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Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**No matter who wins Tuesday's presidential election, now ought to be the time that policy makers in Washington come together to tackle America's greatest economic problem: sclerotic growth. The recession ended more than seven years ago. Unemployment has returned to normal levels. Yet gross domestic product is rising at half its postwar average rate. Achieving better growth is possible, but it will require deep structural reforms.

The policy worthies have said for eight years: stimulus today, structural reform tomorrow. Now it's tomorrow, but novel excuses for stimulus keep coming. "Secular stagnation" or "hysteresis" account for slow growth. Prosperity demands more borrowing and spending -- even on bridges to nowhere -- or deliberate inflation or negative interest rates. Others advocate surrender. More growth is impossible. Accept and manage mediocrity.

But for those willing to recognize the simple lessons of history, slow growth is not hard to diagnose or to cure. The U.S. economy suffers from complex, arbitrary and politicized regulation. The ridiculous tax system and badly structured social programs discourage work and investment. Even internet giants are now running to Washington for regulatory favors.

If you think robust growth is impossible, consider a serious growth-oriented policy program -- one that could even satisfy many of the left's desires.

-- Taxes. The ideal tax system raises revenue for the government while distorting economic decisions as little as possible. A pure tax on consumption, with no corporate, income, estate, or other taxes is pretty close to that ideal.

The U.S. tax system is the opposite: By exempting lots of income, the government raises relatively little money. Yet an extra dollar is heavily taxed, greatly lowering incentives and encouraging people to find or create exemptions. This massive complexity and obscurity undermine faith in the system.

Progressives, ponder this: With a sales tax of only 25%, the government would likely have gotten a lot more money from Donald Trump -- who has employed complex but legal tax-avoidance schemes -- than it did by purporting to tax income at high rates.

-- Regulation. U.S. regulation is arbitrary, slow, discretionary and politicized. Speak out on the wrong side of the party in power and some federal agency will be after you.

Imagine a deep rule-of-law regulatory reform, along the lines proposed by House Speaker Paul Ryan's "Better Way" plan. Congress must review and approve major regulations. People and businesses have a right to see evidence and appeal. Regulators face a shot clock -- no more years and years of delays on decisions. Agencies must conduct serious, transparent and retrospective cost-benefit analysis.

Imagine a similar deep reform of state and local restrictions including zoning laws and occupational-licensing regulations.

-- Social programs. When many people earn an extra dollar, they lose more than a dollar of benefits. If we fixed these disincentives, more Americans would work -- and fewer would need benefits.

-- Health. Replace ObamaCare with a simple health-insurance voucher. Deregulate insurance and entry into health care dramatically.

-- Finance. Replace strangling regulation of financial companies with a simple rule: If you issue enough equity that stockholders bear the risks, you can do what you want. Rep. Jeb Hensarling has proposed such legislation. Hearty competition is the best consumer protection.

-- Labor. The best worker protection is a worker's ability to swiftly change jobs. This is more likely if employers do not face a mountain of red tape, complex rules and legal liability.

-- **Immigration** and trade. The politically incorrect truth: Allowing Americans to buy from the best supplier and permitting people who want to work and start businesses to **immigrate** is good for the economy. Trying to impoverish China will not revive America.

-- Education. Let lower-income Americans get a decent education from charter schools and vouchers.

-- Energy. Trade all the crony subsidies and credits and regulations for a simple uniform revenue-neutral carbon tax. The country will have more growth and less carbon.

It would take an entrenched obtuseness to claim such a program cannot substantially improve economic output and incomes. If you claim such good policy cannot help, then it follows that bad policies do not hurt. Nativism, trade barriers, overregulation, legal capture, high taxes, controlled markets and people excluded from work won't hurt our slow but positive growth. Don't give populists cover to try it again.

If you object that such good policy is politically infeasible, then you at least grant that robust growth is economically possible. And small steps help. Current bipartisan proposals to reform taxes, Social Security, **immigration**, the regulatory state and trade agreements would go a long way to reviving growth. Have a bit more faith in democracy.

On the other hand, the major party presidential candidates' signature plans -- child-care tax credits, college subsidies, higher taxes on people who don't hire good enough lawyers; threatening a trade war and deporting millions of unauthorized **immigrants** -- cannot revive substantial growth.

So why is there so little talk of serious growth-oriented policy? Regulated and protected industries and unions, and the politicians who extract support from them in return for favors, will lose enormously. The global policy elite, steeped in Keynesian demand management for the economy as a whole, and microregulation of individual businesses, are intellectually unprepared for the hard project of "structural reform" -- fixing the entire economy by cleaning up the thousands of little messes. Even economists fight to protect outdated skills.

---

Mr. Cochrane is a senior fellow of the Hoover Institution and an adjunct scholar of the Cato Institute.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: Optimism About Pessimistic Economic Views" -- WSJ November 14, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HAZLETON, Pa. -- In this former center of steelmaking and textiles, Republican Donald Trump's promises of stricter **immigration** laws and tighter borders resonate with voters.

But in the past few years, hundreds of jobs in Hazleton and the surrounding region of northeast Pennsylvania have been preserved or expanded due to investment from an unlikely source: Mexico.

The result is that Hazleton has become a showcase of the contradictions of globalization in an election where both Mr. Trump and Democrat Hillary Clinton have questioned the benefits of free trade.

Mr. Trump had an 11% lead in Luzerne County, which includes Hazleton, in a late-October poll conducted for Axiom Strategies, a firm that has done work for GOP candidates.

In 2009, Mexican baking conglomerate Grupo Bimbo SAB bought Weston Foods Inc., a U.S. unit of George Weston Ltd. of Canada, for $2.38 billion. With it came two Weston plants in Hazleton and a stable of brands, including Arnold's bread, Boboli pizza crust and Thomas' English Muffins.

Despite buying Weston at the height of the financial crisis, Bimbo has cut head count only slightly and built new plants in the region. Bimbo says that since 2012 it has invested $1 billion in the U.S.

Weston had about 2,500 workers in Pennsylvania, while today, Bimbo employs roughly 2,300, including those at its U.S. headquarters in Horsham and workers at nine industrial-scale bakeries.

In a region that lost thousands of factory jobs over the past few decades, the deep-pocketed new owners were welcomed. "Bimbo could have taken the company and moved it out of the area, but we're very fortunate that they decided to keep them here," said Kevin O'Donnell, president of CAN DO Inc., Hazleton's economic development group.

Other Mexico-based food manufacturers have invested in the area as well. In 2005, Mission Foods, a tortilla maker and U.S. arm of Mexico's Gruma SA, opened a plant in nearby Mountain Top that employs roughly 400 people.

And in 2012, Arca Continental SAB acquired Wise Foods Inc., a century-old maker of Cheez Doodles and other snack foods based in Berwick, a small town across the Susquehanna River from Hazleton.

The Hazleton area isn't alone in seeing Mexican investment. Annual direct Mexican investment in the U.S. more than tripled from 2006 to 2015, from $5.3 billion to $16.6 billion, according to Bureau of Economic Analysis data analyzed by the Wilson Center, a nonpartisan think tank in Washington. The Mexican government estimates that 123,000 U.S. jobs are supported by Mexican investment.

"There's been this shift from Mexicans coming across the border looking for jobs, to having this huge boom in capital coming across the border and creating jobs in the U.S.," said Andrew Selee, the Wilson Center's executive vice president and senior adviser to its Mexico Institute. "The infusion of Mexican capital has saved some classic American brands and preserved the jobs that go with them."

Another big Mexican investor north of the border is Mexichem SAB, a global petrochemical giant with $5.7 billion in annual sales that has invested more than $2 billion in the last five years in 13 U.S. states.

Mexichem's chairman, Juan Pablo del Valle, has been one of the few major Mexican businessmen to publicly criticize Mr. Trump's protectionist and anti-**immigration** plans and his speeches against Mexicans and other groups.

At a recent rally in Florida, Mr. Trump referred to "rural towns in Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Carolina and all across our country," saying that establishment politicians had "stripped away these towns bare" and sent jobs and factories to Mexico, China and other countries.

His message is popular in Hazleton, reflecting uncertainty about the economy but also tensions over illegal **immigration**. In April, 77% of voters in Luzerne County's Republican primary voted for Mr. Trump, who won six times as many votes as his nearest competitor, Sen. Ted Cruz.

Until World War II, Hazleton hadthousandsof anthracite coal miners, but the industry declined ascleaner, more efficient fuels gained popularity. Some workers migrated to the steel industry, which had a center in the nearby Bethlehem Steelworks, while others worked in textiles.

But all three industries largely left the area by the end of the 20th century.As of September, the metro area that includes Hazleton, Scranton and Wilkes-Barre had an unemployment rate of 5.9%, 1.1 points higher than the national average.

At the same time, Hazleton, a city of about 25,000 people, saw a large influx of Hispanic **immigrants**, drawn by the relatively inexpensive cost of living and ample jobs in the distribution and food industries.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Put me down as an early-and-often believer in Russian meddling in the U.S. election. In the first weeks after Donald Trump's splashy entry into the race, certain emails arrived in my inbox defending him that had a distinct Russian-troll flavor.

This was troublemaking for the sake of troublemaking, I assumed at the time. The FBI apparently agrees, according to the New York Times, concluding that Russian actions are aimed at "disrupting the presidential election rather than electing Mr. Trump."

In truth, Mr. Trump and Mr. Putin are two ships passing in the night.

In a 1980 MIT computer tournament based on the game theory classic "prisoner's dilemma," the winner was a simple program "tit for tat." It's a lesson Mr. Trump appears to have absorbed. "If he says nice things about me, I'm going to say nice things about him," he said of the Russian leader. Howard Lorber, the New York real-estate mogul and Trump supporter, a few weeks ago spelled out the larger principle to CNBC: "He is prejudiced against one type of person -- the person that attacks him first."

Mr. Putin isn't playing tit-for-tat, but a more recondite game, ably suggested in a new paper by Cambridge's Shaun Larcom, Oxford's Tim Willems and Mare Sarr of University of Capetown.

Applying a rational choice model, they explain why some dictators' behavior improves over time and others' worsens. The key consideration is that a dictator's "use of repression is complementary to his stock of wrongdoing." This consideration is complicated by the dictator's "uncertainty over his degree of impunity in relation to wrongdoing."

What this mouthful means is simply that dictators can be -- but aren't necessarily -- trapped into ever-increasing repression by fear of retribution over the means they used to gain power.

Though the authors don't deal specifically with Mr. Putin, he would seem to fit the model as an authoritarian for whom peaceful retirement will never be possible thanks to the means that greased his rise. Now the Putin power structure has begun to rot, hence his reliance on patriotic adventures abroad to excuse declining living standards and freedom at home. This has very little to do with what goes on in America's election.

Mr. Trump is 70 years old. What you see on the stage and in debates is largely an act. Indeed, his public act has been so successful, in a sense, that the media hasn't bothered to examine Mr. Trump's management practice and discipline, though reason tells us there must be another Trump.

Bottom line: If we think we know what kind of president Trump would be, we probably don't. This is a problem -- though perhaps not the problem the Clinton campaigns flogs, Mr. Trump as reckless blowhard who will get us into nuclear war and (somewhat incompatibly) is Mr. Putin's cat's-paw.

One more stop on our review of incentives is the Wells Fargo scandal, in which low-level employees illegally opened faux accounts in the name of real or fake customers in order to meet sales goals.

A useful text here is a recent study from two professors at the Army War College, Leonard Wong and Stephen J. Gerras, titled "Lying To Ourselves: Dishonesty in the Army Profession."

The U.S. Army loads more checklist requirements on junior officers and their units than they can possibly comply with, leaving junior officers little choice but to become practiced at deciding which requirements to meet and which to lie about.

As a result, say Profs. Wong and Gerras, "an officer's signature and word have become tools to maneuver through the Army bureaucracy rather than being symbols of integrity and honesty."

That's the Wells Fargo scandal exactly. It's also a way to think about a lot of American problems, in the institutional structures and incentives that produce sluggish growth, failing public schools, health-care and tuition costs that rise without commensurate benefit.

Take **immigration**, a Donald Trump focus: Our laws work only in the sense that large numbers of American citizens and illegal **immigrants** conspire to ignore them. Another example is the Clinton Foundation. Mr. Putin obviously has a stake in email leaks that suggest that America is as kleptocratic as Russia.

If next Tuesday's election could be boiled down to "change" and "not change," without the complication of the personalities involved, many of us would find it easier to know how to vote.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Word Detective

By John Simpson

Basic, 364 pages, $27.99

The original Oxford English Dictionary, edited by the great lexicographer James Murray, was never meant to be a mere dictionary. Murray wanted to account for every sense of every word in standard English -- an astonishingly ambitious aim, given the size and fluidity of the language. The OED's originators, Murray observed in 1900, were seeking "not merely to record every word that has been used in the language for the last 800 years . . . but to furnish a biography of each word, giving as nearly as possible the date of its birth or first known appearance . . . and the successive changes of form and developments of sense which [each] has since undergone." The OED was finally completed in 10 bound volumes in 1928, 13 years after Murray's death and 44 years after the first volume had appeared in 1884. It was an expression, Murray wrote, of "the scientific and historical spirit of the nineteenth century" -- or, in other words, of the Victorians' belief in their capacity to master and catalog every field of human endeavor.

The present state of the OED is in many respects a fulfillment of Murray's vision. The third edition, begun in the 1990s and available online (revisions are uploaded at regular intervals), is scheduled for completion by 2034, by which time its enormous size will likely make physical publication impossible. The OED3, as it's called, will attempt to account for every word used anywhere in the Anglophone world for nearly a millennium.

There is a subtle but important difference between the original OED and its present manifestation, however. Whereas it once had a distinctive purpose, it no longer has one. That, at least, is the perhaps idiosyncratic conclusion I drew after reading John Simpson's memoir "The Word Detective."

Mr. Simpson took over as chief editor of the OED in 1993. His book traces his career from reluctant job applicant in 1976 to his retirement in 2013. Together with his co-editor Edmund Weiner, he was responsible for producing the OED's Second Edition in 1989, which appeared in both a massive 20-volume set and later on compact disc. And it was Mr. Simpson as chief editor who launched the third, currently online-only edition.

The memoir of a lexicographer doesn't sound like an enticing prospect (Johnson's famous definition of lexicographer: "a harmless drudge that busies himself in tracing the original, and detailing the signification of words"), but Mr. Simpson pulls it off. He tells us only what we need to know about his career moves and relationships with colleagues at the OED -- which is to say, not very much -- and uses the events of his career as points of departure for discussions of language and lexicography. He breaks up the narrative with periodic histories of words that he's just used in the text.

Most of these short excursions are lighthearted. Mr. Simpson explains, for instance, the history behind the Australian word "pom," an affectionate term of abuse used by Australians for Britons (at least Britons think it's affectionate -- even when used as a modifier in the phrase "pommie bastard"). "Pom" began life in the 1840s as the word "**immigrant**." Australians have a long tradition of jokey word creations, and for a time the word "**immigrant**" became "Jimmy Grant"; then it became "jimmygrant," then the almost rhyming "pomegranate," and by 1912 just "pom." Occasionally, though, these etymologies take on an unexpected poignancy, as when Mr. Simpson, recalling the discovery of his 6-month-old daughter's severe mental disability -- now in her 20s, she has never spoken a word -- suddenly explains the origin of the word "handicap."

But although Mr. Simpson has written an engaging memoir, and although he seems to have left the OED in good institutional shape, I can't help regretting what happened to this greatest of all English dictionaries -- and probably what had to happen to it if it was to survive in the 21st century -- during Mr. Simpson's tenure.

In a word, he democratized it. Or rather he abetted the democratizing process that had already begun before he got there. Upon first arriving at the OED office, he felt, rightly I suspect, that the dictionary "was dominated by the past. It had a crusty, antiquated air." The source quotations for which the OED was famous -- submitted by thousands of the dictionary's voluntary "readers" all over the Anglophone world since the days of James Murray -- tended to favor well known, "classic" authors: Shakespeare, Milton, Swift, Sir Walter Scott, et al. But Mr. Simpson wondered: "Where were the real language creators -- the mass of English speakers, the everyday poets and writers and conversationalists in whose mouths the language had changed from day to day over the centuries? Could we somehow give them a voice in the OED of the future?"

He quickly came to believe (and this is a common view among lexicographers today) that it's "preferable to document the language from everyday sources -- the sort of sources that people encounter in their day-to-day lives -- rather than from the classic authors." Accordingly as an assistant to the editor in the 1970s he began thumbing through magazines on punk rock and Rastafarianism looking for new words and senses. Later, as head of the OED's New Words group in the 1980s, he corresponded with a "dirt bike" magazine in the U.S. in order to get a more accurate definition of that term.

There is nothing exactly wrong with any of this -- the OED was and remains a historical dictionary, designed to show readers how words have been and are used, not how they should be used. It was meant to describe, not to prescribe. But the OED of the 19th and early 20th centuries hadn't yet taken this doctrine to its logical conclusion. Its editors and financial backers and readers viewed the dictionary as a cultural institution of Great Britain, not as a postnational academic project. They were historians concerned with documentation and not schoolteachers concerned with rules, but the idea that "correctness" is a social construct would not have occurred to them.

Mr. Simpson halfheartedly defends the old OED's editors from the accusation that they ignored the way people really used the language in favor of "canonical" authors. "I don't think the editors intended to privilege 'highbrow' literature," he writes; "it was just that these were the texts to which readers had easiest access, and which the publishing world of the day made most readily available." That's not quite right -- the late Victorians had plenty of trashy and ephemeral writing from which they might have drawn quotations. They really did "privilege" (dreadful verb) literary authors. And they did so because they felt that literary authors were likely to have been more careful in their choice of words than, say, the anonymous authors of penny dreadfuls. The governing assumption, in any case, was that some uses of a word or phrase were more accurate than others.

Modern lexicography studiously avoids any talk of right or wrong uses. That's a defensible view, but its relentless logic has turned the OED into something less like an historical dictionary that people might actually use and more like some government research enterprise that ordinary people know nothing about. You see it in the way Mr. Simpson describes his work. The OED on CD-ROM would make possible an "important new area of progressive language research." "We planned a revolution in lexicography." "We thought of it in the same breath as the Human Genome Project" (a rather poorly worded sentence, that last one).

Well, okay. But what is the point of this lexicographical revolution? On that question Mr. Simpson is unconvincing. The project of placing the OED's second edition on a CD, he writes, "opened up the dictionary to questions that people [had] not been able to ask before -- simply because there had been no hope of receiving an answer: not just 'What does this word mean?' but larger ones, like 'How did the set of words first used in English in the early fifteenth century differ from those first encountered in the late eighteenth century, and what does this show about how language and society differed in these two periods?" But who, outside a few academics, would ever ask such questions?

What once gave the OED a presence in Anglophone culture -- what made it relevant, as we would say today -- was its authority. And authority is a prescriptive concept, however you slice it. The Oxford English Dictionary was for many years an imposing set of volumes one consulted for peremptory definitions and word histories. It was a thing English speakers used, or just beheld, with pride in their language. Now it's a very expensive website, seemingly meant to assist academic researchers. And websites, despite all the advantages they offer, have no authority: You can never quite trust that what's there today will be there tomorrow, or 10 years from now.

Maybe that's as it should be. Or as it must be -- authority, as a cultural force, is dead. But I can't help regretting that the OED, like the modern university, now exists almost exclusively for its own sake.

---

Mr. Swaim is the author of "The Speechwriter: A Brief Education in Politics."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON -- A U.K. court put a hurdle in the country's route out of the European Union, ruling that Prime Minister Theresa May can't start the process without approval from Parliament.

The High Court decision offers a potential opening to lawmakers to disrupt her plans and steer the country toward a "soft" exit that maintains stronger ties to the bloc and a more-open **immigration** policy.

The government said it would appeal the verdict to the Supreme Court, which would hear the case in early December, under a predetermined timetable. If the ruling is upheld, lawmakers would have a chance to pressure Mrs. May to soften her terms in breakup negotiations with the EU. They could delay the process or even halt it.

The ruling introduces new uncertainty in the process on a day when the Bank of England, explaining why a further cut in interest rates looked less likely, said it expected Brexit to weigh less heavily on the economy next year than thought.

Brexit proponents called Thursday's ruling an attempt to overturn the will of Britons who chose to break away from the bloc in a June referendum. "I think there is now going to be an attempt by our political class to overturn a significant part of the referendum result," said Nigel Farage, the interim leader of the euroskeptic UK Independence Party. "We voted to leave but our political class will not accept the result."

Mr. Farage said Britain is heading toward a "half Brexit."

If the Supreme Court rejects the government's appeal, Mrs. May could trigger a snap election to seek a bigger parliamentary mandate to carry out Britain's exit from the EU. She currently has a thin majority of 15 lawmakers.

Mrs. May took office in July with a Conservative Party leadership election after her predecessor, David Cameron, resigned when his "Stay" camp lost the Brexit vote. She has said she wouldn't call a snap election and her position hasn't changed, a spokeswoman said Thursday.

Bank of England Gov. Mark Carney -- who warned of the impact of a Brexit before the vote -- called the court's judgment an example of the high degree of uncertainty that will surround the U.K.'s exit path. Central-bank policy makers see scenarios under which their key interest rate could either rise or fall, he said.

Since the June vote, markets have remained jittery and some companies have put plans on hold, though prevote forecasts of economic catastrophe have so far proved wide of the mark.

The ruling on Thursday lifted the pound; the currency later extended its gains after the BOE announcement. The U.K's benchmark FTSE 100 fell 0.23% on Thursday. The U.K.'s major listed companies earn most of their revenue outside the country, so a rise in the pound can be negative for the index.

Mrs. May has said she plans to invoke Article 50, opening the two-year window for exit talks, by the end of March. She has given away little about her negotiating positions, but has suggested that she would put more emphasis on the right to curb **immigration** at the expense of access to the EU's tariff-free single market.

Though Mrs. May has said she would offer lawmakers some kind of say in Brexit, she insisted on the right to unilaterally invoke Article 50 -- a position that was the subject of the court case. The High Court ruled that she can't trigger Article 50 without the approval of Parliament.

The court didn't specify what kind of parliamentary approval is needed, and the appeal won't necessarily draw such guidance from the Supreme Court.

The path through Parliament could be set in part by Mrs. May. The most direct option would be to seek passage of a law that simply gives her the right to trigger Article 50.

But the introduction of any law inevitably opens the door to debate. "The government will want it to be procedural and quick, but you can see ways in which parliamentarians will try to get more substantive answers on what happens," said Kenneth Armstrong, a professor of European Law at the University of Cambridge.

If Mrs. May has to more comprehensively consult Parliament, lawmakers -- a majority of whom voted to stay in the EU -- would be in a position to extract concessions and pressure Mrs. May to soften her stance.

"It could mean the government struggles to get this legislation through by the end of March and the invocation of Article 50 is delayed," said John Curtice, politics professor at the University of Strathclyde. "This is a major spanner in the works for Theresa May's strategy."

The Supreme Court's timetable allows the government to stick to Mrs. May's plan to trigger Article 50 in March, a government spokeswoman said.

Jeremy Corbyn, leader of the opposition Labour Party, said his party respects the referendum results and wouldn't stop Brexit, but called for more openness from the government. "This ruling underlines the need for the government to bring its negotiating terms to Parliament without delay," he said.

Crispin Blunt, a Conservative member of Parliament, said the decision was "profoundly unhelpful" and could allow Britain's unelected upper House of Lords, which is overwhelmingly in favor of staying in the EU, to block or delay any legislation triggering Article 50. Legislation must pass through the lower House of Commons and the House of Lords before becoming law.

---

Nicholas Winning contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Since Ted Chiang published his first story 26 years ago, he has earned a reputation for writing thoughtful and empathetic science fiction. This year, the 49-year-old has accomplished something rare: One of his stories is in two heralded annual anthologies, and Hollywood has come calling, too.

The new film "Arrival," starring Amy Adams and opening Nov. 11, is based on "Story of Your Life," Mr. Chiang's 1998 story that won a Nebula Award for best novella. The film has received early critical acclaim for its blend of cerebral science fiction and emotional resonance, attributes it shares with the writer's fiction.

"He's got a really good mix of humanity and science, unlike some writers," said Ellen Datlow, the editor who acquired "Tower of Babylon," the first story of Mr. Chiang's to be published, for Omni magazine in 1990.

This year could put Mr. Chiang on track to become a star like fellow speculative-fiction writers Isaac Asimov, Ursula K. Le Guin and Arthur C. Clarke. His story, "The Great Silence," about a parrot's desire to communicate with humans, is included in "The Best American Science Fiction and Fantasy" and "The Best American Short Stories." His short-story collection "Stories of Your Life" was also published for the third time since 2002, this time by Vintage Books.

"Story of Your Life," which inspired the "Arrival" film, is told in the second person from the perspective of Louise Banks, a linguist enlisted by the government to establish dialogue with **aliens** who show up in spaceships hovering just above the Earth's surface. As she absorbs more of the creatures' languages, she gains a poignant new understanding of time. The story also works as a meditation on communication and language, subjects Mr. Chiang explores in his fiction.

"Language doesn't only allow us to communicate ideas, it helps us to come up with ideas, to think thoughts that we couldn't have otherwise," Mr. Chiang, also a freelance technical writer who lives in Bellevue, Wash., said in an email interview. "I suppose I am fascinated by the way that words allow us to talk about words."

"Story of Your Life" wasn't an easy sell in Hollywood, according to "Arrival" screenwriter Eric Heisserer, a longtime fan of Mr. Chiang's stories who had pitched the adaptation over the years. Studios and producers were hungry for another potential blockbuster franchise or **alien**-invasion movie, but "Story of Your Life," with its ruminations on free will, grief and language, didn't fit the bill. Mr. Heisserer had given up on pitching the movie version after a few years, but he gave it another shot in a meeting with Dan Levine and Dan Cohen, executives with 21 Laps Entertainment, the production company behind Netflix hit "Stranger Things." They called him the following week and said they loved it, the screenwriter said.

Mr. Heisserer, 46, is developing a screenplay based on Mr. Chiang's story "Understand," which is also collected in "Stories of Your Life."

Mr. Chiang saw "Arrival," which adds a layer of geopolitical conflict to his story, at the Toronto Film Festival in September. He approves.

"For a while people have been asking me how I felt about having my work adapted into a movie, especially since Hollywood seems to think science fiction means special effects and action scenes," Mr. Chiang said. "What I told them was that, while the screenplay departed from the story in significant ways, it retained the emotional core of the story, and if that aspect made it onto the screen intact, I'd be happy. It has, so I am."

Mr. Chiang's fascination with communication and storytelling also extends to a pastime he picked up about 10 years ago: videogames. Drawn to independently developed games which experiment with narrative, he recently played a mystery thriller called "Virginia," which eschews dialogue. "It feels like you're playing a silent film," he said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**No matter what happens in this election," venture capitalist Peter Thiel said in Washington this week, "what Trump represents isn't crazy and it's notgoing away."

When it comes to globalization, Mr. Thiel, a prominent donor to Republican nominee Donald Trump, is almost certainly right. Mr. Trump is unique, but his antipathy to free trade and increased **immigration** isn't.

Those sentiments are shared in differing degrees by the Democratic voters who propelled Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders to second place in the party's primary, by the Britons who voted to leave the European Union in June, and in the populist parties gaining strength across Europe. Hillary Clinton may have turned against the negotiated, unratified 12-nation Trans Pacific Partnership to fend off Mr. Sanders, but is unlikely to flip back. Why spend scarce political capital on a treaty much of her party despises?

For advocates, salvaging globalization requires understanding what's behind the backlash. Many populists think it's a zero-sum game that the U.S. is losing. "The sheer size of the U.S. trade deficit shows that something has gone badly wrong," claims Mr. Thiel. Actually, it doesn't: The U.S. has had one of the developed world's fastest growth rates since 1990 despite that deficit, while Japan has had one of the slowest despite a surplus.

Advocates of free-trade deals think the real problem is that the country as a whole benefits from more trade and **immigration** while only a minority of workers get hit, blame outsiders and turn to politicians like Mr. Trump. Their prescription is to help that minority transition to new and better jobs.

Yet this may not be an antidote to populism. The economic impact of free trade is easily overstated. Trade barriers have steadily declined. This means the gains to incremental liberalization are quite small -- one reason the number of new pacts has also been slipping. Two studies conclude the Trans-Pacific Partnership would eventually raise U.S. output by 0.2% to 0.5%, a positive but hardly life-changing sum.The gains to Canada and Europe from the just-completed Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement are similarly slim.

Nor is opposition to globalization primarily economic. "It's about fairness, loss of control, and elites' loss of credibility. It hurts the cause of trade to pretend otherwise," Dani Rodrik, a Harvard University economist and longtime skeptic of globalization, wrote recently.

Treaties like TPP seek to level the playing field for firms operating across borders, for example in product regulation, settling disputes with governments, and intellectual property protection. Left-wing populists consider this a surrender of national sovereignty to corporate interests.

Lori Wallach, of the left-leaning advocacy group Public Interest, and Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, recently proposed that U.S. agreements should henceforth ditch investor-state dispute settlement, constraints on domestic regulation and other features that favor corporations.

This might satisfy some critics on the left. Similar concessions by Canada and the EU overcame opposition to their deal. But it also leaves little to liberalize beyond tariffs, which are already quite low. Narrowing talks down to just that in the U.S. would make it hard to get the support of businesses and Republicans.

For populists on the right, **immigration** is a bigger worry than free trade. But they too are concerned about more than just their pocketbooks. Many are bothered about cultural change, pressure on public services, and the inability to control the number of foreign entrants. Support for Mr. Trump is strong in counties where the **immigrant** population has grown most, even as unemployment falls there.

So stronger wage growth likely won't defuse the **immigration** backlash. What can help are **immigration** policies better tuned to the host country's absorption capacity and labor force needs. Canada supports legal **immigration** by picking candidates for language and work skills, and keeping illegal arrivals to a minimum. In the U.S., a deal to legalize the illegal population will require satisfying skeptics that strong controls over illegal **immigration** are in place.

Broad majorities of the public still think free trade and **immigration** are good things. The bad news for globalizers is that the populists on the right and left who disagree are increasingly able to stop the process.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERLIN -- Refugees from the war-torn Middle East have been banding together to hound suspected terrorists and war criminals hiding among the nearly two million who have settled in Europe over the past two years, most of them in Germany.

The help, which ranges from individual tipoffs in **immigration** interviews to networks of amateur investigators, has been both a blessing and a burden for officials.

In Frankfurt, a Syrian human-rights activist is collecting files on suspected war criminals and Islamists. In Bavaria, a refugee is sharing information on his former Islamic State captors. Online, refugees are posting pictures of suspected war criminals at a pace authorities can barely keep up with.

Some of the information from refugees is invaluable, security officials said, given authorities are often investigating crimes rooted in distant and inaccessible countries. But many of the tips are vague or unsubstantiated, evidence that is too thin to justify an investigation let alone a trial.

And some have been found to be false alarms based on personal agendas, leading at times to a fruitless strain on already tight resources, the officials said. The patchy effectiveness of the efforts has frustrated both the refugees offering the help, and officials still figuring out how to best use it.

"We have to be careful, we can't simply go after someone just because one person thinks he did something," said Jochen Hollmann, head of the state intelligence agency in Saxony-Anhalt.

In Germany, authorities have received 445 tips on potential terror and Islamist supporters over the past 18 months, and a further 1,250 on suspected war criminals alone this year, according to the federal criminal agency BKA. Of the 445, 80 have led to in-depth investigations, the BKA said.

Islamic State has boasted of directing three attacks in Germany this year -- two by refugees this summer and a murder by an unidentified knife-wielding suspect in Hamburg in October.

German authorities have dismantled several terror cells involving refugees. The attacks and arrests have boosted support for populist, anti-**immigration** parties and fanned fears about the security implications of Chancellor Angela Merkel's decision to let in so many refugees.

"So many people come from places where Islamic State was in control, in most of the cases, they know something," said Masoud Aqil, a 23-year-old Kurdish journalist who was once a prisoner of the extremist group. In Germany, he shared information with police about people he came across while in captivity.

Syrian human-rights activist Abdelkarim Rihawi has set up a team tracking potential war criminals and terrorists suspected to be in Europe from his new home of Frankfurt.

Lawyer Rami Hamido, now in Sweden, founded the private Facebook group "Criminals not Refugees," where members publish information about suspected Syrian war criminals and terror supporters believed to be in Europe.

The BKA said it couldn't comment on individual tipsters.

Despite doubts about the veracity of some of the tips, German authorities have been actively reaching out to refugees for their cooperation.

In Saxony-Anhalt, Mr. Hollmann, the state intelligence chief, is in close contact with the heads of two Muslim associations who agreed to relay suspicions on newcomers, he said.

"Sometimes we get stuck in an investigation, that doesn't necessarily mean that there's nothing there," said Mr. Hollmann. "[The refugees] might very well have some proof that could help us."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ARCADIA, Wis. -- Small towns in the Midwest have diversified more quickly than almost any part of the U.S. since the start of an **immigration** wave at the beginning of this century. The resulting cultural changes appear to be moving the political needle.

A Wall Street Journal analysis of census data shows that counties in a distinct cluster of Midwestern states -- Iowa, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois and Minnesota -- saw among the fastest influxes of nonwhite residents of anywhere in the U.S. between 2000 and 2015. Hundreds of cities long dominated by white residents got a burst of Latino newcomers who migrated from Central America or uprooted from California and Texas.

That shift helps explain the emergence of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump as a political force, and signals that tensions over **immigration** will likely outlive his candidacy. Among GOP voters in this year's presidential primaries, counties that diversified rapidly were more likely to vote for the New York businessman, the Journal's analysis shows.

Mr. Trump is emphasizing the Midwest this week, and visited Wisconsin on Tuesday.

In Arcadia, Wis., Don Leibl saw the dairy-farming hamlet transform from nearly all white to more than one-third Latino as Mexican **immigrants** streamed in for jobs. It is a main reason, he said, he is voting for Mr. Trump for president.

"If you'd seen the way things have changed in this town, you'd say, 'Something needs to be done about it,' " the 51-year-old computer systems analyst said, referring to **immigrants** there illegally.

In this western Wisconsin enclave and other pockets of the rural Midwest, Mr. Trump's pledge to build a wall along the Mexican border and prioritize jobs for American workers has struck a chord with some whites uneasy over rapidly changing demographics. They said they are worried illegal **immigrants** are crowding schools and unfairly tapping public assistance, problems they believe Mr. Trump would fix.

The Journal identified the epicenter of this shift using the diversity index, a tool often used by social scientists and economists. It measures the chance that any two people in a county will have a different race or ethnicity. In 244 counties, that diversity index at least doubled between 2000 and 2015, and more than half those counties were in the cluster of five Midwestern states. The analysis excludes tiny counties that produce numeric aberrations.

Traditional **immigrant** gateways like Los Angeles, Miami and Queens, N.Y., draw a far greater number of Latino and other minority residents, but because they have long been melting pots, their diversity has barely changed over the past 15 years.

In 88% of the rapidly diversifying counties, Latino population growth was the main driver. In about two-thirds of counties, newcomers helped expand the overall population. In the remaining third, the population fell despitean influx ofnew arrivals, which magnified the shift for locals as their peers died or moved away.

Mr. Trump won about 71% of sizable counties nationwide during the Republican presidential primaries. He took 73% of those where diversity at least doubled since 2000, and 80% of those where the diversity index rose at least 150%, the Journal's analysis found.

"You're talking about counties that are predominantly white, but they're seeing a glimmer of change," said William Frey, a demographer at the Brookings Institution. "It connects with the message of Trump."

Diversity has risen in Carroll County, Iowa, where meatpacking jobs have drawn Latino **immigrants**, and Hendricks County, Ind., where minorities are moving for cheaper housing and logistics work at the Indianapolis airport.Mr. Trump won these counties in this year's primaries, as he did in Arcadia's Trempealeau County, in Wisconsin.

An influx of minority residents in a town over time favors Democrats because Latinos and blacks especially are more likely to vote Democratic. In many of these rapidly diversifying counties, the fact that many of the new Latino residents presumably aren't eligible to vote significantly mutes their impact on the electorate.

In Carroll County, the ranks of active registered Democrats have shrunk 0.2% in the past year, while the ranks of active Republicans have grown 8%, according to data from the state elections division. The same pattern shows across 39 sizable Iowa counties where the diversity index at least doubled: Democratic registration has risen 3%, Republican registration, 7%.

Unemployment is actually lower in rapidly diversifying counties than in the country on the whole, a sign that concerns over lost jobs are weighing less on voters in these areas. In counties where diversity at least doubled, unemployment averages 4.5%, compared with 4.9% nationally.

Craig Williams, chairman of the Carroll County Republican Party, said it is the lawlessness of illegal **immigration** that bothers residents. "People talk about **immigration** as if we're a bunch of racists," he said. "Do we have laws, or do we not have laws? If we're just going to ignore them, then what's the point?"

Few U.S. locales have changed as rapidly in recent years as Arcadia, a onetime railroad town nestled in the hills and built by German, Polish and Norwegian **immigrants**. As recently as the late 1990s, its population of about 2,400 was almost entirely white and aging as young residents left and fewer people had children.

That all changed at the turn of this century. Dairy farmers who wanted their cows milked around the clock began calling contacts in Texas to connect them with Mexican workers. Ashley Furniture Industries Inc., now the country's largest furniture maker, hired hundreds of Hispanic workers to build chairs, beds and entertainment consoles at its sprawling headquarters here. Chicken producer GNP Co. tapped the labor pool, too.

The area's unusually strong job market made it a magnet for Mexican, Guatemalan, Honduran and Salvadoran workers. Between 2000 and 2014, Hispanics went from being 3% of the population to 35% in Arcadia, census figures show. Its population rose to around 3,000.

Holy Family Parish brought in Rev. Sebastian Kolodziejczyk, a bilingual priest, and added a Spanish Mass because "everybody wants to pray in their own language," he said. Landlords watched as some Hispanic tenants took in cousins and uncles arriving for their first jobs. A Latino bakery and other shops popped up along Main Street.

"We were hit like a tsunami," said Arcadia Elementary School Principal Paul Halverson, whose school went from almost all white at the turn of the century to 73% Hispanic as of this year.

The share of students in the school districtqualifying for free and reduced-price lunch rose to 65% this year from 20% in the late 1990s. Administrators expanded the summer-school program to bolster students' English and math, and pared homework assignments because Latino parents working long hours struggled to help their children complete it, Superintendent Louie Ferguson said. This year the district opened a new middle school to handle the enrollment surge.

There is no official measure of how many **immigrants** in Arcadia, Wis., are there illegally, and interviews with more than two dozen local officials, employers, longtime residents and **immigrants** suggest the numbers today are off their peak.

Social services workers and others in the town said they saw many people come there without legal status and use false identification to get jobs when the migration wave began.

But employers have become stricter in recent years about verifying workers, and some of those initially there without documentation have since gained legal status.

Ashley Furniture Senior Executive Bill Koslo said, "We exert a tremendous effort" to make sure people are working legally. Bill Petz, director of live operations at GNP, said the company doesn't want to put its business at risk by hiring workers illegally.

The food pantry had to scrap a queue it created for Spanish speakers after some locals complained **immigrants** were getting their food before them. Some newcomers opened their garages and played music, and gathered for big picnics at parks. "Families from Arcadia would call and say, 'I can't stand it. They're so noisy,' " said Cynthia Jacoby, a former family-living educator who runs a church-sponsored thrift shop.

In2006, then-mayor John Kimmel proposed making English the official language for directional signage, requiring an American flag to accompany any foreign flag and capping housing occupancy for rental properties. The idea caused such an uproar among some locals and newcomers that he eventually shelved all but the last proposal.

"As you live by each other and your kids become friends, a lot of that goes by the wayside," he said recently, while eating fish sticks at the bowling alley. He said he plans to vote for Mr. Trump but that his decision "has nothing to do with his **immigration** stance."

Longtime residents said most were happy to have a growing population and embraced the newcomers, who were necessary to absorb the abundance of jobs. Ashley Furniture built soccer fields and basketball courts. Rev. Kolodziejczyk invited a mariachi band to a fall heritage festival that traditionally showcased Polish and German food. Local officials translated signs and pamphlets into Spanish.

"This is a place where if tomorrow every worker of Latino descent up and left, we'd be in a heap load of trouble," said Patricia Malone, a community development educator.

Yesenia Gama Cortez, a 32-year-old Mexican native, said she feels at home selling empanadas, cold Modelo beer and other groceries in the shop she opened along Main Street. "The Arcadia people are very welcoming," she said from behind the counter.

Trempealeau County has voted Democratic in presidential electionssince 1988, and Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton is favored to win the state of Wisconsin. Among GOP voters in the county, Mr. Trump took half the votes to win this year's crowded primary, even though Texas Sen. Ted Cruz won the state.

Republican voters said they are deeply distrustful of Mrs. Clinton in part because they believe she sold government access throughher family foundationand has profited too much off her political career. In addition to his **immigration** plans, they like Mr. Trump's outsider status and support for gun owners.

Mark VanAcker, a 66-year-old farm animal veterinarian, said he is worried that illegal **immigrants** are straining school finances and increasing crime here. He no longer leaves his truck unlocked with the keys in it.

"There is a high suspicion that people coming into our country without citizenship status are entitled to things that we have to work for," he said. "When a politician says that needs to be addressed, we listen."

Carmen Lisowski, a 47-year-old Mexican-born resident, is turned off by how Mr. Trump's harsh talk about **immigrants** "cuts everybody with the same scissors." She came to this town from Northern California so she could earn money making chairs at Ashley Furniture to support her two daughters. Now she works at the preschool, volunteers at the church, cleans houses and helps friends with translation. "I come here for work, not to steal stuff," Ms. Lisowski said. She married a local man almost nine years ago.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The heated debate over **immigration** in the 2016 presidential campaign is part of a broader rift. On the one side is a narrow majority of Americans, 51%, according to a Public Religion Research Institute survey released last week, who believe that America's culture and way of life have changed for the worse since the 1950s. On the other side are the 48% who believe the opposite.

According to the PRRI survey, which I and my colleagues at the Brookings Institution helped design, every Democratic-leaning subgroup of the electorate believes that our way of life has gotten better; every Republican-leaning group disagrees. This election is nothing less than a referendum on two generations of American cultural change.

**Immigration** exemplifies this sharp divide. Forty-six percent of Americans believe that the growing number of newcomers from other countries threatens traditional customs and values, while 44% say that this surge strengthens American society. Seventy-three percent of Republicans see this trend as a threat; only 29% of Democrats agree. More than six in 10 (62%) white working-class Americans see **immigration** as a threat, compared with only 34% of whites with a college education. Black Americans are evenly divided, 46% to 46%, and a surprisingly large share of Latinos (37%) view high levels of **immigration** as a threat.

It is all too easy for those who see today's **immigration** as a source of national vitality to dismiss contrary views out of hand. They should resist this temptation. Instead, they should work harder to understand why people who disagree with them think as they do -- and the extent to which the facts warrant their concerns.

In September, for the first time in nearly two decades, an expert committee of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine delivered a comprehensive report on the economic and social consequences of **immigration**. The report pointed out that after peaking at 15% during the first two decades of the 20th century, first-generation **immigrants** as a share of the U.S. population declined by two-thirds -- to less than 5% -- by the mid-1960s. The 40 years of a highly restrictive law adopted in 1924 witnessed the assimilation of myriad streams of **immigration** from central and southern Europe into the broad group of "white ethnics" and with it the strengthening of a common culture.

The passage of the **immigration** reform bill in 1965 reversed these trends. Over the next five decades, first-generation **immigrants** as a share of our population tripled to 14%, roughly the level that triggered the anti-**immigrant** reaction a century ago.

As the National Academies of Sciences report points out, this renewed flow of **immigrants** has benefited the country in numerous ways. Without **immigration**, for example, the growth of the U.S. labor force would grind to a halt, and fewer people of working age would be available to support Social Security, Medicare and other programs for older and retired Americans.

At the same time, **immigration** has created some unanticipated problems. Although **immigration** strengthens the fiscal condition of the federal government, the reverse is true for states and localities, which must spend more to educate **immigrants**' children and to provide the social services on which low-income families disproportionately rely.

In the past two decades, the children of **immigrants** have surged to 21.5% from 13.6% as a share of K-12 students. Although today's **immigrants** steadily improve their command of English, they do so more slowly than in previous generations. And the flow of less-educated workers, especially from Mexico, has depressed wages for lower-skill workers, including African-Americans and older **immigrants**.

By contrast, skilled **immigrants** benefit all jurisdictions -- and the economy as a whole. Not only do they contribute more in taxes than they consume in services; they are more likely than native-born citizens to earn patents and start new businesses.

There is little that policy makers can do to assuage those who yearn to restore a mostly white population. If we slammed shut the doors of **immigration**tomorrow, Asian and Hispanic Americans would continue to increase their share of the U.S. population for decades to come.

But there are some things we can do to take the edge off the reservations many people reasonably harbor about the consequences of current policy. For example, the federal government could do more to assist states and localities bearing disproportionate financial burdens for **immigrants**' education and social services.

Our **immigration** laws should be reoriented to favor **immigrants** with higher skills. Forcing the talented young visitors we educate at our best schools to go home after they receive their degrees makes no sense whatever. And our laws should put more emphasis on rapidly acquiring not only English-language proficiency but also basic civic competence.

There is no way of quickly defusing this explosive issue. But if those who favor **immigration** reform acknowledged the skeptics' legitimate concerns and reflected them in legislative proposals, the odds of a productive conversation would increase.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A Latino grocery on the west coast of central Florida, El Mariachi Loco, has been celebrated for two decades in the local media as a symbol of the region's growth and diversifying population. Its homemade tacos and sopes left one reviewer feeling "wonderful to be alive."

Then last week, the store's Facebook page was hammered with criticism about stale bread, poor customer service and an invasion of roaches. But the complaints weren't the result of an actual infestation or rancid food at the Sarasota, Fla., business. It was because a Donald Trump yard sign was on display at the home of the store's owner, who is a Colombian **immigrant**.

"I pray God knocks some sense onto that fragile head of yours," one person wrote on the Facebook page. "Hope Trump comes to your store and buys a bag of chips. Ha-ha. You're gonna need every dollar after today. Have a nice night," wrote another.

Emotions run high in the final days of any presidential election. But the antagonism and animosity Americans have aimed at one another over the contest between Mr. Trump, the Republican nominee, and Democrat Hillary Clinton -- two of the most disliked candidates ever to be nominated -- have been boiling over for weeks.

Among Hispanic voters, their passion is occasionally manifested in vitriol aimed at those supporting the GOP nominee. They have an unusually high level of interest in the election, compared with other demographic groups, and are largely united behind Mrs. Clinton, polls show.

Mr. Trump, who supports aggressive deportation measures and a wall along the southern U.S. border, is favored by fewer than one in five Hispanic voters, according to a Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll in October.

The avalanche of anger from fellow Latinos targeted at the grocery owned by Rosalia Holmlund, a 65-year-old American citizen, came despite the fact that she doesn't even support Mr. Trump. The yard sign was installed by her husband, Kenneth Holmlund, 79, who is a longtime Republican and isn't Hispanic.

That her husband's benign display of political preference triggered an upbraiding of the family business on social media is, for her, an example of how the country's political leaders have failed to inspire the country.

"Now, I'm paying for the consequences," she said.

Interviews with more than a dozen of Mr. Trump's Hispanic supporters at recent rallies show that his backers largely agree that a southern border wall will stop illegal **immigration**.

Many of them are just a generation or two removed from naturalization of their own parents or grandparents, but say they worry that a new wave of **immigrants**is bringing crime and drugs into their communities.

"There are all kinds of people against us," said Elma Sanchez, 60, a Trump supporter who wore a "Hillary for Prison" pin to a rally in Pueblo, Colo.

"But we haven't changed -- they've changed and the politicians have changed," she said. "They don't keep their promises, so I'm going to go with Trump and see what he can do."

Many of them said their support for Mr. Trump has put a strain on their relations with family and friends.

"Oh yeah, a lot of relatives and friends laugh at me," John Elizondo, 65, a chauffeur in Summerlin, Nev., said about the reaction from his friends and family to his support for Mr. Trump. Mr. Elizondo said that his mother was born in Mexico.

"Trump is right -- some of the **immigrants** coming in are rapists, and some are criminals," Mr. Elizondo said. "But it's not just the Mexicans. It's the South Americans, it's the Muslims, it's whatever.

"And when he builds that wall," he added, "I'll be the one laughing."

---

Carol E. Lee contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Within 15 minutes one afternoon, Gladys Coloma found 17 **immigrants** in the Corona neighborhood of Queens who wanted free legal help. She didn't ask whether they were in the country illegally. New York City, she told them, would pay for whatever legal services they needed.

Ms. Coloma spoke in Spanish and sometimes even ran after residents who seemed skittish about talking with her. She was spreading the word about a new city program, part of a broader push by New York Mayor Bill de Blasio's administration to help **immigrants**.

The city is spending about $30 million a year on **immigrant** services, up from $14 million in 2014, according to a city budget analysis. In the past several months, officials have scheduled town halls to find illegal **immigrants** to help them get government services. They have given almost a million identification cards to New Yorkers, no matter their **immigration** status, so they can receive city benefits and perks, such as museum admissions.

Mr. de Blasio has all but encouraged New York business owners to hire illegal **immigrants**. On a radio program, he thanked a Brooklyn grocery store owner who called in to say that he had done so.

"The question for us is, how do we speak against this national rhetoric as a city?" said Nisha Agarwal, who heads the city's Office of **Immigrant** Affairs. "In New York, we don't hear a huge amount of disagreement on the things the city should be doing."

New York, with about 500,000 illegal **immigrants**, has become a flashpoint on the campaign trail this year along with other big cities that encourage **immigration**. Republican presidential nominee Donald J. Trump has threatened to strip funding from cities that don't comply with federal **immigration** laws.

Since 2014, the city has increased the number of workers focused on **immigrant** issues to about 50, according to City Hall, and has spent more than $1 million in ad campaigns to reach **immigrants**.

The City Council has committed $1.5 million to reach **immigrants** who are uninsured and has increased its citizenship and English programs.

City officials are funding an array of new legal services programs, at a cost of about $10 million. No matter a person's **immigration** status, he or she now has lawyers. The city's correction department declined to honor more than 700 detention requests, 2014 records show. New York Police Department officers don't ask a person's **immigration** status when they make a stop.

The New York programs have been criticized. Jessica Vaughan, the director of policy studies at the right-leaning Center for **Immigration** Studies in Washington, D.C., said it doesn't make sense for taxpayers to fund lawyers for illegal **immigrants**. The various benefits offered "serve collectively to incentivize people settling illegally in the area," she said. "All of these benefits are clearly part of the calculation of these people here staying or going home."

City officials note crime and unemployment have fallen, even with liberal **immigration** policies, and the city doesn't block detention requests for illegal **immigrants** with serious felony charges. Yet the city has opposed detention requests for hundreds of illegal **immigrants** who have been charged with crimes. "The City cooperates with federal **immigration** authorities where there's probable cause and a risk to public safety," said Rosemary Boeglin, a spokeswoman for the mayor.

There are certainly still hurdles in New York for **immigrants** and the city programs that try to serve them. The ID cards aren't accepted by several banks and other businesses, and many federal benefits aren't available because the cards aren't recognized by the U.S. government. Many illegal **immigrants** live in shabby or crowded conditions, Ms. Agarwal said. Advocates say it is difficult for illegal **immigrants** to find affordable housing.

Ms. Coloma, the organizer with a group called Make the Road New York, which is partially funded by City Hall, said so many **immigrants** want the legal services that it sometimes takes a month or longer to get an appointment.

Yet programs have begun to show dividends, according to advocates, lawyers and business officials.

The Legal Aid Society has beefed up its **immigration** law unit to 28 attorneys, with additional funding from the city, said Maria Navarro, who leads the unit.

Kathryn Wylde, who leads the Partnership for New York City, the city's largest big-business group, said some banks are now accepting the ID card. "City Hall has taken aggressive but positive steps," she said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MALMO, Sweden -- Pope Francis highlighted two major priorities of his papacy at the start of a two-day visit to Sweden: the plight of migrants and healing the 500-year-old rift between Catholics and Protestants.

The head of the global Catholic Church joined Lutheran leaders on Monday to celebrate their churches' efforts to help the poor and marginalized -- including migrants -- before an audience of thousands. The gathering featured refugees' testimony and culminated in the pope reiterating his previous calls on governments for open-door policies on migration.

Pope Francis thanked countries that have aided refugees and other migrants, saying concern for "outcasts and the marginalized" was a priority for all Christians.

The pope's words had a special resonance in Sweden, once one of the most accommodating European countries for displaced persons, offering all Syrians fleeing the war extended residency permits if they reached the country. But after a surge in migrant arrivals and rising support for the anti-**immigration** Sweden Democrats party, the country has implemented some of the tightest rules in Europe on who may enter.

Pontus Andersson, a local representative of the party in Malmo, said the pope's message would change nothing. "Swedes are becoming more critical of high levels of **immigration** and we are not a very religious country, so I don't think people will really care if the pope has a different view," he said.

The pope's two-day visit to Sweden aims to commemorate the Lutheran Reformation that split Protestants from Catholics in the 16th century and to promote their reconciliation.

Earlier Monday afternoon, at an ecumenical worship service in the city of Lund, Pope Francis praised the "spiritual experience" of Martin Luther, the German reformer whose teachings led to the split between Catholic and Protestants. The pope called for "moving beyond the controversies and disagreements" separating Protestants and Catholics.

---

Charles Duxbury contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**STOCKHOLM -- When Pope Francis brings his message of open-door refugee policies to Sweden on Monday, his reception will shine a light on how sharply the attitude to refugees has changed here since the start of Europe's migrant crisis.

Once of the most accommodating states in Europe for displaced people, this Nordic country now has among the tightest rules governing who can enter.

The pontiff's two-day trip to this predominantly Protestant country is strictly religious: to commemorate the Lutheran Reformation that divided Catholics and Protestants five centuries ago and to promote ongoing efforts at their reconciliation.

But the pope is also expected to urge support for migrants and refugees, a keynote of his pontificate and a message that is striking a nerve here.

In the first town the pope will visit, Lund, the far-right Sweden Democrats party has been building support by campaigning against **immigration**.

"If the pope comes with his fluffy, 'Let's open the doors' statements, people will say it is not serious," said Ted Ekeroth, the local party leader in Lund. "It is not grounded in the reality that Sweden has seen."

Left-leaning lawmakers, charities and church leaders, though, say the government has swung too far away from the welcome it adopted at the start of the refugee crisis. "Many people have forgotten our moral obligation to help people in need," said Lutheran Bishop Fredrik Modeus.

In the early days of the migrant crisis, Sweden appeared as a role model for open-door advocates. It offered all Syrian nationals fleeing the war extended residency permits if they reached the country.

Volunteers gathered at train stations and ports to offer clothing and food to weary new arrivals, and the government diverted resources into emergency housing. More than 160,000 asylum seekers last year entered Sweden, the most per capita in Europe.

But as the influx of migrants strained the supply of temporary housing -- some asylum seekers slept in tents and the foyers of public buildings -- Swedes became increasingly concerned their country was being overwhelmed. Support for the anti-**immigration** Sweden Democrats rose to around 20% in polls in September 2015, where it has stayed since.

In January, Sweden effectively closed its borders -- imposing identification checks on its frontier with Denmark for the first time in decades. The government said the measures were necessary because law and order was threatened.

Under Sweden's new refugee policy, asylum seekers must have an ID card to board public transport entering the country. That alone led to a sharp fall in numbers because an estimated 60% of asylum seekers don't have such papers, according to the government. The government this week said it expects 29,000 new arrivals this year.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Eleanor Roosevelt

By Blanche Wiesen Cook

Viking, 670 pages, $40

Eleanor and Hick

By Susan Quinn

Penguin Press, 404 pages, $30

They came by the thousands in February 1940, student activists of the American Youth Congress braving a cold rain to protest Franklin Roosevelt's newfound emphasis on military preparedness over domestic reform. Invited to the White House by the first lady, they assembled on a muddy South Lawn carrying banners demanding "Jobs Not Guns" and "Schools Not Battleships." FDR's greeting did nothing to dispel the chill. In a mood characterized by his son as "I am Jesus -- handle me with care," the president offered well-worn arguments to defend his zigzag pursuit of economic and social justice. He warned about "handouts" and the need to accommodate political demands to the popular mood. Harsh words for the Soviet Union drew hisses from the crowd. A final, flippant send-off admonished his listeners to "keep your ideals high, keep both feet on the ground, and keep everlastingly at it."

Seventy-six years later the shock of his performance remains fresh. This is not the buoyant shapeshifter of whom Churchill observed that meeting him for the first time was like opening a bottle of champagne. Nor is it the shrewd political operative who exploited the complex dynamic of his marriage, variously employing his wife as emissary, political surrogate, lightning rod and canary in the coal mines she famously visited out of concern for those shortchanged by democratic capitalism. In patronizing the children's army on the South Lawn, FDR delivered an implicit rebuke to the woman who rarely hesitated to use her daily newspaper column, weekly radio program, and frequent speeches and press conferences to goad Congress or the White House into accepting a moral obligation toward the outsiders with whom she instinctively identified.

Her empathy versus his calculation -- the South Lawn confrontation not only captures the Roosevelt partnership with unblinking honesty. It also encapsulates this third and concluding volume of Blanche Wiesen Cook's definitive biography of Eleanor Roosevelt, this one covering "the war years and after." Early on, the author recounts a friendly debate she had with Arthur Schlesinger Jr. over the contrasting efforts of the president and first lady regarding Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany. Schlesinger pleaded the pressure of domestic politics and the approaching war in defense of FDR's cautious approach.

Ms. Cook is unpersuaded. Case in point: The president's weakened political position after 1938 gave the whip hand to Southern lawmakers adamantly opposed to anti-lynching legislation. Not for the first time, Eleanor Roosevelt filled the void left by her husband's silence, arguing the bill's merits within the White House and in the 90 newspapers that carried her "My Day" column. The latter, skillfully mined by Ms. Cook, was a kind of public diary, combining family chat and cultural criticism -- ER praised Katharine Hepburn in "The Philadelphia Story" and the floor show of a Florida resort at which she was staying -- with outspoken advocacy of liberal causes ranging from support of Negro colleges to community service in place of the military draft favored by FDR.

On the day in June 1940 that her husband signed the Smith Act, limiting free speech and requiring "all **aliens**" to be fingerprinted by the government or risk deportation, Mrs. Roosevelt penned a brisk denunciation that could have been written with the current presidential campaign in mind. "Something curious is happening to us in this country and I think it is time we stopped and took stock of ourselves. Are we going to be swept away from our traditional attitude toward civil liberties by hysteria about 'Fifth Columnists'?"

Eleanor Roosevelt is widely regarded as the prototypical "modern" first lady, for whom public advocacy is as much a part of the job description as receiving lines and East Room ceremonials. Considering the abuse heaped on Michelle Obama over so anodyne a cause as school nutrition, one wonders. No, in the sheer scope of her activism ER remains sui generis, a grandmotherly nonconformist who flew with Amelia Earhart and championed the cause of the Tuskegee Airmen; argued the merits of the Spanish Republic with Winston Churchill and saw her byline in the movie magazine Photoplay; promoted the cause of handicapped children while minimizing her husband's declining health.

"She saw herself as a watchdog," writes Ms. Cook, "a keen observer, and especially a helpmate. To have political influence directly attributed to her was unacceptable." Her complexities, on par with her achievements and the controversies she stirred, richly warrant Ms. Cook's three thick volumes. More than a presidential spouse, however, or feminist icon, the Eleanor Roosevelt who inhabits these meticulously crafted pages transcends both first-lady history and the marriage around which Roosevelt scholarship has traditionally pivoted. She was never more disarming than when promoting her then-radical agenda of racial equality and freedom of expression. The author slyly describes an African-American soldier eating an ice-cream cone in a segregated canteen. Suddenly he finds himself confronted by Mrs. Roosevelt, in the midst of a grueling 25,000-mile tour of wartime outposts in the Pacific. "May I have some of that ice cream?" she asks. After helping herself to a big bite, she returns the cone to its rightful owner. "You see," she tells him with a grin, "that didn't hurt at all, did it?"

But it is her Sisyphean labors on behalf of refugees, many of them Jews threatened by the Nazi killing machine, that make ER at once heartachingly relevant and as timeless as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that she nurtured to fruition in 1948. As first lady she pressured FDR into establishing an Emergency Visitors Visa Program to save "persons of exceptional merit"; hosted fundraising picnics and concerts; showcased refugee singers and musicians at the White House; and broadcast disarming appeals in which she portrayed thousands of refugee children as "temporary visitors, not **immigrants**."

Through it all, she battled State Department obstructionists like Assistant Secretary Breckinridge Long ("Franklin, you know he's a fascist"), whose striped-pants bigotry condemned countless European Jews to extermination. Not until January 1944 did FDR establish by executive order the War Refugee Board. Another presidential directive mandated the roundup and incarceration of Japanese-Americans. Eleanor's proposal that they adopt a Nisei couple got short shrift from her husband, who said that the Secret Service would never allow it. The author may protest too much the bonds of love that united Eleanor and Franklin in their historic partnership. Having cited the latest instance in which his wartime responsibilities left the first lady feeling excluded if not betrayed, she quotes FDR's holiday toast to "the person who makes it possible for the President to carry on."

The person so recognized did not reciprocate. After nearly 40 years of marriage, Eleanor confessed to a friend, "there is no fundamental love to draw on, just respect and affection." In its place she put her faith in "a sense of obligation and a healthy interest in people." Her children offered little emotional compensation, though she worried like any military mother when her four sons joined the war effort. A classic self-accuser, Mrs. Roosevelt blamed herself for their failed marriages and flawed characters. Happily, no such regrets prevented her from being a hugely successful grandmother.

"I never lost a feeling of kinship for anyone who is suffering," she acknowledged. Her very public pursuit of human rights fully justified the title of "Lady Big Heart" bestowed on her by Thurgood Marshall. Her private emotions were more complex. In earlier volumes, Ms. Cook dealt sensitively with her subject's intricate web of personal relationships, not absolving ER of a thoughtless disregard for those seeking an exclusive connection. Forty years have passed since Doris Faber uncovered, to her frank dismay, incontrovertible evidence at the Roosevelt Library that ER had once been in love with another woman, a crackerjack Associated Press reporter named Lorena Hickok. The two women had exchanged more than 3,300 letters that survive -- we'll never know how many more Hickok destroyed due to their explicit nature.

Like much of the early scholarship surrounding the Roosevelt-Hickok relationship, "The Life of Lorena Hickok" (1980), the book that resulted from Ms. Faber's discovery, suffered from a did-they-or-didn't-they prurience in keeping with Reagan-era squeamishness about AIDS and gay issues generally. It fell to Blanche Wiesen Cook to dispel Victorian prudery and sensationalism alike. Ms. Cook's game-changing work is rightfully acknowledged by Susan Quinn in "Eleanor and Hick," her poignant account of a love affair doomed by circumstance and conflicting needs. Combining exhaustive research with emotional nuance, Ms. Quinn dives deep to convey the differing characters of president and first lady. Confronted with the pending divorce of their daughter, Anna, Eleanor encourages the younger woman to escape an unhappy marriage. FDR, by contrast, urges caution, reminding her that many couples "got on very well in the end without love."

By her own admission, Eleanor Roosevelt fought a lifelong battle against fear, the fear of being unloved most of all. It was a vulnerability she was quick to recognize in others. Enter Lorena Hickok, Hick to her friends and colleagues. Raised in rural South Dakota, she survived a nightmarish childhood with an abusive father who, not content to beat his animal-loving daughter, dashed a favorite kitten's brains against the barn. Taught "never to expect love or affection from anyone," Hick was 13 when her mother died. Within a year she was sent packing by the dead woman's replacement. Taking refuge in books and music, she found work, at age 19, as a cub reporter on a Battle Creek, Mich., newspaper. There she impressed editors with her versatility, humor and sensitivity toward outcasts of every stripe. In Minneapolis and Milwaukee she covered sports as authoritatively as a society ball. By 1932 the sole woman reporter on Franklin Roosevelt's presidential campaign train, Hick concluded of the candidate's wife: "That woman is unhappy about something."

Her journalist's intuition served her better than her journalist's detachment. Before Election Day, Hickok had been given a privileged glimpse into the unorthodox Roosevelt marriage -- into Eleanor's "special friendship" with a handsome New York state trooper named Earl Miller; and Franklin's intimate attachment to his longtime personal secretary Missy LeHand. All this Hick kept secret, along with FDR's long-ago betrayal of his marital vows -- and her own growing attachment to the tall, vulnerable woman who trusted her discretion.

"Remember," Eleanor told Hick shortly after becoming first lady, "no one is just what you are to me." By then Hick had quit the AP, trading her career for a fantasy life to be shared exclusively with her new love. For her part, ER plotted ways to escape the White House, traveling -- more or less -- incognito with Hick through Canada and on the West Coast. When, inevitably, their identities were uncovered, Hick's former colleagues were not kind in their descriptions of her girth, appetite or bruising manner. Sufficient hints were dropped to feed suspicions about the first lady's unconventional attachments.

Eventually, Eleanor's ardor cooled. Needing to be needed, she couldn't bear the thought of being possessed. "You have a feeling for me which I may not return in kind," she told Hick in 1935. Deeply wounded, Hickok took to the road as a semiofficial diarist of the Great Depression. FDR's deputy Harry Hopkins ranked her brilliantly observed field reports among the best histories of Depression-era America. FDR cited them to expedite action from foot-dragging subordinates. Hick's description of soul-crushing poverty in West Virginia prompted ER to undertake Arthurdale, a government-sponsored new town that opened in 1934. A Puerto Rico trip led to new schools and a minimum-wage scale for women garment workers on the island. Finally, Hick's dispatches inspired the first lady to launch her own daily column.

Unlike Ms. Cook, who uncharacteristically limits her account of ER's post-White House activities to a brief epilogue, Ms. Quinn offers a comprehensive, if sometimes painful, narrative of both women in their later years. While FDR's widow became ever more iconic, and influential, her one-time love and enduring friend struggled with declining health and financial hardship. For several years Hick lived in a motel cabin not far from Val-Kill, Eleanor's Hyde Park refuge from the public existence she both craved and disdained. "To know me is a terrible thing," ER once lamented. The evidence presented by Ms. Cook and Ms. Quinn, much of it bravely supplied by Lorena Hickok, suggests just the opposite.

---

Mr. Smith is the author, most recently, of "On His Own Terms: A Life of Nelson Rockefeller."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Federal authorities said Thursday they dismantled a call-center scheme perpetrated by individuals in the U.S. and India who bilked thousands of Americans out of hundreds of millions of dollars by posing as Internal Revenue Service and Department of Homeland Security officials.

An 81-page indictment names 56 people in the U.S. and India and five call centers in Ahmedabad, India, allegedly involved in the fraud. They were charged in a Texas federal district court in Houston with crimes including impersonation of a U.S. officer, identity theft, money laundering and wire fraud.

In the U.S., federal agents arrested 20 people in connection with the alleged scam.

It was unclear Thursday night if the defendants had legal representatives.

Callers in India allegedly phoned individuals in the U.S. and demanded that they make payments to clear purported unpaid taxes or debt to avoid arrest. Their co-conspirators in the U.S. collected the victims' funds, laundered them and transferred them to India, according to the indictment.

The alleged scheme often targeted elderly individuals or **immigrants** with solid credit scores, investigators said. They said **immigrants** were told they would be deported if they didn't pay.

"For nearly four years, this criminal network used a variety of schemes to trick frightened individuals over the telephone by tapping into their worst fears -- arrest, deportation and other problems with the U.S. government authorities," said assistant attorney general Leslie R. Caldwell.

More than 15,000 people paid more than $250 million to the alleged swindlers.

"The scammers were ruthless in their pursuit of their victims," said Peter T. Edge, a senior Homeland Security Investigations official.

The takedown is the culmination of a three-year investigation by U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement's Homeland Security Investigations, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of the Inspector General and the U.S. Treasury's Inspector General for Tax Administration. It represents the largest law-enforcement action ever conducted against a telephone scam, authorities said.

"There's a profile of a vulnerable person; I don't fit that mold," said one alleged victim, a medical-device saleswoman in California in her mid-50s.

She said she turned over $6,800 to the callers, blindsided in part by the fact that the sum was close to a real amount she owed the IRS after an audit. "They knew where I was," she said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**[A series examining the causes and consequences of 2016's political upheaval]

When Donald Trump rode down an escalator at Trump Tower to launch his presidential campaign in June 2015, he began galvanizing a populist version of the Republican Party.

But he didn't create it.

The GOP that carried Mr. Trump to the presidential nomination was formed by waves of new voters who washed onto Republican shores in the last four decades: George Wallace Southerners, Ronald Reagan Democrats, Pat Buchanan pitchfork populists and tea-party foot soldiers.

The Republican establishment was happy to have the votes of these newcomers, many from America's working class, and accommodated their cultural preferences on social issues from guns to abortion to gay marriage. What the establishment didn't do was adjust the GOP's economic approach to match the populist impulses -- or even seem to consider such a shift necessary.

Mr. Trump did. After entering the presidential race with just 3% to 5% support in national polls, he amplified the belief among millions of Republican newcomers that free-trade deals did more harm than good. He defended Social Security and Medicare benefits. He relentlessly voiced the fear that **immigration** shreds the economic and cultural well-being of the middle class.

Those grievances coalesced into an explosion that shocked Republican leaders, crippled the party establishment and will likely alter the GOP's direction for years regardless of the Nov. 8 election's outcome.

Mr. Trump's campaign, like the waves of change that preceded it, has attracted new voters to the Republican party but driven others away. He has opened a deep divide that will be hard to heal and could even split the party into two sides, one made up of newly energized populists and the other of more-traditional moderates and conservatives.

If Mr. Trump wins, he figures to steer the GOP down the more-populist path his campaign has traveled, potentially driving away establishment figures, conservative thinkers and business leaders. He has increasingly belittled those who disagree with him on trade, **immigration** and foreign policy. They would have to decide whether the party can remain a home for them.

If he loses, a nasty debate about what Republicans stand for is likely to erupt, including "a lot of finger-pointing" from Trump supporters who will blame the establishment for failing to get behind their man, predicts former House Republican leader Eric Cantor.

Either way, he says, Republicans should "take the lesson learned from Donald Trump, which is that he has tapped into that anger that says our policies just aren't always yielding positive results" for many average Americans.

A few Republicans saw the explosion coming long ago. As early as 2001, Tim Pawlenty, later Minnesota's governor and a presidential candidate, warned that the GOP needed "to be the party of Sam's Club, not just the country club."

Mr. Buchanan tapped into anti-**immigration** anger in his first presidential campaign in 1992. "We were saying: 'This is what's going to happen,'" he recalls. "And it happened."

Why did so many supposedly smart politicians not see Donald Trump's soldiers gathering?

"It really is the elitism," says Tom Davis, a former Republican congressman from Virginia. The attitude of many in the party was "we're smart, and they're stupid, and we'll just feed them abortion and guns," he says. "It didn't have to be this way."

In 1970, Mr. Davis was a young political aide in President Richard Nixon's White House and worked for an adviser named Harry Dent. Mr. Dent grew up in South Carolina and was plotting to woo conservative Southerners from their traditional mooring in the Democratic Party.

Many of those Democrats voted for George Wallace, the pro-segregation former Alabama governor, as a third-party presidential candidate in 1968. He won five states in the Deep South, and many supporters felt **alienated** from a Democratic Party that was moving to the left.

Mr. Dent and his team made sure the GOP provided a home to disaffected Democrats. While they didn't share the business-friendly economic views of the Republican Party, it offered them allegiance on cultural issues such as hatred of draft dodgers, mistrust of busing to achieve racial desegregation and anger at the sex-and-drugs counterculture.

John Sears, a political operative who worked for Presidents Reagan and Richard Nixon, says Mr. Nixon appealed to crossover Democrats in some of the same ways that Mr. Trump appeals to populists now. Messrs. Nixon and Trump were widely scorned by media and political establishments of their time.

The Southern strategy helped Mr. Nixon win re-election in 1972, and a party long dominated by small-town Midwesterners, Northeastern liberals and a smattering of Western conservatives sprouted a new populist wing.

Growth of the party's Southern-based populism was interrupted by Southern Baptist farmer Jimmy Carter's election in 1976. The Democrat's presidency was widely regarded as a failure, opening the door to the next wave of GOP newcomers.

In 1980, Reagan Democrats were drawn to Mr. Reagan's plain-spoken declaration that liberal policies dragged down them and their communities. Their conversion to the Republican Party completed its consolidation in the South and drew in disgruntled workers from the upper Midwest.

The Reagan Democrats bought into the conservative philosophy of tax cuts, and Mr. Reagan sang the party's odes to the economic virtues of **immigration**. He broke with classic conservatism by imposing tariffs and quotas on Japanese goods, which won him the applause of union members.

Mr. Buchanan's first presidential campaign pointed to trade and **immigration** as culprits in the faltering economy. He toured the Mexican border to raise concerns about undocumented **immigrants** flooding into the U.S. The government later erected a wall along that same stretch of border.

In his speech to the Republican Convention in 1992, Mr. Buchanan challenged the party to stand up for middle-class workers still struggling to emerge from that era's recession. He cited loggers in northern California put out of work to protect the spotted owl and Korean-American business owners who stood up to looters during the Los Angeles riots.

"They are our people, and we need to reconnect with them," said Mr. Buchanan. "We need to let them know we know they're hurting."

The GOP leadership fought Mr. Buchanan, and there weren't enough pitchfork populists for him to prevail. He lost the nomination to a thoroughly mainstream Republican, George H.W. Bush, who then lost to Bill Clinton. While the increasing cultural conservatism of the GOP had attracted some new voters, it also drove away some moderate voters.

Republican leaders thought Mr. Buchanan's failure showed the limited appeal of his message. A better explanation is that much of it was siphoned away by billionaire populist Ross Perot, who ran in 1992 as an independent and in 1996 as a third-party candidate. He got 19% of the vote in 1992.

In 2000, the Republicans' conservative and Wall Street wings coalesced behind George W. Bush, propelling him into the White House with a message that was friendly to traditionalists and business.

But the party's new working-class voters were growing more uneasy with traditional GOP economic formulas. Those pressures appeared first in the House, the chamber of Congress closest to the grass roots.

The House abandoned Mr. Bush's call to overhaul Social Security and then rebelled on **immigration**. Instead of supporting a business-friendly guest-worker program and some path to legal status for undocumented **immigrants** already in the U.S., House Speaker Dennis Hastert, a Republican from Illinois, started a campaign against illegal **immigration** and ordered committee chairmen to hold field hearings along the Mexican border.

In 2006, Congress passed legislation that was signed into law to fence hundreds of miles along the border, an early embrace of a signature proposal made by Mr. Trump from the start of his campaign.

The GOP also benefited from growing Democratic concern about climate change and hostility to fossil fuels. The positions pushed working-class voters in energy-producing states toward the Republican Party.

West Virginia is perhaps the starkest illustration. When Barack Obama won the White House in 2008, Democrats controlled the West Virginia state legislature, and held both of the state's seats in the U.S. Senate and two of three in the House.

Republicans accused Democrats of waging war against coal. In 2014, the GOP took control of both chambers in the West Virginia legislature, won all three House seats and captured the Senate seat held by Democrat Jay Rockefeller for three decades.

The financial crisis energized today's populist army more than anything else, supercharging mistrust of Wall Street and economic elites. The federal bailout of financial institutions in the fall of 2008 drove a wedge between Republican leaders who pushed for the rescue and conservative lawmakers who no longer were content with toeing the party line.

Twice as many Republicans voted against the initial bailout bill as supported it. A revised version of the Troubled Asset Relief Program became law.

The U.S. recession that began in 2007 and ended in 2009 cut the median net worth of American families almost in half, according to the Pew Research Center. Middle- and lower-income households were hit especially hard, and Americans who lacked college degrees lost more ground than any other group.

The illusory recovery for many Americans created a fertile environment for anti-Washington candidates, none more than Mr. Trump.

He also inherited the wave of political activism that came from the tea-party uprising. It was sparked in 2009 by anger over a federal rescue of the mortgage industry and fueled a Republican takeover of the House in 2010.

The Republican establishment actually encouraged the rise of these new forces, thinking it could benefit from tea-party votes and channel the energy toward the GOP's broader purposes.

In 2010, Senate campaign-committee funds fueled the Senate campaigns of numerous tea-party members.

Soon, though, tea-party populists defied the House leadership by trying to shut down the government during spending fights. The rebel forces rose up and destroyed their own patron when a tea-party candidate defeated Mr. Cantor in his 2014 primary race in Virginia.

Economic anxiety also was shaking the core Republican belief in free trade. In 2010, 52% of people who called themselves Republicans said free trade hurt the American economy, while just 21% said it helped, according to an NBC/CNBC poll. Republicans split on the same question in 2007.

Last year, Rep. Jeff Duncan, a tea-party favorite from South Carolina, was one of 50 Republicans to vote against rules to expedite the approval process for trade deals. In 2011, he sided with the Republican-led House on trade pacts with Colombia, Panama and South Korea negotiated by the Obama administration. "Tariffs are taxes," he told an aide.

A spokesman says Mr. Duncan still supports free trade but was concerned about increased negotiating powers that would have been granted to the president. Mr. Duncan also had doubts about a trans-Pacific trade deal that was to be approved under the same rules.

The changes in the past four decades add up to a Republican Party that morphed slowly but inexorably into something fundamentally different.

Among the 100 poorest counties in America, 74 voted for Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney in 2012.

Tom Davis, a former Republican congressman from Virginia, often brandishes a map published by The Wall Street Journal last year showing all the counties that voted Democratic in the 1996 presidential election but had turned Republican by 2012. They form a wide, almost unbroken swath from Louisiana north through Arkansas and Missouri alongthe Mississippi River valley, branching east from there through Kentucky, Tennessee and West Virginia.

Those counties represent the new heart of the GOP. It includes farmers and coal miners. Country music is the norm. Collars are as likely to be blue as white. An America changed by **immigration** stirs as much anxiety as hope.

Long stereotyped as home to the country-club crowd, bankers and big business, the party is increasingly driven by anxious working-class voters, small-town business people and middle-aged Americans.

At the same time, the cultural conservatism that attracted new voters to the Republican Party has repelled some upscale suburban voters who had long been reliable Republicans. The upshot is a changed electoral-college landscape that in many ways favors Democrats.

Thus was the table set for Mr. Trump. He brought incomparable celebrity swagger to this year's race and benefited from Republican distrust of longtime party leaders and positions. Speaking directly to that exasperation enabled Mr. Trump to upend a generation of conservative orthodoxy.

"I'm an outsider and I won the primaries," he said on NBC's "Meet the Press" in June. "I competed along with a lot of establishment people. I beat them all."

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: No Wonder We See a Flood of GOP Populism" -- WSJ Nov. 4, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Amid this dreary campaign's daily back-and-forth about his alleged groping and her embarrassing emails, the strategic premise of Donald Trump's presidential bid is being tested.

Mr. Trump and his managers assume that victory depends on turning out whites who did not vote for Mitt Romney in 2012. This theory holds that President Obama won re-election by 4.9 million votes only because five million whites stayed home, unenthused by Mr. Romney, who didn't connect with them or wasn't harsh enough on Mr. Obama.

On the surface, the "missing five million" sounds plausible. Although 129 million Americans -- 55% of the voting-age population -- cast ballots in the 2012 presidential election, 106 million people didn't. Among them, according to the website FiveThirtyEight, were 47 million whites without a college degree, including 24 million men.

Exit polls from 2012 show that Mr. Romney won 59% of white voters, and that whites constituted 72% of the turnout. The Trumpers say their man can win by boosting those figures only slightly. Increase the GOP's share of the white vote a few points, say to 62%. Raise the white turnout to 74% or 75%. Voila, President Trump.

In the GOP primaries, two Republicans based their campaigns on the "missing five million," but they differed on who the absent voters were. Texas Sen. Ted Cruz contended that they were white evangelicals. Mr. Trump argued that they were white blue-collar workers. But the two agreed that the path forward was to adopt a populist antiestablishmentarianism.

Sen. Cruz and Mr. Trump hurled almost as much abuse at what they said were pusillanimous Republican leaders as they threw at Mr. Obama. Mr. Trump won the nomination by arguing that the "missing five million" would turn out for hard-line **immigration** policies, anti-trade rhetoric and a neo-isolationist foreign policy that put "America First."

How's that working out so far? The Trump camp's first strategic premise -- that he can do better among whites than Mr. Romney did -- isn't being borne out. The Oct. 17 poll from Fox News is representative: Among registered voters, Mr. Trump drew 49% of whites and Mrs. Clinton 38%. Other polls also show Mr. Trump lagging Mr. Romney's performance among whites. Perhaps he could match or exceed it on Election Day if he converts virtually every undecided white voter, but that isn't likely.

We can't evaluate the second strategic premise -- that Mr. Trump can increase the white turnout -- until after the election. But recent history doesn't suggest a dramatic increase in the offing. Exit polls show that whites were 81% of turnout in 2000; 77% in 2004; 74% in 2008; and 72% in 2012. The country is becoming more racially diverse. It will be nearly impossible for Mr. Trump to keep the white share flat, let alone increase it.

This election is also testing the messages being used to energize the "missing five million." Is Mr. Trump's support built on nativism, protectionism and neo-isolationism? Or is it based more on vociferous opposition to Mr. Obama's unpopular policies (like ObamaCare), as well as the country's overwhelming demand for change?

Do most voters really believe that Mr. Trump will somehow make Mexico pay for a wall on the southern border? Or that he will deport millions of illegal **immigrants**? Perhaps that over-the-top rhetoric is hiding his real appeal: that voters believe he would secure the border and get violent illegal **aliens** off the streets. After all, in every general-election poll and virtually every exit poll from the GOP primaries, a majority of voters want to provide a path to legal status for illegal **immigrants**.

Do most Americans want to rip up trade agreements and start trade wars? Or has Mr. Trump simply tapped into a sentiment that America plays by the rules while other countries don't? There is a big difference between wanting to slap tariffs on imported goods, so Americans pay more for life's necessities, and wanting other nations to remove obstacles to U.S. goods and services.

Do most voters really believe in a neo-isolationist foreign policy? Or is it that many think the world has become much more dangerous -- and the U.S. much less secure -- under Mr. Obama's feckless leadership? If the latter, the electorate is unlikely to support a full-scale retreat from the world.

In 12 days, voters will render their verdict, not only on Mr. Trump's conduct and character, but also on his strategic framework, message and policy agenda. If the "missing five million" fail to reappear, Republicans will have to find another road to political dominance and 1600 Pennsylvania Ave.

---

Mr. Rove helped organize the political-action committee American Crossroads and is the author of "The Triumph of William McKinley" (Simon & Schuster, 2015).
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I grew up with parents who liked the old line that they didn't leave the Democratic Party -- the Democratic Party left them. My father's political heroes were Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. My mother had been a campaign volunteer for Sen. Eugene McCarthy in 1968. But the party of George McGovern was not for them. As the left turned on "Amerika," they kept faith in America.

Now it's my turn to watch the Republican Party drift away. Whether the trend continues after the election remains to be seen, but already the GOP is largely unrecognizable to me. To see how far it's fallen, let's remind ourselves of where it once was.

**Immigration**: At a 1980 Republican primary debate in Houston, candidates George H.W. Bush and Ronald Reagan were asked whether the children of illegal **immigrants** should be allowed to attend public schools for free. Mr. Bush said they should. "We're creating a whole society of really honorable, decent, family-loving people that are in violation of the law," he lamented.

Reagan agreed. Instead of "putting up a fence," he asked, "why don't we . . . make it possible for them to come here legally with a work permit, and then, while they're working and earning here, they pay taxes here." For good measure, Reagan suggested we should "open the border both ways."

Where, in the populist fervor to build a wall with Mexico and deport millions of human beings, is that Republican Party today?

Trade: "It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family, never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy," wrote Adam Smith in 1776. "If a foreign country can supply us with a commodity cheaper than we ourselves can make it, better to buy it of them." Two centuries later, Milton Friedman noted that trade protectionism "really means exploiting the consumer" by artificially limiting choice and raising prices for the benefit of domestic producers.

Adam Smith and Milton Friedman were once canonical conservative figures. Free trade was once a Republican conviction. In one of his final radio addresses as president, Reagan warned "we should beware of the demagogues who are ready to declare a trade war against our friends -- weakening our economy, our national security, and the entire free world -- all while cynically waving the American flag."

Where, in the tide of Tea Party opposition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership and all those other "disastrous trade deals" that Donald Trump never fails to mention, is that Republican Party today?

Foreign policy: In 1947 Harry Truman asked Arthur Vandenberg, the Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to support his efforts to shore up the governments in Greece and Turkey against Soviet aggression. Vandenberg agreed, marking his -- and the GOP's -- turn from isolationism to internationalism.

Since then, six Republican presidents have never wavered in their view that a robust system of treaty alliances such as NATO are critical for defending the international liberal order, or that the U.S. should dissuade faraway allies such as South Korea and Saudi Arabia from seeking nuclear weapons, or that states such as Russia should be kept out of regions such as the Middle East.

Where, amid Mr. Trump's routine denunciations of our allegedly freeloading allies, or Newt Gingrich's public doubts about defending NATO member Estonia against Russian aggression, or the alt-right's attacks on "globalism," or Sean Hannity's newfound championship of WikiLeaks and its founder, Julian Assange, is that Republican Party today?

Culture, civility and character: For decades, conservative publishers have issued a long succession of titles on the importance of personal character to the preservation of democratic institutions. Notable on the list William J. Bennett's "The Book of Virtues," whose first chapter deals with the importance of self-discipline. The former secretary of education followed that one up with "The Death of Outrage: Bill Clinton and the Assault on American Ideals," timed to the Lewinsky scandal.

These books were not wrong. Character counts. The example set by a leader colors the culture of the company, institution or country he leads. We long for presidents who might follow Washington's "Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior." Rule No. 1: "Every Action done in Company, ought to be with Some Sign of Respect, to those that are Present."

Where, in the apparently limitless forgiveness GOP voters are willing to extend to Mr. Trump for his public affronts to "that face" Carly or that "nasty woman" Hillary Clinton, is that Republican Party today?

I've become accustomed to the invariable gusher of letters that will follow this column, pointing out Mrs. Clinton's well-known character flaws, along with apocalyptic visions of what her presidency might bring. Such deflections are the usual way in which people seek to justify their own side's moral lapses. I don't see the point of belonging to a party on the increasingly dubious assumption that it's slightly less bad than the opposition. If I can't get my Grand Old Party back, I'd rather help build a new one.

---

Write bstephens@wsj.com.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: The Former Republican Party Must Wise Up" -- WSJ Nov. 3, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ORLANDO, Fla. -- The Republican Party's battle to retain its majority in the House of Representatives runs through districts like this one in suburban, central Florida, where a young woman with an **immigrant** story and a national-security background is trying to end the 23-year tenure of an incumbent Republican.

Rep. John Mica, 73 years old, was first elected in 1992. He is widely recognized in the district as a former House Transportation Committee chairman, who drew funds to the area to rebuild a major highway and construct a commuter rail line.

But court-ordered redistricting in 2015 rejiggered the shape of the district, which includes downtown Orlando and its northern suburbs. The redrawn lines made the district's population younger and more racially diverse. The race is rated a tossup by two independent analysts, the Cook Political Report and the Rothenberg & Gonzales Political Report.

If Democrats regain a House majority in this or future elections, it likely will be the result of winning suburban districts such as this one, more so than by retaking the working-class districts that have tilted to the GOP in recent years, said Dave Wasserman, who analyzes House races for the Cook Political Report.

Democrats struggled to recruit a strong challenger until June, when Stephanie Murphy, a 38-year-old college professor and former national security specialist at the Defense Department, filed papers to run just one day ahead of the deadline. As an infant, Ms. Murphy escaped Vietnam on a boat with her family. She offers a refugee story that contrasts with messages skeptical of **immigration** that have come from some Republicans recently.

Ms. Murphy has cited June's mass shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando, which killed 49 and injured many others, as a reason she decided to join the race. She has highlighted Mr. Mica's stance on gun rights, such as a vote he cast against broadened background checks, and his vote against a bill that would have expanded protections against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

Mr. Mica frames the nightclub shooting as an example of national security vulnerability.

Mr. Mica supports Donald Trump as the GOP presidential nominee, a position that Democrats have worked to highlight.

In an interview, Mr. Mica said: "I'm running my own campaign and telling people I'm supporting the Republican nominee, which I have always done. But I try to stay away from the national politics scene as much as possible."

Like most incumbents, Mr. Mica has raised more money than his challenger. He brought in $1.1 million since the beginning of 2015 through Sept. 30, compared with the $600,000 that Ms. Murphy raised since the end of June.

But Democrats and their allies have sensed opportunity, and they have poured in $4.5 million through the party's congressional campaign arm and affiliated super PAC. The GOP's congressional campaign arm hasn't entered the race.

"If money could buy a race, that's what they're aiming for," Mr. Mica said of the efforts by the national Democratic groups.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MADRID -- Mariano Rajoy, a prominent target of the antiestablishment fervor rising across Europe, was assured of re-election as prime minister when his Socialist rivals conceded defeat Sunday, ending Spain's 10-month leadership impasse.

Socialist leaders, in a reversal, instructed their party's lawmakers to abstain when Parliament considers Mr. Rajoy's candidacy next weekend, depriving other opposition parties of the votes needed to keep blocking the conservative incumbent.

The Socialists, distant runners-up to Mr. Rajoy in two elections of deadlocked parliaments since December, said they feared a deeper loss if a third election was required.

The Socialist leadership committee took Sunday's decision by a vote of 139 to 96.

Mr. Rajoy oversaw Spain's recovery from its worst postwar recession but met a populist backlash over austerity policies and corruption scandals.

The impasse has kept the 61-year-old leader suspended between victory and defeat, his powers reduced to those of a caretaker. On Sunday, he emerged as a consummate survivor, demonstrating the uneven impact of the Continent's insurgent protest parties.

Far from a sweeping mandate, Mr. Rajoy will get a minority government. He said in a recent speech that he would have to "work day to day, with humility and patience," to coax legislative backing for his second-term initiatives.

Mr. Rajoy will become the second head of a eurozone government, after Enda Kenny of Ireland, to win re-election after making painful budget cuts demanded by creditors to ease Europe's financial crisis.

Two prime ministers who took that orthodox course while managing international bailouts lost elections last year to leftist parties in Greece and Portugal.

Antiestablishment forces elsewhere are exploiting distress over the financial crisis, refugee influxes and terrorist attacks, with varying degrees of success.

Spain's old guard has weathered the turbulence for several reasons.

Mr. Rajoy's Popular Party, with its base of reliable elderly voters, dominates the right of Spain's political spectrum. It has no competition from the kind of anti-**immigrant**, euroskeptic movements that have divided conservatives in France and Germany. Spaniards overwhelmingly support EU membership and generally tolerate **immigrants**. The country hasn't suffered a fatal terrorist attack in this decade.

Recovery from the 2008 recession, though far from complete, has been robust by European standards: Spain's economy is expected to grow 3.2% this year.

Instead, Mr. Rajoy was challenged over corruption, high unemployment and income inequality. Two protest parties -- Podemos on the far left, and Ciudadanos in the center -- finished strongly in a December parliamentary election.

The Popular Party, with three million fewer votes than it got for Mr. Rajoy's landslide win in 2011, lost its legislative majority.

But in the ensuing months of parliamentary deadlock, the party stood as a pillar of strength that allowed Mr. Rajoy to exploit the fragmented political landscape to his advantage and widen his lead in a June rerun of the election.

"The fact that he's a strong leader who could placate dissent and keep the party united, despite the scandals, allowed him to present a cohesive alternative" to bickering rivals on the left, said Antonio Barroso, an analyst at the Teneo Intelligence political consultancy.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Look, he's a nut and you know he's a nut. I go to battleground states and talk to anyone, everyone. They all know Donald Trump's a nut. Some will vote for him anyway. Many are in madman-versus-criminal mode, living with (or making) their final decision. They got the blues. Everyone does. They're worried about the whole edifice: If this is where we are, where are we going?

I get the Reagan fantasy -- big guy with a nonstandard resume comes in from the outside, cleans out the stables, saves the day. But it's a fantasy and does not apply to this moment. I get the Jacksonian fantasy -- crude, rude populist comes in from the hinterlands and upends a decadent establishment to the huzzahs of normal people with mud on their boots. But it's a fantasy, and doesn't apply.

Because he's not a grizzled general who bears on his face the scars of a British sword, and not a shining citizen-patriot. He's a screwball. Do you need examples? You do not, because you're already thinking of them. For a year you've been observing the TV funhouse that is his brain.

I offer an observation from Newt Gingrich, Trump friend and supporter, on David Drucker's Washington Examiner podcast. Mr. Gingrich lauded Mr. Trump because he "thinks big" and is a transformational character. But he spoke too of Trump's essential nature. The GOP nominee "reacts very intensely, almost uncontrollably" to "anything which attacks his own sense of integrity or his own sense of respectability." "There's . . . a part of his personality that sometimes gets involved in petty things that make no sense." He found it "frankly pathetic" that Mr. Trump got mad because Paul Ryan didn't call to congratulate him after the second debate.

Mr. Gingrich said he hopes this will change. But people don't change the fundamentals of their nature at age 70.

Mr. Trump's great historical role was to reveal to the Republican Party what half of its own base really thinks about the big issues. The party's leaders didn't know! They were shocked, so much that they indulged in sheer denial and made believe it wasn't happening.

The party's leaders accept more or less open borders and like big trade deals. Half the base does not! It is longtime GOP doctrine to cut entitlement spending. Half the base doesn't want to, not right now! Republican leaders have what might be called assertive foreign-policy impulses. When Mr. Trump insulted George W. Bush and nation-building and said he'd opposed the Iraq invasion, the crowds, taking him at his word, cheered. He was, as they say, declaring that he didn't want to invade the world and invite the world. Not only did half the base cheer him, at least half the remaining half joined in when the primaries ended.

The Republican Party will now begin the long process of redefining itself or continue its long national collapse. This is an epochal event. It happened because Donald Trump intuited where things were and are going.

Since I am more in accord with Mr. Trump's stands than not, I am particularly sorry that as an individual human being he's a nut.

Which gives rise to a question, for me a poignant one.

What if there had been a Sane Donald Trump?

Oh my God, Sane Trump would have won in a landslide.

Sane Donald Trump, just to start, would look normal and happy, not grim and glowering. He would be able to hear and act on good advice. He would explain his positions with clarity and depth, not with the impatient half-grasping of a notion that marks real Donald Trump's public persona.

Sane Donald Trump would have looked at a dubious, anxious and therefore standoffish Republican establishment and not insulted them, diminished them, done tweetstorms against them. Instead he would have said, "Come into my tent. It's a new one, I admit, but it's yuge and has gold faucets and there's a place just for you. What do you need? That I be less excitable and dramatic? Done. That I not act, toward women, like a pig? Done, and I accept your critique. That I explain the moral and practical underpinnings of my stand on refugees from terror nations? I'd be happy to. My well-hidden secret is that I love everyone and hear the common rhythm of their beating hearts."

Sane Donald Trump would have given an anxious country more ease, not more anxiety. He would have demonstrated that he can govern himself. He would have suggested through his actions, while still being entertaining, funny and outsize, that yes, he understands the stakes and yes, since America is always claiming to be the leader of the world -- We are No.1! -- a certain attendant gravity is required of one who'd be its leader.

Sane Donald Trump would have explained his **immigration** proposals with a kind of loving logic -- we must secure our borders for a host of serious reasons, and here they are. But we are grateful for our legal **immigrants**, and by the way, if you want to hear real love for America then go talk to them, for they experience more freshly than we what a wonderful place this is. In time, after we've fully secured our borders and the air of emergency is gone, we will turn to regularizing the situation of everyone here, because Americans are not only kindly, they're practical, and want everyone paying taxes.

Sane Donald Trump would have spoken at great and compelling length of how the huge, complicated trade agreements created the past quarter-century can be improved upon with an eye to helping the American worker. Ideology, he might say, is the pleasant diversion of the unworried, but a nation that no longer knows how to make steel cannot be a great nation. And we are a great nation.

Sane Donald Trump would have argued that controlling entitlement spending is a necessary thing but not, in fact, this moment's priority. People have been battered since the crash, in many ways, and nothing feels stable now. Beyond that no one right now trusts Washington to be fair and wise in these matters. Confidence-building measures are necessary. Let's take on the smaller task of turning around Veterans Affairs and see if we can't make that work.

Sane Donald Trump would have known of America's hidden fractures, and would have insisted that a healthy moderate-populist movement cannot begin as or devolve into a nationalist, identity-politics movement. Those who look down on other groups, races or religions can start their own party. He, the famous brander, would even offer them a name: the Idiot Party.

Sane Donald Trump would not treat the political process of the world's greatest democracy as if it were, as somebody said, the next-to-last episode of a reality-TV series. That's the episode that leaves you wondering how the season will end -- who will scream, who will leave the drunken party in a huff, who will accuse whom of being a whore. I guess that's what "I'll keep you in suspense" as to whether he'll accept the election result was about. We're being teed up. The explosive season finale is Nov.8. Maybe he'll leave in a huff. Maybe he'll call everyone whores.

Does he know he's playing with fire? No. Because he's a nut.

Sane Donald Trump for president. Too bad he doesn't exist.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: Imagine a Sane GOP United Behind Trump" -- WSJ Nov. 1, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Homeland Security officials are quietly scrambling to find 5,000 more prison and jail beds to handle a record number of undocumented **immigrants** being detained in the U.S., according to officials familiar with the discussions.

Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson met Tuesday with senior leaders at the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agency and the Customs and Border Protection agency -- both of which are in his department -- so officials could review their plans to handle thousands more people expected to cross the border with Mexico in coming weeks, the officials said.

ICE is holding more than 40,000 people in detention centers -- more than it has ever had in custody before -- and has warned budget officials that it needs a quick infusion of $136 million more just to keep running detention centers until early December, according to internal Department of Homeland Securitydocuments and officials.

A spokeswoman for the Department of Homeland Security declined to comment on internal agency discussions. The agency is "committed to continuing to ensure that individuals are detained in a safe, secure and humane manner in line with our detention standards and our values as a nation," she said.

The department had previously insisted that ICE is managing its operations at current levels, despite what she called "an uptick" in detentions.

But the problem is going to get worse before it gets better, officials told Mr. Johnson Tuesday. Part of the surge is due to thousands of Haitians who left their country after it was stricken by a severe earthquake in 2010, fleeing to South America and taking several years to make it to the U.S. southern border, officials say. The influx in detained **immigrants** isn't limited to Haitians, but they are a big part of it.

More than 5,000 Haitians have now reached the Mexican towns of Tijuana and Mexicali and are preparing to present themselves at U.S. ports of entry, officials said. U.S. and Mexican officials have sought to avoid a crush at the San Ysidro border crossing in California by having the would-be entrants approach the border in a steady stream rather than all at once, officials said.

Last year, U.S. **immigration** facilities housed between 300 and 400 Haitians at any one time. Now, CBP is sending double that number every week to ICE for detention, officials said.

Put another way, about 100 new Haitians are being detained each day, and that figure is expected to double in coming weeks, officials told Mr. Johnson at the meeting. Overall, ICE is holding more than 2,500 Haitians expected to be deported, officials said.

When Haitian **immigrants** present themselves to the CBP at a U.S. port of entry seeking asylum, they are typically turned over to ICE for detention pending deportation.

Homeland Security officials expect the overall number of individuals who are in jail awaiting deportation to balloon to 45,000 in the coming weeks and months. One internal projection calculates the figure could reach 47,000 by next June, according to people familiar with the discussions.

It is difficult to predict when the number of detainees will start declining, because the U.S. has temporarily suspended deportation flights to Haiti as a result of the damage caused by Hurricane Matthew.

ICE officials are scrambling to sign contracts with jail or detention facilities, whether it is private contractors or state and local jails. They need so many new beds so quickly, according to officials familiar with the work, that they may have to temporarily ignore requirements adopted five years ago to ensure minimum quality standards for **immigrants** likely to be deported.

There are concerns that some new jail spaces may not conform to regulations adopted as a result of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, officials said. "They're scraping the bottom looking for beds," one official said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Some of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump's posts on Facebook have set off an intense debate inside the social media company over the past year, with some employees arguing certain posts about banning Muslims from entering the U.S. should be removed for violating the site's rules on hate speech, according to people familiar with the matter.

The decision to allow Mr. Trump's posts went all the way to Facebook Inc. Chief Executive Mark Zuckerberg, who ruled in December that it would be inappropriate to censor the candidate, according to the people familiar with the matter. That decision has prompted employees to complain on Facebook's internal messaging service and in person to Mr. Zuckerberg and other managers that it was bending the site's rules, and some employees who work in a group charged with reviewing content threatened to quit, the people said.

"Facebook has never contacted us about employee complaints and has never removed a post," a spokeswoman for Mr. Trump's campaign said. "We are not concerned about the liberal Clinton elites who are so intolerant of conservative ideas that they would seek to censor the Trump campaign's enormously successful Facebook engagement."

In a statement provided Wednesday evening, a Facebook spokeswoman said its reviewers consider the context of a post when assessing whether to take it down. "That context can include the value of political discourse," she said. "Many people are voicing opinions about this particular content and it has become an important part of the conversation around who the next U.S. president will be."

On Friday, senior members of Facebook's policy team posted more details on its policy. "In the weeks ahead, we're going to begin allowing more items that people find newsworthy, significant, or important to the public interest -- even if they might otherwise violate our standards," they wrote.

The internal debates shed light on how Facebook has grappled with its position as one of the biggest sources of political information during a particularly contentious election cycle.

This past week, a controversy bubbled up around Facebook director Peter Thiel, who recently pledged $1.25 million to support Mr. Trump. In an internal post to employees confirmed by the company, Mr. Zuckerberg urged tolerance of Mr. Thiel's political activity, saying it was key to cultivating diversity. Facebook declined to comment further, and Mr. Thiel didn't respond to a request for comment.

Facebook -- which stands to collect an estimated $300 million from online political advertising this year, according to Nomura analysts -- has strived to appear nonpartisan and neutral, amid complaints that the company and key executives favor Democrats. A May report from tech blog Gizmodo alleged Facebookcontract workers suppressed news of interest to conservative readers on the site's influential trending topics feature. Facebook denied bias, but in August, it fired the contractors so that it could run the feature largely by software.

"They are confronting in a very real way for the first time the political dimensions of their platform," said Anna Lauren Hoffmann, who teaches information ethics at the University of California, Berkeley.

About 44% of Americans get at least some of their news from Facebook, according to Pew Research.

While the company says it is a neutral platform for open debate, it has strict rules around what users can post. The rules, which Facebook has tightened in recent years, ban discrimination toward people based on their race and religion. Facebook typically removes content that violates the rules.

Issues around Mr. Trump's posts emerged when he posted on Facebook a link to a Dec. 7 campaign statement "on preventing Muslim **immigration**." The statement called for "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on." Mr. Trump has since backed away from an outright ban based on religion, saying his policies would target **immigrants** from countries with a record of terrorism.

Users flagged the December content as hate speech, a move that triggered a review by Facebook's community-operations team, with hundreds of employees in several offices. Some Facebook employees said in internal chat rooms that the post broke Facebook's rules on hate speech as detailed in internal guidelines, according to people familiar with the matter.

Content reviewers were asked by their managers not to remove the post, according to some of the people familiar. Facebook's head of global policy management, Monika Bickert, later explained in an internal post that the company wouldn't take down any of Mr. Trump's posts because it strives to be impartial in the election season, according to people who saw the post.

During one of Mr. Zuckerberg's weekly town-hall meetings in late January at the company's Menlo Park, Calif., headquarters, a Muslim employee asked how the executive could condone Mr. Trump's comments. Mr. Zuckerberg acknowledged Mr. Trump's call for a ban did qualify as hate speech, but he said the implications of removing the posts were too drastic, according to two people who attended the meeting. Mr. Zuckerberg said he backed Ms. Bickert's call, they said.

Many employees supported the decision. "Banning a U.S. presidential candidate is not something you do lightly," said one person familiar with the decision.

But others, including some Muslim employees, were upset that the platform would make an exception. In Dublin, where many of Facebook's content reviewers work, more than a dozen Muslim employees met with their managers to discuss the policy, according to another person familiar with the matter.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**City of Dreams

By Tyler Anbinder

Houghton  Mifflin  Harcourt,  738  pages,  $35

When Annie Moore stepped ashore at Ellis Island on New Year's Day 1892, she became the first **immigrant** to enter the U.S. through the government's new reception center. She would be followed by 15 million others over the next 62 years. But Annie, who had emigrated from Cork, Ireland, with her two younger brothers, was already an anomaly in the mutable world of **immigration**. Most of her fellow passengers were no longer the Irish who had dominated New York **immigration** for the better part of the 19th century but impoverished East European Jews. By the end of World War I, they would account for 600,000 of New York's two million foreign-born residents. Within a century, their share would dwindle, as had the great waves of Italians, Irish, Germans and other Europeans who took root in the city, to be replaced by a migration of global dimensions. It is the protean nature of these waves, from 17th-century Dutch to 21st-century Dominicans, that is the subject of Tyler Anbinder's ambitious "City of Dreams: The 400-Year Epic History of **Immigrant** New York."

From the outset, New York harbored a diverse population of newcomers. As Mr. Anbinder observes, within roughly 30 years of Dutch settlement in 1624, New Amsterdam boasted Irishmen, Italians, Portuguese, Swedes, Danes, Frenchmen, Germans, Jews, Walloons and free blacks.

While all was not harmonious -- there were brawls, racial and religious strife, slavery, and battles between colonists and Indians -- the inhabitants, for the most part, managed to get along, motivated more by commerce than creed, a far cry from the theocracy of Puritan New England. Although the city changed hands and its name with the arrival of a British fleet in 1664, New York remained a relatively diverse locale. Much of this story has been told in such works as Russell Shorto's "Island at the Center of the World" (2004) and Edwin Burrows and Mike Wallace's "Gotham" (1998). But since New York's history is so intricately entwined with that of its **immigration** it is virtually impossible to write a narrative of one without telling the story of the other. **Immigration** is so consequential a factor in New York's history that it merits a study of its own.

And it is quite a story, or array of stories, that Mr. Anbinder selects to illustrate his tale. He introduces us to some of the more notable **immigrants** who have lived on as street names, such as James Rivington, a printer reviled for his Tory sympathies during the American Revolution who was actually a spy for George Washington. For his pains, he was beaten by a Patriot mob, forced to close his newspaper and confined for his final years in debtor's prison, a fate that foreshadowed the impoverished **immigrants** who would languish a century later on the Lower East Side street that bears his name.

There were, of course, more successful **immigrants**, schemers as much as dreamers. Pride of place goes to New York's most celebrated transplant, the orphan lad from the Caribbean island of Nevis, Alexander Hamilton. Following on his heels in the early 19th century are such Horatio Algers as German-born John Jacob Astor, who would become one of America's richest men.

It is in this period, beginning in the 1820s, that New York's population took off, much of the surge driven by emigration from one place: Ireland. By 1845, the city's foreign-born populace jumped to 36%, with Irish **immigrants** accounting for more than all other nations of Europe combined. And this was before the great waves that arrived during the potato famine of the late 1840s.

The overwhelming majority of the Irish were Catholic, and their considerable presence in Manhattan sparked hostility from Yankee natives who feared being overrun by "rum, Romanism and rebellion." Nativist hostility could be withstood and could even serve to unite Irish **immigrants** against a common foe. What was harder to endure was the poverty, squalor, disease and hopelessness that stalked their precincts. Mr. Anbinder has previously written on the Irish enclave of the Five Points, a "notorious slum" between Canal Street and City Hall. He vividly describes the dank, dismal, malodorous, overcrowded tenements; the filthy streets; the residents vulnerable to crime and violence.

Perhaps even worse was the voyage to America -- a sea journey of up to seven weeks, with the **immigrants** packed into a darkened steerage that reeked from the retching of seasick passengers, fed on vile rations, buffeted by storms and menaced by the constant threat of disease in the unsanitary conditions below decks. Once ashore, worn out and confused newcomers were met by "runners" who steered them to boardinghouses where they were often fleeced.

The other significant **immigrant** group to arrive in New York during these years were the Germans, who settled in what is today's Lower East Side in such great numbers that the area came to be known as "Kleindeutschland."

Both **immigrant** groups would make major contributions to the Union Army during the Civil War. New York's Irish Brigade fought with courage and took heavy losses, particularly in the early years of the conflict. It was such a toll that prompted Lincoln's call for conscription in 1863, which led to the notorious draft riots that July, which turned New York into a nightmare landscape of arson and mayhem.

Shortly after the Civil War, a colossal statue, conceived by a Frenchman as a memorial to Emancipation, was commissioned. After languishing for a decade, it was transformed on this side of the Atlantic into a monument commemorating American independence. Dedicated in 1886, the Statue of Liberty was never intended as a beacon of hope to the millions of **immigrants** who would be inspired by its image, but that is what it became.

The migration of a second great wave from 1880 to 1920, consisting mainly of Jews and Italians, was eased somewhat by the introduction of steamships that were able to cut the ocean voyage from seven weeks to one, with accommodations that made steerage somewhat less onerous. Nevertheless, as Mr. Anbinder writes, "the essence of steerage -- the crowding, the indignities, and above all, the pandemonium -- had not changed at all."

The American **Immigration** Act of 1891, which established the **immigration** center at Ellis Island, imposed greater health requirements on steamship companies, stricter regulations at ports of embarkation and rigorous medical examinations for the arrivals. Mr. Anbinder, citing his own forebears, offers us a striking picture of what these **immigrants** underwent. Once here, they crowded into many of the same tenements vacated by the Irish before them or into newer ones that were little better, sweltering in the summer, noisy, unhealthy and unventilated except for air shafts that added to the din. The Italians arrived in the greatest number -- some three million came through the gateway of Ellis Island. Many worked in construction, helping to build the infrastructure that would transport a later generation of New Yorkers. The Jews toiled in the garment trade, at first in stifling tenements, then in factory sweatshops.

The plight of **immigrants** fostered Progressive Era reforms that eventually led to better wages and working conditions and allowed some to start the gradual exodus to the more tolerable climes of Brooklyn and the Bronx. By then, **immigration** had started to slow, impeded first by World War I and then by the ethnic quotas of the 1920s. The flood of **immigration** had prompted a nativist reaction invoking many of the boogeymen of the past -- the newcomers couldn't assimilate, it was said; they brought disease, disorder, subversion, foreign ideas -- and some new calumnies inspired by the eugenics movement and its notions of racial hierarchy.

The result was "a series of successively harsher **immigration** restrictions culminating in the National Origins Act of 1924 which reduced by nearly 95 percent the number of **immigrants** who could enter the United States from southern and eastern Europe" -- in effect, Italians and Jews. New York, like the rest of the country, became more homogeneous over the next 40 years. Although the classic work on the subject of nativist backlash is John Higham's "Strangers in the Land" (1955), Mr. Anbinder provides a sound overview of the subject.

It was not until the Great Society of Lyndon Johnson that America was ready to raise its national quotas and resume a more welcoming **immigration** policy with the passage of the Hart-Celler Act in 1965. This "momentous" legislation allowed 290,000 newcomers annually -- plus an unlimited number of additional **immigrants** who were reuniting with family members. The three most distinguishing aspects of the new influx were transportation (the airplane had replaced steerage); diversity (no single group dominated); and dispersal (the new **immigrants** were spread throughout the city).

Within a dozen years of Hart-Celler, Dominicans, Chinese and non-Hispanic West Indians were among the most numerous arrivals. But there were others as well -- from Korea and the Philippines, Colombia and Albania, Mexico and Russia, India and Ecuador, Pakistan and Ghana, and many other realms. **Immigrant**groups vaulted over one another in their rapid growth.

Mr. Anbinder focuses on three groups: the Chinese in Flushing, Queens, and Brooklyn's Sunset Park; the Dominicans in Washington Heights; and the West Indians in the further reaches of Brooklyn and Queens. But this leaves just a few pages to deal with the considerable impact made by such divergent streams as Colombians, Ecuadoreans and Mexicans, whose "meteoric rise" the author acknowledges but does not fully engage. Such groups are mentioned but more as demographic phenomena than as living people.

It is a pity that, given his omnibus approach, Mr. Anbinder devotes little more than 60 of his 570 pages of text to this third great wave of **immigration**, one of the most exciting chapters in the city's **immigrant** life. Rather than revisit oft-told tales like that of John Jacob Astor, we might have profited more by reading about the abundance of cultures blossoming in the fur magnate's one-time demesne of Astoria. Alas, for this we must turn to such authors as William Helmreich or Joseph Berger, whose "The World in a City" (2007) takes us to Astoria's Steinway Street, where the once-dominant Greeks have given way to Arabs and Brazilians. Or to the Bronx's Grand Concourse, whose Ghanaian residents save to build houses back home. To be sure Mr. Anbinder speaks of such newcomers as Bengali taxi drivers, but we must look elsewhere for the telling anecdote, the sensitive interview, the odd detail -- soap operas beamed from South Korea into Jackson Heights or the small neighborhood travel agencies arranging cheap flights home -- that evoke the distinct experience of today's **immigrants**.

This is important because, 50 years after the Hart-Celler Act, **immigrants** once again account for more than a third of the city's population. There are an additional 500,000 illegal **immigrants**, and this number is only a guess. Many of them are Mexicans and Chinese. Former Mayor Michael Bloomberg said in 2006 that the city's economy "would collapse" without them. Most Americans want them to get in line. But as Mr. Anbinder reminds us, there hardly ever was a line. Until 1921 **immigrants** could arrive without waiting. Now, "the vast majority of visas given to **immigrants** today are reserved for family members of those already legally in the U.S." What's left goes to those with in-demand skills. If you don't meet either of those criteria, there "is no way to **immigrate** legally -- no line to get in at all." Which doesn't mean that people won't keep trying to find a way in.

While there have been other works on U.S. **immigration** policy -- e.g., Aristide Zolberg's invaluable "A Nation by Design" -- or books that have addressed the various ethnic groups who came to our shores, Mr. Anbinder has provided a valuable service by crafting a single volume that focuses solely on New York as a gateway, a haven and a crucible that forged the fates of millions of **immigrants** who in turn shaped the destiny of our nation.

---

Mr. Schwartz is a former book editor of Newsday.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BRUSSELS -- British Prime Minister Theresa May said the U.K. will continue to be a strong partner in the European Union , as she sought to smooth relations at her first bloc summit since becoming prime minister.

Mrs. May, who is under pressure to lay out her vision of the U.K.'s future relationship with the EU , used the summit to establish goodwill with her European counterparts, some of whom face anti-EU movements at home and are under pressure not to make leaving the bloc look like an attractive option.

"The U.K. is leaving the EU but we will continue to play a full role until we leave, and we'll be a strong and dependable partner after we have left," she said.

Since becoming the Conservative Party leader and prime minister in July, weeks after the U.K. voted to leave the EU , Mrs. May has stressed that she wants to restrict **immigration** from the EU while maximizing access to Europe's trading market, a position that has been widely opposed by some of the bloc's biggest members.

Over dinner with other EU leaders, Mrs. May spoke about the work the U.K. is doing to prepare for negotiations ahead of formal talks, which she has signaled would start by the end of March.

A Downing Street official said the British leader also emphasized her view that a good deal for the U.K. is also in the interest of the EU and told her counterparts that there would be no turning back on Britain's decision to leave the bloc.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel said afterward that Ms. May "gave an important message" by saying that the U.K. remains a full EU member with rights and obligations until the Brexit negotiations end.

"She said negotiations should be in the interest of the U.K. but also not hurt the EU ," Ms. Merkel said. "This will be a difficult path, but what she said is a good basis to work on together."

The summit, which ends Friday, is expected to focus on trade and the war in Syria, with Brexit expected to take a back seat.

EU leaders have said they won't agree to a deal that allows the U.K. to cherry pick what it wants from the bloc. Specifically, they have said the U.K. must agree to its rule that allows EU citizens to live and work in any member state if it wants access to the trading market.

Mrs. May earlier this month said the country would prioritize controlling **immigration**. The remarks sent sterling to a 31-year-low. While the pound's steep decline has boosted British exporters and tourism and acted as a giant shock absorber against Brexit, investors say leaving the EU poses serious economic risks.

Earlier Thursday, David Davis, the minister who is overseeing Britain's exit from the EU , made clear the administration sees the bloc and the U.K.'s fates as intertwined.

"If they do not achieve an open and barrier-free trading relationship, that will be harmful for many European countries and harmful for European financial stability," he said.

---

Nicholas Winning in London and Valentina Pop in Brussels contributed to this article.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**No matter who wins the White House on Nov. 8, a majority of the country will dislike the next president. Polling this week from Gallup shows that 56% of Americans view Hillary Clinton unfavorably, and 68% view Donald Trump unfavorably. These are record numbers for presidential candidates.

But from the ashes of this ugly, bitter campaign comes a terrific opportunity for bipartisan cooperation. Because President Clinton or President Trump will be so unpopular from day one, he or she will have a strong incentive to compromise. Pursuing a partisan agenda that creates gridlock in Washington, and bitter debates that threaten to shut down the government, will only make the new president more disliked -- and re-election in 2020 a long shot.

Incoming White House advisers will know this. Every newly elected president appoints staff and develops a policy agenda of what the administration will try to accomplish over its first term. This substantive plan is synchronized with the political plan to get re-elected in four years. Even if the president does not have the next campaign in mind, the senior staff and outside political advisers do.

There's only one way that either of these politically crippled leaders will get anything done as president: lead an unprecedented era of bipartisan compromise between Congress and the White House. Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump are experienced negotiators. Neither is an ideologue, willing to fall on his or her sword for a philosophical cause.

History tells us that bipartisan compromise is how big issues get solved in Washington. President Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill saved Social Security. President George H.W. Bush reached a budget deal with Democratic leaders. President Clinton worked with Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Speaker Newt Gingrich to balance the budget, reform welfare and fight crime.

Today's challenges include reducing the budget deficit, reforming the tax code, repairing America's infrastructure, rebuilding the military, fixing the **immigration**system, and maybe even shoring up entitlement programs like Social Security and Medicare.

A single party working alone cannot address these issues. The election might result in divided government, with President Clinton facing a Republican House, or President Trump a Democratic Senate. But even assuming a one-party sweep, the Senate's filibuster rules mean that significant legislation must pass with 60 votes -- and support on both sides of the aisle.

The good news is that Speaker Paul Ryan is eager to negotiate to solve big problems. So are Mitch McConnell and Chuck Schumer, one of whom will be the next Senate Majority Leader. None of these leaders enjoys Congress's terrible reputation for inaction. This view is shared by the broad mainstream of both parties.

Although the House Freedom Caucus counts a few dozen hard-line conservatives among its members, congressional leaders do not need the extremists in either party to pass legislation. Hard work and serious negotiation will produce bills that a majority of Republicans and Democrats can support.

By pursuing bipartisanship, the new president might **alienate** some of the purists among his or her supporters. But the president will have nothing to fear from the voters at large. Most of the country craves a leader who will seek and achieve political unity to solve problems. In a September poll from Quinnipiac University, 76% of likely voters said it was "very important" that the next president unite the nation. That includes strong majorities of every group polled: 79% of Republicans, 77% of Democrats and 74% of independents; 68% of men and 82% of women; 76% of whites and 77% of nonwhites; 82% of seniors and 69% of millennials.

Bipartisan compromise on big issues promotes a feeling of unity and gives Americans the sense that government is working. Achieving this might provide the new president's only realistic shot at a second term. And the kicker is that it is the right thing to do for the country. Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump aren't popular, and there's only one way to win over Americans: By reaching across the aisle to fix the country's problems.

---

Mr. Black is chairman of the Prime Policy Group and a vice chairman of No Labels.

(See related letter: "Letters to the Editor: Not Much Bipartisanship Seen in the Political Future" -- WSJ Nov. 3, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS -- Donald Trump refused Wednesday to commit to respecting the results of the presidential election if his Democratic rival Hillary Clinton wins, hinting at a challenge to one of the longtime traditions of American democracy.

"I will tell you at the time. I will keep you in suspense," the Republican nominee said here at the third and final presidential debate. "That's horrifying," Mrs. Clinton replied. "That is not the way our democracy works."

The debate at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas was a chance for Mr. Trump to regain momentum in the presidential race, which national and battleground state polls show Mrs. Clinton leading. But the evening's most striking moment came when moderator Chris Wallace asked if the GOP nominee would follow the guidance of his running mate Mike Pence and his daughter, Ivanka, and support the winner even if it wasn't him.

Mr. Trump demurred, and said Mrs. Clinton's very candidacy was proof of conspiracy against him, citing her improper use of private email as secretary of state. "She should not be allowed to run. Just in that respect, I say it's rigged," he said.

Reaction was swift, and negative, from some quarters. "If he loses it will not be because the system is 'rigged,' but because he failed as a candidate," said Sen. Lindsey Graham (R., S.C.), who competed with Mr. Trump in the GOP primaries.

The debate started with a more measured tone compared with their first two showdowns, as Mr. Trump sought to present a more presidential posture that could reassure wavering Republicans and independents about his candidacy. He and Mrs. Clinton offered differing visions over social, economic and foreign policy, and attacked one another harshly over their personal conduct.

Mrs. Clinton pointed to his complaints about his defeat in the Iowa primary, the lawsuit against Trump University and losing an Emmy for his reality TV show. "Every time Donald thinks things are not going in his direction, he claims whatever it is, is rigged against him," she said.

Mr. Trump's response to the query differed from the one he gave in the first debate. "If she wins, I will absolutely support her," he said then, though he added that he doubted she would win. The differing answers reflect the contours of the race over the course of the three presidential debates. At that time, polls were tighter and Mr. Trump was seen as having momentum. Since the first face-off in New York, the advantage has shifted to Mrs. Clinton, giving her a double-digit lead in several national polls.

The bitterness that has developed in recent weeks between the two camps spilled over toward the end of the debate, when Mr. Trump interrupted Mrs. Clinton and called her "such a nasty woman."

The election has featured scant discussion over social issues, but Mr. Wallace put these matters on the table at the start with a discussion over the Supreme Court, a timely matter given that a vacancy currently on the court.

Mr. Trump promised he would appoint justices who would overturn the Roe v. Wade abortion decision and protect gun rights. "They will have a conservative bent," he said. "I will be appointing pro-life judges."

Mrs. Clinton said she would choose justices who would protect abortion rights, same-sex marriage and overturn Citizens United, which removed limits on corporate and union spending in elections. "The Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful corporations and the wealthy," she said.

But the debate soon tilted toward the personal attacks that have dominated this presidential contest. Mrs. Clinton accused Mr. Trump of being a "puppet" of Russian President Vladimir Putin, whom she tied to the hack of her campaign chairman's personal email account. "No puppet," Mr. Trump shot back at Mrs. Clinton. "You're the puppet."

"It's pretty clear that you won't admit that the Russians engaged in cyberattacks, that you encouraged spying against our people, that you are willing to spout the Putin line," Mrs. Clinton said.

"She has no idea," Mr. Trump said. "Putin has outsmarted her at every step of the way."

On **immigration**, Mr. Trump emphasized border security, and the wall he wants to build on the southern border. "We have no country if we have no border," he said. He accused Mrs. Clinton of supporting "amnesty" for those in the country illegally.

Mrs. Clinton said she voted when she was in the Senate for border security as part of a larger **immigration** package, but wants to give safe harbor to illegal **immigrant** already living in the U.S. "I don't want to rip families apart. I don't want to be sending parents away from children," she said. "I don't want to see the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country."

On the economy, Mrs. Clinton offered a positive vision, something her advisers saw as an imperative for her going into the debate. She promised the "biggest jobs program since World War II" by investing in infrastructure and advanced manufacturing. She said she would increase the minimum wage and make college "debt free" for some middle-class families.

Mr. Trump said he wanted to "get government out of the taxes and regulations" and promised to end the North American Free Trade Agreement, the free-trade agreement with Mexico and Canada.

"We are going to cut taxes massively," Mr. Trump said. "We are going to start the engine rolling again."

He blamed Mrs. Clinton and her husband, former President Bill Clinton, for Nafta, which Mr. Clinton signed, and for backing the pending Trans Pacific Partnership. Mrs. Clinton again vowed to oppose the Asian trade deal but moved fast to turn the trade issue against Mr. Trump, saying he had bought Chinese steel and aluminum for his buildings. Mr. Trump replied that Mrs. Clinton had been in office for 30 years and asked why she didn't "make it impossible for me to do that."

The question of Mr. Trump's conduct with women again surfaced. He accused the women who have charged since the last debate that he groped or kissed them without permission of lying. "I think they want either fame or her campaign did it. I think it's her campaign," he said.

Mrs. Clinton replied by quoting Mr. Trump's defense, offered at rallies, that these women weren't attractive enough to warrant such advances.

"Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger. He goes after their dignity, their self-worth, and I don't think there is a woman anywhere who doesn't know what that feels like," she said.

Leaving here after their final debate, the Democratic nominee has the upper hand heading into the home stretch, leading in many polls and enjoying a big cash advantage as the candidates concentrate on Ohio, North Carolina and Pennsylvania, where both will be campaigning in the coming days, as well as Florida.

---

Rebecca Ballhaus and Janet Hook contributed to this article.

License this article from Dow Jones Reprint Service[http://www.djreprints.com/link/DJRFactiva.html?FACTIVA=wjco20161020000115]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**After all of this year's election turmoil -- the noisy clashes over Donald Trump's comments on **immigrants** and women,Hillary Clinton's controversies over email and the Clinton Foundation -- public views of the two candidates have wound up right where they were in January.

Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton are no more liked or disliked than when the year started, nor have more people come to view the prospect of their election with optimism, Wall Street Journal/NBC News polling finds. And in a head-to-head matchup, Mrs. Clinton's 10-point lead of today is exactly where it stood in January, after some tightening in the race in the late spring and early summer.

Those numbers suggest that Wednesday night'sdebate, which produced some dramatic moments -- including clashes over **immigration** and national security, and Mr. Trump's refusal to commit to accepting results of the vote -- is unlikely to change the trajectory of the race. The 2016 election may seem turbulent, with its battle of personalities, hacked emails and late-night tweets. But underneath, there has been more stability than volatility.

Mr. Trump started the year with 29% of voters saying they viewed him in a positive light, Journal/NBC News polls found. Today, that share is again at 29%.

Mrs. Clinton began the year with 40% of voters viewing her in a positive light. Today, the share remains at 40%.

In February, 33% of voters said they would feel optimistic or satisfied if Mr. Trump were elected president, and 43% said so of Mrs. Clinton. Now, those shares are nearly identical.

And asked in January which candidate they would pick for president, 51% of voters chose Mrs. Clinton and 41% Mr. Trump -- the same levels of support as today.

Each candidate has lived through ups and downs during the year: The public image of each took a hit in April, and Mrs. Clinton's lead over Mr. Trump shriveled to 3 points in May.

Some voters remain in flux. Undecided and third-party voters seem to be gravitating toward the two major-party candidates, and recent polling suggests that women are moving more forcefully toward Mrs. Clinton.

Yet overall, the voters have circled back to where they started. Daily news events, including the presidential debates, may appear to have a big impact on the election. "But in truth, everything that has happened up to now has left the voters in the same place," said Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who works on the Journal/NBC News poll.

Micah Roberts, a Republican pollster who helps guide the poll, said the results show that Mr. Trump's campaign hasn't accomplished one of its core goals.

"They had to make some chunk of voters more comfortable with a Donald Trump presidency. And these numbers show that hasn't happened," he said.

The share of voters with positive views of Mr. Trump has never topped 30% in Journal/NBC surveys this year, and voters by a nearly 2-to-1 margin say they would be uncertain and pessimistic about a Trump presidency, rather than optimistic and satisfied.

For her part, Mrs. Clinton has made some progress in improving her image. This summer, she trailed Mr. Trump by 16 percentage points on the question of which candidate was more honest and straightforward; now, she trails by only 4 points. That suggests that one of her biggest liabilities is receding.

But on the broadest measure of her image, Mrs. Clinton's standing is the same as in January. Half of voters view her unfavorably, and more than half say her election would leave them pessimistic and uncertain. Both measures are the same as at the start of the year.

To Mr. Hart, it comes as little surprise that neither candidate has succeeded in making more people enthusiastic about a Trump or Clinton presidency. "If you think the basic tenet of a campaign is to destroy your opponent, then in that case they have fulfilled their duties," he said.

That seemed to be a core mission of both candidates in Wednesday's debate. Mrs. Clinton, in particular, prosecuted a case against Mr. Trump's fitness for office, calling her opponent a "puppet" of the Russian government and saying that "he thinks belittling women makes him bigger." Mr. Trump, for his part, called his rival "a nasty woman" and said she had acted "criminally" in destroying emails.

Jeff Horwitt, a Democratic pollster who also works on the Journal/NBC poll, pointed out that Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton were household names well before they started their campaigns, a contrast with many prior nominees.

In January, he noted, nearly nine in 10 voters felt they knew enough about Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton to offer an opinion, positive or negative, in Journal/NBC News surveys.

Impressions of Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump "had already been formed over years, if not decades," Mr. Horwitt said. Such longstanding views can be hard to change.

Both Messrs. Roberts and Hart said the numbers paint an unhappy picture of the months to come.

"We're going to elect, no matter who it is, the most unpopular president in the history of polling going back to the '30s," Mr. Roberts said. "Whichever person takes office is going to have a heckuva time governing with these kinds of numbers."

The next challenge, Mr. Hart said, is for the winner "to unite the nation."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For a while Wednesday night, at the final presidential debate, Donald Trump was a more sedate and persuasive candidate, the one who calmly explains his positions while avoiding verbal fisticuffs.

Then his favorite topic -- building a wall to stop illegal **immigration** across the southern border -- came up, and Democrat Hillary Clinton said Mr. Trump met Mexico's president and failed to repeat face-to-face his demand that Mexico pay for building that wall. "He choked," she said.

At that point, the tenor of the evening changed. If Mrs. Clinton was baiting Mr. Trump, he took the bait. He considers himself a master counterpuncher, and he began punching back.

A familiar, nasty cloud descended over the conversation, and a kind of downward spiral began, until Mr. Trump said Mrs. Clinton shouldn't even have been allowed to run.

Then, stunningly, he refused to say he would honor the results of the election. "What I'm saying, I will tell you at the time," he said. "I will keep you in suspense."

That is unprecedented and will be the answer for which this debate will be remembered. It's also an answer that will leave other Republicans scrambling. They already had been distancing themselves from his earlier comments that voting would be "rigged." Casting doubt on the validity of voting is an invitation to the party's own supporters not to bother voting, other Republicans fear, and GOP and Democratic candidates alike hope to win in November in elections that are seen as fair and valid.

In sum, for a debate that had a refreshingly substantive start, the tense and nasty exchanges that led to that moment, and the ones that followed it, took the front seat. To that extent, it felt a bit like a repeat, and one that seemed unlikely to change the shape of the race -- which is to the advantage of Mrs. Clinton, the clear leader heading into the night.

Mr. Trump accused Mrs. Clinton of wanting to open the nation's borders and having criminally destroyed 33,000 emails from her private server. She, in turn, said he would be a Russian "puppet" who has encouraged the Kremlin to hack into the email systems of her supporters to influence the outcome of the election.

He accused her of running a "very sleazy campaign" that hired thugs to disrupt his campaign rallies. She said he has been discovered to be a predator to women and denied it by insulting women.

She said he is unqualified to have the codes to the country's nuclear weapons. He said she was responsible for the birth of Islamic State. She stayed on the attack, on his tax returns, on his use of **immigrant** labor and onward, and smiled as he responded. He grew angry and resumed interrupting her answers.

To anyone who has been listening, there was little new of substance. To the extent there was substance, both nominees appeared to be framing their arguments designed more to lock down their supporters than to expand their universe.

The two candidates entered the debate facing different but parallel strategic choices, reflecting both their relative standing in the polls and their potential paths through the remainder of the campaign.

For Mr. Trump, the question was whether to carry what amounts to his scorched-earth strategy -- bash Mrs. Clinton as corrupt and dishonest and proclaim that the election and the political process is rigged -- or pivot back to his populist economic message about lost jobs and bad trade deals. The latter approach might broaden out his appeal. But the former approach has ginned his base, and that along with dragging down Mrs. Clinton seem to be the primary goals of the Trump enterprise at this point.

Mrs. Clinton, by contrast, had to choose whether to duke it out with Mr. Trump on his terms, going on the attack on his personal flaws and answering his attacks in kind, or ignore that terrain and try to strike a more positive note in what was essentially her closing argument to voters. The positive note had some appeal to Clinton advisers. But the fear was that there also would be great danger in leaving Trump attacks unanswered.

In the end, each tried a bit of both approaches available to them.

It seems unlikely that the debate did little more than confirm the views of voters who already seem mostly locked in on their choices. Mr. Trump needed to shake up a race in which he is trailing, and Mrs. Clinton made clear she wasn't going to sit back and allow him to find an opening to do that.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Trump Organization is partnering with a developer on a Texas hotel project that seeks to tap a controversial program granting green cards to foreigners who invest in the U.S.

The federal EB-5 program gives up to 10,000 green cards a year to foreigners who invest at least $500,000 in U.S. businesses deemed to create at least 10 American jobs per investor.

The Republican presidential nominee's company is lending the Trump name to the 33-story luxury hotel and condominium development in downtown Austin, while its partner, Global Management Resources, would take charge of the construction, according to marketing materials reviewed by The Wall Street Journal.

Donald Trump has made tighter **immigration** control a pillar of his presidential campaign. He has also criticized China's trade and financial policies, blaming them for economic woes at home.

"Our growth strategy is to expand the Trump Hotels portfolio by strategically opening properties in key U.S. and international locations," said a representative for Trump Hotels, part of the Trump Organization.

The representative said the company hasn't invested its own capital in the Austin project, but remains interested from a brand and management standpoint. Global Management didn't respond to a request for comment.

The EB-5 program was created in 1990, and for much of its history was used by only a few hundred investors a year. But since 2008, developers have flocked to it as a form of low-cost loans for projects. Because many foreign investors are motivated primarily by the prospect of a green card -- not the financial investment -- they tend to accept below-market interest rates, meaning big savings for developers. A large majority of those investors in recent years have hailed from China, typically accounting for more than 80% of EB-5 visas.

At least $8.7 billion has been invested in the U.S. economy through the program since Oct. 1, 2012, and an estimated 35,140 jobs have been created for U.S. workers through foreign investment via EB-5, according to the **Immigrant** Investor Program Office at U.S. Citizenship and **Immigration** Services.

While some in Congress have criticized the program's premise -- giving green cards to wealthy investors -- other issues also have cast a cloud over the program in recent years. Some developers and middlemen who have raised money through the program have been alleged to be involved in fraudulent schemes.

The program also has become dominated by developers of projects in wealthy neighborhoods who are using a provision meant to aid economically ailing ones.

A study released Wednesday by the U.S. Government Accountability Office found just 12% of investment went to projects located in a census tract with an unemployment rate of at least 8%, even though those projects benefited from a provision earmarked for high-unemployment areas. A large chunk -- 36% -- was for projects in a tract with an unemployment rate of 4% or lower.

The program is due to expire in December, and lawmakers are clashing over proposed changes.

The entity pooling the EB-5 money for the $170 million Trump-branded hotel, Renewable Texas Energy Regional Center LLC, is seeking $40 million from 80 EB-5 investors. The center estimated the project will create 1,427 direct and indirect jobs.

Another Trump-branded project has applied for EB-5 funding: an apartment tower in Jersey City, N.J., being developed by Kushner Cos. and KABR Group. The chief executive of Kushner is Jared Kushner, who is married to Mr. Trump's daughter, Ivanka.

---

Josh Chin and Eliot Brown contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEVADA

Taco Truck Protest

Outside Trump Hotel

Republican nominee Donald Trump spent the night before the third presidential debate in one of his many homes away from home -- his Las Vegas hotel -- but not everyone was rolling out the welcome mat.

Anti-Trump protesters gathered outside the Trump Hotel Las Vegas on Wednesday morning alongside a line of seven taco trucks -- a "wall" to symbolize opposition to Mr. Trump's **immigration** policies, his presidential campaign and, of more local interest, his opposition to efforts by the Culinary Workers Union to organize the hotel staff.

The taco theme was a reference to Mr. Trump's effort to show support for the Cinco de Mayo holiday when he tweeted a picture of himself eating a taco bowl. Critics said that didn't make up for him once calling Mexican **immigrants** rapists and criminals.

Trump Hotel workers voted to join the Culinary Workers Union in December, but haven't been able to negotiate a contract with hotel management.

A coalition of Democratic, union and liberal groups -- including American Bridge, a Washington, D.C., opposition research group -- also sent 40 taco trucks around the city to register voters Tuesday, the last day to register in Nevada.

-- Janet Hook

---

VOTING

RNC Sends Reminder

On 'Ballot Security'

The Republican National Committee asked members to avoid election-related "ballot security" activities such as poll watching in their capacity as Republican Party officers, citing a decades-old court settlement restricting such activities by GOP officials.

As part of a 1982 settlement in a lawsuit brought by Democrats, the RNC agreed to curb its efforts to monitor and challenge voter eligibility at the polls, especially in districts where the racial or ethnic composition of the electorate could be a factor in the outcome.

RNC general counsel John Ryder wrote to members on Wednesday to "remind you of the restrictions placed on the RNC by the consent decree."

The RNC membership is made up of 168 state party representatives, three from each state and territory.

The reminder from the RNC could complicate GOP candidate Donald Trump's efforts to recruit election observers to monitor polling places for intimidation. Though an RNC official said the decree doesn't apply to campaigns or state parties, no committee resources can be used on those efforts.

Mr. Trump's campaign didn't respond to a request for comment.

-- Byron Tau
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON -- Prime Minister Theresa May heads to her first Brussels summit of European Union leaders on Thursday as she wrestles to balance demands at home on how to extract the U.K. from the bloc.

With only a thin majority in Parliament, the premier faces a vociferous group of euroskeptic lawmakers in her party that seeks certainty that she is pursuing a hard break with the EU and that Britain will regain control over its borders. But she also is trying not to **alienate** the vast number of businesses calling for minimal disturbance to Britain's trade relations with EU partners.

Several senior diplomats said other leaders at the summit will be looking to Mrs. May to clarify her recent remarks at the Conservative Party conference, which have been interpreted in Europe as setting Britain on course for a hard break from the bloc and a loosening of economic ties.

Mrs. May plans to lay out her broad approach for taking Britain out of the EU over dinner with the other leaders Thursday, according to a Downing Street official.

But at home, she has resisted giving a running commentary on her approach to the negotiations, which she said she intends to open before the end of March.

Her approach of centralizing decision making and relying on a close-knit circle of advisers has **alienated** officials in some departments and exacerbated differences between members of her cabinet, officials say.

In a committee hearing Wednesday, Chancellor of the Exchequer Philip Hammond said the U.K. must ensure it protects its economy while seeking to sharply cut **immigration**.

"The central trade-off would be around the European Union's negotiating position -- and it is their clearly stated negotiating position -- that access for goods and services to the market is linked inextricably . . . to freedom of movement," he said.

Since coming to office three months ago, Mrs. May has reaped high approval ratings by pledging to crack down on **immigration**. Yet a key EU principle allows its citizens to live and work in any member state, and countries must abide by this rule to have access to the bloc's single market.

Some banks are increasing their lobbying efforts amid fears their right to sell services across the EU could be cut, bank executives say.

---

Laurence Norman contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ALLEX, France -- President Francois Hollande's plan to resolve the Calais migrant crisis is sowing social unrest across the country as dozens of towns brace for the arrival of refugees by the busloads.

By the end of the year -- and as early as this month -- Mr. Hollande plans to transfer thousands of migrants from the blighted port to shelters in far-flung corners of France.

The goal is to dismantle the "Jungle," a sprawling migrant camp skirting the port that has become a symbol of Europe's failure to manage the flow of migrants across its borders from conflict zones in Syria, Afghanistan and beyond. Waves of migrants seeking passage to the U.K. have become bottled up in the port on the French side of the English Channel, living in sordid conditions and hurting the local economy.

For people living in towns and villages such as Allex, a close-knit hilltop community of 2,500 people in Provence, the relocation plan threatens to spread the crisis in Calais to corners of France untouched by the migrant flow.

"We won't let our town become another Calais," said a 45-year-old mason and father of three. The man joined a hundred other townspeople who recently marched through Allex to protest the arrival of 50 migrants at a chateau the government converted into a shelter.

The anti-**immigrant** National Front party and other right-wing politicians are seizing on the public anger to build support ahead of presidential elections in May, organizing referendums and petitioning mayors to stop the spread of "mini-Calais."

At times, the opposition has turned violent. In September, a shelter located in a bedroom community outside Paris was flooded and set on fire. Earlier this month, police found bullet holes in buildings slated to host migrants in two towns.

So far, the government isn't backing down, insisting the political firestorm won't affect its plans. "We keep local officials informed of our plans, but we're not asking for their opinion," Housing Minister Emmanuelle Cosse said. The government hasn't disclosed the complete list of towns and cities set to receive migrants for fear of new acts of violence, officials say.

Previous attempts to solve the Calais crisis have failed as migrants continued flocking to the port, which serves as continental Europe's main gateway to the U.K. Since March 2016, the British government has accepted 96 minors who have family in the U.K. But it has declined to take in large numbers of migrants camped in Calais and has financed the construction of security fences in French territory to keep refugees from crossing the channel.

"Instead of solving the problem with the British, the government is spreading it across the country," said Nicolas Sarkozy, the former French president who is seeking his conservative party's nomination to return to France's highest office next year.

France has offered asylum to many of the refugees in the camp over the past year, but many have refused, clinging to their dreams of reaching the U.K., where family and a more flexible economy awaits. When France began dismantling the southern rim of the Jungle in February, newcomers simply crammed into the northern part of the camp. Since then, Calais has become the scene of smuggling, routine clashes among migrants, and fatal highway accidents caused by migrants sneaking onto U.K.-bound trucks.

Such scenes have startled residents in Allex. "The migrants won't integrate," said Guy Raspolini, a 74-year-old resident of Algerian descent.

Last month, a crowd of 150 people took to the town's streets, brandishing National Front banners and anti-**immigration** slogans. A competing rally of pro-migrant marchers squared off with them, forcing police to intervene. "I had never seen anything like that," Mayor Gerard Crozier said.

Weeks later, a first group of 11 migrants from Iraq, Afghanistan and Sudan, including two women and three young children arrived at the Chateau Pergaud, a small castle that once served as a detox center.

Three police officers were posted outside, and the migrants were instructed to avoid the village center for their own safety.

"When they need to go grocery shopping, we drive them to another nearby town," says Jean-Jacques Bosc of the Diaconat Protestant, the association that runs the center.

Mr. Crozier called for a referendum on whether the town should accept the migrants, but the government obtained a court order to block the vote.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Barring an unprecedented comeback during the final three weeks of the campaign, Donald Trump's insurgent bid for the presidency will fall short. It is not too early to wonder what the Republican Party will do in the wake of his defeat, its third consecutive quadrennial loss.

No Republican will ever try harder than Mr. Trump has to make working-class white voters the centerpiece of a majority coalition. His no-holds barred effort to mobilize them has offended minority voters as well as the more educated white voters who have long supported more mainstream conservative candidates. If current trends continue, he will register single-digit support among African-Americans, he will underperform Mitt Romney's woeful showing among Latinos, and he will lose to Hillary Clinton among college-educated women.

Underlying these results are deep structural tensions. On economics, today's Republicans are -- like Caesar's Gaul -- divided into three parts. Establishment conservatives reflect the interests of corporate America. They favor free trade, **immigration** reform, and well-targeted public investment. They are broadly internationalist and mostly support the treaties and institutions through which the United States exercises global influence.

They believe in climate change and can live with reasonable measures to abate it. They want corporate tax reform, but not at the expense of provisions in the current code that benefit their economic sectors. They would like individual tax reform but already can use the current code to minimize their effective tax rate. They believe in "entitlement reform" but would accept revenue increases along with it -- the ever-elusive "grand bargain" at the heart of blue-ribbon commissions.

Second come the small-town, small-government conservatives who channel the anxieties and antipathies of the National Federation of Independent Businessand whose sentiments pervade the Paul Ryan-House Republican manifesto, "A Better Way." They believe -- passionately -- that government is the principal obstacle to growth. They insist on major tax cuts, especially in the individual code through which their unincorporated businesses are taxed, and fervently reject any new taxes.

They favor reductions in domestic spending (especially welfare), structural changes in Medicare and Medicaid, and an all-out assault on the regulatory state. Compared to their corporate brethren, their outlook is more nationalist. They mostly depend on the domestic market rather than exports and frown on institutions such as the Export-Import Bank, which they regard as corporate welfare. They are not invited to meetings at Davos.

And lastly, we reach the populist conservatives, many of them working class, about whom so much has been written in this election cycle. They mistrust all large institutions, especially the federal government, but they do not have an ideological preference for smaller government. They depend on costly programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Disability Insurance and stand to benefit from the expanded infrastructure investments that Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton have proposed.

They see large corporations as indifferent, even hostile, to their interests and concerns. They view the world outside the United States more as a threat than an opportunity. So they oppose trade agreements as well as large **immigration** flows and are suspicious of the obligations that alliances such as NATO impose on the U.S. Like Mr. Trump, they regard such arrangements, on balance, as burdens rather than benefits. For them, "America First" is more than a slogan; it is a demand.

Despite the hostility between Paul Ryan and Mr. Trump, it is just possible to see how small-government conservatives and populist conservatives might make common cause. The small-government advocates could make their peace with Social Security and phase in changes to Medicare slowly enough to convince the populists, many of whom are near retirement age, that they have nothing to fear. Over time, they might be able to smooth the rough edges off the ethno-nationalism that has disfigured the Trump campaign and repelled so many Americans. Issues such as trade and **immigration** would remain points of contention, but focusing on border security and tougher enforcement of existing trade agreements could make the tensions manageable.

It is harder to see how establishment conservatives can find a place within this coalition. Their policy agenda contradicts the demands of the populists, and their outlooks are antithetical. They know that their long-term success depends on the kinds of public investments that small government conservatives shun -- and the economic internationalism that populists abhor. Having abandoned the bipartisanship they espoused after World War II and casting their lot with the Republican Party, they find their influence shrinking among the kinds of conservatives who have come to dominate the GOP.

As working-class white voters left the Democrats after the 1960s, Republicans won them over with appeals to cultural traditionalism and American exceptionalism. It was a low-cost acquisition. Now, with the hollowing-out of the manufacturing sector on which working class communities depended, the bill -- a balloon payment -- has come due.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**We Wanted Workers

By George J. Borjas

(Norton, 238 pages, $26.95)

Aside from a couple of brief allusions, Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton have skimmed over **immigration** reform in the presidential debates so far. Mr. Trump hasn't mentioned his Great Wall of the Rio Grande. Hillary hasn't repeated her earlier promises to defy Congress if need be and grant unilateral amnesty to large numbers of illegals. We'll see what surprises tonight's debate brings.

The omissions, though, have not been unwelcome. The position of neither candidate reflects a thought-out approach to this rankling issue. Anyone looking for more substance could do worse than to pick up "We Wanted Workers," a readable and detailed historical tour of America's **immigration** debates and policies by Harvard economist George J. Borjas. Agree or disagree with his conclusions, the reader will encounter a level of seriousness that has been lacking in this campaign year.

Mr. Borjas is himself an **immigrant**, having at age 12 fled from Cuba to Miami with his widowed mother in 1962, just before the Cuban Missile Crisis shut down legal exits. As a labor economist, he has spent much of his academic career studying the effects of **immigration** on the American jobs market, often arguing that **immigration** depresses wages, or job opportunities, at the lower end of the scale. Here he notes that, on balance, the added production supplied by **immigrants** makes a modest contribution to U.S. economic growth. He generously provides readers with arguments on all sides, including Milton Friedman's wry observation that illegal **immigrants** are of more net benefit to the American economy than legals because they make less use of welfare-state services.

Mr. Borjas takes a gentle dig at this newspaper's editorials urging more liberal **immigration** laws, saying that such arguments don't take sufficient account of social costs. He offers a fanciful economic model of the borderless world envisioned in the John Lennon song "Imagine." With all barriers down, he estimates, global GDP would soar 60%, or $40 trillion. But the net gain would be only $28.1 trillion because to take full advantage of a borderless world would include the considerable expense of moving 5.6 trillion people from the unproductive "south" to the productive "north."

This tongue-in-cheek fantasy is meant as a put-down of the theoretical view of **immigrants** as merely productive robots, not actual human beings who make decisions, use public services and sometimes create social conflicts. The economic benefits from their production, in short, come with costs. The author observes that the wave of **immigrants** to the U.S. that began in 1980 consisted of more low-skill workers than previous waves. Economic and social assimilation has been slower, particularly when newcomers settle in **immigrant** enclaves, where they feel little pressure to adapt to a new culture.

Citing another, real-life economic model, Mr. Borjas asserts that low-skill **immigrants** put downward pressure on the wages of low-skill natives: "A 10% increase in the number of workers in a particular skill group probably lowers the wage of that group by at least 3 percent." That claim is plausible, but the predicated 10% rise implies a concentration of **immigrants** that may exist in only a few localities. It seems a rather simplistic model from which to draw the generalization, as Mr. Borjas does, that the wage effects of **immigration** bring about a half-trillion-dollar wealth transfer from low-skill workers to their employers, who profit from the lower labor costs. A study released in September by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine could find little impact of **immigration** on the wages and employment opportunities of non-**immigrant** Americans.

After totting up the pluses and minuses, Mr. Borjas concludes that **immigration** has very little effect on the lives of most Americans. He does worry, however, that some future wave might bring along with it the "institutional, cultural and political baggage that may have hampered development in the poor countries" from which **immigrants** often come, and he sees a need for reforms.

Indeed, but what kind? The last major reform, the 1986 Simpson-Mazzoli Act, attempted to transfer enforcement of **immigration** laws to private employers by imposing fines on businesses that failed to confirm that their new hires were legal residents. As the author notes, the law gave rise to a black market in counterfeit birth certificates, green cards and passports. Employers had little inclination to try to find out if the credentials of would-be dishwashers or field workers were valid. Mr. Borjas's proposal to crack down harder on employers sounds like trying still more of a policy that didn't work.

"We Wanted Workers" acknowledges in its title that the post-1980 wave came about because of the rising demand for labor in a flourishing economy. But Mr. Borjas could have given greater attention to why Simpson-Mazzoli's rigidities limited the supply, opening the door, so to speak, to illegals. Farmers since 1986 have often been short on workers to harvest seasonal crops. Mr. Borjas argues that native labor is available to employers willing to pay more, but he doesn't make a convincing case. The reader may well conclude that there should be a greater provision for guest-worker programs and other measures that allow workers to come and go legally as the market demands.

Mr. Borjas ends his tour with a refreshing remark seldom heard from an economist. "Amazingly enough, sometimes inaction is the best action. And benign neglect of this sensitive issue is probably best as long as we take concurrent steps to ensure that we need not revisit this problem in the future with an even larger undocumented population." Many studies show that the illegal population has been steady at about 11 million for the past seven years and that Mexicans, on balance, are going home. So, really, what's all the fuss about?

---

Mr. Melloan, a former columnist and deputy editor of the Journal editorial page, has written a book on the Great Depression to be published next month by Threshold Editions, an imprint of Simon & Schuster.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Some conservatives have watched their evaluations of Donald Trump's character drop so low in recent days that on this vital question they no longer see a choice between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Accordingly, they are forced back onto politics and policy; and naturally Mr. Trump wins in a walk. If conservatives who argue that Mr. Trump is worse than Mrs. Clinton had a case, it would be a relief to vote for Mrs. Clinton or for no one. But they don't, and one is therefore forced for the good of the nation to vote for Mr. Trump.

In his Mr. Nauseating video of last weekend, Mr. Trump showed us that he had all the class and cool of a misbegotten 12-year-old boy. Yet the video taught us nothing; no one had ever mistaken him for anything but an infantile vulgarian. This week's allegations of actual abuse are different. If these stories are true (and I don't know why they shouldn't be), there is nothing to be said for Mr. Trump. Unfortunately, there is nothing to be said for Mrs. Clinton either. If we don't take both facts into account, we are not morally serious.

Mrs. Clinton has nothing on Mr. Trump when it comes to character. She lies ("Wipe? Like with a cloth?" -- cute and charming Mrs. C.) the way basketball stars shoot baskets -- constantly, nonstop, because it's the one thing she is best at and (naturally) it gives her pleasure to hear herself lie -- swish! -- right onto the evening news. And her specialist talent of all is the verbal kick in the groin of a Secret Service man or state trooper who has the nerve to talk to her as if she were merely human. She is no mere rock star; she is Hillary the Queen. She is so big, and you are so small, she can barely even see you from up there. What are you? A macromolecule?

I'll vote for Mr. Trump -- grimly. But there is no alternative, no shadow of a responsible alternative.

Mr. Trump's candidacy is a message from the voters. He is the empty gin bottle they have chosen to toss through the window. The message begins with the fact that voters hear what the leaders and pundits don't: the profound contempt for America and Americans that Mrs. Clinton and President Obama share and their frightening lack of emotional connection to this nation and its people.

Mr. Obama is arch, patronizing, so magnificently weary of having to explain it all, again and again, to the dummies surrounding him. Mrs. Clinton has told us proudly how thoroughly she prepared for the first debate and has prepared to be president. For her, it is all a matter of learning your lines. Her whole life has been memorized in advance. Mr. Obama is at least sincere. Mrs. Clinton is as phony as a three-dollar bill, as a Clinton Global Initiative.

Mr. Obama has governed like a third-rate tyrant. He's been a stern baby sitter to an American public that is increasingly getting on his nerves. ObamaCare and the Iran treaty are his big achievements. That the public has always disliked them, and hates them worse as it knows them better, strikes him as so unspeakably irrelevant; he doesn't know whether to laugh or cry. Do you ask 6-year-olds if they like going to school? Luckily, a few grown-ups have been set over the public to keep it in line.

Mrs. Clinton couldn't agree more. Policy is for smart people, who are people of the left by definition -- leftists having scored all those big successes over the years in foreign policy, race relations, policing, restarting wounded economies, making unsecured loans, running school systems and so on. On topics from Keystone to Guantanamo, Mr. Obama has made it clear that he doesn't give a damn what people think -- he no longer even tries to explain to the citizenry. Do your homework! Understand?

Yes, leadership sometimes requires that you take an unpopular position and make it popular. We are told that Mr. Obama is working on his "legacy" instead, as if that makes him farsighted instead of irresponsible and insanely vain. Presidents are supposed to run the country, not worry about their reputation in coming centuries.

Trump voters have noticed that, not just over Mr. Obama's term but in recent decades, their own opinions have grown increasingly irrelevant. It's something you feel, like encroaching numbness. Since when has the American public endorsed affirmative action? Yet it's a major factor in the lives of every student and many workers. Since when did we decide that men and women are interchangeable in hand-to-hand combat on the front lines? Why do we insist on women in combat but not in the NFL? Because we take football seriously. That's no joke; it's the sad truth.

Did we invite the federal bureaucracy to take charge of school bathrooms? I guess I missed that meeting. The schools are corrupt and the universities rotten to the core, and everyone has known it since the 1980s. But the Democrats are owned by the teachers unions, and Republicans have made only small-scale corrections to a system that needs to be ripped out and carefully disposed of, like poison ivy.

The Emasculated Voter to whom no one pays any attention is the story of modern democracy. Instead of putting voters in charge, we tell them they're in charge, and it's just as good. That's the Establishment's great discovery in the Lois Lerner Age.

Enter Mr. Trump. People say he became a star because he just happened to mention an issue that just happened to catch on. But **immigration** is the central issue of our time. Trump voters zeroed in because they saw what most intellectuals didn't. What is our nation and what will it be? Will America go on being America or turn into something else? That depends on who lives here -- especially given our schools, which no longer condescend to teach Americanism.

The liberal theory is that, other things being equal, all human beings have an equal right to settle in America. For liberals this is too obvious to spell out. But it is also too ludicrous to defend. Does all mankind have a right to camp in your backyard, eat in your kitchen, work at your office and borrow your best jogging outfit? We fail in our duty if we don't think carefully whom we want in this country, who would be best for America.

Furthermore, we know that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." But that's got nothing to do with **immigration**; freedom of religion means freedom for American citizens -- what else could it possibly mean? We must not tamper with Americans' religious life. We must not admit, as possible future citizens, anyone we don't choose to; anyone we don't think will be good for America. Not to admit Muslims is bad policy but it does not violate freedom of religion and the American people have a perfect right to discuss and debate it.

Hold on, some of my fellow conservatives say. Never mind Hillary. Trump would be dangerous. He would further endanger our national security and world position. He might start unnecessary wars. He might even push the nuclear button. These are important objections, but after thinking them through I'm unable to take them seriously, either in political terms or psychological ones.

Mrs. Clinton is right at home in the Oval Office and thinks she owns it. She holds herself entitled to supreme power, as her friends are entitled to fancy positions with enormous salaries and her followers to secure government jobs or ample government funds, as the case may be.

But forget psychology. Ordinary politics says that Mr. Trump will not do crazy things or go off half-cocked, because Republicans in Congress will be eager to impeach him and put Mike Pence in charge. That was the subtext of the vice-presidential debate, though Mr. Pence himself (probably) didn't intend it. When it's my turn, you can all relax. Democrats, obviously, will be eager to help when the task is removing a Republican.

Impeachment is Trump-voters' ace in the hole. It's an abnormal measure, but this is an abnormal year. Impeachment has temporarily dropped out of sight because of special circumstances. Republicans impeached Bill Clinton but got burned in the process; Mr. Obama, as the first black president, was impeachment-proof. Any other president would have encountered serious impeachment talk on several occasions, especially when he ignored Congress and the Constitution and made his own personal treaty-in-all-but-name with Iran.

But Mr. Trump will not have Mr. Obama's advantages -- to say the least. Mr. Trump will be impeachment bait. So will Mrs. Clinton. Even some Democrats have had enough.

Nothing can stop Mr. Trump from shooting off his mouth, but that's all right. I want America's enemies off-balance and guessing. For eight years it's been Humiliate America season -- buzz our ships, capture and embarrass our men, murder an American ambassador -- a resoundingly successful attempt to spit in our faces and tell each one of us to drop dead. Thanks, Mr. President. Enough is enough. You know that Hillary is Obama Part III. We can't let that happen. Parts I and II have brought us close enough to catastrophe.

That is the problem for those whose integrity or nobility won't allow them to vote for Mr. Trump despite their dislike of Mrs. Clinton. There is only one way to take part in protecting this nation from Hillary Clinton, and that is to vote for Donald Trump. A vote for anyone else or for no one might be an honest, admirable gesture in principle, but we don't need conscientious objectors in this war for the country's international standing and hence for the safety of the world and the American way of life. It's too bad one has to vote for Mr. Trump. It will be an unhappy moment at best.

But when all is said and done, it's no big deal of a sacrifice for your country. I can think of bigger ones.

---

Mr. Gelernter is a professor of computer science at Yale.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: Emasculated Voters Get What They Deserve" -- WSJ Oct. 20, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX -- Seated at his desk overlooking this city's downtown, Sheriff Joe Arpaio brandished his silver flip-phone as it rang with a Frank Sinatra tune. "I have regrets, but too few to mention," Mr. Arpaio said, misquoting the song "My Way," but stating a central theme of his campaign: he won't do much differently if re-elected.

But after 24 years as Maricopa County sheriff -- during which he won nationwide fame for his tough treatment of inmates and aggressive pursuit of illegal **immigrants** -- Mr. Arpaio's pledge to keep doing things his way has become a tenuous strategy in his bid for a seventh term. At age 84, he is in a political fight to hold on to his job.

A lawsuit accusing the sheriff's department of racial profiling against Latinos has cost taxpayers here more than $40 million, and counting, in legal fees and other expenses. Federal prosecutors said Tuesday they would charge Mr. Arpaio with criminal-contempt of court for defying a judge's order to stop conducting his signature **immigration** patrols.

The state's growing Latino population has lined up against him, eager to show his uncompromising style can no longer win in a changing Arizona.

Polls have shown him trailing his Democratic opponent, Paul Penzone, a former sergeant with the Phoenix Police Department, by around 4 points. And Democrats believe they might never have a better opportunity to unseat Mr. Arpaio, a Republican, than this November.

"There has just been a constant deterioration at the sheriff's department," Mr. Penzone said. "The community is tired of him, and they're tired of this nonsense."

Mr. Arpaio -- who beat Mr. Penzone by 6 points four years ago -- scoffed at the idea that this is his toughest race yet.

"Really?" he said. "People must like something I'm doing, because I keep getting re-elected over and over again."

Mr. Arpaio has attacked Mr. Penzone in television commercials, and staged press events at "tent city," the makeshift jail he erected in 1993 to ease overcrowding, where he houses inmates outside under the punishing Arizona sun. He has stumped for Donald Trump around the country and appeared with the GOP presidential nominee in Arizona.

But Mr. Trump's embattled campaign may also cause trouble for Mr. Arpaio, particularly with the growing Latino population here. A coalition of Latino organizations say they have registered over 100,000 new voters this year. The tough **immigration** rhetoric from Messrs. Trump and Arpaio is motivating many first-time voters, organizers said.

The policies that have angered **immigrant** communities have made Mr. Arpaio a revered figure for many conservatives, who see him as one of only a few politicians willing to stand up to the federal government. Supporters across the country have donated to Mr. Arpaio's campaign, helping him raise over $10 million. Mr. Penzone had raised less than $500,000 by late September.

In an interview, Mr. Arpaio played to his image as an old-fashioned lawman, repeatedly touting his 55 years in law enforcement. He referred to a typewriter at his desk as "my computer," said he doesn't email (though he does tweet).

He suggested the criminal-contempt charges, which stemmed from the racial profiling case filed by the American Civil Liberties Union, were part of a politically motivated attack on him.

Mr. Penzone has tried to court Latinos while appealing to disgruntled Republicans, often focusing on Mr. Arpaio's legal troubles rather than policy differences. In an interview, he called tent city unsafe and, with the jails far below capacity right now, unnecessary. He stopped short of saying he would close the facility.

Mr. Arpaio shot back, "If it's no good, why didn't he say he'd close it? Because people love it, that's why."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In June, Duane Sigelko traded his workplace at a posh law office in Chicago for a dusty, overcrowded camp on the Greek island of Lesbos.

The attorney is among the dozens of international lawyers who have completed stints in Greece providing legal assistance to Syrian and other refugees seeking asylum. These attorneys, most of them from the U.S., have been volunteering on islands where some 10,000 desperate people await processing.

Mr. Sigelko assisted refugees who had been marooned for months in a squalid, razor-wire-enclosed camp. "They are bedraggled, weary. We can help them," said Mr. Sigelko, a partner at the law firm Reed Smith LLP, which launched the project in May with a Greek nonprofit called METAdrasi.

Hundreds of thousands of refugees and migrants from Syria and elsewhere have crossed the Aegean Sea from Turkey to Greece since last year, hoping to settle in Europe. In an attempt to stanch the flow, an accord between Turkey and the European Union bars migrants who arrived after March 20 from traveling onward. The deal calls for them to be returned to Turkey, but many have applied for asylum in hopes of staying.

The refugees' ability to file strong asylum cases has been hampered by the dearth of legal counsel. International lawyers can make a crucial difference by appearing with refugees in their initial screening, an admissibility hearing conducted in English by EU officers.

U.S. law firms have often done pro-bono work on **immigration** and human-rights issues. Wall Street lawyers, for example, are helping minors who fled gangs in Central America to apply for asylum in the U.S.

"Just watching in the media what was happening -- those terrible pictures of people drowning -- I really wanted to get involved," said Marty Rosenbluth, a North Carolina **immigration** attorney who spent six weeks in Lesbos this summer.

One of his most memorable cases involved a young couple who had fled Syria. The wife had pushed her wheelchair-bound husband -- a victim of torture at the hands of the Assad regime -- all the way to Turkey. "He couldn't walk because of electric shock and beatings on his feet," recalled Mr. Rosenbluth, who speaks Arabic.

When he met them, they were "distraught," Mr. Rosenbluth said, having been told by EU officials that their case would have to be split in two because she is Moroccan and they could not prove that they were married. The couple had lost their marriage certificate when their overloaded raft began to list, prompting everyone to throw their possessions overboard.

Mr. Rosenbluth helped the man win admission to Greece, on the understanding that his wife could join him later as a dependent. "They would have been completely lost at the hearing without our help," the lawyer said.

Via Skype, Mr. Rosenbluth has begun training other attorneys through Advocates Abroad, a U.S.-based nonprofit that is recruiting lawyers to assist refugees.

Reed Smith has enlisted lawyers from its U.S., U.K. and Greek offices, and has also reached out to other American attorneys versed in international law. Over the summer, teams of lawyers with interpreters completed rotations on the Greek islands of Lesbos, Samos and Chios.

Frustrations in the camps have often erupted into brawls. Early this month, a blaze -- widely thought to have been started by refugees to protest the slow processing of their cases -- ravaged the camp on Lesbos. The attorneys were back on the job within hours.

"All of our lawyers understand the risks in the field and are willing to assume those risks," said Jayne Fleming, a Reed Smith attorney who runs the firm's pro-bono program.

While explaining legal processes in August to refugees in the camp on Chios, Ms. Fleming spotted a young man with his arm in a sling and the "haunted look of a torture survivor," she recalled. Through an interpreter, she learned that a jihadist militia had chopped off his hand and beheaded one of his brothers. Ultimately, Ms. Fleming helped the man and his two surviving brothers gain admission to Greece -- a first step toward Canada or Germany, where they have relatives.

Even before the Lesbos fire, working conditions in the camps were rudimentary. "We never knew if we would have a place to sit," said Mr. Sigelko. He often worked under a blistering sun, waiting for hours with his clients outside hearing rooms when they were summoned for their interviews.

Holly Cooper of Davis, Calif., an attorney who volunteered on the island of Samos, said that she held meetings with refugees inside the shipping containers that house them. It was "really eye-opening to see migration that is very different from ours," she said.

Back in the U.S., Ms. Cooper posted on Facebook about her experience in Greece -- and said that she has been "bombarded with interest" from other American lawyers.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Son of Italy

By Pascal D'Angelo (1924)

1. 'Son of Italy' is one of the hidden gems of American **immigrant** autobiography. When D'Angelo arrived in New York in 1910, he discovered that life in America as a day laborer was harder than he had imagined. "Everywhere was toil -- endless, continuous toil, in the flooding blaze of the sun, or in the slashing rain -- toil." Yet while his compatriots aspired to save money and return to Italy, D'Angelo felt an insatiable urge "to cry out my hopes and dreams" through poetry. In 1919 he quit his job at a New Jersey rail yard (where he lived in an abandoned boxcar) and moved to Brooklyn to write. In 1922, Columbia Prof. Carl Van Doren discovered D'Angelo while reading entries to a poetry contest. Van Doren did not award D'Angelo a prize but helped him get his poems published and urged him to write an autobiography. "Son of Italy" briefly made D'Angelo a celebrity, but the public soon lost interest in "the pick and shovel poet," and his memoir is all but forgotten today. He died a half-crazed pauper at age 38.

From Plotzk to Boston

By Mary Antin (1899)

2. Mary Antin was a literary prodigy. She originally wrote these recollections of her childhood in what is now Belarus and her journey to America in Yiddish at age 13. A few years later, she translated them into English, and "From Plotzk to Boston" was published when she was just 18. It conveys the hardships of the Old World and the "America fever" that swept Europe around 1900 with a concise candor that perhaps only a 13-year-old can muster. "'America' was in everybody's mouth," Antin writes. "Business men talked of it over their accounts; the market women made up their quarrels that they might discuss it from stall to stall; people who had relatives in the famous land went around reading their letters for the enlightenment of less fortunate folks." Her terror at being deloused at a German border checkpoint, and her ecstatic joy upon sighting land as her ship approached Boston, are as moving today as they were a century ago.

The Making of an American

By Jacob Riis (1901)

3. The story of Riis's rise from impoverished **immigrant** to renowned journalist and photographer was so extraordinary that even Horatio Alger might have found it far-fetched. Trained as a carpenter, Riis left Denmark not because of poverty or persecution but because of a broken heart. He tried his hand at dozens of different jobs until, through sheer force of will, he managed to break into journalism. As a police reporter for the New York Tribune, Riis found that the rundown tenements he had briefly inhabited in the early 1870s had become squalid deathtraps by the late 1880s as the city filled with Italian and Eastern European Jewish **immigrants**. "The sights I saw . . . gripped my heart until I felt that I must tell of them, or burst, or turn anarchist, or something." When Riis's reporting garnered little attention, he took up photography to document the condition of the tenements so that the plight of their inhabitants could not be ignored. Publication of these images in "How the Other Half Lives" (1890) ushered in generations of tenement reform and urban renewal. "The Making of an American" recounts the story of an **immigrant** whose career changed the lives of millions of other newcomers. When he died in 1914, Theodore Roosevelt called him "the ideal American citizen."

Angela's Ashes

By Frank McCourt (1996)

4. Strictly speaking, Frank McCourt was not an **immigrant**. He was born in New York to Irish parents who had arrived in America on the eve of the Great Depression. With Frank's ne'er-do-well alcoholic father unable to support the family, they moved back to Ireland when he was 4. "My father and mother should have stayed in New York," McCourt writes, for his childhood was far harder in Limerick than it would have been in America. "Worse than the ordinary miserable childhood is the miserable Irish childhood, and worse yet is the miserable Irish Catholic childhood." Somehow he survived the hunger, the epidemics, and the sadism of "pompous priests" and "bullying schoolmasters." When he finally moved back to New York at age 19, his sense of exhilaration was as boundless as that of any true **immigrant**. After "Angela's Ashes" appeared, some of McCourt's surviving neighbors from Limerick insisted that the book overstated his poverty. Even so, it is no exaggeration to call it one of the most moving American memoirs ever written.

The Woman Warrior

By Maxine Hong Kingston (1976)

5. Maxine Hong Kingston, the daughter of Chinese **immigrants**, provides an intimate, hauntingly beautiful glimpse into the lives of Chinese-born Americans in the 1960s and '70s -- especially the inner worlds of Chinese **immigrant** women of that era. In China, her mother and aunts told her, "spirits shimmered among the live creatures, balanced and held in equilibrium by time and land. But one human being flaring up into violence could open up a black hole, a maelstrom that pulled in the sky." Even after moving thousands of miles to the United States, **immigrants** went to great lengths to confuse these gods by "diverting their curses, misleading them with crooked streets and false names. . . . The Chinese I know hide their names; sojourners take new names when their lives change and guard their real names with silence."

---

Mr. Anbinder is the author of 'City of Dreams: The 400-Year Epic History of **Immigrant** New York.'
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON -- The main legal challenge over Brexit kicked off in a packed courtroom Thursday, as pressure mounted on the British government to give lawmakers a vote on how the U.K.'s withdrawal from the European Union will be carried out.

The case marks the most significant effort by opponents since the Brexit referendum, as they argue that though voters chose to leave the bloc, Parliament should have a say in the talks on what the future EU-U.K. relationship will look like.

In a sign of how the issue has divided the country, noisy protesters on both sides gathered outside the U.K. High Court as proceedings began.

At the heart of the case is whether the Conservative-led government has the authority to unilaterally trigger the formal mechanism for leaving the EU, known as Article 50, without prior approval from Parliament.

The complex case -- brought by British citizens with the help of some of the U.K.'s top constitutional lawyers -- is complicating things for U.K. Prime Minister Theresa May, who has said she plans to invoke Article 50 by the end of March.

Mrs. May has taken a hard line on terms of the U.K.'s deal with the EU, pledging to prioritize the right to curb **immigration** over access to the bloc's tariff-free single market. At a debate called by the opposition Labour Party on Wednesday, lawmakers criticized the government over what they said was its lack of transparency.

If the challenge succeeds, the government could be forced to introduce legislation on leaving the EU, giving lawmakers opposed to Brexit a chance to steer the country toward a "softer" exit, with more ties to the bloc and a more open **immigration** policy.

The court could rule in weeks, but legal experts say it is likely to refer the case to the Supreme Court, which could hear the case by the end of the year.

The government says it has the right to leave because of the so-called royal prerogative, whereby executive authority is given to ministers so they can govern on the monarch's behalf.

Lawyers representing the government also say Mrs. May has a responsibility to carry out the wishes of the people as expressed in the June vote.

But the claimants argue that triggering Article 50 without parliamentary consent would effectively override a 1972 statute that enshrines European law in the U.K. and which the claimants say ensures rights that can be removed only by Parliament.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Oh my God, I swear I will leave you right here," says an exasperated Laura Wells (Laura Dern) to her whining client and unwelcome passenger, Fuller (Jared Harris), who, in the wake of an unfavorable legal opinion, has expressed a wish to kill everyone with a machine gun and see his wife wreck her car on the highway.

In his defense, Fuller has suffered a head injury. Which really doesn't differentiate him much from the other men in director Kelly Reichardt's "Certain Women."

The aforementioned is actually one of the noisier moments in the film. Based on the short stories of Maile Meloy and set in the author's native Montana, "Certain Women" is full of silences both natural and uncomfortable, and possesses a sense of visual despair that recalls Edward Hopper. Like Ms. Reichardt's other movies (among them the celebrated "Old Joy" and the unsuccessful "Night Moves") it rests on performances that are internalized tours de force. Ms. Dern, an underappreciated national treasure, is wryly resolute as Laura the lawyer, who is sleeping with another woman's husband, has a nut for a client, and at one point is sent by a clueless sheriff (John Getz) into an office building where Fuller has taken a hostage. The ever-magnetic Michelle Williams, a Reichardt regular, is an iron-willed, would-be Montana home builder -- married to Laura's lover, played by James Le Gros -- ruthlessly intent on obtaining some heritage blocks of sandstone from a local with dementia (Rene Auberjonois). The mutely poetic Lily Gladstone is Jamie, who wanders into a class on education law taught by a stressed-out attorney named Beth Travis (Kristen Stewart) and falls a little in love.

The film, which got an enthusiastic reception at the Toronto Film Festival this year, has been described as being about the characters' intersecting lives, but that seems precisely not the point. The lives have things in common -- a place, a man, a parking lot -- but these details don't really propel the various narratives, and the fact that they don't further punctuates the separateness of the stories and the people involved, rendering them even more solitary, existentially unsettled and reflective of the vast and generally inhospitable landscape that stretches out around them. Ms. Reichardt gets performances out of all her cast that are lovely, even revelatory, though Ms. Stewart should by now be recognized as one of our finer screen actresses.

Viewers could impose a degree of their own reality on "Certain Women" -- there's enough air around the stories and the women for interpretation, as well as a score by Jeff Grace that shimmers, and fine cinematography by Christopher Blauvelt. But the characters are really minimalist masterpieces, sculpted, polished and uncompromisingly female. "I wonder what they thought," asks Gina (Ms. Williams), recalling the coyotes who howled the night before. We can't imagine a man asking that question. Ms. Reichardt lets us draw our own conclusions.

'Desierto'

Even people who run the Oscars will concede that the process of picking Best Foreign Film nominees is a hot mess. Countries not only get to make their own submissions, they determine who makes the choices and how -- politics, invariably, becoming part of the process. Just this year in Brazil, for instance, the selection has been split by the presidential recall, revealing ugly divisions and an eagerness by the Brazilian film industry to shoot itself in the foot.

In "Desierto," the 2017 Mexican Oscar selection. Directed by Jonas Cuaron, son and collaborator of one of his country's most successful filmmakers, Alfonso Cuaron, it's a nail-biter, a solid thriller, an **immigration**-themed takeoff on that old chestnut "The Most Dangerous Game," in which humans are both predator and prey. It's not particularly nuanced. In fact, its lack of nuance is its most distinguishing characteristic.

In what has become at least a trope and perhaps a cliche, a truckload of Mexicans is being smuggled across the border into what one assumes is Arizona (shooting was done on the arid moonscape of Baja California Sur). The truck breaks down, and the passengers are forced to slog an unplanned-for number of miles on foot, putting them in the crosshairs -- literally -- of one angry American. His name, though it never comes up, is Sam.

What do we know about Sam (Jeffrey Dean Morgan)? Nothing as far as personal history. But everything about his position in the American political profile. His well-used, unwashed pickup has country music on the radio (old country, not that new stuff), a high-powered, scoped rifle on the gun rack, a police dog named Tracker in the passenger seat and a ragged Confederate flag on the antenna. A "Don't Tread on Me" sticker decorates a back window. His few utterances include "Welcome to the land of the free" as he guns down -- with an alarming, long-range accuracy that suggests his skills are ex-military, if not pure fantasy -- almost all the Mexicans he forces to run for their lives across a parched, treeless expanse of America.

There's more one could say about Sam -- he wears a scarf that resembles very much a kaffiyeh, for instance, and what that's supposed to signify is anyone's guess. (The dog, more explicitly, suggests concentration camps and Bull Connor.) He's trained his dog to kill, which is one of the more implausible aspects of the film but implies a premeditated bloodlust both distilled and refined. For some reason, he just can't manage, despite his unerring skill with miles-long, free-handed rifle shots, to gun down the very decent Moises, who is unfortunate enough to have been on that broken-down truck. But this is probably because Moises is played by Gael Garcia Bernal.

There are many good things to be said about "Desierto," but we've already said them -- the film is fast-paced, nerve-racking and makes effective, even emotional use of the landscape. Mr. Bernal is, as always, a charmer; Mr. Morgan brings scary life to a scary guy. But where many countries try to tailor their Oscar submissions to what's won before -- the sentimental, the romantic, or both -- Mexico, with "Desierto," is making a rude gesture to U.S. anti-**immigration**forces and is gambling that liberal Hollywood will take the bait. The rest of us may wish the bait weren't quite so obvious or based on what seems to be a recurring Mexican nightmare. (Last year's release "La Jaula de Oro" told a similar story.) There have been reports of vigilante murder along the border but, for the record, a spokesman for U.S. Customs and Border Protection said that the agency "is unaware of any such events as you describe and the sport-shooting of humans anywhere is against the law."

'The Accountant'

There's probably a joke to be made about Ben Affleck playing a character who can't express emotions, but we're not making it here. "The Accountant," which stars Mr. Affleck as a math savant/marksman/martial artist who uncooks books and kicks backsides, is an effective and even affecting pop thriller, based on a pretty novel idea: Mr. Affleck's Christian Wolff is autistic, his disorder giving him the upper hand in a world of international gangsters, drug cartels and government agents trying to take him down.

Will there be a sequel? Is the pope Argentine? The premise for "The Accountant" is one of those "why didn't anyone think of this before" ideas, conjured up by producer Mark Williams and scripted by Bill Dubuque, even if it is something of a minefield -- one in 68 children are identified as being on the spectrum, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in 2014. Making it amusing is a trick. Yet director Gavin O'Connor ("Warrior," "Miracle") treats it all with considerable delicacy, allowing Mr. Affleck to be charming, and juggling a surprising number of intersecting plotlines, considering the usual requirements of a studio thriller.

Christian has a solidly told back story -- a mother who left, a brother oppressed by his sib's developmental disorder, a military father (Robert C. Treveiler) who made his family suffer -- all seen through the film's recurring flashbacks, which are richly detailed. But other, more tangential characters are fleshed out, too, and generously: Marybeth Medina (Cynthia Addai-Robinson), for instance, the Treasury agent assigned to track down the mysterious forensic accountant who keeps popping up in surveillance photos of drug lords and terrorists, has a police record. She's been reluctant to seek promotion lest her past be dug up, which is exactly how her boss, Raymond King (J.K. Simmons) -- a government lifer who has his own nightmarish connection to Christian -- blackmails her into taking the case.

Christian, of course, is too smart to be caught, or to even have his existence acknowledged. (His aliases are always the names of economists and philosophers.) How he keeps himself secret is part of the fun. So is the way he keeps his stuff: in a ready-to-go trailer that contains his weapons, his Renoir, his Pollock and his copy of Action Comics, Vol. 1. He is, needless to say, a nerd.

"The Accountant" shouldn't be taken too seriously. Christian seems to get a little "better" as the film proceeds, evolving from an amusing stoicism to a more receptive attitude toward emotional stimuli -- especially those provided by Dana Cummings (a delightful Anna Kendrick), the junior accountant who discovers a financial discrepancy at Living Robotics, the prosthetics manufacturer owned by Lamar Blackburn (John Lithgow) and his sister Rita (Jean Smart). A montage in which Christian runs their numbers, and delights in his findings, is particularly good, and the robot theme recurs constantly: Christian's chief consultant is the mechanical-sounding voice in his car, a cross between Siri and the car in "Knight Rider." That the film's nonautistic characters are occasionally sociopaths is one point well made. That people with autism are not unreachable is another: "I have to find the person who wants to kill her," Christian says of Dana. "And?" asks the voice in the car. Christian: "Shoot them in the head." Mr. Affleck is in good form. We look forward to seeing Christian Wolff again. It could be soon.

---
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'Clouds of Sils Maria' (2014)

You're not quite sure where you are during this 2014 gem by French director Olivier Assayas, other than in the presence of two actresses at the top of their game: Juliette Binoche, playing the world-famous Maria Enders, who's just been asked to take the older role in the play that made her famous as an ingenue; and Kristen Stewart as Maria's assistant, Valentine, who is not the Eve Harrington character, nor the lesbian love interest, nor anything one expects, except the perfect partner in a dance along a dramatic tightrope.

'Rain Man' (1988)

Raymond ("I'm an excellent driver") Babbitt is perhaps the most famous autistic character in film, a mathematical savant who is taken to Las Vegas by his selfish brother Charlie (Tom Cruise) to work the casino, and wins his sibling's love. The film won four Oscars -- Best Picture, Best Actor (Dustin Hoffman) Best Director (Barry Levinson) and Best Original Screenplay (Ronald Bass, Barry Morrow). Mr. Cruise should at least have been nominated.

'Gravity' (2013)

An intergalactic spectacular that should be seen only on the widest screen available (OK, it should be seen anyway), this lost-in-space vehicle starring Sandra Bullock -- directed by Alfonso Cuaron and written with his son, Jonas -- won seven Oscars and broke new technological ground in moviemaking. It also features an extremely amusing performance by George Clooney.

---

Mr. Anderson is a critic in New York. Joe Morgenstern is on vacation.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump, faced with opposition inside and outside his party, plans to renew the nationalist themes that built his base and amplify his no-holds-barred attacks against Hillary Clinton to try to depress Democratic voter turnout, his advisers said.

Following the release of a tape-recording of his lewd comments about women and several high-profile Republican defections over the weekend, Mr. Trump has effectively given up the conventional wisdom of trying to reach voters far outside his core of support, one high-level Republican supporter said.

The new strategy emerged Tuesdayon Mr. Trump's Twitter account when he sent out messages attacking Republican House Speaker Paul Ryan as a weak leader after Mr. Ryan announced he wouldn't appear with the nominee. Later, in an interview with Bill O'Reilly of Fox News, Mr. Trump seemed to suggest that if he wins the election Mr. Ryan should be removed, saying Mr. Ryan "maybe wouldn't be there, maybe he'll be in a different position."

Mr. Trump, in fact, is trying to use his break with many party leaders as a lever to ramp up support among his base, which includes many voters who feel equally estranged from the party establishment.

The decision means that a campaign already marked by intensely personal attacks is primed to grow even uglier in the remaining four weeks. Mr. Trump plans to keep up a relentless assault on Mrs. Clinton, including her use of a private email server and allegations about her husband, former President Bill Clinton, with the intention of keeping some of her supporters home on Election Day, his advisers said.

"As more and more Republicans defect, it's no surprise that Donald Trump is getting more and more desperate," said Clinton press secretary Brian Fallon. "In the closing weeks, he can run his campaign however he chooses, but Hillary Clinton is going to continue talking about her positive vision for improving the lives for everyday Americans."

It remains questionable whether Mr. Trump's strategy can turn around the electoral math. His core supporters don't make up a majority of the electorate, and most analysts see no path to victory unless he adds to them, even if Mrs. Clinton's vote total is driven down. And a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll shows him trailing the Democratic nominee by nine percentage points among likely voters, though his standing improved after his performance in Sunday's debate, particularly with Republicans.

Mr. Trump's advisers said they and their candidate are convinced he can win, noting that in the three weeks before the first debate, Mr. Trump climbed in the polls to even or ahead of Mrs. Clinton.

Most Republican lawmakers wouldn't comment on their candidate's announced change of tone. A written statement provided by Mr. Ryan said the Wisconsin congressman was "focusing the next month on defeating Democrats, and all Republicans running for office should probably do the same."

Kevin Madden, a Republican strategist who worked on the presidential campaigns of Mitt Romney and George W. Bush, said Mr. Trump's approach would drive turnout among his base, "but **alienating** his own party and swing voters won't grow his vote. His remarks and tactics can have the adverse effect of energizing the Democratic base."

Mr. Trump began losing ground after his panned performance in the first presidential debate last month, which was followed by news of a nearly billion-dollar business loss in the mid-1990s that may have shielded him for years from federal income taxes.

After the debate, Mr. Trump persisted in tweets and in comments on the campaign trail about the weight gains of a former Miss Universe, the woman mentioned by Mrs. Clinton during the first debate as the target of humiliating remarks by Mr. Trump.

Then on Friday, all attention turned to the video of Mr. Trump's talking about groping women's genitals and forcibly kissing women.

Mr. Trump huddled with advisers at the Trump Tower building in New York City that night. That is when they resolved to implement the "scorched-earth" strategy that had been held in reserve, one adviser said.

The campaign recruited appearances by three women who had accused Bill Clinton of sexual misconduct, and a fourth angry at Mrs. Clinton for her work as a legal-aid lawyer defending a man accused of raping the woman when she was a girl. Mr. Clinton has denied the allegations.

On Saturday, as leading Republicans withdrew their endorsements for the GOP nominee, Mr. Trump prepared for the debate in his glass-encased conference room of the Trump Tower on Fifth Avenue in New York City.

Republican National Committee chairman Reince Priebus received many calls and emails from Republicans urging him to pull his funding from the Trump campaign. Most donors and elected officials weren't aware that Mr. Priebus participated in Mr. Trump's debate prep.

In rapid-fire fashion, according to two people there, the RNC chairman asked Mr. Trump questions such as: "I'm a dreamer with illegal-**immigrant** parents and a little brother, what will you do with me?"

Supporters had gathered on the street below, and Mr. Trump put on a suit jacket and went downstairs to greet them. He returned upbeat, several advisers said, and resolved to fight harder against his opponents, including those in his own party. Around 6 p.m., he retired to his penthouse for the night.

The advisers looked at each other. They wanted their boss to prepare more, but they also noticed that Mr. Trump seemed re-energized.

Only five people in the campaign knew the four women would appear with Mr. Trump before the debate. On Sunday, they were brought before news cameras. The Trump campaign had tried to seat them in a box reserved for the family of the two opponents but was refused permission.

When the debate began, Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump didn't shake hands. The Republican nominee attacked Mrs. Clinton's judgment and her use of a private email server. Mrs. Clinton raised public revulsion over Mr. Trump's taped comments about women, as well as his earlier remarks disparaging Hispanics and Muslims.

A new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll suggests Mr. Trump's performance might have stopped his political bleeding. He had trailed Mrs. Clinton by 11 points in Journal/NBC News polling on Saturday and Sunday, conducted shortly after disclosure of the videotape.

Mrs. Clinton's lead in the polls fell in polling Monday. Mr. Trump narrowed the gap with more support from Republicans, the poll found. Some 83% of Republicans said in postdebate polling that they would vote for Mr. Trump in a head-to-head matchup against Mrs. Clinton, up from a weak 60% in weekend surveys.

Over the three days of polling, before and after the debate, Mrs. Clinton's lead stood at 9 percentage points, 46% to 37%, among likely voters on a ballot including third-party candidates

After attacking the Clintons during Sunday's debate, Mr. Trump moved against GOP leaders who had never fully embraced him as candidate or nominee. Mr. Trump has said they risk **alienating** his supporters who make up the biggest share of the Republican base.

"I may be limping across that finish line," Mr. Trump said at a rally Monday. "But I'm getting across that finish line."

License this article from Dow Jones Reprint Service[http://www.djreprints.com/link/DJRFactiva.html?FACTIVA=wjco20161012000117]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Trump plans to renew his nationalist themes and amplify his attacks on Clinton, as he seeks to ramp up support from his base following the defections of leading Republicans.

The GOP candidate is stepping up warnings of a "rigged" vote, raising concern of election officials.

Clinton's staff sought to contain fallout from her use of a private email server, hacked emails show.

Clinton and Trump would take the tax code in sharply different directions, according to a new analysis.

---

DHS will run out of money to detain illegal **immigrants** by early November and plans to ask the White House for funds.

---

The Supreme Court agreed to rule on whether **immigrants** detained after 9/11 can sue U.S. officials.

---

Flooding endangered thousands in North Carolina. The U.S. death toll from Hurricane Matthew rose.

---

Colombia's FARC rebels said they wouldn't resume fighting despite voters' rejection of a peace deal.

---

An attack on worshipers at a Shiite shrine in Kabul killed at least 14 people, Afghan police said.

---

Putin canceled a trip to Paris amid heightened tensions between Russia and the West over Syria.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON -- The Department of Homeland Security is a month away from running out of money to detain illegal **immigrants** -- a fresh sign of federal budget dysfunction emerging less than two weeks after Congress funded the government through early December.

Homeland Security officials plan to ask the White House for a quick transfer of funds to enable them to continue to detain undocumented **immigrants**, according to officials familiar with the discussions. If they don't get more money by early November, officials will be forced to stop holding newly captured illegal **immigrants**, including high-priority arrests at the border, the officials said.

The shortfall has caught the Obama administration by surprise, coming so soon after Congress passed a continuing resolution to keep the government operating through Dec. 9, though congressional Republicans have long warned that the White House wasn't budgeting enough money to detain illegal **immigrants**. The measure passed in September aims only to maintain funding at previous levels, which has turned out to be far short of the money needed to handle a new influx of undocumented people entering the U.S.

"Across the southwest border, we've seen a recent uptick in the number of apprehensions," said a senior official with **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, the agency within DHS that detains **immigrants** awaiting possible deportation. "We are growing our [detention] capacity but there is going to be a cost associated with that."

DHS officials now see an immediate $136 million shortfall to pay for detention beds and nondetention monitoring of illegal **immigration**, according to officials briefed on the problem. And that is just the short-term budget hit. In 2017, **immigration** officials expect they will need significantly more money to detain people awaiting deportation.

ICE officials attribute the budget crunch in part to an influx of Haitian **immigrants** entering along the U.S. border with Mexico. Thousands of Haitians left that country following a massive earthquake in 2010, with many of them heading to Brazil. Now, they are moving through South and Central America to try to get into the U.S., officials said.

The U.S. government said last month that it would end a policy, in place since the 2010 earthquake, of not seeking speedy deportations for undocumented Haitians.

It's unclear how much the recent destruction wrought by Hurricane Matthew in Haiti will again slow U.S. deportations to that country, or lead to more attempts by people there to enter the U.S.

In March, an ICE official told a congressional budget panel that he expected his agency would, on average, detain about 31,000 people, if not fewer, over the rest of the year.

Instead, the number of people detained rose sharply, and the agency projects they will have roughly 42,000 people in detention by the end of this month, according to officials briefed on the matter. The senior ICE official said the turning point came in September, and the March estimate was the best possible one based on information available at the time.

The political calendar also is working against the government when it comes to the detention-bed problem. Lawmakers will spend the next weeks campaigning for their own re-election or the election of others. That means Congress is ill-equipped to give DHS a quick cash infusion. Instead, DHS officials hope to get White House approval to divert money from elsewhere in the federal budget to cover the funding gap.

A Senate Appropriations Committee spokesman said, "Funding **immigration** enforcement has been and will continue to be a priority for the committee."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON -- The Supreme Court said Tuesday it would decide whether Muslims, Arabs and other **immigrants** rounded up immediately after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks can sue former Attorney General John Ashcroft and other officials for violating their civil rights.

The court also said it would rule in a case on whether the parents of a Mexican teenager killed by a U.S. agent who fired across the border into Mexico can sue over his death.

Both cases test the broad immunity federal officials generally enjoy from lawsuits for their official actions.

The Ashcroft case stems from the George W. Bush administration's frenzied response to the 2001 attacks, when officials speculated that additional terror cells could be hidden within Muslim communities in the U.S.

Mr. Ashcroft at the time directed the Justice Department to use any legal pretext to jail a potential suspect.

The U.S. held 762 foreigners for **immigration** violations under the directive. According to a Justice Department report, they were held under the most restrictive conditions possible, akin to those of the most dangerous inmates of a "supermax" prison.

The cases will be argued later in the Supreme Court's 2016-17 term, with decisions before July 2017.

The Justice Department declined to comment on either case.

In its appeal of the Ashcroft case, the department said that even if the detainees were mistreated, it was improper to presume that senior officials such as the attorney general would have knowledge of that conduct, much less condoned it.

"High-level policy decisions are materially different from the unauthorized actions of rogue officers" that can sometimes be exposed to liability, the government said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Congratulations to Oliver Hart and Bengt Holmstrom, who on Monday were announced as this year's winners of the Nobel Prize in economics. Our contributor David Henderson describes their contributions to the study of finance and financial crises nearby, but in America's current political climate the economists are also notable for being **immigrants**.

Mr. Hart is from the United Kingdom and Mr. Holmstrom from Finland. Both men followed the well-worn path of the last century in getting degrees abroad but then moving to the United States to study and earn their Ph.D.s. Mr. Hart graduated from Princeton in 1974 and Mr. Holmstrom from Stanford in 1978. They also did what **immigrants** rich and poor often do: get married and stay in the U.S. They both now live in Massachusetts.

As it happens, the U.S. had six Nobel prize winners this year, and all six are **immigrants**. Chemistry winner Sir J. Fraser Stoddart is from the United Kingdom but now teaches at Northwestern. This year's three physics winners -- David Thouless, Michael Kosterlitz and Duncan Haldane -- are also from Britain but now live and work in the U.S. Give Britain credit for an education system that produces these minds, but the U.S. is fortunate to have a great network of research universities to attract and keep talent from around the world.

These details were tipped to us by Stuart Anderson of the National Foundation for American Policy who has tracked Nobel winners for many years. He reports that **immigrants** have won 40%, or 31 of the 78 Nobels won by Americans in chemistry, medicine and physics since 2000. The winners come from many countries including Japan, Canada, Turkey, Austria, China, Israel, South Africa and Germany.

If you want to get political, you might even say these Nobel winners are pouring across the border. We're glad they came.

(See related editorial: "From Corporate Pay to Private Prisons -- Lessons From the Nobelists" -- WSJ Oct. 11, 2016)

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: How Many of Those Nobel Folk Were in U.S. Illegally?" -- WSJ Oct. 20, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Paul Ryan told House Republicans Monday that he won't defend Donald Trump's campaign or his other behavior, and the Speaker advised Members to do what is best for their districts. This is not a new position so much as the latest restatement of a familiar strategy: to limit the 2016 electoral damage and preserve the GOP majority as a check on whoever wins the Presidency.

Defending down-ballot races isn't the most inspiring goal, and it won't satisfy those who want the moral validation of condemning Mr. Trump and all his works. But Republican leaders have real institutional obligations, and these include serving the country when their political choices are less than ideal.

At the current moment that means preventing Hillary Clinton from returning to Washington with a Democratic Senate and perhaps even House. One irony of this election is that as Mrs. Clinton has focused on disqualifying Mr. Trump's character and temperament, she has also released about 112,000-odd words of little-noticed policy proposals that a Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Speaker Nancy Pelosi would be happy to rubber-stamp.

A new burst of liberal legislation could include a "public option" for ObamaCare that would be one more giant leap toward government-run health care. Energy from fossil fuels would become stranded assets. Government by and for the regulatory state would accelerate, and the Supreme Court would be lost to judicial conservatives for a generation. A final irony is that a Pelosi-Schumer Congress would readily pass the "amnesty" **immigration** bill that has animated Mr. Trump's candidacy.

This prospect ought to concentrate Republican minds because House and Senate races are becoming more competitive as Mr. Trump slips. In the Wall Street Journal-NBC News poll published Monday, voters favored the generic Democratic ballot in Congress by seven points, 49% to 42%. Last month the spread was plus-three.

The same survey also shows the Trump predicament for GOP leaders. Some 67% of Republican voters said Congress should continue to support Mr. Trump, while 14% say they should call on him to drop out and 9% say they can't support him personally. Mrs. Clinton is nonetheless widening her leads in swing states like Florida, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Ohio.

The question for Congressional Republicans is how to distance themselves from Mr. Trump when he says the indefensible without **alienating** his loyal core. Like it or not, a 45% plurality of GOP primary voters nominated Mr. Trump, and they knowingly put him on the ballot because they concluded that his unconventional political profile was a risk worth taking.

That choice may not have been wise, but the GOP can't renounce democracy and win elections. A successful party must acknowledge the voters that Mr. Trump has inspired and the legitimate problems he has identified. These voters aren't "irredeemable" in Mrs. Clinton's phrase; most are ordinary Americans frustrated by their diminished economic prospects.

Despite high-profile divisions with Mr. Trump, on trade and foreign affairs in particular, the House GOP has developed a rough consensus about how to relieve this economic anxiety, and much of its agenda overlaps with Mr. Trump's. None of these ambitious "better way" policies stand a chance of passage without an ally in the White House. House Republicans haven't "sold out" to Mr. Trump or anyone else. They've done what they're done because they don't want the country to live with the consequences of another Clinton Presidency.

If individual Republicans now conclude that Mr. Trump is doomed, then they should have the freedom to do what they think is necessary to survive a loss at the top of the ticket. Some Trump supporters want to call this betrayal, but House and Senate incumbents have tried to accommodate Mr. Trump's unconventional politics. As Mr. Trump might put it in a different context, this is strictly business.

The more puzzling criticism comes from NeverTrumpians who appear willing to have Republicans lose the House and Senate as punishment for even associating with Mr. Trump. In that they are allied with the Pelosi and Elizabeth Warren Democrats, albeit themselves safely insulated from the political consequences.

It makes no sense to purge Republicans who share your principles who will be needed to rebuild the GOP if Mr. Trump loses. And it's a form of insanity to cheer on a Pelosi House and Schumer Senate out of political spite. If the critics think Mr. Trump was an historic mistake, they should start pondering who voters will support in 2020 after four more years of slow growth and the dispiriting status quo.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BUDAPEST -- Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban formally asked parliament Monday to tighten constitutional rules on **immigration**.

Although low turnout made an Oct. 2 referendum on restricting **immigration** legally void, Mr. Orban wants to ensure the European Union won't have authority to relocate asylum seekers, especially Muslims, in the central European country.

To that end, the prime minister has proposed enshrining in the constitution that no external legislation could override Hungary's sovereign decisions to prevent non-European foreigners settling in the country.

The amendment would be largely symbolic because EU authorities have backed off trying to ease the migrant crisis by imposing refugee quotas.

The Socialist party has said it doesn't support the proposal, while the far right Jobbik said that it would propose some changes to the wording, but that it looks "endorsable."

The governing Fidesz party said it expects the bill to pass around Nov. 7. The bill requires a two-thirds majority of lawmakers, meaning that Mr. Orban's party will need the support of allies to clear the amendment in parliament.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump entered Sunday night's debate both lacerated and liberated.

He had been lacerated by the release of a now infamous videotape in which he talked about how he seduces women, including married women.

And he was liberated by essentially declaring his independence from the Republican party and its leading figures, many of whom abandoned him over the release of that tape.

So the question approaching an epic presidential debate Sunday night was whether, in this new phase, a liberated Donald Trump could stop the bleeding and get back on his feet. In the first half hour, that seemed unlikely. But then, over the next hour, he appeared to succeed.

In those raucous opening minutes, Hillary Clinton declared that Mr. Trump isn't fit to be president of the United States. In return, he promised that, if he is elected, he will order his attorney general to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate her.

And those were only the highlights of an opening phase that was simply shocking in the intense nature of the personal attacks between the two people vying to become the next president of the United States. And that seemed unlikely to allow him to recover.

Then a different kind of debate evolved -- one that was still pointed and nasty, but substantive.

Mr. Trump, who had seemed on his heels at the outset, recovered to deliver an effective critique of President Barack Obama's health-care overhaul. He defended his seemingly friendly attitude toward Russian President Vladimir Putin by saying simply that it's worth getting along with Russia if the Kremlin will help attack Islamic State.

At one remarkable point in discussing the vicious civil war in Syria, he acknowledged he disagrees with his own running mate, Gov. Mike Pence, on whether to confront aggressive Russian tactics there.

The candidates engaged in a spirited but enlightening debate on tax policy during which, in an odd twist, two wealthy Americans each accused the other of being in favor of helping other wealthy Americans.

He may have interrupted Mrs. Clinton a bit too often, and engaged in what some will consider bullying tactics. Yet once the atmosphere calmed down, those moments seemed less frequent than in their first debate.

Mrs. Clinton still was the greater master of policy detail, and she delivered her own critique of the so-called Obamacare health law and what she would do to fix the crown jewel of her party's domestic policy achievements in recent years. She continued to hammer Mr. Trump on disparaging comments he's made over time about **immigrants**, Muslims and, especially, women.

She delivered a sharp critique, for example, of Mr. Trump's proposal, made earlier this year, to ban all Muslims from entering the country.

"How do you do that?" she asked. "We are a country founded on religious freedom and liberty. How do we do what he has advocated without causing great distress within our own county?"

But this time Mr. Trump quietly backed away from his original proposal to ban Muslims from entering the country, without exactly admitting that's what he was doing. He called for "extreme vetting" of **immigrants** rather than a ban.

And he turned his repeated calls for American allies to do more to carry their weight into a specific call for them to provide more help in Syria by creating and maintaining safe zones for Syrian refugees.

"I believe in having other people pay for them, as an example, the Gulf states, who are not carrying their weight, but they have nothing but money, and take care of people," he said.

By the end, it had become almost a conventional presidential debate, and Mr. Trump was quicker on his feet and more nimble and more substantive than he was in the first debate. In some ways, in fact, his performance was the reverse of the first debate, when he started strongly and ended poorly.

It is hard to know how much a decent debate performance will matter to the many Republicans who seem to have lost faith in Mr. Trump or confidence that any step forward in his campaign won't be followed by a step backward.

It's also hard to know what will happen to Mr. Trump's support among women, and among Republicans with misgivings about him, whose support he had been consolidating in the weeks before the explosive tape with his lewd comments about women.

It also isn't clear whether his reminding voters of Bill Clinton's sexual history will matter, or how effective he was at skewering Mrs. Clinton again for her use of a private email server as secretary of state.

But if the imperative of this debate was for Mr. Trump to survive the onslaught and get back on his feet, he appeared to do that.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Markets spent much of Friday playing a game of "who shot the pound?" after a surprise plunge in the value of Britain's currency against the dollar. Investors are guessing about whether an opportunistic hedge fund or a misfiring algorithm set off the selling, but the bigger point is that if the pound hadn't fallen abruptly it might have dropped slowly over the coming weeks after the post-Brexit events of recent days.

The pound had a harrowing Friday, falling as much as 5% before bouncing around and settling down by about 1.4%. That left sterling down 4% for the week, and the decline started as early as Monday after Prime Minister Theresa May's announcement Sunday that she'll start Brexit negotiations with Brussels by the end of March.

This put an end to widespread speculation that Mrs. May would find some way to backtrack, or that parliament or divine intervention would stop Britain's departure from the EU. It says something about modern politics that investors could so cavalierly assume that a democratic outcome in June's referendum would mean nothing, but there it is.

On Monday investors also learned from Chancellor Philip Hammond's speech to the Conservative Party conference that he's ready to treat Brexit as an excuse for a spending binge Britain can't afford. The government is abandoning the goal of a balanced budget by 2020, and it's doing that to allow greater spending on public works and handouts to tech industries, for example, instead of tax cuts and other reforms that would increase growth and attract foreign investors.

On Tuesday Home Secretary Amber Rudd suggested that her vision of post-Brexit Britain is a small country with the **immigrant** drawbridges pulled up, not a bold global power. Business groups widely derided Ms. Rudd's **immigration** plans, which would crack down on student and employment visas to keep foreigners from "taking" jobs from British workers. Investors see the danger for an economy that relies heavily on foreign talent to meet the skills gap in the local work force.

On Wednesday Mrs. May delivered her policy address that was heavy on social democracy and light on the market reforms Britain needs to boost competitiveness. Rather than embracing tax cuts and deregulation, she promised such useless bows to populism as putting workers on corporate boards.

Then on Thursday French President Francois Hollande piped up to warn that other EU members might insist on a "hard Brexit" that forces Britain out of the common market in addition to the EU. This is the small-minded politics of European vindictiveness. Western leaders should be rising above Brexit by working to keep close economic and defense ties with the U.K. while heeding its warning that European voters want a more accountable politics.

It's possible to read too much into a few days of currency fluctuations, but it's also a mistake to ignore the warning. Some Keynesians will welcome the pound's decline in the name of lifting exports. But Britain is now largely a service economy, and if devaluation is the post-Brexit Tory strategy then Britain is in even bigger trouble than the pound bears think. Mrs. May needs a growth agenda to make Britain a mecca for capital, both human and financial, or this week's currency jitters will get worse.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The People and the Books

By Adam Kirsch

Norton, 407 pages, $28.95

The Anthology of Great Jewish Books is a genre with a long history -- and it always reveals more about the needs of its readers than about the books it includes. The first instance is right in the Bible itself: The Book of Chronicles, eager to emphasize the centrality of the Jewish kingdom and the Temple in Jerusalem, cheerfully summarizes all the preceding biblical books while leaving out details of little interest to its readers -- like the Exodus from Egypt. Every generation gets the anthology it deserves.

Our generation, in which many Jews can't even name the Five Books of Moses, might not deserve Adam Kirsch, but we are lucky to have him. Mr. Kirsch is one of America's finest literary critics -- I would gladly read him on anything from Genesis to a Geico commercial -- and his latest book, "The People and the Books," is an astute and accessible introduction to 18 Jewish literary classics.

Mr. Kirsch's choices are just as carefully selected as those in Chronicles: He includes Deuteronomy but not Exodus, Talmudic aphorisms but not Talmudic arguments, philosophy but not poetry, Yiddish literary master Sholem Aleichem but not Hebrew Nobel laureate S.Y. Agnon, and, strikingly, no works published in the past 100 years.

Mr. Kirsch's project here is not just to educate readers about these classics but to demonstrate how ancient many modern-seeming concerns actually are. His laser focus on these works' most topical themes makes them feel so urgent that curious readers of any religious persuasion will want to read them all. "How to reconcile reason and faith, how to give Jewish law meaning, how to read the Bible -- these are not modern questions, but ones that recur whenever Jews confront the philosophical tradition," Mr. Kirsch writes in a chapter on Spinoza, tracing the 17th-century philosopher's theological questions to medieval and ancient Jewish sages.

This palimpsest of ancient and modern is evident on every page. In a chapter on the 18th-century rationalist Solomon Maimon's autobiography, Maimon stands over a canal in The Hague contemplating suicide because "the world had no place for someone like him." He does so on Purim, the holiday celebrating the Jews' rescue in the biblical Book of Esther -- a story of diaspora Jews confronting peril, which Mr. Kirsch had introduced several chapters earlier. Describing Theodor Herzl's founding of modern political Zionism with his 1896 pamphlet "The Jewish State," the author writes that "not since Moses stood on the slopes of Mount Nebo and prophesied the fate of the Israelites in the Promised Land . . . had a single person done more to direct the course of Jewish history." As Mr. Kirsch points out: "Perhaps the most striking thing that emerges from reading these books together is the remarkable continuity of Jewish thought."

One central continuity is the Jews' stormy relationship with God. With characteristic insight, Mr. Kirsch writes of Deuteronomy's concern for the Israelites' defiance of God, even among those who personally witnessed divine miracles: "There seems to be something about the presence of God that is hard to bear and about his memory that is almost impossible to sustain." In the 12th century, Maimonides, in an attempt to reconcile religious belief with science and to appeal to educated Jews, developed the idea of a rigorously impersonal God. Then the Zohar, the key book of Jewish mysticism, addressed Jews who felt abandoned by God in difficult times by developing "a technology for bringing God into harmony with himself," as Mr. Kirsch writes.

This focus on the challenges of faith is true to the Jewish tradition. Yet it also reveals the author's desire to invite nonreligious readers into the conversation about these texts. Mr. Kirsch's shrewd knowledge of his audience emerges even more in the works he selects regarding Jewish interactions with non-Jewish societies.

A prime example is the Book of Esther, the only biblical text he includes other than Deuteronomy. Esther tells the story of highly integrated diaspora Jews facing an uncertain future: When a royal vizier plans a genocide of the Persian Empire's Jews, the plot is defeated by the kingdom's savvy Jewish queen. Mr. Kirsch insists that the story illustrates a Jewish social integration more familiar to today's readers than shtetl-era isolation: "Jewish life in 21st century America may resemble the Persia of twenty-five hundred years ago more closely than the Poland of three hundred years ago."

Philo of Alexandria, a first-century Jewish commentator who wrote in Greek (and, like Mr. Kirsch, read the Bible in translation), would be long forgotten without Christian theologians' interest. Mr. Kirsch writes of his "Exposition of the Laws" that his philosophical interpretations were "seemingly designed to be read by Jews with little knowledge of Judaism -- or perhaps even by non-Jews," much like Mr. Kirsch's own work.

Jewish culture is one with a famously high bar for entry, and to Mr. Kirsch's great credit he makes all readers feel at home. Yet this often means avoiding the deep strangeness of these texts: not their literary oddities, like the Zohar's elaborate sexual metaphors, but the unimaginably high stakes that their authors faced as Jews with no political power.

Just as Philo turned Moses into a Stoic philosopher to appeal to his Greek-language readers, Mr. Kirsch highlights what modern readers will appreciate at the expense of a reality that today's readers can barely fathom. Take Josephus, the Jewish rebel turned Roman apologist who documented Judea's catastrophic revolt against Rome in "The Jewish War," written in A.D. 75. Mr. Kirsch focuses on Josephus' pragmatism in rejecting his fellow rebels' suicidal devotion to their cause, an angle that will surely appeal to secular readers in the age of ISIS. But the experience of actually reading Josephus (who switched sides after being captured and wrote his history while living in Emperor Vespasian's house), particularly after the success of modern Zionism, is far more **alienating** than the author lets on. It is like listening to recordings of Patty Hearst.

This hostage-video quality presents in acute form a theme of Jewish history: One brilliant thinker after another either explains away Judaism's particularities to suit the dominant culture's beliefs or proudly professes contempt for them -- all in a degrading effort to earn an acceptance that, in the most disturbing continuity, rarely came. Discussing the 18th-century philosopher Moses Mendelssohn's "Jerusalem," an attempt to reconcile Judaism and modern German culture, Mr. Kirsch explains that if Mendelssohn failed, "either the Jews would go on being excluded from the benefits of modernity, or they would have to give up their Jewishness in exchange for acceptance. (The third possibility, that they would assimilate and still end up being hated and eventually annihilated, was not yet thinkable.)"

Yet that "third possibility" already appears in Mr. Kirsch's chapters on Esther's Persia and Philo's Egypt, both situations where assimilated Jews were threatened with mass murder. It had been thinkable for millennia, just not understandable. Mr. Kirsch's decision to end his book before modern Israel's statehood feels a bit like a contemporary version of this problem. As the author puts it in his preface, one of the key reasons that the Jews became "the People of the Book" is that they were without political sovereignty from the time the Temple was destroyed by the Romans in A.D. 70. Since then, "the history of Judaism would not be told primarily in political terms. It would be, instead, a history of books." Mr. Kirsch's decision to ignore Israel's resurrection suggests a reluctance to **alienate**readers that feels all too similar to many of the works he discusses -- and unwittingly illustrates his point about the uncanny continuities of Jewish books.

The overarching continuity, of course, is the endurance not only of many of these texts but of readers' dynamic relationships with them. In describing a 16th-century Bible commentary aimed at Jewish women (written, like his own book, to introduce the Jewish textual tradition to lay readers), Mr. Kirsch nails the point. "Judaism's holiest texts were taught not just as a collection of tales, but a way of reading," he explains, and such compilations gave readers "some sense of what it means to read as a Jew." To be a Jew, Mr. Kirsch suggests, is to keep reading.

---

Ms. Horn's most recent novel is "A Guide for the Perplexed."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON -- When Japan's Daiwa Securities Group Inc. heard Britain's prime minister pledge on Sunday to put a priority on controlling **immigration** in negotiations to leave the European Union, it didn't wait to act.

The next day, staff accelerated contingency planning for the bank's London investment-banking unit and began to contact other European cities, according to a person familiar with the matter. While Daiwa doesn't have a definite plan yet, it could involve relocating some operations to the Continent.

For the U.K.'s financial sector, Brexit is getting real. Negotiations are due to start by the end of March, and Britain-based banks are scrambling to finesse plans for life after the European Union.

Pleading from banks to retain access to the EU has proved a tough sell, bank executives and their advisers say. Access to Prime Minister Theresa May "has been pretty much zero," said one person advising several lenders on their Brexit plans.

Some executives expressed dismay that Mrs. May recently visited New York to talk to Wall Street executives but hadn't yet met with some British lenders. On Thursday, Chancellor of the Exchequer Philip Hammond also traveled to New York with the intention of reassuring banks he will try to negotiate good access to the EU.

Nevertheless, the prospect of a "hard" Brexit, in which the U.K. cuts trade links with the bloc in return for control over its borders, looms over the sector. "It looks increasingly not 'if' but 'when' banks are going to have to trigger contingency plans," says Stephen Adams a partner at consultancy Global Counsel.

Many banks already are working on the basis that the financial-services industry is going to get a rough ride. Morgan Stanley, for instance, is crafting plans on the basis of a worst-case scenario of a breakaway from the EU, according to a person familiar with the plan.

Even Britain-focused banks are getting sucked in. Executives at U.K. retail bank Lloyds Banking Group PLC are considering ways to create a subsidiary in Europe, mainly to access payment systems there and be able to write business there, according to a person familiar with the matter.

Banks fear two things from Brexit: not being able to seamlessly sell their services across the EU and the impact of potential U.K. **immigration** restrictions on their international workforces. Details on the government's position on both topics remain vague.

The Brexit negotiations are expected to last two years. Banks say that, ideally, they want a treaty to be struck between the EU and the U.K. that allows them to continue to sell products across the Continent in return for adhering to similar regulations.

Also on the wish list: a long transition period to allow companies several years to adjust their business models to any changes.

A vast financial lobbying machine has creaked into action, with trade groups churning out research papers on the impact of Brexit on the finance industry and the British economy. On Wednesday, the City-UK, a business group, warned that up to 75,000 jobs could be moved if the U.K. fails to negotiate access to the EU. If the status quo is broadly maintained, this could be as low as 3,000, the research says.

But politicians are wary to be seen pandering to the scandal-scarred finance industry, analysts say.

Tactics vary on trying to sway politicians. Some lobby groups want to stress London's role facilitating funding for small and medium-size businesses across the EU. Others want to emphasize the impact of a hard Brexit on financial stability.

Dealing with the government's desire to curb **immigration** also is forcing some lobbyists to unusual lengths. The City of London Corp. is pushing a plan to soften the impact of any **immigration** quotas on the British capital. A "London Visa" would help EU citizens find jobs in the city, but not outside it, officials say. It is unclear where London would technically extend to or how this would be policed.

Meanwhile, for lenders, the clock is ticking. The day the Brexit negotiations begin, banks have to decide on whether to press the button on their contingency plans, said Simon Gleeson a partner at law firm Clifford Chance. Shifting operations abroad could take years. "And the last man out of the door looks like a loser."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BIRMINGHAM, England -- U.K. Prime Minister Theresa May positioned her Conservative Party as a champion for the working class and criticized establishment politicians as brushing aside Britons' concerns about increasing levels of **immigration**.

In a speech that cappedthe party's annual fall conference, she said she would bring change to the U.K. by steering it out of the European Union, by focusing on those who felt left behind by globalization and by holding business executives who exploited the system to account.

"Just listen to the way a lot of politicians and commentators talk about the public," she said. "They find their patriotism distasteful, their concerns about **immigration** parochial, their views about crime illiberal, their attachment to their job security inconvenient. They find the fact that more than 17 million people voted to leave the European Union simply bewildering."

The British pound continued to slump, touching fresh 31-year lows against the dollar and a five-year low against the euro. Sterling traded at just over $1.27 on Wednesday, down from above $1.30 last week. The decline was sparked by Mrs. May's Sunday address at the conference in which she signaled **immigration**policy would be a higher priority than staying a member of the bloc's free trade zone.

Mrs. May's approach to Brexit has pleased her party's more euroskeptic lawmakers. But other politicians say it could hurt Britain's economy because EU leaders insist the U.K. can continue to have unfettered access to Europe's single market only if it agrees to the bloc's freedom-of-movement principle.

In an unusual move, Mrs. May also signaled that her government would seek to address the side effects of the easy-money policies pursued by the Bank of England and other central banks since the financial crisis. The Bank of England's ultralow interest rates and asset purchases provided "emergency medicine" for the economy but have worsened inequality, she said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. -- In a lively and combative debate between the two vice-presidential nominees on Tuesday night here, Republican Mike Pence and Democrat Tim Kaine each cast the other party's presidential nominee as an unacceptable choice for a country facing a perilous world.

Although neither presidential candidate was on the stage, Republican Donald Trump and Democrat Hillary Clinton loomed large over the only scheduled debate between the vice-presidential nominees -- with the political vulnerabilities and perceived character liabilities of Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton dominating the bulk of the debate.

The aggressive tone of the debate was set early, with Mr. Kaine embracing the traditional vice-presidential role as the chief attack dog and Mr. Pence sketching out a surprisingly far more confrontational stance against Russia than has been voiced by Mr. Trump.

Mr. Pence did earn high marks from analysts for his cool-under-pressure debating style in the face of frequent interruptions by Mr. Kaine -- especially compared with Mr. Trump's uneven debate performance last week.

A CNN/ORC instant poll conducted among debate viewers gave Mr. Pence, Indiana's governor, a narrow win.

At the same time, Mr. Pence often found himself on the defensive, largely avoiding opportunities to explain some of Mr. Trump's most controversial statements about banning Muslims from **immigrating** to the U.S., his litany of disparaging comments about women and his statements that many Mexican **immigrants**were "rapists."

Moderator Elaine Quijano of CBS News struggled at times to keep the candidates from talking over each other -- with both seeming well-prepared for the debate, knowledgeable on policy and eager to engage with one another.

Still, it's rare for a vice-presidential debate to influence the course of the race, especially given the oversize presence of the two candidates at the top of the tickets.

"People don't vote for vice president. They vote for president," said Lynda Tran, a Democratic consultant and a partner at the firm 270 Strategies, which has consulted for Mrs. Clinton's campaign. "But what a vice-presidential debate allows people to do is get to know someone who is going to be a heartbeat away."

Mr. Kaine, a U.S. senator from Virginia and a former governor and mayor of Richmond, set the aggressive tone early by quickly calling into question Mr. Trump's fitness to serve as president. Mr. Kaine said that Mrs. Clinton should be trusted because of her lifelong history "focused on serving others."

Mr. Pence portrayed Mr. Trump as an agent of change, while criticizing Mrs. Clinton for advocating tax increases and increased regulation, as well as her support for the Affordable Care Act, her use of a private email server for government business and her family foundation's acceptance of foreign government dollars.

Mr. Pence's harsher stance against Russia was striking, given that Mr. Trump has praised President Vladimir Putin as a strong leader and called for better relations between the two countries.

Mr. Pence said the U.S. must be willing to meet with "force" any resistance from the Syrian government and Russia in the conflict against terrorist groups in Syria. He also said the U.S. should do more to prevent Russian provocation in Eastern Europe, and blamed the Obama administration and Mrs. Clinton's "weak and feckless" leadership for allowing Russia to gain influence around the world.

It was unclear whether Mr. Pence was distancing himself from Mr. Trump's position or offering a new set of talking points for the GOP ticket.

On terrorism and foreign policy, both vice-presidential nominees cast the other's running mate as ill-equipped to protect the country.

Mr. Kaine talked up the Obama administration's foreign-policy successes under Mrs. Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, including the killing of terrorist leader Osama bin Laden. By contrast, he said, "Donald Trump can't start a Twitter war with Miss Universe without shooting himself in the foot."

Mr. Pence charged the U.S. is "less safe today than it was the day that Barack Obama became president."

Some of the sharpest exchanges between the two candidates came over the recent revelation that Mr. Trump had taken a $916 million loss on his 1995 tax return, a sum that could have allowed him to avoid paying personal income taxes for 18 years. Mr. Trump bragged on the debate stage last week that he was "smart" to reduce his tax liability as much as possible.

"So it's smart not to pay for our military? It's smart not to pay for veterans?" Mr. Kaine asked on the debate stage. "So I guess all of us who do pay for those things, I guess we're stupid."

Mr. Pence retorted: "Do you take all the deductions that you're entitled to? I do."

The two clashed over refugee policy, as Mr. Pence defended the Trump proposal to use "extreme vetting" to screen out Syrians and other refugees from countries that harbor terrorists, and he criticized Mrs. Clinton for proposing an expansion of the number of Syrians allowed into the U.S.

Mr. Kaine accused Mr. Trump of proposing unconstitutional limits based on national origin or religion. "Hillary and I will do **immigration** enforcement and we'll vet refugees based on whether they are dangerous or not," he said.

Some Republicans saw Mr. Pence's performance as evidence that their party would have been better off with a different presidential nominee.

"This debate highlights the tragedy of Trump's nomination for the GOP. Whenever the topic is anything but Trump himself, Pence is clearly winning," said Michael Steel, who worked for former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush during the primaries and for the party's 2012 vice-presidential nominee, Rep. Paul Ryan.

Mr. Pence succeeded in launching several attacks against Mrs. Clinton that Mr. Trump failed to raise in last week's debate. He criticized the Clinton Foundationfor accepting funds from foreign governments and foreign donors, and charged Mrs. Clinton with running a "pay to play" operation.

Mr. Kaine defended the foundation, calling it one of the "highest-rated charities," and attacked Mr. Trump's own foundation, which the New York attorney general this week ordered to stop fundraising in the state because it lacks the proper certification.

---

Janet Hook, Laura Meckler and Allison Kite contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PRESCOTT VALLEY, Ariz. -- Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump blamed his Democratic opponent, Hillary Clinton, for a U.S. tax code that allowed him to declare a big loss and likely reduced or even eliminated his federal liability for years.

"Why didn't she ever try to change those laws so I couldn't use them?" Mr. Trump said Tuesday at a campaign rally here, referring to her time as a U.S. senator from New York from 2001 to 2009. "The reason that she did not do that is her donors and contributors have used those same tax laws as I did. The same way."

Mr. Trump's tax records that were disclosed over the weekend were from 1995, several years before Mrs. Clinton took office. Mr. Trump himself has been a Clinton donor. Since 2002, he has donated $4,700 to Mrs. Clinton's Senate and presidential campaigns, according to Federal Election Commission filings, though he was ultimately refunded $4,000.

Five weeks from election day, Mr. Trump returned to Arizona for the first time since a noted **immigration** speech in the state on Aug. 31. Although the state has been a conservative stronghold for Republican presidential candidates, a Wall Street Journal/NBC News/Marist poll in Arizona last month showed Mr. Trump with a lead of just 1 percentage point in the state.

Mr. Trump reminded the crowd of several thousand that he wanted to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, which drew applause and chants of "build the wall."

Mr. Trump has spent several days trying to counter the unauthorized release of some of his tax records by acknowledging the unfairness of the U.S. tax code. He has cast himself as the only candidate in the race who understands the nuances of the complex laws.

During two rallies in Colorado on Monday, Mr. Trump said he had a fiduciary responsibility to pay as little tax as possible. He acknowledged that it was unfair and vowed to make the tax code more balanced.

But in Arizona on Tuesday, Mr. Trump mostly returned to his stump speech, promising to be a law-and-order president who would halt illegal **immigration** and reduce crime and poverty in America's major cities.

"I'm going to keep the terrorists the hell out of the country," Mr. Trump said on Tuesday.

Earlier in the day, Mr. Trump held a private meeting with about a dozen energy executives in Denver, where he repeated complaints from the campaign trail that the industry is saddled with too many regulations.

"The energy business is being decimated," he said.

Trump repeatedly criticized Mrs. Clinton during the meeting for what he said was her support of overregulation of the energy industry.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BIRMINGHAM, England -- The U.K. government said it is considering new measures to restrict the number of people coming to study and work in Britain from non-European Union countries, prompting business groups to warn against tighter restrictions on skilled workers.

Home Secretary Amber Rudd, in a speech at the governing Conservative Party's annual fall conference on Tuesday, said the government would launch a consultation this year looking at how to restrict the number of non-EU students coming to Britain by tailoring **immigration** rules to the quality of the course and university. It would also look at various measures to encourage companies to foster local workers and not overlook them in favor of hiring staff from non-EU countries, she said.

Ms. Rudd said London wanted to look at whether the U.K.'s **immigration** system provided "the right incentives for businesses to invest in British workers." She added that the visa test "should ensure people coming here are filling gaps in the labor market, not taking jobs British people could do."

Business groups said companies wouldn't welcome further restrictions on skilled migration from key trading partners and warned the government must tread carefully on any changes to student **immigration** to make sure it doesn't undermine the sector.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I am descended, at least partially, from liars.

I recently learned this by delving into the expanding world of internet genealogical research. Advances in vast digital databases, as well as the low cost of DNA testing, have made it easier than ever to learn about one's family tree, and whether everything you've heard at family gatherings is true.

In my case, large parts weren't. All I have learned so far underscores a thread running through the U.S. **immigration** story: Many **immigrants** reinvented themselves when they arrived here.

I'm not talking about war criminals' cover stories, but average working stiffs changing how they describe their own ethnic or religious backgrounds, either to make the transition into U.S. society easier, or to make themselves more interesting.

Now, with accurate and inexpensive DNA tests, and genealogy databases only a keyboard away, many Americans are conducting genealogical investigations and finding surprises.

Bennett Greenspan, president of Family Tree DNA in Houston, one of several companies mass-marketing consumer DNA test kits, said people are surprised when results don't jibe with family lore. Many **immigrants** arriving in the U.S. in the 19th or early-20th centuries abandoned Jewish, Irish, Italian and other roots they thought might cause problems for them, Mr. Greenspan said.

A 2014 study of the genetic makeup of more than 150,000 customers of 23andMe, a Mountain View, Calif., genetic-testing company, found "admixture," meaning the ethnic and genetic mixing among Americans, was high. Proportions varied by region, depending on when waves of **immigrants** settled there.

My father, a corporate lawyer, exalted his Scottish heritage. Books about clans and castles were prominent on shelves in our suburban Chicago den. He drank only Glenfiddich single-malt whisky. We went to the "homeland" to see Edinburgh, Loch Lomond, Loch Ness. We heard bagpipers at the old Chicago Stadium.

He named me, his first son, Cameron, stamping me a Scot as clearly as if he had tattooed plaid on my forehead. I wore a kilt to my wedding rehearsal dinner.

My mother had her family's story about her great-great-grandmother, a native woman from New Brunswick, Canada. She said it explained her shiny black hair and how quickly she tanned. I retold the story of supposed Indian ancestors to friends, my wife and later my children.

My parents both died last year. And now that they are gone, I have discovered their fiercely-held family narratives, the subject of decades of verbal sparring and bickering, were largely false.

To settle their estate, I had to gather up birth dates, death dates and other sundry information. I turned reflexively to the internet, found several family ancestry sites and was quickly pulled into the obsessive world of modern genealogical research.

I'd had hints that the family stories didn't quite add up. Once, I told a German I'd met that I was descended from Germans on my father's side and the family name was Kruckstein.

"Oh, Jews," he said. When I asked my father about it later, he said all he knew was that his grandmother spoke only German.

With my mother's Indian story, I found letters my maternal grandfather had written to Canadian church officials inquiring about the native ancestor, but they turned up nothing.

I combed ancestry.com, geni.com and other sites with databases of birth certificates, draft records, census reports, school files and digitized newspaper archives. I found a military record listing my father's uncle, killed in World War II, as a "Jewish War Veteran."

I gathered up letters, photos and documents, from my grandfather's handwritten birth certificate to a maternal ancestor's 18th century will. I searched back through church records but found little about the Krucksteins despite thorough German record-keeping. Birth records show my paternal great-grandfather was born in Armagh, Northern Ireland, and the family **immigrated** to Scotland. He told census takers there he was born in Ireland. He moved first to Australia, then to the U.S., and told U.S. census takers he was born in Scotland.

On my mother's side, I found no marriage or birth records involving a Native American. The evidence showed English and Scottish ancestry, and some European nobility in the distant past.

So this summer, I sent off my saliva and $100 to AncestryDNA, part of Ancestry, the Lehi, Utah-based online genealogy service with some two million paying customers, for an analysis of my genetic makeup. Family Tree DNA and 23andMe offer similar comprehensive tests, also at minimal cost.

After six weeks or so, my test results arrived: My genetic makeup is about 33% from England and Scotland and 15% from Scandinavia, likely Vikings who raided the British Isles. No surprises.

But it also found 21% of my code was Irish, 14% was European Jewish and 11% was Eastern European. My father hated Notre Dame, but he could have been one-quarter to one-half Irish. He spoke dismissively of people from Eastern Europe, but part of his genetic code likely came from that region.

My mother at times spoke disparagingly of Jews, yet she was married for more than a half-century to a man who was probably a quarter Jewish. The DNA test found no evidence of Native American genetic makeup: My mother's family story was bunk.

Jennifer Utley, family historian for Ancestry, said a common reason many Americans take the DNA test is to verify a family story about Native American ancestors. "That is also one of the biggest disappointments," she said, because most people find the lore isn't true.

Thanks to technology, I have joined the great genealogical debunking now under way. I expect my parents would be disappointed to learn our family tree spans lochs, lox and the luck of the Irish. In my house, though, the news was a hit. My daughter is excited to be part Jewish; my son is thrilled about the Irish connection. My wife is planning to send her DNA off to be tested soon.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A Bronx man who prosecutors say pretended to be a lawyer and scammed **immigrants** seeking legal assistance was arrested Monday for disobeying a court's order, officials said.

Edwin Rivera operated a Bronx accounting office called Inmigracion Hoy News Today, where he portrayed himself as an attorney experienced in helping undocumented **immigrants** become permanent residents, prosecutors said.

He was taken into custody Monday due to an August ruling from Bronx Supreme Court Justice Betty Owen Stinson, who ordered Mr. Rivera to spend at least 30 days in jail. She found Mr. Rivera in civil and criminal contempt of court, writing that despite prior orders to stop, he "continues to willfully and fraudulently represent that he is a lawyer and continues to provide legal and **immigration** services."

The justice's order stems from information gathered by an undercover investigator and a client who paid $10,000 for Mr. Rivera's services from 2008 through 2015, New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman's office said.

According to the office, which investigated Mr. Rivera, he wasn't a licensed attorney, he misrepresented the law and didn't provide the services he promised. Prosecutors said he cheated **immigrants** out of at least $60,000 in fees for legal services.

A lawyer for Mr. Rivera couldn't be reached for comment. A message left at Inmigracion Hoy News Today wasn't returned. The establishment's voice message called it "an accounting office," and said it was open from 7 a.m. to 11 a.m.

Justice Stinson said in August that Mr. Rivera could spend up to six months in jail, depending on whether or when he pays $34,331 in fines and restitution and provides documentation about his business, according to Mr. Schniederman's office.

Mr. Rivera has a lengthy legal history, which prosecutors say includes ignoring other court orders. The attorney general's office says it sued him in 2004 after he allegedly placed an advertisement in a Spanish-language newspaper saying the Dream Act had passed, and faked an application process. Prosecutors said he charged $1,500 per application.

The Dream Act was aimed at helping young people brought into the country illegally. The legislation hasn't become law.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In their first debate, the presidential nominees veered far away from substantive differences and into personal bickering.

That likely won't be the case with their running mates, who will meet Tuesday for the only vice-presidential debate of 2016.

Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, the Republican, and Virginia Sen. Tim Kaine, the Democrat, have political records that are diametrically opposed, reflect the mainstream of their respective parties and could bring out sharp contrasts. The 90-minute debate will be moderated by Elaine Quijano of CBS News.

Mr. Kaine, a former governor, is for the minimum-wage increase that presidential nominee Hillary Clinton has advocated, while Mr. Pence is opposed. Mr. Pence would rescind the Affordable Care Act, while Mr. Kaine wouldn't. Mr. Pence, since joining the GOP ticket, has defended presidential nominee Donald Trump's proposals to build a wall on the Mexican border and deport illegal **immigrants**. Mr. Kaine opposes both measures.

While vice-presidential debates can at times produce a memorable moment, they typically don't substantially shift the dynamics of a race.

"The challenge for both of them is to make absolutely no news," said Michael B. Murphy, a former Indiana Republican state legislator who has known Mr. Pence since his first run for Congress, in 1988.

The Clinton campaign has largely trained its policy attacks on Mr. Trump and ignored his running mate, while the GOP nominee features in his stump speech an attack on Mr. Kaine for proposing what Mr. Trump has called a "$4 billion tax increase."

During his term as Virginia's governor, Mr. Kaine sought to plug the state's budget holes with tax increases. To pay for transportation infrastructure, Mr. Kaine proposed in 2006 raising state taxes on new vehicle purchases, auto insurance and registration fees to raise $1 billion a year.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch in July noted that a portion of the revenue would have come from boosting traffic ticket fines.

Mr. Kaine, as he was leaving office in December 2009, proposed raising all of Virginia's income-tax brackets by 1 percentage point. The Republican-controlled Virginia legislature killed that idea after he left office. But Mr. Kaine also eliminated Virginia's estate tax and signed an income-tax cut during his four-year term.

Mrs. Clinton opposes eliminating the federal estate tax, while Mr. Trump has said he would repeal it.

On social issues, the vice-presidential hopefuls have adopted different positions. Mr. Pence, a former House member who for years has described himself in speeches as "a Christian, a conservative and a Republican, in that order," emerged in early 2015 as the champion of Indiana's "religious freedom" law that was widely criticized for allowing business owners to deny services to people because of their religious opposition to a customer's sexual orientation.

Mr. Pence initially defended the law, arguing it didn't offer a "license to discriminate." But after a week of intense pressure from corporate leaders in Indiana, Mr. Pence and Republicans who control the state legislature enacted a new version of the law that specified that business owners couldn't deny services. Mr. Pence has since been criticized by some leading social conservatives.

Mr. Kaine, who is Catholic, endorsed same-sex marriage in 2013, two months after his Senate swearing-in and well after President Barack Obama, Mrs. Clinton and other leading Democrats.

Both men have altered their position on trade policy upon being named running mate. Messrs. Pence and Kaine each backed the Trans-Pacific Partnership, though each has rescinded their support in recent months to align with Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton, who both oppose the Pacific Rim trade pact.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON -- The Supreme Court on Monday dashed President Barack Obama's hopes of having his **immigration** plan reconsidered before he leaves office, turning down a White House request to try again to resolve the program's legality after deadlocking 4-4 in June.

The Supreme Court's tie-vote left in place a lower-court decision temporarily blocking implementation of the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans program.

The plan would provide work authorization to more than four million illegal **immigrants** whose children are U.S. citizens or lawful residents. A 26-state coalition led by Texas has sued, opposing the plan.

Losing parties are entitled to ask the Supreme Court to rehear a case, but such requests are almost never granted.

In its July petition for rehearing, the Justice Department sought to put the case back on the docket in the hopes the high court would get a ninth justice who would be able to break the tie.

Justice Antonin Scalia died in February, leaving the court short-handed -- and equally balanced between conservatives and liberals.

Senate Republicans have kept a promise to deny consideration of Mr. Obama's nominee for the high-court vacancy, U.S. Circuit Judge Merrick Garland, leaving little prospect of a ninth justice taking the bench before the president's term expires.

Assuming proceedings continue through the lower courts, the **immigration** case could return to the Supreme Court, perhaps as early as next year.

Political events, however, could overtake the litigation. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has pledged to crack down on illegal **immigrants** and cancel President Obama's plans for lenient treatment of those with significant ties to the U.S.

Meanwhile, Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton has said she would go further than Mr. Obama's **immigration** plan.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS -- Sgt. Jessie Wiggins maneuvered his police cruiser away from the glow of the Strip and into the darkness of a nearby neighborhood that recently had been the scene of a half-dozen robberies, multiple assaults and the killing of a 21-year-old with a shotgun blast to his head.

On this night in early August, Sgt. Wiggins and his eight officers cruised a square-mile area of low-rise apartment complexes, stopping residents for minor offenses in the hopes of nabbing violent criminals and illegal guns. A trespasser turned out to be a suspect in a May murder in the same area.

Later, a newspaper deliveryman, who was stopped for failing to turn on his blinker and had no criminal record, became upset, and he said believed the officers were simply targeting black people.

Sgt. Wiggins, who is white, drove to the scene to try to smooth over the dispute. "We're actually here to help you guys out," Sgt. Wiggins said to the man. "We know you're not a violent guy, you're not the guy we're looking for."

The tactic is part of new effort to stop crime before it happens by using data to send teams of officers to swarm violent-crime hot spots.

Las Vegas, like 28 other large cities in the first half of the year, saw a jump in homicides. The murder rate in the Las Vegas area is still far below more violent cities, such as Baltimore or Chicago.

But the leap in homicides here, from 56 in the first half of 2015 to 90 in the first half of 2016, was one of the largest of police departments surveyed by the Major Cities Chiefs Association at midyear. Robberies and assaults are also up.

Most U.S. cities are much safer than they were in the 1990s, and it is unclear if the recent jumps indicate the beginning of a long-term shift. But it has police chiefs and politicians seeking answers.

Targeting high-crime zones isn't new, but deploying the tactic presents a fresh challenge for police departments grappling with a rise in crime in an era of escalating tension between law enforcement and minority communities.

"It's always a struggle to keep departments in check when there's a significant increase in crime," said Samuel Walker, professor emeritus of criminal justice at the University of Nebraska Omaha. "You've got public pressure to do something, and in the past, it was often do anything."

In the past, police here and across the nation used a zero-tolerance style of policing to fight violent crime, stopping and arresting people for minor offenses. The approach heightened tensions between African-American residents and police in places such as Baltimore and New York.

In Las Vegas, the Metropolitan Police Department is trying to tamp down violent crime without **alienating** the black and Latino residents the department has worked to win over.

Metro came under scrutiny five years ago for a high number of questionable shootings of black men. After a voluntary Justice Department review, Metro introduced new use-of-force training and revamped policies. Body cameras were deployed -- and Metro is currently one of the few major departments to quickly release footage after shootings.

Fatal shootings by police have dropped -- and there is less tension than there is in other places, said Roxann McCoy, president of the NAACP's Las Vegas chapter. "Our police department has changed tremendously," she said.

Even so, Ms. McCoysaid she has received some complaints about the hot-spot policing from residents.

"They just feel like they're being harassed," she said. "We want the bad guys caught, but we don't want the innocent people caught up, too."

Sgt. Wiggins said he instructs his officers to pursue violent criminals, and let "Ma and Pa Kettle" go for minor violations. "We're not just dealing with a spike in violent crime; we have a philosophy that deals with community outreach," he said. "How do we balance these two things?"

Brian Sette and Justin Spurling, the officers who nabbed the trespasser who turned out to be a murder suspect, were grinning when Sgt. Wiggins rolled up on the scene. Sgt. Wiggins called it a "good snag," but when he found out the suspect didn't have a gun, he needled the pair. "I need a gun in my pretty little hands," he said.

A half a block away and a few minutes later, another pair of officers stopped a man for riding a bike without a light. They found hypodermic needles in his bag but no guns.

"That's a fish we throw back," Sgt. Wiggins said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BIRMINGHAM, England -- British Prime Minister Theresa May said the U.K. would trigger the process of disentangling itself from the European Union by the end of March, signaling she would pursue a clear break from the bloc.

Setting the stage for Britain to leave the EU by 2019, Mrs. May gave the clearest indication of her priorities for an exit deal to date, saying she wanted to win British companies "the maximum freedom" to operate in Europe's single market, but not if it meant relinquishing the right to curb **immigration** to the U.K.

"Let me be clear: We are not leaving the European Union only to give up control of **immigration** again," she said Sunday. "We are going to be a fully independent, sovereign country -- a country that is no longer part of a political union with supranational institutions that can override national parliaments and courts."

Mrs. May's announcement, made at her Conservative Party's annual conference, provides some clarity for businesses and European politicians who have pressed her government for more details about its exit plan. It also ratchets pressure on the British leader to set the U.K.'s negotiating position in the coming months.

After Britain invokes Article 50 of the EU's Lisbon Treaty -- the mechanism that officially kicks off the divorce proceedings -- the U.K. has a two-year window to negotiate its new relationship with the EU. That process is likely to be further complicated by elections in France and Germany next year.

Since the June referendum vote, the British government has sought to persuade business executives to continue investing in the U.K. To what extent Britain preserves its access to Europe's single market -- which EU leaders say would require it to abide by the bloc's free-movement principle -- is likely to be a critical factor in companies' plans.

Mrs. May has pointed to SoftBank Group Corp.'s $32 billion acquisition of U.K.-based ARM Holdings PLC, announced in July, as a sign of confidence in the country post-Brexit.

Last week, though, the chief executive of Nissan Motor Co., the owner of the U.K.'s largest car factory, said it might scrap a major investment in the U.K. without more clarity on Britain's future trade relations. Nissan "will not make an important investment decision in the dark," CEO Carlos Ghosn said.

Economic data since the June vote show the U.K. economy -- the world's fifth-largest in 2015 -- appears to be regaining its footing. Official data released on Friday showed Britain's powerhouse services sector posted strong growth in the month immediately after the vote.

Many economists, however, say it is too early to say whether the economy will avoid a slowdown, and uncertainty around the U.K.'s future with its biggest trading partners could weigh on its growth.

Since Mrs. May became prime minister in July, divisions have emerged among U.K. politicians and within her party about whether Britain should break off entirely from the bloc or maintain close ties at the cost of agreeing to abide by some EU laws.

Mrs. May said on Sunday that the U.K. wouldn't be open to negotiating away its sovereignty and that she would seek to end the jurisdiction of Europe's highest court, the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg, over the U.K.

"I think, as a whole, the speech seemed to suggest the U.K. would leave the single market," said Raoul Ruparel, co-director of think tank Open Europe.

Mrs. May faces growing pressure from her party to spell out how she sees Britain's future outside the EU. On Sunday, she said she wouldn't give a running commentary on negotiations as that would put the U.K. at a disadvantage in talks.

The toughest element of the coming negotiation likely will be to what extent the U.K. can access Europe's free-trade zone. Under EU law, countries can be members of the single market only if they agree to Europe's free-movement principle, which allows EU citizens to live and work anywhere in the bloc.

Britain's economy is closely tied to its European neighbors, and trade barriers between them could be costly. The U.K. sent some GBP 230 billion ($297 billion) in exports to the EU in 2014, compared with GBP 88 billion to the U.S. and GBP 18.7 billion to China.

---

Laurence Norman, Gabriele Steinhauser, Marcus Walker and Jason Douglas contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BUDAPEST -- Prime Minister Viktor Orban, a leading backer of tighter **immigration** rules in the European Union, suffered a setback as a majority of Hungarian voters skipped a national referendum he had called to gauge support.

Turnout was below 40%, preliminary results showed, far short of the 50% threshold needed to make a referendum binding. Authorities said a large number of votes were invalid and counted as no shows.

More than 98% of those who took part in the ballot backed Mr. Orban and rejected an EU plan to relocate refugees under a mandatory quota system, officials said. Mr. Orban said it sent a clear signal to Brussels that EU members should be given full control over migration.

"We should be proud to be the first EU country to have expressed our views," he said.

Sunday's referendum was closely watched because Mr. Orban has taken the lead in campaigning against the open-door policy of several EU countries since hundreds of thousands of people from the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa crossed into the Continent last year.

He has clashed repeatedly with other EU leaders, notably German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who has made the acceptance of refugees a cornerstone of her policy.

European Parliament Speaker Martin Schulz said the vote was "a dangerous game," according to an interview published Sunday by German daily Berliner Morgenpost, because it challenged the legality of European lawmaking.

But Ms. Merkel's approach has suffered setbacks at home, where an upstart anti-**immigration** movement outpolled her ruling conservative party in a recent state election and now has seats in 10 state parliaments.

Binding or not, the Hungarian referendum will have little immediate consequence on EU migration policy because Brussels has largely backed off trying to force through measures for greater burden-sharing among member countries.

Resistance to the relocation program in Hungary, and most Central and Eastern European countries, has led EU authorities to consider ways to better tighten the bloc's border while continuing to support asylum seekers, especially war refugees from Syria.

Mr. Orban says migrants represent a security threat because some Islamist radicals have made their way into the EU by posing as refugees.

Although Hungary's working population is expected to shrink by more than 10% over the next four years, Mr. Orban objects to allowing large numbers of refugees, especially Muslims, to settle in the country, saying they would threaten its ethnic cohesion.

At issue, he said in his Sunday address, is "who we want to coexist with, what will happen to our culture, our way of life, our hard-earned economic recovery, and what will happen to our Christian roots."

Left-leaning opposition party Egyutt said the outcome of the ballot was tantamount to a no-confidence vote. The far-right Jobbik Party, the second-most-popular party after Mr. Orban's ruling Fidesz Party, called for the premier's resignation.

---

Friedrich Geiger contributed to this article.

License this article from Dow Jones Reprint Service[http://www.djreprints.com/link/DJRFactiva.html?FACTIVA=wjco20161003000044]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ten Restaurants That Changed America

By Paul Freedman

Liveright, 527 pages, $35

According to a survey of U.S. restaurant menus from 1840 to 1865, the most popular entree, ahead of "currie of lobster" and "oyster patties," was "Macaroni au gratin." Some 150 years later, when Graydon Carter opened the Waverly Inn in the West Village, New Yorkers were abuzz over the price of the restaurant's signature macaroni and cheese with freshly shaved white truffles: $55.

Have our taste buds not evolved since the 19th century? On the one hand, Americans still love the comforting combination of noodles and hot cheese. But on the other, our culinary evolution has been radical: In the 1800s, most Americans never would have heard of a truffle, let alone tasted one. And to boast that the cheese came directly from a farm would have been laughable -- back then, everything did.

How we got from there to here is the fascinating story Paul Freedman tells in "Ten Restaurants That Changed America." Through his selection of iconic establishments -- Delmonico's, Antoine's, Schrafft's, Howard Johnson's, Mamma Leone's, the Mandarin, Sylvia's, Le Pavillon, the Four Seasons and Chez Panisse -- he charts the history of American eating.

There's a lot to digest. Foodies will appreciate the inclusion of vintage menus and marvel at the prices: In 1941, for example, Chateaubriand for two at Le Pavillon was $6 (though that's $98 today). More impressive was the set menu at Chez Panisse from 1971: $3.95 per person, a mere $23 in today's dollars.

As Mr. Freedman makes clear, the chosen 10 aren't necessarily the best restaurants. They made the cut because of "influence and exemplification" -- each has been crucial in "setting or reflecting trends in what Americans think about food and particularly dining out."

Take, for instance, Schrafft's, the Northeast chain that flourished in the mid-20th century and "pioneered the middle-class restaurant experience," as Mr. Freedman writes. The food was geared, in the words of founder Frank Shattuck, toward "secretaries and stenographers who must watch their pocket books." It was also a "safe" environment for these diners: They didn't have to go with a male escort because the place didn't serve any alcohol. But the menu was a patronizing attempt to understand what women want: salads, cottage cheese and 11 flavors of ice cream.

Howard Johnson's -- founded in 1925 -- went even further, with its 28 flavors of ice cream, including some now-forgotten ones like grape nut and fruit salad (all perfected by founder Howard Deering Johnson). But HoJo's main contribution to our food culture was standardization. As Mr. Freedman explains, "the variation and imperfection that today signify handmade and 'artisanal' in the past denoted food that was poor quality and unreliable. The individuality of the proverbial greasy spoon was unattractive compared to the formulaic, immaculate, white-tiled, orange-roofed 'Host of the Highways.'"

The original menu touted such classics as fried clams, "frankfort" hot dogs grilled in butter, triple-decker sandwiches and "sizzling steaks." Sadly, when the founder's son, Bud Johnson, took full control of the business following his father's death in 1972, the emphasis was on cutting food costs. "Prime graded steak was replaced by Choice, then Select, and finally by frozen pre-cut portions." Customers noticed. It also didn't help that McDonald's -- Ray Kroc opened the first restaurant in 1955 -- was stealing those customers away. In 1979 there were more than 1,000 HoJo's across the country. Today, there is one, in Lake George, N.Y.

The contributions of African-Americans and **immigrants** are integral to Mr. Freedman's story. The Mandarin, opened in San Francisco in 1961 by Cecilia Chiang, a Chinese **immigrant**, helped popularize stir-fry cooking, kung pao chicken, twice-cooked pork and tofu. For the uninitiated, the menu provided tips on how to order: "For two persons, for instance, a soup and 2 or 3 dishes and rice are enough. For larger groups, order as many dishes as there are persons in the party, plus 'one for the table,' and a soup." A separate menu existed for Chinese customers, on the assumption that Caucasians couldn't handle pork kidneys and fish heads.

"What is distinctive about the United States is that foreign restaurants also intrigued customers from the majority culture," Mr. Freedman writes. In European countries there are regional cuisines. Not so in our melting pot, where "diners tend to experiment with cuisines and usually patronize a mix of restaurants."

But the reigning influence over American cuisine (at least for the country's first 180 years) was French -- and there was no more quintessentially French institution than Le Pavillon. It began as an exhibit at the 1939 World's Fair, where 136,000 meals were served in six months. After Hitler invaded France the following year, "the restaurant personnel had to decide whether to return to Nazi-occupied France, or, as stranded refugees, try to make a go of it in America." Henri Soule, the pavilion's manager, hired those who decided to stay and opened Le Pavillon in Midtown Manhattan. It was a sensation. The front section was reserved for VIPs; the rear was referred to as Siberia. John F. Kennedy was known to order a bottle of milk. As Joseph Wechsberg writes in "Dining at the Pavillon" (1962), "the bottle was served in a silver bucket, like vintage champagne."

Naturally, there was a downside: "Snobbery, discrimination, and intimidation were majestically deployed by the imperious if often entertaining Soule, and these imputed characteristics have damaged the reputation of French cuisine in America ever since." The result, Mr. Freedman writes, is that today "it is easier to find Indian vegetarian or Ethiopian food in the United States than an actual French restaurant."

That said, "Soule trained an entire generation of French chefs and New York restaurant owners, some of whom departed as refugees from the tyranny of this irritable genius." Both La Caravelle and La Grenouille (the latter is still around) were founded by Pavillon alumni. Pierre Franey and Jacques Pepin also cooked under Soule. When I interviewed Mr. Pepin in 2012, he was still critical of his former patron: "He never came to the kitchen. He'd yell from the top. I mean, the cook to him was still someone in the black hole."

The Four Seasons, which opened in 1959, was decidedly not French. This was a deliberate decision by its overseer, the legendary Joe Baum. The space was designed by Philip Johnson and cost more to build than the Guggenheim Museum. The walls were adorned with the works of Miro and Picasso. The term "power lunch" was invented for this restaurant. Also of significance was its menu, composed by the powerhouse team of Albert Stockli, Mimi Sheraton and James Beard, which rotated with the seasons, a concept taken to the next level by Alice Waters.

Ms. Waters's restaurant, Chez Panisse, which opened its doors in 1971, spawned a farm-to-table movement that is dominant to this day -- even McDonald'srecently ran a "farm-to-fork" ad campaign featuring their potato farmers. So every time a waiter takes several minutes to tell you about the wild-caught salmon or grassfed steak, thank Alice Waters.

It's unlikely we will see a resurgence in French cuisine, and it's hard to imagine Maryland terrapins or Beef Robespierre appearing on a menu anytime soon. But Mr. Freedman's book suggests that it's not ultimately restaurants that change America -- it's the people in the kitchen.

---

Mr. Matus, a senior editor at the Weekly Standard, is the author of "Vodka: How a Colorless, Odorless, Flavorless Spirit Conquered America."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There were cheers when Donald Trump assured his Virginia audience last weekend that the wall will be built and, yes, that Mexico would pay for it. But the cheers lacked the roaring ecstasy his promise used to evoke at rallies. No one has the heart, by now, to pretend that such a wall will actually be built, but that's all right with Mr. Trump's dauntless fans, who can find plenty of other reasons for their faith in him. The NeverTrump forces, appalled at the prospect of a Trump presidency, are no less passionate.

The NeverHillary forces are another matter entirely -- citizens well aware of the darker aspects of Donald Trump's character but who have nonetheless concluded that they should give him their vote. They are aware of his casual disregard for truth, his self-obsession, his ignorance, his ingrained vindictiveness. Not even the first presidential debate, which saw him erupt into a snarling aside about Rosie O'Donnell, could loosen his hold on that visceral drive to inflict payback, in this case over a feud 10 years old.

The NeverHillary forces are aware, too, of his grandiosity -- his announcement that he knows more about Islamic State than any of America's generals will long be remembered -- his impulse-driven character, his insatiable need for applause, the head-turning effect on him of an approving word from Vladimir Putin. The Russian leader's compliment late last year was of the mildest kind -- he referred to Mr. Trump as "talented" and "colorful" -- but it was enough to make the candidate's heart go pitter-patter with gratitude and engender instant expressions of his faith in Mr. Putin's integrity and leadership. As Mr. Trump himself has explained, "if he says nice things about me, I'm going to say nice things about him."

Such are the values that drive the Republican candidate's judgment -- a fact interesting to contemplate as one imagines a President Trump dealing with international conflict and rogue heads of state. Still Mr. Trump is now the choice of voters who have concluded that of the two flawed contenders running, he would be far preferable.

Yes, he may be rough around the edges, but he's a fresh force, the argument goes, unlike the establishment war horse, Mrs. Clinton, with her history of scandal and rumors thereof, and her decades in politics. Mr. Trump is the dynamo who will blow up the old order. He's authentic, a man with the courage of his convictions.

Mr. Trump has not, of course, shown himself notably reliable as regards the courage of his convictions. It's by now impossible to count the number of times and ways in which he's sidled away from his grand plans on **immigration**, that promise to deport everyone here illegally, not to mention his proposal to institute a total block on Muslim **immigration** "till we figure things out." He's proffered no less than three different views on abortion, one of which called for "at least some punishment" for the woman involved -- quickly changed to wait, no, it should be the doctor.

Still, it was the view of Donald Trump as a fearless foe of liberal piety, that image of him as an outsider, untainted by experience in government -- itself one of the more remarkable boasts of any presidential campaign in memory -- that persuaded so many Americans he is the leader the country needs. As opposed, that is, to Mrs. Clinton -- the educated former secretary of state, with lengthy experience in government.

Equally remarkable, even for a change election, that experience, those years of education in national security somehow rank high on the list of defects the anti-Hillary brigades find so objectionable. Here is a flaw apparently even more rankling than her email server history, the questions about Benghazi, or the Clinton Foundation: She offers nothing of Mr. Trump's aura of free-swinging dynamism, not to mention a mind blissfully uncluttered by facts, knowledge of geopolitical realities, and the like.

Mrs. Clinton hasn't failed to provide, on her own, cause for concern about her own proclivities and never more intolerably than in that debate Monday when she chose to ramble on, familiarly, about institutional racism, which invariably emerges in her responses on conflagration involving police action. Americans have a right to cringe at this reflexive, factually distorted, and inflammatory sermonizing. The accompanying, deep felt tribute to the police and their heroism, invariably added, can never offset the insidiousness of these messages.

Even so, such proclivities pale next to the occasion for cringing that would come with a Trump presidency. No one witnessing Mr. Trump's primary race -- his accumulation of Alt-Right cheerleaders, white supremacists and swastika devotees -- could fail to notice the menacing tone and the bitterness that came with it.

Not for nothing did the Democrats bring off a triumph of a convention, alive with cheer, not to mention its two visitors whose story would lift countless American hearts. They were, of course, the Muslim couple Khizr and Ghazala Khan, whose son, Capt. Humayun Khan -- brought here as a child -- died in Iraq in 2004, saving his men from an explosive-rigged car.

His countrymen now go streaming to his grave at Arlington National Cemetery to leave notes and flowers. He reminded us of who we are -- the nation that takes its newcomers and transforms them into Americans. After 9/11, Capt. Khan, American, could scarcely wait to serve his country. The national response to the Khans injected a sense of unity and affirmation, however brief, into an atmosphere of embittering divisiveness.

The end of the election is now in sight. Some among the anti-Hillary brigades have decided, in deference to their exquisite sensibilities, to stay at home on Election Day, rather than vote for Mrs. Clinton. But most Americans will soon make their choice. It will be either Mr. Trump or Mrs. Clinton -- experienced, forward-looking, indomitably determined and eminently sane. Her election alone is what stands between the American nation and the reign of the most unstable, proudly uninformed, psychologically unfit president ever to enter the White House.

---

Ms. Rabinowitz is a member of the Journal's editorial board.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: Bipartisan Election Derangement Syndrome" -- WSJ Oct. 6, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TIHANY, Hungary -- At a tavern in this lakeside resort town, the waiter scurrying from table to table could use some help.

Most of his colleagues have gone abroad to seek better pay, leaving Ferenc Punk's family-run business heavily understaffed.

Mr. Punk could have tapped a vast pool of potential workers: Scores of migrants, mainly from Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, have traveled through the Central European country over the past two years, and thousands more are waiting at its southern border in the hope of entering the European Union.

Instead, the 67-year-old restaurant owner plans to make his dining room smaller. He won't recruit migrants, especially if they are Muslims.

"I wouldn't know what to do with them," Mr. Punk said. "I'm not against them but they are coming from a totally different culture."

Mr. Punk's tavern is a microcosm of the wider forces shaping Hungary's society and economy ahead of Sunday's referendum on **immigration**. Prime Minister Viktor Orban, who opposes Muslim **immigration**, wants voters to say no to an EU policy to impose "the obligatory resettlement of non-Hungarian citizens."

Although Hungary's working population is expected to shrink by more than 10% over the next four years, Mr. Orban objects to allowing large numbers of refugees to settle in the country, saying they would threaten its ethnic cohesion.

The prime minister argues migrants also represent a security threat because some Islamist radicals have made their way into the EU by posing as refugees.

In tandem with Poland's Jaroslaw Kaczynski, leader of the country's ruling Law and Justice party, Mr. Orban is campaigning in Brussels against the EU plan to impose refugee quotas on bloc members.

That has put him on a collision course with other EUâ€‹ leaders, notably German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who has made the acceptance of refugees a cornerstone of her policy.

But Ms. Merkel's approach has suffered setbacks at home, where an upstart anti-**immigration** movement outpolled her ruling conservative party in a recent state election.

"Courageous politicians in Germany and Austria do say that what the Hungarians are doing is good for Germany and for Austria as well," Mr. Orban said on state television Tuesday.

Since joining the EU in 2004, the country of nearly 10 million has seen an estimated 350,000 of its skilled and educated workers leave. At least 90,000 alone have relocated to the U.K. The "brain drain" -- along with a low birthrate and aging population -- has resulted in chronic labor shortages in service industries and at factories and farms.

Romanians and ethnic Hungarians in neighboring countries traditionally filled many jobs in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors here, but now leapfrog Hungary to move farther west.

That has left members of DelKerTESZ, a cooperative of some 500 vegetable producers in Szentes, in southern Hungary, mustering friends and relatives to avoid losing harvests.

"We get family members to work on the fields or transport the produce on Saturdays and Sundays," said Ferenc Ledo, the cooperative chief. "It's impossible to find crop pickers."

Hungary's main association of entrepreneurs and employers, Mgyosz, has warned that the dearth of applicants in many sectors was endangering economic growth. The association sides with government policy, though, saying only migrant workers who "are skilled and could culturally fit in" are needed.

More than 150,000 non-European refugee seekers applied for asylum in Hungary last year. But nearly all of them continued their journeys to Germany or Scandinavia.

The government now lets about 30 migrants a day cross through its heavily guarded border with Serbia. Almost none of them stay in the country, according to the Helsinki Committee, a human-rights group.

The government's anti-**immigration** policy has been pilloried by the Two-Tailed Dog Party, a group founded by prankster artists that launched a mock billboard campaign.

"Did you know? Hungarians see more UFOs in their lifetime than migrants," one of the recent billboards reads.

Yet a survey conducted in mid-September by polling agency Publicus suggests 61% of Hungarians will support Mr. Orban's **immigration** stance on Sunday. The referendum, which is valid only if turnout surpasses a threshold of 50%, is largely symbolic, as it carries no legal bearing and Brussels has backed off trying to impose refugee quotas.

At the Tihany tavern, Mr. Punk casts his support with the government, saying it has made Hungary a safer and more attractive place. "Some Germans have already moved here," he said. "They can have a cozy life here."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AFGHANISTAN

Residents Say U.S.

Strike Killed Civilians

A U.S. airstrike killed at least 15 civilians at a private residence in eastern Afghanistan, local residents said, but Afghan security officials claimed it was militants who were targeted.

The U.S. military confirmed it had struck the Achin district of Nangarhar province, which is partly under the control of Islamic State, as part of a counterterrorism mission. Military spokesman Brig. Gen. Charles Cleveland said the U.S. is investigating claims that civilians had been killed.

Residents said the strike wounded dozens of people welcoming a villager returning from the annual Hajj pilgrimage to the Saudi holy city of Mecca.

A provincial police spokesman said the strike had killed Islamic State fighters and denied any civilians were among the dead.

-- Habib Khan Totakhil

---

CHINA

Landslides Leave

Over 30 Missing

Rescuers rushed to find at least 32 people missing after a typhoon triggered landslides in villages in eastern China, according to local government and state media reports.

The landslides hit mountainous counties in Zhejiang province Wednesday evening after the area was battered by heavy rains from Typhoon Megi, the reports said.

Tumbling rock and soil destroyed several houses in the village of Sucun. State media said rescuers managed to pull some free, but 26 remained missing. Six people were missing in a nearby county, according to Xinhua.

Typhoon Megi, which has cut a destructive swath through the region, hit the coastal city of Quanzhou Wednesday morning, leaving one dead despite weakening to a tropical storm.

-- Josh Chin

---

UNITED KINGDOM

Labour Pledges No

Limits on **Immigration**

The leader of the U.K.'s main opposition, Jeremy Corbyn, has signaled his Labour Party wouldn't seek to limit **immigration** into Britain and said the party should prepare in case an early election is called next year.

Frustration at high levels of net migration from Europe was seen as a key issue for many Britons who voted to leave the European Union in a June referendum.

Mr. Corbyn, who was re-elected Labour leader Saturday after a bruising contest, said a Labour government would try to mitigate the impacts of **immigration**.

Prime Minister Theresa May has said she would seek to control **immigration** as part of Brexit negotiations. She has said the next election should be in 2020, as scheduled, to give the government time to work on withdrawing from the EU.

-- Nicholas Winning
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A recent Homeland Security Department decision to consider ending the widespread outsourcing of **immigrant** detention could mean overhauling a $2 billion-a-year system built around private prison contractors that house the majority of **immigrant** detainees.

But **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, the agency within Homeland Security that oversees **immigrant** detention, says the current system is efficient and cost-effective, given the congressional mandate to have 34,000 prison beds available each day.

Transferring control of all **immigrant** prisons to ICE "would require an 800% expansion of ICE capacity" to replace facilities that are privately run, said a senior ICE official who declined to be identified, adding that it likely would cost "billions."

Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson recently directed his advisory council to "evaluate whether **immigration** detention should move in the same direction as the Justice Department," which on Aug. 18 announced that it would stop housing inmates in private prisons. Mr. Johnson expects a recommendation by Nov. 30.

The review comes after a federal report concluded privately run prisons were less safe than those operated by the government, and after advocates complained about conditions for **immigrants** in privately run detention centers.

The detention of **immigrants** has become central to the presidential election. Republican candidate Donald Trump has vowed he would detain **immigrants**until they are deported from the U.S., instead of releasing them, as happens in some instances, until a judge decides their case.

On Wednesday, human-rights and **immigrant**-advocacy groups are set to deliver a petition with 200,000 signatures demanding that Homeland Security follow the Justice Department's lead.

Dozens of for-profit prisons are contracted to hold undocumented **immigrants**, at a cost of $127 a day a person, as they fight deportation in court, await removal from the country or seek asylum in the U.S.

Roughly 10% of detainees are held in ICE-controlled facilities, more than two-thirds are in private detention centers, and the rest are in state or municipal facilities. As of Aug. 8, there were 33,676 **immigrants** in detention. More than half in ICE custody don't have a criminal conviction.

Contracts between ICE and for-profit prison companies hang in the balance, depending on the result of the review. For instance, ICE signed a new contract last year with GEO Group to operate the Northwest Detention Center in Washington for another decade, renewable each year. The Tacoma facility has grown to 1,575 beds, from about 500 beds a decade ago.

The contract, which is typical, guarantees that the government will cover the cost of half the beds, regardless of whether they are occupied, in order to secure them at a reduced rate.

Eduardo Trujillo Lopez, an undocumented Mexican living in Walla Walla for nearly a decade, spent six months at the Tacoma facility after being arrested in March last year for driving with a suspended license. He had failed to pay traffic tickets, according to attorneys at the Northwest **Immigrant** Rights Project.

The 33-year-old construction worker, who is married to a U.S. citizen and has a U.S.-born daughter, was detained until the advocacy group helped him obtain and post an $8,000 bond.

Critics of ICE question why there are so many people in custody when illegal **immigration** has slowed. "The growth in the private-prison industry has been driven by more enforcement that fills beds, even at a time of relatively low **immigration** levels," said Bob Libal, executive director of Grassroots Leadership.

The bed quota, which Congress first mandated in 2009, benefits the private-prison industry and promotes detention, Mr. Libal and others say.

ICE said that all of those in detention meet **immigration**-enforcement priorities.

GEO Group and Corrections Corp., the two largest private-prison companies, said they were confident that the independent review would show they provide quality, cost-effective services.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**We recently visited Norway and Sweden to understand more about the European migrant crisis. What we saw provides important lessons for the American **immigration** debate.

More than 1.5 million people have relocated to Europe over the last two years. Many are refugees from Syria, Iraq and other war-torn lands. Many are simply economic migrants leaving poorer nations. This mass migration has strained European societies and upended European politics with populist insurgencies.

Though economically and demographically similar, Norway and Sweden have adopted sharply different approaches to the policy and politics of **immigration**, and have reaped sharply differing outcomes.

Starting in 2015, Norway adopted an **immigration** policy it has termed "strict but fair." The Norwegians agreed to accept 8,000 migrants from other European nations, though they weren't obligated to do so.

Norway also established measures to stop uncontrolled migration. It imposed new border controls featuring a border fence, increased waiting periods for residency and deportation of ineligible migrants. It also reduced migrant benefits to match those offered by its neighbors. Norway even advertised in foreign nations, warning that migrants who do not face war or persecution will be deported.

The result? Asylum applications in Norway fell 95% between the last quarter of 2015 and the first quarter of 2016.

Norway is far from hardhearted. It has welcomed refugees for decades and its foreign policy prioritizes conflict resolution and humanitarian relief. But Norwegians understand that an open-border policy would strain their resources, disrupt the integration of other recently arrived **immigrants**, and undercut the legitimate desire of Norwegians to preserve their nation's culture and character.

Also significant: Norway's political system has effectively accommodated a broad spectrum of views on **immigration**. The Progress Party, the traditional home for **immigration** skeptics, has won the second- or third-largest share of seats in the Norwegian Parliament since the 1990s. Rather than shun Progress, as has happened to similar parties in many European countries, mainstream leaders welcomed it into the political debate and, eventually, into the governing coalition. As one government leader explained to us, "In Norway, we discuss every issue and concern. Nothing is out of bounds."

Contrast this with Sweden's approach. Sweden threw open its doors in 2013, offering Syrian refugees permanent residency. Asylum applications from across the world -- not just Syria -- spiked. Sweden has since received more than 280,000 migrants, and counting. That is by far the most migrants per capita of any EUnation and akin to the U.S. adding the population of Michigan. These migrants are disproportionately poor, young, male, undereducated, conservatively Muslim and possess virtually no Swedish-language skills.

This radical policy occurred with little debate because political correctness pervades Sweden. They even have a term for the phenomenon: asiktskorridor, or "the opinion corridor." Any questions about the economic, fiscal and cultural impact of an immediate influx of migrants clearly lay outside the corridor; asking them could result in accusations of xenophobia or racism.

But these questions are real and they reflect legitimate concerns for the Swedish people. Because conventional political parties didn't respond to public concern, a controversial **immigration**-restrictionist party, the Sweden Democrats, more than doubled its vote share in the 2014 elections and became the third-largest party in parliament. The left and the right refused to work with the Sweden Democrats, creating a hamstrung minority government.

Faced with growing public dissatisfaction, the Swedish government finally relented and imposed border controls and other restrictions this summer. But not before committing more than 7% of its 2016 budget to migrant services, with costs set to steadily increase. No one knows where the new money will come from, where many of the recent migrants will live or work, or what the ultimate social impact will be.

Sweden's failures have been repeated in Germany, France, Austria and elsewhere. **Immigration** was the key issue driving British votes to leave the European Union

The parallels to the U.S. **immigration** debate are clear. For years, a bipartisan elite consensus has favored the mass **immigration** of unskilled and low-skilled workers into America coupled with the legalization of millions of illegal **immigrants** already here. Only one thing has stopped these elites from their desired **immigration** policy: Two-thirds to three-quarters of Americans consistently oppose any increase in **immigration**.

**Immigration** is the central issue of Donald Trump's presidential campaign. He saw legitimate concerns about stagnant wages, low workforce-participation rates and lower levels of **immigrant** assimilation. He also understood that our own "opinion corridor" of political correctness largely ruled these topics out of bounds. When conventional leaders would not address their concerns, it's not surprising that Americans turned to a new voice.

One need not support Mr. Trump to acknowledge these reasonable concerns of the 14 million Republicans who voted for him in the primaries and the tens of millions who will vote for him in November. These voters are not xenophobic or racist. They simply want the priority of America's **immigration** policy to be the economic and social interests of American citizens.

Norwegian leaders responded to similar concerns and their country is safe and stable. Swedish leaders didn't and their country faces economic, social, and political upheaval. There is a lesson here for American elites.

---

Mr. Cotton is a Republican senator from Arkansas. Mr. Pompeo is a Republican congressman from Kansas.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: Lessons From Scandinavian **Immigration** Law" -- WSJ October 7, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For astronomers, Proxima b is a dream planet. Discovered last month orbiting the star nearest to our own solar system, it is thought to reside squarely in what scientists call the "Goldilocks zone" -- where the temperature for life is just right.

The news prompted excited questions among scientists: Is there really water on Proxima b? Could a rocket make it there one day? Could there be life on the planet? But it started a very different discussion among Christians: Would **alien** souls need saving? And if so, do missionaries have a responsibility to rocket into space with a trunk full of Bibles?

"At a minimum, a Christian would have an obligation to at least tell the Gospel story to other life-forms found outside of Earth," said Bill Nettles, the chair of the physics department at Union University, an evangelical college in Jackson, Tenn.

But to other Christians, the idea that an extraterrestrial, no matter how intelligent, could have a spiritual relationship with God is unthinkable.

"It's just planet Earth that has spiritual beings in need of redemption," said Hugh Ross, an astrophysicist who founded Reasons to Believe, a ministry that seeks to show that science supports Christian scripture. "That doesn't rule out dolphins or grass or bacteria on another planet," he said, but he doesn't expect to find life anywhere else in the universe. He added, "It's not Jesus Christ dying on 1,000 planets."

Discussion of **alien** spirituality has long been the stuff of science fiction. But as humans have peered further into space with telescopes and unmanned probes, religious groups have been forced to grapple -- sometimes uncomfortably -- with what the existence of intelligent extraterrestrial life would mean for their faith.

In 2014, two Jesuit astronomers at the Vatican published a book with the title, "Would You Baptize an Extraterrestrial?" That year, Pope Francis himself -- during a hypothetical section of a weekly homily -- said that he would baptize a green Martian with a "long nose and big ears," although only if the **alien** ambled into St. Peter's Basilica and asked. "Who are we to close doors?" the pontiff asked.

Evangelical Christians, who believe in spreading the Gospel, are starting to openly debate whether that duty extends beyond Earth's atmosphere.

As for Mormons, they may have an edge: They are already in space -- proudly counting several astronauts in their fold -- and are used to evangelizing in far-flung places. Utah has stood in for Mars in at least one movie and is home to a research station for the Mars Society.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints declined to comment, but a church official pointed to the "Encyclopedia of Mormonism," which accepts "the existence of other worlds created by God for a divine purpose that is the same as the purpose of earth life."

"For most denominations of Christianity," said David Weintraub, an astronomy professor at Vanderbilt University and the author of "Religions and Extraterrestrial Life," the possibility of life elsewhere presents "serious theological problems." "Until now, questions about who created us and are we alone were purely theological," he said. But now, astronomers are saying, "'We're taking over some turf that used to belong to you.'"

Christians have long argued about the cosmos -- at least since Galileo insisted in 1633 that the Earth revolved around the sun, a heresy that won him house arrest for the rest of his life. Nearly 200 years later, the philosopher Thomas Paine asked whether life on other planets would mean that Jesus was constantly incarnating and dying on various worlds -- a concept that few Christians found appealing.

On a recent morning outside St. Mark's Catholic Church in Los Angeles, parishioners were at ease with the possibility of sentient life on other planets -- and with spreading the Gospel there. "The Bible should be preached all over," Chutti Vanderwall, 64, said after mass. "The Bible teaches love -- not just here. It teaches us to be good people."

Some theologians argue that Ms. Vanderwall's observation -- that the Bible "teaches us to be good people" -- is precisely why Christians shouldn't plan to baptize **alien** life-forms. The Gospel tells of the fall and salvation of humanity, they say, not of other beings on some far-off world. Other theologians posit that intelligent extraterrestrials would have their own relationships with God.

Beyond the theological questions lie serious practical obstacles. "Communication would take a long time, obviously," said Deborah Haarsma, president of BioLogos, a group that promotes the idea that Christianity and science are in harmony. Even if communication were possible, she added, "Can we communicate about something as profound as God?"

Christians have plenty of time to decide all this. Proxima b is 4.2 light years away -- so a space probe using current technology would take thousands of years to get there.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Waves of **immigrants** coming into the U.S. in recent decades have helped the economy over the long haul and had little lasting impact on the wages or employment levels of native-born Americans, according to one of the most comprehensive studies yet on the topic.

The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine report on **immigration** assesses the economic and fiscal impacts of **immigration**, offering a broad look at a phenomenon that has moved to the forefront of the presidential race, with both candidates debating the downsides and merits of **immigration**.

The conclusion runs counter to a popular narrative suggesting that **immigrants** take the jobs of U.S. citizens, though it does acknowledge some costs for segments of the population. It highlights research showing an influx of lower-skilled workers can lead to lower wages for earlier waves of **immigrants** and native-born high-school dropouts. And the study found **immigration** can burden government finances, especially education budgets at the state and local levels.

The report, citing a lack of data, doesn't distinguish between the impacts of documented and undocumented **immigrants**.

The distillation of research and previously unavailable data offer a big-picture view that highlights the overarching benefits of **immigration** without discounting the dislocation and the fiscal costs associated with illegal and legal arrivals into the U.S.

"**Immigration** enlarges the economy while leaving the native population slightly better off on average, but the greatest beneficiaries of **immigration** are the **immigrants** themselves as they avail themselves of opportunities not available to them in their home countries," the report said.

**Immigration** also can lead to more innovation, entrepreneurship and technological change across the economy, the report found. About 53% of **immigrants**had at least some college, including 16% with a graduate education, as of 2012.

"The prospects for long run economic growth in the United States would be considerably dimmed without the contributions of high-skilled **immigrants**," the report said.

The study also found that "over a long time horizon (75 years in our estimates)," the fiscal impacts of **immigrants** "are generally positive at the federal level and negative at the state and local levels."

Much of the focus on **immigration** follows a significant jump in the foreign-born population and worries about illegal entry into the U.S.

The number of **immigrants** living in the country has risen to 42.3 million, or about 13% of the population in 2014, from 24.5 million, or 9% of the population in 1995. During the same period, the number of unauthorized **immigrants** roughly doubled, reaching 11.1 million in 2014, according to the study's findings. Since 2009, about 300,000 to 400,000 new unauthorized **immigrants** have arrived each year and about the same number have left.

The study, featuring more than 20 leading academics, is the first such broad look at **immigration** in nearly 20 years. Its timing coincides with a particularly heated discussion of the topic during the presidential race.

Republican candidate Donald Trump has made construction of a wall along the Mexican border his signature issue. He also has said he would step up deportation of illegal **immigrants** "arrested for any crime whatsoever."

Democrat Hillary Clinton is calling for an **immigration** overhaul that includes a pathway to citizenship for those already in the country.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SWITZERLAND

Parliament Moves Bill

To End Rift With EU

Switzerland's lower house of parliament sought to defuse a conflict with the European Commission over efforts to restrict **immigration**. Parliamentarians backed measures for the country to make better use of the domestic workforce to help limit **immigration** and to seek the approval of Brussels if it wanted to take additional corrective action.

Switzerland and Brussels have been at odds since February 2014, when the Swiss approved a referendum to limit **immigration**, effectively rejecting the European Union principle of the free movement of workers.

Parliament's actions suggest that the Swiss are seeking a compromise to ensure its access to the massive EU market. The measure now goes to the Senate.

-- Brian Blackstone

---

ROME

Mayor Pulls Plug

On Olympics Bid

Rome's new antiestablishment mayor said she wouldn't back a bid for her city to host the 2024 Olympic Games, dealing what is likely to be a fatal blow to the capital's candidacy to stage the sporting event.

The move makes Rome the latest city to withdraw its support for a bid to host the Games.

Virginia Raggi, a member of Italy's 5 Star Movement who was elected in June, said the Games "would just bring further debts" to a heavily indebted city.

The movement has also argued that spending for the Games could fall victim to the nepotism and corruption that often plagues public works in Italy.

Italy's Olympics committee and Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi have said the city's candidacy would likely be withdrawn if the new mayor decided to yank her support.

-- Manuela Mesco

---

CANADA

Province's Schools

Shut on Bomb Scare

All schools in the Canadian province of Prince Edward Island were evacuated early Wednesday after a faxed bomb threat, the national police force said.

The threat indicated bombs had been placed in a number of schools and would detonate sometime during the school day, the Royal Canadian Mounted Policesaid. The police said no suspect has yet been identified.

RCMP Sgt. Kevin Bailey said no bombs were discovered on school properties. He said the fax didn't identify specific schools.

Prince Edward Island is Canada's smallest province, with a population of about 150,000. Nearly 20,000 students attend 62 English and French public schools, according to provincial statistics.

The director of the public schools branch said he expected school operations would return to normal Thursday morning.

-- Judy McKinnon

---

BRAZIL

Reversal Sought on

Zika-Spraying Decree

The attorney general recommended against using insecticide-spraying aircraft to combat mosquitoes amid Brazil's battle to control the spread of the Zika virus.

Attorney General Rodrigo Janot has asked Brazil's Supreme Court to reverse a presidential decree permitting such spraying, "because of the danger of immediate damage to ecosystems and the risk of human poisoning."

President Michel Temer signed the decree in June as part of a campaign to kill mosquitoes that spread the Dengue, Zika and Chikungunya viruses. Aerial spraying hasn't yet started.

The government hasn't said which pesticides would be permitted for aerial spraying, but they reportedly wouldn't include DDT, which is prohibited in Brazil.

There is no deadline for the Supreme Court to issue a ruling.

-- Rogerio Jelmayer
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CAIRO -- At least 41 migrants died Wednesday when a rickety boat shared by nearly 600 passengers capsized near Egypt's Mediterranean Sea coast, according to officials cited by state media.

The boat sank some 112 miles north of Cairo, near Kafr el Sheikh, officials said, asrescue efforts continued late into the afternoon. The official Middle East News Agency said 155 people had been rescued so far. The boat was believed to be heading to Italy, Maj. Gen. Mohamed Kharisa, head of the Criminal Investigation Department in neighboring al-Beheira province, told the news agency.

People from Syria, Egypt, Sudan and other sub-Saharan nations have increasingly sought to migrate to Europe via Egypt. Routes through neighboring Libya, one of the most popular for migrants, are slowly becoming impassable due to security concerns caused by its civil conflict and efforts by international authorities to cut off the heavily trafficked corridors.

More than 300,000 migrants have crossed the Mediterranean Sea so far this year, according to the United Nations' refugee agency, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. Nearly 3,211 of those who embarked on the dangerous journey have died or are unaccounted for, it said.

The Mediterranean crossing from North Africa into Europe accounted for 78% of global migration deaths so far this year, according to the International Organization for Migration, up 52% since 2014.

"New routes are also increasingly risky, particularly when boats depart from Egypt," the IOM said in a report last month. "The journey is longer, and search and rescue is often carried out further away from land."

In a speech at the U.N. this week, Egyptian President Abdel Fattah Al Sisi said his government is moving closer toward completing legislation to combat illegal **immigration** from Egypt. Illegal **immigration** attempts are regularly intercepted by the country's coast guard and navy. This month, two boats carrying a total of about 440 migrants were foiled on takeoff by the country's navy, which regularly arrests migrants and smugglers operating illegally.

---

Tamer El-Ghobashy contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The number of **immigrants** unlawfully in the U.S. has been steady at 11 million since the end of the Great Recession, while the undocumented Mexican population continues to shrink, according to a study released Tuesday.

The multiyear trend marks a reversal of the migratory tide that for decades provided workers for key sectors of the U.S. economy. It's a turning point that is affecting employers in agriculture and construction, which are reporting labor shortages as those businesses added jobs amid the economy's recovery.

The Pew Research Center, which analyzed census data, concluded that the leveling off of the illegal population since 2009 is a direct consequence of the decline in the number of Mexicans who are undocumented. The trend was offset only by a rise in undocumented **immigrants** from Central America, Asia and Africa.

Illegal **immigration**, a central issue in the presidential campaign, peaked at 12.2 million in 2007. It was 11.1 million in 2014 and 11.3 million in 2009,according to the report.

In 2007, there were 6.9 million undocumented Mexicans in the U.S. In 2014, Mexicans still represented the majority of the nation's illegal **immigrants**, but their number had dropped to 5.8 million.

In the states where the overall undocumented population slipped in the past five years, including California, Georgia and Illinois, the decline in undocumented Mexicans was the main factor.

"We see a continued drop in the Mexican unauthorized **immigrant** population," said Jeff Passel, the center's senior demographer."That's in contrast to the late '90s and early 2000s, when their numbers" were growing at the rate of several hundred thousand a year.

Meanwhile, the number of undocumented **immigrants** from other parts of the world has grown by 325,000 since 2009, to 5.3 million in 2014. For example, the number of illegal **immigrants** from India reached 500,000 in 2014, up 130,000 in five years.

The Border Patrol reports an increase in illegal entries by people from places other than Mexico. Poverty and violence in El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala continue to drive people north.

In Mexico, economic pressures that pushed people to seek a future in the U.S. have subsided. Chief among them is the advent of smaller families, which means fewer mouths to feed. Drug cartels operating on migratory routes, beefed-up border patrols and the steep price charged by human smugglers also discourage migration.

**Immigrant** workers who returned willingly or were deported to their home countries during the recession aren't being replaced by new arrivals or young Americans.

The Pew report said the recession reduced employment in construction and other sectors where Mexican **immigrants** overall are especially likely to work. But as the economy has recovered, those sectors have begun to feel the impact of the decline in Mexican workers.

"I don't think there is a farming company in Ventura County that is not very short of labor," said Guillermo Magdaleno, who supplies workers to citrus and avocado growers in Southern California.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Facing an impending expiration, a controversial federal program designed to attract wealthy **immigrants** has federal lawmakers at an impasse, leaving its long-term future uncertain.

A key provision of the EB-5 program, which gives permanent U.S. residency to foreigners who invest at least $500,000 in certain businesses, is due to lapse Sept. 30, although Congress on Tuesday appeared to be ready to give it a short-term extension until after the presidential election.

The program has surged in popularity in recent years among real-estate developers who have tapped it to help finance some of the most high-profile projects in the U.S., including the giant Hudson Yards development rising on Manhattan's West Side in New York. The main draw is the low-cost loans provided by foreign investors -- mostly from China -- which can save the developers tens of millions dollars to hundreds of millions of dollars in borrowing costs.

But the program has drawn criticism. Allegations of fraud have marred numerous projects that have left investors with neither their money nor a visa amid loose regulations, including a high-profile Vermont ski resort. In addition, the program has become dominated by high-end developments in prosperous urban neighborhoods that are using a piece of the program meant for rural and high-unemployment neighborhoods. This practice, known as gerrymandering because the developers draw special districts that link their projects with high-unemployment neighborhoods that are sometimes miles away, has made it harder to raise money in economically struggling areas, EB-5 professionals say.

Congressional lawmakers have reached an accord on measures to limit fraud. But for the past year, the urban developers and their allies in Congress, mainly Sens. Charles Schumer (D., N.Y.) and John Cornyn (R., Texas), have beat back attempts to redefine the benefit so many of the high-end skyscrapers can't qualify.

Mr. Schumer has said the investments create jobs throughout cities, suggesting there was no need to distinguish between poor Bronx neighborhoods and Midtown Manhattan. Other key lawmakers, including the Democratic and Republican leaders of the Judiciary committees in both the Senate and the House, disagree and have been holding out in an attempt to block the urban developers from dominating the program.

A bill introduced in the House earlier this month would have reserved 4,000 of the 10,000 EB-5 visas awarded annually for projects in rural and low-income census tracts.

"The facts make it clear that this program is in desperate need of statutory and regulatory reform," Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R., Va.) said in a statement announcing the bill.

Many developers are pushing for fewer restrictions, and any compromise seems far off.

Multiple other ideas to bridge the gap have been floated, but few have gained traction. Proposals include increasing the number of visas, restricting the benefit for rural and high-unemployment areas to only areas suffering from very high poverty.

Meanwhile, for the first time in years, the popularity of the program appears to be waning. While **immigrant** investor applications reached a high of 14,373 in the federal fiscal year that ended last September, investor applications in the first nine months of this fiscal year were just 8,638, on pace for a big annual drop. The slowdown has been attributed to a number of factors including the uncertainty over renewal as well as the yearslong waiting list that has formed for the program, which reached its 10,000 visa capacity for the first time in 2014.

On top of that, a slowdown in the Chinese economy and a government crackdown on moving money out of China have hurt demand, said Nicholas Mastroianni II, chief executive of the U.S. **Immigration** Fund that works with developers to secure EB-5 investors.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Corrections & Amplifications

Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump criticized people who were reluctant to profile in a Sept. 19 interview about terrorism on the morning news show Fox & Friends. A Page One article on Sept. 20 about national-security concerns and the presidential race didn't make clear that Mr. Trump's comments came on the show. It also incorrectly said that Mr. Trump used the word race when he spoke about profiling.

(WSJ Sept. 27, 2016)

(END)

National-security concerns lurched back to the forefront of the 2016 presidential race Monday as Democrat Hillary Clinton and Republican Donald Trump battled over policy and fitness to lead after the series of weekend bombings in the New York City area.

Their responses put a new edge on the deep divisions between the two candidates' approaches to how best to weed out terror threats: Mrs. Clinton emphasized intelligence and police work and stressed her experience, while Mr. Trump renewed his call for imposing stricter limits on **immigration**. The suspect in the incidents is a naturalized American citizen whose family came to the U.S. from Afghanistan when he was a child.

"These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals coming into our country," Mr. Trump said at a rally in Estero, Fla.

Mrs. Clinton, earlier in the day, called on Americans to be "vigilant but not afraid."

"We have faced threats before, she said. "I know we will meet this new danger with the same courage and vigilance."

The attacks come at a time when voters' concern about terrorism is running higher as a priority than in any other presidential election over the last generation, an analysis of Wall Street Journal/NBC News polling shows.

Asked this past June what is the most important issue for the federal government to address, the issue picked by more than any other as first choice was national security and terrorism, ranked at the top by 28% of the respondents. That survey was conducted just after the mass shooting in Orlando, Fla., by a New York-born man whose parents came to the U.S. from Afghanistan.

The candidates' responses and next week's first debate, which will touch on security issues, are among the final opportunities for both candidates to try to woo the roughly 11% of voters who are undecided or leaning toward third-party candidates.

Two political scientists who have studied terrorism and politics -- Elizabeth Zechmeister of Vanderbilt University and Jennifer Merolla of the University of California, Riverside -- have found that traditionally Republicans enjoy a political advantage at times of high perceived terrorist threats. However, they have concluded that this year Mrs. Clinton's experience neutralizes Mr. Trump's edge.

Ms. Merolla said their research suggests that terrorist attacks may have another effect on the election: making voters more attentive to candidates' character rather than focusing on their policy positions.

"Even if leadership evaluations do not shift at all for either candidate, if terrorism remains in the news, we should expect to see voters placing more weight on leadership qualities in deciding which candidate to cast a ballot for," she said.

The campaigns were shadowed Monday by the developments of the weekend, when a powerful blast rocked New York City on Saturday evening, after a homemade pipe bomb had earlier in the day detonated in New Jersey. No one was killed, although more than two dozen were injured in the New York blast.

Investigators later found a second explosive device in New York City, and five more pipe bombs near a train station in Elizabeth, N.J. They hadn't detonated, although one blew up when police were trying to defuse it using a robot.

On Monday morning, authorities detained Ahmad Khan Rahami, a 28-year-old from New Jersey, as a suspect in the bombing incidents after a shootout with police near his home in Elizabeth.

Separately, a man in St. Cloud, Minn., late Saturday injured nine people in knife attacks at a shopping mall, a rampage being investigated as a possible terrorist incident.

Mrs. Clinton is emphasizing her experience in the White House as secretary of state and said at a Philadelphia campaign stop that such times are a "sobering reminder that we need steady leadership."

"I am prepared to, ready to actually take on those challenges," Mrs. Clinton said, "not engage in a lot of irresponsible, reckless rhetoric."

She mocked Mr. Trump's assertion that he could be more effective in combating Islamic State and other terrorist groups. "You don't hear a plan from him. He keeps saying he has a secret plan," she said, referring to Mr. Trump. "The secret is he has no plan."

And she quoted former Central Intelligence Agency director Michael Hayden, who said this year that Mr. Trump was being used as a "recruiting sergeant" for Islamic State, also known as ISIS. "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," Mrs. Clinton said.

Mr. Trump delivered an equally sharp personal rebuke of his opponent. He called for allowing police more latitude in profiling suspects, including by race, and tougher **immigrant** screenings.

He also criticized Mrs. Clinton's support for increased admissions of refugees from the Middle East.

Speaking of Mr. Rahami, who was detained and being treated in a New Jersey hospital, Mr. Trump said: "The bad part now, we will give him amazing hospitalization . . . .He will be represented by an outstanding lawyer."

The GOP nominee also said Congress should pass a measure to ensure that "foreign enemy combatants are treated as such."

---

Byron Tau and Reid J. Epstein contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ELIZABETH, N. J. -- Until recently, Ahmad Khan Rahami was best-known in this blue-collar neighborhood as a quiet young man who served fried chicken at his father's fast-food restaurant.

But Monday morning, the 28-year-old Afghan **immigrant**, who some customers called "Med" or "Mad" -- short for Ahmad -- was on the run, suspected of planting two bombs in New York City's Chelsea neighborhood and placing several more explosive devices around New Jersey.

After a gun battle with police, Mr. Rahami, shot in the leg, was taken into custody in Linden, just several miles from where he grew up in the **immigrant**enclaves of North Jersey.

What motivated Mr. Rahami, a naturalized U.S. citizen whose family came to this country from war-ravaged Afghanistan when he was a young child, is still murky, and authorities were trying Monday to puzzle together clues.

U.S. officials said Mr. Rahami traveled more than once to Afghanistan, but he wasn't on a terrorist watch list. Investigators have also found he traveled to Pakistan, where he had family ties and married Asia Bibi Rahami.

In 2014 Mr. Rahami contacted his congressman, Rep. Albio Sires, to find out why his wife was having trouble getting an **immigrant** visa so she could move from Pakistan to the U.S., Mr. Sires said.

Mr. Sires, a Democrat, said Mr. Rahami had been living in Islamabad, Pakistan, for about a year. Asia Rahami had an expired passport, Mr. Sires said, and eventually received a visa after giving birth. The congressman said he didn't know whether she entered the U.S.

Mr. Sires said his office made inquiries to the State Department. He recalled one of his staff members complaining that Mr. Rahami was "nasty." "He was a type of guy that wanted things done his way," Mr. Sires said.

Others who knew him -- old classmates, acquaintances and customers at his father's restaurant, First American Fried Chicken -- said they saw few signs of anger, describing Mr. Rahami as reserved.

"The guy was always to himself," said Joshua Sanchez, a construction worker who frequented the restaurant.

It is unclear precisely when the Rahami family **immigrated** from Afghanistan. But records show the Rahamis moved to various locations in New Jersey when Mr. Rahami was young before settling in Elizabeth, a city of 129,000 about 20 miles from Manhattan.

Javid Barakzai, of Carteret, N.J., said he grew up near Mr. Rahami when the two families lived in Newark. He described Mr. Rahami's family as "normal, chill, nice," and neighbors recalled the Rahamis were quiet and kept to themselves.

Still, there were some signs of discord in Mr. Rahami's life. Chris Konya, a classmate at Edison High School, where Mr. Rahami graduated in 2007, said Mr. Rahami had gotten his girlfriend pregnant before the couple graduated. A second classmate confirmed Mr. Konya's account.

After high school, Mr. Rahami attended community college at Middlesex County College in Edison from 2010 to 2012, majoring in criminal justice, but didn't graduate, said Patrick Madama, vice president for institutional advancement. He said he didn't know why Mr. Rahami left the community college 24 credits short of an associate degree.

Mr. Rahami's family was mired in financial problems, records show, and his father, Mohammad, filed for bankruptcy protection in 2005.

The restaurant was also embroiled in legal disputes. Several years ago, the Elizabeth City Council passed an ordinance requiring it to shut its doors at 10 p.m., said Mayor J. Chris Bollwage. The restaurant "had code enforcement violations and noise violations" he said.

In response, the elder Rahami and two of his other sons sued the city, alleging religious discrimination, Mr. Bollwage said, adding that the suit was dismissed in court in 2012.

---

Scott Calvert, Mark Morales and Alejandro Lazo contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERLIN -- German Chancellor Angela Merkel reacted to her party's latest electoral loss by saying she would stick to her migration policy but acknowledging, more explicitly than before, that she had made mistakes along the way.

Ms. Merkel on Monday described her center-right Christian Democratic Union's second-place performance in Sunday's election in the city-state of Berlin as a "very unsatisfactory, disappointing" result. She acknowledged widespread public discomfort with the influx of more than a million asylum applicants to Germany this year and last, saying she heard voters' concerns.

"If I could, I would turn back time many, many years to be able to better prepare myself and the whole government and all those in positions of responsibility for the situation that met us rather unprepared in late summer 2015," Ms. Merkel said at a news conference at her party's headquarters in the German capital.

Nevertheless, Ms. Merkel -- whose steadfast refusal to close the German border to asylum seekers has become a focal point in the global debate over how to treat refugees -- said she would stick to her current policy. She said she was guided both by a conviction that Germany has a duty to take in people in need and a recognition that the sort of chaotic, mass influx of people the country experienced last year had to be prevented.

Faster processing of asylum requests and deportation of those rejected was necessary, she said, while conditions in Africa, Syria, and elsewhere needed to be improved to reduce the numbers of refugees.

"No one wants this to be repeated, and I don't either," Ms. Merkel said of last year's refugee influx into Germany.

The Alternative for Germany, the upstart anti-**immigrant** party that took 14.2% in Sunday's Berlin vote, has called for the country to turn away asylum seekers at the border and to limit **immigration** by Muslims.

Ms. Merkel rejected those calls in her remarks on Monday. Blocking all refugees or all Muslims, she said, would contradict not only "the German constitution and our country's duties under international law, but also above all the ethical foundations of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany and my personal convictions."

The center-left Social Democrats won Sunday's election in the city-state of Berlin with just 21.6% of the vote -- the worst result for any winner in a state election in German postwar history. Both the Social Democrats and the Christian Democrats, who came in second with 17.6%, lost more than 5 percentage points compared with Berlin's 2011 vote.

They were followed closely by the Left Party -- the successors to the East German Communists -- and the environmentalist Greens. Those two parties are expected to replace the Christian Democrats in a new governing coalition under the leadership of Mayor Michael Muller of the Social Democrats, pushing the politics of Berlin to the left.

But likely the biggest change will come as the Alternative for Germany, or AfD, enters the Berlin parliament. The three-year-old party came in fifth on Sunday, securing its 10th set of seats in Germany's 16 state parliaments.

"Whoever tries to carry on the status quo here in Berlin will have a problem with us," said Georg Pazderski, the AfD's lead candidate here. "We will put our finger in the wound and we won't allow anything to be swept under the rug."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump is unfurling new policies that would spread tens of billions of federal dollars across the landscape of American life -- borders, schools, highways and bridges, even child-care arrangements.

He wants to raise spending for the Pentagon and triple the number of **immigration** and customs officials; double the amount Democratic presidential rival Hillary Clinton proposes for infrastructure; allocate $20 billion to expand school choice and $2.5 billion for guaranteed paid maternity leave. And more.

He is proposing more than $4 trillion in tax cuts and vowing not to cut fast-growing entitlement programs like Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Trump said in an economic speech last week that he expects his policies wouldn't add to the federal deficit. But while his spending plans are specific, his proposals to pay for them have been less precise: He counts on economic growth to generate more revenue, and on oft-tried measures as eliminating waste and catching more tax cheats.

For her part, Mrs. Clinton is proposing a far bigger expansion of government spending than Mr. Trump, with tax increases to pay for it. She wants to spend more to lower or fully eliminate college costs for many young Americans, for example, and has proposed a big boost in spending for early childhood education.

The result is a presidential campaign where neither of the major party candidates is making a serious push to reduce the size and scope of government.

But the GOP nominee has his own ambitious agenda -- "It is time to start thinking big again," he said last week -- that raises concerns among fiscal conservatives that he is too quick to propose new spending and not committed enough to reducing the nation's $19 trillion debt.

"He campaigns like a Democrat," said Douglas Holtz-Eakin, a Republican economist who advised the 2008 presidential bid of Sen. John McCain. "This is not your traditional small-government conservative."

Mr. Trump has said he wants to get rid of the nation's debt. He once said it could be done over eight years. But he hasn't said how he would do it.

In his speech last week, Mr. Trump offered his clearest statement yet of his desire to offset the cost of his tax-and-spending programs. He detailed changes in his tax plan that scaled back the revenue loss from more than $9 trillion over 10 years to $4.4 trillion -- or less, he figured, after taking account of returns from better economic growth. He proposed for the first time to help pay for tax cuts by imposing a 1% cut on domestic spending, not including entitlements.

But independent budget experts cast doubt on the claim that Trump policies would be deficit-neutral. Maya MacGuineas, president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, an antideficit group, said Mr. Trump was leaning on overly optimistic projections and inadequate spending cuts.

"The good news is he has started talking about spending cuts, but only on a small sliver of the budget," she said.

The Trump campaign stands by its projections that the campaign's proposed spending cuts and revenue from economic growth would cover the cost of its agenda.

"Mr. Trump has outlined detailed offsets for his plan to create 25 million jobs that will shrink our bureaucracy and make government leaner and more responsive," said Stephen Miller, senior policy adviser. He said more savings in government benefit spending would result from proposed restrictions on refugees and **immigration**.

The campaign hasn't explained how or if the 1% cut would apply to programs he has pledged to fund more generously, such as highways, veterans' affairs and education.

The Congressional Budget Office has said it expects the deficit for the fiscal year that ends this month to expand to $549 billion, after adjusting for calendar differences, from $500 billion in an estimate earlier this year. The office also said recently that it expects the economy to grow more slowly over the coming decade than it forecast earlier this year, driven by slower growth in the labor force after 2020, but that extended lower interest rates would trim the spending level projected earlier.

The National Taxpayers Union Foundation has calculated the net effect of Mr. Trump's proposals so far, the ones for which costs could be determined, would be to increase spending $18 billion a year. When the group ran a similar tally in 2012, it found that GOP nominee Mitt Romney's plans would cut spending by some $353 billion a year.

Mrs. Clinton has advanced proposals to spend far more -- a net effect of $198 billion a year, the taxpayers' union said. Her proposed tax increases would help offset that, to the tune of $1.1 trillion over a decade, according to an estimate by the Tax Policy Center, a project of the Brookings Institution and the Urban Institute.

On entitlement programs, Mrs. Clinton, like Mr. Trump, hasn't proposed long-term changes to rein in costs and shore up Social Security or Medicare. She has, however, talked about possibly expanding Social Security benefits for some retirees.

"From the point of view of spending control, neither candidate is talking about that," said Robert Bixby, executive director of the Concord Coalition, a budget watchdog group.

Over the past two months, Mr. Trump has been laying out more policy specifics.

On **immigration**, he called for improving border security by tripling the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officers, and offsetting the cost by cutting off federal per-child credits for illegal **immigrants**. His wall on the U.S.-Mexico border could cost some $2.5 billion a year, the taxpayers' union estimated. Mr. Trump said Mexico would pay for it; he has offered no offsets if that doesn't happen.

In a speech on defense policy, he proposed repealing the scheduled cuts in military spending known as the "sequester," and listed programs on which he would spend more. He said he would pay for the bigger defense budget through government workforce attrition; cutting appropriations for unauthorized programs; reducing improper payments; and improving tax collections.

An analysis by the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget found it would cost $450 billion over 10 years to repeal the sequester, but that the proposed offsets would cover only two-thirds of the cost.

On infrastructure, Mr. Trump has said he wants twice the spending of Mrs. Clinton's $275 billion, five-year proposal. A Trump aide said the plan would propose cost offsets.

On child care, Mr. Trump proposed guaranteed paid leave of six weeks for women whose employers don't provide it. The campaign said it would be financed by rooting out abuse in the unemployment insurance system. Many conservatives objected to federal social-policy mandates, and critics say he is overestimating the amount that could be gleaned from fraud.

---

Nick Timiraos contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Zama

By Antonio Di Benedetto

NYRB, 198 pages, $15.95

Antonio Di Benedetto's mesmerizing "Zama" -- first published in 1956 and now translated in English for the first time -- is a modern novel that refutes a central tenet of modernity and a historical novel that rejects the romance of the past. The protagonist is Diego de Zama, a tortured legal counselor to the governor of Paraguay at the end of the 18th century.

Trapped in the backwater city of Asuncion, Don Diego hungers for an assignment in Buenos Aires, closer to his wife, Marta, and his sons. Of Spanish blood but South American birth -- an americano -- Don Diego is a second-tier white within the Spanish colonial hierarchy. His future depends entirely on the whim of the crown. The novel tracks his descent into idle despair as he waits endlessly for bureaucratic deliverance.

Di Benedetto's prose, at once methodical and otherworldly, captures the grim humor of Don Diego's plight. He goes to wait by the river, where he imagines that an incoming ship will carry Marta, or at least a letter from her. After years of separation, "I needed physical love as badly as I needed to eat," he confesses. Yet he remains faithful to Marta, to help avoid becoming attached to provincial exile. Underneath a ruined wharf, as if capturing a glimpse of himself, he watches a dead monkey "drift[ing] back and forth with a certain precision" among the pilings.

Di Benedetto (1922-86), the translator Esther Allen explains in the preface, was himself self-tethered to his home city of Mendoza, far from the center of Argentinean literary life in Buenos Aires. In 1953, he published "Animal World," his first book; three others, including "Zama," hundreds of short stories, and a couple screenplays followed. The military junta that took power in March 1976 had Di Benedetto arrested and jailed for reasons still unclear. Released after 18 months, he went into exile, living in Europe and the United States.

"Animal World," Ms. Allen notes, "concerns all sorts of transactions and transmutations between human and animal" and seems to draw thematically on Franz Kafka. But Di Benedetto always maintained that he didn't read Kafka until just before he wrote "Zama," in which animals appear mostly as metaphor. (In Asuncion, for example, certain fish "that the river spurns" are "attached, perhaps despite themselves, to the very element that repudiates them.")

But Di Benedetto applied real elements of Kafka's fable of modernity to "Zama." As Ms. Allen points out, Zama's name, pronounced with a soft "z" in the local accent, is quite possibly a play on Samsa, the name of Kafka's protagonist in "The Metamorphosis." Just as Kafka distorts time and distance through the eyes of the man turned into an insect, Di Benedetto deploys them as a gauge of Zama's exile: "There was nothing before me but a flat expanse where every need was abolished. I had only to move forward, farther and farther. But I feared the end. For, presumably, there was no end."

Gregor Samsa's horrifying predicament can be read as a critique of the modern idea that human beings can invent themselves anew by separating from and exploiting nature and by harnessing time and distance Samsa, a harried traveling salesman, is now trapped in place, helplessly late for work. The New World --born Zama is also determined to self-invent. But the forces he wishes to seize for his self-invention turn on him. To get ahead, Zama believes that he should associate only with the Spanish-born; once his fidelity begins to fail, he refuses any woman who is black, Indian or mestizo. This position **alienates** him from the emerging cross-ethnic culture of Latin America that will soon overthrow Spanish rule. That Zama chooses this **alienation** only deepens it. "It was as if I, I myself, might generate failure," he reflects.

Zama's self-deprecating honesty, even amidst episodes of lechery, cowardice and violence, allows the reader to empathize and hope, against all odds, that he will escape exile. Human beings indeed have always had dirty minds and foul hearts, sought danger, and betrayed themselves, Di Benedetto suggests. "Zama" is thus an early example of historical fiction that rejects the seductive spell of an innocent past. Our pleasure in the historical setting isn't that of the voyeur, gazing on a purer time and place, but that of looking into a slightly distorting mirror on ourselves.

The Argentinian novelist Cesar Aira may be the most compelling inheritor of Di Benedetto's project, particularly in the affecting novel "An Episode in the Life of a Landscape Painter" (2000), which takes place in the early 19th century, just after "Zama's" end. In Mr. Aira's novel, the German landscape painter Johann Moritz Rugendas sets out from Mendoza at the urging of Alexander von Humboldt to capture the "totality" of the country's landscape -- surely a modern impulse. But nature intervenes, sending Rugendas into a dangerous spiral; as Di Benedetto shows and Mr. Aira confirms, how a man faces his own abyss is, indeed, the question for all time.

---

Mr. Popkin is the author of the novel "Lion and Leopard."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ever since the start of this bizarre presidential campaign, Donald Trump has ensured that most discussions of **immigration** focus on Mexico and Mexicans. But his noxious rhetoric has obscured the fact that illegal border crossings are just part of the problem. The U.S. system for legal **immigration** also badly needs reform -- and here the answers lie not south but north, in Canada.

Canada today has one of the highest **immigration** rates in the world. For the past two decades, it has admitted about 250,000 newcomers a year -- close to 1% of the population -- and Ottawa expects that number to grow to 337,000 a year by 2018. More than 20% of Canada's inhabitants are now foreign-born -- almost twice the proportion of residents of Sweden, Germany or the U.S., even if you lump in undocumented migrants.

Yet most Canadians couldn't be happier about it. Polls have shown that two-thirds of them feel that **immigration** is one of Canada's key strengths, and the same proportion favors keeping it at its current level -- or even increasing it. Despite the global recession and the specter of terrorism, public support for **immigration** in Canada is near an all-time high.

Canada wasn't always like this. Until after World War II, Ottawa accepted few outsiders. Even after that changed, who got in was determined by a policy unofficially known as "White Canada." Northern Europeans were courted; swarthier types from Southern or Eastern Europe were only let in during severe manpower shortages; everybody else was basically banned.

So how did that Canada -- timid, racist and parochial -- become the multihued and fiercely open-minded Canada of today? The country didn't change for some idealistic reason. Canada embraced **immigration** because it had to. Canadian virtue, such as it is, was born of necessity.

The story dates back to the mid-1960s. At the time, the economy of this vast yet sparsely populated country was booming. But Europe, Canada's preferred source for the right (read: white) sort of workers, had stopped exporting them as it finally recovered from the war.

After a few false starts, Ottawa accepted the inevitable in 1967 and dropped all ethnic criteria from its **immigration** rules, replacing them with a revolutionary new policy. Under this system -- the essence of which remains in effect today -- applicants for residency were assigned points based on nine criteria, such as education, age, fluency in English or French, and whether or not their skills fit Canada's economic needs. Those who scored above a certain number got in, period. Nothing else mattered.

The effects of this change were dramatic. Between 1946 and 1953, 96% of **immigrants** to Canada had come from Europe. Between 1968 and 1988, that figure fell to 38%.

The new system may have made good sense on economic grounds, but ordinary Canadians didn't like it -- in fact, they hated it. Polls taken in the mid-1960s found that a majority wanted the government to keep excluding nonwhites, while 67% opposed any increase in **immigration**.

This was one of two big problems facing Pierre Trudeau (the father of Canada's current leader) when he became prime minister in 1968. The other hit closer to home: His birthplace, the largely Francophone province of Quebec, was threatening to secede, and separatists were setting off bombs in Montreal.

After his first efforts to deal with these problems flopped, Trudeau decided to try something radical. In October 1971, he strode into Canada's Parliament and, in a bombshell speech, announced that "cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity." Declaring that no "ethnic group [should] take precedence over any other," he unveiled a new policy of official multiculturalism.

In recent years, critics have come to deride multiculturalism as politically correct nonsense (at best) or a path to ethnic Balkanization (at worst). But there was nothing softheaded about Trudeau's gambit. When he declared that his government would begin supporting all of the country's cultures -- "the small and weak groups no less than the strong" -- he also set out a condition: Such groups had to demonstrate "a desire and effort to . . . contribute to Canada." His subtext was clear: Integration remained a key goal. But now integration and the retention of one's native culture wouldn't be mutually exclusive.

Trudeau liked to stress the idealistic side of his new policy, but he also had pragmatic ends in mind: reducing the threat of Quebecois separatism while also easing the acceptance of the new workers that Canada so desperately needed. And his strategy worked. In fact, the two policies -- on **immigration** and multiculturalism -- reinforced one another.

Picking most **immigrants** based on their ability to make material contributions began paying dividends that benefited everyone. Indeed, the system has produced one of the most successful **immigrant** populations in the world. According to the OECD, Canadian **immigrants** are better educated than any other country's foreign-born population (53% of them enter Canada with college degrees, compared with 39% in the U.S.). Their employment rate is among the highest in the developed world, and without them, Canada's workforce would be shrinking and aging.

Meanwhile, generous government support for integration and multicultural initiatives -- Ottawa currently spends an estimated $1 billion a year on celebrations of ethnic heritage, pro-**immigration** TV programs and the like -- has driven home the message that broadening the country's cultural makeup makes it more Canadian, not less. All of this helps to explain why, when recently asked what makes them proudest of their country, Canadians told pollsters for the firm Environics that they ranked multiculturalism ahead of hockey. Hockey!

No wonder, then, that support for **immigration** has become a bipartisan cause. Trudeau was a Liberal, but it was a Tory, Brian Mulroney, who enshrined Canada's multiculturalism into law in 1988. And in 2011, the Conservative Party worked so hard to court foreign-born Canadians that it beat the Liberals among **immigrant** voters for the first time in history.

Of course, Canada has never had much of a problem with undocumented migrants, thanks to its geographic isolation. Whereas almost a third of the current foreign-born population in the U.S. is undocumented, the figure is no more than 6% in Canada.

These numbers help to explain Canadians' openness, but they don't tell the whole story. After all, the U.K. is also isolated geographically and has close to the same percentage of undocumented workers. Yet Brits are twice as hostile to **immigration** as are their former colonial subjects. So smart policies matter.

Was Pierre Trudeau's grand scheme just a cynical political move dressed up as high principle? Maybe, but the results are what count, and in Canada, they have been spectacular -- a record for politicians everywhere to emulate.

---

Mr. Tepperman is the managing editor of Foreign Affairs. This essay is adapted from his new book, "The Fix: How Nations Survive and Thrive in a World in Decline," which will be published on Sept. 20 by Tim Duggan Books.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**[A Wall Street Journal series examining the economic roots of America's populist discontent]

READING, Pa. -- This coal and steel region was thriving when Gary Martin started working construction sites in the mid-1970s. Ironworkers jammed the local union hall, the union sponsored a big picnic each spring, and business groups were flush with volunteers for charity drives.

Mr. Martin's extended family attended church, as it had for generations, in an area called Irish Valley in neighboring Schuylkill County. Two-parent families were the norm, and fatal drug overdoses were so rare that some coroners didn't bother tallying them.

No longer. Working-class neighborhoods, in particular white ones hit hard by the decline of the U.S. industrial base, are crumbling under the weight of deepening social problems.

Mr. Martin, 63 years old, retired last year as head of Ironworkers Local 420 but financially supports three grandsons -- 22, 21 and 19 -- because his daughter became an addict. The oldest grandson turned to heroin, too, and Mr. Martin and his wife got divorced in another casualty of the stress, they say.

"Rather than spending my retirement half-time in Ireland as I planned, I moved back to the house with a dirt-floor basement where I grew up to try to help raise my grandchildren," he says.

The buckling of social institutions fundamental to American civic life is deepening a sense of pessimism and disorientation, while adding fuel to this year's rise of political populists like Donald Trumpand Bernie Sanders.

Here and across the U.S., key measures of civic engagement ranging from church attendance to civic-group membership to bowling-league participation to union activity are slipping. Unlocked doors have given way to anxiety. In Reading, tension between longtime white residents and Hispanic newcomers has added to the unease.

For Mr. Martin, social and economic setbacks led him to support Mr. Sanders, who he figured would stick it to the big businesses Mr. Martin feels have sold out working people. Other people here find resonance in Mr. Trump's message that the U.S. has skidded so far off course that it needs to lock out **immigrants** and block imports to recover an era of greatness.

"When you lose the family unit and you lose the church community, you are losing a whole lot," says Bonnie Stock, a retired teacher in Reading and Trump supporter, who says the church where she was baptized is dying from lack of young members. "People are looking at Trump because most of us see this [community] isn't working," she says.

Ms. Stock figures Mr. Trump's business experience would help him better attack societal problems like drug addiction.

Across the U.S., the Republican presidential nominee has his firmest support among the white working class. In the Republican primaries, he carried all but nine of the country's 156 counties where at least 85% of the adult population was whites without four-year college degrees. Mr. Trump won 64% of the vote in Berks and Schuylkill counties, where noncollege whites were 66% of the adult population as of 2014.

In Berks County, once famous for the Reading Railroad stop on the Monopoly board game, social ills have been exacerbated by a 30% decline in manufacturing jobs and 6% fall in inflation-adjusted median income since 1995.

In 2014, 55.2% of the white women in Berks County who gave birth hadn't finished college and were unmarried, up from 16.5% in 1980, according to Bowling Green State University's National Center for Family and Marriage Research. Single mothers had a median income of just $22,378 in 2014, less than half that of the typical household in Berks County and the U.S. overall.

Gustave Meyer III, who oversees Lions clubs in Berks County, says members try to help some single parents with food, rent and utilities, but it's tough because the district's membership has declined 43% to 1,284 from 2,251 in the past 20 years, while the community's needs have grown.

To attract members, the Lions club district has done away with mandatory meeting requirements and waived initiation fees for veterans.

Ruth Gonzalez, 44, is getting help from the Lions Club in trying to renegotiate the two mortgages on her house, which is facing foreclosure. She fell behind on her payments because of mounting medical bills for her wheelchair-bound, 18-year-old son and repair costs for the van she uses to transport him.

She earns $11.75 an hour as a sewing-machine operator and is estranged from her husband.

The number of civic, professional and business organizations in Berks and Schuylkill counties declined to 131 in 2014 from 156 in 2000, according to Pennsylvania State University's Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development. The number of unions and other labor groups fell to 29 from 41.

Some economists say the decline of institutions that fortify communities has a negative impact on household income. Without the support system from those networks, known as social capital, some people miss work more often during times of need, and their children have fewer extracurricular activities and other ways to get ahead.

For decades, Pottsville, a Reading suburb of about 14,000 people where the coal economy has evaporated, has relied on a volunteer fire department. Fire Chief Todd March says the number of active firefighters has shrunk to about 120 from 400 in 2000 because training requirements increased and stressed-out volunteers, juggling work and family demands, didn't have time to fight fires.

About 15 years ago, five of the eight fire companies in Pottsville hosted annual block parties with amusement-park rides, beer and hot dogs to raise money and cement neighborhood ties. Now just one is carrying on the tradition, Mr. March says.

"It's hard getting volunteers, and people don't have money to spend," he says.

At Pottsville's Kiwanis and Rotary clubs, membership is down by more than half since 2000. Three other Kiwanis clubs nearby have closed. Takeovers of local banks left fewer executives with the time for organized charitable efforts.

Social problems in white working-class communities nationwide started to escalate in the 1970s. The number of single parents in those places rose, and so did divorces and the number of men who dropped out of the workforce, says Charles Murray, a political scientist at the conservative American Enterprise Institute, who has worked to quantify the decline of working-class America.

Those problems seemed to ease briefly in the late 1990s as the economy expanded and the crime rate dropped. President Bill Clinton and lawmakers revamped the U.S. welfare system in 1996 to focus more on jobs. The nationwide divorce rate stabilized, as did the percentage of children born to unwed mothers. Regular church attendance held steady.

That masked a constant decline in other barometers of the white working class. In southeastern Pennsylvania, longtime residents say they have become wary of their neighbors, especially as the percentage of Hispanics from outside the region has increased. In Reading, non-Hispanic whites are 25% of the city's population of 88,000, down from 82% in 1980. Thousands of white Reading residents have moved to the suburbs.

Some people feel discombobulated by not knowing the newcomers, fear they are soaking up government benefits and think they are deepening the area's drug problem, even though 83% of overdose deaths in Berks and Schuylkill counties last year were of whites, according to the Pennsylvania State Coroners Association.

Some whites and blacks still recall the 2005 raid of a Wal-Mart Stores Inc. distribution center under construction near Pottsville, where 125 workers from Mexico and Central America were arrested for working in the U.S. illegally. The incident left a sense among non-Hispanics that their community was under siege from outsiders.

"There aren't too many opportunities for jobs," says Stanley Blair, 41, a warehouse laborer who used a day off to repair his house near Reading High School. "I walk out and I don't hear English. It's like I'm in a foreign land."

Stephen Weber, 61, says he remembers Reading's heyday when the shopping district on Penn Street was hopping and residents put on dresses and suits to shop. Vagrants now loiter there in the middle of the day. Mr. Weber says his neighbors in the 1960s and 1970s, including German **immigrants**, turned a gravel-filled lot into a neighborhood park and installed basketball equipment, monkey bars and swings.

Mr. Weber, a carpenter, moved to the Berks County suburbs. During visits to his old neighborhood, he sees the park often filled with trash and people sometimes buying and selling drugs, he says.

Many Hispanics have lived in the Reading area for decades, moving here for jobs as agricultural workers, and say they belong in the community as much as anyone else.

Some community groups try to bridge the gap between whites and Hispanics, but the results sometimes fall flat. Reading's Downtown Improvement District co-sponsors free outdoor concerts during the summer, but a concert in August attracted a nearly white-only audience.

Evan Siegel, a former mortgage broker with two white teenage daughters and a Hispanic teenage stepson, says the two communities "don't coexist socioeconomically." He wasn't surprised that Hispanics stayed away from the concert, which he described as "two white bands from the '90s."

Deepening the sense of **alienation** is the inability of Reading and nearby cities to stem their drug problems, especially overdoses of heroin and prescription drugs. Berks County had 69 drug-related deaths last year, triple the total in 2001.

Berks County Prosecutor John Adams says it is a rare day when police officers don't have to respond to a drug emergency. They carry the overdose-reversal medication naloxone in their patrol cars.

Princeton University economists Anne Case and Angus Deaton say the surge in drug deaths and suicides among middle-aged whites nationally began around 2000, when the economy fell into recession, Chinese imports began to surge and manufacturing jobs started to decline sharply.

Laid-off workers turned increasingly to Social Security disability payments and got prescriptions for painkillers to treat back pain from years of factory work. Mr. Deaton, who won the Nobel Prize in economics in 2015, sees a "strong correlation" between declining employment locally and deaths from suicide, drugs and alcohol.

Dozens of prayers are scribbled in ink on poster boards at St. John's German Lutheran Church in downtown Reading, imploring spiritual help for jobs, a chance to finish school or escape from the ravages of drugs.

"Pray for my aunt's addiction," said one prayer. Another: "I pray that my dad overcomes his addiction." And another: "Pray for Harrisburg and Reading."

Like churches across America, those in Reading face declining attendance. Michael Kaucher, executive director of Reading Berks Conference of Churches, estimates that 75% of the area's population don't belong to a church.

Reading's dwindling congregations come at a time when Americans as a whole are less likely to be regular churchgoers. In 2014, about 26% of Americans surveyed by the University of Chicago's General Social Survey said they don't attend religious services, up from 9% in 1972.

Millennials are less likely to attend church, and young families shuttle their children to sporting events rather than Sunday school.

Churches often rely on a concentrated cadre of volunteers. Fewer members means fewer people who can help out in the surrounding community.

The First United Church of Christ, founded in Reading, Pa. in 1753, had 700 members in the 1960s. Last year, 70 was a good crowd, and there have been fewer than 30 on some recent Sundays. The congregation is deciding whether to shut down.

"These downtown churches aren't neighborhood churches anymore" because the neighborhoods have fallen apart, says Bonnie Stock, a retired teacher in Reading and Trump supporter.

First United Church of Christ hosts Alcohol Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings downtown, close to a drug-counseling center.

In Pottsville, former heroin addict Travis Snyder, 34, leads a volunteer drug-recovery group called "The Skook Recovers," using a nickname for Schuylkill County. Along with two dozen other recovering addicts, Mr. Snyder picks weekly community projects, such as cleaning up parks, organizing antidrug marches and speaking at high schools. Participants crave a sense of community, he says, which gives them a way to contribute to a place that might otherwise dismiss them as failures.

"We pick up trash and make things look pretty," Mr. Snyder says. "You don't need a college degree for this; you don't need a lot of skills. But you're getting together with people you don't know to bring about a common purpose."

(See related letter: "Letters to the Editor: Infrastructure for Countering Social Erosion" -- WSJ September 30, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK -- Donald Trump offered an expanded economic blueprint and outlined an overhaul of his tax plan on Thursday, but skeptics in both parties questioned his promise to offset steep tax cuts with significantly stronger economic growth.

In a speech at the Economic Club of New York, the Republican presidential nominee sought to cast his vision for the economy as the only one focused on boosting growth, framing Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton's policies as based instead on redistributing the gains of a slower-growing economy.

"My economic plan rejects the cynicism that says our labor force will keep declining, that our jobs will keep leaving and that our economy can never grow as it did once before," Mr. Trump said.

Mr. Trump's campaign said his revamped tax-cut plan would cost $4.4 trillion over a decade, before taking into account any returns from better growth. That total was down from independent estimates that pegged the cost of his earlier proposal at more than $9 trillion.

The Clinton campaign dismissed Mr. Trump's latest tax proposal as a giveaway. It would "benefit Trump at the expense of millions of hard-working folks across our country who deserve the opportunity of a better future," said Jacob Leibenluft, a senior policy adviser to Mrs. Clinton.

In his speech, Mr. Trump said the new plan -- which includes proposals such as collapsing the seven individual tax brackets into three, and lowering the corporate tax rate to 15% from 35% -- would simplify the tax code, though it came days after a separate proposal to help families defray child-care costs that would add new complexity to the tax system.

The New York businessman also said proposals to ramp up energy production and to slash environmental and consumer-protection regulations could boost jobs and growth, defraying the revenue lost from his tax cuts. Specifically, he called for a halt to all new regulations and an agency-wide scrub of existing rules to determine their economic impact. He also listed several regulations he wanted to scrap outright, including rules for power-plant emissions, ground-level ozone and food-safety standards.

Outside experts cast doubt on whether Mr. Trump's tax and economic policies could deliver the growth and employment gains suggested by the Trump campaign without also running large budget deficits.

"It doesn't add up," said Douglas Holtz-Eakin,a conservative economist who used to head the Congressional Budget Office and advised President George W. Bush and Sen. John McCain. For example, he said, the energy sector has slumped in the past two years as oil prices have cratered, and it was unlikely Mr. Trump could add thousands of new jobs without higher oil prices.

Mr. Trump, who has proposed large increases in spending on defense, infrastructure, veterans' health care and border security, also outlined plans for the first time to cut nondefense budgets by 1% annually. Those cuts would exempt entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare, the largest drivers of federal spending growth.

Such annual budget cuts would reduce federal spending on nondefense budgets, which include homeland security, transportation and veterans' affairs, by 29% from current levels over the next decade, after accounting for inflation, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a liberal Washington think tank.

Mr. Trump said his plans could return growth to levels not seen since the late 1990s -- by boosting gross domestic product 3.5% annually, up from recent levels of more than 2%. He promised the higher growth would create around 25 million new jobs over a decade, eclipsing even the 22 million jobs added during the 1990s economic boom.

But the economy today faces stiffer headwinds than it did 20 years ago because of an aging workforce and slowing birthrates. Other industrialized nations face even bigger demographic challenges than the U.S., which has seen larger population growth from **immigration**, but Mr. Trump has promised to curb the flow of **immigrants** to the U.S.

Mr. Trump's embrace of higher spending and tax cuts to boost the economy marks a noticeable shift for the GOP from a few years ago, when the Tea Party movement rebelled against bailouts and demanded greater attention to deficits. For Mr. Trump, "growth is a much higher priority than deficit reduction," said Stephen Moore, an economic adviser to Mr. Trump.

Republican lawmakers cheered Mr. Trump's embrace of a tax plan that is much closer to one offered by the House GOP and his push for cutting regulations. "He caught the attention of all the House Republicans when he called for a regulatory freeze," said Rep. French Hill (R., Ark.).

But Mr. Trump has enjoyed less solid backing from traditional conservative groups. For example, representatives of the Heritage Foundation and its lobbying arm, Heritage Action for America, said this week they weren't available to comment on the latest economic-policy proposals.

Balanced-budget advocates have reacted cautiously to proposals to boost spending or cut taxes without specific measures to avoid higher deficits if growth doesn't materialize. In contrast to Mr. Trump, Mrs. Clinton has promised to raise taxes on higher-income households to pay for some new spending.

The latest proposal from Mr. Trump moved "in the right direction . . . but the plan appears to rely on rosy assumptions and murky policy changes," said Maya MacGuineas, president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, which backs debt reduction.

The proposals could shore up support from some Republicans who have harbored doubts over his conservative bona fides, while other proposals, such as on child care, could woo independent voters.

"Trump's ability to maintain the style and resolve of today's speech and performance now bears watching, particularly as the campaign enters the home stretch and the race has tightened," said Terry Haines, a political analyst at ISI Evercore in Washington.

In his speech on Thursday, Mr. Trump deviated only occasionally from his prepared remarks, launching a broadside against Ford Motor Co. for its decision to move small-car production to Mexico.

On taxes, Mr. Trump's proposal would collapse the seven individual tax brackets into three, with a top tax rate of 33%, which would apply to income above $225,000 for a married couple and half that for a single filer. The top capital-gains rate would be 20%, down from 23.8%.

The candidate now wants to cap deductions at $100,000 for a single filer and $200,000 for a married couple. That would severely curb high-income households' ability to deduct their state and local taxes, mortgage interest and charitable contributions.

Mr. Trump also would set the standard deduction at $15,000 for individuals and $30,000 for married couples. That is higher than current law, pushing more families off the tax rolls, but it is lower than the $25,000 and $50,000 tax-free levels that he proposed last year.

Mr. Trump would lower the corporate tax rate from 35% to 15%. He also appeared to abandon a core plank of his earlier tax plans, which called for a 15% top tax rate on business income reported on individual tax returns, instead of taxing such income at the same rates as ordinary income.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump is overweight and taking a drug to lower his cholesterol, but is otherwise in good health, according to a letter from his doctor that his campaign released Thursday.

Mr. Trump is 6 feet 3 inches tall and weighs 236 pounds, Dr. Harold Bornstein wrote in the letter. That means Mr. Trump, who enjoys fast food and doesn't regularly exercise, is overweight, according to the National Institutes of Health's body-mass index calculator.

"I could lose a little weight," Mr. Trump said on "The Dr. Oz Show," which aired Thursday. "It's tough because of the way I live. But the one thing I would like to do is be able to drop 15, 20 pounds."

The health of Mr. Trump and his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, has received increased scrutiny because of the age of the candidates.

The New York businessman is 70 years old, and if he prevails, he would be the oldest newly elected president, eclipsing Ronald Reagan, who was 69 when he took the oath of office in 1981.

Mrs. Clinton, who turns 69 in October, would be the second-oldest first-term president.

Mrs. Clinton released a two-page note from her doctor Wednesday. It showed the former secretary of state is in good overall health, coming off a pneumonia diagnosis and a near-collapse over the weekend while she was getting into her vehicle at a 9/11 memorial ceremony in New York. In the letter, her physician pronounced her healthy and "fit to serve as president."

Dr. Bornstein's letter said Mr. Trump is in "excellent physical health." The letter says he is taking a statin drug for cholesterol and low-dose aspirin.

Dr. Bornstein's letter was written in a more straightforward fashion than an earlier letter from December 2015 attesting to Mr. Trump's health. In that letter, Dr. Bornstein said that Mr. Trump, if elected, "will be the healthiest individual ever elected to the presidency."

In his TV appearance Thursday, Mr. Trump told Dr. Mehmet Oz that when he looks into the mirror, he sees a man half his age, and compared himself to Tom Brady, the 39-year-old quarterback for the New England Patriots.

"I feel the same age as him," Mr. Trump said. "It's crazy."

Dr. Oz asked Mr. Trump a question related to one of the candidate's signature issues, illegal **immigration**: Does the U.S. have a moral responsibility to provide lifesaving care to undocumented **immigrants**? Mr. Trump responded that he would stop illegal **immigration**, so it wouldn't be an issue. "They'd only come in the country legally," he said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump installed his third leadership team at a campaign low point on Aug. 16. The next day, his new managers at a meeting in his Trump Tower office in New York suggested the Republican Party nominee visit residents suffering in the Louisiana floods.

Mr. Trump didn't like the idea. Wouldn't he look like he was pandering? he asked, according to advisers. And besides, he added, Louisiana wasn't a swing state.

Newly installed campaign chief executive Stephen Bannon and campaign manager Kellyanne Conway told their new boss, basically, trust us. Mr. Trump needed to move away from a preoccupation with rallies and wall-to-wall TV interviews toward "moments," in the new managers' parlance, that showed him in TV newscasts as presidential, with a caring side.

The approach would give Mr. Trump a break from the media replaying unattractive off-script comments and off-putting tweets -- including a few viewed as racist -- that were helping widen the polling lead of Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton, they said. Besides, President Barack Obama was away playing golf on an island vacation.

Mr. Trump went to Louisiana the next day, Aug. 18, accompanied by running mate Mike Pence. The trip turned out successfully in Mr. Trump's view, and cinched his ties with Mr. Bannon and Ms. Conway, shifting his campaign's focus toward such events as a trip to a Detroit inner-city church, the meeting with Mexico's president and a planned visit Wednesday to Flint, Mich., to speak with families hurt by tainted drinking water, campaign advisers said.

The new team, said supporters, has fostered a more disciplined candidacy.

"Actually I'm freer now, relying on my instincts and working with a team I trust," Mr. Trump said in an interview.

His political opponents question how much has changed. Hours after his visit last month with Mexico's President Enrique Pena Nieto, they said, Mr. Trump delivered an **immigration** speech in Arizona that made even some Trump supporters cringe over its harsh tone and off-the-cuff flourishes.

"Fifty days of script can't change 15 months of actual positions and beliefs," said Hilary Rosen, a Democratic strategist and Clinton supporter. "Trump isn't going to be able to run away from his divisive rhetoric."

After Mrs. Clinton's campaign announced lateSundaythat she had been diagnosed with pneumonia, many expected Mr. Trump to pounce on the news, arguing that it proved his claim she lacks the stamina to be president.

Instead, Mr. Trump told campaign advisers deluged with media calls to stand down. The response struck opponents as uncharacteristic, and some supporters attributed Mr. Trump's restraint to his new campaign organization.

Mr. Trump said efforts by previous campaign leaders to remake him into a politician were "dishonest." And, Mr. Trump said, he sometimes resisted at times by going off script.

The Republican nominee said he was more comfortable with his new team, which, ironically, has succeeded in some of the same changes sought by former campaign chairman Paul Manafort: Mr. Trump is sticking closer to a teleprompter, giving more policy details in speeches -- and making fewer off-the-cuff remarks, which hurt his campaign after the GOP convention this summer.

The shift began around the second week of August, as Mr. Trump saw a sharp decline in the polls. After Mr. Manafort's team told Mr. Trump in several campaign meetings that he was losing and needed to stick to the message, Mr. Trump looked to Ms. Conway, then working as a campaign adviser.

Mr. Trump said he told Ms. Conway that he needed advisers he trusted and who "wouldnt say Im going to pivot at the slightest inkling of a problem." Ms. Conway told Mr. Trump that he was behind, but there were ways of getting back on track, according to a person familiar with the conversation.

A few days later, Mr. Bannon told Mr. Trump that campaign messaging, which was emphasized by Mr. Manafort, was "for politicians," while "communicating is for leaders," according to people familiar with the conversation.

Shortly afterward, Mr. Manafort was sidelined in favor of Mr. Bannon and Ms. Conway.

The new campaign team, now in its fourth week, consists of three interconnected circles of advisers.

One circle consists of newly-installed political pros led by Ms. Conway, now the campaign's main pollster. Another circle, headed by Mr. Bannon, the former head of Breitbart, the pro-Trump online news site, helps produce policy and TV campaign "moments" and provides camaraderie. That group includes press secretary Hope Hicks and former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani.

A third circle includes Mr. Trump's older children in a less prominent day-to-day role. Eric Trump has negotiated leases for field offices in Virginia and Pennsylvania, and is a frequent surrogate on cable TV news. Donald Trump Jr. travels to campaign fundraising events. Their sister Ivanka Trump helped with the rollout of Mr. Trump's child-care policyTuesday. Her husband, real-estate developer Jared Kushner, is probably the most involved family member in strategy.

"With these circles working together, Donald is more effective every day," said Republican Sen. Jeff Sessions of Alabama, a Trump adviser and member of the circle of political pros.

The Trump campaign circles don't always agree. Regarding **immigration**, Mr. Trump at first appeared to soften his stance on whether illegal **immigrants** must be deported. The political pros, led by Ms. Conway and Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus, wanted Mr. Trump to relax his hard-line stance. Mr. Bannon urged immediate deportation.

After days of wavering, Mr. Trump's speech in Arizona largely reverted to the tougher policy he staked out originally.

Another policy debate played out during a recent night at Trump Tower headquarters. Ms. Conway and Mr. Bannon reviewed a giant U.S. map in Ms. Conway's office punctured with colored pins in battleground states.

The question looming that night -- as well as over the coming weeks of the race -- is how much Mr. Trump should participate in the sort of "retail-style" campaigning he largely shunned during the Republican primaries.

Mr. Bannon argued in favor of staging large rallies, which Mr. Trump enjoys. "He feeds off their energy," Mr. Bannon said, standing to make his point.

Ms. Conway argued the GOP candidate was a "natural in a diner or at a round table."

The decision: Most of Mr. Trump's campaign swings will include a prepared speech, maybe a rally and, always, an appearance at a small local venue.

One constant remains for Mr. Trump, a preoccupation with poll results. "Did you see the polls showing I'm beating Hillary?" he asked during a recent flight aboard his private plane.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW HAVEN, Conn. -- A surge in Syrian refugees has overwhelmed resettlement agencies, pushing them to add staff to help newcomers who need apartments, English lessons and job training.

National Security Adviser Susan Rice announced Aug. 29 that the U.S. had reached its goal of admitting 10,000 Syrian refugees this fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30. The majority arrived in the past five months.

In the tri-state area, 90% of the 1,192 Syrian refugees resettled this fiscal year arrived after April 1.

The surge has made the summer months particularly hectic, said Mia Witte, associate director for resettlement for Church World Service, one of nine resettlement agencies contracted by the federal government to help refugees.

"It kind of overwhelms people and institutions when everyone arrives at once," she said.

The surge stems from the Obama administration's efforts to reach its yearly resettlement goal for Syrians after a slow start. Beginning in February, the federal government sent additional staff to the Middle East to review applications and conduct security checks.

"Implementing enhancements that allow for a significant increase in arrivals takes time," said a State Department spokesman.

Church World Service, which has resettled 1,334 Syrians across the country this fiscal year, surveyed its 33 local offices nationwide and found that housing has been the biggest challenge. Many Syrian families are large, sometimes numbering eight members, and finding places that are both big enough and affordable can be difficult.

"Almost everyone was having trouble identifying housing for so many people at once," Ms. Witte said.

Church World Service is in the process of recruiting a housing specialist who will help local resettlement offices. The agency also raised $100,000 through its summer fundraising appeal to fund emergency housing assistance for refugees.

The group's top location nationally for Syrian resettlement is New Haven. Its affiliate there, Integrated Refugee & **Immigrant** Services, has developed partnerships with local community groups willing to co-sponsor refugee families. The partnerships have allowed the agency to more than double its caseload since last fiscal year, said Executive Director Chris George.

The agency had resettled 267 Syrian refugees as of Monday, up from 23 last fiscal year. On a Wednesday morning earlier this month, refugees crowded the agency's hallways as they waited to enter the food pantry, which was stocked with fresh tomatoes and corn, potatoes and boxed couscous. A sign on the refrigerator in the corner indicated the meat inside was "halal," meaning it conformed with Muslim dietary laws.

Upstairs, a group of seven Syrian men attending daylong English classes sat around a table studying furnishings vocabulary.

"Do you have a carpet in your living room?" one man asked.

"I have a radio," another man replied.

"English only!" The instructor pleaded as the enthusiastic group slipped into Arabic.

Even with support from community groups across Connecticut, Integrated Refugee & **Immigrant** Services needed to hire four full-time and several part-time staff members to manage the influx.

"It's a lot of work," Mr. George said. "But we're happy to do it."

In New York, 92% of the 589 Syrian refugees resettled this fiscal year, mostly in Albany, Buffalo and Syracuse, arrived after April 1. Marlene Schillinger, chief executive officer of Jewish Family Service of Buffalo & Erie County New York, said her agency expects to have resettled 64 Syrians by the end of the month after not receiving any last fiscal year.

Ms. Schillinger said she is hiring two full-time and one part-time employees to handle the extra workload. Helping refugees secure their Social Security cards has been difficult, she said.

"In Buffalo, the social services system is jammed, they're overloaded with refugees and others, so we take our refugees 45 minutes away to Niagara Falls," Ms. Schillinger said.

Darren Lutz, a public-affairs specialist for the U.S. Social Security Administration, said all of its offices are busy, but Buffalo's may be more so compared with Niagara Falls' because it is in a more populated area.

Resettlement agencies are required to find and furnish refugees' housing before they arrive, pick them up from the airport, help them sign up for social services and enroll their children in school. In New Jersey, where 91% of the 275 Syrian refugees resettled this fiscal year arrived after April 1, finding and furnishing apartments was extremely difficult, said Mahmoud Mahmoud, the former director of Church World Service's Jersey City office.

The amount of funding the federal government provides isn't enough for resettlement agencies to hire the necessary staff, Mr. Mahmoud said.

"All the things they require -- it just isn't realistic," he said.

In addition to federal funding that goes directly to refugees, the State Department also allocates $14 million a year to the nine resettlement agencies to defray administrative costs. A spokesman for the State Department said refugee resettlement is a "public-private partnership" and relies on donations from individuals and companies.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton's campaign said Sunday she had been diagnosed with pneumonia and would cancel a planned two-day swing through California, hours after the Democratic presidential nominee abruptly left a 9/11 memorial ceremony in New York for what her aides described as her feeling "overheated."

The diagnosis, coupled with a remark by Mrs. Clinton late Friday criticizing some Trump supporters as a "basket of deplorables," is an unwelcome distraction for a campaign facing a tightening of polls in recent weeks.

Amateur video taken Sunday near Ground Zero in New York showed Mrs. Clinton looking wobbly as she got into her motorcade with an assist from staff and Secret Service agents. The 68-year-old went to her daughter's apartment and emerged about two hours later, waving at the waiting cameras.

"I'm feeling great," she said. "It's a beautiful day in New York."

Her Republican challenger, businessman Donald Trump, has sought to fan concerns about Mrs. Clinton's health, questioning her stamina and chiding her for keeping what he says is a light campaign schedule.

Mrs. Clinton's doctor examined the candidate at her home in Chappaqua, N.Y., later Sunday and said in a written statement that she had been diagnosed two days earlier with pneumonia. The doctor on Sunday said she had been dehydrated and overheated and was "recovering nicely."

The Clinton campaign didn't respond to a request for comment about why they didn't reveal the diagnosis earlier. Mr. Trump hadn't commented on the matter as of Sunday night.

The campaign said Mrs. Clinton was canceling a planned trip to California for early this week. She had planned to attend fundraisers and tape an appearance on Ellen DeGeneres's talk show.

Mr. Trump, who is 70, has called on Mrs. Clinton to release more detailed medical records. In December 2012, Mrs. Clinton fainted and suffered a concussion. She was hospitalized and treated for a blood clot in her head.

In July 2015, her personal physician wrote a letter saying Mrs. Clinton was in "excellent physical condition and fit to serve" as president. The letter said Mrs. Clinton suffered from hypothyroidism and seasonal pollen allergies.

With polls showing voters question Mrs. Clinton's honesty, the delay in revealing her condition after Sunday's incident could further damage her credibility, critics said.

"I can't understand the Clinton operation. You have to frankly tell people what happened and do so right away," said Ari Fleischer, White House press secretary under President George. W. Bush. "If you do that, these things really are not big deals. They only become big if it doesn't appear you're dealing straight."

Mr. Trump himself has come under attack for putting out few details about his health.

The Clinton campaign's recent difficulties stand in contrast to a summer in which its allies saw a position so commanding they didn't think Mrs. Clinton needed to do much in the way of campaigning. She spent parts of August holed up in private fundraising events.

Mr. Trump, meanwhile, was on the defensive over a back-and-forth with a Gold Star military family and over other comments. The Republican ousted top campaign advisers and hired new ones, and Mrs. Clinton largely kept out of the spotlight.

But the release in recent weeks of new documents on Mrs. Clinton's use of private email while secretary of state, as well as news coverage about Mrs. Clinton's ties to her family foundation's donors, have weighed on her poll numbers. An average of polls by Real Clear Politics shows Mr. Trump down by just 3 points.

Whit Ayres, a Republican pollster, said polls showing that so many voters view Mrs. Clinton as unlikable and untrustworthy are "all you've got to know to figure out why this race is reasonably close." Polls have shown Mr. Trump regarded even more unfavorably.

A fresh round of polls shows the race tightening in important battleground states. A pair of Democratic states in the last two presidential races -- Nevada and New Hampshire -- are now too close to call, according to a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News/Marist poll.

Another potential problem for the campaign was the remark Friday night. Assessing some of Mr. Trump's voters at a fundraiser, Mrs. Clinton said about half fall into what she called "the basket of deplorables."

The next day, Mrs. Clinton had put out a statement saying she was "wrong" to have demeaned some Trump voters in this fashion.

"There's no value in attacking a candidate's voters for how they vote," said Chris Kofinis, a Democratic strategist. A better strategy, he said, is to keep the focus squarely on one's opponent.

Mrs. Clinton still profits from an electoral map that gives Democrats an edge in the race for 270 electoral college votes. And the same Wall Street Journal/NBC News/Marist poll also offered troubling news for Mr. Trump. In two reliably Republican states, Mr. Trump led only narrowly: In Arizona, by one percentage point; in Georgia by three.

The Journal/NBC News/Marist results show how the traditional electoral map is being scrambled in a year that could see a realignment of both parties' coalitions.

Mr. Trump is making inroads among working-class, white men but **alienating** many Hispanic voters with his rhetoric about Mexico and illegal **immigration**. Mrs. Clinton is scoring gains among college-educated white voters, a bloc that Republicans have carried handily in the past.

"As we enter the final lap of this very unconventional election, it would not be surprising if the electoral map, in the end, has new contours," said Lee M. Miringoff, director of the Marist College Institute for Public Opinion. "Any of these four states [Nevada, New Hampshire, Arizona and Georgia] could awaken a fault line in what is looking more and more like a shake-up election."

These four states have historically been less competitive than vote-rich battlegrounds such as Ohio and Florida. President Barack Obama won New Hampshire and Nevada by more than 5 percentage points in 2012, while GOP nominee Mitt Romney won Georgia by nearly 8 points and Arizona by 9.

---

Laura Meckler contributed to this article.

(See related article: "Election 2016: Pneumonia Can Be Mild" -- WSJ September 12, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In July, the New Zealand government announced its intention to eradicate all rats, stoats and possums from the entire country by 2050 to save native birds such as the kiwi. It's an ambitious plan, perhaps impossible to pull off with the methods available today, but it's a stark reminder that invasive **alien** species today constitute perhaps the greatest extinction threat to animal populations world-wide.

Birdlife International, a charity that works to save endangered birds, reckons that of the 140 bird species confirmed to have gone extinct since 1500, invasive **alien** species were a factor in the demise of at least 71 -- an impact greater than hunting, logging, agriculture, fire or climate change.

Rats, cats and diseases were the biggest culprits, contributing to the extinction of 41, 34 and 16 species, respectively. Most of these were on islands. The dodo on Mauritius, emblematic of extinction, was wiped out less by hungry sailors than by the rats, pigs, dogs and cats they brought with them. Hawaii once had 55 species of honeycreeper; today just 17 remain, thanks largely to rats and avian malaria, transmitted by **alien** mosquitoes brought by people. Guam has lost nine species of bird to an introduced snake.

But continents aren't immune to invasion by **alien** species. In the Mississippi River, it is Asian carp; in the Everglades, Burmese pythons; in the Great Lakes, Russian zebra mussels; in the South, Indochinese kudzu vine. In Australia, cane toads from South America; in Lake Victoria in Africa, water hyacinth from the Amazon; in Germany, Chinese mitten crabs; in the Caribbean, lionfish from the Pacific. A fungus spread by African clawed toads (used in laboratories) has wiped out frogs in Central America.

On my farm in Northern England, three native species of animal are being extinguished by **alien** invaders from North America: the white-clawed crayfish by the signal crayfish; the water vole by the mink; and the red squirrel by the gray squirrel. Himalayan balsam flowers and Japanese knotweed infest the woods.

**Aliens** turn into pests away from home because they encounter naive and ill-equipped competitors or prey, and they leave behind their diseases and predators. Globalization is increasing the flow. An insect that would have struggled to survive a long journey by ship can stow away on board a plane. Today only Australia and New Zealand, whose isolated fauna and flora are especially vulnerable to invasives, take biosecurity really seriously.

European countries, by contrast, are lax in allowing exotic pets. In Britain, pet raccoons (native to North America) and raccoon dogs (native to China) have escaped into the wild and may one day establish breeding populations that would devastate native wildlife.

A paper published last month by a team of ecologists, led by Regan Early of the University of Exeter in Britain, points out that whereas most invasive **alien**species (IAS) have affected rich countries so far, the developing world is increasingly at risk: "Many of the global biodiversity hot spots that are highly vulnerable to invasion are found in countries that our results suggest have little capacity to respond to IAS (in particular Central America, Africa, Central Asia and Indochina)."

None of this is to say that invasive species are always a threat. They can bring positive effects, too, by increasing biodiversity within a region. Ascension Island in the Atlantic was once a barren volcanic rock but is now much greener thanks to a deliberate policy, suggested by Charles Darwin, of bringing in plants from elsewhere in the tropics to create a forest ecosystem. Dov Sax of Brown University points out that New Zealand once had approximately 2,000 native plant species, has gained approximately 2,000 nonnative species that now have self-sustaining populations, and yet has lost fewer than 10 native plant species.

Another positive effect is that invasive species sometimes improve, rather than harm, ecosystem services -- the quality of water, soil or air. Zebra mussels were so effective in filtering the water of Lake Erie that they made its water clear. In the American Southwest, the endangered willow flycatcher has taken to nesting on **alien** tamarisk bushes, embarrassing conservationists who spent millions trying to eradicate the plant for the sake of the bird.

The best way to fight invasive **aliens** is often with other **aliens**: Go back to their native country, find an insect or fungus that eats them, and bring it in to help. Early horror stories when **alien** predators introduced to control **alien** prey turned on native wildlife instead -- cane toads in Australia, stoats in New Zealand -- have given way to much more cautious and careful scientific introductions of highly specific control organisms. Done right, such biological control is indispensable.

The Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International is an international agency that scours the native homes of invasive **alien** pests for predators that can control them. It found a rust fungus that has reduced the infestation of rubbervine weed from Madagascar in Queensland, Australia -- by up to 90% in some areas. The Centre used two parasitic wasps to control the mango mealybug from Asia, which did huge damage to mango trees in Benin in Africa.

Vaccines that cause sterility are another promising weapon. Spreading food coated with such a vaccine could render a species sterile, causing its numbers to fall. This approach is working well in the lab with pigs -- invasive species in various places -- and may soon help to fight gray squirrels in Britain.

Genomics is the latest weapon. The Aedes mosquito that spreads dengue and Zika in the Americas is an invasive **alien**, from Africa. A biotech firm called Oxitec has devised a way of suppressing its population using mass releases of genetically modified males (males don't bite), which father offspring that cannot mature. In trials in Brazil, this method has achieved more than 90% suppression of numbers.

The next step is even craftier. Using a mechanism called "gene drive," it is possible in the laboratory to create a genetic variant that will gradually infect an entire population of a species with infertility. Whether such a technique would work in the wild, and how it could be safely controlled, or reversed if it began to affect the species back in its native range, are still unanswered questions.

Many nonnative species are here to stay, and many are welcome additions to biodiversity of a country. But scientists are going to be very busy over the next few decades working to reverse the damage done by some and to prevent the arrival of others.

---

Mr. Ridley is the author, most recently, of "The Evolution of Everything: How New Ideas Emerge" and a member of the British House of Lords.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**All These Worlds Are Yours

By Jon Willis

Yale, 214 pages, $30

Imagine that life is discovered beyond the Earth. How would you react? Would it bring about some profound change of attitude? Hold on, it's happened already. I remember the day -- Aug. 7, 1996 -- when NASA announced evidence of what appeared to be microfossils in a piece of Martian rock. My jaw dropped at news I'd longed to hear since childhood: We were no longer alone in the universe. As President Bill Clinton told the press assembled on the South Lawn of the White House: "If this discovery is confirmed, it will surely be one of the most stunning insights into our universe that science has ever uncovered." Yet for all the fanfare, Martian meteorite ALH84001 soon slipped out of the limelight. Here were no little green men, only tiny mineral structures resembling bacteria. And 20 years on, the evidence is still considered inconclusive. It serves, Jon Willis writes in "All These Worlds Are Yours," as a warning that any search for extraterrestrial life "may not offer the clear answers that we perhaps naively expect."

A naive expectation on my part was that Mr. Willis's survey of the quest for **alien** life would give substantial coverage to the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, or SETI, an organization that focuses on trying to pick up radio communications from distant planets. Leaving aside theoretical arguments against the likelihood of ever hearing anything, the decades of silence endured by SETI researchers are enough to convince Mr. Willis that the venture does not merit public funding. NASA agrees: It ceased its support in 1995. The project now relies on the generosity of patrons such as billionaire Yuri Milner and the roughly five million people who donate computer time to a crowd-sourced offshoot known as SETI@home.

Mr. Willis wishes them all the luck in this and every other world, but as a professional astronomer he is concerned with trying to identify areas with the best chance of actually finding something. There are, he says, two ways we might discover **alien** life: by detecting a "biomarker" in a planetary atmosphere or by observing actual organisms. The first requires powerful telescopes; the second involves robotic space missions. In either case we need to have some idea of what we might be looking for.

NASA sets much store by both possibilities, and the anticlimax of ALH84001 has done little to dent hope or deflate hype. In April 2014 it was announced that the Kepler space telescope had detected an Earth-size planet in the "habitable zone" of a star 500 light years away. Dubbed Kepler-186f, the planet is at such a distance from its parent star as to allow liquid water to exist on its surface, and the media were quick to take up the possibility of a "twin Earth" that could potentially support life. But we don't know if there is any water on Kepler-186f, let alone anything swimming there.

A better measure of life-bearing possibility is the composition of a planet's atmosphere. The idea originated with James Lovelock, famous for his Gaia hypothesis. Suppose an **alien** civilization knew nothing about the Earth except what was revealed by sunlight glinting through air at the edge of its tiny far-off disk. As Mr. Lovelock pointed out, the **aliens** would be struck by the abundance of oxygen. The element was lacking on our planet until the appearance of photosynthesizing organisms that produced it as a waste product, making possible the evolution of animals such as ourselves who breathe it, and it is life that keeps oxygen at a high and fairly constant level. If all life vanished from the Earth, then so too, over a relatively short geological time period, would oxygen, consumed in fires, rusting and other reactions. One exoplanet that has yielded to the difficult challenge of having its atmosphere analyzed is HAT-P-11b, a Neptune-like world a little over 100 light years away, imaged by the Hubble Space Telescope and found to have water vapor in its clouds.

But is water necessary for life, and would oxygen be the surest biomarker? As Mr. Willis explains, extraterrestrial life could have evolved in very different conditions, and along very different chemical pathways, from our own. Aside from our oxygen-fed, glucose-burning metabolism there are other reactions that could potentially release energy into living cells: for example, inhaling acetylene and hydrogen and releasing methane. Interestingly, there is an anomalous abundance of methane on Titan, the largest of Saturn's moons. Perhaps the gas is venting from reserves beneath the surface, but life is seriously being considered as an explanation. Measurements by the Cassini spacecraft have revealed that acetylene and hydrogen are somehow being used up near Titan's surface, in unknown reactions. So, Mr. Willis asks, is this unambiguous evidence for acetylene-gulping microbes? No, he says: "A good astrobiologist should use life as the conclusion of last resort."

In 2005 the Huygens probe landed on Titan's surface, and through an orange fog it showed a terrain strewn with icy pebbles but devoid of any visible organisms. Scientists will need a lot of convincing before reaching for that last resort -- as Carl Sagan liked to say, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. Biomarkers detected from afar might never be enough to remove doubt, and if **aliens** never give us a call then perhaps the only hope of unequivocal proof will be when living goo is scooped from another world and brought back to Earth. That makes our own solar system the only feasible search area, and Mr. Willis singles out the prime targets as Mars, Titan and two of Jupiter's moons, Europa and Enceladus. His book largely concentrates on these worlds and the challenge of reaching them.

Mr. Willis teaches astrobiology to college students, and his book conveys great enthusiasm alongside necessary scientific skepticism. The technical details and problems are clearly laid out and discussed -- even defining "life" is far from straightforward. All of this makes welcome reading for lovers of science fact, though it might be disappointing for those raised on science fiction and perhaps also those hoping for a little more by way of historical perspective on a subject that people have been speculating about for centuries. And while the transfer from lecture hall to page generally works well enough, I did wish that we could have had rather fewer rhetorical questions. At one point I counted 13 in three paragraphs.

If Mr. Willis could pick only one target from his shortlist it would be Enceladus; it is not as far away as Titan and has convenient water-spewing geysers whose outpourings could be collected by an orbiting craft. He puts the price tag of a Enceladus mission at $4 billion, noting that this is how much the world's nations collectively spend on defense every day.

All of which leaves the final rhetorical question: Is that a price worth paying?

---

Mr. Crumey's most recent novel is "The Secret Knowledge."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The growth in the population of U.S. Latinos, who represent the nation's largest minority, has slowed substantially since the Great Recession, and most Hispanics in the country are now born here, according to a new study.

Latino settlement across the country, which gave rise to Hispanic enclaves in the likes of North Carolina and Iowa in the 1990s and early 2000s, has also slowed since the onset of the recession in 2007, according to an analysis of U.S. Census data by the Pew Research Center released Thursday.

Between 2007 and 2014, the U.S. Hispanic population grew about 2.8% annually, down from 4.4% between 2000 and 2007, and 5.8% annually in the 1990s.

"Lower fertility combined with less **immigration** has led to slower growth of Hispanics," said Mark Hugo Lopez, Pew's director of Hispanic Research and co-author of the report. "It has also led to a slowdown in their dispersion," he said.

These two trends point to the end of the U.S. demographic earthquake unleashed by rapid Latino population growth that began in the 1990s. That growth caused Latinos to surpass blacks and become the second-largest population group in the country, after whites.

"The demographic impact of Latinos that we have seen over the last 2.5 decades will continue into the future, but it is going to be a declining impact," said Mr. Lopez.

All told, the U.S. was home to 55.4 million Hispanics in 2014, out of a total population of around 319 million that year. U.S. Latinos, or Hispanics, are individuals born mainly in Mexico, Caribbean countries like Cuba and the Dominican Republic, and Central American countries like Guatemala and El Salvador, as well as all Americans who trace their ancestry to those places.

Despite the slowdown, Latinos still represented 54% of the nation's population growth between 2000 and 2014, according to Pew.

Minorities could determine the outcome of the presidential election in November, and Latino electoral clout will continue to climb in coming years. That is in part because Hispanics in the U.S. are increasingly born here -- and, thus, automatically eligible to vote.

**Immigration**, once the biggest driver of Hispanic population growth, has taken a back seat to U.S. births. Indeed, more people from Mexico, the biggest source of Latino **immigrants**, are now leaving than entering the U.S., according to Pew.

In most states, Hispanics born in the U.S. now outnumber their foreign-born brethren.

In California, the country's most populous state and home to the most Latinos, nearly two-thirds of Hispanics were U.S.-born in 2014. In Texas, which ranks second, 70% of Hispanics were born in the U.S. In Colorado, that figure was 76%.

Among the 15 metropolitan areas with the largest Hispanic population, only two are majority foreign-born. In Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, 61% of Latinos are foreign-born, and in Washington, D.C., and adjacent Virginia and Maryland suburbs, 53% are **immigrants**.

The Hispanic fertility rate has fallen as the share of Hispanics who are **immigrants** has declined.

Throughout the early 2000s, the birthrate among Hispanic women of childbearing age was 95 births per 1,000 women, peaking at 98.3 in 2006. The Hispanic birthrate declined steadily, to 72.1 in 2014, and is unlikely to reverse.

Take Ana Villegas, one of six U.S.-born children to Mexican **immigrants** in California.

The 33-year-old executive assistant at a nonprofit in Los Angeles plans to have one or two children to "make sure I can offer them the best possible quality of life," she said.

Her sister, 35-year-old Gricelda, the oldest of the six children and the only one who is married, has two kids and doesn't want more, she said.

The Pew analysis found that Hispanics were more evenly distributed across U.S. counties in 2014 than previously, but that their dispersion has slowed since 2007.

The biggest increase in Latino population happened in North Dakota, where energy-related jobs due to expansion of the oil and natural-gas sectors also attracted other groups. The size of that state's Hispanic population doubled in the seven-year postrecession period, albeit to just 18,000.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Denial

Sept. 30

"History has had its day in court and scored a crushing victory," declared the Times of London after the American academic Deborah E. Lipstadt and her publisher Penguin won a landmark libel case brought by the British Holocaust denier David Irving.

"Denial" is based on Ms. Lipstadt's 2006 book "History on Trial," about her five-year legal battle with Mr. Irving, whom she characterized in an earlier book as "one of the most dangerous spokesmen for Holocaust denial."

The movie, directed by Mick Jackson with a script by playwright David Hare, begins in 1996 when Mr. Irving turns up to a talk of Ms. Lipstadt's offering $1,000 to anyone who can produce a document showing that Hitler ordered the Holocaust. In the movie, most of which takes place in London where the trial was held, Ms. Lipstadt (Rachel Weisz) says that Holocaust deniers always have a hidden agenda and in Mr. Irving's case it is all about his determination to exculpate Hitler: If the Holocaust hadn't happened, how could Hitler have known about it or ordered it?

During the movie's trial Mr. Irving (Timothy Spall), who acted as his own counsel, accuses Ms. Lipstadt of destroying his career as a respected historian by labeling him a "denier," which he says is equivalent to "a moral yellow star."

In a recent article he wrote for the Guardian newspaper, "Denial's" screenwriter Mr. Hare, whose credits include World War II movies like "The Reader" (2008) and "Plenty" (1995), said he spent weeks reading through the 32 days of transcript made during the trial.

Mr. Hare says he challenged himself to stick rigidly to the exact words used in the courtroom. "At times, I would beat my head, wondering why real-life characters couldn't put things in ways which more pithily expressed their purposes," wrote Mr. Hare.

-- Tobias Grey

Hacksaw Ridge

Nov. 4

Just because "Hacksaw Ridge," directed by Mel Gibson, is about a faith-driven, peace-loving conscientious objector during World War II, don't expect it to dial down the battlefield gore. Desmond Doss was a real soldier who won the right to go to the front lines without carrying a weapon, in keeping with his patriotic urge to enlist and his Seventh-day Adventist beliefs.

In the movie, Army officials pressure Doss (Andrew Garfield) to quit if he won't carry a rifle to defend himself and his platoon mates. They try to court-martial him, and they jail him, before grudgingly sending him as a medic to the Battle of Okinawa.

"While everyone else is taking life, I'm gonna be saving it," he promises. American GI's get slaughtered trying to take the fictitious Hacksaw Ridge from the Japanese, and Pfc. Doss is credited with saving 75 wounded soldiers, some of whom had mocked him as a coward. Doss became the first conscientious objector awarded the Medal of Honor.

The assault on Okinawa in 1945 was the deadliest battle of the Pacific theater, and the film shows it. "A medic has to deal with what happens when men lose their legs, when their guts are pouring out," producer Bill Mechanic points out. "We weren't trying to dwell on it, but we did want to give a feeling for just how awful it actually is."

"Hacksaw Ridge" seems likely to get an R rating, something Mr. Mechanic insisted on for realism during its prolonged journey to the screen. "That was one of the reasons it never got made," he says.

Producers had tried for decades to film Doss's story. Mr. Mechanic says Doss in 1946 rebuffed Hal Wallis, producer of "Casablanca." Director Terry Benedict won the rights to make a 2004 documentary about Doss and secured dramatic rights in the process. Doss died in 2006. Mr. Mechanic acquired and then sold the rights to a company that insisted on a PG-13 version of the battle, then he spent years working to buy the rights back.

Some critics may find the movie a little preachy, speechy and old-fashioned. But it seems likely to resonate with viewers seeking a hero who isn't wearing a cape, as well as those who read or saw "Unbroken." Its mix of faith, patriotism and on-screen brutality seems to suit the strengths of its director. Mr. Gibson may be a controversial figure in many quarters, but his "The Passion of the Christ" was a huge hit in parts of the nation where "Lone Survivor" and Clint Eastwood's "American Sniper" later did well.

Now a producer, Mr. Mechanic had headed the Fox movie studio during a run that included overseeing Mr. Gibson's "Braveheart."

"I saw this as sort of a different version of 'Braveheart,' a story of a person who was willing to die for his beliefs. If you took 'Braveheart' and 'The Passion of the Christ,' the intersection gives you Desmond Doss," he says.

Mr. Gibson hadn't directed a film since "Apocalypto" in 2006, the year of his infamous DUI arrest and bigoted tirade.

"There's no question there is baggage," Mr. Mechanic acknowledges. "It's a story of forgiveness, which I felt ultimately was a good thing for Mel."

-- Don Steinberg

Loving

Nov. 4

"Loving" is an understated drama about two modest people who accidentally changed history. Writer-director Jeff Nichols tells the real-life story of Richard and Mildred Loving, an interracial couple jailed in Virginia in 1958 because their marriage violated the state's anti-miscegenation law. They reluctantly took their case to the U.S. Supreme Court, which in 1967 declared those laws unconstitutional.

Actress Ruth Negga, born in Ethiopia and raised in Ireland, plays the soft-spoken but determined Mildred, who was African-American and Native American. She is so desperate for help that she writes to Attorney General Robert Kennedy about their problem, setting the legal process in motion.

Joel Edgerton ("Black Mass") is Richard, a taciturn laborer. Mr. Edgerton delivers what may be the film's signature line: Asked by his young ACLU lawyer (Nick Kroll) if he wants to send a message to the Supreme Court justices, he answers simply, "Tell them I love my wife." The film premiered at the Cannes Film Festival in May.

Mr. Nichols (known for other Southern-set films including "Mud" and "Midnight Special") creates a narrative that plays out in quiet family moments more often than in court. While their lawyers argue the case in Washington, the Lovings remain in their rural house, little more than a shack, their three children playing outside.

The Lovings' personalities and relationship drew Mr. Nichols to the project, his first not based on his original idea. He was approached by the producers, who sent him a copy of the 2011 documentary "The Loving Story."

"These two people got married without any political convictions or agenda," he says. "They just thought it was all right, which is a really bizarre thing in the 1950s in the American South. You'd have to ask, are they just super naive or stupid, or what's going on? But they weren't. They just were from this small, tight-knit community where races had been mingling -- both sexually and not -- for a long time."

The fact that they had no desire to be public figures, Mr. Nichols says, enhances their story's relevance. "They genuinely just loved each other. That seems like an important thing to make a movie about."

-- Caryn James

Arrival

Nov. 11

"Arrival" is a quiet science-fiction mindbender about free will and destiny, about motherhood and mourning. It's about linguistics and how the structure of our language can influence the way we perceive the world.

It also has slimy **aliens** that look like seven-legged squids.

"It took us a long time to create the **aliens**. It's so difficult to create a species that doesn't look like something you've seen before," says director Denis Villeneuve, who has plunged into worlds-of-their-own on Earth in his gripping films including "Sicario," "Prisoners" and "Incendies."

The movie is based on "The Story of Your Life," a 1998 short story by Ted Chiang. The story's title hints at the intimacy at the film's core amid its intergalactic plot.

Amy Adams plays Dr. Louise Banks, a mother dealing with a tragedy. She's also a world-class linguist who has worked with the government on national-security-related translations. When a dozen 1,500-foot tall watermelon-seed-shaped vehicles from outer space start hovering around the globe, Colonel G.T. Weber (Forest Whitaker) recruits Dr. Banks to visit Montana and start a dialogue with the **aliens** inside the oblong ship that's parked there.

"Priority one: What do they want? Where are they from?" the colonel says on the helicopter. Dr. Banks is teamed with a mathematician (Jeremy Renner), and they make contact with the strange visitors. She learns to understand the **aliens**' written language, circular symbols that resemble random coffee-mug stains and express complete thoughts rather than individual words or sounds.

"I liked the idea of it as a sort of Rorschach," Mr. Villeneuve says of the symbols.

There's ticking-clock suspense, as governments around the world start to freak out -- are these good **aliens** or bad **aliens**? -- and reach for their weapons. Only Dr. Banks's proper understanding of the **aliens**' intentions can preclude war.

Mr. Villeneuve, 48, hadn't done much science fiction before, aside from the quirky "Enemy" in 2013, though he spent this past summer in Budapest filming a sequel to "Blade Runner," slated for release next year. He grew up in Quebec as a fan of Frank Herbert's "Dune" and European science fiction including French cartoonist Moebius and the French fanzine Metal hurlant, published in America as "Heavy Metal."

**Alien** movies tend to be either home games or away games. The **aliens** come here (in the Steven Spielberg tradition), or we confront them in space (George Lucas, Ridley Scott). "Arrival" sort of sits in between. **Aliens** arrive on Earth, but much of the action takes place inside an **alien** ship, essentially on their turf. It's also in-between as a movie, bigger in scale than an independent "low-fi sci-fi" picture, and based around a brainy concept, although with less spectacle than "Gravity" or "The Martian" or "Interstellar."

"I tried to bring some scope and visual poetry to the movie," the director says. "But still the art of the film is based on that short story, that beautiful idea that language can transform your perception of reality."

-- D.S.

Manchester By The Sea

Nov. 18

When it premiered at the Sundance Film Festival, this drama quickly became the critics' favorite and has only gained momentum since.

Casey Affleck plays Lee, a janitor near Boston, who has been emotionally shattered by a tragedy. When his brother dies, he is called back to his hometown on the North Shore to become guardian of his teenage nephew. Painfully, he tries to rebuild his life. Grim as it sounds, the film is full of dry comic notes and shrewd observations.

The film's writer and director Kenneth Lonergan is known for plays ("The Waverly Gallery") and his films, "You Can Count on Me" (2000) with Laura Linney and Mark Ruffalo, and "Margaret" (2011), which went unreleased for six years amid legal disputes. Many critics liked the latter movie, but it grossed less than $47,000 at the box office.

At Sundance, Amazon bought "Manchester" for $10 million, adding commercial pressure to an independent film that relies on subtlety and close observation of the characters. Mr. Lonergan says he doesn't feel that pressure himself.

"That's the nice thing about movies," he says. "You have to lock them and you're done. Now it's up to the distributor and whoever else to make sure the movie gets promoted and released in a good way. I just have to show up when they ask."

Although the film's focus on families and grief makes Mr. Lonergan's fingerprints easy to spot, "Manchester" didn't start out as his project at all. Matt Damon and John Krasinski came to him with the concept for the story and asked him to write the screenplay, which Mr. Damon would direct with Mr. Krasinski as the star.

After several changes in their schedules, they asked Mr. Lonergan to direct, with Mr. Damon staying on as a producer. Along with Mr. Affleck, the cast includes Michelle Williams as Lee's ex-wife, and Kyle Chandler, seen in extensive flashbacks as his brother.

Mr. Lonergan, who has done plenty of film-writing for hire, says the film seemed like his more personal work. "I felt safe putting my heart and soul into it because I knew Matt wouldn't rewrite me or fire me."

-- C.J.

Rules Don't Apply

Nov. 23

Rumors that Warren Beatty has been working for decades on a closely guarded biographical film about Howard Hughes have finally been put to rest -- sort of.

In "Rules Don't Apply," he does play the eccentric billionaire. But, he said before a recent press screening: "This is not a Howard Hughes biopic. It's about sexual puritanism in the 1950s and '60s, around the time I got to Hollywood." Mr. Beatty, now 79, is also the writer and director of the film, the first he's directed since "Bulworth" in 1998.

Mr. Beatty has actually had some iteration of a Hughes project in the works for many years. The film that arrives this fall is a romantic comedy that also takes a satiric look at the Hollywood that Hughes was part of, just before the inventor, aviator and film producer became so reclusive. The plot centers around a young would-be singer and actress named Marla Mabrey (Lily Collins), one of many women Hughes puts under contract, supporting with acting lessons and a salary. He's also said to seek romantic favors from some. Marla falls for her driver, a Hughes employee named Frank Forbes (Alden Ehrenreich, recently cast as the young Han Solo in a future "Star Wars" movie). She is a Baptist, he is a Methodist; both are devoutly religious and intensely attracted to each other.

Mr. Beatty's age-appropriate Hughes is, for the first stretch of the film, heard but not seen, a voice from the shadows. He finally emerges as a man with all the eccentricities money can buy. He has hundreds of gallons of a discontinued flavor of ice cream delivered to his Las Vegas hotel and quickly loses his taste for it. He invites Marla to his darkened hotel room and serves frozen dinners on a snack tray.

The ensemble cast includes some well-known names in supporting roles. Annette Bening plays Marla's protective mother, who accompanies her to Hollywood. Candice Bergen plays Hughes' secretary. Matthew Broderick and Martin Sheen are Hughes company executives, leaping at their boss' every whim.

The fictionalized Hughes character may not always be the center of the film, but he has his scene-stealing moments. When a drug-fueled Hughes recklessly pilots a small plane, alarming his passengers, Mr. Beatty sings "Is It True What They Say About Dixie" with abandon.

-- C.J.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As our dispiriting presidential campaign grinds on, the rest of the world is not standing still. And the news is not good.

At the G-20 meeting last weekend, Chinese officials treated the president of the United States and his senior aides with blatant disrespect. As Chinese nationalism surges, President Xi Jinping is asserting his country's claims throughout the South China Sea, a move that episodic demonstrations of American naval power have failed to halt. Meanwhile, the linchpin of President Obama's "pivot" to Asia -- the Trans-Pacific Partnership -- faces opposition from both presidential candidates and hangs by a thread in Congress. Its defeat would deal a heavy blow to American credibility.

In the Middle East, the Syrian civil war continues its bloody course, and the latest effort to negotiate a humanitarian cease-fire with the Russians has foundered over what the administration describes as "trust" issues. Mr. Obama's prediction that Vladimir Putin's use of military force would land him in a quagmire described his own state of mind rather than reality. Instead, at modest cost, Mr. Putin has restored Russia's standing as a key player in the region, while our friends and allies see America in retreat.

In northern Syria, U.S.-backed Kurds have been the only effective fighters against Islamic State. But when Turkey sent its forces across the border, Mr. Obama sent Vice President Joe Biden to Turkey, where he demanded that the Kurds withdraw from ISIS-held territory they had recently seized. President Recep Tayyip Erdogan sees every manifestation of Kurdish nationalism, wherever it may occur, as a threat to Turkey's domestic security.

The U.S. is under no obligation to agree with him, especially at the expense of one of the few reliably pro-Western forces in the region. Mr. Obama's meeting in China with Mr. Erdogan did not yield an agreement. The administration's brand of "realism" in Syria has ended in a damaging muddle.

The group photo at the G-20 meeting spoke volumes. At one end, President Putin was speaking to President Erdogan, who listened attentively. At the other end, President Obama peered curiously at the colloquy. In the middle, President Xi smiled confidently. As the authoritarian entente cordiale flowers, the U.S. is reduced to a bystander's role.

Mr. Obama seems to have assumed that events in Syria, however awful to behold, would have no effect on core American interests. If so, he was badly mistaken. The flood of Syrian refugees has destabilized its neighbors in the Middle East and Europe.

Anti-**immigrant** nationalism is on the rise throughout the Continent, and it contributed to June's pro-Brexit vote in the U.K. German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who initially welcomed the refugees, has been thrown on the defensive. In an election in her home state last weekend, her Christian Democrats finished third, behind the anti-**immigrant** Alternative for Germany party. Even Denmark, long regarded as a bastion of tolerance, is witnessing a backlash, and the anti-**immigrant** Danish People's Party is now the country's second-largest.

Weakness begets weakness. America's response to Mr. Putin's annexation of Ukraine's Crimea was totally ineffective. When Hitler's forces marched into the Rhineland in 1936, along the demilitarized border with France, England's Lord Lothian remarked that this was no more than the Germans walking into "their own back garden" -- never mind Germany's treaty obligations not to do so.

It was not hard to discern similar undercurrents in the wake of Mr. Putin's bold Crimea stroke and the U.S. failure to provide defensive weaponry to Ukraine after Russian-backed separatists struck again in eastern Ukraine.

Presidents often define their foreign policy in opposition to the most unpopular features of their predecessor's. This seldom works out well: The opposite of a mistake is usually the opposite mistake.

And so it has been with Mr. Obama. He opposed George W. Bush's decision to invade Iraq -- rightly, in my view -- and rode that opposition to the White House. But "no more Iraqs" turned out be an inadequate maxim, even (or especially) in the Middle East. His allergy to the use, or even the threat, of force has rendered U.S. diplomacy all but toothless. We have conducted an eight-year experiment in foreign policy with almost no sticks and very few carrots. The results are clear: The force of the better argument is seldom enough to prevail on its own.

Donald Trump's election would make a bad situation worse, which is why most of the Republican foreign-policy establishment has deserted him. Some of them have already announced that they will vote for Hillary Clinton, who has emerged as the one champion of the traditional, muscular, often bipartisan approach to American foreign policy.

Despite its many mistakes, the U.S. remains the most credible guarantor of global peace and security. No invisible hand will secure this outcome. When we pull back, chaos results. And nothing in human affairs is worse.

(See related letter: "Letters to the Editor: Hillary: A Big Part of Many U.S. Foreign Policy Failures" -- WSJ Sept. 16, 2016)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Chinese and Indian newcomers to the U.S. are now outpacing Mexican arrivals in most regions of the country, a marked reversal from a decade ago, when **immigrants** from America's southern neighbor dwarfed arrivals from the large Asian countries.

A Wall Street Journal analysis of census figures shows that in Illinois, New York, Ohio, Virginia, Florida, Georgia and other states, more **immigrants** from China and India arrived than from Mexico in 2014, the most recent year for which data are available.

That year, about 136,000 people came to the U.S. from India, about 128,000 from China and about 123,000 from Mexico, census figures show. As recently as 2005, Mexico sent more than 10 times as many people to the U.S. as China, and more than six times as many as India.

The figures include people who come legally and illegally, but don't distinguish between the two. While Chinese and Indian **immigrants** are far more likely to be in the U.S. legally than those from Mexico, Asians represent one of the fastest-growing segments of undocumented **immigrants** in the country, researchers say. People from Mexico and other Central American countries account for about 71% of the U.S. unauthorized **immigrant** population, while Asians account for the second-largest share at 13%, according to the Migration Policy Institute.

Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has made stopping illegal **immigration** from Mexico a centerpiece of his campaign, through his proposed border wall and other enforcement measures. Last week, he also pledged to add thousands of new border enforcement agents.

But demographers say the quick shift in migration flows shows that the campaign discussion's emphasis on illegal crossings at the nation's southern border doesn't tell the whole picture.

"This notion of a wall and of Mexican **immigration** being the most pressing challenge facing the United States is completely out of touch with the reality we face," said Karthick Ramakrishnan, associate dean of the University of California, Riverside School of Public Policy. **Immigration** today "is much more Asian."

A spokesman for Mr. Trump said the campaign is focused on stemming illegal border crossings from all of Central America, noting that apprehensions along the southwest border have surpassed those from the previous fiscal year.

The Republican also has proposed a biometric tracking system to tackle visa overstays, which account for an estimated 40% or more of the people in the U.S. illegally. The federal government has already tried and failed to create the exit portion of such a system, most recently when lawmakers worked on an **immigration** overhaul in 2013. A spokesman for Mr. Trump called such a system a national-security imperative and said it is achievable with the right leadership.

Democrat Hillary Clinton wants to enact an **immigration** overhaul that would create a path to citizenship for some Americans here illegally and end rules requiring certain green card seekers to first leave the country. Her plans also don't explicitly address the shift toward Asian **immigration**, but put far less focus on securing the Mexican border. A Clinton spokeswoman said the Democratic nominee backs an **immigration** overhaul but didn't address details of her proposals so far.

The Journal's analysis found that in 2014, there were 31 states where more **immigrants** arrived from China than from Mexico that year, up from seven states in 2005. Newly arrived **immigrants** from India in 2014 outnumbered those from Mexico in 25 states, up from four states in 2005. Even in California, Chinese **immigrants** outnumbered Mexican **immigrants** in 2014, and the number from India was only slightly below that of Mexico.

Census figures show that about 82,000 people came to the U.S. from all other Central American countries besides Mexico in 2014, a surge from the prior year tied largely to an influx of unaccompanied children from Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador that has since tapered off.

A swirl of forces is driving the shift. Highly educated technology workers from China and India are flocking to the U.S. for skilled jobs. While the number of such work visas is capped each year, extended families that trail such workers are spawning their own wave of new arrivals. China and India now send more international students to the U.S. than any other countries.

At the same time, fewer Mexicans are coming to the U.S. as Mexico's own job market improves and its birth rate has declined.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A substantial bloc of Republican-leaning voters has declined so far to back either major-party candidate for president, suggesting Donald Trump has an opportunity to make the race more competitive by persuading them to return to the GOP.

His challenge is formidable, however, since almost 8 in 10 of these voters have sharply negative views of Mr. Trump and his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton. That raises the prospect they might vote a third-party candidate -- or sit out the election.

The composition of theundecidedpool also is far different than in prior years, data from Wall StreetJournal/NBC News polling shows. Typically,undecided voters show little attachment to either party and only slight enthusiasm for the election.

They also tend to have lower income levels and educational attainment than voters overall. This year, the pool includes far more upper-income and Republican-leaning voters from suburban and metropolitan communities -- areas that often determine which party will win a state.And they form a larger pool than in the last election -- about 13% of all voters, compared with 8% in2012.

Among them,some 48% of those who say in Journal/NBC News surveys that they don't back either major-party candidate nonetheless want the next Congress to be controlled by Republicans, suggesting they are GOP voters at heart. That is a far larger share than in 2012 and about twice the share who want Democrats to run the next Congress.

"These are not the less-engaged, weakly partisan people," said Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "They're better-educated people who lean Republican, who don't like Trump and have zero use for Hillary Clinton, and they're sort of paralyzed and frozen right now."

Some surveys in recent days have shown the contest tightening, a development arising in part from some Republican holdouts moving to support Mr. Trump. In a new CNN/ORC poll, for instance, Mr. Trump was backed by 83% of Republican registered voters, up from 78% in late July.

Overall, Mr. Trump led Mrs. Clinton by 2 percentage points among likely voters in the CNN/ORC survey, 45% to 43%, on a ballot that included third-party candidates. Mr. Trump trailed Mrs. Clinton by three points among registered voters.

There appears to be little movement in the share of voters who pick neither Mr. Trump nor Mrs. Clinton. Asked which candidate they'd choose, some 15% in a Journal/NBC News survey in August said neither the New York businessman nor the former secretary of state, another candidate or that they were unsure. That was about the same share as in June and July. Similarly, the share backing neither candidate has held fairly steady since late July in CNN/ORC polling.

An analysis by thefirm Survey Monkey, which specializes in online polling, also concluded that more Republicans than Democrats are undecided, with independents outnumbering both.

"Should every undecided voter cast a ballot, these results suggest an opportunity for Trump to narrow Clinton's lead," Mark Blumenthal, who leads election polling at the company, wrote about the study.

But he added that the company's data also suggest that being undecided correlates with skipping the election. "So, the slightly greater Republican skew of the totally undecided may be early signs of lower than usual turnout on the horizon among Republican partisans," he wrote.

Normally, people who remainundecidedat this point "are voters who aren't paying attention," said Terry Madonna, director of the Franklin & Marshall College Poll of Pennsylvania voters. That isn't the case with many of this year'sundecidedor third-party voters. "There are a larger number of particularly Republicans on the fence, because they're torn. They'd like to vote their party" but are wary of backing "the controversial Donald Trump," he said.

Nationally, these are voters such as Erin Tolman, 29, a pharmacy technician and mother in College Station, Texas, who voted for Republican Mitt Romney in 2012 and backed social conservative Ben Carson in this year's GOP primaries. Now, she plans on voting for Libertarian Gary Johnson.

Mrs. Clinton, says Ms. Tolman, is a "career politician," while Mr. Trump's tough stance on illegal **immigration** turns her off. "He's against everything that as Americans we believe in," she said. "We're a country of **immigrants**."

Roughly 6% of all voters favor a GOP-led Congress over a Democratic one but aren't backing either major-party candidate, merged data from Journal/NBC News surveys from July and August shows. Results from the two months were compared with those from July and August of 2012.

If Mr. Trump could win this group over, he would make the race more competitive, said Mr. McInturff, who directs the Journal/NBC News poll with Democrat Fred Yang. But it would take more than that to overcome the advantage Mrs. Clinton holds due to the larger number of Democrats than Republicans in the electorate.

---

Dante Chinni and Janet Hook contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump added another round of uncertainty to his **immigration** policy Monday, saying he was reconsidering whether undocumented **immigrants** must "return home" before seeking legal status in the U.S.

"We're going to make that decision into the future," the Republican presidential nominee told reporters in Ohio, potentially reversing a position he staked out firmly only days ago.

Speaking aboard his private plane, Mr. Trump reinforced his plan to focus on deporting criminal **immigrants** who are in the country illegally. Asked what he thought about fellow Republicans who supported legal status for undocumented **immigrants** who have long lived in the U.S. without committing a crime, Mr. Trump said, "Good question. I'm glad you asked it." Then he added, "That decision will be made."

In a Phoenix speech last week, Mr. Trump repeatedly said he opposed protecting undocumented **immigrants** from deportation: "You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country. Can't do it."

Mr. Trump also has backed away from his promise to deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants** in the country, and has softened his call for a temporary ban of all Muslim **immigrants**.

Meanwhile, Mr. Trump, who previously hadn't committed to the schedule outlined by the nonpartisan Commission on Presidential Debates, said only an act of God could keep him from three debates with his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton.

Mrs. Clinton committed last month to the debates, which are scheduled for Sept. 26 in Hempstead, N.Y., Oct. 9 in St. Louis, and Oct. 19 in Las Vegas.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERLIN -- Growing populist forces shook Europe's pillar of stability this weekend, as an unprecedented defeat for Chancellor Angela Merkel's conservatives in Germany signaled more political tumult across the continent.

For the first time in postwar history, Ms. Merkel's Christian Democrats finished behind a populist challenger to their political right in a state election. Riding a wave of discontent with her migration policy, the Alternative for Germany -- a three-year-old anti-**immigrant** party -- beat the chancellor's party in her home state, spurring her allies to debate Monday whether she should change course.

Beyond Germany, more political crossroads are approaching that could jolt Europe -- as the migrant influx, terrorism fears, and antiestablishment sentiment complicate the recovery from years of economic problems.

A week from Sunday, an election in the city-state of Berlin is likely to deliver Ms. Merkel another setback, according to opinion polls. Two weeks after that, polls show voters in Austria's second-round presidential election could crown postwar Western Europe's first right-wing, populist head of state.

Later in the fall, Italy faces a constitutional referendum seen as an up-or-down vote on Premier Matteo Renzi's pro-European government. And in December, Spain could face its third parliamentary elections in a year if its troubles in forming a government persist -- a symptom of the same political fragmentation and antiestablishment sentiment dogging much of Europe.

Every populist success in one European country appears to be emboldening the populists in the next. "That which was impossible yesterday has become possible," French nationalist leader Marine Le Pen wrote in a Twitter post after results of Alternative for Germany, or AfD, came in. "The patriots of the AfD have swept away the party of Ms. Merkel. All my congratulations!" Polls show Ms. Le Pen is likely to make it into the second round when France votes for a president in the spring.

The political turbulence has added to the challenges weighing on Europe's economies, which, to the exception of Germany's, remain anemic despite the European Central Bank's years of ultra-easy monetary policy. In turn, the bank's strategy, including large-scale bond purchases and negative interest rates, has sparked mounting complaints in Germany, in part because of its ill effects for the country's millions of savers.

In an example of political and economic uncertainty feeding on each other, Germany's finance minister said earlier this year that the ECB had contributed to the Alternative for Germany's rise.

Amid the drama, European politicians will be watching events across the English Channel in Britain as a barometer of the consequences of turning away from the EU. It was in the U.K. that antiestablishment populists have scored their biggest success so far this year, winning the referendum to quit the bloc.

A string of data there suggests the British economy appears to be regaining its footing following the Brexit vote -- including a survey published Monday showing the U.K.'s powerhouse services sector bounced back to growth in August following a July slump.

The precise contours of the political debate differ across Europe, but the disaffection with the establishment -- often in favor of **immigration**, greater EUintegration, and free trade -- echoes from country to country.

Another major point of contention -- refugee policy -- has put Germany at the debate's epicenter, after the arrival of more than a million asylum seekers since early last year. The three-year-old AfD has made opposition to Ms. Merkel's acceptance of refugees the centerpiece of its campaigns.

Its second-place finish behind the incumbent Social Democrats in the eastern state of Mecklenburg-West Pomerania on Sunday marked one of the AfD's most striking advances yet.

With slogans such as "Politics for our own people!" the AfD finished with 20.8% of the vote, ahead of the 19% won by Ms. Merkel's center-right Christian Democrats, traditionally the big-tent home for conservatives in a country long wary of nationalist populism. The AfD will now hold seats in nine of Germany's 16 powerful state parliaments.

In response to the regional defeat, the chancellor acknowledged the need to give Germans more confidence that the government had things under control, but said her migration policy remained on track. "I believe the fundamental decisions we made in the past months were right, but we have much to do to win back trust," she said on the sidelines of the Group of 20 meeting of economic powers in Hangzhou, China.

In recent months, her government has sought to speed deportations of rejected asylum applicants and negotiated with Turkey to successfully stem the flow of Middle Eastern migrants. Nevertheless, exit polls showed that the AfD drew voters mainly motivated by the refugee issue.

"People have a diffuse feeling that the state no longer has this challenge under control," said Mike Mohring, the Christian Democrats' party chairman in the state of Thuringia.

Ms. Merkel has yet to announce whether she will seek a fourth term in Germany's national elections next year, but a strong AfD showing in the national vote would likely complicate her efforts to form a new governing coalition.

"One cannot act in politics against the people, against the will of the people," lawmaker Hans Michelbach, a conservative ally of Ms. Merkel, said Monday, urging her to be more responsive to public criticism of her refugee policy. "One must of course also take the concerns and fears of the people seriously."

---

Andrea Thomas contributed to this article.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's **immigration** plan aims to deport more categories of people than the Obama administration does, speed up the removal process and take broader actions to crack down on the estimated 11 million people living unlawfully in the U.S.

The nation's current deportation policy targets felons who pose a threat to public safety, as well as those recently caught illegally crossing the border. Officials with U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, the main agency charged with identifying individuals for deportation, are directed to exercise discretion, avoiding breaking up families and deporting those who have committed minor offenses, such as traffic infractions.

In his speech on Wednesday night in Phoenix, the Republican presidential candidate suggested he would cast a wider net to detain and deport people in the country illegally. "We will issue detainers for illegal **immigrants** who are arrested for any crime whatsoever, and they will be placed into immediate removal proceedings, if we even have to do that," he said.

Citing a figure that there are 2 million criminal illegal **immigrants** at large that he would swiftly target, he pledged, "We will begin moving them out day one. As soon as I take office. Day one."

Department of Homeland Security officials couldn't corroborate the 2 million figure. According to official data, 176,000 **immigrants** convicted of a crime and ordered removed from the country by a judge remain in the U.S., their whereabouts unknown.

To carry out more deportations, Mr. Trump said he would create a new "special deportation task force," which would count on three times more ICE deportation officers.

Currently, about 6,200 ICE deportation officers are charged with finding removable individuals and making arrest, detention and prosecution determinations.

Unless an individual agrees to voluntary removal, which can be immediate, he or she is afforded by law the opportunity to a hearing in **immigration** court. It can take several months or years until a judge makes a decision.

Mr. Trump didn't specify whether he would bypass the legal system and try to use his executive authority to achieve his deportation objectives.

"He can't just deport people who have a right to a hearing," said Carl Shusterman, a Los Angeles attorney who was a prosecutor for the former **Immigration**and Naturalization Service. "That would be unconstitutional, unless Congress changed the system and put it into law," he said.

The candidate also said that he would deputize federal, state and local law enforcement in his efforts to track down those here illegally, which would mark a significant expansion of their role in **immigration** enforcement.

In fiscal year 2015, ICE conducted 235,413 removals and returns, down from 315,953 the previous year, or a 25% drop. About 59% of the total were convicted criminals; 41% were noncriminals.

In its 2015 annual **immigration** enforcement report, Homeland Security attributed the decline in removals and returns to the administration's "clearer and more refined civil **immigration** enforcement priorities." It also noted that the nature and scope of enforcement has been affected by illegal **immigrant** flows.

Illegal entries are at their lowest level in more than four decades. Border-patrol apprehensions, a key indicator of the influx, totaled 325,117 in fiscal 2015, the smallest number since 1971.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**UECKERMUNDE, Germany -- Two years ago, Tommy Piper, upset about increasing numbers of foreigners living in the country, voted for an ultranationalist, anti-**immigrant** party that claims German taxpayers are being squeezed by "Jewish interests."

Now the 20-year-old electrician says he is happy to have found a more moderate standard-bearer for his views: the upstart Alternative for Germany, or AfD.

"They represent my beliefs without being so radical," said Mr. Piper, who voted for the National Democratic Party, or NPD, in 2014 local elections. "Instead, they are reasonable, and they can make their arguments well."

Sunday's election in the northeast German state of Mecklenburg-West Pomerania could herald a turning point in the politics of Europe's largest economy. Polls show the populist, anti-**immigrant** AfD could both defeat German Chancellor Angela Merkel's mainstream conservative Christian Democrats, or CDU, and deprive the NPD of its last seats in a state parliament.

The three-year-old AfD is emerging as an unpredictable force in German politics, drawing mainstream conservatives disenchanted with Ms. Merkel's acceptance of refugees and fringe voters further to the right.

Such broad support poses a challenge to Ms. Merkel a year ahead of her possible run for a fourth term and is ushering in new uncertainty for a system long dominated by two large, centrist parties.

The AfD "is a party with a very broad appeal," said Jurgen Falter, a specialist in political extremism at the University of Mainz. But, he added, the young party lacks a stable, moderate core, making it susceptible to a shift toward greater radicalism. "This is, of course, potentially dangerous, because we don't know who will gain the upper hand in the party in the end," he said.

Sunday's vote in the economically struggling, former East German state bordering Poland and the Baltic Sea will likely grant the AfD its ninth set of seats in Germany's 16 powerful state parliaments.

Now polling above 20%, the AfD has a shot at beating the center-right Christian Democrats for the first time in a state election and at challenging the center-left Social Democrats for the No. 1 position in the state. It is seeking momentum ahead of the vote for Berlin's state legislature two weeks later and its bid to win its first seats in the national parliament in September 2017.

The campaign here in Ueckermunde, a half-hour drive from the Polish border, shows how the AfD's rise is shaking up German politics. The AfD's 31-year-old candidate in the electoral district, Stephan Reuken, says he gave up his Christian Democrat party membership in 2014 because he "didn't feel represented at all as a conservative person."

"I don't know if you want to call it the Merkel factor -- it has to do with national issues, with the refugee problem," said Andreas Texter, the CDU's candidate here, explaining why his party is on the verge of its worst result in the state since German reunification.

But Mr. Reuken isn't just wooing CDU voters. The NPD garnered a state-best 15.4% here in 2011, and the AfD's campaign has echoed that party's nationalist slogans. "Politics for our own people!" and "Save our homeland and values!" posters say.

"Many protest voters are switching over from the NPD," said Leif-Erik Holm, the top AfD candidate in the state. "They basically only have the real, hard-core Nazi voters left."

Analysts say the AfD has managed to criticize **immigration** and Islam while not becoming branded as neo-Nazi -- a tough balancing act in a country whose past has bred broad suspicion of right-wing populism.

Pollster Manfred Gullner, head of the Forsa Institute in Berlin, said this finely calibrated message also appeals to right-wing voters in the middle class, in addition to the largely working-class voters who used to support the NPD.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It's not easy being a Floridian. We're dealing with scary mosquitoes and major storms with unpronounceable names such as "Hermine."

And then there's the fact that the rest of the country thinks we're nuts.

Every few months, I get a call from some media person wanting to interview me about Florida, where I have lived for three decades. The tone of the interview is never positive, or even neutral. The interviewer never asks: "Why do you live in Florida?" Or: "What do you like about Florida?"

No, the tone is always: "What the hell is wrong with Florida?"

These interviewers are not always calling from states that have a lot to brag about. I have been interviewed on the wrongness of Florida by people who live in, for example, Illinois, which constantly has to build new prisons just to hold all of its convicted former governors, who form violent prison gangs and get into rumbles with gangs of convicted former state legislators.

Even so, Florida has become the Punchline State, the one everybody makes fun of. If states were characters on "Seinfeld," Florida would be Kramer: Every time it appears, the audience automatically laughs, knowing it's going to do some idiot thing.

But we weren't always the Punchline State. We used to be the Sunshine State, known for our orange groves and beaches and deceased senior citizens playing shuffleboard. People might have seen Florida as boring, but they didn't laugh at it. They laughed at New Jersey, because it contained the New Jersey Turnpike and smelled like a giant armpit. Or they laughed at California, because it was populated by trend-obsessed goobers wearing Earth shoes and getting recreational enemas.

But today, all of these states are laughing at Florida. Everybody is laughing at Florida. Mississippi is laughing at Florida.

How did this happen? As far as I have been able to determine without doing any research, the turning point was the 2000 presidential election. On election night, almost all of the other states were able to figure out pretty quickly whether they voted for Al Gore or George W. Bush. But not Florida. Florida had no earthly idea who it had voted for. By dawn we still had no winner, and network TV political analysts were openly shooting heroin on camera.

Meanwhile, the morning skies over the state were darkened by vast fleets of transport planes swooping in from Washington, D.C., opening their doors and dropping tens of thousands of election lawyers. Some landed in the Everglades and were consumed by Burmese pythons. But tragically, many survived, and, without taking time to remove their parachutes, they commenced filing lawsuits.

This finally ended when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled, in a 7-2 decision, that Florida should be given back to Spain. OK, not really. But by then, that was basically how the rest of the nation felt. And the nation did not forget. The nation had formed a negative, stereotyped image of Florida as a subtropical festival of stupid. From then on, every time anything stupid happened here, America rolled its national eyeballs and went, "There goes Florida again!"

Journalists have built entire careers on chronicling Florida people doing stupid things. Somebody started a popular Twitter account called "Florida Man," which consists entirely of links to news items about Florida men doing stupid things: "Florida Man Seen Firing Musket at Cars While Dressed as Pirate"; "Florida Man Poses as Superman on Side of Road While Pantless, Urinating"; "Florida Man Sets Home on Fire With Bomb Made From Bowling Ball"; "Florida Man Seen Trying to Sell Live Shark in Grocery Store Parking Lot"; and on and on and on.

Why do there seem to be so many stupid people in Florida? There is a scientific explanation.

Imagine several hundred laboratory rats that have been selected at random from the general rat population. Now imagine that laboratory scientists scientifically place these rats in the center of a large box that is open on top but has high walls around the perimeter. The box is shaped roughly like a rectangle, but at the lower right corner, a long, skinny, dead-end corridor juts out.

The rats can roam freely inside the box. Almost all of them, sooner or later, venture down the skinny corridor. After checking it out, they decide to leave. The intelligent ones immediately realize that they need to turn around and go back out the way they came in. The ones with average intelligence, or even slightly below-average intelligence, take longer, but eventually they too figure it out. But what happens to the really stupid rats?

That's right: They elect the governor of Illinois.

No, seriously, because these rats aren't smart enough to turn around and retrace their steps, they become stuck down there in the corridor, wandering cluelessly this way and that, unable to figure out how to get out.

This is exactly what has happened in Florida, except instead of rats we have people, and instead of walls we have the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

People come down here all the time. Most of them, sooner or later, decide to leave, but the stupid ones can't figure out how to do this. So they remain, and in time are issued ballots.

The point is that, yes, Florida, because of its unique shape and warm climate, does have an unusually high percentage of low-IQ people doing stupid things, frequently naked. But most of these people came here from other states, the very same states that are laughing at Florida. Those of us who live here have to contend with not just our native-born stupid, but your stupid, too. We are like Ellis Island, except instead of taking the huddled masses yearning to breathe free, we take people who yearn to pleasure themselves into a stuffed animal at Wal-Mart.

But it isn't just the Stupid Factor that has given Florida its unfortunate national reputation. There is also the Weirdness Factor. Things keep happening in Florida -- things that are similar to things that happen in other states, except that there is some mutant element, some surreal twist, that makes the rest of the nation nod its national head and think, "Ah, Florida."

In 2015, for example, a tractor-trailer blew a tire on Interstate 95 and went off the road into some woods in Volusia County, Fla. The crash resulted in a fatality.

"Wait a minute," I hear you saying. "That's unfortunate, but it's not weird. Accidents involving fatalities happen all the time."

Yes, but in this case, the fatality was a shark. The tractor trailer was carrying four sharks from the Florida Keys to an aquarium in Coney Island in New York City, and one of the sharks was ejected during the crash. Fortunately, it didn't hit anybody, but the fact remains that there was, briefly, an airborne shark on Interstate 95, and it could have hit a car, which would have been tragic, by which I mean pretty funny.

Another vivid example of a Florida story that got national attention involved the death in 2012 of a man at a Deerfield Beach reptile store. I don't recall ever seeing a reptile store when I lived in the Northeast, but down here they're everywhere, like Starbucks, except instead of lattes they sell snakes.

Now: Try to guess what would cause this man to die at a reptile store. If you guessed that he was bitten by a venomous snake, thank you for playing, but no. The cause of his death -- and here we are definitely in Florida-only territory -- was eating cockroaches. The store held a cockroach-eating contest.

Now try to guess why this man entered a cockroach-eating contest. To pay the mortgage? To defray urgent medical expenses? Don't be silly. He was trying to win a snake. First prize was a ball python -- which, for the record, the man didn't even intend to keep for his personal use. He planned to give it to a friend. Anyway, he won the contest, but tragically, the cockroaches did not agree with him. The reptile store stated on Facebook that the snake "now belongs to his estate."

This would not have happened in a normal state. Florida, through no fault of its own, and possibly as a result of some kind of powerful Weirdness Ray being beamed at us from a distant planet inhabited by an advanced **alien** civilization that enjoys playing interstellar pranks, has a random Weirdness Factor that blankets the state like a fog.

And so we are the Punchline State, the state everybody loves to mock. Nobody overlooks Florida's flaws. Nobody cuts Florida any slack.

And yet Florida is also the number-one destination of people leaving a number of other states, including both New York and New Jersey. In fact, people from all over are moving to Florida. Florida's population is growing like crazy. It's now bigger than New York's.

So we have an apparent contradiction: On the one hand, the national consensus is that Florida is a stupid weird insane dysfunctional hellhole that is also a hurricane zone that will soon be largely submerged when global climate change causes the seas to rise to the point where vast herds of lobsters roam what is now Interstate 95; and on the other, people keep coming here. And most of them -- even the non-stupid ones -- decide to stay here.

The question is: Why?

To answer that question properly, we need to conduct an objective, in-depth study of the Florida **immigration** phenomenon -- a study involving a professionally designed and conducted survey of scientifically selected sample of **immigrants** to the state over a significant time period. I think we can all agree that such an effort would be unbelievably boring. So instead, I'll just tell you some of the reasons why I, personally, like living in Florida:

The weather is warm. Almost any day of the year, I could walk out my front door naked and be perfectly physically comfortable until the police Taser me. Granted, sometimes in the summer (defined as June through the following June), it gets a little too warm down here, but too warm beats the hell out of too cold. Too cold means if you stay outside too long you will die. Too warm means you might have to have another beer.

The taxes are low. Florida's taxes are close to the lowest in the nation. There is no personal income tax. And yet our state government is excellent. All right, that's a lie: Our state government is incompetent and corrupt. But so are the state governments of California, Illinois, New Jersey and New York, and their taxes are high. So residents of California, Illinois, New Jersey and New York -- not to mention other states -- are paying unnecessarily high taxes for the quality of state government they're getting. These people could move to Florida and get corrupt and incompetent government for much less. "More Value for Your Dollar" should be the official state motto of Florida, except that the Florida government would spell it "More Value for You're Dollar," and nobody would notice the mistake until after all the stationery was printed.

It isn't boring. As we have established, things keep happening here. Granted, many of these things are bizarre or stupid or dangerous. Often drugs are involved. Or alligators. We cannot rule out the possibility of alligators on drugs. We cannot rule anything out, because we never know what will happen next in Florida. We know only that, any minute now, something will. That's what makes Florida more interesting than states such as, no offense, Nebraska.

Florida has Disney World. This means that wherever you live in Florida, you have easy access to the number-one family theme resort in the world. My family can get into our car in Miami and, in just 3 1/2 hours, we can be in the Magic Kingdom, standing in a four-hour line to get into Space Mountain. You cannot put a price tag on a family theme experience like that.

I could go on and on, listing all the good things about Florida. I could point out that it is the only state where you can get a really good mojito. Or that it's the nation's flattest state, so if you fall down after a few mojitos, you will not roll far. Or that Florida is a very tolerant state, willing to grant a driver's license to pretty much any organism consisting of more than one cell. Or that Florida leads the nation in lightning strikes, which is pretty cool as long as the lightning does not strike you personally.

But I think I have more than proved my point. Florida, despite what you hear, is a great state. To live here is to truly understand the feelings of the great Spanish explorer Juan Tostones de Bodega, who, upon setting foot in Florida for the first time in the year 1503, is said to have observed: "Esa arana tiene el tamano de un guante de receptor," or, "That spider is the size of a catcher's mitt." He died only hours later, but his words are as true today as they ever were.

---

Adapted from Mr. Barry's "Best. State. Ever.: A Florida Man Defends His Homeland," to be published Sept. 6 by Putnam.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREIn 1977, in the introduction to an anthology of "Jewish-American Stories," Irving Howe sounded a controversial death knell for Jewish literature in the United States. The distinction of that literature, Howe wrote, relied on a firsthand exposure to the **immigrant** experience. From Henry Roth to Philip Roth, the uniqueness of Jewish-American writers -- their singular voice and perspective -- was bound to the outsider's struggle to leave behind the old world and find a foothold in the new. The problem was that Jews had been too successful at integrating. Assimilation necessarily meant dilution.

His premise has been debated ever since, but Howe would feel vindicated by "Here I Am" (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 571 pages, $28), the long-awaited third novel by Jonathan Safran Foer. At the center of the book is Jacob Bloch, a suburbanite struggling through the "Great Flatness" of middle age. This particular Bloch is blocked; once an acclaimed novelist -- like Mr. Foer, he won a National Jewish Book Award at age 24 -- he now has a soulless job writing for television.

Jacob's marriage, which has been shaky for years, is nearing its end after his wife, Julia, discovered him sexting with one of the show's directors. Meanwhile his son Sam, the oldest of three boys, is petitioning to skip his own bar mitzvah, a ritual he considers pointless and insincere. The bar mitzvah is supposed to be a signal event for the Bloch family -- Jacob's **immigrant** grandfather is willing himself to stay alive solely to witness it -- and Sam's repudiation is an indictment of his father's longstanding indifference to his religion.

"He cleaved to the life from which he cleaved himself," we're told of Jacob as he desperately clings to his unraveling marriage and the frayed strands of his faith. The sentence gives a nice example of a contronym, the rare linguistic case when two of a word's definitions have directly opposed meanings. A contradictory doubleness defines Jacob's identity as well: He's a writer who barely writes, a Jew who doesn't observe or believe, and a husband who can't look his wife in the eye.

Jacob's spiritual malaise, and the ripple effect on his family, forms the drama around which "Here I Am" is built. But it's difficult to sustain a novel with the kind of low-grade conflict that his ambivalence and inertia provide. To his credit, Mr. Foer is aware of the dilemma, and the book is replete with self-conscious diagnoses that might apply equally to Jacob and, one feels, to the current state of Jewish-American fiction. "The inside of life became far smaller than the outside, creating a cavity, an emptiness," he writes. When Jacob's brash Israeli cousin Tamir visits, he judges that Jacob has gone soft from easy living: "The problem is that you don't have nearly enough problems."

A lot of "Here I Am" is just such psychiatrist's-couch platitudes, which infiltrate the characters' speech. This is a novel staged in noisy arguments: between Jacob and Julia; Jacob and his freakishly intelligent sons, who each spout accidental wisdom like a fire hose; Jacob and Tamir; Jacob and his bloviating neocon father. Mr. Foer is good at reproducing the din of domesticity -- there's a vibrant comic energy to the arguments, which are constantly sidetracked by nosy children and kibitzing relatives -- but you can't shake a sense that the incessant dialogue is covering for the novel's lack of substance, a suspicion bolstered when Julia complains to her husband, "you're always talking, and your words never mean anything."

Only at the book's midpoint, after much foreshadowing, does Mr. Foer introduce the event that rouses Jacob from his chatty lassitude. An earthquake strikes Israel, devastating its infrastructure and damaging the holy sites. In the chaotic aftermath, the Arab world unifies to declare war against the Jewish homeland, which responds by calling for a "reverse diaspora," urging Jews from all nations to return to Israel to fight.

However far-fetched, the catastrophe is a fascinating thought experiment. How would the world respond if battle lines were suddenly drawn this sharply? And what would secular American Jews do? For Jacob, the war provides an opportunity to remedy his bereft "homelandless" condition and inject meaning into his life, so to his family's shock he announces that he is going to Israel with Tamir to join the army.

And this is pretty much where Mr. Foer leaves matters. Having spurred Jacob to his momentous resolution, the world war and its ramifications fade into the background. "Here I Am" almost defiantly returns its focus to the Bloch family crises of Sam's bar mitzvah and Jacob and Julia's separation. "It was amazing how little changed as everything changed," thinks Jacob. He eventually goes to Israel, but events there exist beyond the narrative -- though Mr. Foer does assure readers that Jacob comes back safely, sadder but possessed of more self-knowledge.

This is a familiar move for the author. His blockbuster novels "Everything Is Illuminated" (2002) and "Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close" (2005) were structurally daring but born of the insecure conviction that contemporary Jewish-American experience is fundamentally insufficient as a source of literature without a horrible cataclysm to dignify it. In those books Mr. Foer used, respectively, the Holocaust and 9/11 to offer healing lessons in how to bravely overcome historical trauma and grief. In "Here I Am," he invents the catastrophe, but he exploits it for the same kind of tackily ennobling personal transformation. This is a better book than its predecessors, more intelligent and more demanding. Still, it's amazing how little has changed.

There's a temptation to contrast the weaknesses of "Here I Am" with the strengths of the short, exceptional debut novel by Anuk Arudpragasam, "The Story of a Brief Marriage" (Flatiron, 193 pages, $24.99). The book takes place over the span of around 12 hours in a Tamil refugee camp during the last months of the savage Sri Lankan civil war. Dinesh is a student who was uprooted from his home nearly a year earlier, and though he has managed to avoid conscription into the separatist army -- a certain death sentence -- the Sri Lankan military is subjecting the camp to hourly airstrikes, and he now has little to do but wait, with thousands of other displaced civilians, for his turn to be killed.

Stupefied by the bombing and the multitude of dead and mutilated bodies, Dinesh views his surroundings with the forensic detachment that characterizes so many accounts of trench warfare during World War I. The novel opens with a remorselessly matter-of-fact description of a child having his mangled arm amputated. But Dinesh's morbid vigil is interrupted when an older man singles him out for a shotgun marriage with his daughter Ganga. The proposition is practical -- married women have an infinitesimally better chance of escaping abuse from their captors -- yet the sudden intimacy it creates subtly alters Dinesh's perceptions, awakening in him tenuous notions of a future life that the bombardment had foreclosed.

With rapt precision, the novel details the first hours of this makeshift union: Ganga prepares a meal; Dinesh bathes and washes his clothing; they take turns falling asleep beside each other. Mr. Arudpragasam invests these normally prosaic events with the sort of religious awe that their proximity to annihilation confers. Watching Ganga sleep, Dinesh notices that her "lips were twitching faintly, with words that couldn't be made out, and beneath her eyelids strange images seemed to flicker and die." She is dreaming, and the presence of that mysterious world within her fills him "with a strange reverence."

Like "Here I Am," "The Story of a Brief Marriage" fuses the personal and the political. But while war is largely rhetorical for Mr. Foer -- a plot device and an odd source of wish fulfillment -- Mr. Arudpragasam depicts it realistically, as a meaningless, machine-like force of destruction. And in examining the basic particulars of human interaction, his book displays the devotional intensity that Mr. Foer's characters endlessly pontificate about but rarely find.

"The Story of a Brief Marriage" offers no revelations or emotional uplift. It's simply beautiful and penetrating and truthful: a small work of art whittled from atrocity.
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NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERERonald Reagan described America as "a city on a hill" that people around the world aspire to reach. Donald Trump offered a different vision in his **immigration**speech Wednesday night: A fortress surrounded by a wall with guards and sensory detectors and police to hunt down and expel anyone who makes it past the barriers.

This isn't the "softening" **immigration** policy that Mr. Trump had been signaling for more than a week. Perhaps he blinked amid criticism from supporters, or perhaps he has decided this is what he really believes. Whatever the motive, the New Yorker's 10-point plan came straight from the wish list of the most restrictionist corners of the political right.

---

We understand that in a world of rising terror threats the U.S. needs border controls and **immigrant** vetting. Most Americans no doubt agree with Mr. Trump's plan to deport criminal **aliens**, though his claim of two million far exceeds other estimates. Mr. Trump also has a strong case against "sanctuary cities," a reference to mayors who defy federal **immigration** law.

But the businessman missed a chance to make a more reasonable case to honor the law without embracing mass deportation that is politically impossible and economically damaging. "Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation," Mr. Trump said. "And you can call it deported if you want. The press doesn't like that term. You can call it whatever the hell you want. They're gone."

This presumably includes all 11 million people estimated to be here illegally, including those who have lived and worked in the U.S. for decades. It also presumably includes children born in the U.S. whose parents are illegal and thus lack documents through no fault of their own.

Mr. Trump said that anyone who wants to gain legal status must first return to his native country and "will have to enter under the **immigration** caps or limits that will be established." That means waiting five or 10 years or more, depending on the country quotas, which would mean breaking up families. These **immigrants** would have no incentive to declare themselves and become legal.

To hunt them down, the Republican would unleash a new wave of **immigration** enforcement well beyond the border and against American business. He would triple the number of deportation agents. So the same federal government that can't manage a competent E-Verify program for its own documents is going to harass employers for not adequately vetting those documents. How about focusing on the criminals first?

Mr. Trump also pledges to "turn off the jobs and benefits magnet" for **immigrants**. Yet he is offering no new legal ways to work in the U.S. He can build the tallest wall in the world at the border, but as long as jobs exist to be filled, **immigrants** will come to fill them. Border enforcement without a guest-worker program is like drug enforcement without reducing drug use: It won't work.

The New Yorker's plan would do economic harm by slashing the workforce for construction, agriculture, restaurants, travel and other services. There aren't enough Americans to fill those jobs now, so many of these services will vanish or become much more expensive. This is why Mr. Trump employs H-2B visa holders at his Mar-a-Lago resort.

Beyond the bad economics is the puzzle of Mr. Trump's political strategy. Wednesday's **immigration** speech was an appeal to his core, mostly white, supporters who propelled him to the GOP nomination and whose votes he already has. It made little effort to expand his coalition to ethnic groups with large numbers of mostly legal **immigrants**.

The Republican has closed the polling gap with Hillary Clinton but more because her favorable rating is falling again than any improvement in his standing. Mr. Trump's problem continues to be dreadful ratings among minorities, women and college-educated Republicans. It's revealing that the Clinton campaign almost seemed relieved when Mr. Trump didn't use his speech to modify his anti-**immigration** rhetoric.

The irony is that the speech came only hours after what may have been Mr. Trump's best move of the campaign -- a high-profile meeting with Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto. At a press event after the hour-long parley, the two men were candid about their differences. But Mr. Trump showed a respect and graciousness that belied the image promoted by his critics of an uncouth bully who can't behave in diplomatic company.

The nearby table shows the exit poll for ethnic voting groups in recent elections. (See accompanying table -- WSJ September 2, 2016) Mitt Romney carried 59% of the white vote but still lost because he was crushed among minorities, including Hispanics and Asians. On present trend Mr. Trump won't get Mr. Romney's share of the white vote and will do worse among minorities.

These voters care about more than **immigration**, and Mrs. Clinton's ethics and the electorate's overwhelming desire for change are keeping the race competitive. But if Mr. Trump loses, his vision of an America that fears more than welcomes **immigrants** will be a large part of the reason.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: Fortress America Garrisoned by the Idle Army" -- WSJ Sept. 10, 2016)
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NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREAs Donald Trump arrived in Phoenix late Wednesday, fresh from a visit to Mexico City's presidential palace, he had in his hands a big **immigration** speech that omitted the usual line that Mexico would have to pay for his proposed wall along the U.S. southern border.

Just after landing, though, Mr. Trump discovered that Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto had tweeted that he had told the Republican presidential nominee during their private meeting earlier that day that his country would refuse to pay for the wall.

Mr. Trump was peeved that Mr. Pena Nieto had gone public with the fact that the Mexican president had broken what Mr. Trump considered a deal to keep the question of paying for the wall off the table at their initial meeting.

So Mr. Trump hurriedly inserted a new sentence in his **immigration** speech, and he soon boomed out from the podium his traditional declaration that the wall would be paid for by Mexico -- adding, "They don't know it yet but they're going to pay for the wall."

"I had no choice," Mr. Trump said in an interview on Thursday. But he also said of the Mexican president, "I liked him very much."

All told, Wednesday was a day of exceptional twists and turns, spanning multiple time zones and two countries, on the trade and **immigration** issues that have become signatures of the Trump presidential campaign.

The day wasn't only one of the most unusual in the campaign, but one of the most controversial. Many Mexicans were incensed that their president invited Mr. Trump. A poll published in the Reforma newspaper Wednesday showed 85% of Mexicans disapproved of the invitation, and 72% thought it weakened the Mexican government.

As the dispute between Mr. Trump and Mr. Pena Nieto over paying for the wall escalated, John Podesta, the chairman of Democrat Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign, tweeted late Thursday: "What a mess."

The high-stakes day, which seemed to have been put together at the last minute, actually had been discussed internally for weeks, according to Trump campaign advisers. The campaign saw the meeting in Mexico as a chance to appeal to moderate voters, and the **immigration** speech as a chance to motivate Mr. Trump's core voters.

Jared Kushner, the real-estate investor married to Mr. Trump's daughter Ivanka, initially floated to his father-in-law the idea of a trip to Mexico, Mr. Trump said. Mexico, of course, had been a central and controversial topic since the day Mr. Trump announced his presidential campaign with a speech in which he accused it of sending the U.S. its criminals and "rapists."

Meanwhile, Mr. Pena Nieto was asked by media in his country if he would ever meet with Mr. Trump. He ultimately responded by sending invitations to both Mr. Trump and Mrs. Clinton last week. The former secretary of state hasn't accepted, but Mr. Kushner moved quickly to accept on Mr. Trump's behalf and orchestrate logistics.

At the same time, Mr. Trump's team and the candidate himself suggested in media interviews that he was "softening" his **immigration** stance, particularly on deporting illegal **immigrants** already in the U.S.

As the campaign set Wednesday's speech in Phoenix as the time when Mr. Trump would lay out his detailed **immigration** platform, it also concluded the plan to meet the Mexican president. Over last weekend, the two sides drew up a list of items for discussion for this "initial meeting," according to former New York Mayor and current Trump adviser Rudy Giuliani.

Both sides agreed on several points -- the need to reduce crime, including drugs and guns, each country's right to protect its "sovereign border" by whatever means, and that the North American Free Trade Agreement should be improved to benefit each country, Trump advisers said.

One point on which they agreed to disagree: who would pay for a wall. Trump advisers said the two sides decided they wouldn't discuss the topic of payment in their first meeting, to ease the process of getting acquainted and to focus on the bigger picture.

Mr. Trump flew to Mexico City with a small team, landing Wednesday morning. They flew by helicopter into the grounds of the presidential palace, where they were met by Mr. Pena Nieto. Messrs. Trump and Pena Nieto sat in two wingback chairs with their advisers on either side. Mr. Trump brought into the meeting Mr. Giuliani, Alabama GOP Sen. Jeff Sessions, an early supporter and hard-liner on **immigration**, and Mr. Kushner.

The hourlong meeting began on a cordial tone, as the two men agreed on areas in common, such as an American-Mexican task force to go after drug cartels, similar to one that the U.S. implemented with Colombia, Mr. Giuliani said.

But Mr. Pena Nieto surprised Mr. Trump when he stated flatly that his country wouldn't pay for the wall. Immediately, Mr. Giuliani responded for Mr. Trump, "That's off the table." With that, Mr. Trump moved to another topic.

A person close to Mr. Pena Nieto said that "since there was such a clear disagreement in preparatory conversations over issues about the wall and its payment, both parties agreed not to discuss them at the meeting." The person added: "Before the conversation began, Mr. Pena Neto reiterated to Mr. Trump that Mexico won't pay for any wall, and as agreed, they discussed other topics."

At the press conference after the meeting, the Trump campaign got the photo op it wanted of Mr. Trump and a world leader. When asked if they discussed the GOP nominee's wall, Mr. Trump said they did, but not who would pay for it. Mr. Pena Nieto stayed silent. It wasn't until landing in Phoenix that Mr. Trump saw the Mexican's tweet about not paying.

Mr. Trump and his team were stunned, advisers said. News reports were questioning why Mr. Trump didn't discuss the payment issue at the joint press conference.

"I have to add back the line that Mexico will pay," Mr. Trump said, according to the people with him, adding that he couldn't let that tweet go unanswered.
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NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREDonald Trump's **immigration** proposals outlined during an evening rally Wednesday shocked some Hispanic leaders his campaign was courting, and may have narrowed the Republican presidential nominee's path to victory in November.

At least two members of Mr. Trump's Hispanic Advisory Council -- Texas attorney Jacob Monty and business executive Massey Villareal -- resigned after the speech, in which Mr. Trump said all illegal **immigrants** in the country would be "subject to deportation."

"I gave Donald Trump a plan that would improve border security, remove hardened criminal **aliens** and most importantly give work authority to the millions of honest, hardworking **immigrants** in the US," Mr. Monty wrote on Facebook. "He rejected that tonight and so I must reject him."

Asked for comment about the resignations, Jason Miller, a spokesman for the Trump campaign, said the GOP nominee "has been consistent in advocating for an end to illegal **immigration** and he will continue to reach out and work with voters from all communities to defeat crooked Hillary Clinton this fall."

Artemio Muniz, who leads the Federation of Hispanic Republicans in Texas, said Mr. Trump's warning to minority voters that illegal **immigrants** were taking their jobs would fall flat, and that his campaign was trying to "win with the Caucasian coalition."

"Pitting Hispanics and blacks against illegal **immigrants** is class warfare, not conservatism," Mr. Muniz said. "Hispanic voters can see right through that."

The rejection of Mr. Trump by high-profile conservative Hispanics is a setback for a campaign that only recently set out to expand its support to the minority voters who could determine the outcome of the presidential race.

If he can't recover, Mr. Trump would be forced to rely in November on the same base of white, blue-collar workers who carried him to victory in the GOP primaries, a risky strategy in must-win battleground states such as Florida, where the electorate is increasingly diverse.

"Unless they have a magic wand, they can't create more white, pro-Trump voters," said Bettina Inclan, a former Hispanic outreach director at the Republican National Committee. "Elections are simple math: subtraction and addition, and I don't see the addition."

Jeff Roe, who managed Texas Senator Ted Cruz's Republican presidential campaign, said a strategy that focuses on white voters could work for Mr. Trump if his campaign modestly boosts white turnout from four years ago and wins a larger share of these voters.

But tosucceed, Mr. Trump must improve his standing among suburban woman and college educated white voters who Mr. Roe said are turned off by the New York billionaire's combative style. Both groups are roughly split between Mr. Trump and Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton.

"He needs to get his base juiced up, and get the independents thinking he can do a state visit without embarrassing himself," Mr. Roe said.

That conflict -- how to keep core supporters enthusiastic while winning over college-educated white voters -- resulted in the seemingly mixed messages from Mr. Trump over the past week. He held his first meeting with a newly formed National Hispanic Advisory Council and began making direct appeals to minority voters at rallies that attracted mostly white audiences.

On Wednesday afternoon, Mr. Trump won applause from Republican strategists and Hispanic community leaders for his measured and welcoming posture at a news conference with Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto.

But hours later, Mr. Trump promised in his Phoenix speech a "new, special deportation task force" and vowed to end President Obama's orders that protect an estimated 750,000 young undocumented people from deportation.

While Mr. Roe said his party's nominee had a successful day appealing to white voters, Ms. Inclan said her party's nominee was losing Hispanic voters by "hanging the ills impacting society around the necks of illegal **immigrants**."

She said that would also add to his troubles in Colorado and Nevada, two other traditional battleground states with significant Hispanic populations.
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NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREPHOENIX -- Hours after seeming to ease his **immigration** and trade policy while standing with Mexico's president, Donald Trump reiterated the tough stance that powered his Republican presidential campaign.

He told a crowd of raucous supporters Wednesday evening that all illegal **immigrants** are "subject to deportation" and all those seeking legalization would have to go home and re-enter the country legally.

Mr. Trump also doubled down on his assertion that Mexico will pay to build an "impenetrable" wall on the Southern border. "They don't know it yet, and they're going to pay for it," he said at a rally here just hours after his meeting in Mexico City with President Enrique Pena Nieto, who told Mr. Trump that his nation had no intentions of underwriting such a project.

In amplifying the harsh tone of his **immigration** policy, Mr. Trump was placing a clear bet that, on this signature issue of his campaign, it is more important to err on the side of revving up his supporters than to soften his tone to reach out to unpersuaded voters.

"We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. There will be no amnesty," Mr. Trump said. "Our message to the world will be this: you cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the U.S. by illegally entering our country."

The surprise visit to Mexico City Wednesday and Phoenix address came as Mr. Trump trails Democratic rival Hillary Clinton in polling in each of the 11 battleground states that will decide the general election.

His weakness among Hispanic voters has damaged his standing in Colorado, Nevada and Florida, and made Arizona competitive -- a heavily Republican state where the Clinton campaign opened two offices in August and invested more than $100,000 in field staffers to register voters and boost Democratic turnout.

David Axelrod, the senior strategist for President Barack Obama's presidential campaigns, predicted Mr. Trump would reap some political benefit merely by standing next to a world leader. But Mrs. Clinton disagreed, saying on Twitter, "Trump just failed his first foreign test. Diplomacy isn't as easy as it looks."

For the last 10 days Mr. Trump has articulated varied proposals on how he would deal with the millions of undocumented **immigrants** already in the country. On Wednesday, he punted on that politically-vexing issue.

Instead, Mr. Trump said he would jettison protections President Barack Obama has sought for parents of legal U.S. citizens and, on his first day in office, deport 2 million illegal **immigrants** he said have criminal records. He also said he would, without due process, remove any undocumented person who is arrested for any crime.

"We will issue detainers for illegal **immigrants** who are arrested for any crime whatsoever and they will be placed into immediate removal proceedings," he said.

Deportations wouldn't be limited to people suspected or convicted of crimes. "Anyone who enters the United States illegally is subject to deportation," he said.

For new **immigrants**, Mr. Trump said he would install "new screening tests" that he said would "include an ideological certification." He also said he would complete a "biometric entry-exit visa tracking system."

Mr. Trump also reiterated **immigration** proposals he has touted on the campaign trail. He would rescind Mr. Obama's executive actions to defer deportations for some illegal **immigrants** brought to the U.S. as children and some illegal **immigrant** parents whose children are American citizens.

In addition to building the wall he said he would add 5,000 border patrol officers.

Earlier, Mr. Trump's campaign had signaled a softening of his rhetoric on issues of trade and **immigration**, and a more subdued Mr. Trump appeared to do that during a joint appearance with Mr. Enrique Pena Nieto.

On the issue of trade, the Republican presidential nominee did appear to give some room, telling reporters in Mexico City that he would aim to "improve" the North American Free Trade Agreement, an accord he has long called "a disaster." In a joint briefing after the meeting, he also said he would aim to keep manufacturing "in our hemisphere," referring to North America.

Yet, during his evening rally, Mr. Trump repeated his pledges to punish American companies that move to Mexico and enact steep new tariffs on imports.

Earlier in the day in Mexico City, Mr. Trump said at the briefing that "we didn't discuss payment of the wall," but called the barrier "a shared objective."

Mr. Pena Nieto, however, said he told Mr. Trump in private that Mexico wouldn't subsidize a border barrier. "At the beginning of my conversation with Donald Trump I made clear that Mexico would not pay for the wall," he wrote on Twitter later Wednesday.

Mr. Pena Nieto's spokesman, Eduardo Sanchez, said Mr. Trump didn't respond to the president's statement, so there was no discussion. Trump spokesman Jason Miller released a statement that didn't mention the wall payment dispute but said "it is unsurprising that they hold two different views on this issue." Mr. Miller didn't respond to requests for clarification.

Mr. Pena Nieto condemned several of Mr. Trump's campaign proposals and his characterization of some illegal **immigrants** as drug dealers and rapists. "Mexicans felt offended by what was said" during the campaign, Mr. Pena Nieto said.

The Mexican president noted illegal **immigration** was at a 10-year low, and said economic activity in the two nations benefit each other. He called the Nafta trade pact a boon to the U.S. economy, but said he would be willing to "modernize" it.

Messrs. Trump and Pena Nieto described their meeting as polite but blunt. Mr. Trump said it was "a great honor" to be invited to Los Pinos, the official residence of the Mexican president, while Mr. Pena Nieto said Mr. Trump demonstrated his willingness to work with Mexico by visiting the country.

Mr. Trump, reading from notes, said he told Mr. Pena Nieto that Nafta has benefited Mexico far more than it has the U.S. Mr. Pena Nieto said his priority is "to protect Mexicans, wherever they are."

The visit was harshly criticized in Mexico as capitulation to a U.S. candidate who had attacked the country repeatedly on the campaign trail. The meeting was unlikely to help Mr. Pena Nieto improve his approval ratings, which are the lowest of any Mexican leader in two decades, analysts said.

"Pena Nieto had a golden opportunity to speak truth to power and instead he showed weakness, handing the stage to Trump to reaffirm in our faces that yes, there will be a wall," said Sergio Aguayo, an academic at the Colegio de Mexico graduate school in Mexico City.

Mr. Trump's revised approach to Nafta differs from the trade policy he has articulated since launching his campaign. During a "60 Minutes" interview last September, he called Nafta "a disaster" that "shouldn't exist."

Though he said Wednesday that Nafta has benefited Mexico more than it has the U.S., he didn't repeat calls to install tariffs of up to 40% on U.S. companies that relocate to Mexico.

---

Santiago Perez and Hanaa Tameez contributed to this article.
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NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREIs Donald Trump's presidential nomination the vanguard of a new political movement in the Republican Party or an accident of circumstance in this odd election year? The answer won't be clear at least until November, but the evidence in recent GOP primaries suggests it may be the latter.

That message came through Tuesday with the thumping primary victories by Senators Marco Rubio in Florida and John McCain in Arizona. Mr. Rubio received more than 70% of the vote in a multicandidate field that included businessman Carlos Beruff, who campaigned as a Trump clone on trade and **immigration**. He spent $8 million of his own money but didn't get a fifth of the vote.

Mr. McCain defied predictions of a close primary in Arizona by whipping former state senator Kelli Ward by double digits. Ms. Ward was backed by Robert Mercer, the hedge-fund operator who financed Ted Cruz. Ms. Ward ran hard against **immigration** and tried to portray the five-term Senator, who turned 80 years old Monday, as a tainted fixture of Washington.

The impact of **immigration** is especially intriguing in these primaries. Messrs. Rubio and McCain were members of the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" Senators who negotiated the 2013 **immigration** reform. That bill passed the Senate but never made it to the House floor amid a conservative panic. Their opponents tried to make those Senate votes disqualifying, but GOP primary voters seem to have put **immigration** well down the list of priorities.

These races follow the defeat of businessman Paul Nehlen, another Trumpian, who received less than 16% against House Speaker Paul Ryan in Wisconsin in early August. Mr. Nehlen received lots of out-of-state money and publicity from the Trump network, especially Breitbart.com.

All of this cuts against the right-left analysis that Mr. Trump's nomination means the GOP has now become a nativist and protectionist party. Those issues have long had support among a GOP minority but not as party litmus tests.

Mr. Trump ran on both issues, but his victory may have owed more to a confluence of unrepeatable factors: his unique celebrity, the 16-person field, tactical mistakes by his competitors, and the luck that his main opponent in the decisive Indiana primary was the much-disliked Mr. Cruz. As for **immigration**, even Mr. Trump is now recognizing he has to shift to the middle to win in November.

By the way, there's also good news on the politics of trade from Democrats. Politico reports that after Tuesday's results the 28 House Democrats who voted for trade-promotion authority in 2015 have either won their primaries or didn't have a challenge. This is notable because Big Labor had promised to defeat the trade heretics. Maybe Hillary Clinton should rethink her retreat toward protectionism that began in the primaries against Bernie Sanders and has grown worse against Mr. Trump.

The relatively easy wins by Senators Rubio and McCain increase the GOP's odds of keeping its Senate majority. The men still face stiff November challenges in states where Mr. Trump is struggling, but their GOP competitors would have lost easily. With Mr. Trump trailing in the polls, GOP voters may be concluding they need Congress as a check against President Hillary.
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