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Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The anti-establishment outsider who threatens to upend the political system has his own plane emblazoned with gold lettering: TRUMP.

As it rolled up to a hangar in eastern North Carolina on the campaign's final weekend, the theme from Air Force One blaring away, Donald Trump's supporters waved signs and snapped cellphone photos while eagerly awaiting the presidential candidate's final argument - - one that targets the American political system generally and Hillary Clinton, in particular.

"To all Americans I say it's time for change," Trump told his backers while echoing themes he has used for more than 16 months on the campaign trail. "It's time for new leadership."

The New York businessman, Apprentice star, and novice politician took that message this weekend from the coast of North Carolina to the casinos of Nevada, from the rocky mountains of Colorado to the shuttered steel mills of western Pennsylvania, promising a new approach on issues like trade, **immigration**, terrorism, foreign policy and the work of the federal government itself.

The Republican candidate claims he will rework trade agreements that he alleges have sent jobs overseas and tighten **immigration** policies that currently permit "open borders." He pledges to curtail "government corruption" with a program that includes restrictions on lobbying by ex-government officials and term limits for members of Congress. He vows to repeal Obamacare and "rebuild our badly depleted military."

Above all, however, Trump is selling himself: An "outsider" businessman who will shake up a "failed" political establishment.

"At the heart of this election is a simple question," Trump told backers Sunday in Sioux City, Iowa. "Will our country be governed by the people or will it be governed by the corrupt political class? We're going to find out very soon."

The candidate also found himself rewriting the script as he crossed the country Sunday, reacting to an FBI disclosure that -- as the bureau first announced in July -- it would not recommend charges against Clinton over her use of private email while at the State Department, a flap that has fueled Trump's campaign in recent days.

While Trump did not specifically cite the FBI announcement during a rally in Minneapolis, he did tell supporters: "You have to understand: It's a rigged system and she's protected."

The Clinton campaign and Trump's many other critics have no doubt he would radically overhaul the government -- and that's the problem.

The results would include expensive trade wars with economic competitors and heightened tensions with other countries, Trump's opponents say. They warn that an "unstable" and volatile person such as Trump should not be allowed near the nuclear button.

"Imagine how easily it could be that Donald Trump would feel insulted and start a real war -- not just a Twitter war -- at 3 o'clock in the morning," Clinton told supporters this weekend in Pittsburgh.

To Trump's many fans, his lack of government experience is an asset.

"I love the fact he's not a politician," said Pat Bullock, 55, a retired office manager from Wilmington who waited for the arrival of Trump Force One. "I love the fact he's a business person."

She added: "Anybody but Hillary -- I'd take an asteroid over Hillary."

Trump's original political message, Make America Great Again -- he copyrighted the phrase shortly after the 2012 election -- applies to any number of Trump promises.

Jobs will come back if the U.S. negotiates better trade deals, Trump says. Illegal **immigration** will be stopped by a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border (which Mexico would supposedly pay for, though officials in that country insist that won't happen). Trump has also vowed to block refugees from Syria and other Middle East countries, citing fears of terrorism.

However, analysts argue that industrial jobs disappeared because of automation -- not trade -- and changing trade agreements, or voiding them outright, will only increase costs for everybody, including consumers. His **immigration** policies, they say, would also block legal migrants, undercutting the economy.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For 17 months, I've traveled this country and met countless Americans from every walk of life. Your hopes have become my hopes and your dreams have become my dreams.

I've been inspired on this journey by the millions of you who came to cheer a simple idea: that we can make America great again.

Real change begins with immediately repealing and replacing job- killing Obamacare -- Americans are experiencing soaring double- digit premium hikes, insurers are leaving, doctors are quitting, jobs are fleeing, and deductibles are through the roof.

It also means immediately fixing our terrible trade deals, which have killed American jobs and crushed American incomes. This means renegotiating Bill and Hillary Clinton's disastrous NAFTA and China deals that have deindustrialized the United States -- importing unemployment and exporting our wealth.

It means we don't have to keep kids trapped in failing schools -- that we can give every parent the right to send their kids to the school of their choice, including millions of low-income African- American and Hispanic children who have been failed for generations by Democratic politicians like Hillary Clinton.

Real change also means draining the swamp of corruption in Washington. We must fix a rigged system in which political insiders can break the law without consequence and where government officials put special interests above the national interest. If we want to make America great again, we must clean up this corruption.

Hillary Clinton has been the subject of an FBI criminal investigation into many crimes against this nation. Were she ever to be elected, it would trigger an unprecedented constitutional crisis -- Hillary is likely to be under investigation for a long time, grinding our government to a halt.

America has too many problems, too many things to fix, to mire our government in years of sordid corruption and criminal investigation.

It is time to cut our ties with the failed politicians of the past, and embrace a bright, new future for all of our people.

That's what I'm offering in my Contract with the American Voter, a 100-day action plan to clean up corruption and bring change to Washington. It's there for you to read at www.TheTrumpContract.com[http://www.TheTrumpContract.com].

In my Contract with the American Voter, I offer a historic pro- growth plan to create 25 million good paying jobs. We will cut taxes on middle-class Americans by 35%. We will eliminate every needless job-killing regulation. We will repeal and replace catastrophic Obamacare with new reforms that dramatically expand choice, substantially lower costs, and significantly improve the quality of care. And we will end the offshoring of American jobs.

In my contract, I also offer a detailed plan to immediately secure the border, stop illegal **immigration** and keep radical Islamic terrorists out of our country. Hillary has pledged "open borders," mass amnesty, and a 550% increase in Syrian refugees. America's **immigration** officers described Hillary's extremist plan as "the most radical **immigration** agenda proposal in U.S. history."

I will restore the constitutional rule of law and nominate Supreme Court justices who will do the same.

Finally, I pledge to fight for the right of every child in American to grow up in safety and peace, and undertake a national effort to bring jobs, security and prosperity to our inner cities.

I am asking for your vote, and to be your champion in the White House.

Together, we will take our government back from the special interests -- and we will Make America Great Again.

Donald J. Trump is the Republican nominee for president.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In January, America is going to have a new president. Things are going to change -- that much is certain. The question is, what kind of change are we going to have?

We can build an economy that works for everyone, or stack the deck even more for those at the top.

We can keep America safe through strength and smarts -- or turn our backs on our allies, and cozy up to our adversaries.

We can come together to build a stronger, fairer America, or fear the future and fear each other.

Everything I've done, as first lady, senator, or secretary of State, I've done by listening to people and looking for common ground, even with people who disagree with me. And if you elect me on Tuesday, that's the kind of president I'll be.

Here are four priorities for my first 100 days -- issues I've heard about from Americans all over our country.

First, we will put forward the biggest investment in new jobs since World War II. We'll invest in infrastructure and manufacturing to grow our economy for years to come. We'll produce enough renewable energy to power every home in America within a decade. We'll cut red tape for small businesses and make it easier for entrepreneurs to get the credit they need to grow and hire -- because in America, if you can dream it, you should be able to build it. We'll pay for it all by asking the wealthy, Wall Street and big corporations to finally pay their fair share. And this commitment will go far beyond the first 100 days. Creating more good jobs with rising incomes will be a central mission of my presidency.

Second, we will introduce comprehensive **immigration** reform legislation. The last president to sign comprehensive **immigration** reform was Ronald Reagan, and it was a priority for George W. Bush. I'm confident that we can work across the aisle to pass comprehensive reform that keeps families together and creates a path to citizenship, secures our border, and focuses our enforcement resources on violent criminals. This is the right thing to do, and it will also grow our economy.

Third, to break the gridlock in Washington, we need to get secret, unaccountable money out of our politics. It's drowning out the voices of the American people. So within my first 30 days, I will introduce a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United. We should be protecting citizens' rights to vote, not corporations' rights to buy elections.

Fourth, we need to get started on end-to-end criminal justice reform. Too many people have been sent away for far too long for non- violent offenses. I believe our country will be stronger and safer when everyone has respect for the law and everyone is respected by the law.

There's so much more we need to do together, and we certainly won't get it all done in the first 100 days. But we're going to roll up our sleeves and get to work for American families -- and I'll never, ever quit.

I want to be president for all Americans -- Democrats, Republicans and independents; Americans of every race, faith and background.

My opponent has run his campaign on divisiveness, fear and insults, and spent months pitting Americans against each other. I've said many times that Donald Trump has shown us who he is. Now we have to decide who we are.

Because it's not just our names on the ballot this year. Every issue we care about is on the ballot, too. This is about who we are as a country -- and whether we are going to have change that makes us stronger together, or change that pushes us further apart.

It all comes down to this. I love our country. I believe in our people. And I think there's nothing we can't achieve if we work together and invest in each other.

Hillary Clinton is the Democratic nominee for president.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Election Day could be doomsday -- or just another day -- for Wall Street.

With just days until the presidential election, Wall Street remains on high alert. Investors are in risk-watch mode thanks to a bitter campaign punctuated by narrowing polls, candidates with low likability ratings and unexpected bombshells like claims of Donald Trump groping women and the FBI's ongoing investigation into Hillary Clinton's emails.

Here are three shocks that could rock markets:

1. A TRUMP WIN

It would be a big surprise, one few investors saw coming. Even Trump says if he pulls off the upset it would equate to "Brexit times 10," or way bigger than the shock waves the United Kingdom sent through markets in June when it voted to exit the European Union.

Stocks will likely sell off if Trump triumphs. Barclays says the Standard & Poor's 500 stock index has downside risk of 11% to 13% if the billionaire businessman wins. Declines could be as big as "10% to 15%," according to a paper by University of Michigan's Justin Wolfers, Dartmouth's Eric Zitzewitz and the National Bureau of Economic Research.

And don't rule out a bear market if Clinton loses, warns Don Luskin, chief investment officer at financial research firm TrendMacro.

"If Trump wins stocks will drop at least 20% just like that," Luskin told USA TODAY. "Because markets hate to be surprised and hate it when the conventional wisdom is dead wrong. Just look at the reaction to Brexit."

Why are investors so averse to Trump? Too many unknowns and too little political experience, says Thomas Block, Washington policy strategist at FundStrat Global Advisors.

"I don't see how investors can envision what his administration would look like," Block told USA TODAY.

"Plus I don't see his harsh rhetoric and take-no-prisoners negotiating style working with strong-willed legislators. Relations with allies in Europe and Asia could seriously deteriorate, and China, with its large U.S. Treasury holdings, would be very anxious."

2. A DEMOCRATIC SWEEP

Financial pain would also likely be felt if Clinton takes the White House and Democrats retake control of the Senate and House of Representatives, although odds still favor the GOP holding the House.

"A Democratic sweep is a tail risk," says Andy Laperriere, head of U.S. Policy Research for Cornerstone Macro.

An election hat trick would enable Democrats to take fuller control of the legislative process, making it easier for Clinton to push through her less business-friendly platform of higher taxes on the rich and investors, more regulation of businesses and spending programs.

Wall Street prefers political "gridlock" where legislative decisions related to trade, **immigration**, taxes, health care and regulation are made with input from both parties.

"A split chamber probably delivers the gridlock the market prefers," says Mark Luschini, chief investment strategist for Janney.

3. POST-ELECTION VIOLENCE OR SCANDAL

Since World War II stocks have risen 2%, on average, from Election Day until year-end, thanks to the lifting of uncertainty, according to CFRA, an independent stock and fund research firm.

But what happens if uncertainty doesn't lift once the votes are counted? Or if violence breaks out, as 51% of voters fear, according to a recent USA TODAY/Suffolk University poll? How would investors react if Clinton wins but her legal troubles related to use of a personal email server while secretary of State worsen and spark a post-election crisis? What if Trump wins and the more than six dozen pending lawsuits now open against him and his company are tried while he's president, or if his controversial policies on trade and **immigration** get fast-tracked, or his claims of a rigged election gain traction?

"Consumer confidence often increases after a presidential election, but perhaps not this time since both candidates are viewed as so flawed and unlikable," says Gregory Valliere, chief strategist at Horizon Investments. "If Trump (loses and) proclaims the election is rigged, perhaps a quarter of all Americans may agree with him. That's hardly a prescription for higher consumer confidence."

Violence in the aftermath of the election, if it occurs, is viewed as a short-term hiccup. "If it (violence) was widespread and had economic consequences, such as consumers staying home and not spending, it could (impact markets)," Luschini says.

Adds Luskin: "Markets are not typically rattled by violence in the streets. Remember 1968 -- riots, assassinations, shootings all over the world -- stocks just went higher and higher, through it all."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Get a grip, America. FBI Director James Comey has no idea what is contained in the new emails that agents will be examining in connection with the Hillary Clinton email investigation. Odds are the FBI will no more uncover an indictable offense than it did in July.

Whatever happens, the choice next Tuesday remains simple and stark.

On the one hand, we have a candidate with years of service as first lady, senator and secretary of State. She is a centrist Democrat who knows public policy cold. Her meticulous preparation was on display in the three debates, all of which she won.

Sure, like all politicians, Clinton sometimes stretches the truth. (No, she wasn't under sniper fire in Bosnia.) Sure, like all politicians, she adjusts some positions based on shifting public sentiments. She was for the Trans-Pacific Partnership before she was against it. She was, at the least, "extremely careless" with her emails, as Comey said in July. Her ties to the Clinton Foundation lead many to wonder whether donors were buying access.

Her ethics vs. his

These would be serious handicaps if Clinton were running against Jeb Bush or John Kasich. But she's running against Donald Trump. To paraphrase P.J. O'Rourke, Clinton's problems are within the normal parameters; Trump's are off the charts.

Think she has ethics issues? Trump faces a civil trial for fraud over Trump University. He has denounced illegal **immigration** while employing illegal **immigrants** to build his buildings. He claimed to have donated $102 million to charity without giving a penny of his own money. He is a pathological liar who keeps repeating falsehoods - - such as his claim to have opposed the Iraq War -- long after they have been debunked. According to Politico, he lies an average of once every three minutes and 15 seconds.

One of the few times he told the truth was when he bragged about groping women against their will. A dozen women have come forward to accuse him of sexual assault. Another claims in a civil lawsuit that he raped her when she was 13; a status conference is set for Dec. 16. This is not "locker room" talk. If true, these are criminal acts far more serious than anything in Clinton's emails.

What land mines await

What Trump is doing to our democracy is also a serious offense. He vows to lock up his political opponent, calls the election "rigged" without evidence, and won't promise to respect the result if he loses.

Another disqualification: Trump is the first presidential candidate in decades not to release his tax returns. We know he probably hasn't paid much if any federal income tax since 1995, when he lost $916 million, contradicting his claims to be a boffo businessman, but we don't know what other ethical land mines are buried in his records.

Does he have financial as well as sentimental ties to Russian President Vladimir Putin? No way to know.

We do know Trump is intolerant of dissent. He threatened lawsuits against his accusers and libel suits against newspapers that have reported their allegations. He wants to loosen libel laws to facilitate such suits. He has incited violence at his rallies. He is, in short, a budding authoritarian who should never be given control of the FBI and IRS.

Trump lacks a presidential temperament. He gets flustered in debates. Imagine how he'd perform in a crisis.

Trump is also almost completely ignorant of public policy. He says U.S. and Iraqi forces blundered by not launching a surprise attack on Mosul, yet can't explain how it's possible to hide 30,000 troops in flat terrain.

When Trump speaks, he offends. He insulted a Gold Star family, called U.S. troops thieves, and said Sen. John McCain isn't a hero. He mocked a disabled reporter. He said Judge Gonzalo Curiel, who was born in Indiana, isn't fit to preside over his fraud trial because he's "Mexican." He spent years pushing offensive claims that Barack Obama, the first African-American president, wasn't born in America. He has run the most blatantly racist campaign since George Wallace.

It's almost an afterthought, but Trump does have policy proposals -- and they would be ruinous if implemented: He thinks NATO, the most successful alliance in history, is obsolete. He threatens to pull troops out of South Korea and Japan, and he doesn't care whether this leads to nuclear proliferation. He wants to order U.S. troops to commit war crimes by killing relatives of terrorists and torturing terrorist suspects. He vows to launch trade wars that will cost millions of jobs.

The email flap doesn't change the fact that Clinton is sane and safe, while Trump is the least qualified, most dangerous presidential candidate in U.S. history.

This should not be a close call, America.

Max Boot is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and a member of USA TODAY's Board of Contributors.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**He rode down an escalator into the glittering lobby of a Fifth Avenue skyscraper he'd built himself. She stepped up to a stage on an island in the East River named for one of her political heroes.

That was June 2015, when Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton launched their presidential campaigns in earnest three days and 1 mile apart. At the time, the proximity didn't seem important; the candidacies didn't seem equivalent.

She was an inevitability, already the assumed standard-bearer for Democrats heading into the 2016 campaign. He was an impossibility -- just one more entry, the 12th, in a still-growing Republican field. He was expected to contribute little more than reality TV-style entertainment. When his GOP rivals talked about Trump, they smiled.

But now, with Election Day a week off, it's clear that first week contained clues about why neither campaign would go as expected; why Clinton's juggernaut would be slowed by Bernie Sanders, yet ultimately prevail; why Trump would rout his competition, including nine past or present governors and five past or present U.S. senators.

Saturday, June 13, was Clinton's first big rally, held on Roosevelt Island at a park also named for Franklin D. Roosevelt, who in the war year of 1941 enunciated "four freedoms" he said people everywhere deserved: Freedom from want and fear, and freedom of speech and worship.

Clinton promised "four fights," none as readily memorable as FDR's freedoms: to create a fairer economy, to strengthen families, to maintain America's world leadership and to reform government.

She did not mention Trump, his treatment of women or his taxes. She called herself a "fighter," unaware her eventual opponent would be one of the biggest brawlers in the history of U.S. politics.

Trump announced the following Tuesday at Trump Tower. He said many undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico were criminals and rapists; promised to force Mexico to pay for a giant wall he'd build along the Southern border; complained that Americans "don't have victories anymore," especially in trade negotiations.

He vowed "to make our country great again."

He did not mention Hillary Clinton, her emails or the Clinton Foundation.

After their announcements, the candidates flew to Iowa to campaign. In reality, they'd been candidates for months; Trump had formed an exploratory committee in March, and Clinton formally announced in April, albeit via online video.

But it was in mid-June, nearly 17 months before Election Day, that 2016's beast of a general election began to stir. Looking back, there was much that week told us, not about what was too come, but about how the candidates and their campaigns would handle it when it did.

He'd stick to a few themes -- simple, memorable, visceral.

That first week it was jobs, **immigration** and trade. The menu would change over the months to include other items -- crime, election fraud, his opponent's dishonesty. The constant was Trump's ability to tap into voters' emotions and probe his rivals' weaknesses.

He didn't give a lot of details. He said "believe me" a lot. And by the end of the month, he'd trail only Jeb Bush in a poll of New Hampshire primary voters.

She'd be cautious, deliberate, detailed.

The Roosevelt Island speech contained a litany of liberal to moderate ideals that appealed to almost every Democratic constituency. Each word seemed focus-group-tested and committee- vetted.

Later in the week came specifics. In New Hampshire, she called for universal prekindergarten for every 4-year-old within a decade. In South Carolina, she proposed a $1,500 tax credit for certain businesses that hire apprentices.

Asked in an Iowa radio interview about President Obama's plan to send 450 military advisers to Iraq to combat the Islamic State, she spoke slowly and carefully:

"I do not believe that U.S. troops should be on the ground in Iraq doing combat. I think what the president is trying to accomplish is using the unique skills that the American military has in intelligence, surveillance, training, to buttress the efforts of the Iraqis themselves. I have supported the president's approach to dealing with this very serious treat."

Trump on the same topic: "We should go blast the hell out of that oil."

He'd be unscripted.

Trump had no text, no teleprompter, no filter. He was spontaneous, occasionally rambling, always entertaining. He was immodest -- "I'm really rich," he said -- and shamelessly plugged his hotels and golf courses.

"I like going off script," he said after his announcement. But he seemed to have it in his head.

He'd live (or die) with social media, free TV and a bare-bones organization.

Trump, the organizational genius who said he "built a great, great business," didn't have much of a political organization.

He didn't seem to think he needed one. Not with 3 million Twitter followers and 1.7 million Facebook fans at the time. In the 24 hours after he announced, 3.4 million Facebook users shared information about Trump 6.4 million times. When Bush announced that Monday, the comparables were 493,000 users and 849,000 messages.

She'd bend, but not break.

Clinton's flexibility was on view that week on trade -- one of the few issues that united Trump and Sanders, but that she handled bloodlessly in her kickoff speech: Global trade had "created whole new areas of economic activity and opened new markets for our exports, but also displaced jobs and undercut wages for millions of Americans."

She recovered the next day, signaling she was easing away from her original support for the increasingly unpopular Trans-Pacific Partnership trade pact and urging Obama to confer with House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (a TPP opponent) "to make sure we get the best, strongest deal possible, and if we don't get it, there should be no deal."

By October, she'd withdrawn her support for the agreement entirely.

He'd attack, attack, attack.

Just ask Neil Young.

After the rock star objected to Trump's use of his song Rockin' in the Free World at the Trump Tower announcement -- Young supported Sanders -- Trump took to Twitter to call Young a "total hypocrite" who once visited Trump's office requesting money for an audio deal.

Trump also had words for Bush's open-collared presidential announcement: "He can't even put on a tie and jacket. He's running for president. Maybe he knows something I don't know. Maybe I should take it off because I want to be one of everybody. You know what? You run for president, maybe put on a tie."

She'd play the gender card.

In 2008, Clinton sometimes seemed to downplay her gender. This time she embraced it. On Roosevelt Island, she joked that while she might not be the youngest person ever elected president, she'd be the youngest woman.

Trump took note. "She's playing the woman card really big," he told a crowd in Des Moines the night he announced. "I watched her the other day and all she would talk about was, 'Women! Women! I'm a woman! I'm going to be the youngest woman in the White House!"'

In New Hampshire, she helped read The Very Hungry Caterpillar to a pre-K class -- something it was hard to imagine Trump doing. Later in the campaign, at a rally, he'd make fun of a crying baby.

He'd run as a conservative without conservative consensus.

Karl Rove, George Will, the Koch brothers -- none from the start had any use for Trump, who seemed reluctant to touch social welfare entitlements and prone to presidential overreach.

"Trump is so far from being a mainstream Reagan-style conservative that the real question is why he is bringing his circus to the GOP tent in the first place," wrote Jeff Jacoby, a conservative columnist for The Boston Globe. Trump's announcement speech, he said, "drove the needle on the crazy-meter way into the red zone."

She could get under his skin.

After a gunman killed nine members of a Bible study group in Charleston, S.C., on the Wednesday after the campaign kickoff events, Clinton said that Trump's comments about Mexicans were the kind that could "trigger people who are less than stable to do something. Everybody should stand up and say that's not acceptable."

Trump took the bait, accusing Clinton in an Instagram video of a "pathetic" attempt to blame him for the tragedy. He said it was more proof that "politicians are just no good."

He wouldn't back down.

After the Trump Tower speech, as sponsors severed their connections to him and denunciation rained down across the political spectrum, Trump was offered a chance to back off.

Many candidates would have; not him. "The speech went well," he told the Associated Press. "There's nothing in there I didn't mean."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A new species of sitcom is landing on TBS.

The Conan O'Brien-produced People of Earth (premiering Monday, 9 ET/PT) centers on a skeptical journalist named Ozzie Graham (Wyatt Cenac) sent on assignment to a small-town support group for people who believe they were abducted by Martians. Created by newcomer David Jenkins and executive-produced by Greg Daniels (NBC's The Office), the extraterrestrial comedy tracks Ozzie's descent into zany madness as he starts to think that he, too, may be an **alien** "experiencer."

O'Brien, Jenkins and Daniels caught up with USA TODAY to chat about the offbeat People and the state of TV comedy:

Q Where did the idea for this show come from?

Jenkins: I read about an **alien**-abduction support group on the East Coast, and they just sounded very interesting to me. They all sounded like normal people. I started the article expecting to hear about a bunch of crazy people you would find on Craigslist or something, but they were Realtors, bankers (and) had jobs.

Q Conan, what about David's voice or sense of humor did you respond to?

O'Brien: When you make comedy for a living, people always say, "You must go home and love watching comedy." I love watching things that have a strong comedic element, but often I find myself drawn to shows like (FX's) Fargo, things that have a real dark subcurrent. I really love stuff that's trying to frighten me and has an edgy tone, and what I loved about this script was the humor kept sneaking up on me. It was a comedic take on an

X-Files but (also a) well-observed comedy of human interaction. Not jokes, not gags -- just comedy that is like oaked wine. It's in there, but it's not in your face.

Q What are some of your favorite comedies now?

Daniels: My favorite right now is (Amazon's) Fleabag. I think it's amazing.

O'Brien: I like (FX's) Atlanta. I just want to go door to door and tell people to watch it. There was an episode a week or two ago where maybe two-thirds of the commercials were these subtle parodies that wove their way through the show. They completely had me.

Q Do you think the fact that TV is so fragmented now -- with cable, streaming and network sitcoms -- is better or worse for comedy?

O'Brien: It's the yin and yang. There's never been more good television being made than there is at this moment. The flip side is that you can have seven or eight like-minded friends in a room talking about their favorite shows, and in the past, that'd usually mean the same one or two shows. Now it's someone saying Fleabag, someone saying Atlanta, someone else saying Black Mirror (or) Game of Thrones. So I think it's harder for shows to grab America with a capital "A," but I'm not even sure that's necessary.

Jenkins: We're still at this place where we say a half-hour is comedy, an hour is not comedy. I'm relieved to see something like Atlanta or (HBO's) High Maintenance, where those are not "laugh, laugh, laugh" shows. Some people say, "Oh, it's a dramedy," and I feel that's an interesting place for comedy to be.

Q Do you believe in **aliens**?

Daniels: If you study science and know how many planets there are that could carry life, how many star systems, I think the odds are that there's got to be **alien**life somewhere out there.

O'Brien: I agree. But my suspicion is that they don't have really cool spaceships and ray guns. It's going to be like a three-celled kind of yeast. We're going to see this new life and expect them to be way more advanced than we are, and then we're going to end up slowly teaching them how to make fire.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Federal authorities unsealed an indictment Thursday, charging 56 people in a vast scheme in which suspects posed as Internal Revenue Service agents and **immigration** authorities to siphon more than $300 million from thousands of unwitting victims to clear fictitious deportation warrants and phony tax debts.

The scheme, which employed a network of telephone call centers based in India, relied on personal information obtained from data brokers to target at least 15,000 victims with threats of fines, deportation or imprisonment if they did not pay the demanded fees.

In the thousands of cases where victims did agree to settle the fictitious accounts, the money allegedly was laundered through groups of U.S. co-conspirators using wire transfers and debit cards.

Twenty of the 24 U.S. suspects were arrested Thursday, officials said. One other is in **immigration** custody, arrests are pending against two more and a fourth, Jerry Norris, 46, of Oakland, Calif., is being sought by federal authorities. Thirty-two suspects were believed to be living in India, and the court documents also outlined charges against five call center operations. U.S. officials said that they would seek to prosecute the Indian suspects in the United States and that the Indian government was notified after the charges were unsealed.

"This is a transnational problem and demonstrates that modern criminals target Americans both from inside our borders and from abroad," Assistant Attorney General Leslie Caldwell said of the alleged activity uncovered during a three-year investigation.

The co-conspirators, according to federal authorities, used "hawala transfers" in which money is transferred internationally outside of the formal banking system to direct extorted funds to accounts belonging to U.S.-based individuals.

According to the indictment, the conspirators allegedly kept a percentage of the proceeds for themselves for taking part in the transfer.

In the case of a San Diego victim, prosecutors allege that a call center extorted $12,300 from an 85-year-old woman after threatening her with arrest if she did not settle phony tax violations. The same day that the payment was made, a U.S.-based suspect allegedly loaded a debit card to buy money orders in Frisco, Texas.

Another California victim lost $136,000 to suspects posing as IRS agents demanding payment for fictitious tax charges. The suspects, according to court documents, contacted the victim multiple times during a period of 20 days. The money was then allegedly transferred to multiple debit cards.

In some cases, prosecutors allege, the conspirators requested "good-faith deposits" from victims in exchange for the promise of phony grants and loans.

"To potential victims, our message today is simple," said Peter Edge, an executive associate director with **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement. "U.S. government agencies do not make these types of calls. And if you receive one, contact law enforcement before you make a payment."

The Indian call centers were described in court documents as akin to high-octane boiler-room enterprises, which maintained daily attendance sheets for workers and distributed "lead lists" identifying potential targets for callers.

Some call center operators were literally invested in their work, maintaining "equity shares" in their businesses.

All five of the call centers charged in the case were located in Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India, according to court documents.

"During the course of the conspiracy, the call center conglomerates often acted together to effect the scheme to include: sharing call scripts and lists of potential victims, processing payments for each other and liquidating victim scammed funds," prosecutors asserted.

"The defendants have perpetrated an enormous and complex fraud scheme that resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in victim losses derived from persons located throughout the United States," the court documents stated. "The design of the scheme and the rapid movement of victim funds often resulted in victims being unable to report the fraud in time for their funds to be recovered."

In addition to the estimated 15,000 people who lost money, the identities of up to 50,000 others were stolen to allegedly facilitate the movement of funds.

Although the volume of suspected scam calls around the U.S. dropped after the India raids, additional victims continued to be identified, he said, warning that the threat is not over.

"We feared all along there were multiple call centers responsible for this activity," Camus said.

Contributing: Kevin McCoy

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On the anniversary of the start of his presidential campaign, Donald Trump spent much of the day in a setting he knows well -- a room full of high-priced lawyers battling out a civil lawsuit.

Trump paused his campaigning June 16 to answer questions under oath in one of his lawsuits against two celebrity chefs. He had sued Geoffrey Zakarian and Jose Andres after they backed out of a restaurant deal in response to Trump's inflammatory statements about Mexican **immigrants**.

The two-hour deposition was at least the third time Trump had to leave the campaign trail to be deposed by attorneys in one of his organization's many lawsuits.

Just two weeks before Election Day, at least 75 of the 4,000- plus lawsuits involving Trump and his businesses remain open, according to an ongoing, nationwide analysis of state and federal court records by USA TODAY. Trump is running well behind Democrat Hillary Clinton in most polls -- about 5 percentage points behind in the popular vote in RealClearPolitics' rolling average of national polls. But if Trump were to win, the number of unresolved cases is unprecedented for a presidential candidate, according to political scientists and historians.

Trump faces significant open litigation tied to his businesses: angry members at his Jupiter, Fla., golf course say they were cheated out of refunds on their dues and a former employee at the same club claims she was fired after reporting sexual harassment. There's a fraud case brought by Trump University students who say the mogul's company ripped them off for tens of thousands in tuition for a sham real estate course.

Trump is also defending lawsuits tied to his campaign. A disgruntled GOP political consultant sued for $4 million, saying Trump defamed her. Another suit, a class action, says the campaign violated consumer protection laws by sending unsolicited text messages.

If elected, the open lawsuits would tag along with Trump. He would not be entitled to immunity and could be required to give depositions or even testify in open court. That could chew up time and expose a litany of uncomfortable private and business dealings to the public.

One trial, over not paying tips to caterers at Trump SoHo Hotel in New York City, is set to start a week before Election Day.

Even in the waning days of the campaign, in a speech Saturday in Gettysburg, Pa., outlining his first actions if he wins the White House, Trump threatened to sue all of the women who've accused him of unwanted sexual advances, saying all of them are lying.

The open cases raise questions about potential conflicts of interest that could become difficult for Trump to navigate.

For instance, could his judicial appointments be influenced by his own court cases? This summer, he attacked a federal judge who is presiding over the lawsuit against Trump University, saying District Judge Gonzalo Curiel is biased against Trump because the judge is of Mexican descent and Trump proposes a "great wall" along the Mexican border.

Another potential issue: Would lawyers, parties in cases and even judges seek to curry favor with a powerful individual in a way that might alter the outcome?

IRS audit the 'MOTHER OF ALL CONFLICT'

Norm Eisen, who founded the non-partisan watchdog organization Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in 2003 and later was the top White House ethics lawyer for President Obama in 2009 and 2010, ticked off a series of potential conflicts.

The lawsuits against Trump University could raise questions about whom Trump would appoint as Education secretary, Eisen said. "Somebody with favor to for-profit colleges?"

Trump's development of the Old Post Office Building in Washington is being overseen by the federal government, and lawsuits involving the development could involve government officials.

"Will he really put someone in charge that would testify against his business?" Eisen wonders.

"And the mother of all conflict could be the IRS audit," he said. "What if they suggest civil penalties, or even criminal proceedings?"

Alan Garten, general counsel for Trump and his business interests, downplayed the significance of the cases.

Garten said only about 30 significant cases are open. The others are run-of-the-mill cases involving one Trump holding or another, frivolous causes or suits destined to be dismissed. "The reality is we're an operating company. We'll treat all cases the same way if he's elected or not -- and the results shouldn't be different in the eyes of the law."

Clinton has her own share of litigation heading toward Election Day. Media groups are suing her trying to get more emails from her private server. They've also argued for the release of deposition videos.

The email lawsuit is among about 30 open civil cases Clinton faces. In nearly all cases, Clinton is named solely in her government capacity, often among a laundry list of other public officials. In a small fraction, as with the email server, some argue she should be held accountable as a private individual. Clinton's campaign staff did not respond to questions.

Mountain of lawsuits unprecedented

USA TODAY Network reporters spent more than six months gathering court records in more than 4,000 lawsuits involving Trump and his companies. They traveled to courthouses, studied thousands of pages of records and contacted lawyers, litigants and witnesses across the country. For comparison, reporters also pieced together the record of Clinton's court cases.

The analysis found an unprecedented mountain of legal battles for a presidential candidate, ranging from skirmishes with pageant contestants to multimillion-dollar real estate lawsuits. The cases offer clues to the leadership style the billionaire would bring to the White House.

The review shows that Trump frequently responds to even small disputes with overwhelming legal force, not hesitating to use his tremendous wealth and legal firepower against adversaries with limited resources.

He has repeatedly refused to pay people and small businesses for their work, forcing them to spend time and legal fees if they want to recover their losses.

At least 60 lawsuits -- plus hundreds of additional liens, judgments, and other government filings -- documented cases where people accused Trump and his businesses of failing to pay them what they were owed for their work. Among them: painters, glassmakers, real estate agents, bartenders and hourly workers at Trump resorts coast to coast. Even his own lawyers.

The review also shows Trump and his companies have been accused for years of mistreating women. In at least 20 lawsuits, plaintiffs accused Trump and managers at his companies of discriminating against women, ignoring sexual harassment complaints and even participating in the harassment themselves. Women in those disputes testified they were fired for complaining.

Trump's companies have been engaged in battles over taxes almost every year from the 1980s until as recently as last spring, when New York had to take legal action to collect $8,578 in unpaid taxes on the Trump-owned company that owns the trademark Boeing 757 that jetted the mogul to campaign rallies.

The review found that people who say something Trump doesn't like will frequently get threatened with a lawsuit. "I'll sue you" was a Trump mantra long before "Build a wall." The analysis, however, showed he rarely follows through with threatened lawsuits over people's words and almost always loses when he does. The lone win was a lawsuit against Miss Pennsylvania over her claim on Facebook that Trump's Miss USA pageant was rigged.

A window into private places

If Trump is elected president, it won't change the way his lawsuits are handled.

His companies face open cases of sexual discrimination and fraud, unpaid bills and contract disputes. In any of the open cases, litigants would have the right to demand testimony from Trump or people close to him.

Such legal action can -- and often does -- unlock private financial and other records. Even if Trump broke no laws or committed no wrongdoing, that kind of inside information could be used by political opponents to try to embarrass him or weaken him politically.

Clinton could face similar challenges in litigation over her refusal to turn over emails from her time as secretary of State.

"It could pose a problem for both sides in the presidency," said Julian Zelizer, a history professor at Princeton University. "They could produce damaging information, and given the partisan environment, any kind of scandal or investigation could be used to stifle a president."

Those kinds of tactics have affected past presidencies.

President Ulysses Grant was among the early commanders in chief beset by scandal. He was forced to testify under oath at the White House in a high-profile federal prosecution of an illegal whiskey running scheme that ensnared some of his closest political associates.

Grant's testimony helped get his top aide off the hook and further soiled the public perception of his administration. Today, he is widely considered one of the least effective presidents in U.S. history.

In more modern times, President Richard Nixon's administration was ensnared by repeated legal woes, scandals, botched cover-ups and ultimately his resignation.

Bill Clinton faced legal issues tied to Whitewater, Paula Jones and White House intern Monica Lewinsky.

Clinton was forced to give a deposition in one sex-scandal case involving Jones and later faced an impeachment trial over his relations with Lewinsky at the White House. In the latter, Clinton became the first sitting president to testify before a grand jury investigating his own conduct, which became a years-long distraction.

Yet, no president had litigation in the volume of a potential President Trump.

"Because of the Supreme Court case related to Bill Clinton, there's no automatic shield for the president from civil action," said Samuel Issacharoff, a law professor at New York University. "If he were president and called to testify and hostilities break out in the Middle East a court would probably postpone -- but of course it's a major dislocation to be going through these civil trials while he's running an administration."

Trump university presents a Troublesome case

Among the many Trump lawsuits, the most problematic could be the Trump University cases.

Former students from across the country have sued in two class actions, accusing the school of charging them up to $35,000 and lying about the value of the lessons they would receive. New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman sued in 2013 and has since described Trump University as a "fraud" and a "scam."

While the open cases are civil, some legal scholars raise the prospect that a court could ultimately find Trump University or even Trump personally liable for fraud. In the worst case, a finding that fraud took place -- even by a civil court -- could provide Congress with the grounds to consider impeachment proceedings.

"These claims are different in an important way than most of his other cases," said Christopher Peterson, a law professor at the University of Utah. Even though the burden of proof would be lower in civil court to prove Trump liable for fraud or racketeering, Peterson said, "the evidence that you would use to prove those claims would be interchangeable. It's the same kind of claims that you would get the Mob for in a concrete scam."

At a minimum, if the cases go forward, additional testimony by instructors and students about predatory sales tactics would become public. Trump already has been deposed about the university. He downplayed his role, but could be called to testify at a trial.

If that happens, Trump would become the first modern sitting president to do so in open court. Bill Clinton gave testimony to a grand jury investigating the Monica Lewinsky scandal in 1998.

Trump fights to keep records secret

For years, Trump's legal team has successfully kept secret much of the financial information disclosed in his court cases.

The vast majority of settlement payments Trump has made to litigants is secret under non-disclosure agreements.

Trump's attorneys also regularly ask judges to seal records that come out during the cases, something that is often done for plaintiffs and defendants in civil cases.

If Trump is elected president, the already immense pressure to release records could escalate even further.

"You don't know what you don't know," said Katie Townsend, litigation director for the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, a plaintiff seeking to liberate some of the sealed records. "Either way, these documents would be newsworthy, before or after the election."

Already Trump's candidacy has prompted court battles to get records in his cases unsealed.

In September, a judge ruled against USA TODAY and The New York Times in an attempt to unseal court files from Trump's 1990 divorce from his first wife, Ivana.

District Court Judge Gonzalo Curiel ruled over the summer to keep private the video recording of depositions in the Trump University cases, partly for fear they would add to the political tint of the case and because transcripts are already available.

But in September, Trump attorney's lost battles to keep videotapes sealed in cases involving his Washington, D.C., hotel and Jupiter, Fla., golf resort.

And a group of journalists are battling to unseal the settlement in a 1983 case tied to the destruction of Bonwit Tower in Manhattan to make way for Trump Tower. The suit alleged undocumented Polish workers worked off-the-books. The settlement is still secret. A judge ruled against unsealing those records this summer, but the journalist group is appealing.

In June, in the days after the deadliest mass shooting in American history, as both presidential candidates and the rest of the nation were coming to grips with the terrorist attack on Orlando's Pulse nightclub, Trump was also being deposed in Washington in one of two lawsuits against the chefs, Zakarian and Andres.

The duo wanted no part of the eatery they'd planned to open in Trump's luxury hotel in the Old Post Office Building just down the street from the White House. Their reason: Their reputations were damaged after Trump's comments a year earlier branding Mexican **immigrants** as rapists, murderers and criminals.

As they sought to establish the idea that such statements could be bad for any business, the chef's attorneys asked Trump about the fallout for his businesses. They pressed him about whether he thought his words might keep Hispanics from going to a restaurant in one of his hotels. Trump's response: The election and the attention he's getting for the words he's using are only going to be good for business.

"I'm running for office. I obviously have credibility because I now, as it turns out, became the Republican nominee running against, we have a total of 17 people that were mostly senators and governors, highly respected people," he said under oath.

After explaining the "very dishonest" news media distorted his remarks about Mexican **immigrants**, he added: "I think, you know, most people think I'm right."

His booming popularity would only help a restaurant succeed, he testified. But, he conceded, the comments could turn some Hispanic patrons off.

"It is always possible," Trump said. "I just don't know. I mean, I don't know how to answer that question. It's possible."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lynda Carter's favorite thing about playing a president on TV? No fundraising involved.

The 1970s star of Wonder Woman returns to the world of small- screen superheroes as President Olivia Marsdin on Monday's episode of CW's Supergirl (8 ET/PT). Carter's commander in chief comes to National City -- and meets Supergirl (Melissa Benoist) -- as the town is divided on the civil rights of **aliens**.

"There are good **aliens** and bad **aliens**," says Carter, 65. "Different doesn't necessarily mean bad, and there are some topical things that are being dealt with."

The Supergirl role is the latest authoritative character for the actress, who played a governor in the 2001 comedy Super Troopers (and is reprising her part for the upcoming sequel) and a school principal in the 2005 kid-friendly film Sky High.

"It's really great because I have none of that with my children," says Carter, who has a son, James, 28, and daughter Jessica, 26. "I try to assert myself, and they'll have none of it."

Carter, a singer and former Miss World America, discusses her role on Supergirl and fan-casts a disco-era Batman:

Q What's President Marsdin like?

A I really did model my character off of Hillary Clinton because I've known her since 1983. I know who she is because I've seen her in all kinds of situations -- I spent quite a bit of time with her during the whole impeachment and (saw) how she handled herself with grace. When she's working, she's got her first-class brain going, and the difference between her and most other politicians is it's not just her own voice she likes -- she listens. That's what I tried to convey in what an effective president would be: warm and passionate.

Q Melissa's roughly the same age you were playing Wonder Woman. Do you see any similarities?

A Sure, I do. It was very easy for me to get the frustrations, the everyday-ness and what the public sees. She plays a superhero extremely well, and it's difficult because the tendency is to make fun of it and you can't do that. You have to play it with complete sincerity, otherwise it doesn't work. She does a beautiful job and she's a wonderful young woman.

Q If you were to run for president, what would your platform be?

A Let me put it this way: I will never run for office because it is so complicated, there is so much that goes on.

Q Let's say there had been a Justice League movie in the 1970s with you as Wonder Woman and Christopher Reeve as Superman. Who's your Batman?

A Kurt Russell, probably. He was really cute! Great body, with all that hair. Why not?

Q When's your next episode of Supergirl?

A Fans better start pressuring them because I have not been (cast) in a subsequent episode. I'm thinking, 'Well, when are you going to advance this thing?' Because I'm getting busy!

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Kevin Can Wait CBS, 8 ET/PT

Kevin James' disappointingly clunky new sitcom moves into its regular time period Monday, where it will provide a lead-in

for Matt LeBlanc's even more disappointing Man With a Plan (8:30 ET/PT). If nothing else, Kevin's making the move with a great guest attached, Everybody Loves Raymond's Ray Romano -- who's bringing his son Matt along for extra measure. Romano's Raymond, by the way, was the last CBS sitcom to win the best-comedy Emmy, back in 2005. If last week's almost unwatchably awful Kevin episode, or Man's similarly dismal first two installments, are a fair guide, don't count on either show to break that CBS losing streak.

Supergirl CW, 8 ET/PT

When it comes to booking guest stars, who could be a more appropriate visitor to Supergirl than Wonder Woman herself, Lynda Carter? (Q&A, 3D). Don't get your superhero hopes up too high, however -- she's not playing Wonder Woman this time. Instead, Carter guests as the president, whose visit to National City is marred by an **alien** attack and launches a **alien**-rights controversy.

Lucifer Fox, 9 ET/PT

Then there are those guest-casting choices that may strike you as, let's say, curious. Michael Imperioli, an Emmy-winner for The Sopranos, joins this show as the Angel Uriel, brother to Lucifer and Amenadiel. It is not a happy family reunion.

Email TV questions to

askbianco@usatoday.com ahead of Robert Bianco's live video chat Mondays, 2 p.m. ET/11 a.m. PT, at facebook.com/usatodaylife.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a final burst of bombastic bluster in the third televised debate, Donald Trump came across as more insecure, unprepared and angrily unhinged than ever before. In the days remaining before Nov. 8, his true believers will turn with deepening desperation to the search for scapegoats for their flailing, failing campaign.

In addition to general denunciations of a "rigged system," they've found a favorite target with NeverTrumpers -- disillusioned conservatives who allegedly place self-interest ahead of the nation's survival. According to this argument, Republicans who object the nominee's loutish behavior seek to appease "respectable" opinion while destroying the last, best hope to rescue the Republic from demonic Democratic domination.

This argument rests entirely on dubious assumptions.

First, it's hardly advantageous for GOP officials or conservative opinion leaders to decline to board the Trump Train. The path of least resistance would be to ignore Trump's flaws and hype the horrors of Hillary Clinton, or to give the nominee at least nominal endorsement (like House Speaker Paul Ryan, or radio host Mark Levin) while still lamenting the ways his candidacy falls short.

My indignant listeners

As one of the lonely few broadcasters in national radio syndication to maintain opposition to the Trump candidacy, I can attest that my position has generated primarily anger from our syndicator, many of our 300 local affiliates, and thousands of indignant listeners who feel no hesitation in expressing their rage in emails and phone calls.

The reason to endure such denunciation involves far more than distaste for Trump's loathsome boasts about assaulting women. Even if the nominee led a personal life as spotless as Mitt Romney's, his candidacy would be impossible to support for many thoughtful conservatives.

His three distinctive policy priorities -- opposing free trade, **immigration** and American leadership on the world stage -- characterize him as a big government populist and reflexive isolationist, not a conservative.

On these core issues, Trump also split dramatically from the leader who defined modern conservatism. Ronald Reagan championed muscular American leadership, robust free trade, and **immigration** -- including "amnesty" for the undocumented. And on each of these crucial questions, Hillary Clinton, for all her faults, comes closer to mainstream Reaganite positions than does the imperious "I Alone Can Fix It" Bonapartist poseur, Donald Trump.

Trumpian loyalists cite the poisonous progressive priorities that Clinton promises to impose. But the most obnoxious elements of her program -- raising taxes, expanding entitlements, appointing liberals to the Supreme Court -- require congressional approval. That increases the stakes for defending GOP majorities in both houses of Congress. By contrast, Trump's most menacing proposals -- blowing up alliances, deporting millions, starting trade wars by erasing accords -- could be implemented by a president acting on his own, if he's irresponsible enough to do so.

Moreover, the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget suggests that even if Clinton managed to enact all her budgetary and tax proposals, she might add $20 billion dollars a year to the national debt over the next 10 years. Trump, by contrast, would swell that debt by $500 billion annually if he pushed through his agenda, inflicting incalculable damage on the economy.

The assertion that Clinton threatens prosperity and security more dangerously than Trump rests on an obvious contradiction in his candidacy.

The land we love

Since beginning his campaign, The Donald has equated Hillary with "more of the same" while promising his presidency would radically restructure the political order. Now, with President Obama's popularity near its second-term high and no seething majority demanding a clean break, Trumpers equate Clinton with apocalypse, not status quo. The prospect of more of the same in Washington might remain distinctly unappetizing, but it hardly threatens cataclysm.

The perils of a Trump presidency remain far more menacing -- especially with the man's demonstrable lack of impulse control and propensity for picking pointless fights.

In opposing the election of the most dubious candidate ever nominated by a major party, Republicans of conscience aren't switching sides. We're not on the Democrats' side, or Clinton's side. We're on America's side, protecting the land we love from a uniquely dangerous demagogue.

Michael Medved, a member of the USA TODAY board of contributors, hosts a national talk radio show. His new book The American Miracle will be out in November.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The three-part reality TV miniseries Presidential Debates: Special Victims Unit is blessedly over, leaving three major questions: Who will be elected president Nov. 8? If Donald Trump loses, as polls suggest, will he concede? And on his way to that finale, will the GOP's wrecking ball of a nominee level the whole Republican neighborhood or just a few blocks of it?

Those are merely the political questions, of course. At Wednesday night's final faceoff, moderator Chris Wallace gamely tried to keep the focus on weightier questions such as the Supreme Court, **immigration**, the federal budget, the economy, and foreign hot spots such as Iraq and Syria.

In other words, enough about "hate in her heart" and "Go directly to jail. Do not pass go, do not collect $200" (or $225,000 from Wall Street). Enough about snorting and sniffling and drug tests. Enough with the eye-rolling yet riveting spectacle of Trump's say- anything, do-anything brand of psychological warfare.

The debate began promisingly enough, though without a handshake, launching instantly into the most divisive issues of the day -- guns, abortion, **immigration**, the Citizens United decision that has triggered a flood of what Hillary Clinton called "dark, unaccountable money" into politics. While virtually everyone knows at this point that Clinton would want a Supreme Court that "stands up" for women's and gay rights, and that Trump wants to build a wall along the Mexican border and go after "bad hombres," the opening tone was less personal and more informative than we've grown used to.

But the "fitness to be president" segment plunged back into familiar territory. Clinton called Trump "unfit" and a puppet of Vladimir Putin. Trump called Clinton "a nasty woman" who is running a "very sleazy" campaign that is behind the multiple women accusing him of unwanted sexual advances and groping. "Fiction," he insisted.

Anyone looking for clarity on Clinton's entangled interests and what Trump called "pay to play" would not have found it. More ominously, Trump contradicted running mate Mike Pence and refused to say that he would accept the results of what he calls a "rigged" election. "I will look at it at the time," he said, adding: "I will keep you in suspense." A presidential nominee who undermines the peaceful transfer of power in our democracy? Appalling, and disqualifying.

For what it's worth, and keeping in mind that fact-checkers won't be able to rest for days, it was Trump's best performance, at least at the start. But to most Americans, we suspect, it is a relief that the debates are over. It is a relief for parents who won't have to worry that the children might hear God-knows-what from a presidential candidate. It will, frankly, be a relief when this ugly campaign is over and the nation can return to its regularly scheduled programming.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump began their final debate by contrasting their visions for the future of the Supreme Court, then clashing on **immigration** policy and abortion before Trump suggested he might not accept the outcome of the election Nov. 8.

Asked whether he would respect the results of the election, Trump said, "I will tell you at the time. I will keep you in suspense." Clinton pounced, saying the comments are "horrifying," given that the nation's democratic system is built upon a peaceful transfer of power.

"Every time things aren't going in Donald's direction, he claims it is rigged against him," Clinton said, citing his insistence that the Republican primary was rigged after he lost Iowa and Wisconsin, that the courts were rigged when Trump University was sued for fraud and even that the Emmys were rigged when he didn't receive one. "It's funny, but it is also really troubling," she said.

Trump has crisscrossed the country saying the election is "rigged" as a series of national polls show Clinton with a wide lead at the national level and in critical battlegrounds, including Pennsylvania.

On the Supreme Court, Clinton said she would appoint members who would "stand up" for average people and not just the "powerful," and Trump said he would nominate justices with "a conservative bent."

Clinton said the court "raises the central issue in this election" and should protect women's rights and marriage equality, as well as reverse the Citizens Uniteddecision that has "undermined" the electoral system. "I have major disagreements with my opponent about these issues and others," she said.

Trump said, "The Supreme Court is what it's all about." He contended that the Second Amendment right to bear arms "is under absolute siege," and he warned that if Clinton is elected, "it will be a very very small replica of what it is now."

Clinton reiterated her respect for the Second Amendment and said it is not incompatible with "reasonable regulation" to keep guns away from "people who shouldn't have guns."

The candidates' final debate was their last opportunity to reach an audience of millions of voters. They had far different goals as they presented their closing arguments to America.

On abortion, Clinton made clear she will defend a woman's right to choose. Trump berated her for backing late-term abortions. Clinton noted that she supports late-term abortion in cases to defend the life of the mother. "I do not think the United States government should be stepping in and making those most personal of decisions," she said.

Trump called it "terrible if you go with what Hillary is saying," because it would allow a doctor to "rip the baby out of the womb of the mother" in the ninth month. "It's not OK with me," he said. Clinton said Trump misrepresented the circumstances of most late- term abortions: "That is not what happens in these cases, and using that kind of scare rhetoric is terribly unfortunate," she said.

On **immigration**, Clinton argued that Trump's deportation plan is tantamount to a national effort to round up people and put them on trains and buses to get them out of the country. "That is an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation" and "would rip our country apart."

She called for an **immigration** policy that includes border security and took aim at Trump's proposal to build a wall along the border with Mexico. Trump stressed that he would force all undocumented **immigrants** to return to their home country: "We have some bad hombres here, and we're gonna get em out," he said.

Clinton called it a "rank mischaracterization" that she is for totally open borders before accusing Russia is hacking her campaign emails. The hacks are coming "from the highest levels of the Kremlin," she said.

Trump refused to accept U.S. intelligence reports that Russia is behind the cyberattacks that exposed emails from Clinton campaign manager John Podesta. "That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders," Trump said before getting into a tussle with Clinton about which one of them is a "puppet" for Russian President Vladimir Putin.

A gloves-off tone was apparent from the beginning as the families and candidates bypassed the customary handshake.

Real estate billionaire Trump has been the underdog in nearly every single national poll conducted in the past week, a deficit that could translate into a crushing defeat in the Electoral College. Surveys showed traditionally Republican states such as Arizona in play.

Clinton looks to maximize her appeal to independent and soft Republican voters. If polls are accurate that she's the prohibitive winner, her next challenge will be to unify the country behind her, which looks increasingly difficult in an election among the nastiest and most personal.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The three-part reality TV miniseries Presidential Debates: Special Victims Unit is blessedly over, leaving three major questions: Who will be elected president Nov. 8? What will become of Donald Trump if, as appears likely, he loses? And on his way to that finale, will the GOP's wrecking ball of a nominee level the whole Republican neighborhood or just a few blocks of it?

Those are merely the political questions, of course. At Wednesday night's final faceoff, which ended after this edition went to press, moderator Chris Wallace gamely tried to keep the focus on weightier questions such as the Supreme Court, **immigration**, the federal budget, the economy, and foreign hot spots such as Iraq, Afghanistan and Yemen.

In other words, enough about "hate in her heart" and "Go directly to jail. Do not pass go, do not collect $200" (or $225,000 from Wall Street). Enough about snorting and sniffling and drug tests. Enough with the eye-rolling yet riveting spectacle of Trump's say- anything, do-anything brand of psychological warfare -- epitomized by his Las Vegas invitations to Patricia Smith, the mother of a State Department employee killed in the 2012 Benghazi attacks, and Malik Obama, the president's Kenyan-born half brother who is a U.S. citizen and supports Trump.

The session began promisingly, though without a handshake, launching instantly into the most divisive issues of the day -- guns, abortion, **immigration**, the Citizens United decision that has triggered a flood of what Clinton called "dark, unaccountable money" into politics. While virtually everyone knows at this point that Clinton would want a Supreme Court that "stands up" for women's and gay rights, or that Trump wants to build a wall and go after "bad hombres," the opening tone was less personal and more informative than we've grown used to in this campaign.

Recent days have not been entirely without substance. Clinton has been discussing her plan to fight poverty. Trump came out for congressional term limits and slowing Washington's revolving door. Still, particularly on his side, the gruel has been awfully thin. And it's probably a vain hope that, with less than three weeks until Election Day, the profound and the practical will suddenly move to the fore.

The final debate was a final chance to make the election about the voters instead of the candidates. At least at the start, it delivered with an issue-focused discussion.

It is nevertheless a relief that the debates, with their gimmickry, one-upmanship and theatricality, are over. It is a relief for parents who don't have to guard the TV against children who might hear God-knows-what out of the mouth of a presidential candidate, or a moderator quoting him. It will, frankly, be a relief when this campaign is over and the nation can go back to its regularly scheduled programming.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Three Kansas men accused of plotting to blow up an apartment complex housing scores of Somalis may have hoped to inspire more attacks on Muslims, but some Garden City residents say just the opposite is happening in their community.

A federal magistrate in Wichita on Monday ordered Curtis Allen and Gavin Wright, both 49, and Patrick Eugene Stein, 47, to remain in custody pending hearings in coming days. The men hoped the attack, planned for the day after next month's presidential election, would "wake people up" to a perceived Islamic threat and inspire other militia groups to commit similar violent acts, according to the federal complaint unsealed Friday.

Halima Farah, 26, lives in the targeted complex. She said news of the plot rocked the Somali community of about 500 people in the western Kansas city of about 25,000.

"It was so scary," she told USA TODAY. "Garden City is small and peaceful. I love living here. I didn't think something like that could happen here."

None of the suspects is from Garden City. Farah said authorities assured the community that the plot had been foiled and that they should feel safe. Neighbors also showed support.

"People have been coming to our apartments and saying 'We are sorry. Nothing will happen. We love you,'" Farah said. "That is what the USA is about. It's not about divisions."

Churches that help settle the Somalis also were discussed as targets, the federal complaint says. Steve Ensz, pastor of Garden Valley Church, said Monday that won't stop his church from collecting items for distribution to **immigrants** setting up households in Garden City.

"We will keep helping them, even more so," Ensz told USA TODAY. "This is a tense time in our community, but we want to move forward with building friendships and being the neighbors God has called on us to be."

Authorities said the suspects, charged with conspiring to use an implement of mass destruction, were part of an anti-Muslim, anti- **immigration** group called the Crusaders.

The group planned to circle the complex with truck bombs and ignite them with a cellphone, authorities said. About 120 Somalis live there.

The complex was targeted because of its population and because one of the apartments was being used as a mosque, the complaint alleges.

Ann Burgess, who with her husband, Steven, owns the complex, told USA TODAY she has been renting to Somali **immigrants** for more than a decade. She said her tenants work hard, take good care of the property and are an important part of the community. "These people are fine, upstanding citizens."

Authorities monitored the group for eight months through a paid informant until Allen's girlfriend called Liberal, Kan., police to report a domestic battery incident last week, Beall said. She led police to a stash of weapons, and police estimated they found "close to a metric ton of ammunition in Allen's residence," the complaint says.

If convicted, the defendants could be sentenced to life in federal prison.

Farah said Muslims don't want people to blame the Muslim community for the behavior of Islamic extremists who commit violence. "We aren't going to blame all white people because of these three men," she said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's derogatory comments about Mexicans and his vow to build a wall along the southern U.S. border have failed to spark a surge in voter registrations among Hispanics living in key swing states, a USA TODAY analysis shows.

The study looked at the 50 counties with the largest Hispanic population in 10 swing states and found that voter registrations in those counties have increased during the 2016 election cycle. But the gains simply mirrored the growth in the Hispanic population and did not represent a "Trump effect" -- a rush to register by Hispanics who plan to vote against the Republican presidential nominee -- as some Democratic and Hispanic groups had expected.

Overall, voter rolls in those 50 counties increased by 3.8% in the lead-up to the 2016 election, compared to a 3.5% increase during the 2012 election cycle. Those increases are explained by overall population growth (2.9% this election cycle and 2.7% in the 2012 period) as well as even faster growth in the Hispanic population, which has jumped nearly 10% since 2010.

The lack of a "Trump effect" is clearer in the few states that provide voter registration data specifically for Hispanics. In Florida, the number of Hispanics registered to vote has increased 14.6% during the 2016 election cycle, nearly identical to a 14.4% increase before the 2012 election.

The findings show that Hispanics will play a larger role in the 2016 election, as the country's largest minority group continues increasing its share of the U.S. electorate, which has grown from 10% in 2012 to 12% now.

The data make clear, however, that Hispanic advocacy groups, the Democratic Party and party presidential nominee Hillary Clinton have yet to take advantage of Trump's disparaging remarks and tough **immigration** enforcement views.

Last year, in announcing his presidential run, Trump said of some Mexicans coming into the U.S.: "They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people." He also has called for construction of a wall along the border paid for by Mexico and questioned the qualifications of a U.S.-born federal judge because he was "Mexican."

Ali Noorani, executive director of the National **Immigration** Forum, a Washington-based group that advocates for **immigrants**' rights, blames both political parties for not doing enough to court Hispanics.

"Republicans are ignoring this growing electorate," Noorani said. "And these numbers show that Democrats are leaving a lot of votes on the table too."

Clinton's campaign has used a variety of strategies to court Hispanics. The campaign has run 40 TV ads and 24 radio ads, and pushed its message through newspapers and social media in Spanish and English targeting Hispanics. The campaign created phone banks so female Hispanic supporters call Hispanic women in the community. And the campaign has programs focused on Hispanic small businesses, Hispanic religious leaders and is even using undocumented **immigrants** to lobby for Clinton's policies to protect them from deportation.

Hispanic advocacy groups, such as the National Council of La Raza, have held their traditional voter registration drives. Spanish- language media organizations, such as Univision, have also led voter registration efforts. Even taco trucks have become a place to register after a Trump surrogate warned about unfettered **immigration** leading to a flood of taco trucks on every street corner.

Xochitl Hinojosa, a spokeswoman for Clinton's campaign, said even the slightest gains in Hispanic registrations can help decide the race in swing states like North Carolina.

"That is why we're doing everything we can to register and turnout Latino voters," she said. "We've invested in the Latino community since day one of this campaign, and will continue to do so until Election Day."

The Trump campaign did not respond to requests for comment.

Analyzing how Hispanics are registering to vote across different states is difficult. The secretaries of state of most states publish the total number of people who have registered to vote and many break that down by party affiliation, but very few provide data that identifies Hispanic voters.

To get around those limitations, USA TODAY used data from the Pew Research Center to identify the five counties with the largest population of Hispanics in each of 10 swing states: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin.

The analysis compared voter registration data from election officials in each state from the beginning of 2015 through the end of the summer of 2016. (States report voter registration data at different times, but most started around Jan. 1, 2015, and ended around Sept. 1, 2016.) USA TODAY then looked at the same time period in 2012.

USA TODAY also looked at voter registration data in the two states that provide detailed data on Hispanic voter registrations: Florida and North Carolina.

Mark Hugo Lopez, director of Hispanic research at the Pew Research Center, analyzed USA TODAY's findings and described them as a "good barometer we should be using" for measuring Hispanic voter registrations given the limited data available. He said some Hispanics are definitely registering specifically to oppose Trump, but the overall numbers show that Hispanic voting numbers would have risen with or without Trump as the Republican nominee.

"It looks like this year is no different in terms of the growth of the number of Hispanic registered voters," he said.

Here are some of the findings:

The 50 counties analyzed represent the fastest-growing portions of those states and are driving most of the voter registration increases. Voter rolls in the most heavily Hispanic counties grew faster than the state average in 9 out of 10 states, both in 2016 and 2012.

The voter registration increases in the most heavily Hispanic counties drove Democratic gains in most of the states, even if the states overall are trending Republican. In Iowa, Republicans have added 14,000 more registered voters than Democrats leading up to the election. But in the five counties examined, Democrats outgained Republicans 2-to-1.

In some cases, the state would have seen a decline in total voters from 2012 to 2016 if not for the heavily-Hispanic counties. In Wisconsin, the state would have lost 3,606 voters, if not for the increases in Milwaukee, Dane, Racine, Kenosha and Brown counties.

In some states, Hispanic voter growth has slowed. In North Carolina, Hispanic voter registration overall increased 23.3% during the 2016 election, compared to 25.2% in 2012.

Iowa was the only state during the 2016 election cycle to lose both voters across the state and in the counties with the most Hispanics.

The states with the largest voter increases in the most heavily- Hispanic counties were Florida, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Nevada and North Carolina.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Google is giving $1 million to Silicon Valley organizations that serve Latino students and their families as it pushes to increase the diversity of its workforce.

The Internet giant's philanthropic arm Google.org is making a $750,000 grant to Silicon Valley Education Foundation to support its work narrowing the achievement gap and $250,000 to the Hispanic Foundation of Silicon Valley to increase high school and graduation rates for Latino students. Both organizations are working to build career pathways for Latinos into tech companies.

Ron Gonzales, president and CEO of the Hispanic Foundation of Silicon Valley, says programs like his are "low-cost, local solutions to this (tech) industry crisis of not having enough diversity in the workforce."

Hispanics are the second-largest population group in the country after whites. In California, they make up nearly 40% of the population and in Silicon Valley 27%. Yet, in Silicon Valley tech companies, they make up 6% of employees, vs. the 22% of employees in non-tech firms in the area, according to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

At major Silicon Valley tech companies, that percentage is even smaller. Hispanics account for 3% of Google's workforce. Hispanics are not highly visible among the ranks of entrepreneurs and investors either. Less than 1% of venture-backed start-ups has a Latino founder, according to CB Insights.

The shortage of Latinos is a problem for Silicon Valley's tech industry, which is competing in a global marketplace. And Hispanics, who have higher rates of unemployment in California and wide disparities in higher education and homeownership, are being shut out of one of the fastest-growing, highest-paying sectors of the American economy.

Suzanna Bobadilla, who works on Google's social impact marketing team, says she and other Latino employees want to get out the word that Google -- and the tech industry at large -- wants to bring more Latinos into the fold.

Google says its research shows that 51% of African-American students and 47% of Hispanic students don't have access to computer science classes in school. Google wants to encourage more students to pursue careers in the technology field and to raise awareness of other opportunities in the tech industry.

"For Latinos interested in STEM, interested in Google, we are so excited to have you join us. We can't wait," said Bobadilla, the daughter of a Mexican **immigrant**.

Bobadilla says she was lucky. "Growing up, the only engineer I knew was a Latino engineer," she says.

Her father, a civil engineer and a programmer, taught her how to code, how computers work, even how to troubleshoot the family printer. He also inspired her deep pride in her heritage.

"I know that there is unfortunately a political climate that categorizes Latino **immigrants** as a detriment," she says. "I'm proud of my father. He's what Latino innovation looks like."

Gonzales says he's hoping Google's investment will spur others to open their wallets for the Hispanic Foundation of Silicon Valley. He says he has more applications for college scholarships from Latino students studying STEM than he has funds. A former employee of Hewlett-Packard and mayor of San Jose, Gonzales is surprised so few high-tech companies struggling to diversify their workforces have stepped forward with donations.

"Our scholarship program is designed to create engineers from our local neighborhoods that are down the street from their headquarters," he said. "I think they are trying their own programs, but, quite frankly, they have not been tremendously successful. Hopefully in time they will look at other options."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREImmigrants** are gaining on U.S.-born residents in homeownership, a positive development that's likely enhancing their contribution to the economy, a Truliastudy shows.

"When it comes to achieving the American dream, (**immigrants**) look very similar to native-born Americans," says Ralph McLaughlin, chief economist of Trulia, a real estate research firm.

**Immigration** has played a central role in the presidential campaign, with Republican nominee Donald Trump calling for tighter constraints and deportation of millions of undocumented **immigrants**.

Half of **immigrants** in the country owned homes last year, compared with 66% of U.S.-born residents, the smallest gap between the groups in two decades, the study says. The disparity peaked in 2001, when 70.3% of American-born residents owned homes, vs. 49.6% of **immigrants**.

Foreign-born homeowners are more likely than renters to amass home equity and wealth and spend more, adding to U.S. economic growth. They also are more likely to be involved in their communities and civic affairs.

The main reason **immigrants** are catching up is that their average tenure in the U.S. has increased, giving them more time to build up a work history, burnish their credit scores and save for a down payment, McLaughlin says. In 2014, 75% of **immigrants** had lived in the U.S. at least 10 years, up from 65% in 2005, according to data from the Census Bureau and Trulia. In Montana and Vermont, states with the smallest gaps between native-born and **immigrant**homeownership rates -- 3.2 and 4.2 percentage points, respectively - - **immigrants** have among the highest average tenures in the U.S.

Other forces also are at work. Since the housing crash and Great Recession, the homeownership rate for all Americans has fallen, reaching a 50-year low of 62.9% in the second quarter. Many people lost homes through foreclosure. And credit standards remain tight, especially for Millennials burdened by student debt whose careers were set back by the downturn.

But in recent years, the ownership rate for American-born residents has continued to fall while the rate for **immigrants** has leveled off. To **immigrate** to the U.S., especially in economically challenging times, foreign-born residents likely must have more resources and skew older than their American counterparts, McLaughlin says.

From 2006 to 2014, the portion of U.S.-born households headed by 18- to 25-year-olds has been stable at 11%, while the share of **immigrant** households led by young adults has dropped to 8.7% from 11.6%, according to Census Bureau and Trulia figures.

"It takes some money and job prospects" to pull up stakes, McLaughlin says.

Another factor: A tight labor market has many employers struggling to find workers and willing to go to greater lengths to secure visas for highly skilled foreign employees, he says.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**'The Care Bears Movie' (1985)

The family-friendly animated film was one of the first to bring popular toys to the movies, but historical value aside, Care Bears was a load of feel-good malarkey. A plot that placed Tenderheart Bear, Friend Bear and Share Bear in a place called Care-A-Lot calls for a certain amount of saccharine sweetness, but throwing in orphan kids and family themes, too, was simply death by sugar rush.

'Masters of the Universe' (1987)

That old He-Man cartoon mantra "I have the power!" couldn't be said of this box office flop starring Dolph Lundgren as the muscular Eternian warrior tapped to help Earth when it is threatened by an evil force. It probably made sense for Lundgren, whose physique was appropriately He-Man-esque, and a pre-Friends Courteney Cox, as one of the earthlings caught in this interdimensional scrape. But for Frank Langella, Tony winner and Oscar nominee, wearing a cheesy skull mask and going way over the top as the antagonist Skeletor was maybe a bit of a head-scratcher.

'Transformers: Revenge of the Fallen' (2009)

The Transformers movies on the whole have been a smorgasbord of bad but the second film, Revenge of the Fallen, was the most egregious of them all. Horrendous acting and bad CGI were the big culprits, but other questionable decisions included Skids and Mudflap (Autobots with uncomfortable racial stereotyping), the elderly Jetfire (it's really weird to see an **alien** robot needing a walker) and Devastator (the gigantic villain who seemingly has a wrecking ball as robotic genitalia).

'G.I. Joe: The Rise of Cobra' (2009)

Beloved by '80s kids, G.I. Joe arrived with a thud on the big screen, though it at least had a B-movie vibe with scenes like the Eiffel Tower getting eaten by green mechanical nanites. Fans didn't love that good guy Duke (Channing Tatum) and bad girl Baroness (Sienna Miller) had a romantic past, or that Joseph Gordon-Levitt was a complete fail as a Cobra Commander. Dwayne Johnson's appearance in G.I. Joe: Retaliation four years later helped save some face, but when a star like Tatum is cool with getting killed off in a sequel, it's not a good look for your franchise.

'Battleship' (2012)

Between Rihanna randomly showing up as a Navy weapons specialist, Liam Neeson chewing scenery as a fleet commander (and protective dad) and a so-bad-this-is-kinda-good vibe, Battleship has its guilty- pleasure moments. Still, it's sunk from the beginning by poor acting and uninteresting **aliens** that seem like Independence Day rejects. Just play the board game.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Letters

The vice presidential debate was disappointing. Indiana Gov. Mike Pence showed his Midwestern decency and civil manner. I found Sen. Tim Kaine's interruptions and aggressiveness quite uncouth and bully- like and lacking in decency and civility, to say the least.

Kaine talking over moderator Elaine Quijano was disrespectful to Quijano, Pence and the American people. I commend Quijano for her incisive and astute questions.

If Kaine's goal was to display that his testosterone overdrive and disrespectful behaviors could match those of Trump, he succeeded.

While most voters will not cast their votes based on the vice presidential debate, the debate did remind us how pathetic, offensive and low some politicians' behaviors have gotten.

Anh Le

San Francisco

Facebook

Mike Pence's now-famous line "you whipped out that Mexican thing again" is being used to help register Latino voters.

I guess being called a "thing" is better than being called an "illegal." God bless Republicans, they just refuse to refer to **immigrants** as people.

Robert Montgomery

Where to even begin when people feel so free to say such inappropriate and racist comments? Using lies, fear and hate will never get your party ahead.

Tanya Denise

Fact is, some entering illegally are murderers and rapists. Democrats can't deny that.

Phil Koprowski

No Pence, Tim Kaine didn't "whip" it out. Your running mate dwelled on it for months on end. Now, of course, Trump shut up about it because he thinks Hispanic people are ignorant enough to think he cares about them.

Sam Forsythe-Danford

I agree. Pence shouldn't have said "Mexican thing." He should have said "race baiting," "race hustling" or "trafficking in racial politics for votes." You know, all of the racist things the left does.

James Mann

Twitter

We asked our followers whether they prefer Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine's **immigration** plan or Donald Trump and Mike Pence's.

The Clinton plan is to accept millions of **immigrants** and provide welfare and food stamps. It's pathetic.

@idotsom

Well, Clinton's is a positive plan. Trump's plan is only filled with negatives (as are all of his messages).

@44bedford

Clinton and Kaine at least have productive ideas. Trump and Pence only have obnoxious complaints.

@H673H

Clinton and Kaine, because this country was built on the backs of the people Trump wants to deport! #pathwaytocitizenship.

@jenniconn1975

They are both just divisive political tools used to gather like- minded masses and discourage reason.

@CommonSenseUGH

For more, follow @USATOpinion or #tellusatoday.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Obama approval rating hits second-term high

President Obama just hit the highest approval rating of his second term in a new poll.

On Thursday, a CNN/ORC survey found that 55% of Americans approve of the job Obama is doing, the highest mark in the poll since the president was sworn in for a second time in January 2013.

Obama hit 55% just twice in the CNN survey after his first year in office, including once right before his second term began. His approval ratings were much higher in the opening months of 2009, but he was also riding a post-election high.

--Eliza Collins

**immigration** plan causes stir for uk politician

One of Britain's most senior politicians was caught in an escalating argument about **immigration** Thursday, after a company she claimed recruited most of its staff from Eastern Europe said 75% of its employees were British.

Amber Rudd, the home secretary, proposed that companies disclose what percentage of their workers are foreign in a bid to make them train and employ more locals, in an announcement during the ruling Conservative Party's annual conference.

Guterres formally nominated to U.N. post

The United Nations Security Council on Thursday ratified its unanimous decision to back Portugal's former prime minister Antonio Guterres as the organization's next secretary-general.

The Security Council's formal recommendation was announced after its morning meeting in New York City. The recommendation goes next to the 193-member U.N. General Assembly for approval in the coming days.

--Oren Dorell

Poles protested abortion law -- and it worked

Hundreds of thousands of Polish women and men took to the streets this week to tell the country's conservative ruling Law and Justice party that they were against a proposed law that would have imposed a total ban on abortion -- and the government listened.

Polish lawmakers abandoned the bill Thursday after coming under social pressure from throngs of black-clad opponents of the law who held massive protests up and down Poland on Monday.

Legislators voted 352-58 against it in parliament. The proposed law would have outlawed abortion even in cases of rape.

--Kim Hjelmgaard

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Vice presidential debates, like Tuesday night's in Farmville, Va., usually don't garner much attention. They have a bit of a kids' table quality to them, perhaps because they also generally involve candidates who are less exciting and less well-known than the people at the top of the ticket.

This year was no different.

Gov. Mike Pence, R-Ind., and Sen. Tim Kaine, D-Va., assumed the traditional role of surrogates, talking up their respective running mates and cutting down the other party's.

Pence was the smoother pitchman, but he was selling an inferior product, attempting to defend a presidential candidate -- Donald Trump -- who is ill-prepared for the White House and prone to offensive, self-destructive comments. A former radio talk show host, Pence was polished and cool, a vast improvement over Trump and often better than Kaine. Yet even as Pence denied that the Republican ticket is running an insult-driven campaign, Trump was tweeting put- downs from the sidelines.

Kaine had the task of adding likeability to the Democratic ticket while also defending Hillary Clinton and taking on Trump. He was best when citing the litany of invectives that Trump has hurled at **immigrants**, women, soldiers and others. But Kaine was overly and annoyingly eager to interrupt, and most of his zingers fell flat.

When not attacking each other's running mates, the two sparred on Russia, nuclear proliferation, **immigration**, taxes and a host of other issues. At least on foreign policy, they produced a debate that was more substantive than the one last week between the presidential nominees.

Pence, by virtue of his even temperament and background as a congressman and governor, is more suited for the presidency than Trump and a more credible messenger of conservative values.

Kaine has less foreign policy experience than Clinton but has an extensive career in politics that includes time as a Richmond city councilman and mayor, lieutenant governor and governor of Virginia, and a U.S. senator. What's more, he has managed to do all this without creating the swirl of controversy that seems to follow Clinton wherever she goes.

Tuesday's joyless debate between the two relatively low-key vice presidential nominees is unlikely to change the trajectory of this year's race. At best, Pence stopped the GOP ticket's bleeding enough to give Trump a chance to rebound at Sunday night's second presidential debate.

But it would be a mistake to conclude that the running mates don't matter. Perhaps never in recent history has there been a greater chance that one of the two vice presidential candidates might end up in the Oval Office.

Trump, 70, would be the oldest person ever elected U.S. president. Clinton, who's turning 69 this month, would be second only to President Reagan when he took office. Their ages alone increase the odds that this year's winner might leave office prematurely or decide not to seek a second term.

Voters would do well to pay attention to Pence, 57, and Kaine, 58. Come Nov. 8, one of them could become a historical footnote. The other will be in the news for a long time.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Turkey extends state of emergency by 3 months

Turkish Deputy Prime Minister Numan Kurtulmussaid Monday a three- month-long state of emergency, declared after Turkey's failed military coup, has been extended by three more months.

Kurtulmus said the state of emergency would be extended as of Oct. 19 for 90 more days, with parliament's approval, according to state-run Anadolu news agency.

The state of emergency started on July 20 -- days after the failed coup attempt left at least 270 people dead.

--Jessica Durando

Supreme Court refuses to hear **immigration** case

The Supreme Court refused Monday to reconsider President Obama's proposed overhaul of the nation's **immigration** system following a tie vote in June that blocked its implementation.

The eight-member court's order shut the door on a plan that already seemed all but dead a few months ago. The court declined to wait until a ninth justice is confirmed and seated in order to rehear the case -- and possibly reverse its June decision.

The decision was applauded by Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton, who led a group of states in seeking to invalidate the plan. "Rewriting national **immigration** law requires the full and careful consideration of Congress," he said. "This is the latest setback to the president's attempt to expand executive power."

--Richard Wolf

Japan's Ohsumi wins Nobel Prize in medicine

A Japanese scientist whose research is focused on how cells gets recycled by the human body was awarded the Nobel Prize in medicine Monday.

Yoshinori Ohsumi, 71, is a cell biologist who specializes in "autophagy," described by the 2016 Nobel academy as a "self eating" process for degrading and recycling cellular components. When autophagy does not occur, it has been linked to diseases such as Parkinson's, diabetes and cancer.

The prize was awarded by the Nobel Assembly at Stockholm's Karolinska Institute. "Intense research is now ongoing to develop drugs that can target autophagy," Karolinska said.

--Kim Hjelmgaard

Also

Ohio plans to resume executions next year with a new three-drug combination after a three-year hiatus, state officials said Monday. Ohio is one of about a dozen states where executions have been stalled amid difficulties obtaining dependable drugs.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It's been a week since Angelina Jolie filed for divorce from Brad Pitt, thus upending widespread romantic notions about Hollywood's most "golden" couple. For seven days it's been one startling revelation after another. So what happens next?

First up: Pitt has 30 days from the time Jolie filed her petition (Sept. 19) to file his official response. Also possible: A resolution of allegations now being investigated that he verbally and physically abused one of his kids.

His response will be public record. The child-abuse investigation is not, and if the lawyers have their way, we may not find out for sure what happens on that question -- until it's leaked. Which, of course, is all too possible.

No matter how much divorce lawyers protest that this latest mega- celeb divorce should be conducted outside the bear pit of the public courtroom, the pressure in the tabloid media to get the latest juicy details -- and the need to win the public relations war -- is strong.

What is likely to happen after Pitt files a response?

In most cases, the divorce court would make a temporary spousal- support order, but neither multimillionaire Jolie nor multimillionaire Pitt is likely to need money from the other, says Los Angeles divorce attorney Fahi Takesh Hallin of Harris Ginsberg.

"But they will need a temporary custody schedule, and my intuition tells me they will be in court over that," Hallin says. "If the parties are able to resolve that amicably, it will be private. If they have to go to court, it will be open to the public."

Hallin predicts the next thing to watch for is Pitt's attempt to ensure he has equal time with the couple's six kids, ages 8 to 15, until the divorce is granted. He also can be expected to "vigorously defend" himself against the report being investigated by child protective services that he verbally and physically abused one of his children while on a private flight from France to the USA on Sept. 14.

The Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services will not confirm or deny there is an investigation because it is prohibited by law from doing so. But a source close to Pitt, who was not authorized to speak publicly, has told USA TODAY that Pitt is taking the matter "very seriously and is fully cooperating," though he calls the allegations "greatly exaggerated or fabricated."

While the family services department is investigating, "(Pitt's) attorneys will take depositions of everybody involved, there will be a meeting with (family services) and a hearing if necessary," Hallin says. "All of which will be behind closed doors."

If there is a prenup, why does it matter?

It means the asset-dividing part of the divorce can be easily settled. The question that remains is custody of the kids. Jolie indicated in her petition that she is seeking full physical custody, and in her sole press statement she said she sought the divorce "for the health of the family."

It's significant that Jolie mentioned nothing about a prenup in her divorce petition.

"Usually when we (lawyers) file a petition, if there is a prenup we indicate that -- unless we don't like it," Hallin says. "When (Pitt) files his response, he will say in there whether he wants to enforce (a prenup)."

Under the divorce court rules, Pitt has three weeks left to file his response, but Hallin says it's not uncommon for respondents to ask for an extension and for petitioners to agree.

about custody?

It doesn't matter, because under California law, a prenup can't include or control questions of child support or custody, Hallin says.

Where will the allegations and custody question be handled first?

Allegations of abuse or safety involving minor children of a divorcing couple are handled by the Department of Children and Family Services and by special forums called dependency courts. And all proceedings are closed to the public.

Family court, or divorce court, handles the divorce, and all proceedings are public record.

Hallin says the two forums work on parallel tracks, but while allegations of child abuse are being investigated, proceedings in the divorce may be frozen pending an outcome. The child-abuse allegations are being investigated behind closed doors, and once they are resolved, the question of custody will return to the divorce court.

"As long as the dependency court has jurisdiction, as long as a (family services) case is open, the divorce court can't make a custody order," Hallin says. "Nothing is going to happen in divorce court until the (dependency) court releases jurisdiction over these children. They're going to have to do battle in that court first."

What will the divorce court consider?

Besides reviewing results of the abuse inquiry, a divorce court judge will consider other factors in deciding whether Jolie gets sole custody or whether the couple share custody equally after the divorce. The judge will look into "what the norm was" for the children, says divorce lawyer Nancy Chemtob, founding partner at Chemtob Moss & Forman, who has represented high-profile clients including Star Jones and Tory Burch: "Who is the one who took them to school, who is the one who made dinner for them, who made sure they were doing their extracurricular activities?"

What if the abuse allegations are true?

The family services department "will report to a judge in dependency court and say whether a claim is substantiated or not," Hallin says. "If it is, the dependency court will order protection of the children and arrange to get help for the parent."

That means "it can be anything from shifting custody from the primary parent to the other parent -- or neither parent," says Christina Riehl, senior staff attorney for the Children's Advocacy Institute.

But there are variables at play, says Chemtob. "If (the abuse allegations) come out to be true and it was a one-off situation, maybe they would send (Pitt) to anger-management classes," she says. Also, supervised visitation could be ordered.

What if the allegations are false or exaggerated?

"Then (family services) closes the case and the parties can proceed to fighting over custody in family court," Hallin says.

Pitt could then move forward in the legal war. "If one of the parents is creating (claims of abuse), then that would play into custody decisions made at that point by the family court," Riehl says.

"False allegations of abuse is one of the biggest factors for losing custody, coupled with **alienation**," says Chemtob, defining **alienation** as situations in which one parent is preventing the other parent from seeing his or her children or badmouthing the other parent.

If the allegations are determined to be false or exaggerated, that could backfire on Jolie, says divorce lawyer Neena Tanka in New York.

And **alienation** "is very difficult to prove," Riehl says. "It's really a judgment call based on sometimes therapists' reports."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The USA TODAY Network is spending time in eight counties in eight states, exploring the key electoral themes that could decide this fall's election. Each week until the election, we will feature a different one. The series has looked at Waukesha County in Wisconsin, Chester County in Pennsylvania and Wayne County in Michigan. Today: Maricopa County in Arizona.

Fred Oaxaca bounded into a room inside a Phoenix union hall and yelled a cheer.

"Se puede?" ("Can it be done?")

The room full of workers, mostly young Latinos in high school or their early 20s, yelled back even louder.

"Si, se puede!" ("Yes, it can be!")

Oaxaca, 21, a team leader for Central Arizonans for a Sustainable Economy (CASE), pounded the table with his palms, ending the cheer with a loud clap. The room shook as everyone joined in. They were pumped and ready to spend another afternoon going door-to-door in the 100-degree heat, standing in shopping mall parking lots or riding the light rail to register Latino voters.

"It's all about turnout. Everything comes down to turnout," Oaxaca said.

Turning that energy into votes in Maricopa County won't be easy. No other demographic group represents so much potential and so much disappointment on Election Day.

The number of Latino voters has steadily increased nationally from one presidential election to the next: 11.1 million Latinos voted in 2012, up from 9.7 million in 2008, according to Census data. But their voting rates significantly lag other demographic groups. In 2012, 48% of Latinos voted, compared with 66.6% of blacks and 64.1% of non-Hispanic whites, according to the Pew Research Center.

Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's tough stance on **immigration**, anchored by a promise to build a giant wall on the southern border and make Mexico pay for it, may spur Latinos to the polls. But Hillary Clinton, the Democratic nominee, has not ignited the same level of excitement nationally among Latino voters as President Obama did in 2012.

A poll taken Aug. 19-30 by the polling firm Latino Decisions showed 75% of Latinos view Obama favorably, compared with 68% for Clinton and 21% for Trump.

Perhaps no place illustrates the lackluster voter turnout among Latinos better than Maricopa County.

Sprawling over more than 9,000 square miles is a mix of sun- drenched farming communities, tourist resorts, strip malls, red- tiled suburban housing subdivisions and the gleaming glass-and- steel office towers of Phoenix, the nation's sixth-largest city.

Six out of 10 Arizonans live in Maricopa County. Its Latino population has soared in recent years, from 345,000 in 1990 to more than 1.2 million in 2014, and is the fifth-largest of any county in the nation.

The growth is driven in large part by a surge in voting-age Latinos who have turned 18 since the last presidential election.

Every month, on average, 2,042 Latinos in Maricopa County turn 18, compared with 1,975 whites -- a trend taking place nationally, according to estimates by the Morrison Institute Latino Public Policy Center at Arizona State University.

When it comes to voting, Latinos here have a reputation of "punching below their weight."

Considering the size of the Latino population, their voting rates have been "slow and evolving," said Lattie Coor, the former president of Arizona State University who runs the Center for the Future of Arizona, a thinktank in Phoenix.

Many Latinos in Maricopa County don't vote because they are documented **immigrants** who haven't become naturalized citizens or they are in the country illegally and have no way to legalize their status and become citizens.

What's more, data show people with high school diplomas and college degrees vote more often than those who don't, Coor said. Latinos in Arizona are less likely to have high school diplomas or college degrees than other demographic groups, he said.

After leading the cheer, Oaxaca drove off to pick up a group of high school students to take them to a neighborhood on the city's northwest side for an afternoon of voter canvassing.

Since the beginning of July, Oaxaca spent every afternoon registering voters. By the time he left to start his senior year at Santa Clara University in the San Francisco Bay Area, his records showed he had registered 414 people, many of them young Latinos like himself with parents who are **immigrants** and can't vote.

"There are a lot of other members of the community that have very similar (backgrounds), and if we aren't voting, then we are voting against our own family," he said. "Not voting only allows the status quo to continue."

CASE is one of a dozen groups in Maricopa County that belong to One Arizona, a coalition of 14 non-profit, non-partisan, mostly **immigrant** and Latino rights groups that statewide is trying to register 120,000 Latino voters after meeting its original goal of 75,000.

The group receives funding from the Unite Here labor union, among other liberal organizations. Because CASE is non-partisan, canvassers can't talk about particular candidates or take sides on political issues when registering voters, said Brendan Walsh, the executive director.

Its main focus is to get more Latinos to vote, so both parties will pay attention to them, he said. "Arizona's politics and voting are largely dominated by an older group of white voters," Walsh said. "Younger voters and **immigrant** voters do not have a voice in Arizona, so we are trying to lift up that voice to make sure that our politics in Arizona is more representative of our population."

After dropping the students off in a neighborhood, Oaxaca parked in a shopping complex parking lot. Clipboard in hand, he spent the next three hours walking up to strangers to ask, "Excuse me, are you registered to vote?" If not, "Can I ask why?"

His goal was to register eight voters that evening or convince as many voters to sign up for mail-in ballots. Registered voters who receive mail-in ballots are far more likely to cast ballots than those who have to drive to the polls on Election Day, Oaxaca said.

The work was slow going.

Most people ignored Oaxaca and kept walking. Some told him in Spanish they weren't eligible because they weren't citizens. Others said they didn't have time or didn't think their vote mattered. An hour passed before Oaxaca logged his first mail-in ballot registration.

Lisa Perez, 31, said she registered to vote for the first time in July because she wanted to vote against Trump, whose rhetoric she found offensive to Latinos.

"I thought my vote is going to count this year because I definitely do not want him to be the president," said Perez, a credit-card financial-services auditor.

The push to register Latino voters in Maricopa County mirrors drives taking place in counties around the country with significant and fast-growing Latino populations. Among them: Clark County, Nev.; Marion County, Ore.; Adams County, Colo.; Kane County, Ill; Hampden County, Mass.; Prince William County, Va.

In Maricopa County, efforts have focused heavily on the disproportionately high number of Latinos who are eligible to vote but aren't registered, said Ian Danley, director of One Arizona.

Based on data from consulting company TargetSmart, shared by One Arizona, 224,129 Latinos in Maricopa County are eligible to vote but are not registered, and 352,553 are registered. That means about 61% of the 576,682 eligible Latino voters in Maricopa County are registered, compared with 74% of the eligible non-Hispanic whites, according to the TargetSmart data.

A concerted effort is underway to register Latinos who reached voting age since the last presidential election. About 96,000 Latinos in Maricopa County have turned 18 since November 2012, according to Dan Hunting, senior policy analyst at ASU's Morrison Institute, based on Census data he analyzed from the American Community Survey.

Esther Rivera turns 18 on Oct. 23, 16 days before the presidential election. She registered in July, hoping her vote would help bring **immigration** changes that will benefit her mother and 21- year-old brother, who are both undocumented. Her brother received a deportation deferment and temporary work permit under Obama's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program.

"The main reason I want to vote this year is to put my voice out there for the voiceless," Rivera said. "My mother, she cannot vote, but I can, and there (are) a lot of people out there in my community who can't vote, but they want to. Just one vote can help a lot, as long as we try."

Irma Maldonado, 18, a nursing student at Grand Canyon University, will vote for the first time.

Maldonado moved to San Felipe, a small town in the coastal state of Nayarit in Mexico, in October 2012 after her mother, who had lived in the USA without documents for 20 years, could find no way to legalize her status and decided to "self-deport."

Maldonado, a U.S.-born citizen, returned in 2014 to live with her sister in Phoenix and finish high school. She plans to use her vote to "say no to Donald Trump." She's not sure she'll cast a ballot for Clinton.

"I think it would be awesome if we had the first woman president," she said, but she isn't sure she can trust Clinton after Obama made similar promises to pass **immigration** changes but failed to deliver.

"She is saying the right thing, but she isn't going to do anything about it," said Maldonado, who favored Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders in the Democratic primary.

Many Latino Republicans find it hard to vote for Trump.

Felix Garcia, 34, an **immigrant** from Hermosillo, a city in the northern state of Sonora across the border from Arizona in Mexico, is a naturalized U.S. citizen who owns a construction company in Phoenix.

Originally, he supported former Florida governor Jeb Bush because of his stance on **immigration**. Now he campaigns to get Latinos to vote for Libertarian Gary Johnson, who like Clinton supports **immigration** changes that would provide a pathway to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants**.

"Donald Trump, I don't like his attitude with the Hispanic community. He is very aggressive," Garcia said.

Strong turnout by Latino voters could help tilt Maricopa County in favor of Clinton, which would all but guarantee a win for the Democratic nominee in Arizona. That may seem far-fetched, considering the county's long track record of voting GOP in presidential elections. Even Bill Clinton, the last Democratic presidential candidate to win Arizona in 1996, lost Maricopa County to Republican Bob Dole.

But a statewide Arizona Republic/Morrison/Cronkite News poll showed the race in Maricopa County between Clinton and Trump too close to call. The poll, conducted Aug. 17-31, found Clinton leading Trump 34.2% to 33.2% among likely voters, well within the poll's margin of error.

In such a tight race, Latino voter turnout could make the difference.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LETTERS

In response to Laura Pea's commentary, "**Immigration** lawyer: Trump's wall won't work," I'm calling out all those who take an issue with Donald Trump's idea to build a wall. The whole idea behind this wall is national security. Who doesn't want safety? The wall will prevent illegal **immigrants** from entering our country. What person who considers himself an American wouldn't want that? The idea of illegal people entering our country right now is frightening. So please, refrain from focusing on all of the technicalities behind the wall, and think about it on a broader scale. We lock our doors, tuck in our children, and protect our families to the best of our abilities everyday. So why not put a giant "door" on our home?

So again I will ask, what is wrong with protecting ourselves?

Ben Craig

Pittsburgh

FACEBOOK

Change E-Verify to be a mandate on all employers to use it. Without jobs, illegals will have to go home. If they went home, employers would be paying Americans more to take those jobs.

Roy E. Bennington

I fail to understand why everyone fixates on building a wall. Just mandate E-Verify across the board and jail employers who fail to use it. Problem solved.

Matthew Cronin

The wall will only help to keep drugs and terrorists out. Take away any benefit of coming here illegally, and they will only come the legal way.

Jerry Bilyeu

Donald Trump's plan might be unrealistic, but Hillary Clinton's plan of amnesty is definitely not going to keep people from coming illegally.

I'd rather see E-Verify put in place and removal of all other regulations .

Joylynn Howie

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**U.N. suspends aid to Syria after convoy attacked

The United Nations suspended aid deliveries to Syria on Tuesday, hours after a convoy carrying humanitarian aid to rebel-held parts of Aleppo was attacked and about 20 people were killed.

Jens Laerke, a spokesman for the U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, said deliveries would be held pending a review of the security situation in the war-torn country.

The suspension of aid came soon after the Syrian military said a week-long cease-fire deal brokered by Russia and the United States was over, citing violations on all sides, including a U.S.-led coalition airstrike on Saturday that mistakenly killed dozens of Syrian soldiers.

--Jane Onyanga-Omara

Number of undocumented **immigrants** stays same

The number of undocumented **immigrants** living in the U.S. remains steady at 11.1 million for the sixth straight year, as a drop in people coming from Mexico is offset by an increase from the rest of the world, according to a report released Tuesday.

After two decades of continuous growth, the country's undocumented **immigrant** population peaked at 12.2 million in 2007. Once the Great Recession started in 2008, that number dropped and has remained steady since 2014, according to the report from the Pew Research Center, based on the most recent data available.

That has changed the nature of undocumented **immigrants** in America, with more becoming long-term residents established in their communities. In 2014, 66% had lived in the U.S. for 10 years or longer, compared withjust 36% in 2000.--Alan Gomez

Also

A protest erupted Tuesday night after an African-American man was shot and killed in an officer-involved shooting. Earlier in the day, officers saw the man get out of a car with a firearm and then get back in. When officers approached the car, the person got out again with the gun. The officers considered the man to be "an imminent deadly threat to the officers who subsequently fired their weapon striking the subject," according to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department.--WCNC-TV, Charlotte

Humanity just sweltered through its hottest summer ever recorded, beating the previous mark set only last year. From June to August, average temperatures across global land and ocean surfaces soared 1.6 degrees Fahrenheit above the 20th-century average of 60.1 degrees F, according to a federal climate report released Tuesday.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The 3acres of shady land just off Highway 281 have been in Eloisa Tamez's family's possession for more than two centuries.

Tamez traces her roots on that small patch of land to 1767, when an ancestor won a grant from the Spanish crown for a stretch of land along the Rio Grande. The land has since been parceled, farmed on and sold off, with Tamez's 3 acres one of the last remnants of that family heritage.

Today, an 18-foot-tall metal fence runs through the middle of the property, pinching her off from half of her land and providing a daily, rusty reminder of the federal government's willingness to impose its will on the Rio Grande Valley.

"It's very depressing," Tamez told me recently. "We're law- abiding American citizens, and we're not free to move around in our own land."

I visited this stretch of the border recently to see what border residents and leaders thought about Donald Trump's proposed border wall. They have experience: They've lived with an 18-foot-fence and other barriers for nearly a decade.

Take a drive south along Highway 281 between McAllen and Brownsville, and you'll see the fence winding along the banks of the Rio Grande, butting up against fenced yards and, at times, slicing straight through them. The fence is the product of the 2006 Secure Fence Act, which created a series of fences and barriers that stretch from this border city to the California coast and is widely criticized as a $3 billion boondoggle.

If Trump were to ever embark on building his proposed border wall, the stiffest opposition he'd face won't be from **immigration** advocates or environmentalists. It'd be from property owners like Tamez, whose ranches and homes line most of Texas' 1,254-mile border with Mexico.

Building the fence was easier in Arizona, New Mexico and California, where long stretches of federal land straddle the border. But in Texas, the project ran into a buzzsaw of lawsuits from landowners who refused to have the fence dissect their properties.

So many property owners fought the fence that the initiative wound up with just 110 miles of fence and barriers in Texas, even though its border with Mexico is 12 times that size, Scott Nicol, of the Borderlands Sierra Club, told me as we toured a chunk of border fence in Hidalgo, outside of McAllen.

If Trump wants his wall, he'll face the same legal maelstrom, he says.

"You're talking hundreds of land-acquisition lawsuits," Nichol says. "There's not enough lawyers or courts out there to handle them all."

He'll have to face people like Tamez, 81, a nursing professor at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley in Brownsville. Her father and grandfather farmed tomatoes, corn and green beans on the land. Today, she needs a code to open a mammoth gate to drive through her property.

When she first heard in 2006 that the federal government planned to erect a fence through her neighborhood, whether the neighbors liked it or not, she couldn't believe it. The government had grabbed land around here before, first from the Comanche and Lipan Apache tribes, then the Mexicans. The area has had at least six flags fly over it, as it was traded from country to country: First Spain, then France, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Confederate States of America and the United States. (Which is where, incidentally, the Six Flags amusement park company gets its name.)

But Tamez, who is of Lipan Apache and Hispanic descent, thought it couldn't happen again. Not in the 21st century. Not to U.S. citizens. As the plans progressed, she sued the Department of Homeland Security to keep the feds off her land. The government ultimately won and built the fence on her property, but paid her a $56,000 settlement. She donated most of the money for scholarships at the nursing school where she works and used part of the payout to refurbish a home on her property, where visiting professors and researchers can stay for free while studying the border.

Tamez wants people to know that it's not just **immigrants** who are punished by the wall; it's also U.S. citizens with roots in the region that stretch back centuries. She doesn't have the money for lengthy legal battles. But if Trump tries to build another wall in her area, she'll be right back in court, she says.

"We're not going to stand by and be deposed from our land," Tamez says. "We won't stand for it."

Something in her voice tells me she means it.

Jervis is USA TODAY's Austin-based correspondent.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For all the sound and fury surrounding the weekend bomb plots in New York and New Jersey, the reality is that the anti-terror system worked. In a metropolitan area of 20 million people, the prime suspect was tracked down and captured within 36 hours. Through a combination of luck, good police work and the bomber's ineptitude, no one was killed.

Law enforcement showed impressive skills collecting video images that showed suspect Ahmad Khan Rahami moving explosives near the scene of a blast in Manhattan's Chelsea neighborhood. Authorities pulled his fingerprint from an unexploded device discovered nearby.

City leaders kept the public informed each step of the way. Despite the usual hand-wringing on social media, most New Yorkers remained composed. By Monday morning, police were circulating Rahami's name and photo.

People were vigilant. A tip phoned in late Monday morning about a man who looked like Rahami sleeping in the doorway of a bar in Linden, N.J., led to a shootout with police and his arrest.

All in all, a satisfying conclusion to a scary couple of days. Yet how did the Republican nominee for president react to this sequence of events? As shrilly as the screech of tires on pavement or a baying car alarm.

The episode, said Donald Trump, proved that "we can't let any more people come into this country." We need "extreme, extreme vetting" of Muslim **immigrants**. We shouldn't supply terror suspects, even U.S. citizens such as Rahami, with decent medical care and quality legal representation. Donald Trump Jr. did his part by tweeting an image (on an iPhone invented by the son of a Syrian **immigrant**) comparing Syrian refugees to Skittles.

Well. Is there room for improvement in **immigration** security? Sure.

Rahami was questioned after returning from Afghanistan, and more could have been learned about the state of his loyalties after those visits. An audit released Monday showed that the U.S. government mistakenly granted citizenship to 858 people from dangerous regions or areas of high **immigration** fraud.

Even so, the terror threat needs to be kept in perspective. Terrorism has killed fewer than 100 people in America since 9/11. The U.S. allows about 70,000 refugees to enter each year; President Obama raised that figure to 85,000 this year. Those from violent areas already receive stringent screening.

Since 2009, there have been only about 10 occasions where refugees were arrested on terrorism-related charges. Of the most deadly homegrown attacks in recent years, nearly all were carried out by people born in the USA -- second-generation **immigrants** -- including Omar Mateen, the shooter at the gay nightclub in Orlando that left 49 dead in June.

**Immigration** bans do nothing to stop people already here, and **alienating** Muslim Americans risks shutting down a vital conduit of information that police need to ferret out threats from self- radicalized individuals.

Protecting the homeland from the simmering threat of terror requires careful military operations abroad and painstaking police work at home -- efforts that shouldn't be drowned out by the sounds of political expediency.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**U.N. suspends aid to Syria after convoy attacked

The United Nations suspended aid deliveries to Syria on Tuesday, hours after a convoy carrying humanitarian aid to rebel-held parts of Aleppo was attacked and about 20 people were killed.

Jens Laerke, a spokesman for the U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, said deliveries would be held pending a review of the security situation in the war-torn country.

The suspension of aid came soon after the Syrian military said a week-long cease-fire deal brokered by Russia and the United States was over, citing violations on all sides, including a U.S.-led coalition airstrike on Saturday that mistakenly killed dozens of Syrian soldiers.

The U.N. said at least 18 of 31 trucks in a U.N. and Syrian Arab Red Crescent convoy that was transporting aid to 78,000 people were hit while traveling to Urm al-Kubra in Aleppo on Monday.

--Jane Onyanga-Omara

Number of undocumented **immigrants** stays same

The number of undocumented **immigrants** living in the U.S. remains steady at 11.1 million for the sixth straight year, as a drop in people coming from Mexico is offset by an increase from the rest of the world, according to a report released Tuesday.

After two decades of continuous growth, the country's undocumented **immigrant** population peaked at 12.2 million in 2007. Once the Great Recession started in 2008, that number dropped and has remained steady since 2014, according to the report from the Pew Research Center, based on the most recent data available.

That has changed the nature of undocumented **immigrants** in America, with more becoming long-term residents established in their communities. In 2014, 66% had lived in the U.S. for 10 years or longer, compared withjust 36% in 2000.--Alan Gomez

Also

Paris prosecutors say that there have been eight new arrests in connection with the Bastille Day truck attack in Nice that left 86 people dead. Prosecutors said Tuesday that the suspects were linked to the attacker, Mohamed Lahouaiej Bouhlel. The eight men arrested are Tunisian and French.

Humanity just sweltered through its hottest summer ever recorded, beating the previous mark set only last year. From June to August, average temperatures across global land and ocean surfaces soared 1.6 degrees Fahrenheit above the 20th-century average of 60.1 degrees F, according to a federal climate report released Tuesday.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The American Dream is persistent. Despite rampant income inequality, decreased social mobility and resistance to **immigration**, the founding myth of freedom and opportunity for one and all still comforts American citizens and lures seekers from across borders and overseas.

In her debut novel, Behold the Dreamers (Random House, 382 pp., \*\*\*1/2 out of four), Imbolo Mbue performs an in-depth audit of The Dream through the experiences of one industrious **immigrant** couple caught in the tumult of the 2008 financial crisis.

Jende and Neni Jonga are recent arrivals from Limbe, Cameroon, living in a roach-infested one-bedroom apartment in Harlem with their young son, Liomi. Their **immigration** status is tenuous -- Neni has a student visa, while Jende's somewhat dubious asylum application is pending -- and the threat of deportation casts a long shadow over their lives.

But despite their humble, unstable circumstances, the Jongas are determined and optimistic, confident of the bright future just beyond the next hurdle in their new country. "If she were a citizen, (Neni) would be a pharmacist in no more than five years. A pharmacist with a nice SUV and a home in Yonkers or Mount Vernon or maybe even New Rochelle."

When Jende lands a salaried job as a chauffeur for Lehman Brothers senior executive Clark Edwards, he and Neni rejoice. ("Papa God, oh! I'm dancing right now, Jends. I'm doing gymnastics, oh!") After years working as a dishwasher and livery cabdriver, Jende appears to be laying claim to The Dream.

Jende drives for the whole Edwards family -- Clark; his wife, Cindy; their sons, Vince and Mighty -- and this daily proximity gives him an intimate view of their various affairs. He overhears troubling conversations between Clark and his Lehman cohorts; Cindy fighting with Clark and calling her girlfriends.

He develops a rapport with his employers, enough so that when Cindy needs a temporary housekeeper for the Edwards summer home in the Hamptons, she offers the job to Neni. Neni grows close to young Mighty, whom she often babysits in his parents' absence, and forms a strange, volatile bond with Cindy when she finds her employer in compromised circumstances.

The Jongas discover that even the wealthy, successful Edwardses are plagued with suffering. When Lehman collapses, both families -- along with the rest of the country -- are thrown into turmoil. But while the Jongas' hardships belong to the Jongas alone, the Edwards' family problems affect their employees in harsh and unexpected ways.

There's a Pollyanna cheer to the first half of the book -- immense gratitude to wealthy employers, boundless love for America - - and though this falls away as brutal realities set in, the novel's best elements remain in place: Mbue's vivacious brand of humor and her enduring empathy for even her most repulsive characters.

Even as Behold the Dreamers takes some dark, vicious turns, it never feels cheaply cynical, grounded as it is in the problems of well-imagined characters who try, through whatever means possible, to protect their families and better their lives.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Law enforcement officers deserve our praise for tracking down jihad bomber Ahmad Rahami so quickly. But their job is to look for perps after they commit a crime.

The goal for policymakers should be to try to prevent such attacks from happening in the first place. Tighter **immigration** policies are essential to that end. The first line of the 9/11 Commission staff report on **immigration** makes this clear: "It is perhaps obvious to state that terrorists cannot plan and carry out attacks in the United States if they are unable to enter the country."

The authorities were told that Rahami was a potential threat, but their investigation yielded nothing they could act on. This was also true of the Orlando and Boston Marathon jihadists as well. There's just no way to know which of the militant Islamists we let in to our country will actually follow through with violence.

And even if we did, there aren't enough police in the world to watch them all. Last year, it was reported that the FBI's intensive tracking of just 48 terror suspects was "almost overwhelming." We're expecting too much of law enforcement if we think they can cope with the admission of large numbers of potential killers.

A prudent **immigration** policy would err on the side of caution. **Immigration** from countries suffering from widespread jihadist violence should generally not be permitted. Our officials do the best job they can, but there is literally no way to adequately vet people from places such as Somalia or Afghanistan.

Refugees, in particular, should not be resettled in the United States except in the most unusual circumstances; we can help 12 times as many people abroad for the same money, and keep potential security threats off shore.

And since many terrorists have come here as children, like Rahami, screening the adults for retrograde values -- what Donald Trump called "extreme vetting" -- is essential to try to prevent the growth of new terrorists on our soil.

In a globalized world, a loose **immigration** system is a threat to our country's safety. National security is not possible without **immigration** security.

Mark Krikorian is executive director of the Center for **Immigration** Studies.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump accused each other of heightening the risk of domestic terror attacks in the aftermath of bombings in New York and New Jersey.

Trump called Clinton's refugee policies "weak." She said he's become an online "recruiting sergeant" for terrorists, given his rhetoric, and has no plan to defeat the Islamic State, also known as ISIL or ISIS.

In response to blasts Saturday in New Jersey and New York and a knife attack in Minnesota, Clinton called Monday for a surge in intelligence and greater coordination with law enforcement and Silicon Valley technology companies; more outreach to Muslim- American communities to apprehend troubled individuals; and intensified diplomatic efforts across the Middle East.

"It's important for voters to hear this and weigh it," Clinton said after Trump accused her and President Obama of being weak on terror.

"We know that a lot of the rhetoric we've heard from Donald Trump has been seized on by terrorists, in particular ISIS, because they are looking to make this into a war against Islam rather than a war against jihadists, violent terrorists," Clinton said at an airport hangar in White Plains, N.Y.

"They want to use that to recruit more fighters to their cause by turning it into a religious conflict. That's why I've been very clear: We're going after the bad guys, and we're going to get them, but we're not going to go after an entire religion and give ISIS exactly what it is wanting," Clinton said.

The Islamic State and Al Shabaab, the East African affiliate of the al-Qaeda terrorist group, have used video clips of Trump calling for a temporary ban on Muslims entering the USA, according to PolitiFact.

In a campaign stop in Florida, Trump said Clinton lacks the "moral clarity" to serve as president.

"She very much caused the problem," he said, citing "her weakness, her ineffectiveness." He blamed the weekend attacks on an "extremely open **immigration**system which fails to properly vet and screen" individuals coming to the USA. Terrorists "want her so badly to be your president, you have no idea," he said, citing the Obama administration's policies in Iraq, Syria and the Middle East. "Her attacks on me are all meant to deflect her record of unleashing this monster of evil," he said.

The GOP presidential nominee called for profiling individuals in a manner similar to Israel's approach. Trump reiterated his call for a suspension of **immigration**from regions that pose a terrorist threat. Trump pointed to the administration's policy of admitting refugees from war-torn areas of the Middle East, such as Syria.

Contributing: Eliza Collins

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For more than a year, Donald Trump has been raising an alarm about the upswing of terrorism in the United States, promising to address it head-on without any of Washington's usual political pieties. Jargon-laden responses to terror attacks from the White House and Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign only tend to confirm Trump voters' worst fears about the Washington establishment, rather than build support for the Obama-Clinton approach to fighting the Islamic State terrorist group.

On Saturday a pressure cooker bomb detonated in a Manhattan dumpster, wounding 29. A second device was found blocks away and disarmed. This followed a pipe bombing that morning in Seaside Park, N.J., targeting the Marine Semper Fi 5K fundraising race. Fortunately, only one bomb detonated and no one was harmed.

On Sunday, five bombs were found in a backpack near a train station in Elizabeth, N.J. On Monday, Afghan **immigrant** Ahmad Rahami was arrested after a shootout with police in Linden.

While all this was playing out on the East Coast, on Saturday a man went on a stabbing rampage at a mall in St. Cloud, Minn., wounding nine people before being gunned down by an off-duty police officer. The assailant, Somali **immigrant** Dahir Adan, whom ISIL claimed as a "soldier," asked one of his victims whether he was a Muslim before stabbing him.

'Narrative fight'

Monday morning, White House spokesman Josh Earnest attempted to calm rattled public nerves, saying that "when it comes to ISIL, we are in a fight, a narrative fight with them, a narrative battle."

He assured us we are winning it. Democratic presidential candidate Clinton quickly echoed this line, and accused Trump of giving "aid and comfort" to the terrorists by counseling a get- tough approach against radical Islam that strays from the administration's more restrained rhetoric.

The White House response that America is successfully challenging ISIL's "narrative" is cold comfort when improvised explosive devices are blowing up on American streets.

Clinton's charge against Trump of what amounts to treason has to be weighed against a grim reality. This weekend's attacks were much closer to Trump's worldview than that of the Democrats. The pattern - - domestic terrorism allegedly committed by radical Muslim **immigrants** connected to, or inspired by, ISIL ideology -- tracks the type of extremist threat Trump has been warning the country about all along.

In addition, incidents over the last year in Chattanooga, San Bernardino and Orlando show similar attacker profiles and motivations. The problem isn't an image-driven contest of conflicting narratives; it is a fundamental failure to secure America from violent radicals.

This uptick in terrorism puts Clinton in a bind. She cannot critique the Obama administration's shaky counterterrorism strategy, but she cannot duck the reality that Americans feel less safe.

Recruiting videos

Her only option then is to blame Trump. This is nothing new. Back in December, she falsely claimed that ISIL had recruiting videos featuring Trump. But the terrorists must have been listening to her because five months later, a video with a clip of Trump emerged. Essentially, Clinton wrote the Islamic State's talking point.

This month, Clinton said that ISIL is rooting for a Trump victory and that it's saying, "Oh, please Allah, make Trump president of America."

For its part, ISIL has yet to release its official campaign endorsements. But it is hard to believe its leaders would be praying for a Trump victory given their successes.

Clinton's charge that a vote for Trump is a vote for the Islamic State doesn't explain why the terrorist group wouldn't rather keep the current policies under which it has been able to construct a global terror network with reach extending inside the United States.

Clinton has offered little in terms of new ideas to fight the growing domestic terror threat, if she even acknowledges the growing threat.

She refuses to criticize President Obama for his failure to secure our borders from terrorism. And she usually eschews the words "radical Islamist terrorists," which have been forbidden in the Obama administration's grand struggle over the narrative.

Unfortunately, they also accurately describe the threat we are supposed to be fighting.

James S. Robbins writes weekly for USA TODAY and is the author of This Time We Win: Revisiting the Tet Offensive.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Despite the 18-foot-tall iron security fence cutting through her family's citrus farm, Bonnie Elbert still sees a relentless flow of undocumented **immigrants** and smugglers carrying trash bags full of drugs sneaking into this southern tip of the USA.

Elbert considers herself politically conservative and wants lawmakers to do something about illegal **immigration**. But the proposal to build a wall between the U.S. and Mexico to make America safer -- a cornerstone of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump's campaign -- is unrealistic, she said.

"The one we have doesn't really work," Elbert said as she drove recently through Loop Farms, more than 700 acres of orange and grapefruit orchards the family has tended since the 1920s. "What makes them think a new one will?"

Trump's proposal to build a 40-foot-high wall across the U.S. border with Mexico and make Mexico pay for it sparked a Twitter clash between the GOP candidate and Mexican President Enrique Pea Nieto.

Residents on the border have lived for years with a close facsimile: 650 miles of metal fencing and other barriers erected in 2009 and stretching, in sections, from this Texas border city to the California coast. The fence, created through the 2006 Secure Fence Act, is nearly continuous along the border with Arizona, New Mexico and California, because of long stretches of federal land along the border. But in Texas, the fence is chopped up into multiple sections because the state's border with Mexico is comprised mostly of private property, which is harder to acquire and build on.

Trump has said he needs to build only about 1,000 miles of wall along the nearly 2,000-mile border with Mexico, because of natural barriers. But the current fence sparked costly legal fights with property owners, disrupted communities that straddle the border and has proven largely ineffective in stemming the flow of undocumented **immigrants**, according to residents, community leaders and border patrol officials.

Whoever pays for it, a newer, bigger wall would waste more money and be just as futile in preventing illegal crossings, Brownsville Mayor Tony Martinez said.

"It's gibberish," Martinez said. "It doesn't prevent people from coming in or drugs from coming in. It's not a deterrent and it's not effective."

He noted that Mexican drug lord Joaqun Guzmn, known as El Chapo, tunneled his way out of prison last year before being recaptured by Mexican marines. "We should learn from El Chapo," he said. "They could always build tunnels."

Days after the fence went up along the border near McAllen, border agents there realized the smugglers' answer to the barrier: ladders.

Agents began collecting the 19-foot ladders -- some wooden and homemade, others construction-grade aluminum -- propped up against the 18-foot fence, said Chris Cabrera, a McAllen-based border patrol agent and vice president of the local chapter of the National Border Patrol Council, the agents' union.

So many ladders piled up in their station that supervisors told the agents to stop bringing them in, he said. Meanwhile, the flow of **immigrants** and drugs continued unabated. Apprehensions in the Rio Grande Valley sector of the Border Patrol, which sees the largest number of crossings in the USA, has more than doubled from 60,989 in fiscal year 2009 to 147,257 last fiscal year, according to Border Patrol statistics.

The Border Patrol union has endorsed Trump because of his focus on border security and **immigration** reform, Cabrera said. But the concept of building a bigger wall without other measures, such as increased manpower and technology, is ill-informed, he said.

"If you're in the business of selling ladders, it's a good idea," Cabrera said. "If you build a bigger wall, they're going to come with bigger ladders." He added, "If they're thinking of putting up a wall as a be-all, end-all they're looking in the wrong place."

The security fence project also ran into a litany of private property lawsuits and environmental opposition that ran up costs and led to delays, said Denise Gilman, director of the **Immigration** Clinic at the University of Texas-Austin School of Law.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LETTERS

Ouisa Davis' commentary, "Melania, tell your **immigrant** story," is very thoughtful. Several weeks ago, Donald Trump stated that Melania would discuss her **immigration** history "in a few weeks." But those few weeks have come and gone without explanation. Now Melania seems to have vanished from the campaign trail.

I live and work in Manhattan and have many actor friends who are **immigrants**. I have written letters for several of them, trying to help them secure visas and citizenship -- it is not an easy process. As stated in Davis' commentary, there are conflicting stories and many questions about how his wife was able to work here and become a citizen. It is simply astounding that Trump demands accountability and transparency from our president, yet refuses to release his tax records or explain how his wife became a citizen.

Kathryn Kates

New York

While having a heated debate about the presidential nominees, a friend commented: "For you, **immigration** is the most important reason to not vote for Trump."

She is right! My wife and I arrived in the U.S. as teens. She came from the Middle East and I from South America. We got married here, had three great kids and built a business. The U.S. became a home we care more about than our native countries. After living in different parts of the world, we are convinced this is the only country in which one can come from zero, work hard and become anything. I despise Trump because his speech is full of hate. He brings out the worst in people. Many of his supporters believe bigotry and xenophobia are acceptable. Some opponents are using a voice that is louder and more hostile than his. His intolerance has turned me into a combatant!

Mauricio Fraga-Rosenfeld

Washington, D.C.

TWITTER

We asked whether Melania Trump's story would influence the credibility of her husband's policies.

Give her a break. Melania was born in a poor communist country. She had to make ends meet.

@Fred\_945

Nothing about them seems credible to me.

@mdeluzgon

We don't care. Everything Trump says is a lie unless proven otherwise. We aren't blind.

@Jmdmd1Maurice

Seriously, Melania's story is the bottom of the pile. Taxes? Foundation? Foreign deals?

@plish516

Only European **immigrants** are "safe" in his eyes.

@xxkillacam214

Yes, he seems to have a different set of rules for his wife and young models opposed to Mexicans.

@casawhitby

No. Donand Trump has money and seems to think he is exempt.

@michael63226085

For more, follow @USATOpinion or #tellusatoday.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The White House plans to sharply increase the number of refugees accepted by the United States to 110,000 in the fiscal year that begins Oct. 1, saying the move is necessary to help stem a migrant crisis gripping Europe and the Middle East.

The new target is a 29% increase over the 85,000 refugees accepted this fiscal year and a 57% increase over the 70,000 refugees allowed per year from 2013 to 2015.

Secretary of State John Kerry informed members of Congress about the proposed increase Tuesday, according to a senior administration official who was not authorized to discuss the change publicly.

Obama and Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton have said the U.S needs to do more to help ease the burden on countries in Europe and elsewhere that have accepted millions of migrants fleeing war and famine in the Middle East and Africa.

Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump has called for the opposite approach, saying the U.S. needs to better screen migrants who may be terrorists. He initially called for a temporary ban on **immigrants** from all Muslim nations, but has since refined his stance to say would-be refugees from countries with known ties to terrorism require "extreme vetting" before being admitted to the U.S.

Much of the debate over refugees has focused on the 11 million people who have fled Syria as a bloody civil war continues into its sixth year. The Obama administration has argued that Syrian refugees undergo extensive background checks, a process that can last up to two years, as U.S. and United Nations officials verify asylum seekers' stories and check possible ties to terrorist organizations.

The White House announced last month that the U.S. had accepted its 10,000th Syrian refugee of the year, and press secretary Josh Earnest said Obama was "gratified" that the administration had reached its annual goal. Clinton has said she would raise that ceiling even higher if elected president.

Republican lawmakers and governors have fought back, arguing that the Islamic State and other terrorist groups will try to exploit the refugee program to slip operatives into the United States.

Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., a Trump adviser on **immigration** and refugee issues, said migrants from Syria have caused mayhem throughout Europe and could do the same in the U.S. if more are accepted.

He said U.S. officials cannot conduct thorough background checks, since Syria is in the middle of a war and criminal records are difficult, if not impossible, to find.

Rep. Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said Obama's ability to unilaterally increase the number of refugees is a reminder why the country's refugee laws need to be updated.

"We must remain compassionate toward refugees, but we also need to make sure that we use common sense," Goodlatte said in a statement.

Obama "continues to ignore warnings from his own national security officials and plans to bring in even more Syrian refugees over the next year."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In early 2015, I entered a stuffy, packed federal courtroom in Los Angeles. I was the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) trial attorney, doing my best to follow the priorities set by President Obama: to deport felons, not families, and identify people who pose a threat to society.

I took a deep breath as the judge called the first case -- a crying baby, no more than eight months old, one of the thousands of unaccompanied minors in **immigration** court during the Central America border surge. The judge glared at me while trying to figure out how to get an infant on the official court record.

Before then, as a senior adviser at the State Department under Secretary Hillary Clinton, I listened to government officials in Central America express frustration about our mass deportation of hardened criminals, many of whom spoke little Spanish. These native sons and daughters had learned violence on the streets of L.A., and continued the cycle of violence on their return.

Donald Trump portrays America under Obama and Clinton as a lawless nation that allows all criminal **immigrants** to stay in the country. But his fear tactics distort the reality. I worked alongside ordinary civil servants looking for humane ways to focus our deportation efforts on national security threats, known gang members, violent criminals and recent arrivals to the U.S.

Trump's hallmark policy is a border wall that he insists Mexico will finance. It would fail miserably. As an ICE officer, I visited the wall along the San Diego and Tijuana border, and saw portions blasted by smugglers only to be rebuilt over and over on the taxpayers' dime. How many times would Trump try to rebuild his multibillion dollar wall? Once? Ten times?

The steps we really need are in the direction of improved technology, increased resources and reliance on old-fashioned American ingenuity.

In contrast to Trump's wall-centered policy, Clinton promises to push for comprehensive **immigration** reform in her first 100 days in office. She has also vowed to defend Obama's executive actions to keep families together, and ensure that violent criminals are detained and deported.

After being part of ICE, I decided that nobody "wins" or "loses" in **immigration** court -- but everyone leaves feeling scarred. Our system has been overly politicized and our laws are inadequate, forcing certain **immigrants** into court because there is no ability to seek relief elsewhere. People can languish for years on simple administrative issues that could be solved if only they had the right to an attorney. Finally, our **immigration** judges are doing Herculean work that remains underfunded and underappreciated.

If we are going to fix our **immigration** system, we need a president who understands the gravity and complexity of the problem. For this former ICE official, the choice is clear.

Laura Pea, a business **immigration** attorney, is a former assistant chief counsel at ICE. She was director of Latino outreach for Clinton's 2008 campaign.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The inescapable conclusion from Hillary Clinton's health saga is not that she is, as Team Trump continually suggests, too sick and weak to be president. It's that she and her campaign were hoping to get away with never disclosing her pneumonia diagnosis.

At least now, both camps are pledging to release more medical details about the nominees. But given Clinton's history of withholding and Donald Trump's many broken promises regarding transparency, it is doubtful we'll get enough information to put reasonable questions to rest.

Clinton, 68, has had a few health incidents, but there is no evidence of anything chronically incapacitating. To the contrary, she has shown endurance beyond many younger people -- in her August fundraising schedule as well as in her 11 hours of testimony a year ago before the House Select Committee on Benghazi.

What's more, a woman of Clinton's age can expect to live 18 additional years (four more than a man of Trump's age, 70). However, pneumonia and influenza are the sixth leading cause of death for white women ages 65 and over. Such a diagnosis should not be taken lightly, nor should a major party presidential nominee hide it from the public.

That's especially true for a politician who for decades has repeatedly lost battles to protect what she thinks ought to be zones of privacy. Clinton has never been a believer in putting everything out there, coping with the fallout and moving on as quickly as possible. From the Whitewater real estate deal in Arkansas to her email server and now the pneumonia, it is always drip-drip-drip.

Yet she is the only realistic alternative to Trump, which makes it maddening that she fell right into Trump's trap. He and his allies cooked up a conspiracy about her dire health, then waited. For the coughing fit. For the stumble. For -- jackpot -- the pneumonia and what looks like a coverup.

As usual, keeping the public in the dark is not working to Clinton's advantage. What might have been a brief flurry about a minor health issue has become a media and political frenzy that confirms the widely held and damaging sense that she can't be trusted.

The fact that Clinton and her advisers haven't figured this out augers a White House tenure hampered by self-inflicted drama.

In reality, Trump is hiding far more than Clinton. But Clinton herself has done more to obscure that than anyone else, and in the process made this race closer than anyone thought it would be.

While she released a two-page doctor's letter last year, he has disclosed little beyond a six-paragraph doctor's letter so Trumpian in its language, it would be funny if it were not the only word voters have on his health.

Trump has released no tax returns, even as his claims of wealth and charitable giving are in question. And there has been no clarity on Melania Trump's **immigration** status when she first came to the U.S., though Trump's hard line on illegal **immigration** is a pillar of his campaign.

America needs to face facts. Both nominees are seniors, and neither is being straightforward on health. Clinton has the bigger reputation for secrecy. But Trump is master of "do as I say, not as I do." He has by far the most questions to answer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At age 48, Patty Mapa can't remember ever voting for a Democrat for president.

Then Republicans nominated Donald Trump.

The substitute kindergarten teacher, who was shopping for fresh produce with her husband and daughter at the West Chester Growers Market in this Philadelphia suburb on a recent day, worried that the billionaire businessman is "negative, just very divisive and erratic." She was less than thrilled about casting her ballot for Democrat Hillary Clinton -- "There's that dark little cloud" when it comes to trustworthiness, she said -- but on this Mapa was certain: "I am voting against Trump."

The biggest swing in the American electorate this year is happening among white, college-educated voters such as Mapa. They are a big and growing group -- about 23% of the electorate four years ago and likely to be a bit more this year -- and they have voted Republican in every presidential election since at least 1952. Four years ago, Mitt Romney won their support by a solid 14 percentage points, according to surveys of voters as they left polling places. But in the latest Pew Research Center poll, taken last month, Clinton led among whites who have a college degree by 14 points.

That may be the most dramatic partisan shift by a major demographic group from one presidential election to the next in modern American history.

In places such as Chester County in Pennsylvania, Douglas County in Colorado, Delaware County in Ohio, Wake County in North Carolina and Fairfax County in Virginia, those changing allegiances create formidable problems for Trump in states he needs to win the White House. Though national polls give the businessman and reality TV star a 2-1 lead among white voters who don't have a college education, Democrats' traditional appeal among minority voters and their new strength among better-educated whites, especially women, risk making an electoral majority all but out of reach for him.

Pennsylvania is a crucial state. Trump, Clinton and running mates Mike Pence and Tim Kaine all have campaigned here since the Democratic convention, and the Clinton campaign has sent in Vice President Biden and former president Bill Clinton.

On a sunny Saturday near summer's end, the weekly farmers market tucked on an open lot in downtown West Chester bustled with shoppers eyeing stacks of tomatoes and corn, six kinds of apples, early pumpkins and gourds and homemade pies and cobblers.

Margot McKee, who works in real estate sales (and described her age only as "old enough to know better") voted for Trump in Pennsylvania's GOP primary in April. He trounced his rivals, winning 57% of the vote over Texas Sen. Ted Cruz (22%) and Ohio Gov. John Kasich (19%). Now, McKee anguishes over what to do in November.

"I think he's done a great job in getting people's attention to some issues that have been neglected, and Congress is dysfunctional and politicians are dysfunctional, and they don't seem willing to do their jobs," she said, but Trump needs to "grow up and learn to keep his mouth shut." She described him as "impossible," then called him an unprintable epithet.

What about Clinton? McKee sighed. "I'm drawn to her because of her experience and her even manner, but I'm not sure that she's honest," she said, adding unhappily that "the Clintons seem to know how to duck and bob."

"I'm so disgusted I'm thinking that maybe I'm not going to vote," something she's never done before, she said. "But then, that's a cop- out."

The four "collar counties" around Philadelphia -- Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery -- have provided Republican margins to help neutralize the Democratic advantage in the city itself. In the past 12 presidential elections, Chester voted for the Democratic candidate only once, in 2008. But Democrats have become increasingly competitive in the suburban counties, which include about a third of the state's voters. In 2012, Romney lost the other three and carried Chester by just two-tenths of a percentage point, the closest margin in the state.

Or as West Chester Mayor Carolyn Comitta, a Democrat, ruefully recalled: "529 votes."

The county has a population of about 516,000, and half have college degrees -- the highest proportion in the state. Average household incomes are well above the state average, unemployment is well below, and voter turnout is high. Four years ago, seven in 10 of the voting-age citizens in Chester cast ballots. The county's residents are overwhelmingly white. Just 6% are African-American, 7% Latino.

Even so, it is Trump's provocative rhetoric about Mexicans, Muslims and **immigrants** that's created the biggest backlash among Chester County voters.

"Typically here, it's having a fiscal conservative that's most important to Chester County voters, but this race is transcending traditional issues," Chester County Republican Chairman Val DiGiorgio, a lawyer, said. "What's important here and determinative here is whether Donald Trump can show himself to be someone who reaches out to a broader segment of the population, as opposed to what he did during the primaries. We're still waiting to see whether that's the case."

DiGiorgio, who endorsed Florida Sen. Marco Rubio in the Republican primary, now supports Trump and is "putting all our efforts to make sure he's elected president." He said the New York billionaire has drawn more volunteers than usual to the local GOP organization.

But the Republican county committee's home page on Monday didn't mention Trump's name or the presidential race. The website's tab listing "2016 candidates" included statewide and local contenders, but not the top of the ticket.

The home page of the Chester County Democratic Committee didn't mention Clinton, though she was listed on the "2016 candidates" tab. A banner across the top of the page declared, "If you don't vote the whole ballot, you are not doing your full part against Trumpism."

Just how much impact Trump could have down the ballot is a worry for Republicans and a hope for Democrats. In a statewide Franklin & Marshall College Poll taken last month, Clinton led Trump by 7 points, 47%-40%, and Democratic Senate challenger Katie McGinty led incumbent Republican Pat Toomey by 5points, 43%-38%. The hard- fought Keystone State race is one of a handful likely to determine control of the Senate.

"The fact is she's the beneficiary of Clinton emerging into the lead," G. Terry Madonna, director of the poll and a professor of public affairs, said of McGinty. "I think if it's 5 points or less, Toomey has a good chance of winning." If Clinton wins the state by more than 5 points, Trump may leave Toomey with too much ground to make up among voters willing to split their ticket.

Comitta, who is challenging three-term Republican incumbent Dan Truitt for the state House of Representatives, enthusiastically backs Clinton. But she generally tries to talk about local and state issues, not the national race, as she campaigns. She stopped by the farmers market after a morning of walking door-to-door, distributing fliers that didn't mention party affiliation, instead describing her as "Mom. Educator. Mayor."

"I hear from some people who love her, some people who would never vote for her and some who will vote for her because they can't imagine Trump being president," she said of Clinton. "Because the two candidates are so polarizing, and I have to win my race, I'm not going there. That's a whole other conversation."

Truitt didn't return calls seeking comment.

Trump does have enthusiastic supporters in Chester County, and Linda Ives is one of them.

"You look at a human being as a body of work, and I think that the gentleman has without a doubt provided opportunities, job opportunities, for hundreds of thousands of people, and after watching his children at the convention, I was most impressed," said Ives, 54, a retired Army captain who works as a consultant.

She is motivated by fierce opposition to Clinton. She called the former secretary of State "a criminal" for her role in the deaths of four Americans in 2012 in Benghazi, Libya, and her carelessness in sending classified information on her private email server.

"If I had sent one unclassified email like that, I would be at Fort Leavenworth right now; I would be in jail," Ives said. She is concerned about Trump's "delivery," but she said unfair news coverage contributes to his problems.

"I think people are embarrassed to say they're supporting Trump," she said. "I think what's happening is -- sorry, guys -- the liberal media is just pushing the whole, 'The man is a ridiculous clown' and the only people who are going to vote for him is the young, uneducated male. So people are then, 'I'm an educated person, why would I be stupid enough to vote for Trump?'"

Indeed, the electoral shift among college-educated whites in four years has been of historic proportions, particularly for such a large group of voters.

"In Donald Trump, you have a perfect storm of a candidate in terms of pressing buttons to sending white, college-educated voters, particularly women, in the other direction," said Ruy Teixeira, co- director of States of Change, a non-partisan project that studies the impact of demographic trends on elections. "These are not voters who are protectionist or anti-**immigrant**. He represents a type of Republicanism or strand of the Republican Party that they probably like the least."

What's not clear is whether Republican-leaning voters such as those in Chester County who plan to vote for Clinton will stick with Democrats down the road.

"Trump's success reflects the way the bases of the two parties have changed," said political scientist Alan Abramowitz of Emory University.

The 2016 race may accelerate long-term trends reshaping the historic perception of Democrats as the party of blue-collar workers and Republicans as the party of white-collar workers. "Especially at the presidential level, now Republicans are the party of the white working class," Abramowitz said.

Lisa Cromley, 53, a middle-school English and history teacher, shopped at the farmers market, then dropped by a Democratic campaign storefront around the corner.

"I am so concerned about Trump that I don't know where to begin," she said, then ticked off a list. "I'm concerned that he doesn't know any issues; he's not a politician. He doesn't have a legal background; he really has a business background, and the business background he has isn't even something that I think translates. I'm concerned about his attitude toward most of the people who make up our pluralistic nation, our multicultural nation. I'm concerned that he doesn't think before he speaks.

"But I try not to talk to people about this campaign," Cromley added. "It's so divisive."

---

The USA TODAY Network is spending time in eight counties in eight states, exploring the key electoral themes that could decide this fall's election. Each week until the election, we will feature a different one. The series debuted last week with a look at Waukesha County in Wisconsin. Today: Chester County in Pennsylvania.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Where does Donald Trump stand on issues of importance to small businesses? The short answer is "Who knows?" Trump changes his positions quicker than Taylor Swift changes boyfriends.

On Aug. 8, Trump unveiled his economic plan in a speech in Detroit. From that speech and other positions he's made throughout the campaign, we can try to navigate the haze of where Trump stands on matters important to small-business owners and entrepreneurs.

Taxes

Trump's main business tax policy is that "No American company will pay more than 15% of their business income in taxes." Sounds good, but don't spend your tax savings yet. Your small business is almost certainly taxed on a "pass-through" basis, meaning income is taxed as individual income, not corporate income. Only "C" corporations are likely to benefit from Trump's cut. So big corporations and fewer than 8% of small companies would save on taxes. Good for your competitors.

New business formation

Reading from prepared remarks rather than speaking off-the-cuff, Trump said, "You cannot ever start a small business under the tremendous regulatory burden you have today in our country." Trump is just plain off the wall here. In 2015, there were 669,917 new employer businesses, and in 2014 there were 831,317 new "non- employer" businesses, according to the U.S. Census. More than 1 million businesses get started every year.

Estate taxes

About 10 years ago, it was popular to rage against the "death tax." That disappeared as a talking point because the very rich pay virtually all estate taxes. Only 30 farms and closely held businesses paid ANY estate taxes in 2015, and the top 1/10th of 1% of all taxpayers -- the uber rich -- paid 35% of all estate taxes. The rest were paid for by the top 1%. So, Trump's plan on estate taxes is basically a "save billionaire's rich kids some money" plan.

Of course, when assessing the impact of a Trump presidency, small- business owners may want to consider other positions he's taken:

**Immigration**

Trump rose to prominence by stoking anti-**immigrant** fervor. He's promised to deport all illegal **immigrants**, build a wall with Mexico and refuse to allow any Muslims from entering the country. Trump's anti-**immigrant** comments have increased antagonism to all **immigrants**, legal or not. However, **immigrants** start businesses at twice the rate of native-born Americans and were responsible for 28.5% of all new businesses in 2014. Making America a less inviting place for **immigrants** will negatively affect overall economic growth.

Trade

Trump consistently calls for raising tariffs on imported goods and renegotiating or stopping trade agreements. Economic experts believe this could lead to trade wars. The impact on small businesses? Small exporters are likely to be hit, as other countries retaliate and impose tariffs or limit imports. Small manufacturers serving the domestic market might be somewhat better able to withstand foreign competition.

Past small-biz dealings

Trump has left a trail of mistreated small-business vendors who've done business with his company. They've complained about not being paid, being paid far less than agreed upon or Trump declaring bankruptcy to avoid paying creditors. In an expose, the New York Daily News showed that after 9/11, Trump applied for, and received, a $150,000 grant that was set aside to help small businesses recover.

Of course, the most important question is whether you think Trump has the temperament, judgment and competence to be president. Leaders in the business, technology and foreign policy communities -- many life-long Republicans -- doubt he does.

As a small-business owner, I know that nothing affects the health of my business -- no specific policy or decision -- as much as the health of the overall economy. Hundreds of business leaders, including billionaire investor Warren Buffett, HP's Meg Whitman, Alphabet's Eric Schmidt, Michael Bloomberg and the founders of Costco, Airbnb, SalesForce, Dish Network and many more, see Trump as a threat to the economic vitality of this country. That's a risk most small-business owners shouldn't want to take.

Abrams is the author of 19 books including "Successful Business Plan: Secrets & Strategies." Connect with Rhonda at facebook.com/ RhondaAbramsSmallBusiness. Register for Rhonda's free business tips newsletter at www.PlanningShop.com[http://www.PlanningShop.com]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With six children and two on the way, Rosemary Tello does not have much space left in the single room she rents in a downtown apartment alongside other Peruvian **immigrants** here.

The landlord built Tello a loft to create more space that she lined wall-to-wall with beds, leaving the common area for her to prepare food to sell on the corner.

Chile has become more attractive to working **immigrants** elsewhere in South America because of its economy, but a lack of housing and programs to handle the flood of **immigrants** force people to cram into overcrowded apartments like Tello's, or to live in slums or on the streets.

"Even though I'm legal, it's hard to rent here just because I'm foreign," said Tello, 30. Besides Peruvians -- like Tello -- and Bolivians in search of work, Chile has seen an influx of Venezuelans, who are fleeing economic chaos, and Haitians and Dominicans, who learn about jobs in Santiago through Chile's continued efforts to help Haiti recover from a devastating earthquake six years ago.

Historically, Chile has been a less appealing destination for South American **immigrants** than larger neighbors, such as Brazil and Argentina. But the flow of **immigrants** started to grow after Augusto Pinochet's dictatorship ended in 1990, and the country has experienced a boom since 2010, when its economy became one of the strongest and most stable on the continent, according to the World Economic Forum.

Nearly 360,000 South American **immigrants** moved to Chile in 2015 through midyear, according to the Migration Policy Institute, a Washington, D.C., think tank. Critics say Chile isn't prepared to absorb so many people and often violates their human rights as a result.

"We are building ghettos," said Jorge Sagastume, coordinator for the Chilean branch of the International Organization for Migration, which works with governments around the world to aid migrants. "If those **immigrants** continue living that way, and their children continue living there, we're going to have an explosion within a decade."

**Immigrants** can send their children to school without proper documents, Sagastume said. They can seek medical care. But there is virtually no established policy that addresses living conditions.

"I wish **immigrants** had more access to housing," said Mara Theresa Flores, 32, a Peruvian who lives in one room with her mother and two children. "I don't know the rules, and I can't rent anything else. I'm not thinking of me, but for my kids."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Hispanic population living in the USA is growing at the slowest rate since official record-keeping began nearly 50 years ago, according to a report released Thursday.

Hispanics grew by an average of more than 5% annually throughout the 1970s, '80s and '90s, driving much of the population growth in the country. According to a new report from the Pew Research Center, that number started falling in 2007 with the Great Recession and continued to slide to a record-low 2.1% growth rate in 2014.

Mark Hugo Lopez, director of Hispanic research at Pew and a co- author of the report, said the drop is because of lower levels of legal and illegal **immigration**to the USA from Mexico and lower birthrates among Hispanics.

"These two together are slowing Hispanic population growth at the national level," Lopez said.

The report comes as **immigration** and the role of Hispanics in the USA continue to play a central role in the presidential election. Republican Donald Trump has focused his campaign on stopping illegal **immigration** and slowing legal **immigration**, while Democrat Hillary Clinton has vowed to protect some undocumented **immigrants** from deportation, trying to maximize her appeal with Hispanic voters.

Lopez said Hispanics continued driving much of the country's growth in recent years, accounting for 54% of the nation's population growth since 2000.

As fewer Hispanic **immigrants** enter the country and more Hispanics settle into their communities, the group is not spreading around the country as widely as it once did.

The share of U.S. counties with at least 1,000 Hispanics grew from 27% in 1990 to 38% in 2000 and 46% in 2007, according to the report. Since then, the share of U.S. counties with at least 1,000 Hispanics has grown only 4%.

Lopez said the counties that remain with small numbers of Hispanics are mostly remote places that don't have job markets to lure large numbers of people, Hispanic or not.

"You're talking about counties in rural Alaska or rural Montana," he said. "Maybe the Latinos have dispersed across all the counties that have economic opportunities for them."

The report highlighted the rise in **immigration** from other countries, including China and India. The growth rate of the Asian population in the USA is higher than the Hispanic population.

Randy Capps, director of research for U.S. programs at the Washington-based Migration Policy Institute, said that's partly because the large number of Hispanics in the USA makes it difficult to maintain such a high growth rate.

There are 55 million Hispanics in the USA, which represents 17.4% of the population. Capps said it's difficult to imagine that Hispanics could return to the days of 5% annual growth.

Mexico's economy has improved, meaning fewer people are **immigrating** to the USA.

Other findings from the report:

The only areas that saw drops in their Hispanic population from 2007 to 2014 were focused in a rural corner of western Texas, southern Colorado and northern New Mexico. Lopez said those are agricultural areas with older populations, meaning people are dying faster than **immigrants** are moving in.

About 72% of Hispanics in counties with the fastest-growing Hispanic populations speak English proficiently, compared with the national average of 68%.

The states with the largest number of Hispanics remained California (15 million), Texas (10.4million), Florida (4.8 million), New York (3.7 million) and Illinois (2.2 million).

States where Hispanics make up the largest percentage of the population are New Mexico (48%), California (39%), Texas (39%), Arizona (31%) and Nevada (28%).

Pew conducted its review using data from the U.S. Census Bureau. The bureau began counting Hispanics in 1970.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For thousands of consumers, proving they are legal U.S. residents so they can keep their Obamacare plans can be a bigger health care challenge than affording them.

Documentation issues over **immigration** status ensnared more than a half million people who bought plans on HealthCare.gov last year. Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell noted 85% fewer people had plans terminated for "data matching" issues for the first three months of 2016 -- the most recent information available -- than the first quarter of 2015.

That's 17,000 people in the first quarter of this year compared with 117,000 people in early 2015.

"If you have a data issue and you're not well, you're going to work hard to get it resolved," Burwell said recently. But if you're healthy and struggling to find the forms needed to satisfy federal regulators, you're more likely to give up, she said.

For those trying to find the correct forms to show they're legal residents, the challenges are daunting and can mean the difference between having insurance or going without it.

Padma Obla of South Riding, Va., has been without health insurance since May 1 when she was abruptly dropped from a family plan that also covered her husband, Shyam, and their 5-year-old son, Amirthyog. After Shyam threatened to call the couple's U.S. senator, a supervisor at the HealthCare.gov call center discovered the problem was because Padma Obla's Social Security card had her maiden name while her passport had her married name.

A new Social Security card with the right name was uploaded Wednesday, but it's unclear how long it will take for HealthCare.gov to verify it and for Padma to get insurance coverage again.

"Luckily, she didn't get sick," Shyam Obla says.

Shyam moved to the USA from India in 1991; Padma arrived in 1999, the year they were married. They became citizens in 2009.

Federal officials "never quite got it right for **immigrant** families," says Angel Padilla, a health policy analyst with the National **Immigration** Law Center. "They've come a long way and have worked to improve systemic problems, but there are still some lingering issues in trying to make this work for **immigrants**."

Once her plan is reinstated, the Obla family will owe back premiums or face a penalty at tax time for the months she was uninsured. Shyam says they will do so, but Jonathan Katz, an insurance broker with Virginia Health Plans in Herndon, Va., says some would rather take a chance or may not have the money.

Hitches can appear "completely random" and involve people who aren't even **immigrants**, Katz says. Parents who were born in Virginia hospitals have been asked to prove their new babies are here legally. Even a birth certificate may not be enough; Katz has had to provide pediatrician records on behalf of clients' babies. "The most maddening part of the whole data matching issue is that there is no conclusive way to know they've accepted the documents," Katz says.

Consumers who haven't provided adequate citizenship or **immigration** status documentation within 95 days have their plans terminated. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services say consumers can enroll again through HealthCare.gov during a special enrollment period.

Data issues go beyond health or inconvenience for the individual consumers. They jeopardize the balance of sick and healthy individuals insured, which increases insurers' costs and makes them more likely to raise premiums or drop out of the market.

About 11 million people are insured on the federal and state health exchanges. The uninsured rate is below 9% -- the lowest in history -- but the National Health Interview Survey out this week showed the rate of progress has slowed dramatically.

Retention of those already enrolled was a top concern mentioned by Burwell, but enrolling the healthier people is just as critical.

When people who have health plans and are getting medical treatment have their insurance suddenly canceled, "it is adding to the instability consumers and plans are dealing with in the market and drives up the costs for everybody," says America's Health Insurance Plans' Clare Krusing.

Data problems appear most tied to HealthCare.gov, the federal Affordable Care Act exchange that handles insurance sales for 38 states that don't have their own marketplaces for individual health plans.

States that set up their own exchanges have far more flexibility to solve enrollment and eligibility issues than the federal government does, says Maydad Cohen, a former special assistant to the governor of Massachusetts. That state faced data-matching issues of its own relating to **immigration** documentation and general identity proofing. Cohen led the effort to integrate the state eligibility and enrollment system for the 2015 open enrollment.

The state did targeted outreach to the people affected by the issues.

"If you could not prove who you said you were, you could not continue," says Cohen, a senior vice president at IT company hCentive, which helped launch some state exchanges. When that happens, "people are going to say, 'I didn't even want to do this in the first place.' Healthy people are more likely to say that."

Though document matching causes some people to incorrectly be blocked from enrollment, Cohen says "it is playing a key role in stopping those not eligible from receiving insurance."

Still, even for legal residents, "any additional barrier is going to reduce enrollment rates," Padilla says. "Their primary concern is keeping the family intact."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Like a lot of things in life, it started with a kiss.

The 1968 Star Trek episode "Plato's Stepchildren" began like most others: The crew meets a new **alien** race. The villains of the story start wreaking havoc. But then Capt. Kirk (William Shatner), a white man, and Lt. Uhura (Nichelle Nichols), a black woman, kissed.

Widely thought to be the first interracial kiss depicted on television (although archivists have found earlier examples), the episode was a monumental moment in American television and culture.

"I made sure they didn't have a place to edit. I just forced the pace. I don't quite remember what I did, but it apparently worked," Shatner recalls of the day the scene was shot. "My goal was to sustain the kiss so they couldn't cut away from it."

Shawn Taylor, a writer for Nerds of Color, a website dedicated to culture criticism, says: "Talking to people who witnessed it on television in its original airing, it was like a nuclear bomb went off in their living rooms. The best science fiction is always about the present."

Star Trek went boldly where few shows had gone before in terms of diversity and representation, in that historic moment and beyond. The series, and the shows that followed, tackled themes of race and identity years before other shows would even touch them. Even the cast of the original series was revolutionary.

"That vision that (creator Gene Roddenberry) had: starship Enterprise, a metaphor for starship Earth," original cast member George Takei tells Neil deGrasse Tyson in his forthcoming book, Star Talk. "And the strength of the starship lay in its diversity, coming together and working in concert."

Roddenberry's son Rod, chief of Roddenberry Entertainment, agrees. The show "was about searching out and finding new ideas. That was the most fundamental thing," he says. "Let's find a new **alien**. Who cares what they look like? Let's find out what they know about the universe, even if it's contrary to our beliefs."

The shows and movies have included storylines on transracial adoption, gender fluidity and racism, including a third-season episode, "Let That Be Your Last Battlefield," in which an **alien** whose face is white on one side and black on the other rages against a man with the same colors on opposite sides of his face.

"The stupidity of racism was dramatized. That's Star Trek at its best," Shatner says.

Occasionally, the franchise missed the mark on inclusion.

Kevin Church, a writer for the Star Trek-centric site They Boldly Went, calls the depiction of Native Americans in Season 3's "The Paradise Syndrome" "embarrassing."

And while some spinoff projects such as tie-in novels have depicted LGBT characters, the shows and movies have been lacking, until now: Actor John Cho told Australia's Herald Sun that Sulu is gay in Star Trek Beyond. (George Takei, now openly gay, played the character in the original series).

What resonated from the past 50 years of Trek with a young fan like Taylor was something as simple as showing a black man as the commander of a space station, in the form of Benjamin Sisko (Avery Brooks) in the 1990s series Star Trek: Deep Space Nine.

"Here was a guy, a black man, who was a single, loving father, which you hardly ever see," he says. "Here's a black man leading the series -- that was my Obama moment."

Contributing: Bill Keveney

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It might have been a simpler time, but it certainly wasn't a better one.

Viewed from a 50-year distance through the CGI lens of modern sci- fi blockbusters, NBC's original Star Trek TV series, which premiered on Sept. 8, 1966, can look adorably quaint. The oh-so-obviously plastic models visiting planets that are clearly back lots and sound stages. The by-now-standard multinational, multi-ethnic crew: a Russian, an Asian, an African American and an intellectually advanced **alien** among them. And that peaceful mission, to explore but not to interfere, and never -- heaven forbid -- to conquer.

It's all so cute. Except there was nothing cute about it at the time -- and nothing cute about the times.

Star Trek began in 1966 and ended in 1969 -- a three-year span that was one of the most tumultuous and divisive in our nation's history. The 1965 Watts riots warned of the simmering racial tensions that would explode over the next few summers, setting many of our inner cities ablaze. The war in Vietnam raged every night on our TV newscasts, leading to riots at the 1968 Democratic convention and widespread fears that the conflict might engulf all of Asia. There was war in the Middle East; the assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr. at home; and a Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia that seemed to bring us all one step closer to nuclear annihilation.

That's not just a quick history lesson -- it's the context through which Star Trek must be viewed. In the midst of international strife, Trek creator Gene Roddenberry preached a message of peaceful coexistence. In the face of racial and ethnic divides, his show offered an unprecedented view of a diverse workplace where everyone was competent, everyone was relied upon, and everyone was treated with friendship and respect.

We're used to such TV ensembles today. But at the time it was revolutionary -- so much

so, that NBC initially balked at showing a kiss between Trek's Caucasian captain and African-American communications officer. The mere fact that she was an officer, by the way, and not the ship's cook or cleaning woman was a welcome change all by itself.

Nor was Roddenberry shy about hammering home his message. Another famous episode centered on two **aliens** -- half-black and half- white, but with the colors on opposite sides of their faces -- locked in a ceaseless, pointless racial war. Seen now, the episode may seem heavy-handed and obvious; then, in a nation that often seemed to be on the verge of collapse, it was a scream for help.

As time passed, the show has come to be appreciated as entertainment alone -- and for creating as indelible a set of characters as any TV series has ever produced. Is there a sci-fi fan alive who doesn't know Kirk, Spock, McCoy, Scotty, Uhura, Sulu and Chekov? Those are the names that have launched a thousand spinoffs and imitators, all trying to find stories that resonate as well as The Trouble With Tribbles or villains who can stand up to Khan Noonien Singh.

Even at the time, of course, no one mistook Star Trek for Shakespeare. Viewers were aware of the sacrificial nature of the redshirts, and the show's over-reliance on alternate-history universes. Many of us noted that William Shatner's performance, like Captain Kirk's costumes, seemed to expand as the seasons wore on.

It hardly mattered then, and it matters less now. This is a show that, in very difficult times, tried to be good and do good -- and succeeded at both.

And that makes it a show for our times, as well as its own.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Letters

Donald Trump is back to his strong stance on mass deportation of illegal **immigrants**. Obviously, he has not thought his plan through. For example, the amount of resources that would be needed. Would there be massive hiring of enforcement squads? Where would the money come from to enact such a policy? Would there be deficit spending or cuts in other government services? What about due process hearings? How long would it take to round up 11 million people? How would they be transported to their countries of origin? Where would they be detained and for how long?

And while all of this is going on, what about other priorities that the U.S. is facing domestically and abroad? Would there even be time to think about those? This kind of thinking does not consider the massive disruption that the U.S. would face. His stance shows how ill-prepared Trump is in dealing realistically with the issue, and it's a sign of how incompetent he may be on others.

George Magakis Jr.

Norristown, Pa.

Facebook

Donald Trump focused on the issue regarding felons, drug dealers and criminals. While listening, I thought he was less interested in pursuing law abiding **aliens**. He said as much about families who work hard and behave. He gave a sensational talk. He may not win, but he's appealing to more voters.

Marcus David

As long as American businesses hire illegals, the problem will not go away! I'm tired of hearing how they hire illegals because American workers won't take the jobs. It's these American business owners that are causing a lot of the problem, and it needs to stop. Let's start by giving our homeless and our veterans a chance to work and build up, not only our country, but also their pride!

Rick Neal

Twitter

We asked our followers how they would grade Donald Trump's **immigration** plan, as outlined on Wednesday. For more, follow @USATOpinion or #tellusatoday.

Monumental, specific, fearless and an absolute game-changer for his campaign. The momentum is back on his side.

@karbs76

Excellent speech, loaded with details. Mark it down. This was a huge game-changer.

@paperboyvolman

F-. A president ordering local police forces around? An "ideological certification"? What the heck does that mean? Scary stuff.

@nwjerseyliz

Awful! F-! Very little policy, but lots of hate. I am embarrassed. The world could think Trump could be our president.

@davepounds

Trump's plan must be done to save the country. The plan is workable, and people are behind it. He receives an A+.

@cindyteatime

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Not even their own supporters are all that excited about winning.

A nationwide USA TODAY/Suffolk University Poll, taken as Labor Day launches the final sprint toward the election, finds supporters of Democrat Hillary Clinton and Republican Donald Trump more motivated by fear about the other side claiming the White House than they are by excitement about their own candidate prevailing.

Clinton holds a 7-percentage-point lead over Trump, 48%-41%, close to the 6-point lead she held two months ago in the survey. The proportion of undecided voters is chipping away, below 10%. In a separate four-way ballot, support for third-party contenders ticked up, to 9% for Libertarian Gary Johnson and 4% for Jill Stein of the Green Party.

Driving the election is antipathy toward the competition: 80% of Trump supporters and 62% of Clinton supporters say if the other candidate wins in November, they would feel "scared," the most negative of four possible choices.

Those are stronger feelings than they express about a victory by their own candidate. Twenty-seven percent of Clinton supporters and 29% of Trump backers would be "excited," the most positive choice. A majority of both sides -- 62% for Clinton and 52% for Trump -- predict a more temperate "satisfied" feeling.

"I honestly think she'll be a good president, as flawed as she is," says Carol Fisher, 56, a Clinton supporter and registered nurse from Teaneck, N.J., who was among those surveyed. "And I believe the alternative of a Trump presidency would be disastrous, not just for our country but for the whole world." Though she usually votes for Democrats, she says, "I've never been so afraid of a Republican before."

Noel Hartman, 64, of Humboldt, Ariz., says he feels the same way about Clinton. "The one word that really stands out is 'above the law,'" the retired farmer says in a follow-up interview. "I mean, anything that she ever did has never been accounted for, and she gets by with just laughing it off." He supports Trump. "I know he doesn't say stuff right, but I'm so tired of being lied to," Hartman says. "I'm hoping for change."

The poll of 1,000 likely voters, taken Aug. 24-29, has a margin of error of +/-3 percentage points.

Unprecedented negative ratings for both candidates and fierce polarization between the two parties underscore the challenges ahead for the winner in November. The new president will face a significant swath of voters who view his or her election as catastrophic for the country -- not exactly a prescription for a political honeymoon.

Clinton's TV ads darkly question whether Trump could be trusted to command nuclear weapons. Trump has dubbed his opponent "Crooked Hillary," and his rallies rebound with chants of "Lock her up!"

Nearly three in 10 Clinton supporters say they are mostly voting against Trump, not for her. Nearly four in 10 Trump supporters say they are voting mostly against Clinton, not for him.

Are they honest?

Most Americans doubt the integrity of both candidates. Fifty- nine percent say they don't think Clinton is honest and trustworthy, including nearly one-fourth of her supporters. Sixty-one percent of those surveyed say they don't think Trump is honest and trustworthy, including one-fifth of his supporters.

Two controversies may contribute to those impressions:

Nearly eight in 10 say Trump should release his tax returns, as every major-party presidential nominee has done since 1976. Two- thirds of those who back Trump say he should release them, at least for the years that are no longer being audited. Trump says he won't release any returns until an IRS audit is concluded.

A 54% majority of those surveyed say Clinton and her husband, former president Bill Clinton, didn't take appropriate steps to avoid conflicts of interest in donations to the Clinton Foundation. Thirty percent say she shouldn't be criticized for the donations to the foundation. Newly released emails show foundation officials seeking meetings for big donors with Hillary Clinton when she was secretary of State. Nearly three in 10 of those who back Clinton say she didn't take appropriate steps to avoid the controversy.

"Whatever happened to morals and standards?" fumes Joe Thomas, 64, a Trump supporter from Trinity, N.C. "She's not honest and trustworthy." Is Trump? "Well, more than her," he replies.

Lori Sorenson, 34, a software trainer from Alexandria, Va., says the flap over the foundation doesn't bother her "that much," saying Clinton is faulted for practices many politicians follow. "I've never been a big fan of her," Sorenson says. "But I'm definitely a bigger fan of her than him."

Americans are divided on whether Trump is a racist, a charge made by critics who cite his rhetoric against Mexicans, Muslims and **immigrants**: 44% of those surveyed say they see him as a racist; 47% say he's not. Among African Americans, more than eight in 10 say he's a racist, and among Hispanics, more than six in 10 agree. A 54% majority of whites say he's not.

By wide margins, supporters of both candidates say third-party contenders who are certified on a majority of state ballots should be included in the fall debates. The non-partisan Commission on Presidential Debates sets a threshold of 15% support in national polls, a benchmark neither Johnson nor Stein meets. But 76% of those surveyed say they should be allowed to participate; 17% say they shouldn't.

The first debate is scheduled for Sept. 26 at Hofstra University on Long Island in New York.

Time and opportunity

There's time and opportunity for the landscape to change. Still ahead are millions of dollars worth of TV ads and four debates, three between the presidential candidates and one between the vice presidential candidates, assuming they go ahead as planned. Unexpected developments, here or abroad, could seize the headlines.

Intense media coverage and roiling controversies on issues from Clinton's emails to Trump's shifting stance on **immigration** have done little to move the electorate. Clinton's unfavorable rating has inched down a point and a half since June; her favorable rating hasn't changed. Trump's ratings have barely budged. Their negative ratings, 51% for Clinton and 59% for Trump, set unwelcome records for presidential candidates in the modern era.

There's a gender gap that rivals the record. Clinton leads among women by 54%-38% while the two contenders split men, 44% for Trump and 43% for Clinton. The 11-point difference in Clinton's support between male and female voters precisely mirrors the record gender gap Bill Clinton scored over Bob Dole two decades ago.

There is also a racial divide, despite recent speeches in which Trump sought the votes of African Americans. In the survey, more than nine of 10 black voters and two-thirds of Hispanic voters support Clinton. Trump is supported by a minuscule 4% of blacks and about one in four Hispanics. He leads Clinton among whites, 49% to 41%.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A right-wing, anti-**immigrant** party stands to make strong election gains Sunday in Chancellor Angela Merkel's home state, a potential embarrassment for the German leader's liberal refugee policy.

The vote in the Baltic Sea region of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania will test the resilience of Merkel's conservative Christian Democratic Union and other mainstream parties ahead of next year's federal elections. Another gauge will be the Sept. 18 regional election in Berlin.

The anti-**immigrant** Alternative for Germany (AfD) party has been buoyed by dissatisfaction with Merkel's decision last year to take in more than 1 million asylum seekers, mostly Muslims.

"If we want to feel like we're still in Germany, we need to send a stop signal," AfD candidate Lars Loewe told a rally in Wismar.

"The refugee issue has helped AfD a lot, and it reflects political **alienation**," said Josef Janning with the Berlin office of the European Council on Foreign Relations.

A poll by the political research Insa Institute shows AfD could win 23% in Sunday's vote, while Merkel's party would get 20%. When Merkel's party is combined with its coalition partner, the left- leaning Social Democratic Party, which is polling at 28%, the result could be enough to retain power in the northeastern state.

Merkel's popularity rating has slumped to 45% since she opened Germany's borders to asylum seekers, down from 75%.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FACEBOOK

Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump met with Mexican President Enrique Pea Nieto on Wednesday.

First Trump goes to Louisiana to meet the victims, now he meets with the president of Mexico. Trump has done more presidential things in two weeks than President Obama or Hillary Clinton have in 2016.

So golf and fundraising aren't what make an effective president? Huh.

David Groner

Looks like someone told Trump that without the Latino vote he is dead in the water. If he reverses his stance now, he looks like a flake, and if he doesn't, he loses the election. This is why you get a quality campaign manager and speech writer on board before you open your mouth.

Sy Burr

No wonder Trump said, and I quote, "We love the poorly educated." He is treating his supporters as ignorants who will believe anything he says. Sad.

Noemi Acevedo Garcia

Trump had an opportunity to demonstrate maturity instead of petulance. A constructive, give-and-take discussion with the Mexican president, and an issue-based speech regarding illegal **immigration** in America, were necessary to rebuild even a semblance of confidence in his candidacy.

The month after his nomination has been wasted on ill-advised dust-ups with individuals.

The time is growing ever shorter for him to address the very real confidence issue he has with the voting public. If he chooses, he can sound presidential, if he simply seizes the chance to do so.

Peter Fonseca

Did the president of Mexico put money into the Clinton Foundation? No? Then sorry. Clinton is not accepting the invitation from Pea Nieto. You can still change her mind, President Pea Nieto!

David Groner

He did not need to meet with a Mexican to determine what is good for Americans.

Ken White

TWITTER

We asked our followers their thoughts on Donald Trump meeting with Mexican President Enrique Pea Nieto.

I think this meeting is too little too late, and it will have no effect on voters after hearing Trump's rhetoric.

@hotflesh

It's an act of desperation on both sides. Trump wants the votes and Pea Nieto wants to be a hero. Too late.

@jamezolah

Trump pulled in massive support from his hard-line stance on **immigration**. It's a betrayal to his followers.

@InvokeTruth

Unexpected and intelligent, diplomatic move by Trump!

@MurrayMaza

It's theater. Trump has pandered to the alt-right for over a year. Who is he trying to kid?

@RMAlvarado52

For more, follow @USATOpinion or #tellusatoday.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump was said to have been considering ways to recast his hard-line positions on **immigration** without offending his base. Given the centrality of the issue to his presidential campaign, this would have been the political equivalent of a reverse pike four-and-a- half somersault high dive.

Trump seemingly began the maneuver Wednesday with a presidential- like visit to Mexico City, where he met with President Enrique Pea Nieto. But anyone thinking Trump would complete the move -- however inartfully -- with a shift to the center on **immigration** would have been sorely disappointed.

His speech delivered later in the day in Phoenix was nothing short of a full-throated rant designed to whip up his base with angry -- and largely inaccurate -- descriptions of current policies and trends.

No. 1 among his 10-step **immigration** plan was a renewal of his call to build a "great wall along the southern border," to be staffed with an additional 5,000 border agents.

A wall along the southern border, supposedly to be paid for by Mexico, has long been a Trump staple. In the world of political promises, such a wall has undeniable emotional potency as a symbol of America's resolve to secure its border.

But in the world of bricks, mortar and budgets, Trump's wall along the 1,989-mile border with Mexico would be hugely costly (estimates range anywhere from $5 billion to $25 billion) and only marginally effective.

Start with the simple fact that roughly 40% of undocumented **immigrants** in the United States are people who overstay their visas, not people who sneak into the country. A wall wouldn't affect them.

Add to this the fact that 670 miles of wall and fencing has already been erected in recent years, with other stretches of the border covered by "virtual walls" of electronic monitors and patrols. Other parts of the border, moreover, have significant natural barriers, such as the Sonoran Desert.

You wouldn't know it from listening to Trump, but as a result of these existing barriers, and falling birth rates in Latin America, illegal **immigration** has been declining over the past decade.

That doesn't exactly call out for one of the largest public works projects the United States has ever undertaken, one that would involve getting massive amounts of concrete and steel to remote and roadless places.

There are much better uses for infrastructure money -- and much better ways to curb the flow of undocumented workers.

Principal among them is E-Verify, the system the federal government developed to track the status of job applicants. E- Verify remains voluntary in much of the country, and sanctions against companies that repeatedly hire undocumented workers are weak.

The government doesn't press harder largely because business groups push back. They need undocumented workers to fill jobs that are difficult or impossible to fill with Americans.

Trump's wall is best viewed as a stage prop for an **immigration** policy that's likely to end in an ugly belly flop.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Sixty-five countries have built security fences and other barriers to protect themselves from large scale migration and the infiltration of terrorists. Fences do not guarantee security, but they are an integral tool for securing borders.

In 2006, Congress acknowledged the need when it approved the Secure Fence Act. The legislation called for secure double-layered fencing along 700 miles of the border, augmented by manpower and technology to maintain overall control. Notably, both Sens. Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton voted in favor of the Secure Fence Act.

A decade later, the bill's promise remains unfulfilled. Given the growth in worldwide migration and the emergence of new terrorist organizations, it is essential that the fence be completed and other security structures -- including a wall where appropriate -- be fully implemented.

While completing the fence is vital, we must not lose sight of the fact that our porous border is not the problem; it's the symptom of the problem. Instead of enforcing our **immigration** laws, we provide incentives for people to violate them. Under the Obama administration, those incentives have become more enticing -- on purpose.

While virtually everyone acknowledges that jobs are the primary magnet for illegal **immigration**, we do virtually nothing to prevent illegal **aliens** from working here. The Obama administration has abandoned meaningful enforcement against employers who hire them. Congress refuses to make E-Verify mandatory for all employers, despite the system's proven track record.

The administration has also made it clear that it will not enforce **immigration** laws, unless an illegal **alien** has been convicted of other serious crimes. In addition, some 300 jurisdictions around the country shield illegal **aliens** through a variety of formal and informal sanctuary policies. Other jurisdictions readily provide the full panoply of taxpayer benefits and services.

If we truly want to control our borders, we must not only have physical barriers that make illegal entry difficult, we must also discourage illegal **immigration** by making it clear that it will never be rewarded.

Dan Stein is president of the Federation for American **Immigration** Reform.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has turned his **immigration** policy into hash, but some still wonder whether a kinder and gentler Donald Trump could make amends with Latino voters. It is hard to imagine anything he says now making a difference. There is a reason that 80% of Latinos disapprove of Trump, his words, his policies and his methods. Actually, I can think of at least 10:

1. Trump launched his campaign last year by attacking our southern neighbor: "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best." Consistent with the model set a century ago by countries such as Ireland and Italy, Mexico is in fact sending its best, who bring with them youth, energy, daring and optimism.

2. Then Trump took aim at the **immigrants**, saying, "They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists." He ended with an unconvincing: "Some, I assume, are good people." Some **immigrants** come with criminal intent, but most come to work. Besides, the universe of criminals, rapists and drug traffickers includes lots of Americans.

3. Trump has cozied up in Arizona to Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio, whose department was recently found guilty by a federal judge of racially profiling Latinos and defying court orders to cease the practice.

4. Trump defers to Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., as his top adviser on **immigration**. That makes for strange bedfellows given that Trump supports more legal **immigration**, while Sessions advocates limiting it.

5. While announcing that he would create a "deportation force," Trump praised President Eisenhower who, as the candidate noted during a debate last year, "moved 1.5 million illegal **immigrants** out of this country." The effort was inhumane, and many U.S.-born Hispanics were caught in the web. Trump was careful not to mention the program's name, but Latinos know it all too well: "Operation Wetback."

6. Despite the fact that a majority of Latinos support President Obama's executive actions to offer young undocumented **immigrants** who were brought here as children temporary reprieves from deportation, the Republican presidential nominee has promised to end Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

7. Last August, Trump challenged a provision of the Constitution that makes plain that the U.S.-born children of undocumented **immigrants** are, in fact, U.S. citizens. Trump insisted that "many of the great scholars say that anchor babies are not covered" by the 14th Amendment.

8. During the GOP primary, Trump retweeted an offensive comment about former Florida governor Jeb Bush's Mexican-born wife, suggesting: "#JebBush has to like the Mexican illegals because of his wife." Columba Bush came here legally. Trump deleted the retweet, but he never apologized. Trump also admonished Bush for speaking Spanish on the stump and demanded that his rival speak English while in the United States.

9. Also during the primary, Trump laid waste to rival candidates Bush, Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and even **immigration** hard-liner Sen. Ted Cruz of Texas by portraying them as soft on illegal **immigration**. He did so by oversimplifying a complicated issue, advancing falsehoods and spreading demagoguery. Ironically, in recent days, Trump has flirted with "softening" his position and adopting a stance similar to those held by the opponents he defeated.

10. Trump went from wading in racism to bathing in it when he challenged the ability of Gonzalo Curiel, a U.S.-born federal judge of Mexican descent, to be fair and objective in adjudicating a lawsuit against Trump University.

That's quite a list, and it's not even complete. I'm convinced that Trump did most of these things to antagonize Latinos, not out of malice but because of opportunism. He knew it would excite his base of mostly white voters to see him treating Mexicans, and other Latinos, like piatas. What fun. Just wait until November, amigo -- when the piatas hit back.

Ruben Navarrette Jr., a member of the USA TODAY Board of Contributors, is opinions editor at MOSH.US and a syndicated columnist with the Washington Post Writers Group.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump clarified his views on **immigration** in a speech Wednesday in Phoenix, saying the country needs a wall on the southern border, extra agents patrolling it and an aggressive system to urgently expel 2 million **immigrants** with criminal ties.

As part of a 10-point plan, Trump said he envisions a revamped system that accepts only people likely to thrive and love their new country.

The 72-minute speech largely reinforced the hard-line position Trump has staked out from the beginning of his campaign. He maintained illegal **immigration** fuels crime, drains the social safety net and leaves Americans with fewer job options in their own country.

"There is only one core issue in the **immigration** debate and that is the well-being of the American people. Nothing even comes a close second," Trump said to loud applause. "Our greatest compassion must be for our American citizens."

While Trump had discussed "softening" on **immigration** reforms in recent weeks, his Phoenix speech made clear he intends to head into the fall campaign stressing concepts like zero-tolerance, "extreme" vetting of **immigrants** and no amnesty.

The first feature of his plan was the wall that he has promised nearly from the beginning.

"We will build a great wall along the southern border," said Trump, who was joined by his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence. "And Mexico will pay for the wall, 100%. They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for it."

It was Trump's fifth visit to Arizona since entering the presidential race, underscoring the central role of **immigration** in his campaign, but also the GOP's tenuous political hold on the state this year.

Trump's speech came hours after the Republican nominee met with Mexican President Enrique Pea Nieto in Mexico City. Trump said the two discussed the need for both countries to stem illegal **immigration** and said he viewed a wall as a sovereign right. Trump said they did not discuss payment for the wall, though Pea Nieto said later in a post to Twitter that he raised the issue.

"At the start of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall," according to Pea Nieto's account.

The foreign visit raised further interest in the Phoenix event that had been anticipated nationally for more than a week yet swirled with questions of cancellation, a change in topic or a shift in Trump's policy position.

Since at least June, Trump backed off promises of mass deportations. On Aug. 23, for example, Trump told Fox News "there could certainly be a softening because we're not looking to hurt people."

After drawing a line against allowing a path to citizenship for illegal **immigrants**, Trump added, "They'll pay back taxes. They have to pay taxes. There's no amnesty, as such. There's no amnesty, but we work with them."

In Phoenix on Wednesday, Trump held firm on deporting illegal **immigrants**, prioritizing those with serious criminal records. Last week Trump acknowledged that approach is "the same thing" as the Obama administration has used "perhaps with a lot more energy."

"We will begin moving them out, day one," Trump said "My first hour in office, those people are gone. You can call it whatever the hell you want, they're gone."

Underscoring the criminal problem he said illegal **immigrants** represent, Trump shared the stage with several people who said they had lost loved ones in incidents ranging from wrong-way drivers to shootings.

Trump promised again to institute extreme vetting that would bar **immigrants** from countries that pose a security threat, such as Syria and Libya. This would include questioning prospective **immigrants** about whether they believe in "honor killings" against women and radical Islam.

"We have no idea who they are," he said of refugees entering from such places. "It's going to end badly folks. It's going to end badly."

In some cases undocumented **immigrants** are treated "better than our vets. Not going to happen any more folks. November 8."

In Cincinnati, Hillary Clinton, the Democratic nominee, ripped Trump's visit to Mexico before he got there.

"It certainly takes more than trying to make up for a year of insults and insinuations by dropping in on our neighbors for a few hours and then flying home again," she said.

Trump's **immigration** speech comes as he is trailing Clinton in most national polling, though some surveys showed her lead beginning to shrink again.
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