thick eyeliner peer through a metal grate. The shopkeeper at a vape store closes up wearing the pair of sunglasses he got in New York with an electronic marquee; “EXCLUSIVE VAPE AND GLASS” scrolls over his eyes.

A little farther down is a church with a cemetery. Old headstones, smoothed by time, poke out of the earth like a jagged row of teeth. Three cats hide in the shadows behind them.

Past the courthouse, the sounds of cars are replaced by the chirp of crickets. There do not appear to be many people around, but the orb hanging off the corner of a general contractor’s building is a reminder of the times we live in: a security camera. When you are conscious of their presence, they seem to be everywhere.

And, it turns out, the area is not as dead as it seemed: A woman’s emotional message in Spanish, sounding almost like a wail, seeps through a white door adorned only with block letter stickers that spell “El Shaddai Community Center.” “We cannot be desecrated people when we’re living in this world, God,” she says, before a passing train drowns her out.

The trail leads to a street lined with houses. They are modest and almost all have siding that, in this light, appears to be a similar shade of gray. But the yards are tidy and some are decorated. The only indication that Elizabeth has given way to Linden is a sign in a vacant lot admonishing people to pick up after their dogs, an instruction that has been flagrantly ignored.

It is possible to catch glimpses of how people along the street go about their evening: The sounds of news in Spanish or dishes being washed escapes through open windows; the blue light from a big-screen television fills a living room window, with the silhouette of a person standing in front of it; and just beyond the houses, peek in the side door of a bowling alley, and a woman with a shock of white hair and a man in a baseball cap huddle close on stools at the concession stand, sharing a Pepsi.

The homestretch is mostly an industrial corridor: some auto body shops, a toner supplier, an office of some kind where the light is still on and an older man with no shirt on sits at a desk. Bob Petty stands outside a red-brick building in a shower cap and a white uniform he borrowed from his boss. It is a ricotta factory, where he has worked for three months.

Mr. Petty knows Mr. Rahami and his family, he said, or at least he went to their chicken restaurant once or twice a week. He had thought Mr. Rahami was friendly. “He’d give you anything you wanted on credit,” he recalled. “If you didn’t have the money, he’d still give it to you.”

Closer to the bar, Judi Zabita pulls her sedan to the side of the road. She has her mother, her sister and her friend in the car with her. They have gone to the train station, they plan to go to the hospital, and now they are trying to get to Merdie’s Tavern, where Mr. Rahami was spotted. She says they are taking their own “version of the TMZ bus tour” of celebrity spots around Los Angeles.

“She wanted to understand how a terrorist could be so close to us,” Ms. Zabita said of her mother. “We’re going through the whole chain of events.”

They will not be able to get any closer. A strip of police tape and a police vehicle block Elizabeth Avenue in Linden. An officer who raised his hand for some overtime is on a 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. shift, here to keep people from coming in and grumbling about the young woman who has left a house behind the police line to see her boyfriend, kissing him on the cheek.

Has the officer ever seen something like this before? He replied with a cool shrug. “I used to work homicide.”

The end of the trail is just beyond the tape, past a few buildings and across from a row of houses — the damp, dark doorway where Mr. Rahami was found. He has been labeled by commentators on Twitter and elsewhere as incompetent for a suspected terrorist, relaxing while on the run and drifting off in a place where he could be seen the next morning.

But think of it this way: Feel the sensation of relief that comes when you sit for the first time after hours of walking, your feet aching in your boots. In that moment, it is a choice that can make all the sense in the world.

Correction: September 20, 2016, Tuesday

An earlier version of this article misspelled the surname of an Elizabeth, N.J., resident and community advocate. He is Salaam Ismial, not Ismail.

\* Ahmad Khan Rahami Was Inspired by Bin Laden, Charges Say[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/nyregion/ahmad-khan-rahami-suspect.html]

\* Bombing Suspect’s Hometown Is a Magnet for **Immigrants**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/nyregion/elizabeth-new-jersey-ahmad-khan-rahami.html]

\* In a Fictional Pub, a Tale of a Bombing. A Block Away, a Very Real Explosion.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/21/nyregion/quietly-play-chelsea-bombing.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

World leaders are gathering in New York this week for the United Nations General Assembly, and at the top of their agenda sits a refugee crisis that has reached a level of urgency not seen since World War II. The United Nations Summit for Refugees and Migrants[http://refugeesmigrants.un.org/summit] and President Obama’s Leaders’ Summit on Refugees[http://www.state.gov/p/io/c71574.htm] represent a watershed moment that is putting a global spotlight on the need for an effective response to a growing humanitarian crisis.

Our shared perspective is informed by the sober awareness of the dangers we face. In the aftermath of an explosive device going off in [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html] the Chelsea neighborhood [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html] of New York[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html] last weekend, and other attacks in cities throughout the world, we recognize that the security of all our residents is paramount in large, open, democratic societies. But it is wrong to characterize **immigrant** and refugee communities as radical and dangerous. Therefore, we must continue to pursue an inclusive approach to resettlement in order to combat the growing tide of xenophobic language around the globe. Such language will lead only to the increased marginalization of our **immigrant** communities, and without making us any safer.

As the mayors of three great global cities — New York, Paris and London — we urge the world leaders assembling at the United Nations to take decisive action to provide relief and safe haven to refugees fleeing conflict and migrants fleeing economic hardship, and to support those who are already doing this work.

We will do our part, too. Our cities pledge to continue to stand for inclusivity, and that is why our cities support services and programs that help all residents, including our diverse **immigrant** communities, feel welcome, so that every resident feels part of our great cities.

In New York and Paris, for example, municipal ID programs have achieved great success in increasing a sense of belonging among **immigrants** and allowing for greater access to services like bank accounts and veterans benefits and city resources like libraries and cultural institutions. In less than two years, New York’s municipal ID program, known as IDNYC[http://www1.nyc.gov/site/idnyc/index.page], has signed up over 10 percent of the city’s total population and garnered strong praise from a diverse coalition of community members, advocates and institutional partners.

Programs like IDNYC build safer cities because **immigrants** and refugees know that they are included and recognized by their governments. In New York, the Police Department was a crucial partner in the establishment of the municipal ID program, as residents are more likely to report crimes when they have a form of ID that is accepted by law enforcement. In Paris, new measures such as the Carte C[http://www.paris.fr/actualites/decouvrez-le-nouveau-programme-de-la-carte-citoyenne-citoyen-de-paris-3518] itoyenne[http://www.paris.fr/actualites/decouvrez-le-nouveau-programme-de-la-carte-citoyenne-citoyen-de-paris-3518] and the participatory budget, which lets Parisians decide how to allocate a percentage of the city’s annual spending, offer the opportunity to all residents to take part in civic life and become local stakeholders, without any restriction.

Investing in the integration of refugees and **immigrants** is not only the right thing to do, it is also the smart thing to do. Refugees and other foreign-born residents bring needed skills and enhance the vitality and growth of local economies, and their presence has long benefited our three cities.

In New York, nearly half of all small-business owners are **immigrants** who contribute to the tax base and expand job opportunities for other New Yorkers. London recently began a publicity campaign, #LondonIsOpen, which highlights similar success stories, drawing from the three million Londoners who were born abroad and contribute to the city’s creativity, vitality and entrepreneurial spirit.

Our cities are also on the front lines of helping those fleeing violence or persecution connect to critical, often lifesaving, services. Paris is one of the first major municipalities to open a refugee center in the heart of the city. Beginning in October, the center will provide services and basic necessities, as well as administrative support, to 400 refugees. New York has placed city representatives in **immigration** court to connect the thousands of unaccompanied children from Central America seeking asylum to crucial health, education and other social services. Last year London boroughs provided support to more than 1,000 unaccompanied, asylum-seeking children, and the city is now developing new ways of working with communities to offer support to resettled refugees.

We know policies that embrace diversity and promote inclusion are successful. We call on world leaders to adopt a similar welcoming and collaborative spirit on behalf of the refugees all over the world during the summit meeting this week. Our cities stand united in the call for inclusivity. It is part of who we are as citizens of diverse and thriving cities.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Bill de Blasio is the mayor of New York. Anne Hidalgo is the mayor of Paris. Sadiq Khan is the mayor of London.

Correction: September 21, 2016, Wednesday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An Op-Ed essay on Tuesday about relief for refugees included the phrase, “In our experience, militant violence is vanishingly rare.” Because of a miscommunication, the phrase, which was added by an editor, was published without final approval of the authors.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ELIZABETH, N.J. — Along the commercial corridor of Elmora Avenue, Salvadoran pupusas are sold next to kosher California rolls and across the street from a salon where three Colombians, a Cuban and a Uruguayan cut hair. Past Las Américas Bakery, the owner of another salon is the proud daughter of southern Italian **immigrants**.

And on that same street, which decades ago used to be populated by Orthodox Jews, there stands an outlier: First American Fried Chicken, owned and operated by the Rahami family, **immigrants** from Afghanistan.

Afghans are not a particularly large group living in Elizabeth. There were only about 200 in a city of nearly 127,000 people, with 77 born in Afghanistan, according to 2014 census figures compiled by researchers at Queens College. In that same year, 63 percent of Elizabeth residents were Hispanic. But because of Ahmad Khan Rahami, the 28-year-old arrested on Monday after a gunfight[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html] and suspected of planting bombs in Manhattan and New Jersey, Afghans have become the most talked about **immigrants** in what seemed to be a haven of diversity.

“I woke up feeling like it was a dream; I never felt like that could happen here,” Agueda Elizabeth Meza, 54, the owner of a Peruvian restaurant on Elizabeth Avenue, said through an interpreter. “Elizabeth is a city of all different bloods — as García Márquez said.”

Pick a flag — there are more than 50 nationalities, and more than 37 languages spoken[http://www.elizabethnj.org/community/living-elizabeth], according to the office of Mayor J. Christian Bollwage (who is of German and Irish heritage). From Poland, Portugal and Peru, they all have come to Elizabeth.

The International Rescue Committee[https://www.rescue.org/], one of nine agencies in the United States that work with the government to resettle refugees, said that since 2010, its office here had helped 102 Afghan refugees, which includes 30 families.

It is still not clear why Mr. Rahami and his family settled in Elizabeth. The authorities said he arrived in the United States as a child and, while a minor, was naturalized through his father — a different path from recent refugees who have come after years of international vetting.

“One thing we do not want to see is any sort of backlash against the community in or around Elizabeth,” said Avigail Ziv, the International Rescue Committee’s executive director for New York and New Jersey. “These are refugees who have suffered a lot and have dealt with violence as well. They are just trying to rebuild their lives.”

There are four mosques in Elizabeth, but the largest, and where the agency said its Afghan refugees attended, is Darul Islam[https://www.facebook.com/Masjid-Darul-Islam-161033917267688/], in the northwestern part of the city. The president of the mosque, Hassen Abdellah, said he did not know whether Mr. Rahami had been there.

“If he prayed in Elizabeth, my gut is that he did come here, everybody comes here,” said Mr. Abdellah, born in New Jersey, who was one of the mosque’s founding members in 1992. “We have an international community, people from Russia, Turkey, Pakistan. We have Asians, Africans, African-Americans, we have the whole tree.”

Asked how many Afghans attend his mosque, Mr. Abdellah said it was perhaps “6 to 7 percent.”

On Monday morning, Mr. Abdellah received an email sent to leaders of area mosques with pictures of Mr. Rahami. “I was in shock, like everybody else,” he said. “I can’t believe that somebody in Elizabeth was involved in something like this. We’ve always been in partnership with the city and the government.”

The surprise registered closer to the fried chicken restaurant on Elmora Avenue. Guillermo Niell, 35, from Uruguay, said he and his family live across the street. He would often buy Coca-Cola there and he never noticed anything strange about the owners.

But his Uruguayan hair stylist, Pepo Lambrechts, recalled that recently Mr. Rahami was always on his computer or his phone, not paying attention to customers.

“My father loved that place,” Cristina Castro, 35, the Colombian-born owner of the salon, said. Once a week, when he used to visit from Colombia, her daughter, Lesley, 13, would take him there.

Ms. Castro’s mother, Gladys Echeverri, said she moved the family to Elizabeth in 1999, after the largest rebel group in Colombia made owning a hair salon too difficult in their small town outside Medellin.

Ms. Echeverri was worried that Mr. Rahami’s arrest would affect business in Elizabeth. “It will hurt the reputation,” she said.

But Ms. Castro said the city’s image was already tarnished by being in the dingy shadow of Newark.

Officials with the Greater Elizabeth Chamber of Commerce would disagree. They are trying to turn Elizabeth into prime tourist destination[http://www.goelizabethnj.com/], with the Jersey Gardens outlets mall as its biggest draw and its history — thanks to Alexander Hamilton[http://www.goelizabethnj.com/hamilton/], who lived and studied in Elizabeth after coming to the American colonies in 1772 — in vogue.

“We were the first capital of New Jersey; this is where New Jersey was founded,” said Gordon Haas, the president of the Chamber of Commerce.

“We advertise, ‘You can dine the world without a passport,’ because you name a restaurant, we’ve got it,” Mr. Haas said, adding, “including now, I guess, an Afghani chicken place.”

On Monday, as police cars and government vehicles cordoned off the street next to the restaurant and others around downtown Elizabeth, there was a another kind of tension in the air for some **immigrants**. Back in January, **immigration** officials conducted raids in New Jersey as part of a nationwide effort[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/07/nyregion/rumors-of-immigration-raids-stoke-fear-in-new-york.html] to deport those who had orders of removal. That brought an increased law enforcement presence and anxiety to Elmora Avenue.

“On the one side, you feel some security having all of this police around,” Ms. Meza said. “But on the other side, there is this feeling of fear because only a few months ago raids were happening in our community, and one cannot help but be reminded.”

\* Pipe Bombs Found Near Train Station in Elizabeth, N.J.[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/pipe-bombs-found-near-train-station-in-elizabeth-nj-official-says.html]

\* Syrian Family of 7 Is Settled in New Jersey Against Christie’s Opposition[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/01/nyregion/syrian-family-of-7-is-quickly-settled-in-new-jersey.html]

\* Ahmad Rahami: Fixture in Family’s Business and, Lately, a ‘Completely Different Person’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/ahmad-khan-rahami-bombing-suspect.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If Donald Trump were to win the presidency and carry out his strident promise to build an impregnable wall along the border with Mexico, both advocates and foes agree, it would turn the United States into a nation quite different from the one they live in.

They don’t know the half of it: Under Mr. Trump’s anti-**immigrant** proposals, the American population would probably shrink to 323 million by 2024, about one million fewer people than today and 22 million fewer people than the Census Bureau’s projections eight years from now.

There is another side to the story, too: With Hillary Clinton as the next president, the population of the United States is more likely to increase to 360 million in 2024, from 324 million today.

Of course, these disparate futures, estimated by Joseph Chamie, a demographer who once headed the United Nations Population Division, rely on a few assumptions. Mr. Trump would expel 11 million **immigrants** who are illegally in the country; Mrs. Clinton would legalize them. Future migration in a Trumpian America would fall to zero but would rise if Mrs. Clinton were president, as many newly legalized residents brought their families along.

The gap — 37 million people, more than a tenth of the population — underscores how powerfully **immigration** policy will shape the future of the United States. And it highlights the shortcoming of a decades-old political debate over overhauling the nation’s **immigration** system that has failed to take into account the disconnect between policy makers and the American public.

“One of the main demographic effects would likely be on overall population size,” said Michael S. Teitelbaum, who in the 1990s was vice chairman and acting chairman of the United States Commission on International Migration. “Another major effect would be on demographic composition in terms of national origin, language, education, religion, race/ethnicity, et cetera.”

Nobody disputes that America’s **immigration** system is broken. The law governing **immigration** is pretty much irrelevant to the reality of **immigration** on the ground. But we can’t just patch the system up.

Attempts at reform have focused on cobbling together constituencies that would stand to gain from specific changes: businesses eager to acquire cheap workers; labor unions interested in organizing newly legalized foreigners; advocacy groups out to protect the rights of **immigrants** who are toiling with little recourse to law.

One problem with this approach is that it has bypassed American voters.

Most Americans would rather not allow more **immigrants** into the United States. Many would prefer [http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/09/30/on-views-of-immigrants-americans-largely-split-along-party-lines/] fewer[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/09/30/on-views-of-immigrants-americans-largely-split-along-party-lines/]. In 2010, three out of four said they favored tighter restrictions[http://www.pewglobal.org/2007/10/04/world-publics-welcome-global-trade-but-not-immigration/258-2/] on **immigration**.

This doesn’t mean the United States should pull up the drawbridge, as Mr. Trump proposes. But it does suggest that any effort to change **immigration** laws and practices faces a big democratic challenge.

Mr. Trump’s **immigration** strategy has little contact with reality. Even under the most favorable circumstances its costs would exceed its potential benefits[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/07/business/economy/the-crumbling-case-for-a-mexican-border-wall.html]. According to some **immigration** experts, his vaunted border wall could even increase the number of **immigrants**[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/02/business/economy/trumps-shaky-stance-on-illegal-immigration.html] living and working illegally in the United States. Unless Mr. Trump were also prepared to impose a police state that would hunt down and deport every foreigner, **immigrants** facing a higher cost of entry — higher smugglers’ fees, greater odds of dying on the way — would be more likely to stay once they got in.

“What the U.S. government is doing in terms of border enforcement, mass deportations and other restrictive policies just isn’t relevant to the decision to stay home,” noted the Mexican Migration Field Research and Training Program of the University of California, San Diego, which has interviewed thousands of **immigrants** and potential **immigrants** in communities across Mexico.

Wayne A. Cornelius, who heads the effort, concluded that “border enforcement, in whatever form and at whatever level, has never been a cost-effective deterrent.”

If Mr. Trump were able to cut **immigration** to zero, it would have other consequences. The United States would have not just a smaller population in the future but also an older one. The work force, which powers economic growth, would be smaller. Each worker would have to maintain more retirees.

But Mr. Trump is not the only politician misleading the public about **immigration**.

For decades, the political debate over **immigration** has been mired in implausible possibilities. Notably, even reformers on the pro-**immigration** side still peddle the notion that illegal **immigration** could be stopped after the latest batch of unauthorized **immigrants** obtained legal residence.

This proposition doesn’t mesh with an ineffectual enforcement policy and a border that, to most voters, looks like Swiss cheese. What it does is squander voters’ trust. “What trips this up is that politicians are continuously making claims which turn out not to be true,” Mr. Chamie, the demographer, told me.

The runaway popularity of Mr. Trump’s extreme anti-**immigrant** stance among a large bloc of the electorate tells you just how mistrustful voters have become over the prevarications of the political class.

In 1965, when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law an **immigration** bill that abolished national quotas favoring migrants from Western European countries, he told Americans[http://www.lbjlibrary.org/lyndon-baines-johnson/timeline/lbj-on-immigration] that it would “not affect the lives of millions,” nor “reshape the structure of our daily lives.”

Two decades later, President Ronald Reagan signed the **Immigration** Reform and Control Act, which offered amnesty to several million unauthorized **immigrants** but promised to slam the door on future illegal **immigrants** by holding their employers accountable.

Lots of things happened over the last few decades. What’s certain is that **immigration** did not follow the pattern envisaged by President Reagan. Nor did its impact on the makeup of the United States fit the modesty of President Johnson’s prognostication.

**Immigrants**, their children and grandchildren have accounted for 55 percent of the country’s population growth since 1965, according to the Pew Research Center[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/28/chapter-2-immigrations-impact-on-past-and-future-u-s-population-change]. Then, the country was 84 percent white, 4 percent Hispanic and less than 1 percent Asian. Today it is 62 percent white, 18 percent Hispanic and 6 percent Asian. Unauthorized **immigrants**, brought close to zero after the legalization wave of the 1980s, are back at an estimated 11 million.

**Immigration** brings many positive things, including diversity of experience and talent, new ideas, customs and skills. The National Academy of Sciences this week will release a report that the **immigration** surge to the United States from 1990 to 2010 produced net benefits for the native-born, beyond those accruing to the **immigrants** themselves, of $50 billion a year, a small but nontrivial amount. It is bigger than the economic gains expected from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the trade agreement among 12 Pacific Rim nations now stalled in Congress.

But admitting new **immigrants** carries costs, too, like pressure on land, housing and natural resources, and lower wages for workers with scant education who compete directly with **immigrants** in the labor market. It might be a bad idea to craft policy around Americans’ misgivings about ethnic and cultural change. Still, they should be brought into the conversation.

Any effort at durable **immigration** reform must acknowledge that expelling 11 million people and having them wait in some nonexistent line to return legally would not just be inhumane but also impossible. The effort must come to terms with the fact that the United States economy benefits from workers of many different backgrounds. It must accept that stopping illegal **immigration** from the poorer regions of the world will require offering a legal avenue for entry.

Reform cannot simply deal with things like border controls and requiring employers to verify legal status. Education — both of **immigrants** and the American-born — will be critical to nurture bonds of identity.

Reformers must engage with Americans’ fears, while offering those who suffer economic losses the means to overcome their loss. Reform efforts will not succeed if they fail to bring Americans along.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] Jr. is facing intense backlash on social media after he posted a message on Twitter Monday night that compared Syrian refugees to a bowl of Skittles sprinkled with a few that “would kill you.”

This image says it all. Let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first. #trump2016[https://twitter.com/hashtag/trump2016?src=hash] pic.twitter.com/9fHwog7ssN[https://t.co/9fHwog7ssN] — Donald Trump Jr. (@DonaldJTrumpJr) September 19, 2016[https://twitter.com/DonaldJTrumpJr/status/778016283342307328]

Mr. Trump, a top adviser in his father’s presidential campaign, appeared to suggest that the nation was faced with a blind selection process in which a few potentially poisoned pieces would be lurking among the thousands of Syrians fleeing a brutal five-year-old civil war.

The post, shared widely on Twitter, drew swift condemnation and comparisons to white supremacist memes. Social media users shared images of bombing victims in the region, including [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/19/world/middleeast/omran-daqneesh-syria-aleppo.html] Omran Daqneesh[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/19/world/middleeast/omran-daqneesh-syria-aleppo.html], the bloodstained, dust-coated boy sitting in an ambulance after an airstrike and became a symbol of the suffering in Aleppo, Syria.

The post also spurred a strong response from Wrigley, the owner of Skittles:

“Skittles are candy. Refugees are people. We don’t feel it’s an appropriate analogy. We will respectfully refrain from further commentary as anything we say could be misinterpreted as marketing,” the company said in an emailed statement from a spokeswoman, initially reported by The Hollywood Reporter.

A rep for @Skittles[https://twitter.com/Skittles] gives me their response to @DonaldJTrumpJr[https://twitter.com/DonaldJTrumpJr] pic.twitter.com/OmkJQkIqug[https://t.co/OmkJQkIqug] — Seth Abramovitch (@SethAbramovitch) September 20, 2016[https://twitter.com/SethAbramovitch/status/778091768793407488]

Emails sent to the campaign of Donald J. Trump, the Republican presidential nominee, were not immediately answered on Tuesday morning.

The war in Syria has killed over 400,000 [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/world/middleeast/syria-civil-war-bashar-al-assad-refugees-islamic-state.html?\_r=0]people and has uprooted nearly five million.[http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php] On the campaign trail, Mr. Trump has likened the influx of Syrian refugees to infiltrators in a Trojan horse[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/11/16/trump-questions-whether-syrian-refugees-are-trojan-horse/?\_r=0] and said he would like to “build a safe zone in Syria, build a big, beautiful safe zone, and you have whatever it is, so they can live.

The Trump meme, using the stark white bowl brimming with multicolored candy, generated accusations of insensitivity.[http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-11-21/syrian-refugee-situation-summed-using-mms]

These aren't Skittles, @DonaldJTrumpJr[https://twitter.com/DonaldJTrumpJr]. pic.twitter.com/h8DXvdFtVM[https://t.co/h8DXvdFtVM] — Jason Sparks (@sparksjls) September 20, 2016[https://twitter.com/sparksjls/status/778041808018374656]

Joe Walsh, a conservative radio talk show host and former Illinois [https://twitter.com/WalshFreedom/status/778030543803822080] congressman[https://twitter.com/WalshFreedom/status/778030543803822080] known for his Tea Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/t/tea\_party\_movement/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] views, also took credit for making the exact analogy last month.

Hey @DonaldJTrumpJr[https://twitter.com/DonaldJTrumpJr], that's the point I made last month.Glad you agree. pic.twitter.com/Nssw6KC1HY[https://t.co/Nssw6KC1HY] — Joe Walsh (@WalshFreedom) September 20, 2016[https://twitter.com/WalshFreedom/status/778030543803822080]

Others noted that the meme dated to at least 2014, but used a bowl of M&M’s[http://imgur.com/gallery/BA9a0SG].

Some chastised the younger Mr. Trump for wildly overstating the dangers posed by refugees.[http://www.cato.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/blog/syrian-refugees-dont-pose-serious-security-threat]

“the chance of an American being murdered in a terrorist attack caused by a refugee is 1 in 3.64 billion per year” https://t.co/ZWsr8SsRLK[https://t.co/ZWsr8SsRLK] https://t.co/NPsUxPhsFV[https://t.co/NPsUxPhsFV] — Elise Foley (@elisefoley) September 20, 2016[https://twitter.com/elisefoley/status/778022958442876929]

Last month, the United States said it had met its goal for the year, welcoming its 10,000th Syrian refugee[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/syrian-refugee-resettlement\_us\_57c471b6e4b0664f13c9b54c]. And State Department statistics say that fewer than 20 [http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2016-01-08/refugee-program-decried-after-iraqis-terror-related-arrests] of the 785,000 refugees settled in the United States since Sept. 11, 2001, [http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2016-01-08/refugee-program-decried-after-iraqis-terror-related-arrests] have been arrested on terrorism charges[http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2016-01-08/refugee-program-decried-after-iraqis-terror-related-arrests].

Others saw a clear link to white supremacist themes[https://www.rawstory.com/2016/09/trump-jrs-skittles-tweet-is-based-on-two-different-white-supremacist-memes/], and a link to Trayvon Martin, the black teenager who went out to buy Skittles in 2012 and was fatally shot by George Zimmerman in Florida.

If you think the choice of Skittles is accidental here, you haven't seen the George Zimmerman alt right fan memes. pic.twitter.com/OlZoMgHkze[https://t.co/OlZoMgHkze] — Bob Schooley (@Rschooley) September 20, 2016[https://twitter.com/Rschooley/status/778030659524714496]

Others used the meme to extrapolate the premise for other issues, like prisoners and guns.

I'm sure someone's already made this, but: pic.twitter.com/srX6xuidSt[https://t.co/srX6xuidSt] — Alex SK Clatworthy (@LeonFenrir) September 20, 2016[https://twitter.com/LeonFenrir/status/778075032530673664]

The younger Mr. Trump was criticized this month for evoking Holocaust imagery in criticisms about the news media [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/us/politics/donald-trump-jr-holocaust.html]after he posted an image of Pepe the Frog, a popular alt-right symbol[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/donald-trump-jr-pepe-the-frog-228268].

In this latest flare-up, some noted that the meme was tweeted from an iPhone, made by Apple, which was co-founded by Steve Jobs, the son of a Syrian **immigrant**.

Pause to reflect on the fact that this was sent from an iPhone, which was created by the son of a Syrian **immigrant**. https://t.co/N13gXgRozn[https://t.co/N13gXgRozn] — Binyamin Appelbaum (@BCAppelbaum) September 20, 2016[https://twitter.com/BCAppelbaum/status/778031002878967813]

\* How Omran Daqneesh, 5, Became a Symbol of Aleppo’s Suffering[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/19/world/middleeast/omran-daqneesh-syria-aleppo.html]

\* Donald Trump Jr. Invokes Holocaust Imagery in Complaint Against Media[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/us/politics/donald-trump-jr-holocaust.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

BERLIN — Throughout the almost 11 years Chancellor Angela Merkel[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela\_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per] has been in office in Germany[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/germany/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], her nation has been reassuringly stable in the midst of tumult throughout Europe, maintaining a steady economy and stolidly predictable politics.

But it is becoming increasingly clear that Ms. Merkel’s decision last year to allow hundreds of thousands of migrants to enter the country has set off aftershocks that continue to upend politics in Germany and beyond. And on Monday, a day after voters in Berlin dealt her party another stinging loss[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/world/europe/nationalist-partys-challenge-to-merkel-moves-to-berlin-state-elections.html] in the second regional vote in two weeks, she was left to convince voters that she was not out of touch with their anger and anxiety over the flood of **immigrants**.

“If I could, I would turn back time by many, many years to better prepare myself and the whole German government for the situation that reached us unprepared in late summer 2015,” Ms. Merkel said after meeting with leaders of her party, the center-right Christian Democratic Union. “Nobody, including myself, wants a repeat of this situation.”

In a speech that was at times personal, Ms. Merkel took responsibility for her party’s record-low showing in balloting in Berlin. She also acknowledged a role in the party’s humiliating third-place finish[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/angela-merkel-germany-mecklenburg-vorpommern-elections-refugees.html], behind the Social Democratic Party and a nationalist party, Alternative for Germany, two weeks ago in her home state, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. She pledged to work to regain voters’ trust.

Since her decision to welcome refugees from Syria and other poor and war-torn countries, the effects across Germany and Europe have only grown more intense. The main political beneficiary of the backlash in Germany has been Alternative for Germany — a trend that has played out across much of the Continent, where far-right, anti-**immigrant** parties are on the rise in many countries.

The question of how far to go in assimilating the migrants has exposed a deep rift between Eastern and Western Europe, and the economic and cultural challenges of absorbing so many people have contributed to rising nationalism in countries including France, the Netherlands and Austria, and to Britain’s decision to leave the European Union[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/britain-brexit-european-union].

On Monday, instead of gathering with President Obama and other world leaders in New York at the United Nations, Ms. Merkel stayed home to shore up her political standing a year before general elections, deflecting questions about whether she would even run again.

The chancellor defended her decision as “absolutely right,” but she acknowledged that “ultimately, it led to a time when we did not have enough control over the situation.” She pointed to legislation and efforts since then aimed at helping to regain control and integrate the new arrivals.

Her conservative party’s loss on Sunday in the state elections in Berlin, she acknowledged, was the result of the mass arrival of refugees and a resulting protest vote against the party.

But there were several other reasons, she said, including the emergence of “a post-facts world, where people are not necessarily interested in facts, they are just following their feelings.”

The gut-driven behavior of voters and politicians this year — most stunningly seen in Britain’s vote to leave the European Union — has upset faith in opinion polls and in institutions developed since World War II to contain the far-right or far-left thought that is now attracting populist support.

Many Germans found their country’s chaotic response to the influx of migrants worrying to the point that they felt a threat, whether real or perceived, to their personal stability and prosperity, said Constanze Stelzenmüller, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.

“To many, the German state appeared not to be capable of handling this wave of migrants,” Ms. Stelzenmüller said. “That raised questions of safety of their own personal life. That showed, right or wrong, their country’s institutions were not as strong as people thought they are. The shock of the initial wave is still in people’s bones.”

Ms. Merkel said it was vital to recognize the economic roots of insecurity, suggesting that globalization and new trade patterns could have profound effects on people, from the German farmer to the young population of Africa.

Making that connection, she argued, is essential for a decent future.

Germany “won’t let itself be rattled to its core,” she said, adding, “That didn’t happen even in such a turning-point, indeed extremely unsettling, year as the past one.”

Germans in rural areas — where Christian Democrats hold more sway than in cities — are deeply worried that even if they are doing well, they have lost faith in their prospects for the future, she said.

“When the young people all leave the villages, when one can only with difficulty sell one’s home,” she noted, there is drama and uncertainty “which thicken into a fear, or at the very least a worry about the future.”

After 1989, the fall of the Berlin Wall[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/b/berlin\_wall/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and the spread of freedom across Europe, she said, made it seem that Europe was on a victorious course and could not be overtaken. Now, she added, “something has developed where we notice that in the globalized world, we are not necessarily in the forefront.”

Correction: October 20, 2016, Thursday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An article on Sept. 20 about Chancellor Angela Merkel’s acceptance of blame for her party’s losses in German regional elections quoted incorrectly from comments by Constanze Stelzenmüller, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution who said many Germans felt threatened by the influx of migrants last year. She said, “To many, the German state appeared not to be capable of handling this wave of migrants” — not “ ... not to be capable of not handling this wave of migrants.”

\* Berlin Election Deals Angela Merkel’s Party Another Blow[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/world/europe/nationalist-partys-challenge-to-merkel-moves-to-berlin-state-elections.html]

\* Overcoming Cruelty in Today’s Germany[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/world/europe/overcoming-cruelty-in-todays-germany.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

A suspect in a bombing was still at large Monday morning, his motives and intentions unknown — but Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] were already racing to seize the political upper hand.

With a manhunt still in progress before an arrest later in the day[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html], Mrs. Clinton sought to shift the terms of the presidential contest back in her direction. She called Mr. Trump a “recruiting sergeant for the terrorists” and, from a rainy airport in White Plains, offered herself as a seasoned warrior against terrorism.

Mr. Trump returned fire hours later, blaming Mrs. Clinton and President Obama’s handling of **immigration** and the Iraq war for bringing terrorism to American shores. He called for vigorous police profiling of people from the Muslim world and drew a direct equation between **immigration** controls and national defense.

The attacks could reframe the presidential race around stark questions of national security after weeks of often-bitter sniping between Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton over more personal matters of character, transparency and medical records. The violence of the weekend is all but certain to ripple in the first presidential debate, set for next Monday at Hofstra University on Long Island.

For both the candidates and their parties, the bombings in New York[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/nyregion/chelsea-explosion-new-york-city.html] and New Jersey[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/nyregion/jersey-shore-charity-race-canceled-after-explosion.html] over the weekend are a critical inflection point. Not since the Iraq war has the mantle of national security and protection been more vigorously contested than it has been in this campaign, or its textures more difficult to define.

With seven weeks left in the campaign, the candidates’ responses to an apparent terrorist plot on American soil could sharply alter voters’ views not only of them but of the parties they lead. And both candidates set up extraordinary stakes, each asserting that the other was not only wrong on national security, but actively abetting terrorists in word or deed.

It was Mrs. Clinton who appeared most determined to bend the moment to her advantage. Unlike most Democratic nominees, she has enjoyed an edge over her Republican opponent on issues of national security and foreign policy. Having faced a rocky stretch in the presidential race, punctuated by a bout of[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/12/us/politics/hillary-clinton-campaign-pneumonia.html] pneumonia[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/12/us/politics/hillary-clinton-campaign-pneumonia.html], she appeared to welcome a renewed debate over terrorism.

Before flying to Philadelphia to court younger voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/us/politics/hillary-clinton-speech-millennials.html], Mrs. Clinton held a news conference to call for “courage and vigilance” in the face of terrorism, and warned that Mr. Trump was unprepared to keep the country safe.

Citing former intelligence and counterterrorism officials who have criticized Mr. Trump’s caustic remarks about Islam, Mrs. Clinton leveled an attack that might have shocked the political world in any other campaign: In addition to calling him a “recruiting sergeant” for terrorists, she accused him of giving “aid and comfort” to the Islamic State with his campaign oratory.

“We’re going after the bad guys, and we’re going to get them, but we’re not going after an entire religion,” Mrs. Clinton said, adding, “We know that Donald Trump’s comments have been used online for the recruitment of terrorists.”

It was the most drastic version yet of an attack Mrs. Clinton has tried out recently with increasing boldness: In an interview on Israeli television[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/us/politics/hillary-clinton-israel.html] this month, she said the Islamic State was praying for Mr. Trump’s victory, and she has warned that foreign adversaries could seek to sway the election[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/hillary-clinton-russia.html] in her opponent’s favor.

Mr. Trump, she said on Monday, has helped the Islamic State and other terrorist groups cast their attacks as part of a religious war between Islam and the West.

“They are looking to make this into a war against Islam, rather than a war against jihadists, violent terrorists,” Mrs. Clinton said. “The kinds of rhetoric and language Mr. Trump has used is giving aid and comfort to our adversaries.”

Mr. Trump responded with indignation. His campaign released a string of statements expressing outrage, criticizing Mrs. Clinton for favoring more lenient **immigration** policies and calling her attack on Mr. Trump tantamount to an accusation of treason.

At a rally in Florida on Monday afternoon, Mr. Trump blasted Mrs. Clinton for failing, as a member of the Obama administration, to stop the rise of the Islamic State, employing much the same throw-the-bums-out argument he has used to demand an overhaul of government on domestic matters.

“Her weakness, her ineffectiveness, caused the problem, and now she wants to be president,” he said. “I don’t think so.”

Mr. Trump directly equated American vulnerability to terrorism with what he called laxness in the **immigration** system. He has mainly warned about the risk of admitting refugees from Syria and other war-torn countries, though the suspect arrested in the weekend attacks, Ahmad Khan Rahami, is a naturalized citizen born in Afghanistan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/ahmad-khan-rahami-bombing-suspect.html] and has lived in the United States for years.

“These attacks, and many others, were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system,” Mr. Trump said, trying to return the political debate to the issue he is most comfortable discussing. “**Immigration** security,” he added, “is national security.”

But Mr. Trump may have to clear a higher standard than merely keeping up, punch for punch, with Mrs. Clinton. While he has drawn close to her[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-poll.html] in the polls, he still faces broad reservations among voters about his readiness to serve as commander in chief. In the past, he has provoked a backlash after terror attacks by fulminating against Muslims and shifting too quickly onto the offensive.

If Mr. Trump finished the day with a forceful speech denouncing Mrs. Clinton, he began with a meandering telephone interview with Fox News, during which he asserted that there were “many foreign connections” to the weekend attacks, though none had been established. And he suggested, again without supplying evidence, that American police officers fail to act against terrorism suspects because of political correctness.

Mr. Trump also applauded himself for having described the Saturday night explosion in New York City as a bombing even before the police did. “I should be a newscaster,” he said. “I called it before the news.”

The hostilities between the candidates erupted at the start of a week when both were aiming to cut a presidential profile and to strengthen their credentials on the international stage by meeting with foreign leaders in New York at the annual session of the United Nations General Assembly.

In many respects, Mrs. Clinton’s campaign against Mr. Trump has flipped the traditional contours of defense politics, offering voters a Democrat with more hawkish instincts and deeper ties to the national security establishment, and a Republican who has broadly rejected military intervention and has been spurned by many defense leaders in his own party[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/09/us/politics/national-security-gop-donald-trump.html].

Mrs. Clinton is by far the more conventionally experienced and credentialed candidate, and in some respects is more hawkish: She has called[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/20/us/politics/hillary-clinton-syria-islamic-state.html] for the creation of a no-fly zone in Syria, as well as more airstrikes there, and has urged closer collaboration with Silicon Valley to expand the United States’ surveillance capabilities, alarming some civil liberties advocates.

In Mr. Trump, she confronts a candidate who has been abandoned by most of his party’s national security elite, who is still unable to produce a detailed set of proposals for stopping terrorism, and whose essential political brand — disruption — does not always comfort voters seeking strength in moments of crisis and terror.

Tommy Vietor, a former national security spokesman for Mr. Obama, said that if Democrats were conventionally cast as the “mommy party” and Republicans as the “daddy party” in American politics, then “Trump is the crazy uncle and Hillary Clinton is the only person you trust to watch your family for a week.”

Mr. Trump has also cast doubt[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/us/politics/donald-trump-issues.html] on American participation in NATO and spoken warmly[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-putin.html] of Vladimir V. Putin, the Russian president and strongman. And in recent days, he has feuded[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/09/17/trump-goes-hard-after-robert-gates-saying-he-likely-has-undisclosed-problem/] with Robert M. Gates, a highly regarded former defense secretary, and found himself mocked by another respected national security figure, former Secretary of State Colin Powell, who called Mr. Trump “a national disgrace and an international pariah” in private emails released by hackers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/us/politics/colin-powell-emails-hack-donald-trump.html] last week.

Whatever doubts many voters still have about Mrs. Clinton’s trustworthiness, most appear to consider her better suited to manage foreign policy and threats to the American people. Before the Chelsea bombing, according to a New York Times/CBS News poll, voters gave her a slight edge on the question of who would better handle terrorism and national security, and a large one on foreign policy. Some polling suggests that she has a bigger lead over Mr. Trump on related questions — who would be a better commander in chief, for example — than past Democratic nominees have had over Republicans.

“Voters look for the qualities of experience, temperament and judgment,” said Evan McMullin, a former intelligence officer who is running[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/09/us/politics/evan-mcmullin-independent-candidate.html] for president as a conservative independent candidate. “Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump lack some or all of them. But Trump lacks all of them.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Amy Chozick contributed reporting.

Correction: September 19, 2016, Monday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: Because of an editing error, an earlier version of this article misstated the surname of the suspect in the bombings in New Jersey and New York. He is Ahmad Khan Rahami, not Rahmani.

\* Ahmad Khan Rahami Is Arrested in Manhattan and New Jersey Bombings[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/20/nyregion/nyc-nj-explosions-ahmad-khan-rahami.html]

\* Manhattan Bombs Provide Trove of Clues; F.B.I. Questions 5 People[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/nyregion/new-york-explosion-chelsea.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

ST. CLOUD, Minn. — The man who the police say stabbed 10 people at a mall[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/us/police-shoot-attacker-in-minnesota-mall-after-8-are-stabbed.html] here on Saturday seemed like a model of assimilation, not a violent jihadist, people who knew him and his family said. The son of Somali refugees, he lived in the United States most of his life, did well in school, played sports, worked as a security guard and took classes at a local college.

But a new description has been applied to him: terrorist. As he stalked through the Crossroads Center mall, wearing a security guard uniform and wielding a knife, the attacker, identified by officials on Monday as Dahir Adan, mentioned Allah and asked at least one victim if he was Muslim, the police said.

A report by a news agency linked to the Islamic State claimed on Sunday that a “soldier of the Islamic State” was behind the stabbing. The F.B.I. is investigating the attack as a possible terrorist act.

But law enforcement officials were unsure whether Mr. Adan had made contact with any terror organization, or had “self-radicalized,” heeding the online calls to radical jihad that terrorist groups have used to goad Westerners into mounting attacks at home. The St. Cloud police chief, William Blair Anderson, stressed that the investigation had barely started, adding, “I want to know everything about this individual since the day he was born until last Saturday.”

“He was a normal American kid,” said Jama Alimad, a leader among St. Cloud’s ethnic Somalis and a friend of the Adan family, who had seen Mr. Adan as recently as this summer. “I can’t see anyone more assimilated than that guy.”

As customers in the mall fled the attacker and rushed for the exits, the rampage ended when Mr. Adan, who was in his early 20s, was shot and killed inside Macy’s by an off-duty police officer.

On Monday, the St. Cloud police raised the number of wounded from nine to 10, explaining that they had learned of a victim who had not immediately sought medical treatment. None of the eight men and two women who were stabbed suffered life-threatening injuries, and none remained hospitalized, officials said. The mall reopened on Monday morning.

Since the attack, people who had encountered Mr. Adan have tried to reconcile the quiet, mild-mannered youth they saw with the bloody accounts of his actions. People who have spoken with his family said that he had shown no signs of radicalization, and that on Saturday, he seemed to be in good spirits and said he was going to the mall to buy a new iPhone.

“That’s something he was hiding very well if indeed he did that,” said Haji Yussuf, director of UniteCloud[http://www.unitecloud.org/], a group that tries to resolve tensions between cultures in the city.

Until the police release video recordings of the attack, “we cannot believe the speculation we hear,” said Mohamoud Ismail Mohamed, executive director of the Saint Cloud Area Somali Salvation Organization, who said he helped the Adan family settle in St. Cloud about seven or eight years ago. “What happened that night between leaving home and the shooting is the million dollar question.”

A few of Mr. Adan’s friends and schoolmates took to social media to express their disbelief and confusion. One called Chammy said on Twitter, “He was such a sweet humble guy, and that’s still how I see him.”

We don't know the story. We don't know what Dahir was going through. He was a sweet humble guy, and that's still how I see him. — Chammy (@Cham\_odol) September 19, 2016[https://twitter.com/Cham\_odol/status/777697374621863936]

President Obama said that he was being briefed on the investigation, and that there was no sign of a link to explosions in and around New York City[http://www.nytimes.com/live/new-york-explosion] on Saturday.

“At this point, we see no connection between that incident and what happened in New York and New Jersey,” the president said at a news conference in New York, where he was attending the annual session of the United Nations General Assembly.

“We will continue to lead the global coalition in the fight to destroy ISIL, which is instigating a lot of people over the internet to carry out attacks,” Mr. Obama said, referring to the Islamic State. He said the group’s aim was to sow fear as well as destruction, and “We all have a role to play as citizens to make sure we don’t succumb to that fear.”

Mr. Alimad said Mr. Adan had **immigrated** to the United States as a toddler and grew up in St. Cloud. He said Mr. Adan excelled in school, and was not especially religious, though also not an atheist.

“We need to get to the bottom of this,” he added. “We need to know what triggered this kid.”

The Star Tribune in Minneapolis reported[http://www.startribune.com/st-cloud-mall-closed-until-monday-is-crime-scene-after-stabbings/393872071/] that Mr. Adan lived with his father in an apartment in St. Cloud. The father said his son was born in Kenya, where many Somalis have fled to escape the long-running civil war in their country.

He graduated in 2014 from Apollo High School in St. Cloud, then enrolled at St. Cloud State University, intending to major in information systems, the university said, but he was not enrolled for the fall term.

Mr. Adan worked part time for a global security firm, Securitas, which assigned him to weekend guard duty at an Electrolux facility in St. Cloud, according to both companies. Securitas released a brief statement saying that Mr. Adan had quit in June, offering little else about his history with the company, except that he “was hired in accordance with Minnesota state law and company policy.”

Family friends said he had a security guard job at the time of the attack, but it was not clear where.

The attacker was stopped by Jason Falconer, an off-duty part-time police officer in Avon, a nearby town.

“He’s a firearms instructor for the City of Avon,” said Corey Nellis, Avon’s police chief. “He’s a competitive shooter. If I was going to ask anybody to fire live rounds in a crowded mall, I would trust his abilities next to anybody’s.”

“Officer Falconer put himself in harm’s way to protect the public from a man who had already stabbed nine people and would have very likely harmed more people had Officer Falconer not acted so quickly and decisively,” he said.

Chief Nellis said that Mr. Falconer, a former police chief in another nearby town, Albany, worked only an occasional shift for his department; in fact, he was not scheduled to work over the next two months.

Minnesota is home to about 25,000 Somalis, the largest concentration in the United States. Some have flocked in recent years to St. Cloud, a small city northwest of the Twin Cities, in search of safety and jobs, where Somali leaders say they have mostly been made to feel welcome.

“Knowing your neighbor makes you less fearful of your neighbor,” said Mayor Dave Kleis, who said the city has worked hard to welcome and integrate the newcomers.

Gov. Mark Dayton, a Democrat who has long been an outspoken advocate for **immigrants**, said at a news conference on Monday, “I implore citizens of St. Cloud, and really citizens throughout Minnesota, to rise above this tragic incident and to remember our common humanity, our shared citizenship, and our shared desires to live together peacefully.”

But Somalis said there was a widespread fear of a backlash after the attack.

“We are really fearful,” Mr. Alimad said. “Kids are afraid. Women are afraid to go to shop. And this is happening in the land of the free.”

For breaking news and in-depth reporting, follow @NYTNational[https://twitter.com/NYTNational] on Twitter.

Mitch Smith reported from St. Cloud, and Richard Pérez-Peña from New York. Reporting was contributed by Matt Furber from St. Cloud, Christine Hauser from New York, Christina Capecchi from St. Paul, Mark Landler from New York, and Adam Goldman from Washington.

Correction: September 19, 2016, Monday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An earlier version of this article misspelled in two instances the surname of the off-duty police officer who shot and killed a man who stabbed nine people. He is Jason Falconer, not Faulkner.

\* F.B.I. Treats Minnesota Mall Stabbing Attack as ‘Potential Act of Terrorism’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/us/police-shoot-attacker-in-minnesota-mall-after-8-are-stabbed.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON — The Department of Homeland Security[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/h/homeland\_security\_department/index.html?inline=nyt-org] granted citizenship to hundreds of people who had previously been ordered deported or removed under different names because of flaws in keeping fingerprint records, according to a report released Monday.

The report[https://www.oig.dhs.gov/assets/pr/2016/oigpr-091916.pdf] from the department’s Office of Inspector General found that nearly 900 individuals were granted citizenship because neither the agency nor the F.B.I. databases contained all of the fingerprint records of people who had previously been ordered to be deported.

Nearly 150,000 older fingerprint records were not digitized or simply were not included in the Department of Homeland Security’s databases when they were being developed, the report said. In other cases, fingerprints that were taken by **immigration** officials during the deportation process were not forwarded to the F.B.I.

“This situation created opportunities for individuals to gain rights and privileges of U.S. citizenship through fraud,” said John Roth, the inspector general at Homeland Security.

The report comes as members of Congress, Homeland Security and intelligence officials have undertaken a broader examination of the nation’s **immigration**policy and have raised concern about individuals with ties to terrorist groups gaining entry into the United States. The examination began in the wake of terrorist attacks in Paris[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/attacks-in-paris?inline=nyt-classifier] in November and the shooting in San Bernardino, Calif., that left 14 people dead in December.

After the attacks, President Obama signed legislation that tightened visa waivers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/22/us/politics/us-tightens-visa-rules-for-some-european-visitors.html] to make it harder for travelers to enter the United States from Europe if they had dual citizenship from Iran, Iraq, Sudan or Syria, or had visited one of those countries in the previous five years.

About 38 countries, mostly in Europe, participate in the visa-waiver program, which allows their citizens to visit the United States without a visa on trips of 90 days or less. Homeland Security officials have also begun an extensive review of the K-1 visa, also known as a fiancé visa, which allowed Tashfeen Malik, one of the attackers in San Bernardino, to enter the United States.

Officials say the findings illustrate a major security gap.

“This failure represents a significant risk to America’s national security as these naturalized individuals have access to serve in positions of public trust and the ability to obtain security clearances,” Senator Ron Johnson, a Wisconsin Republican who is chairman of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, wrote in a letter to Jeh Johnson, the secretary of homeland security.

The United States Citizenship and **Immigration** Service, an agency within Homeland Security that oversees citizenship, is supposed to check the fingerprints of applicants for citizenship against a number of databases to make sure that they do not have criminal records or pose a threat to national security.

But since the fingerprint databases are incomplete, the report found that the agency had no way of knowing if the individuals were actually who they said they were.

Investigators found that in more than 200 cases they examined, none of the individuals disclosed that they had another identity or that they had final deportation orders on their naturalization application.

As naturalized citizens, these individuals retain many of the rights and privileges of American citizenship, including serving in law enforcement, obtaining a security clearance and sponsoring other the entry of other foreigners into the United States, the report said.

For example, investigators with the inspector general’s office said during their examination that they learned that at least three people, who became naturalized citizens after having been deported under a different name, had managed to obtain the necessary clearances to conduct security-sensitive work at commercial airports or at ports and aboard ships.

Since being identified, all have had their credentials revoked, the report said.

The inspector general’s report said the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agency had investigated few of the naturalized citizens to determine whether they should have their citizenship revoked. That agency is now taking steps to increase its inquiries and to digitize all its fingerprint records.

In a statement, the Department of Homeland Security acknowledged the issues raised in the report.

But the department’s statement added, “It is important to note that the fact that fingerprint records in these cases may have been incomplete at the time of the naturalization interview does not necessarily mean that the applicant was in fact granted naturalization, or that the applicant obtained naturalization fraudulently.”

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/nytpolitics], and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics/].

Follow Ron Nixon on Twitter @nixonron.

\* Visa Program Up for Renewal Amid Allegations of Fraud[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/12/us/politics/visa-program-up-for-renewal-amid-allegations-of-fraud.html]

\* Laid-Off Americans, Required to Zip Lips on Way Out, Grow Bolder[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/12/us/laid-off-americans-required-to-zip-lips-on-way-out-grow-bolder.html]

\* U.S. Expands Restrictions on Visa-Waiver Program for Visitors[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/19/us/politics/us-expands-restrictions-on-visa-waiver-program-for-visitors.html]

\* Program That Lets Foreigners Write a Check, and Get a Visa, Draws Scrutiny[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/16/us/politics/program-that-lets-foreigners-write-a-check-and-get-a-visa-draws-scrutiny.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS — France[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/france/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] is frightened about many things these days, terrorism above all. But there is another fear — raised recently by prominent politicians on the right and on the left — of slipping into an acceptance of what is often called an Anglo-Saxon multicultural model, in which ethnic communities live separately, even autonomously.

The idea that this model, or “communautarisme,” should be so repellent can be baffling to Anglo-Saxons, largely understood by the French to be British and Americans who, for the most part, stopped thinking of themselves exclusively in such narrow terms long ago.

France’s idea of an Anglo-Saxon model has meant many things over the last century, sometimes referring to liberal capitalism, rampant individualism, consumerism or, in the view of President Charles de Gaulle, the threat of a global hegemony based on American power and the English language.

But today the perceived Anglo-Saxon threat is about the breakdown of France into distinct communities based on ethnic identity. Prime Minister Manuel Valls referred to this obliquely in criti[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/france-manuel-valls-burkini-muslim-women.html?\_r=0] cizing[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/france-manuel-valls-burkini-muslim-women.html?\_r=0] a New York Times [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/france-manuel-valls-burkini-muslim-women.html?\_r=0] article[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/france-manuel-valls-burkini-muslim-women.html?\_r=0] about the European experience of Muslim women, who described a day to day “struggle.” Mr. Valls, a Socialist, stressed that “France, as distinct from other countries, does not see itself as a juxtaposition of communities, each with their autonomous path.”

Nicolas Sarkozy, the former president now seeking his conservative party’s nomination for next year’s presidential election, was more explicit in his latest book. Calling for a muscular defense of the French identity, he wrote, “We are not like the Anglo-Saxons who let communities live side by side, ignoring each other and at any rate not mixing.”

The issue is not just whether the French model, which emphasizes integration or assimilation into a single identity, is succeeding or not these days. The question is also why the British and American experience with **immigration** is viewed through such a skewed lens.

Both countries have long traditions of tolerating multiple identities and community-based politics, which produces candidates who represent ethnic groups and their concerns.

Unlike France, the United States and Britain allow census figures on ethnic origins and religious affiliations, and celebrations of diverse identities are encouraged.

That is not to say that racism and de facto segregation are not stubborn realities in the United States and Britain, with issues like police violence against black men growing more visible rather than less. This year, appeals to nativist sentiments helped propel Britain’s decision to leave the European Union[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/britain-brexit-european-union] and are fueling Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump]’s campaign for president. In both countries, economic and social mobility can be limited by race and ethnicity.

Still, that hardly adds up to societies divided into autonomous neighborhoods that shun contact with one another, an exaggeration that would surprise recent **immigrants** who live in the swirling mix of cultures that define London, New York and other cities.

So what is it that makes the Anglo-Saxon model so scary to the French today? Emile Chabal, a professor of modern French history at the University of Edinburgh, traces it to France’s deeply held faith in a single, indivisible republic that makes no distinction among its citizens.

“Within French republicanism, which is today the dominant political language, the fear of fragmentation is very powerful and very real,” Mr. Chabal said in an interview. “This means any political process that is seen to encourage that — community leaders, accommodations to certain groups — is seen as a threat to the unity of the nation.”

So why is the threat of a creeping Anglo-Saxon model being brandished in France today? Mr. Chabal said it was a political response based on a “double lie,” one that is a misreading of life on the ground in Britain and the United States, as well as a denial of reality in France.

In fact, he said, the differences between the two approaches are narrowing. In France, despite their allegiance to republican values, local politicians are compelled to deal with competing concerns of diverse communities. “It is the reality of a pluralistic society,” Mr. Chabal said. “Pressure groups are part and parcel of modern democracy.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**STRANGERS IN THEIR OWN LAND

Anger and Mourning on the American Right

By Arlie Russell Hochschild

351 pp. The New Press. $27.95.

Arlie Hochschild’s generous but disconcerting look at the Tea Party presents a likable fellow named Lee Sherman, who once worked for a Louisiana chemical plant where his duties included illegally dumping toxic waste into the bayou.

Sherman did the dirty work; then the company did him dirty. After 15 years on the job, he was doused with chemicals that “burned my clothes clean off me” and left him ill. But rather than pay his disability costs, his bosses accused him of absenteeism and fired him.

Sherman became a fledgling environmentalist and got his revenge after a giant fish kill threatened the livelihood of nearby fishermen. Company officials feigned innocence, but Sherman barged into a public meeting with an incriminating sign: I’M THE ONE WHO DUMPED IT IN THE BAYOU. Fast-forward a couple of decades and Sherman, still an environmentalist, is campaigning for a Tea Party congressman who wants to gut the Environmental Protection Agency. Sherman still distrusts chemical companies, but he distrusts the federal government more, because it spends his tax money on people who “lazed around days and partied at night.”

In “Strangers in Their Own Land,” which has been nominated for a National Book Award[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/books/national-book-foundation-announces-10-nominees-for-2016-fiction-award.html], Hochschild calls this the “Great Paradox” — opposition to federal help from people and places that need it — and sets off across Louisiana on an energetic, open-minded quest to understand it.

A distinguished Berkeley sociologist, Hochschild is a woman of the left, but her mission is empathy, not polemics. She takes seriously the Tea Partiers’ complaints that they have become the “strangers” of the title — triply marginalized by flat or falling wages, rapid demographic change, and liberal culture that mocks their faith and patriotism. Her affection for her characters is palpable.

But the resentments she finds are as toxic as the pollutants in the marsh and metastasizing throughout politics. What unites her subjects is the powerful feeling that others are “cutting in line” and that the federal government is supporting people on the dole — “taking money from the workers and giving it to the idle.” Income is flowing up, but the anger points down.

The people who feel this are white. The usurpers they picture are blacks and **immigrants**. Hochschild takes care not to call anyone racist but concludes that “race is an essential part of this story.” When she asks a small-town mayor to describe his politics, his first two issues — or is it one in his mind? — are welfare and race: “I don’t like the government paying unwed mothers to have a lot of kids, and I don’t go for affirmative action.”

In welfare politics, this is déjà vu all over again. It’s been two decades since Bill Clinton signed a tough welfare law aimed in part to end the politics of blame. “Ending welfare as we know it” would recast the needy as workers, he said, and build support for a new safety net. The rolls of the main federal cash program have fallen by 80 percent from their 1990s highs — in Louisiana, by 95 percent. But reverse class anger is more potent than ever.

Liberals have long wondered why ­working-class voters support policies that (the liberals think) hurt the working class. Why would victims of pollution side with the polluters?

Theories abound. Thomas Frank accuses the G.O.P. of luring voters with social issues but delivering tax cuts for the rich. Others point to the political machines built by ultra-wealthy donors like Charles and David Koch. Still others emphasize the influence of conservative media like Fox News.

Hochschild sees these as partial explanations but wants a fuller understanding of “emotion in politics” — she wants to know how Tea Partiers feel, on the theory that the movement serves their “emotional self-interest” by providing “a giddy release” from years of frustration.

Six characters dominate the book, including Harold Areno, who lives on a swamp so polluted even the rugged cypress trees are dead. He and his wife have had cancer. Yet Areno supports politicians hostile to environmental regulation because he cares more about banning abortion. “We vote for candidates that put the Bible where it belongs,” he said.

Mike Schaff lost his neighborhood to the Bayou Corne sinkhole, which started to swallow 37 acres in 2012 after a lightly regulated drilling company punctured an underground salt dome. But he remains a “free market man,” because “Big Government” threatens “community.”

Many Tea Party adherents warn that more regulation will cost them jobs. (A small-town mayor says the pungent chemical plant “smells like rice and ­gravy.”) But Hochschild detects other passions and assembles what she calls the “deep story” — a “feels as if” story, beyond facts or judgment, that presents her subjects’ worldview.

It goes like this:

“You are patiently standing in a long line” for something you call the American dream. You are white, Christian, of modest means, and getting along in years. You are male. There are people of color behind you, and “in principle you wish them well.” But you’ve waited long, worked hard, “and the line is barely moving.”

Then “Look! You see people cutting in line ahead of you!” Who are these interlopers? “Some are black,” others “**immigrants**, refugees.” They get affirmative action, sympathy and welfare — “checks for the listless and idle.” The government wants you to feel sorry for them.

And who runs the government? “The biracial son of a low-income single mother,” and he’s cheering on the line cutters. “The president and his wife are line cutters themselves.” The liberal media mocks you as racist or homophobic. Everywhere you look, “you feel betrayed.”

Hochschild runs the myth past her Tea Party friends.

“You’ve read my mind,” Lee Sherman said.

“I live your analogy,” Mike Schaff said.

Harold Areno’s niece agrees, and says she has seen people drive their children to Head Start in Lexuses. “If people refuse to work, we should let them starve,” she said.

Actually, anger this raw may depart from the 1990s, when welfare critics often framed their attacks as efforts to help the poor by fighting dependency. The resentments Hochschild presents are unadorned, and they have mutated into a broader suspicion of almost everything the federal government does. “The government has gone rogue, corrupt, malicious and ugly,” one Tea Partier complains. “It can’t help anybody.”

Did welfare really “end”? Conservatives say no. Cash aid plummeted, but food stamp usage soared to new highs and the Medicaid rolls expanded. There’s room for debate, but the grievances Hochschild presents feel immune to policy solutions. As long as larger forces are squeezing whites of modest means, it’s going to “feel as if” people are cutting in line. In Lexuses.

None of Hochschild’s characters appear to have been directly hurt by competition from people of color. Their economic problems lie elsewhere, she argues, in unchecked corporate power and technological transformation. Still there’s no denying that demographic and cultural change have robbed white men of the status they once enjoyed. Hochschild doesn’t buy the racial finger-pointing, but she can see their pain.

Whatever racial or class resentments she finds, Hochschild makes clear that she likes the people she meets. They aren’t just soldiers in a class war but victims of one, too. She mourns their economic losses, praises their warmth and hospitality, and admires their “grit and resilience.” While her hopes of finding common political ground seem overly optimistic, this is a smart, respectful and compelling book.

Jason DeParle, a reporter for The New York Times and an Emerson Fellow at New America, is writing a book about **immigration**.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERLIN — Chancellor Angela Merkel[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela\_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per]’s party suffered the latest in a string of defeats in German state elections on Sunday, when her Christian Democratic Union was ousted from power in Berlin after its worst showing in the capital since World War II, according to exit polls

Voters in Berlin turned out in higher numbers than in previous years, many responding to voter mobilization calls from the nationalist Alternative for Germany[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/angela-merkel-germany-mecklenburg-vorpommern-elections-refugees.html] party. The anti-**immigrant** party is now poised to enter the city-state’s legislature for the first time, although its share of the vote, about 12 percent, was less than what it was two weeks ago in Ms. Merkel’s home state, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, where it placed second, ahead of the chancellor’s conservative party.

Ms. Merkel’s party won about 18 percent of the vote in Berlin, not enough to allow it to continue as the junior partner in a governing coalition with the Social Democrats. The center-left Social Democratic Party earned about 22 percent of the vote and is expected to form a government with two other parties, the Greens and the Left Party, which each earned about 15 percent of the vote.

“We are all angry that the AfD got in,” Michael Müller, Berlin’s mayor and the Social Democrats’ leading candidate, told cheering supporters in the capital, referring to the Alternative for Germany party. “But I can assure you that Berlin will remain an international city, open to the world.”

The result proved that the Alternative for Germany party is not as popular in the cosmopolitan capital as it is elsewhere in Germany, but it managed to draw considerable support, mostly from the eastern districts of the city. It campaigned hard against the chancellor’s decision[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/06/world/europe/migrant-crisis-austria-hungary-germany.html] last year to allow more than one million migrants, most of them without **immigration** documents, into the country.

Many of the former supporters of the chancellor’s party drifted to the liberal Free Democratic Party, which voters returned to the state legislature with about 6 percent of the vote, after it was ousted in the 2011 election.

The chancellor in recent days attacked Mr. Müller, the center-left mayor, blaming him for the Berlin authorities’ inability to adequately register refugees, which left people stranded for weeks and underscored the strains already affecting the capital’s bureaucracy.

Ms. Merkel, who governs on the national level in a coalition with the Social Democrats, had blamed Mr. Müller for refusing to be held accountable for the chaotic circumstances faced by the 79,000 refugees who arrived last year in the capital.

“Based on my own experience, I know that leaders of government are always responsible and they will be made responsible,” the chancellor said in an interview with the Berlin newspaper Tagesspiegel before the vote.

Yet many in Ms. Merkel’s own conservative bloc have criticized her for allowing the influx of refugees to become a crisis in the first place.

Horst Seehofer, the leader of a Bavarian sister party to Ms. Merkel’s conservatives, has been among her loudest critics. In an interview released on Friday, Mr. Seehofer threatened to withhold his party’s support for her candidacy in 2017, unless she agreed to set a limit on the number of new refugees the country would take in. Ms. Merkel has not yet announced whether she will run for a fourth term when the country elects a new government in autumn next year.

\* Far-Right Overtakes Angela Merkel’s Bloc in Her Home State[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/angela-merkel-germany-mecklenburg-vorpommern-elections-refugees.html]

\* Merkel Feels Political Pressure in Germany as Europe Is in Flux[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/world/europe/angela-merkel-germany.html]

\* Germans Welcome Migrants After Long Journey Through Hungary and Austria[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/06/world/europe/migrant-crisis-austria-hungary-germany.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Affordable Care Act has helped 20 million people gain health insurance, but it explicitly excludes one group: undocumented **immigrants**. Now, lawmakers in California[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/us/california-moves-to-allow-undocumented-immigrants-to-buy-insurance.html] want to help change that by letting all **immigrants** purchase policies on the state’s insurance marketplace without federal subsidies. This is a good idea that the Obama administration should support.

The act bars undocumented **immigrants**[https://www.healthcare.gov/immigrants/coverage/] from purchasing policies on the federal and state health insurance marketplaces with or without tax subsidies. California officials say they will seek a waiver from the federal government under a provision of the law that allows states to experiment with different approaches. About 30 percent of California’s two million undocumented adults could be eligible, and state lawmakers estimated that 17,000 people would sign up for coverage in the first year if the Obama administration granted the waiver. Administration officials say they will consider the request.

Undocumented **immigrants** can already buy coverage directly from insurers, but these policies tend not to be as comprehensive as plans sold on the state’s Covered California marketplace. The waiver would also help families in which only some members are undocumented **immigrants**. Currently, some of these families choose not to buy marketplace policies because they fear that doing so will increase their risk of deportation.

Conservative critics of health care reform are opposing California’s plan, the first of its kind in the country, but it is not clear why they would fight it. The people who obtain coverage through the wavier would pay the full cost of the insurance. Allowing them to spend their own money in this way would, in fact, benefit the state and local governments by reducing demand for charity care at emergency rooms and public hospitals, which are typically the last resort for people who lack insurance.

The decision to seek a waiver passed by a large bipartisan majority in the California Legislature. In the last year, California extended state subsidized care to undocumented children under its Medi-Cal program. More than 135,000 children have been enrolled, and officials say this has encouraged parents to get children vaccinated and to use other preventive services, which benefits public health by limiting the spread of infections. A handful of other states[https://thinkprogress.org/thousands-of-undocumented-kids-can-now-enroll-in-health-care-coverage-ee232cbfc020#.ij3lko5n7], including Illinois, Massachusetts and New York, also provide coverage to undocumented children.

Helping **immigrants** gain access to health care is not just sound fiscal and health policy. It is also a matter of fairness. Economists say **immigrants** typically contribute more in income, payroll and other taxes to support public programs like Medicare and Social Security than they receive in government benefits. For example, between 2002 and 2009, **immigrants** contributed $115 billion more to Medicare than they received from the program, according to a 2013 study[http://content.healthaffairs.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/content/32/6/1153] published in the journal Health Affairs. That’s to say nothing of the many nonfinancial contributions they make to their cities and states.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The man stood at the podium in the cramped Masjid Un-Noor mosque on Staten Island as hundreds of Muslims sat barefoot on the carpet before him, facing east, just before the start of Friday prayers. In his outstretched right hand, he held up a tiny American flag and a pocket-size copy of the Constitution.

“This unites us,” said the man, Suhail Muzaffar, a leader at the mosque. “It is not Christian, it is not Buddhist, it is not Muslim.”

“Please,” he added. “Find time to look at this document.”

The scene, charged with symbolism, had a familiarity for many in the crowd. After the services, one man in the congregation approached Mr. Muzaffar and told him, “You looked just like Khizr Khan.”

He was referring, of course, to the Pakistani **immigrant** whose tribute[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/us/elections/khizr-humayun-khan-speech.html] to his son, an Army captain killed in combat, electrified the Democratic National Convention in what became a memorable moment in the presidential campaign, caused sales of pocket-size copies of the Constitution to skyrocket[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/01/us/winner-in-trump-feud-with-khan-family-the-constitution.html] and galvanized American Muslims eager to answer the anti-Muslim rhetoric of Donald J. Trump, the Republican presidential nominee.

A month and a half after that speech, what might be called the Khizr Khan effect was as palpable as ever in this small Muslim community on Staten Island. After the prayers, a group of high school students passed out 200 miniature copies of the Constitution, accompanied by an equal number of American flags, to mosque members, in hopes that reading it would remind them of their rights as Americans.

Mohammad Manhal Hussain, 17, who is known as Manhal, was an intern at the mosque this summer. He was helping Mr. Muzaffar organize a voter registration drive when he watched Mr. Khan deliver his convention speech.

“It’s powerful to see a Muslim man standing and giving a speech at the D.N.C.,” he said. “That got us all on our toes.”

He said he had asked Mr. Muzaffar if the mosque could order a shipment of the small copies of the Constitution to distribute to the congregation on Friday, the day before the anniversary of the Constitution’s signing in 1787. He thought it would help affirm for the congregation’s members that their rights as American citizens were clear, despite what they might hear from Mr. Trump and other politicians.

“It’s a sense of comfort,” Manhal said. “If they’re saying my rights don’t fit, then theirs don’t either.”

Mr. Muzaffar said that reading the Constitution was especially important for congregants of his who had recently **immigrated** from Pakistan and were more in tune with the politics of their home country than they were with politics in the United States.

He said he hoped it would also help the mosque’s broader effort to increase voter registration among members, mirroring a nationwide push by Muslim leaders to encourage American Muslims to make their voices heard in this year’s election.

Robert McCaw, director of government affairs at the Council on American-Islamic Relations, a national advocacy group, said the Muslim vote could help tip the election, given the large numbers of Muslim voters in swing states like Florida, Ohio and Virginia.

On Staten Island, a Republican stronghold and New York City’s least ethnically diverse borough, Mr. Muzaffar said he felt that Muslim residents had a crucial duty to vote.

“You want to fight back?” he said. “There is no bigger bullet than the ballot.”

Estimates of the Muslim population in the city vary[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/18/nyregion/muslims-in-new-york-city-unite-on-push-to-add-holidays-to-school-calendar.html] widely[http://www.nycreligion.info/muslims-nyc-area/], from a few hundred thousand to more than one million. Of the five boroughs, Staten Island has the fewest Muslims, said Abdul Bhuiyan, secretary general of the Majlis Ashura, the Islamic Leadership Council of New York. Brooklyn, the borough with the largest Muslim population, has more than 70 mosques, he said; Staten Island has about a half-dozen.

There were no mosques on Staten Island before the mid-1980s, Mr. Muzaffar said. Masjid Un-Noor was its first. But, he added, “the face of Staten Island is changing.” He estimated that about 10,000 Muslims may live in the borough now.

Manhal, the summer intern, said the goal was to persuade 1,500 members of the roughly 600-family congregation to register to vote. More than 700 had signed up so far, he said.

With that kind of clout, he said, “we have a form of power, a form of strength within our community.”

Nearly all 200 of the miniature copies of the Constitution had been distributed by the end of Friday. Aziz Ur-Rehman, 78, who **immigrated** to the United States from Pakistan nine years ago, grabbed one on his way out of the mosque. He had never read it before, he said, and planned to look it over as soon as he got home.

“I’m going to have it in my pocket,” he said.

As Amal Muzaffar, 23, Suhail Muzaffar’s daughter, walked through the parking lot with an extra box of the copies, several people approached asking her where they could get one.

“It’s telling our community that you are American,” she said. “Feel that connection, and feel that you’re not an outsider.”

In his brief speech to the congregation during the prayer services, Mr. Muzaffar urged his fellow Muslims not to think of the American political system as defective, even if they felt threatened by the rhetoric of politicians like Mr. Trump.

“No sir,” he said. “Look at the effective part, that you as an American citizen get to decide whether he gets to be president or not.”

And he urged members of the congregation, once more, to read the Constitution. “It’s very, very simple,” he insisted.

“And vote this year,” he added, “inshallah” — God willing.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PORTLAND, Me. — Leopold Ndayisabye, a Rwandan **immigrant** who works as a caseworker, has watched refugees, asylum seekers and other **immigrants**move to this city, fill health care jobs, send their children to school and line up to buy goods in the local stores.

And increasingly, he said, he has witnessed their anxiety when Gov. Paul R. LePage [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/controversial-gov-paul-lepage-maine-list.html]makes sweeping statements denigrating asylum seekers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/paul-lepage-maine-governor.html], saying they are bringing diseases into the state or draining public money that should be going to people born in Maine[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/destination/maine].

“People are not feeling safe,” said Mr. Ndayisabye, 46, the president of the local Rwandan association. He says he knows some **immigrants** who, feeling uneasy, have left for places like Ohio, Michigan and Washington State.

“Because it’s from the governor’s mouth,” he said, “that’s an official thing.”

Community leaders and caseworkers here say that the unwelcoming stance[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/controversial-gov-paul-lepage-maine-list.html?emc=edit\_th\_20160830&nl=todaysheadlines&nlid=66973413] of Mr. LePage, a Republican who strongly backs Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?8qa] for president, has left many recent arrivals to Maine increasingly concerned about living here. Mr. Trump has called for a nationwide ban on Muslim **immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/12/07/donald-trump-calls-for-banning-muslims-from-entering-u-s/] amid fears that resettlement of Syrian refugees in the United States could allow terrorists to slip in.

Quite apart from the national debate over **immigration**, Mr. LePage’s views are causing anxiety among some of Maine’s foreign-born residents. They could also have serious social and economic implications for a state that lost population last year.

As other cities and states have discovered, an influx of **immigrants** can reverse population decline and stave off the loss of political clout in Washington. But in Maine, the governor’s pronouncements are complicating efforts to attract the very people the state needs to grow. And some analysts worry about the long-term consequences.

“Anything we’re doing now to keep **immigrants** out, and anything we’re doing to not attract people to come to Maine from the rest of the U.S. and the rest of the world, is going to be deadly for the next decade,” said Charles S. Colgan[https://usm.maine.edu/mcber/charles-s-colgan], a longtime economic forecaster and professor emeritus at the University of Southern Maine.

Maine is bedeviled by its population trends: Its median age of 44.5 makes it the oldest state in the country, and it has the nation’s highest concentration of baby boomers. Mr. Colgan said that the retirement of the boomer generation was creating a “slow-motion disaster.”

As older residents retire or die, they are not being replaced. Maine was one of seven states that lost population last year and one of two, West Virginia being the other, where deaths outnumbered births.

“Maine’s demographics are putting the state in a precarious position going forward,” said Amanda Rector[http://www.maine.gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/economist/members.shtml], the state economist. “We’re the leading edge of this aging baby boomer population that’s going to lead to serious work force shortfalls if things don’t change.”

The trends were set in motion long before Mr. LePage took office in 2011, and they are not unique to Maine. But bringing about change here may be harder than elsewhere, analysts say, in part because Maine starts with an older, less diverse population. It is almost 95 percent white, compared with the nation as a whole, which is 62 percent white.

“Governor LePage didn’t cause these problems, but he has exacerbated them,” said James E. Tierney[http://www.law.columbia.edu/fac/James\_Tierney], a former state attorney general who has studied the state’s demographics.

Mr. LePage, who did not respond to a request for comment, has argued that public funds should go to Maine residents before they go to asylum seekers, even though they are not allowed to work while their applications are being processed, which can take several months. He has tried multiple times to withhold or limit the funds. In February, he called asylum-seekers “the biggest problem in our state” and suggested they were bringing in diseases.

Earlier this year, he pretended to sneeze when pronouncing the name of a Chinese executive whose last name is Chiu — pronounced “choo” — and has drawn criticism for speaking flippantly about Indians and Bulgarians. He has joined other governors in calling for a ban on Syrian refugees, and last month, told The Boston Herald that he would review welfare benefits[http://www.bostonherald.com/news/local\_coverage/2016/08/maine\_gov\_paul\_r\_lepage\_expands\_refugee\_review] for refugees, though they are mostly administered under federal rules, after learning that an Iranian who had joined the Islamic State[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/organization/islamic-state?8qa] had received welfare in Maine.

Mr. LePage’s views are in contrast to those of officials elsewhere who see **immigrants** as essential to their economies.

“I fundamentally don’t believe that the Northeast will solve our young people shortage until we become a more welcoming place for people who are newcomers to America,” said Gov.[http://governor.vermont.gov/] Peter Shumlin[http://governor.vermont.gov/], Democrat from Vermont, a state that is almost as old and white as Maine and is caught up in its own controversies[http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2016-07-05/vermont-town-debates-welcome-for-100-syrians-as-trump-pushes-ban] over refugee resettlement.

Many **immigrants** have found welcoming communities and do not plan to leave, despite Mr. LaPage’s antipathy toward some foreign-born newcomers. Still, the state’s demographic challenges have set off alarm bells.

A new report[http://www.maine.gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/labor/cwri/data/projections/2024/2024\_Outlook.pdf] from the Maine Department of Labor says the work force is shrinking just as demand for certain jobs, particularly in health care, is increasing and leading to shortages that will ripple across the state.

“That translates ultimately into a health care crisis, a work force crisis, it will affect the whole notion of what small-town life is like,” said State Representative Erik C. Jorgensen[https://legislature.maine.gov/house/hsebios/jorgec.htm], a Democrat who represents Portland, one of the few cities in Maine that has generally welcomed **immigrants**.

Like many states in the Northeast, Maine has had difficulty retaining young people and attracting those from other states. Its relatively low wages, high cost of energy, remoteness and long, harsh winters may account for some of the resistance.

“A lot of the challenge is making Maine a place where people want to be and are able to make a living and trying to compete with places like New Hampshire, which is very similar to Maine but doesn’t have an income tax,” said Ms. Rector, the state economist. (Mr. LePage has sought, unsuccessfully, to eliminate Maine’s income tax.[http://www.forbes.com/sites/rexsinquefield/2015/05/15/governor-lepage-leads-the-charge-to-eliminate-income-tax-by-2020/#5c8703763829])

Whatever the cause, many businesses and local governments are struggling to find qualified workers. Maine is projecting a drop to 2.1 people of working age per retiree by 2032, down from 3.2 per retiree in 2017, according to the Maine Development Foundation[http://www.mdf.org/about-us.php], a private organization devoted to improving the state’s economy.

The foundation has set a goal of expanding the labor force by a net of at least 45,000 new workers by 2020 — a difficult task because the work force is projected to shrink by 20,000 during that period. A major component of those new workers, the foundation hopes, will be foreign-born **immigrants**, along with young adults from other states and expanded opportunities for seniors, people with disabilities and veterans.

“We can’t suddenly expect to flip a switch and become a preferred destination,” said Yellow L. Breen, president and chief executive of the foundation. “But we have to send a message that is welcoming and have all the tools for **immigrants** who do come to succeed.”

He declined to comment on whether the governor’s stance had been counterproductive. He did say that the foundation hoped its efforts would “transcend any short-term political winds,” adding that, along with the state Chamber of Commerce, it preparing a report on the value of **immigrants** to the labor force.

Others were more blunt.

Michael F. Brennan, the Democratic former mayor of Portland, where **immigrants** make up 13 percent of the population and 42 percent of public school students are minorities, has clashed often with Mr. LePage, particularly over those seeking asylum.

“I’d be hard pressed, at this point, to find another state that is faced with the demographic challenges,” Mr. Brennan said, “where you have a significant number of business people and elected officials that are pursuing one policy objective that are being directly contradicted and thwarted and undermined by the governor.”

In addition to his comments against asylum-seekers, Mr. LePage has blamed black drug dealers on more than one occasion for fueling Maine’s heroin crisis. “The enemy right now, the overwhelming majority of people coming in, are people of color, or people of Hispanic origin,” he said last month. (The American Civil Liberties Union of Maine[https://www.aclumaine.org/] has said that statistically, more whites than blacks are selling drugs here, suggesting that more blacks are being arrested because of racial profiling.)

The governor’s comments have disheartened **immigrants** and asylum-seekers in particular.

Mohamud Barre, a community leader who fled Somalia two decades ago, worries that as the pressure from Mr. LePage intensifies, more families will leave. “Most of the people I see, they are so afraid of what’s coming from him,” said Mr. Barre.

“Personally,” he added, “I don’t like to see my neighbor moving to Minneapolis,” a city that many view as a model for welcoming African **immigrants**. “I like people to stay here.”

\* How Controversial Is Gov. Paul LePage of Maine? Here’s a Partial List[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/controversial-gov-paul-lepage-maine-list.html]

\* Support Wanes for Paul LePage, Maine’s Brash Governor[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/us/support-wanes-for-paul-lepage-maines-brash-governor.html]

\* Paul LePage, the Governor of Maine, Now Says He’s Not Quitting[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/paul-lepage-maine-governor.html]

\* Paul LePage, Besieged Maine Governor, Sends Conflicting Signals Over Intentions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/paul-lepage-maine-governor.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HARLOW, England — Perceptions of what happened that night, when a Polish **immigrant** was killed in a fight with a gang of British teenagers, depend on who is talking, and what they saw.

But with Britain[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] increasingly forced to confront questions about tolerance toward **immigrants**, the killing and a separate assault on two Poles in Harlow, a town of 82,000 where one in 10 residents is foreign born, have focused new attention on whether ethnic tensions are spilling over into hate crimes.

After the June referendum[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/britain-brexit-european-union-referendum.html] on membership in the European Union, in which Britain voted to leave and which gave voice to anti-**immigrant** sentiment in England, attacks and threats targeting racial and ethnic minorities have prompted soul-searching. Some observers warn that the vote unleashed a latent racism among some Britons, and others caution that not every alcohol-fueled altercation or personal disagreement has its roots in racial and ethnic differences.

The death last month of a Polish **immigrant**, Arkadiusz Jozwik[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/world/europe/britain-polish-man-killed-brexit.html], 40, a worker at a sausage factory, and the subsequent beating of two other Poles in front of a pub after a night out probably would not have made headlines a year ago, given that brawls and bar fights are not exactly uncommon in Britain.

But now, residents of Harlow are split over the meaning of the violence and what it says about their town and their country. And the attacks have shaken Poles in the area so much that Warsaw [https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/sep/14/warsaw-sends-police-officers-to-harlow-after-killing-of-polish-man] deployed[https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/sep/14/warsaw-sends-police-officers-to-harlow-after-killing-of-polish-man] two Polish police officers to Harlow this week to patrol the streets in cooperation with the local authorities.

“It’s got me round the twist,” said Martin Herglotz, 59, using an idiom for “crazy” in referring to the assault on Mr. Jozwik, whom he had met at a barbecue last year. The atmosphere here is tense, Mr. Herglotz said. Harlow, 30 miles north of London, voted overwhelmingly to leave the European Union. “I hope it was just a drunken brawl,” he said, “but I don’t think it was.”

The latest police figures show that nationally hate crimes rose by 32 percent in England, Wales and Northern Ireland in the eight weeks after the referendum, compared with the same period a year earlier. The police attributed the increase partly to higher awareness of hate crimes.

Among those most affected are **immigrants** from Central and Eastern Europe, including substantial numbers who came to Britain under European Union rules that allow citizens of member nations to live and work in other member countries without a visa. In Leeds, in northern England, a 28-year-old Polish man was kicked and punched[http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-leeds-37362606] last week by a group of up to 20 teenagers wearing hoodies, the police in West Yorkshire said on Monday. The attack was being investigated as “racially aggravated due to comments made to the victim and his friend,” the police said in a statement, adding that the man required stitches for a head wound.

There has also been an increase in attacks and insults aimed at native Britons who have Asian or African ancestry or are Muslim. Last month in Milton Keynes, a town 45 miles north of London, a 34-year-old pregnant Muslim woman was kicked in the stomach[https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/sep/14/man-arrested-over-assault-on-pregnant-woman-who-lost-unborn-child] by a man shouting racist remarks, the police said on Tuesday. “This racially aggravated assault had absolutely devastating consequences for the victim, who lost her baby as a result of the attack,” said Richard Armitage, the investigating officer for the Milton Keynes police.

Harlow is characterized by seemingly endless roundabouts and tired-looking low-rise buildings. Mr. Jozwik’s death on Aug. 29 has divided residents here. Some see it as an obvious hate crime, while others regard the episode as merely a symptom of the town’s persistent youth crime. Nearly 1,000 criminal offenses, most of them nonviolent, were recorded in Harlow in June alone.

Part of the debate here surrounds the legal definition of hate crimes, which some consider too subjective. According to the police, a victim’s perception is what counts, even if the motivation behind a hostile act is unclear. A slur based on race, religion, sexual orientation, gender or disability that emerged in the heat of an argument, for example, can be recorded as a hate incident if that was how someone perceived it. But, to some people, such insults are relatively normal exchanges during a fight.

Mark Hamilton, an assistant chief constable who leads hate crime policy for the National Police Chiefs’ Council[http://www.npcc.police.uk/], said in an interview that if a court decides Mr. Jozwik’s killing was a hate crime, it will be the most serious attack since the referendum.

Mr. Jozwik and a friend were assaulted just before midnight on Aug. 27 outside a pizza place at the Stow, a small, run-down shopping mall in Harlow. The police, citing security camera footage, said that after the men ordered from TGF Pizza, they went outside and spoke with a group of young people for 20 minutes.

Then the mood changed. A quarrel began and Mr. Jozwik received a single punch in the face, causing him to fall backward and bang his head on the ground. The suspects fled.

Mr. Jozwik died two days later from a head injury before he was able to testify, a police official said. His friend and another man were also injured. Six people, ages 15 and 16, were arrested and released on bail. They will appear in court next month.

Residents said groups of teenagers of different racial and ethnic backgrounds often hang out in the area and yell at both **immigrants** and native citizens.

Bob Davis, an official who represents the neighborhood for the ward where Mr. Jozwik’s assault took place, said that the teenagers often ride bicycles, get drunk and hassle shopkeepers and residents. People “kept complaining to the police but police were not responding adequately,” Mr. Davis said.

“I don’t think it was inspired by racial hatred,” he said. “But everyone wants to jump on that bandwagon.”

In an email response to questions, the police in Essex County, of which Harlow is a district, cited testimony from the other two victims that they may have been racially abused before being assaulted.

“This will be one of several lines of inquiry,” the police said, “and we are keeping an open mind as we continue our investigation.”

As the police investigated Mr. Jozwik’s death, even more attention was heaped on Harlow after the two Polish men were beaten up days later.

Officers were called at 3:30 a.m. on Sept. 4 after reports that four to five men attacked the pair in front of the William Aylmer, a pub. One suffered a cut to his head, and the other a broken nose.

Diana, a 37-year-old Lithuanian woman who worked at the factory with Mr. Jozwik, said she witnessed the attack against the two men.

“Of course it was a hate crime,” she said, nervously puffing a cigarette outside an Eastern European supermarket in the town’s center. She was fearful and requested that her last name not be published. She said that the group started chanting a derogatory term in Polish at the two men, and that when one of them approached the group a fight broke out.

The police said they were treating the assault as a possible hate crime.

Whatever the motives, the attacks have only heightened suspicion between Britons and **immigrants**, with some recent arrivals saying the attacks have prompted them to consider moving because they fear for their safety. Some Britons in Harlow say they fear a possible backlash from the **immigrants**.

“I live next to a house with 11 Romanians,” said Martin Wildish, 63, sipping a pint of beer at the pub where the Polish men were assaulted. “Who knows what they might do to someone like me out of revenge?”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Diane James[http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/sep/15/diane-james-favourite-ukip-leader-party-conference], a businesswoman and staunch critic of the European Union, on Friday was elected leader of the U.K. Independence Party, a far-right, anti-**immigrant** party that was a driving force for Britain’s exit from the bloc.

Ms. James[https://twitter.com/DianeJamesMEP?ref\_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Eauthor], 56, takes over from Nigel Farage, the brash, combative and divisive former commodities broker who resigned as leader in July[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/05/world/europe/nigel-farage-ukip-brexit.html], shortly after Britain voted to leave the European Union. He and the party have also been criticized for fanning racism and xenophobia by scapegoating **immigrants**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/20/world/europe/anti-immigration-poster-denounced-by-a-top-brexit-advocate.html].

As he handed over the mantle on Friday, Mr. Farage said that he planned to travel across the Continent this fall and help “democracy movements” that want to leave the European Union. Over the summer, he highlighted polls in the Czech Republic, Denmark, Italy and the Netherlands that showed backing for referendums, and said Britain had become a “beacon.”[http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3676746/Now-s-going-domino-effect-Nigel-Farage-pledges-use-time-help-EU-nations-win-independence-quitting-Ukip-leader.html]

Mr. Farage, who spent his political career pushing for Britain to quit the European Union, said that the “Brexit” vote was a “fairy tale come true,” and credited UKIP with causing an “earthquake” in British politics.

His departure, however, comes with the party in disarray[http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/sep/16/nigel-farage-aide-says-ukip-supporters-have-flocked-to-tories] and fighting to be relevant.

Though it holds just one seat in Britain’s 650-member House of Commons, UKIP has had outsize influence on British politics in recent years. It got 13 percent of the vote in the 2015 general election, and its years of pressure on the political right wing of the Conservative Party was decisive in forcing former Prime Minister David Cameron to call the referendum on Britain’s membership in the European Union.

The Brexit vote[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/world/europe/theresa-may-britain-brexit.html] accomplished UKIP’s core aim, but it has also paradoxically deprived it of its main platform, and the party has been struggling to find a purpose in the new post-Brexit era.

Enter Ms. James, a relative unknown in British national politics.

Ms. James, who founded an international consultancy focusing on the health care sector, is the first woman to lead UKIP. A member of the European Parliamentsince 2014, she is considered an able communicator who has imbibed Mr. Farage’s mix of anti-European populism and feel-good nationalism. She has professed admiration for President Vladimir V. Putin[http://www.lbc.co.uk/ukips-diane-james-admires-putin-107803] of Russia, saying that she appreciates his “nationalist” leadership and strength.

She is also the latest woman to lead a far-right party in Europe, following in the steps of Marine Le Pen[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/28/opinion/marine-le-pen-after-brexit-the-peoples-spring-is-inevitable.html] of France’s far-right National Front, and Frauke Petry[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/world/europe/germanys-embrace-of-migrants-spawns-rise-of-far-right-leader.html], a British-educated scientist who leads the Alternative for Germany party. Both have ridden a wave of support by adroitly tapping into widespread discontent over **immigration**.

Speaking after her victory was announced Friday at UKIP’s party conference in the seaside resort of Bournemouth, Ms. James stressed that her priority was to assure that the government delivered on its promise to follow through with Britain’s exit from the European Union.

She called on Prime Minister Theresa May to stop stalling and to begin the two-year process of negotiating Britain’s departure. Mrs. May has said she will not invoke it until next year.

“Stop the faff, stop the fudge, get on with it,” she said, addressing Mrs. May by name and referring to those who campaigned in favor of Britain remaining in the bloc as “Remainiacs.”

“We must fight against Brexit Lite,” she said.

Ms. James indicated she would take a tough stance on **immigration**, stressing that Britain must only accept **immigrants** with the “expertise and skills and social values that this country wants.” In 2013, she called for a temporary brake on **immigration** to stop Romanians from coming to Britain and committing crimes. (She later apologized saying that she had not meant to generalize “against every single individual born with a Romanian passport.”)

Some critics, however, questioned whether Ms. James has the necessary leadership skills to repurpose and unify UKIP after she failed to turn up to any of the party’s dozen leadership campaign events, instead opting for her own events which she could stage-manage.

Whether she can fill the void left by Mr. Farage, however, is an open question.

Ms. James suggested on Friday that she might prove to be less blunt than Mr. Farage, who famously told a former president of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, in 2010[http://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/681530/nigel-farage-herman-van-rompuy] that he had “the charisma of a damp rag and the appearance of a low-grade bank clerk.”

She said she hoped Mr. Farage would continue to be a “thorn” in the European Union’s “backside.”

But, she noted, she will not be “Nigel Farage Lite.”

Follow Dan Bilefsky on Twitter @DanBilefsky.

\* France’s Far Right Sees an Opportunity in ‘Brexit’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/29/world/europe/france-national-front-brexit.html]

\* Germany’s Embrace of Migrants Spawns Rise of Far-Right Leader[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/world/europe/germanys-embrace-of-migrants-spawns-rise-of-far-right-leader.html]

\* UKIP Has Changed Britain’s Conversation. Now It Needs a Big Win.[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/02/world/europe/ukip-has-changed-britains-conversation-now-it-needs-a-big-win.html]

\* A Spot of Tea Party?[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/18/magazine/nigel-farage-and-his-uk-independence-party-want-out-of-europe.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**So many development battles in major cities around the world fall into easy narratives (villainy versus virtue, for instance) that we tend to imagine them all possessing moral fault lines that are clearly visible: a set of capitalist savages on one side, and on the other, the marginalized agents of a more noble civic mission. That scenario has proved vulnerable to inconsistency. This year, a group of neighbors inhabiting a patch of the Upper West Side just south of Columbia University began a campaign called Save Manhattan Valley[http://www.savemanhattanvalley.org/single-post/2015/11/10/Top-10-great-skate-spots].

From what did they hope to save it? In this instance, the enemy was not a future condominium tower with an in-house aromatherapist and windows the height of an Italian cypress. Instead, it was the city’s planned demolition of three parking garages it owns on West 108th Street, to make space for the construction of an 11-story building that would add 258 units of affordable and supportive housing for the poor and the elderly.

Fliers and petitions circulated. “There are no plans to replace the garages,” one document proclaimed. “800 more cars will be competing for street parking!” On the face of it, of course, the argument is absurd, if not enraging — pitting the interests of people who seek the most convenient transit to Fairway or Bucks County against those who do not have a decent place to live, and for whom a $345 monthly parking bill might be considered a luxury on the order of a cabin on the Queen Mary. “Earlier this week I got a letter from a woman who was the single caretaker of her grandchild,” Vicki L. Been, New York City’s housing commissioner, told me when I called to gauge her reaction. “She enters housing lotteries, and her number never comes up. She is worried about becoming homeless. I have to say to people like her, ‘I’m sorry. It’s more important for people to have parking’? I just don’t think that’s the kind of city we want to have.”

The opponents of the project leading this brigade, however, hardly conform to type. One of the founders of Save Manhattan Valley is a woman named Glory Ann Hussey Kerstein, who began squatting in an abandoned building on West 106th Street in the early 1980s with a group of Dominican **immigrants**. A tenant organizer in the Bronx who would go on to run three homeless shelters, Ms. Kerstein worked to get the city to turn the building over to its occupants; the apartments eventually became co-ops that would be owned by many of the same Dominican families who were residing in them illegally. Ms. Kerstein, who has long hair dyed vaguely the color of a slice of red-velvet cake, doesn’t own a car.

Given how much of the debate around affordable housing in New York has revolved around the notion that the apartments created are not nearly affordable enough, her point of opposition is unusual. Because the new project would be geared toward very low-income earners, she maintains, children from the **immigrant** families who have long lived in Manhattan Valley — those who have gone off to college and would like to return to be close to their parents — would make too much money to qualify to live there. She and her compatriots also worry about the shopkeepers who, because they lack easy access to public transportation, drive in from outside the city to work in the unglamorous stores that make up a stretch of Columbus Avenue in the low 100s. How will they get to their jobs if parking is unfeasible? What will happen to the employees of the garages when those garages are razed?

During a housing crisis so acute[http://www.coalitionforthehomeless.org/the-catastrophe-of-homelessness/facts-about-homelessness/] — the number of people arriving in homeless shelters each night now exceeds 60,000 — there comes a time to ask when some democracy is arguably too much, when need and inconvenience can no longer be weighed equally. During both the Bloomberg and de Blasio administrations, and surely before that, community groups have typically complained that their concerns have been dismissed amid the process of planning new developments. The city almost always counters that it has listened plenty, and that it has sent its representatives to community board meetings and commissioned studies and compromised. Most often the bureaucrats who conceived of the project have their way, but through legal recourse and the channels of the City Council, a community can sometimes kill plans for housing it decides it does not want.

That the loss of parking spaces, though seemingly preposterous in the age of CitiBike, Uber, car sharing and global warming, can be the cause remains a perplexing reality.

In the coming weeks, a proposal for a development made up entirely of affordable housing in Sunnyside, Queens, one to be built by a nonprofit developer, is likely to be scotched. One line of complaint among residents is that the building would supplant an existing parking lot.

Regulations that date from 1961 zoning laws mandate that a certain number of parking spots be allocated per housing unit. This requirement has obscured the city’s vision of creating affordable housing for some time. When the de Blasio administration put together zoning changes, to fulfill its goal of preserving and creating 200,000 units of affordable housing, it hoped to cut back drastically on parking requirements. The initiative was met with fierce pushback. The administration was able to get rid of the parking requirements for affordable-housing development in much of Manhattan and parts of Brooklyn, but the mandates still exist elsewhere and remain in place for market-rate buildings.

Mandated parking obviously limits the number of units a developer can create. The irony is that parking spots in an affordable complex can often sit vacant, because owning a car and maintaining it generally do not fall within the means of people in need of subsidized housing. When the Hudson Companies, a well-known developer of affordable housing in the city, built Dumont Green, a project in East New York, Brooklyn, it was forced to create approximately 44 parking spots for 176 units. When the building opened, only three spots were leased. Most of the time, according to the Hudson Companies, the parking spots are unused. The cost of adding a parking space to an affordable-housing unit is approximately $50,000, money that is essentially wasted. It seems as if the moment has arrived for drivers to take the back seat.

Email: bigcity@nytimes.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A guy walks into a TV studio. His name is Marco Gutierrez, founder of Latinos for Trump, and he is there to defend Donald Trump’s merciless **immigrant**-expulsion plan as tough but necessary, given what he knows about Mexicans.

“My culture is a very dominant culture,” he says on MSNBC, the day after Mr. Trump’s Aug. 31 **immigration** speech in Phoenix, “and it’s imposing and it’s causing problems. If you don’t do something about it, you’re going to have taco trucks on every corner.”

Drugs, rape, murder, tacos: Leave it to the Trump crowd to frame the presidential race as a cultural death match. And leave it to Phoenix — border-state capital and overheated epicenter of the great American **immigration** freakout — to have gone down this road already, years ago.

Mr. Gutierrez, meet Salvador Reza.

Mr. Reza is an American of Mexican ancestry, a day-laborer organizer, military veteran and teacher, who has spent years in Phoenix being a thorn in the side of racist bureaucrats and law enforcement officials, especially Sheriff Joe Arpaio[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/opinion/donald-trumps-deportation-nation.html], the county’s Trump-supporting, serial **immigrant** abuser.

“People don’t know this,” Mr. Reza said, “but the precursor of all the anti-**immigration** laws in Arizona was the 1990s taco wars.”

In 1999, Mr. Reza read in the paper about plans[http://articles.latimes.com/1999/jul/11/opinion/op-54840] by the city to eliminate taco trucks by enforcing an ordinance regulating traveling carnivals — no vendor could operate for more than five days.

He recognized the danger and called the taco vendors, or taqueros, to an emergency meeting. Within 24 hours a few dozen of them had raised $5,000 for a lawyer and began a long campaign of wrangling with the city, neighborhood residents, zoning officials and the county health department. Protests led to organizing, and to victory. Taqueros who had worked out of home kitchens ended up with a commissary, where they bought supplies in bulk and used commercial-grade equipment to cook and clean.

“I think we now have about 60 trucks and hot-dog carts,” Mr. Reza said. “We probably give work to about 600 families. We’ve been at it for 15 years and we’re still going.”

In a better world, Republicans would celebrate this happy ending. Taqueros are, after all, part of the small-business bedrock of America. These are women and men who accept no handouts, who would cross a burning desert to support their families, who work hard to make America a tastier place. But that wasn’t the message spread in Phoenix by Mr. Trump, who likes to say that if people don’t listen to him on **immigrants**, “We’re not going to have a country, folks.”

Mr. Reza knows the subtext of that argument, how Mr. Trump’s vision of an America under siege is a call for cultural erasure: Let’s build the border wall, deport as many of them as we can and terrify the rest, so we can finally stop pressing 1 for English and start picking our own tomatoes, minding our own children and making America great again.

Mr. Reza has a riff about how cultural genocide has always been linked to food: the extermination of buffalo devastating the Sioux, the burning of Indian cornfields. He sees eliminating taco trucks as a wishful step toward eliminating **immigrant** livelihoods — and neighborhoods.

But the Phoenix taco wars are over, and tacos won. On Sept. 26, the night of the first presidential debate, a well-loved Mexican restaurant, El Portal — owned by Mary Rose Wilcox, a former county official and a nemesis of Sheriff Arpaio — is going to reopen. A truck will be parked outside selling tacos, in a rebuke to Mr. Trump, Mr. Gutierrez and nativist fearmongers everywhere. Go, if you can. Go to support the taqueros of Phoenix, and the optimistic, can-do culture Mexicans bring with them over the border. Go to support the America they are helping to build.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**My grandfather **immigrated** to the United States from China almost 100 years ago — on Nov. 16, 1916. Because of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and subsequent similar legislation, there was no open door to the American dream for him. He was able to enter only by buying a piece of paper representing that he was the son of a United States citizen.

My grandfather worked as a waiter in Chinese restaurants in New York for many years. He returned to China only twice — once in the 1920s, when he married my grandmother, and once in the 1930s, when my father was born. Both times he left his family in China to return to the United States. He could not bring his wife or son with him, because of the **immigration** laws, but he could better support them here in America. He shared a railroad apartment in Chinatown with other Chinese men, and every month, like them, he would buy a money order at the post office and send it home to his family in China.

In 1947, something remarkable happened: My grandfather became an American citizen.

Today I see his journey from a special perspective. I am a federal judge, and like many of my judicial colleagues, I have been able to play a personal role in the process as **immigrants** from all around the world have become American citizens.

On Sept. 16, the federal courts and many Americans celebrate Constitution Day, which marks the signing of the United States Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787, and Citizenship Day, which celebrates the rights of all Americans. All across the country federal judges are swearing in new Americans.

Because we are also celebrating the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service, many of these ceremonies will be held in national parks, including Ellis Island in New York, the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, and the Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site in Topeka, Kan. On Friday in Ellis Island’s Great Hall, hundreds of new Americans will swear to uphold our nation’s Constitution and to fulfill their obligations as citizens.

When my grandfather was naturalized as a citizen, he had been separated from my father for many years. But because he became a citizen, when the **immigration** laws were reformed in the 1950s, my grandfather was able to bring his family here. By then, my father was a young man in Hong Kong, with a family of his own. My parents and their three children — including me — were able to join my grandfather in America.

My parents spoke little English. My father worked as a cook in Chinese restaurants and my mother as a seamstress in garment factories. They understood the importance of education, and thus my siblings and I worked hard in school. My parents also appreciated the importance of citizenship, and they became naturalized in 1965. And because I was only 11 years old that year, I became an American citizen as well, by operation of law.

I was appointed a federal trial judge in 1994 and served in that capacity until I was elevated to the federal appellate court in 2010. I now sit in the magnificent Thurgood Marshall United States Court House in Lower Manhattan, in chambers once occupied by Justice Marshall himself when he was a judge on our court in the 1960s. I know that none of this would have happened if my grandfather and parents had not worked so hard for so long, had they not become United States citizens.

My grandfather’s naturalization certificate hangs on the wall in my chambers. On the back, it states that he was sworn in as a new citizen in “open court,” in the very courthouse, I believe, where I sit now.

One of the things I have missed since becoming an appellate judge is the naturalization ceremony. When I served as a Federal District Court judge, I performed the naturalization ceremony regularly. I would naturalize some 200 **immigrants** at a time, from dozens of countries around the world. And when I performed that ceremony, I would take my grandfather’s naturalization certificate into the courtroom, and I would show it to the new citizens and tell them the story of my grandfather.

When the ceremony was over, I would shake the hand of each new citizen. I was most inspired by the elderly, some hobbling, some wheelchair-bound, who still appreciated the importance of becoming an American citizen.

On this Constitution Day and Citizenship Day, I will be thinking of my grandfather and of the many new citizens I was privileged to swear in over the years, and of the principles of liberty, justice and equality that have made our country so great.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Denny Chin is a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX — Arizona’s attorney general on Thursday detailed limits on the authority of state and local agencies to enforce **immigration** laws, ending a six-year fight[https://www.aclu.org/cases/valle-del-sol-v-whiting-et-al] over a state law that gave local authorities broad powers to detain anyone they suspected of being in the country illegally.

In a nonbinding opinion filed[http://www.acluaz.org/sites/default/files/documents/VDS%20Proposed%20Attorney%20General%20Opinion.pdf] in Federal District Court here, the attorney general, Mark Brnovich[https://www.azag.gov/profile/mark-brnovich], recommended specific limits on the actions of state and local police officers: They are permitted to ask about **immigration** status during a traffic stop or criminal investigation, but they may not extend a stop, detention or arrest simply to verify a person’s **immigration** status.

“Maybe this should have been done years ago,” Mr. Brnovich said in an interview. “Some folks look for answers, others look for fights. I think in this situation, we’re ready for answers.”

The opinion was the first time that a Republican elected official in Arizona had moved to clarify the limits of the stringent state law, known as S.B. 1070[https://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/sb1070s.pdf], that was aimed at identifying, prosecuting and deporting undocumented **immigrants**.

The law required state law enforcement officials to determine the **immigration** status of anyone they stopped or arrested if there was “reasonable suspicion” that the person might be in the county illegally, leading to widespread claims of discrimination against Latinos.

It came as part of a settlement of a lawsuit filed by **immigrants**’ rights groups in 2010, shortly after the bill was signed into law.

The opinion instructs officers not to make an arrest simply because a person lacks proper identification, and not to use race, ethnicity or national origin as a reason to stop or detain a person “except when it is part of a suspect description.”

The opinion, Mr. Brnovich said, will serve as a guide for law enforcement agencies and officers, but it is not binding. Police departments and county sheriff’s offices are free to ignore it. Nonetheless, Mr. Brnovich said that as the state’s chief law enforcement official, he would share it with “every police agency that wants to listen” and encourage compliance.

Some departments, like those in the cities of Mesa and Tucson[https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/police/general-orders/2300IMMIGRATION.pdf], have already adopted similar policies, although the American Civil Liberties Union[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/organization/american-civil-liberties-union?8qa] has since documented several claims[http://www.acluaz.org/issues/press-releases/2014-04/4524] of racial profiling against the Tucson police.

The enforcement guidelines give the **immigrants** rights groups that sued the state over S.B. 1070 the ammunition to go after local law enforcement agencies that flout the law.

“The legislators who passed S.B. 1070 were envisioning an Arizona where every police officer would be able to detain people based on their **immigration**status, and the opinion by the attorney general recognizes for the first time that this is illegal,” Cecillia Wang, the director of the A.C.L.U.’s **Immigrants**’ Rights Project, said in an interview.

“While that’s a victory, we’re not done yet,” she said. “We’ll be watching every police officer, every sheriff’s office in the state to make sure they comply with the constitution.”

Mr. Brnovich’s enforcement guidelines were part of a settlement[http://www.acluaz.org/sites/default/files/documents/VDS%20Joint%20Case%20Disposition.pdf] of a lawsuit filed in 2010 by the A.C.L.U., the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund and other advocacy groups soon after Jan Brewer[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/11/upshot/before-donald-trump-there-was-jan-brewer.html], then the governor of Arizona, signed S.B. 1070 into law.

The lawsuit did not stop lawmakers in two dozen states from introducing similar bills. Five states — Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, South Carolina and Utah — passed laws, but most have been limited by the courts.

In Arizona, Ms. Brewer and Sheriff Joe Arpaio[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio.html], who built a name for himself as an unapologetic pursuer of undocumented **immigrants**, became villains to **immigration** advocates and heroes to those who believed in the need for strong **immigration** enforcement.

But the law was costly to Arizona, resulting in boycotts and loss of concerts, conventions and business.

“When the state takes such an aggressive lead on questions of **immigration** enforcement, it’s not just bad for the community,” Lisa Urias, executive board member of the Arizona Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, a plaintiff in the lawsuit. “It’s bad for business. It tarnishes the image of state.”

As part of the settlement, the state will pay the plaintiffs’ $1.4 million in legal fees.

A separate lawsuit against the state over the law, filed by the Obama administration, went to the Supreme Court[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2012/06/26/us/scotus-immigrationlaw-analysis.html], where justices struck down a measure that would have subjected undocumented **immigrants** to criminal penalties if they were caught looking for work.

Mr. Brnovich’s guidelines echo many of the boundaries already established by the federal courts. Among them is a ruling against Sheriff Arpaio and his deputies at the Maricopa County sheriff’s office, who were found to have used racial profiling and illegal detentions to target Latinos.

The sheriff is now facing criminal contempt[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/14/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio-ruling.html?\_r=0] charges for failing to implement the court’s orders.

One of the sponsors of S.B. 1070, State Senator John Kavanagh[http://www.azleg.gov/MembersPage.asp?Member\_ID=23&Legislature=52&Session\_ID=115], characterized the settlement as “a clear rejection of the notion that the law is racist” because it does not fundamentally change anything about the provision, one of the few remaining elements of the law that still stands.

“I certainly have no problem with instructing police officers in its proper application,” he said.

At a news conference, Salvador Reza, a community activist, said he does not see the attorney general’s guidelines and the lawsuit’s settlement as a victory.

Anywhere in the state, the police can still “stop somebody, a lawful stop — and we know what a lawful stop means here in Arizona — and when somebody doesn’t produce a driver’s license, they can start an investigation on their status,” Mr. Reza said.

“I’m glad the attorney general finally put something out. However, our community, the one I represent, I’ve warned them: don’t let your guard down.”

For breaking news and in-depth reporting , follow @NYTNational[https://twitter.com/NYTNational?version=meter+at+3&module=meter-Links&pgtype=article&contentId=&mediaId=&referrer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nytimes.com%2Fsection%2Fus%3Faction%3Dclick%26pgtype%3DHomepage%26region%3DTopBar%26module%3DHPMiniNav%26contentCollection%3DU.S.%26WT.nav%3Dpage&priority=true&action=click&contentCollection=meter-links-click] on Twitter.

\* Photos Offer Glimpse Inside Arizona Border Detention Centers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/19/us/photos-show-conditions-in-arizona-border-detention-centers.html]

\* Contempt Ruling Rebukes Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Arizona[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/14/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio-ruling.html]

\* Judge Refers Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio for Criminal Prosecution[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/us/arizona-sheriff-joe-arpaio.html]

\* The Time I Went on Border Patrol in a Virtual Reality World[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/13/us/the-time-i-went-on-border-patrol-in-a-virtual-reality-world.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

In June, not long after Donald Trump attacked an Indiana-born judge because he was “Mexican,” I went to go see Representative Raúl Labrador in the Longworth Office Building on Capitol Hill. Labrador, an Idaho Republican, cuts an unusual profile in Washington. Born in Puerto Rico, he was raised Mormon by a single mother in Las Vegas and now, as he told me, represents “one of the most conservative districts in the United States, one of the whitest districts in the United States.” Labrador came to Congress as part of the Tea Party wave of 2010 and later helped found the Freedom Caucus, the House’s conservative vanguard. He was also a pivotal member of a bipartisan group of eight House members who, in early 2013, came together in hopes of producing comprehensive legislation to fix the nation’s **immigration** system.

Today, nearly every word of that last sentence feels as if it were ripped from a political fiction of “West Wing”-level implausibility. **Immigration** is the conflict that has eaten the 2016 elections — relegating other pressing issues to the margins, embodying Washington’s political dysfunction, further polarizing a divided country and, above all, fueling the presidential campaign of a man who began his candidacy by vowing to build a wall[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/17/us/politics/donald-trump-runs-for-president-this-time-for-real-he-says.html] to keep Mexico from sending “rapists” to America. In recent weeks, even Trump’s own campaign seems to have grown alarmed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] by the political toxicity of what it has unleashed, embarking on a series of incoherent revisions before settling back on hard talk about creating a “special deportation task force.”

But just four years ago, Republican leaders, coming off a presidential election in which their candidate received barely a quarter of the Hispanic vote, made a concerted push to reach a compromise on **immigration** reform. President Obama, too, elevated it as one of the top issues of his second term. Two days after the election, Speaker John Boehner told ABC News[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/09/us/politics/boehner-confident-of-deal-with-white-house-on-immigration.html] that reform was “long overdue,” saying that “I’m confident that the president, myself, others can find the common ground to take care of this issue once and for all.” At a time when Congress, because of the strategic calculus of its Republican leadership, was struggling to pass such once-rudimentary measures as budgets and highway bills, and bipartisan legislative efforts had become a snow-leopard-like rarity in Washington, it was a remarkable moment: The parties’ imperatives had converged on what everyone involved envisioned as a historic piece of legislation to resolve one of the nation’s most conspicuous problems, a broken **immigration** system that had left 11 million people undocumented.

The **immigration** bill was supposed to be a relatively straightforward en­deavor — not politically painless, by any means, but a clear win for all the parties involved, enough so that it came much closer to happening than most people think. “I’ve never been involved in an issue where there’s no organized opposition to it,” Representative John Yarmuth of Louisville, Ky., one of Labrador’s Democratic colleagues in the Group of 8, told me. “It’s so bizarre when you have the business community, organized labor, the faith community, law enforcement, you name it, everybody’s for it. Come on — how can you have something everybody’s for and not get it passed?”

But the bill did not pass. And its failure revealed how fully the Republican Party had boxed itself in in Congress — the degree to which it had been paralyzed by its own extremity and tactical logic, and the degree to which this intransigence had produced a cynicism among Demo­crats that amounted to a self-fulfilling prophecy. In retrospect, Congress left itself open to the rise of someone like Trump, who, with his blend of nativism and anti-Washingtonism, was able to draw on resentment of undocumented **immigrants** themselves and resentment of Washington’s inability to come up with a solution for the problem.

I didn’t bring up Trump in my conversation with Labrador, but Labrador did. In the midst of talking about the collapse of the **immigration**-reform effort he had been part of, he broke off and said, matter-of-factly: “The reason we have Donald Trump as a nominee today is because we as Republicans have failed on this issue.”

It’s easy to forget how recently the Hispanic vote was viewed as up for grabs. In 2004, George W. Bush won 44 percent of Latino voters. As late as 2006, Demo­crats and Republicans responded similarly to a Pew Research Center question about whether **immigrants** “strengthen our country because of their hard work and talents,” with about 40 percent in each party saying yes.[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/15/americans-views-of-immigrants-marked-by-widening-partisan-generational-divides/]

Seeking to secure lasting Hispanic support for Republicans, Bush in 2007 threw his support behind a bipartisan push for comprehensive **immigration** reform on the Hill. But the legislation failed amid a talk-radio-fueled backlash over “amnesty” — granting legal status to many **immigrants** who arrived in the country illegally — as well as a lack of political capital on Bush’s part and ambivalence among many Democrats and organized labor about the bill’s provisions.

In late 2007, after that effort foundered, Representative Xavier Becerra, a Los Angeles Demo­crat, approached Representative Sam Johnson, a Republican from the northern suburbs of Dallas. Becerra, the American-born son of Mexican **immigrants**, had grown up hearing his father talk about seeing “No dogs or Mexicans” signs in windows. By his estimate, his district held more noncitizens than any other in the country, and it seemed to him that his entire career in Congress had been defined by the fight to bring clarity for those people and their families.

Johnson, a retired Air Force colonel who spent nearly seven years in a North Vietnamese prison after being shot down during the Vietnam War, was staunchly conservative but not doctrinaire; Becerra was easygoing and well-liked by many of his Republican colleagues. The two congressmen had worked together in the past. “I said, ‘Sam, I betcha you and I, we’re about as opposite as you can get, but if you and I sat down, we could figure this out,’ ” Becerra says. “He said, ‘You know what, partner, you’re probably right.’ ”

Becerra and Johnson invited colleagues to expand the conversation, and by the 2008 election, the group had grown to 16. They met often, for hours at a time, and always behind closed doors, to protect the Republicans participating — memories of the 2007 backlash lingered. By 2010, they had the bones of a bill. “It became clear that there were a whole bunch of R’s that wanted to get this done,” Becerra told me.

The essential elements of any comprehensive reform package had been clear for some time: improving enforcement for those overstaying their visas; tightening border security; easing the route for legal entry to reduce future illegal **immigration** and supply the work force; and coming to a disposition for the millions already in the United States. In early 2010, the group worked through the usual tension points — how many guest workers to allow for agriculture and other seasonal employment, what kind of compliance to demand from employers, how many visas to grant for high-tech workers from abroad, how long the path to citizenship for those granted legal status should be and so on.

They made real progress that year, but outside the room, the climate was deteriorating. House Republicans had mounted party-line opposition to Obama’s economic-stimulus package, climate legislation and Obamacare. There also simply wasn’t the necessary time or attention available, the secretary of homeland security at the time, Janet Napolitano, told me. “The energies of the administration were focused on the economy, and we were still in Iraq and Afghanistan,” she says.

That fall, Republicans swept the House, deposing many of the Democrats involved in the **immigration** effort, and the talks came to an abrupt end. The lesson was plain: Bipartisan huddles were well and good, but they meant little in the absence of will on the part of party leaders.

That will suddenly materialized after Mitt Romney’s decisive loss in the 2012 presidential election. Romney won just 27 percent of the Hispanic vote,[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/11/07/latino-voters-in-the-2012-election/] devastating his chances in swing states like Florida, Nevada and Colorado. Republican leaders and conservative pundits took a hard look at his 44-point deficit with Hispanics and saw in it both threat and opportunity. On one hand, a Republican Party that could not attract Hispanic voters risked demographic obsolescence. On the other, a party that could attract those voters might not need to change much else in its policy platform.

It seemed a seductively easy fix. “There’s no need for radical change,” the conservative Washington Post columnist Charles Krauthammer, who had previously opposed reform, wrote two days after the election.[https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/charles-krauthammer-the-way-forward/2012/11/08/6592e302-29d8-11e2-96b6-8e6a7524553f\_story.html?utm\_term=.29b503af29cd] “The other party thinks it owns the demographic future — counter that in one stroke by fixing the Latino problem.” Also announcing his conversion that day was Sean Hannity of Fox News.[http://www.politico.com/blogs/media/2012/11/hannity-ive-evolved-on-immigration-and-support-a-pathway-to-citizenship-149078] “It’s simple to me to fix it,” he said. “If people are here, law-abiding, participating for years, their kids are born here, you know, first secure the border, pathway to citizenship, done.”

Eight days after the election, Bill O’Reilly aired a segment on **immigration** reform on his Fox News show[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=km\_gNmEdLR4] and invited on Luis Gutiérrez, a Democrat born to Puerto Rican parents who represents part of Chicago and for a time participated in Becerra and Johnson’s bipartisan talks. “I have many Republican colleagues, good men and women,” Gutiérrez told O’Reilly. “And you know what they’ve been telling me? They said: ‘Luis, let’s take this off the table. Let’s take it off the table once and for all, or you’re going to run the tables on us.’ ”

The following day, Gutiérrez was at the House of Representatives’ gymnasium when he spied the Republican Party’s most famous gym rat: Representative Paul Ryan, who was readjusting to normal life in the Capitol after the Romney campaign. “Hey man, I did everything I could to be sure you couldn’t be vice president,” Gutiérrez told him. “Just joking.”

Ryan took the gibe in stride, then got down to business. He told Gutiérrez that he’d seen him the night before on O’Reilly’s show. “He said to me, ‘I don’t want to do it to take it off the table, Luis,’ ” Gutiérrez told me. “ ‘I don’t want to do it because it’s politically expedient. I want to do it because it’s the right thing to do, because I’m Catholic, and my Christian values say we cannot have millions of people in second-tier status.’ I was like, Brother, you and I are going to get along just fine.”

The Republican National Committee, for its part, had convened the Growth and Opportu­nity Project, a wide-ranging overhaul — the commentariat called it the party’s “autopsy” — that, among other things, aimed to determine how the party could fare better with Hispanic voters. In December, Ryan was at the Capitol Hill Club, the Republican social organization a block from the Capitol, when he spotted Ali Noorani, executive director of the nonpartisan National **Immigration**Forum. Ryan “talked my ear off” about **immigration** reform, Noorani recalls. “He said, ‘We’re going to do a conservative, five-bill package, with a different coalition of members for each bill.’ ”

The White House and congressional Democrats were eager to take the Republicans up on their new resolve. Obama had incurred the wrath of **immigrant**advocates by presiding over hundreds of thousands of deportations — making an ex­plicit exception only for **immigrants** brought to the country as children — precisely in order to build up credibility with Republicans for this moment. And Congress wouldn’t be starting from zero; they still had the groundwork laid by Becerra and Johnson’s aborted post-2007 effort. In December 2012, Becerra approached Johnson again. “We’ve got Barack Obama for another four years,” he told him. “Think we can start talking again?”

Among the members of the reconstituted House **immigration** group was Mario Diaz-Balart, a Republican from Miami. In Florida, the Diaz-Balarts are a political dynasty. Mario’s grandfather and father were legislators and held other offices in Cuba during the Batista years; his aunt was Fidel Castro’s first wife; his older brother Lincoln was a recently retired congressman who had also been in Becerra’s group of 16. (A younger brother, José, is a news anchor on Telemundo.) Mario, who has the bluff, jocular bearing of the classic urban politician, saw himself as a dealmaker who could skirt partisan ruts to achieve a historic breakthrough.

After the 2012 election, Diaz-Balart instructed his chief of staff, Cesar Gonzalez, to open a back channel to the Obama administration. Gonzalez tried to reach the White House domestic-policy adviser Cecilia Muñoz, the daughter of Bolivian **immigrants** and a longtime **immigrant** advocate who was the administration’s point person on the issue, to set up a meeting at an exurban Starbucks where no one would recognize them. After some prodding, Muñoz agreed instead to call Diaz-Balart one day in January. Gonzalez told her that any time would work, except for one 20-minute window in which his boss was meeting with a foreign minister. Muñoz called during that window.

After that, Gonzalez pleaded with Muñoz to coordinate better and asked if the administration had any big moves planned on **immigration**. Muñoz said it did not. Shortly after Gonzalez hung up the phone, news broke that Obama planned to give a speech in Las Vegas demanding that Congress pass **immigration**reform. Gonzalez got the message: He and Diaz-Balart were on their own.

As that episode suggested, the Obama administration and Democratic congressional leadership did not see eye to eye with the House **immigration** group. In the administration’s view, the path to **immigration** reform ran not through the House but through the Senate, where an­other bipartisan group was at work on the issue. The Senate was still under Democratic control and could be counted on to produce legislation closer to the administration’s ideal.

The Democrats’ ambitions for a more liberal bill also reflected how much, and how quickly, the politics of **immigration** had shifted — a shift that occurred mostly within the Democratic Party. In Pew’s regular polling on the issue, the share of Republicans saying that **immigrants** strengthened the country had dipped slightly since 2006. But the percentage of Democrats saying so had soared to around 70 percent. Reform would eventually need the approval of the House, of course, where Republicans held a 33-seat edge. But the administration was proceeding on the assumption that legislation based on the Senate bill, when it was passed, would be able to clear the lower chamber with the backing of most Democrats and some Republicans. Obama’s staff had counted the votes and felt sure they were there.

This plan, however, hinged on one assumption: that Boehner would be willing to hold a vote on the legislation. Dennis Hastert, the previous Republican speaker, had formalized a Republican custom — now known as the Hastert rule — by which the speaker would not bring up a bill for a vote if it did not command support from a majority of the party’s caucus. Boehner had held to the Hastert rule in all but a few cases.

But in early 2013, Boehner was speaking often with Obama about **immigration** and giving every indication of being very serious about doing whatever it took to pass legislation. So the White House focused its efforts on shaping the Senate bill, while limiting its House considerations mainly to building the outside coalition — supporters from law enforcement, the evangelical community, small businesses and corporations — that would provide cover for an eventual vote.

The administration’s focus on the Senate did not dissuade the House group from forging ahead. The lawmakers began holding marathon meetings again, switching locations among House offices to throw the press off the scent, with members taking turns picking up the dinner-catering tabs. The four Republicans were Johnson, Diaz-Balart, Labrador and Representative John Carter, a former judge from central Texas. The Democrats were Becerra, Gutiérrez, Yarmuth and Representative Zoe Lofgren of San Jose, Calif.

As had been the case in past efforts, the basic approach to reform was no mystery: Everyone agreed it would involve improving border security and internal visa enforcement, rationalizing the system for legal entry and allowing most of those already here to stay. (Polls in early 2013[http://www.gallup.com/poll/160307/americans-widely-support-immigration-reform-proposals.aspx] showed strong public support, around 70 percent, for such a package.) “The ground rules were that we wanted to come up with something that fixes the problem and can pass,” Yarmuth says. “Those were the only two criteria.”

The group was under no illusions that it would be easy to get the bill through the House. Diaz-Balart says that Boehner was all along telling him that whatever bill they came up with should ideally command a majority of Republican support, thus conforming to the Hastert rule. Getting a majority did not seem out of the question to Diaz-Balart. A small core of Republicans would be viscerally opposed to any **immigration** bill. But this group, by Diaz-Balart’s reckoning, was not much larger than the group firmly in favor of reform, and the great mass of House Republicans, he thought, was not out of reach.

This last group was wary of **immigration** — uncertain on the policy details, uncomfortable talking about it and oversensitive to the calls they got from constituents and activists opposed to it, despite the fact that very few members had ever actually been threatened over the issue by a primary challenger. But this mass operated with a herd instinct. With safety in numbers, it could potentially be moved. “Most people realize the system we have is broken,” Diaz-Balart told me.

Luis Gutiérrez was, by his own admission, not exactly a Democratic Party foot soldier when it came to **immigration** reform. Getting relief from the threat of deportation for families trumped all else, even party loyalty. He had been a holdout on Obamacare over the question of undocu­mented **immigrants** not receiving benefits and over the administration’s deferral of **immigration** reform — to the point of being upbraided at a meeting by Valerie Jarrett, Obama’s consigliere, who asked him why he wasn’t falling in line. “It was an intervention, and I was the drug addict,” he jokes.

In April 2013, as the Senate and House groups were plugging along with their bills, Paul Ryan joined Gutiérrez at a Chicago City Club luncheon to push **immigration** reform. Gutiérrez was also seeing what seemed like encouraging signs from Boehner. But he was starting to get worrisome signals from the Democratic leadership in the House, the Senate and the White House — a sense that they weren’t taking the House group’s effort seriously. They, along with reform advocates, were focusing all their attention on the Senate bill to a degree that he found nonsensical.

The R.N.C.’s Growth and Opportunity report, ordered up after Romney’s loss and released on March 18, did not mince words. “We must embrace and champion comprehensive **immigration** reform,” it argued. “If we do not, our party’s appeal will continue to shrink to its core constituencies only.” Democratic leaders essentially took that language at face value, assuming House Republicans were under orders to deal with the issue. They were wagering that they could get a better bill by ignoring the House group’s work; if that project failed, then the Democrats could simply press the more liberal Senate bill upon the House. “It was clear to me that no matter what I negotiated, they didn’t want me to really reach an agreement, because they wanted to go with the Senate version,” Gutiérrez says.

To Gutiérrez, this was borderline delusional; it ignored both the House’s longstanding resentment of being seen as subordinate to the Senate and the weak position of Republican leaders, whose edicts about demographic imperatives carried only so much weight with members in safe districts with few Hispanic voters. Gutiérrez told me that when he pointed out to Senate Democrats and **immigrant** advocates all the House Republicans who had sworn they wouldn’t accept the Senate bill, they waved off his concerns: “ ‘Don’t worry, Luis. Whatever you do, we’re going to overwhelm them with such a huge vote in the Senate’ ” — with lots of Republicans — “ ‘that they will take the Senate bill.’ It was not a plan for success.”

The Republican contingent had its own icono­clast in the form of Raúl Labrador. The Idahoan had worked for 15 years as an **immigration** lawyer, which made him a natural addition to the House group — a perfect liaison to the new Tea Party-aligned wing of the caucus who also had a professional understanding of the issue.

To his Democratic colleagues, Labrador’s assertive good cheer belied his doctrinaire conservatism. “Labrador,” Gutiérrez told me, “is the kind of guy, if your car broke down, he’d come by and help you fix your tire and get you back on the road — and if it was too late, you’d stay at his house. But don’t expect him the next day, you know?” Labrador’s mantra was that any legislation had to avoid repeating the failures of the 1986 **immigration** law signed by Ronald Reagan, which Labrador argued provided inadequate enforcement alongside its amnesty provisions. “The principle is you cannot make the mistake of Reagan,” Labrador told me.

Labrador arrived with a list of conservative criticisms of what the group was drafting. As the group worked through issues he raised, there was something that bothered him: the way the Democrats kept having to seek approval of agreements the group had reached with the office of the top House Democrat, Nancy Pelosi. “The four Republicans,” he told me, “were told by the speaker and the people in charge, ‘You come up with a deal.’ The Democrats did not have that independence. They had to run everything by their leadership.”

Labrador soon discovered that there was one point on which the Democrats in the group were particularly sensitive. The group that met in 2010 agreed that **immigrants** seeking legal status would need to pay for the cost of their own health care. The Affordable Care Act had complicated this requirement by eliminating the cheap catastrophic health care plans that low-income **immigrants** could most easily afford.

In negotiations, Labrador insisted that undocumented **immigrants** would need to be made explicitly ineligible for any health care subsidies whatsoever — that, as he put it to me, “taxpayers are not going to be stuck with a dime.” He even questioned the status quo of hospitals’ paying for emergency treatment for undocumented **immigrants** with federal funds for indigent care, demanding that the **immigrants** be required to pay off their bills over time.

House Democratic leaders, including Pelosi, argued that this could have the effect of sending people into bankruptcy, forcing them to leave the country. If the Democrats were so worried about **immigrants**’ ability to meet the requirement, Labrador countered, they could carve out an exception to Obamacare, allowing catastrophic plans.

Labrador’s demands created a bind for the Democrats — especially Xavier Becerra, who helped found the group back in 2007. Among the Democrats, Becerra was now often the most wary of tentative agreements within the group, saying they needed to be run past Pelosi. (Becerra says he was simply concerned about the language being “unworkable.”) “His attitude changed dramatically,” Diaz-Balart says. “Gutiérrez had been a straight shooter — ‘I can’t go any further than this.’ You know where he stands.” Becerra, he said, “had been fine, and then it was like a switch, wham. ... It was like, whoa.”

Gutiérrez had some idea what had happened. Becerra had risen to the No. 4 slot among House Democrats and was close with Pelosi, who in turn was in constant communication with the White House. Gutiérrez himself was under great pressure from Pelosi not to give up too much to the Republicans — especially nothing that would undermine Obamacare. Gutiérrez shrugged off her admonitions. “I just found it extraordinary that every time we reached an agreement on something, then we had to go back to House Democratic leadership to explain it all over again,” he says. Lofgren was more diplomatic. “Becerra is a very cautious man,” she told me.

The mind-set that Gutiérrez was contending with among Democratic leaders was hardly incomprehensible. They had for years faced total Republican intransigence on any bill that might be of political value to Obama. The notion that the House could now muster legislation on so thorny an issue was hard to credit; in my conversations with White House and Senate Democratic staff members, their estimation of the House’s efforts on **immigration** oozed condescension verging on scorn. House Republicans had become trapped in a cage of their own making: On the one side they were hemmed in by a constituency and far-right contingent opposed to compromise on principle. On the other side were Democrats who, even when many Republicans did want to pass a law — one the Democrats wanted, too — responded with a collective eye roll.

Soon enough, Gutiérrez’s warnings to Democratic leaders proved prescient. In mid-April, the Senate group introduced its bill, whose generally liberal provisions — a path to eventual citizenship for most of those in the United States illegally, generous levels of visas for family reunification and fewer guest-worker permits than many businesses wanted — and association with Sena­tor Chuck Schumer of New York, the dominant Democrat in the group, predictably riled House Republicans. Labrador and the two Texans, John Carter and Sam Johnson, started coming under pressure for their involvement. On May 15, Carter delivered an ultimatum: If there wasn’t resolution at the group’s next meeting, the next day, he was out. For the first time, the meeting’s location in one of the House office buildings was leaked to the press. A couple dozen reporters massed outside the room, ready to pounce if Carter or anyone else walked out.

Inside, Lofgren proposed new language on health care. Her colleagues gathered to read it over her shoulder on her new iPad Mini. It was very vague, essentially stating that **immigrants** would need to pay for their own health care and that if any government entity provided them with services, they would be ineligible for permanent residence. Everyone seemed provisionally in favor of it — except for Becerra. The Republicans were exasperated. “F Becerra,” Gonzalez, Diaz-Balart’s chief of staff, emailed a colleague. “Ugh. Now I’m looking for window.”

The group broke into separate rooms, Demo­crats in one and Republicans in another. When the group reassembled, the Republicans said they were fine with the language. Then Becerra said he would have to run it by Pelosi.

Carter exploded. “I don’t have to check it with John [Boehner], why do you have to check with Nancy?” he said, according to Gonzalez and others in the room. “I’m making a decision here — why can’t you?”

The group left the meeting saying they had a tentative agreement, but in the days that followed, the Democrats backed away. At a meeting with the group’s Democrats, Pelosi loudly scolded Gutiérrez for having strayed too far from his brief on **immigration**. Gutiérrez himself was furious that health care had assumed such importance. At the next meeting of the group, Gutiérrez asked the staff members to leave, which was unusual, and berated Becerra for having made things so hard.

It was the Republicans, however, who finally broke first. On June 5, 2013, Labrador announced he was leaving the group, saying the health care issue had become insurmountable and that he would focus on crafting Republican-only legislation instead. It was a grievous blow to the group, coming after it had gone to great lengths — falling behind the Senate in drafting its bill — to address Labrador’s complaints on multiple fronts. Democrats I spoke to viewed his protestations as fundamentally cynical, an excuse to kill a bill he was ambivalent about by placing it in conflict with the other party’s most treasured recent legislative accomplishment. “If people want to get to an outcome, they can get to an outcome,” Muñoz said, and sighed. “Look, there’s a reason why no bill ever got introduced. Had a bill been introduced, the pressure to bring it through the process would have been very, very high, which was why they never introduced it.”

Labrador’s exit provided some relief at first. “He’s a very emotional guy, and everybody was like, whew,” Lofgren says. “It was easier to have discussions that were productive with Labrador out, because people could focus and not go off on tangents.” The group also kept getting encouragement from Boehner. He surprised Lofgren by inviting her to a private meeting. “He said: ‘Keep this going. This is really important. This is the best chance we have.’ ”

The subtext of Boehner’s pep talk was that the political context around the issue was changing, in unhelpful ways. He was coming under increasing pressure from his conservative flank to vow not to break the Hastert rule on **immigration**. The increase in drug trafficking from Mexico was giving opponents more fodder. Representative Steve King of Iowa warned that summer[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V4UJmJ3FA5E] of **immigrants** with “calves the size of cantaloupes because they’re hauling 75 pounds of mari­juana across the desert.” And the Senate, by having released its bill first, had given opponents something to push back against.

Support for the bill from Republican-allied outside groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was registering less in the House than hoped. And the memory of the 2012 loss was fading. Members were talking up a series of posts by Sean Trende,[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/11/08/the\_case\_of\_the\_missing\_white\_voters\_116106.html] a RealClearPolitics.com analyst, that presented an alternate explanation for the defeat. Contrary to conventional wisdom, Trende argued, Republicans did not need more Hispanic support to win the presidency. They just needed to draw out the “missing white voters” Romney had failed to excite.

On June 18, Boehner stated more definitively than before in a meeting with fellow House Republicans that he would not allow an **immigration** reform bill to come to the floor without a majority of Republicans behind it. The following week, the Senate passed its bill[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/28/us/politics/immigration-bill-clears-final-hurdle-to-senate-approval.html] by a vote of 68-32, with 14 Republicans in favor — the sort of decisive victory that Democratic leaders had banked on. But in a meeting of House Republicans in the Capitol basement, Boehner said the House would not take up the Senate bill and would instead continue to produce its own legislation.

What legislation, **immigration** reformers wondered, was Boehner talking about? The Group of 8 had not yet produced a draft. The support that Paul Ryan had communicated so enthusiastically to Gutiérrez in late 2012 was also proving elusive. On Sept. 10, Diaz-Balart hosted an evening meeting at his apartment to discuss a path forward on **immigration**, with Ryan, Labrador and a handful of staff members. But the evening wore on with barely any mention of the issue. It was the night of Obama’s speech announcing that he had asked Congress to postpone its vote on authorizing airstrikes on Syria. The group watched the speech, hung around for a while and then dispersed.

Ten days later, Sam Johnson and John Carter announced that they, too, were officially leaving the bipartisan group, rendering it defunct. They were under increasing pressure for participating, and since Labrador had left and taken with him the group’s line to the House’s Tea Party contingent, the project’s efficacy was in doubt. After all the years spent haggling together in small rooms, the news of the Texans’ departure reached the other remaining members via news release.

After the Group of 8 disintegrated, Boehner seemed adrift on **immigration**. In January 2014, he announced a set of “standards” for the legislation at a party retreat, but they went over poorly, and even supporters of reform were puzzled by their purpose. “That kind of fell like a lead balloon,” Diaz-Balart told me. After members heading into primary season for the 2014 midterms complained that it wasn’t a good time for the issue, Boehner announced that he would not proceed after all.

Boehner’s No. 2 and likely successor, Eric Cantor, was even more wary. “He was one of the most hard-ass guys we dealt with,” Diaz-Balart says. “He was always fair but very tough on us.” On May 12, Boehner was in Laredo, Tex., on the Mexican border, during a fund-raising tour, when he ran into Ali Noorani, the **immigration**-reform advocate. Noorani asked Boehner where things stood. “In all my years in public service, I’ve seen weird issues, but this is the weirdest,” Boehner said, according to Noorani. “My own guys” — his fellow party leaders — “aren’t even with me on this.”

Diaz-Balart and Gonzalez, meanwhile, were making a last-ditch effort to salvage the group’s work. For months, they had quietly pitched to House Republicans an idea for a bill that would combine heightened border security and visa enforcement with legalization for many of the 11 million but, unlike the Senate’s bill, would offer no dedicated path to citizenship. They were getting moral support from Ryan, who saw their proposal as in keeping with what he had outlined to Noorani in late 2012, the central plank in a series of bills. They got clearance from Boehner, if no direct aid from his leadership staff, on one condition: “You get the majority of the majority.”

They assembled their own team of a dozen or so representatives, including several ardent conservatives, to assist in approaching members. They brought together small groups of members to review results from two different pollsters showing surprisingly strong support from Republican voters and to watch a focus group where voters backed the language they were settling on. They tracked members’ likelihood of support, on a 1-to-5 scale, on an Excel spreadsheet.

Gutiérrez assured them that they could get sufficient Democratic support even without a special path to citizenship, on the assumption that millions could eventually attain citizenship even without such a path; he had briefed Pelosi on the proposal and she had not waved him off it. Diaz-Balart even finally got a call from Obama. It felt perfunctory, but at least it was something. Gonzalez had become so desperate to reach Muñoz by early 2014 that he emailed her during a visit to the White House Easter Egg Roll asking if he could come in and see her.

On June 10, as primary season was nearing its end, Diaz-Balart told House leaders that his count of Republicans supporting his **immigration**-bill language was up to 140 — well above a majority of the caucus. Boehner scheduled a meeting for later in the week to decide how to proceed. Reform-advocacy groups, including the one formed by Mark Zuckerberg,[http://www.fwd.us/] readied a blast of ads in support of imminent legislation. Diaz-Balart was ebullient. He took a couple of bottles of wine back to his apartment to celebrate with Gonzalez and others.

They were gathering when, around 7 p.m., Diaz-Balart got an email from another member. The colleague had seen some worrying numbers coming out of Virginia, where polls had just closed in the Republican primary. Eric Cantor was defending his seat against David Brat, a conservative economics professor who had mounted a challenge inveighing against Cantor’s Wall Street ties, his inattention to his district and his support — grudging as it was — for **immigration**reform. Diaz-Balart dismissed it as early noise. “We were going to toast,” he said. “And then all of a sudden. ... ”

It wasn’t even close. Cantor lost by 11 points. When one top Democratic Senate **immigration** aide found out, she burst into tears, knowing that reform opponents would seize on Cantor’s loss as a referendum on the issue, regardless of Cantor’s ambivalence on it. Gutiérrez called Diaz-Balart. “Luis,” Diaz-Balart told him. “We lost the whole thing. It’s over.”

Reform advocates scrambled together an emergency effort to counter the spin, promoted by opponents like the talk-show host Laura Ingraham, that Cantor had lost because of **immigration**, but it was to no avail. “People got concerned, and we didn’t have the ability anymore to keep the numbers,” Diaz-Balart says. “They came to me on the floor the next day and said, ‘Hey, man, I know I whipped, but this is not the time.’ ”

The administration read the writing on the wall, too. Two weeks later, with a surge of unaccompanied minors from Central America giving more fuel to reform opponents, Obama said his staff would start drafting executive action on **immigration** in lieu of legislation.

When Diaz-Balart held a news conference shortly afterward, he was so upset that he had trouble speaking. He singled out Gutiérrez for his help and his “willingness, when necessary, to take on Republicans, Democrats and the president.”

“It is highly irresponsible not to deal with the issue,” he said. “We were sent here by the American people precisely to tackle difficult issues and not to take the easy way out.”

One evening in April of this year, John Boehner settled into an armchair on an auditorium stage at Stanford University for one of his first public appearances since his resignation the previous September. Sitting opposite the Stanford historian David M. Kennedy, Boehner giddily unburdened himself of his feelings about his fellow Republicans. “It got to the point where I had to sneak into the White House,” he said, according to a recording provided by The Stanford Daily. “I’d walk to the White House, and the right-wing press would say, ‘Ooh, what deal is he going to cut?’ ” He railed at the “anything but yes group” in his caucus — “the knuckleheads.”

He said that he had been the one who first encouraged bipartisan talks on **immigration** reform years earlier, and that the House group “essentially had an agreement.” Yet, he said, the compromise was undone by his party. “There was no way the votes were there in the House to do it,” he said. “Believe me, I tried a dozen times to bring **immigration** reform to the floor. I got slapped down by my colleagues, slapped down by other leaders.” The failure to pass **immigration**reform, he said, was “one of my greatest disappointments.”

The event made headlines for Boehner’s frankness[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/29/us/politics/out-of-office-ex-speaker-john-boehner-gleefully-releases-mute-button.html] — at one point he called Ted Cruz “Lucifer in the flesh” — but his account of the **immigration** battle was notably incomplete. He failed to mention that he could, all along, have pushed harder to bring **immigration** reform to the floor had he merely been willing to skirt the Hastert rule.

By early 2014, Boehner was already planning to retire; if there had ever been an opportunity for statesmanship at little personal cost, this was it. And yet he could not bring himself to press forward with a legislative effort that he believed was in the best interest of his party and the country. “Our problem was not a substantive problem — it was a political problem,” says Muñoz, at the White House. “In the end, the coalition on the Hill which could pass a bill was going to consist of a lot of Democrats and probably not a majority of the Republicans. And the speaker never got to a place where that felt comfortable.” She added, “It takes a little bit of courage to overcome the political obstacles on the Republican side, and that courage did not manifest itself.”

But the administration and Democratic leaders made their own miscalculations. They had underestimated both the likelihood and the value of having a bipartisan bill emerge from the House. Their strategy had been informed by the ace they had waiting in their pocket: the executive action that Obama could, and did, authorize in the event of a stalemate on Capitol Hill. But this was a rickety scaffolding on which to build an **immigration** policy. In February 2015, a federal judge in Texas ruled in favor of that state’s challenge of the executive order. After the eight sitting Supreme Court justices split on the case in June, the judge’s injunction stands, and millions of families remain in limbo.

Not long before Boehner’s Stanford talk, I attended a Republican Party dinner at a Holiday Inn in Butler County, Ohio, Boehner’s home base in the Cincinnati exurbs, where the former speaker was making his postcongressional debut. As Boehner strode through a back hallway to the ballroom, I asked if he would care to take a few questions on **immigration** reform. “Oh, God, no,” he said. After the speech, he escaped through the kitchen to avoid any more encounters.

The top candidates to take Boehner’s seat were at the dinner. One had come out against birthright citizenship. Another had secured the endorsement of Butler County’s sheriff, Rick Jones, who is virulently opposed to illegal **immigration**; he posted a sign reading “Illegal **Aliens** Here” outside his jail and sent Mexico a $900,000 bill for **immigrants** he was holding there.

Sheriff Jones was at the event himself, with his brown dress uniform and walrus mustache. He had threatened to run against Boehner in the past. But Boehner was gone now, replaced as speaker by Paul Ryan, who was forced to swear off pursuing **immigration** reform as a condition for winning support from conservative members for his ascension.

The party had not merely failed to address the existential crisis laid bare by the 2012 election; it had lurched in the opposite direction, embracing Donald Trump, a nominee whose idea of Hispanic outreach was tweeting a picture of himself with a taco bowl on Cinco de Mayo. Speaking with Trump supporters in Ohio, I was struck by how thoroughly he had managed to fuse anxieties about border security and terrorism — my questions about **immigration** were often answered with references to ISIS and Syrian refugees rather than Mexicans. But what also struck me was the extent to which their frustration was aimed at Washington’s inability to get anything done, rather than at Republicans’ having conceded too much. Unwilling to risk a backlash against a controversial step forward, the party had ended up with a backlash against its own fecklessness.

At the Holiday Inn, Jones was excited to tell me about his role the next day as the introductory speaker at a rally just a mile away, for Trump. There, Jones would tell the crowd about his three trips to inspect the Mexican border. “Law enforcement, chiefs of police, we’re fed up, we get no help,” he would say. “Drugs are pouring in from the border.”

Jones had his own ideas for how to fix the problem, he said, but those weren’t needed just yet. “My job,” he told me, “is to get the crowd fired up.”

Sign up for our newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Alec MacGillis is a government and politics reporter for ProPublica, the independent nonprofit investigative-journalism organization, and the author of ‘The Cynic: The Political Education of Mitch McConnell.’ This article is a collaboration between The Times and ProPublica.

Correction: September 18, 2016, Sunday

An article on Page 52 this weekend about efforts in the House of Representatives to reach a compromise on **immigration** reform misidentifies the birthplace of Representative Luis Gutiérrez, Democrat of Illinois, who helped draft legislation. He was born in Chicago, not Puerto Rico.

\* 27 Million Potential Hispanic Votes. But What Will They Really Add Up To?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/27-million-potential-hispanic-votes-but-what-will-they-really-add-up-to.html]

\* The New Attack on Hispanic Voting Rights[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/20/magazine/block-the-vote.html]

\* Do Donald Trump and Republicans Need the Hispanic Vote?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/12/upshot/does-donald-trump-need-the-hispanic-vote-not-as-much-as-you-might-think.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A certain menacing terror is back in the Maryland woods to wreak havoc in “Blair Witch,”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/movies/blair-witch-review.html] a new sequel to the 1999 horror hit “The Blair Witch Project,” opening Friday. The director Adam Wingard and the screenwriter Simon Barrett send a new batch of young documentarians into the forest for new dreadful encounters. This time, the cameras are more advanced, as are some of the scares.

This scene[http://www.nytimes.com/video/movies/100000004650241/anatomy-of-a-scene-blair-witch.html] is from the film’s opening and sets the stage for the sequel. During an interview at the Toronto International Film Festival[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/t/toronto\_international\_film\_festival/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] (where “Blair Witch” played in the Midnight Madness program), Mr. Wingard discussed making the movie a wilder ride than the first, using drone cameras for certain scenes and working from a formal screenplay rather than improvisation.

Below are edited excerpts from that conversation.

Q. Why did you want to return to the “Blair Witch” world?

A. I wanted to be able to reapproach what I remembered wanting out of a sequel to the original “Blair Witch Project.” I was very disappointed with “Book of Shadows” [http://www.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9800EFDF1131F934A15753C1A9669C8B63] when it came out because it didn’t understand what, as a fan, I wanted to get out of it. I wanted to see the “**Aliens**” approach to “Blair Witch,” where you have the first film in the “**Alien**” series, which is kind of a quiet build. And then a sequel where you just kind of go all-out.

The original “Blair Witch” is known for its low-quality video shaky-cam. Tell me how you decided what cameras would be used here?

I knew I wanted the movie to be a kind of fast-paced editing style. So it was very important that we had lots of different cameras. And then it became, what’s something that we’ve never seen before? That’s where we landed with the main camera that you see in the film, which are these Bluetooth cameras that the characters wear in their ear.

We picked that for a couple of reasons. One, it’s attached to the characters’ heads so you’re really in their P.O.V. We wanted this to be a P.O.V. experience — “Blair Witch” the ride, essentially. But also they’re very discreet looking devices so you can not really be distracted by the characters filming each other.

There’s a drone camera here too. Would you talk about the decision to incorporate that?

I thought, since we’re going to do a bigger budget movie than we’ve done before, we wanted to expand the scope. I immediately started thinking about helicopter shots. But within a movie like this, you can’t cut to a helicopter shot because it wouldn’t fit. So I came up with the idea with Simon of adding a drone in there because it allows the film to take a departure and have a couple of moments where you can kind of fly out of the movie and have a little more quiet. It hopefully builds the scope in an organic way.

What was your approach to the screenplay? Was there improvisation like in the original?

It was a very tight script in terms of specific story beats. It was much more formalized than the original film. But the one thing we did do was when it came to the horror set pieces, it was really important that the actors experience those moments and live in them.

\* Review: ‘Blair Witch’: Don’t Go Back Into the Woods[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/movies/blair-witch-review.html]

\* ‘Blair Witch’: Shaky Cams That Left Audiences Shaking[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/11/movies/blair-witch-shaky-cams-that-left-audiences-shaking.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the closing days of World War II, the American publisher Alfred A. Knopf was pursuing English-language rights to Albert Camus’s novel “The Plague,” with its powerful and clear allegorical view of Nazism. With hesitation, he also acquired Camus’s first novel, “The Stranger,” which one reader at the company described as “pleasant, unexciting reading” that seemed “neither very important nor very memorable.”

The novel went on to become, by consensus, one of the most important and memorable books of the 20th century. Alice Kaplan, in the prologue to “Looking for ‘The Stranger,’” her new history of Camus’s profoundly influential debut, writes that critics have seen the novel variously as “a colonial allegory, an existential prayer book, an indictment of conventional morality, a study in **alienation**, or ‘a Hemingway rewrite of Kafka.’” This “critical commotion,” in Ms. Kaplan’s phrasing, “is one mark of a masterpiece.”

Ms. Kaplan sets out to tell “the story of exactly how Camus created this singular book.” It’s a story that unfolded against one of the most dramatic backdrops in history.

In his mid-20s when we meet him in 1939, Camus was a hugely ambitious, if yet to be published, writer living in his native Algeria. He was working on a novel he would abandon titled “A Happy Death”; a play about the emperor Caligula; and a philosophical essay, “The Myth of Sisyphus.” He would soon add the germinal ideas of “The Stranger” to that mix.

Camus, though, as is well known, was a man involved in the world, not a writer locked in his room, and his story is deeply entwined with the complex political climate in French-ruled Algeria during the time that France was occupied by the Nazis. Ms. Kaplan, a professor of French at Yale, is the acclaimed author of several previous books, including the memoir “French Lessons” and “Dreaming in French: The Paris Years of Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, Susan Sontag, and Angela Davis.”[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/04/books/dreaming-in-french-by-alice-kaplan.html] To this new project, she brings equally honed skills as a historian, literary critic and biographer.

We learn extensively about Camus’s relationships with his family and with fellow writers; about his activities as an anti-fascist; and about what led to everything in “The Stranger,” from the rhythm of its sentences to the conception of the unforgettable scene in which a sun-dazed Meursault murders an Arab on the beach.

Indicative of Ms. Kaplan’s approach is the chapter on Camus’s time as a court reporter for the anticolonial newspaper Alger-Républicain in the late 1930s. The experience gave him a front-row seat in “a theater for the tensions and dramas of a society structured on inequality.” It also provided him specific material for “The Stranger,” like the scene in which a judge waves a crucifix at Meursault and insists that he believe in Christian forgiveness.

“The Stranger” was the first work of fiction to fully convey the icy **alienation** of existentialism. (Camus didn’t like the E word, but the shoe fits, and snugly.) This slim, spartan novel’s antecedents were garishly voice-driven by comparison. The unnamed narrator of Dostoevsky’s “Notes From Underground” has an often spirited, wisecracking relationship with the reader. (“In my soul I have never been a coward, though I constantly turned coward in reality, but — don’t laugh too quickly, there’s an explanation for that; rest assured, I have an explanation for everything.”) The protagonist of Sartre’s “Nausea,” published in 1938, just four years before “The Stranger,” is more akin to Dostoevsky’s garrulous, opinionated guide than to Camus’s detached antihero. (“To think that there are idiots who get consolation from the fine arts.”)

Those books might have been fixated on the emptiness of existence, but they entertained us as they sounded our hollows. Meursault, the protagonist of “The Stranger,” isn’t cranky, defiant or darkly funny good company. Ms. Kaplan describes him as “incapable of empathy.” “That evening Marie came by to see me and asked me if I wanted to marry her,” he recounts. “I said it didn’t make any difference to me and that we could if she wanted to.”

Meursault’s blankness has continually drawn readers and critics hoping to fill him in. This fascination has been joined by increasing interest in — and frustration with — the blankness of the unnamed Arab stranger killed by Meursault.

The lack of a name for the Arab could be seen as simply underscoring the meaningless absurdity of his death. But such a reading would be helped if Meursault’s own existence lacked a deeper meaning; harder to countenance when, for instance, Camus once described him as “the only Christ we deserve.”

Toward the end of her book, Ms. Kaplan writes about Kamel Daoud[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/05/magazine/stranger-still.html], whose 2015 novel, “The Meursault Investigation,”[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/14/books/review/the-meursault-investigation-by-kamel-daoud.html] put the Arab at center stage. It gave him a name, Musa, a family and his own experience of life in French-ruled Algeria. Then, in an epilogue, Ms. Kaplan goes a step further and looks for the identity of the Arab involved in the real-life altercation (in which no one died) that inspired the novel’s pivotal scene. What she learns about him is fascinating, and how she writes about parallels between him and Camus is a lovely example of her own imaginative powers and stylish prose.

Not all of the details in this book about a book are equally gripping, but Ms. Kaplan mostly keeps momentum by adhering to her plan to write about Camus “as though I were looking over his shoulder.”

Reading “The Stranger” is a bracing but somewhat bloodless experience. Ms. Kaplan has hung warm flesh on its steely bones.

Looking for ‘The Stranger’

Albert Camus and the Life of a Literary Classic

By Alice Kaplan

Illustrated. 289 pages. The University of

Chicago Press. $26.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Here’s one thing to like about Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s speech at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on Thursday: He cast attention on what really is one of the defining economic challenges[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/upshot/were-in-a-low-growth-world-how-did-we-get-here.html] of our era, slow growth.

Mr. Trump would like to “establish a national goal of reaching 4 percent economic growth,” as he told the Economic Club of New York. He claims his economic plan will generate 3.5 percent growth and 25 million new jobs over the next decade.

Here’s what he gets right. Growth in the United States (and the entire advanced world) has been well below its post-World War II norms since the turn of the century. From 1947 to 2000, the United States economy expanded at an average of 3.6 percent a year. Since then it has been 1.8 percent.

It’s probably true as a society that we’ve become too accepting of sluggish growth, even if everyone has different theories of how to fix it. The problem is that when you dive into the math around jobs and G.D.P., it becomes clear how unlikely the country is to meet Mr. Trump’s goals. And that’s true even if you believe his agenda would be good for the economy.

As a simple matter of arithmetic, G.D.P. boils down to how much people are working, and how much economic output is generated for each unit of work. Let’s start with how many people will be working after Mr. Trump tries to make America great again, where he was most specific in his forecasts.

The more workers you have, the more hours people will work and the more stuff you’ll make. Demography is really important to shaping how high G.D.P. can grow. For example, those shiny growth numbers in the second half of the 20th century were helped along by millions of women entering the work force.

Right now there are 152 million Americans working. The Congressional Budget Office projects that number will be 159 million in 2026, at the end of the 10-year window Mr. Trump talks about.

The C.B.O. bases its forecasts on demographic modeling. If they’re right, that’s only a rise of seven million in employment, a far cry from the 25 million Mr. Trump envisions. So he would have to find huge numbers of extra workers somewhere.

The most obvious source is to pull from the legions of adults who aren’t in the labor force, who currently neither work nor look for work. And their numbers have soared since the 2008 recession. “Right now, 92 million Americans are on the sidelines, outside the work force, and not part of our economy,” Mr. Trump said, according to the prepared text of his speech. “It’s a silent nation of jobless Americans.”

But the problem with that number (it actually is 94 million, if he’s referring to the Bureau of Labor Statistics number for adults not in the labor force) is that it includes a lot of people who aren’t working for good reason: They’re high school and college students; parents who stay home with their kids; people who are disabled; retirees.

When you look at how many of those people would be working in a completely healthy economy, the numbers look a lot smaller. For example, at the record high, the proportion of 25-to-54-year-old Americans who were working was 81.9 percent (that was in April 2000, when the economy was in an all-out boom). If we returned to that ratio immediately, from the current 77.8 percent, it would add about 5.2 million additional workers.

In theory that rate could rise above its 2000 levels, but at any plausible level — meaning one that doesn’t involve forcing unwilling people to work — you would need to look elsewhere to find those 18 million extra workers beyond the seven million that demographics alone are expected to produce.

One option would be to encourage people to work until a much older age. Sorry, Grandpa, you may need to go back to work so President Trump can hit his employment target.

Another option is to substantially increase **immigration** levels above currently forecast levels. That is, of course, inconsistent with other dimensions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/20/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html] of the Trump policy agenda. Indeed, if he follows through on plans to deport millions of **immigrants** working illegally, that would make hitting the job and G.D.P. growth goals that much harder.

But G.D.P. growth isn’t just about demographics and work force trends. It also depends on how effective businesses are at converting human labor into economic output. In a word, productivity.

Some simple arithmetic shows that to meet Mr. Trump’s projection of 3.5 percent annual G.D.P. growth each year, even assuming the extraordinary addition of 25 million jobs, you’d still need 2.2 percent annual growth in labor productivity, up from 0.9 percent in the time frame from 2008 to 2015 (assuming hours worked per worker remains constant).

That would be terrific. And it’s plausible (productivity growth was 2.4 percent from 1950 to 1973).

But it’s also the case that economists don’t generally believe that presidents have much power, at least directly, over productivity growth. More common explanations focus on innovations that do or do not occur within businesses to make their processes more efficient. Think of the word processor and email making millions of secretaries unneeded, or robotics that reduce the number of human-hours needed to build a car.

Maybe the burst of infrastructure spending and rollback of regulations Mr. Trump promises will unleash a new surge of productivity growth. Or maybe whatever happens to productivity in the coming years, good or bad, will happen regardless of who is president.

Add it all up, and is Mr. Trump’s promise of 25 million new jobs over the next decade and 3.5 percent annual economic growth possible? Only if a burst of innovation arrives that makes every worker’s labor go further, and if millions of new **immigrants** arrive from overseas or the ratio of American adults who want to work rises far higher than it has ever been. Absent all that, the math just doesn’t work.

The Upshot[http://www.nytimes.com/upshot/] provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/upshot] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/UpshotNYT]. Sign up for our newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/upshot/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump unveiled a pledge on Thursday to create 25 million jobs over the next decade, but he offered few details on how he would achieve that ambitious goal as president.

In remarks that may stir new consternation abroad, Mr. Trump told the Economic Club of New York[https://www.econclubny.org/?page=about] that he would pay for his economic agenda in part by requiring allies to shoulder the full cost of American military resources deployed in their defense.

Mr. Trump has long criticized the country’s defense arrangements, but on Thursday he drew an uncommonly straight line between his job-creation promises and the “billions and billions of dollars” currently spent on “defending other people.” He specifically mentioned Germany, Japan, Saudi Arabia and South Korea as “economic behemoths” that the United States should not pay to protect.

“You could ask yourself, how long would Saudi Arabia even be there if we weren’t defending them?” Mr. Trump said in his speech. “And I think we should defend them, but we have to be compensated properly.”

He added, “I’m sure they’ll be thrilled to hear that.”

Speaking at the Waldorf Astoria, Mr. Trump largely reiterated a set of tax and trade policies he outlined in Detroit last month. He has vowed to slash taxes on business and scale back federal regulations, and to redraft or void trade agreements he views as disadvantageous to the United States.

By putting a hard number on his job-creation promises, Mr. Trump may be aiming to strengthen a campaign message that has been light on policy, with only a hazy agenda outside a few core issues like **immigration** and trade. He has insisted over the last week that he is running a substantive campaign, and he has accused Hillary Clinton, his Democratic rival, of lacking policy specifics, although Mrs. Clinton has detailed far more extensive plans for governing.

Mr. Trump spoke loosely and plainly enjoyed himself, repeatedly teasing the well-tailored crowd about their own wealth and business ventures. He put his audience on notice that he would enlist some of them in government, to help renegotiate deals far larger than any they had dealt with before.

“Hate to say it,” Mr. Trump joked, “but your companies are peanuts.”

But Mr. Trump also continued to cast himself as a champion of working-class interests, and in his remarks invoked nostalgia for the heyday of the American auto industry, steel manufacturing and coal mining. And Mr. Trump attacked Mrs. Clinton for having described some of his supporters as “deplorables” for holding views she called bigoted.

“My economic plan rejects the cynicism that says our labor force will keep declining, that our jobs will keep leaving and that our economy can never grow as it did once before,” Mr. Trump said. “And boy, oh boy, did it used to grow.”

Mr. Trump’s description of an economy growing more slowly than it did after World War II until 2000 is accurate. But his promise to return to that postwar growth rate and add 25 million jobs over the next decade would be difficult to attain, given the nation’s shifting demographics.

Part of the downshift in the growth rate since 2000 was caused by a working-age population that has grown less rapidly than in earlier eras. And that trend is unlikely to reverse, despite Mr. Trump’s criticism in his speech of “cynicism that our labor force will keep declining.”

The Congressional Budget Office projects employment will rise by 7.1 million over current levels by 2026 amid an increase in the labor force of eight million people.

In effect, to add 25 million jobs by then, the number of people who seek to work would have to increase more than three times as much as the economists at the budget office think likely.

One way would be to encourage more prime-age Americans who neither work nor look for work to do so. This group includes stay-at-home parents and those who see few possibilities in the work force, and their numbers have risen substantially since 2008. But even if the percentage of working 25- to 54-year-olds returned to its peak of the spring of 2000, that would add only about 5.2 million more potential workers compared with current levels.

Another way would be to encourage people to retire later, extending the length of their careers. A third option would be to increase **immigration** levels sharply over the next decade so that there are more potential workers born elsewhere.

Beyond promising to put many more people to work, Mr. Trump pledged to attain 3.5 percent annual growth in gross domestic product over the next decade — versus the 2 percent that has been routine in recent years and that the Congressional Budget Office projects for the decade ahead; such growth would require a steep increase in businesses’ productivity.

Economists do not fully understand why productivity has underperformed in the last several years, and many ascribe it to technological shifts. But Mr. Trump is making clear his diagnosis: Government regulations and tax policies are the culprits.

While not articulated in these terms, his plan imagines that the much-remarked-upon slump in [https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/29/upshot/why-is-productivity-so-weak-three-theories.html?\_r=0] productivity [https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/29/upshot/why-is-productivity-so-weak-three-theories.html?\_r=0]will reverse itself if Mr. Trump’s agenda of lighter regulation and lower taxes were put into effect.

Mr. Trump also released new details of his tax plan, which he said would reduce taxes by $4.4 trillion. He argued that his plan would generate such explosive economic growth that federal revenue would fall by only $2.6 trillion.

The plan outlined Thursday largely tracks with a proposal Mr. Trump has presented before, which in turn is modeled after a proposal by House Republicans to lower the top income tax rate on the wealthy to 33 percent from 39.6 percent. His plan contains subtle changes from earlier versions that eliminated loopholes. It no longer applies a 15 percent corporate income tax rate to partnership income, for example — an earlier proposal that would have given affluent Americans an easy way to shrink their tax burdens.

Mr. Trump’s proposals drew a friendly reception from his audience, particularly for his plan to reduce taxation on businesses.

But he also offered reminders of the distance that separates him from many of the financiers and business leaders who typically fund Republican campaigns. He repeatedly attacked foreign trade in harsh language, and for the second time this week questioned the independence and legitimacy of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Trump charged that rather than simply doing what is right for the economy, the Fed made “the political decision every single time.”

And there was perhaps a subtler reminder of the divisive nature of Mr. Trump’s campaign: Terry J. Lundgren, the chief executive of Macy’s and the chairman of the Economic Club of New York, did not attend the speech. Under Mr. Lundgren, Macy’s pulled Trump-branded merchandise from its shelves last year, after Mr. Trump — who retaliated by repeatedly taunting Mr. Lundgren from the campaign trail — described undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico as rapists and drug smugglers.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* New Doctor’s Note Describes Donald Trump’s Health as ‘Excellent’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/16/us/politics/donald-trump-health.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Bronx is surging. The borough, which lost one in five residents during the 1970s when it was afflicted by high crime and arson fires, has not only recouped its population loss but also appears to have surpassed its historic peak, according to census projections.

An influx of **immigrants** helped boost the borough’s population to 1.455 million as of July 1, 2015, according to the United States Census Bureau. At the annual rate the Bronx has been growing since 2010, about 1 percent, the highest of any county in the state, that would place the current total ahead of the high of 1.472 million in 1970, demographers agree.

And Queens, already a polyglot mix of residents from every corner of the globe, is growing ever more diverse. Nearly half, or about 48 percent, of the population of Queens is foreign born, ranking the borough second only to Miami-Dade in Florida (with nearly 53 percent) among larger American counties in the share of residents from abroad. One-fourth of Queens residents come from Asia.

The latest figures from the bureau’s American Community Survey and other estimates also confirm that New York City’s total population has exceeded 8.5 million, the highest it has ever been.

In the Bronx, a housing boom has contributed to the population comeback.

A recent report by the New York Building Congress found that the Bronx accounted for nearly 32 percent of building permits issued by mid-2016, compared with an annual average of 11 percent between 2011 and 2015. The Bronx led all five boroughs in the number of homes and apartments authorized for construction, with 1,926.

Over 50,000 more people are employed in the Bronx this year than five years ago, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In the 1970s alone, the Bronx population declined from 1.472 million to 1.169 million, largely as a result of white flight. From 2007 to 2014, another 30,000 whites left the Bronx. But from 2014 to2015, fewer than 1,000 did.

In that same one-year period, the borough gained 13,000 foreign **immigrants**, second only to Brooklyn and even more than the usual leader, Queens. The three percent increase in the Bronx’s foreign-born population was surpassed only by the rate of increase on Staten Island.

“Folks are starting to realize we’re no longer the Bronx of the ’70s and ’80s, that we’re safer than we’ve been in 50 years,” Ruben Diaz Jr., the Bronx borough president, said.

Prof. Andrew A. Beveridge, a Queens College demographer, said, “The continued population growth of the outer boroughs of New York City, typical of Brooklyn and to some extent Queens, now seems to be spreading to parts of the Bronx, as they reach their record population.”

Over the five years ending July 1, 2015, Brooklyn led the boroughs in population growth, followed by the Bronx, Queens, Manhattan and Staten Island. The city’s overall population increased by 375,000 residents or about 4.6 percent during that period — the greatest growth since the 1920s.

Mirroring a national trend, between 2014 and 2015, median household income citywide rose to $55,752 and the poverty rate declined from 20.9 percent to 20 percent, but New Yorkers were not as well off by either measure as they were in 2007 before the recession.

“This is the first tangible sign that the impact of the recession is starting to abate,” said David Jones, of the Community Service Society, a research and advocacy group. But the fact that the rate barely declined among Hispanic New Yorkers, for one thing, he said, made his organization’s agenda for a higher minimum wage and more affordable housing all the more relevant.

“I’m not going out of business,” Mr. Jones said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW DELHI — An activist from the Indian-controlled portion of Kashmir[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/kashmir/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] said on Thursday that he had been prevented from boarding a flight in Delhi as he was on his way to Geneva to speak at a session of the United Nations Human Rights Council.

The activist, Khurram Parvez, of the Jammu Kashmir Coalition of Civil Society, planned to submit a “civil society stakeholder’s report” to the council on the situation in Kashmir, where the death of a commander for a separatist group in July has set off [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/world/asia/indian-forces-kill-10-during-kashmir-protests-over-separatists-death.html] clashes[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/world/asia/indian-forces-kill-10-during-kashmir-protests-over-separatists-death.html] between stone-throwing protesters and Indian security forces. He had also planned to attend a European Union session in Brussels.

More than 70 people, most of them civilians, have been killed in the confrontations, and thousands of civilians and security forces have been injured.

Mr. Parvez said he had already passed through security checks at the airport on Wednesday when “something popped up on the screen of the **immigration**officer’s computer.”

“He said he had to consult someone and disappeared in a back room for the next 15 minutes,” said Mr. Parvez, who has since returned to Srinagar, the capital of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir.

A spokesman for India[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/india/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s Ministry of Home Affairs said that he could not immediately comment on the reasons Mr. Parvez was prevented from traveling.

Mr. Parvez said that after an hour and a half, the **immigration** official told him that he had instructions from an official in the Intelligence Bureau to bar him from traveling to Geneva. The official noted that there were no charges against him.

The incident echoed a decision in January 2015 to prevent Priya Pillai, a Greenpeace activist, from flying to London[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/15/world/asia/india-blocked-an-activist-from-traveling-to-britain.html] to speak on the effects of mining on indigenous tribes in the central Indian state of Madhya Pradesh. She was told that her name was in a database of people not allowed to leave the country.

The Ministry of Home Affairs said afterward that her visit was “prejudicial to the national interest” and would harm India’s image abroad.

In March of that year, the Delhi High Court ruled in favor of Ms. Pillai’s petition against the ministry, ordering the government to expunge the “offload” notation in her passport.

Mr. Parvez said on Thursday that he had filed inquiries with the Ministry of External Affairs and the Home Affairs Ministry, asking why he was barred from traveling.

\* An Epidemic of ‘Dead Eyes’ in Kashmir as India Uses Pellet Guns on Protesters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/29/world/asia/pellet-guns-used-in-kashmir-protests-cause-dead-eyes-epidemic.html]

\* News Crackdown in Kashmir Leaves Locals ‘Surrounded by Rumors’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/19/world/asia/news-crackdown-in-kashmir-leaves-locals-surrounded-by-rumors.html]

\* How Killing of Prominent Separatist Set Off Turmoil in Kashmir[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/17/world/asia/how-killing-of-prominent-separatist-set-off-turmoil-in-kashmir.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SYDNEY, Australia — Two decades ago, Pauline Hanson prompted outrage when she said that Australia[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/australia/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] was in danger of being swamped by Asians in her first speech in Parliament.

This week, she has done it again.

As a newly elected senator, Ms. Hanson, the leader of the One Nation party, called for an end to Muslim **immigration** and a ban on the burqa, and she told members of Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull’s Liberal Party that she planned to “give them a kick up the backside.”

But this time, the response from the conservative coalition, led by the Liberal Party, has been carefully calibrated. Although many disagree with Ms. Hanson’s far-right stances, the coalition is treading warily: The government may need her vote, and those of her fellow party members, to ensure their bills pass through the splintered upper house.

“Pauline Hanson was elected by the people of Queensland to represent their interests in the Senate,” said Julie Bishop, the foreign minister and one of Mr. Turnbull’s most senior lawmakers. “She is entitled to her views.”

Ms. Bishop, speaking Wednesday on ABC television after Ms. Hanson delivered her first speech in the Senate following national elections[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/30/world/australia/australian-election-malcolm-turnbull-bill-shorten.html] on July 2, said that Australians “believe in open debate.”

“I understand there are people who support her views and are concerned about the issues she raised,” Ms. Bishop said, adding that she did not agree with many of Ms. Hanson’s opinions.

Ms. Hanson’s address on Wednesday was her second maiden speech. She was first elected to the Parliament, in the House of Representatives, 20 years ago but left in 1998. She founded the One Nation party, and its members, along with seven other independent senators, hold enough sway in the 76-seat Senate to barter with the prime minister.

The problem for Mr. Turnbull will be corralling that bloc or working with the opposition Labor Party to pass laws.

“Turnbull’s position is extremely problematic,” said Peter Chen, a political science professor at the University of Sydney. “His strategy, the best one he can come up with, is governing with the support of the Labor Party.”

Before the elections, Mr. Turnbull had said that Ms. Hanson was not a welcome presence in politics. But that was before he narrowly scraped back into power.

Mr. Turnbull dissolved both houses of Parliament in May, calling a double dissolution election, in which all Senate seats were open for a vote, instead of the usual half. His aim was to increase the government’s majority and its chances of having legislation passed through the Senate, where he said he believed it would be harder for dissenting lawmakers to retain their seats. He was wrong.

The coalition lost three Senate seats and now holds 30, and One Nation, which previously had no Senate seats, won four. The opposition Labor Party holds 26, and the Greens party, the next biggest voting bloc, has nine.

Smaller parties, including the independent Nick Xenophon Team, Family First, the Liberal Democrats and the Jacqui Lambie Network, also secured seats in the Senate, which is home to the largest number of independents not aligned with a major political party in more than a decade.

In the 150-seat House of Representatives, the coalition has a majority of just one seat.

On Wednesday, senators from the Greens party filed out of the chamber as Ms. Hanson spoke.

“In my first speech, in 1996, I said we were in danger of being swamped by Asians,” Ms. Hanson said. “Now we are in danger of being swamped by Muslims, who bear a culture and ideology that is incompatible with our own.”

She said Muslims are “prominent in organized crime, with associated violence and drug dealing.”

She added: “I call for stopping further Muslim **immigration** and banning the burqa as they have done in many countries around the world.”

The government should prohibit the sale of infrastructure assets to overseas interests, especially Chinese buyers, cut welfare payments and change family law, she said in her wide-ranging speech, which reflected sentiments that often appeal to voters who have tired of Australia’s two mainstream political parties.

When Ms. Hanson delivered her speech, Penny Wong, a senior Labor Party senator, was absent from the chamber.

“I chose not to attend,” Ms. Wong told ABC radio on Thursday. “We, as Australians, should reject the views she puts forward. I think she peddles prejudice and fear. There is no community that has been made stronger by prejudice and fear.”

Professor Chen said that two decades after Ms. Hanson first entered federal politics, voters were no longer as shocked by what she said.

“But does that mean she is a more serious problem?” he said. “She has four senators in the Australian Parliament. People voted for her. You have to take that seriously.”

Follow Michelle Innis on Twitter @MichelleInnis.

\* Australia’s Leader Calls for National Gay Marriage Vote[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/world/australia/malcolm-turnbull-gay-marriage-vote.html]

\* Chinese Company’s Payment to Lawmaker Sets Off Furor in Australia[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/07/world/australia/sam-dastyari-china-senator-donation.html]

\* Indigenous Australians in Queensland Said to Face Higher Juvenile Detention Rates[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/world/australia/indigenous-children-detention.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ATHENS — Democracies may be destined to dislike one another. When people have a decisive voice in government, they are guided by self-interest, and put their short-term concerns before those of neighbors or partners. In an effort to channel this endless ebb and flow of passions, institutions provide a framework of “rights” and “wrongs,” and governments function by persuading the greatest number of voters that they are doing the “right” thing.

What happens, however, when leaders are unable or unwilling to turn the tide of nationalism, xenophobia and self-interest?

In many liberal democracies, the network of systems that maintained stability and promoted prosperity (nationally and internationally) appears to be disintegrating. When people cannot be assured of continued prosperity, when they face mass **immigration** and the threat of terrorism, the pull of populism — with its simple messages of who is to blame and what is to be done — is strong. When leaders cannot (or will not) persuade citizens that their long-term interest lies in dialogue and consensus with other groups and nations, politicians find it even more difficult to do the right thing; they may be carried away by the forces that divide society into ever smaller self-interested groups.

Greece has been on the front line of these changes. Here we first saw the collapse of confidence in elites and technocrats in Athens and Brussels. This was followed by the election of a formerly fringe party, Syriza, whose rejection of reform and austerity (in return for bailouts) was a dead end. The debt crisis[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/e/european\_sovereign\_debt\_crisis/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] has been compounded by the refugee crisis, provoking domestic turmoil and damaging relations with European Union[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org] partners. This has resulted in a long limbo. Recession continues and public and private debts increase, with more people falling behind in paying taxes[http://www.ekathimerini.com/211004/article/ekathimerini/business/greeks-tax-debts-keep-growing], bank loans[http://www.ekathimerini.com/210865/article/ekathimerini/business/bog-five-steps-to-tackle-npls] and social security fees[http://www.ekathimerini.com/210768/article/ekathimerini/business/keao-targets-strategic-dodgers-among-social-security-payment-debtors]. And there is further dependence on outside support.

Today the sources of that support are themselves under threat, none more so than the European Union. Economic difficulties and **immigration** are dividing nations, and pitting them against one another. Greece needs a reduction of its enormous public debt in order to function, but governments in creditor countries do not dare propose this to their voters. France and Italy are in favor of looser fiscal rules, which Germany refuses. Ad hoc alliances of “Northern” and “Southern” countries line up against one another. In several countries, hard-line nationalists openly challenge European Union principles of liberal democracy and solidarity — questioning even membership in the union.

On the refugee issue, Greece and Germany are on the same side, the former being the main entry point for the record 1 million refugees and migrants last year, the latter taking in the greatest number. Here, too, the European Union was split between countries trying to cope with the influx and adhering to the bloc’s principle of solidarity with those in need, and others who rejected an[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/22/eu-governments-divisive-quotas-deal-share-120000-refugees] agreement[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/22/eu-governments-divisive-quotas-deal-share-120000-refugees] under which member states would share the responsibility of hosting asylum seekers. These tensions, along with fear of terrorism, have resulted in fences being built and border controls returning to what had been a passport-free zone in Europe.

In July, a Pew Research Center survey in 10 European countries reflected how economic and security concerns compound each other. Among all the countries polled, 59 percent of respondents thought that refugees would increase the likelihood of terrorism in their country, and 50 percent saw refugees as a burden because they take jobs and use social benefits. In Greece, which has not suffered an attack in the current surge of Islamic-inspired terrorism, 72 percent worried about the economic burden, while 55 percent feared terrorism. In Germany, 31 percent of those surveyed worried about the economic burden, while 61 percent were concerned about increased terrorism.

Two of the European Union’s crowning achievements — monetary union and the eradication of borders — have become threats to its very existence. Britain’s vote to pull out of the union is the clearest evidence of this and a major threat in itself. The principles of solidarity among member states, and with the world’s needy, which are fundamental to the European Union’s core purpose, have been shaken. Diplomatic language was abandoned during the Greek debt crisis, and hostile outbursts have become frequent, not only in popular media but also between governments.

When battle lines over different issues are drawn across the Continent, alliances will shift continually, and consensus will become even more difficult. If no single, unifying policy can be adopted on a given issue, divisions will deepen. Then only outside intervention can break the deadlock. This is what the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan achieved after the carnage of World War II, allowing Europe’s nations to move toward democracy, open economies and, eventually, the European Union.

Today the United States is neither interested in nor capable of promoting anything equivalent to this. And Europe already has the benefits of liberal democracy and of a unification process that provided decades of peace and prosperity. Yet its nations still cannot agree on common policies that will control debt and promote growth; they are still wary of ceding enough sovereignty to solidify what is, in effect, still one of the world’s largest economies. The European Union was created to prevent a slide back into the Europe of the 1930s, when the democracies that had won World War I undermined one another in a climate of economic instability while autocratic rivals prepared for what became the greatest slaughter humanity has known.

When Chancellor Angela Merkel[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela\_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per] stands up to the German populists who fought against the bailout of Greece and are now making gains by opposing the settlement of refugees, she is keeping the flame of principle alive against the winds of expedience. “Change is not a bad thing,” she recently told her Parliament. “I am sure that if we stick to the truth, we will win back what we need — people’s trust.”

She needs that trust to be a voice of moral authority in Europe. It is crucial that she balance humanism on the refugee issue with a reassessment of her country’s priorities on economic issues, allowing closer economic union and promoting growth. Other leaders must be just as brave, working to persuade voters that the security and prosperity of each nation can be achieved only through collective action, not division.

Europe’s nations have a duty to confirm democracy’s resilience under pressure. The future of the union — the future of Europe — depends on this.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Nikos Konstandaras is the managing editor and a columnist at the newspaper Kathimerini.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LOS ANGELES — In a move that is sure to draw the ire of Republicans, California officials are asking the Obama administration this week to approve a plan that would allow undocumented **immigrants** to buy health insurance[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/health\_insurance\_and\_managed\_care/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] on the state’s public exchange.

Officials say that up to 30 percent of the state’s two million undocumented adults could be eligible for the program, and that roughly 17,000 people are expected to participate in the first year, if the plan is approved. But the proposal faces serious hurdles in Washington, where it must be approved by both the Treasury and the Health and Human Services Departments.

During debates over health care in his first term, and again when Congress considered an **immigration** overhaul in 2013, President Obama made it clear that health insurance subsidies under the Affordable Care Act would not go to **immigrants** who are living in the United States illegally. And two provisions of the health care law[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/health\_insurance\_and\_managed\_care/health\_care\_reform/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] limit coverage to residents who are here legally. But advocates of California’s initiative argue that the plan should be approved under what is known as an “innovation waiver,” which allows states to have provisions of the federal law modified, because no federal dollars will be used to fund the program.

“This really represents the next step in health for all,” said State Senator Ricardo Lara, a Democrat and the author of the bill, who was in Washington this week to garner support for the measure. “We’re simply asking Washington to allow California to once again allow more people to pay into the system. We’re reaffirming once again our desire to make affordable preventative care available to everyone and our belief that health care is a human right not a privilege.”

California is the first state to propose such a plan. **Immigrants** living here illegally represent the largest share of the uninsured in California, and public health officials have been working for years [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/22/us/in-california-a-push-for-immigrant-health.html]to find ways to provide them with preventive health care[http://health.nytimes.com/health/guides/specialtopic/preventive-health-care/overview.html?inline=nyt-classifier]. California already offers **immigrants** more care than other states do. Many counties here provide some basic care through community clinics. And children who are undocumented can now receive Medi-Cal, the state’s public health insurance for low-income residents, under a law that took effect this spring.

More than 135,000 children have enrolled so far, but public health officials estimate that the number of those eligible is even higher. Many so-called mixed households, in which some family members are here legally and others are not, have been reluctant to sign up, fearing that they would put themselves at risk for deportation, health officials say.

“We have been saying to people, ‘We can sign up your child, but we can’t sign you up,’” said Anthony Wright, the executive director of Health Access California[http://www.health-access.org/], an advocacy group. “There’s a symbolic issue of having a state agency that cannot serve an important part of society, even when they are ready to use their own resources.”

Mr. Wright said that he believed the administration would approve the plan because the state was no longer receiving federal subsidies for the operation of its health insurance exchange, Covered California, which is widely seen as one of the best-run exchanges in the country.

Michael F. Cannon, the director of health policy studies at the Cato Institute and a frequent critic of the health care law, said, “Obama has already broken promises about the law and doing this would be another broken promise.” While undocumented **immigrants** should have the right to purchase health insurance on the private market, they should not be allowed to do so on public exchanges, Mr. Cannon said, adding: “This certainly has the potential to become a welfare magnet. You could easily imagine families with high medical expenses moving to California.”

While the proposal will most likely meet resistance in Washington, it is widely supported in California, where public health advocates have been laying the groundwork for such a policy for years. Several Republicans in the State Legislature voted to approve the legislation in June, and Gov. Jerry Brown signed it into law in July. Covered California then drafted an application for the waiver, which it will submit to the federal government this month. This week, the state’s Democratic congressional delegation wrote a letter urging the Obama administration to approve it.

A federal decision on the waiver application could take several months, officials said.

“They have guaranteed there would be no cost to the federal government, so there’s no reason not to do this,” said Representative Zoe Lofgren of San Jose, who is the senior Democrat on the House Judiciary subcommittee on **immigration**. “Republicans might rant and rave away, but this is the next logical thing to do if the state wants it.”

Allowing undocumented **immigrants** to buy health insurance could also save the state money in the long run, Ms. Lofgren and other advocates say, because it would decrease the reliance on emergency rooms.

Chona de Leon, the chief operating officer at Eisner Pediatric and Family Medical Center in Los Angeles, said that many of the uninsured families the clinic sees routinely avoid doctor visits until they wind up in an emergency room.

“They just wait until they are really sick, and it ends up being more expensive for everybody,” Ms. de Leon said.

Since undocumented children began receiving insurance through Medi-Cal, more families have been coming in for immunizations and well-child visits[http://health.nytimes.com/health/guides/specialtopic/well-child-visits/overview.html?inline=nyt-classifier], she said. But their parents are still reluctant to see a doctor, she said. “They want to stay healthy and they don’t have any way of doing it.”

\* California Pushes for **Immigrant** Health[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/22/us/in-california-a-push-for-immigrant-health.html]

\* **Immigrants**, the Poor and Minorities Gain Sharply Under Affordable Care Act[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/18/health/immigrants-the-poor-and-minorities-gain-sharply-under-health-act.html]

\* States Struggle to Add Latinos to Health Rolls[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/14/us/states-struggle-to-add-latinos-to-health-rolls.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On June 7, Alan Noble, an English professor at Oklahoma Baptist University, laid out the Christian case against Donald Trump for Vox[http://www.vox.com/2016/6/7/11868028/evangelicals-nevertrump]. Noble, whose goal is “to edify the Church and witness to the world[http://www.graceforsinners.com/blog/2015/01/26/culture-creators-an-interview-with-dr-o-alan-noble],” declared that

Trump has boasted of infidelities[http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/01/27/christians-cringe-at-donald-trump-s-sexy-past.html], profited off gambling, mocked the handicapped[http://www.cnn.com/videos/tv/2015/11/26/donald-trump-mocks-reporter-with-disability-berman-sot-ac.cnn], cheered and offered financial assistance for his supporters who fight protesters[http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2016/03/donald-trump-violent-supporters-legal-fees], supported abortion[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/03/02/donald-trumps-incredibly-bizarre-relationship-with-planned-parenthood/] (until his fortuitous change of heart before the election), called for war crimes against innocent people[http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/mar/3/donald-trump-says-hed-force-us-military-commit-war/], demonized minorities and **immigrants**[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/9-outrageous-things-donald-trump-has-said-about-latinos\_us\_55e483a1e4b0c818f618904b], knowingly played upon racist fears, promoted open racists through social media[http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/gop-primaries/276919-trump-retweets-another-apparent-white-supremacist], promoted conspiracy theories[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/01/us/politics/donald-trump-conspiracy-theories.html], and crudely treated women[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trumps-history-of-flippant-misogyny/2015/08/08/891f1bec-3de4-11e5-9c2d-ed991d848c48\_story.html].

Noble’s argument has fallen on deaf ears. As of mid-August, a Pew survey[http://www.people-press.org/2016/08/18/1-voters-general-election-preferences/] found Trump beating Hillary Clinton 63-17 among white religious conservatives.

Evangelical Christians may not approve of Trump, but they are among his strongest constituencies in this year’s campaign. The Christian right has found common ground with Trump’s less devout supporters on a wide range of matters.

Gary Bauer, the president of American Values[https://www.ouramericanvalues.org/], who has endorsed Trump, captured a key aspect of Trump’s appeal to leaders of the Christian right in his address[https://www.ouramericanvalues.org/gary-bauer-speaking-2016-values-voter-summit] to the Values Voters Summit last weekend in Washington:

This country is the equivalent of that hijacked plane right now. We’re headed to a disaster, unless we can get control of the cockpit again.

Bauer continued to invoke a metaphor that in short order has become a talking point[http://www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/the-flight-93-election/] on the right:

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a Flight 93 election. This may be our last shot. It’s time to roll. It’s time to run down the aisle and save Western civilization.

The findings[http://www.prri.org/research/prrithe-atlantic-survey-two-thirds-trump-supporters-say-nation-needs-leader-willing-break-rules/] of two surveys[http://www.prri.org/research/prri-brookings-immigration-report/] conducted this year by the Public Religion Research Institute[http://www.prri.org/] provide insight into the underlying logic of white evangelical support for Trump.

In April, P.R.R.I. asked voters: do you agree or disagree with the statement “Society as a whole has become too soft and feminine.” The results demonstrated the overlap between the views of the religious right and the Trump electorate:

Among religious groups, white evangelical Protestants stand out as the only one in which a majority, 53 percent, agree that society has become too soft and feminine.

Along parallel lines, the survey found that 68 percent of Trump supporters agree that society is too soft and feminine, far more than supporters of any other candidate, Republican or Democrat.

A second illuminating question P.R.R.I. posed to voters was whether this statement accurately described their feelings: “It bothers me when I come in contact with **immigrants** who speak little or no English.”

Again Trump voters and the religious right agree. Compared to backers of all the other candidates, Trump voters expressed the highest level of discomfort, 77 percent. Among religious groups, white evangelical Protestants voiced the highest levels of distress, 64 percent, when they find themselves around **immigrants**who speak little or no English,.

There are a host of other measures on which Trump supporters and the religious right are in accord.

Take responses to a third P.R.R.I. statement: “Today discrimination against whites has become as big a problem as discrimination against blacks and other minorities.”

A solid 57 percent majority of white Americans whom P.R.R.I. surveyed agreed, but two groups stood out: Trump supporters at 81 percent and white evangelical Protestants at 68 percent.

The opinion overlap does not end there, P.R.R.I. found:

No group of Americans is more nostalgic about the 1950s than white evangelical Protestants. Seven in ten (70-29) white evangelical Protestants believe that American culture and way of life has mostly changed for the worse since the 1950s.

Robert Jones, the C.E.O. of P.R.R.I. and the author of the new book, “The End of White Christian America[http://www.prri.org/end-white-christian-america/],” described this overlap in an email:

Donald Trump has successfully transformed evangelical voters from so-called “values voters” into “nostalgia voters.”

Similarly, according to P.R.R.I.,

Republican and Republican-leaning independents who supported Trump during the primary are far more likely to say that American culture and way of life has gotten worse (68 percent) than to say it has improved (32 percent).

A separate Pew Research Center poll in August[http://www.people-press.org/2016/08/25/on-immigration-policy-partisan-differences-but-also-some-common-ground/] expanded upon these findings: white Christian evangelicals consistently demonstrated the highest levels of support for Trump’s views, including for the argument that undocumented **immigrants** take jobs Americans “would like to have;” for the belief that undocumented **immigrants** are “more likely to commit serious crimes” than Americans; and for building a wall along the entire border with Mexico.

Melissa Deckman, a political scientist at Washington College in Chestertown, Md., argued in an email that a national shift to the left[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/magazine/archive/2016/01/why-america-is-moving-left/419112/] on many social and cultural issues is driving the white evangelical community into the Trump camp.

Trump has endorsed[http://bjconline.org/in-acceptance-speech-donald-trump-calls-for-an-end-to-pulpit-endorsement-ban-072016/] so-called religious liberty legislation[http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/mississippi-senate-passes-sweeping-religious-liberty-bill-n548601] that agressively affirms a minister’s right to refuse to marry a same-sex couple, for example, or a devout baker’s right to refuse to provide a cake for a same-sex marriage. At the federal level, the legislation would make it legal for churches to engage in direct political action without facing a threat to their tax exemptions.

Many conservative Christians consider enactment of religious liberty legislation crucial to the survival of their movement.

Here is Deckman on the idea of “religious liberty”:

Fearful that the government will make our pastors perform same-sex marriage? Fearful that our children will be placed in danger because they will have to use bathrooms that are gender neutral? Fearful that “un-American” Muslims will **immigrate** to the United States and enact sharia law? Religious liberty is a concept that encapsulates these concerns. Fear is always a powerful motivator in American politics.

What this and the poll data tells us is that the Trump campaign has become, however improbably[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/01/opinion/campaign-stops/what-wouldnt-jesus-do.html?\_r=2], a comfortable home for the religious right.

Yet another area of commonality between Christian conservatives and the Trump campaign is their shared belief in the duty of the strong to lead the weak — the importance of leadership built on strength, authority and discipline.

Take a story first told in 1978 by James Dobson[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James\_Dobson], the founder of Focus on the Family[http://www.focusonthefamily.com/about], in his book “The Strong-Willed Child[http://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/new-strong-willed-child-james-c-dobson/1103065332].” It provides crucial understanding of this worldview.

Dobson’s thinking on the topic of strength and authority is dominated by a single theme:

If the strong-willed child is allowed by indulgence to develop “habits” of defiance and disrespect during his early childhood, those characteristics will haunt him and his parents for the next twenty years.

As a case study for handling defiant children, Dobson describes his own method for dealing with a six-year-old pet Dachshund, Siggie, who refused Dobson’s order to go to sleep in “a permanent enclosure.”

The only way to make Siggie obey is to threaten him with destruction. Nothing else works. I turned and went to my closet and got a small belt to help me “reason” with Mr. Freud.

What developed next is impossible to describe. That tiny dog and I had the most vicious fight ever staged between man and beast. I fought him up one wall and down the other, with both of us scratching and clawing and growling and swinging the belt. Inch by inch I moved him toward the family room and his bed. As a final desperate maneuver, Siggie backed into the corner for one last snarling stand. I eventually got him to bed, only because I outweighed him 200 to 12!

Permissive adults who fail to learn the importance of establishing who’s boss, according to Dobson[http://drjamesdobson.org/Solid-Answers/Answers?a=e1ab8e73-170c-45e3-8d73-7657db38d085], will suffer the consequences:

To a power-hungry tyrant of any age, appeasement only inflames his or her lust for more power.

Dobson’s story about Siggie gives us a glimpse of how the views on authority of some on the right match up with Trump’s views on what it takes to be an effective leader.

Failed leaders — Trump’s Republican opponents in the primaries, Republicans who continue to reject his bid and, most of all, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama — are endlessly “weak:”

The weakest person on this stage by far on illegal **immigration** is Jeb Bush[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2016/02/13/trump\_to\_jeb\_.html].

On Kelly Ayotte, New Hampshire Republican Senator:

We need fighters in this country. We don’t need weak people[http://www.wmur.com/politics/now-trump-turns-his-famous-ire-on-kelly-ayotte/41020406].

On Clinton:

She’s weak. She’s a weak person. I know her. She’s a weak person[http://www.cnn.com/2016/08/05/politics/donald-trump-hillary-clinton-unhinged-lock-her-up/].

On Obama:

He’s been weak, he’s been ineffective[http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/08/02/trump-calls-obama-worst-president-disaster-after-unfit-to-serve-slam.html].

Weak leaders, in Trump’s view, encourage adversaries to defy American authority. In this context, weakness and permissiveness are interchangeable.

“President Obama has weakened our military by weakening our economy,” Trump declared in an April foreign policy address[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/28/us/politics/transcript-trump-foreign-policy.html]. The result of this weakness, according to Trump, is that:

The list of humiliations goes on and on and on. President Obama watches helplessly as North Korea increases its aggression and expands further and further with its nuclear reach. Our president has allowed China to continue its economic assault on American jobs and wealth, refusing to enforce trade deals and apply leverage on China necessary to rein in North Korea.

Russell Moore, the president of the Southern Baptist Convention’s Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission and one of the few leaders on the Christian Right to oppose Trump, wrote on Feb. 29[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/02/29/russell-moore-why-this-election-makes-me-hate-the-word-evangelical/] in the Washington Post:

For years, secular progressives have said that evangelical social action in America is not about religious conviction but all about power.

This year, Moore noted, Christian leaders who in the 1990s

gave stem-winding speeches about “character” in office during the Clinton administration now minimize the spewing of profanities in campaign speeches, race-baiting and courting white supremacists, boasting of adulterous affairs, debauching public morality and justice through the casino and pornography industries.

In backing Trump, Moore concluded, “a group of high-profile old-guard evangelicals has proven these critics right.”

Moore’s voice has, been drowned out on the Christian Right by pastors like the Rev. Robert Jeffress in Dallas[http://www.baptisthistory.org/bsb/bsb2016\_07.html#first%20story], who has said that if offered a candidate modeled on Jesus:

I would run from that candidate as far as possible, because the Sermon on the Mount was not given as a governing principle for this nation.

In practice, Jeffress said:

Nowhere is government told to forgive those who wrong it, nowhere is government told to turn the other cheek. Government is to be a strongman to protect its citizens against evildoers. When I’m looking for somebody who’s going to deal with ISIS and exterminate ISIS, I don’t care about that candidate’s tone or vocabulary, I want the meanest, toughest, son of a you-know-what I can find, and I believe that’s biblical.

In other words, key leaders of the Christian right want a president who will treat recalcitrant nations and people in the way that Dobson dealt with Siggie — “the meanest, toughest, son of a you-know-what I can find.” It’s little wonder that these same leaders are willing to overlook the bottomless list of Trump’s personal and business failings.

Clyde Wilcox, a political scientist at Georgetown who has written sympathetically about the religious right, emailed me his take:

In the end it is partisanship and not religion that drives them nearly 40 years after the formation of the Moral Majority.

But it is Randall Balmer, a professor of religion at Dartmouth, who wrote perhaps the most cogent analysis[https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/05/16/trumps-success-with-evangelical-voters-isnt-surprising-it-was-inevitable/?utm\_term=.b8cfbb6d4ece] of Trump’s evangelical support in an op-ed in the Washington Post in May:

The religious right was never about the advancement of biblical values. The modern, politically conservative evangelical movement we know is a movement rooted in the perpetuation of racial segregation, and its affiliation with the hard-right fringes of the conservative movement in the late 1970s produced a mutant form of evangelicalism inconsistent with the best traditions of evangelicalism itself. Since then, evangelicals have embraced increasingly secular positions divorced from any biblical grounding, and supporting Donald Trump represents the logical conclusion of that tragic aberration.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] first called for a “total and complete” shutdown of Muslim **immigration** into the United States last December, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana rejected that stance as “offensive and unconstitutional.” But that was then.

Once he was chosen as Mr. Trump’s running mate this summer, Mr. Pence instantly became one of the strongest Republican voices to echo Mr. Trump’s anti-**immigrant** broadsides, pronouncing himself “very supportive.”

And on Wednesday Indiana officials went before a federal appeals court in Chicago to defend Mr. Pence’s outrageous order to block Syrian refugees from settling in Indiana by denying them aid for social services.

Exodus Refugee **Immigration**, a social services group that sued to stop the order, argued that under constitutional principles states may not interfere with or penalize refugees who are in the federal refugee resettlement program, which ultimately decides where to send them.

The order was struck down earlier this year by a federal district judge in Indianapolis, who rejected the state’s contention that it was needed as a defense against terrorists. Judge Tanya Walton Pratt found instead that Mr. Pence’s order “clearly constitutes national origin discrimination” in a policy of “punishing Syrian refugees already in Indiana in the hopes that no more will come.”

As Mr. Trump’s running mate, Mr. Pence is in no position to back down from carrying the ticket’s nativist banner. So the state appealed Judge Pratt’s ruling, and on Wednesday was back in court to argue that the anti-refugee order was similar to quarantining the contagiously ill from contaminating Indiana’s residents.

Members of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit were highly skeptical as they grilled Indiana’s solicitor general, Thomas Fisher. “Are Syrians the only Muslims Indiana fears?” asked Judge Richard Posner, who noted that the refugee families from Syria have been thoroughly screened by the State Department. “You are so out of it! You don’t think there are dangers from other countries?” he asked.

Judge Frank Easterbrook said slyly that the state’s insistence that barring Syrians has nothing to do with rank discrimination “produces nothing but a broad smile.”

The resettlement program drew loud protests from more than 20 governors when it was announced a year ago. But despite xenophobic warnings about unknown newcomers, the governors can do little to stop the resettlements. Since last October, 11,491 Syrian refugees have arrived in the United States, according to the Pew Charitable Trust’s Stateline[http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2016/09/14/despite-governors-protests-syrian-refugees-settle-across-the-us], and more are likely to arrive, according to the Obama administration’s plans.

But there stands Mr. Pence, on guard duty for the Trump campaign, while his pathetic anti-refugee position collapses in court, as more than 170 Syrians are starting new lives in Indiana.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — On a soggy morning in late June, as Britain absorbed the staggering news that it had voted to abandon the European Union, a stone-faced Canadian took to national television to offer assurances that the world was not ending.

Mark Carney, the first foreigner to head Britain’s central bank in its 322 years of existence, was suddenly a crucial figure in the improvised effort to manage the fallout of the so-called Brexit vote.

No one knew what the referendum meant, but markets worldwide were plummet[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/business/how-britains-breakup-with-the-eu-could-reshape-world-markets.html] ing[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/business/how-britains-breakup-with-the-eu-could-reshape-world-markets.html] in fear and confusion. Much of the British government was in tatters. The central bank was wielding 250 billion pounds, or about $345 billion, to throw at the financial system. “We are well prepared for this,” Mr. Carney said that morning.

In the weeks after, Mr. Carney led the Bank of England[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/b/bank\_of\_england/index.html?inline=nyt-org] to drop interest rates[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/05/business/dealbook/bank-of-england-interest-rates-brexit.html] to a record low while stepping up its purchases of bonds to expand credit through the economy — all in a bid to spur spending and investment. He vouched for the ability of the British financial system to withstand a shock.

But as Mr. Carney convenes the monetary policy committee of the Bank of England this week to consider further action, he finds himself confronting political controversy along with pointed questions over the effectiveness and legitimacy of his activist course.

Even those who lavish praise on his leadership suggest the bank may be out of ammunition. Whatever happens from here — whether Britain slides into recession or escapes that fate — may depend more on whether the Treasury unleashes government spending than on anything Mr. Carney may be considering.

“He’s a very cool, collected person, and he indeed rose to the occasion, but there are clear limits to what he can do,” said Richard Portes, an economist at the London Business School, who counts Mr. Carney a friend. “They can’t seriously counteract the underlying real economic effects of this.”

His detractors in the Conservative Party argue that Mr. Carney tried to scare the electorate into voting to stay in Europe with exaggerated forecasts of economic damage, then acted precipitously to cut interest rates even as the economy proved resilient.

“You begin to think that all his actions have a political spin to them, and therefore people make the criticism that he cut rates in a panic to prove himself right,” Mr. Carney’s principal critic, Jacob Rees-Mogg, a supporter of the decision to leave and a member of the House of Commons Treasury Committee, told Bloomber[http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-09-06/carney-s-brexit-tormentor-says-boe-acted-too-early-on-rates] g News[http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-09-06/carney-s-brexit-tormentor-says-boe-acted-too-early-on-rates] last week. “He has undermined the perception of impartiality of the Bank of England.”

If Mr. Carney feels misgivings, he betrayed none during an appearance at a Parliamentary committee last week.

“I’m absolutely serene,” he said. “I absolutely feel comfortable in the decision that I supported and the committee took in August to supply monetary policy stimulus.”

Economists generally dismiss talk[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/27/opinion/this-is-just-the-start-of-the-brexits-economic-disaster.html] that Britain is safely past troubles caused by the referendum.

“It’s rubbish,” said John Van Reenen, an economist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston. “We haven’t had any Brexit yet. In terms of the economic effects, we are looking at what happens when we leave the European Union.”

Stock markets and consumer spending have held up better than anticipated, but the full impact will not be known for at least several months.

A slowdown in investment is expected, as multinational companies hold off on expanding operations in Britain until its future trading relationship with Europe is clear. Major banks are actively exploring shifting parts of their businesses out of Britain, a potentially significant blow.

But one worry does seem to have been dispatched — the threat that the vote could deliver a shock to the global financial system. Here, Mr. Carney draws plaudits for the performance art aspects of central banking.

As the referendum result reverberated on the morning of June 24, markets plunged from Tokyo to London to New York, erasing $2 trillion in global wealth. The sell-off conjured talk of another Lehman Brothers, the investment bank that collapsed in 2008, setting off the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/g/great\_depression\_1930s/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

The vote ostensibly kicked off torturous divorce proceedings with Europe that jeopardized Britain’s exports while threatening to send major banks scrambling to abandon London.

No one appeared to be running things. Prime Minister David Cameron would soon declare his pending resignation. The man in charge of the budget, George Osborne, disappeared from the scene. The opposition Labour Party commenced bloody recriminations.

As he stepped in front of the cameras at the Bank of England, the yellow light of a chandelier glowing in a hallway behind him, Mr. Carney appeared to be the only powerful figure in Britain who was at once awake, sober and not about to begin spending more time with the family.

He had long carried a reputation as the supreme grown-up in every room. Britain had just taken a leap into the wild unknown. Here was the one person who had remembered to pack provisions.

“There was a general need to bring about some restoration of confidence in the economy,” said Charles Goodhart, a former member of the Bank of England’s monetary policy committee, and now a professor at the London School of Economics. “Mark Carney as governor of the Bank of England was one of the few remaining figures of authority in place who could tell people that things were not falling apart.”

That Mr. Carney operates with a North American accent appears to have lent him some immunity as politicians who supported the referendum have accused him of stoking fears.

“If he’d been a Brit, people would have been able to say, ‘Oh, you would say that, because you went to that school, or belong to this club,’” Mr. Van Reenen said. “Having someone who’s a bit of an outsider, it gave him more robustness in defending what he was doing.”

Born in Canada’s remote Northwest Territories (population, 44,340), Mr. Carney grew up primarily in Edmonton. He spent 13 years traveling the globe for Goldman Sachs and assumed the governorship of Canada’s central bank in 2008.

If bankers expected that his Goldman ties would make Mr. Carney a pliable regulator, they were in for disappointment. His central bank forced Canadian institutions to reserve more of their capital than lenders elsewhere. That limited Canada’s exposure to the global financial crisis.

In 2011, as central bankers drafted new rules aimed at preventing another financial crisis, Jamie Dimon, chief executive of JPMorgan Chase, famously excoriated Mr. Carney behind closed doors: The proposed rules discriminated against American bankers, Mr. Dimon charged.

Mr. Carney held his ground. “If some institutions feel pressure today,” he declared in a speech two days later, “it is because they have done too little for too long.”

Most observers assume Mr. Carney prefers to avoid more monetary loosening, allowing the Treasury to take the lead, but will not hesitate if economic growth deteriorates.

Given that the vote was, on one level, a call for limits on **immigration**, some celebrate Mr. Carney’s prominent role as a sign that British openness endures.

“The only grown-up in the room turns out to be an **immigrant**,” said Ricardo Reis, an economist at the London School of Economics.

But if the electorate had in mind limiting the influx of Polish plumbers and Syrian refugees, Mr. Carney presents a different sort of **immigrant**. He bears degrees from Harvard and Oxford. He is married to the British economist Diana Carney. His pay package runs 874,000 pounds a year, or nearly $1.2 million.

Still, the presence of a Canadian heading the institution that watches the money attests to Britain’s continued willingness to import high-level talent.

The English Premier League, the pinnacle of global soccer, is stocked with top players from every shore. Chefs, architects and theater directors flock to London.

“The U.K. is the epicenter of what is frequently known as the Wimbledon effect,” Mr. Goodhart said. Before Andy Murray won the tennis tournament for the first time in 2013, no Briton had taken the trophy for 77 years, yet people cheered the winners.

“We don’t care about the identity of the person,” Mr. Goodhart said, “as long as they are doing the right thing for us in the U.K.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For nearly 40 years, one name had been synonymous with Lower Manhattan politics: Sheldon Silver[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/sheldon\_silver/index.html?inline=nyt-per].

Now there is a new name — and it bears translating. Yuh-Line Niou, a 33-year-old, Taiwanese-born candidate, won Tuesday’s Democratic primary to overturn Mr. Silver’s hold on the Assembly district that encompasses the area. Pronounced “You Lean New,” her name in Chinese, she said, means “something so pretty or so precious that you want to hide it.”

Instead, Ms. Niou, 33, has vaulted into the spotlight. Her victory in November, which is almost assured in the heavily Democratic 65th Assembly District, would double the number of Asian-American state legislators — to two.

“I think it’s a testament to how far we have come in embracing diversity in the city,” said Assemblyman Ron Kim, a Korean-born Democrat from Queens, and the other Asian-American in the Legislature. Ms. Niou was Mr. Kim’s chief of staff during his first three years in office. “That gives the next generation, and so many young women of color, inspiration,” Mr. Kim added, “That ‘I can have a funny Chinese name and I can run for office.’”

Ms. Niou said she did not know her opponent in the general election. It is Bryan Jung, a Republican district leader.

Ms. Niou emerged as the winner[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/nyregion/assembly-primary-yuh-line-niou-sheldon-silver.html] from a crowded field of six Democrats that had two other Chinese-born contenders running. She captured the Chinatown districts, including the high-rise of Confucius Plaza, earning 32 percent of the vote. She won by 1,130 votes over Jenifer Rajkumar, a daughter of Indian **immigrants**.

Ultimately, ethnic-identity politics were not the decisive factor in the race. New York City Board of Election statistics show that Ms. Niou prevailed because she was also able to draw from the Assembly district’s diverse neighborhoods — from a sizable Orthodox Jewish community to lower-income residents off Cherry Street to voters in the well-heeled Financial District.

“Our district is asking for a change, and we are all ready,” she said in a breathless telephone interview on Wednesday. “It doesn’t matter how long anyone has been there, we are all neighbors.”

Some of those attending her victory party, Ms. Niou said, underscored the diversity of the district’s neighborhoods. Among those on hand were two modern Orthodox rabbis and three tenant association leaders, two Latino and one African-American.

“With six candidates splitting the votes,” said Steven Romalewski of the City University of New York’s Center for Urban Research[http://www.gc.cuny.edu/CUR]. “In order to win, it’s essential to go beyond just Chinatown.”

In Upper Manhattan, it was the opposite case. In the Senate District 31, the seat being vacated by Adriano D. Espaillat, who is running for Congress, Mr. Espaillat’s endorsed candidate, Marisol Alcantara, a Dominican labor organizer, beat out Micah Lasher and Robert Jackson by galvanizing her base. It was the in the Dominican strongholds, including Washington Heights east of Broadway and parts of Inwood, where she edged out her competition. There, she had about twice the votes as her closest rival, Mr. Jackson.

“If Lasher or Jackson had been able to get support across the district, that might have tipped the scales to them,” Mr. Romalewski said. “Identity politics sometimes wins out.”

The candidates in the two races represent the two largest **immigrant** groups in New York City — Dominicans and Chinese. Ms. Niou said making government services accessible to **immigrants** was a priority for her.

Ms. Niou was six months old when she came to the United States with her parents, settling in Moscow, Idaho, where her father studied to be an engineer and her mother was a nurse. She learned English at school and Mandarin from her grandmother, who had been a teacher in Taiwan. Ms. Niou also lived in El Paso, Texas, where she attended a Jewish community center summer day camp, and in Vancouver, Wash.

She earned a Master of Public Administration as part of the National Urban Fellows program at Baruch College[http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/] in Manhattan. Soon after earning her degree, she was hired by Mr. Kim as his chief of staff. He said he would never forget the weekend before she officially started. “She was the only one in the office on New Year’s weekend, she had rolled up her sleeves, painting the walls,” he said.

Three years later, Mr. Silver was convicted on federal corruption charges. “It’s literally one of those things, when the seat came up, I was asked by our senator, Daniel Squadron, to consider running,” Ms. Niou said.

When the Democratic Party did not nominate her for the special election in April, she ran on the Working Families Party line. Alice Cancel, the candidate supported by Mr. Silver, won an interim term, but Ms. Niou gained name recognition in advance of the primary. Bill Lipton, the New York Working Families Party director, said that both elections were part of a “the long game.”

Jenny Low, chairwoman of the Chinese-American Planning Council[https://cpc-nyc.org/], a social services organization, and an executive with the United Democratic Organization, a Chinatown club that endorsed Ms. Niou, pointed to her ability to draw votes from across the district.

“That she won from everyone else’s territory, frankly, it says a lot,” Ms. Low said.

“On top of that, and the icing on the cake for me,” Ms. Low said, “is that she’s one of ours.”

\* Mixed Results Seen in Special Races to Replace Silver and Skelos[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/20/nyregion/mixed-results-seen-in-special-races-to-replace-silver-and-skelos.html]

\* Race to Replace Sheldon Silver Reflects His District’s Ethnic Diversity[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/nyregion/race-to-replace-sheldon-silver-reflects-lower-east-side-diversity.html]

\* Yuh-Line Niou Defeats Sheldon Silver Ally in Primary for His Old Assembly Seat[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/nyregion/assembly-primary-yuh-line-niou-sheldon-silver.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — She is known in the British civil service as Theresa May , or Maybe Not. But after months in which she has provided little clue as to how she intends to negotiate Britain’s exit from the European Union [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org], Mrs. May could soon have a harder time dodging the question.

Mrs. May, the surprising successor as prime minister to David Cameron , who said a day after losing the June referendum on membership in the bloc that he would step down [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/britain-brexit-european-union-referendum.html], has largely kept her own counsel. Although she was a quiet and perhaps lukewarm supporter of staying in the European Union , she has made it clear that she views the vote as democratic and that there would not be a do-over.

Mrs. May got through the summer by saying, “Brexit means Brexit,” a gnomic statement that raised countless questions; left cabinet ministers trying to shape the debate to their own, often diverging, views; and annoyed her counterparts in Europe, who are eager to get on with the negotiations.

The leaders of the 27 other European Union nations will meet on Friday in Bratislava, Slovakia, but Mrs. May has been conspicuously excluded from the gathering, intended to begin discussing the shape and direction of the bloc after a British exit. Like much of Britain, the European leaders are still trying to discern her priorities and to size up her approach to carrying out a historic and complex rupture.

If Mrs. May has signaled any strategy, it is to play for time, giving her government — well stocked with members who were among the most prominent supporters of an exit — a chance to hash out a negotiating position, and perhaps to allow the political passions of the spring and summer to subside somewhat. Despite pressure from Brussels to move quickly, she has said that Britain will not invoke Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty [http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/06/23/world/europe/brexit-european-union-process.html], formally notifying an intention to quit the bloc and beginning a two-year negotiation process, until the first quarter of 2017.

The choices ahead are extremely complex and contentious, and for now, Mrs. May is letting various members of her cabinet set their own priorities, while emphasizing that the government — namely, she — has not yet taken official positions. She has no intention, she told Parliament, of giving “a running commentary” of the negotiations.

In her cabinet, she put prominent advocates of leaving the European Union in central positions to manage that exit: Boris Johnson [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/world/europe/david-cameron-theresa-may-prime-minister.html], the popular former London mayor who was the face of the campaign to leave the bloc, as foreign secretary; David Davis [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/15/world/europe/uk-cabinet-theresa-may.html], a veteran Conservative lawmaker, as secretary of state for exiting the European Union ; and a former defense secretary, Liam Fox , in charge of international trade.

Mrs. May then set them, and some of their more pro-European colleagues, against one another. They have been fighting over turf, and over how many Foreign Office staff members could be sent to work at the other ministries. And she ruled that all three should share the use of Chevening House [http://www.cheveninghouse.com/], a country mansion in Kent that is traditionally assigned to the foreign secretary, but that is now nicknamed Brexit Towers [http://www.heraldscotland.com/politics/14625962.Brexit\_Towers\_\_Chevening\_mansion\_set\_to\_become\_unofficial\_HQ\_for\_the\_plan\_to\_leave\_the\_EU/].

While Mrs. May has remained nearly mute on the subject of the path leading to a British exit, her ministers have managed to inject their views into the public debate. Mr. Johnson, for one, wrote her a “private” memo setting out his position, which was promptly leaked [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3772134/Boris-lays-law-Brexit-tells-Theresa-UK-NOT-stay-single-market-NOT-pay-EU.html].

In it, Mr. Johnson, reflecting concern among campaigners from the “Leave” camp that Mrs. May would water down their victory by negotiating a less-than-full break from Brussels, laid down four red lines: control over **immigration** from European Union countries, an end to British contributions to the European budget, ceasing the application of European legislation to Britain, and removing the country from the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice countries, an end to British contributions to the European budget, ceasing the application of European legislation to Britain, and removing the country from the jurisdiction of the

Mr. Johnson has also thrown his support behind a new lobbying group, Change Britain, introduced over the weekend and intended to maintain pressure on the prime minister to have what is known as a “hard exit” from the European Union , with control over **immigration** and no attempt to bargain with it to preserve duty-free access to the single European market of 500 million people. Other supporters include prominent Conservatives like Michael Gove [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/02/world/europe/brexit-michael-gove-conservative-party-britain.html], the former justice minister, and Nigel Lawson, a former chancellor of the Exchequer under Margaret Thatcher .

At some point, Mrs. May’s studied silence risks creating a leadership vacuum or feeding into the economic uncertainty that has hung over Britain since the referendum. The most fundamental decision may be how much to prioritize control over **immigration**, one of the clear demands from the referendum, and ending the freedom of movement and labor that membership in the European Union requires.

While those favoring a British departure promised during the referendum campaign that **immigration** could be controlled and that Britain could retain access to the single market, agreement by the other 27 countries is nearly inconceivable, as it would overthrow one of the basic tenets of the bloc: that market access and freedom of movement are inextricably linked.

While reclaiming control over the nation’s borders seems to be the priority for many of the voters who favored leaving the bloc, many business interests in Britain — not least the financial services industry in the City of London and big manufacturers — want to retain access to the single market.

That trade-off, and the degree to which Britain would be willing to make other concessions to Europe to retain market access, is likely to be the trickiest issue confronting Ms. May. Mr. Johnson aside, would Britain be willing to pay into the European Union budget as a nonmember, as Norway does [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/business/international/after-brexit-britain-could-look-to-norway-as-a-model.html], and if not, what kind of trade deal could Britain negotiate, sector by sector, and how long would that take?

When Mr. Davis told the House of Commons this month that it was “very improbable” that Britain would remain in the single market, Mrs. May, through her spokeswoman, chided him and said he was only “setting out his opinion.”

“The prime minister’s view is that we should be ambitious and go after the best deal we can,” said the spokeswoman, Helen Bower.

Britain’s financial sector, which represents 10 percent of gross domestic product, wants to preserve “passporting rights,” the ability to offer services throughout the rest of the bloc, including in the 19 countries that use the euro. The chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond, who backed remaining in the European Union , also wants to preserve passporting rights.

But French officials like Emmanuel Macron [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/10/world/europe/emmanuel-macron-france-en-marche.html], the former economy minister and a possible [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/world/europe/emmanuel-macron-eying-french-presidency-resigns-as-economy-minister.html], the former economy minister and a presidential candidate [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/world/europe/emmanuel-macron-eying-french-presidency-resigns-as-economy-minister.html], are dead set against that.

In an interview in London, Mr. Macron said that financial institutions based in Britain must be prevented from selling their services in the eurozone after the country leaves the European Union . Passporting is an integral part of the single market, he said, and “should not be seen as a technical issue but a matter of sovereignty.”

He continued: “We have the eurozone. Could we accept to be cleared, regulated and de facto have inflows and outflows from a country that has decided to leave the E.U.? For me, definitely not.”

In the meantime, Mrs. May and her country are getting a taste of what it will mean to be outside Europe. While the summit meeting on Friday in Bratislava of the other European Union leaders is expected to produce little of substance, its theme is “security,” including borders, migration, terrorism and further defense cooperation. These are issues in which Britain, still a full member of the European Union , has a considerable interest and stake.

How much cooperation will Britain after its departure want or expect from the European Union on such matters as policing, intelligence sharing, arrest warrants, extradition?

Mrs. May, Britain’s home secretary for six years, will have to make some choices there, as well.

Follow Steven Erlanger on Twitter @StevenErlanger.

\* Theresa May’s Style: Put Your Head Down and Get to Work [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/world/europe/theresa-may-profile.html]

\* Theresa May, New British Prime Minister, Gives Boris Johnson a Key Post [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/world/europe/david-cameron-theresa-may-prime-minister.html]

\* Theresa May’s British Cabinet Has New Faces but Old Divides [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/15/world/europe/uk-cabinet-theresa-may.html]

\* Theresa May Is Poised to Be Britain’s Next Prime Minister [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/12/world/europe/andrea-leadsom-theresa-may-britain.html]

\* Voting on European Integration: A Long History of Skepticism [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/19/world/europe/europe-integration-timeline.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ivana Trump, best known as the first spouse of the 2016 Republican candidate for president and the woman who coined the term “The Donald,” made her New York Fashion Week[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/n/new\_york\_fashion\_week/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] spring 2017 debut at Dennis Basso on Tuesday, sitting front row at Moynihan Station on the West Side of Manhattan.

Ms. Trump wore a black-and-white patterned dress and sat next to Nikki Haskell, a West Coast socialite who helped invent the weight-loss pill Star Caps and who was profiled recently in Politico[http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/09/donald-trump-2016-trumpettes-bel-air-214206] in an article called “The Real Trumpettes of Bel Air.”

When the Trumps divorced in the early ’90s, after Mr. Trump’s affair with Marla Maples (soon to be Wife No. 2), things were anything but cordial between them. But reporters hoping for a morsel of news that might somehow break the Twittersphere were going to walk away disappointed on this day.

Ms. Trump has already issued unequivocal support for her former husband. And as a reporter approached, she was busy telling someone else about her stance on **immigration**.

“I think the Mexican people and all the **immigrants** are perfectly fine,” she said. “They are good workers and good people, but they have to come here legally, they have to speak at least a little bit of English and pay their taxes.”

She was also not so inclined to discuss such issues with anyone from The New York Times.

“You are not so nice to Donald,” Ms. Trump said, adding that she was “not a politician” and was here only because Mr. Basso was a “good friend.”

Had he designed her dress, too?

“No,” she said. “Roberto Cavalli.”

Security guards announced that the show was about to begin, and party page fixtures like Nicky Hilton Rothschild, Somers Farkas and Elisabeth Kieselstein-Cord took their seats.

Then, electronic music blared for 15 minutes, while models showed off white fitted cocktail dresses, taupe suede skirts and luscious brown bolero-like fur coats.

In the audience was Kelly Killoren Bensimon and Luann de Lesseps — both of whom have appeared on “The Real Housewives of New York” over the years.

Ms. de Lesseps and Ms. Bensimon (who referred to the crowd as “well bred, well fed and well read”) headed backstage afterward to kiss the ring of the man who designed the collection.

Mr. Basso was dressed in a black blazer, a black-and-white tie and khaki-ish dress pants. And it was quickly clear that he has a formidable ability to show equal love for all the women in attendance, whether young or old, famous or nonfamous.

He kissed random grandmothers and squeezed their wrists. He posed for pictures with the young daughters of his more middle-aged clients.

“It’s wonderful,” he said, looking out at all his well-wishers a moment later. “We have young women in their teens to women of a certain age. I think that’s great.”

Of course, not every designer in this polarized election season would be so eager to have the supportive ex-wife of the Republican contestant for president as one of these front-row patrons, but Mr. Basso had no such quibbles.

“She’s a wonderful woman,” he said of Ms. Trump, shortly after a quick hello with her, too. “She was at my first show in 1983. And she’s actually been to every show since then. Her children come. We’re friends of the family.”

But he was not about to say whom he was planning on voting for.

“I think that’s a personal question,” he said, darting off to kiss more cheeks and squeeze more wrists.

Continue following our fashion and lifestyle coverage on Facebook (Styles[https://www.facebook.com/nytimesstyles] and Modern Love[https://www.facebook.com/modernlove]), Twitter (Styles[https://twitter.com/nytstyles], Fashion[https://twitter.com/nytfashion] and Weddings[https://twitter.com/nytimesvows]) and Instagram[https://instagram.com/nytimesfashion].

\* The R&B Duo Chloe x Halle Were in the Front Row of Tory Burch[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/13/fashion/chloe-and-halle-bailey-tory-burch-new-york-times.html]

\* Gold Medalist Aly Raisman Goes to Fashion Week[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/13/fashion/aly-raisman-jeremy-scott-new-york-fashion-week.html]

\* Kelly Osbourne, Suffering for Fashion[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/10/fashion/kelly-osbourne-suffering-for-fashion.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This year’s Athens Democracy Forum will be the fourth, and it will not be the last. It cannot be. Democratization is not accomplished or achieved. It is a process, as complex and changing as the world, forever in danger, forever evolving, forever in need of vigilance and repair.

Democracy is not irreversible. We see evidence again and again, as unscrupulous leaders take advantage of popular fears and insecurities to subvert democratic institutions, often with the loud support of a majority that feels threatened by a changing world and finds respite in demagoguery. Freedom of expression is often the first victim.

No democracy is immune. Even the most established are finding themselves under challenge from xenophobic politicians exploiting fears of migrants or economic crises to advance isolationist, reactionary ideologies.

And while most of the world’s governments call themselves democratic, many have redefined the concept almost beyond recognition.

Some claim that the Western forms of democracy are unsuitable for their societies, and that to argue otherwise is a form of cultural imperialism. Some claim that authoritarian rule is a more familiar and efficient form of “democracy” in less developed parts of the world. Some argue that democracy includes the right to maintain the purity of a national identity. In the most extreme challenge, an Islamist fringe perceives Western democracy as an evil that justifies the most repugnant violence.

But then democracy has always been in peril. It exists to give people control over those who wield power, and those who have power often want more. In recent months alone we have witnessed a deeply troubling American presidential campaign; the dubious impeachment of the president of Brazil; a vote in Britain to leave the European Union[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org]; and more.

This year, the forum focuses on four challenges to democracy: migration, the rise of the authoritarian leader, and the roles of business and of religion.

Largely because of the civil war in Syria, the flood of refugees from there, combined with a continuing flow of Africans fleeing poverty and strife, has become the defining challenge to Western democracy. This challenge casts many of the fundamental tenets of liberal democracy — to be the Mother of Exiles, as Emma Lazarus phrased it in her famous poem on the Statue of Liberty[http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/statue\_of\_liberty/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] — against the fear of the “other” undermining national identity, comfort and security.

Chancellor Angela Merkel[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela\_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per] threw down the gauntlet to Europe when she opened Germany’s doors wide to refugees a year ago. Other nations — particularly those of the former Soviet bloc — tried to shut their gates. In Britain, resentment of foreigners became a rallying cry in the vote against membership in the European Union. In the United States, the fate of undocumented **immigrants** has become a major issue, with Donald J. Trump demanding a wall with Mexico.

The attraction of the “big man” — the tough boss who stands up to perceived slights and threats, civil rights and democratic niceties be damned — is another challenge in urgent need of a response. The loud support for increasingly authoritarian rule in places like Russia and Turkey, and the rise of populist politicians in the United States and across Europe, have raised fundamental questions about the ability of democratic institutions to deal with economic or social turmoil.

The interaction of an elected government and business is a hardy perennial in the evolution of democratic rule. The degree to which government should be a partner, regulator or defender of commercial interests is one question to which different democracies have devised different answers.

Another challenge is the growing ability of large multinationals to pick and choose where to do business. The suit against Apple by the European Union has raised a welter of issues about jurisdiction, taxation and national pride.

Then there is the religion question, raised in its most terrible guise in the violence of radical Islamists. The power of religion is also increasingly evident in less vicious but still essential social debates in all corners of the world, including the democracies that purport to separate church and state.

Same-sex marriage[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/same\_sex\_marriage/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and abortion are only some of the most prominent issues in which religion plays a central role. The resistance to Muslim refugees in the United States and Europe is partly based on the notion that they are **alien** to the West’s Judeo-Christian identity.

The challenges are daunting. But so long as we can discuss the glitches, we can try to correct them. That’s why this will not be the last forum.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Two weeks after Hillary Clinton accepted the Democratic presidential nomination in Philadelphia, beaming through a hail of gigantic balloons, her campaign’s “Latinos con Hillary” program began in five cities in Virginia. One of the kickoff parties took place at Todos Supermarket in Prince William County, in a modest white room where about 40 people gathered around three tables draped in cheap blue cloth to hear a speech by Clinton’s national Latino-vote director, Lorella Praeli. When she was 2, Praeli, now 28, lost one of her legs in a car accident, but with her crutches, she commanded the room more adroitly than any of the speakers who preceded her, moving among the tables as she rallied her troops. Though the party was advertised on Facebook, most of the men and women in attendance were seasoned Democratic politicians, staff members and volunteers.

“I’m not here to make it pretty,” Praeli said. “The work ahead of us, the task and challenge ahead of us for the next what — 96 days — is huge.” She ticked through the efforts needed to register and turn out Latinos: knocking on doors, hosting phone-bank parties, convincing friends, haunting markets, teaching Spanish-speakers the how and the when and the where of voting. In her speech, the job sounded herculean. Near the end of her pitch, she asked everyone to stand and feel the energy in the room while they said, in Spanish, “We will be the difference.”

“I want you to say it and to believe it,” Praeli instructed. “I want you to say it and to commit yourself.” She smiled, but these were marching orders. “If we don’t believe it, other people won’t believe,” Praeli said in Spanish. “If we don’t believe it in this room, we won’t be the difference in November.”

Latinos have been hearing that they will be the difference for decades. In Spanish-language media this year, the rhetoric around the election has often gone so far as to imply that Latinos will decide the result on their own. Telemundo’s election coverage runs under the slogan “Yo Decido,” “I Decide.” The Univision news anchor Jorge Ramos told The Times last year that “the new rule in American politics is that no one can make it to the White House without the Hispanic vote.”

It’s true enough that 800,000 Latinos turn 18 every year, and both parties burn millions of dollars trying to woo Hispanic voters. This year, 27 million will be eligible to vote. But the idea of a fearsome Latino political power remains more myth than reality. Journalists have been writing about the so-called “sleeping giant” of Hispanic voters since at least the 1970s, but the fact is that voter turnout among Latinos remains dismal. It can run almost 20 percentage points lower than that of African-Americans and non-Hispanic whites. Exactly the same percentage of eligible Latinos, 48 percent, showed up for Romney versus Obama in 2012 as turned out for Bush versus Dukakis in 1988. While the raw number of Latino ballots cast has tripled since 1998, so has the number of Latino citizens who don’t vote. Only once in the past 28 years, during the 1992 match among George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton and Ross Perot that spurred a jump in overall turnout, has Latino turnout exceeded 50 percent. More often than not, “Yo Decido” to stay home.

This year, the new spin on the old dream is that Donald Trump will finally shake the giant awake. He opened his campaign last summer by calling Mexican **immigrants** “rapists,” has repeatedly proclaimed that he will build a wall between Mexico and the United States and, until recently, has made the deportation of 11 million undocumented **immigrants** a cornerstone of his platform. As early as September 2015, Javier Palomarez, the president and chief executive of the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, told Politico: “I think the greatest thing to ever happen to the Hispanic electorate is a gentleman named Donald Trump. He has crystallized the angst and anger of the Hispanic community.” He added, “I think we can all rest assured that Hispanics can turn out in record numbers.”

Perhaps. But achieving record turnout for a demographic with a lackluster voting history isn’t so simple as watching them take themselves to the polls. In June, Mi Familia Vota and the National Council of La Raza, two nonprofit groups devoted to organizing Latinos, warned that they needed more cash to match their voter registration numbers from 2012. In July, the Pew Research Center noted that “Hispanic voters lag all registered voters on several measures of engagement” — they aren’t paying attention to election news as closely as other citizens and they aren’t thinking about the election as much. At a conference on the Hispanic vote held in New York City in January, the big unanswered question was “Why have Latinos never really turned out in force?”

Looking for answers, I spent six months interviewing scores of Latinos in Virginia, a battleground state where the Latino share of the population has more than tripled since 1990. I met with Latino Catholics, Pentecostals and Mormons, with legal residents, citizens and undocumented **immigrants**. I frequented a church and a community center, soccer fields and a dance club. I lurked around Republican and Democratic events and a skateboard park. I interviewed custodians and construction workers, lawyers and real estate agents, restaurant owners and community organizers, college students and political staffers. In all, I spoke with more than 100 Virginians of various ethnic backgrounds.

For all the energy that activists, especially on the Democratic side, have put into turning out the Latino vote, I met strikingly few Latinos outside the upper-middle class who talked about voting as if it were something they did regularly. The exceptions tended to be people like Lucía Rodriguez, 61, who cleans houses and has voted regularly for more than a decade — even in 2008 after she and her husband, a custodian, saw all their savings vanish in the mortgage crisis. For years afterward, they scrambled to keep their family afloat, working every available hour. Yet she kept on voting. Why? “It’s a civic duty,” she said. Rodriguez explained that in Bolivia, where she had been an accountant, she learned the habit of voting because nonvoters could be penalized with fines. In her Mormon church in the United States, she was surrounded by friends who voted. To pass her citizenship test, she had to study American government and learn English. Her voting behavior entailed years of effort and experience. Through all my conversations, I began to fear that the real roots of political engagement, which lie not in quadrennial outreach programs but around dinner tables and in churches and classrooms, are far more absent from Latino life in America than most people understand.

“A person on the fence needs to be activated to turn into a voter,” Marvin Figueroa, 30, said one humid Friday in July as he stood before a crowd of white-collar professionals at a “Happy Hour for Hillary.” These borderline voters, he said, often need “13 touches” — calls, door knocks, texts, etc. — before they would turn out. Figueroa is Clinton’s political director for Virginia. His spreadsheets contain not only Latinos but also African-Americans, millennials and Muslims: any constituent group that might be pulled into a pro-Clinton coali­tion. This evening, inside the Arlington home of a defense contractor who turned Democrat after the Tea Party swept into Congress in 2010, the audience was mostly female, mostly Caucasian and only marginally Latino. The doors to the screened-in porch were open; the air-conditioning was off; the margarita machine was on. The Spanish speakers blended into the crowd.

Statistically, the Latinos most likely to cast ballots are almost identical to other reliable American voters. They are over 40. They’ve lived in the United States for at least 20 years. They are Puerto Ricans and Cuban-Americans with long cultural histories of citizenship. They are college graduates.

The Latinos least likely to vote represent a different demographic slice altogether. They are under 30, single and Mexican-American. Their families earn less than $50,000 a year. They may not have completed high school.

Data capsules like these suggest that the Latino vote is simply hamstrung by the same factors that impede the Election Day turnout of all Americans: poverty, youth, lack of schooling. Political scientists showed long ago that voting goes hand in glove with affluence and education. Generally speaking, the wealthier you are, the more degrees you earn, the more likely you are to turn out. But if these were the only relevant factors, Latino voting would most likely rise naturally over time as more Latinos enrolled in college and as the age of the average American-born Latino increased. (In 2012 their average age was 18.)

Causality unravels, however, when you start picking at the numbers. Take income, for example. While nearly a quarter of Latinos live in poverty, as a group they are slightly better off than African-Americans. Yet in 2012, African-Americans had the highest turnout rates in the nation. They, not Latinos, have arguably been the decisive bloc in our last two presidential contests and in this year’s Democratic primary. So poverty alone can’t explain the weak Hispanic vote.

Youth and education also prove to be red herrings. Hispanics are America’s youngest and least-educated major racial or ethnic group. Nearly a third of foreign-born Latinos never reached ninth grade. Some have never had a day of schooling in their lives. But if age and learning were the decisive catalysts, we would expect to find the highest voter turnout among Asian-Americans, who are our second-oldest and best-educated group. More than half of Asian-Americans hold bachelors degrees. Yet Asian-Americans tend to vote at even lower rates than Latinos. In 2012, 53 percent of their eligible voters did not go to the polls.

So what do Asians and Hispanics, two vastly different groups in terms of age, education and culture, have in common? It’s obvious once you look for it: For the past 30 years, most of America’s **immigrants** have arrived from Asia and Latin America. Both groups struggle with English. Roughly a third of Hispanic adults and a 10th of Hispanic children say that they cannot speak English “very well.” Among Asians, the numbers are similar.

The American political system once efficiently trained **immigrants** in how to pull electoral levers. For all their flaws, urban political machines like Tammany Hall did an extraordinary job of recruiting poor, undereducated Irish and Italian **immigrants**, then shepherding their political incorporation into local and national affairs. But **immigrants** from Latin America and Asia were largely excluded from the old machines, both by laws limiting their naturalization and enfranchisement and by racism. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was not extended to Hispanics and Asians until 1975. By then most of the urban machines had been dismantled, and the leading edge of our current wave of Asian and Hispanic **immigrants** began unpacking their bags in Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York, Atlanta and Washington.

The **immigrants** from Latin America immediately found themselves lumped together under the label “Hispanic,” even if they spoke Portuguese or an indigenous language, even if they had no ancestral link to Spain. It’s tough to galvanize such a heterogeneous group. The panethnic, multilingual category of “Hispanic” is a uniquely American invention, created by congressional legislation in the 1970s. In her book “Making Hispanics,” G. Cristina Mora shows how bureaucrats, media executives and political activists built the notion to combine Mexican-Americans, Cuban-Americans, Puerto Ricans and others in census counts and federal programs. The term was always deliberately ambiguous, Mora notes, so that it could accommodate varied origin stories. There are Hispanics who swam the Rio Grande hoping for a living wage, Hispanics who flew business class to enroll in Ivy League schools, Hispanics who disembarked as Cold Warriors in Florida. There are even Hispanics whose families owned land in the Southwest before it was ever part of the United States. (These “Hispanics” like to joke that they didn’t cross the border; the border crossed them.) Unlike African-Americans, most of whom can trace a connection to slavery, Latinos have no single common history. Trump, Figueroa once told me, “makes us more Latino”: His threats and insults provoke a unifying sense of indignation.

Sifting thorough the numbers and this complicated history makes the 52 percent of nonvoting Latinos look rather different. The problem isn’t their youth, poverty or lack of education. The problem is that when you’re poor, young or undereducated, it takes more effort to overcome your **immigrant** family’s low levels of political socialization. For first-generation Americans, politics is often just one more cultural expression that they must decipher on their own. It’s rarely a priority. The **immigrant** parents that I spoke with swam rivers and boarded airplanes to escape violence, to earn money, to educate their children. Learning to play American politics was never on the agenda.

In Virginia, I found that serious political talk was so rare among the American-born children of Spanish-speaking **immigrants** that they would often ask me questions like “What is the Tea Party?” and “Who is my mayor?” Alicio Castañeda, a student at George Mason University whose parents are from Mexico, told me that after we had lunch in April, he began reading more news articles and researching deeper into the presidential candidates. He voted on Super Tuesday. His love for the soccer team Manchester United had led him to The Guardian newspaper, which reminded him that it was a big day in America. “I’ve always been personally interested in politics,” he told me, “but I haven’t had anyone to talk to about it.”

Until the 1960s, high schools often taught courses on democracy, civics and government. At the turn of the 21st century, most teenagers received one such class, or none. This drought in civics hurts all Americans, but for Latinos it’s devastating. Several studies have found that merely hearing parents chat about politics or watching them cast a ballot improves the odds that a child will later vote as an adult. Yet a national survey directed by Mark Hugo Lopez in 2002 found that young Latinos were the least likely to have discussed politics with their parents. They were also the most likely to believe that voting is “difficult.”

On Super Tuesday, I glimpsed what was missing among so many of the Latino families I spoke with when I met Kat Heller, a non-Hispanic mother, exiting a polling station with two children. Growing up in Minnesota, Heller had always tagged along with her parents when they voted. Once, when she was about 12, her father took her to watch the ballots being counted. “I just remember feeling it was really exciting,” she told me. “It was seeing history happening. Everyone was waiting breathlessly.” Inside the voting booth on Super Tuesday, Heller put her 3-year-old son on her hip and asked him: “Which do you think we should vote for?” His 13 touches had already begun.

Absent Tammany Hall and civics in schools, the work of turning “new Americans” into voters often falls to volunteers like Keisy Chavez. Several weekends this summer, Chavez, 45, has stood outside of Todos Supermarket and other locations in Northern Virginia, clipboard in hand, fishing for Latinos who haven’t registered to vote. On the Saturday morning that I joined her, she looked surprisingly stylish for the occasion: gold-toned sandals, brilliant white capri pants, fiery nails and a bright orange T-shirt blazoned with the words “New Virginia Majority.” You could not engineer a better volunteer than Chavez to help turn out the Latino vote. Political appeals, social scientists have found, work best when delivered by co-ethnics. Chavez meets other requirements as well: She’s bilingual, outgoing and frank.

A good rate for voter registration is two new registrations an hour. Chavez and her colleague hit the mark with four new registrations between them (the colleague waited for Chavez every time someone’s dominant language was Spanish). Still, most passers-by ignored them. One 20-something with jet black hair who did stop told Chavez, in Spanish, that he was a citizen but not registered. She tried to reel him in.

“O.K.,” she responded with a smile, “what is the problem?”

He said that he would come back to register next week, that she should give him her phone number.

“What happens if you don’t come next week?” she asked him.

“I promise you.”

“You know what happens,” she said. “If you don’t do it now, four more years will go by, and you won’t vote.”

Back and forth they went for several minutes. Finally, seeing that Chavez wouldn’t give him her number, the man walked away without registering. Winning votes, Lola Quintela of the Fairfax County Democratic Committee told me, is “trabajo de hormiga” — ants’ work, performed grain by grain.

The political scientist Lisa García Bedolla proposed a different method in a 2005 paper for The Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy. Because political engagement is strongly influenced by social ties, she argues, Latinos should improve their participation by politicizing their existing social networks. (She also pushes for civics in schools.) Several of the Latinos I met seemed to vote only because they were connected to a political junkie. Manuel Fernandez, 25, a Mexican-American born in New York State, prefers rebuilding and drifting cars to reading politics, but he has voted in local and presidential elections since he turned 18 because his father, Guadencio, a businessman, persuaded him to register to vote and tells him when and how to cast his ballots. “Dad is really into it,” he said. “Whenever my dad says it’s voting time, we go vote.”

The Clinton campaign is splitting its strategy between the tactics. After analyzing which programs worked best during the primaries, Praeli began pushing an expansion of Nevada’s bilingual Mujeres in Politics program in battleground and “expansion” states across the country. Mujeres in Politics marshals Latinas for the ant work of canvassing and phone banking, but it also relies on social ties to deepen the campaign’s reach into Latino communities. Each Latina who participates is tasked with the responsibility of drawing in five more Latina volunteers.

“The theory for us was if you target Latinas and then you have Latinas talk to other Latinas, they’re the best communicators to do that,” Praeli told me. “We see them as the C.E.O.s of their family and their communities. Part of my program description is you need to know that bodega with the highest foot traffic or the church secretary that can give you access to a faith community or who are the comadres in the neighborhood that have the largest influence. All you have to do is talk to a Latina to really understand that.” Of course, it doesn’t hurt that Latinas have voted in higher numbers than Latinos or that they were a key base for Clinton in the primaries.

Chavez herself was lured into politics by a Latina friend. For years after she settled in Virginia from Peru, she earned money washing dishes, waitressing, cleaning bathrooms, cleaning offices, “cleaning anything,” she says. At one point she held three jobs: a full-time job, a part-time job and a weekend job cleaning the airport at night. In 1996, she earned her real estate license. Then in 2009, after a friend asked her to walk with Terry McAuliffe in a parade, she was so smitten by his concern for Latinos that she decided to volunteer for his campaign for governor. For Chavez, the experience was intoxicating: “I was like, ‘Whoa, I did not know any of this existed.’ ” She has volunteered for Virginia Democrats every year since then. Election season feels like a party to her. “I have the best time,” she told me. When Praeli spoke at the “Latinos con Hillary” event at Todos, Chavez was there, dressed head to toenails in blue.

The widespread assumption has been that rising numbers of Hispanic citizens will turn Virginia and other states in the South permanently Democratic. Certainly, with each election since 2001, Virginia Democrats have expanded their network of experienced Latino staff members and volunteers. Praeli and Figueroa’s work depends on these veterans, a fact that Clinton tacitly acknowledged before Figueroa was even hired. On June 11, five days after The Associated Press called the Democratic primary for Hillary Clinton, the former president Bill Clinton held a closed-door round table in Arlington with about 20 key Latino leaders from all over the state. He, like Praeli after him, was rallying troops.

But Latinos aren’t natural Democrats, any more than they are natural Republicans. In 1984, Ronald Reagan won the presidency with nearly half their vote in California. In 2004, George W. Bush won a second term with 40 percent of the national Latino vote, setting off panic in Democratic circles. And even in 2012, 33 percent of the Latino vote in Virginia went to Mitt Romney. He also took 39 percent of the Latino vote in Florida and 42 percent in Ohio.

From the beginning, Latino voters have been up for grabs. The national electoral bloc that we now call the Hispanic vote was created by middle- and upper-class Mexican-American Democrats who wanted more clout in government and politics. According to the historian Ignacio M. García’s book on the subject, they organized “Viva Kennedy” clubs in Texas, California, New Mexico, Indiana, Illinois and elsewhere. Working together under an absurd logo of John Kennedy riding a grinning burro, these grass-roots clubs turned out thousands of Spanish speakers in delegate-rich states, helping Kennedy squeak into the White House by a margin of less than 1 percent of the popular vote. But Republicans pushed the strategy further: In “Making Hispanics,” Mora shows how members of Richard Nixon’s 1972 re-election campaign, who nicknamed themselves the “Brown Mafia,” ran Spanish-language ads on radio and television. They crafted three distinct campaigns to bring in not just Mexican-Americans but also Puerto Ricans and Cuban-Americans. With their help, Nixon was re-elected by a landslide, taking about 35 percent of what was then known as the “Spanish speaking” vote. The real loss for Republicans since President George W. Bush left office is that their candidates have frittered away the affections that he and Reagan earned among Latinos.

Many conservative Hispanics I spoke with in Virginia told me that they don’t fit neatly into either party. They would prefer a candidate who legalizes undocumented **immigrants**, outlaws abortion, makes college education free, wipes out drugs and gangs, rolls back the legal right to gay marriage, supports small-business credits and raises the minimum wage. **Immigration** reform might be a distinguishing concern for Latinos, but a recent report from Pew found that, as in previous presidential contests, it is not the top issue for Latino voters. More Latino voters say that the economy, health care and terrorism are very important.

Several of the Catholic Latinos I met said that abortion laws were their top priority. “If we can close that one clinic,” Iris Chavez told me with a sparkle in her eye, referring to a Planned Parenthood-like women’s clinic that was once located in Manassas, “we can set fire to the nation.” Chavez, 26, was brought into the United States illegally from El Salvador when she was 11 and was protected by Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, which Obama created in 2012 for undocumented millennials who came to the United States as children. She works part-time as a secretary at All Saints Catholic Church, where so many Latinos attend the Sunday afternoon, Spanish-language Mass that they spill from the pews to stand three to four deep against the walls. She doesn’t much like Donald Trump, she told me, but if she could vote, she would vote for him based on her belief that abortion is murder.

Chavez is the kind of Latino that Nixon’s “Brown Mafia” was after — the same kind that Reagan tried to embrace with his 1986 amnesty, which legalized 2.7 million Hispanics who had no criminal history, and the kind that Reince Priebus had hoped the Republican National Committee’s 2012 election autopsy would provoke Republicans to seek again. If the party had followed George W. Bush’s lead, Todos Supermarket might have become a site for G.O.P. events. Carlos Castro, its owner, considered himself “almost 100 percent Republican” until 2007, when the Republicans of Prince William County championed an anti-Hispanic “**Immigration** Resolution,” and he began to reconsider. He’s now an independent. Other conservatives in the county told me that they would keep their votes out of everybody’s reach until a candidate arrives whom they can fully support.

The specter of Trump has roused many Latinos to change their minds about registering; spikes have been documented in North Carolina and Georgia. In California, the rise in registrations early this year was almost double what it was during the same period in 2012. Jairo Castillo, a Nicaraguan-American construction worker in Virginia, complained to me in April that the vote “doesn’t count,” but after Trump secured the Republican nomination in June, he registered to vote for the first time.

Even if a “Trump effect” among Latinos this year does help put Clinton in the White House, will those new voters stay engaged? History suggests they might not. According to the political scientists Matt Barreto and Gary M. Segura, more than a million Latinos in California registered to vote for the first time in the years after the state passed Proposition 187, a 1994 ballot initiative. Prop. 187 prohibited undocumented **immigrants** from state-funded institutions, like schools, and required police officers to report their arrests to federal **immigration** authorities. In a statewide election, the initiative passed with 59 percent of the vote. Pete Wilson, the Republican governor who had championed the measure, won re-election that same fall. Prop. 187 was soon tied up in federal court, which ruled many of its elements unconstitutional, but California’s electorate soon went on to pass a ban on affirmative action (Prop. 209) and a reduction in bilingual education (Prop. 227). Both measures were widely regarded as anti-Hispanic.

Prop. 187 and its cousins had notoriously partisan effects in California. In a paper published in The American Journal of Political Science in 2006, the political scientists Shaun Bowler, Stephen P. Nicholson and Segura found that before 1994 Latinos split their votes almost equally between the two parties. By contrast, after the passage of these propositions, the probability that a Latino would identify as Republican fell by more than two-thirds, erasing all the gains that Republicans made since Ronald Reagan’s 1980 campaign. Data also revealed that the propositions moved many non-Hispanic whites in California into the Democratic column. Attacking undocumented **immigrants** and Latinos had provoked a white backlash against Republicans that mirrors the disaffection that Trump’s nomination has stirred among many party moderates this season.

But as time went on, Prop. 187’s effect on Latino turnout revealed itself to be not a turning point but a blip. Last September, The Los Angeles Times noted that only 17 percent of eligible California Latinos voted in 2014. Turnout was similar among Asian-Americans, while all other racial and ethnic groups combined voted more than twice as much. “By all accounts, the Central Valley is a place where Latino candidates should win elections,” the reporter Kate Linthicum noted. “Yet Latino candidates’ election losses have piled up here in recent years — in large part because Latinos aren’t turning out to vote.”

Among those defeated in 2014 was Amanda Renteria, now the national political director for Hillary Clinton’s presidential campaign. Renteria ran for Congress in a Central Valley district that was 74 percent Hispanic. She grew up in the Central Valley and taught math at her old high school in Woodlake before attending Harvard Business School and becoming the first Latina chief of staff in the history of the Senate. She lost her 2014 bid for Congress by 17 points. If Latinos had turned out for her at the levels that African-Americans turned out for Obama, it’s possible that today she would sit in Congress.

This March, the Public Policy Institute of California released a report that detailed the gulf that has opened up in California politics since the Prop. 187 surge. “Voters in California,” it noted, “tend to be older, white, college educated, affluent and homeowners. They also tend to identify themselves as ‘haves’ — rather than ‘have-nots’ — when asked to choose between these two economic categories. Nonvoters tend to be younger, Latino, renters, less affluent and less likely to be college educated than likely voters — and they generally identify themselves as have-nots.”

California may be a majority-minority state in terms of its population, the report observed, but its electorate is not: 60 percent of its likely voters are white, while only 18 percent are Latino. It would be naïve, however, to expect Democrats to throw themselves wholeheartedly into the project of turning out the state’s Hispanics given that they already control solid majorities in California’s State Assembly and State Senate.

“We have to be honest,” María Teresa Kumar, the president and co-founder of Voto Latino, a nonpartisan organization, told me last fall. “When it comes to voter registration, each party is looking to the Latino community and the African-American community for enough votes. They don’t need us all.” From her office in Washington, she directs efforts to engage young Latinos who are often navigating the political system for their families. “Our job,” Kumar said, “is to do true political empowerment: It’s mass mobilization and mass participation. And for parties, it’s about how little do they need to spend to get over the top.”

If Virginia’s battleground status suggests a triumph of the Latino vote, it also provides a cautionary tale about its limitations. In early August, Senator Tim Kaine, Hillary Clinton’s running mate, appeared in the green-and-yellow gymnasium of Huguenot High School in Richmond. “Yes, we Kaine!” the crowd shouted under the floodlights. His homecoming rally doubled as a history lesson. Kaine pointed out that Virginia had gone 170 years without a president or vice-president. When he moved to Virginia in 1984, he said, neither Republicans nor Democrats bothered to campaign in the state, a situation that he attributed to a conservative lock on power that depended upon marginalizing women and minorities. “We pushed you away from the table,” he said. But since Barack Obama turned Virginia into a battleground, it has become a campaign stop for every would-be president. “It’s much better to live in state where no one can take you for granted,” Kaine said.

The shift that brought volunteers like Keisy Chavez to the Democratic table actually began long before Obama. When Mark Warner was elected governor in 2001, his campaign strategy relied on winning rural, Nascar-loving Republicans, not on including minorities. But Kaine’s own gubernatorial victory in 2005 used an urban-suburban strategy that relied upon the participation of Northern Virginia’s fast-growing, multiethnic communities. Given Kaine’s experiences arguing civil rights cases and his work as a missionary in Honduras, the shift may have reflected personal affinities. It was also a canny response to Virginia’s changing demographics. According to the University of Virginia’s Demographics Research Group, in 1970 only one in 100 Virginians were born outside of the United States. By 2012, that ratio had increased to one in nine. Such demographic transformations are hardly unique to the state. Between 1990 and 2008, the number of Latinos living in Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee grew by 602 percent, prompting political scientists to dub the region the “Nuevo South.” “If you put your faith in the Virginia voter,” Kaine recalled telling the candidate Obama in 2008, “You’re going to win Virginia.”

Yet the majority of Virginia’s General Assembly is still Republican, and only two of its state-level representatives, the delegates Alfonso Lopez and Jason Miyares, are Latino. Harry Wiggins, the chairman of Prince William County’s Democratic Committee, described the problem like this: “We win the presidential. We won for Mark Warner. We won for Tim Kaine. We won for Terry McAuliffe. Yet the county board we lose, because they have off-year elections, and we have very light turnout.”

Figueroa is already preparing for the inevitable drop. “The numbers are going to plummet next year in places that count, like Prince William,” he told me. In 2015, the Census Bureau weighed Prince William County at 22.3 percent Latino, 21.8 percent African-American and 8.7 percent Asian. The chairman of its board of supervisors, however, is Corey Stewart, a Republican, who is also chairman of Donald Trump’s campaign in the state. “When he is president and I am governor, you’re going to see one helluva tag team in Virginia, and we’re finally going to remove illegal **immigrants**,” Stewart told The Richmond Times-Dispatch in June. The gubernatorial race will occur next year, when no other state in the country except New Jersey will be holding elections.

While Kaine spoke, Figueroa stood near the press box, tapping at his phone and taking in the scene. In the days leading up to the rally, he mentioned several times that he was working to make the event “blacker and browner.” His handiwork was evident in the V.I.P. bleachers directly in front of the television cameras, where a group of people sat, many of them wearing the unmistakable bright blue-and-white jerseys of El Salvador’s national soccer team. They were students, parents and teachers associated with the English-as-a-second-language program at Huguenot High School and its International Club. Their V.I.P. seating had come from Figueroa. Their homemade red, white and blue sign “Juntos Se Puede!” (“Together we can!”) gave Kaine a camera-ready opportunity that he seized, pointing to them and leading a round of “Sí se puede!” — a chant that will always have special resonance for those who know that it originated not in 2008 with Obama but with Cesar Chavez and Dolores Huerta in 1972.

After Kaine finished his speech, as “Shake It Off” blasted through the gym, several of these students joined the throng vying for an opportunity to snap a selfie with him. I asked two of them what they knew about Kaine. “He was mayor of Virginia,” one said. The other added that he had lived in Honduras and was a friend of Latinos. That was all that they seemed to know. Two parents I spoke with told me, in Spanish, that they understood only pieces of Kaine’s speech, which was in English. This explained why one father appeared so poker-faced through much of the rally. Unless his son translated the speeches for him, he couldn’t form an opinion. He didn’t understand what was being said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Emily Blunt[http://movies.nytimes.com/person/412768/Emily-Blunt?inline=nyt-per]’s metamorphosis into Rachel Watson, the physically ravaged, emotionally shattered alcoholic in “The Girl on the Train[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KkoEE1i0CX8]” (out Oct. 7) burrowed deeper than a mere Hollywood make-under.

“I don’t have an addictive personality whatsoever, so it was like wearing somebody else’s skin,” Ms. Blunt said of portraying the New York City suburbanite obsessed with a seemingly perfect couple she glimpses each day on her soused commute — just two doors down from where her ex-husband lives with his new wife and baby. And when her fantasy woman goes missing in this feverishly anticipated adaptation of the Paula Hawkins literary sensation, Rachel, her memory failing, fears she is responsible.

“As **alien** as this person is to who I truly am, I had to understand her and empathize and get into that mind-set,” Ms. Blunt added. “The thing I found most helpful was watching ‘Intervention[https://www.youtube.com/show/intervention]’ on a loop until I had seen every type of addiction in action.”

Since snap-snapping her fingers into stardom as Miranda Priestly’s senior assistant in “The Devil Wears Prada,” Ms. Blunt has revealed an impressive range, veering from an **alien**-battling warrior in “Edge of Tomorrow” to the barren Baker’s Wife in the screen musical “Into the Woods” to an F.B.I. agent stalking a Mexican drug cartel in “Sicario[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/06/movies/emily-blunt-plunges-into-the-drug-wars-morass-in-sicario.html?\_r=0].”

Offscreen, she’s the mother of 2½-year-old Hazel and 3-month-old Violet, her daughters with her husband, John Krasinski. In a phone interview from their Brooklyn home, the London-born, crisply funny Ms. Blunt, 33, talked about filming while pregnant and life with another actor. These are edited excerpts from the conversation.

Were you a fan of the book before you took on the role?

I was determined not to read the book initially because I saw everyone else and their auntie reading it. Then the producer called me and said, “We’re really interested in you for it, and do you want to have a read and see what you think?” I could quickly see why it became the phenomenon that it did. These domestic thrillers are quite tantalizing for readers. You can see yourself in these people. And that idea of danger being close to home is exciting.

What appealed about Rachel?

I don’t think I’ve ever played somebody who is living in such a dark place, who is truly in the depths of despair. And it was such an unusual element for your female protagonist, your heroine, to be a blackout drunk. In these movies that are expected to be blockbusters, women are usually held in some sort of feminine ideal, so that they’re appealing and likable and pretty. And I just thought, How fantastic that she looks like this and that she is your eyes and ears, the most unreliable witness, the most unreliable narrator in the world. It was a very easy yes.

Your Rachel is not the very overweight Rachel of the book.

Tate [Taylor[http://movies.nytimes.com/person/1225545/Tate-Taylor?inline=nyt-per], the director, whose credits include “The Help”] wanted it being less that she physically had let herself go and more a state of mind. She is not just an addict. She is compulsive and voyeuristic and damaged and self-loathing. Considers herself dangerous. I thought, What a thrill to play somebody who spends the entirety of the film living in fear of their own abilities and their own downfalls.

What are the hallmarks of her addiction?

Oh, huge guilt and huge regret — and regret is one of the most horrific emotions. She’s been spun a whole web of lies that she so readily believes about herself. She is certainly not somebody who walks into every room with great hope. She walks into every room with the idea that nobody wants to breathe the same air as her.

How far did Tate allow you to go in finding the character?

He gives you free rein, and I found that very helpful, to not feel straitjacketed or to conform to somebody else’s vision. She really needed to be my own, because it was such a stretch for me. The more I do this job, the more I realize that so much about performance is creating happy environments for people and making sure that they know that they can mess up and it doesn’t matter. You can always go again.

Did it bother you that the setting was moved from London to Ardsley, N.Y.?

In a way you can transplant this movie and put it anywhere, because that suburban commute is universal.

Did you actually shoot on a train?

We shot all of the interior stuff on this incredible rig that they made with green screen and plate shots. It was incredibly technical and complicated, and everyone just felt really seasick, because the train was jiggling around and moving but going nowhere. So it was like being in some weird twilight zone. And it was suffocatingly hot, and the poor extras were barely being offered a thimble of water.

And you were pregnant on top of it.

The only person who knew was Justin Theroux, because he’s my long-term friend. And he guessed, because I was being a bit of a wuss about some of the stunts. He was like, “You did ‘Edge of Tomorrow.’ What is wrong with you? Are you pregnant?” And I was like: “Yes, but shut up! Don’t tell anybody!” Then I had to tell Tate a little further along, because there was that scene in the bathtub, and I was like: “Here’s the deal. You have to shoot it from behind.” And he was like, “Why?” And I was like, “No. 1, because I don’t want to show everything, but No. 2, because of this.” I was like 20 weeks when we finished.

You’ve spoken out about the need for pay equity in Hollywood. Do you feel you’ve made a difference?

It is up to people like me, in my very fortunate position, to fight for equal pay, because that means that people who have less of a voice may receive the same. But I honestly don’t know if speaking out is the thing that makes the difference. I think it’s more in how I react when I’m making a deal.

You’ve been cast as Mary Poppins in a coming remake, and Julie Andrews has given you her stamp of approval.

Well, thank God! Can you imagine if she was like, “Oh God, not her”? I’d be devastated. But I’m very excited. My heart races about it, actually. And what a gift as a mom to have that for my daughters.

What’s it like being a working mother in a two-actor family?

[Laughs sharply] Sometimes actresses talk about being a working mother as if they’re the only working mothers in the world. My sister, for example, is a literary agent who literally wakes up to 800 emails in her inbox, and she has a 19-month-old. I don’t know how she does it. I actually get long chunks of time off that I take very seriously, because my kids are at very tender ages where they need me. And I’m very fortunate, because there are so many mothers who don’t get to be picky about when they work.

The two-actor family thing has always been something wonderful for John and I, because we deeply understand what each other do and have a shared love of it. Actresses say to me, “Oh I could never be with an actor.” But I think it depends on the actor. You know, I just happen to be with a very secure, wonderful one.

With great abs, according to People magazine.

With great abs. Exactly.

\* Another Girl Gone in a Tale of Betrayal[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/05/books/the-girl-on-the-train-by-paula-hawkins.html]

\* Welcoming the Dark Twist in Her Career[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/31/books/paula-hawkinss-journey-to-the-girl-on-the-train.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As so much of our world’s population ages and faces the attendant burden of Alzheimer’s and other forms of dementia[http://health.nytimes.com/health/guides/disease/dementia/overview.html?inline=nyt-classifier], the rest of us are left to consider the collective mysteries of memory. When just about all is forgotten, how do we process what remains?

We both have long been interested in these alternative takes on memory, especially the premise of forgetting. Through research we learned that in the first stages of Alzheimer’s, the individual tends to remember early childhood most clearly — in many cases, as vividly as if it had just happened. So we wondered what this experience might be like for an **immigrant** afflicted by the disease, someone whose childhood home was radically different from the environment he or she inhabited later in life.

The Danish film festival CPH:DOX had invited us two years ago to make a film together, but being from Chile and Lithuania, we had never met, and it felt like a blind date. As we tried to figure out each other’s styles and interests, however, we quickly settled on this topic, which seemed to lend itself naturally to the type of conceptual film we are both drawn to. We were especially interested in capturing the feeling of **alienation** inherent to **immigration** — and also, perhaps, to living in a nursing home: the feeling of not truly being at home. We decided to make our film in Chile, a country that saw an influx of **immigration** in the 20th century, and searched there for **immigrants** afflicted with Alzheimer’s.

Finally we found our protagonist Josebe, a Basque **immigrant** in a Chilean retirement home, who is certain she’s somewhere else. At age 91, Josebe’s memory worked as we imagined, against the striking backdrop of her fiercely intense personality. Watching her grapple with her affliction, we saw that the contrast of her memory’s limitations with the strength of her character could not have been clearer, not even if scripted for a fiction film. So as directors from different nations, with different languages, we worked to fit her experience into one that transcended that of a Spanish **immigrant** to Chile, into one that felt fittingly universal. Josebe’s character and actions flow naturally before the camera. She was our guide, showing us how this film should unfold.

We found that this extraordinary woman helped us explore how the past defines us, even when we are unable to remember what happened yesterday. Alzheimer’s may erase the present, but our lives’ milestones remain alive in our minds. In this way, the past coexists with the present, forged together from daily experiences. From it, we see a new reality: a lucid portrait of mental illness, one projected with humor and joy on every memory we cherish.

Op-Docs[http://www.nytimes.com/video/landing/op-docs/100000001150263/index.html] is a forum for short, opinionated documentaries, produced with creative latitude by independent filmmakers and artists. Learn more[http://www.nytimes.com/ref/opinion/about-op-docs.html] about Op-Docs and how to submit[http://www.nytimes.com/content/help/site/editorial/op-video/video.html?ref=opinion] to the series.
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Maite Alberdi, is a Chilean director and producer who directed the documentary features “The Lifeguard” (2011) and “Tea Time” (2016). Her previous Op-Doc is “Another Tea?” Giedre Zickyte is a Lithuanian film director and producer, who directed the documentary features “How We Played the Revolution” (2011) and “Master and Tatyana” (2015).

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Jacob Monty is not a RINO — a Republican in Name Only — even though some of his hate mail says otherwise. Mr. Monty, an **immigration** lawyer in Houston, has been deeply involved in Republican politics in Texas and nationally for much of the past 20 years. He was a fund-raiser for both of George W. Bush’s campaigns, and estimates that he has personally contributed more than $250,000 to Republican candidates.

But this year’s presidential race has pushed Mr. Monty to abandon his party’s presidential nominee.

On Aug. 20, Mr. Monty and a group of Hispanic Republicans on an advisory council to Donald J. Trump gathered[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/trump-national-hispanic-advisory-council/] at Trump Tower in New York to discuss Mr. Trump’s **immigration** proposals. They left with the impression[http://www.univision.com/univision-news/politics/trump-now-says-he-plans-to-legalize-some-undocumented-immigrants] that Mr. Trump had changed course and would put forward a plan that included a path to legal status for some undocumented **immigrants**. Mr. Monty said he felt that he’d just met “the real Donald Trump.”

“I connected with him — I think everyone at the table did,” he said. He added: “I’m not going to say who I think the real Donald Trump is. I think I met him on Aug. 20.”

Whomever he met then, someone else spoke at the end of the month, when Mr. Trump used a speech in Phoenix to double down[http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-donald-trump-immigration-speech-transcript-20160831-snap-htmlstory.html] on his hard-line position on **immigration**, call for a “new special deportation task force” and lay the blame for all of society’s ills — from crime, to joblessness, to an implicit loss of America’s cultural identity — squarely at the feet of **immigrants**.

That was the end for Mr. Monty and Mr. Trump. While Mr. Monty plans to support Republicans in state and local races, and hopes his party maintains control of Congress, he will not be voting for Mr. Trump. Neither will many Hispanic Republicans who say they cannot tolerate Mr. Trump’s policies, especially on **immigration**.

Many Republican strategists, donors and other members of the party establishment — especially minority men and women — have made their disgust with their nominee known. Mr. Trump’s candidacy has been especially frustrating for the people who have worked to bolster the party’s dismal outreach to black and Hispanic voters in recent years.

How does it feel to be a black or Hispanic Republican this year, and to see Mr. Trump rise to the top of your party?

“If I were to sum it up in one word, the word is depressing,” said Charles Badger, who oversaw outreach to black voters for Jeb Bush’s presidential campaign. Mr. Trump, he said, “has sent the party back to, I don’t know, the Stone Age — it’s that bad.”

In 2004, Massey Villarreal was the national chairman of the Republican National Hispanic Assembly. His work helped President Bush earn 40 percent[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/11/07/latino-voters-in-the-2012-election/] of the Hispanic vote in 2004, a height unmatched by Republican nominees since.

Mr. Villarreal was another member of Mr. Trump’s Hispanic Advisory Council. And, like Mr. Monty and other members of the council[https://www.buzzfeed.com/adriancarrasquillo/the-rise-and-fall-of-trumps-hispanic-advisory-council?utm\_term=.mlZ6WZQmO%23.koDvDqKxA], Mr. Villarreal resigned after watching Mr. Trump’s speech in Phoenix.

“It was a nativist, xenophobic speech,” Mr. Villareal said in a text message. “The enforcement-only speech is of no real value to America.”

In conversations with disaffected Republican operatives, one question arose over and over: Who is the real Donald Trump? And does it matter if he acts one way in private, and another way in public?

“I don’t know whether Donald Trump is a racist or not,” said Mr. Badger. “What I know is that he plays a racist on TV, and that’s actually much, much, much worse.”

Mr. Monty said he found it worrisome that Mr. Trump acted one way in private and another way in front of a crowd.

“In person he’s humble — ‘I hear you, I want to learn,’ — but you can’t turn it off like that,” said Mr. Monty. “There’s clearly a pattern here, and that’s not good. That’s not leadership.”

Ron Christie remembers being one of the few black Republican staff members on Capitol Hill in 1991, when he worked for John Kasich, then a representative from central Ohio. He went on to work for Vice President Dick Cheney, and then as a special assistant to President Bush. He said Mr. Trump’s candidacy is a “disaster” for his party.

“The Republican Party that I started off with in 1991 died when Donald Trump received the nomination,” he said.

As Mr. Trump neared the nomination, the Republican National Committee experienced an exodus of black and Hispanic staff members. Orlando Watson, a spokesman who specialized in dealing with the black news media, left[http://www.nbcnews.com/news/nbcblk/rnc-losing-top-black-staffer-n533671] in March, as did Kristal Quarker-Hartsfield[http://www.nbcnews.com/news/nbcblk/yet-another-top-african-american-staffer-departs-rnc-n548506], the national director of African-American initiatives. Tara Wall[https://www.buzzfeed.com/darrensands/tara-wall-top-black-gop-operative-is-out-at-the-rnc], a senior strategist for media and engagement, who did black outreach for Mitt Romney’s 2012 campaign, also departed.

Ruth Guerra, the committee’s director of Hispanic media, left in June to work for a conservative “super PAC,” and was reported to have told colleagues she felt uncomfortable working to get Mr. Trump elected. The party hired[http://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/election/article81270292.html] Helen Aguirre Ferré, who had been a senior adviser to Jeb Bush’s primary campaign, to replace Ms. Guerra. Ms. Ferré had to delete negative tweets[http://mediamatters.org/blog/2016/06/02/rnc-s-newest-hispanic-outreach-director-scrubs-tweets-warning-about-dangers-trump/210671] she had written about Mr. Trump during the primary.

Republican strategists are worried about Mr. Trump’s impact on their ability to win over Hispanics, and for good reason. From 2000 to 2014, the United States-born Hispanic population grew[http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/04/19/statistical-portrait-of-hispanics-in-the-united-states-key-charts/%23hispanic-pop] by 70 percent, to 36 million from 21 million. A recent poll found that only 19 percent[http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/09/clinton-trounces-trump-new-poll-latino-voters] of Latino voters (and just 1 percent[http://time.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/4389251/donald-trump-1-percent-support-poll/] of black voters) supported Mr. Trump.

Lionel Sosa is not in that 19 percent. This veteran political consultant said he became a Republican after watching Dwight D. Eisenhower accept his party’s nomination in 1952.

“He sounded a lot like my dad talking about personal responsibility,” Mr. Sosa said. “I thought, ‘Man, I’m a Republican!’”

Mr. Sosa has worked on eight Republican presidential campaigns, writing and producing political advertisements aimed at Hispanic voters. This will be the first Republican presidential campaign in 32 years that he hasn’t worked on, he says, because Mr. Trump doesn’t respect Latinos like himself.

“When he says ‘Make America Great Again,’ to me, it means, ‘Make America White Again,’ make it the way it used to be when there were only other people like ‘us’ in this country,” Mr. Sosa said. He plans to vote for Gary Johnson, the Libertarian Party candidate, in November.

Mr. Badger said Mr. Trump’s candidacy would create a hole in the party “that will take generations to climb out of.”

“We are receding more and more and more into just being a white Southern party that’s really only viable in Western Plains states and the Deep South,” he said. “By definition, that makes you not a national party.”

After November, anti-Trump Republicans can only hope they will find a party they can take pride in returning to, and one that regains national ambitions. But even if Mr. Trump loses, and loses badly, it’s unclear whether party leaders will take this lesson to heart by renouncing their support for Mr. Trump or if they’ll simply shrug it off and expect voters — and the black and Hispanic Republicans who fled the party — to give them a mulligan.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Emma Roller (@EmmaRoller), a former reporter for National Journal, is a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

Welcome to Watching, The New York Times’s what-to-watch guide. We comb through releases big and small to email readers twice a week with our timely recommendations. You can browse previous guides here[http://www.nytimes.com/column/watching], and to receive recommendations straight to your inbox, sign up here[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/watching?module=articletext-watching]. Stay tuned for our coming website.

Dear Watchers,

The Emmys are Sunday, and we’ll have plenty of coverage coming up this weekend, but for now, let’s take one last look at the summer that was. Today’s newsletter rounds up the worthy shows that came out in the last few months, some of which you might have missed, and some of which you might have added to ye olde DVR but have not gotten to.

Happy watching.

The Buzziest Shows of the Summer

“O.J.: Made in America” is maybe Watching’s most mentioned TV specimen so far, and with good reason: It’s one of the best mini-series in living memory. ESPN’s five-part documentary is gripping and educational and made what I thought was a familiar story into something completely new and riveting. If you don’t want to commit, at least watch the first episode, which alone is one of the best documentaries about race in Los Angeles you are likely ever to see. (Watch on ESPN.[http://www.espn.com/30for30/ojsimpsonmadeinamerica/])

Neflix’s “Stranger Things” has captured the internet’s imagination to a degree that surpasses understanding. It’s pretty good, and I enjoyed it tremendously, but I have no idea how it became such a thing. Aspirational nostalgia from people too young to actually remember 1983? Maybe! “Stranger” is radically straightforward for a horror story: It isn’t trying to trick you, and it isn’t trying to wink at you. (I didn’t find it all that scary, but I am in the minority.) (Watch on Netflix.[https://www.netflix.com/title/80057281])

“The Great British Baking Show” makes its way to PBS on a seemingly arbitrary schedule, but if one has to endure frustrating broadcast delays in order to encounter the most charming food show currently airing, well, that’s just the way the cookie crumbles. Big-hearted but brutally exacting, the series pulls off a feat almost unheard of on reality contest shows: There’s zero away-from-the-kitchen drama. The entire story of every episode revolves solely around baking triumphs and failures. Let this show inspire you to live every day as if you were a “star baker.” (Watch on PBS[http://www.pbs.org/show/great-british-baking-show/] and Netflix[https://www.netflix.com/title/80063224].)

Some Overlooked Gems

Sometimes great shows don’t capture “the conversation.” Boo. These shows are fantastic; give ‘em a go if you haven’t already.

The megachurch ensemble drama “Greenleaf” premiered as OWN’s biggest show ever, and yet it didn’t seem to be particularly buzzy[http://www.slate.com/blogs/browbeat/2016/08/30/greenleaf\_is\_a\_major\_hit\_so\_why\_aren\_t\_more\_people\_talking\_about\_it.html]. While its network mate “Queen Sugar” is destined for more acclaim, “Greenleaf” deserves plenty of attention, too. It’s vibrant and smart, and not afraid of soapier moments. (Watch on the OWN app.[http://www.greenleafown.tv/])

If you miss “Friday Night Lights[http://www.nytimes.com/watching/recommendations/watching-tv-friday-night-lights?te=1&nl=watching&emc=edit\_wg\_20160912]” — don’t we all? — watch Netflix’s “Last Chance U,” a six-episode documentary series about a community college football team that sends most of its players on to Division I programs. After you watch it, please tweet me[https://twitter.com/margeincharge] your thoughts, because I want to talk about this show so much. ( Watch on Netflix[https://www.netflix.com/title/80091742] .)

For anyone who likes medical shows, “Boston EMS” is an absorbing spin. It’s a documentary series that never crosses the threshold of a hospital; the show only takes place on the road and in the ambulances. Rare is the series that can make you care so much so quickly. (Watch on ABC.[http://abc.go.com/shows/boston-ems])

“Take My Wife,” on NBC’s comedy streaming service Seeso, is a quick six episodes, but they charmed me so much I watched them twice. Stand-ups and wives Cameron Esposito and Rhea Butcher star as loosely themselves, and the show covers the ins and outs of the Los Angeles comedy scene without being tragic or sleazy. There are a ton of shows right now where comedians play themselves, but “Wife” is the only one pulling off stand-up-as-selfhood, exploring the idea that the more you’re yourself in your life, the better your comedy becomes. ( Watch on Seeso for Amazon.[https://www.amazon.com/dp/B01IU9MRM6/ref=DVM\_US\_JK\_PS\_TAKEMYWIFEHTb1] )

Maybe You’ll Like These Shows (or Maybe Not)

Some people loved them! Some people didn’t care at all! Which one are you? I don’t know! You are the captain of your own vessels. I can only offer guidance.

CBS’s twisted political black comedy “BrainDead,” from the creators of “The Good Wife,” was a tough sell. **Alien** ants crawl into politicos’ ears, turn them extra partisan, and sometimes heads literally explode. I didn’t always grasp the rules that governed the **alien** invasion, but both Mary Elizabeth Winstead’s sparkling performance and Jonathan Coulton’s silly songs that served as the “previously on” segments delighted me. (Watch on Amazon.[https://www.amazon.com/BrainDead-Season-1/dp/B01H0KBQS2])

If “Stranger Things” hadn’t come out this summer, would “The Get Down” have been Netflix’s big show? It’s someone’s job to know the answer to that, but not mine. Baz Luhrmann’s hip-hop origin story, set in the Bronx in the 1970s, has a messy pilot but pulls itself together in subsequent episodes. I didn’t have the real estate for another sprawling show, but maybe you do. (Watch on Netflix[https://www.netflix.com/title/80025601].)

If you want to watch two attractive actors in attractive locations learn about attractive beverages, then yeah, “The Wine Show” is for you. But maybe you are just a salty crab crabbing around, and you want educational shows to be more substantive, cohesive and convincing. A toast to however you are. (Watch on Hulu.[http://www.hulu.com/the-wine-show])

Wait, That Was a Show?

If you thought those hidden gems above were hidden, well … these were even more hidden.“Still the King” is a Billy Ray Cyrus vehicle on CMT where he plays a washed-up singer pretending to be a minister back in his rural hometown. I know, I know. But it’s reminiscent of “My Name Is Earl” in all the good ways, and it’s an undercover sweetheart of a show. ( Watch on CMT[http://www.cmt.com/shows/still-the-king/video/full-episodes/] .)

On the drama front, TNT’s “Animal Kingdom” really aimed for a “Diet ‘Sons Of Anarchy’” vibe and mostly hit it — it’s physically and emotionally violent, bordering on grotesque. Ellen Barkin stars as the matriarch of a California crime family, where‚ if you can believe it, there is not honor among thieves. ( Watch on TNT Drama[http://www.tntdrama.com/shows/animal-kingdom.html] .)

I didn’t love “Queen of the South,” USA’s drug queenpin drama adapted from a popular book and Telemundo telenovela, but I might give it another try knowing that Season 2 will have a different showrunner[http://variety.com/2016/tv/news/queen-of-the-south-renewed-season-2-usa-network-1201851515/]. But if you have an insatiable appetite for stories of violent drug trafficking, theoretically you could do worse. ( Watch on USA.[http://www.usanetwork.com/queenofthesouth] )

Something Foreign Must Have Aired, Right?

Indeed. Lots of good stuff, actually.

If you like low-concept family dramas that still have potent dialogue, try the British series“The A Word,” about a family whose 5-year-old son is autistic. It’s the right amount of emotional without being wrenching — it’s not a show that wrecks you, but you might want to drink tea and wear sweaters for a while after watching it. ( Watch on Sundance.[http://www.sundance.tv/series/the-a-word] )

Satisfying though never surprising, Australia’s “Cleverman” uses Aboriginal mythology in its superhero storytelling. It’s reminiscent of “District 9” and “Black Mirror,” but a bit sloppier and less horrific. ( Watch on Netflix.[https://www.netflix.com/title/80107077] )

For many viewers, the only thing better than a British murder show is a Scandinavian murder show. “The Tunnel” is somewhere in between as a British adaptation of a Scandinavian series. If you’ve watched the original “Bron/Broen,” or the American adaptation “The Bridge,” this politically-tinted serial killer mystery will seem redundant, but if not, there are thrills aplenty. (Watch on PBS.[http://www.pbs.org/show/tunnel/])

There are plenty of dead-girl shows, but “Thirteen” is the rare alive-girl show: Ivy is a 26-year-old woman who was kidnapped 13 years ago and has now returned. It’s creepy and haunting, and luckily moves very quickly. Is England half murderers? Maybe! (Watch on BBC America.[http://www.bbcamerica.com/shows/thirteen])

What Will Be the Next Cool Series?

Amazon’s two most promising pilots this go-round are Jill Soloway’s “I Love Dick[https://www.amazon.com/I-Love-Dick/dp/B01J77H9Z0]” and the reboot of “The Tick[https://www.amazon.com/The-Tick-Season-1/dp/B0013SL6WE].” Could Amazon market this in a package called “Dick and the Tick”? They could but shouldn’t. “Dick” stars Kathryn Hahn as a frustrated filmmaker who develops an obsession with a mysterious academic (Kevin Bacon). And “The Tick” is an effective entry in the very saturated superhero genre, satirical but thoughtful and textured.

Watch This Movie Before It Leaves Netflix

On Sept. 17, “Gimme the Loot” will expire from Netflix. In this wonderful “summer in the city” movie, Malcolm (Ty Hickson) and Sofia (Tashiana Washington) are burgeoning graffiti artists struggling to gain respect. So they hatch a plan to boost their reputation: tag a New York City icon so that no one will forget them. But it’s the lived-in, realistic friendship between Malcolm and Sofia that makes “Gimme the Loot” memorable. ( Watch on Netflix[http://www.netflix.com/watch/70234896]; watch the trailer and add the film to your watchlist here[http://www.nytimes.com/watching/recommendations/watching-film-gimme-the-loot?te=1&nl=watching&emc=edit\_wg\_20160912].) — Monica Castillo

Wait, One More Thing

“American Horror Story” returns for its sixth season on Wednesday. At this point, you probably know if you like “A.H.S.” or not. Unlike previous years, FX hasn’t announced the premise or setting for the season, nor have they sent episodes to critics. Enter at your own risk.

Correction: September 13, 2016, Tuesday

An earlier version of a picture caption with this article misidentified one of the actor’s in “Stranger Things.” He is Noah Schnapp, not Finn Wolfhard, another cast member.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction Appended

WASHINGTON — A contentious visa program that allows wealthy foreigners to obtain a green card by investing in economic development projects will expire at the end of this month unless Congress acts to extend it.

The program, called EB-5[https://www.uscis.gov/eb-5], allows foreign investors to gain a quicker path to citizenship by investing from $500,000 to more than $1 million to finance a business that eventually employs, directly or indirectly, at least 10 American workers in economically depressed areas.

Developers and supporters in Congress say the program, run by the Department of Homeland Security[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/organization/homeland-security-department?inline=nyt-org], has brought billions of dollars to areas that would otherwise not have access to capital.

But the program has been marred by fraud and used to build large projects in wealthier areas like Manhattan and the Las Vegas Strip instead of high-unemployment or rural areas. Federal investigators have also discovered that attempts to infiltrate the program were made by people with possible ties to Chinese and Iranian intelligence, and that international fugitives who laundered money in their home countries gained citizenship through the program.

More recently, federal prosecutors in April charged two Vermont developers, Ariel Quiros and William Stenger, with defrauding investors[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/11/us/fraud%2Dcharges%2Dmar%2Da%2Dplan%2Dto%2Daid%2Da%2Dstruggling%2Dvermont%2Dregion.html] from at least 74 countries. Federal and state officials said the two raised $350 million through the EB-5 program for an array of projects including a ski resort.

According to a 52-count civil complaint[http://www.sec.gov/litigation/complaints/2016/comp-pr2016-69.pdf] filed by the federal Securities and Exchange Commission[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/securities\_and\_exchange\_commission/index.html?inline=nyt-org] and a 15-count complaint[http://www.dfr.vermont.gov/jay-peak-eb-5-lawsuit] by Vermont, the developers engaged in a “massive eight-year fraudulent scheme” in which they “systematically looted” millions of dollars from the foreign investors. Mr. Quiros was accused of using $50 million for personal expenses including a luxury condominium at Trump Place in New York.

Mr. Stenger announced in a statement this month that he had reached a settlement with the federal government. The case against Mr. Quiros is pending.

Critics of the EB-5 program, like Senators Charles E. Grassley[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/g/charles\_e\_grassley/index.html?inline=nyt-per], Republican of Iowa, and Patrick J. Leahy, Democrat of Vermont, see reauthorization of the program as an opportunity to fix problems with how the money is used, increase oversight and address national security issues. They sent a letter on Thursday to Senate leaders opposing reauthorization of the program without a significant overhaul.

“The program has become plagued by fraud and abuse and, if not reformed, it should be allowed to expire on September 30th,” they wrote.

Proponents, including the United States[http://www.usmayors.org/] Conference of Mayors[http://www.usmayors.org/], have urged Congress to leave the program intact, although they say they support some of the changes lawmakers are expected to consider.

“There is a need for more oversight and transparency,” said Ronald R. Fieldstone, a Miami lawyer who has been involved in using EB-5 funding for development projects. “If there is no independence in the administering and the distribution of the funds, it exposes the program to instances of fraud.”

But Mr. Grassley and Mr. Leahy say other changes are needed.

The program, which was created in 1990, has expanded well beyond its original intent, they say. EB-5 requires an investment in either a rural area or a “targeted employment area,” which is defined as an urban area with an unemployment rate of at least 150 percent of the national average.

But Mr. Grassley and Mr. Leahy said developers had broadly defined these areas by adding a few low-income communities to wealthier neighborhoods so they could use EB-5 funding to build luxury condos, convention centers and hotels, amounting to what the senators said was economic gerrymandering.

Angelique Brunner, owner of a Washington-based center that raises capital through the EB-5 program, said many of the examples that critics point to as EB-5 investments in upscale areas failed to note that the program helped transform places that were previously economically depressed.

“One of the challenges of EB-5 investment is that people look at what an area looks like after the investment,” she said. “It’s hard to convince them what it looked like before.”

The EB-5 program has grown rapidly. About 10,000 visas are awarded annually, primarily to wealthy Chinese citizens, who make up about 80 percent of the investors and see the program as an easier way to gain United States citizenship for themselves and their families.

Senator Dianne Feinstein, Democrat of California, said the EB-5 program has sent a terrible message to millions of **immigrants** waiting their turn to enter the United States through normal channels. A number of other members of Congress echo her concerns, in large part because while most visa applicants must meet education or work requirements, the primary requirement for the EB-5 program is a “lawful source of investment income,” as a Homeland Security memo put it.

Many lawmakers say there are also national security concerns. A Government Accountability Office report[http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-15-696] released last year found that the agency could not be sure that money used for the visas was not coming from “the drug trade, human trafficking or other criminal activities.”

Officials at Homeland Security Investigations[https://www.ice.gov/hsi], a division of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, said they were concerned that those who prepare overseas documents “may try to use increasingly sophisticated methods to circumvent” the program. In a 2013 memo, the agency suggested that the EB-5 regional center program end because “there are no safeguards that can be put in place that will ensure the integrity” of the regional center model.

United States Citizenship and **Immigration** Services[https://www.uscis.gov/], the agency that oversees the EB-5 program, said it was taking additional steps to increase the vetting of applicants for the program and its oversight of the regional centers The S.E.C. said it would increase oversight as well.

Lawmakers have not said when they would take up the EB-5 reauthorization. Last year, the program was extended as part of the omnibus spending bill.

Correction: September 14, 2016, Wednesday

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: An article on Monday about the EB-5 visa program referred incorrectly to one aspect of the process. The program allows foreign investors to gain permanent residency when they invest between $500,000 and $1 million in a business that creates 10 jobs directly or indirectly. They do not gain citizenship by doing so. (They can apply for full citizenship after five years.) The article also referred incorrectly to Angelique Brunner, a spokeswoman for the EB-5 Investment Coalition, which is made up of investors and developers. Ms. Brunner is the owner of a Washington-based center that raises capital through the EB-5 program; she is not a developer.

\* Visa Abuses Harm American Workers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/16/opinion/visa-abuses-harm-american-workers.html]

\* Program That Lets Foreigners Write a Check, and Get a Visa, Draws Scrutiny[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/16/us/politics/program-that-lets-foreigners-write-a-check-and-get-a-visa-draws-scrutiny.html]

\* Large Companies Game H-1B Visa Program, Costing the U.S. Jobs[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/11/us/large-companies-game-h-1b-visa-program-leaving-smaller-ones-in-the-cold.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Grand Central Terminal[http://www.gcthistory.com/#intro], the main building on Ellis Island[http://www.libertyellisfoundation.org/immigration-museum] and the Enid A. Haupt Conservatory[http://www.nybg.org/gardens/conservatory/] at the New York Botanical Garden[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/new\_york\_botanical\_garden/index.html?inline=nyt-org] — all among the greatest New York City landmarks — look better today than they have since their earliest years.

Many hands were responsible. John Belle was the common denominator.

Mr. Belle, the retired founding partner of Beyer Blinder Belle[http://www.beyerblinderbelle.com/profile/history], an architectural and planning firm that has specialized in preservation, restoration and contextual design, died last week at 84.

With his death, the city has lost an architect who conveyed a genial joy in resuscitating the masterworks of his predecessors. That made him an appealingly modest figure in a room full of big architectural egos, since he was at his best when his own interventions were least obvious.

New York has also lost a link to the intellectual crucible of the 1960s, when Jane Jacobs[http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/26/books/26jacobs.html] and others demanded that architects stop obliterating the past and, instead, take time to understand the many ways in which people were well served by older buildings and neighborhoods.

“Preservation is one of the highest forms of good citizenship,” Mr. Belle said on his firm’s website[http://www.beyerblinderbelle.com/profile/people/john\_belle]. “As a witness to the aftermath of the urban renewal movement in New York, I was determined to find a different way.”

For her part, Ms. Jacobs held Beyer Blinder Belle in high regard.

“They were looking at the fabric of the community,” she said in an interview in[https://www.nytimes.com/1998/06/07/realestate/the-preservation-band-that-sets-the-tone.html] 1998[https://www.nytimes.com/1998/06/07/realestate/the-preservation-band-that-sets-the-tone.html]. “That was very welcome and very exciting, that there were professionals who were, at last, doing that.” She added: “A community can’t just come by waving a wand. It has history. History was, to the modernists, an enemy. So this was a very radical realization. And an important one.”

John Belle was born on June 30, 1932, in Cardiff, Wales. His father, Arthur, was a clerk at a Lyons tea shop in Cardiff. His mother, Gladys, was a housewife. Mr. Belle received diplomas from the Portsmouth School of Architecture in England and the Architectural Association in London before moving to the United States in 1959.

Once in America, Mr. Belle worked for Josep Lluís Sert[http://www.nytimes.com/1983/03/17/obituaries/josep-l-sert-80-architect-was-harvard-dean-of-design.html] and Victor Gruen before starting his own firm in 1968 with Richard L. Blinder and John H. Beyer[http://www.beyerblinderbelle.com/profile/people/john\_h\_beyer]. Mr. Blinder died in 2006[http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/08/arts/08blin.html]. Mr. Beyer is still active.

Mr. Belle’s early work included community planning projects in Manhattan. With the addition of James Marston Fitch[http://www.nytimes.com/2000/04/12/arts/james-marston-fitch-90-architect-and-preservationist.html] to the practice in 1979, Beyer Blinder Belle began moving to the forefront of preservation-oriented architecture.

The firm attracted wide attention in 1990 with its renovation and restoration of the abandoned Ellis Island **immigration**station[http://www.nytimes.com/1990/08/14/arts/review-architecture-gateway-to-america-is-once-again-ready-to-greet-the-masses.html] into the Ellis Island National Museum of **Immigration**. The vaulted ceiling in the former Registry Room, made of 28,258 Guastavino tiles, was cleaned until it looked — as Mr. Belle aptly put it — like mother-of-pearl[http://www.nytimes.com/1987/02/25/nyregion/at-ellis-island-gloomy-ruin-starts-to-shine.html]. Where modern interventions were needed, they were made as inconspicuous and respectful as possible.

When the Haupt Conservatory at the botanical garden in the Bronx was restored in 1997, Herbert Muschamp[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/03/arts/design/04muschamp.html], who was then the architecture critic at The New York Times, said it could “once again hold its sparkling glass head up high[http://www.nytimes.com/1997/05/01/garden/a-flower-reopens-in-the-bronx.html] amid the great architectural symbols of New York.”

Though critics have faulted Beyer Blinder Belle’s conservatism, it is worth recalling that the firm was associated in 1998 with the daring architect Santiago Calatrava[http://www.calatrava.com/] in what proved to be a losing bid to redesign the James A. Farley Building, also known as the General Post Office, as a Pennsylvania Station annex.

Penn Station was not where Mr. Belle was to win his greatest renown. That was at Grand Central.

You almost had to have been there in the 1970s and ’80s to believe how far the Beaux-Arts terminal had fallen into decrepitude, even after its status as a landmark was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in 1978. Travelers shared Grand Central with a large homeless population.

“The building was divided into turf claimed by different drug dealers,” Mr. Belle and Maxinne R. Leighton wrote in “Grand Central: Gateway to a Million Lives[https://books-google-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/books/about/Grand\_Central.html?id=1lAoZNGmx00C].” “Commuters were scared to take trains there at night. Parents warned their children not to use the dangerous bathrooms.”

In 1990, a design and engineering consortium led by Beyer Blinder Belle began work. Their strategic first strike was to demolish a billboard called the Kodak Colorama, which had blocked daylight into the main concourse for 40 years.

“It was as if life were being breathed back into the building,” Mr. Belle and Ms. Leighton wrote. “Many commuters stopped in their tracks, speechless and amazed at the change that had so instantly brought back the majesty of the space.”

Their astonishment increased as the concourse ceiling was cleaned by workers on a scaffold that was rolled slowly through the room over a nine-month period. The mud brown sky turned a startling teal, with stars, constellations and zodiac signs popping out in gold-leaf contrast.

Besides restoring the past, Beyer Blinder Belle made fundamental changes, too, starting with the construction of an entirely new marble staircase to the east balcony. It echoed, but did not replicate, the ornate western staircase. Some preservationists hated the idea.

But the firm prevailed before city and state preservation agencies after it uncovered a plan by the original architects, Warren & Wetmore, that showed a staircase to the east balcony. That proved, Mr. Belle and Ms. Leighton wrote, that the idea “was not an ego-driven ploy to have our personal imprint on the building, but that in fact our goal was to complete the original design.”

Mr. Muschamp, the architecture critic, approved. “The new eastern staircase, which threatened to diminish the room’s amplitude, has the opposite effect of magnifying it,” he wrote in 1998, as the $425 million renovation neared completion. He continued, “Even more impressive is the uncovering of the ramps, located just behind the ticket windows, that lead down to the lower level and its fabled Oyster Bar.”

“Beyer Blinder Belle’s greatest accomplishment,” Mr. Muschamp said, “has been to reveal that Grand Central is above all a monument to movement[http://www.nytimes.com/1998/10/02/nyregion/restoration-liberates-grand-vistas-and-ideas.html].”

Mr. Belle’s first wife, Wendy Adams Belle, an artist and teacher, died in 1974. His second wife, Anne Belle[http://www.nytimes.com/2003/06/25/arts/anne-belle-68-whose-films-captured-lives-of-ballet-dancers.html], a documentary filmmaker, died in 2003. He died on Thursday in Remsenburg, N.Y., where he had a home. He also lived in Manhattan. The cause was Lewy body disease, said his son David Belle, who survives him, along with another son, Sebastian; three daughters, Amelia, Fenella and Antonia Chapman; and eight grandchildren.

Mr. Belle knew his work would never fully be done. “The act of restoring a building to its original state is only half the battle,” he and Ms. Leighton wrote. “The other half is to guard against its denigration throughout its future existence.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Political scientists teach[http://scholar.google.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/scholar?q=downs+economic+theory+of+democracy&btnG=&hl=en&as\_sdt=0%2C43] their students that to win elections, the parties in a competitive two-party system must take policy positions that appeal to centrist “swing voters.” If voters choose the candidate closest to them ideologically, moderates will hold the crucial balance of power necessary to win a majority.

But contemporary American political parties seem not to have gotten the message. On major issues, their positions routinely diverge from the center of public opinion, with Democrats well to the left (for example, see Hillary Clinton[http://www.ontheissues.org/Hillary\_Clinton\_VoteMatch.htm] on abortion, affirmative action and government spending) and Republicans well to the right (for example, see Donald J. Trump[http://www.ontheissues.org/Donald\_Trump\_VoteMatch.htm] on **immigration**, foreign policy and tax cuts for the wealthy).

Many analysts argue that candidates — usually meaning their political opponents — take “extreme” positions because they must cater to the views of the core partisans who provide them with primary votes, enthusiasm and money. “Modern Republican politicians can’t be serious,” liberals[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/07/opinion/paul-krugman-from-trump-on-down-the-republicans-cant-be-serious.html?\_r=1] like Paul Krugman say, because the party’s base “demands extremist positions.” Conservatives[http://www.breitbart.com/2016-presidential-race/2016/06/06/trump-broadens-base-support-clinton-courts-extremists/] like Jason Greenblatt claim that Democratic candidates compete to see who “can genuflect lower before the radical, anti-capitalist, anti-Israel fringe of the Democratic Party.”

Yet the striking fact is that presidential candidates are frequently even more extreme than their own party’s core supporters, who have also become more extreme in recent decades.

Using survey data from the authoritative American National Election Studies[http://www.electionstudies.org/], I have tracked[http://ann.sagepub.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/content/667/1/143.full.pdf?ijkey=WgHVQ7b4B5U5iqg&keytype=finite] the positions of swing voters (those who are most likely to be pivotal in a close election) and core partisans (the most committed and politically active members of each party’s base) on five important issues since 1980 — government spending, jobs, aid to African-Americans (the survey asks if the federal government should make every “effort to improve the social and economic positions of blacks”), military spending and overall liberal-conservative ideology. I compared these positions with the positions of the parties’ presidential candidates (as assessed by politically well-informed citizens in each election year who were asked to place the candidates on the same issue scales they used to place themselves).

Across all five issues, the average distance between Democratic and Republican core partisans increased by almost one-third between 1980 and 2012, from 26 points to 34 points on a 100-point scale. On average, the Democratic base moved 1.5 points further to the left of swing voters, while the Republican base moved 6.5 points further to the right.

While candidates’ positions do not seem very responsive to shifts in the positions of swing voters, they are sometimes not all that responsive to shifts in the positions of their core supporters, either. Blaming the parties’ bases for political polarization misses most of the story.

A more compelling explanation is that candidates take extreme stands because they can — the electoral incentive to moderate their positions is too weak to outweigh their own ideological convictions.

The problem with the theory predicting that candidates will be compelled to adopt centrist positions to get elected is that it assumes centrist voters will reliably choose the candidate whose policy positions are closest to their own. But centrist voters mostly have other things on their minds[http://press.princeton.edu/titles/10671.html] — from economic anxieties to foreign crises, cultural animosities and candidates’ personalities.

The authors of a recent analysis[http://ann.sagepub.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/content/667/1/126.full.pdf?ijkey=yyXzFDVlx7vghVr&keytype=finite] of ideological extremism in presidential elections over the past several decades — including the landslide defeats of Barry Goldwater and George McGovern — concluded that the electoral cost of extremism was “negligible” compared with the effects of other economic and political factors.

Goldwater in 1964 and McGovern in 1972 probably did a few percentage points worse than they would have if they had been more moderate, but they lost mainly because they were challenging incumbents who presided over election-year economic booms.

In contrast, Ronald Reagan in 1980 and Barack Obama in 2008 had the good fortune to run in years when economic recessions undermined the political appeal of their more moderate opponents, and they both won easily.

In this year’s race, Mrs. Clinton is leading in the polls despite her “hard-core liberal” campaign stands[http://www.ontheissues.org/Hillary\_Clinton\_VoteMatch.htm] and a voting record[http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/hillary-clinton-was-liberal-hillary-clinton-is-liberal/] to the left of most Senate Democrats. Mr. Trump is trailing despite having moderated[http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-trump-gop-positions-20160720-snap-htmlstory.html] some of his party’s conservative stands on issues like social spending and gay rights. On the whole, his policy positions are probably closer to the “center” of the electorate than those of previous Republican presidential candidates have been. Yet many voters who ought to find those positions appealing have been **alienated** by Mr. Trump’s bombast[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/18/us/politics/donald-trumps-complicated-charisma-fills-void-in-republican-politics.html] and political inexperience[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/poll-who-has-more-experience-2016-223860].

It would be hard to argue that a candidate’s temperament and experience should be irrelevant to voters. But it is also worth asking whether policy “extremism” is such a bad thing, anyway. People who are quick to condemn the extremism of their political opponents often see virtue in their own party’s deviations from centrist opinion.

The single largest difference in positions between either party’s presidential candidates and swing voters over the past three decades has been on the issue of racial policy. On average, Republican candidates have been seen as just six points to the right of the political center on the question of government assistance to African-Americans. Democratic candidates have been 26 points to the left.

This gulf between Democratic candidates and swing voters may reflect principled adherence to a progressive vision of racial justice, or pragmatic catering to the interests of a key group in the Democratic electoral coalition, or — most likely — some combination of both.

The gulf widened in the last two election cycles, but not because Barack Obama was seen as more liberal than his predecessors on this issue. Rather, the political center had itself shifted even further to the right than it had been in the 1980s and ’90s.

Democrats may be tempted to say that that is a political center they want no part of. Perhaps they would add — with or without some awareness of irony[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RVNoClu0h9M] — that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.

But that is just the sort of thinking, repeated on issue after issue on both sides of the political spectrum, that accounts for why our politics often seem so polarized.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTOpinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Larry M. Bartels, a political scientist at Vanderbilt University, is an author of “Democracy for Realists” and the editor of a symposium on American elections in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERLIN — Even Angela Merkel[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela\_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per], the usually unruffled veteran of European crises after almost 11 years as chancellor of Germany[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/germany/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], had to admit it last week: “The world finds itself in a critical condition,” she said, and there is no point “in painting anything rosier than it is.”

The outlook for Ms. Merkel is not especially rosy, either.

After years of broad and deep support at home, bolstering her as she grew to become the Continent’s most powerful leader, she is heading toward national elections next year more politically vulnerable than at any time since her early days in office, with implications that extend far beyond Germany’s borders.

When she arrives in Slovakia on Friday for a summit meeting of leaders from 27 European Union[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european\_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org] nations — all save Britain, which voted in June to leave the bloc — her ability to navigate her troubles at home will hang over the gathering.

Since Britain’s decision, other European governments have done little to respond to the surge in populism and nationalism across the Continent or reassure their citizens that the European Union can be a force for good in their lives. With Ms. Merkel’s attention split between shoring up her domestic position and addressing Europe’s woes, the task of developing a united and effective response could become that much harder.

Her continued defense of her decision to admit more than a million migrants to Germany last year has left her increasingly isolated from other leaders coping with anti-**immigrant**, anti-Muslim sentiment in their electorates, especially in a time of terrorism attacks.

With growth across the eurozone still “tilted to the down side,” as the European Central Bank chief, Mario Draghi, said on Thursday, her new vulnerability may undercut Germany’s ability to impose its austerity-based economic policy on the bloc and fuel calls for more government spending from countries still struggling with high unemployment and slow growth.

And an inward turn by Germany as it debates its response to the migration crisis and holds elections in a year’s time could create a further leadership void in Europe at a critical moment.

Already, President François Hollande of France is all but a lame duck, deeply unpopular and a long shot for re-election next year, and Prime Minister Matteo Renzi of Italy remains politically fragile, struggling to push through constitutional changes and to assert himself on the European stage. And the rift between the more pluralistic nations of Western Europe and governments in Central and Eastern Europe, some of which are increasingly authoritarian, has heightened the challenge of keeping the Continent knit tightly together.

In the middle of all this, as ever, is Ms. Merkel, whose political peril in Germany remains hard to judge — especially, her supporters stress, while the country’s economy remains relatively strong.

But she is under increased attack, from within her own center-right bloc and from a resurgent far-right, over her **immigration** policy. And while German officials remain aghast at Britain’s lack of a plan for disengaging from the European Union, she has not offered any well-articulated vision for how to hold the bloc together.

Hostile commentators and critics in her own bloc could hardly contain their glee at her new vulnerability after the far-right, anti-**immigrant** Alternative for Germany party pushed Ms. Merkel’s conservatives into third place[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/angela-merkel-germany-mecklenburg-vorpommern-elections-refugees.html] in an election in the impoverished and sparsely populated northeastern state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern on Sept. 4.

It was the first time Ms. Merkel’s bloc of Christian Democrats and their Bavarian sister party, the Christian Social Union, had been overtaken on the right in any such election in modern Germany. That the result came a year to the day after she threw open the country’s borders to admit migrants trapped in Hungary, and that the vote occurred in her political home state, which shelters very few refugees, accentuated the loss.

“Angela Merkel is wobbling,” said Wolfram Weimer of the news channel N-TV. “Her aura of winner is destroyed, and her image as farseeing, clever strategist of power along with it.”

Talk of the twilight of Ms. Merkel’s time in office may be exaggerated, said Tina Hildebrandt of the influential weekly Die Zeit, “but that so much is open is spectacular enough.”

“Merkel’s loss of reputation is immense,” Ms. Hildebrandt added. “Her situation almost reminds us of the beginning of her career,” when the distinctly un-chic Ms. Merkel, a physicist from the Communist East, was much criticized for her style — and much underestimated in her ability and will to get to the top.

The chancellor showed that grit on Wednesday with a spirited speech to Parliament, defending her policy at home and the controversial pact she negotiated with Turkey to stop Middle Eastern migrants from crossing to Greece and into Europe.

Since that agreement was signed, she said, almost no migrants have drowned in the Aegean, compared with hundreds in the two months before.

“In that situation, you can’t just loon on,” said Ms. Merkel, the daughter of a Lutheran pastor. “You must work with another country and find a way forward.”

Ms. Merkel has taken responsibility for the election loss on Sept. 4 and doubled down on her refusal to emulate neighboring Austria by limiting the number of asylum seekers who can come each year. (Austria, her partner last year in admitting the migrants, is possibly set to elect a far-right politician[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/02/world/europe/austria-president-runoff.html] as president this year).

But as politicians scramble ahead of German national elections due in fall 2017, that limit on **immigration** is becoming a litmus test for her conservative Bavarian sister party, and even for the center-left Social Democrats, with whom Ms. Merkel governs nationally in a coalition.

Ms. Merkel has met almost every European leader ahead of the summit meeting in Bratislava, where the 27 nations are expected to agree on enhanced security measures and try again to stimulate economic growth and jobs for the young.

Daniela Schwarzer, a senior director of the German Marshall Fund in Berlin, said she saw the chancellor as still very much in charge.

“I would not say that she has lost control, or the capacity to lead Germany,” Ms. Schwarzer said. “But she will have to take into account that there are vocal people in populist parties, and critical voices in her own camp.”

The far-right Alternative for Germany party now has seats in nine of the country’s 16 state legislatures and seems likely to win more when the city-state of Berlin votes on Sunday.

The chancellor might turn with relief to the next item on her calendar: a Sept. 19 summit meeting at the United Nations, hosted with President Obama, on the global crisis of up to 60 million migrants, many of them in Africa. Ms. Merkel wants vastly more aid and action to prevent sub-Saharans from surging through Niger and Mali to Libya and then to Europe.

Mr. Obama may be more sympathetic to her challenges than many of Ms. Merkel’s compatriots.

“Perhaps because she once lived behind a wall herself,” Mr. Obama said on a visit to Germany in April, “Angela understands the aspirations of those who’ve been denied their freedom and who seek a better life.”

He added, “I know the politics around this issue can be difficult in all of our countries.”

Follow Alison Smale on Twitter @asmalenyt
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**VICTORICA, Argentina — Each year on the night of June 23, they gather at the sacred outpost on the brown flatlands to celebrate New Year’s on a pre-Columbian calendar. Wearing ponchos and a type of jewelry called tupu, they make offerings of food, feast on barbecued ribs and tell stories. In the morning, they march around a ceremonial wooden stake and a fire fueled through the night to honor the land.

For the indigenous Ranquel (pronounced Ran-KEL), the scene is charged with many emotions, and offers a glimpse of their resurgence amid a long struggle for recognition after centuries of hardship and loss.

Similar struggles, of course, have unfolded across both South and North America, but the sense of being excluded from the national conversation has been particularly acute for the indigenous peoples of Argentina[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/argentina/index.html?inline=nyt-geo].

While policy makers in Buenos Aires and the provinces have made reconciliation efforts, indigenous leaders were baffled when Mauricio Macri, after winning the presidential election[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/23/world/americas/argentina-president-election-mauricio-macri.html] last year, singled out the achievements of influential European **immigrants** in his victory speech[http://tn.com.ar/politica/un-macri-emocionado-en-su-primer-discurso-como-presidente-electo-ustedes-hoy-hicieron-posible-lo\_637538]. (He later sought to calm the waters by meeting with indigenous representatives.)

“No Argentine president has truly tried to repair the damage done to indigenous people,” said Pedro Coria, 51, a trade unionist and the president of the Ranquel Chieftains Council in Santa Rosa, the capital of La Pampa Province.

That damage began after the Spanish conquest[http://www.learnnc.org/lp/editions/nchist-twoworlds/1677], with forced labor in mines far from ancestral homelands and the colonial masters’ use of people as currency in business deals. The native tribes fought back in the 19th century with several incursions. But in the late 1870s, Julio Argentino[https://www-britannica-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/biography/Julio-Argentino-Roca] Roca[https://www-britannica-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/biography/Julio-Argentino-Roca], a general and soon to be president, led a campaign called the Conquest of the Desert[http://www.encyclopedia.com/article-1G2-3078901658/conquest-desert.html], which seized the pampas and northern Patagonia from them.

General Roca, long considered a hero who opened the wilderness to poor European **immigrants** and united an unruly nation, has more recently been labeled a genocidal murderer[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/jan/13/argentinian-founding-father-genocide-row] by some historians and activists. That has led to campaigns to rename boulevards dedicated to him, tear down his statues[http://www.clarin.com/politica/Bariloche-trataron-tirar-estatua-Roca\_0\_791321012.html] and even remove images of him and his conquest from the 100-peso note[http://comosellamala.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Billete-de-100-Roca.jpg].

Yet a consensus on the past treatment of indigenous people, and on responding to their grievances now, has proved elusive. The influential and conservative newspaper La Nación, in a lengthy editorial[http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1930090-la-utilizacion-populista-de-los-pueblos-originarios], recently leapt to General Roca’s defense.

Indigenous movements in other parts of the region have seen high-profile triumphs. Bolivia has had an indigenous president[http://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/19/world/americas/coca-advocate-wins-election-for-president-in-bolivia.html], Evo Morales, for more than a decade. In Paraguay, an indigenous language on equal footing with Spanish continues to thrive[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/12/world/americas/in-paraguay-indigenous-language-with-unique-staying-power.html?\_r=0]. Ecuador’s government incorporated indigenous concepts in the Constitution in 2008[http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Constitutions/Ecuador/english08.html].

In Argentina, however, the commemorations of the nation’s bicentennial in July[https://www-britannica-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/story/argentina-celebrates-200-years-of-independence] chafed, seeming to confirm suspicions among native peoples that their culture and history were being ignored.

In a statement, some groups asked[http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/sociedad/3-303331-2016-07-04.html] rhetorically, “What do we have to celebrate?”

But as debates about the Qom[http://www.worldlibrary.org/articles/toba\_(tribe)] and Wichí[https://www-britannica-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/topic/Wichi] people in the north of Argentina often hinge on child malnutrition[http://www.clarin.com/sociedad/chico-qom-murio-chaco-desnutricion-tuberculosis\_0\_1427857397.html], and as the Mapuche[https://www-britannica-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/topic/Mapuche] people in Patagonia battle the encroaching shale oil industry[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/22/business/energy-environment/argentinas-oil-ambitions-create-unlikely-alliance-with-chevron.html?\_r=0], Ranquel communities have emerged as patient champions of indigenous rights.

The communities have secured a string of victories, including settling land disputes and phonetically transcribing textbooks to preserve their language, which was unwritten. More broadly, they have reversed a tradition among provincial Argentines of concealing their Ranquel ancestry. An indigenous bloodline no longer elicits shame; rather, it is esteemed.

“They have toiled away largely unnoticed,” said Graciana Pérez Zavala, a historian at the National University of Río Cuarto who has written widely on the Ranquel.

“They’re ripping apart the notion that indigenous people were exterminated during the Conquest of the Desert,” she added. “They are showing that they are alive.”

A short distance from Victorica, a farming town of about 6,000 enveloped by forests of caldén trees, the Ranquel can point to perhaps their proudest achievement — the return of a two-hectare site (about five acres) that was part of their largest settlement, Leuvucó, before General Roca reneged on peace treaties and sent soldiers rampaging across the central plains.

They recovered the barren stretch of land in 2001 after putting aside clan rivalries and enlisting the aid of federal and provincial authorities. That is where they celebrate New Year’s, and it is where they buried the remains of a prominent 19th-century chieftain, Panguithruz Güor, that had been kept in a museum 500 miles away.

To outsiders, the patch of land and the rusting monument to several Ranquel chieftains may seem little more than symbols. But they have power.

“Symbolism is important,” Fernanda Alonso, the social development minister for La Pampa Province, said in an interview in Santa Rosa. For the Ranquel to flourish, she said, “they have to reconstruct their past.”

Previously, visitors to La Pampa were unlikely to learn much about the province’s indigenous heritage, though they might have noticed the image of a mounted Ranquel on the provincial crest[http://www.lapampa.gov.ar/escudo-de-la-provincia-de-la-pampa.html] and some of the ancient trails.

Though some scholars point to earlier endeavors[http://www.laarena.com.ar/la\_ciudad-murio\_canhue\_luchador\_incansable\_por\_la\_causa\_de\_pueblos\_ranqueles-66334-115.html] to advance the cause of indigenous people, 2001 is widely viewed as the year of a rebirth for the Ranquel, energizing more than 20 communities across La Pampa.

“The restitution was a landmark,” said María Inés Serraino, 47, a science teacher in Victorica, where her neighbors announce their arrival with a rhythmic clap of hands. “It is paving the way to rescue a culture we were always denied.”

Ms. Serraino recalled how her paternal grandmother, a Ranquel who married a Sicilian **immigrant**, regaled her with stories about indigenous values, like cherishing nature and communal life.

In recent years, she and her family have formed a Ranquel community of 14 people, recognized by the National Institute for Indigenous Affairs.

Though bolstered by a law passed in 2006[http://servicios.infoleg.gob.ar/infolegInternet/anexos/120000-124999/122499/norma.htm], indigenous peoples across Argentina continue to struggle over land rights. But Ms. Serraino’s community, named for her grandmother, has conditionally been given a six-hectare parcel by the municipal authorities. On the land, her group wants to revive the tradition of community subsistence farming. It is also putting up a small building for meetings and cultural events.

Similar success stories are being replicated[http://comunidadwilliantu.org/proyectos/] across central Argentina, not just in La Pampa but in neighboring San Luis Province[http://www.ranqueles.sanluis.gov.ar/historia/historia.html], too.

In western La Pampa, the authorities have supported Ranquel communities, including one called Epumer[http://www.territorioindigena.com.ar/Casos?id\_conflicto=45], that have been threatened with eviction because of legal battles over territory. Fears abound of an escalation in such disputes as farmers seek new frontiers beyond Argentina’s agricultural heartland.

Seeking to reconnect the population with its indigenous roots, leaders also give talks to schoolchildren. And in Santa Rosa, which will host a Latin American summit meeting[http://www.telonpampeano.com.ar/index.php/7-blog/4467-se-realizara-en-la-pampa-el-ii-congreso-de-pueblos-indigenas] of indigenous peoples this month, the chieftains council moved about five years ago into modest rented headquarters that house a small library and guest rooms.

In a meeting room where a newly designed Ranquel flag is displayed, classes in the Ranquel language are taught to groups of adults. In Victorica, road signs even carry Ranquel translations of Spanish street numbers.

Still, obstacles persist. Advocates, for instance, say no community has yet been handed the deeds to reclaimed lands.

And highlighting the tentative nature of even the Ranquel’s most pivotal accomplishment, Osvaldo R. Borthiry, 83, the landowner who donated the two hectares at the Leuvucó site, said his children would decide the property’s future.

Others dismiss the idea of working within the system and call for a separatist stance. “When your country does not represent who you are, what else can you do?” said Miguel Ángel Saulo, 62, a leader of the Tehuelche people[https://www-britannica-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/topic/Tehuelche-people] in the south of Argentina.

But the Ranquel and their supporters remain undeterred.

“It used to be embarrassing to say that you were a descendant of indigenous people,” said Marcela Suárez, 46, a janitor, as she stamped around the wooden stake at Leuvucó. “Now it makes you proud.”

\* On Argentina Plains, Hunters Feel Besieged by Critics ‘Made of Asphalt’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/26/world/americas/on-argentina-plains-hunters-feel-besieged-by-critics-made-of-asphalt.html]

\* 7 Teenage Deaths, but No Answers for Aboriginal Canadians[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/14/world/americas/unsolved-deaths-of-indigenous-canadian-students-offer-a-glimpse-of-hardship.html]

\* At Mass, Pope Francis Embraces ‘Misunderstood’ of Mexico[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/16/world/americas/at-mass-pope-francis-embraces-misunderstood-of-mexico.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Opponents of Jeremy Corbyn, the left-wing leader of Britain’s Labour Party, usually claim one of two things about him: that his politics are extreme and will lead the party to electoral oblivion, or that his values are admirable but he is too incompetent to put them into effect.

These two arguments seem contradictory, but in Mr. Corbyn’s handling of an anti-Semitism scandal that has hung over the Labour Party, they have converged. In April, after months of accusations of anti-Semitism among party members, particularly on social media, Mr. Corbyn ordered an inquiry and asked Shami Chakrabarti, who had just stepped down as the director of Britain’s leading civil liberties organization, Liberty, to head it. So far, so good.

The aftermath of her report, however, has aggravated the very wounds it was supposed to heal. It was inauspicious that, at the news conference in June for its publication, Mr. Corbyn looked on in silence as one of his supporters accused Ruth Smeeth, a Jewish member of Parliament, of conspiring against the party leader. Ms. Smeeth left the room in tears.

Worse followed when, a few weeks later, Mr. Corbyn broke his vow not to create any new members of the House of Lords by nominating Ms. Chakrabarti for a peerage. Whatever justification there might be for this award, it gave the impression of a quid pro quo: that Mr. Corbyn was willing to compromise his lifelong hostility to Britain’s system of unelected privilege in return for an inquiry that pulled its punches.

Ms. Chakrabarti’s report was not without merit. Many Jews welcomed its calls on the party to outlaw “Zio” as a term of abuse[http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/labour-antisemitism-report-hitler-ken-livingstone-shami-chakrabarti-inquiry-a7110886.html] and for members to avoid making comparisons between Nazi Germany and Israel. What was missing, though, was any broader analysis of why such language has become so prevalent on the British left. Many British Jews believe it is connected to strident anti-Israel politics with which Mr. Corbyn sympathizes.

A year into Mr. Corbyn’s tenure, there is no trust and precious little dialogue between the Labour leader and Britain’s Jews. The country’s chief rabbi, Ephraim Mirvis, has spoken of Labour’s “severe” problem of anti-Semitism — a problem that Jonathan Arkush, the president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the community’s leading representative body, says Mr. Corbyn is loath to tackle.

Mr. Corbyn faces a challenge in a new election for the leadership, which most analysts think he will win thanks to a large influx of left-leaning supporters into the party’s ranks. But when the Jewish Labour Movement, an organization affiliated with the Labour Party for nearly a century, recently polled its members on how they would vote in the leadership election, only 4 percent supported Mr. Corbyn, while 92 percent backed his challenger, Owen Smith. (The result of the race will be announced on Sept. 24.)

Mr. Corbyn himself appears bemused. The mantra he repeats — that he is opposed to racism, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia (he rarely speaks solely of anti-Semitism) — suggests that he is wedded to the idea that anti-Semitism is chiefly a right-wing phenomenon. It is true that Mr. Corbyn’s predecessor as Labour leader, Ed Miliband, was the target of some thinly veiled anti-Semitic slurs from Britain’s tabloid newspapers. But the notion that well-meaning people on the left might also harbor bias against Jews seems to pass him by.

The insensitivity extends to Mr. Corbyn’s inner circle. One senior party spokesman, Paul Flynn, said in 2011 that Britain should not appoint a Jew as ambassador to Israel, because the post should be filled by “someone with roots” in Britain who couldn’t “be accused of having Jewish loyalty” — unwittingly invoking the anti-Semitic trope of Jewish disloyalty. This year, one of Mr. Corbyn’s closest aides, Seumas Milne, wanted to remove the greeting “Chag Kasher VeSameach,” which translates as “A Happy and Kosher Holiday,’ from the leader’s Passover[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/p/passover/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] message to the community because he felt the use of Hebrew implied support for Zionism. (After some debate, Mr. Milne was overruled.)

For many Corbyn supporters, talk of Labour anti-Semitism is a smear intended to silence advocacy for Palestinians[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/p/palestinians/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]. This segment of party members tends also to subscribe to a worldview that blames the United States and its allies — foremost among them, Israel — for all that is wrong in the world.

This anti-American, anti-imperialist strain of the British left has deep roots, but the 2003 Iraq war gave it a new impetus, and opened up a broad rift in the Labour Party. On one side are supporters of the Blairite legacy that includes a warm embrace of Israel and of Labour Zionists; on the other stand Mr. Corbyn and other veterans of the Stop the War Coalition. Despite the initial mass protests against the Iraq war, the coalition was run by an activist core of far-left groups like the Socialist Workers Party allied with Islamists like the Muslim Association of Britain. For this alliance, a visceral objection to Israel’s existence was a key point of unity.

The Muslim Association of Britain has been described by a government minister as the British “representative” of the international Muslim Brotherhoodorganization. The Palestinian branch of the Brotherhood is Hamas, the radical group that governs Gaza — and which Mr. Corbyn has praised for its commitment to “peace and social justice and political justice.” This is not the only case of Mr. Corbyn’s appearing to align himself with Islamism: From 2009 to 2012, he was a paid host on the Iranian state-owned Press TV.

For many British Jews and others, Mr. Corbyn thus personifies a tolerance among parts of the left for reactionary Islamists that is at best naïve, at worst malign — not least because it overlooks Islamism’s history of murderous repression toward democratic socialists in Muslim-majority countries.

Labour had once been Britain’s most pro-Zionist party. This began to change when support for Palestinian statehood entered party policy. Mr. Corbyn arrived as a new member of Parliament in 1983 as a sponsor of the Labour Movement Campaign for Palestine, a new group that was pledged to “eradicate Zionism” from the party and saw Israel as a colonial implant in the Middle East. Rather than being a legitimate expression of Jewish national longing, Zionism was then labeled a racist ideology akin to apartheid.

At the same time, Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government included a record number of Jewish ministers. Most British Jews had long since moved on from their origins in a prewar **immigrant** working class, and many among the new suburban Jewish middle class were attracted to Mrs. Thatcher’s entrepreneurial capitalism. According to the historian Geoffrey Alderman, “Anglo-Jewish political attitudes and loyalties, which were substantially Liberal for much of the 19th century and substantially Labour in the mid-20th, are now substantially Conservative.”

This may be of little electoral consequence to Labour, since Jewish voters influence the outcome in only a handful of parliamentary seats. In any case, the Corbyn project seems more directed at molding an ideologically pure movement than winning power at the next general election in 2020.

Yet there remains a strong progressive tradition among Jews that now has no political home. Their **alienation** from Labour is an ill omen: Whether British Jews ever feel they can return to Labour will give a strong indication about the future direction and character of the party as a whole.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Dave Rich, the author of “The Left’s Jewish Problem: Jeremy Corbyn, Israel and Anti-Semitism,” is the deputy director of communications at the Community Security Trust, a group that monitors anti-Semitic incidents and provides protection services.

\* A Remark on Israel by Jeremy Corbyn Incites Outrage in Britain and Abroad[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/01/world/europe/jeremy-corbyn-labour-antisemitism.html]

\* The British Left’s ‘Jewish Problem’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/04/opinion/the-british-lefts-jewish-problem.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Michael Robert Jarecki and Chirag Gopal Badlani were married Sept. 10 in Chicago. Judge Ann Claire Williams of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, for whom Mr. Badlani was a law clerk until 2012, officiated at the Chicago Cultural Center.

Mr. Jarecki (left), 37, is an **immigration** lawyer in Chicago, and the vice chairman of the Chicago chapter of the American **Immigration** Lawyers Association. He graduated magna cum laude from Loyola University Chicago and received a law degree from the University of Illinois.

He is a son of Kathleen Jarecki Leverenz and a stepson of Ted E. Leverenz of Melrose Park, Ill. His mother is an office manager in Broadview, Ill., at Presence Behavioral Health. His stepfather was in the Illinois House of Representatives from 1974 to 1991 and in the Illinois State Senate from 1991 to 1993.

Mr. Badlani, 34, is a partner, focusing on civil rights law and civil litigation, in the Chicago law firm Hughes Socol Piers Resnick & Dym. He graduated from Yale and received a law degree magna cum laude from N.Y.U.

He is the son of Dr. Charulata G. Badlani and Dr. Gopal H. Badlani of Winston-Salem, N.C. His mother retired as a physiatrist at Wake Forest University Baptist Medical Center in Winston-Salem, where is father is a urologist.

The couple met in 2011 while training for the Chicago Marathon with Team to End AIDS, a charity training program benefiting the AIDS Foundation of Chicago.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MOSCOW — Tiger shooter, bare-chested horseman and architect of Russia[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/russiaandtheformersovietunion/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s revival as a muscular global power, President Vladimir V. Putin[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/vladimir\_v\_putin/index.html?inline=nyt-per], dressed in a somber suit and tie, sat for over an hour this past week sipping tea from a delicate porcelain cup and offering earnest advice on how to improve housing, medical care and other services in a provincial town south of here.

State-television broadcast the entire encounter, in between reports of Russian airstrikes in Syria ordered by Mr. Putin and gleeful accounts of how, thanks to a stunt by a pro-Putin athlete, the Russian flag appeared during the opening ceremony of the Paralympic Games[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/p/paralympic\_games/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] in Rio de Janeiro despite a ban on the Russian squad because of a doping scandal.

It was, in the span of just a few hours, a dizzying display of the political mastery that Mr. Putin has over his country and his own image — a tough, can-do warrior; caring father of his people; and guarantor that no slight to Russia’s pride will go unanswered.

Mr. Putin, 63, has shown an extraordinary ability to project an image of towering strength no matter what the circumstances. When he first took power, an old schoolteacher of his in St. Petersburg, Vera Malishkina, remembered her former pupil, who is below average height, as a superb basketball player because he was “very tall.”

He has many critics, many of them now in exile outside Russia or voiceless outside the coffee shops and wine bars of cosmopolitan cities like Moscow. But as Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] said with admiration:[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5pHgcOz2SVQ] Mr. Putin has “very strong control” over Russia.

According to Mr. Trump, the Republican Party’s presidential nominee, “He has been a leader far more than our leader.”

The beauty of that is largely in the eye of the beholder, and is certainly lost on Mr. Putin’s Russian opponents.

“Vladimir Putin is a strong leader in the same way that arsenic is a strong drink,” Garry Kasparov, the former world chess champion and a fierce critic of the Russian president, said in a Facebook post. “Praising a brutal K.G.B.[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/k/kgb/index.html?inline=nyt-org] dictator, especially as preferable to a democratically elected U.S. president, whether you like Obama or hate him, is despicable and dangerous.”

But what, aside from his undeniable skill at rallying the support of the Russian public, has made Mr. Putin such a potent figure, giving him a growing band of admirers like Mr. Trump and any number of right-wing populist leaders scattered across Europe?

Mr. Putin has annexed Crimea, stirred up and armed a pro-Russian rebellion in eastern Ukraine[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/ukraine/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], turned a once vibrant Russian news media into an echo chamber, and restored Moscow as an indispensable player on the world stage, by turns a peacemaker and troublemaker. His peacemaking was at the fore early on Saturday when Russia and the United States agreed in Geneva[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/10/world/middleeast/syria-john-kerry-ceasefire-deal-russia.html] to a new plan to curb violence in the Syrian conflict, in which Washington and Moscow back opposite sides but share a desire to destroy the Islamic State.

Judged by many of the yardsticks of success he set before his first presidential race in March 2000, however, Mr. Putin has often faltered.

Out With Oligarchs, in With Cronies

He has cut down to size or driven into exile some of the so-called oligarchs who made billions in murky deals under President Boris N. Yeltsin in the 1990s. But far from eliminating “oligarchs as a class” as he promised, he has created a new class of business moguls who still enjoy sweet insider deals and whose only real difference with those who thrived under Mr. Yeltsin is that they do not dare challenge the Kremlin.

An Economy Running on Fumes

Mr. Putin’s economic record has also been mixed to poor. The economy grew rapidly during his first two terms as president, from 2000 to 2008 — about 8 percent annually, on average, thanks largely to soaring prices for energy, of which Russia is a major exporter. But it developed none of the diversity beyond oil and gas or freedom from corruption that Mr. Putin repeatedly promised.

And with oil prices now below $50 a barrel, half what they were in 2014 and far off their peak of $145 in 2008, the economy is in the doldrums. It perked up slightly in June but has declined over all by nearly 1 percent since the start of the year. That is better than the decline of 3.7 percent last year but still a threat to what had been Mr. Putin’s contract with his people: rising prosperity in return for obedience.

Winning Russian Hearts Abroad

With the economy on the ropes, the Kremlin has turned increasingly to foreign affairs to keep Mr. Putin’s popularity at levels that would delight any Western leader. His ratings soared after the annexation of Crimea in 2014, which unleashed a wave of patriotic fervor across Russia — and caused more economic pain as the United States and the European Union imposed sanctions.

The military interventions in Syria to prop up President Bashar al-Assad have been accompanied by a drumbeat of reports on state television celebrating Russia’s role as a key power without which no military or political knot can be untied. This has reinforced his status at home, but also a deep wariness of his intentions among mainstream political leaders abroad.

He has inserted Russia not only into Syria but also into the even more intractable Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with Russian diplomats working frantically to organize a meeting in Moscow between Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and the leader of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas.

“It is important for Putin to drive home the message, especially to the U.S., that Russia is a global power,” said Dmitri Trenin[http://carnegieendowment.org/experts/287], the director of the Moscow Carnegie C[http://carnegie.ru/?lang=en] enter[http://carnegie.ru/?lang=en], a research group, and an expert on Russian foreign policy.

Mr. Putin, he said, was “incensed” in 2014 when President Obama dismissed Russia as a “regional power.” Eager to show that Mr. Obama underestimated Russia’s reach, Mr. Putin has since embarked on a whirlwind of diplomatic activity across the Middle East and in Asia, asserting Moscow’s role far beyond the narrow confines of the former Soviet Union.

“You can criticize Russia for anything, but if you belittle Russia, that is a crime,” Mr. Trenin said.

A Muffled News Media

That Russia is now a power to be reckoned with is a message drummed home relentlessly on television. Under President Yeltsin, television had a wide array of state and private channels offering a cacophony of views, but now it is largely state-controlled and entirely on message with the Kremlin.

“We interpret freedom of expression in different ways,” Mr. Putin told three Russian journalists who were writing a book to burnish his image before the 2000 presidential election, when he was a little-known former K.G.B. officer.

One of those journalists, Nataliya Gevorkyan, has since been beaten up twice by unidentified assailants in Moscow, and her old and once freewheeling newspaper, Kommersant, was taken over by a pro-Kremlin businessman. Effectively barred from publishing in Russia, she lives mostly in France.

But He Has a Seductive Popularity

While never a fan of Mr. Putin — “I was sure a guy who served in the K.G.B. should never be president” — Ms. Gevorkyan granted the Russian president one indisputable asset, one that appalls Moscow intellectuals but enthralls admirers like Mr. Trump: “People elected him.”

“He is popular. Maybe not 86 percent, but definitely more than 50 percent,” she continued. “That is democracy. I really don’t know about democracy anymore.”

Mr. Putin’s ratings are certainly far higher than those of Mr. Obama, and Mr. Putin should easily win the next presidential election in 2018 if he runs. But the authorities are taking no chances. In the latest strike in a sustained campaign to shut down or at least tame alternative sources of information, Russia’s Justice Ministry recently announced that it would place the Levada Center, an independent and highly respected national pollster, on its official register of organizations “operating as foreign agents,” a listing that the center said would cripple its work.

The decision to brand the country’s most reliable polling organization as an **alien** force followed the release of an opinion survey that showed declining support for Mr. Putin’s United Russia Party ahead of elections for Parliament on Sept. 18.

Mr. Putin’s popularity, said Peter Kreko of the Political Capital Institute, a research group in Budapest, has made him a seductive figure for Western politicians and electors, who often pine for decisive action and a more secure world, free from the uncertainties created by **immigration**, insecurity and economic globalization.

“All Western politicians that define themselves as out of the mainstream tend to have positive views of Russia and Putin,” he said. “They regard the Putin regime as hyper-efficient, contrary to the hesitant democratic and sometimes incompetent and paralyzed systems in their own countries.”

This efficiency, Mr. Kreko added, is mostly a myth but is widely believed. “We used to think that because of pluralist media, checks and balances, and globalization that people could not be brainwashed,” he said, “but what we see in Russia and also Hungary is that people can be brainwashed.”

Sophia Kishkovsky contributed reporting.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Americans are such sticklers. Such poops. Sure, some of Vladimir Putin’s political opponents wind up in jail, while some of the journalists he dislikes end up in the morgue. Yes, his government is apparently committing cybercrimes to meddle in our election. And there was that small matter of invading and annexing one of Russia’s neighbors.

But look at his numbers! What’s a little blood on your hands when you’re polling like that?

“He does have an 82 percent approval rating,” Donald Trump said during the special “commander in chief” forum last week. It’s worth dwelling on that sentence, because it’s the key to what drives and guides his presidential bid. It’s the giveaway.

For Trump, the whole point of political office is adulation, and adulation is the entire proof of a person’s worth. Rectitude pales next to ratings. Ethics are a sorry substitute for applause. And the methods by which a crowd is fired up don’t matter, so long as he can bask in the clapping.

This is Trump’s core — or, rather, his terrifying lack of one.

It’s why he swerves from one pronouncement to its opposite and one position to its alternate. It’s why he tells lies with such ease and glee. He’s not sweating the substance of what he’s saying or doing, because that’s a negotiable, trivial thing. He’s just gauging the reaction, and a positive one — in the form of victories in the primaries, dominance in the media or supremacy in polls — means that his course is just. If Trump’s in his heaven, all’s right with the world.

He’s not confused about **immigration**. He’s confused about how to wring the most love from the issue.

He grew so enamored of a magnificent, impenetrable wall along the Mexican border because the primary-season voters who thronged his rallies went gaga for it. He was a rat pressing a lever and getting precisely the pellet of reverence that he sought, so he kept pressing, over and over, harder and harder: Mexico will pay for it! Meanwhile I’ll round up and deport all the illegals! Let’s ban Muslims while we’re at it!

If he’d elicited the same orgiastic response by promising free milk to every malnourished child in the developing world, he would have built his entire campaign around a new era in lactose diplomacy and named a dairy cow as his running mate. He has no real philosophy, just an all-consuming need.

And so his **immigration** policy softened, only to harden anew. The general election is a laboratory with rules different from those of the Republican primaries, and he’s still trying to figure out which lever to press.

In a sense he’s a fun-house mirror of the inconstancy, vanity and insecurity in almost every politician. But the distortion is extreme. From the start of his campaign, he has exhibited a near-pathological obsession with how people and organizations fare in the fickle (and corruptible) court of public opinion. When his insults aren’t about physical appearance, they’re about popularity.

A newscaster is incompetent because his or her show isn’t No. 1. A newspaper isn’t trustworthy because its profit margin is down. Jeb Bush wasn’t fit for the presidency because voters didn’t swoon for him. Trump deserved the job because more people chanted his name.

Detailed policies? Those could come later. Mastery of issues? He’d bone up on them in due time. A sophisticated campaign operation? Any dweeb could put that together. Trump led the polls. None of the usual, humdrum preparations or qualifications for the job held a candle to that.

The idea of intrinsic merit is **alien** to him. Numbers render the final verdict, and numbers don’t lie.

Except they do. Putin’s routinely high approval ratings exist in a context of intimidation and fear. There’s no way to know how many Russians feel free to speak their minds to pollsters. There’s no way to overstate the amount of propaganda that they’re subjected to. There’s no way to adjust for the lengths to which Putin will go to stoke nationalist fervor and whip Russians into a state of Putin-worshiping pride.

Trump’s possible blindness to that is scary. His probable awareness of it is scarier still.

Several Republicans who have had dealings with him tell me that they can’t really determine which of his most outrageous, deplorable statements are instances of a mask falling away and which are instances of a mask being put on, because with Trump it’s all about the situation and the audience, and if the audience signals an inclination to embrace him, he recites the lines that guarantee the hug. Never mind if the script is hateful. Never mind if it causes hurt.

He praises Putin in large part because Putin praises him back, or so he’s convinced himself. “If he says great things about me,” Trump told Matt Lauer during that forum, “I’m going to say great things about him.”

But the compliment in question is open to question. As The Times’s Steven Lee Myers recently explained[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/us/politics/donald-trump-vladimir-putin.html], the Russian word that Putin used for Trump can mean not only “brilliant,” which is Trump’s interpretation, but also “colorful” or “flamboyant.”

Trump hears only what he wants to hear. He bases his regard for people on their regard for him. He judges their actions in terms of the benefit to him. When he demeans the very Republican senators whose re-election campaigns he should be helping, it’s typically on the grounds that they haven’t showered him with praise or genuflected when he draws near. No sin is graver than the diminution of Donald Trump.

And no cause is nobler than his elevation.

He has long boasted of a plan to defeat the Islamic State, but has vowed not to share it because Barack Obama might implement it and take the victory lap. Follow that reasoning. He’s saying that if lives are lost in the meantime, so be it. At least the bump in the polls won’t be the president’s.

Of course there’s no plan, just a blowhard ceaselessly tooting his horn. Of course he’s blasé about Putin’s possible manipulation of our presidential election — and at one point encouraged it — because he assumes the manipulation will favor him.

He’ll play a fascist if that’s the path to the throne. He’ll weave ludicrously tall tales if that’s the route. Should he get there, he’ll proclaim his arrival the very evidence that he’s worthy, and then he’ll do whatever it takes to continue feeling as affirmed as he wants to and as invulnerable as he’ll need to. Ratings are rectitude, and he has found his role model — in the Kremlin of all places. Eighty-two percent or bust.

I invite you to follow me on Twitter (@FrankBruni)[http://twitter.com/frankbruni] and join me on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/frankbruninyt].

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If anything is likely to pierce the seemingly impenetrable fashion week bubble, surely it has to be this wacko election season. Not even the most frivolous catwalk devotee remains untouched by a presidential race as unprecedentedly weird as this one.

That, anyway, is how Carol Lim and Humberto Leon, the designers of Opening Ceremony, felt as they surveyed the landscape of yet another fashion week, concluding that instead of the usual predictable runway presentation they would stage their show as a “Pageant of the People.”

As the children of **immigrants** (Ms. Lim is of Korean ancestry, Mr. Leon Peruvian-Chinese), the Berkeley-educated designers grew up as “loud and proud Americans,” Mr. Leon said last week at the pair’s Chinatown headquarters.

“We’re pro-gay rights, pro-**immigrant**, pro-Black Lives Matter,” he said. “And we’re in a place where we question a lot of what’s happening and are not afraid to talk about it.”

Blending elements of a beauty pageant (minus the sashes) and a town-hall meeting, the duo envisioned a show at which some of the fascinating pals they’ve drawn to them in the decade and a half since they opened their influential SoHo store would appear on the runway alternating with models wearing their latest designs.

That those friends include Whoopi Goldberg, Rosario Dawson, Natasha Lyonne, Rowan Blanchard and Rashida Jones, among others, tells you something about both Mr. Leon’s and Ms. Lim’s politics and the crowd they run with.

Hosted by Carrie Brownstein and Fred Armisen, the creators of the show “Portlandia,” the “Pageant of the People” breaks with fashion week tradition in a number of ways. For a start, it takes place at a convention center named for Jacob Javits, a New York politician who served in Congress for 30 years as a liberal-leaning Republican in an era when that descriptor was not an oxymoron. It will be held on the evening of the 15th anniversary of the Sept. 11 attacks.

And although the designers were wary of revealing too many secrets, the show is likely to provide a forum at which the celebrity participants will answer Miss America-style questions put to them by the celebrity M.C.’s. That, in itself, is a slightly risky and unorthodox move, since if there is one thing nobody on a runway ever does, it is to speak.

Yet silence is hardly an option in the current political climate, the actress Natasha Lyonne said by telephone from Los Angeles.

“I’m not Captain Fashion over here, but when Humberto reached out to me, I said yes before he could even get out the idea,” said Ms. Lyonne, a star of “Orange Is the New Black.”

A fashion show staged as a theatricalized town-hall meeting “transcends clothes and becomes about a moment in time,” she added. “I don’t see it being a big debate forum so much as vague metaphor for maintaining personal freedom in an increasingly terrifying world.”

Hot-button issues of race, **immigration**, gender and a polarized electorate are not the usual stuff of fashion, as the “Parks and Recreation” actress Rashida Jones suggested. And yet, unlike many industries, the fashion business is peopled by Americans from across the racial and economic spectrum.

“A lot of questions about what it means to be an American have not been answered,” Ms. Jones said. “We will always be different and will always observe our differences, but it’s how we talk to each other about it that has to change.”

And if the rhetoric and invective of a political season charged with old and long-dormant hatreds have had a generally destructive effect on what passes for political discourse, perhaps a “Pageant of the People,” she said, might symbolize a means of “understanding each other better and getting past this ugly time.”

As Rowan Blanchard, the young star of “Girl Meets World,” pointed out, other Opening Ceremony shows — like “100% Lost Cotton,” the spring 2015 show in the form of a satire staged at the Metropolitan Opera House and starring Dree Hemingway, Catherine Keener, Bobby Cannavale, John Cameron Mitchell and Elle Fanning — “have been more about smarts and less about how beautiful or skinny the models are.”

Initially apprehensive about walking a Fashion Week runway (“I was a little bit nervous about feminists tearing me apart,” she said), the 14-year-old actress came around when informed about the stellar company she would be keeping.

“If fashion is something you can manipulate and make work for you, why not do it?” Ms. Blanchard said.

Those sentiments were echoed by Sarah McBride, who became the first openly transgender person to address a national political convention when she spoke at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia in July. “For me, it sounded like an opportunity to take a message I try to share of acceptance into a new place, the world of fashion,” Ms. McBride said. “On my worst days, I worry that we’re seeing the birth of a new hateful discriminatory force in this country.”

One way to maintain optimism through an election season marred by attitudes reminiscent of some of the uglier chapters in our history may be through such seemingly silly things as a fashion show highlighting diversity and inclusion. “Expressing the genuine, authentic feelings we all have of anger, hope, sadness, bringing that to the table and saying, ‘This is how this conversation is making me feel,’ is a great way to beat back bigotry,” Ms. McBride said.

Continue following our fashion and lifestyle coverage on Facebook (Styles[https://www.facebook.com/nytimesstyles] and Modern Love[https://www.facebook.com/modernlove]), Twitter (Styles[https://twitter.com/nytstyles], Fashion[https://twitter.com/nytfashion] and Weddings[https://twitter.com/nytimesvows]) and Instagram[https://instagram.com/nytimesfashion].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In their struggle to understand the Trump phenomenon, establishment pundits, political scientists and millions of flabbergasted American voters have settled on a long list of sober-sounding socioeconomic explanations: Deindustrialization. Anomie. Racial animosity. The rising up of a dislocated America.

Perhaps. Surely, Donald J. Trump is where he is because of a new force in American politics, one very different from the old politics as usual. But the difference is not just socioeconomic. It’s much deeper than that. Mr. Trump has survived disasters that would have sunk an establishment politician because he and his supporters have a fundamentally different worldview. Mr. Trump isn’t just the first reality-TV candidate; he is the first candidate to embrace a slice of the country that sees everything, even the fate of the nation, through the logic of cutthroat American capitalism.

The world that Mr. Trump inhabits is today’s Other America, the seamy, blustering, hustling and huckstering underside of our fabled brightness and optimism. For those who can afford to idealize politics, it may seem **alien**. But for many people, it is everyday life.

The political and business worlds have always overlapped. But we used to — and the establishment still does — expect politicians to adhere to a minimal level of honesty and consistency. We judge business tycoons differently; within the confines of the law, more or less, we expect them to lie and cheat their way to the top, and we assess them solely on how quickly and efficiently they get there. The reputation of Ulysses S. Grant was tarnished by the mere association with the unseemly practices that earned his Gilded Age counterparts in the business world everlasting glory.

Perhaps it was only a matter of time before someone with the plutocrat’s professional ethics made that leap into presidential politics. But the rest of the country had to catch up. We lauded robber barons like John D. Rockefeller and Jay Gould for their business success, but no one suggested for a second that they were statesman material. Now, in an era when the market reaches deep into our private lives and even high school students are expected to be experts in self-marketing, the door is finally open. Enter Donald Trump.

He thrives where others flail. His rivals — including Hillary Clinton — have had to submit to their vocation as politicians and try to sell their character and integrity. Mr. Trump has had to sell only the idea of his success, which, according to the modern law of transitive properties, will make everyone who embraces him successful, too.

No wonder, according to reports, that Mr. Trump possesses such a fondness for McDonald’s, whose motto is “I’m lovin’ it.” The pitch requires no argument, no evidence, no complex rhetoric. You’re gonna love our burgers because the fact that billions of them have been sold proves the validity of the claim. You’re gonna love Mr. Trump because millions of Americans already do.

Seen in the light of modern commerce, Melania Trump’s lifting of lines for her convention speech from a speech by Michelle Obama had nothing improper about it. Success builds on success. There was nothing unusual about Mr. Trump’s acceptance speech in Cleveland, either. People were astonished that he did not tell a touching personal story, as all politicians do, and as Ronald Reagan did to consummate effect. Products, though, have no personal past or any kind of human dimension. A winning product is a result of the seller’s rigid, inflexible, even fanatical belief in the consistent quality of his merchandise.

The same goes for Mr. Trump’s bald lies at this week’s national security forum. He denied, despite hard evidence, that he ever supported the Iraq war. Pundits were dismayed. But his supporters love him all the more for his brazen adherence to the integrity of his “brand” over minor details like the truth.

Yet Mr. Trump seems to suffer from a manufacturing defect. Republican leaders seem to want to recall him as though he were a faulty airbag. And it’s unlikely that enough Americans will buy his marketing pitch for him to win in November.

Imagine, though, a different figure, someone with Mr. Trump’s callousness but without the thin skin, lack of self-control and fragile, oversize ego. Imagine, in other words, a demagogue who embodies the dynamics of America’s pervasive commercial atmosphere, but who is smart, cunning, self-aware and self-disciplined — so cunning that he would, say, embrace the parents of Capt. Humayun Khan with the slightest trace of a wink to his or her followers, and then, once elected, close the door to any Muslim who wished to **immigrate** to America. Imagine this same figure prefacing an insinuation that Mrs. Clinton be assassinated with a heartfelt declaration of her decency and good faith.

We had better prepare for such a person. In business, Mr. Trump might be called a beta test, or a “proof of concept.” To that end, he has already succeeded. Trumpism — not the political ideology rooted in xenophobia and nationalism, but the cynical worldview that sees politics, like everything, as a market to be conquered — is not going anywhere.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Lee Siegel is the author of the forthcoming book “The Draw: A Memoir.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Weeks after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, with bodies still being pulled from the smoldering rubble, New York’s mayor, Rudolph W. Giuliani[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/g/rudolph\_w\_giuliani/index.html?inline=nyt-per], delivered an emotional address before a hushed United Nations.

He spoke with blunt force about the need for the world’s countries to unite in a global battle against terrorism. But he also sounded a powerful note of inclusion and unity, reminding the delegates — many of them Arab or Muslim — that New York was a city of **immigrants**, within a nation of **immigrants**.

“Like the victims of the World Trade Center attack, we’re of every race, we’re of every religion, we’re of every ethnicity, and our diversity has been our greatest source of strength,” he said. “It’s the thing that renews us and revives us in every generation — our openness to new people from all over the world.”

At the time, Mr. Giuliani’s political promise seemed limitless. But after a calamitous presidential run in 2008, his once-outsize profile shriveled.

Mr. Giuliani is now back on the national political stage, serving as one of Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s most prominent advisers and most vocal defenders. Once an outspoken advocate of a bipartisan **immigration** overhaul, he is championing a candidate who has vowed to build an “impenetrable physical wall” on the country’s southern border and severely restrict **immigration** from Muslim countries.

He has assumed his new role with apparent relish, embracing some of the most controversial tactics of Mr. Trump’s campaign, including its penchant for unsubstantiated assertions: Last week, Mr. Giuliani said that Mr. Trump had abandoned his insistence that President Obama was born outside the United States, even though Mr. Trump has never done so publicly.

Mr. Giuliani has also questioned Hillary Clinton’s mental and physical health, buttressing his charges with debunked internet memes. “Go online and put down ‘Hillary Clinton illness,’ take a look at the videos for yourself,” he said last month.

It has been a startling next — and perhaps last — act for a 72-year-old politician once nicknamed America’s Mayor, and noteworthy enough for a handful of editorial pages to call him “unhinged.”[http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/internet-field-day-bizarre-opening-night-republican-article-1.2716454]

But the Trump campaign has given Mr. Giuliani, a former federal prosecutor, the chance to mold a potential president, and to do battle with an old rival he deeply dislikes, one who he bitterly insists received special treatment from the F.B.I.

A Trump victory could open the door for Mr. Giuliani to return to public office, perhaps as head of the Department of Homeland Security or even Secretary of State.

But his ardent support for Mr. Trump could, alternatively, come at a cost to his legacy, as it has put Mr. Giuliani starkly at odds with other right-of-center Republican figures who have described the nominee as a dangerous threat to the nation and have refused to support him.

This is a source of deep concern to a large cadre of former Giuliani aides, people who recall him as the steely, compassionate leader of post-9/11 New York, and as the mayor who presided over a historic reduction in crime in the decade before — a period when he also denounced the most extreme elements of the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org], advocated stricter gun control and signed a landmark domestic partnerships bill.

“That’s what makes it so painful to watch,” said Rick Wilson, an adviser to Mr. Giuliani’s 1997 re-election effort who is now advising a third-party candidate for president, Evan McMullin[https://www.evanmcmullin.com/]. “Trump is the kind of person that Rudy in a lot of ways would have laughed off the stage.”

In a telephone interview, Mr. Giuliani acknowledged that a large segment of people who have worked with him over the last three decades have recoiled from Mr. Trump’s candidacy. Among other things, his former aides have expressed concerns about Mr. Trump’s questioning of the impartiality of a judge because of his Mexican heritage, and belittling the Muslim parents of a slain Army officer.

“They don’t know him as well as I do,” Mr. Giuliani said, adding, “There’s not a racist bone in his body.”

The real Donald Trump, he said, “is a guy without these prejudices.”

Since Mr. Giuliani’s speech at the Republican convention in July, when he fulminated about the dangers of a Clinton presidency in tones that struck many as over the top, he has been a frequent presence by Mr. Trump’s side, trying to steady the Republican candidate’s wobbly campaign.

He accompanied Mr. Trump to Mexico on Aug. 31, and then introduced him before his **immigration** speech the same night in Phoenix, even donning a white “Make Mexico Great Again Also” hat for the occasion. Mr. Giuliani has played a significant role behind the scenes, too, urging Mr. Trump to tone down his remarks and rethink his **immigration** plan. He also took control of a private campaign round-table discussion of national security recently, in which he addressed the room as often as Mr. Trump did, according to someone in attendance.

Former Giuliani aides discern other imprints on the Trump campaign: Mr. Trump’s policy addresses about school reform and his recent outreach to black voters in Detroit, they said, contained echoes of Mr. Giuliani’s mayoral re-election campaign in 1997, when he argued with black New Yorkers that Democrats had let them down.

Mr. Giuliani still has his defenders.

“Rudy Giuliani presided over the single greatest transformation of a major American city in our history,” said Anthony V. Carbonetti, a longtime adviser. “It sickens me to hear people diminish that simply because they disagree with his politics.”

Mr. Giuliani said that he did not share all of Mr. Trump’s views, but that on the issues that mattered most, the economy and foreign policy, they were in sync. He said he believed that Mr. Trump had made adjustments in his approach, including on **immigration**.

On paper, at least, the two men have much in common. Both are relatively socially liberal and twice-divorced products of neighborhoods outside Manhattan, where they eventually gained fame. Both are pugnacious, with hearty appetites for conflict and for attention from a news media they often condemn as biased.

But there are significant differences. Mr. Giuliani is a well-read student of history who absorbs himself in the details of policy debates. Mr. Trump skims briefing books and prefers to get his information from cable news.

Mr. Giuliani waited until the New York primary to declare his support for Mr. Trump, then did so cautiously, saying he was troubled by some of the candidate’s more personal attacks on his rivals. But once Mr. Trump won the nomination, Mr. Giuliani’s tentative embrace became a bear hug.

The relationship between the two dates back decades, to when Mr. Trump was actively developing real estate in New York.

Mr. Trump was not a major donor to Mr. Giuliani’s campaigns, but in 1999, the mayor came under fire for a deal that allowed Mr. Trump to build a 72-story condominium tower on the East Side of Manhattan, far bigger than the zoning code had contemplated. That same year, Mr. Giuliani spoke at the funeral of Mr. Trump’s father, Fred, calling him “a giant.”

Mr. Trump lent his airplane to Mr. Giuliani at least twice in the immediate aftermath of Sept. 11. He let the mayor and Gov. George E. Pataki fly to Washington for President George W. Bush’s first address to Congress. There was a catch, though: The plane had been grounded at La Guardia Airport after the attacks. Mr. Trump asked Mr. Giuliani’s aides to help get the restriction lifted. They did.

Mr. Trump has sat in Mr. Giuliani’s box at Yankee Stadium, and each attended the other’s most recent wedding: Mr. Giuliani to Judith Nathan, Mr. Trump to Melania Knauss.

Now, they share a common adversary.

Mr. Giuliani had planned to run against Mrs. Clinton for the Senate in 2000, but dropped out of the race after a prostate cancer scare.

“He didn’t have a lot of use for either of the Clintons,” said Jerome Hauer, who was Mr. Giuliani’s emergency management director but later had a falling out with him. Mr. Hauer recalled having to persuade the mayor to let him give a briefing to President Bill Clinton in 1998.

“I think there’s a significant animus towards Hillary, almost a vendetta,” Mr. Hauer said.

Mr. Giuliani said he never considered running for president this year, despite a political climate that could have been more favorable to him. He also brushed aside speculation that he covets a cabinet position, saying his decision to support Mr. Trump was animated by his concern for the country’s security.

Nevertheless, watching Mr. Giuliani vouch for and cheer on the divisive Mr. Trump has been jarring for those who recall the former mayor’s denunciation of Patrick J. Buchanan’s[http://www.nytimes.com/1996/02/22/us/politics-in-new-york-giuliani-criticizes-policies-of-buchanan-as-dangerous.html] anti-**immigrant**presidential campaign in 1996, and his leadership of a badly shaken city in September 2001, when he grimly warned that “the number of casualties will be more than any of us can bear, ultimately.”

It is those moments that many of Mr. Giuliani’s former aides hope he will be remembered for, not his full-throated support for Mr. Trump.

“Rudy is being called on to defend the indefensible,” John Avlon, a former Giuliani speechwriter, said recently on CNN. “It doesn’t reflect his best self, but it should not define him in the totality of his career.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Kitty Bennett contributed research.

\* Rudy Giuliani’s Racial Myths[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/12/opinion/rudy-giulianis-racial-myths.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Paris, Ky. — After Bill Bissett, the president of the Kentucky Coal Association, told me that “President Obama cares more about Paris, France, than he does about Paris, Kentucky” — a sentiment that seems broadly shared around here — I decided to check out this little town with a big name set amid the verdant undulations of picket-fenced Kentucky horse country. Soon enough I ran into Cindy Hedges, whose boot store stands on Main Street and whose hours, as described by a sign on the door, are: “If I’m here, I’m here. If I ain’t, I ain’t.”

Straight talk, the way the people of this particular Paris like it, is the kind of talk they recognize in Donald J. Trump. Hedges is a garrulous woman who says she’s “never met a stranger.” But recent times have tried her affability. Her business has been slow. Her husband, Mitch, lost his job as the coal business collapsed, she has been withdrawing money from savings, and the couple are struggling to afford health insurance. All of which has led her to the conviction that the country is off track and needs “somebody spectacular to get us halfway straight.”

For her, that somebody is Trump. She voted for Barack Obama in 2008, and says her political choices are gut-driven rather than party-driven. “I have never been this political,” she tells me. “This is the most fired-up I’ve ever been for a candidate.” She believes Trump will get business going, revoke trade deals she sees as draining domestic jobs, and “clean up the mess Obama has left us.” But what, I ask, of Trump’s evident character flaws? “Sure, he’s kind of a loose canon, but he tells it the way it is and, if elected, people will be there to calm him down a bit, tweak a word or two in his speeches. And I just don’t trust Hillary Clinton.”

Kentucky voted twice for Bill Clinton before going solidly Republican in presidential elections. Now Kentuckians are clambering aboard the Trump train — and to heck with its destination. Obama is blamed for the collapse of coal, particularly in eastern Kentucky, and the ever more stringent standards of the Environmental Protection Agency. Beyond that, the blame is aimed at airy-fairy liberals more concerned about climate change — often contested or derided — than about Americans trying to make their house payments.

The number of Kentucky coal jobs has plunged to fewer than 6,500 from about 18,000 when Obama took office; the number fell 6.9 percent between this April and June alone. Hillary Clinton’s words in Ohio — “We’re going to put a lot of coal miners and coal companies out of business” — echo on Republican radio ads, plucked out of context from her pledge to replace those jobs with opportunities in clean, renewable energy. By contrast, Trump declared in West Virginia in May that miners should “get ready, because you are going to be working your asses off!”

“I don’t believe Obama has a white board on how he’s going to torture us, but he has,” Bissett told me at his office in Lexington. “I cannot tell you how rabid the support for Trump is.”

That support is proving resilient. The post-convention Trump free fall has run into the obstinacy of his appeal — an appeal that seems to defy every gaffe, untruth and insult. The race is tightening once again because Trump’s perceived character — a strong leader with a simple message, never flinching from a fight, cutting through political correctness with a bracing bluntness — resonates in places like Appalachia where courage, country and cussedness are core values.

“Trump’s appeal is nationalistic, the authoritarian shepherd of the flock,” Al Cross, an associate professor at the University of Kentucky, told me. “That’s why evangelical Christians are willing to vote for this twice-divorced man who brags about the size of his penis. There’s a strong belief here still in America as special and exceptional, and Obama is seen as having played that down.”

But the Trump magnetism goes deeper than resentment at Obama’s regretful tone from Havana to Hiroshima. It seems to go beyond the predictable Republican domination in this part of the country. There’s a sense, crystallized in coal’s steady demise, that, as the political scientist Norman Ornstein put it to me, “Somebody is taking everything you are used to and you had” — your steady middle-class existence, your values, your security. It’s not that the economy is bad in all of Kentucky; the arrival of the auto industry has been a boon, and the unemployment rate is just 4.9 percent. It’s that all the old certainties have vanished.

Far from the metropolitan hubs inhabited by the main beneficiaries of globalization’s churn, many people feel disenfranchised from both main political parties, angry at stagnant wages and growing inequality, and estranged from a prevailing liberal urban ethos. I heard a lot about how Obama has not been supportive enough of the police, of how white lives matter, too, and of how illegal — as in illegal **immigrant** — means illegal, just as robbing a bank is. For anyone used to New York chatter, or for that matter London or Paris chatter, Kentucky is a through-the-looking-glass experience. There are just as many certainties; they are simply the opposite ones, whether on **immigration**, police violence toward African-Americans, or guns. America is now tribal, with each tribe imbibing its own social-media-fed ranting.

The Clintons were feted here in the 1990s, but two decades on Hillary Clinton is viewed with cool suspicion. That’s because both the economy and values have moved on, too. Jobs went south to Mexico or east to Asia. Somewhere on the winding road from whites-only bathrooms to choose-your-gender bathrooms, many white, blue-collar Kentucky workers — and the state is 85.1 percent white — feel their country got lost. The F.D.R. Democrats who became Reagan Democrats and then Clinton Democrats could well be November’s Trump Democrats.

America is no longer white enough for that to be decisive, but it is significant. To these people, Trump’s “Make America Great Again” is not the empty rhetoric of a media-savvy con artist from Queens but a last-ditch rallying cry for the soul of a changing land where minorities will be the majority by the middle of the century.

Hazard, set in the mountains of eastern Kentucky, is a once bustling town with its guts wrenched out. On Main Street, the skeleton of a mall that burned down last year presents its charred remains for dismal contemplation. Young people with drugged eyes lean against boarded-up walls on desolate streets. The whistle of trains hauling coal, once as regular as the chiming of the hours, has all but vanished. So have the coal trucks spewing splinters of rock that shattered windshields. In the age of cheap natural gas and mountaintop removal mining, a coal town is not where you want to be.

Hazard is in Perry County, where unemployment is above 10 percent. On a bench opposite the county courthouse, on the Starbucks-free Main Street, I found Steve Smith and Paul Bush. Smith used to work underground at the Starfire mine. He earned as much as $1,500 a week, but was laid off a while ago. His unemployment has dried up and he has four children to feed. His family scrapes by on his wife’s income as a nurse. He’d been in court over a traffic offense; now an idle afternoon stretched away.

“Trump’s going to get us killed, probably!” he told me. “But I’ll vote for him anyway over Hillary. If you vote for Hillary you vote for Obama, and he’s made it impossible to ship coal. This place is about dried up. A job at Wendy’s is the only thing left. We may have to move.”

“Yeah, another year without change and they’ll be shutting Hazard down,” Bush suggested.

He was awaiting his son, in court on a drug charge for the painkiller Percocet. A retired operator of heavy equipment for the Road Department, Bush said his son did nothing, “just a few odd jobs.” He continued: “Obama’s probably never known hardship. He and Hillary don’t get it. At least Trump don’t hold nothing back: If he don’t like something, he tells you about it.”

His son’s girlfriend emerged from the courthouse. “They locked him up,” she said.

“Why?”

“He failed one of the drug tests.”

“Well, ain’t nothin’ we can do about it,” Bush said.

There are people here who are not resigned, people thinking about what can be done about a post-coal Hazard. Self-reliance remains an important Appalachian value even if many people are “on the draw.” An initiative backed by Congressman Hal Rogers, a Republican, to bring broadband access to rural areas in Kentucky has been announced.

Jenny Williams, an English teacher at Hazard Community and Technical College, told me it’s past time to get over divisions between “Friends of Coal” — a popular movement and bumper sticker — and anti-coal environmentalists to forge a creative economy around agriculture, ecotourism, education and small-scale manufacture. Coal, she observed, was never going to last forever. “How could any idiot support Trump?” she said. “But when you’ve been on $70,000 a year in coal mines, and your life’s pulled out from under you, who else can you be mad at but the government?”

That anger simmers. It’s directed at Obama, and by extension Clinton, and by further extension a Democratic Party that, as the former Democratic senator Jim Webb from Virginia told me, “has now built its constituency based on ethnic groups other than white working people.” The frustration of these people, whether they are in Kentucky, or Texas, or throughout the Midwest, is acute. They are looking for “someone who will articulate the truth of their disenfranchisement,” as Webb put it. Trump, for all his bullying petulance, has come closest to being that politician, which is why millions of Americans support him.

Bissett, the Coal Association president, made clear to me that he did not dismiss the emissions concerns about coal; what bothers him is what he sees as Obama’s and the E.P.A.’s refusal to seek a reasonable balance between the economy and the environment. The administration, he argues, has moved the goal posts to kill coal. It is this that feels punitive. For example, the E.P.A.’s Clean Power Plan, first presented in 2014 with no backing from Congress, requires every state to submit proposals for reducing carbon dioxide emissions by 2018. The Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision, blocked the initiative early this year. But that was just before Justice Antonin Scalia died. “We need Trump for a reasonable Supreme Court and an E.P.A no longer skewed against fossil fuels,” Bissett argued. “A lot of jobs here still depend on coal and cheap electricity. That’s why Clinton is toxic right now.”

At Jabo’s Coal River Grille, a popular restaurant in Hazard, I met Phillip Clemons, known as “Jabo” (“perhaps because I used to box”). He owns the Locust Grove mining company, with 15 employees, down from 150. As a hedge, he opened the restaurant, where he was working a shift to keep payroll down. He called the election a “terrible choice,” but he’s with Trump, because he believes that, as a businessman, Trump will respect the need to “balance the books,” past bankruptcies notwithstanding. “Obama just hates coal,” he said. “I don’t dislike people because of their color. I liked Herman Cain a lot. I can tell you the only black person who’s ever been mean to me is Barack Obama.”

What’s happened to eastern Kentucky is devastating, but far from unique. At France’s diner, another popular Hazard hangout, Daniel Walker, who works from home for a medical software company, told me: “Look, I lived for a while in Mansfield, Ohio, and General Motors moved its stamping plant there to Mexico, with the loss of thousands of factory jobs. The decent middle-class life is gone.” There are many places, here and abroad, where people feel shoved aside by technology and cheap global labor, leading them to seek radical political answers. Trump is one of those answers; Brexit, the surprise British vote to leave the European Union, was another; the fall of Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany next year could be a third, after she trailed an anti-**immigrant** party in a local election this month.

Trump can’t reverse globalization. Nor is he likely to save coal in an era of cheap natural gas. His gratuitous insults, evident racism, hair-trigger temper and lack of preparation suggest he would be a reckless, even perilous, choice for the Oval Office. I don’t think he is a danger to the Republic because American institutions are stronger than Trump’s ego, but that the question even arises is troubling.

Still, in a climate where disruption is sought at any cost (whether political in Hazard or economic in Silicon Valley), it would be foolhardy to suggest that Trump cannot win. He can; and he can in part because of the liberal intellectual arrogance that dismisses the economic, social and cultural problems his rise has underscored. Whatever happens in November, these problems will persist, and it will take major public and private investment and an unlikely rebirth of bipartisanship in Washington to make any dent in them.

Back in Paris — the Kentucky one — I sit down in a coffee shop with Cindy Hedges and her husband, Mitch. He worked for more than 30 years as a welder and then a supervisor in a factory that refurbished mining equipment. It was dirty work — coal is black, grease is black, hydraulic oil is black — but it was a good living. He lost his job in February, before returning on a temporary contract a couple of weeks ago, and when I ask him why his full-time employment disappeared, the answer is by now familiar: the E.P.A. and Obama, for whom, like his wife, he voted in 2008. But when I turn to this political season, he springs a surprise.

“Look, there’s nobody to vote for,” he says. “Trump is an idiot, he pisses everyone off, he’s scary, he’ll pump his mouth off to some foreign country and we’ll be at war. He’s a billionaire on a power trip with as much reason to be president as I have. If Trump had shut up, he’d win the election. So do you vote for the one who’s going to lie, or the one who takes you to war? I’m leaning Hillary.”

“Oh, come on, Mitch!” says Cindy.

“What? With Bill Clinton the economy was rolling. I was working a 50-hour week and my 401 (k) outperformed my salary. He’s going to be advising Hillary, suggesting she needs to do this or this.”

“They don’t get along, Mitch.”

“Well, I’m scared of Trump.”

“I guess we’ll cancel each other out then,” says Cindy.

At the boot store, Carrie McCall, a FedEx driver, appears with a package.

“I love Trump,” she declares. “He shoots from the hip.”

But, I ask, isn’t that dangerous?

“I don’t care. After all we’ve been through, I just don’t care.”

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Europe’s ability to accept more refugees is “close to the limits,” warned[http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/09/04-tusk-remarks-before-g20-china/] the European Council president, Donald Tusk, at the G20 meeting on Sunday. For the truck drivers and local citizens who staged a protest on Monday in Calais, France, where the population of a migrant tent camp has swelled to more than 10,000, that limit has been reached.

Calais is a magnet for migrants trying to reach Britain because it is close to the Eurotunnel. Under a 2003 agreement between the two countries, British border control takes place on the French side of the tunnel. With Britain unwilling to take in migrants, the result is a bottleneck in Calais.

A year ago, when the population of the Calais camp had grown to about 5,000, Britain pledged $11 million to beef up security at both ends of the tunnel, and France committed more police officers. This year, the government of President François Hollande had the northern portion of the squalid camp razed, and set up shipping containers to house some migrants.

The camp’s population has doubled since then, and conditions are worse. Migrants are resorting to desperate means to try to get through the Eurotunnel, including attacking trucks bound for Britain so they can clamber on board. The conservative Les Républicains mayor of Calais, Natacha Bouchart, is demanding that Mr. Hollande’s Socialist government send in the army to control the migrants. Former President Nicolas Sarkozy of France, who is running for president again, wants to set up a detention center for migrants on British soil, an idea the British promptly rejected. With presidential elections scheduled for spring, Calais has become an anti-**immigrant** rallying cry for Les Républicains and the far-right National Front party.

Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve of France promised Friday that the camp will be gone by the end of this year, with migrants transferred to other parts of France. But the details remain vague, and Monday’s protesters want immediate action. This will not be easy. Anti-**immigrant** fever is on the rise: Early Tuesday, a refugee center set to open next month outside Paris was set on fire.

At the G20 meeting, Mr. Tusk said the rest of the world must step up and do its share on the global refugee crisis. No doubt, an international effort is needed. But it is shameful that Britain and France, two of the wealthiest countries in Europe, have failed to deal humanely with the migrants in Calais.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I doubt that many of us veterans had high expectations for the candidates’ forum on national security on Wednesday. Our country has essentially been at war now for 15 years, yet fewer of our would-be leaders have real ties to the military.

But, in the crowd of veterans at the forum, I, and those around me, were startled more than once by Donald J. Trump’s lack of understanding of how his comments would be heard by us. In his allotted 30 minutes, he made several statements that reflected a lack of knowledge of how the military works, or appeared to argue for action that would be a violation of the armed services’ values.

I was a member of the class of 1980 at West Point — the first class that admitted women — and I served in the Army for five years. Since then, my work and life have been connected to the military. In the 1990s I worked on the failed campaign to end the ban on service by gay Americans, and a decade later I worked to get the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy repealed. I have stayed close to West Point and mentored cadets and staff.

Now, I am seeking local office as a Democrat in New Jersey. I am not among the 55 percent of current or former members[http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/poll-trump-leads-clinton-among-military-veteran-voters-n643501] of the military who support Mr. Trump’s candidacy. But I went to the forum with an open mind, interested to hear how Mr. Trump would speak directly to his military supporters, and to see his grasp of the issues that affect us all.

I was able to ask him a question. Because he has been so outspoken about **immigrants**, saying that people[http://www.cnn.com/2016/09/04/politics/donald-trump-immigration-deportations-rudy-giuliani/] who have entered the country illegally would not be allowed to stay, I wanted to know whether he believed an undocumented **immigrant** who wanted to serve in the military should be allowed to do so. He said they could stay in that circumstance. I agree with him there, but I don’t understand how that fits with his previous statements. Which is true?

When a Marine veteran, Rachel Fredericks, asked him about suicide statistics among veterans, he corrected her numbers — but she was right and he was wrong[http://www.salon.com/2016/09/08/veteran-with-ptsd-responds-to-trumps-incorrect-fact-check-of-veteran-suicides-yet-again-we-are-going-to-stigmitaze-veterans/].

Regarding sexual assault, he commented that a military court system to handle such cases “practically doesn’t exist,” which is baffling. The Judge Advocate General’s[http://www.goarmy.com/jag.html] Corps in the Army[http://www.goarmy.com/jag.html] alone constitutes one of the world’s largest law firms.

But worse were those comments that fly in the face of our core values. You cannot underestimate the importance of honor, of virtuous conduct, among military people. Mr. Trump said[http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/trump-said-take-oil-can-he-n645021] that the United States should “take the oil” from Iraq, citing the adage that to the victor go the spoils. When he said this, there was a muffled gasp in the room. This is called plunder. Stealing the national resources of another sovereign country is effectively a war crime.

Given an opportunity to explain a 2013 tweet[https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/331907383771148288?lang=en] — “26,000 unreported sexual assaults in the military — only 238 convictions. What did these geniuses expect when they put men and women together?” — he doubled down.

“It is a correct tweet,” he said. “There are many people that think that’s absolutely correct.”

If he was banking on an innate resentment of female soldiers by their male peers, he was discounting not only the female veterans in the room, but the men who fought in Iraq and Afghanistan alongside them, who bristled at his comment.

Mr. Trump suggested that, as commander in chief, he would install different generals. From where? He would plan to fire our senior leaders and replace them with whom? Generals who fit his political viewpoint, like the 88 retired generals and admirals who recently endorsed[https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/88-retired-u.s.-generals-and-admirals-endorse-trump] him?

The importance of civil-military leadership is taught to all military cadets; and it runs both ways. Not only does the military take orders from civilian leadership, but smart civilian leaders respect the expertise of military leaders who are expected to give their best objective advice based on years of experience.

The biggest jaw-dropper in Mr. Trump’s comments was his insult to today’s military. One thing that all of us who served before 2001 know: Troops from the most recent generation have deployed more, and been at war far longer, than any of us. We know that today’s generals are more seasoned, more experienced, than ever. They’ve spent the past 15 years commanding troops in combat.

For Mr. Trump to stand in front of a group of veterans and say[http://thehill.com/policy/national-security/294919-trump-us-generals-have-been-reduced-to-rubble], “The generals have been reduced to rubble” and “Right now, we are not strong[http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/ap-fact-check-multiple-missteps-mark-trump-clinton-41949946],” was a slap in the face. We don’t care if you say[http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1605/31/ath.02.html] that you “love the vets.” Do not expect us to nod our heads at this denigration of our service and our profession.

As Mr. Trump left, we applauded courteously, until the signal that we were off the air. After a beat, someone yelled from the back, “Make America great again!” In the smattering of applause that followed, my friend, Tanya Domi, a former Army captain, growled, “America is already great!” to whoops and cheers. Of all the Army values Mr. Trump has flouted in this campaign — respect, selfless service, personal courage — perhaps the most telling is loyalty.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Sue Fulton served in the United States Army from 1980 to 1985 and is the former president of Sparta, an advocacy group for gay and transgender troops.

\* Veterans as Props on NBC’s Commander-in-Chief Forum[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/opinion/veterans-as-props-on-nbcs-commander-in-chief-forum.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There was not much of a contest in Wednesday night’s forum[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/08/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-national-security.html] with Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. Mrs. Clinton answered the questions of the moderator, Matt Lauer, in coherent sentences, often with specific details. Mr. Trump alternated between rambling statements and grandiose boasts when he wasn’t lying.

Mr. Lauer largely neglected to ask penetrating questions, call out falsehoods or insist on answers when it was obvious that Mr. Trump’s responses had drifted off.

If the moderators of the coming debates do not figure out a better way to get the candidates to speak accurately about their records and policies — especially Mr. Trump, who seems to feel he can skate by unchallenged with his own version of reality while Mrs. Clinton is grilled and entangled in the fine points of domestic and foreign policy — then they will have done the country a grave disservice.

Whether or not one agrees with her positions, Mrs. Clinton, formerly secretary of state and once a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, showed a firm understanding of the complex issues facing the country. Mr. Trump reveled in his ignorance about global affairs and his belief that leading the world’s most powerful nation is no harder than running his business empire, which has included at least four [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/21/us/politics/donald-trump-debt.html?\_r=0] bankruptcies[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/21/us/politics/donald-trump-debt.html?\_r=0].

Mr. Lauer seemed most energized interrogating Mrs. Clinton about her use of a personal email server while secretary of state. Focusing on it meant that other critical issues — like America’s role in Afghanistan and its ties with China — went unaddressed. He was harder on Mrs. Clinton than on Mr. Trump, reflecting a tendency among some journalists to let Mr. Trump’s deceptions go unchallenged. That certainly was the case when he let Mr. Trump attack Mrs. Clinton for voting for the Iraq war and going into Libya[https://buzzfeed-video1.s3.amazonaws.com/video/2016/01/19/FromTheDeskOfDonaldTrump2-28-624x350.mp4] when Mr. Trump had supported[http://www.vox.com/2016/9/7/12842998/trump-iraq-libya-lie-command-in-chief-forum] those actions.

Disputing outright lies may actually be one of the easier challenges for a moderator. The harder task is to pierce fantasies and gibberish. That requires preparation and persistence.

Mr. Trump was asked to explain his qualifications to lead the armed forces. “I have great judgment,[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/09/07/the-first-hillary-clinton-vs-donald-trump-showdown-of-2016-annotated/]” was his response. Fortunately, despite the lack of a follow-up question to that non-answer, Mr. Trump was perfectly able to display his abysmal judgment.

He repeated his view that President Vladimir Putin of Russia, who invaded Ukraine and annexed Crimea, is a better leader than President Obama. He denigrated America’s generals as having been “reduced to rubble.” He talked in circles about defeating the Islamic State, boasting of a secret plan that he would not share.

Mr. Trump reinforced his reputation for misogyny by defending his tweet from 2013 suggesting that sexual assaults were to be expected if women serve in the military. And, prompted by an audience question, he adjusted his **immigration** policy on the fly, suggesting that **immigrants** who join the military could avoid deportation.

Lucky for him, no one bothered to ask why he should be allowed to be commander in chief when he spent so much time attacking the parents of a Muslim Army captain killed in Iraq. Earlier in the day, Mr. Trump called for a huge expansion of the military that experts said would cost an extra $150 billion [http://www.crfb.org/blogs/how-much-would-trumps-new-defense-plan-cost]over a decade. He gave no hint where that money would come from.

At one point, Mrs. Clinton, trying to assure the audience that she would use military force judiciously, said, “We are not putting ground troops into Iraq ever again, and we’re not putting ground troops into Syria.” This left unanswered the question of whether she had made a promise she can’t keep, particularly since there are some Special Operations forces in both battlefields now.

There will be many issues to explore at the three presidential debates. For the sake of the nation, the moderators need to be fully prepared to challenge the candidates, so voters can have a clear picture of how they will lead.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NORTHBROOK, Ill. — Representative Robert J. Dold, Republican of Illinois, is eager to work with Democrats to change the nation’s **immigration** laws, despite Donald J. Trump’s signature proposal to build a border wall and deport **immigrants** who are in the country illegally.

But he may not be around in January to act on his conviction.

Mr. Dold, who represents Chicago’s northern suburbs, is one of at least a dozen House Republicans who have been weighing a push for broad **immigration**legislation as soon as next year.

Several of the most ardent Republican supporters of an **immigration** overhaul are locked in fierce election fights, potentially leaving an even more conservative party in the House that will be less willing to negotiate on fixing the **immigration** system.

For many members of Congress, being open to an **immigration** overhaul is increasingly a matter of political survival: About 27.3 million Latinos are qualified to vote in this year’s election, according to the Pew Research Center[http://www.pewhispanic.org/interactives/mapping-the-latino-electorate-by-congressional-district/], constituting a record 11.9 percent of eligible voters. Latino organizations have been focused on encouraging turnout in a year some speculate could make Hispanic voters an electoral heavyweight for years to come.

In 164 of 435 districts, the share of eligible Latino voters increased by at least 1 percent during the past four years, said David Wasserman, an editor for the nonpartisan Cook Political Report who focuses on House races. Most of the districts that have had the most growth are held by Democrats, though 70 of those 164 are in Republican hands, he said.

Representative Mike Coffman of Colorado, for instance, has seen the emerging power of the Hispanic vote. A Republican who voted in his first term against [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/14/us/politics/donald-trump-mike-coffman-colorado-congress.html] a bill to create a path to legalization[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/14/us/politics/donald-trump-mike-coffman-colorado-congress.html] for young people who came to the United States as children, he watched — and reacted — as redistricting abruptly dealt him a constituency in which one in five residents is Latino, compared with less than one in 10 when he was first elected. Now Mr. Coffman is among those House Republicans most engaged in conversations about the need for an **immigration**overhaul.

Yet for lawmakers like Mr. Dold and Mr. Coffman, it is increasingly difficult to put distance between themselves and Mr. Trump.

Mr. Dold has certainly been trying. Democratic leaders want to make an **immigration** overhaul a priority of the next Congress, and Mr. Dold did not conceal his enthusiasm when this fact was mentioned in an interview. “Great,” he said in the sunny, modernly sparse offices of TechNexus, a firm that connects entrepreneurs and corporations, perched above the Civic Opera House in Chicago.

Mr. Dold serves in perhaps the most heavily Democratic district represented by a Republican. Stretching along Lake Michigan, this relatively well-educated district sits among the affluent Chicago suburbs. Many of its Hispanic residents live in Waukegan, a blue-collar city toward the northern end of the district.

President Obama won commanding victories here in 2008 and 2012; Mr. Trump’s popularity hangs dismally somewhere between lake-effect snow and ketchup on hot dogs[http://www.chicagotribune.com/dining/ct-chicago-ketchup-hot-dog-20150714-story.html].

About 59,000 Latinos are eligible to vote in Mr. Dold’s district, making up 11.2 percent of the electorate — a key group given that Mr. Dold beat Brad Schneider, a former Democratic congressman who is challenging him again this year, by less than 5,000 votes in 2014. That year, 7.37 percent of those who voted were Hispanic — casting more than 13,500 votes — according to numbers provided by Mr. Dold’s staff.

Participating in an all-Republican panel discussion on a “common-sense” **immigration** overhaul last month at TechNexus, Mr. Dold rebuked Mr. Trump, whom he has said he will not support. He sat alongside Representative Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida and Senator Mark S. Kirk of Illinois, who is also at risk in November.

“There’s no way in the world that we are going to send 11 million people out of the United States,” Mr. Dold said. “Many of them — most of them, I would argue — are more American than their next-door neighbors, because many of them are our next-door neighbors.”

But while Mr. Dold has introduced legislation that would help entrepreneurs and students with advanced degrees obtain visas, Mr. Schneider has pushed for larger changes, having been one of many sponsors on the House version of the Senate “Gang of Eight” **immigration** legislation in 2013 when he held the seat.

“To me, **immigration** reform could be, should be, one of the first things we pass because of the immediate impact it would have on our communities,” Mr. Schneider said.

Some who want an **immigration** overhaul are hopeful about their prospects in the next Congress, even ascribing some credit to an unlikely source: Mr. Trump. The Republican nominee — who last week reiterated his assertion that many **immigrants** are criminals in an address on **immigration**policy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] — has shown lawmakers that many voters will recoil when a candidate adopts an extreme stance on illegal **immigration**, said Ali Noorani, the executive director of the National **Immigration**Forum[http://immigrationforum.org/].

“I think that Trump is the best thing that has happened to the **immigration** issue in a long time,” Mr. Noorani said.

Representative Carlos Curbelo, a Florida Republican who offered his own legislation to outline a path to citizenship for children brought to the country illegally, said he had been talking to about a dozen like-minded Republicans about pushing for broader **immigration** legislation early next year. He started a leadership political action committee last year aimed at helping Republicans open to changes in **immigration** law.

“I know a lot of people, myself included — we regret the way **immigration** has been discussed so far in this presidential election,” Mr. Curbelo said. “The silver lining is, the fact that it has received so much attention is going to help build momentum for solutions early in the next Congress.”

But the reality is that Mr. Curbelo, like Mr. Dold, might not be part of the new Congress. He is running in one of the country’s most competitive House races, against Joe Garcia, a former Democratic congressman who introduced the House companion to the “Gang of Eight” legislation.

Mr. Trump’s approach to illegal **immigration** is also complicating the prospects for three House Republicans in California in particular: Representatives Jeff Denham, David Valadao and Steve Knight, all of whom are locked in tight races in districts where at least 25 percent of eligible voters are Latino. While Mr. Knight takes a tougher stance that starts with border security, Mr. Denham and Mr. Valadao advocate a broader overhaul.

Stances like Mr. Trump’s may cause heartburn for many Republicans, still haunted by the party’s internal “autopsy report”[http://goproject.gop.com/rnc\_growth\_opportunity\_book\_2013.pdf] after Mitt Romney lost the presidential election in 2012. “If Hispanics think we do not want them here, they will close their ears to our policies,” the report concluded. This election could worsen things for the Republican Party, Mr. Wasserman said.

“There will be almost no pro-**immigration** voices in this conference if all of these members lose, and so that’s a big problem for the party’s prospects nationally,” he said.

For now, overhaul-minded Republicans are left to find ways to distinguish themselves from the top of the ticket as Election Day approaches. And that is no easy task, said Jill Normington, a Washington-based Democratic strategist advising Mr. Schneider.

“As much as they might want to distance themselves from their own party, it says ‘Bob Dold, Republican’ on the ballot,” she said. “And that is a liability in 2016, not an asset.”

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/nytpolitics], and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics/].

\* Donald Trump Tries to Clarify **Immigration** Plan, but Avoids Key Issue[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html]

\* Donald Trump, Wavering on **Immigration**, Finds Anger in All Corners[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/26/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This year, it’s not the economy. And actually, there’s nothing stupid about that.

In 1992, with President George Bush weakened by recession, Bill Clinton made “It’s the economy, stupid” his campaign mantra. Since then, the phrase has stood for the idea that winning candidates focus on pocketbook concerns.

In 2016, however, neither Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] nor Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] has established a clear advantage when it comes to the economy. So while voters tell pollsters that the economy remains their most important issue, the candidates focus on other subjects.

That reflects the unique contours of the race this year and the middling state of the United States economy.

Businesses have added 15 million jobs since 2010, the start of the longest streak of private-sector job creation in United States history. Unemployment has fallen to 4.9 percent after peaking at 10 percent after the 2008 financial crisis and subsequent recession.

Those gains silenced the cries of “Where are the jobs?” that helped Republicans recapture the House of Representatives in 2010. They undercut claims of “job killing” consequences from the Affordable Care Act, President Obama’s health care plan, which helped Republicans win the Senate four years later.

Now Republicans are focusing on lackluster economic expansion, citing the 1.1 percent annual growth rate in gross domestic product in the second quarter of this year. Government data shows that the recovery from this recession has been the most sluggish of any since World War II.

That only tells part of the story. The economists Kenneth Rogoff and Carmen Reinhart, leading experts on the effects of financial crises, say the United States economy has recovered better than those of nearly all other advanced countries since the global economic disaster of 2008, and more rapidly than the historical average after previous meltdowns.

Yet President Obama himself calls economic progress inadequate, which helps affirm the Republican critique. So did a Democratic primary campaign in which Mrs. Clinton competed with Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont over proposals to curb income inequality and lift long-stagnant wages.

The candidates’ backgrounds further complicate attempts to seize the economic issue.

Mr. Trump’s wealth and business career award him a presumption of economic competence from some voters. His denunciation of international trade agreements resonates with those who’ve lost ground in the era of globalization.

But Mr. Trump evinces little interest in economic policy specifics beyond his pledge to make “great deals.” He revamped his tax-cut plan in response to criticism that his first version would balloon the federal budget[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/federal\_budget\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] deficit.

Mrs. Clinton benefits from memories of prosperity during her husband’s presidency. She offers detailed plans to increase infrastructure spending, expand child care for working parents and encourage companies to share profits with workers without increasing the deficit.

Yet she inherits accumulated discontent with the party that has held the White House since Mr. Obama took office in 2009. By publicly renouncing the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a trade deal she once heralded as “the gold standard,” she has broken with Mr. Obama and with her husband’s free-trade legacy.

The result: In a Fox News poll[http://www.foxnews.com/politics/interactive/2016/08/31/fox-news-poll-aug-31-2016/] last week, registered voters split evenly, 48 percent apiece, on whether Mr. Trump or Mrs. Clinton would handle the economy better.

So Mr. Trump emphasizes his signature issue of **immigration**. That has gained him fervent support among voters who feel most aggrieved by America’s changing demography, particularly white voters without college educations.

As the self-described law-and-order candidate, Mr. Trump casts **immigration** largely as an issue of personal safety. In assailing Mrs. Clinton, he focuses on her vulnerability surrounding issues of trustworthiness.

Mrs. Clinton levels the broadest possible attack on Mr. Trump, calling him “temperamentally unfit” for the White House. Vowing to be “a president for all Americans,” she accuses him of fostering racial and ethnic “prejudice and paranoia.”

Her invocation of race represents a landmark shift in circumstances. For her husband, economic appeals offset Democratic weakness on cultural issues within an electorate that in 1992 was 87 percent white.

The nonwhite electorate has more than doubled since then. For a Democrat in 2016, emphasizing cultural issues isn’t stupid at all.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERLIN — Perhaps it was inevitable that as Turkey[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/turkey/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/e/recep\_tayyip\_erdogan/index.html?inline=nyt-per], continued his authoritarian course, relations with his Western European neighbors would worsen. Unfortunately, he’s managing to ruin not just his own relationships with other governments, but also the Turkish-German community’s relationship with the rest of their country.

In recent weeks, many policy makers have audibly changed their tone in addressing German Turks and those who claim to represent them in Germany[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/germany/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], culminating in a harsh statement from Chancellor Angela Merkel[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela\_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per] in late August. “We expect from people of Turkish descent who have been living in Germany for a long time to develop a high level of loyalty toward our country,” she said in an interview. “In return, we try to listen to their concerns.” For Germans of Turkish descent who have lived in this country their entire lives, that had to sting.

And yet she wasn’t lobbing wholly baseless allegations. The situation started to escalate in June, when the German Parliament adopted a resolution defining the murder of hundreds of thousands of Armenians in 1915 as genocide, a move that Mr. Erdogan protested vigorously. So did German Turks: Soon after, about 1,500 people showed up to protest in front of the Brandenburg Gate.

German Turks’ public support for Mr. Erdogan’s government soared after this summer’s coup attempt. Many came out into the Berlin streets after Mr. Erdogan called on Turks abroad to show their solidarity with him. Some 40,000 gathered in Cologne in a roaring sea of red moon-and-star-flags.

Such outpourings only deepened suspicion of dual loyalty among the rest of Germany. When the newsmagazine Der Spiegel reported recently that Turkey had 6,000 informants and 500 intelligence agents in Germany, the image seemed complete: Germany was being systematically undercut by the Turkish government through the medium of the Turkish community in Germany.

There are roughly three million people of Turkish descent in Germany, many of whom are culturally and religiously conservative and sympathize with Mr. Erdogan’s Justice and Development Party. That’s their right, but it is still hard, as a German, to see them hail a ruthless autocrat who has smashed Turkey’s independent news media, arrested thousands of alleged supporters of the coup and is flirting with the reintroduction of the death penalty.

But the community is not monolithic, and neither is its attitude toward Mr. Erdogan. Many feel increasingly **alienated** from the country of their ancestors. Serap Guler, a politician in Ms. Merkel’s conservative Christian Democratic Party, is one. She also complained in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung that “many in my generation and the generation that follow would rather let themselves be used as extras” in Mr. Erdogan’s “great show than grapple with the true challenges.”

Often, the cleavages run right through families. My friend Hatice Akyun, a journalist, described the conflict with her father in an essay about a year ago, when Mr. Erdogan resumed his repression of his country’s Kurdish minority. Her father supports Mr. Erdogan; she is horrified by his embrace of authoritarian violence. “It’s poisoning our relationship,” she wrote.

To generally question this large and diverse group’s “loyalty” to Germany, as Ms. Merkel did, is as unfair as it is counterproductive. In demanding loyalty from Turkish Germans to the German state, Ms. Merkel is playing along with Mr. Erdogan’s scheme to segregate Turks from the rest of Germany, of making them a Turkish exclave on German soil, deepening the mutual feeling of **alienation**.

But Ms. Merkel also speaks for a large number of Germans, if not the majority, a fact that is as instructive as it is depressing. Despite the occasional tensions and setbacks, despite the considerably lower-than-average level of education and prosperity among Germans of Turkish descent, the country had just started to portray their integration as a success story.

Even the marches this summer, full of older and largely poor Turkish Germans, were a reminder of what that first generation of **immigrants** achieved in creating in their offspring, a generation of doctors, journalists, businesspeople — of successful, integrated Germans. But it is harder and harder to see things that way.

The renewed feeling of mutual **alienation** also gives us a better idea of the minimal requirements for being German. While bias and distrust toward Turks in the past were often driven by criticisms of conservative practices of Islam (and, no less, by racism and Islamophobia), the excessive public support for Mr. Erdogan also repels the German left and liberals. To them, “loyalty” to the German state means loyalty to the German Constitution and its liberal, democratic values — “the decisive marker of German identity,” according to Herfried and Marina Münkler, the authors of “The New Germans.” The pro-Erdogan rallies looked like a thousandfold public rejection of that identity.

All of this is instructive, not just in how Germany relates to its established **immigrant** communities, but the million refugees who have recently entered the country and are now attempting to build a new life. It is a reminder that, even decades from now, the process will still be continuing, with setbacks and tensions. But it should also be a reason for optimism — that Germany can, and must, make it work.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Anna Sauerbrey is an editor on the opinion page of the newspaper Der Tagesspiegel and a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It’s easy to assume that now must be a better time than ever to be a lesbian, gay or bisexual teenager. We recently celebrated the one-year anniversary of the Supreme Court’s ruling in favor of same-sex marriage. Our culture has grown more accepting, too; one of the most anticipated albums of the year, Frank Ocean’s, embraces his desire for men. These factors work together to create the illusion that as a society we are barreling toward a world of complete liberation, where everyone is truly free to be whoever they are.

A major study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has revealed that, for high schoolers, that narrative simply isn’t true. In August, the C.D.C. released the results of a national survey of about 15,600 students, grades nine through 12, to better understand high-risk behaviors among that demographic. It is one of the most comprehensive studies of gay and lesbian teenagers’ well-being to date. (The survey does not yet include an option to identify as transgender or nonbinary.) It confirmed what had long been suspected but was perhaps lost in all the excitement over the gains being made: that sexual-minority youth still face challenges their straight peers do not. Teenagers who identify as gay, lesbian or bisexual — they make up about 8 percent of the high-school population, or roughly 1.3 million students — suffer from substantially higher levels of harassment and physical and sexual abuse than those who identify as straight.

The numbers are heartbreaking: Lesbian, gay and bisexual teenagers were more likely to have been in a fight; they were nearly three times as likely to skip school out of fear for their safety. About a third were bullied, both at school and online; nearly half said they had seriously contemplated suicide in the last year. Almost a third had tried it at least once in the same time frame. High school is already an academic and social pressure cooker, and the forces that make it stressful are amplified for queer students. Difference is prized, but only up to a point, and the social order determines your quality of life. Your placement within this cruel, arbitrary system can be a source of tremendous angst. Kids who don’t fit in are prime targets for all sorts of inventive ridicule and torture, made all the more easy by social media.

To get a sense of the everyday high-school experience for gay and queer teenagers today, I reached out to several organizations and project leaders who work with L.G.B.T. youth, and they put me in touch with a handful of kids who were willing to talk. Zeam, a sweet-faced 18-year-old trans man with a curly undercut, is a recent high-school graduate from Minnesota. Zeam, who prefers the pronouns they and them, says their days were defined by “accidental” body checks in the hallway, crying fits in the guidance counselor’s office and self-harm habits like cutting and eating disorders. There were only a few classmates who could really relate to what Zeam was going through. Many of Zeam’s friends had experienced homelessness, kicked out by their families. One of Zeam’s friends committed suicide. Even at a school that was nominally welcoming, and where Zeam’s teachers and fellow students made efforts to be accepting, Zeam still felt **alienated**. “I had this rage,” Zeam said. “My issues are a lot deeper and more systematic than pronouns.”

For all teenagers, the internet offers a periscope to the outside world, but it’s particularly important for students who are unable to find themselves represented and understood in their immediate surroundings. For Laurel, a 17-year-old living in Minneapolis, this self-discovery happened on Tumblr. Laurel had felt **alienated** and had been hospitalized for anxiety and depression. Laurel, who prefers the pronouns they and them, told me that Tumblr helped them understand genderfluidity and learn how to talk about it. “Our health classes don’t even talk about homosexuality, let alone gender, so it’s a very hard thing to talk to people who have no concept that you don’t have to be the gender you are assigned,” Laurel said. “I would look for terms I felt like I connected with,” like “pansexual” and “nonbinary,” which Laurel uses today. Laurel also posts on Instagram to update friends and peers about their preferred terms, and what is respectful and appropriate and what is not. In this way, social media doubles as a means for students to find solidarity outside their schools and to communicate what they’re experiencing back to their peers.

Gabrielle Gladu attempted suicide before she started high school, when she was in the eighth grade. Before she came out as transgender, she despised her male body and found it disorienting, given how feminine she felt inside. Watching YouTube videos about gender helped her realize that she wasn’t gay but trans. During her freshman year, she came out as trans. She asked everyone to call her Belle, a shortened version of Gabrielle, and to use female pronouns. She also began documenting her transition online in a series of popular YouTube videos. Support flowed in, giving her the courage to continue, and she began her medical transition the next year. Even though she was an anomaly at her school, the internet reassured her that she was not alone. And eventually her online popularity changed what her classmates thought of her. It made her, well, cool. Best of all, her videos offered her the perfect comeback to those with probing or invasive questions: “If you want to know everything,” she recalls saying, “you can go on YouTube and follow my story.”

Sign up for our newsletter [http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/magazine] to get the best of The New York Times Magazine delivered to your inbox every week.

Jenna Wortham, a staff writer, is the magazine’s On Technology columnist. She last wrote about how to turn apps into personal travel guides.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — The fallout from a wildly unpopular meeting last week between President Enrique Peña Nieto[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/enrique\_pena\_nieto/index.html?inline=nyt-per] of Mexico and Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump] appears to have cost Mr. Peña Nieto one of his closest cabinet allies.

The meeting prompted widespread dismay and anger[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/americas/trump-mexico-pena-nieto-reaction.html] among Mexicans, and reportedly divided Mr. Peña Nieto’s cabinet. Luis Videgaray, the finance minister, had ardently championed the idea of inviting Mr. Trump to Mexico City over the objections of other cabinet members, according to several Mexican news media reports, though Mr. Peña Nieto insisted it was his own initiative.

On Wednesday, Mr. Peña Nieto announced Mr. Videgaray’s resignation at a news conference.

He did not give a reason for Mr. Videgaray’s departure. But some analysts interpreted it as the latest, and most dramatic, effort by the president to regain the trust of the Mexican public following his meeting with Mr. Trump, the Republican nominee in the American presidential race, who has made repeated criticism of Mexicans and Mexico an incendiary motif of his campaign.

“It will help mitigate the anger,” said José Antonio Crespo Mendoza, a professor of politics at Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, a Mexican center of research and higher education. “President Peña Nieto realized things could not stay as they were, and that they could no longer insist that it had been a good call” to invite Mr. Trump.

Mr. Trump has cast his visit to Mexico as a statesmanlike effort to reach out to a country he had **alienated**. But hours after his meeting with Mr. Peña Nieto, he gave a combative speech in Phoenix that struck many of the anti-**immigrant** themes that have defined his candidacy. The whole episode has left Mr. Peña Nieto and his government embarrassed at a time when his approval ratings were already at record lows.

In the days after the meeting, the president scrambled to contain the fallout and to repair the damage in a television interview, a newspaper column and a town-hall-style meeting held to mark his annual “Informe de Gobierno,” Mexico’s equivalent of the State of the Union address[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/state\_of\_the\_union\_message\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]. But these steps seemed to do little to mollify many Mexicans, who accused the president of humiliating the nation, first by inviting Mr. Trump and then by failing to use the opportunity to push back against the candidate’s criticism of Mexico and Mexicans.

The discontent has continued to simmer on social media and in the news, and an anti-Peña Nieto demonstration has been called for Sept. 15. On Tuesday, an opposition senator — seeking to provide the defense of Mexico that he said Mr. Peña Nieto had failed to offer — submitted a bill that would empower the government to fight back against several of Mr. Trump’s foreign policy proposals, including his promise to force Mexico to pay for the construction of a border wall and his threat to withdraw the United States from the North American Free Trade Agreement.

“Of all the scandals Peña Nieto has faced, this is the most devastating,” said Alfonso Zárate, a political analyst and columnist in Mexico City.

From Mr. Trump’s perspective, the trip was a risky move from the start, given the potential for embarrassment if the Mexican president were to criticize him publicly.

It came together after Jared Kushner, the son-in-law and campaign adviser to Mr. Trump, began to lay the groundwork with Mexican officials in early August. Mr. Kushner dealt with Mr. Videgaray and other government officials in negotiating how the meeting would happen, according to a close ally of Mr. Trump who was involved in the arrangements.

Mr. Trump’s visit was largely incident-free, and provided his campaign with pleasing visuals of the Republican nominee standing side by side with a head of state. But any positive effect was quickly undone by Mr. Peña Nieto’s insistence afterward that he had told Mr. Trump Mexico would not pay for a border wall, a claim that contradicted Mr. Trump’s account.

Even so, the impact on Mr. Peña Nieto seems to have been far worse.

While Mr. Videgaray’s resignation may have been intended to stanch the political bleeding in Mexico City and salvage the president’s standing, it has also shifted the odds in the contest for future leadership of the governing Institutional Revolutionary Party, or P.R.I. It has also left Mr. Peña Nieto without one of his closest confidantes in his administration.

Mr. Videgaray, who holds a doctorate in economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, had been a rising star in the P.R.I., and his name was often mentioned as a possible contender to represent the party in the 2018 presidential election.

He had worked for the president since 2005, when Mr. Peña Nieto was the governor of the State of Mexico, helping him restructure the state’s debt and coordinating the campaign team for Mr. Peña Nieto’s 2012 presidential bid.

Mr. Videgaray became the president’s closest ally and adviser in the cabinet — “the power behind the throne,” Mr. Zárate said.

His reputation was tarnished by reports that he had bought a house at a golf club from a government contractor, though it was not sullied enough to force him out of the cabinet or out of contention for 2018. The president, who is known for his loyalty to his inner circle, stuck by him.

Indeed, Mr. Peña Nieto was accompanied by Mr. Videgaray when he made the announcement on Wednesday, and was warm and effusive toward his longtime associate and adviser, thanking him for being “committed to Mexico and loyal to the president of Mexico.”

Mr. Zárate said the departure of Mr. Videgaray was “very painful for the president.” He added, “we all know the enormous influence that he has.’’

“It leaves the president orphaned,” Mr. Zárate said.

As finance minister, Mr. Videgaray was at the center of the administration’s efforts to overhaul the country’s telecommunications and energy sectors. He successfully pushed to open the nation’s oil industry[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/subject/oil-and-gasoline?inline=nyt-classifier], which had been a state-run monopoly since the 1930s. He also championed a tax overhaul program that increased tax revenue but earned him some enemies within the business community.

During his tenure, however, Mexico saw slow economic growth and a weak peso, and the country’s standing with credit-rating agencies has suffered. Moody’s Investors Service and S&P Global Ratings have each lowered their outlook from stable to negative in recent months.

Economic performance has been so underwhelming that some analysts believe Mr. Videgaray’s departure was an inevitability that was discussed well before Mr. Trump’s visit. Furthermore, Mr. Videgaray is rumored to be a possible P.R.I. candidate for the governorship of the State of Mexico.

“I see this as a clear electoral play,” said Genaro Lozano, a professor of United States government and society at the Universidad Iberoamericana in Mexico City. “The State of Mexico is what they are betting on, what they have their eye on. It is one of the largest states in terms of population, with a solid and powerful P.R.I. structure, electoral support base and political mobilization. Even if they would put Trump’s cousin as candidate for governor, P.R.I. would win.”

The cabinet shuffle occurred a day before the Mexican government was scheduled to present its 2017 budget, a job that now shifts to the new finance minister, José Antonio Meade, whose appointment was announced at the news conference.

Mr. Meade, 47, who has a doctorate in economics from Yale University, has been a significant player in the last two administrations. He was finance minister under Mr. Peña Nieto’s predecessor, Felipe Calderón, and Mr. Peña Nieto made him the foreign minister in 2012. In that post, he broke from his reputation as an apolitical technocrat when he led an angry defense of the government against a United Nations report that condemned Mexico for its use of torture on suspects in detention.

Thirteen months ago, Mr. Peña Nieto appointed him to head the Social Development Ministry, a post that elevated Mr. Meade to the level of a possible presidential candidate as he traveled around the country promoting the government’s programs for the poor.

Paulina Villegas contributed reporting from Mexico City, and Maggie Haberman from New York.

\* Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump to Discuss Security and Veterans Issues[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/08/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-national-security.html]

\* Donald Trump Vows to Bolster Nation’s Military Capacities[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/08/us/politics/donald-trump-speech.html]

\* Fact-Checking Donald Trump’s National Security Speech[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/08/us/politics/donald-trump-fact-check.html]

\* Highlights of Donald Trump’s **Immigration** Speech and Mexico Trip[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREImmigration**, xenophobia, a refugee surge and a humanitarian crisis are roiling politics across Europe and the United States. It’s a fray that M.I.A. is eager to plunge into, once again, on her fifth studio album, “AIM.” She has said it may be her last album[https://www.theguardian.com/music/2016/jul/15/mia-aim-last-album], though she’s not planning to stop making music.

From her first single in 2003, “Galang,”[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rg4u3byLcs] Mathangi (nicknamed Maya) Arulpragasam, a.k.a. M.I.A., has based much of her work — music, video, graphics, public statements — on her frontier-crossing identity as the British-born daughter of Tamil **immigrants** from Sri Lanka. She grew up in Sri Lanka during its civil war, in India and eventually in London, at first in refugee housing. She went on to attend art school and start recording songs.

In an exhilaratingly fractious career, M.I.A. has been a hitmaker (“Paper Planes”), a graphic artist, a political activist (particularly concerned with **immigration**, poverty and the reach of the internet), a fashion model, a video director, a label head, a social-media scrapper and, indelibly, the mass-culture provocateur who raised a middle finger[http://fifthdown.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/02/05/m-i-a-s-gesture-upstages-madonna/] to the camera and the world in her guest spot during Madonna’s 2012 Super Bowl show. It’s no surprise that “AIM” retains those ambitions, juggling social consciousness and self-assurance as M.I.A. has from the start.

“AIM” starts with its masterpiece: “Borders,”[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r-Nw7HbaeWY] which works best as a synergy of song and video clip. Its images — fences, ships, hordes of straining bodies — bring gravity and historical resonance to the song. The production merges the ratchety sound of trap percussion with a nasal, modal hook that points eastward; M.I.A.’s rap starts out asking: “Freedom, ‘I’dom, ‘Me’dom, Where’s your ‘We’dom?”

[Video: M.I.A. - "Borders" Watch on YouTube.[http://youtube.com/embed/r-Nw7HbaeWY]]

The song affirms M.I.A.’s gift for addressing a large issue with beats that take global input for granted, a tune that could easily be sung on a playground and splintered lyrics that tease at big thoughts. “Visa” returns to a border: this time the Mexican one, with a skeletal dance-hall beat, a piano hook hammering just two notes and a chorus affirming on her own abbreviated slogan, “Yala” — “you always live again.”

In “Freedun,” an extended boast with an ardent pop chorus sung by Zayn Malik, formerly of One Direction, M.I.A. slips in lines like “Refugees learn about patience.” “Ali R U OK,” built on a loop that sounds like South Asian traditional music, sympathizes with an **immigrant** friend exploited by a boss: “Ali, I haven’t even seen you since we left Calais,” M.I.A. says, referring to the Calais “Jungle,” a notorious longtime refugee settlement[http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/britain-build-13ft-wall-calais-jungle-block-refugee-migrant-entering-uk-a7229386.html].

“AIM” is full of crisply accomplished rhythm tracks and productions that steer clear of the bombast and the abrasiveness M.I.A. has tried in the past; her collaborators include the hip-hop and dance-music experts Blaqstarr, Polow da Don and Skrillex, and her East-West hybrids, though less novel than they were in 2003, are still her own. “A.M.P. (All My People),” another boast, ricochets from hip-hop allusions to cyberspace — “Encrypt and code it/And I put it on your laptop” — with a mix and coproduction by Skrillex that has M.I.A. hurling nonsense syllables like stones from a slingshot.

But much of the album comes across as lightweight. Too many of the songs sound like sketches, running out of ideas midway through. “Bird Song” is just that, a contrived string of ornithological wordplays: “Stayin’ rich like an ostrich.” “Foreign Friend” opens with the Jamaican dance-hall singjay Dexta Daps[http://www.dextadaps.com/] belting a soulful promise over minor chords — “I’mma treat you like my best friend” — but M.I.A.’s lyrics squander a chance to look into the “foreign” part of that friendship.

While it’s hardly certain that “AIM” is really M.I.A.’s last album — she has been known to change course at whim — it does conclude with a kind of valedictory: “Survivor.” Over shimmering electronic orchestration punctuated by snappy trap percussion, M.I.A. sings more than she raps, merging self-praise with solidarity: “Who said it was easy/Survivor, they can never stop we,” she promises, then names some adversaries: “G.O.D., gold and oil and dollars.” It’s neat and pointed pop phrasing, a taunt to powerful interests delivered with nonchalance and cleareyed defiance. There are still targets for M.I.A.; she’d be missed if she retired.

\* Why M.I.A. Made ‘an Album About Not Hating’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/arts/music/mia-new-album-aim.html]

\* M.I.A.’s Agitprop Pop [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/30/magazine/30mia-t.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HANGZHOU, China — Human rights barely registered on President Obama[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack\_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per]’s latest visit to China[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/china/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], which ended Monday night with a news conference at which he made only a glancing reference to differences with Beijing over “religious freedom.”

And as Mr. Obama moved on to Laos for a summit meeting of Asian nations[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/07/world/asia/obama-laos-bombs-war.html], human rights advocates worried that their concerns were falling off the American agenda not only with China but also across the region, for the same reason: Beijing’s continuing rise as an economic and geopolitical power.

As China challenges the United States for influence in Asia, the administration is concerned that any criticism of nations like Malaysia, Vietnam, the Philippines and Laos for backsliding on human rights could **alienate** them rather than pulling them closer. At the same time, shining a spotlight on China’s own rough treatment of dissidents risks losing Beijing’s cooperation on issues like trade, climate change and nuclear proliferation.

Rights advocates accused the administration of being too timid, arguing that the United States should put as much pressure on governments over how they treat their citizens as they do during trade negotiations.

“Decades of experience should make clear to Washington that Beijing responds only to the expectation of unpleasant consequences,” said Sophie Richardson, the China director for Human Rights Watch.

“Why not threaten sanctions, cut out the pointless pomp or visibly align with peaceful critics of the government?” she said. “On other diplomatic, economic and security issues, governments recognize and use these points of leverage. Why not on human rights?”

Others say Mr. Obama, who speaks openly about civil rights in the United States, has been wise not to inject the issue into talks with China, even as Beijing has carried out the most sweeping crackdown on Chinese civil society[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/24/world/asia/china-un-human-rights-philip-alston.html] in nearly 20 years. They say the president understands that a more powerful China is better able to resist American pressure on human rights than it was a decade ago.

“To its credit, the Obama administration has not exacerbated the many U.S.-China economic and security issues with a high-profile human rights policy,” said Robert S. Ross, a professor of political science at Boston College. “It is quite a stretch to argue that diplomacy could persuade an authoritarian, single-party government to undermine its domestic political power by allowing greater opposition to the government and tolerating greater political instability.”

The pattern is now extending beyond China’s borders. During Mr. Obama’s visit to Laos, a tiny country run by a repressive Communist regime, he so far has chosen not to publicly raise the case of an American-trained civil rights worker who disappeared at a police checkpoint four years ago.

He has refrained, at least in public, from criticizing the new president of the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte, who has been unapologetic about waging a violent war against drugs[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/asia/in-philippine-drug-war-little-help-for-those-who-surrender.html] in the first two months of his term. On Wednesday, a day after Mr. Obama abruptly canceled[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/asia/philippines-duterte-obama.html] a meeting with Mr. Duterte, who had unleashed a profanity-laden diatribe against him, the two men met informally.

During Mr. Obama’s visit to Vietnam in May, he agreed to lift a longstanding ban on the sale of lethal weapons without winning significant concessions on human rights. And after trying to draw Malaysia closer, Mr. Obama has been embarrassed by the country’s prime minister, Najib Razak, who has closed online news outlets and prosecuted opposition figures in an effort to stay in power.

The Obama administration has pressed China on human rights in a high-profile way on only a few occasions. In 2012, the American Embassy in Beijing harbored Chen Guangcheng[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/28/world/asia/chen-guangcheng-blind-lawyer-escapes-house-arrest-china.html], a blind Chinese dissident, and flew him to the United States. But the days when the White House could demand and expect the release of a few Chinese political prisoners before a summit meeting are gone, Professor Ross said.

As the Chinese Communist Party gained confidence, it began rearresting dissidents who had been released before American summit meetings. “Since then,” Professor Ross said, “U.S. human rights diplomacy has been reduced to rhetoric, which, no surprise, has not improved China’s human rights situation.”

Despite Mr. Obama’s fleeting public reference to religious repression this week, for example, few expect the Chinese authorities to retreat from a campaign against Christian churches[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/22/world/asia/china-christians-zhejiang.html] in the area surrounding Hangzhou, the city that hosted the Group of 20 meeting.

One of the new challenges for Mr. Obama, and one for his successor, will be how to deal with Mr. Duterte. The police in the Philippines say they have killed about 1,000 suspects in the antidrug campaign, and about 300 people have been killed by vigilantes. Rights groups have urged the United States to do something about the situation.

“It’d be difficult for us to overstate how grave the situation has become in the Philippines,” said John Sifton, the deputy Washington director of Human Rights Watch. “At this rate, we’re talking about over 6,000 people dead by the end of the year.”

But the Philippines is an American ally and a bulwark against Chinese military gains in the South China Sea. By that calculus, the United States cannot afford to **alienate** Mr. Duterte. Philippine analysts say that Mr. Duterte is on good terms with Chinese business executives who invested in Davao, the city where he served as mayor, and that he may be open to negotiating with Beijing over the South China Sea.

Under American legislation known as the Leahy Amendment, Washington is obliged to cut off assistance to Philippines law enforcement units that are suspected of human rights abuses. But Antonio La Viña, a professor of government at Ateneo de Manila University, said the threat of such a sanction was unlikely to be effective.

“The truth is that the Philippines has the money to modernize our military,” he said.

Mr. Obama is the first sitting American president to visit Laos[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/laos/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], and he has sought to promote reconciliation with the nation, on which the United States dropped more than two million tons of bombs at the height of the Vietnam War.

But he is also being called on to press Laos’s repressive government — a traditional ally of China — on the case of Sombath Somphone[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/11/world/asia/with-laos-disappearance-signs-of-a-liberalization-in-backslide.html], a civil rights campaigner and American-trained agriculture specialist who disappeared at a police checkpoint in the capital, Vientiane, four years ago. Mr. Obama will also have to decide how hard to push concerns about human rights with other leaders at the meeting, several of whom are being wooed by China.

One of Mr. Obama’s favorite Southeast Asian leaders, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/15/world/asia/obama-aung-san-suu-kyi-myanmar.html] of Myanmar, is scheduled to visit the White House this month, and American officials hope to make progress on addressing the plight of the Rohingya[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/05/13/world/asia/15rohingya-explainer.html], a persecuted Muslim minority in the predominantly Buddhist country. More than 100,000 Rohingya live in fenced-off camps in northern Myanmar, and Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi has appointed a commission that includes the former United Nations secretary general Kofi Annan to find solutions.

“She has demonstrated a recognition that this is a problem that must be solved,” said Tom Malinowski, the United States assistant secretary for democracy, human rights and labor.

The Obama administration has been less vocal on conditions in Vietnam, which it has tried to steer closer to the United States in the face of Chinese pressure over territorial disputes in the South China Sea.

Since then, the human rights situation has only deteriorated, said Nguyen Quang A[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/04/world/asia/vietnam-activist-nguyen-quang-a.html], an activist and a former member of the Vietnamese Communist Party who was invited to meet Mr. Obama in Hanoi but who was stopped by Vietnamese security forces. Political prisoners remain in jail, the news media is muzzled, and independent labor unions have not been allowed, despite promises to Washington.

“Should Obama have done more to try and influence the government of Vietnam?” Mr. Quang A asked. “Absolutely.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The humiliation that Germany’s ruling Christian Democrats suffered in the state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, pushed to third place behind a nationalist, anti-**immigrant** party, is not good news. The results[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/angela-merkel-germany-mecklenburg-vorpommern-elections-refugees.html] are a repudiation of Chancellor Angela Merkel’s liberal refugee policy, and they follow a continentwide rise of far-right parties feeding on fears of terrorism and resentment of refugees. With such a poor showing in a state where Ms. Merkel’s constituency is based, the chancellor suddenly seems vulnerable as she considers whether to run in next year’s general election.

But it is far too early to cross off Ms. Merkel, who has been chancellor for 11 years and has earned great respect as a world leader. Her decision a year ago[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/05/world/europe/migrant-crisis-hungary.html] to open Germany’s borders to refugees was courageous and just. She has weathered many political crises before with her instinct for pragmatism and compromise. Her approval rating in Germany is at a five-year low but is still 45 percent — a strong showing on a continent in turmoil, when President François Hollande of France has been polling under 20 percent this summer.

Sunday’s vote should be seen in context: Mecklenburg-Vorpommern is one of the poorest and least-populated states in Germany. It was formerly part of East Germany, and anti-**immigrant** sentiments have been strong in the former East Europe. All major parties in the state lost votes to Alternative for Germany, a party that got its start opposing bailouts for Greece and then exploited the refugee crisis. The state will continue to be governed by a coalition of the Christian Democrats and Social Democrats, like the one Ms. Merkel heads at the federal level.

She acknowledged that the refugee issue was a major cause of the drubbing but said “the decisions made were right and we have to continue to work on them.” They were right, and her government, which has led the European Union in managing the crisis, should continue to do so.

Ms. Merkel also acknowledged that she and her party have lost the trust of some voters. Now that the vote has raised the question of Ms. Merkel’s future, it is bound to be under scrutiny, especially in municipal elections in Lower Saxony on Sunday and state elections in Berlin on Sept. 18.

No politician who has been in office for so long, even one as respected as Ms. Merkel, can, or should, be immune to discussion about whether a party needs to offer new faces. But a bad showing in one atypical state is not a political obituary.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MARIETTA, Ga. — William Stocks, a white, Alabama-born, Republican-leaning member of Johnson Ferry Baptist Church[http://www.johnsonferry.org/], arrived at the tiny apartment of a Syrian refugee family on a Wednesday night after work. He was wearing a green-striped golf shirt and a gentle smile, and he was eager to teach yet another improvised session of English 101.

Mr. Stocks, 23, had recently moved to Georgia from Alabama, states where the governors are, like him, Southern Baptists. They are also among the more than 30 Republican governors who have publicly resisted[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/17/us/politics/gop-governors-vow-to-close-doors-to-syrian-refugees.html] the federal government’s plan to resettle refugees from war-ravaged Syria[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/destination/syria?inline=nyt-geo], fearing that they might bring terrorism to their states.

To Mr. Stocks, such questions belonged in the realm of politics — and he had not come that evening for political reasons. Rather, he said, he had come as a follower of Christ. “My job is to serve these people,” he said, “because they need to be served.”

But politics and faith have always had the potential to conflict in the questions about resettling Syrian refugees in the United States.

And at a time when conservative politicians, many with ties to Christian religious groups, have aggressively sought to keep the Syrian newcomers out of their states, it is conservative people of faith who, in many cases, are serving as their indispensable support system.

Here in Marietta, the English lesson began around the donated kitchen table of Anwar and Daleen, two of the 10,000 Syrian refugees who have arrived in the United States in the past year only to grapple with that political reality, one as confusing as any new language.

Anwar and Daleen are Syrian Muslims who fled the bombings on their hometown, Tafas, in November 2012. They first crossed into Jordan, and, eventually, to this suburban sanctuary, where they settled in May in an apartment with their two children; a third child was born in August. Here, thousands of miles from civil war, they were still so fearful of reprisals against family members in Syria that they declined to be identified by their full names.

Speaking through an interpreter, Anwar, 33, and Daleen, 27, said they were aware of the American politicians who oppose the arrival of Syrians here. They mentioned Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?8qa], the Republican presidential nominee, who had proposed temporarily barr[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/09/us/politics/donald-trump-muslims.html] ing[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/09/us/politics/donald-trump-muslims.html] all Muslims from entering the United States, a position he has since modified several times.

But the political issues, they said, they knew only from television. Their closest interactions with Americans have been largely with the members of Johnson Ferry Church, like Mr. Stocks. It was members of the church, most of whom are Republicans, who outfitted their tiny apartment and showed them how to navigate America’s cavernous grocery stores.

They also steered Anwar through the health care system as he prepares for heart surgery.

“I have been here for four months,” Anwar said, “and I have seen nothing except goodness.”

Of the politicians, he said he was not afraid: “I fear only God.”

The arrival of the 10,000th Syrian refugee[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/06/us/politics/us-could-exceed-goal-of-accepting-10000-syrian-refugees.html] last month fulfilled a goal for the 2016 fiscal year that President Obama announced last September[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/11/world/middleeast/obama-directs-administration-to-accept-10000-syrian-refugees.html]. Though they are a small fraction of the millions who have fled Syria, the concern among many conservative voters that the refugees could incubate domestic terrorism remains potent.

Gov. Robert J. Bentley of Alabama and Gov. Greg Abbott[http://gov.texas.gov/about] of Texas have filed separate lawsuits challenging [https://www.aclu.org/legal-document/texas-health-and-human-services-commission-v-united-states-america-order-6-16]the Obama administration’s refugee policy, but those efforts have sputtered[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/17/us/federal-judge-tosses-texas-lawsuit-to-bar-syrian-refugees.html] in the federal courts.

The Rev. Franklin Graham, a son of the Rev. Billy Graham[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/billy-graham?8qa], has said that he agreed with Mr. Trump’s idea of a ban on **immigration** by Muslims. In an interview last week, Franklin Graham said that he remained concerned about gaps in the screening process for refugees, and has argued that the United States should rely on aid efforts closer to the Middle East to help resolve the humanitarian crisis.

“We’re not just leaving them on the side of the road, but we also care for this country and the people of this nation,” Mr. Graham said. “We have to put America first.”

His stance is at odds with some influential Christians, including the leaders of the Southern Baptist Convention[http://www.sbc.net/]. In June, the convention approved a resolution[http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/2273/on-refugee-ministry] to “encourage Southern Baptist churches and families to welcome and adopt refugees into their churches and homes as a means to demonstrate to the nations that our God longs for every tribe, tongue and nation to be welcomed at his throne.”

Dr. Russell D. Moore[http://www.russellmoore.com/about/], the president of the group’s Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, said there was “a clear distinction on this issue between the church and the rest of American society.”

Politicians, even those generally closely tied to religious conservatives, were often just being politicians, he said.

“It’s not unusual that we have politicians timid in the face of fear,” Mr. Moore said. “But the task of the church is a different one. The church is called to see the image of God in all people and to minister Christ’s presence to all people. That’s what churches are doing.”

Officials at the nongovernment organizations that resettle refugees say that members of the Mormon Church have been particularly helpful in resettling Syrian refugees in states like Utah, Texas and Arizona. Mormons historically tend to favor Republicans, but some polls in the spring showed Hillary Clinton, the Democratic presidential nominee, tied with Mr. Trump in heavily Mormon Utah, a state Democrats have not won since 1964.

Mr. Trump’s position on Muslims may be a factor. In December, soon after Mr. Trump announced his idea for a Muslim ban, the Mormon Church issued a statement reasserting its commitment to religious liberty. On Monday, the church, responding to what it called “the global refugee crisis,” donated $2 million to two groups that help resettle refugees: the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops[http://www.usccb.org/about/] and the International Rescue Committee[https://help.rescue.org/secure/make-donation?ms=gs\_brnd\_eoy\_best\_ES\_141217&utm\_source=brandedSearch&utm\_medium=ppc&utm\_campaign=eoy&utm\_content=branded&gclid=CKno2Myd8s4CFYsfhgodzU4E7A].

In Marietta, Mr. Stocks has made some strides in the three months he has been teaching Anwar and Daleen, even though he has little experience as a teacher. (Mr. Stocks is a project manager in the construction business .) On Wednesday, with his guidance, the couple wrote out the months of the year in English, recited their birthdays and responded to simple questions about their children. A yellow sticky note on the wall said “wall.” One on a door said “door.”

Anwar was asked what he wanted to do after recovering from his heart surgery. “Work,” he said — any kind of work.

“These are the most hospitable and loving people you’ll ever meet, which is why it’s frustrating to see the different things on the news that all these people are terrorists,” Mr. Stocks said. “They don’t know these people personally.”

Mr. Stocks’s church, Johnson Ferry, is one of 1,055 churches that in the past year worked with World Relief[http://www.worldrelief.org/], an evangelical resettlement organization, to help refugees and **immigrants**. The Rev. Bryant Wright, the senior pastor of Johnson Ferry, acknowledged the possibility that there could be dangers in admitting the Syrians to the United States. “I know there’s risk,” he said. “I’m not being naïve.”

But Pastor Wright said that Jesus commanded his disciples, in the Book of Matthew, to “make disciples of all nations.”

He also said that there were worldly reasons to help. “Think of it from a strictly practical standpoint,” he said. “Would it be better for these people to see Americans reaching out with love, and showing them all of the blessings Americans can have? Or do we turn our backs on them, and make them more sympathetic to Islamic terrorism?”

Richard Fausset reported from Marietta, and Alan Blinder from Atlanta.

\* Looking Back at Alan Kurdi and Other Faces of Syrian Crisis[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/world/middleeast/alan-kurdi-aylan-anniversary-turkey-syria-refugees-death.html]

\* U.S. Could Exceed Goal of Accepting 10,000 Syrian Refugees[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/06/us/politics/us-could-exceed-goal-of-accepting-10000-syrian-refugees.html]

\* Refugees Encounter a Foreign Word: Welcome[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/01/world/americas/canada-syrian-refugees.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Bar patrons have long been used to looking up from their glasses to catch the night’s game on a big-screen TV. But at Jupiter[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/jupiter\_planet/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] Disco in Bushwick, Brooklyn, they will see something else: the name of the drink they just ordered.

The bar’s beer, wine and cocktail menus will scroll by on two monitors in green phosphor letters against a black screen. It’s a look familiar to anyone who owned a computer in the 1980s or has seen “**Alien**” or “The Terminator.”

The retro screens are enough to elicit a nostalgic sigh from a science-fiction fan — including the owners, Al Sotack and Maks Pazuniak. Both are modern mixologists with résumés an arm long: Mr. Sotack helped open what is now known as the Franklin Bar[http://www.thefranklinbar.com/] in Philadelphia, and Mr. Pazuniak has bartended at Cure[http://curenola.com/] in New Orleans and at Maison Premiere[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/05/dining/reviews/hungry-city-maison-premiere-in-williamsburg.html] and t[http://www.countingroom.com/] he Counting Room[http://www.countingroom.com/] in Brooklyn. But they bonded over science fiction and music, swapping books and albums.

“You take the sci-fi thing and the music thing, and you’re halfway to Jupiter Disco,” Mr. Sotack said. Sci-fi nuts will note the framed blueprint for the Mos Eisley bar[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g6PDcBhODqo] in the original “Star Wars” film. The famous **alien** dive bar was a stylistic touchstone for Jupiter Disco’s look, as was the bar frequented by Harrison Ford[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AlRFiiKiPJs] in “Blade Runner.” There are colored neon tubes on the ceiling and a certain dystopian air to the place, which used to be a steel-ceilinged check-cashing store. “The quality of a bunker is definitely something we liked about the space,” Mr. Sotack said.

Music lovers may be excited by the D.J. booth, which has a custom-built analog rotary mixer; the large, exposed Danley speakers on the ceiling; the subwoofers underneath the banquettes; the reel-to-reel audio player behind the bar; and the framed schematics of a Moog synthesizer.

“One of the themes we explored alongside the sci-fi is the idea of analog or digital,” Mr. Pazuniak said. Jupiter Disco sides with analog. Music will range from R&B and garage band to punk rock and hip-hop.

This marriage of drinks and discs is an old one: Scratch a mixologist and, more often than not, you’ll find a turntable owner. The partners want to make sure that platter-spinners feel as welcome as tin shakers.

“In terms of the D.J.’s, we wanted to provide a similar sandbox to what we provide for the bartenders,” Mr. Sotack said. Or as Mr. Pazuniak put it, “It sounds awesome in here.”

Jupiter Disco 1237 Flushing Avenue, (Wyckoff Avenue), Bushwick, Brooklyn, October.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Is there actually a case for The Wall?

Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s boast to build a “big, beautiful” wall along the southern border clearly provided a lift to his candidacy, arguably delivering him the Republican presidential nomination. Along with his promise to deport millions of **immigrants** who are living in the United States without legal authorization, it remains the leitmotif of his campaign, despite occasional bursts of softer rhetoric.

Mr. Trump is not wrong that **immigration** from Mexico and other countries in the poorer south over the last quarter-century has injured some American workers who competed with **immigrants** in the job market. It is not his concern alone; similar fears are shared by organized labor and others on the left of the political spectrum[http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=990DEFDC1430F934A15750C0A9609C8B63]. Improbable as this may sound, the question he raises is legitimate.

But even looking at a best-case situation, the answer is still straightforward: No. Even if you care only about the workers most hurt by new **immigrant** labor, Mr. Trump’s proposals simply aren’t worth the cost.

In an article in the Journal of Economic Perspectives scheduled to be published this fall, Gordon H. Hanson and Craig McIntosh of the University of California, San Diego, lay out the most obvious reason walling off Mexico would be pointless: Mexicans aren’t coming anymore.[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/02/business/economy/trumps-shaky-stance-on-illegal-immigration.html]

Those arriving in the 1980s and 1990s were born in the 1960s and 1970s, when Mexico’s fertility rates was as high as seven children per woman. Mexico was hit by repeated macroeconomic crises. To Mexicans growing up at the time, the prospect of a job in the prosperous American economy of that era was worth braving the Arizona desert and the border patrol.

Mexico is a different country today. It is older. Since 1970, fertility rates have declined to just above the replacement rate of 2.1. Its labor supply is growing at about the same pace as in the United States. And though Mexico is still much poorer, it is no longer prone to crises and unemployment spikes every couple of years.

“The completion of the demographic transition in most of the Western Hemisphere leaves one to wonder whether the benefits of continued U.S. enforcement spending will justify its costs,” Professors Hanson and McIntosh concluded.

Of course, this won’t settle the argument to the satisfaction of Mr. Trump’s angry base of white working-class men. And perhaps the demographic analysis has blind spots. What about unauthorized **immigrants** from Africa and the Middle East, where fertility rates remain high, conflicts frequent and job prospects poor?

They might not be stopped with a literal wall — they are more likely to arrive legally and overstay their visa. But don’t they justify spending more on **immigration** enforcement?

I can’t think of anybody among the ranks of top **immigration** experts who would make for a better adviser to the Trump campaign than George J. Borjas. Over a long and prolific career, Mr. Borjas, a prominent Harvard economist, has written innumerable papers and books making a case for fewer **immigrants** and more restrictive **immigration** policies.

He has advocated a points system to favor more highly skilled migrants, arguing that the quality of **immigrants** deteriorated since national quotas were abolished in 1965. That opened the door to Mexicans and others of less schooling and skill, more likely to rely on public benefits. Perhaps most uncomfortably for those on the left, he forcefully makes the case that **immigration** hurts less-skilled Americans, those in most direct competition against low-wage **immigrants** from south of the border.

But even Mr. Borjas’s dire conclusions about the damage inflicted by **immigration** on American-born workers makes a weak case for tougher border controls.

Mr. Borjas is not advising Mr. Trump. But he has waded into the political arena[http://www.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/articles/SB830473614115429500], once advising Pete Wilson, a Republican governor of California who ran a successful uphill battle for re-election in 1994 by proposing to bar illegal **immigrants**from schools and other government services.

Mr. Borjas acknowledges that the **immigration** surge to the United States from 1990 to 2010 produced a net benefit to the economy — $50 billion a year, according to a report to be published one of these days by the National Academies of Science. Still, he notes, none of this went to workers. Workers who dropped out of high school, he states, lost big.

Professor Borjas’s economic research, outlined in his 2014 book “**Immigration** Economics” (Harvard University Press) and reiterated in his coming “We Wanted Workers” (W. W. Norton), concluded that the two-decade **immigration** binge cut the wages of American-born high school dropouts over the long term[https://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/16/business/yourmoney/cost-of-illegal-immigration-may-be-less-than-meets-the.html] by 3.1 percent. This penalty, which takes into account how businesses would react by investing more in enterprises that could profit from the new **immigrant** labor, amounts to about $900 a year.

This analysis has been criticized by other scholars[http://davidcard.berkeley.edu/papers/card-peri-jel-april-6-2016.pdf] for making assumptions that make the picture look bleaker than it really is. For instance, it assumes that undocumented **immigrants** without a high school diploma are perfect substitutes for American workers without a high school diploma, an implausible proposition on language grounds alone.

But my argument is blunter: 3.1 percent, so what?

This is not to be callous. Of course $900 makes a difference to a worker making less than $30,000 a year. Nonetheless, a pay cut of 3.1 percent for 10 percent of the American work force seems modest compared to the price tag of ramping up **immigration** enforcement. What’s more, there are probably cheaper and more effective policies available than walls and police officers on the border.

Today **immigration** enforcement costs $30 billion a year and, by Mr. Trump’s own account, the border still feels like Swiss cheese. Should that be doubled? Quadrupled? What about the cost[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/20/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html] of finding and deporting 11 million people who have made their lives in the United States, in many cases having children who have a legal right to stay?

More significantly, perhaps, is the immense cost to the **immigrants** themselves — measured in lost opportunities to achieve a better life. This may be of no concern to Mr. Trump’s supporters. But it is worth pondering the cost to Mexican stability — and its knock-on effect on the United States — had Mexico suffered through the many crises of the 1980s and 1990s without the escape valve of migration.

American **immigration** policy over the last couple of decades may look like a mess. Still, “if we could turn back the clock,” Mr. Hanson said, “I’m not sure we would have done things differently.”

And if economics teaches us anything, it is that much of the money could have been better spent on something else.

Instead of a new wall, how about an expanded earned-income tax credit? Or how about more training for low-skilled workers? “Where should **immigration**policy be among the options to help workers with stagnant wages?” Mr. Hanson asked. “I think it should be pretty far down the list.”

For all his skepticism about the benefits from **immigration**, this is something even Mr. Borjas might agree with.

“Maybe we have to think about **immigration** in broader terms,” he told me. “Maybe the discussion should not be just about who gets a green card but about how the benefits of **immigration** could be more evenly distributed. That would clarify what is at stake.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] and Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] enter the final stretch of the presidential race essentially tied, according to a new national poll released on Tuesday that reveals a country deeply divided on a racial and gender lines ahead of the November election.

A survey from CNN/ORC [http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2016/images/09/05/rel13a.-.2016.post-labor.day.pdf]shows 45 percent of likely voters backing Mr. Trump, the Republican nominee, and 43 percent supporting Mrs. Clinton, the Democratic standard-bearer. Gary Johnson[https://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/gary-e-johnson?inline=nyt-per], the Libertarian Party candidate who is banking on late surge in the polls to be included in the presidential debates, sits in third place at 7 percent.

The poll suggests that the post-convention bounces have subsided and that Mr. Trump has weathered a difficult August, in which he shuffled staff members, insulted a Gold Star family and confused voters about his **immigration** policy. But Mrs. Clinton continues to face questions about her honesty, and new revelations about her email practices as secretary of state have cast a shadow over her campaign.

Mrs. Clinton was leading most national and state polls after the Democratic National Convention in late July, but Mr. Trump has gradually been gaining some ground in recent weeks. She still has the upper hand in many of the crucial swing states, such as Pennsylvania and Florida, which will likely decide the election.

The contours of the race remain relatively unchanged, according to the CNN poll. Mrs. Clinton continues to hold large leads with women, minorities and voters with college degrees. Mr. Trump does best with men, white voters and those who did not go to college.

On issues, Mr. Trump is seen as the strongest candidate to manage the economy and handle terrorism, while Mrs. Clinton wins on foreign policy and has an edge on **immigration**.

Voters view Mr. Trump as being the more honest candidate, but they prefer Mrs. Clinton’s temperament when it comes to being best suited to be commander in chief. Last week, Mr. Trump engaged in a Twitter spat with the president of Mexico, raising questions about his ability to deal with other world leaders.

But Mr. Trump, who has been moderating his positions recently, has also gained an advantage over Mrs. Clinton when it comes to appealing to independent voters. Nearly half of those queried say they would vote for the Republican nominee, while 29 percent say they would vote for Mr. Trump.

Although the poll does not indicate whether Mr. Johnson is pulling voters from either candidate, his supporters tend to be younger and more highly educated — suggesting that they would be more likely to be potential backers of Mrs. Clinton.

The poll had a margin of error of plus or minus four percentage points.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS — One of the most popular items on the social networks as Nicolas Sarkozy[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/nicolas\_sarkozy/index.html?inline=nyt-per] opened his new presidential bid last month was a video of an interview he gave to the French news channel BFM-TV on March 8, 2012. Still president then, Mr. Sarkozy was seeking a second five-year term, with François Hollande[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/h/francois\_hollande/index.html?inline=nyt-per] running against him. Asked whether he would quit politics if he lost, he firmly answered, “Yes.” The journalist was taken aback. “Will you quit politics?” he asked again, incredulous. “You can ask me a third time,” the president shot back. “I’m telling you: yes.”

Four years later, “Sarko” is back. Just like his interviewer that day, nobody in France[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/france/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] quite believed that this man, who admitted as early as 2003 that he thought all the time about running for president, could live without the adrenaline of a life in politics. In 2012, it took him a few months to recover from defeat, but soon enough he was maneuvering to take back his right-wing party, renaming it Les Républicains and putting his people in charge. In a book published last January, “La France pour la vie” (“France Forever”), a seemingly humbled Mr. Sarkozy acknowledged a few mistakes and tried to portray himself as a new man. This was the first stage of his campaign.

A second book, published last week, “Tout pour la France” (“All for France”), provided a springboard for formally starting his candidacy for the presidential election next April. Written in July in the privacy of the Riviera mansion owned by his wife, Carla Bruni, so hurriedly that spelling mistakes were overlooked, the book argues that Nicolas Sarkozy had to come back, for one simple reason: France needs him, just as France needed Charles de Gaulle in 1958.

In a way, this is reassuring: He has not changed. The image of a humbled, apologetic politician was short-lived — all the more so since it did him no favors in the opinion polls. Better go back to the original. The Sarko we knew is back, with a vengeance.

It is not so easy to run again when you have been ejected from office by a clear majority of voters (he lost to Mr. Hollande by more than three percentage points). Neither is it easy to run again when every poll since you’ve been back in the political arena shows an intense dislike among a large group of voters and a high rate of negative opinions. But one thing Nicolas Sarkozy, 61, does not lack is political ambition. However unpopular, he will do whatever it takes to come back.

The fight will be harder this time, despite President Hollande’s dismal standing in opinion polls. Mr. Sarkozy’s problem is that he first needs to win a primary in November. He is no longer the champion of the right, but rather the challenger: His former foreign minister, Alain Juppé, 71, leads in the primary race. And a former prime minister, François Fillon, who is also running, is crucifying his ex-boss for comparing himself to de Gaulle. (“Can you imagine de Gaulle under investigation?” he lashed out recently, in a reference to long-running charges against Mr. Sarkozy of illegal campaign financing.)

So why should France need Mr. Sarkozy in 2017 if it did not want him in 2012? Because, as he explains in his new book, this is not the same country. The situation created by the recent wave of terrorist attacks requires a strong, experienced man at the helm, this argument goes. “I felt I had the strength to lead this battle at such a tormented moment in our history,” he wrote. Some saw in the title “All for France” a reference to a book written by Jacques Chirac for his 1995 campaign, “La France pour tous” (“France for All”). By reversing the proposition, Mr. Sarkozy hopes that his new patriotic spirit will erase the worst memories he left — of his obsessive ego, his arrogance, his bragging and his bellicosity.

Will he succeed? Convinced that next year’s election will be fought on the right, rather than at the center, the former president is making a huge wager. The No. 1 issue of this campaign, he thinks, will not be the economy, which he did not have the courage to reform when he was in office, but France, war and Islam: It’s the identity, stupid.

This is a risky bet. Where Mr. Juppé aims to unify and pacify, Mr. Sarkozy is unabashedly divisive. **Immigration**, he says, took a wrong turn in 1976 when President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing allowed families to join economic **immigrants** in France. Since then, he argues, things have been out of control. He advocates stopping economic **immigration** for five years, reasoning that integrating **immigrants** is an old-fashioned concept that has failed. He paints France as a country “forced” by “the ideologues of multiculturalism and the sociologists of inequality” to give up the mission of assimilating newcomers. “Assimilate means not only acquiring French citizenship but also France’s values, culture and way of life,” he has written. “We are not Anglo-Saxons who allow communities to live side by side, ignoring each other.”

Just as Donald J. Trump wants to “make America great again,” Nicolas Sarkozy wants to “make France proud again.” Schoolbooks, he says, should “make our country loved, not make it feel guilty.” He advocates “a French Islam, not Islam in France.” And oh, yes, of course he wants to ban the burkini.

The whole question is whether, even in such tense times, the French are ready for another dose of Sarko. Patriotism is indeed on the rise, but not in a divisive way. **Immigration** and Islam are certainly worth a debate, and will most likely dominate the campaign in the coming months, but the country needs firefighters, not arsonists. Incendiary politics is Marine Le Pen’s territory; Mr. Sarkozy’s plan, obviously, is to siphon off as many votes as he can from her National Front. But he has been down that road before, and it has not served him well. Indeed, the mood has changed France since the current wave of terrorist attacks began in January 2015. But the turn has not been toward confrontation, and Nicolas Sarkozy may well have misjudged it.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Sylvie Kauffmann, the editorial director and a former editor in chief of Le Monde, is a contributing opinion writer.

\* Nicolas Sarkozy Mounts What He Hopes Is a Comeback in France[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/europe/france-nicolas-sarkozy-presidential-election.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Good morning.

Here’s what you need to know:

And they’re off.

Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump each spent time in Ohio[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/clinton-trump-labor-day-campaign.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] on Labor Day to kick off the final two months of the presidential campaign. Mrs. Clinton will be in Florida today, and Mr. Trump is expected to visit Virginia and North Carolina.

D[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/bernie-sanders-campaign.html?ref=politics] ie-hard supporters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/bernie-sanders-campaign.html?ref=politics] of Senator Bernie Sanders and young African[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/us/politics/young-blacks-voice-skepticism-on-hillary-clinton-worrying-democrats.html?ref=politics] -[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/us/politics/young-blacks-voice-skepticism-on-hillary-clinton-worrying-democrats.html?ref=politics] Americans[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/us/politics/young-blacks-voice-skepticism-on-hillary-clinton-worrying-democrats.html?ref=politics] are still skeptical of Mrs. Clinton, and Gary Johnson, the Libertarian nominee who has cast himself as an alternative to Mr. Trump, is polling at 10 percent[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/us/politics/gary-johnson-libertarian-third-party.html?ref=politics].

• Obama’s trip to Asia.

President Obama is in Laos[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/07/world/asia/laos-history-politics-human-rights.html] today to attend an Association of Southeast Asian Nations[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/a/association\_of\_southeast\_asian\_nations/index.html?inline=nyt-org] gathering, becoming the first sitting U.S. leader to visit the country. He canceled a meeting with President Rodrigo Duterte of the Philippines after Mr. Duterte directed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/asia/philippines-duterte-obama.html] an expletive at him on Monday.

The episode followed a dispute between American and Chinese officials over how Mr. Obama would exit his plane[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/asia/china-obama-group-of-20-summit-airport-arrival.html] as he arrived for the Group of 20 summit meeting in Hangzhou, China. Russia and the United States failed at the meeting to broker a cease-fire[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/g20-obama-syria.html] in Syria’s civil war.

• **Immigration** tensions in Europe.

Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany said she would stand by her refugee policy after her party finished behind a nationalist, anti-migrant group[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/merkel-vows-to-stay-on-course-despite-german-election-setback.html?ref=europe] in her home state’s elections on Sunday.

We also look at a backlash[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/denmark-migrants-refugees-racism.html?ref=europe] in Denmark to the wave of asylum seekers, which is challenging the country’s progressive self-image. Separately, France’s prime minister criticized[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/france-manuel-valls-burkini-muslim-women.html] a recent Times article featuring comments[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/world/europe/burkini-ban-muslim-women.html?\_r=0] by Muslim women about how they’re treated in parts of Europe.

• The Supreme Court.

As the justices prepare to return to work next month, the court’s lack[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/sotomayor-kagan-supreme-court.html] of educational, religious and geographical diversity is being discussed by some of its members. “The Supreme Court is never going to be a melting pot reflective of the country,” Justice Sonia Sotomayor recently said.

In Frederick, Md., an effort to remove a statue of Roger Brooke Taney, the chief justice who wrote the notorious 1857 Dred Scott[http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/0306.html] ruling denying citizenship to blacks, is caught in a maze[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/us/he-denied-blacks-citizenship-now-a-city-is-deciding-his-statues-fate.html] of bureaucracy. And no one seems willing to take the statue.

• Severe weather threats.

Though a storm forecast to wreak havoc on the East Coast drifted out to sea instead, the dire predictions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/nyregion/jersey-shore-shopkeepers-are-hit-by-a-storm-that-never-arrived.html] hurt some local businesses over Labor Day weekend.

Despite the miss, coastal communities are already in a constant state of [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/science/flooding-of-coast-caused-by-global-warming-has-already-begun.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fscience&action=click&contentCollection=science®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=2&pgtype=sectionfront] danger[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/science/flooding-of-coast-caused-by-global-warming-has-already-begun.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fscience&action=click&contentCollection=science®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=2&pgtype=sectionfront] from tidal floods as global warming causes seas to rise. “It’s not 100 years off — it’s now,” one scientist warned.

• Out in space.

The premise of the mission for NASA’s latest robotic spacecraft[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/science/nasa-osiris-rex-asteroid-bennu-sample.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fscience&action=click&contentCollection=science®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront] is simple: Fly to an asteroid and retrieve rock samples so scientists can study some of the ingredients that helped form the solar system. A different spacecraft that went missing two years ago was found on a comet[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/science/philae-spacecraft-rosetta-comet.html?action=click&contentCollection=science®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront].

In other asteroid news, one was recently renamed[http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2016/09/05/arts/ap-eu-freddie-mercury-asteroid.html] for the singer Freddie Mercury to commemorate what would have been his 70th birthday on Monday.

Business

• Apple is expected to unveil the latest model of the iPhone this week. There are r[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/technology/will-the-new-iphone-have-a-headphone-jack-rumormongers-say-it-wont.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=second-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] umors[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/technology/will-the-new-iphone-have-a-headphone-jack-rumormongers-say-it-wont.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=second-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news] it won’t have a headphone jack.

• The news media can survive the decline of the newspaper[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/business/yes-the-news-can-survive-the-newspaper.html?src=me], our media columnist says. Separately, BuzzFeed is the latest outlet to aggressively pursue[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/business/media/buzzfeed-regroups-as-media-industry-turns-to-video.html?ref=business] video as a major source of revenue.

• How do cabdrivers decide when to call it a day? Economists have argued over the question for years, and Uber has joined the debate[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/business/economy/how-uber-drivers-decide-how-long-to-work.html?ref=business] with its own research.

• U.S. stocks finished slightly down[http://markets.on.nytimes.com/research/markets/usmarkets/usmarkets.asp] to end last week. Here’s a snapshot of global markets[http://markets.on.nytimes.com/research/markets/worldmarkets/worldmarkets.asp].

Over the holiday weekend.

• Pope Francis declared Mother Teresa a saint. Our reporter observed the canonization from Kolkata, India, where her legacy[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/asia/mother-teresa-kolkata-canonization-saint.html] was burnished.

• In memoriam: Phyllis Schlafly[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/obituaries/phyllis-schlafly-conservative-leader-and-foe-of-era-dies-at-92.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=second-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news], 92, a conservative leader who reshaped American politics with campaigns against Communism, abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment.

• Hong Kong’s pro-democracy movement scored[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/asia/hong-kong-election-china-basic-law.html?ref=asia] a victory as six young members won seats in the city’s legislature. Now China must deal with its own version of an indigenous movement elevation to a position of political power.

• The word “braconid[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/world/europe/braconid-wins-the-day-and-the-world-scrabble-championship-2016.html]” helped clinch the World Scrabble Championship final.

Noteworthy

• At the U.S. Open.

Serena Williams’s quest for a 23rd Grand Slam title continues after she reached the quarterfinals on Monday. Her sister Venus[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/sports/tennis/venus-williams-loses-third-set-tiebreaker-karolina-pliskova.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=mini-moth®ion=top-stories-below&WT.nav=top-stories-below] lost, though.

Three [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/sports/tennis/jo-wilfried-tsonga-gael-monfils-lucas-pouille-novak-djokovic.html?ref=tennis] French players[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/sports/tennis/jo-wilfried-tsonga-gael-monfils-lucas-pouille-novak-djokovic.html?ref=tennis] are in the quarterfinals on the men’s side, and all are eager to topple the top seed, Novak Djokovic, who faces Jo-Wilfried Tsonga tonight.

• Blockbuster season ends.

The horror film “Don’t Breathe” took the top spot at the North American box office[http://www.nytimes.com/reuters/2016/09/05/arts/05reuters-usa-boxoffice.html], and “Suicide Squad” passed the $300 million mark in ticket sales.

Colossal flops and megahits[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/business/media/hollywoods-summer-of-extremes-megahits-superflops-and-little-else.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fmovies&action=click&contentCollection=movies®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront] defined Hollywood’s summer performance, but our critic says cinema is not dead[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/movies/telluride-film-festival.html?action=click&contentCollection=movies®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=sectionfront].

• Recipes of the day.

A bowl of rainbow quinoa salad[http://cooking.nytimes.com/recipes/1016222-rainbow-quinoa-salad] is an excellent, wholesome dinner. Or go a different route, with macaroni and beef casserole[http://cooking.nytimes.com/recipes/3178-macaroni-and-beef-casserole].

Back Story

It was a moment that Major League Baseball badly needed.

An eight-month players’ strike that began in August of 1994 upended two straight seasons and **alienated** fans. But they packed Camden Yards in Baltimore on this day in 1995 to see Cal Ripken Jr., a shortstop for the Orioles, break a record once considered untouchable.

After the top of the fifth inning when the game against the California Angels became official, a sign behind the right field wall was changed from 2,130 to 2,131 — the number of consecutive games Ripken had played[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5jUkeTAJvAQ] — surpassing the mark set by Lou Gehrig 56 years earlier.

The game was paused for 22 minutes as the crowd, which included President Bill Clinton and Joe DiMaggio, cheered. Ripken greeted his family in the stands and took a lap around the field, shaking hands with fans.

“You could come to the conclusion that this was the best day baseball had had in years,” Harvey Araton wrote in The Times[http://www.nytimes.com/1995/09/07/sports/sports-of-the-times-great-day-for-baseball-in-the-90-s.html].

Ripken ended the streak[http://www.baltimoresun.com/sports/orioles/cal-ripken-jr/bal-ripken-rests-after-2-632-consecutive-games-sits-out-first-game-since-may-82-20150831-story.html] in 1998 at 2,632 games, and he retired in 2001.

Today, he promotes youth programs, appears as a corporate speaker and owns an Orioles minor league team.

“It seems as though I am busier now than when I played,” Ripken, now 56, told The Times this summer[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/12/sports/baseball/30-seconds-with-cal-ripken-jr.html].

Jennifer Jett contributed reporting.

Your Morning Briefing is published weekdays at 6 a.m. Eastern and updated on the web all morning[http://www.nytimes.com/morningbriefing].

What would you like to see here? Contact us at briefing@nytimes.com[mailto:briefing@nytimes.com].

You can sign up here[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/nyt-now-morning-briefing] to get the briefing delivered to your inbox.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I’m not positive, but at least somewhat sure, that this presidential election has been going on since Hannibal’s elephants crossed the Alps. It has been going on since Assyria fell to Alexander the Great. It has been going on since before rocks were invented.

Nearly 17 months into the quest for the White House, some people may feel completely exhausted with the news of the campaign. These people might feel, as they sit down at their laptop and scroll through their Facebook feeds, as if they are trudging through endless waste, trying to find one colorful remnant of uplifting news in an expanse of political sludge. The campaign’s seeming interminability may even have led some campaign observers to contemplate the cool embrace of the void. Maybe. Just speculating here.

And yet, according to a linear theory of time, this presidential election will one day be over. So why does it feel never-ending?

Because the starting line moved up on us. In years past, most voters did not actually start paying close attention to the presidential campaign until after Labor Day. This is when campaigns had to get serious in their appeals to voters and solidify their ground game ahead of Election Day.

But in recent decades, Labor Day has lost its importance in presidential election — and this year’s bitter contest between Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump has only served to make a long campaign feel even longer. At least half of the American population thinks our election season is too long[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/17/upshot/how-presidential-campaigns-became-two-year-marathons.html], according to Pew.

In his book “The Vanishing Voter,” Thomas Patterson, a Harvard political scientist, writes that Labor Day speeches “once served as coming-out parties” for party nominees. In 1936, in the doldrums of the Great Depression, roughly half a million people in Detroit turned out to see President Franklin Delano Roosevelt kick off his re-election campaign. But in the modern presidential campaign, Mr. Patterson writes, Labor Day “might as well be Groundhog Day.”

While it may seem that many voters are checked out of the grueling campaign process, this year’s electorate has actually been more engaged than in many recent campaigns. It’s not hard to figure out why more people started paying attention to this election earlier than they did in 2012 — just look to the glowing orange beacon on your TV screen.

“The public got more involved earlier this year than in the past, and I think you can point to one person as the reason: Donald Trump,” Mr. Patterson said in an interview.

He added that Mr. Trump has a “water-cooler effect” — people like to talk about him — which could also account for the early voter engagement.

“There’s nothing quite like people talking as an indicator of their engagement in the campaign,” Mr. Patterson said. He added, “Now, whether he gets them thinking is a different thing. But he does get them talking.”

The water-cooler effect is apparent online as well, according to CrowdTangle, a tool that tracks social media usage. The company compared Facebook users’ engagement in the 2012 election between March and September with engagement numbers for the same period of time in 2016. Its findings: the number of public posts that mentioned “Hillary” or “Trump” was roughly the same as the number of posts that mentioned “Obama” or “Romney” in 2012. But the number of interactions — that is, the number of likes, shares and comments generated by users — quadrupled between 2012 and 2016, from 90 million to 361 million. Facebook’s daily active users roughly doubled in that time, but still, that makes it double the users, quadruple the interaction.

“In my opinion, those are pretty amazing numbers,” Brandon Silverman, the co-founder and chief executive of CrowdTangle, said in an email. He added that this election cycle “is generating a massive amount of interest and passion in the election, even this early on, and an extraordinary amount of it is being expressed on Facebook every day.”

Mr. Trump has singularly engaged people in the election — positively or negatively — earlier than voters normally would be paying attention. Last August, more than 24 million viewers[http://money.cnn.com/2015/08/07/media/gop-debate-fox-news-ratings/index.html] tuned in to watch the first debate of the Republican primary, breaking ratings records. By comparison, the most-watched Republican primary debate in 2012 attracted 7.6 million viewers.

Labor Day is also the time when, conventional wisdom says, candidates really start to “pivot” toward the general election, taking a more moderate tack than they did during the primaries. That may be one reason reporters eagerly wondered if Mr. Trump’s visit to Mexico last week, and his subsequent **immigration** speech in Arizona, represented a potential pivot point[http://www.wired.com/2016/09/time-stop-tweeting-trumps-nonexistent-pivot/]. Would he be softening[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-softening-on-immigration-many-of-his-supporters-dont-seem-to-mind/2016/08/24/668f91e2-6a0c-11e6-ba32-5a4bf5aad4fa\_story.html] his **immigration** stance? Would he put a more “humane gloss”[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/trump-chilled-by-cold-election-day-reality-227572] on his views toward undocumented **immigrants**? In the end, no such pivoting, softening, or glossing occurred.

The fact that Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump are two of the most polarizing and least well-liked general election candidates in recent history has also likely driven discussion. This election has been more volatile than the last presidential election. Between July and September 2012, President Obama maintained[http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/2012-general-election-romney-vs-obama] a slim 2-point margin above his Republican challenger, Mitt Romney. Over the same two-month period this year, Mrs. Clinton’s lead over Mr. Trump grew[http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/2016-general-election-trump-vs-clinton] from 5 points to 6.5 points.

So, where does voter fatigue come from, and why does it seem to be getting worse? One part of the problem is that our election season is simply too long. The United States has the longest head-of-state campaign season by a long shot. Senator Ted Cruz, the first serious candidate to announce he was running, announced on March 23, 2015[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/23/us/politics/ted-cruz-to-announce-on-monday-he-plans-to-run-for-president.html]. That means that, by Election Day, the campaign will have gone on for 597 days. In the span with which we’ve been paying attention to the same presidential campaign, had we could have instead hosted approximately four Mexican elections[http://www.npr.org/sections/itsallpolitics/2015/10/21/450238156/canadas-11-week-campaign-reminds-us-that-american-elections-are-much-longer], seven Canadian elections[http://ottawacitizen.com/news/politics/two-down-76-to-go-the-longest-election-campaign-since-we-first-re-elected-john-a], 14 British elections[http://www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/foreigners/2015/04/britain\_and\_america\_s\_election\_season\_what\_the\_brits\_and\_the\_americans\_should.html], 14 Australian elections[http://www.loc.gov/law/help/campaign-finance/comparative-summary.php] or 41 French elections.

It’s hard not to get exhausted when there’s barely a break between when one campaign ends and speculation about the next campaign begins. Political journalists — ahem — can also claim partial responsibility for voter fatigue. A recent Pew Research Center poll found[http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/07/14/most-americans-already-feel-election-coverage-fatigue/] that roughly six in ten Americans “feel exhausted by the amount of election coverage.” Still, there could be at least one upside to the deluge of campaign coverage over the past year-and-a-half: a large volume of media coverage has been found to contribute[http://www.ibtimes.com/why-there-so-much-voter-apathy-us-elections-315494] to higher voter turnout in November.

That is the irony of this year’s election: Voters are simultaneously more interested in, and more exhausted with, the campaign than in past election years.

So if Labor Day doesn’t really matter anymore, when’s the new starting point for when the election kicks into high gear? Mr. Patterson said the first presidential debate between the two party nominees could act as the new starting gun.

“The conditions are such that the debates could make more of a difference than they normally do,” he said.

While the debates in a “normal” election year mainly serve to solidify both sides’ support for their candidate, this year’s debates could be a potentially huge reckoning for Mr. Trump, who may have gotten off a few zingers during the primary debates, but who has nowhere near the policy fluency that Mrs. Clinton does. That could stand out to voters who haven’t yet made up their minds.

So, undecided voters — yes, all four of you — vacation is over. It’s time for you to start paying attention to every tweet, sound bite and policy proposal that populate your TV, smartphone and computer screen. Come on in, the sludge is fine.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Emma Roller (@EmmaRoller), a former reporter for National Journal, is a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Outlining the first, tentative details of how she intends to leave the European Union without inflicting damage on Britain [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s economy, Prime Minister Theresa May on Monday ruled out the type of **immigration** curbs championed by prominent supporters of withdrawal before June’s referendum on quitting the bloc.

In a news conference at the Group of 20 summit meeting in China [http://www.nytimes.com/topic/organization/group-of-20], Mrs. May said Britain would not adopt the points-based system used by Australia, a model advocated by senior Leave campaigners including Boris Johnson, who is now Britain’s foreign secretary. Under this system, migrants are rated according to their age, education and other qualifications, with those scoring highest favored.

Mrs. May, who has said little about her strategy for Britain’s exit from the European Union [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/overwhelmed-by-brexit-here-are-the-basics.html], or “Brexit,” said she would cut migration, but did so in reassuring tones. Emphasizing that Britons had opted for “an element of control” over the free movement of workers from the Continent, she said there were “various ways” that could be achieved. She also kept open the option of favoring Europeans over non-Europeans in any new migration system.

Her comments highlight the difficult balancing act she faces now that her favored sound bite — “Brexit means Brexit” — has reached the end of its shelf life. She is facing a growing clamor for more clarity on issues like migration curbs, and calls to maintain the unfettered access to the European market that many businesses and financial institutions prize.

She received little help on Monday in fleshing out that detail from the minister responsible for negotiating Britain’s exit, David Davis. Speaking to Parliament, he provided few details, but argued that Mrs. May had rejected a points-based **immigration** system because it was “too open-ended.” He added that Britain’s new plans might be “more rigorous.”

Mr. Davis said he wanted to build a “national consensus” around a negotiating position for Brexit but added that the government in Scotland — where voters largely favored remaining in the European Union — would not be given a veto over withdrawal.

“We will, by the end of this process, have left the European Union , and put the sovereignty and supremacy of this Parliament beyond doubt,” he said.

The government’s halting efforts to date were ridiculed by its opponents. “This Govt really is up #Brexit [https://twitter.com/hashtag/Brexit?src=hash] creek without a paddle,” Nick Clegg, a Liberal Democratic former deputy prime minister, said on Twitter [https://twitter.com/nick\_clegg/status/772819336356630528?ref\_src=twsrc%5Etfw]. “More round tables? Is that all they’ve come up with?”

As a member of the European Union , Britain is part of Europe’s single market of around 500 million people but, as a quid pro quo, accepts the free movement of workers across national frontiers.

Many British employers want to keep the right to recruit foreign workers, and one business federation, the Institute of Directors , said a points-based system, already used by Britain for non-European migrants, was “hopelessly bureaucratic, governed by 13 different acts of Parliament and creating 1,400 categories of **immigrant**.”

But curbing the number of **immigrants** from the European mainland was one of the main demands of the Leave campaign, and on Monday, Nigel Farage, the former leader of the pro-Brexit U.K. Independence Party, criticized Mrs. May’s dismissal of the points-based **immigration** system.

Other critics have complained that several pledges from the Leave campaign that persuaded voters to support withdrawal — including a promise of millions of pounds a week in health care spending — now lie in tatters, suggesting that the British people were misled.

Yet the greater unknown is whether foreign-owned manufacturers and financial institutions will abandon Britain if Brexit restricts their access to European markets or leads to import or export tariffs with the Continent.

Those worries were underscored in a blunt warning, made public on Sunday, from Japan, which said its companies might move some operations if Brexit was mishandled.

“Japanese businesses with their European headquarters in the U.K. may decide to transfer their head-office function to Continental Europe if E.U. laws cease to be applicable in the U.K. after its withdrawal,” said a document released by the Japanese [http://www.mofa.go.jp.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/files/000185466.pdf] M [http://www.mofa.go.jp.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/files/000185466.pdf] inistry of Foreign Affairs. [http://www.mofa.go.jp.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/files/000185466.pdf]

Aside from a steep fall in the value of the British pound, the economic fallout from the vote has so far been less pronounced than critics had predicted, and on Monday there was positive news from survey data from the important services sector.

However, ministers are aware that these are early days and that Britain has yet to start formal negotiations on its exit, something Mrs. May has said will not happen before next year. In an interview broadcast Sunday, Mrs. May also sought to manage expectations by telling the BBC that Britain needs to be prepared for some “difficult times” and that the withdrawal will not be “plain sailing.”

But while British lawmakers on Monday also discussed a petition, signed by more than four million people, demanding a fresh vote, the government was adamant that there would be no second referendum.

Mr. Davis told Parliament that there must be “no attempt to delay, frustrate or thwart the will of the British people” and “no attempt to engineer a second referendum because some people didn’t like the first answer.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CLEVELAND — Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump ran virtually parallel campaigns on Monday as they geared up for the final stretch of the presidential race. She made nice with the news media by opening up her campaign plane and chatting with reporters. He followed suit, inviting a smaller group of reporters onto his plane and answering questions during the 30-minute flight.

She took along her running mate, and so did he, as both focused on Ohio and nearly crossed paths in Cleveland. Their motorcades all but passed each other, and all four candidates’ planes ended up on the tarmac at Cleveland Hopkins International Airport at the same time.

Mrs. Clinton moved on several fronts on Monday to confront nagging doubts about her candidacy, despite her comfortable lead in many swing-state polls. Courting labor supporters, she met with union leaders in Cleveland while her husband, Bill Clinton, appeared at a Labor Day[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/l/labor\_day/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] parade in Detroit. Seeking the backing of progressive voters, she enlisted her primary opponent, Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont, who made his first solo appearance on Mrs. Clinton’s behalf at a rally in New Hampshire.

And her outreach to reporters included her most extensive question-and-answer session with them in months. She expressed alarm “about the credible reports about Russian government interference in our elections” through hacking[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/politics/harry-reid-russia-tampering-election-fbi.html], saying, “We’ve never had a foreign adversarial power be already involved in our electoral process.”

Not to be outdone, Mr. Trump used his airborne meeting with reporters to clarify his views on **immigration**, saying he opposed any path to citizenship for the 11 million **immigrants** in the country illegally. But he did not explicitly rule out a long-term path to legal status if the nation’s **immigration** system is overhauled.

“We’re going to make that decision into the future,” Mr. Trump said. But, he added, “to become a citizen, you are going to have to go out and come back in through the process. You’re going to have to go out and get in line. This isn’t touchback. You have to get in line.”

On the plane, Mr. Trump also told reporters that, “as of this moment,” he planned to attend all three debates, and that only a “natural disaster” could make him change his mind. He added that, while he was preparing, he was not holding any mock debate sessions.

Labor Day is traditionally the beginning of a two-month sprint to Election Day, in which candidates try to seize voters’ attention as summer fades and debates loom. Monday was no exception. The visits to Ohio by Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton — along with their respective running mates, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana and Senator Tim Kaine of Virginia — highlighted the importance of a state that Republicans believe Mr. Trump must win to have any shot of reaching the White House.

“Labor Day comes, and it’s kind of like a recalibration,” said Beth Myers, who managed Mitt Romney’s 2008 presidential campaign and served as his senior adviser in 2012. “You see the finish line, you see that there’s not too many game-changing events left, and most campaigns take a measure of where you are on Labor Day.”

This cycle, however, both candidates have eschewed traditional campaigning, albeit in divergent ways. Normally, they would already have been circling each other in swing states.

But Mrs. Clinton has spent most of the summer away from the campaign trail, focusing on fund-raising[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/us/politics/hillary-clinton-fundraising.html] in places like the Hamptons and Beverly Hills with celebrities like Jimmy Buffett and Harvey Weinstein. Mr. Trump has also kept a languid pace, favoring large rallies, often in the evening, over several daily stops.

Mr. Trump, a political novice, and Mrs. Clinton, a veteran politician, are confronting historically low approval ratings among voters for whom they are well-known commodities.

“Labor Day used to be this big, important marker in the campaign season,” said Amy Walter, national editor at the nonpartisan Cook Political Report. “A kickoff, if you will. Today, it feels like the start of the third quarter instead of the kickoff.”

“The candidates are well-defined, the ads have been running for months and TVs have been saturated with talking heads,” she added.

Mr. Trump tried to burnish his image as a statesman last week with a hastily arranged trip[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico-enrique-pena-nieto.html] to Mexico City. He has also tried to increase his outreach to minorities, from a promised “softening”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html] on **immigration** that concluded with a fiery, nativist speech[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] in Phoenix, to a stop at a black church[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters-detroit.html] in Detroit.

That approach was also on display on Monday. At a diner in Cleveland, Mr. Trump met Maria Hernandez, a Mexican-American who said she was supporting him. “Mexican-American supports Trump,” he said. “It’s so nice.” Then he turned to the nearby reporters to emphasize his focus group of one: “Make a note of it, guys,” he said.

Earlier, speaking to a dozen white men and a lone white woman at an American Legion post here, Mr. Trump criticized China’s treatment of President Obama: When the president landed in Hangzhou for the Group of 20 summit meeting, the host country forced him to disembark from the plane’s belly[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/05/world/asia/china-obama-group-of-20-summit-airport-arrival.html]. Mr. Trump said he would not have gotten off the plane, but instead have urged his crew to “get out of here.”

He also took a shot at Mrs. Clinton, saying, “And she looks presidential, fellows?”

Mrs. Clinton’s appearance in Cleveland was meant as a show of labor support during a campaign in which many rank-and-file union members were drawn to Mr. Sanders’s promise to take on income inequality. At a Labor Day festival here, she and Mr. Kaine were joined by the A.F.L.-C.I.O.’s president, Richard L. Trumka; Lee Saunders, the president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; and Randi Weingarten, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, one of the first unions to endorse Mrs. Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/07/11/hillary-clinton-picks-up-teachers-union-endorsement/].

Mrs. Clinton’s surrogates were also out in force. On a sunny morning in Pittsburgh, Mr. Kaine and the man he hopes to succeed, Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., spoke at a rally before the city’s Labor Day parade, addressing a crowd that included many in union T-shirts. Mr. Kaine assailed Mr. Trump for refusing to release his tax returns, then turned the stage over to Mr. Biden.

“My name is Joe Biden, and I work for Hillary Clinton and whatever the hell this guy’s name is,” he said.

Mr. Clinton also defended the Clinton Foundation, a popular topic of criticism from Mr. Trump, and hit the Republican nominee over his own foundation, referring to a Washington Post report[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/09/01/trump-pays-irs-a-penalty-for-his-foundation-violating-rules-with-gift-to-florida-attorney-general/] that found that Mr. Trump’s charitable organization paid the Internal Revenue Service a $2,500 penalty this year after improperly giving a political contribution to a campaign group with ties to the attorney general of Florida.

And at a rally in Lebanon, N.H., Mr. Sanders praised Mrs. Clinton for supporting a host of progressive positions, including free college tuition for students from working-class families, and for opposing the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a trade deal that has become a hot-button issue.

“I would hope and ask you all, very much, that we have got to do everything we can to make sure that Hillary Clinton is elected president,” he said. “But two days after the election, we have got to continue the pressure.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Amy Chozick contributed reporting from Cleveland, Thomas Kaplan from Pittsburgh, and Yamiche Alcindor from Lebanon, N.H.

\* Despite Bernie Sanders’s Urging, Die-Hards Still Resist Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/us/politics/bernie-sanders-campaign.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has devoted most of the past two weeks to discussing **immigration**, even though only 8 percent of Americans rank it as “the most important problem facing this country today,” according to a recent Gallup poll[http://www.gallup.com/poll/1675/most-important-problem.aspx].

But within that thin slice of the electorate reside Mr. Trump’s staunchest supporters, the “alternative right,” or alt-right. The Southern Poverty Law Centercalls[https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/ideology/alternative-right] the alt-right “a set of far-right ideologies, groups and individuals whose core belief is that ‘white identity’ is under attack by multicultural forces using ‘political correctness’ and ‘social justice’ to undermine white people and ‘their’ civilization.” Most Americans hadn’t heard about the alt-right until this election, and some not until last month, when Hillary Clinton gave a speech in Reno, Nev., linking Donald Trump to it.

The term was coined in 2008 by Richard Spencer, a white supremacist whose National Policy Institute says it is “dedicated to the heritage, identity and future of people of European descent in the United States, and around the world.” Through his online writings and YouTube channel, Mr. Spencer is a key player in the social-media universe where this core group of Trump supporters get their “news,” from sources with which most people aren’t familiar. A quick scan shows that **immigration** is not only their most important issue, it’s pretty much their only issue.

“**Immigration** is a kind of proxy war — and maybe a last stand — for White Americans, who are undergoing a painful recognition that, unless dramatic action is taken, their grandchildren will live in a country that is **alien** and hostile,” Mr. Spencer wrote in a National Policy Institute column[http://www.npiamerica.org/the-national-policy-institute/category/limbo].

Infowars is another website that puts **immigration** front and center. The site was created by the radio commentator/conspiracy theorist Alex Jones, who is the source of Mr. Trump’s false claim that thousands of New Jersey Muslims celebrated 9/11, and on whose show Mr. Trump said: “Your reputation is amazing. I will not let you down.” Infowars called Mr. Trump’s slashing anti-**immigrant** rant on Wednesday “an excellent speech sure to win him support from those who’ve been conned by the lying media into thinking he’s some evil demon creature when the truth is he’s a man with a heart of gold.”

Mr. Trump says he isn’t signaling the alt-right when he says of **immigrants**, as he did again on Wednesday: “We have no idea who these people are, where they come from. I always say Trojan Horse. Watch what’s going to happen, folks. It’s not going to be pretty.” Or when he said — in a line widely quoted on alt-right websites — “There is only one core issue in the **immigration** debate and it is this: the well-being of the American people.” Mr. Trump’s white supremacist followers don’t take his disavowals too seriously. After all, he has enthusiastically retweeted bogus crime statistics and incendiary imagery from these websites and hired one of their biggest lights, Stephen Bannon of Breitbart News, to manage his campaign.

There aren’t enough of these people to put Mr. Trump in the White House. But his candidacy has granted them the legitimacy they have craved for years. For the first time, a candidate is using a major-party megaphone to shout the ideas they once could only mutter among themselves in the shadowy fringes of national debate.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TAARNBY, Denmark — Johnny Christensen, a stout and silver-whiskered retired bank employee, always thought of himself as sympathetic to people fleeing war and welcoming to **immigrants**. But after more than 36,000 mostly Muslim asylum seekers poured into Denmark[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/denmark/index.html?inline=nyt-geo] over the past two years, Mr. Christensen, 65, said, “I’ve become a racist.”

He believes these new migrants are draining Denmark’s cherished social-welfare system but failing to adapt to its customs. “Just kick them out,” he said, unleashing a mighty kick at an imaginary target on a suburban sidewalk. “These Muslims want to keep their own culture, but we have our own rules here and everyone must follow them.”

Denmark, a small and orderly nation with a progressive self-image, is built on a social covenant: In return for some of the world’s highest wages and benefits, people are expected to work hard and pay into the system. Newcomers must quickly learn Danish — and adapt to norms like keeping tidy gardens and riding bicycles.

The country had little experience with **immigrants** until 1967, when the first “guest workers” were invited from Turkey, Pakistan and what was then Yugoslavia. Its 5.7 million people remain overwhelmingly native born, though the percentage has dropped to 88 today from 97 in 1980.

Bo Lidegaard, a prominent historian, said many Danes feel strongly that “we are a multiethnic society today, and we have to realize it — but we are not and should never become a multicultural society.”

The recent influx[http://www.migrationsverket.se/download/18.7c00d8e6143101d166d1aab/1451894593595/Inkomna+ans%C3%B6kningar+om+asyl+2015+-+Applications+for+asylum+received+2015.pdf] pales next to the one million migrants absorbed into Germany[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/world/europe/merkel-migrants-germany.html] or the 163,000 into Sweden last year, but the pace shocked this stable, homogeneous country. The center-right government has backed a series of harsh measures targeting migrants, hate speech has spiked, and the anti-**immigrant** Danish People’s Party is now the second largest in Parliament.

There is new tension between Danes still opening their arms and a resurgent right wing that seeks to ban all Muslims and shut Denmark off from Europe. Mr. Christensen, the retired banker, supports emerging proposals for his country to follow Britain in exiting the European Union.

There is tension, too, over whether the backlash is really about a strain on Denmark’s generous public benefits or a rising terrorist threat — or whether a longstanding but latent racial hostility is being unearthed.

Analysts say that the public voiced little opposition after 5,000 Poles and 3,300 Americans, among other Westerners, emigrated to Denmark in 2014, but that there has been significant criticism of the nearly 16,000 Syrian asylum seekers who arrived that year and the next. They and other migrants were not invited, and many ended up here by accident, intercepted on their route to Sweden.

Critics complain that these newcomers have been slow to learn Danish — though the **immigration** ministry recently reported that 72 percent passed a required language exam. Some Danes blister at what they see as ethnic enclaves: About 30 percent of new **immigrants** lived in the nation’s two largest cities, Aarhus and Copenhagen, where Muslim women in abayas and men in prayer caps stand out among the blond and blue-eyed crowds on narrow streets.

Perhaps the leading — and most substantive — concern is that the migrants are an economic drain. In 2014, 48 percent of **immigrants** from non-Western countries ages 16 to 64 were employed, compared with 74 percent of native Danes.

The **immigration** ministry has sought to avoid what it calls “parallel societies” of migrants living in “vicious circles of bad image, social problems and a high rate of unemployment.” Tightened **immigration** requirements, the ministry said in its latest annual report, weed out those “who have weaker capabilities for being able to integrate into Danish society.”

Omar Mahmoud, 34, an Iraqi engineer who entered Denmark a year ago and lives in a refugee center in Randers, a city of 60,000, is trying his best to fit in. He and his wife are taking Danish classes, and their three children are learning the language and making Danish friends in school. They are Muslim, but attend church to learn about Christianity, and he said he was not opposed to his son’s eating pork, a staple of the Danish diet, though it is forbidden in Islam.

Mr. Mahmoud said his family had not encountered direct insults or threats, but was frightened by the anti-**immigrant** and anti-Muslim tenor in the public discourse.

“It’s like foreigners are put in a special clan, separate from the Danish people,” he lamented. Still, Mr. Mahmoud said that “some of the Danish people are angels” and that he was relieved to be far from the violence of Iraq. “I’m in my heaven now.”

Anders Buhl-Christensen, a center-right city councilman in Randers, said the influx had forced a more honest conversation about national identity. “Our problem in Denmark is that we’ve been too polite,” he said. “No one dared talk about” **immigration**, he added, “because they were afraid they’d be called racist.”

‘It’s not racism to be aware of the difference’

Denmark is just one of many European nations grappling with the wave of migrants amid a spate of terrorist attacks across the Continent by Islamic extremists: A recent Pew Research Center survey[http://www.pewglobal.org/2016/07/11/europeans-fear-wave-of-refugees-will-mean-more-terrorism-fewer-jobs] found that at least half the citizens in eight of 10 countries polled said incoming refugees increased the likelihood of terrorist attacks.

The confluence of these and other factors has prompted a re-examination of the postwar promise of a unified, borderless Europe[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/29/world/europe/immigration-tests-prospects-for-a-borderless-europe.html]. Macedonia, Hungary and Slovenia have all built border fences. Denmark imposed new identity controls on its border with Germany in January, and for the first time since 1958, Sweden requires entering Danes to show identity papers[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/05/world/europe/sweden-denmark-border-check-migrants.html].

Many analysts saw Britain’s surprise vote to leave the European Union as an angry expression of concern[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/world/europe/brexit-immigrants-great-britain-eu.html] that British — or, especially, English — identity was being diluted by the nation’s growing diversity. Debate is raging anew over whether certain Islamic modes of dress — full-body swimsuits, known as burkinis, in France[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/19/world/europe/frances-burkini-bans-are-about-more-than-religion-or-clothing.html] and face veils in Germany[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/20/world/europe/germany-face-veils-burqa.html] — inherently contravene countries’ values.

Similar themes are seen as underpinning a wave of new measures here in Denmark.

The government has made its citizenship test more difficult[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/08/world/europe/denmark-citizenship-test.html] and slashed by nearly half[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/16/world/europe/nordic-countries-overwhelmed-by-migrants-retreat-from-generous-traditions.html?\_r=0] a package of integration benefits. A measure passed in January, though rarely enforced, empowers the authorities to confiscate valuables[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/27/world/europe/denmark-asks-refugees-for-valuables.html] from new arrivals to offset the cost of settling them.

Last year, Denmark placed ads in Arabic-language newspapers stressing its tough new policies, essentially suggesting: Don’t come here.

Muslims do not assimilate as easily as Europeans or some Asians, said Denmark’s culture minister, Bertel Haarder, partly because, as he put it, their patriarchal culture frowns on women working outside the home and often constrains freedom of speech.

“It’s not racism to be aware of the difference — it’s stupid not to be aware,” Mr. Haarder said. “We do them a blessing by being very clear and outspoken as to what kind of country they have come to, what are our basic values.”

But much of the difference remains unspoken. This is a country where pedestrians wait for a green light to cross even when no cars are in sight, a contrast to the bustling streets of Middle Eastern capitals.

Birgitte Romme Larsen, a Danish anthropologist who has studied refugees and asylum seekers in rural areas, mentioned an African refugee who did not realize that closing his curtains during the day was interpreted as being unduly secretive. Other newcomers were not aware that congregating and talking loudly at a grocery might offend Danish sensibilities.

“These implicit expectations cannot be written into an integration folder” migrants receive, Ms. Larsen said.

‘A Dane of a different color’

Sherif Sulaiman, an organic food scientist who moved to Denmark eight years ago from Egypt, said Muslims must not close themselves off in enclaves but open themselves up for interaction.

He is the manager of an Islamic center that opened in 2014 and invites Danes in for meals and for an annual “harmony week.” Mr. Sulaiman pushed to have the mosque complex use Scandinavian architectural style and furniture, and lends its conference room to a church for meetings.

“We should be like this glass — transparent,” he said, pointing to a window. “As long as we follow the rules of the country, we are part of Danish society.”

But some dark-skinned **immigrants** who have lived in Denmark for decades say assimilation seems an elusive and ever-shifting target.

Patricia Bandak and her brother Sylvester Bbaale came to Denmark from Uganda as babies in 1989. Like their native neighbors, they are polite and punctual and ride their bicycles everywhere.

The siblings are not Muslim but said they frequently encountered racism: In school, they were called the n-word, and told that they should stop eating Ugandan food like matoke, a starchy fruit. Mr. Bbaale, who is 27 and operates a food truck, said he was beaten on the street last year by three men who cursed at him and told him to go back to Africa.

“For a lot of people, being Danish is in your blood, so I will never be Danish,” said Ms. Bandak, 28, who became a Danish citizen in 2010 and is studying documentary film. “I call myself a Dane of a different color.”

Then there is Ozlem Cekic, a Turkish-born Muslim who served as a leftist member of Parliament from 2007 to 2015. Her three children were born in Denmark, she wrote a 2009 memoir in Danish, and, she said, “I even dream in Danish.”

Yet Mrs. Cekic, 40, said she often received death threats and heard shouts of “Go home!” on the street. Every time terrorists strike Europe, she is bombarded by hundreds of hate messages. Lately, people have inundated her with accusations that Muslims are milking the welfare system and plotting against Danes.

While in Parliament, Mrs. Cekic held “dialogue coffees,” where she would explain — in fluent Danish — why she is as Danish as anyone.

“They meet me for coffee and suddenly they say their problem isn’t with me but with those other people,” she recalled. “I tell them: I am the other.”

‘Denmark is closing in on itself’

Karin Andersen is one of thousands of Danes trying to help the **immigrants** settle through groups formed on Facebook called Venligboerne, or Kind Citizens. She spends several days each month with Housam Mohammed Shamden, 38, his wife and two daughters, who fled Syria in 2014 and now live in Randers, with small Danish flags taped to the front door of their apartment and tucked into flower vases.

“Danes are so concerned about losing their culture,” said Ms. Andersen, 62, a retired teacher. “But how many help the ones who want to be part of it?”

However many, they are often drowned out by reports of Muslims being spat at and showered with racist slurs. In May, two Danes ripped the head scarves off two girls. The month before, a national controversy erupted[http://www.thelocal.dk/20160427/muslim-girls-only-swimming-sessions-ripple-danish-waters] after a public swimming pool in Copenhagen created girls-only lessons in response to Muslim requests.

“Freedom of speech is now interpreted as freedom to say anything hateful,” said Julie Jeeg, a law student who volunteers with an anti-racism group. “Denmark is closing in on itself. People are retreating inward.”

Witness the “meatball war[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/21/world/europe/randers-denmark-pork.html].”

In January, after revelations that a Randers day care center had stopped serving pork meatballs since its Muslim students would not eat them, the Town Council narrowly passed a measure requiring that pork be served “on equal terms with other kinds of food.”

The councilman who pushed the measure, Frank Noergaard of the Danish People’s Party, said he was incensed that “pork could be abandoned in Denmark,” adding: “If you give in on pork, what’s next?”

\* Denmark’s Tougher Citizenship Test Stumps Even Its Natives[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/08/world/europe/denmark-citizenship-test.html]

\* Nordic Countries, Overwhelmed by Migrants, Retreat From Generous Traditions[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/16/world/europe/nordic-countries-overwhelmed-by-migrants-retreat-from-generous-traditions.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Department of Homeland Security announced late last month that it is considering[https://www.dhs.gov/news/2016/08/29/statement-secretary-jeh-c-johnson-establishing-review-privatized-immigration] ending its use of private prisons, as the Justice Department has decided to do. The Homeland Security secretary, Jeh Johnson, told his department’s a[https://www.dhs.gov/news/2016/08/29/statement-secretary-jeh-c-johnson-establishing-review-privatized-immigration] dvisory c[https://www.dhs.gov/news/2016/08/29/statement-secretary-jeh-c-johnson-establishing-review-privatized-immigration] ouncil[https://www.dhs.gov/news/2016/08/29/statement-secretary-jeh-c-johnson-establishing-review-privatized-immigration] to study the issue and report back to him by the end of November.

That gives him only a few weeks to read, review and act before everything gets bumped to the Trump or Clinton administration. To save time, Mr. Johnson could do the wise thing and end the contracts now.

There is no need to further study the failings of the private prison industry. Mr. Johnson only has to read the Justice Department inspector general’s report[https://oig.justice.gov/reports/2016/e1606.pdf] in August about the prevalence of safety and security problems at private prisons, or a recent Mother Jonesarticle[http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/06/cca-private-prisons-corrections-corporation-inmates-investigation-bauer] that looks inside a brutal, mismanaged Louisiana prison run by Corrections Corporation of America, one of two companies that dominate the **immigrant**-prison business.

Whether private prison contracts should be canceled or simply not renewed, or whether Homeland Security should contract with state or county lockups, or run its own, will need to be answered. But the administration should first be asking itself why it locks up so many **immigrants** who are not safety threats, who are not there to be punished, who in many cases are refugees and who are the mothers of young children or are young children.

The Obama administration has spent years endorsing and enacting smart criminal-justice reforms, including pushing back against decades of useless, degrading imprisonment of nonviolent and petty offenders. But there is one huge area where it seems immune to enlightenment: **immigration** enforcement.

**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, known as ICE, takes about 300,000 **immigrants** a year into detention; the daily population averaged about 28,000 in fiscal 2015. About 63 percent of detainees are held in private prisons under contract with Homeland Security.

The administration’s deportations have ebbed in recent years, as illegal border crossings have slowed, and President Obama has used broad executive action to defer the deportations of hundreds of thousands of young **immigrants** who are the lowest enforcement priorities. He tried to expand the program to millions more, a worthy effort that was stalled by federal courts. But despite his claims of going after “felons, not families,” the machinery he controls still catches too many of the wrong people.

Consider two situations. Xochitl Hernandez, a 40-year-old grandmother in Los Angeles, was arrested in an anti-gang operation by the Los Angeles Police Department and ICE. She has one misdemeanor shoplifting conviction, from 2004, but has no gang record, was not in a police gang database and was not a target of the operation. She was first held on $60,000 bond, which an **immigration** judge lowered to $5,000. Advocates[http://action.ndlon.org/p/dia/action3/common/public/?action\_KEY=23453] are trying to raise the money to get her out. She isn’t a threat to the homeland.

Then there is Berks County Residential Center, in Pennsylvania, where detainees include 22 women[http://www.pri.org/stories/2016-08-25/madres-berks-are-hunger-strike-get-their-kids-out-immigration-detention], recent arrivals from Central America, who went on a hunger strike[https://www.scribd.com/document/322150813/A-letter-from-women-detained-in-the-Berks-County-Residential-Center] in August to protest their detention. Some have been detained for months, some for a year, and all are baffled and desolate.

Mr. Johnson recently defended[http://thehill.com/policy/national-security/290316-dhs-chief-defends-child-detention-practices] the practice of detaining families as necessary to screen for health problems and security risks. But the administration has no answer for why it lacks a more robust set of alternatives to detention, like monitoring in the community by local organizations that would ensure people return to court for their deportation or asylum cases. More lawyers and more judicious enforcement are the answers.

There are ways to enforce the law without mistreating a population that fits no definition of a criminal threat. The job of dismantling the prison network Mr. Obama built will pass on to Hillary Clinton, if she is elected. If it’s Donald Trump, who wants to make **immigration** enforcement the federal government’s overriding priority, then private incarceration, industry profits and human suffering will go through the roof.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Gary Johnson[https://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/gary-e-johnson?inline=nyt-per], the Libertarian candidate for president, may be on track to win more votes than any third-party candidate in 20 years, if current polling holds up.

Who are his supporters?

Mr. Johnson, a former Republican governor of New Mexico, is relying heavily on the backing of young people and independent voters disillusioned with the two major parties’ nominees.

More than 70 percent of his backers are younger than 50, and over three-fifths are political independents, according to a mid-August poll [http://www.people-press.org/2016/08/18/1-voters-general-election-preferences/]by the Pew Research Center.

Over all, Mr. Johnson, who will be on the ballot in all 50 states, has the backing of 10 percent of registered voters, the Pew poll found.

Mr. Johnson’s coalition is relatively diverse, particularly compared with that of Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], the Republican presidential nominee.

Thirteen percent of Mr. Johnson’s backers are black or Latino, compared with just 6 percent for Mr. Trump.

And while just 42 percent of Mr. Trump’s supporters are women, the Pew center found that Mr. Johnson’s are evenly divided — 51 percent women, 49 percent men.

Republican strategists have long said that their party must do more to appeal to voters who are younger, nonwhite and women. Mr. Trump trails Hillary Clinton[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/hillary-clinton-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], the Democratic presidential nominee, by almost 20 points among women, and by far more among minority voters, Pew found.

“Something is happening where the coalition is no longer able to appeal beyond its disparate and shrinking constituencies,” said Michael Madrid, a principal at GrassrootsLab, a Republican consulting firm. “That’s the main problem facing Republicans.”

As Mr. Trump departs from Republican orthodoxy on issues including free trade and entitlement reform, he remains burdened by the thing that may be most unpopular about the party: its own brand. More than six in 10 Americans view the Republican Party unfavorably, according to a New York Times/CBS News poll from July[http://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/07/15/us/politics/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-poll.html?\_r=0&referer=https://www-google-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/].

Originally an entrepreneur, Mr. Johnson has cast himself as an alternative to Mr. Trump by focusing on reducing the size of the government while embracing a hands-off approach to social issues.

He advocates abolishing the income tax, removing regulations on internet companies and moving aggressively to balance the federal budget[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/federal\_budget\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier].

But much of Mr. Johnson’s message has focused on social policy. His support for abortion rights and legalized marijuana appeals to many young people, while putting him out of step with his former party.

“When you get past the rhetoric and past the primary politics that Republicans and Democrats each have to play, the real majority of Americans are essentially fiscally responsible and socially inclusive,” said Joe Hunter, a spokesman for Mr. Johnson.

“Right now, neither of the two major parties — particularly the Republican Party — is representing that view,” Mr. Hunter said.

Mr. Johnson has strongly opposed Mr. Trump’s proposal for a wall along the border with Mexico, saying instead that the government should make it easier for **immigrants** to enter the United States legally.

The ascent of Mr. Johnson — who garnered less than 1 percent of the vote as the Libertarian candidate in 2012 — owes partly to dissatisfaction with Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton, who both receive negative ratings from most voters. It also reflects the fact that a plurality of Americans today identify as independents.

A Washington Post/ABC News poll from August[https://www.washingtonpost.com/page/2010-2019/WashingtonPost/2016/08/07/National-Politics/Polling/release\_435.xml?tid=a\_inl] put Mr. Johnson’s overall support at 8 percent, but showed him earning 14 percent among independents. He is drawing support about equally from voters who would otherwise lean toward Mr. Trump or Mrs. Clinton.

Mr. Johnson is pushing to reach 15 percent in the major national polls, which would qualify him to participate in nationally televised presidential debates.

The business mogul Ross Perot[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/ross\_perot/index.html?inline=nyt-per] ran as an independent presidential candidate in 1992, earning 19 percent of the popular vote with a platform of socially moderate and fiscally conservative policies not unlike those of Mr. Johnson. He, too, drew most of his support from younger voters. Mr. Perot ran again in 1996 and got 8 percent of the vote.

Mr. Johnson is currently nowhere near where Mr. Perot was in 1992, when he briefly led both Bill Clinton and George Bush in the polls.

And there are distinct vulnerabilities in Mr. Johnson’s appeal.

He leans heavily on the Western states, drawing about a third of his support from there, according to two recent Washington Post/ABC News polls.

And the Pew survey shows Mr. Johnson polling at just 4 percent among voters 65 and older. He is doing equally poorly among those who describe themselves as very conservative.

For now, older voters and the conservative base remain crucial to the Republican Party. Despite its troubles in presidential elections over the past 25 years, the party controls both houses of Congress and most state legislatures.

But Mr. Trump faces an uphill battle, and if he loses, the Republicans will once again have to rethink how they pick their presidential nominee and how to widen their appeal to a changing electorate.

“This is likely to be the sixth election out of the last seven when Republicans lose the popular vote,” said Richard Born, a political scientist at Vassar College who studies political polarization. “They’re going to have to moderate, and **immigration** rights will be one place they have to moderate.”

If Mr. Trump loses in November, he added, the Republican Party’s 2020 nominee could be “somewhere in between a Gary Johnson and a Mitt Romney.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Gary Johnson, Libertarian Nominee, Denounces Donald Trump as Authoritarian[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/24/us/politics/gary-johnson-campaign.html]

\* Gary Johnson Sees This Election as the Libertarians’ Big Moment[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/24/us/politics/gary-johnson-libertarian-big-moment.html]

\* Gary Johnson to the Rescue[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/09/opinion/campaign-stops/gary-johnson-to-the-rescue.html]

\* Congressman Backs Libertarian Presidential Candidate in Campaign First[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/us/politics/gary-johnson-libertarian-scott-rigell.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — A recent semi-scandal over seats on a train illuminates the deep problems of Britain’s Labour Party [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/world/europe/britain-corbyn-labour-party.html]. Its left-wing leader, Jeremy Corbyn [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/13/world/europe/labour-jeremy-corbyn.html], made a video sitting on the floor of a train calling for the renationalization of the railways while claiming that there were no empty seats and travelers were “ram-packed.”

Virgin Trains , which operates the service, then released closed-circuit television images showing numerous vacant seats bypassed by Mr. Corbyn, who was later filmed in a seat for most of the journey.

That many of Britain’s privatized railways are badly overcrowded, especially in southern England, is indisputable. But the episode was another indication that the Labour Party is a shambles: Its leader and its members of Parliament are in a virtual civil war, and it is deeply unpopular with the broader electorate.

Yet the party’s membership is soaring. Under Mr. Corbyn, some 300,000 people have joined Labour in the last year. Labour has more members, about 500,000, than all the other British political parties put together.

The obvious contradiction is at the heart of Labour’s dilemma. Mr. Corbyn, a man of the hard left who also wants to renationalize the utilities and make Britain non-nuclear, is deeply skeptical of the United States and considers NATO an outdated, aggressive alliance. With his anti-establishment stands, he has brought many young people and many hard-left advocates back into Labour, some of whom had been expelled under former Prime Minister Tony Blair [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/08/world/europe/tony-blair-chilcot-report-iraq.html].

Yet opinion polls show Labour under Mr. Corbyn is sure to lose the next election to the governing Conservatives and lose it badly, doing worse than it did in May 2015 [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/09/world/europe/david-cameron-and-conservatives-emerge-victorious-in-british-election.html], which led to the resignation of its leader, Ed Miliband. Mr. Miliband moved the party to the left, away from the centrist policies of Mr. Blair, who won three elections.

But in 2015, the party was essentially wiped out in Scotland and won only 232 seats in all of Britain — down from 258 in 2010 — the worst showing for the party since 1983. It was led at that time by Michael Foot, whose election platform was described as “the longest suicide note in history,” and yet whose policies most closely resemble those of Mr. Corbyn’s.

Labour’s members of Parliament, who survived the 2015 debacle, fear worse to come under Mr. Corbyn, 67, whose election as leader was entirely unexpected. He was the beneficiary of weak opponents and a strong vote from new party members and anyone who was willing to pay three pounds to vote, member or not.

First elected to Parliament in 1983, Mr. Corbyn had always been on Labour’s fringe. He supported Hugo Chávez [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/06/world/americas/hugo-chavez-venezuelas-polarizing-leader-dies-at-58.html], the leftist Venezuelan strongman; has pushed hard for more spending for the poor; and has been a persistent critic of Israel and supporter of Palestinian [http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/p/palestinians/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] statehood.

And while Labour officially supported Britain’s remaining in the European Union , Mr. Corbyn was halfhearted at best.

A former shadow chancellor of the Exchequer, Ed Balls, in excerpts from an autobiography [http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-37211591], said Mr. Corbyn’s Labour leadership was a “leftist utopian fantasy” that is “devoid of connection to the reality of people’s lives.”

Mr. Balls wrote: “Refusing to listen to the electorate has never been a winning formula any more than Jeremy Corbyn thinking the volume of the cheering from your core supporters is a reliable guide to wider public opinion.”

Labour legislators have also complained bitterly about Mr. Corbyn’s disorganization, his lack of interest in reaching out to centrist voters and his tendency to moralize and speak only to crowds of supporters. At crucial moments, they say, he is often unavailable, growing vegetables or making jam, two of his hobbies.

Fearing another quick general election after the resignation of Prime Minister David Cameron [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/world/europe/britain-david-cameron-legacy.html], the Labour legislators revolted, trying to force Mr. Corbyn to quit. Many resigned from the shadow cabinet or refused to serve in it, and when Mr. Corbyn insisted that only the party members could decide his fate, they forced a new election for party leader.

Mr. Corbyn won a court case allowing him to run without being renominated by the legislators. The rebels finally united behind Owen Smith, 46, an English-born member of Parliament from a Welsh seat, who was first elected in 2010 after a career as a radio producer and a lobbyist for pharmaceutical companies.

Mr. Smith is considered “soft left,” but even he is to the left of Mr. Miliband. While he has done reasonably well in a series of debates with Mr. Corbyn, the large influx of new members, enthused by Mr. Corbyn’s harder left policies, suggest that when the votes are counted on Sept. 24, Mr. Corbyn will be re-elected.

A likely Corbyn victory has added to the concerns of the Labour legislators, who fear that they will be challenged in their constituencies by more militant left-wing Corbyn supporters, a process known as “reselection.” Corbyn backers have threatened mandatory reselection for all Labour legislators, but a Conservative change to the election boundaries is a clearer threat.

Under Mr. Cameron, the Conservatives pushed through a law that would reduce the number of parliamentary constituencies to 600 from 650, while trying to equalize the number of voters in each constituency — the same reasoning behind redistricting in the United States after a census.

But as in the United States, the devil is in the details of how the constituencies are redrawn, and there are already charges of gerrymandering by the government. A review of the new boundaries has suggested 200 Labour seats would be affected, with up to 30 seats being scrapped, because many Labour seats in Wales and the northeast have smaller populations.

By contrast, the Conservatives face losing only between 10 and 15 seats, according to the review [http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/aug/28/boundary-review-changes-affect-200-labour-party-seats-robert-hayward-report]by Robert Hayward, a political expert and a Conservative member of the House of Lords.

New boundaries will mean a new selection process for many Labour legislators, which could mean that those opposed to Mr. Corbyn would be rejected.

So there is increasing talk of Labour legislators forming their own parliamentary opposition in the House of Commons, where they would, by their numbers, become the official opposition.

Some analysts have suggested that there is a pro-European, centrist party in the making that could also attract Liberal Democrats and some Conservatives, too. But the British political system punishes third parties, and everyone is mindful of the fate of the Social Democratic Party, formed in 1981 by Labour legislators who revolted against the party’s antinuclear and anti-European policies.

After a lively start, that party merged with the Liberals and finally disappeared.

Mr. Corbyn has said he “hopes Labour M.P.s will recognize the outcome of this election, and not walk away.” More likely, they will hope for an early election in which the Corbyn-led party is badly defeated but they somehow survive, resulting in his resignation. But having seized the party machinery, Mr. Corbyn seems unlikely to give it up, even in defeat.

In his view, and that of his followers, he is building a socialist movement for the future, and he and his followers regard the centrists, in the words of the former Labour legislator Chris Williamson, as Conservative “sleeper” agents [http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/labour-mps-tory-sleeper-agents-jeremy-corbyn-rally-told-as-leadership-campaign-begins\_uk\_578fe079e4b05c99a708e364] at war not with Mr. Corbyn but with the members of the party themselves.

Follow Steven Erlanger on Twitter @StevenErlanger.

\* ‘Brexit’ Vote Feeds Scotland’s **Alienation** [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/27/world/europe/brexit-scotland.html]

\* British Politics Gives a Sense of Government by Old School Chums [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/08/world/europe/britain-brexit-elite-politics.html]

\* Economic Fears Rising, Britain Hopes to Stay in E.U. Market [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/28/world/europe/boris-johnson-brexit.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**DETROIT — Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], who has campaigned for president as a blunt provocateur, dismissing complaints of racial insensitivity as political correctness, took an uncharacteristic step on Saturday: He visited a black church for the first time and tried to blend in.

Flanked by a few black supporters, including Ben Carson[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/ben-carson-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], a former presidential candidate, and Omarosa Manigault, a former contestant on “The Apprentice,” Mr. Trump cut a subdued figure here at Great Faith Ministries International[http://www.greatfaith.org/].

He beamed as congregants greeted him and swayed to the chords of the song “What a Mighty God We Serve.” Speaking softly, he invoked the civil rights movement and Abraham Lincoln. Donning a prayer shawl given to him by the church’s pastor, Bishop Wayne T. Jackson, Mr. Trump proclaimed, “I feel better already.”

Mr. Trump is deeply unpopular with black voters and perceived by many as hostile to their community. His company has faced accusations of discrimination[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/us/politics/donald-trump-housing-race.html] against black tenants; he has alleged falsely in the past that President Obama was not born in the United States; and a champion of aggressive policing, he has stirred indignation by caricaturing black neighborhoods as blighted by crime and economic despair.

In Detroit, Mr. Trump did not express regret for, or even acknowledge, the actions and remarks that have opened a gulf between him and black voters.

Instead, reading from prepared remarks, he hailed the Christian values and political contributions of black Americans and told his audience he cared about making their lives better.

“I fully understand that the African-American community has suffered from discrimination and that there are many wrongs that must still be made right,” Mr. Trump said, adding: “For any who are hurting: Things are going to turn around. Tomorrow will be better.”

Mr. Trump’s visit to the church concluded a week of fitful outreach to black and Hispanic voters, capping off a frenzied campaign schedule that took him to Mexico’s presidential palace, to a meeting in North Philadelphia with black leaders[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FTrump%2C%20Donald%20J.&action=click&contentCollection=timestopics®ion=stream&module=stream\_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=5&pgtype=collection], and finally to Detroit.

Far more than even a typical Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Trump faces a wall of opposition from nonwhite voters. He records virtually no support from black voters in the polls. Their resistance has emerged as one of the most important impediments to Mr. Trump’s candidacy, threatening to put several major swing states, like Michigan and Pennsylvania, entirely out of reach.

Mr. Trump’s appearance on Saturday, long billed by campaign aides as a pivotal opportunity to reintroduce himself to black voters, was swathed in uncertainty up to the last minute, as the Trump campaign and the pastor deliberated over whether the Republican nominee would actually speak at the church. Plans for stops in nearby neighborhoods were announced, then retracted; Mr. Trump ultimately paid a short visit to Mr. Carson’s childhood home before flying out of Detroit.

And a scheduled interview with Mr. Jackson, Mr. Trump’s host on Saturday, became a source of embarrassment when it was revealed[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters-wayne-jackson.html] that both the questions and Mr. Trump’s answers were scripted in advance. Mr. Trump taped the television appearance before the church service on Saturday, and it is expected to air in the next few days.

Mr. Jackson acknowledged offhand the unusual spectacle of Mr. Trump’s presence in his church. Introducing Mr. Trump, Mr. Jackson noted with a chuckle: “This is the first African-American church he’s been in.”

Though a program provided by Mr. Jackson budgeted just one minute for Mr. Trump to speak, the pastor said Mr. Trump requested additional time to offer his thoughts, and he went on for more than 10 minutes.

In his relatively muted address, Mr. Trump did not employ his typical heated language about urban crime or illegal **immigration**.

Instead, he offered praise for black Christians and called for a “civil rights agenda for our time,” including support for charter schools[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/charter\_schools/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and new job growth.

And Mr. Trump, who has not made professions of faith a regular element of his campaign, called on Americans to “turn again to our Christian heritage to lift up the soul of our nation.”

Leaving the church, Mr. Trump made a stop at the former residence of Mr. Carson, a retired neurosurgeon who has become one of Mr. Trump’s steadfast political allies. Bantering briefly with the current owner, Felicia Reese, Mr. Trump mused that the house must be a valuable property because Mr. Carson had lived there.

Ms. Manigault, who directs outreach efforts for the Trump campaign, told Ms. Reese that the campaign would send her a copy of Mr. Trump’s book of business advice, “The Art of the Deal.”

It remains to be seen if Mr. Trump will make a more sustained bid to attract black support. His campaign advisers have routinely announced changes in strategy, and promised adjustments to Mr. Trump’s message and political style, only to have the candidate quickly lose interest and revert to form. On Wednesday, Mr. Trump followed up his surprise trip to Mexico City[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico.html], where he expressed admiration for Mexican Americans, with an angry speech in Arizona denouncing illegal **immigration** and reiterating his pledge to wall off the southern border.

But for Mr. Trump, winning the presidency might be all but impossible without a reversal of fortune with black and Hispanic voters. While Republicans usually lose those constituencies by a wide margin, polls suggest Mr. Trump is on track for such a historic rout that he may be unable to make up the difference with white voters.

Mr. Jackson weathered some criticism for inviting Mr. Trump, and his own parishioners were split on Mr. Trump’s visit, with several expressing support for Mr. Jackson’s decision despite their own negative feelings about Mr. Trump’s candidacy. Candice Smith, 31, of Detroit, said she had been attending the church for 20 years and considered it a welcoming environment.

“We accept anybody,” said Ms. Smith, a cosmetologist. “We are kind of like an open church. Everybody is welcome to come.”

Jan Counts, 55, a computer designer, expressed skepticism of Mr. Trump’s intentions, and said it was too late for Mr. Trump to win his vote.

“I think he’s using the church,” said Mr. Counts, a congregant since 1993. “You can’t just change everything that you have been saying before and say something else and want me to believe that.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Yamiche Alcindor reported from Detroit, and Alexander Burns from New York.
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\* ‘No Vacancies’ for Blacks: How Donald Trump Got His Start, and Was First Accused of Bias[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/us/politics/donald-trump-housing-race.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ithaca, N.Y. — RECENT polls put Hillary Clinton slightly ahead of Donald Trump in traditionally Republican states like Georgia and close even in South Carolina. Should she make the serious investment necessary to put those states in play for real? Or should she ignore them and invest the same money in traditional battleground states? If the only concern were to minimize Mr. Trump’s chances of winning, it would be an easy call: Caution would dictate focusing exclusively on swing states.

Yet as basic economic principles make clear, caution dictates no such thing. Most people prefer not to take risks, yes, but reducing one risk sometimes creates greater exposure to another. For example, Republican congressional majorities have repeatedly blocked our rapidly dwindling opportunity to mitigate climate change, which is one of several crucial areas where they have failed us. **Immigration** reform, income inequality and civil rights also come to mind. The point is that expenditures on the presidential campaign must be weighed against those for congressional races. To get what they want, Democrats must go all in.

The Democratic Party comp seems poised to recapture its Senate majority this year, but the House is a different matter. Many warn that the current 61-seat Republican majority, much of it achieved by post-2010 gerrymandering, has made flipping the lower chamber an unrealistic goal.

But that view betrays a misunderstanding of how partisan gerrymandering actually works. One aim of the practice has been to reconfigure electoral boundaries to transfer redundant votes from safe districts into swing districts. If one district usually votes 60 percent Republican and an adjacent one votes 48 percent Republican, for example, boundaries might be redrawn so that each would vote 54 percent Republican. In a typical election year, the formerly Democratic district would flip Republican. But since each new district would have only a 4 percentage point cushion, both seats would turn blue in a Democratic wave election.

The redrawing of Pennsylvania’s congressional districts[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/08/10/the-republicans-big-gerrymander-could-backfire-in-a-major-way/] in 2011 illustrates the Republicans’ problem. Taken together, the state’s Democratic candidates won about 3 percent more votes than their opponents in 2012, but they won only five of its 18 seats. In the process, however, Republicans created four districts in which Republican presidential candidates normally win by less than two percentage points and another six with margins of six points or less. In theory, each of those seats is now more vulnerable than before. As of last month[http://washingtonmonthly.com/2016/08/10/is-a-democratic-majority-in-the-house-possible/], according to the Republican political consultant Adrian Gray, Mrs. Clinton led in 54 Republican-held districts nationwide while Mr. Trump led in only three Democratic districts.

Although few Republican House candidates seem eager to embrace Mr. Trump publicly, most have formally endorsed him. Rescinding those endorsements would **alienate** Trump supporters they need. That President Obama has exhorted them to do so would only intensify the resulting backlash if they followed his advice.

It is difficult to overstate the threat that Mr. Trump poses for down-ballot candidates. Across party lines, high-ranking current and former government officials view him as lacking the temperament, character, judgment and experience required of a president. Polls suggest that this assessment is also widely shared by ordinary voters[https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2016/07/18/donald-trump-is-not-qualified-to-be-president-and-the-american-people-know-it/?utm\_term=.e6f969f77752]. Although vocal minorities have held similar views about presidential candidates in the past, the current situation is without precedent.

The ads for Democratic opponents of Republican incumbents virtually write themselves. John Plumb, who’s challenging my own congressman, the Trump supporter and Tea Party Republican Tom Reed, might consider an ad like the following: “In a briefing on nuclear weapons with a foreign policy expert, Donald Trump repeatedly asked, ‘If we have them, why can’t we use them?’ [http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/290217-scarborough-trump-asked-about-adviser-about-using-nuclear]Tom Reed wants to entrust this man with the nuclear codes.” An actual ad[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-vOZHubJPVc] emphasizing the lack of daylight between her opponent’s positions and those of Mr. Trump, made by LuAnn Bennett, who is challenging Barbara Comstock, a Republican in Virginia’s 10th District, further illustrates Mr. Trump’s potential to haunt down-ballot candidates.

Since many potentially vulnerable Republican congressional seats are in safely blue states like California and New York, a serious effort to end Republican majorities would of course require expenditures that will have no impact on the Electoral College vote. In the standard way of thinking about trade-offs like these, it would be rational to tolerate a slight increase in the risk of losing the electoral vote if doing so would sufficiently increase the odds of ending congressional gridlock.

But because a campaign’s budget is not a fixed sum, the trade-off may be more apparent than real. As economists have long stressed, the amount that people are willing to pay for something depends on what they expect to get in return. Democratic donors understand that their biggest concerns can’t be addressed until Republicans lose their congressional majorities. They also understand that if the House doesn’t flip this year, there will be virtually no chance of it flipping in the 2018 midterm elections. And until Democrats win enough seats in state legislatures to undo Republican gerrymandering — which could take decades — a wave election is the only near-term hope.

The candidacy of Donald Trump offers a unique opportunity. If Mrs. Clinton made the case clearly in these terms, many donors would step up. Democrats could compete for every vulnerable Republican seat without diverting a single dollar from the Electoral College battle.

Some argue that money in politics doesn’t matter. That’s true in the sense that when both sides spend equally, their efforts tend to be mutually offsetting. But that’s why the current opportunity is unique. Democratic donors, who have already been giving generously, have both the means and the inclination to pay for an advertising blitz that Republicans probably cannot match this time around.

If Mrs. Clinton wins the presidency, she has pledged to appoint Supreme Court justices sympathetic to laws curtailing campaign spending. But this election is governed by current laws. A certain rough justice would be served if those laws helped dislodge the Republicans who favor them.

Again, the most urgent reason for a serious effort to flip the House is that longstanding Republican hostility to climate science has blocked steps that could parry the biggest threat to our planet’s survival. Estimates suggest[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/21/business/economy/21view.html?\_r=0] that taxing carbon could slow greenhouse gas emissions by enough to stabilize global temperatures by the middle of this century. In a rational world, we would have long since taken that step. But Republicans have persistently refused even to discuss that possibility.

REPUBLICAN opposition to greater investment in clean energy and infrastructure refurbishment is rooted largely in their hostility to higher taxes. But supporting such investments would be less difficult than most people realize. That’s because of the seemingly plausible, but essentially false, belief that higher taxes would make it harder for prosperous people to buy what they want.

To get a house with a commanding view or a choice slip in the marina, people must outbid others with similar tastes and incomes. Since tax increases leave all bidders with less to spend, the best home sites and marina slips would still go to the same people as before.

Similar logic suggests why Mr. Trump’s candidacy may also facilitate action on the vexing problems that stem from growing income inequality. Most of the income gains of the last 40 years have been concentrated among top earners, who have responded as people normally do, by spending more on everything. The average new house is almost half again as large as its counterpart from 1980, and the average wedding now costs three times as much as it did then. Yet those increases have merely shifted the frames of reference that define what’s considered special. If those same dollars had been channeled into productive public investment, families all along the income scale would have benefited enormously. But that won’t happen if Republicans retain their congressional majorities.

David Wasserman, an analyst for The Cook Political Report, estimates that House Democrats would need to win[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-gops-house-majority-is-safe-right/] roughly eight percentage points[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-gops-house-majority-is-safe-right/] more votes than Republicans nationally to flip the House this year. In an increasingly polarized electorate, achieving a margin that large would be difficult, especially if a significant number of people abandon their recent tendency to cast straight party-line votes. But this is not a normal year, and Donald Trump is not a normal candidate.

Many experienced political observers[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/what-a-clinton-landslide-would-look-like/] have said they can easily imagine Mrs. Clinton achieving a double-digit margin in November. Substantial uncertainty remains, of course, but if Mr. Trump continues to provide vivid reminders of his unfitness for the presidency, such a margin would hardly seem surprising.

More important, trying to win big would be a prudent goal even if it fell short. Each additional seat Republicans lose this year is one less seat that Democrats will need to achieve future majorities. And if the race were to suddenly tighten, the Clinton campaign could quickly adjust its strategy.

History suggests why certain kinds of change are less improbable than they may seem. National trends often begin many years earlier in California, where **immigration**-bashing Republicans made a hash of the state’s budget and did much to degrade its most cherished institutions, including the best public university system in the world. The state’s voters eventually got fed up. Once the tipping point was reached, the change was remarkably rapid.

Before Mr. Trump secured the Republican nomination, it seemed naïve to imagine that the opportunity for a similar national transition would arrive this quickly. But here we are.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Robert H. Frank, an economist at Cornell, is the author of “Success and Luck: Good Fortune and the Myth of Meritocracy.”

\* Moderate Republicans, Unite![http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/opinion/sunday/moderate-republicans-unite.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Labor Day weekend has always had a particular resonance in American politics as the official start of the sprint to Election Day, celebrated by rallies, marches and lakeside picnics.

Of course, those days are long gone in this era of the permanent campaign. Donald J. Trump, the Republican, and Hillary Clinton, the Democrat, have been sprinting to Election Day for more than a year now.

Nonetheless, it seems like a good moment to assess what political analysts say the candidates need to do in the final two months if they want to move into the White House in January. And while polls suggest that Mrs. Clinton has a clear advantage over Mr. Trump, the race is hardly over. The unpopularity of both candidates has lent this contest a volatility rarely seen at this stage of a campaign.

DONALD TRUMP

1. Focus, focus, focus.

Mr. Trump might be well advised to stop spending time in states he is not going to win and courting voters who are unlikely to support him. There are too many states where Mr. Trump needs to win, such as Florida and Nevada, to allow him to devote time and money resources to ones like Washington, which hasn’t voted for a Republican since Ronald Reagan in 1984. (For that matter, he shouldn’t be wasting time in states like Mississippi, which hasn’t voted for a Democrat since Jimmy Carter was elected president in 1976.)

And from a strategic point of view, the time is over for trying to fake out the other side, or test to see if a longer-shot state is in play. In 2012, President Obama’s campaign made a real effort in Arizona, but pulled out before the summer. “We decided in May that we just couldn’t afford to do it — that we had to give up the dream,” said Jim Messina, who managed Mr. Obama’s 2012 campaign.

Mr. Trump might also reconsider how much time to devote to appealing to Latinos and African-Americans. Yes, it’s hard to see how anyone can win the presidency on the white vote alone. And Mr. Trump’s real, if unspoken, strategy here may well be making himself more palatable to moderate white voters, and holding down turnout among minority voters.

Still, few analysts give Mr. Trump much of a chance of winning support from either Latinos or African-Americans. That is all the more so after this week, when his harsh **immigration** speech was condemned by Latino leaders, and black leaders ridiculed his campaign for trying to choreograph a question-and-answer session with Mr. Trump and a black minister in Detroit, preparing lengthy answers to pre-submitted questions.

2. Seize the debates.

There are a dwindling number of opportunities for Mr. Trump to change the dynamics of the race, and the debates are Nos. 1, 2 and 3 on that list. They offer Mr. Trump a huge audience to appeal to this year’s swing voters: people who don’t like Mrs. Clinton but are afraid of a Trump presidency. “Trump has to show that he is acceptable,’ said Neil Newhouse, a Republican pollster. “Right now, looking at the numbers, he is not. It’s not the message but the messenger that’s holding some of these voters back.”

3. It’s about Clinton.

Mrs. Clinton is trying to make this a referendum on Donald Trump, and on many days Mr. Trump seems to be doing his best to help her. Instead, Mr. Trump should turn this into a discussion of Mrs. Clinton. There is a receptive audience for change among voters tired of eight years of Democratic rule and 25 years of the Clinton family.

Rather than spending two weeks wrestling with **immigration**, Mr. Trump might have been better off talking about the Clinton Foundation, or Mrs. Clinton’s email troubles. Every day. Repetition, repetition, repetition can be boring, especially for someone like Mr. Trump. But that’s the way to win an election.

4. Tone matters.

Mr. Trump, analysts from both parties say, needs to resist his more combative instincts and stop doubling down every time he says anything that turns into a firestorm. Every moment now should be about trying to convince voters that he has the temperament and stability to be president. If Mr. Trump can return to that point in the campaign where he seemed funny and even likable, that might serve him well against a candidate like Mrs. Clinton.

He might also be wise to take a Twitter holiday, or do whatever the digital equivalent is of putting the indignant letter in the desk drawer overnight and deciding in the morning whether to send it.

“You start with doing the simple things,” Mr. Newhouse said. “No more interceptions. No more miscues. String together a couple of weeks after a couple of weeks. There’s not much time left. Consistency is competency.”

That goes for winning or losing: It is important, at least for the future of the Republican Party, that Mr. Trump comports himself in a way that keeps the contest close.

HILLARY CLINTON

1. Complacency, complacency, complacency.

There may no bigger foe to Mrs. Clinton than the perception that she is breezing toward a victory, reinforced daily by polls showing that she is going to win. This would be a problem for any politician, but it is a particular problem for Mrs. Clinton, given that many of her supporters cannot be described as enthusiastic.

She is in danger of losing the “hold-your-nose” vote, those who might choose to stay at home or cast a protest vote for Jill Stein, the Green Party candidate. This could also be a problem with prospective Clinton supporters who have a history of not turning out, including Latinos, young voters and African-Americans. She is going to need a big turnout among Latinos in particular if she wants to win Nevada, and have any hope of finally doing what Mr. Messina attempted in 2012 in Arizona.

And then there are the supporters of Bernie Sanders, the Vermont senator she defeated for the nomination, who have always been wary of her, and many of whom have watched with concern as she has reached out for support from Republican leaders and voters. “She has to make sure Democratic turnout is strong enough,” said David Plouffe, who managed Mr. Obama’s 2008 campaign for the White House. “It’s tricky because there are clearly a whole bunch of Republicans and moderate-leaning independents available to her that she’d like to get.”

Mr. Trump’s supporters certainly seem energized, and all the more so after his **immigration** speech. Ann Coulter, the conservative commentator, called it[https://twitter.com/AnnCoulter/status/771172220249014272] the “most magnificent speech ever given.”

2. Trust matters.

At this point, can Mrs. Clinton turn around all those voters who don’t like or trust her? Does it even matter? It might, especially if Mr. Trump crosses the acceptability hurdle at the first debate. To this end, she might hold a news conference to offer a clear explanation of what was going on with the Clinton Foundation, and her own role with it, and attempt to account for what appear to be her inconsistent responses during the email investigation.

It’s not only a matter of winning the White House. “She should do whatever she can to whittle down the suspicion that she is not honest or trustworthy, as much for governing as for winning the election,” said Whit Ayres, a Republican pollster. “When two-thirds of the people think she’s dishonest and untrustworthy, that’s a real problem.”

One force working against that is that Mrs. Clinton is a politician who has — since her first run for the Senate in New York — tended to play it safe. And given Mr. Trump’s troubles, the temptation to coast is understandable.

But playing it safe is sometimes not the safest thing to do in a campaign. Mr. Trump has captured the imagination of voters with his bold if unconventional approach to politics, and he certainly has dominated the campaign.

“Take a risk,” Mr. Newhouse said. “For God’s sake, hold a news conference. Disband the Clinton Foundation. They are just too timid. They’re afraid of their own shadow.”

3. Seize the debates.

The debates also present an opportunity for Mrs. Clinton, though it may end up being more complicated terrain for her. Ideally for the Democrats, a strong performance by Mrs. Clinton — or a particularly weak one by Mr. Trump — could let the air out of this campaign. But if there is any upside to Mr. Trump’s problems as a candidate, it is that expectations for his first debate performance could be low.

“The key moment is going to be that first debate,” Mr. Plouffe said. “Trump will be viewed as a distinct underdog, which could be dangerous. You have to make sure you dominate the first debate.”

4. Force Trump to spread himself thin.

Mrs. Clinton has the money and support to start moving into states where Democrats might normally not be competitive: Georgia, Arizona, Utah and Missouri. In some states, she might actually have a chance of winning, like Arizona. Others, like Utah, not so much.

No matter. If Mrs. Clinton puts resources into any of those on-the-margin states, it could force Mr. Trump to divert resources from states like Ohio and New Hampshire. His campaign’s lack of experience is going to be tested now, when there are important split-second assessments to be made about what the other side is doing.

“What Clinton has to do is make sure Trump doesn’t gain any strength or momentum,” Mr. Plouffe said. “You keep the battleground state map extraordinarily broad. Make him play defense.”

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Adam Nagourney is Los Angeles bureau chief and a former chief national political correspondent for The New York Times.

\* Moderate Republicans, Unite![http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/opinion/sunday/moderate-republicans-unite.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the first two ads for Donald J. Trump in the general election campaign, his message and style have closely followed his stump speech: a dark, ominous and fearful portrait of the future under Hillary Clinton, and proclamations of all that the country has to gain by supporting him. His first ad focused on **immigration**, and his new ad, titled “Two Americas: Economy,” is about jobs.

THE AD A shadowy portrait of Mrs. Clinton fills the screen, which then fades to shots of a chained-up factory and working-class men and women who look as if they have the weight of the world on their shoulders. “In Hillary Clinton’s America, families get crushed,” a narrator says, claiming that Mrs. Clinton’s tax plans will lead “hundreds of thousands of jobs to disappear.” The dystopian portrait of the country under Mrs. Clinton is reinforced by a syncopated piano, softly tracking along in a minor key.

Uplifting violin arrangements signal the arrival of “Donald Trump’s America,” where “millions of new jobs are created,” “wages go up” and “small businesses thrive,” as the images get brighter, both in tone and in mood. A family of four embraces in its yard, a gray-bearded man in a worker’s apron smiles proudly in front of a produce stand, and an African-American family hangs a flag outside its home.

The ad closes on a shot of One World Trade Center[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/freedom\_tower\_nyc/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] in Manhattan, panning up to its spire, as the narrator closes: “Change that makes America great again.”

THE MESSAGE One of two Americas, but not the story of class strife and stratification that John Edwards ran on in 2004. Rather, it is one of a country on the brink, with two paths ahead: Mr. Trump’s or Mrs. Clinton’s.

THE TAKEAWAY Although it is without the loud and occasionally caustic style of Mr. Trump’s rallies, the Trump ad campaign is following his strategy of sowing fear of a world without Mr. Trump as president. The new ad capitalizes on his economic message, centered on lower taxes and a rethinking of free-trade agreements, which helped him dominate the Republican primaries, and is more palatable to many voters than his hard-line stands on **immigration**. With it he is extending his advertising reach to new states like Colorado and Virginia, where he is behind in polls.

Changing channels ...

Battleground Arizona?

After Mr. Trump’s provocative speech on **immigration** on Wednesday in Arizona, the Clinton campaign launched a six-figure ad buy in the state. It is using its “Role Models” ad, featuring children watching some of Mr. Trump’s most caustic comments, to try to blunt any advantage the speech might have given Mr. Trump in Arizona, where illegal **immigration** is a major concern. Through Sept. 18, the campaign has reserved just under $500,000 in television time in the state, according to Kantar Media/CMAG. The candidates had been statistically tied in Arizona polls for a time, which was notable in a state that only one Democrat — Bill Clinton in 1996 — has won since 1948. But the most recent poll[http://www.politico.com/blogs/swing-states-2016-election/2016/08/clinton-trump-arizona-north-carolina-227379] showed Mr. Trump with a five-point edge there.

Another Choice

Gary Johnson, the former New Mexico governor and the Libertarian Party candidate for president, remains short of the 15 percent support in polls he needs to make it to the debate stage. Helping him now is Purple PAC, a libertarian “super PAC[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/campaign\_finance/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]” that has spent just over a half-million dollars airing ads on national cable to introduce the candidate to a wide audience. Its main message[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BPw7iu5S\_e4]: With two candidates who have historically high unfavorable ratings, “America deserves better.” But because it is an unaffiliated super PAC that cannot legally coordinate with Mr. Johnson’s campaign, the candidate himself never speaks to the camera, making it an awkward national introduction for a candidate without the same name recognition as the two major-party candidates.

Numbers

$36.3 million spent on presidential campaign ads in Florida so far.

$27 million spent in Ohio.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Here are the top 10 comments of the week on our digital platforms, as selected by our readers and the journalists who moderate nearly every comment.

Protests and the National Anthem

1. The very thing that makes America great is our right to free expression, but don’t try to use it or you will be called un-American.

— Elisabeth King on The Times’s Facebook page,[https://www.facebook.com/nytimes/posts/10150890481319999?comment\_id=10150890510874999&comment\_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R0%22%7D] responding to an article about the reaction to San Francisco 49ers quarterback Colin Kaepernick’s decision to kneel during the national anthem before an exhibition football game. Mr. Kaepernick said he was protesting police brutality.

This comment received more than 1,300 likes.

Donald Trump Goes to Mexico

2. With 330 million people in the U.S., do we really need millions more **immigrants**? Either Mexican or Muslim? Many citizens would say no.

So why are liberals so hard on Trump’s basic campaign points? Many people agree we have a problem. Trump is promising to fix these issues. He may turn out to be like all the past leaders and so, basically nothing, but with Hillary, I believe the problems of **immigration** will get worse.

— Alex Landry in Austin, Tex., reacting to[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html?comments#permid=19668833] an article about Donald J. Trump’s visit to Mexico to meet with President Enrique Peña Nieto, where the two discussed Mr. Trump’s **immigration** plan.

3. So when Trump is campaigning in America, we’re all “rapists” and “drug dealers,” but when he’s in Mexico City, we are “amazing people?” Interesting.

— Jorge Flores in Mexico[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html?comments#permid=19663387].

This comment received more than 1,000 reader recommendations and more than 20 reader responses.

4. Americans: We love the vast majority of you very much. We know that Trump doesn’t speak for all Americans, just as some criminals don’t speak for our country. We know this is just politics; our relationship will continue to be close.

— Adrian Garcia on The Times’s Facebook page[https://www.facebook.com/nytimes/posts/10150889352984999?comment\_id=10150889358389999&comment\_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R%22%7D].

Anthony Weiner Sexting Scandal

5. Some here will make this about Hillary and Huma, calling them enablers of the lousy behaviors of their husbands.

Essentially, this holds women responsible for the sexual acting out of men — if women can’t stop the men in their lives from acting out, then there must be something wrong with them, the women.

This is not about Hillary or Huma. Anthony Weiner has a serious problem and if and when he and he alone wants to quit his personal choice to sexually act out, then that will be up to him.

Now, Huma has made her choice.

— Abel Fernandez in New Mexico, reacting to[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/nyregion/anthony-weiner-sexting-huma-abedin.html?comments&\_r=0#permid=19635191] an article about Anthony Weiner’s latest sexting scandal. Mr. Weiner’s wife, Huma Abedin, a senior aide to Hillary Clinton, left him in the wake of the new revelations.

This comment has more than 3,100 reader recommendations and more than 30 reader responses.

The Clinton Foundation

6. Hillary Clinton has always been fiercely goal-oriented, and one of her goals is wealth. This is not necessarily a bad thing, but earning personal money via a charity has a bad taste to it, and makes one wonder exactly why Clinton wants to be president. The pay isn’t that great.

— KJ in Tennessee, reacting to[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/opinion/cutting-ties-to-the-clinton-foundation.html#permid=19643481] an editorial about the Clinton Foundation and favors its donors may have received while Mrs. Clinton was secretary of state.

Voting Rights in North Carolina

7. As a North Carolina resident, I find the arrogance and far-right leanings of the Republican legislators very troubling.

They have managed to damage the reputation of a Southern state that was prized for being tolerant and inclusive.

Instead, Republicans here have shown nothing but belligerence for minorities and disregard for voters’ rights. The unfair gerrymandering, extreme transgender bill, and restrictive voting legislation are classic examples of a legislature and governor that want to return North Carolina to the Jim Crow days.

— Barry in North Carolina[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/election-rules-north-carolina.html?comments#permid=19656216], responding to an article about local elections boards in North Carolina that, critics say, rewrote election regulations with the intent of suppressing the black vote.

Environmental Crisis in Indiana

8. I work in this business (environmental science) and what I see is that when a problem like this is near a rich neighborhood, the residents have the resources and time to hire lawyers and consultants, to organize public meetings and demand action.

It is not surpising that this kind of disparity exists. Like so many things, the squeaky wheel gets the grease, and in this case being squeaky requires money and clout. If my middle-class neighborhood got a letter saying “don’t play in the dirt,” there would be outrage and we would spend the money to get expert help. Every local doctor and lawyer would be helping for free.

What’s frustrating about this story (and Flint for that matter) is that it doesn’t need to happen. We have the technical know-how to fix it. What’s missing is a strong ethic of environmental justice and the funding to give these people an actual empowered voice in these decisions.

— Dan S. in Phoenix, reacting to[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/lead-contamination-public-housing-east-chicago-indiana.html?comments#permid=19649715] an article about the 1,100 residents of a housing development in Indiana who must relocate because of toxic levels of lead in the soil.

This comment received more than 290 reader recommendations.

Teaching the Teachers

9. I am going to show this to my middle-school-aged daughter. What a powerful reminder about what her classmates might be dealing with without her knowledge, and a reminder to her to respond with compassion.

The “annoying” or “weird” or “disruptive” kids are people with lives we don’t always know about.

— Kristina Louise Dahl on The Times’s Facebook page,[https://www.facebook.com/nytimes/posts/10150888963909999?comment\_id=10150889137679999&comment\_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R9%22%7D] reacting to an article about an exercise that a teacher in Denver created to find out one thing her students wanted her to know about their lives.

This comment received more than 2,200 likes.

Faking Mount Everest

10. We live in times when a picture of having done something is more important than actually having done it. This is actually tragic for them because it means that their rewards come from what people think they do and not from actually doing those things.

— Aditi Nadkarni on The Times’s Facebook page,[https://www.facebook.com/nytimes/posts/10150889486319999?comment\_id=10150889566089999&comment\_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R9%22%7D] reacting to an article about an Indian couple who submitted doctored photos purporting to show that they reached the summit of Mount Everest.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHILADELPHIA — Amid confusion over whether he would speak at a black church this weekend, Donald J. Trump’s[http://www.nytimes.com/topic/person/donald-trump?8qa] halting attempts to win over African-American voters took him to Philadelphia on Friday, where he spoke with a small group of business owners and community leaders and had an emotional meeting with the mother of a young woman who was killed by undocumented **immigrants**.

After largely avoiding black audiences during his campaign, Mr. Trump had arranged to appear at a prominent black church, Great Faith Ministries, in Detroit on Saturday.

After a New York Times report[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters-wayne-jackson.html] that he would not address the congregation and would give only scripted answers to questions pre-submitted by the pastor, his campaign said Thursday that Mr. Trump would speak to the crowd for five to 10 minutes.

But on Friday afternoon, the pastor, Bishop Wayne T. Jackson, insisted that talk of Mr. Trump speaking was only “rumors” and that he would be allowed to offer only a short greeting to the congregation, not a pitch for why they should vote for him.

“When we have guests, whether they are a celebrity, an actress, an actor, or whether it’s just somebody who is well known, we do allow them to say, ‘I’m here today,’” Mr. Jackson said. “A greeting. Thank you very much and sit down. There is not going to be a 10 minute speech from nobody. No.”

The Trump campaign did not immediately respond on Friday.

The night before, his senior communications adviser, Jason Miller, had said Mr. Trump was eager to present himself to members of the church.

“If you know anything about Mr. Trump, it’s that he will want the opportunity to take his vision and message of opportunity directly to the people on Saturday,” Mr. Miller had said.

Mr. Trump’s support among black voters remains dismal, low even by Republican standards, owing to a string of slights that include his questioning of President Obama’s birth certificate and his dismissive treatment of Black Lives Matter protesters.

But in swing states like Pennsylvania, winning over even a few new African-American voters could mean the difference.

Mr. Trump believes his calls to end illegal **immigration** can transcend racial lines, and on Friday, he met with a black woman, Shalga Hightower, 55, who wept as she described how her 20-year-old daughter Iofemi was murdered[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/30/nyregion/30newark.html], along with two friends, by a group of men who included two undocumented **immigrants**.

Mr. Trump asked about the fate of the young men and Ms. Hightower said that they had all received life sentences.

“But they should have never been here,” said Mr. Trump, looking solemn as he consoled the crying mother.

“But they should have never been here, absolutely,” she replied.

When reporters asked about a few dozen protesters who could be heard shouting outside, Ms. Hightower’s son, Jamar Hightower, 26, jumped into the discussion.

“It’s way bigger than that,” he said. “I mean there’s freedom of speech and they can think what they want. But, at the end of the day, I feel as though this man is the only one that’s actually standing up to do something about it.”

The Hightowers and the 12 local leaders, most of them Republicans, who met with Mr. Trump Friday were aware that many black Americans have a dim view of the candidate.

Even so, Daphne Goggins, a local party leader, thanked Mr. Trump for coming and wept as she said: “For the first time in my life, I feel like my vote is going to count.”

And Renee Amoore, the founder of a consulting firm, said she appreciated Mr. Trump for “coming to the hood.”

“That’s a big deal,” she said. “Let’s be clear here, folks.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* Leaked Script Shows What Advisers Want Donald Trump to Say at Black Church[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters-wayne-jackson.html]

\* Excerpts From a Draft Script for Donald Trump’s Q&A With a Black Church’s Pastor[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/trump-jackson-excerpts.html]

\* Donald Trump to Press Case With Black Voters in Detroit[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters.html]

\* G.O.P. Urges Donald Trump to Broaden Outreach to Black Voters[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/16/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Margarita Alberto cannot forget the tantrum her 6-year-old son threw several months ago. One afternoon he started shouting that he wanted to leave the Pennsylvania **immigration** detention center for families, where they have been held since Oct. 28, 2015, “He said, ‘It’s your fault that we’re here, your fault!’” Ms. Alberto said.

And then, she recalled, he tightened the lanyard holding his ID card around his neck, threatening to choke himself if they didn’t get out.

Ms. Alberto and her son, migrants from El Salvador seeking asylum in the United States, are still detained, along with 65 other women and children at the Berks County Residential Center in Leesport, Pa., about 70 miles northwest of Philadelphia.

“The truth is, I’m in limbo,” Ms. Alberto said in Spanish through a translator during a telephone interview last week from the center. “I don’t know if I’ll be released here or if they’ll return me to my country, which is what I don’t want.”

She is one of 28 women who were denied asylum and who have filed a federal lawsuit seeking new hearings because, they said, their original “credible fear” hearings were conducted improperly. An appeals court rejected their claim on Monday.

On Wednesday Ms. Alberto and 21 other women who call themselves “Madres Berks[http://kristof.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/08/12/mothers-to-homeland-security-we-wont-eat-until-we-have-asylum/],” or “Berks Mothers,” restarted a hunger strike they had conducted for 16 days in August. Their action drew renewed attention to the Obama administration’s policy toward migrants from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras who have crossed the United States border in order to flee extreme violence.

As a response to an enormous influx of Central Americans in 2014, the Department of Homeland Security began putting mothers and children who crossed the border in detention[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/09/us/a-rush-of-central-americans-compounds-obamas-immigration-task.html], hoping that it would discourage others from coming to the United States. But under pressure from advocates, and prompted by a federal court ruling in August 2015[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/23/us/judge-increases-pressure-on-us-to-release-migrant-families.html], the agency changed course, moving to curtail the prolonged detention of most families seeking asylum.

The family detention center in Berks County is one of three in the United States; the other two are larger and in Texas.

Jeh Johnson, the Homeland Security secretary, said last month that a committee would conduct an internal review of the privately run family detention centers by November. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement[https://www.nytimes.com/topic/organization/us-immigration-and-customs-enforcement] officials said that the Berks center, run by the county, would be evaluated in a separate review.

When Mr. Johnson said last month that the average length of stay at a family detention center was 20 days, that upset the women in Berks and prompted their hunger strike.

“I have been here for 320 days,” Amparo Osorio, 26, who came from Honduras and has a 2-year-old son, said on Tuesday. Like all the women detained at Berks who spoke in telephone interviews conducted in Spanish, she asked not to be identified by her complete name, for fear of retaliation by staff members.

“What we want is for our voices to be heard,” Ms. Osorio said.

Senator Bob Casey, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, sent a letter on Aug. 24 to Mr. Johnson about the prolonged detentions and the conditions at Berks.

“The families detained there have in many cases escaped unspeakable horrors in their countries of origin and are seeking asylum and a better life, ” Mr. Casey wrote. “We can do better than the treatment they are receiving.”

Bridget Cambria, one of three local lawyers who represents the detainees, said there are limited services available to the families at Berks. Children, who range in age from 2 to 16, are divided into two classrooms, but are not allowed to attend an outside school. (The government said it provides five full-time teachers.) The families have access to outdoor recreation, but are prohibited from going outside a wooden fence. They can use the internet, but social media is not allowed. The detainees must clean the center themselves — for which they get paid $1 a day.

The mothers say the monotony is hardest on their children. “We wake up and we see the same walls, the same ceiling, and we think to ourselves, ‘When will this end?’” said Estefani, 16, the oldest child at Berks. She and her sister and their mother, Maria Leiva, who came from El Salvador, had been in detention for 373 days as of Friday.

About a third of the women are plaintiffs in a federal lawsuit brought in March by the American Civil Liberties Union against the Department of Homeland Security. The suit contested the legality of their initial asylum interviews. A district court in Philadelphia said that it did not have jurisdiction in the case.

But on Monday, a federal appeals court went even further. It ruled that the women, because they had been apprehended hours after having “surreptitiously” crossed the border, had no right to sue. That, said several legal scholars this week, violated habeas corpus[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/habeas\_corpus/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier], the basic constitutional right to challenge the legality of imprisonment or detention.

Only suspended in times of rebellion or invasion, that right has been extended to slaves and, more recently, to noncitizen “enemy combatants” held at Guantánamo Bay in Cuba.

“It was exactly designed to protect outsiders,” said Eric M. Freedman, a professor at Hofstra Law School who specializes in constitutional law.

“If this decision is left intact, it’s going to be the first time in the history of this country in which noncitizens who enter the United States and are on U.S. soil, are not going to have the opportunity in habeas corpus to challenge their removal orders,” said Lee Gelernt, the lead lawyer arguing the case for the ACLU.

The women are appealing the decision.

They say their acts of civil disobedience — protests and hunger strikes — have provoked tensions with Berks and **immigration** officials. Thomas Decker, an **immigration** field officer, met with the women in August and warned them to suspend the hunger strike because they could become too weakened to take care of their children; he said they could be sent to an “adult jail” without their children, three mothers said.

“We told him, ‘Why would he do that?’” Ms. Leiva, 41, said. “We weren’t criminals or delinquents.”

Khaalid Walls, a spokesman for the **immigration** agency, said in a statement: “I.C.E. fully respects the rights of all people to voice their opinion without interference. I.C.E. does not retaliate in any way against hunger strikers. I.C.E. explains the negative health effects of not eating to our residents. For their health and safety, I.C.E. closely monitors the food and water intake of those identified as being on a hunger strike.”

The women question why they cannot be released and wear ankle bracelets with tracking devices while waiting for their asylum cases to proceed.

Some women who are part of the lawsuit have already been released. Mr. Walls said, adding that “many factors can contribute to the length of a resident’s stay, including but not limited to the current disposition of their **immigration** cases.”

But Ms. Alberto’s lawyers say the government is retaliating against her for speaking to the media. Last week, the government requested her emergency transfer to a more secure center in Karnes City, Tex., because of her “disruptive” presence at Berks. Her lawyers argued against the move in an appeal filed Wednesday, offering consistently positive conduct reports by the staff as evidence.

Dr. Alan Shapiro[https://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/25/nyregion/after-a-border-crossing-a-joyous-haven-in-the-south-bronx.html], the senior medical director of pediatric programs of the Children’s Hospital at Montefiore in the Bronx, has made several visits to Berks to examine the children. In court documents filed last week, he said another move to a detention center would be harmful to Ms. Alberto’s 6-year-old son; he diagnosed the child with chronic Post-traumatic stress disorder, from witnessing violence in El Salvador, the trip across the border and his prolonged detention.

Dr. Shapiro also confirmed that during his evaluation, the boy again simulated choking himself with his ID card lanyard — a “clear sign of stress and anxiety,” he said.

The adverse psychological effects of detention on children have been subject to several reports from Human Rights First, an advocacy group, including one in[http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/resource/family-detention-berks-county-pennsylvania] 2015[http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/resource/family-detention-berks-county-pennsylvania] on conditions at Berks.

The **immigration** agency was not able to immediately grant a request for a New York Times reporter to observe the center and to interview the residents on site.

There is yet another complicating matter: The center is operating without a license. In February, the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services revoked the county’s license because it applied only to serving children — not their mothers as well. The county appealed and has been allowed to operate while the matter is pending. The next hearing is scheduled for November.

Isvett Verde contributed reporting.

\* A Rush of Central Americans Complicates Obama’s **Immigration** Task[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/09/us/a-rush-of-central-americans-compounds-obamas-immigration-task.html]

\* Judge Increases Pressure on U.S. to Release Migrant Families[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/23/us/judge-increases-pressure-on-us-to-release-migrant-families.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Many people have characterized my novel, “The Sympathizer,” as an **immigrant** story, and me as an **immigrant**. No. My novel is a war story and I am not an **immigrant**. I am a refugee who, like many others, has never ceased being a refugee in some corner of my mind.

**Immigrants** are more reassuring than refugees because there is an endpoint to their story; however they arrive, whether they are documented or not, their desires for a new life can be absorbed into the American dream or into the European narrative of civilization.

By contrast, refugees are the zombies of the world, the undead who rise from dying states to march or swim toward our borders in endless waves. An estimated 60 million such stateless people exist, 1 in every 122 people alive today. If they formed their own country, it would be the world’s 24th largest — bigger than South Africa, Spain, Iraq or Canada.

My memories of becoming a refugee are fragments of a dream, hallucinatory and unreliable. Soldiers bouncing me on their knees, a tank rumbling through the streets, a crowded barge of desperate people fleeing Vietnam.

I have no guarantee these images are true. They date from the early 1970s, when I lived in the country synonymous with war. I wonder if the fact that I cannot stand the taste of milk today has to do with being a 4-year-old boy on that barge, sipping from milk a stranger shared with my family.

Perhaps this is how history becomes imprinted in the body, how fear becomes a reflex, how memory becomes a matter of taste and feeling.

My real memories began soon after we arrived at the refugee camp in Fort Indiantown Gap, Pa., in the summer of 1975. Only those refugees with sponsors could leave the camp. But no sponsor would take our family of four, so my parents went to one home, my 10-year-old brother went to another and I went to a third. My separation from my parents lasted only a few months, but it felt much longer. This forced separation, what my childhood self experienced as abandonment, remains an invisible brand stamped between my shoulder blades.

A few years later we moved across the country. My parents, merchants in their homeland, had no desire to do the menial work expected of them in Harrisburg, Pa., where we had settled.

Instead, they opened a grocery store in a depressed area of downtown San Jose, working 12- to 14-hour days, seven days a week, except for Christmas Day, Easter and New Year’s Day. They became successful, at the cost of being shot in an armed robbery.

Today, when many Americans think of Vietnamese-Americans as a success story, we forget that the majority of Americans in 1975 did not want to accept Vietnamese refugees. (A sign hung in the window of a store near my parents’ grocery: “Another American forced out of business by the Vietnamese.”) For a country that prides itself on the American dream, refugees are simply un-American, despite the fact that some of the original English settlers of this country, the Puritans, were religious refugees.

Today, Syrian refugees face a similar reaction. To some Europeans, these refugees seem un-European for reasons of culture, religion and language. And in Europe and the United States, the attacks in Paris[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/attacks-in-paris?inline=nyt-classifier], Brussels, San Bernardino, Calif., and Orlando, Fla., have people fearing that Syrian refugees could be Islamic radicals, forgetting that those refugees are some of the first victims of the Islamic State.

Because those judgments have been rendered on many who have been cast out or who have fled, it is important for those of us who were refugees to remind the world of what our experiences mean.

I was — I am — the lucky kind of refugee who was carried along by his parents and who had no memory of the crossing. For people like my parents and the Syrians today, their voyages across land and sea are far more perilous than the ones undertaken by astronauts or Christopher Columbus. To those watching news reports, the refugees may be threatening or pitiful, but in reality, they are nothing less than heroic.

They will remain scarred by their history. It is understandable that some do not want to speak of their scars and might want to pretend that they are not refugees. It is more glamorous to be an exile, more comprehensible to be an **immigrant**, more desirable to be an expatriate. The need to belong can change refugees themselves both consciously and unconsciously, as has happened to me and others.

A Vietnamese colleague of mine once jokingly referred to his journey from “refugee to bourgeoisie.” When I told him I, too, was a refugee, he stopped joking and said, “You don’t look like one.”

He was right. We can be invisible even to one another. But it is precisely because I do not look like a refugee that I have to proclaim being one, even when those of us who were refugees would rather forget that there was a time when the world thought us to be less than human.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Viet Thanh Nguyen’s novel “The Sympathizer” won the 2016 Pulitzer Prize for fiction. His short story collection “The Refugees” comes out in February.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Republican National Committee[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_national\_committee/index.html?inline=nyt-org] had high hopes that Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] would deliver a compassionate and measured speech about **immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico.html] on Wednesday, and prepared to lavish praise on the candidate on the party’s Twitter account.

So when Mr. Trump instead offered a fiery denunciation of migrant criminals and suggested deporting Hillary Clinton, Reince Priebus, the party chairman, signaled that aides should scrap the plan, and the committee made no statement at all.

The evening tore a painful new wound in Mr. Trump’s relationship with the Republican National Committee, imperiling his most important remaining political alliance.

Mr. Priebus and his organization have been steadfastly supportive of Mr. Trump, defending him in public and spending millions of dollars to aid him. But the collaboration between Mr. Trump’s campaign and Mr. Priebus’s committee has grown strained over the last month, according to six senior Republicans with detailed knowledge of both groups, some of whom asked to speak anonymously for fear of exacerbating tensions.

There is no prospect of a full public breach between the Trump campaign and the R.N.C. because both sides rely on a joint fund-raising arrangement crucial to their election efforts.

But tensions have grown to such a point that they threaten to diminish the party’s ability to work smoothly with Mr. Trump during the most critical post-Labor Day phase of the race, when the committee traditionally helps supervise an extensive voter turnout effort.

Mr. Trump, who has struggled to raise money, is dependent on his party’s national committee to perform many of the basic functions of a presidential campaign. Should the partnership continue to deteriorate, it could hinder Mr. Trump’s bid for a late comeback in the race.

Mr. Priebus said in a statement that there was no significant friction between his committee and the Trump campaign, describing theirs as a “fantastic working relationship.”

“Any insinuation to the contrary is purely overblown gossip,” Mr. Priebus said.

But already, senior advisers to Mr. Priebus and Mr. Trump have collided over the turbulence in the campaign, the senior Republicans said. Mr. Trump’s top policy adviser questioned Mr. Priebus’s competence in a caustic email this week after the Phoenix speech. And Mr. Trump’s son-in-law, Jared Kushner, and Mr. Priebus’s chief of staff clashed in a tense meeting over the use of the committee’s war chest.

Within Mr. Trump’s circle, there is impatience with what advisers view as a cautious and conventional party bureaucracy, ill-equipped to accommodate Mr. Trump’s improvisational style. At times, Trump aides have vented that frustration in language that was contemptuous of Mr. Priebus, a genial Wisconsin lawyer who has served as chairman for five years.

When Mr. Trump’s **immigration** speech this week spurred resignations from the National Hispanic Advisory Council for Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/gop-hispanic-reaction-trump.html], a party-backed group, one of Mr. Trump’s top advisers lashed out at Mr. Priebus in an email to the campaign staff.

“The RNC needs to take control of this situation and quickly,” wrote Stephen Miller, Mr. Trump’s senior policy adviser, who often travels with the candidate.

Describing the Hispanic Republicans who resigned in dismay as “professional amnesty lobbyists,” Mr. Miller asked: “Can Reince do his job?”

Inside the committee, top officials have lost confidence in Mr. Trump’s ability to right his listing campaign, according to the senior Republicans. Complaints abound about the haphazard nature of Mr. Trump’s operation, in which power is so divided among strategists and members of the Trump family that the process of making even simple decisions is laborious and unpredictable. Mr. Trump is on his third campaign leadership team, having dismissed two previous chief advisers, and he has already fired two senior staff members, Rick Wiley and Ed Brookover, who whose jobs included coordinating his strategy with the R.N.C.

Mr. Priebus, who has a warm personal relationship with Mr. Trump and speaks with him daily, has also confided to some Republicans that he has been disappointed by Mr. Trump’s failure to evolve as a candidate in the general election.

He denied in a statement that he had complained about Mr. Trump’s refusal to shift course. “I’ve said exactly the opposite,” Mr. Priebus said. “I think he’s had his best three weeks.”

Robin Hayes, the chairman of the North Carolina Republican Party, said he was optimistic about the emerging relationship between his organization and the Trump campaign in his own state. But Mr. Hayes said it was widely understood within the national committee that Mr. Trump needed to make adjustments.

“There have been discussions, that we don’t need to create, ‘Cleanup on Aisle 3,’ for ourselves,” Mr. Hayes said. “He’s still going to be Trump — that’s important — but Trump in a way that fits into a general election.”

Throughout the campaign, Mr. Priebus and his committee have been broadly deferential to Mr. Trump, declining to criticize many of his most provocative remarks and quickly designating him as the party’s presumptive nominee in May. For Mr. Trump, Mr. Priebus has appeared to be a patient and accommodating partner, eager to promote his campaign in public and willing to rebuke Republicans who have declined to support him.

Recently, the committee has sent aides to work several days a week in Trump Tower to bolster collaboration with Mr. Trump’s campaign, including Sean Spicer, a close adviser to Mr. Priebus.

But the conflict has continued. At a meeting in New York late last month, Mr. Kushner, who is married to Ivanka Trump, pointedly challenged Katie Walsh, the committee’s chief of staff, over the party’s spending plans.

In a tone that several witnesses described as imperious and aggressive, Mr. Kushner suggested that the national committee might not be giving Mr. Trump all the support he was due.

Ms. Walsh pushed back strongly, telling Mr. Kushner, who has no background in politics, that the committee’s fund-raising and spending are disclosed in detail to the Federal Election Commission, according to the witnesses who were in the room and two people briefed by them afterward.

Ms. Walsh told Mr. Kushner that the committee had a responsibility to take a broad view of its finances, mapping out a budget for the entire party and ensuring it could remain operational for the rest of the year, and could not solely focus on Mr. Trump’s needs.

Mike DuHaime, a former political director for the committee, said tensions with the campaign could be harmful to both sides in the general election.

“For the field operation to be truly effective, the campaign, the R.N.C and down-ballot races need to be on the same page about goals and resource allocation,” he said.

Rudolph W. Giuliani, the former New York City mayor who has become one of Mr. Trump’s closest advisers, said he was confident that Mr. Priebus remained “on board” with the Trump campaign. At the same time, he acknowledged that much of the institutional Republican Party remained unfriendly to Mr. Trump.

“The R.N.C. is giving him a lot of support,” Mr. Giuliani said. “He doesn’t have the united Republican Party behind him in the way that a more establishment candidate would.”

Some members of the committee staff found Mr. Trump’s nomination impossible to stomach, and more than half a dozen aides at the committee have resigned since Mr. Trump claimed the nomination.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

\* ‘Taco Trucks on Every Corner’: Trump Supporter’s Anti-**Immigration** Warning[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/03/us/politics/taco-trucks-on-every-corner-trump-supporters-anti-immigration-warning.html]

\* Leaked Script Shows What Advisers Want Donald Trump to Say at Black Church[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-black-voters-wayne-jackson.html]

\* Explaining What Donald Trump Wants to Do Now on **Immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-far-from-softening-lays-out-tough-immigration-plans.html]

\* Trailing Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump Turns to Political Gymnastics[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/trump-campaign.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AUGUSTA, Me. — No visitor to Gov. Paul R. LePage’s office suite can miss the framed message on the wall, opposite the main door: “Don’t expect to build up the weak by pulling down the strong.”

It is a quote from Calvin Coolidge, used as wall art — and an indication of the combative philosophy of government under a Republican governor who has, time and again, generated headlines over vulgar and racially charged remarks.

This week he landed himself in the national spotlight after leaving a profane and threatening voice mail[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/27/us/profane-phone-message-has-gov-paul-lepage-of-maine-in-hot-water-again.html] for a Democratic lawmaker and by committing to sweeping generalizations about race and the state’s heroin crisis.

It is the worst crisis of his six-year tenure and Mr. LePage, with the backing of top House Republicans, has vowed to ride it out, even though the Democratic House speaker on Friday began polling members on whether they want to convene a special session to address the governor’s behavior.

But beyond the offensive comments[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/controversial-gov-paul-lepage-maine-list.html?\_r=0], lawmakers from both parties describe confounding difficulties under Mr. LePage, who they say has instigated dramatic shifts in the state’s political atmosphere, thrown wrenches into basic workings of state government, and made a habit of outbursts that even his allies concede distract from his political accomplishments.

“He’s abrasive and rough on the edges and no one agrees with that,” Kenneth Fredette, minority leader of the Democratic-controlled House and a key ally for Mr. LePage, said Tuesday, even as he announced he did not want to convene a special legislative session on the governor’s behavior. “I get so mad at him when he does that, because it takes away from the good work that we are doing.”

Mr. LePage, who has vowed this week to never speak to the press again, did not respond to a detailed request for comment.

Republicans in the state praise Mr. LePage for seeking to cut welfare costs, paying off the state’s hospital debt and overseeing a considerable drop in the unemployment rate: It stands at 3.9 percent, down from 8.1 percent when he was first elected, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics[http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LASST230000000000003]. Yet, many say, at the same time he has elevated personal differences into political hurdles.

Mr. LePage has created rifts with even would-be ideological allies like Senate President Mike Thibodeau, a conservative Republican, avoiding meetings with him after the Senate Republicans failed to support his budget last year.

“A lot of this is about relationships, and relationships are frayed,” Mr. Thibodeau said this week.

Mr. LePage has made no secret of his disdain for much of the Legislature, and one way he has shown it is by keeping a tight grip on the information lawmakers say they need. Legislators have banded together to act on things like the state budget despite his vetoes.

“Many of the governor’s actual broad policy goals, most if not all of us in the party agree with,” said Senator Roger Katz, a Republican who has been critical of Mr. LePage for much of his term. “But in many ways he’s been his own worst enemy.”

Top House Republicans are standing by the governor, and Mr. Thibodeau, the Senate’s Republican leader who is open to a special session, said he does not want to go as far as impeachment. Assuming he stays in office, observers say, Mr. LePage could well will finish out the rest of his second term more detached than ever. (He is term-limited and cannot seek re-election.)

“His combativeness ultimately further polarizes his enemies, and pushes away his allies,” said Bill Nemitz, a columnist for The Portland Press Herald, a newspaper Mr. LePage once jokingly said that he would like to blow up. “As he gets deeper and deeper into his tenure, he finds himself more and more isolated and unable to accomplish anything.”

It seemed so different when Mr. LePage was elected in a three-way race during the Tea Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/t/tea\_party\_movement/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] sweep of 2010 that gave Republicans the majority in the House and Senate here for the first time in decades. He was re-elected easily in 2014 in another three-way race.

“It was a big deal,” said Lance Dutson, a Republican political strategist who worked to get Mr. LePage elected and then ran the conservative Maine Heritage Policy Center in the early years of his term, where he was supportive of Mr. LePage’s policies. He has since come out publicly against the governor.

But “his first foray into Augusta politics was just an utter disaster,” Mr. Dutson said. “There was all kinds of infighting with the Legislature. He did not want the Legislature to participate in the budget process.”

Mr. LePage’s temper and erratic behavior became an open secret, shocking a State House that had long prided itself on cordial politics. He has, over the years, yelled at Democrats, held angry news conferences, **alienated** members of both parties and marched unannounced into legislative hearings. The Republican Party had a storied legacy of bipartisan deal-making, represented by elected officials like United States Senator Susan Collins and Margaret Chase Smith, a former United States senator.

“Paul LePage’s tenure so far as governor of Maine has fundamentally changed the political climate in this state,” said Mark D. Brewer, a political scientist at the University of Maine. “It’s changed how business is done in Augusta for sure.”

Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle say Mr. LePage’s administration tightly controls basic information, leaving members of the Appropriations Committee in the dark about critical spending information. He has, at times, banned agency heads from appearing before committees and instructed legislators to route any questions through his office.

“He wants to control every issue, every minute issue,” said Linda Valentino, the lead Senate Democrat on the Appropriations Committee. “He’s micromanaging every aspect of state government.”

Mr. LePage has also been openly retaliatory. Last summer, he threatened[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/29/us/combative-maine-governor-becomes-a-party-of-one.html] to take away a charter school[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/charter\_schools/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]’s funding if it did not rescind a job offer to the Democratic House speaker, and attempted to veto dozens of bills in an effort to punish the entire Legislature for not supporting his effort to eliminate the income tax. The courts overturned 65 vetoes.

It has created a quandary for Republicans like Senator Amy Volk, who comes from a moderate district and called this week for Mr. LePage to be censured.

“He’s tried to do, and he has done, some really positive things for our state,” Ms. Volk said in an interview. “At other times, his unwillingness to meet even with Republicans, and his unwillingness to do things like put together a budget, have made it more challenging and have contributed to partisanship in the State House.”

Some say it has also created a climate that leaves state employees fearful of retribution.

“I represent more state employees than anybody,” said Senator Katz, the Republican whose district includes the capital, Augusta. “I think it’s safe to say that general state employee morale is poor.”

Mr. LePage has also returned, time and again, to themes of race and **immigration**. This year, he said asylum-seekers brought diseases like the “ziki-fly,” and his administration pushed to cut welfare benefits for some asylum-seekers, frustrating members of a community that has grown in Maine. And he has repeatedly linked the state’s heroin crisis, especially in the last week, to black and Hispanic people from out of state.

“It seems he doesn’t like **immigrants**, he doesn’t like people from other parts of the world, he’s always against refugees, and now he’s against African-Americans,” said Hassan Adan, a social services case manager who arrived in Lewiston 10 years ago as a refugee from Somalia. “His comments may divide the community, because some people may believe what he says.”

In a statement released on Wednesday — the first after a week of controversy — Rick Bennett, the chairman of the Maine’s Republican Party, called the controversies related to to Mr. LePage “tremendously difficult and unnecessary for the people of Maine.”

No one knows that more than the Legislature’s Republicans, who must now face to their districts, where they all must seek re-election in November, and explain what they make of Mr. LePage.

“Let’s just be honest,” Mr. Thibodeau, the Senate president, said Thursday. “The governor’s put Republicans in a tough spot.”

\* Paul LePage, the Governor of Maine, Now Says He’s Not Quitting[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/paul-lepage-maine-governor.html]

\* Paul LePage, Besieged Maine Governor, Sends Conflicting Signals Over Intentions[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/paul-lepage-maine-governor.html]

\* How Controversial Is Gov. Paul LePage of Maine? Here’s a Partial List[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/controversial-gov-paul-lepage-maine-list.html]

\* Profane Phone Message Has Gov. Paul LePage of Maine in Hot Water Again[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/27/us/profane-phone-message-has-gov-paul-lepage-of-maine-in-hot-water-again.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**“My culture is a very dominant culture, and it’s imposing and it’s causing problems. If you don’t do something about it, you’re going to have taco trucks on every corner.”

That was Marco Gutierrez, founder of the group Latinos for Trump, issuing a dire warning to the United States in an interview with Joy Reid on MSNBC on Thursday night.

America’s response? Mmm, tacos!

In case you missed the source of #TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner[https://twitter.com/hashtag/TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner?src=hash] → https://t.co/4vnpZY2cQw[https://t.co/4vnpZY2cQw] #inners[https://twitter.com/hashtag/inners?src=hash] #reiders[https://twitter.com/hashtag/reiders?src=hash] — AM Joy w/Joy Reid (@amjoyshow) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/amjoyshow/status/771541495010562048]

Though some sympathized with the message, Mr. Gutierrez’s comments elicited a largely sarcastic backlash on social media. #TacosOnEveryCorner surged to the top of Twitter’s list of trending topics, where it remained on Friday morning.

@allinwithchris[https://twitter.com/allinwithchris] @MarcoGutierrez[https://twitter.com/MarcoGutierrez] That’s the worst thing you can think of? What else? Invading mariachi bands? — Corinne Marasco (@CorinneAM) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/CorinneAM/status/771512622193766401]

#TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner[https://twitter.com/hashtag/TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner?src=hash] sounds like the real American dream to me. FOH. pic.twitter.com/0e5Wx4lRpM[https://t.co/0e5Wx4lRpM] — Akilah Hughes (@AkilahObviously) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/AkilahObviously/status/771555551033499648]

It has begun pic.twitter.com/yaLdFakiC0[https://t.co/yaLdFakiC0] — Blake Hounshell (@blakehounshell) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/blakehounshell/status/771699679914561536]

The comment came at a sensitive time for Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s presidential campaign. Several members of his Hispanic advisory council withdrew their support this week, saying they had been led to believe that Mr. Trump was shifting his hard-line tone on **immigration**.

“He used us as props,” said Jacob Monty[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/gop-hispanic-reaction-trump.html], who resigned after Mr. Trump reverted to his fiery language on **immigration** Wednesday night after returning from Mexico, where he had struck a more measured, even subdued, tone.

During the interview with Mr. Gutierrez, Ms. Reid quickly interjected, saying, “I don’t even know what that means, and I’m almost afraid to ask.”

Mr. Gutierrez explained:

“We are a culture that — we have a lot of good things that we bring to the United States, but we also have problems.”

Mr. Gutierrez might have spared himself some of the ridicule had he recognized America’s longstanding love affair with Mexican food. Nearly 25 years ago, salsa surpassed ketchup[http://www.nytimes.com/1992/03/11/garden/new-mainstream-hot-dogs-apple-pie-and-salsa.html] in retail store sales, and some would argue that Mexican food has already conquered American cuisine[https://www.amazon.com/Taco-USA-Mexican-Conquered-America/dp/1439148627].

Mr. Trump, for his part, has long been accused of being tone-deaf in his Hispanic outreach, including, for example, in his posting of a photo of himself and a taco bowl on May 5, proclaiming, “I love Hispanics!”

Happy #CincoDeMayo[https://twitter.com/hashtag/CincoDeMayo?src=hash]! The best taco bowls are made in Trump Tower Grill. I love Hispanics! https://t.co/ufoTeQd8yA[https://t.co/ufoTeQd8yA] pic.twitter.com/k01Mc6CuDI[https://t.co/k01Mc6CuDI] — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) May 5, 2016[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/728297587418247168]

From the start, his hard-line approach to **immigration** has **alienated** Hispanics, and his accusation that Mexico was sending rapists across the border did nothing to tame the controversy.

“When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best,” Mr. Trump said in announcing his campaign[http://blogs.wsj.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/washwire/2015/06/16/donald-trump-transcript-our-country-needs-a-truly-great-leader/] in June 2015. “They’re not sending you. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.”

Later that day, he added that, to keep out undocumented **immigrants**, he would “build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me,” a promise repeated numerous times since, including in Phoenix on Wednesday.

As a Trump surrogate, Mr. Gutierrez is not the first to offend. The African-American pastor Mark Burns has said that Hillary Clinton, the Democratic nominee, panders to African-Americans and endorses black genocide[http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/03/20/pro-trump-pastor-mark-burns-says-hillary-clinton-endorses-black-genocide.html]. He also apologized for retweeting[http://www.cnn.com/2016/08/29/politics/mark-burns-clinton-blackface-cartoon-trump/] images of Mrs. Clinton in blackface.

Some observers saw the taco truck remarks as code words to mine the racial resentments[http://www.vox.com/2016/9/2/12768774/trump-taco-trucks] of white Americans.

cats and dogs, living together, a taco truck on every corner, you know, real end of the world type stuff — Oliver Willis (@owillis) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/owillis/status/771723796373987328]

Others reacted with humor:

“We shall defend our #TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner[https://twitter.com/hashtag/TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner?src=hash]” whatever the cost may be…we shall never surrender.” Winston Churchill https://t.co/CZcy1xGMn1[https://t.co/CZcy1xGMn1] — Corinne Marasco (@CorinneAM) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/CorinneAM/status/771714227056902144]

Here for #TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner[https://twitter.com/hashtag/TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner?src=hash] like... pic.twitter.com/rmyBnsEuna[https://t.co/rmyBnsEuna] — Josh Shahryar (@JShahryar) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/JShahryar/status/771546802122219522]

Personally I'd like a taco truck on every corner of my living room. — (((maura quint))) (@behindyourback) September 2, 2016[https://twitter.com/behindyourback/status/771720388715876356]

\* Explaining What Donald Trump Wants to Do Now on **Immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-far-from-softening-lays-out-tough-immigration-plans.html]

\* Donald Trump Gambles on **Immigration** but Sends Conflicting Signals[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Give me your extreme-vetted, your ideologically certified, your elite. Send only the smartest, the best-connected, the richest to our shores. No losers, no freethinkers, and no ugly people, please.

In the hate speech that Donald Trump gave on **immigration** in Phoenix on Wednesday night, he all but deported the Statue of Liberty, laying out one of the darkest visions of the American experience that any major-party nominee has ever given. Despite the media misread by some who presented the speech as a pivot, it got rave reviews from neo-Nazi and Ku Klux Klan supporters, and prompted some of Trump’s few Latino advisers to resign in protest. “Excellent speech,” said David Duke, the former Klan leader.

In Trump’s America, those working in the shadows are not the lawn cutters, Sheetrock hangers, fruit pickers or nannies we see in every community, but the criminal dregs. Under his rules, this country would have closed its doors long ago to those who made the United States the great experiment, unique to the world. He would have shut off the flow of people whose best and perhaps only asset at the time was desire for a better life.

So, the Kennedys from County Wexford, the family that eventually gave us the first Irish Catholic president — not worthy of entry. Famine rejects! No prospects. From a nation whose people were already filling New York’s jails in the 1850s. Enough with potato-panicked Paddys.

At the door into Trump’s America, he would “select **immigrants** based on their likelihood of success in U.S. society, and their ability to be financially self-sufficient,” he said. Sorry, Sicilian peasants. Not many of them could pass a Trump screen for “merit, skill and proficiency.” Not many of them could even read, or speak the language, let alone operate an Industrial Age machine. And what about those secret societies that many of them belonged to?

The Republican nominee laid out a test for political correctness, in the most authoritarian sense of the term. “I call it extreme vetting,” said Trump. “Right? Extreme vetting. I want extreme.” What’s he talking about? He said “an ideological certification” would be required.

Sorry, Albert Einstein. So, the German-born Jew knew a thing or two about physics, what with his fancy Theory of Relativity. But he had some uncertifiable political views. He could never get past Trump’s extreme vetting after saying things like this: “I am convinced that there is only one way to eliminate these grave evils, namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals.”

He sounds like nothing but trouble. On top of that, his native country accused him of treason. There’s something there, folks, something going on. You have to wonder why Einstein’s property was seized and his books were burned. When Germany sends its people, it’s sending the treasonous, people whose ideas don’t always match ours. Get him out.

That goes for Andrew Carnegie as well. What kind of man gives away all his money after making one of the great fortunes in the world? A dangerous one. Trump’s political police would have turned the Scottish-born Carnegies away before they ever got anywhere near Allegheny, Pa.

Andrew Carnegie’s father was a loser; couldn’t hold his job as a weaver. The old man was part of Britain’s Chartist Movement, a bunch of wild-eyed dreamers espousing worker rights and universal suffrage. On his mother’s side, same thing — one of the leading political radicals in Scotland was her father, Thomas Morrison.

And Trump wants to make sure that countries associated with drugs don’t send their people here, either. Sorry, Colin Powell. His parents were from Jamaica, the largest illicit producer and exporter of marijuana in the Caribbean. Sure, Colin would became a four-star general and secretary of state, but the parents? Would they have been living in the South Bronx if they could show “an ability to be financially self-sufficient?” Not so sure about that.

Speaking of Caribbean, how did Alexander Hamilton get in? A lot of red flags with this character. Dubious parentage from an exotic island. An unemployed single mother who was locked up for violating the sexual standards of the day. Extreme vetting would have stopped this abandoned Hamilton kid before he got to New York and starting toying with the mechanics of nation-building.

We shouldn’t be fooled, as the hapless Mexican president was, as much of the political press was, by Trump’s stunt this week — trying to hold his hatred back long enough to get a statesman photo op. His true feelings poured out in the rant in Phoenix.

Look around you — at O’Shaunnessys and Riveras and Naccaratos and Goldbergs and Chens and Khans. Those families would never have left their old countries if they were living in comfort, if they could easily demonstrate “merit, skill and proficiency.” What forces someone to leave a home, family — everything — is desperation. And then, more often than not, having seen the worst that life can offer, those families become the best.

Follow me on Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytegan] (@nytegan).

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

\* In Debate Over ‘Sanctuary Cities,’ a Divide on the Role of the Local Police[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/in-debate-over-sanctuary-cities-a-divide-on-the-role-of-the-local-police.html]

\* Donald Trump, Deporter in Waiting[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/opinion/donald-trump-deporter-in-waiting.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Don’t be confused by the days of mixed messaging from Donald Trump’s campaign, or the head-feint trip to Mexico[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/mexico/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], where he was polite to the president. Speaking on Wednesday in Phoenix[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-far-from-softening-lays-out-tough-immigration-plans.html], Mr. Trump did not retreat from, or in any way soften, his promise to make 11 million unauthorized **immigrants** targets for deportation. His speech — in 10 points, embellished with statistics, ad-libbed asides and audience hollering and chanting — was as clear a statement of hard-core restrictionism as any he has given.

It was a mass-deportation speech, even if he avoided that phrase. Its intent was hard to miss.

Leave aside the bit about the “impenetrable” wall, an applause line for an engineering fiction. To understand what’s so appalling and frightening about Mr. Trump, focus instead on some things he could actually try to do, if America gives him the job and Congress gives the money:

1. “Under my administration, anyone who illegally crosses the border will be detained until they are removed out of our country and back to the country from which they came. And they’ll be brought great distances.”

2. “We will issue detainers for illegal **immigrants** who are arrested for any crime whatsoever, and they will be placed into immediate removal proceedings.”

3. “My plan also includes cooperating closely with local jurisdictions to remove criminal **aliens** immediately. We will restore the highly successful Secure Communities program. Good program. We will expand and revitalize the popular 287(g) partnerships[https://www.ice.gov/287g].”

4. “We’re going to triple the number of ICE [**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement] deportation officers. Within ICE, I am going to create a new special deportation task force focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants**. ... We’re also going to hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents.”

5. “We will immediately terminate President Obama’s two illegal executive amnesties in which he defied federal law and the Constitution to give amnesty to approximately five million illegal **immigrants**.”

This isn’t the full list, but it’s enough to show how drastically Mr. Trump wants to remake the country.

Nos. 1 and 2 are a plan to add many tens of thousands, or hundreds of thousands, of new prison beds, while also filling local jails to bursting. They’re a gift to the private, for-profit prison industry and will ensure that any arrests, even false ones, can be springboards to deportation.

No. 3 is a discarded page from President Obama’s playbook. Mr. Obama vastly expanded[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/17/opinion/the-great-sanctuary-city-slander.html] Secure Communities, a national dragnet that enlisted state and local law-enforcement officials to check the **immigration** status of everyone arrested. Many communities resisted it, calling it a tool for racial profiling that wasted resources, traumatized innocent people and got in the way of deterring crime before Mr. Obama abandoned it. Under the similarly toxic 287(g) program, local departments — like that of the infamous Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Arizona — became partners of ICE on street patrols and in jails.

No. 4 is a gift to an ICE union that endorsed Mr. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/05/opinion/the-border-patrols-bizarre-choice.html], and a plan to make the most bloated federal law-enforcement bureaucracy, Homeland Security, even bigger.

And No. 5 tells millions of **immigrants** — who were brought here as children, or have citizen children, and pose no threat — to be very afraid, because we will hunt you down and expel you, and we already know where you live.

The entire speech, in fact, imagines that government at all levels will be used to hunt down and remove **immigrants** from their homes, families and jobs. Mr. Trump was describing a world of lockups and surveillance and fugitive-hunting squads, a vast system of indiscriminate catch-and-punish that works as hard to catch hotel maids and landscapers as it does gang members and terrorists.

And this applies not just to **immigrants**, but to everyone who could be mistaken for one. Corrupt local police officers will pick up anyone they want, knowing Mr. Trump’s agents will swiftly take suspects off their hands.

Nativists across the land were praising Mr. Trump’s **immigration** speech as wonderful, potent stuff. Mark Krikorian of the Center for **Immigration** Studies, an organization that wants to restrict **immigration**, called it a “real-world version” of what’s “necessary to control **immigration**.” If you saw Mr. Trump’s speech, and you care about the country and values of tolerance and human rights and weren’t disgusted, you were either fooled, or not paying attention.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Once, I seem to recall, we had philosophical and ideological differences. Once, politics was a debate between liberals and conservatives, between different views of government, different views on values and America’s role in the world.

But this year, it seems, everything has been stripped down to the bone. Politics is dividing along crude identity lines — along race and class. Are you a native-born white or are you an outsider? Are you one of the people or one of the elites?

Politics is no longer about argument or discussion; it’s about trying to put your opponents into the box of the untouchables.

Donald Trump didn’t invent this game, but he embodies it. His advisers tried to dress him up on Wednesday afternoon as some sort of mature summiteer. But he just can’t be phony.

By his evening **immigration** speech he’d returned to the class and race tropes that have defined his campaign: that the American government is in the grips of a rich oligarchy that distorts everything for its benefit; that the American people are besieged by foreigners, who take their jobs and threaten their lives.

It’s not that these two ideas are completely wrong. The rich do have more influence. There are indeed some foreigners who seek to harm us. It is just that Trump (like other race and class warriors) takes these kernels of truth and grows them into a lie.

Trump argues that **immigration** has sown chaos across middle-class neighborhoods. This is false[http://www.cato.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/blog/immigration-crime-what-research-says]. Research suggests that the recent surge in **immigration** has made America’s streets safer. That’s because foreign-born men are very unlikely to commit violent crime.

According to one study, only 2 or 3 percent of Mexican-, Guatemalan- or Salvadoran-born men without a high school degree end up incarcerated, compared with 11 percent of their American-born counterparts.

Trump argues that the flood of **immigrants** is taking jobs away from unskilled native workers. But this is mainly false, too. There’s an intricate debate among economists about this, but if you survey the whole literature on the subject you find that most research shows **immigration** has very little effect on native wage or unemployment levels.

That’s because **immigrants** flow into different types of unskilled jobs[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/politics/archive/2015/10/immigrants-arent-stealing-american-jobs/433158/]. Unskilled **immigrants** tend to become maids, cooks and farm workers — jobs that require less English. Unskilled natives tend to become cashiers and drivers. If **immigrants** are driving down wages, it is mostly those of other **immigrants**.

Trump claims the rich benefit from **immigration** while everyone else suffers. Doctors get cheap nannies, everyone else gets the shaft.

This is false, too. The fact is, a vast majority of Americans benefit. A study[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/business/archive/2015/05/actually-immigration-can-create-jobs/391997/] by John McLaren of U.Va. and Gihoon Hong of Indiana University found that each new **immigrant** produced about 1.2 new jobs, because **immigrants** are producers and consumers and increase overall economic activity.

A report from the Partnership for a New American Economy found that **immigrants** accounted for 28 percent of all new small businesses in 2011. Between 2006 and 2012, over 40 percent of tech start-ups in Silicon Valley had at least one foreign-born founder.

The cities that are doing best economically work hard to attract new **immigrants** because the benefits are widely shared. As Ted Hesson points out[http://www.theatlantic.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/business/archive/2015/07/us-cities-immigrants-economy/398987/] in The Atlantic, New York, Chicago, Houston and Los Angeles account for about 20 percent of America’s economic output, and in those places, **immigrants** can make up as much as 44 percent of the total labor supply.

Identity politics distorts politics in two ways. First, it is Manichaean. It cleanly divides the world into opposing forces of light and darkness. You are a worker or an elite. You are American or foreigner.

Seeing this way is understandable if you are scared, but it is also a sign of intellectual laziness. The reality is that people can’t be reduced to a single story. An issue as complex as **immigration** can’t be reduced to a cartoon. It is simultaneously true that **immigration** fuels American dynamism and that the mixture of mass unskilled **immigration** and the high-tech economy threatens to create a permanent underclass.

Second and most important, identity politics is inherently the politics of division. But on most issues — whether it is **immigration** or the economy or national security — we rise and fall together. **Immigration**, even a reasonable amount of illegal **immigration**, helps a vast majority of Americans. An economy that grows at 3 percent would help all Americans.

Identity politics, as practiced by Trump, but also by others on the left and the right, distracts from the reality that we are one nation. It corrodes the sense of solidarity. It breeds suspicion, cynicism and distrust.

Human beings are too complicated to be defined by skin color, income or citizenship status. Those who try to reduce politics to these identities do real violence to national life.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter (@NYTopinion)[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion], and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s telling, there are places across America that have become dangerous oases for criminals, where foreign lawbreakers roam the streets without fear of the authorities.

Using the label “sanctuary cities,” Mr. Trump vowed in his hard-edge **immigration** speech in Phoenix on Wednesday to force such jurisdictions to abandon their policies protecting undocumented **immigrants** or face the loss of federal funding.

“We will end the sanctuary cities that have caused so many needless deaths,” Mr. Trump said. “No more funds!”

With his proposal, Mr. Trump is coming down on one side of a vigorous partisan debate over the degree to which local law enforcement should be involved in enforcing **immigration** laws. There is a deep split among law enforcement officials, not to mention elected officials. Just last year, after a young woman was shot by an **immigrant** here illegally[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/08/us/san-francisco-murder-case-exposes-lapses-in-immigration-enforcement.html] with a criminal record who had been released by the authorities in San Francisco, the Republican-led House voted[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/22/us/politics/republicans-look-to-penalize-sanctuary-cities-that-shield-illegal-immigrants.html] to withhold some federal funding from jurisdictions that shield undocumented **immigrants** from federal officials. In the Senate, Democrats this summer blocked a similar bill[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/us/politics/congresss-republicans-pursue-bills.html], which the White House had vowed to veto.

In limiting cooperation with the federal **immigration** authorities, some local law enforcement officials contend that they are making their jurisdictions safer by encouraging undocumented **immigrants** to take the risk of coming forward to report crimes. But those who see **immigration** violations as serious offenses contend that such policies lead to criminality.

The issue has bedeviled the Obama administration for years. In his first term, President Obama expanded nationwide a program allowing the Department of Homeland Security to receive the fingerprints of every person booked by the state and local police. After many **immigrant** communities rebelled, the administration canceled some of its efforts in 2014, and replaced them with a single, less intrusive one, hoping to court big cities to cooperate rather than to coerce them.

The list of cities, counties and states adopting such approaches is extensive. The State of California passed a law in 2013 limiting cooperation between the police and federal **immigration** authorities. Cities including Chicago, Philadelphia, New Orleans, New York and nearly 300 other places have adopted similar policies, according to the Center for **Immigration** Studies, a research group that supports Mr. Trump’s approach.

Mr. Trump did not specify which federal funds he would cut off, saying only that “cities that refuse to cooperate with federal authorities will not receive taxpayer dollars.”

While some cities, including New York and San Francisco[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/21/us/san-francisco-votes-to-keep-shielding-immigrants-from-deportation-officials.html], embrace the sanctuary label, none of the locales are entirely havens for **immigrants** in the country illegally. The term refers to jurisdictions that have placed limits on when local police departments will comply with federal requests to hold undocumented **immigrants** for detention. None of the cities restrain the police from pursuing or prosecuting **immigrants** who commit crimes.

While Mr. Trump said that “countless Americans” had lost their lives to **immigrant** criminals as a result of sanctuary policies, known cases are few. But a shocking killing happened just as Mr. Trump announced his presidential bid last year. Kathryn Steinle, a tourist, was shot while strolling with her father on a pier in San Francisco. The suspect, Juan Francisco López-Sánchez, was an undocumented **immigrant** from Mexico with a long criminal record who had been deported five times previously and had just completed a sentence in federal prison.

Mr. López-Sánchez confessed to the shooting but said it was an accident. Citing a trail of errors that led to his release by federal prison and **immigration**authorities and the San Francisco sheriff, Ross Mirkarimi, Ms. Steinle’s frustrated family brought a wrongful-death lawsuit against them and the City of San Francisco in May.

Mr. Trump referred to Ms. Steinle in his speech, saying of Mr. López-Sánchez, “They knew he was no good.”

But officials in San Francisco have argued that Ms. Steinle’s case was a disastrous exception and did not reflect the results of the city’s sanctuary policy, which has been in place since 1989. City officials broadly reaffirmed the policy.

But many county sheriffs support Mr. Trump’s argument that the police have a duty to help deport any **immigrant** who entered the country illegally.

“If you want federal dollars, you have to obey federal law,” said Sam Page, the sheriff of Rockingham County, N.C. “I believe we need to remove all criminal offenders that are in this country illegally.”

In 2014, the New York City Council passed a law that sharply limited the cooperation of the police and corrections departments with the federal enforcement authorities. The departments would honor a hold request only from a federal judge, and only if the subject had been convicted of a violent or serious crime.

Were it not for that city law, one 33-year-old man might have been sent back to Honduras this summer — for hanging a green pine tree air-freshener on his rearview mirror. In July, the man, who spoke on the condition that only his middle name, Omar, would be used since he does not have legal status, was pulled over while driving in Queens.

According to his lawyer, Su Yon Yi, of Queens Law Associates, the police stopped him for a traffic violation — obstructing the view while driving. The police then cited him for not having a driver’s license.

Omar pleaded guilty to driving without a license, paid a fine and was immediately released. Ms. Yi said that without the sanctuary policy in effect he might have been turned over to the **immigration** authorities.

“He really did benefit because he was in New York,” Ms. Yi said. “Instead of spending a couple of days in criminal jail and waiting for **immigration** and perhaps spending countless days in **immigration** custody — all based on an air-freshener — he was released and could go home to his family.”

Liz Robbins contributed reporting.

\* ‘He Used Us as Props’: Conservative Hispanics Deplore Donald Trump’s Speech[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/gop-hispanic-reaction-trump.html]

\* Explaining What Donald Trump Wants to Do Now on **Immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-far-from-softening-lays-out-tough-immigration-plans.html]

\* What an Undocumented **Immigrant** Wanted to Tell Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/donald-trump-immigration-phoenix.html]

\* Donald Trump Gambles on **Immigration** but Sends Conflicting Signals[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Mexico City — Mexico[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/mexico/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s president, Enrique Peña Nieto[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/enrique\_pena\_nieto/index.html?inline=nyt-per], had already had a terrible summer. July was the most murderous month in Mexico since he took office in 2012. Second-quarter results showed negative economic growth for the first time in three years. A survey found his approval rating slipping to 23 percent[http://gruporeforma.reforma.com/interactivo/encuestas/enc\_11a\_epn/]. And a news report even alleged that he plagiarized[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/world/americas/report-accuses-mexicos-president-of-plagiarism-in-law-school-thesis.html?\_r=0] nearly a third of his law degree thesis. How could he make it any worse?

Only by inviting Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per], one of the most hated men in Mexico — so hated that piñatas with his visage are brisk sellers across the country — to his presidential palace.

The curious thing about Mr. Peña Nieto’s latest debacle is how, unlike his other woes, it was totally self-inflicted. There is little tradition of sitting Mexican leaders meeting with American presidential hopefuls, so he was under no pressure to arrange the get-together. And it couldn’t have come at a worse time: the very day of Mr. Trump’s hard-hitting **immigration** speech, and the day before Mr. Peña Nieto’s state of the union address. Mr. Peña Nieto had even compared Mr. Trump to Hitler.

But in a stupefying decision, last week he sent invitations out to the Democratic hopeful Hillary Clinton and Mr. Trump to come to Mexico, and then conceded, reportedly[http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/entrada-de-opinion/columna/bajo-reserva-periodistas-el-universal/nacion/2016/08/31/portazo-de-trump] under pressure from the Trump team, to meet its candidate first, on the fateful Aug. 31.

Mr. Peña Nieto insists that his nation won something from the encounter. “I was very clear — in public and private — in emphasizing that in Mexico we feel wounded and hurt by his announcements about Mexicans,” he wrote in an opinion piece[http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/entrada-de-opinion/colaboracion/enrique-pena-nieto/nacion/2016/09/1/para-que-me-reuni-con-donald] in El Universal newspaper on Thursday. “I expressed that Mexicans deserve respect.”

But most politicians and pundits — and the public — read the scene differently. To them, Mr. Peña Nieto looked weak and submissive in front of a bully who is humiliating their nation. Certainly he lost the opportunity, in his own palace, and as a president to a mere candidate, to state clearly that his country would never pay for a border wall in the United States. His later tweet that he warned Mr. Trump is weak tea, a diplomatic “he said, she said.”

Mr. Trump’s staff claimed meanwhile that he looked presidential and firm in a difficult foreign country — and may have won points with Mexican-American voters. Indeed, Mr. Peña Nieto had been a useful pawn in Mr. Trump’s election campaign. Just consider Mr. Trump’s Arizona **immigration** speech just hours after the meeting, when the candidate repeated his mantra, “We will build a great wall along the southern border,” and then left a dramatic pause before digging the knife in with, “and Mexico will pay for the wall. One hundred percent.” The Mexican president had failed to move Mr. Trump’s position one iota.

The debacle seems so predictable that it’s hard not imagine that Mr. Peña Nieto’s advisers deliberately led him to error, in a “House of Cards”-style plot. But the truth is likely one that is harder for Mr. Peña Nieto to find a quick fix for. His problems, including the Trump caper, reflect how ill-suited he is to govern a major country like Mexico.

The president’s Institutional Revolutionary Party, or P.R.I., ruled Mexico for 71 straight years until 2000, through an all-encompassing political machine that the writer Mario Vargas Llosa called “the perfect dictatorship.” Mr. Peña Nieto won back power for his party after 12 years in the wilderness with the promise that it had changed into a dynamic, democratic party that would modernize Mexico. And he was its telegenic leader, with a soap opera star for a first lady. After he won office, newspapers predicted a forthcoming “Mexican miracle.”

But it gradually became apparent that Mr. Peña Nieto and his P.R.I. team were more of the same, representing entrenched interests and out of sync with much of their country. After cartel gunmen and police officers kidnapped 43 student teachers in 2014, the government failed to carry out a satisfactory investigation into the corrupt security forces, despite major protests. That same year it was revealed that Mr. Peña Nieto’s wife was buying a $7 million mansion from a company that received government contracts. He apologized, and his wife gave the house back, but P.R.I. politicians have resisted effective anticorruption laws, defying the popular mood.

The Trump meeting is just par for the course, showing how out of touch he is with his country and the millions of Mexicans living in the United States. Surveys here show an enormous rejection of the Republican candidate; one[http://aristeguinoticias.com/1608/mexico/3-de-mexicanos-respaldan-a-donald-trump-encuesta-reforma/], by the newspaper Reforma, found that only 3 percent of Mexicans would like to see Mr. Trump as America’s president.

So what was he thinking? Maybe Mr. Peña Nieto gambled that he could change Mr. Trump’s position, and lost. Maybe his low approval ratings sapped his confidence to publicly confront Mr. Trump about the border wall. Maybe he thought he could divert attention from his domestic troubles.

Whatever his motives, the Trump encounter only dug a deeper hole for Mr. Peña Nieto, who will rule until 2018. The future will show whether his approval ratings tumble even further and how difficult his last two years of his government will be — in a country that desperately needs smart leadership.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytopinion] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/NYTOpinion] (@NYTOpinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/opiniontoday/].

Ioan Grillo is the author of “Gangster Warlords: Drug Dollars, Killing Fields and the New Politics of Latin America” and a contributing opinion writer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald J. Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per] faced a backlash on Thursday from some of his top conservative Hispanic supporters who said their hopes that he was softening his **immigration** policy were dashed by his fiery speech Wednesday night, which they said was anti-**immigrant**.

Mr. Trump, the Republican presidential nominee, had shown signs in recent weeks that he was prepared to take a more conciliatory approach to **immigrants**who had entered the country illegally, dropping talk of a deportation force and instead speaking of treating those **immigrants** in a fair and humane fashion.

Less than two weeks ago, he held a meeting with his Hispanic advisory council in Trump Tower, leaving attendees with the impression that he was working on a new plan that included a path to citizenship.

That impression faded in Phoenix on Wednesday night.

“There was so much hope,” said Jacob Monty, a member of the Hispanic advisory council who was at the meeting with Mr. Trump. “He used us as props.”

Mr. Monty, a longtime Republican, said that Mr. Trump appeared humble during the meeting, listened to their proposals, acknowledged the difficulty of deporting 11 million unauthorized **immigrants** and suggested that he was working on a new policy that included a path to legalization. Mr. Monty resigned from the council after Mr. Trump’s speech.

“That was not a Republican speech, that was populist propaganda,” Mr. Monty said. “He must listen to whoever speaks to him last.”

Ramiro Pena, a pastor from Texas who was on Mr. Trump’s advisory council, also abandoned the campaign. According to an email to the Trump campaign, obtained by Politico[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/donald-trump-hispanic-leaders-arizona-immigration-227615], Mr. Pena — who could not be reached for comment — said the group that Mr. Trump had formed was a “scam.”

Other conservative Hispanic leaders were also disappointed.

Alfonso Aguilar, director of American Principles Project’s Latino Partnership, who backed Mr. Trump and offered advice on **immigration** policy to his campaign, withdrew his support on Thursday morning. Mr. Aguilar said that he and other conservative Hispanic leaders got behind Mr. Trump because they thought he would be able to work with Congress to get something done on **immigration** reform.

“A couple of weeks ago it sounded as if there was going to be a pivot,” said Mr. Aguilar, who predicted that other Republican Latinos would soon renounce their support for Mr. Trump. “If you heard the speech last night, it was either self-deport or be deported.”

Some advisers who expressed concern said they still planned to stick with Mr. Trump, hopeful that their input might make a difference in the future.

Alberto Delgado, a Florida pastor who was at the meeting with Mr. Trump, was aware of his plans to build a wall and remove criminals who are in the country illegally. But he was disappointed to hear that all unauthorized **immigrants** would have to leave the country and go through an application process to return.

“That gets me a little bit,” said Mr. Delgado, who was expecting to hear about a quick administrative fix that would keep families together. “If you apply, you don’t always get what you apply for.”

Still, Mr. Delgado said that he was not ready quit the advisory group.

Mr. Trump has been trying to improve his Hispanic outreach efforts as he has continued to lag behind Hillary Clinton in most national and state polls. Recently he adjusted his pitch to minority voters to argue that his plans to restore law and order would be in their best interests and that Democrats were taking them for granted.

The Trump campaign shrugged off any dissension among conservative Hispanics on Thursday.

“Mr. Trump has been consistent in advocating for an end to illegal **immigration** and he will continue to reach out and work with voters from all communities to defeat crooked Hillary Clinton this fall,” said Jason Miller, a spokesman for the campaign.

Mr. Trump continued to talk tough on **immigration** on Thursday at a midday rally in Wilmington, Ohio.

“Last night I outlined a bold new **immigration** reform to create prosperity and opportunity for all of our people, especially those who have the least,” he told the crowd. “We will treat everyone with dignity, respect and compassion, but our greatest compassion will be for the American citizen.”

Some of Mr. Trump’s most ardent conservative boosters, such as the commentators Rush Limbaugh and Ann Coulter, had expressed concern last week that Mr. Trump was preparing to reverse himself on **immigration**. Ms. Coulter’s fears were assuaged by the speech, which she called “the most magnificent” ever given.

Mr. Trump, for his part, continued to spar with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto over who would pay for a border wall, vowing in a tweet that Mexico would bear the cost.

Mexico will pay for the wall! — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) September 1, 2016[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/771294347501461504]

Mr. Peña Nieto fired back in a tweet of his own[https://twitter.com/EPN/status/771423919978913792?ref\_src=twsrc%5Etfw] to say that, as they discussed in person, his country would do no such thing.

For Hispanic leaders who have been critical of Mr. Trump from the beginning, his speech in Arizona was more evidence that he has not changed and likely will not.

Javier Palomarez, president of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, said Mr. Trump had proven to be a “clown” and that it was a sad moment for the Republican Party[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org].

“I think he’s done for with the Hispanic community,” Mr. Palomarez told MSNBC on Thursday. “He’s never going to see the White House if he doesn’t get a significant portion of the Hispanic vote.”

For their part, Democrats sought to press their advantage with Hispanics on Thursday, describing Mr. Trump’s remarks as offensive and racist.

“This was a dark and disturbing speech,” Senator Tim Kaine, Mrs. Clinton’s running mate, said on CBS. “This is the kind of anti-**immigrant** language that’s always had a tiny fringe support in this country, but it was a speech that’s not worthy of a president.”

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

Nick Corasaniti contributed reporting from Wilmington, Ohio.

\* Explaining What Donald Trump Wants to Do Now on **Immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/donald-trump-far-from-softening-lays-out-tough-immigration-plans.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was a fast-paced day for the team covering politics at The New York Times on Wednesday.

In the late afternoon, Donald J. Trump was playing the diplomat in Mexico City[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] with President Enrique Peña Nieto, standing alongside a state leader and vowing to treat everyone living or residing in the United States with great dignity. “So important,” Trump added.

By that evening, Trump was goosing a rowdy crowd in Phoenix and ensuring that anyone who entered the United States illegally would be subject to deportation, especially the criminals among them.

The problem back in The Times’s newsroom was that its main news story — published online after Trump spoke in Phoenix — captured more of Mexico’s demure Trump than the familiar firebrand who jetted to Arizona.

For many readers, the story looked like a significant misportrayal of events. Anyone coming to the Times site around 11 p.m., over an hour after Trump’s speech began, saw a story that seemed blind to the angry, aggressive rhetoric that Trump delivered to his voting base along the border.

Liam Burke of San Jose, Calif. was among them. “As others have no doubt mentioned, I was surprised to see the lede to this article,” he wrote. “This description of Trump’s speech seems simply false and diminishing of the extreme, off-kilter racist rhetoric he offered. As the paper of record, don’t you feel you have a responsibility to accurately represent the intensity of Trump’s rage and the danger he poses to American values?”

I can see why Burke and others are questioning the piece. They should be. After all, it seemed not to match the Trump they just saw on TV, even though the Times story was posted after the Arizona event.

Here’s the top of the piece:

Donald J. Trump made an audacious attempt on Wednesday to remake his image on the divisive issue of **immigration**, shelving his plan to deport 11 million undocumented people and suggesting that the United States and Mexico would solve the **immigration** crisis together.

In a spirited bid for undecided American voters to see him anew, Mr. Trump swept into Mexico City to make overtures to a nation he has repeatedly denigrated, then flew to Phoenix to outline his latest priorities on **immigration** — a stark turnaround from the “deportation force” and other severe tactics that helped win him the Republican nomination.

This 11 p.m. version made no mention of Trump’s invitation to have individuals join him onstage to share the names of relatives who they said were killed by illegal **immigrants**. Nor did it refer to Trump’s line that his enforcement priorities would include removing criminals, gang members, security threats, visa overstays and those relying on public welfare or straining the safety net, along with millions of recent illegal arrivals. That doesn’t sound like a stark turnaround from the old Trump.

Several prominent components of the coverage, including a live chat[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/31/us/politics/trump-immigration-speech-live.html?ref=politics] at the top of the homepage, were being quickly updated with the Arizona Trump.

But the main news story was not significantly updated until an hour later[http://newsdiffs.org/diff/1240899/1240928/www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html], around midnight. By then it captured the more aggressive Trump and delivered a more balanced portrayal of the day.

What happened? Why did the first version seem so off and why wasn’t The Times more transparent about the changes?

I asked Carolyn Ryan, The Times’s political editor, for an explanation. “Trump acted jarringly differently in Phoenix than he did in Mexico, and we scrambled to reflect that, without obscuring the fact that he was backing away from his policy to deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants**,” she said. “I think readers were eager to see the fiery language and belligerent tone in Phoenix reflected quickly in the story, especially if they had just watched his appearance, and I understand that.”

What that boils down to is: We were moving as fast as we could and the story changed on us.

The flaw in hanging this simply on tight deadlines and fast-changing facts is that many other major news sites managed to hit the mark.

Politico was up not long after the Times article with a piece[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/donald-trump-immigration-address-arizona-227612] that said Trump squashed any speculation that he might soften on **immigration**, “delivering a hawkish, hardline, and true-to-his-roots border platform and vowing that on Day One of his administration, the United States would launch a mammoth deportation program and begin construction of a wall.”

The Washington Post, also posting around the same time, had updated its article[https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-lands-in-mexico-for-last-minute-meeting-with-president-pena-nieto/2016/08/31/6e1a9f8c-6f8f-11e6-8533-6b0b0ded0253\_story.html] to say that hours after leaving Mexico Trump returned to his aggressive tenor on **immigration**, yelling at the crowd in Arizona and promising to subject illegals to deportation.

The Arizona Republic was up with a similar piece[http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/09/01/trump-rejects-moderation-goes-hard-line-immigration/89686144/].

Ryan maintains that The Times was on the news too. She said that there has been too much focus on this single piece. Her team, she said, primarily relies on both live discussions and concise briefings on breaking news, and indeed these features dominated the homepage Wednesday night.

“We aggressively update our coverage, minute by minute, through our live chat, which highlights and analyzes political events as they unfold, and our live briefing, which tells readers what they have missed,” she said. “Both are enormously popular with readers, and they have given us a flexible platform to drive real-time coverage in politics.”

Worthwhile point. But I’m not sure that a rolling discussion among staff members[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/31/us/politics/trump-immigration-speech-live.html?ref=politics] and a briefing roundup[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico.html] satisfies the needs of readers landing on the Times site wanting a clear sense of a confusing story. And if all the reporters on the live chat are up on the latest developments, why can’t some of that make it into the main news story?

Here’s my take. I see nothing nefarious or ill-intentioned on the part of any editors or reporters involved in the Trump piece. Everyone was scrambling with late-breaking news across time zones, many moving parts, and both print and web deadlines.

But given the complications of the story — an unpredictable candidate, brutal deadlines — it seems the newsroom was not in position to deliver a strong coverage package. None of the main political writers were on the scene in Mexico City or in Arizona and Patrick Healy, writer of the lead story, drew the short straw of producing both the version for the print edition and for the web. In this instance, Healy would have greatly benefited from being relieved of writing the print story in order to concentrate on the web. That might have given him some extra time to absorb the news in Phoenix and make sense of the changing rhetoric.

All of this may sound like tedious newsroom mechanics, but mistakes can have a genuine impact on The Times’s reputation among readers. In a climate where sinister motives are attached to every word and headline The Times produces, looking squarely at such episodes is a step worth taking.

Follow the public editor on Twitter @spaydl[https://twitter.com/spaydl] and reach her by email at public@nytimes.com[mailto:public@nytimes.com].

\* Donald Trump Gambles on **Immigration** but Sends Conflicting Signals[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html]

\* Highlights of Donald Trump’s **Immigration** Speech and Mexico Trip[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NOGALES, Ariz. — On an embankment that runs along a towering steel fence separating this border town from its Mexican sister city, a patch of new concrete with a date carved into it stands out, marking the exit of a tunnel Border Patrol agents sealed in May.

Dozens more like it snake around town, part of a vast underground network that Mexican drug cartels have used for years to funnel hundreds of pounds of illicit drugs into the United States. When Border Patrol agents find the tunnels, they dump concrete to seal them and stamp them with the date that they are shut down.

But they struggle to stay ahead of the digging. Last Friday, the Border Patrol, in a joint operation with Mexican authorities, discovered an unfinished tunnel that started in a Mexican cemetery.

“The clock is ticking as soon as they complete a tunnel,” said Kevin Hecht, a Border Patrol tunneling expert. “They know that we will eventually find them. But if even one load gets through before we find it, they consider it a success.”

While Donald J. Trump, the Republican presidential nominee, has made building a wall at the border a central element of his campaign, the fence here that reaches up to 30 feet has done little to deter enterprising drug smugglers. It has simply helped push[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/03/us/03tunnels.html] them underground[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/03/us/03tunnels.html].

Border Patrol agents cannot hear smugglers digging and do not know how many tunnels there are, a gap in border security that homeland security experts say renders talk of a wall moot.

“The Border Patrol has done an incredible job, given its resources,” said Gen. Barry R. McCaffrey, the White House drug policy director in the Clinton administration. “But it would be a stretch to say that the border and border communities are secure when the agency lacks a high-confidence ability to detect cross-border tunnels. No wall is going to fix that.”

During his **immigration** speech Wednesday in Arizona, Mr. Trump said his border security plan would use the best technology, including above- and below-ground sensors to “find and dislocate tunnels and keep out criminal cartels.”

But no technology exists to reliably detect the tunnels, and experts say it may be years before such a system is developed.

Since the first drug tunnel was discovered in 1990[http://www.nytimes.com/1990/05/19/us/agents-find-drug-tunnel-to-us.html] in Douglas, Ariz., border officials say they have found nearly 200 more along the nearly 2,000-mile Southwest border, mostly in Arizona and California. Tunnels are so numerous in the Nogales area that Border Patrol agents described the ground underneath the city as “Swiss cheese.”

Mr. Hecht said smugglers dig tunnels mostly into the drainage system shared by the two cities. Others are burrowed into the basements of homes on the American side from buildings in Mexico. One tunnel was dug under a heavily guarded port of entry.

Technological advances such as ground radar to detect movement, hundreds of high-tech cameras with night-vision lenses and drones flying overhead have drastically transformed border security. These tools have helped federal investigators track and arrest hundreds of smuggling suspects, and seize tons of marijuana, methamphetamines[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/methamphetamines/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier] and cocaine. Remote-controlled robots help agents explore tunnels that are too risky for humans to enter.

The American government has poured hundreds of millions of dollars into research in hopes of finding a way to detect tunnels, but most of these efforts have ended in disappointment. Most recently, the Science and Technology Directorate[https://www.dhs.gov/science-and-technology] of the Department of Homeland Security concluded that none of the current methods used to detect underground tunnels were “necessarily suited to Border Patrol agents’ operational needs.”

In the absence of technology to detect tunnels, Border Patrol officials have worked with Mexican authorities to develop informants and patrol the border, including water and sewerage infrastructure, looking for suspicious activity. About half of the Border Patrol agents here have been trained to work underground.

“But you don’t know what you don’t know,” said R. Gil Kerlikowske, the United States Customs and Border Protection commissioner, who conceded that many more tunnels might exist.

Part of the problem in detecting tunnels, say experts like Paul Bauman, a Canadian geophysicist, is the ground itself. Finding what is under the surface is not as simple as shooting radar or electromagnetic waves into the ground, he said.

With underground cracks, water tables, tree roots and caves, it is hard to tell what is and is not a tunnel, he said.

Mr. Bauman, who has worked with the Israel Defense Forces in their efforts to find tunnels, said most of the devices used for tunnel detection were developed for industries to find oil or mineral deposits, not drug tunnels.

Carey M. Rappaport, a professor of electrical and computer engineering at Northeastern University in Boston, said the depth of many tunnels also posed a technological challenge. Some can be as deep as 90 feet, beyond the reach of most ground-radar devices and sensors.

“Soil is very good at keeping secrets,” said Mr. Rappaport, who has also worked with the United States and Israeli governments on tunnel-detection methods.

In the 2016 defense authorization bill, Congress provided about $120 million for a joint Defense Department and Israel Defense Forces tunnel-detection project. Israel is among several nations, including Egypt, Jordan and South Korea, that have had major problems with hostile groups using tunnels to stage attacks. American officials hope the technology developed in Israel can aid efforts on the Mexican border.

A spokeswoman for the Israeli Defense Ministry declined to comment.

The Science and Technology Directorate at Homeland Security is also spending several million dollars a year to fund tunnel-detection research.

In San Diego, a task force of agents from **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, Homeland Security Investigations, the Border Patrol and the Drug Enforcement Administration has tried a variety of technologies to detect tunnels, much like their colleagues in Nogales have.

One of the tools is a ground-radar machine that looks like a large lawn mower. The device, which is intended to locate underground utility lines and flaws in road construction, shoots radar waves about 10 feet into the ground. A screen displays various shades that identify anomalies underground that could be tunnels.

But that is often not deep enough. “We’ve never found a tunnel using them,” said David Shaw, a special agent in charge of Homeland Security Investigations in San Diego.

Mr. Shaw said the task force relied mainly on old-fashioned law enforcement techniques, such as cultivating informants in cartels or getting business owners and residents to report suspicious activities.

That’s how the most recent tunnel in San Diego was discovered[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/22/us/drug-smuggling-tunnel-from-tijuana-mexico-found-in-san-diego.html?\_r=0] in April. Its exit was in a fenced-off area in the heavily industrial Otay Mesa warehouse district, about 500 yards from the border.

According to Wendi Lee, a Border Patrol agent, business owners across the street alerted the agency to what they said was suspicious activity. The tunnel, hidden under a trash bin, was about 800 yards long. The authorities seized about 2,200 pounds of cocaine and 14,000 pounds of marijuana. The tunnel was one of about a half-dozen discovered in the area in recent years.

“Smugglers keep digging them because the tunnels work,” Mr. Shaw said.

Still, some law enforcement officials say their efforts appear to be having an effect. Data from Homeland Security shows that fewer tunnels have been discovered in recent years.

However, Mr. Hecht of the Border Patrol in Nogales said the number of tunnels discovered should not be used to measure success.

“For every tunnel we find, we feel they’re building another one somewhere, and they might get more creative in concealing it,” he said. “Next year, I could find 10. Until there is some device on the market to help us accurately detect them, we just won’t know.”

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/nytpolitics], and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics/].

Follow Ron Nixon on Twitter @nixonron.

\* Donald Trump Gambles on **Immigration** but Sends Conflicting Signals[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html]

\* Artists Begin Building Trump’s Border Wall, Sending Mexico the Bill[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/09/arts/design/artists-begin-building-trumps-border-wall-sending-mexico-the-bill.html]

\* What Would It Take for Donald Trump to Deport 11 Million and Build a Wall?[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/20/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html]

\* Drug-Smuggling Tunnel, Found in San Diego, Is Longest Yet[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/22/us/drug-smuggling-tunnel-from-tijuana-mexico-found-in-san-diego.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On one side lie eggs scrambled with lox over a drape of injera, the sour, springy Ethiopian flatbread as thin and pliant as a crepe and perforated like coral. On the other side, challah French toast, its egg coating spiked with awaze, a meld of earthy-hot berbere and tej, or Ethiopian honey wine, a drink of millenniums past.

At Tsion Cafe in Harlem, breakfast is biography. Beejhy Barhany, the chef, was born in the Tigray region of northern Ethiopia, into a community of Beta Israel, as Ethiopian Jews are known. In 1980, when she was 3, her family and almost the entire population of her village fled on foot to Sudan, walking only at night to evade detection and resting on the Sabbath. The exodus took two months.

They hoped one day to reach the Holy Land, invoking Israel’s Law of Return, which welcomes those of Jewish heritage as **immigrants**. (According to one origin story, Ethiopian Jews are descended from King Solomon and Queen Sheba.) After three years, with help from the Israeli government, Ms. Barhany’s family was smuggled through Kenya and Uganda by Land Rover, then flown to France and, finally, Israel.

She spent four years on a kibbutz tilling the land, an experience that taught her to respect ingredients in their natural state. At Tsion, Ethiopian vegetable stews betray little tinkering beyond the near-melt of slow-cooked onions, garlic and ginger that gives body to every dish, and an occasional shot of berbere, a concatenation of 17 spices, the strongest among them cumin, cardamom and chile.

Collard greens, typically long-braised in clarified butter, arrive dark and intact, with more than just a memory of crunch. Beets are tender but firm; carrots and potatoes give way without losing coherence. All come in discrete heaps on a round of injera punctured by tiny eyes, or ain, the Amharic term for bubbles trapped in the dough.

Injera is made with teff, an ancient grain indigenous to Ethiopia, hardly the size of a poppy seed. Ms. Barhany adds a sift of wheat flour for suppleness and lets the batter ferment a week or more. (A teff-only version is available at an extra charge, to compensate for both the grain’s higher price and the testiness of the batter.)

The bread is soft and airy, if somewhat less assertive in tang than elsewhere in town. It proves a fine backdrop for less traditional dishes, like those scrambled eggs and smoked salmon (a salute to the city’s Jewish diaspora) or alongside fir-fir, onion and tomatoes simmered with crumbled injera, suggesting a cooked-down, concentrated panzanella.

With injera, you’re meant to tear off strips, for pinching mouthfuls of food. But malawach, a fried bread from Yemen with flaking layers, is a pleasure unto itself, equally fine in two incarnations: savory, accompanied by a daub of green awaze ignited by jalapeños; and sweet, filigreed in shredded coconut and honey. It’s no redundancy to order both.

Like many young Israelis, after serving in the army, Ms. Barhany went backpacking, climbing Machu Picchu in Peru and eating alfajores (dulce de leche sandwich cookies) in Argentina, which she recreates here. Eventually she settled in New York and, like many Jewish **immigrants** before her, found work in the diamond district.

She and her husband, Padmore John, a native of Dominica, opened Tsion in 2014 in the historic Harlem district of Sugar Hill, where they live. An angel watches over the door, just a head with wings, as in Ethiopian folk art, albeit with saucy cartoon eyes. The dining room is a long sweep, barely populated by tables, ending in a patch of sun-steeped garden.

Some nights live jazz lends the air muscle, as if channeling the 1930s and ’40s, when the basement space was an after-hours club called Jimmy’s Chicken Shack. Charlie Parker took a job washing dishes just so he could listen to Art Tatum tear up the piano. Later, Redd Foxx scrubbed pots while Malcolm X waited on tables, serving fried chicken and whiskey in coffee cups.

Sugar Hill is not quite Mount Zion. It is not even properly a hill. Nevertheless, the address partly inspired the restaurant’s name: to be a place on a mountain, Ms. Barhany explained, “where people can come nourish their body and their soul.”

Tsion Cafe

763 St. Nicholas Avenue (148th Street), Sugar Hill, Harlem; 212-234-2070; tsioncafe.com.

Recommended Malawach with green awaze or roasted coconut and honey; Ethiopian brunch combo with fir-fir and Addis eggs over injera; Ethiopian vegetable combo; challah French toast.

Drinks and Wine Beer and wine, including Ethiopian lager, merlot from the Rift Valley and tej (Ethiopian honey wine).

Prices $8 to $25.

Open Tuesday to Sunday for breakfast, lunch and dinner.

Reservations Accepted on nights when there is live music.

Wheelchair Access Entrance is down several steps. The restroom is spacious and has a handrail.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Following is a transcript of the remarks by Donald J. Trump on **immigration** in Phoenix[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] on Wednesday, as transcribed by the Federal News Service.

TRUMP: Wow. Thank you. That’s a lot of people, Phoenix, that’s a lot of people.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Phoenix. I am so glad to be back in Arizona.

(APPLAUSE)

The state that has a very, very special place in my heart. I love people of Arizona and together we are going to win the White House in November.

(APPLAUSE)

Now, you know this is where it all began for me. Remember that massive crowd also? So, I said let’s go and have some fun tonight. We’re going to Arizona, O.K.?

This will be a little bit different. This won’t be a rally speech, per se. Instead, I’m going to deliver a detailed policy address on one of the greatest challenges facing our country today, illegal **immigration**.

(APPLAUSE)

I’ve just landed having returned from a very important and special meeting with the president of Mexico, a man I like and respect very much. And a man who truly loves his country, Mexico.

And, by the way, just like I am a man who loves my country, the United States.

(APPLAUSE)

We agree on the importance of ending the illegal flow of drugs, cash, guns, and people across our border, and to put the cartels out of business.

(APPLAUSE)

We also discussed the great contributions of Mexican-American citizens to our two countries, my love for the people of Mexico, and the leadership and friendship between Mexico and the United States. It was a thoughtful and substantive conversation and it will go on for awhile. And, in the end we’re all going to win. Both countries, we’re all going to win.

This is the first of what I expect will be many, many conversations. And in a Trump administration we’re going to go about creating a new relationship between our two countries, but it’s going to be a fair relationship. We want fairness.

(APPLAUSE)

But to fix our **immigration** system, we must change our leadership in Washington and we must change it quickly. Sadly, sadly there is no other way. The truth is our **immigration** system is worse than anybody ever realized. But the facts aren’t known because the media won’t report on them. The politicians won’t talk about them and the special interests spend a lot of money trying to cover them up because they are making an absolute fortune. That’s the way it is.

Today, on a very complicated and very difficult subject, you will get the truth. The fundamental problem with the **immigration** system in our country is that it serves the needs of wealthy donors, political activists and powerful, powerful politicians. It’s all you can do. Thank you. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

Let me tell you who it does not serve. It does not serve you the American people. Doesn’t serve you. When politicians talk about **immigration** reform, they usually mean the following: amnesty, open borders, lower wages. **Immigration** reform should mean something else entirely. It should mean improvements to our laws and policies to make life better for American citizens.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you. But if we’re going to make our **immigration** system work, then we have to be prepared to talk honestly and without fear about these important and very sensitive issues. For instance, we have to listen to the concerns that working people, our forgotten working people, have over the record pace of **immigration** and it’s impact on their jobs, wages, housing, schools, tax bills and general living conditions.

These are valid concerns expressed by decent and patriotic citizens from all backgrounds, all over. We also have to be honest about the fact that not everyone who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully assimilate. Sometimes it’s just not going to work out. It’s our right, as a sovereign nation, to chose **immigrants** that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us.

(APPLAUSE)

Then there is the issue of security. Countless innocent American lives have been stolen because our politicians have failed in their duty to secure our borders and enforce our laws like they have to be enforced. I have met with many of the great parents who lost their children to sanctuary cities and open borders. So many people, so many, many people. So sad. They will be joining me on this stage in a little while and I look forward to introducing, these are amazing, amazing people.

Countless Americans who have died in recent years would be alive today if not for the open border policies of this administration and the administration that causes this horrible, horrible thought process, called Hillary Clinton.

(APPLAUSE)

This includes incredible Americans like 21-year-old Sarah Root. The man who killed her arrived at the border, entered federal custody and then was released into the U.S., think of it, into the U.S. community under the policies of the White House Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Weak, weak policies. Weak and foolish policies.

He was released again after the crime, and now he’s out there at large. Sarah had graduated from college with a 4.0, top student in her class one day before her death.

Also among the victims of the Obama-Clinton open-border policy was Grant Ronnebeck, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk and a really good guy from Mesa, Arizona. A lot of you have known about Grant.

He was murdered by an illegal **immigrant** gang member previously convicted of burglary, who had also been released from federal custody, and they knew it was going to happen again.

Another victim is Kate Steinle. Gunned down in the sanctuary city of San Francisco, by an illegal **immigrant**, deported five previous times. And they knew he was no good.

Then there is the case of 90-year-old Earl Olander, who was brutally beaten and left to bleed to death in his home, 90 years old and defenseless. The perpetrators were illegal **immigrants** with criminal records a mile long, who did not meet Obama administration standards for removal. And they knew it was going to happen.

In California, a 64-year-old Air Force veteran, a great woman, according to everybody that knew her, Marilyn Pharis, was sexually assaulted and beaten to death with a hammer. Her killer had been arrested on multiple occasions but was never, ever deported, despite the fact that everybody wanted him out.

A 2011 report from the Government Accountability Office found that illegal **immigrants** and other non-citizens, in our prisons and jails together, had around 25,000 homicide arrests to their names, 25,000.

On top of that, illegal **immigration** costs our country more than $113 billion a year. And this is what we get. For the money we are going to spend on illegal **immigration** over the next 10 years, we could provide one million at-risk students with a school voucher, which so many people are wanting.

While there are many illegal **immigrants** in our country who are good people, many, many, this doesn’t change the fact that most illegal **immigrants** are lower skilled workers with less education, who compete directly against vulnerable American workers, and that these illegal workers draw much more out from the system than they can ever possibly pay back.

And they’re hurting a lot of our people that cannot get jobs under any circumstances.

But these facts are never reported. Instead, the media and my opponent discuss one thing and only one thing, the needs of people living here illegally. In many cases, by the way, they’re treated better than our vets.

Not going to happen anymore, folks. November 8th. Not going to happen anymore.

(APPLAUSE)

AUDIENCE: Trump! Trump! Trump!

The truth is, the central issue is not the needs of the 11 million illegal **immigrants** or however many there may be — and honestly we’ve been hearing that number for years. It’s always 11 million. Our government has no idea. It could be three million. It could be 30 million. They have no idea what the number is.

Frankly our government has no idea what they’re doing on many, many fronts, folks.

(APPLAUSE)

But whatever the number, that’s never really been the central issue. It will never be a central issue. It doesn’t matter from that standpoint. Anyone who tells you that the core issue is the needs of those living here illegally has simply spent too much time in Washington.

(APPLAUSE)

Only the out of touch media elites think the biggest problems facing America — you know this, this is what they talk about, facing American society today is that there are 11 million illegal **immigrants** who don’t have legal status. And, they also think the biggest thing, and you know this, it’s not nuclear, and it’s not ISIS, it’s not Russia, it’s not China, it’s global warming.

To all the politicians, donors, and special interests, hear these words from me and all of you today. There is only one core issue in the **immigration** debate, and that issue is the well being of the American people.

(APPLAUSE)

Nothing even comes a close second. Hillary Clinton, for instance, talks constantly about her fears that families will be separated, but she’s not talking about the American families who have been permanently separated from their loved ones because of a preventable homicide, because of a preventable death, because of murder.

No, she’s only talking about families who come here in violation of the law. We will treat everyone living or residing in our country with great dignity. So important.

We will be fair, just, and compassionate to all, but our greatest compassion must be for our American citizens.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you.

President Obama and Hillary Clinton have engaged in gross dereliction of duty by surrendering the safety of the American people to open borders, and you know it better than anybody right here in Arizona. You know it.

President Obama and Hillary Clinton support sanctuary cities. They support catch and release on the border. They support visa overstays. They support the release of dangerous, dangerous, dangerous, criminals from detention. And they support unconstitutional executive amnesty.

Hillary Clinton has pledged amnesty in her first 100 days, and her plan will provide Obamacare, Social Security, and Medicare for illegal **immigrants**, breaking the federal budget.

On top of that she promises uncontrolled, low-skilled **immigration** that continues to reduce jobs and wages for American workers, and especially for African-American and Hispanic workers within our country. Our citizens.

Most incredibly, because to me this is unbelievable, we have no idea who these people are, where they come from. I always say Trojan horse. Watch what’s going to happen, folks. It’s not going to be pretty.

This includes her plan to bring in 620,000 new refugees from Syria and that region over a short period of time. And even yesterday, when you were watching the news, you saw thousands and thousands of people coming in from Syria. What is wrong with our politicians, our leaders if we can call them that. What the hell are we doing?

(APPLAUSE)

Hard to believe. Hard to believe. Now that you’ve heard about Hillary Clinton’s plan, about which she has not answered a single question, let me tell you about my plan. And do you notice...

(APPLAUSE)

And do you notice all the time for weeks and weeks of debating my plan, debating, talking about it, what about this, what about that. They never even mentioned her plan on **immigration** because she doesn’t want to get into the quagmire. It’s a tough one, she doesn’t know what she’s doing except open borders and let everybody come in and destroy our country by the way.

(APPLAUSE)

While Hillary Clinton meets only with donors and lobbyists, my plan was crafted with the input from Federal **Immigration** offices, very great people. Among the top **immigration** experts anywhere in this country, who represent workers, not corporations, very important to us.

I also worked with lawmakers, who’ve led on this issue on behalf of American citizens for many years. And most importantly I’ve met with the people directly impacted by these policies. So important.

Number one, are you ready? Are you ready?

(APPLAUSE)

We will build a great wall along the southern border.

(APPLAUSE)

AUDIENCE: Build the wall! Build the wall! Build the wall!

And Mexico will pay for the wall.

(APPLAUSE)

One hundred percent. They don’t know it yet, but they’re going to pay for it. And they’re great people and great leaders but they’re going to pay for the wall.

On day one, we will begin working on an impenetrable, physical, tall, power, beautiful southern border wall.

(APPLAUSE)

We will use the best technology, including above and below ground sensors that’s the tunnels. Remember that, above and below.

(APPLAUSE)

Above and below ground sensors. Towers, aerial surveillance and manpower to supplement the wall, find and dislocate tunnels and keep out criminal cartels and Mexico you know that, will work with us. I really believe it. Mexico will work with us. I absolutely believe it. And especially after meeting with their wonderful, wonderful president today. I really believe they want to solve this problem along with us, and I’m sure they will.

(APPLAUSE)

Number two, we are going to end catch and release. We catch them, oh go ahead. We catch them, go ahead.

(APPLAUSE)

Under my administration, anyone who illegally crosses the border will be detained until they are removed out of our country and back to the country from which they came.

(APPLAUSE)

And they’ll be brought great distances. We’re not dropping them right across. They learned that. President Eisenhower. They’d drop them across, right across, and they’d come back. And across.

Then when they flew them to a long distance, all of a sudden that was the end. We will take them great distances. But we will take them to the country where they came from, O.K.?

Number three. Number three, this is the one, I think it’s so great. It’s hard to believe, people don’t even talk about it. Zero tolerance for criminal **aliens**. Zero. Zero.

(APPLAUSE)

Zero. They don’t come in here. They don’t come in here.

According to federal data, there are at least two million, two million, think of it, criminal **aliens** now inside of our country, two million people criminal **aliens**. We will begin moving them out day one. As soon as I take office. Day one. In joint operation with local, state, and federal law enforcement.

Now, just so you understand, the police, who we all respect — say hello to the police. Boy, they don’t get the credit they deserve. I can tell you. They’re great people. But the police and law enforcement, they know who these people are.

They live with these people. They get mocked by these people. They can’t do anything about these people, and they want to. They know who these people are. Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone.

(APPLAUSE)

And you can call it deported if you want. The press doesn’t like that term. You can call it whatever the hell you want. They’re gone.

Beyond the two million, and there are vast numbers of additional criminal illegal **immigrants** who have fled, but their days have run out in this country. The crime will stop. They’re going to be gone. It will be over.

(APPLAUSE)

They’re going out. They’re going out fast.

Moving forward. We will issue detainers for illegal **immigrants** who are arrested for any crime whatsoever, and they will be placed into immediate removal proceedings if we even have to do that.

We will terminate the Obama administration’s deadly, and it is deadly, non-enforcement policies that allow thousands of criminal **aliens** to freely roam our streets, walk around, do whatever they want to do, crime all over the place.

That’s over. That’s over, folks. That’s over.

Since 2013 alone, the Obama administration has allowed 300,000 criminal **aliens** to return back into United States communities. These are individuals encountered or identified by ICE, but who were not detained or processed for deportation because it wouldn’t have been politically correct.

My plan also includes cooperating closely with local jurisdictions to remove criminal **aliens** immediately. We will restore the highly successful Secure Communities Program. Good program. We will expand and revitalize the popular 287(g) partnerships, which will help to identify hundreds of thousands of deportable **aliens** in local jails that we don’t even know about.

Both of these programs have been recklessly gutted by this administration. And those were programs that worked.

This is yet one more area where we are headed in a totally opposite direction. There’s no common sense, there’s no brain power in our administration by our leader, or our leaders. None, none, none.

On my first day in office I am also going to ask Congress to pass Kate’s Law, named for Kate Steinle...

(APPLAUSE)

... to ensure that criminal **aliens** convicted of illegal reentry receive strong mandatory minimum sentences. Strong.

(APPLAUSE)

And then we get them out.

Another reform I’m proposing is the passage of legislation named for Detective Michael Davis and Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver, two law enforcement officers recently killed by a previously deported illegal **immigrant**.

The Davis-Oliver bill will enhance cooperation with state and local authorities to ensure that criminal **immigrants** and terrorists are swiftly, really swiftly, identified and removed. And they will go face, believe me. They’re going to go.

We’re going to triple the number of ICE deportation officers.

(APPLAUSE)

Within ICE I am going to create a new special deportation task force focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants** in America who have evaded justice just like Hillary Clinton has evaded justice, O.K.?

(APPLAUSE)

Maybe they’ll be able to deport her.

(APPLAUSE)

The local police who know every one of these criminals, and they know each and every one by name, by crime, where they live, they will work so fast. And our local police will be so happy that they don’t have to be abused by these thugs anymore.

There’s no great mystery to it, they’ve put up with it for years, and now finally we will turn the tables and law enforcement and our police will be allowed to clear up this dangerous and threatening mess.

We’re also going to hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents.

(APPLAUSE)

Who gave me their endorsement, 16,500 gave me their endorsement.

And put more of them on the border instead of behind desks which is good. We will expand the number of border patrol stations significantly.

I’ve had a chance to spend time with these incredible law enforcement officers, and I want to take a moment to thank them. What they do is incredible.

(APPLAUSE)

And getting their endorsement means so much to me. More to me really than I can say. Means so much. First time they’ve ever endorsed a presidential candidate.

Number four, block funding for sanctuary cities. We block the funding. No more funds.

(APPLAUSE)

We will end the sanctuary cities that have resulted in so many needless deaths. Cities that refuse to cooperate with federal authorities will not receive taxpayer dollars, and we will work with Congress to pass legislation to protect those jurisdictions that do assist federal authorities. Number five, cancel unconstitutional executive orders and enforce all **immigration** laws.

(APPLAUSE)

We will immediately terminate President Obama’s two illegal executive amnesties in which he defied federal law and the Constitution to give amnesty to approximately five million illegal **immigrants**, five million.

(BOOING)

And how about all the millions that are waiting on line, going through the process legally? So unfair.

Hillary Clinton has pledged to keep both of these illegal amnesty programs, including the 2014 amnesty which has been blocked by the United States Supreme Court. Great.

Clinton has also pledged to add a third executive amnesty. And by the way, folks, she will be a disaster for our country, a disaster in so many other ways.

And don’t forget the Supreme Court of the United States. Don’t forget that when you go to vote on November 8. And don’t forget your Second Amendment. And don’t forget the repeal and replacement of Obamacare.

(APPLAUSE)

And don’t forget building up our depleted military. And don’t forget taking care of our vets. Don’t forget our vets. They have been forgotten.

(APPLAUSE)

Clinton’s plan would trigger a constitutional crisis unlike almost anything we have ever seen before. In effect, she would be abolishing the lawmaking powers of Congress in order to write her own laws from the Oval Office. And you see what bad judgment she has. She has seriously bad judgment.

(BOOING)

Can you imagine? In a Trump administration all **immigration** laws will be enforced, will be enforced. As with any law enforcement activity, we will set priorities. But unlike this administration, no one will be immune or exempt from enforcement. And ICE and Border Patrol officers will be allowed to do their jobs the way their jobs are supposed to be done.

(APPLAUSE)

Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation. That is what it means to have laws and to have a country. Otherwise we don’t have a country.

Our enforcement priorities will include removing criminals, gang members, security threats, visa overstays, public charges. That is those relying on public welfare or straining the safety net along with millions of recent illegal arrivals and overstays who’ve come here under this current corrupt administration.

(APPLAUSE)

Number six, we are going to suspend the issuance of visas to any place where adequate screening cannot occur.

(APPLAUSE)

According to data provided by the Senate Subcommittee on **Immigration**, and the national interest between 9/11 and the end of 2014, at least 380 foreign born individuals were convicted in terror cases inside the United States. And even right now the largest number of people are under investigation for exactly this that we’ve ever had in the history of our country.

Our country is a mess. We don’t even know what to look for anymore, folks. Our country has to straighten out. And we have to straighten out fast.

The number is likely higher. But the administration refuses to provide this information, even to Congress. As soon as I enter office I am going to ask the Department of State, which has been brutalized by Hillary Clinton, brutalized.

(BOOING)

Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to begin a comprehensive review of these cases in order to develop a list of regions and countries from which **immigration** must be suspended until proven and effective vetting mechanisms can be put in place.

I call it extreme vetting right? Extreme vetting. I want extreme. It’s going to be so tough, and if somebody comes in that’s fine but they’re going to be good. It’s extreme.

And if people don’t like it, we’ve got have a country folks. Got to have a country. Countries in which **immigration** will be suspended would include places like Syria and Libya. And we are going to stop the tens of thousands of people coming in from Syria. We have no idea who they are, where they come from. There’s no documentation. There’s no paperwork. It’s going to end badly folks. It’s going to end very, very badly.

For the price of resettling one refugee in the United States, 12 could be resettled in a safe zone in their home region. Which I agree with 100 percent. We have to build safe zones and we’ll get the money from Gulf states. We don’t want to put up the money. We owe almost $20 trillion. Doubled since Obama took office, our national debt.

But we will get the money from Gulf states and others. We’ll supervise it. We’ll build safe zones which is something that I think all of us want to see.

Another reform involves new screening tests for all applicants that include, and this is so important, especially if you get the right people. And we will get the right people. An ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you. We’re very proud of our country. Aren’t we? Really? With all it’s going through, we’re very proud of our country. For instance, in the last five years, we’ve admitted nearly 100,000 **immigrants** from Iraq and Afghanistan. And these two countries according to Pew Research, a majority of residents say that the barbaric practice of honor killings against women are often or sometimes justified. That’s what they say.

(APPLAUSE)

That’s what they say. They’re justified. Right? And we’re admitting them to our country. Applicants will be asked their views about honor killings, about respect for women and gays and minorities. Attitudes on radical Islam, which our president refuses to say and many other topics as part of this vetting procedure. And if we have the right people doing it, believe me, very, very few will slip through the cracks. Hopefully, none.

(APPLAUSE)

Number seven, we will insure that other countries take their people back when they order them deported.

(APPLAUSE)

There are at least 23 countries that refuse to take their people back after they’ve been ordered to leave the United States. Including large numbers of violent criminals, they won’t take them back. So we say, O.K., we’ll keep them. Not going to happen with me, not going to happen with me.

(APPLAUSE)

Due to a Supreme Court decision, if these violent offenders cannot be sent home, our law enforcement officers have to release them into your communities.

(APPLAUSE)

And by the way, the results are horrific, horrific. There are often terrible consequences, such as Casey Chadwick’s tragic death in Connecticut just last year. Yet despite the existence of a law that commands the secretary of state to stop issuing visas to these countries.

Secretary Hillary Clinton ignored this law and refused to use this powerful tool to bring nations into compliance. And, they would comply if we would act properly.

In other words, if we had leaders that knew what they were doing, which we don’t.

The result of her misconduct was the release of thousands and thousands of dangerous criminal **aliens** who should have been sent home to their countries. Instead we have them all over the place. Probably a couple in this room as a matter of fact, but I hope not.

According to a report for the Boston Globe from the year 2008 to 2014 nearly 13,000 criminal **aliens** were released back into U.S. communities because their home countries would not, under any circumstances, take them back. Hard to believe with the power we have. Hard to believe.

We’re like the big bully that keeps getting beat up. You ever see that? The big bully that keeps getting beat up.

These 13,000 releases occurred on Hillary Clinton’s watch. She had the power and the duty to stop it cold, and she decided she would not do it.

(BOOING)

And Arizona knows better than most exactly what I’m talking about.

(APPLAUSE)

Those released include individuals convicted of killings, sexual assaults, and some of the most heinous crimes imaginable.

The Boston Globe writes that a Globe review of 323 criminals released in New England from 2008 to 2012 found that as many as 30 percent committed new offenses, including rape, attempted murder, and child molestation. We take them, we take them.

(BOOING)

Number eight, we will finally complete the biometric entry-exit visa tracking system which we need desperately.

(APPLAUSE)

For years Congress has required biometric entry-exit visa tracking systems, but it has never been completed. The politicians are all talk, no action, never happens. Never happens.

Hillary Clinton, all talk. Unfortunately when there is action it’s always the wrong decision. You ever notice?

In my administration we will ensure that this system is in place. And, I will tell you, it will be on land, it will be on sea, it will be in air. We will have a proper tracking system.

Approximately half of new illegal **immigrants** came on temporary visas and then never, ever left. Why should they? Nobody’s telling them to leave. Stay as long as you want, we’ll take care of you.

Beyond violating our laws, visa overstays pose — and they really are a big problem — pose a substantial threat to national security. The 9/11 Commission said that this tracking system should be a high priority and would have assisted law enforcement and intelligence officials in August and September 2001 in conducting a search for two of the 9/11 hijackers that were in the United States on expired visas.

And you know what that would have meant, what that could have meant. Wouldn’t that have been wonderful, right? What that could have meant.

Last year alone nearly half a million individuals overstayed their temporary visas. Removing these overstays will be a top priority of my administration.

(APPLAUSE)

If people around the world believe they can just come on a temporary visa and never, ever leave, the Obama-Clinton policy, that’s what it is, then we have a completely open border, and we no longer have a country.

We must send a message that visa expiration dates will be strongly enforced.

Number nine, we will turn off the jobs and benefits magnet.

(APPLAUSE)

We will ensure that E-Verify is used to the fullest extent possible under existing law, and we will work with Congress to strengthen and expand its use across the country.

**Immigration** law doesn’t exist for the purpose of keeping criminals out. It exists to protect all aspects of American life. The work site, the welfare office, the education system, and everything else.

That is why **immigration** limits are established in the first place. If we only enforced the laws against crime, then we have an open border to the entire world. We will enforce all of our **immigration** laws.

(APPLAUSE)

And the same goes for government benefits. The Center for **Immigration** Studies estimates that 62 percent of households headed by illegal **immigrants** use some form of cash or non-cash welfare programs like food stamps or housing assistance.

Tremendous costs, by the way, to our country. Tremendous costs. This directly violates the federal public charge law designed to protect the United States Treasury. Those who abuse our welfare system will be priorities for immediate removal.

(APPLAUSE)

Number 10, we will reform legal **immigration** to serve the best interests of America and its workers, the forgotten people. Workers. We’re going to take care of our workers.

And by the way, and by the way, we’re going to make great trade deals. We’re going to renegotiate trade deals. We’re going to bring our jobs back home. We’re going to bring our jobs back home.

We have the most incompetently worked trade deals ever negotiated probably in the history of the world, and that starts with Nafta. And now they want to go TPP, one of the great disasters.

We’re going to bring our jobs back home. And if companies want to leave Arizona and if they want to leave other states, there’s going to be a lot of trouble for them. It’s not going to be so easy. There will be consequence. Remember that. There will be consequence. They’re not going to be leaving, go to another country, make the product, sell it into the United States, and all we end up with is no taxes and total unemployment. It’s not going to happen. There will be consequences.

(APPLAUSE)

We’ve admitted 59 million **immigrants** to the United States between 1965 and 2015. Many of these arrivals have greatly enriched our country. So true. But we now have an obligation to them and to their children to control future **immigration** as we are following, if you think, previous **immigration** waves.

We’ve had some big waves. And tremendously positive things have happened. Incredible things have happened. To ensure assimilation we want to ensure that it works. Assimilation, an important word. Integration and upward mobility.

(APPLAUSE)

Within just a few years **immigration** as a share of national population is set to break all historical records. The time has come for a new **immigration**commission to develop a new set of reforms to our legal **immigration** system in order to achieve the following goals.

To keep **immigration** levels measured by population share within historical norms. To select **immigrants** based on their likelihood of success in U.S. society and their ability to be financially self- sufficient.

(APPLAUSE)

We take anybody. Come on in, anybody. Just come on in. Not anymore.

You know, folks, it’s called a two-way street. It is a two-way street, right? We need a system that serves our needs, not the needs of others. Remember, under a Trump administration it’s called America first. Remember that.

(APPLAUSE)

To choose **immigrants** based on merit. Merit, skill, and proficiency. Doesn’t that sound nice? And to establish new **immigration** controls to boost wages and to ensure that open jobs are offered to American workers first. And that in particular African-American and Latino workers who are being shut out in this process so unfairly.

(APPLAUSE)

And Hillary Clinton is going to do nothing for the African-American worker, the Latino worker. She’s going to do nothing. Give me your vote, she says, on November 8th. And then she’ll say, so long, see you in four years. That’s what it is.

She is going to do nothing. And just look at the past. She’s done nothing. She’s been there for 35 years. She’s done nothing. And I say what do you have to lose? Choose me. Watch how good we’re going to do together. Watch.

(APPLAUSE)

You watch. We want people to come into our country, but they have to come into our country legally and properly vetted, and in a manner that serves the national interest. We’ve been living under outdated **immigration** rules from decades ago. They’re decades and decades old.

To avoid this happening in the future, I believe we should sunset our visa laws so that Congress is forced to periodically revise and revisit them to bring them up to date. They’re archaic. They’re ancient. We wouldn’t put our entire federal budget on auto pilot for decades, so why should we do the same for the very, very complex subject of **immigration**?

So let’s now talk about the big picture. These 10 steps, if rigorously followed and enforced, will accomplish more in a matter of months than our politicians have accomplished on this issue in the last 50 years. It’s going to happen, folks. Because I am proudly not a politician, because I am not behold to any special interest, I’ve spent a lot of money on my campaign, I’ll tell you. I write those checks. Nobody owns Trump.

I will get this done for you and for your family. We’ll do it right. You’ll be proud of our country again. We’ll do it right. We will accomplish all of the steps outlined above. And, when we do, peace and law and justice and prosperity will prevail. Crime will go down. Border crossings will plummet. Gangs will disappear.

And the gangs are all over the place. And welfare use will decrease. We will have a peace dividend to spend on rebuilding America, beginning with our American inner cities. We’re going to rebuild them, for once and for all.

For those here illegally today, who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and one route only. To return home and apply for reentry like everybody else, under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined above. Those who have left to seek entry —

Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you. Those who have left to seek entry under this new system — and it will be an efficient system — will not be awarded surplus visas, but will have to apply for entry under the **immigration** caps or limits that will be established in the future.TRUMP: We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. We will break the cycle. There will be no amnesty.

(APPLAUSE)

Our message to the world will be this. You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country. Can’t do it.

(APPLAUSE)

This declaration alone will help stop the crisis of illegal crossings and illegal overstays, very importantly. People will know that you can’t just smuggle in, hunker down and wait to be legalized. It’s not going to work that way. Those days are over.

(APPLAUSE)

Importantly, in several years when we have accomplished all of our enforcement and deportation goals and truly ended illegal **immigration** for good, including the construction of a great wall, which we will have built in record time. And at a reasonable cost, which you never hear from the government.

(APPLAUSE)

And the establishment of our new lawful **immigration** system then and only then will we be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain.

That discussion can take place only in an atmosphere in which illegal **immigration** is a memory of the past, no longer with us, allowing us to weigh the different options available based on the new circumstances at the time.

(APPLAUSE)

Right now, however, we’re in the middle of a jobs crisis, a border crisis and a terrorism crisis like never before. All energies of the federal government and the legislative process must now be focused on **immigration** security. That is the only conversation we should be having at this time, **immigration** security. Cut it off.

Whether it’s dangerous materials being smuggled across the border, terrorists entering on visas or Americans losing their jobs to foreign workers, these are the problems we must now focus on fixing. And the media needs to begin demanding to hear Hillary Clinton’s answer on how her policies will affect Americans and their security.

(APPLAUSE)

These are matters of life and death for our country and its people, and we deserve answers from Hillary Clinton. And do you notice, she doesn’t answer.

She didn’t go to Louisiana. She didn’t go to Mexico. She was invited.

She doesn’t have the strength or the stamina to make America great again. Believe me.

(APPLAUSE)

What we do know, despite the lack of media curiosity, is that Hillary Clinton promises a radical amnesty combined with a radical reduction in **immigration**enforcement. Just ask the Border Patrol about Hillary Clinton. You won’t like what you’re hearing.

The result will be millions more illegal **immigrants**; thousands of more violent, horrible crimes; and total chaos and lawlessness. That’s what’s going to happen, as sure as you’re standing there.

This election, and I believe this, is our last chance to secure the border, stop illegal **immigration** and reform our laws to make your life better. I really believe this is it. This is our last time. November 8. November 8. You got to get out and vote on November 8.

(APPLAUSE)

It’s our last chance. It’s our last chance. And that includes Supreme Court justices and Second Amendment. Remember that. So I want to remind everyone what we’re fighting for and who we are fighting for.

I am going to ask — these are really special people that I’ve gotten to know. I’m going to ask all of the “Angel Moms” to come join me on the stage right now.

These are amazing women.

(APPLAUSE)

These are amazing people.

(APPLAUSE)

AUDIENCE: USA! USA! USA!

I’ve become friends with so many. But Jamiel Shaw, incredible guy, lost his son so violently. Say just a few words about your child.

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): My son Ronald da Silva (ph) was murdered April 27, 2002 by an illegal **alien** who had been previously deported. And what so — makes me so outrageous is that we came here legally.

Thank you, Mr. Trump. I totally support you. You have my vote.

TRUMP: Thank you, thank you.

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): God bless you.

(APPLAUSE)

TRUMP: You know what? Name your child and come right by. Go ahead.

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): Laura Wilkerson. And my son was Joshua Wilkerson. He was murdered by an illegal in 2010. And I personally support Mr. Trump for our next president.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): My name is Ruth Johnston Martin (ph). My husband was shot by an illegal **alien**. He fought the good fight but he took his last breath in 2002. And I support this man who’s going to change this country for the better. God bless you.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): My name Maureen Maloney (ph), and our son Matthew Denise (ph) was 23 years old when he was dragged a quarter of a mile to his death by an illegal **alien**, while horrified witnesses were banging on the truck trying to stop him.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): Our son Matthew Denise, if Donald Trump were president in 2011, our son Matthew Denise and other Americans would be alive today.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): Thank you. My name is Kathy Woods (ph). My son Steve (ph), a high school senior, 17 years old, went to the beach after a high school football game. A local gang came along, nine members. The cars were battered to — like war in Beirut. And all I can say is they murdered him and if Mr. Trump had been in office then the border would have been secure and our children would not be dead today.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): Hi. My name is Brenda Sparks (ph), and my son is named Eric Zapeda (ph). He was raised by a legal **immigrant** from Honduras only to be murdered by an illegal in 2011. His murderer never did a second in handcuffs or jail. Got away with killing an American. So I’m voting for trump. And by the way, so is my mother.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): My name is Dee Angle (ph). My cousin Rebecca Ann Johnston (ph), known as Becky, was murdered on January the 1st, 1989 in North Little Rock, Arkansas. Thank you. And if you don’t vote Trump, we won’t have a country. Trump all the way.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): I’m Shannon Estes (ph). And my daughter Shaley Estes (ph), 22 years old, was murdered here in Phoenix last July 24 by a Russian who overstayed his visa. And vote Trump.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): I’m Mary Ann Mendoza, the mother of Sergeant Brandon Mendoza, who was killed in a violent head-on collision in Mesa.

Thank you.

I want to thank Phoenix for the support you’ve always given me, and I want to tell you what. I’m supporting the man who will — who is the only man who is going to save our country, and what we our going to be leaving our children.

(APPLAUSE)

(SPEAKER’S VOICE): I’m Steve Ronnebeck, father of Grant Ronnebeck, 21 years old. Killed January 22, 2015 by an illegal **immigrant** who shot him in the face. I truly believe that Mr. Trump is going to change things. He’s going to fight for my family, and he’s going to fight for America.

(APPLAUSE)

TRUMP: These are amazing people, and I am not asking for their endorsement, believe me that. I just think I’ve gotten to know so many of them, and many more, from our group. But they are incredible people and what they’re going through is incredible, and there’s just no reason for it. Let’s give them a really tremendous hand.

(APPLAUSE)

That’s tough stuff, I will tell you. That is tough stuff. Incredible people.

So, now is the time for these voices to be heard. Now is the time for the media to begin asking questions on their behalf. Now is the time for all of us as one country, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative to band together to deliver justice, and safety, and security for all Americans.

Let’s fix this horrible, horrible, problem. It can be fixed quickly. Let’s our secure our border.

(APPLAUSE)

Let’s stop the drugs and the crime from pouring into our country. Let’s protect our social security and Medicare. Let’s get unemployed Americans off the welfare and back to work in their own country.

This has been an incredible evening. We’re going to remember this evening. November 8, we have to get everybody. This is such an important state. November 8 we have to get everybody to go out and vote.

We’re going to bring — thank you, thank you. We’re going to take our country back, folks. This is a movement. We’re going to take our country back.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you.

This is an incredible movement. The world is talking about it. The world is talking about it and by the way, if you haven’t been looking to what’s been happening at the polls over the last three or four days I think you should start looking. You should start looking.

(APPLAUSE)

Together we can save American lives, American jobs, and American futures. Together we can save America itself. Join me in this mission, we’re going to make America great again.

Thank you. I love you. God bless you, everybody. God bless you. God bless you, thank you.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It’s probably just a piece of cosmic spam, the astrophysical equivalent of butt dialing. But nobody really knows for sure.

The attention of the world’s astronomers has been riveted these last few days on a star in the constellation Hercules, wondering if the end of humanity’s cosmic loneliness was finally at hand.

It was from that spot in Hercules that a team of Russian radio astronomers recorded a two-second burst of radio waves last year on May 15. But the Russians did not follow the usual protocol of alerting other observatories that could confirm the signal, and as a result nobody else knew about the pulse until a few days ago.

That putative signal had the potential to be the fantasied “Hi there,” from another world that practitioners of the field known as SETI, the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, have been looking for over the last century. Or it could simply be a false alarm from terrestrial interference, a secret military transmission or some rare astrophysical misunderstanding.

Astronomers already knew there was at least one planet, about 17 times the mass of Earth, circling that star, which is 94 light years from here and goes by the unheroic designation of HD164595.

But there were also problems, the Russians, led by Alexander Panov of Lomonosov Moscow State University, realized. The signal appeared only once in 39 observations, and to produce the observed signal at such a distance would take a transmitter with the power of at least a trillion watts, comparable to the total energy consumption of all humankind.

Moreover, the design of the Russian telescope, known as Ratan-600, a giant circle of antennas in the Caucasus near Georgia, leaves it susceptible, astronomers say, to radiation from unwanted directions, increasing the chances of interference from military or other terrestrial sources.

Word finally got out a few days ago. Claudio Maccone, a member of the team and chairman of the SETI committee of the International Academy of Astronautics, circulated a description of the observations in advance of a SETI meeting to be held on Sept. 27 in Guadalajara, Mexico. While the report did not claim that this was an **alien** detection, it did say, “Permanent monitoring of this target is needed.”

In an email on Aug. 29, Dr. Maccone said he agreed. “I certainly share the view that it is likely not an intelligent signal,” he said. “Nevertheless it had to be PUBLISHED, rather than being kept secret for over a year, and this is what I did: convince the Russians to publish it.”

After the astronomy writer Paul Gilster reported it on his blog Centauri Dreams[http://www.centauri-dreams.org/], the signal went supernova on the internet.

But so far the results have been zilch. Starting on the evening of Aug. 28, astronomers from the SETI Institute of Mountain View, Calif., swung into action with the Allen Telescope Array[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/06/science/space/astronomers-resume-search-for-evidence-of-life-out-there.html], a set of antennas in Hat Creek, Calif., built specifically to look for **alien** broadcasts.

After two nights of observing, Seth Shostak, spokesman for the institute reported, “We covered the frequencies observed by the Russians and more … No dice.”

Meanwhile astronomers from Breakthrough Listen, a new SETI project funded by the Russian philanthropist and entrepreneur Yuri Milner, used the Green Bank Telescope, in Green Bank, W.Va., the world’s largest steerable radio dish, to check out the star. They found nothing but noise.

Indeed, according to Tass, the Russian news agency, the researchers had also concluded that their signal was a result of terrestrial interference. The observatory, the researcher Yulia Sotnikova said, was preparing an official disclaimer of any media claims of extraterrestrial contact.

Everybody plans to keep looking, but for now the Hercules signal seems destined to join the other false alarms that have characterized the SETI endeavor, most notably the “wow” signal that appeared on the printout of an Ohio State radio telescope in 1977 but never reappeared.

As Dr. Maccone said: “There were similar cases in the past, and probably there will be more in the future. The point is to PUBLISH everything and EXCHANGE DATA worldwide about the stars where they come from.”

Astronomers have been trying to tune in E.T. ever since Frank Drake, now at the University of California, Santa Cruz, aimed an antenna in 1960 at a pair of stars and thought he heard a signal — the first false alarm.

But nothing has been able to discourage astronomers from a notion that is as powerful and simple as a poem: Radio signals can bridge the gulfs between stars more cheaply than spacecraft, allowing distant species to communicate by a sort of cosmic ham radio or galactic internet.

There are more than 100 billion stars in the Milky Way and some nine billion radio channels on which to listen — a “cosmic haystack” in the vernacular, of which only a minuscule fraction has been sampled to date.

There is a lively and rich literature on what channels **aliens** might use and what kind of signals they might send, and an equally rich literature on why we haven’t seen any evidence of them[http://www.nytimes.com/2003/11/11/science/where-are-those-aliens.html] (outside of the racks in supermarkets).

Among the possible answers is that we are under quarantine, or that technological species kill themselves off[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/04/science/space/the-flip-side-of-optimism-about-life-on-other-planets.html] before they get to the stage of reaching out.

Or perhaps that we simply don’t have any idea what we are looking for. We know of only one example of life and intelligence in the universe, Jill Tarter[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/19/science/seti-research-head-retires-after-long-search-for-alien-life.html] of the SETI Institute once told me. That is of course our own biosphere.

“In this field,” she said, “number two is the all-important number. We count one, two, infinity. We’re all looking for number two.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX — He had heard about Donald J. Trump’s trip here on the news the night before and wondered: What if I could meet him? José Enrique Camacho had so much to tell Mr. Trump, but, “if I could say only one thing,” he said, “I’d tell him about how proud I am that my children, my family, are part of this country.”

Mr. Camacho, 50, is a groundskeeper in one of the rental apartment buildings that dot the downtown skyline here, even though he has no legal papers allowing him to live or work in the United States. He ended his shift at 4 p.m. on Wednesday and, instead of waiting for his ride to take him home, he walked seven blocks south to the Phoenix Convention Center, where Mr. Trump would soon deliver a speech[http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/2016/08/31/watch-live-donald-trump-gives-speech-immigration/89665208/] on **immigration**.

Like millions of others in this country illegally, Mr. Camacho worries about Mr. Trump’s call to deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants**.

“I don’t drink. I don’t steal. I go to church on Sundays,” Mr. Camacho said. “I don’t have papers, but I’m not a delinquent.”

He planted himself in the shade of a palo verde tree across the street from the convention center and watched as protesters inflated a giant effigy of Mr. Trump, a swastika stamped on its chest. Mixing English and Spanish, Mr. Camacho talked about his daughter, who just graduated from college, and his son, who is starting high school.

“I always tell my children: This is a country where you can do a lot, si trabajan duro” – if they work hard, Mr. Camacho said. “That’s not possible in my country. I wish I could tell that to Donald Trump.”

Inside, Mr. Trump’s supporters chanted: “Build that wall! Build that wall!” Mr. Trump would go on to call for a new “deportation task force” that would focus on rounding up only the “most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants**.”

Mr. Camacho said he is from an impoverished village in the Mexican state of Sinaloa, and he crossed the border illegally 24 years ago, from Nogales, Mexico, into Nogales, Ariz., before thick, tall steel plates separated the cities. He owns a home and a car, he said. He makes extra money delivering newspapers before he starts mowing grass, trimming shrubs and blowing leaves off the walkways at the apartment complex.

Mr. Trump landed in Phoenix late in the afternoon from Mexico, where, in a meeting with President Enrique Peña Nieto, he traded his tough talk on **immigration** for a more conciliatory message of cooperation between two neighbors.

Nowhere has the debate over **immigration** been more fierce than in Phoenix, where calls to deport undocumented **immigrants** have been relentless, even as those **immigrants** have become part of the fabric of the city.

Between the convention center and the airport where Mr. Trump arrived, there is a mortgage bank’s billboard on Washington Street, advertising, in Spanish, “mi casa es mi casa” — my home is my home. There is also a Roman Catholic Church named Inmaculado Corazón de Maria, Spanish for Immaculate Heart of Mary, where a painting of the Virgin of Guadalupe, patron saint of Mexico, beams from the facade.

At an auto repair shop on the corner of Washington and North 18th Street, Francisco Rodriguez proudly proclaimed, “I’m illegal, but I’m a business owner.” He came to Phoenix in 2003 from the Mexican state of Nayarit and opened the shop eight years later, on the same spot where it remains — right along the route from the airport to downtown.

“What Trump says about Mexicans — that we’re rapists, we’re criminals — doesn’t affect me,” said Mr. Rodriguez, 54, a wrench wedged in his pant’s pocket. “I wake up every day and I work hard, Monday through Saturday, and I tune out the noise.”

For Mr. Camacho, it is not as easy to ignore some of the things Mr. Trump has said: that he will build a big wall along the border and make Mexico pay for it, that he will round up undocumented **immigrants** and send them “right back into the country from which they came,” starting on his first day in office.

“Mr. Donald Trump, he doesn’t know that when we come here from Mexico, it’s because we’re hungry, we’re needy,” Mr. Camacho said. “We come here to help ourselves and our families.”

He recalled a cousin who died three years ago after the smuggler who was guiding him across the desert, toward Arizona, abandoned him along the way.

“Mexico can’t help us,” he said. “If it could, no one would ever leave.”

He excused himself and speed-walked toward a television reporter he recognized, Ricardo Arambarri, of the Spanish-language station Univision. He pulled out his cellphone and took a picture of them side by side, his arm draped over Mr. Arambarri’s shoulder.

“I watch you on TV all the time,” Mr. Camacho told him.

By then, the protesters had gathered around a group of men and women dressed in colorful feathered costumes, dancing indigenous Mexican dances to the sound of drums.

“The protest has turned into a party,” he said with a chuckle.

So Mr. Camacho decided it was time to go home.

He crossed the street, walked past a huddle of Phoenix police officers, a motorcyclist in a black leather vest and a woman holding a sign that read, “Make America great again,” Mr. Trump’s rallying cry. He kept his eyes on the ground and kept on walking.

“Imagine what would happen if all the Mexicans left this country,” he said. “Has Donald Trump ever thought of that?”

Follow Fernanda Santos @fernandanyt[https://twitter.com/fernandaNYT] on Twitter.

For breaking news and in-depth reporting, follow@NYTNational[https://twitter.com/NYTNational].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(Want to get this briefing by email? Here’s the sign-up[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/nyt-now-morning-briefing].)

Good morning.

Here’s what you need to know:

• Trump’s conflicting signals.

Donald J. Trump renewed his vow to crack down on illegal **immigration**, proposing a 10-point plan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico.html] at a rally in Phoenix on Wednesday night that includes no amnesty. Earlier, Mr. Trump had softened his language in a meeting with Mexico’s president[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/trump-pena-nieto-remarks.html].

C[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] onflicting signals[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] on this signature issue are part of his new approach[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/trump-campaign.html]. Here’s how his positions on **immigration**[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-changes.html] have changed, and how they’ve remained the same.

• North Carolina’s voting law blocked.

A divided Supreme Court refused to revive[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/north-carolina-supreme-court-voting-rights-act.html] parts of the state law that a federal appeals court had struck down as an effort to “target African-Americans with almost surgical precision.”

Some local elections boards[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/election-rules-north-carolina.html], all controlled by Republicans, have been accused of staging an end run around the court ruling they are supposed to enforce.

• Inquiry into Russia’s hacking.

U.S. intelligence agencies are still sorting out how emails and documents from the Democratic National Committee made their way to WikiLeaks[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/dnc-hack-russia.html].

American officials say the organization and its founder, Julian Assange, probably have no direct ties to Russian intelligence services. But the agendas of WikiLeaks and the Kremlin[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/europe/wikileaks-julian-assange-russia.html] have often dovetailed. Watch our interview[https://www.facebook.com/nytimes/videos/vb.5281959998/10150889009744999/?type=2&theater] with Mr. Assange.

• President Obama’s final trip to Asia.

Mr. Obama will visit the Midway Atoll[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/obama-asia-trip.html], a speck of land in the Pacific, where he will highlight the creation of the largest marine preserve[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/26/us/politics/obamas-action-will-create-largest-marine-reserve-on-earth.html] in the world and speak about the perils of climate change.

The president is also expected[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/obama-heads-to-asia-seeking-breakthrough-on-trade-and-climate-change.html] to announce progress with China on the Paris climate accord and will state his case with other Asian countries on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

• Brazil’s leader is removed from office.

The Senate removed President Dilma Rousseff[https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/americas/brazil-dilma-rousseff-impeached-removed-president.html] from office for manipulating the federal budget to try to hide the country’s mounting economic problems.

Her ouster — which was expected and which she calls a coup — is a verdict on her leadership and the sinking fortunes of Latin America’s largest country.

• Georgetown University makes amends.

The school, which in 1838 sold 272 slaves, plans to award preferential status in the admissions process to descendants of slaves[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/slaves-georgetown-university.html], among other moves.

• Triple threat of storms.

A tropical storm is expected to reach the Florida Panhandle as a hurricane[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/florida-hurricane-hermine.html]. It would be the first hurricane to make landfall in Florida since 2005. A hurricane weakened to a tropical storm as it passed Hawaii, which was already expecting a major storm.

And in Phoenix, a TV meteorologist is seeking the help of his viewers for fresh ways to say “it’s hot.”[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/phoenix-weather-forecaster-seeks-viewers-help-saying-its-hot.html]

Business

• Law firms are being sued by women[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/business/dealbook/female-lawyers-gender-bias-suit-challenges-law-firm-pay-practices.html] who say they received less compensation than their male counterparts.

• JetBlue became the first U.S. airline carrier[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/americas/cuba-us-first-flight-jetblue.html] in more than 50 years to fly a scheduled service to Cuba. Here’s how you can [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/travel/how-to-go-to-cuba-now-jetblue.html] travel there[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/travel/how-to-go-to-cuba-now-jetblue.html].

• New car sales have been softening in recent months, and the August sales report due today is likely to confirm that. A decline this year would end a streak of six straight years of growth.

Noteworthy

• Back on campus.

Universities are investing in big, high-tech buildings[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/education/edlife/innovation-campus-entrepreneurship-engineering-arts.html] in the hope of evoking big, high-tech thinking. Here’s expert advice on how parents can help freshmen navigate the early weeks of college[http://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/08/17/for-freshmen-campus-life-poses-new-risks/] safely.

Read the new rules[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/16/your-money/college-student-financial-aid.html] for college financial aid accounts. There’s an earlier date for filing a Fafsa form for aid[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/11/your-money/student-loans/fafsa-college-student-financial-aid.html?ref=business], and remember that co-signing a student loan comes with plenty of risk[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/13/your-money/student-loans/co-signing-private-student-loans.html].

• Sports roundup.

At the U.S. Open, the retractable roof[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/nyregion/how-the-roof-was-raised-at-arthur-ashe-stadium.html] over Arthur Ashe Stadium was closed during a match for the first time[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/sports/tennis/roof-closed-arthur-ashe-stadium-us-open.html], and Rafael Nadal defeated Andreas Seppi. Among Wednesday’s winners: Caroline Wozniacki[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/sports/tennis/us-open-caroline-wozniacki-svetlana-kuznetsova.html], CiCi Bellis[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/sports/tennis/cici-bellis-defeats-shelby-rogers-us-open.html] and Ryan Harrison[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/sports/tennis/ryan-harrison-upsets-no-5-milos-raonic.html]. More highlights are here[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/sports/tennis/us-open-results-schedule.html].

The N.F.L. cleared[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/sports/football/nfl-clears-james-harrison-clay-matthews-julius-peppers-doping.html] James Harrison, Clay Matthews and Julius Peppers, saying it found “no credible evidence” that the players were given performance-enhancing drugs, despite the claims by a pharmacist.

• “Ring of Fire.”

An annular eclipse[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/science/ring-of-fire-solar-eclipse.html], which occurs when the moon does not completely blot out the sun, will be visible from parts of Africa.

Six researchers, just released after spending a year in a Mars-like habitat[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/science/how-to-win-friends-and-influence-people-on-fake-mars.html] in Hawaii, say they spent a lot of time trying to get along.

• Recipes of the day.

Keep it easy tonight with an upgraded sheet-pan chicken[http://cooking.nytimes.com/recipes/1016067-easy-sheet-pan-chicken] dinner, or go with chile-[http://cooking.nytimes.com/recipes/12873-chile-crusted-black-sea-bass] crusted black sea bass[http://cooking.nytimes.com/recipes/12873-chile-crusted-black-sea-bass].

Back Story

Pull up a chair. For many baseball fans, Vincent Edward Scully is known as the “voice of summer” or the “voice of heaven.”

This is the homestretch for Mr. Scully, 88, who is wrapping up his 67th year as a play-by-play announcer for the Los Angeles Dodgers. (Though the team appears to be a lock for the playoffs in October, national broadcasters will assume his role for those games.)

When he was growing up in New York City, he was a fan of the Giants[http://articles.latimes.com/2007/oct/07/sports/sp-scully7]. He started rooting for them in 1936, after they were walloped in a World Series game[http://www.baseball-reference.com/boxes/NY1/NY1193610020.shtml] by the Yankees. He said he felt sorry for them.

Scully lived in Manhattan near the Giants stadium, the Polo Grounds[http://sabr.org/bioproj/park/58d80eca], and he could see many of their games for free. Once inside, he would look up at the press box and dream of being in the booth.

He got there quickly, as the Brooklyn Dodgers hired him in 1950, just a year after his college graduation. Seven years later, he joined the team as it left for Los Angeles, while the Giants moved to San Francisco.

The Dodgers franchise was born in 1890[http://losangeles.dodgers.mlb.com/la/history/timeline.jsp], meaning that Scully has broadcast more than half their seasons and witnessed milestones like Hank Aaron’s historic 715th home run[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QjqYThEVoSQ&feature=youtu.be]. To fans, he is treasured as a dazzling storyteller; just listen to a few of his tales[http://m.mlb.com/cutfour/2016/04/27/174849170/vin-scullys-best-stories-on-national-tell-a-story-day].

His final broadcast is scheduled for Oct. 2, precisely 80 years after that 1936 World Series game. Fittingly, Scully will be with the Dodgers in San Francisco as they face the Giants.

Your Morning Briefing is published weekdays at 6 a.m. Eastern and updated on the web all morning[http://www.nytimes.com/morningbriefing].

What would you like to see here? Contact us at briefing@nytimes.com[mailto:briefing@nytimes.com].

You can sign up here[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/nyt-now-morning-briefing] to get the briefing delivered to your inbox.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Two Polish **immigrants** were eating takeout pizza against a brick wall on a muggy night in Harlow, a working-class town about 20 miles northeast of central London.

As they chatted in Polish, witnesses said, a group of young boys and girls attacked them. The group repeatedly pummeled and kicked one of the men, Arkadiusz Jozwik, 40, a meat factory worker, in the head. He died two days later from his injuries, in a killing that police are investigating as a possible hate crime.

The second man, who was not identified by the police, was hospitalized with bruises and hand fractures.

Six boys from Harlow — five 15-year-olds and one 16-year-old — have[https://www.essex.police.uk/news/news-and-features/2016/08aug/murder-investigation-launched-in-harlow/] been arrested on suspicion of murder[https://www.essex.police.uk/news/news-and-features/2016/08aug/murder-investigation-launched-in-harlow/] in the attack, which occurred shortly before midnight on Saturday. All have been released on bail. The police have appealed for witnesses to come forward, and they said they were investigating reports that the attackers had hurled racist abuse at the victims.

The brutality of the killing and its apparent targeting of **immigrants** shocked many Britons and prompted soul-searching. It renewed alarm among Eastern European **immigrants** that the campaign leading to Britain[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s decision in a June 23 referendum to leave the European Union[http://www.nytimes.com/news-event/britain-brexit-european-union], known as “Brexit,” has unleashed a wave of xenophobia.

Before the vote, members of the far-right who supported leaving the bloc played adroitly on concerns about unchecked **immigration**, warning that the union’s open borders threatened the British way of life, made the country vulnerable to terrorism and hurt workers. One poster[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/20/world/europe/anti-immigration-poster-denounced-by-a-top-brexit-advocate.html], released during the campaign by the far-right U.K. Independence Party, showed a seemingly endless line of migrants and the words “Breaking Point.”

The killing has shaken the close-knit multicultural community in Harlow, which has a large Polish population. Dozens of residents participated in a candlelit vigil; some held signs saying “migrants and refugees welcome here.” Others lay flowers in a makeshift memorial on the street where the attack took place. One note read, “Not everyone in Harlow is as evil as those people.”

Poles constitute the largest number of foreign-born residents[https://cy.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/bulletins/ukpopulationbycountryofbirthandnationality/august2016] of Britain, with 831,000 of them in the country, and the assault in Harlow added to a string of attacks against them. In June, shortly after the referendum, the Polish Social and Cultural Association in the Hammersmith district of London, home to a large Polish community, was vandalized.

In early July, laminated cards with abusive messages like “No more Polish vermin” and “Go home, Polish scum” were left on cars and at several properties in Cambridgeshire, north of London.

The death of Mr. Jozwik has been devastating for his family. His brother, Radoslaw Jozwik, spoke this week outside the pizzeria with his wife, Sylwia. He said that his mother, who had worked alongside Arkadiusz at the meat factory, was struggling to cope with his death.

“My mum came back from holiday and did not know what had happened,” Radoslaw Jozwik told reporters. “We had to meet her at Stansted Airport and tell her, and then take her straight to the hospital. She is really struggling.”

He said his brother, who came to Britain four years ago to work, had been targeted because he was Polish. “The police have told us he was attacked because they heard him and his friends speaking the Polish language,” he said. “He was standing, eating pizza and they picked on him because of that. He does not speak much English,” he said.

He added, “After the Brexit vote it has got worse — I have seen people change — it is hard at the moment.”

Arkady Rzegocki[https://www.facebook.com/RzegockiArkady/], Poland[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/poland/index.html?inline=nyt-geo]’s recently appointed ambassador to Britain, said in an interview that he feared the decision to leave the European Union had given license to xenophobia, and that more minorities were being targeted. He visited the crime scene in Harlow on Wednesday and met with Mr. Jozwik’s family. He plans to participate in a “march of silence” organized by the Polish community on Saturday.

“This was a big tragedy, and I was very shocked,” Mr. Rzegocki said by telephone. “The truth, unfortunately, is that before the Brexit referendum there was less xenophobia and racism. Now, we are seeing an increase in such incidents.”

He was joined at the site of the killing by Robert Halfon[http://new.roberthalfon.com/], the Conservative member of Parliament for Harlow, who lamented that a “very small minority” was using the referendum result to exploit divisions and pursue a racist agenda. Such people, he added, “come from the sewers.”

Mr. Halfon added that Polish **immigration** to Harlow had helped regenerate the town, which is dotted with grocery stories run by **immigrants**.

The killing has reverberated in Poland. The left-wing political party Razem posted a statement[https://www.facebook.com/partiarazem/photos/a.430709850430410.1073741828.430323810469014/650380145130045/] expressing solidarity with the victim’s family. “The racist and xenophobic attitudes are reaping an increasingly horrid harvest,” it said.

Pawel Robert Kowal, a former member of the European Parliament, told the Polish news channel TVN24 BiS[http://fakty.tvn24.pl/fakty-z-zagranicy,61/prof-iwinski-ksenofobia-w-europie-umacnia-sie-to-zywy-problem,672393.html] that the scapegoating of minorities by politicians had empowered hooligans. “Today, those who use anti-**immigrant** rhetoric, even if innocently, are doubly guilty,” he said.

Britain’s foreign secretary, Boris Johnson, was scheduled to meet with his Polish counterpart, Witold Waszczykowski, in Potsdam, Germany, on Thursday to discuss recent attacks on Poles in Britain.

According to the National Police Chiefs’ Council[http://www.npcc.police.uk/], the number of reported hate crimes in England, Wales and Northern Ireland has jumped 46 percent, to 1,831 in the week after the June 23 referendum from the comparable week a year earlier. More recently, in the period from July 22 to 28, reports of hate crimes had jumped 34 percent from a year earlier. The police cautioned, however, that the rise could be attributed in part to higher awareness of hate crimes.

Mr. Rzegocki, the ambassador, emphasized that there had been an outpouring of support from residents of Harlow, and from Britons of all walks of life, since the killing.

“There are two faces of Britain,” he said.

Follow Dan Bilefsky on Twitter @DanBilefsky.Joanna Berendt contributed reporting from Warsaw.

\* Black Lives Matter Activists Stage Protests Across Britain[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/06/world/europe/black-lives-matter-demonstrations-britain.html]

\* After ‘Brexit’ Vote, **Immigrants** Feel a Town Turn Against Them[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/10/world/europe/brexit-immigrants-great-britain-eu.html]

\* Victim of Racist Taunts in England: A Mexican-American Who Backs ‘Brexit’[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/30/world/europe/brexit-victim-racist-taunts-manchester-britain.html]

\* As Migrants Face Abuse, Fear That ‘Brexit’ Has Given License to Xenophobia[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/28/world/europe/as-migrants-face-abuse-fear-that-brexit-has-given-license-to-xenophobia.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Each week, Nate Cohn, The Upshot’s elections analyst, based in Washington, and Toni Monkovic, an Upshot editor in New York, discuss the 2016 race and post a lightly edited transcript of their written exchange.

Toni Let’s imagine that we were in Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s shoes or advising him. What should he be doing to turn it around[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/upshot/presidential-polls-forecast.html]?

Nate At this point I think Trump needs to win four states: Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida and North Carolina. For breathing room, I think he could also target some combination of Michigan, New Hampshire, Iowa and Nevada. I don’t think Virginia or Colorado are credible at this point.

Within those states, I think there are two types of locations where I’d be sending him most often: conservative suburbs and white working-class Democratic towns. There are a lot more of the latter than you would think, especially in the industrial Midwest.

Toni You mentioned Michigan. I wanted to ask you about that. A recent poll put Clinton up by seven points, not shocking but closer than you would think. Michigan is supposed to be a blue state. Then again, Bernie Sanders defeated Clinton in Michigan in maybe the biggest surprise[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/10/upshot/bernie-sanderss-win-in-michiganprobably-wont-change-therace.html] of the primary season. Also, Trump just put in[http://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2016/08/30/trump-ads/89587742/] an advertising buy in the state, probably based on some internal polling. Thoughts?

Nate I think Michigan is a pretty tough state for Trump. It’s less Appalachian and a shade more diverse than Pennsylvania or Ohio. I think he’s going to struggle in Western Michigan, the state’s G.O.P.[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican\_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org] base. It’s a very traditionally conservative, ancestrally Dutch area where he fared very poorly in the primary. It’s a lot like the other sort of conservative, religious and ethnically homogeneous areas where Trump is struggling, like Utah or the Milwaukee suburbs. And while I do think there probably is some upside for Trump among the state’s many white working-class Democrats, there’s downside for him in well-educated suburbs in the eastern part of the state.

[Before the Iowa caucuses, Nate wrote about an influential and ancestrally Dutch corner of Iowa[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/17/upshot/how-a-quiet-corner-of-iowa-packs-such-a-fierce-conservative-punch.html?\_r=0].]

That said, it would not surprise me if a hypothetical Trump comeback involved making things interesting in Michigan. A comeback would presumably involve reunifying conservatives like those in Western Michigan, holding down his losses in well-educated suburbs like those in the Detroit area, and running up the score among white working-class voters in traditionally Democratic areas, which are quite plentiful in Michigan.

Toni How many minds do you think are actually left to change? We’ve been living with these candidates for more than a year. What could Trump say to win converts in those conservative suburbs and white working-class Democratic towns?

Or is too late?

I’ll point you to this recent article[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2016/08/30/polling\_benchmarks\_trump\_needs\_to\_overtake\_clinton.html] by David Byler of Real Clear Politics, which offers some hope for Trump supporters: “I analyzed polling from 11 presidential elections and came up with three rules of thumb: Trump can still win; to do so he needs to be within a few points in late September; and there isn’t much time to move polls in October.”

Nate I have two conflicting thoughts on it. One thought is that views of Trump are really entrenched. The other thought is that a lot of these voters are legitimately cross-pressured between their traditional party and their issues with the current set of nominees.

There are a lot of conservative voters out there who voted for Mitt Romney and don’t like Trump or Hillary Clinton. I think Trump can win some of them. I think there are a lot of white working-class Democrats who voted for Obama, in no small part because they didn’t think Romney was fighting for them, who are now doubting that Clinton is on their side. I think Trump can win some of them.

Toni To win over those people, I think he’d actually need to change some things, like ...

A) Delete his Twitter account[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/01/28/upshot/donald-trump-twitter-insults.html], or have it strictly supervised.

B) Stay on message the rest of the way, sticking to economic issues like jobs, trade and tax relief.

C) Keep reminding conservatives about who could control the Supreme Court.

But I think the more interesting question is: What could Trump have done differently from the beginning? In retrospect, the G.O.P. was so hollowed out — the base felt betrayed[https://www-nationaljournal-com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/s/641064?unlock=LLK1BM2FTX88F1XZ&mref=homepage-free] — that I think if he had played his cards right, he still could have won the nomination and not damaged himself so much for the general election.

Nate The list of things he could have done differently is obviously quite long. But back in June, I thought Trump could win, and I still think I wasn’t wrong in believing that.

Maybe that wasn’t true. Maybe he’s just not someone who is capable of pulling off the campaign he needed.

But I think that a modestly more disciplined Trump with a real campaign[https://twitter.com/Taniel/status/770726740624805888] and some luck could have done it.

# of state offices:PA: Clinton 36, Trump 2NC: Clinton 30, Trump 0NH: Clinton 17, Trump 1FL: Clinton 34, Trump 1https://t.co/NK5HyWkbdZ[https://t.co/NK5HyWkbdZ] — Taniel (@Taniel) August 30, 2016[https://twitter.com/Taniel/status/770726740624805888]

Toni You tweeted recently: “You could imagine Clinton’s attack inadvertently forcing a long overdue Trump ‘Sister Souljah’ moment against racists.” You believe he should have challenged white nationalists.

Do you think there’s a chance Trump could still try that as a Hail Mary pass? And what effect do you think it could have?

Nate I think it’s too late for that.

And it’s hard to think he’ll try it, given that he didn’t do it in March when questioned about David Duke, and he didn’t do it last week, when Clinton gave a whole speech[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/27/us/politics/alt-right-reaction.html] about it.

Toni I think you’re right that “A Better Trump” — one that was more disciplined, less divisive — would have been much more competitive. I think an interesting question is whether A Better Trump could come to the fore in 2020 should he lose.

Frank Bruni wrote a good [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/opinion/sunday/the-misery-of-the-mini-trumps.html] column[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/opinion/sunday/the-misery-of-the-mini-trumps.html] about how it wouldn’t be easy to duplicate Trump — he’s one of a kind. Can a G.O.P. candidate thread the needle to keep Romney moderate-suburban voters and still appeal to working-class whites the way Trump did?

Nate Well, why is Trump losing moderate-suburban voters? Is it his policies? Or is it that he seems unfit to be president?

I think that’s an open question.

And if Clinton doesn’t have a great presidency, I’d bet a lot of those Republican-leaning voters will be on board.

Toni I think the answer is “unfit.” The more these moderate voters saw of him, the less they could stomach his erratic behavior and his appeals to racial/ethnic resentment. In the comment section yesterday, a reader named Kylie wrote:

All Republicans needed was the everyday common-sense man who speaks from the heart. One that speaks to all Americans. A candidate who doesn’t make it US (whites) against THEM (minorities), and Republicans could have taken the White House. Because in any other election Hillary would lose.

Obviously, a big question[http://www.nbcnews.com/specials/donald-trump-republican-party/gop-future] is what happens after the election. And which of the 2016 Republican candidates is best positioned for 2020 if Trump loses. Not Ted Cruz, I don’t think. Not John Kasich, unless he can repair his image with the base. (He actually visited [http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/kasich-back-hampshire-nostalgia-eye-future-41736651] New Hampshire this [http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/kasich-back-hampshire-nostalgia-eye-future-41736651] week[http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/kasich-back-hampshire-nostalgia-eye-future-41736651] — amazingly, we now seem to have four-year campaigns.)

Not Chris Christie. Not Jeb Bush. Not Rand Paul. I think Marco Rubio would have a shot. Or more likely someone who didn’t run this cycle. (On Monday, Rubio refused to commit[http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2016/08/30/marco-rubio-wont-commit-to-serving-full-term-if-re-elected-to-us-senate/] to serving his full term if he wins his Senate race.)

Nate Well, I think Rubio would have a shot but I don’t think he’s a good fit to try to be Better Trump. I think he’s a return to the Romney-Ryan electoral path, which was not a good one.

Toni Who could be a fresh, new[http://www.nationalreview.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/article/436633/ben-sasse-tom-cotton-opposite-conservative-responses-donald-trump] candidate? Ben Sasse? Tom Cotton? And if we’re having a hard time thinking of one, does it bolster the point that Bruni made? He wrote: “It turns out that Trump’s magic, if you can call it that, resists cloning. It’s not easily transferable, either. Unlike other political supernovas, Trump doesn’t have coattails or for that matter a coat — not even a windbreaker. And that casts serious doubt on the existence of Trumpism minus Trump.”

How many celebrity billionaires are there?

Nate I don’t know — I think it’s entirely possible that Trump has laid the foundation for both Republican leaders and voters to accept a candidate who rails against trade, argues for lower **immigration** flows, largely cedes the old religious culture war, and instead emphasizes anti-political-correctness.

But I’m not sure who could emerge and do it.

Toni Republicans may have four years to figure it out. ....

I’d like to pivot, so to speak, to another topic. A recent article[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/08/28/donald-trump-has-a-massive-catholic-problem/] declared that Trump has lost huge ground among Catholics. Hispanics are a large and growing part[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/06/upshot/hispanic-growth-is-strength-but-also-challenge-for-us-catholic-church.html] of the Catholic population, and Trump has antagonized many of them. But I found the claim a little surprising because Trump performed well among white working-class Catholics in the primaries — for example, Irish-Americans and Italian-Americans in places like [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/01/upshot/why-liberal-massachusetts-is-poised-to-give-donald-trump-a-big-victory.html] Massachusetts[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/01/upshot/why-liberal-massachusetts-is-poised-to-give-donald-trump-a-big-victory.html] and Staten Island[http://time.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/4297099/donald-trump-staten-island-new-york-primary-fred-trump/]. What gives?

Nate I’m not sure the claim is right. I haven’t really looked at it in depth, but I have a few problems with it. One is that it relies on a comparison between exit polls and pre-election polls, which are often pretty dubious.

Exits and pre-election polls (wtd to census) have ~irreconcilable pictures of the electorate. Can't really compare https://t.co/l8EXTn7wzH[https://t.co/l8EXTn7wzH] — Nate Cohn (@Nate\_Cohn) August 28, 2016[https://twitter.com/Nate\_Cohn/status/770031378666778625]

One other possibility is that there’s a big educational split at play.

Maybe well-educated Catholics are especially likely to be abandoning Trump — take, for instance, the suburbs of Philadelphia and Milwaukee, which both have a lot of Catholic voters. Even as working-class Catholics in those same states move the other way.

Toni We’re seeing a slight tightening in the polling, and Clinton still hasn’t clinched the deal with young voters, especially when you include Gary Johnson and Jill Stein in polling. Is this anything that Trump supporters should be cheered about or that Clinton supporters should be worried about?

Nate I think that, as expected, Clinton has ticked down a little bit over the last couple of weeks, since she peaked at around plus-7 or plus-8 points a few weeks ago.

I don’t think this is surprising.

Clinton’s in a better position than she was heading into the conventions, and probably in a better spot than in late June, before the F.B.I.’s decision[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/06/us/politics/hillary-clinton-fbi-email-comey.html] not to indict her.

I think Clinton supporters can continue to be dismayed at her weak favorability ratings and uneasy that it’s not November yet, but otherwise it’s a pretty good place to be.

Toni I guess one thing Trump needs to fix is to stop holding campaign events in your deep-blue home state. He was in Everett, Wash., on Tuesday[http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/politics/live-updates-what-you-need-to-know-about-donald-trumps-everett-rally/]. He was also in Washington State in May.

Nate Yeah, I can’t say I’d be sending him to Washington — although I wouldn’t mind the excuse to head home for a bit.

Toni Less than 70 days to go, then you can catch halibut[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/29/us/catching-fish-at-seattle-pike-place-market.html] at Pike Place Market.

Nate They don’t usually let the customer catch the fish, you know.

Toni I’m sure Gary Locke[https://twitter.com/nate\_cohn/status/743647596393140225] would grant you special dispensation.

Update: The sum total of Trump’s Mexican adventure and subsequent **immigration** speech seems to be a[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/trump-campaign.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=a-lede-package-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news&\_r=0] bit of a muddle[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/trump-campaign.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=a-lede-package-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news&\_r=0]. Nate’s reaction on Twitter: “I have a hunch we’re going to forget about this trip about as quickly as it came together.”

Last week, Nate and Toni discussed whether migration patterns from Northern states to Southern ones were helping turn states like North Carolina blue. Can Democrats dream of two blue coasts[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/26/upshot/two-completely-blue-coasts-hillary-clinton-is-in-striking-distance.html]?

The Upshot[http://www.nytimes.com/upshot/] provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/upshot] and Twitter[http://twitter.com/UpshotNYT]. Sign up for our newsletter.[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/upshot/]

\* Democratic Dream of Two Blue Coasts? Clinton Is in Striking Distance[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/26/upshot/two-completely-blue-coasts-hillary-clinton-is-in-striking-distance.html]

\* How Much Is Donald Trump Hurting the G.O.P.? Here’s a Way to See[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/upshot/theres-a-way-to-see-how-much-donald-trumps-nomination-has-cost-the-gop.html]

\* Democrats’ Edge in Voter Registration Is Declining, but Looks Can Be Deceiving[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/upshot/democrats-edge-in-voter-registration-is-declining-but-looks-can-be-deceiving.html]

\* What a Clinton Landslide Map Would Look Like, and How Trump Could Still Rally[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/17/upshot/what-a-clinton-landslide-map-would-look-like-and-how-trump-could-still-rally.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BURBANK, Calif. — It was early afternoon on the set of “The Good Place” here, and the cast had scattered — Ted Danson[http://www.nytimes.com/movies/person/16938/Ted-Danson?inline=nyt-per] to his trailer for a costume change, Kristen Bell[http://movies.nytimes.com/person/369786/Kristen-Bell?inline=nyt-per] to hers for hair extensions — leaving the creator of this new comedy, Mike Schur, to enlighten me on its embrace of wild and just plain weird visual effects.

Like flying shrimp.

“The Good Place[http://www.nbc.com/the-good-place/video/the-good-place-official-trailer/3035972],” arriving Sept. 19 on NBC[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/nbc\_universal/index.html?inline=nyt-org], takes place in what is essentially heaven. It’s an idyllic, flower-filled town where residents are awarded soul mates and shop at a clothing store called Everything Fits. But when a newly dead woman (Ms. Bell) turns up — by mistake, having not lived her life as a particularly good person — really strange things start to happen. With perfect harmony upended, giraffes clomp out of nowhere, vitamin bottles the size of oil barrels roll down the streets, and a flock of wriggling prawns fills the sky.

“The shrimp are actually only about a 4 on the 10-point crazy scale,” Mr. Schur said with a laugh. “At one point, we had two human-sized grasshoppers dressed in outfits from ‘Dangerous Liaisons’[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FbB2oBlP2uI] having a sword fight and yelling in French.”

Arriving during the coming TV season — hidden among the reboots and movie spinoffs and copy-of-a-copy sitcoms — are at least five comedies like “The Good Place” that break what has long been a cardinal broadcast-network rule: Go with what has worked before. Instead, as they try to break through the television glut, NBC, ABC and Fox are suddenly serving up audacious, almost experimental prime-time humor more in keeping with cable networks like FX and the risk-taking streaming services. There is an overbearing animated warrior returning to the real world, where he wreaks suburban havoc while revisiting his live-action family. Another new comedy provides Jenna Elfman with a furry, spotted, nonhuman B.F.F. with a big mouth.

These “high-concept” shows (to use the Hollywood term) can be difficult to execute, partly because writers must walk a fine line between inventive and gimmicky, especially given the broadcast networks’ longer seasons, compared with cable. But they represent a new programming strategy for old-school prime time. Broadcasters are not quite throwing in the ratings towel, but they are trying to worry less about an immediate mass audience and more about finding, at the very least, a group of core fans attracted to a strong comedic point of view — what Jennifer Salke, NBC’s president of entertainment, calls “not a broad and soft, trying-to-please-the-whole-world kind of show.”

“Instead of ending up in the not-so-special middle, do comedy that is specific and sophisticated,” Ms. Salke said in an interview. “That might mean that it’s not for everybody. But a big group of people will love it, and those people will become advocates and help build a broader audience over time.” She added, “Dramas use what-will-happen-next to keep people coming back. More than ever, comedies rely on passionate fans.”

This coming season will bring its share of old-fashioned sitcoms — most notably on CBS, where Kevin James (“Kevin Can Wait”) and Matt LeBlanc (“Man With a Plan”) will both headline new shows with laugh tracks and time-tested bumbling-dad story lines. Most networks, though, have struggled in recent years to find new mass-appeal comedies. NBC — which hopes “The Good Place” will fill a void left[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/25/arts/television/parks-and-recreation-finale-ends-shows-run-sunny-as-ever.html?\_r=0] by “Parks and Recreation” (which Mr. Schur helped create) — has had a particularly difficult run. For part of the season in 2015, for the first time since the early 1980s, NBC abandoned comedy[http://www.cnn.com/2014/12/15/showbiz/nbc-thursday-comedy/] entirely on Thursdays. And Fox tried and failed to establish three conventional comedies last year.

So, for the new season, Fox is throwing caution to the wind. “Son of Zorn[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kPnlQTi8heM],” set to have a preview on Sept. 11 and its premiere on Sept. 25, mashes together 1980s-style animation and live action: An updated He-Man[http://he-man.wikia.com/wiki/He-Man], voiced by Jason Sudeikis, returns to conservative Orange County, Calif., and tries to reconnect with his ex-wife, played by Cheryl Hines. “Making History[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z-TVyOqCkr0],” headed for Fox’s midseason schedule, is a time-travel comedy that finds its cast (and a ham — don’t ask) zapping among the centuries. Both series come from Phil Lord and Christopher Miller, the duo behind creatively adventurous films[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/08/movies/lord-and-miller-directors-with-a-golden-touch.html?\_r=0] like “The Lego Movie.”

ABC is readying “Imaginary Mary[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=15vywGIjvPk],” in which an invented childhood friend (voiced by Rachel Dratch) returns to offer sometimes misguided advice. A talking-pet show called “Downward Dog[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ePcQrc1vrqc]” is also headed to ABC, with Allison Tolman (“Fargo” on FX) as the pooch’s owner. (Both will debut this winter.) “The minute you see that dog, and you hear his voice, which is a little acerbic and a little narcissistic, you start to laugh,” said Jamila Hunter, ABC’s vice president for multiplatform comedy development.

“The minute” being the crucial part. High-concept comedies are not new — consider “Mork & Mindy,” “ALF,” “My Mother the Car[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9kz3hfJweE0],” “Bewitched” — but they are coming back, in part, because they have an immediate hook and premises explained in easy shorthand. In an age when viewers are inundated with more than 400 original scripted series[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/17/business/media/how-many-scripted-tv-shows-in-2015-a-precise-number-and-a-record.html] annually (up from about 200 seven years ago), that’s important.

“You are competing not just against what’s on television right now but against everything that’s been made in the history of television,” Mr. Miller said, noting the many services that offer old shows. (“Family Ties,” for example, is available on Amazon, iTunes, CBS All Access and Vudu.) As a result, Mr. Lord and Mr. Miller say shows must push beyond accepted boundaries. At its core, “Son of Zorn” is a fish-out-of-water comedy — one of the oldest setups in the book — but the animation-live-action mash-up lends it a freshness, or so they hope.

“We’re not in as much of a big-tent landscape anymore,” Mr. Lord added, echoing Ms. Salke’s point about shifting broadcast network thinking, at least concerning comedy: Rather than aiming at everyone, find an audience — any audience — as long as it’s a passionate one. (Consider “Crazy Ex-Girlfriend,” one of the more out-there shows from last year. The musical comedy series was a ratings flop, but CW gave it a second season largely because the fans it did attract were extremely vocal.)

Success is never guaranteed, of course, especially once the initial novelty wears off. “The Last Man on Earth[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xf0YgnV0mdg],” which finds Will Forte in postapocalyptic Tucson, started strong on Fox, but has lately sputtered, although the network has renewed it for a third season. (Mr. Miller and Mr. Lord are among its executive producers.) Other recent high-concept comedies have gone down in flames, including ABC’s series “The Muppets[http://variety.com/2016/tv/news/the-muppets-cancelled-by-abc-1201773341/]” and “The Neighbors[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=08B8a3yZ9dU],” set in a New Jersey suburb filled with **aliens** who show emotion by leaking green goo from their ears.

There is an important distinction between the coming crop of extra-kooky comedies and ones that have come before, network executives and writer-producers say. Most classic high-concept shows were designed to deliver easy escape. “I Dream of Jeannie[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zT\_sYe65hpg]” did not dazzle with its dopey jokes; the draw was fantasy and the thrill of theretofore unseen visual effects. The new entries are trying to distinguish themselves in the execution as well as the conceit — to create complex characters and be about something. And that is what networks hope will give them staying power.

“Son of Zorn” is intended to explore divorce in a new way, and maybe even **immigration**. (After all, Zorn comes from a distant island.) “Making History” will have an undercurrent of “going back and addressing your regret,” Mr. Lord said.

ABC knows that “Downward Dog” cannot trade for long on the talking gag — television audiences have seen that before (horses[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=czsNX9agMxc], babies[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rxf2dIA58es]) — and so the show is also about “people are staying single longer, delaying having families, and family being something that you choose,” Ms. Hunter said. The made-up friend in “Imaginary Mary,” said Lynn Barrie, ABC’s vice president for network comedy, “allowed us to get to the main character’s inner thoughts and emotions in a fun way.”

And Mr. Schur said he has ideas about ethics that he wants to explore in “The Good Place,” including living life in a “self-sacrificing, empathetic way without being preachy or soapboxy.”

Sitting inside Stage 44[http://www.thestudiotour.com/ush/frontlot/stage44.php] on the Universal Studios lot in early August, Mr. Schur said his new show was not conceived “as a reaction to the marketplace, or an effort to game the system.” But Mr. Schur, who was also a creator of “Brooklyn Nine-Nine[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pmm3qOFVi9s]” and worked on “The Office,” conceded that his latest series springs from a category he calls “other.”

“There are basically three kinds of comedies: workplace, family and other,” he said in his mile-a-minute way. Tired of workplace situations, he first tried to come up with a family comedy. “But I had nothing,” he said. “The best family comedies right now come from personal experience. And here’s my family: White dude and white lady with two white kids live in fairly affluent area of Los Angeles. Not interesting, nothing new to say. At least for a long while, I think we’re done with comedies about white dudes and their families.” (Mr. Schur is married to J. J. Philbin[http://joannaphilbin.com/about.html], the daughter of Regis Philbin.)

So that left him with “other.” Mr. Schur, 40, said he began to think about a game he sometimes plays while commuting.

“It’s about desperately hoping that someone is keeping score of the terrible things that people do when they are driving,” he said. “For instance, when people are trying to turn against traffic at a stoplight. I believe that two cars are allowed to turn as the light turns yellow. Two. When there’s a third, I get annoyed. When there’s a fourth, I go crazy.” Mr. Schur said he started to meld that idea with a sketch he created in 1999 as a “Saturday Night Live[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/saturday\_night\_live/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier]” writer. “It never got on the air,” he said, “but it was about God coming to earth and saying, ‘Just so everyone knows, the correct answer is Presbyterian.’”

As “The Good Place” began to materialize, Mr. Schur began talking to Ms. Bell (“Veronica Mars[http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/07/fashion/kristen-bell-into-the-fast-lane.html]”; the voice of Anna in “Frozen”) about playing the female lead, which he summed up this way: “You’re the driver of that fourth car, and when the other drivers honk and get mad, you flip them off.”

Ms. Bell loved the idea of a comedy about ethical behavior.

“This topic — being a good person, what is my ripple effect in the world — is something that I was already spending a lot of time thinking about in my personal life,” she said, sitting in the show’s hair and makeup trailer. “Like, sometimes to the degree that I drive myself crazy.” She added, making a loose-screw hand gesture beside her head, “Mike didn’t know that side of me then, but he certainly does now!”

For his part, Mr. Danson, who plays a bow-tie-wearing guide to the afterlife, said “The Good Place” appealed to him because it was so weird. Along with flying shrimp, the pilot episode involves monster-truck-size ladybugs, Ariana Grande and a Buddhist monk — heaven meets “Alice in Wonderland.” (The grasshoppers, alas, were deemed too over the top.)

“It was the strangest idea I had ever heard, and that excited me,” said Mr. Danson, the “Cheers” veteran whose recent credits[http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/07/fashion/kristen-bell-into-the-fast-lane.html] include the “C.S.I.” franchise and “Fargo.” “I needed to chase the giggle again, but I didn’t want to do another standard comedy. I did that for so many years that I stopped finding myself amusing.”

There is enormous pressure on “The Good Place” to perform, even with Ms. Salke’s professed ratings patience. Based on Mr. Schur’s track record, NBC decided to forgo making a pilot and speed ahead with 13 episodes. The network aggressively promoted the show during the Olympics, and has planned a high-profile rollout for it: Two new episodes will run back-to-back on Monday, Sept. 19, after the season premiere of “The Voice,” followed by a third new episode on Sept. 22. “The Good Place” will subsequently air on Thursday nights.

Mr. Schur feels the weight of NBC’s expectations. But he said the network’s willingness to let him complete all 13 episodes in a bubble (all will have been shot before the first airs) was essential to ironing out the wrinkles that come with such an unorthodox concept.

“This show, so far, has been a lot of trial and error,” he said. “What’s too much, what’s too little. Viewers must feel comfortable and tethered and in good hands — that this wild stuff is happening for a reason, and it’s not just crazy, willy-nilly land.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BEHOLD THE DREAMERS

By Imbolo Mbue

382 pp. Random House. $28.

The years 2007-9 were bad ones for America. The housing bubble burst, the auto industry was in free fall, unemployment rose as high as 10 percent, and Wall Street was at the edge of an abyss.

It’s just before this tumult that Jende Jonga, an **immigrant** from Cameroon and one of the central characters in Imbolo Mbue’s debut novel, “Behold the Dreamers,” arrives in New York with a visitor’s visa and the hope that somehow he might transform his temporary status with a green card. Two years later, he sends for his wife, Neni, and their son, Liomi, who join him in Harlem.

When we first meet Jende, he’s on his way to a job interview, aiming to become a chauffeur for Clark Edwards, an ­executive at Lehman Brothers. Jende gets the job, and before long he’s shuttling not only Clark but Clark’s wife, ­Cindy, and their two children throughout the city.

Mbue writes with great confidence and warmth, effortlessly inhabiting the minds of both Jende and his wife. Neni, balancing motherhood and her dreams of becoming a pharmacist, is particularly appealing; she thrums on the page, full of complexity and yearning. Only once, in a pivotal moment toward the end of the book, does she act out of character in a way that feels forced, but elsewhere her sense of her own transformation (“Maybe I’m becoming another person”) struck me as a fresh take on the **immigrant** experience — ­providing not simply the jolt of being in a new place but also the jolt of taking on a new identity because of that place.

Still, if it’s place you want, the novel offers that too. Neni observes that “even in New York City, even in a place of many nations and cultures, men and women, young and old, rich and poor, preferred their kind when it came to those they kept closest.” Jende’s **immigration** lawyer tells him: “The police is for the protection of white people. . . . But not black men.” Jende laments that “people in this country, always worrying about how to eat, they pay someone good money to tell them: Eat this, don’t eat that. If you don’t know how to eat, what else can you know how to do in this world?”

As the story progresses, the plot, which is premised on a class divide, unfolds to ­reveal many more fissures crackling beneath the surface — **immigration**proceedings don’t go well, marriages falter, friendships fail, children stray. There are a lot of spinning plates, and Mbue balances them skillfully, keeping ­everything in motion. Even more impressive is the vitality that gleams through the film of gloom as the story becomes less about what happens to the Jongas than about their efforts to make peace with their fate, whatever and wherever it might be.

And yet, while the novel’s setup is rich with possibility, Mbue doesn’t always make the most of it. Within the confines of the car, Jende regularly overhears Clark’s business conversations, but the words float through the narrative without consequence. When Lehman goes bankrupt, the event is devoid of context; it doesn’t offer us a glimpse into much beyond Jende’s panic, his fear that he’ll lose his job. When Neni starts working for Cindy Edwards at the family’s vacation house in the Hamptons, the conceit is ripe — the Jongas of Harlem pitted against the ­Edwardses of the Hamptons. But these places remain little more than signifiers. The living room of the ­Edwardses’ porticoed mansion has an “all-white décor and large windows as if to never lose a view of the sky.” In contrast, the Jongas’ dark, fifth-floor walk-up apartment has a “threadbare living room sofa” and is “full of cockroaches.” There’s no deep exploration of the true gap between the two.

Even so, “Behold the Dreamers” is a capacious, big-hearted novel. Near the end of it, Neni describes America as “a magnificent land of uninhibited dreamers.” That might aptly describe the book as well.

Cristina Henríquez is the author, most recently, of “The Book of Unknown Americans.”

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With calls to end so-called sanctuary cities, create a deportation task force and maintain “zero tolerance for criminal **aliens**,” Donald J. Trump laid out a 10-point **immigration** plan[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html] on Wednesday in Phoenix that reverted to the tough, uncompromising talk on the issue that has powered his appeal to his strongest supporters. While he is no longer talking about immediately deporting the estimated 11 million people in the United States illegally, he also distanced himself from any notion that they could gain legal status anytime soon.

“There will be no amnesty,” Mr. Trump said[https://www.c-span.org/video/?414550-1/donald-trump-delivers-immigration-policy-address] with renewed determination.

A close inspection of Mr. Trump’s new **immigration** plans reveals that some are more workable than others, and some are not too different from President Obama’s policies. But most would significantly expand and accelerate current enforcement practices. Mr. Trump promised to achieve the whole package, including the deportations of more than two million **immigrants**, in “a matter of months,” a time frame that seemed more rhetorical than realistic.

Deporting Criminals

Mr. Trump said his main focus would be on swiftly deporting **immigrants** with criminal records. “Day 1, my first hour in office, those people are gone,” he said.

“You can call it whatever the hell you want,” he added. “They’re gone.”

As president, he said, he would issue an order immediately empowering enforcement agencies to be aggressive in hunting down **immigrants** with criminal records and speeding their deportation. He said that more than two million undocumented **immigrants** had some kind of criminal record and would be pursued for deportation.

In some ways, Mr. Trump’s proposal is not radically different from the current policy of the Obama administration. In November 2014, President Obama established new priorities[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/11/20/us/2014-11-20-immigration.html] for foreigners who should be deported. The highest priority is on removing **immigrants** who pose security threats, gang members and convicted felons. Mr. Obama has said his approach is to deport “felons, not families.”

In the past two years, however, the number of criminals deported has fallen from a peak of 199,000 in 2013. It dropped to 168,000 in 2014 and even fewer last year, according to an analysis of official figures by the Pew Research Center.

One big difference between Mr. Trump’s proposal and current policy is that the Obama administration has told enforcement agents to use discretion and avoid deporting undocumented **immigrants** with families in the country who committed no crimes or minor offenses like traffic violations. Mr. Trump said he would cancel any programs based on Mr. Obama’s discretionary policies, and he appears to be far more willing to deport people who have committed less serious crimes.

Another large difference is the speed and sweep of the deportation drive Mr. Trump proposes. He suggested he would find ways to deport many **immigrants**with new, expedited procedures. **Immigration** lawyers said it is within the president’s authority to set aside many due-process protections to order wide sweeps and accelerated removals.

“Our **immigration** laws are set up to do mass deportation,” said Benjamin Johnson, executive director of the American **Immigration** Lawyers Association.

“They are rigid and full of zero tolerance and there is not a lot of fairness, humanity or due process built in,” said Mr. Johnson, who added that he does not support Mr. Trump’s plans.

But it is not clear how Mr. Trump arrived at the figure of two million **immigrants** with criminal records. According to the **immigration** enforcement agency, about 176,000 **immigrants** at large in the country have been convicted of crimes and ordered deported by judges. To reach two million, he appears to have included hundreds of thousands of **immigrants** who are longtime residents with minor offenses.

In some cases, foreign-born criminals have not been deported because the countries they came from — notably China — have refused to take them back. Mr. Trump said he would swiftly sanction countries that decline to receive criminal deportees.

Deportation Force

Mr. Trump added new detail to the idea of a special “deportation force[http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/trump-vows-humane-deportation-force]” to carry out his plans. He once suggested that this force would be like the military units that deported more than a million **immigrants**, mostly Mexicans, during Operation Wetback in 1954. Mr. Trump has previously spoken with admiration of President Eisenhower for his carrying-out of that blitz.

Mr. Trump clarified that his primary plan is to add more agents to existing forces, including hiring an additional 5,000 for the Border Patrol and tripling **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/i/immigration\_and\_customs\_enforcement\_us/index.html?inline=nyt-org]’s staff of deportation officers. To be consistent with his earlier promise, Mr. Trump said he would create a task force within the enforcement agency to focus on the highest-priority cases of **immigrants** who have committed heinous crimes.

Sanctuary Cities

Mr. Trump said he would cancel federal funding for cities that have curtailed their cooperation with federal **immigration** authorities. He did not say which funding he meant.

According to **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, there are about 300 cities and towns in the United States that critics like Mr. Trump — as well as some supporters of the practice — have labeled “sanctuary cities.”

Those are places where the local authorities have decided not to cooperate with requests from federal agents to hold **immigrants** in custody. In most cases, local police forces or governments decided not to assist federal agents because they were concerned that cooperation would erode trust with **immigrant**communities they considered vital to police efforts to fight crime. Among those places are Denver, New Haven, New York and many counties in California.

Mr. Trump pointed to several instances in which the failure of the local police to detain an **immigrant** who was a criminal had tragic results. He mentioned the case of Kate Steinle[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/05/us/california%2Djudge%2Dorders%2Da%2Dmurder%2Dtrial.html], who was shot to death on a pier in San Francisco by a Mexican man who had been deported several times but returned to the country and was released by the sheriff.

Since 2014, the Obama administration has worked to court cities with sanctuary policies and bring them back to a cooperative relationship with **immigration**agents. Los Angeles is one city that has renewed its cooperation with the administration. Mr. Trump’s plan would be far more coercive.

Legalization

While there had been speculation recently that Mr. Trump might be softening on legalization, he made it clear in Phoenix[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/31/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico.html] that his line is as hard as ever. He said there was “one route and one route only” for **immigrants** in the country illegally: “to return home and apply for re-entry like everybody else.” This self-deportation option seemed to echo a similar idea by Mitt Romney, the onetime governor of Massachusetts, when he was the Republican nominee in 2012.

In practice, **immigrants** who depart could face years of uncertain waiting outside the country. Mr. Trump said his main purpose would be to send a clear message that “you cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country.”

But Mr. Trump said he would first work with Congress to change the **immigration** system to create new, more rigorous vetting to reduce **immigration** and determine that **immigrants** who come here are people who “love us.” Given the recent gridlock in Congress, it could take years for an ambitious overhaul.

That Wall

Mr. Trump’s very first promise in his remarks on Wednesday night was a reiteration of his plan for a “great wall along the southern border.” The Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, said that in their meeting in Mexico City on Wednesday afternoon, he told Mr. Trump that his country would not pay for the wall. But that did not move Mr. Trump, who said on Wednesday night, to great cheers from the Phoenix audience, that “Mexico will pay for the wall.”

As was previously reported[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/20/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration.html], that kind of border defense would be a major logistical challenge and extremely expensive for whoever pays the bill.

Find out what you need to know about the 2016 presidential race[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/election-2016.html] today, and get politics news updates via Facebook[https://www.facebook.com/nytpolitics], Twitter[https://twitter.com/nytpolitics] and the First Draft newsletter[http://www.nytimes.com/newsletters/politics].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Before setting off on Wednesday to visit Enrique Peña Nieto, the president of Mexico, Donald Trump appeared to be making a feint toward equivocation on **immigration** and trade. But with less than 10 weeks to go before Election Day, a blustering Trump told an expectant audience in Arizona that he wasn’t reneging on his signature promise. After failing to address the issue with Nieto in a serious way — bringing back nothing concrete and providing no further details — he blithely told a rally in Phoenix:

We will build a great wall along the southern border. And Mexico will pay for the wall. One hundred percent. They don’t know it yet, but they’re going to pay for it.

The election still must be won on native ground, though, and all flimflam aside, Trump still faces a narrow Electoral College pathway to 270 votes.

That’s where New Hampshire comes in — New Hampshire, where a measly 11 percent[http://www.cnn.com/2016/01/20/politics/new-hampshire-poll-republicans-results/index.html] of voters say **immigration** is their top issue, and where Trump’s Mexican theatrics have little purchase.

The most striking thing about the less than impressive Trump rally in Manchester, N.H., I attended last week was the near complete absence of any of the state’s prominent Republicans.

In normal times, you could not keep ambitions politicians away from an opportunity to meet and greet 800-plus voters two weeks ahead of the state primary on Sept. 13, and with Election Day in sight.

Not so with Trump at the top of the ticket. A sole beleaguered Congressman showed up, Frank Guinta, hoping his loyalty to Trump would pay off in November despite a campaign finance scandal[http://www.rollcall.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/news/home/frank-guinta-campaign-finance-ayotte-2016] that is hurting his re-election bid.

Other Republicans in tough races in New Hampshire have decided that sticking with Trump is a losing bet in a state that has moved from red to purple. They are keeping him at arm’s length.

Senator Kelly Ayotte, elected in the Tea Party wave of 2010, was nowhere to be found in Manchester. She has distanced[http://www.cnn.com/2016/08/16/politics/kelly-ayotte-trump-hassan-new-hampshire/] herself from the Trump campaign as her convoluted equivocation — “While he has my vote he doesn’t have my endorsement” — has drawn national attention, and, in some quarters, ridicule.

Facing a tough challenge from Maggie Hassan, the Democratic Governor, Ayotte, who campaigned long and hard for Mitt Romney in 2012, has tried to describe what she calls a “big distinction.”

On one hand, she said “Everyone gets a vote, I do too.” On the other, “an endorsement is when you are campaigning with someone.”

While this is just the kind of distinction without a difference voters are suspicious of, Ayotte is very clearly not campaigning with Trump.

Rich Ashooh, a businessman from Bedford, N.H., who is running against Guinta in the Republican primary, ducks and weaves on the topic of Trump. When Paul Steinhauser, political director of NH1 TV[http://www.nh1.com/player/?video\_id=12104], asked him if he would campaign with Trump, Ashooh said:

I am going to be doing what’s best for my campaign and the voters who are putting their trust in me. Whatever happens on the campaign trail will be built around that.

The bottom line is that an unusually high percentage of Republican voters in New Hampshire find Trump unacceptable. A recent WBUR poll[http://www.wbur.org/politicker/2016/08/04/clinton-over-trump-new-hampshire-poll] reported that only 63 percent of self-identified Republicans said they would vote for him. The remainder includes 14 percent who plan to defect to Clinton, 14 percent who plan to vote for third party candidates and 10 percent who remain undecided.

In contrast — at least before the latest Clinton foundation revelations — New Hampshire Democrats were solidly in Hillary Clinton’s camp. The WBUR survey found that 86 percent of Democrats said they would vote for Clinton, while 4 percent would vote for Trump; 8 percent said they would vote for a third-party candidate and one percent said they were undecided.

Even more troubling for local Republican candidates is the finding that independent voters favor Clinton over Trump by better than two to one, 49-23.

A higher than average share of New Hampshire voters do not align with either party — pollsters estimate that 15 to 17 percent fall into this category — and they play a crucial role in determining the outcome of general elections.

Democrats, for their part, are doing everything they can to turn Trump into a Republican albatross.

Maggie Hassan repeatedly links Ayotte to Trump. In one recent week, Governor Hassan issued eight Ayotte/Trump press releases, starting with “In Just One Interview, Ayotte Praises Trump, Doubles Down on Raising Social Security Eligibility Age & More[http://maggiehassan.com/press-release/release-just-one-interview-ayotte-praises-trump-doubles-raising-social-security-eligibility-age/]” and moving on to “In Two Interviews, Ayotte Refuses Multiple Times to Say Whether She Trusts Trump with Nuclear Arsenal[http://maggiehassan.com/press-release/release-two-interviews-ayotte-refuses-multiple-times-say-whether-trusts-trump-nuclear-arsenal/]” by the end of the week.

New Hampshire, once one of the most reliably Republican states in the nation, began to shift in a Democratic direction in 1992. From 1992 to 2012, Democratic presidential candidates carried the state in every election except 2000.

Democrats are by no means guaranteed victory. The state’s two Senate and two House seats are split between the parties. The 2016 Senate race is a virtual tie[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/nh/new\_hampshire\_senate\_ayotte\_vs\_hassan-3862.html], with Hassan holding a 1 point edge over Ayotte, according to RealClearPolitics.

New Hampshire reflects many of the difficulties facing the Trump campaign.

First, take a central Trump theme, that the American economy is in crisis: “The businesses are being sucked out of our country,” Trump told voters in April[http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/mike-pence-donald-trump-economics-226262#ixzz4Ife1cIgH] in Evansville, Indiana:

And if you look at New York, you look at Indiana, you look at Pennsylvania, you look at all of them … they all have one thing in common. No matter where you go, it’s like 40 percent, it’s like 50 percent, 60 percent, jobs are gone.

That simply does not ring true in New Hampshire, where the unemployment rate in July was 2.9 percent[http://www.nhes.nh.gov/elmi/statistics/documents/laus-current.pdf], well below the 4.9 percent national rate[http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNS14000000]. Nor does it ring true in other battleground states where Trump is behind.

In North Carolina[http://www.deptofnumbers.com/unemployment/north-carolina/], the unemployment rate is 4.7 percent; according to RealClearPolitics[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/president/us/general\_election\_trump\_vs\_clinton-5491.html], Clinton has a 1.7 point lead. In Colorado[http://www.bls.gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/eag/eag.co.htm], the unemployment rate is 3.8 percent; Clinton leads Trump by 11.8 points. In Virginia[http://www.bls.gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/web/laus/laumstrk.htm], unemployment is 3.7 percent; Clinton is ahead by 12.8 points.

Second, Trump’s Manchester rally itself raises a basic question: Why was the Republican presidential nominee spending valuable time in New Hampshire, a state with a paltry four Electoral College votes? His trip here last Thursday was his second this summer and his fourth since he won big in the state primary in February.

What gives? According to RealClearPolitics, Trump is currently 8 points behind[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/president/nh/new\_hampshire\_trump\_vs\_clinton\_vs\_johnson\_vs\_stein-6022.html#polls] Clinton in New Hampshire.

Joel Benenson, pollster and strategist for the Clinton campaign, said in a phone interview that New Hampshire reflects the national campaign:

The dynamic here is that there is no state where Trump is forcing us to play defense in a state we wouldn’t play in anyway. He is not pushing into our map. States like New Hampshire, he can’t afford to lose, while we have opportunity states, like Virginia, Arizona and North Carolina. Real opportunities to expand the map.

Another factor in Trump’s decision to invest a chunk of time in New Hampshire last week is that he has no strong surrogates here to build momentum. With prominent Republicans shunning him, he has to do his own heavy lifting.

Voters I talked to in downtown Concord expressed a strong distaste for both candidates, but generally tilted toward Clinton when pressed.

A policewoman ticketing cars on North Main Street initially said she did not like either candidate — “I’m thankful I’m wearing this uniform so I don’t have to answer you.” But as the conversation progressed, she acknowledged that she was almost certain to vote for Clinton. “She wants to help families, jobs, the middle class. There really is no other choice.” As for Trump, “I don’t believe a word that comes out of his mouth.”

Jeffery Wells, 51, who told me that he receives annual disability payments of roughly $22,000 for COPD and back trouble, captured the conflicted feelings of some Clinton supporters:

Like her, no. But vote for her, yes. She’s much more experienced, she’s been everywhere, she has done a lot for families and children.

Bill and Christine White are independent voters who moved to New Hampshire from Massachusetts 15 years ago after they retired. Ms. White, who recalled her support for George McGovern in 1972, said “Trump is the worst candidate I can remember in my life.” Her husband believes that “Hillary is just saying everything people want to hear.” Both Whites plan to vote for a third-party candidate so that, as Bill White said, they can “feel morally right.”

There are orthodox Republicans who do plan to support Trump.

At a Republican gathering — the Henniker Reception for Jim Lawrence for Congress[http://nh.gop/event/henniker-reception-jim-lawrence-congress/] — held at a brewery 31 miles northwest of Manchester, most of the men and women I spoke with were planning to vote for Trump, although they expressed some ambivalence.

They argued that Trump would be more reasonable in the White House than he has been on the campaign trail, and that his experience in business would make him a good chief executive.

“He’s not crazy. You don’t get where he is by being crazy,” said David P. Currier, a former state senator who now is running the Henniker Brewing Company. “He says a lot of things for effect — he’s a New Yorker.”

Bob Nash, a state lobbyist for an insurance agents association, said that he is confident that Trump, once in the White House, would be constrained by the American system of government.

“I am a firm believer in the check and balances in our system,” Nash said, adding “Trump is an intelligent man, he’s been a successful man all his life.”

Nash said he voted for Clinton in the 2008 New Hampshire primary, but that as a veteran he is now firmly opposed to her bid because he believes she mismanaged the 2012 attack on the American diplomatic compound in Benghazi. “I am absolutely convinced without a shadow of a doubt that she lied to those parents,” he said.

Leigh Bosse, 69, who publishes a weekly paper in Hillsborough, N.H., said he was voting for Trump, but with mixed feelings.

“I’ve put my foot in my mouth many times, but he does it daily,” Bosse said. “Trump says some good things, but by God” — Bosse paused to show his exasperation. He said he would vote for Gary Johnson if the Libertarian Party nominee had a chance of winning. But as a practical matter, Bosse said he will vote for Trump in large part because he finds Clinton anathema: “I can’t believe Hillary hasn’t been indicted.”

Trump’s uphill fight to win New Hampshire is likely to be made steeper by the Union Leader, the dominant paper in the state.

Just before the primary on Feb. 9, the paper published an editorial signed by Joseph McQuaid[http://www.unionleader.com/Joseph-W-McQuaid-Trump-campaign-insults-NH-voters-], the publisher, that did not hold back:

Trump has shown himself to be a crude blowhard with no clear political philosophy and no deeper understanding of the important and serious role of President of the United States than one of the goons he lets rough up protesters in his crowds.

Trump promptly countered[https://mic.com/articles/131389/donald-trump-news-latest-attack-aimed-at-new-hampshire-union-leader-s-joe-mc-quaid#.J0p1GrxuH], calling McQuaid a “real lowlife”, and the paper “a piece of garbage.”

The Trump-McQuaid dust-up illuminates some of the most important dilemmas facing the Trump campaign.

In theory, New Hampshire should be fertile territory for Trump. Many of the state’s population characteristics fit the portrait of likely Trump voters found in one of the most exhaustive studies to date, “Explaining Nationalist Political Views: The Case of Donald Trump[http://papers.ssrn.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2822059],” by Jonathan T. Rothwell, a former Brookings fellow who is now a senior economist at Gallup.

Rothwell analyzed geographic and demographic characteristics of 87,428 adults asked in Gallup Daily Tracking surveys in July if they had favorable or unfavorable views of Trump.

Rothwell found that

Trump’s supporters are older, with higher household incomes, are more likely to be male, white non-Hispanic, less likely to identify as LGBTQ, less likely to hold a bachelor’s degree or higher education, more likely to be a veteran or family member of a veteran, more likely to work in a blue-collar occupation, and are more likely to be Christian and report that religion is important to them.

In addition, racial isolation increases the likelihood of Trump support:

People living in ZIP codes with disproportionately high shares of white residents are significantly and robustly more likely to view Trump favorably.

How well does New Hampshire[http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/33] meet Rothwell’s predictions of Trump favorability? Pretty well: It is 91 percent white[http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/33]; the median age is 42.5[http://www.statista.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/statistics/208048/median-age-of-population-in-the-usa-by-state/] years, the third highest in the country; and veterans[https://www-census-gov.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00] make up 8.2 percent of the population in New Hampshire, compared to 6.4 percent of the country.

Trump’s problem, in New Hampshire and elsewhere, is that his pockets of strength are not substantial enough to produce majorities. In the huge Gallup sample, 65 percent reported unfavorable views of Trump.

The models for a Trump victory are right wingpopulists like Marine Le Pen[http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-12202197], leader of the National Front in France, or Norbert Hofer[http://www.breitbart.com/london/2016/07/31/right-wing-nationalist-set-win-rerun-austrian-presidential-race/], the Austrian Freedom Party’s presidential nominee.

The funny thing is that what would make a Trump victory most plausible is just the kind of un-American activity he has been campaigning against — in this case, a multiparty parliamentary system. For good or ill, many European electoral systems foster, rather than suffocate, candidates who can’t win majorities but who have a shot at winning a plurality.

It’s not the kind of country Trump would want to live in, but it’s the kind of country that might elect him.
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\* Pariahs for Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/opinion/pariahs-for-donald-trump.html]

\* Why This Economy Needs Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/opinion/why-this-economy-needs-donald-trump.html]

\* Mexicans Accuse President of ‘Historic Error’ in Welcoming Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/world/americas/trump-mexico-pena-nieto-reaction.html]

\* Donald Trump Gambles on **Immigration** but Sends Conflicting Signals[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/donald-trump-immigration-speech.html]

\* Trailing Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump Turns to Political Gymnastics[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/us/politics/trump-campaign.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It’s ridiculous that Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/donald-trump-on-the-issues.html?inline=nyt-per]’s **immigration**proposals — not so much a policy as empty words strung together and repeated — should have propelled him as far as they have. This confounding situation hit peak absurdity on Wednesday.

It started with Mr. Trump’s meeting with President Enrique Peña Nieto[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/enrique\_pena\_nieto/index.html?inline=nyt-per] of Mexico[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/mexico/index.html?inline=nyt-geo], in Mexico City. It was surreal because Mr. Trump has spent his entire campaign painting Mexico as a nation of rapists, drug smugglers and trade hustlers who would have to pay for the 2,000-mile border wall that Mr. Trump was going to build. But instead of chastising Mr. Trump, Mr. Peña Nieto treated him like a visiting head of state at a news conference, with side-by-side lecterns and words of deferential mush.

An unusually muted Mr. Trump called Mr. Peña Nieto his friend and said they had not talked about the bill for the wall; Mr. Peña Nieto later disputed that on Twitter, saying he had refused to pay. There was no friction at the photo-op, which allowed the Republican nominee to try on his calm, grown-up voice, avoid offending his nativist base and humiliate Mexico, all at the same time.

Mr. Trump then headed back over the border, shedding his decorum by the time he got to Phoenix.

In a strident speech given over a steady roar of cheers, he restated his brutally simple message: Criminal **aliens** were roaming our streets by the millions, killing Americans and stealing our jobs, and he’d kick them all out with a new “deportation force,” build the wall and make America safe again.

The speech was a reverie of **immigrant**-fearing, police-state bluster, with Mr. Trump gushing about building “an impenetrable, physical, tall, powerful, beautiful southern border wall,” assailing “media elites” and listing his various notions for thwarting evil foreigners. He said the **immigration** force might deport Hillary Clinton.

By now we should all know better than to take what Mr. Trump says on any given Wednesday as somehow truer than what he said the previous Wednesday, or will say the following Wednesday, and whether what he tells the Mexican president or a crowd in Phoenix is more honest than what he says at a presidential debate or in a campaign ad.

The details may change. Mr. Trump and his surrogates may talk about a real or “virtual” border wall, electronic workplace verification, this or that entry-exit system, an aggressive deportation force or more gradual “attrition through enforcement.” They may talk about legalization someday, years from now, or never. Those talking points ultimately don’t matter — a President Trump wouldn’t have the resources to deport 11 million people. He has no workable plan to seal the border, build a wall or repair the economy once he destroys it by devastating the **immigrant** work force. He would, however, be able to make millions of **immigrants** miserable, and break up their families, and damage the country.

To mock him for emptiness is almost too easy. But the fear and loathing that he has tapped into, that so easily won him the nomination, are real. They are real in Arizona, home to one of the nation’s worst state **immigration** laws, where the political and law-enforcement powers have been arrayed for years against Latino **immigrants**.

Which is what makes Mr. Trump’s decision to speak in Phoenix so perversely appropriate. While Mr. Trump’s plans for a locked-down deportation nation are largely a nativist fantasy, **immigrant** communities in Arizona have lived with the reality of what the Trump vision leads to: the brutal racial profiling and policing abuses of Sheriff Joe Arpaio[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/a/joseph\_m\_arpaio/index.html?inline=nyt-per], a staunch Trump ally, who echoes and inspires Mr. Trump’s vicious talk about **immigrants** as criminals. As Sheriff Arpaio seeks a seventh term this fall, his opponents are pushing back, with protests and get-out-the-vote campaigns, to stop the sheriff’s re-election.

Arizona, home of Minutemen vigilantes and a powerful grass-roots **immigrant**-rights movement, has long been a national bellwether on **immigration** policy. It was a fitting backdrop to Mr. Trump’s hollow proposals, and his relentless lies about the dangers that **immigrants** pose to the lives of “our American citizens.” Tornadoes are hollow at the center, too, and they do a lot of damage.
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\* The Duplicity of Donald Trump[http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/01/opinion/campaign-stops/the-duplicity-of-donald-trump.html]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump is the internet troll of presidential politics. When he’s securely removed from the objects of his scorn, he’s tough as nails; when he’s in their presence, he quivers like a bowl of Jell-O.

Such is the way of a bully.

Furthermore, when he is surrounded by supporters who cheer his base nature, he amplifies the enmity. When the applause of hostility is out of earshot, he tones down his vitriol to a whimper.

He is not only a bully, it seems to me, but also something of a coward, who lacks the force of his convictions — or who lacks basic convictions at all. He seems to be simply playing to the audience, whatever that audience may be. He’s amenable to the mood of any particular room.

This is the most frightening type of man, whose basic character is vile but not inviolable, who springs from darkness and bends toward anything that casts light, even if that light is, as the internet loves to say, a dumpster fire.

Case in point: Trump has spent the whole of his campaign maligning Mexican **immigrants**, people of “Mexican heritage” and the country of Mexico itself.

The Hillary Clinton campaign was quick to remind voters of the horrid things Trump has tweeted[https://www.hillaryclinton.com/post/donald-trump-is-about-to-meet-the-president-of-mexico-which-of-these-tweets-might-they-discuss/] about Mexico and Mexicans, and the list was a doozy.

They included calling the Mexican government “totally corrupt” and the Mexican court system “dishonest” and saying that “Mexico is not our friend” and ”I want nothing to do with Mexico other than to build an impenetrable WALL and stop them from ripping off U.S.”

Indeed, one of Trump’s main focuses has been the wall — which he has insisted from the beginning that he would make Mexico pay for — and a “deportation force[http://www.msnbc.com/morning-joe/watch/theres-going-to-be-a-trump-wall-564264515912]” to round up and deport all of the approximately 11 million **immigrants** who are in this country illegally.

These are the Mexican **immigrants** who Trump initially described this way[http://www.nbcnews.com/video/trump-mexico-sends-its-problems-to-the-u-s-465592899915]: “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re not sending you. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.”

And yet, when he made the quick decision to visit Mexico Wednesday and meet with that country’s president, Enrique Peña Nieto, Trump was much more contrite in his comments. Indeed, for most of the subsequent news conference, Trump looked lost and confused.

As Trump put it[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/08/31/donald-trumps-mexican-press-conference-annotated/]:

“I happen to have a tremendous feeling for Mexican-Americans not only in terms of friendships, but in terms of the tremendous numbers that I employ in the United States and they are amazing people, amazing people. I have many friends, so many friends and so many friends coming to Mexico and in Mexico. I am proud to say how many people I employ. And the United States first, second and third generation Mexicans are just beyond reproach. Spectacular, spectacular hard-working people. I have such great respect for them and their strong values of family, faith and community.”

Huh? Who is this guy? Of course, this time he was reading a speech. This is no doubt some soft-pedal written by his aides to make him sound more human and less monstrous.

Kellyanne Conway, you are one of the best ventriloquists in politics, the way you put words in this man’s mouth. But I’m not buying it. You can repackage your bigot if you choose, but the basic contours of the man betray your efforts to remake him. And, your support and promotion of him makes you one of the most dangerous, though soft-spoken, people in America at this moment.

According to Trump, he didn’t even discuss with Peña Nieto that he would demand that Mexico pay for the Southern border wall. But Peña Nieto disputed that account, tweeting[https://twitter.com/EPN/status/771118159654891520] in Spanish: “At the start of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall.” If you believe Peña Nieto, Trump, the self-proclaimed tough negotiator, not only choked but openly lied about choking.

And this is the supposedly brassy billionaire people support because he’s tough and tells it like it is? Trump is a paper tiger if ever there was one.

And then, a few hours later in Arizona, at what was billed as a major policy speech on his now muddled stance on **immigration**, and before his jeering acolytes, he gave a speech full of fear, about murderous **immigrants**, and reiterated that he would build a southern border wall and, you guessed it, Mexico would pay for it.

Trump was back to his hate. He was back to his hyperbolic histrionics.

This is what every voter must remember: Trump has two faces and two sets of facts and too much latitude to spread his animus, anti-intellectualism and lies, and he must never see the inside of the Oval Office.

I invite you to join me on Facebook[http://www.facebook.com/CharlesMBlow] and follow me on Twitter[http://twitter.com/CharlesMBlow] (@CharlesMBlow), or email me at chblow@nytimes.com[mailto:chblow@nytimes.com].
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