|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FBI Director James B. Comey said Sunday that the bureau had completed its examination of newly discovered emails connected to Hillary Clinton — an inquiry that had roiled the presidential race for nine days — and found nothing to alter its months-old decision not to seek charges against the former secretary of state for her use of a private email server.

In a letter to congressional committee chairmen, Comey said investigators had worked "around the clock" to review the emails. The investigators found that the emails were either duplicates of correspondence they had reviewed earlier or were personal emails that did not pertain to State Department business, government officials said.

The emails were on a computer used by former congressman Anthony Weiner — the estranged husband of longtime Clinton aide Huma Abedin — that was seized during an FBI investigation into lewd text messages that Weiner (D-N.Y.) is alleged to have sent to a 15-year-old girl.

In late October, Comey said that some of the emails on the computer, sent or received by Abedin, may have been "pertinent" to an FBI investigation of a private server that Clinton used to conduct government business.

On Sunday, however, Comey said that after reviewing emails on the computer, "we have not changed our conclusions expressed in July."

A Clinton spokeswoman on Sunday made a brief statement to reporters on the Democratic nominee's plane: "We are glad to see that . . . he has confirmed the conclusions that he reached in July," Jennifer Palmieri said of Comey. "We are glad that this matter is resolved."

This summer, Comey had ended an FBI probe into the server by saying that although he believed Clinton was "extremely careless" with classified information in the emails, Comey felt that "no reasonable prosecutor" would recommend criminal charges.

One of the government officials said Comey's letter on Sunday was not an "interim report" but rather represented a conclusion of the investigation.

So, after nine days of uncertainty, the FBI 's investigators had ended where they began.

In the meantime, however, much had changed.

Comey — a nine-day hero to some on the right — was now under criticism from both sides, for jumping into the late stages of a presidential race and then trying to jump back out.

The FBI itself had been drawn into partisan politics, as leaks revealed internal fights between agents and prosecutors squabbling over proposed investigations of the Clinton family.

The presidential race had also been altered.

Republican Donald Trump , who had been trailing badly in the polls when the new emails were revealed, had since narrowed the gap, leaning on a message that Clinton was "crooked" and likely to be charged.

Clinton, who had been trying to expand the electoral map by focusing on red states that included Georgia and Arizona, drew back to defend blue turf like Michigan and Pennsylvania. In those days, millions of votes were cast.

In Colorado, for instance, voters submit their ballots by mail. Daniel Cole, a Republican strategist in the state, said the number of Democrats returning ballots had been surging past the GOP total — until Comey announced his inquiry.

Then, on Friday, the GOP total actually eclipsed the Democrats.

"There was an enthusiasm gap," Cole said. "Until the latest bend in the email scandal, the wind was kind of out of our sails."

Across the country, Clinton remained a clear favorite in the race, even before Comey's announcement that the new inquiry was over.

Clinton led by two to five points in national surveys, held narrow polling leads in a slew of swing states, and had been encouraged by a surge in early voting among Latinos in the key battlegrounds of Nevada and Florida.

During an afternoon rally in Cleveland, Clinton made no mention of Comey's decision, perhaps calculating that once again reminding voters of the original email investigation would do more harm than good.

Instead, she focused, as she has at other recent rallies, on an optimistic look ahead.

"I want an America where every­one has a place, where everyone is included," Clinton said. "And I know there is a lot of frustration, even anger, in this election season. I see it, I hear it, you know, I'm a subject of it. I get it. But anger is not a plan. Anger is not going to get us new jobs."

Sunday's event was Clinton's last scheduled visit to Ohio, where she has trailed Trump in most recent polls despite a heavy emphasis on turning out black voters in Cleveland. This rally included Cleveland Cavaliers super­star LeBron James, an Ohio native. On Friday, husband and wife singers Jay Z and Beyoncé had performed at another Clinton rally in Cleveland.

In his first rally after the news broke, Trump called Clinton the most corrupt person ever to seek the presidency, and he predicted that her term in office would be shadowed by investigations. Later Sunday, in Sterling Heights, Mich., he said: "Hillary Clinton is guilty. She's knows it. The FBI knows it. . . . Now it's up to the American people to deliver justice at the ballot box on Nov. 8."

Trump has been praised in recent days for avoiding the kind of insults and outbursts that had alienated voters in the past. A New York Times article on Sunday said that campaign aides have wrested away control of Trump's Twitter account, which the candidate had used to shoot himself in the metaphorical foot.

But on Sunday — while Clinton sought to lay out an optimistic, national message — Trump was in Minnesota, warning about a local **immigrant** population: Somalis, largely Muslim, who have left their war-ravaged country and settled in large numbers around Minneapolis.

"You don't even have the right to talk about it. You don't even know who's coming in. You have no idea. You'll find out. You'll find out," Trump said.

He mentioned a recent case in which 10 people were stabbed at a Minnesota mall. The attacker was a Somali man who had **immigrated** to the United States with his parents when he was 2. A news agency tied to the Islamic State later claimed responsibility for the attack, saying the man was a "soldier" for the group.

"You've suffered enough in Minnesota," Trump said.

He said Clinton would allow more refugees to enter: "Her plan will import generations of terrorism."

In the last few days of the campaign, Trump has decided to invest time and resources in blue-leaning Midwestern states, including Minnesota, Michigan and Pennsylvania. Most recent opinion polls show Clinton leading in all three, but Trump is hoping for a surge among white voters who lack college degrees.

At each stop on Sunday, Trump was greeted by thousands of adoring fans. His aides saw these crowds as reason to hope for victories on Tuesday.

On Monday, the day before Election Day, Trump's schedule reflects his tough position — needing to win a string of states where the race is either tied or he is behind.

He will hold five rallies in a day, jetting from Florida to North Carolina to Pennsylvania to New Hampshire and then to Michigan.

Clinton, by contrast, will appear in three states: North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Michigan.

On Sunday, a spokesman for the FBI declined to comment on Comey's letter. A Justice Department spokesman said only that the department and the FBI had "dedicated all necessary resources to conduct this review expeditiously."

The newly discovered emails came from a laptop owned by Weiner. Abedin has told people close to her that she does not know how her emails ended up on her husband's laptop.

Comey had come under fire for inserting the FBI into the campaign's final days after senior Justice Department officials warned him not to. Justice Department policy discourages the bureau from taking steps in the days before an election in an attempt to avoid the perception that the FBI is trying to the influence the outcome.

On Sunday, Comey's three-paragraph letter was sent to the chairmen of the Homeland Security, Judiciary, Appropriations and Oversight and Government Reform committees and was copied to the ranking Democratic members. Comey said the FBI had performed an "extraordinary amount of high-quality work in a short period of time."

Asked Sunday to react to Comey's announcement, Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway told MSNBC that "he's mishandled the investigation from the beginning."

House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) said that regardless of Comey's announcement, "the undisputed finding of the FBI 's investigation is that Secretary Clinton put our nation's secrets at risk and in doing so compromised our national security."

"Fortunately, the American people have the opportunity to ensure Secretary Clinton never gets her hands on classified information again. Let's bring the Clinton era to an end by voting for Donald Trump on Tuesday," Ryan said in a statement.

Sen. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said in a statement that the "vague" announcement by the FBI failed to provide context, and he was unsure even if the review was over.

"The growing number of unanswered questions demand explanations," Grassley said. Is the FBI continuing to review the newly-revealed emails? Did the FBIlimit its review to email from when Clinton was Secretary of State, leaving out emails that could shed light on possible obstruction of Congress?"

Rep. Elijah E. Cummings (D-Md.), the top Democrat on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, said the announcement "affirms and vindicates" the FBI 's July decision.

"Over the past week, Republicans have engaged in wild speculation and launched unsubstantiated accusations, but the FBI has determined — yet again — that they are without merit," he said. "Now it is time for the American people to go forward based on the facts."
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Johnson reported from Minneapolis. Anne Gearan in Cleveland, Dave Weigel in Colorado Springs and Tom Hamburger, John Wagner, Abby Phillip, Matt Zapotosky, Ellen Nakashima, Scott Clement and Emily Guskin in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**KABUL — Few countries have been as affected by the twists and turns of recent U.S. foreign policy as Afghanistan. Once supported by Washington as a Cold War proxy, it was abandoned to civil conflict, then liberated from Islamist repression and, under the Obama administration, flooded with troops and remolded as a modern Muslim democracy.

Perhaps it should not come as a surprise, then, that Afghans — like Americans — appear to be divided into two camps on the U.S. presidential election. Some are hoping for a continuation of Washington's political and military involvement, but others are eager for a radical change.

In some ways, the American election seems remote in this war-weary capital that is rapidly succumbing to an early winter chill. The faces on political posters and billboards are those of Afghan warlord-politicians. The evening news is dominated by the latest Taliban suicide attack or government squabble. No national polls have been done to parse Afghans' views on the U.S. race.

But in office corners, tea shops and commuter buses, people are puzzling over the faraway brawl between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, wondering how serious Trump is about banning Muslims from the United States and whether Clinton will keep U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

While some Afghans said in interviews that they are fearful that a Trump presidency would be hostile to Muslims of all kinds, others dismissed his harsh comments as campaign rhetoric. Trump initially called for preventing Muslims from entering the United States but later said he wanted to limit **immigration** from countries experiencing terrorism.

Some Afghans said they believed he would not be able to sharply limit the arrival of Muslims, given the broad diversity and freedoms of American society.

"Maybe Trump is a racist, but he also seems like someone who can solve problems," said Noor Akhtar, 23, an engineering student at Kabul University. "Islam is a religion with 1,400 years of history, and the terrorist phenomenon is only 20 years old," he added, noting that many Muslim **immigrants** live in the United States. "There is no reason to blame one for the other."

Numerous people said that they thought Clinton would probably win and that she would presumably continue the foreign policies of the Obama administration. Some described those policies as open-minded and pro-democratic, but others said they had focused too much on defeating the Taliban and al-Qaeda, bringing years of war to Afghanistan that caused many civilian casualties and other problems.

"We all thought the Americans would bring peace and stability to Afghanistan, but that hasn't happened. It gets worse every year," said Rustam Mobasher, 25, a medical student. "Trump seems tougher than Hillary, and he can change those policies." He dismissed Trump's anti-Muslim comments as a ploy to win voters, predicting that "after the election, that will change."

Several Afghan politicians and analysts who have followed the campaign closely said they expected that Clinton would be elected and act as a reasonable world leader. But some said they were surprised and worried by the public anger and prejudice that has emerged.

"A lot of people here think Hillary will win, but others see Trump as the real face of America, a different America," said Waheed Mojda, a political analyst. "If he comes to power, it would be far worse, not just for Afghanistan but for the whole Muslim world."

Several younger Afghans, who were applying for visas to study in the United States, said they were hurrying to make those plans in case the U.S. governmentsuddenly changes its policies. Hundreds of thousands of Afghans have relatives who have **immigrated** to the United States, and some have expressed concern that they might be prevented from visiting them.

But several students said they thought Trump's business background might strengthen the U.S. economy and create job opportunities for ambitious young foreigners like themselves.

Najib Mahmoud, a professor of law and political science, said he was not worried about a Trump victory "because the American people will not allow him to implement his election slogans."

"They do not want to be criticized and mocked by the world while Russia and China gain strength globally," he said.

Fauzia Koofi, a member of parliament and a rights activist, said that no matter which candidate wins the election, "they will be representing a superpower that has a responsibility to represent and support democracy in the world."

She noted that although neither candidate had focused much on Afghanistan, "they will have to keep helping us, because we are still suffering from the Talibanand al-Qaeda, and now we have Daesh, too," the Arabic acronym for the Islamic State militant group.

Although Trump's toughness clearly appeals to some Afghans, several observers said that Clinton has strong support here because she is a woman and Afghan women identify with her efforts to get ahead in a man's world.

"We Afghans really appreciate that for the first time in history, a woman could become the American president," said Moeen Manastial, a political party activist and consultant. "She represents both continuity in American policy but also a fight for women's rights. I will be very happy if she wins."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One of the biggest political issues of the 2016 election has been **immigration**. The issue is a signature part of the campaign of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, who has pledged tougher vetting of **immigrants** and an impenetrable physical wall on the border with Mexico.

"We are a nation that is seriously troubled. We're losing our jobs. People are pouring into our country," Trump said in the first debate.

Others in politics have put a finer touch on it. "Absent visa reductions, the annual rate of **immigration**, the total level of **immigration**, and the percentage of the country that is foreign-born will continue surging every single year," Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) and Rep. Dave Brat (R-Va.) said in a letter last year.

But the problem with this view, as Ira Glass noted in a recent episode of the podcast "This American Life," is that it really is not true.

Although the flow of illegal **immigrants** across the border may be higher than some want, it has not risen in recent years. In fact, as a new report from Pew Research Center shows, the number of illegal **immigrants** working or looking for work in the United States has been roughly flat between 2009 and 2014, at about 8 million people. There is some movement across the border, but it's hardly massive: About 350,000 illegal **immigrants** have entered the country each year, but the same number have also left the country.

Together, unauthorized **immigrants** make up 5 percent of America's civilian labor force, a proportion that is down slightly since 2009, Pew says. The unauthorized **immigrant** population in the United States grew rapidly in the 1990s and early 2000s, but those trends changed dramatically with the financial crisis.

Some sources, such as the Conservative Review, have reported a surge in **immigration** after 2014. It's true that data from one survey, the 2015 Current Population Survey, showed an increase in Mexican **immigration**. But Jeffrey Passel, a senior demographer at Pew, says that over time, it has become more clear that results from that survey were an anomaly — which is something that occasionally happens with individual surveys — rather than an indication of a big migration event.

"Those numbers were not consistent with anything else we've seen," Passel said.

Although that 2015 survey showed an increase in Mexican **immigration**, the 2015 American Community Survey, which is based on a much larger sample, showed that the total number of Mexican **immigrants** in the country is virtually unchanged over the 2010-2016 period, Passel said. The 2016 Current Population Survey, labor-force surveys of out-migration in Mexico and apprehensions of undocumented Mexicans at the Southern border all pointed to the same trend — that the number of Mexican **immigrants** in the United States has been roughly constant for many years.

"By the end of 2015, there's no indication of this surge. If there had been a surge, there was a surge back by the end of the year," Passel said.

See also:

It's the one thing Trump and Clinton agree on — and it's probably a fantasy

Here's how little Americans really know about **immigration**

Three charts make painfully simple how American politics became so messed up

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton has a handful of top priorities she says she'd pursue right away if she wins the White House. Donald Trump has a whole contract of them. They are radically different, in content and in emphasis, and they underscore just how vastly the candidates disagree on policy this year.

Clinton, the Democratic nominee, would launch her presidency with a focus on jobs and **immigration**. She says she would push Congress to approve a $275 billion infrastructure plan, look to bolster clean-energy manufacturing and ramp up trade enforcement.

She has repeatedly promised to immediately pursue comprehensive **immigration** reform, including a path to citizenship for **immigrants** who currently reside in the country illegally.

Trump would start by reversing a bundle of executive orders issued by President Obama, including ones that have shielded some unauthorized **immigrants**from deportation. He would push a variety of measures through Congress, including his plan to cut taxes and also his plan to spur up to $1 trillion in infrastructure spending.

Perhaps most aggressively, he would change the United States' long-standing stance toward international trade, formally signaling his desire to renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico, labeling China a currency manipulator and preparing to levy tariffs on China, Mexico and other American trading partners.

In an election where other issues have often crowded out policy, it's worth revisiting the candidates' stances on these and other issues, before you cast your vote.

1) **Immigration**

On **immigration**, the candidates have taken diametrically opposed stances.

Trump announced his campaign for the presidency last year by casting Mexican **immigrants** as criminals. "They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime," Trump said at the time. "They're rapists, and some, I assume, are good people."

He has said that all **immigrants** in the country illegally must be deported — an estimated 10.9 million people. In a speech on **immigration** in September, he suggested that his first priority would be deporting undocumented **immigrants** who arrested for other crimes. He has spoken favorably of President Obama's deportation policies. The administration has removed at least 2.4 million **immigrants** since Obama took office.

Trump has also planned to build a wall along the Mexican border, and in that speech he made clear that he was not speaking metaphorically. "On day one, we will begin working on an impenetrable, physical, tall, powerful, beautiful southern border wall," he said, adding that the wall would be supplemented by towers, sensors and additional manpower.

Trump has also called for barring any Muslim who is not a U.S. citizen from entering the United States. Additionally, he called for a "vetting procedure" for potential **immigrants** to ensure that they share American values in his speech in September.

Clinton, in stark contrast, advocates for allowing those in the country illegally to eventually become citizens.

"I don't want to rip families apart. I don't want to be sending parents away from children," Clinton said in her final debate with Trump. "Bringing undocumented **immigrants** out from the shadows — putting them into the formal economy — will be good, because then employers can't exploit them and undercut Americans' wages."

http://www.washingtonpost.com/video/politics/clinton-outlines-**immigration**-reform-plan/2015/12/14/73f62f0a-a2cd-11e5-8318-bd8caed8c588\_video.html[http://www.washingtonpost.com/video/politics/clinton-outlines-immigration-reform-plan/2015/12/14/73f62f0a-a2cd-11e5-8318-bd8caed8c588\_video.html]

She has also called for expanding Obama's executive actions, which granted a temporary reprieve from deportation to children brought here illegally as children and to undocumented **immigrants** who are the parents of U.S. citizens. The courts, however, have stymied Obama's most recent executive action on **immigration**, so it is unclear whether Clinton would be able to pursue this policy if elected.

2) Taxes

Clinton and Trump also take opposite approaches to taxes. Trump would substantially reduce taxes, mostly for wealthy Americans. Clinton, by contrast, would modestly increase taxes on corporations and the rich.

Trump would reduce marginal rates on ordinary income — a change that would primarily benefit affluent families, who would pay a maximum marginal rate of just 33 percent, compared to 39.6 percent in the current system. Trump would also eliminate the estate tax, which is currently paid by the wealthiest families, and instead tax any gains on investments when the investor dies.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 51 percent of the savings from Trump's tax relief would eventually go to the richest 1 percent of American households. His plan would reduce taxes for the typical household in this group by $317,000 a year.

Clinton, for her part, would increase taxes on the rich, imposing a new 4 percent surcharge on annual incomes above $5 million and a minimum tax of 30 percent on incomes above $2 million. She would expand the estate tax.

Clinton would increase taxes on certain kinds of investments, and she would modestly increase taxes for corporations while offering new breaks to small businesses.

On the whole, taxes for most ordinarily families would change little if at all under Clinton's plan. She would increase taxes for the average family in the richest 1 percent of households by about $118,000 a year, according to the Tax Policy Center.

Trump has argued that his proposals would be a major stimulus for the U.S. economy. The center, however, warns that if Trump simply funded the government's operations by borrowing more money instead of through collecting taxes, the increase in the national debt could have negative economic consequences in the long term.

3) Family

The candidates' fiscal policies could also mean a big difference in the finances of families with children.

Clinton has made helping families financially an important theme of her campaign, and she recently called for expanding the tax credit for children. Under her proposal, the tax credit would be doubled to a maximum of $2,000 for children under 5 years of age, and poor families would be able to claim a larger share of the credit despite their limited earnings.

The former secretary of state has also called for a public paid-leave program. Every worker would be able to take 12 weeks of paid family leave and 12 weeks of paid medical leave under her plan. During that time, workers would be compensated by the government at two thirds of their wages.

Clinton has also said she plans on limiting child-care expenses to 10 percent of any family's income, though she has not put forward a specific proposal for doing so.

Trump is the first Republican presidential candidate to put forward proposals on child care. His plans would primarily benefit more affluent families rather than those with less income.

He would allow families to save for child care in special accounts that would be sheltered from taxes. He would also allow biological mothers to apply for unemployment insurance in order to receive up to six weeks of maternity leave.

Trump plans to allow families to deduct their child-care expenses from their taxes. This proposal would benefit families that itemize their deductions, who tend to be richer, federal data show.

At the same time, Trump would also eliminate personal exemptions — a provision of the tax code that allows households to pay less based on the number of people in the family — and the head-of-household status, which gives single parents a break on their taxes. The result is that families with multiple children or single parents would not benefit as much from Trump's other proposals, and some would even wind up paying more.

4) Health care

Trump has said he will repeal the Affordable Care Act, Obama's health-care reform. Yet the New York businessman has said little about the system he envisions putting in its place. Nonpartisan analysts project that as many as 25 million people could lose health insurance if the law is repealed.

Clinton, on the other hand, would expand the reform, also known as Obamacare, by increasing the financial help people can receive from the government to buy health insurance.

She would also provide a new tax credit that households could use to cover excessive out-of-pocket costs. This credit would be worth about $500 for families in the middle class, depending on their expenses, and somewhat less for richer and poorer families.

5) Trade

One area of partial agreement between the two candidates concerns international trade. Both Clinton and Trump oppose the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Obama administration's controversial trade deal.

Trump would go further, however. He has also pledged to renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement, and he has threatened to impose punitive tariffs on goods from China and Mexico. The additional taxes would increase costs for U.S. consumers, but Trump argues that doing so would increase wages and create more opportunities for workers in domestic manufacturing.

Most economists are apprehensive about the possibility that Trump could win election and impose tariffs on imports. Mark Zandi, who is the chief economist at the private research firm Moody's Analytics and who is supporting Clinton, projects that Trump's economic policies would create an extended recession, increasing the rate of unemployment to 7.4 percent.

6) The environment

Donald Trump has often described global warming as a "hoax." If elected, he could make immediate changes to U.S. environmental policy.

Trump has said he would withdraw from the Paris Agreement, the international accord on national responsibilities to reduce carbon-dioxide emissions. He has also written that he would review the Environmental Protection Agency's finding that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant, and he could delay or potentially abandon the rules the Obama administration is putting into effect to control greenhouse gases.

Additionally, Trump would open federal lands to fossil-fuel extraction, according to a campaign document.

Clinton would largely continue Obama's policies with regard to energy. She has also called for eliminating subsidies for the fossil fuel industry and for expanding tax credits to encourage new development in places where coal mines have closed or laid off workers.

7) Foreign policy

Trump advocates a broad retrenchment in U.S. involvement in foreign affairs. He would ask allied countries to contribute more to ensuring global security. He argues that the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization pay too little toward ensuring their common defense and has called for a rapprochement with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

He has called for an aggressive military campaign against the Islamic State and has proposed deploying as many as 30,000 U.S. ground troops in Iraq and Syria.

Clinton has rejected the idea of once again committing large numbers of American ground troops to the region, but she has also called for enforcing a no-fly zone in Syria.

Clinton supports the nuclear accord with Iran, which her Republican rival has denounced.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This post has been updated.

Here's a wrinkle in the electoral math on Tuesday: What if we told you that 270 electoral college votes wouldn't be enough to elect Hillary Clinton president?

That appears to be the situation, after in recent days one Democratic elector in Washington state said he won't vote for Clinton and another in the same state said he won't commit to doing so -- meaning that if Clinton, the Democratic nominee, wins Washington state, she may have to win at least 272 electoral votes nationwide. The Seattle Times has the details:

"No, no, no on Hillary. Absolutely not. No way," said Robert Satiacum, a member of Washington's Puyallup Tribe who had supported Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders as the Democratic presidential nominee.

This actually isn't even the first time this has come up this election cycle. In August, a Georgia Republican elector also announced that he might not vote for Republican nominee Donald Trump, citing his status as an **immigrant** and Trump's **immigration** policies. He later resigned. And later that month, a Texas GOP elector threatened to do the same but quickly walked it back.

All of these probably would have come into play and deprive Trump and Clinton of electoral votes, given Trump is favored to win Georgia and Texas, and Clinton is almost sure to win Washington state on Election Day.

But how can this happen? And is there any recourse? Back when the potential "faithless elector" in Georgia cropped up, we put together a little explainer. Below, we've updated it.

First, it bears noting that these comments are striking because the electors are talking about withholding votes before the general election is even concluded — apparently trying to send a message. This is certainly a sign of the times and the unhappiness with the two major-party nominees.

But even faithless electors writ large are exceedingly rare.

According to the voting reform group FairVote, there have been 157 faithless electors in American history. About 45 percent of those electoral votes were changed because the candidate died before the Electoral College voters were tallied. Among the rest, three electors chose to abstain, while 82 voted for a candidate other than the one they were required to support. That's fewer than two true faithless electors per election, given that we've had 57 presidential elections.

The last time we had a faithless elector in a presidential campaign was more than a decade ago -- in 2004 -- and it might have been a mistake. In that case, an anonymous Minnesota elector voted for John F. Kerry's running mate, then-Sen. John Edwards (D-N.C.), rather than Kerry. It was widely thought to be an error rather than a protest vote.

Before that, D.C. elector Barbara Lett-Simmons in 2000 abstained from voting for Al Gore, citing the District's lack of voting representation in Congress. In 1988, a West Virginia Democratic elector did what the Minnesota elector did and cast a ballot for vice-presidential candidate Lloyd Bentsen rather than Michael Dukakis for president. In 1976, an impatient Washington state Republican voted for Gerald R. Ford's primary opponent, Ronald Reagan, instead of Ford. Richard Nixon lost one elector each in the presidential elections of 1960, 1968 and 1972; all of them went not for the Democratic nominees but for other options.

The Georgia and Texas electors did have the right -- in their states, at least -- not to vote for the person who wins their state's electoral votes. But Satiacum and Chiafolo both face a $1,000 fine in Washington if they don't vote for Clinton. This is telling; some states have no legal requirement preventing faithless electors, while others do -- but the penalties are usually small, including fines, and generally aren't enforced.

Although the Constitution does spell out the details of the Electoral College, it does not weigh in on how electors are supposed to vote. According to the National Archives, the Supreme Court has said that political parties may require electors to take pledges to vote for a particular candidate, but it has not weighed in on whether penalties for breaking that pledge are constitutional.

Georgia and Texas are two of 21 states without faithless elector laws. The other 29 and the District do have such laws, but no faithless electors have ever been prosecuted, according to the Archives.

A big reason nobody has been prosecuted is because faithless electors have never changed the outcome of a presidential election. Which brings us to ...

In a word, yes. But it's unlikely.

Given that we are just talking about a loss of one or two electoral votes out of 538 for both Trump and Clinton, their margins of victory would have to be very narrow. And assembling a realistic combination of states that gets either of them to 270 or 271 electoral votes -- the number where one or two faithless electors who prevent them from actually hitting 270 -- is very tough.

Over at the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University, Edward B. Foley assembled a couple instances in which Clinton would win with 270 electoral votes. But one of them involves Trump winning Florida and blue-leaning Colorado and Wisconsin but losing red-leaning Arizona, while the other has him losing Florida while winning blue-leaning Pennsylvania and Virginia.

And even if there were more faithless electors, the number of realistic scenarios under which they would actually matter are few.

In addition, falling below that 270-electoral-vote threshold probably wouldn't hand the election to their opponent; for reasons we'll discuss, it would almost definitely instead force the House to make the final call.

But will it be just one or two faithless electors? There have been cases in which groups of faithless electors joined forces, although it has been more than a century since the last instance. In 1986 and 1912, groups of four and eight electors, respectively, voted for vice-presidential candidates other than the ones they were pledged for. In 1872, 63 Democratic electors declined to vote for Democratic nominee Horace Greeley, who died after Election Day.

In fact, the only time that faithless electors could have changed the outcome of a presidential election was for vice president, and it was a long time ago.

In 1836, 23 Democratic electors from Virginia declined to vote for Richard Mentor Johnson for vice president because of his relationship with a black woman, leaving him shy of a majority. But the Senate, which is tasked with resolving vice-presidential elections in which no candidate gets a majority of the electoral votes, made Johnson vice president anyway.

It has been 180 years since a conspiracy to stop a presidential or vice-presidential candidate from taking their rightful victory in the electoral college has truly been hatched.

But there's very good reason for that, and it's the same reason Republicans didn't really try to stop Trump from taking the GOP nomination at their convention in July: It would be overturning the will of the voters.

There's also the fact that faithless electors almost never cross over and vote for the other candidate. Almost all of the faithless electors described above voted for either another member of their own party or for a third-party option — not the other major party's presidential or vice-presidential nominee. The Texas elector was the only one of this year's potential faithless electors who has talked about possibly crossing over, though again he quickly reversed course.

So if a candidate — whether Trump or Clinton — lost the electoral college majority because of faithless electors, it doesn't necessarily mean the other candidate wins. It's much more likely that the House would decide (the Senate gets to resolve undecided VP races, but the House gets to pick a president if nobody gets a majority).

There certainly have been situations in which faithless electors could have changed the outcome of the election; given George W. Bush's five-electoral vote win of 271 to 266 in 2000 -- it was 271 to 267 before the D.C. elector's abstention -- only two electors would have had to change their votes to throw the race to the House, and three crossovers (which again, are very, very rare) could have made Gore the president.

But the likelihood that the 2016 election would be close enough for faithless electors to make a difference and that there would be enough of them to actually change that outcome makes it a remote possibility. And if it got to that point, they'd probably think pretty hard about being labeled as the people who overturned the result of a presidential election.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MIAMI — Five undocumented domestic workers, all named Maria, fanned out across Little Havana delivering a desperate, last-minute plea to Hispanic voters: We can't vote, but you can. Vote early to ensure a President Trump does not deport us.

In Hialeah, a traditional stronghold for Cuban American Republicans, backers of Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton drove a colorful, Colombian-style chiva party bus with bongo drums and rumba dancers handing out Cuban pastries and "Hispanics for Hillary" signs.

And in ritzy Coral Gables, Maria Ballaster, a 60-year-old Cuban American who has always voted Republican reflected on why she had just split her ballot — sticking with her party's nominee for the U.S. Senate, Marco Rubio, while casting a vote for Clinton.

"I trust Rubio, but I don't trust Mr. Crazy," Ballaster said.

Here in Florida and across the country, there are early indications that Hispanics have mobilized for this election like no other in U.S. history. Activist groups and Clinton allies, motivated largely by a deepening fear of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, are deploying new voter outreach strategies and hoping to take advantage of growth in the Latino electorate.

In Nevada, thousands of voters lined up outside an early-voting site at a Latino market Friday night, prompting voting hours to be extended at the end of what has been a record-breaking early-voting surge in the state. Turnout was so high in Clark County, home to Las Vegas, that Democrats enter Tuesday with an advantage similar to the one they held there four years ago when President Obama won Nevada by seven points.

Similarly heavy early-voting turnout among Hispanics in Colorado and Arizona has given Democrats hope in those battleground states, too.

Early voting is not necessarily an indication of final results, given that those who have turned out so far are highly motivated and that the election will be decided by the millions more who cast ballots Tuesday. Some analysts say it is possible that Latino early voting will draw from Election Day turnout rates.

Nonetheless, the increase has taken place even in states such as Texas, where Democrats have not focused on galvanizing voters. The spike appears to be the result of the rising number of Hispanic voters and the increasingly aggressive efforts to organize what has long been considered a potent voting bloc whose numbers have never lived up to their potential. Adding to the fervor is widespread anger at Trump's incendiary rhetoric about Hispanics and Mexico, suggesting that Clinton could outperform Obama's 71 percent share of the Hispanic vote from 2012.

"Trump has built a wall, indeed," said Fernand Amandi, a Democratic pollster who specializes in Latino voters. "And it is a new firewall for Democrats."

Experts who closely track Hispanic voters caution that the turnout numbers so far seem to reflect anticipated growth rates expected to continue into the 2030s. "This year's historic turnout in some respects is not unusual," said Mark Lopez, Pew Research Center's director of Hispanic research.

About 11.2 million Hispanics voted in 2012, representing just less than 50 percent of all eligible Latino voters. Since then, the number of eligible Hispanics has jumped by about 4 million voters, which is on par with the overall growth rates of the Hispanic population, according to Pew.

In Colorado, the steady growth of the Latino vote has fueled a narrow edge for Democrats. Obama's campaign registered thousands of Hispanics there in 2008 and 2012, and many more have been registered by Clinton's campaign and that of her Democratic primary rival, Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, and groups such as the Colorado **Immigrant** Rights Coalition.

In every part of the state, Democrats have found Latino voters who have not been active in recent elections or had voted for more moderate Republicans. Damian Alcazar, 46, was registered with the Republican Party and had backed the 2008 presidential bid of Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.). But by Friday night, when he stopped by a GOP get-out-the-vote rally in Aurora, he had already cast a ballot for Clinton.

"Trump's way too risky," he said.

In Colorado Springs, the center of the state's largest Republican stronghold, Democrats were targeting and turning out Latinos. Over lunch at El Ranchito 2, a supermarket and restaurant, an entirely Latino clientele was divided between those who could not vote and those who had already voted for Clinton.

"The Democrats sent me mail, but I didn't really need it," said Jaime Valdez, 70. "I was going to vote for Hillary."

In Florida, early-voting data suggests that Hispanics are emerging as a larger force in the state's electorate — and that many Latinos are participating for the first time.

The Hispanic share of overall early voters is sharply higher this year, reaching about 15 percent from about 10 percent at this stage four years ago, according to an analysis by University of Florida political scientist Daniel A. Smith. Another examination of the numbers, by Democratic strategist Steve Schale, found that more than half of the Hispanics who have voted so far have either never voted before or voted only once previously.

The diversity of the state's Hispanic electorate has long presented a challenge for campaigns in both parties. Cuban Americans, particularly in Miami, have been Republican stalwarts, though younger generations have been trending toward the Democrats. People with roots in Central America and Mexico have favored the Democrats historically. In the past, Republicans have made some inroads with the hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans who have settled largely around Orlando and have been a swing bloc.

Overall, the polls in Florida are tight. The Trump campaign and its allies have been working to mobilize voters in the state's more rural and conservative areas. Trump and his backers have also predicted that many Hispanics will turn out for him Tuesday.

"I don't believe the polls," said Nelson Diaz, the Miami-Dade County GOP chairman. "There's been an incredible intensity for Trump and long lines in our Hispanic Republican precincts. There's a big misunderstanding of what's happening. There's a silent majority and first-time voters that the polls aren't capturing, and I think he's going to end up doing well here."

On Saturday, the Democrats' efforts to court Cuban Americans was on display in Hialeah, the heart of the exile community. In addition to the chiva bus, Clinton allies parked a van blasting hip-hop and reggaeton music. They also handed out guava pastries from a tent. Waiting for them were a group of Trump supporters who started yelling, "Lock her up!"

The Democrats started shouting back, comparing the GOP presidential nominee to the reviled Cuban dictator: "Castro, no! Trump tampoco!" They also chanted another Spanish phrase that suggested Trump and Castro were funded by the Russians.

Across Miami-Dade County, Hispanics seemed to be heavily favoring Clinton.

Marilyn Ralat-Albernas considered the stakes in the election so high for her Hispanic community that she took a month off work to volunteer for Clinton.

Ralat-Albernas, a 62-year-old registered nurse of Puerto Rican descent, said she has spent days knocking on doors, canvassing neighborhoods, attesting to the benefits of the Affordable Care Act and proclaiming the threat posed by Trump to millions of undocumented **immigrants**.

"When he insulted Mexicans, he was insulting all of us," said Ralat-Albernas, referring to Trump's description of Mexican **immigrants** as rapists. "He doesn't understand our culture. We need to come together and show him that our community is powerful."

In Florida, a network of **immigrant** rights organizations, unions and leftist nonprofits aligned to bring out the vote for more than a year, according to Maria Rodriguez, executive director of the Florida **Immigrant** Coalition.

In the past year, they knocked on 1 million doors of low- and mid-propensity voters throughout the state, nearly 60 percent of whom were Latino. In the trendy Miami Modern District, they handed out cups of Cuban coffee near a mural depicting Trump as a flying pig, to attract young Latinos to vote; they invested in ads on salsa radio stations on Pandora that encouraged listeners to vote early. They scoured areas with large Central American populations to interact with Honduran and Nicaraguan voters who are not typically targeted.

The community seemed ready to engage, according to Monica Russo, executive vice president of the local Service Employees International Union. Those voters who answered the doors were already concerned with raising the federal minimum wage and **immigration** reform. By the time Trump captured the Republican Party's nomination, Russo said these voters were already inspired to make a difference.

"Folks don't seem afraid," Russo said. "They seemed determined."

Lorella Praeli, the Clinton campaign's director of Hispanic outreach, said the campaign sought to recruit ambassadors inside communities — the owner of the local bodega or Spanish grocery and the matriarchs and abuelas who might have an affinity for electing the first female president.

"We look forward to welcoming some of the most influential Latinas in the country as we build our path to la victoria para Hillary," read one advertisement. "Latinos will shape the future of our país."

When Praeli produced the ad, she said some asked why they would publish something in the informal Spanglish.

"This is a part of our culture," Praeli said. "It shows that we understand how families speak with one another."

One of the most persuasive strategies for Clinton allies has been to send undocumented workers to knock on the doors of potential Hispanic voters to explain the stakes of the election.

On Friday, Maria Bilbao and her son, Tomas Kennedy, jumped into their old Mercedes with broken air conditioning to explain what a Trump presidency might mean for their family. She was one of the five undocumented Marias canvassing around Little Havana.

"To be honest, I'm not voting," said one woman, Maria Figueroa, 56, upon opening her door to see Bilbao and Kennedy. "They are both liars."

Kennedy explained that he agreed the candidates were not the best, but one candidate was better than the other.

"This is my mother, and she is undocumented," Kennedy told her. Their family moved from Argentina in 2001, when its economy was collapsing. They were told the wait list to move legally lasted 17 years. Kennedy received a reprieve through the Obama administration's decision to shield from deportation many people who came to the country as young children. His mother is still at risk.

"If Trump is elected, we don't know what he will do," Kennedy continued. "He's going to pull our family apart."

"He is crazy," Bilbao added, circling one finger around her ear.

Figueroa finally agreed she would vote. She wrote down the address for her polling place.

"It's true," Figueroa said, "he cannot be a president."

As the sun beat down that afternoon, the Marias stood on the sidewalk and traded stories of their interactions with voters.

"I told her I cannot vote, but this country needs you to vote," Maria Lima said, recalling another woman she persuaded. "Our dreams of better life rest on you."

She lifted her sunglasses to wipe the moisture from her face. It was a mixture of sweat and tears.

robert.samuels@washpost.com

David Weigel in Colorado and Ed O'Keefe in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ALIQUIPPA, Pa. — Drive through this sleepy town and you'll see rows of shuttered homes and the carcasses of buildings where molten metal once flowed. Stop by Babich's Family Restaurant and you'll find supporters of Donald Trump.

Joshua Carr, 35, is one of them. He's the owner. Black T-shirt and a backward cap, raising a young family with his wife. Craving not just change but the kind of radical change that Trump offers.

"The world is all screwed up. The big J and L" — the former Jones & Laughlin steel complex along the Ohio River — "is gone." So is most everything else around here, he said. The people. The jobs.

"Put in Trump," he said, "and we'll win again."

Carr, a Democrat who voted for President Obama, was the first person encountered during a road trip late last week that began in western Pennsylvania and ended 350 miles to the east in a prosperous Philadelphia suburb — and he reflected both the promise and peril facing the Republican presidential nominee in this battleground state in the race's final sprint.

Although Trump has electrified white working-class people across the spectrum who are eager for volatile transformation, those voters are far from the entirety of an increasingly diverse electorate where Trump-style change is as feared in the cities and suburbs as it is embraced in the countryside.

Trump's chances Tuesday are likely to hinge on whether there are enough voters in states like Pennsylvania, which last sided with a Republican in 1988 and where Trump has poured energy, who are willing to abandon their usual voting patterns in favor of disruption.

The journey through Pennsylvania revealed that while Trump signs dot countless lawns throughout the industrial region, they do so progressively less as you move east, as if Trump's support were a fading red swath on the map. Cities such as Pittsburgh and many suburbs are still strongholds for Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, who has been ahead in polls all year and remains narrowly so in the final days of the election.

For Trump — who rallied Sunday in Moon, Pa., near Pittsburgh and plans to be in Scranton on Monday — the hurdle remains wary voters, including moderates in his own party, who see his rowdy populism as an unwelcome upending of American life.

Clinton's challenge is one of turnout. The demographics and organization favor her in vote-rich areas like Philadelphia, where she will appear Monday night with President Obama, first lady Michelle Obama and former president Bill Clinton. But the appetite for change elsewhere does not.

Sitting across Babich's is Phil Patton, 69. A Vietnam veteran, he graduated from the nearby high school with the brother of Mike Ditka, the legendary football coach who hails from here and is part of the town's mythology.

"Always been the home of champions," Patton said. "It's the way we were all brought up."

But Patton said Aliquippa has changed, and so has he. This year the longtime Democrat will vote for Trump: "He's a nut and he runs his mouth. He's not honest. But if not him, the country might as well fold up. It's over."

Tucking into their breakfasts, John Rita and Bill Battisti were similarly bleak but do not back Trump. Both 76-year-old Democrats, they have seen men like Trump throughout their lives and "we see right through him," Rita said.

"He says he's going to bring the steel mills back. Doesn't he understand they're gone?" Rita asked. "There's grass there now. What's he going to do? Throw some seeds down and the mills will grow?"

The men recalled that when they were in high school, they got recruited by manufacturing companies "before we even graduated," Battisti said. "They wanted you that quickly."

"It's never like that nowadays," Rita said. "I keep getting calls for contracting jobs because the younger people don't get trained or they can't pass the piss test."

Their waitress — Trish Mihalik, 52 — has three sons working with her husband down the road at Smiley's Tire. She said they're doing fine but it's not easy. Her family, which is Pentecostal Christian, is praying for Trump.

"Look around Aliquippa. It's dead," she said. "There's nothing. I've put it all in God's hands."

Pittsburgh

Twenty miles southeast and in the shadow of the Pittsburgh Pirates' gleaming baseball stadium is a Giant Eagle grocery store on the city's North Side. A light rain drizzles as a predominantly African American crowd makes its way through the parking lot. The only signs for blocks are baby-blue banners.

"That's Clinton blue," Katie Hicks, 60, said. She said this city, along with Philadelphia, is Clinton's base and the reason Democrats should expect to carry Pennsylvania.

"Before I retired, I had a good job at the Heinz factory — put the ketchup into packets. Started in '77, benefits and Blue Cross, you name it," Hicks said. "That was then. It was a good job. But hey, let's not call it the glory days."

"I don't want to go back to the old Pittsburgh. All of that coal, the polluted air and rivers," she said, not to mention tense race relations. "That's why I'm for Hillary."

Smoking a cigarette near the shopping carts is George Crawford, 37, who lost his job recently as a busser at a restaurant downtown. He's living in a halfway house and said men like Trump "don't have any idea about my life."

"I was supposedly let go because someone didn't like the way I said something. Crazy," Crawford said.

He glanced away. "The Trump wall isn't going to give me a job. Donald Trump doesn't make it better."

Dwayne Ellis, 42, agreed. The handyman predicted a "civil war" if Trump wins, caused by Trump cutting social spending levels and by anger over economic stagnation.

"Imagine, he gets in after making all of these promises and doesn't keep them? There's your war," he said. "Hillary has her mind set right. She'll make things happen."

Somerset

There they are, the embodiment of Trump Country in Pennsylvania: Angelo Donia, Todd Menser and Carl Kennell. The three friends are mingling and cracking jokes outside the Paint Chop, a custom-paint shop on a leafy street in Somerset, off Exit 110 of the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Trump-Pence signs neatly line the curb.

They're conservative Republicans who work with their hands. They're convinced that Clinton is corrupt. They insist that the national media cannot be trusted. And if a traditional Republican had been nominated, they said they may not have voted.

"It ain't working with the people in there, that's for damn sure. The whole system is sick and it's getting worse," said Menser, a burly 65-year-old plumber with a thick white beard. "The working man is tired of taking a beating."

Donia, 53, is furious about the Clintons' wealth: "How do you come out of these government jobs and make millions and millions of dollars for giving speeches? It's criminal.

"So while they make their millions, the little guy here is getting choked," he added. "You can't live on minimum wage unless you're getting assistance."

Somerset has rebellious anti-tax roots that trace to its role in the Whiskey Rebellion. It's also near Shanksville, where Flight 93 crashed during the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Menser was there that day: "I was a fireman and worked out at the morgue. You don't forget that, the smell. You don't forget what you see."

One by one, each of them said they support Trump's proposal to temporarily ban Muslims from entering the country.

"I don't want to see the Muslim flag flying at the White House," Kennell said. "I know no one likes to hear that but it's coming. In fact, it's almost here."

Carlisle

This bustling borough in central Pennsylvania generally tilts right. The local GOP congressman, Lou Barletta, is nationally known for his advocacy of hard-line **immigration** policies. Farms around here have Trump-Pence logos painted on barn doors.

But there are pockets of blue in the exurbs of Harrisburg, the state capital. As you travel east in the state, people seem more open to government, which is a major employer, and happier about the way their lives are going.

Sue Walker, 55, the owner of Jaymee Lee's Diner in the adjacent hamlet of Newville, counts herself as a proud Democrat.

When the man who lives on the second floor above her restaurant put up homemade posters that read "Trump dug his hole now we bury him" and "Our new president Hillary Clinton," Walker didn't ask him to take them down.

"Oh, customers grumbled," she said as pots of steaming coffee whizzed by and the Diet Pepsi nozzle filled up glasses. "I had a guy who lectured me for a freaking hour. He got teary eyed as he talked about Donald Trump and put him in the same sentence as Jesus. I mean, really?"

Walker said the pro-Clinton paraphernalia hasn't been a problem for business, either.

"Does it look like we're hurting?" she asked, gesturing to the packed restaurant.

Walker said she and many women she knows find Trump "disgusting."

"Every woman has known men like Donald Trump. It's nauseating and obnoxious and we've had enough."

"Being a woman, though, isn't why I'm with her," Walker said pointedly. "I'm with her because she has the experience. She wouldn't start fighting with everyone."

Newtown

If you're an upper-middle-class Republican who is uneasy about Trump, you can find refuge at the Starbucks on State Street, where lawyers and corporate professionals pick up iced lattes on their way to office parks.

Matt Benchener, 30, is in gym clothes and hunched over his laptop. A soft-spoken Wharton graduate, he works for a financial services company.

Benchener describes himself as fiscally conservative, a foreign-policy hawk and "fairly socially progressive." These days, however, he's mostly pained. Same with his wife, with whom he has two children younger than 5.

"Maybe we'll have to go third party," he said. "I keep thinking if [House Speaker] Paul Ryan had run this year, that would've been very appealing."

JoAnn Snow, 65, a Democrat and retired saleswoman, says she doesn't believe that the Republicans here are as anti-Trump as they say.

"I'm worried all the time," Snow said as she waits for a friend. "I see more and more Trump signs. I know Clinton supporters are subtler, but it bothers me. Not too long ago I was so confident. Now I'm scared. If he wins, I will cry for days."

Michael Roytman, 45, said Snow could be right. In private, most of the suburban Republicans this conservative knows fume about the way the federal government and their children's schools are managed.

"Mediocrity is too often becoming acceptable" said Roytman, a compliance specialist who **immigrated** from the then Soviet Union in 1991.

Emily Edelson, 46, a staunch Democrat and office manager, said she understands aspects of those frothing frustrations but wonders if they're "a little over the top."

"The country is actually better off than it gets credit for," she said. "It's not this dire, awful place."

"Right?"

In Pennsylvania, the answer tends to depend on where you are.

robert.costa@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With the 2016 presidential election race coming to a close tomorrow, here's a roundup of 29 claims being made by Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in their "final argument" speeches. Trump repeated many of his greatest hits of debunked claims, and Clinton mainly attacked Trump.

And, remember, no matter what your politics, please don't take your right to vote for granted.

Donald Trump

"I'm honored to have the endorsement of 200 — more than that now, much more than that — top admirals and generals."

Trump has been making this claim for weeks. But the last news release from his campaign on flag officer endorsements, issued Sept. 16, only listed 164. The list currently stands at 165.

"Eight years ago when he [Barack Obama] was running for the first time, he essentially was talking about how corrupt the election system is in Chicago. I saw it. I said wait a minute, he's telling us how Trump shouldn't be saying these things. And this guy, eight years ago, is on television last night, talking about how corrupt it is and saying, 'I'm lucky I'm from Chicago.'"

This appears to be a reference to a video of Barack Obama at a 2008 campaign event at Kent State University in New Philadelphia, Ohio. But Trump takes Obama's answer out of context — and Obama does not say he's lucky he's from Chicago.

A voter asked, "I would just like to know what you can say to reassure us that this election will not be rigged or stolen." Here's Obama's answer:

"Well, I tell you what, it helps in Ohio that we've got Democrats in charge of the machines. But look, I come from Chicago. So I want to be honest, it's not as if it's just Republicans who have monkeyed around with elections in the past. Sometimes Democrats have, too. Whenever people are in power, they have this tendency to try to, you know, tilt things in their direction. That's why we've got to have, I believe, a voting rights division in the Justice Department that is not partisan, and that is serious about investigating cases of vote fraud, serious about making sure people aren't being discouraged to vote. That's why the voting rights legislation that was passed a couple of years ago to help county clerks make sure the machines were in place that were needed. That's why we need paper trails on these new election machines, so that you actually have something that you can hang on to after you punch that letter, to make sure it hasn't been hacked into. Those are all part of the process of making sure our democracy works for everybody."

"Our trade deal with Mexico, NAFTA, is a defective deal. It was defective almost from the beginning because we have different tax systems. They're on a VAT system. We're on our system. Well, there's almost a 17 percent difference. So every deal that we make, we are behind 17 percent before we even start. People have known that for years and years and years, and it's a defective agreement. Nobody's ever changed it. Believe me, it's going to get changed very quickly, okay?"

Trump is misleading by characterizing Mexico's 16 percent value added tax, or VAT, as a trade barrier. The VAT is a consumption tax levied on goods and services that are produced and sold in Mexico. These taxes do not apply to products exported from Mexico.

This tax works the same way as U.S. federal excise taxes on certain imported (but not exported) goods and state retail sales taxes on domestic consumption of products (and not exports), according to Eric Toder, co-director of the Tax Policy Center. Toder wrote on the Tax Policy Center's TaxVox Blog that the VAT does not favor one country's producers over another's.

"The World Trade Organization rightly does not view these rules as trade barriers," Toder wrote. "They are simply ways for a country to tax its own residents, without discriminating based on where goods are produced. In contrast, the WTO would appropriately view a tariff that is imposed only on imported goods and services but exempts domestically produced products as a trade barrier."

"It was reported last night that the FBI is conducting a criminal investigation into Hillary Clinton's pay-for-play corruption during her tenure as secretary of state. In other words, the FBI is investigating how Hillary Clinton put the office of secretary of state up for sale in violation of federal law."

This is false. There were FBI agents who argued for the bureau to pursue an investigation into the Clinton Foundation and allegations of corruption and conflicts of interest. But senior law enforcement officials believed there wasn't enough evidence to move forward, according to the Wall Street Journal's detailed account of the infighting over whether to investigate the Clinton Foundation.

"It isn't unusual for field agents to favor a more aggressive approach than supervisors and prosecutors think is merited. But the internal debates about the Clinton Foundation show the high stakes when such disagreements occur surrounding someone who is running for president," the Journal reported.

"Nationwide, murders have experienced the largest single-year increase in 45 years….  A Trump administration will work with local and fed law enforcement to end this growing crime wave. It's very substantial."

Trump is citing FBI data showing homicides were up 10.8 percent nationwide in 2015. That was the biggest percentage jump in a single year since 1971. Sometimes, he incorrectly cites this figure to say that "we have the highest murder rate in this country in 45 years." We have awarded that incorrect version Four Pinocchios.

We frequently warn against comparing crime trends from short periods of time, such as year over year. An annual trend can show a trajectory of where the trend might be headed but still does not give a full picture. Crime trends are determined over at least five years, preferably 10 or 20 years, of data. The sharp increase in violent crime rate and homicide rates in 2015 do not necessarily indicate a "crime wave." Overall, violent crimes and murders have been declining nationwide since their peak in 1991.

"General [David] Petraeus's life and reputation have been destroyed, for doing nothing, by comparison, to what Hillary Clinton did."

Trump repeats a Three Pinocchio comparison of how Petraeus and Clinton handled classified information. FBI Director James B. Comey has rejected the claim that Petraeus "got in trouble for far less" than Clinton. "It's the reverse," Comey has said, as the Petraeus case "illustrates perfectly the kind of cases the Department of Justice is willing to prosecute." Mainly, the Petraeus case involved a combination of obstruction of justice, intentional misconduct and a vast quantity of classified information that did not exist in the Clinton case, and Petraeus admitted that he knew that was the wrong thing to do, Comey has said.

"They took the kid who wanted some pictures of the submarine. That's an old submarine; they've got plenty of pictures, if the enemy wants them, they've got plenty of them. He wanted to take a couple of pictures. They put him in jail for a year."

Trump compared the case of Kristian Saucier to the Clinton email case, to illustrate that others have been punished for doing "nothing by comparison to what she's done." But Saucier's case is not exactly comparable, either. The Navy sailor was sentenced to prison after taking photos in classified areas of a nuclear submarine. He then destroyed the evidence after learning that he was under investigation. In fact, Saucier's lawyers even acknowledged that the two cases were different: Saucier admitted knowing that what he was doing was illegal, unlike Clinton.

"As secretary of state, Hillary Clinton allowed thousands of the most dangerous and violent criminal aliens to go free because their home countries were intelligent; they wouldn't take them back."

We have awarded Three Pinocchios to this claim. Under section 243(d) of the **Immigration** and Nationality Act, the secretary of state does have power to discontinue the granting of certain types of visas to countries that refuse to take back their citizens with U.S. deportation orders, including convicted criminals. Such action is taken rarely, and is used against relatively small countries with little economic power.

Trump goes too far suggesting that Clinton decided to allow these illegal **immigrants** to stay here. Under Clinton, the State Department and **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement in 2011 signed a memorandum of understanding to increase pressure on recalcitrant countries. This formalized a series of increasingly tougher steps that could be taken when dealing with countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals. At the end of that process, the secretary's authority under section 243(d) could be invoked.

"Let's do this. Let's not worry about it. Get out and vote by the millions, and we won't have to worry about what's taking place behind the scenes. Remember this, 1.8 million people that are dead are registered to vote. You know, they talk about, oh, that's a threat to democracy what I'm saying, 1.8 million people, 2.75 million people are registered to vote in two states."

This is a reference to findings of a 2012 Pew Center on the States study of ways to make the election system more accurate, cost-effective and efficient. There were more than 1.8 million records for people who are deceased, but whose registrations were still on voter rolls. About 2.75 million people were registered to vote in more than one state, which could happen if voters move to a new state and register to vote without notifying their former state. As we have noted, the study does not say that these problems indicated signs of isolated or widespread voter fraud, as Trump suggests.

"It's just been announced that Michigan residents are going to experience crushing double-digit premium hikes, congratulations — congratulations. In fact a number is so high, I don't want to give it to you 'cause I want you to have a good time today, okay?"

Trump repeatedly points out premium hikes in 2017 under the Affordable Care Act, and has been using a version of this claim tailored to the state in which he is speaking. As we've explained, most Americans get their health insurance through their employer and thus are not impacted — and a majority of people who purchase health care on the state exchange will not be affected by the increases.

For example, individual health plans sold on the state exchange in Michigan will increase 16.7 percent next year. But most people in Michigan who purchase health care on the state exchange qualify for tax credit subsidies and won't be affected, according to the Detroit Free Press. If a person makes too much income to qualify for a subsidy, then they would face a premium increase.

"Hillary is the one who destroyed 33,000 emails after she got the subpoena, after. Before it's no good, but after, no; that's why something should've happened then, but that's okay."

Trump is technically correct on the timeline, but Clinton's staff had requested the emails to be deleted months before the subpoena, according to the FBI's August 2016 report. An employee of the company that managed her server told the FBI he had an "oh s-- " moment and realized he did not delete the emails until after the subpoena.

Moreover, there's no evidence Clinton deleted the emails in anticipation of the subpoena, and FBI director James B. Comey has said his agency's investigation found no evidence that any work-related emails were "intentionally deleted in an effort to conceal them." Here's PolitiFact's helpful timeline of events relating to Clinton's release of her emails.

"Your car production facilities, like the Ford facility, will continue to leave Michigan. Nothing's gonna get done."

Ford is moving its small-car production to Mexico, but the company has said the expansion will not affect U.S. workers. Production of Ford Focus models will shift to Mexico, but the plant in Michigan will build other, larger vehicles, Ford said.

Mexico is increasingly attractive for automakers because of the low cost of labor, which makes it cheaper to make labor-intensive small cars in Mexico. But it tends to be cheaper to build larger and more expensive cars in the United States, where electricity is cheaper and there is more access to equipment and skilled technicians.

"I don't know if you know, Hillary wanted a wall. Did you know that?"

Not exactly. Clinton supported the Secure Fence Act of 2006, which authorized the construction of fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border. The fence is mostly vehicle barriers and single-layer pedestrian fence. Trump has called for a border wall of precast concrete, as tall as 30 to 60 feet.

In a January 2016 interview with Jorge Ramos, Clinton said the fence is different from Trump's wall. "So we do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barrier.… I voted for border security, and some of it was a fence." Trump himself has called the fencing under the Secure Fence Act of 2006 "such a little wall; it was such a nothing wall."

"And they don't take care of monetary manipulation, which is the single biggest weapon that foreign countries use to kill us, especially China. They're grand masters."

As we have pointed out repeatedly, Trump's complaints about currency manipulation by China are out of date. China has not manipulated its currency for at least two years, and the yuan has appreciated over the past decade. Recently, China has been selling dollars and running down its reserves in an effort to strengthen the currency.

"Twenty-two veterans a day commit suicide. Can you believe that number? Twenty-two veterans a day are committing suicide."

Once upon a time, not too long ago, we awarded Trump the rare Geppetto Checkmark for using the most up-to-date figure of 20 veteran suicides a day. Alas, he has reverted since then to using the 22 figure — a rough and outdated estimate based on partial data.

In 2014, an average of 20 veterans died from suicide a day. This is based on the findings of the most comprehensive, data-driven study of veteran suicides to date, published August 2016. For the first time, federal agencies pieced together 55 million veteran records over 35 years using military, health and mortality data. The study confirmed that veterans generally have higher suicides rates than civilian populations, though the degree of difference varies for specific populations.

"We're the highest taxed nation in the world."

Trump revived an oldie but goodie that he repeated throughout the primaries, but it's still inaccurate.

Pew Research Center, using 2014 data, found that the tax bill for Americans, under various scenarios, is below average for developed countries. In 2014, according to comparative tables of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), revenue as a percentage of the gross domestic product — the broadest measure of the economy — was 26 percent for the United States. Out of 34 countries, that put the United States in the bottom third — and well below the OECD average of 34.4 percent.

"You look at unemployment rate of African American youth, you look at it, it's 58 percent."

Trump repeats a Four Pinocchio claim. The Bureau of Labor Statistics unemployment rate for black youth as of July 2016 is 20.6 percent — about one-third of the rate Trump uses.

The BLS unemployment rate refers to people who are actively looking for jobs but can't find one. Trump's rate includes anyone who doesn't have a job, whether they are looking for one or not. That's particularly problematic with this age range of 16 to 24 years old, because Trump is counting students as "unemployed," even though they are in school full-time.

"Now ISIS is in 32 countries all around the world, and what a shame it is."

Trump's statement lacks context, and has earned Two Pinocchios. He could point to 32 countries — and probably more — where the Islamic State has conducted attacks, occupies territory or has terrorist cells that have pledged some sort of allegiance. But that is half the size of a comparable list for al-Qaeda after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.

Moreover, Trump implies that Islamic State has operational control in 32 countries. The Congressional Research Service, in a June 2016 report, listed only six affiliates beyond Iraq and Syria — in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Nigeria, Afghanistan and Yemen.

"We have illegal **immigrants** coming into the country that are taken better care of than our vets."

We have awarded Four Pinocchios to this absurd comparison.  Broadly speaking, people who are in the United States illegally aren't granted the same rights as people here legally — both civilians and veterans. Unauthorized people, who are not granted any deferred-action status that deems them lawfully present in the country, are not eligible to receive Social Security benefits or any other federal means-tested benefits, even though many of them pay into Social Security.

Hillary Clinton

"I am running against a man who says he doesn't understand why we can't use nuclear weapons. He actually said, then why are we making them? And he wants more countries to have nuclear weapons, Japan, South Korea, even Saudi Arabia.… When he was asked who he consults on foreign policy, Donald Trump said he didn't need to consult because, and I quote, 'I have a very good brain.' … He says he knows more about ISIS than our generals do."

These lines are all derived from actual statements by Trump, though in many cases he may have said it only once.

\* In a March 30 interview, after Chris Mathews told Trump nobody wants to hear an American president about possibly using nuclear weapons, Trump responded: "Then why are we making them? Why do we make them?"

\* In a March 29 interview on CNN, Anderson Cooper asked Trump: "So if you said, Japan, yes, it's fine, you get nuclear weapons, South Korea, you as well, and Saudi Arabia says we want them, too?" Trump responded: "Can I be honest with you? It's going to happen, anyway. It's going to happen anyway. It's only a question of time. … Wouldn't you rather in a certain sense have Japan have nuclear weapons when North Korea has nuclear weapons?"

\* Asked on March 16 by MSNBC's Mika Brzezinski about his foreign policy consultants, Trump replied: "I am speaking with myself, number one, because I have a very good brain." He then went onto cite a previously debunked claim that he had predicted Osama bin Laden would attack the United States.

\* Trump, at a Nov. 12, 2015, rally in Fort Dodge, Iowa, said: "I know more about ISIS than the generals do, believe me."

"After the world watched with horror as the twin towers fell, he called in to a New York TV station, and even on that horrible day when thousands of people lost their lives, he couldn't stop himself from pointing out that now, because the towers had fallen, a building he owned was the tallest in Lower Manhattan."

This is correct. On Sept. 11, 2001, Trump called WWOR-TV in New York and made this observation during the 10-minute interview: "Forty Wall St. actually was the second-tallest building in downtown Manhattan, and it was, actually, before the World Trade Center, was the tallest. And then when they built the World Trade Center, it became known as the second-tallest, and now it's the tallest."

"He is praising tyrants and dictators, like Saddam Hussein and Kim Jong Un in North Korea and Bashar al-Assad for their supposed strong leadership. He even praised the Chinese government for massacring protesters in Tiananmen Square."

There are strong elements of truth in this line, but some of it is exaggerated.

\* We've previously given Clinton Two Pinocchios for claiming that Trump had praised Kim Jong Un. The use of the word "praise" certainly reflects some news headlines, but Trump's actual remarks were a bit more nuanced (though confusing). Trump made it clear he thought Kim was a threat, in part because of how he ruthlessly seized power.

\* As for Hussein, Trump at a July 5 campaign rally called him a "bad guy" but added: "But you know what he did well? He killed terrorists. He did that so good. They didn't read them the rights. They didn't talk. They were terrorists. It was over." This statement was actually wrong — Hussein supported terrorists — and earned Trump Four Pinocchios.

\* In the third presidential debate, Trump asserted that Syrian President Assad is "just much tougher and much smarter than her [Clinton] and Obama. And everyone thought he was gone two years ago, three years ago. He aligned with Russia, he now also aligned with Iran, who we made very powerful."

\* The comment regarding Tiananmen Square is more than a quarter-century old. Trump made these observations in a 1990 interview with Playboy: "When the students poured into Tiananmen Square, the Chinese government almost blew it. Then they were vicious, they were horrible, but they put it down with strength. That shows you the power of strength. Our country is right now perceived as weak … as being spit on by the rest of the world."

"It's no surprise that not a single former president, secretary of state or national security adviser from either party has endorsed him."

This is true. Most former Republican presidents, secretaries of state and national security advisers have remained silent, in stark contrast to the strong endorsements of Mitt Romney in 2012. Clinton has been endorsed by Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser under George H.W. Bush, and Colin Powell, secretary of state under George W. Bush (who also endorsed Obama). Condoleezza Rice, who was national security adviser and then secretary of state for George W. Bush, called on Trump to drop out of the race.

"We're going to finally guarantee equal pay for women's work."

There is no way to guarantee this. Clinton is referring to a proposed law called the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would make it easier to sue an employer. As we have often noted, the pay gap shrinks when factors within a women's control, such as choice of occupation and work hours, are taken into consideration. But there remains a smaller, unexplained gap that may be the result of discrimination.

"He doesn't think we should raise the national minimum wage."

Trump has said this, but he's also said the opposite. We counted at least five flip-flops by Trump on this issue. More recently, he has been open to raising the federal minimum wage.

"He's hired hundreds of small business and contractors to do work for him and his hotels and his casinos, cabinet-makers, piano-sellers, drapery-printers, so many more. They did the work and then Donald refused to pay what he owed."

Trump's practice of not paying bills to contractors has been well documented. See, for instance, this investigation by USA Today.

"He told the students at Trump University that they would get an Ivy League education. They paid $10,000, $20,000, even $70,000 for courses that turned out to be worthless. Now they're suing him for fraud, but he — he walked away with $5 million."

The Clinton campaign can document all of these assertions.

\* The reference to "Ivy League quality curriculums" appeared in Trump University press materials and on its website.

\* Court documents in one of the lawsuits against Trump over the university identify at least eight students who paid at least $70,000.

\* New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, who described Trump University as a fraud, has said "initial estimates are that [Trump] personally pocketed 5 million" from the university. Trump has denied any wrongdoing.

"When I was in the Senate, I was there mostly when the Republicans were in charge. There are 400 pieces of legislation with my name on it, as a sponsor or a co-sponsor."

Clinton appears to have modified this claim after our colleagues at PolitiFact found her use of the term "bills" was half true. That's because the list includes nonbinding resolutions and amendments. Of bills that Clinton sponsored, only three (all noncontroversial) became law. Clinton is listed as a co-sponsor on 74 bills that became law. Of those, 27 bills were sponsored by a Republican.

"Just last year he said again it wouldn't have mattered if we'd rescued the auto industry or let it go bankrupt. What is he talking about? I'm proud that President Obama saved the auto industry."

Clinton has recast a talking point that previously earned her Four Pinocchios. She used to say Trump opposed the government-led rescue of the auto industry in 2008-2009, but that was false. Now she has focused on a meandering comment about the auto bailout on Aug. 11, 2015, in which he tried to have it all ways.

"You could have let it go, and rebuild itself, through the free enterprise system," Trump said. "You could have let it go bankrupt, frankly, and rebuild itself, and a lot of people think that's the way it should have happened. Or you could have done it the way it went. I could have done it either way. Either way would have been acceptable. I think you would have wound up in the same place."

As can be seen from the full statement, Trump said the outcome would have been the same no matter what path was chosen. (Experts would disagree.) He did not say, as Clinton suggested, that it would not have mattered if the auto industry disappeared.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If, as appears increasingly likely, Hillary Clinton wins tomorrow, the Republicans most responsible for the calamity will stand ready to spout a load of excuses they've been accumulating since the Republican National Convention, when it became reasonably apparent Donald Trump was going to run his general-election campaign just the way he did his primary race. Let's save them the trouble:

It's the media's fault. How long are inept and out-of-touch Republicans going to blame the media? They've got Fox News, Breitbart, talk radio, etc. -- advantages some Republicans never had before. They had multiple debates to get their message out. Oh, yes, and the media handed Trump a couple of billion dollars' worth of ad time in the primaries, making his nomination possible. If they cannot win with all that, they never will.

It's the FBI's fault. We thought James B. Comey was a hero. Oh, I know, that's so pre-Nov. 6 (the day of his last letter)! Seriously, if Republicans need a criminal prosecution to beat a flawed opponent running for a third Democratic presidential term, they have real problems. Saying that Clinton never should have been allowed to run assumes that she was a really good candidate, not a weak one.

It's the #NeverTrumpers' fault. C'mon, guys. The people who warned that Trump was a disaster are not to be blamed. The people who ignored the #NeverTrumpers are. To our chagrin, the large majority of Republicans will vote for Trump. It's everyone else -- that means Democrats and independents, in addition to a small but determined batch of Republicans -- who would be responsible for his defeat, if Clinton wins. The argument blaming #NeverTrumpers ignores why they voted against Trump and presupposes that the highest obligation Republicans have is not to country, but to party. Many Republicans emphatically reject the argument.

It's a one-off problem unique to the Trump candidacy. Nonsense. The GOP has not won the presidency since 2004 because it insists on relying on a diminishing segment of the electorate and infuriating everyone else. The chickens are coming home to roost as millions of women, African Americans, Hispanics and millennials turn against the GOP in ever greater numbers.

It's the way the system works; there was nothing to be done. That's the excuse we may hear from Republican National Committee officials who were so worried about losing Trump that they sold their party's principles away to keep him in the fold. At several instances, the RNC could have made a difference if it had repudiated him, demanded that he release tax information or allowed delegates to vote their conscience. Moreover, this doesn't explain why GOP primary voters failed to reject an ignoramus, a racist, a xenophobe and a dangerous narcissist. By the time the primaries rolled around -- and certainly the general election -- they knew exactly what they were getting. They voted for him anyway.

It's the fault of white voters who didn't turn out. This sort of magical thinking is what got the GOP into trouble in the first place. There is no electoral majority of right-wing, older white males who resent women in the workplace and **immigrants** in their country. Americans are a diverse, tolerant nation of **immigrants**who, generally speaking, do not hate government; the GOP's resistance to that reality has led to its current, sorry state.

It was closer than the [Goldwater/McCain/Romney] race. If Trump goes down to defeat, the margin may be big or small. Nevertheless, he will have lost to Hillary Clinton, for goodness' sake, who is the most flawed, disliked and untrustworthy major-party candidate in history with one exception. It's not enough to say that Trump (perhaps) made it close. Any other Republican should have cleaned up against a candidate with this many faults.

No, my dear Republicans, if Trump loses tomorrow, they have themselves to blame -- for adopting a white-grievance mentality, for burrowing in a right-wing media cave, for pretending that the country is supposed to be what it was in 1950 when white Christian America was supreme, for listening to anti-**immigrant**advocates spout untruths to justify xenophobia, for getting cowed by the irrational mob, for becoming anti-government ideologues, for forgetting the essence of modern conservatism (humility, caution, respect for fellow Americans, dedication to equality of opportunity), for losing interest in good governance, for following religious charlatans who laughably claim the moral high ground, for giving way to all-or-nothing purists who make money from obstructionist tactics and for refusing to denounce hucksters and con men who plowed the way for Trump. If the party doesn't attend to those very real, serious problems, it will keep on losing presidential races -- and maybe fade away altogether.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Latino voters are making themselves heard in city halls and statehouses from Idaho to Florida, reshaping the nation's political landscape and delivering a surge of support for Hillary Clinton in the homestretch of the presidential campaign.

In the nation's capital, by contrast, their voice is barely audible.

As residents head to the polls this week, they will once again beelectinga D.C. Council without a single Latino representative — despite a growing Hispanic population that now stands at about 10 percent.

The city has elected a handful of Latino advisory neighborhood commissioners and school board members, as well as Franklin Garcia, who serves as the District's unofficial "shadow representative" in Congress. But a Latino mayor or council member has never held office.

"We're still powerless in terms of political representation," said Pedro Aviles, a longtime political activist and founding member of the Latino Civil Rights Task Force, which was formed after the 1991 riots in the city's heavily Hispanic Mount Pleasant neighborhood.

"We've had deputy mayors, and we've had appointments to powerful positions in the District of Columbia. But we've never gotten anyone elected," Aviles said. "There is participation at the political level, but it's not enough."

The reasons for that absence are rooted both in demographic realities that have hampered Latinos' influence at the ballot box throughout the country and in the idiosyncrasies of D.C. politics.

Mirroring a national trend for a minority group substantially made up of recent **immigrants**, fewer Latinos are eligible to vote in the District than in the city's population as a whole. Less than half of District Latinos are eligible to cast a ballot, compared with 76 percent of blacks and 85 percent of whites, according to the Pew Research Center.

Rapid development and rising rents have dispersed the District's Hispanic population from its historic concentration in Columbia Heights, Mount Pleasant and Adams Morgan, leaving Latinos without a political power base in a single council ward.

The District's small number of elected offices and insular political culture have also made it tougher for Latino politicians to ascend here than in neighboring Virginia or Maryland, said Joshua Lopez, a 32-year-old Petworth resident who ran and lost in 2011 for an at-large council seat.

The winner in that race was veteran District politician Vincent B. Orange, who lost his primary race in Juneandthenresigned under pressure from the councilin August because of his effort to take on a dual role as head of the D.C. Chamber of Commerce.

"There's only so many seats you can go for because we're not a state," Lopez said.

Given the city's limited and diffuse Latino population, he added, identity politics alone isn't a sufficient foundation for a successful campaign. Whether in a ward or citywide, Lopez said, a Latino candidate would have to build an electoral coalition that includes other ethnic and interest groups.

"If you're going to go at it as a Latino only, it would be very, very difficult to win on that platform," he said.

Angela Franco, president of the Greater Washington Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, said the problem of Hispanic political representation in the District was "a two-way street." She said a talented candidate was needed — as well as the right political and demographic alignment — to elect the city's first Latino council member or mayor.

"Honestly, from my point of view, there's nobody who's ready to take on that role," Franco said.

Jackie Reyes, director of Mayor Muriel E. Bowser's Office on Latino Affairs, said Bowser (D) is using the machinery of government to help Latinos even in the absence of Latino elected representatives.

Just last week, Reyes noted, the mayor's office announced close to $1.3 million in grants for community organizations that work with Hispanics.

"We might not have the representation of public officials, but we have the structure to give services," Reyes said.

The lack of Latino officeholders in the District contrasts with elected bodies elsewhere in the country. Nationwide, the number of elected Latino officials grew by 25 percent between 2004 and 2014, according to NALEO Educational Fund, a nonprofit group that advocates greater participation by Latinos in politics.

Last year, Seattle — a city whose size and Hispanic population are similar to the District's — elected the first two Latino members in history to its nine-seat council. Just north of the District, Nancy Navarro is serving as the first Latina on the Montgomery County Council.

The District's predominantly Salvadoran Hispanic population is young compared with those of cities such as New York, Los Angeles and Miami, with many tracing their roots to a wave of Central American **immigrants** to the city in the 1970s and 1980s.

Peter Tatian, a senior fellow at the Urban Institute who studies the District's demographic trends, said Latino involvement in local politics could increase as an established second generation comes of age and guides its children through the city's school system.

"We have a lot more Latinos who have been in the District a while now," Tatian said. "Not only **immigrants** who are coming in, but people who are living here, having families here. And that's changing the community."

On a recent morning in Mount Pleasant — a neighborhood where pupuserias jostle with upscale coffee shops, and different types of newcomers, young and white, tote skateboards and yoga mats past clusters of men and women speaking Spanish — Jasmina Garcia said a Latino elected representative in the District's government was overdue.

A 58-year-old housekeeper who speaks limited English and lives in Friendship Heights, Garcia said she thought an elected Latino in city hall would better understand and address problems widely experienced among those she knows, issues such as wage theft and the challenges of the **immigration** process.

"I don't know who the representation is for Latinos in this city," she said.

Walking her dog nearby, Gloria Sanchez, 51, said she thought many of her neighbors were still focused on the immediate concerns of first-generation **immigrants**.

"I think that the Latin families, their thing is just work, work, work. They don't take the time to figure out what they can do [politically]," said Sanchez, who moved to the District with her family from El Salvador when she was 5. "They're always busy and tired."

Asked whether that might change in the years ahead, she paused.

"Maybe with this new generation," she said. "Maybe."

This story has been updated from an earlier version, which incorrectly stated that no Latino had held citywide office.

peter.jamison@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Like some other Volokh Conspiracy bloggers, I am going to be voting for the Democratic candidate for president for the first time in my life (for some it may be "only" the first time in decades). In my case, it's not because I'm With Her, but because I am Against Him. Despite her flaws, Hillary Clinton offers the only realistic chance of forestalling a vastly worse outcome. I don't think every marginal voter should necessarily support Clinton, particularly if you live in a state likely to be overwhelmingly Red or Blue. But I do believe that voting for the least bad of the major party candidates is the best course of action for those who live in swing states, including my own home state of Virginia.

The main reasons for that conclusion are that Trump has a much worse policy agenda than Hillary Clinton, his victory threatens to turn the GOP into a big-government xenophobic nationalist party, his authoritarian personality and gratuitous cruelty make him manifestly unfit for the presidency, and that Hillary Clinton is likely to be constrained by divided government, whereas Trump (if he wins) might well be empowered by GOP control of Congress.

In this post, I am not going to try to recapitulate these points in detail. Instead, I offer interested readers a collection of links to what I think are the more significant posts on Trump and the election, written by my co-bloggers and myself. I don't agree with every single point made by my co-bloggers and they likely differ with some of mine. But I think you will see lots of commonality nonetheless. Collectively, the posts amount to a Volokh Conspiracy case against Trump.

Here goes (links organized by author):

Jonathan Adler

Trump won't make federalism great again.

Trump's attack on Hispanic judge Gonzalo Curiel.

Trump only hires the best people -- except when it comes to his health care advisers.

The New York Times compelling response to Trump's lawsuit threat.

David Bernstein

Why David is #NeverTrump.

How Trump strengthens the case for limiting executive power.

Why Trump is the "simian alpha male" anticonstitutional candidate.

How Utah could potentially save the nation from Trump.

Orin Kerr

Why Orin is With Her, despite not voting for any other Democratic nominee in decades.

Imagining a Trump Justice Department.

Orin's answer to the common argument that Trump is a lesser evil because he hasn't done anything bad in government, while Clinton has.

Donald Trump scares me too.

Orin on the Clinton e-mail investigation (this post was written before FBI Director James Comey's recent announcement indicating that the newly discovered e-mails do not justify a criminal prosecution of Clinton).

Trump and the politics of deligitimatization.

David Post

Why David is voting for Hillary Clinton.

Trump and the rule of law. and Trump and the rule of law, Part 2.

An open letter to Volokh Conspiracy readers who are Trump supporters -- and David's response to the responders.

Ilya Somin

Why Hillary Clinton is a lesser evil than Donald Trump -- and why the gap between her and Trump has actually grown, e-mail revelations notwithstanding.

The pitfalls of voting for "change"

The logic of voting for a lesser evil. This post includes responses to several common objections to voting for a lesser evil.

Trump and the Constitution

Why constitutional originalists should be #NeverTrump all the way -- and why they should not be swayed by his expanded Supreme Court list.

Trump's awful record on property rights -- and his lightweight defense of it.

How Trump strengthens the forces of political correctness.

Why Trump is wrong about **immigration** and sovereignty

Why conservatives should rethink their restrictionist positions on **immigration**. This post addresses a variety of standard conservative restrictionist arguments, including several that are far more intellectually serious than the claptrap peddled by Trump.

Why **immigrants** would not be the only victims of Trumpian **immigration** restrictions and deportations. Large numbers of native-born Americans would suffer too.

Trump's great wall of eminent domain, and how it poses a threat to property rights.

UPDATE: I have updated this post to include several links to posts by Jonathan Adler, which I had previously overlooked.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The list of Republicans supporting Hillary Clinton is still growing. For months, we have been keeping track of all of the GOP politicians, administration officials, business leaders and donors who have crossed over to back Clinton over Donald Trump.

The most recent high-profile announced was from former secretary of state Colin Powell. "General Powell said at a meeting of the Long Island Association that he would be voting for Hillary Clinton," spokeswoman Peggy Cifrino said in late October. Powell added in a brief interview with The Post's Karen DeYoung that he picked Clinton "because I think she's qualified, and the other gentleman is not qualified."

Powell's support isn't much of a surprise, given his support for President Obama in 2008 and 2012 and clear distaste for Donald Trump. In his leaked emails from last month, Powell also appeared to be talking over the best time to announce his support for Clinton.

But at least it's official now. And Powell is now the third Bush Cabinet official to support Clinton.

Below is that list as it stands:

\* George H.W. Bush (?) -- Kathleen Kennedy Townsend said in a Facebook post that Bush told her this in-person. The president's office isn't confirming it, but she stands by it. "That's what he said," she told Politico

\* Rep. Richard Hanna (N.Y.), a moderate Republican who is retiring this year, told Syracuse.com that he will support Clinton and that Trump is unfit to lead. He cited Trump's criticism of Khizr Khan. "I think Trump is a national embarrassment," Hanna said. "Is he really the guy you want to have the nuclear codes?"

\* John Warner, former senator from Virginia -- "Loose lips sink ships. Got that, Trump? Loose lips sink ships." Warner added: "You can't pull up a quick text like 'National Security for Dummies.'"

\* Christine Todd Whitman, former New Jersey governor and George W. Bush administration official: "Why Clinton is the only choice for president"

\* Chris Shays, former congressman from Connecticut — "I have friends who are up for office and they say, you know, if you don't support Donald Trump, you're hurting us because then we have to answer the question. And now I'm going one step further. So I am hurting them. But, you know, there's a time when you put your country first."

\* Sherwood Boehlert, former congressman from New York

\* Connie Morella, former congresswoman from Maryland

\* David Durenberger, former senator from Minnesota

\* Claudine Schneider, former congresswoman from Rhode Island

\* William Milliken, who served as governor of Michigan from 1969 to 1983 — "Because I feel so strongly about our nation's future, I will be joining the growing list of former and present government officials in casting my vote for Hillary Clinton for president in 2016."

\* Larry Pressler, former three-term Republican senator from South Dakota who lost an independent campaign for his old seat in 2014 — "I can't believe I'm endorsing Hillary Clinton for president, but I am. If someone had told me 10 years ago I would do this, I wouldn't have believed them."

\* Grant Woods, former attorney general of Arizona -- "Hillary Clinton is one of the most qualified nominees to ever run for president. Donald Trump is the least qualified ever."

\* Howard Denis, former Maryland state senator

\* Jack McGregor, former Pennsylvania state senator

\* Colin Powell, secretary of state

\* Henry Paulson, treasury secretary

\* Michael Chertoff, Homeland Security secretary

\* Carlos Gutierrez, commerce secretary

\* Rosario Marin, U.S. treasurer -- "I will stand up for my community against the menace of a tyrannical presidency that does not value the countless contributions of **immigrants**."

\* John Negroponte, director of national intelligence and deputy secretary of state under Bush, five-time ambassador and Reagan deputy national security adviser

\* Richard Armitage, deputy secretary of state and adviser to Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush — Trump "doesn't appear to be a Republican, he doesn't appear to want to learn about issues. So I'm going to vote for Mrs. Clinton."

\* Brent Scowcroft, chairman of the President's Intelligence Advisory Board and adviser to three previous Republican presidents — "The presidency requires the judgment and knowledge to make tough calls under pressure. ... [Clinton] has the wisdom and experience to lead our country at this critical time."

\* James Clad, deputy assistant secretary of defense -- "There is no choice: In razor sharp contrast to her opponent, Secretary Clinton is ready, steady and prepared. With a proven preference for bipartisanship, she must win this election."

\* Richard Painter, chief White House ethics lawyer -- "I'm a Republican, but I believe that Hillary Clinton is the only qualified major party candidate in the race and she should become president.

\* James Glassman, under secretary of state for public diplomacy and public affairs -- "

\* William Reilly, Environmental Protection Agency adminstrator

\* Alan Steinberg, regional EPA administrator

\* Robert Blackwill, former deputy national security adviser and ambassador to India

\* Scott Evertz, former director of the Office of National AIDS Policy

\* Lezlee Westine, former White House director of public liaison and deputy assistant to the president — "Our nation faces a unique set of challenges that require steady and experienced leadership. That is why today I am personally supporting Hillary Clinton."

\* Shirin Tahir-Kheli, special assistant to the president and ambassador and senior adviser for women's empowerment under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice

\* Ashley J. Tellis, special assistant to the president and senior director for strategic planning and Southwest Asia

\* David A. Gross, State Department coordinator for international communications and information policy

\* James Kunder, assistant administrator for Asia and the Near East at USAID

\* Matthew Waxman, senior official in the State Department and Defense Department

\* Kori Schake, National Security Council and State Department aide

\* William Sanchez, special counsel for the Justice Department

\* Timothy P. Stratford, assistant U.S. trade representative for China

\* Daniel Twining, former State Department staff and foreign policy adviser to John McCain

\* Deborah Loewer, retired Navy rear admiral and director of White House situation room

\* Mark Lagon, former U.S. ambassador-at-large to combat trafficking in persons

\* David Ross Meyers, assistant staff secretary

\* William A. Pierce, former deputy assistant secretary for public affairs at the Department of Health and Human Services

\* Donald Gregg, national security adviser

\* Louis Sullivan, health and human services secretary under George H.W. Bush -- "I am a Republican, but I am voting for Hillary. I'm not that fired up about Hillary, but I detest Donald Trump so much."

\* Frank Lavin, former Reagan political director and ambassador to Singapore — "It might not be entirely clear that Hillary Clinton deserves to win the presidency, but it is thunderingly clear that Donald Trump deserves to lose. From this premise, I will do something that I have not done in 40 years of voting: I will vote for the Democratic nominee for president."

\* Doug Elmets, former Reagan spokesman — "I could live with four years of Hillary Clinton before I could ever live with one day of Donald Trump as president." Elmets spoke at the Democratic National Convention, along with other Republicans now backing Clinton.

\* Jim Cicconi, former Reagan and George H.W. Bush aide — "Hillary Clinton is experienced, qualified and will make a fine president. The alternative, I fear, would set our nation on a very dark path."

\* Fred T. Goldberg Jr., former assistant U.S. treasury secretary and IRS commissioner under George H.W. Bush

\* Charles Fried, former U.S. solicitor general under Reagan and current Harvard Law professor — "Though long a registered Republican, this will be the third consecutive presidential election in which my party forces the choice between party and, in John McCain's words, putting America first. ... It is to [Mitt] Romney's credit that this year, like John Paulson and George Will, he is standing up against the brutal, substantively incoherent, and authoritarian tendencies of Donald Trump."

\* Pete Teeley, press secretary to then-Vice President George H.W. Bush, former U.S. ambassador to Canada and U.S. representative to UNICEF

\* Richard Howill, former deputy assistant secretary of state and ambassador to Ecuador under Reagan

\* William Ruckelshaus, former Environmental Protection Agency head, deputy attorney general and acting FBI director

\* Carla Hills, U.S. trade representative under George H.W. Bush, Housing and Urban Development secretary under Gerald Ford

\* Nicholas Rostow, special assistant to Reagan and George H.W. Bush on national security

\* Phil Brady, Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations

\* Michael Browne, deputy undersecretary of transportation under Gerald Ford

\* Robert Kagan, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, former Reagan State Department aide and adviser to the presidential campaigns of John McCain and Mitt Romney

\* Max Boot, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and adviser to GOP presidential candidates — "I'm literally losing sleep over Donald Trump. She would be vastly preferable to Trump."

\* Peter Mansoor, retired Army colonel and former aide to former CIA director David Petraeus — "It will be the first Democratic presidential candidate I've voted for in my adult life."

\* Meg Whitman, former Hewlett-Packard chief executive and California gubernatorial nominee — "Donald Trump's demagoguery has undermined the fabric of our national character. America needs the kind of stable and aspirational leadership Secretary Clinton can provide."

\* Marc Andreessen, venture capitalist — "[Silicon] Valley wouldn't be here, we wouldn't be doing any of this if we didn't have the amazing flow of **immigrants**that we've had in the last 80 years. And the idea of choking that off just makes me sick to my stomach."

\* Harry Sloan, head of Global Eagle Acquisition — "He is unprepared and temperamentally unfit to be our president. Most of my Republican friends feel the same way. As a businessman, a father and a conservative, it is clear to me that Hillary Clinton is the right choice in this election."

\* Dan Akerson, former chairman and chief executive of General Motors — "Serving as the leader of the free world requires effective leadership, sound judgment, a steady hand and, most importantly, the temperament to deal with crises large and small. Donald Trump lacks each of these characteristics."

\* Chuck Robbins, chief executive of Cisco

\* Hamid Moghadam, chairman and chief executive of Prologis — "Our country is about tolerance and inclusion and that's why, as a lifelong Republican supporter, I endorse Hillary Clinton for president in this election."

\* William Oberndorf, donor of $3 million to GOP candidates since 2012 — "If it is Trump vs. Clinton, and there is no viable third-party candidate, I will be voting for Hillary Clinton."

\* Mike Fernandez, $4 million to GOP candidates in recent years — "If I have a choice — and you can put it in bold — if I have a choice between Trump and Hillary Clinton, I'm choosing Hillary. She's the lesser of two evils."

\* David Nierenberg, finance chairman to Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign

\* Mark Salter, former top adviser to John McCain — "Whatever Hillary Clinton's faults, she's not ignorant or hateful or a nut. She acts like an adult and understands the responsibilities of an American president. That might not be a ringing endorsement. But in 2016, the year of Trump's s campaign, it's more than enough."

\* Sally Bradshaw, former top Jeb Bush adviser, told CNN that she had left the Republican Party to become an independent because of Trump's presence at the top of the ticket — and that if the race were close in her home state of Florida this fall, she would be voting for Clinton. "As much as I don't want another four years of [President Barack] Obama's policies, I can't look my children in the eye and tell them I voted for Donald Trump."

\* Ana Navarro, Florida GOP consultant and frequent CNN guest

\* Maria Comella, former spokeswoman for two of Trump's top backers, Chris Christie and Rudy Giuliani — "Instead of speaking out against instances of bigotry, racism and inflammatory rhetoric whether it's been against women, **immigrants** or Muslims, we made a calculus that it was better to say nothing at all in the interest of politics and winning elections."

\* Kurt Bardella, former top aide to Rep. Darrel Issa (R-Calif.) and ex-spokesman for Breitbart News -- "A big reason why I decided that Hillary Clinton is the candidate who I'm voting for -- the first Democrat I'm voting for in my life -- is because this is a time where what's going on is much bigger than partisanship, bigger than Republican or Democrat, or single issues that traditionally these campaigns are about."

\* Mike Treiser, former Mitt Romney aide — "In the face of bigotry, hatred, violence, and small-mindedness, this time, I'm with her."

\* Craig Snyder, former chief of staff to then-Republican Sen. Arlen Specter (Pa.) and an ex-colleague of former top Trump adviser Roger Stone and current top Trump adviser Paul Manafort.

\* Lionel Sosa, a GOP ad-maker who worked for George W. Bush and Ronald Reagan

\* Cindy Guerra, former Broward County (Fla.) Republican Party chair

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Post/ABC poll has Hillary Clinton leading in a 4-way race 48 to 43 percent. Moreover:

By 58 percent to 32 percent, more voters prefer Clinton's personality and temperament, and by 55 percent to 36 percent, more say she has better qualifications for the job than Trump does. [Clinton] also holds an eight-point advantage on the question of which candidate has a better understanding of the 'problems of people like you,' and a seven-point lead when voters are asked which candidate has stronger moral character.

In 2012 Mitt Romney won white, college-educated women by 6 points; Clinton leads them by 16 points.

Likewise, the Wall Street Journal/NBC polls shows Clinton leading by 4 points in a 4-person race. Once again we see: "Among white women with a college degree, Mr. Trump is losing by an even larger margin, 18 percentage points. And by 8 points, Mr. Trump trails among suburban women, an important swing group that makes up nearly a third of the electorate."

None of this comes as a surprise to the #NeverTrump voices in the GOP who back in the spring warned that a candidate so obviously misogynistic and racist, running on an incoherent agenda of made-up facts and xenophobia, would be about the only candidate who couldn't beat Hillary Clinton.

Trump's bombastic style of politics based on demonization of "the other" and white, male grievances makes him anathema to minority voters and college-educated voters, who acutely feel a lack of respect.

First Lady Michelle Obama caught the essence of offensiveness:

It reminds us of stories we heard from our mothers and grandmothers about how, back in their day, the boss could say and do whatever he pleased to the women in the office, and even though they worked so hard, jumped over every hurdle to prove themselves, it was never enough.

Hearing him disdain, insult and objectify people in poverty and war zones, call Mexican **immigrants** "rapists" and say a judge cannot do his job because he is "Mexican" (Trump denies a judge born in Indiana the status of "American") millions of non-whites feel like he's turned the clock back to the pre-Civil Rights era. Everything about Trump -- from his views on women to his notion that "globalism" (i.e., modernity) is the enemy -- is reactionary.

Reactionaries, as political theorists explain, suffer from false memory and the need to shut out current reality:

"[The reactionary's] story begins with a happy, well-ordered state where people who know their place live in harmony and submit to tradition and their God. Then **alien** ideas promoted by intellectuals—writers, journalists, professors—challenge this harmony and the will to maintain order weakens at the top. (The betrayal of elites is the linchpin of every reactionary story.) A false consciousness soon descends on the society as a whole as it willingly, even joyfully, heads for destruction. Only those who have preserved memories of the old ways see what is happening. Whether the society reverses direction or rushes to its doom depends entirely on their resistance.

For Trump "a happy, well-ordered state" means women are docile, minorities do not compete for white males' jobs and the United States stands apart from the world. This infatuation of the past is characteristic of  the alt-right (who'd like to reverse 60 years, at least, of racial progress). It likewise reflects the vibe of white Christian evangelicals who resent no longer dominating the culture (hence the obsession with getting everyone to say "Merry Christmas") and who have adjusted poorly to the rapid influx of non-whites. He perfectly encapsulates the sentiments of the anti-**immigrant** exclusionists who fear newcomers will deform America (i.e., move it away from its white, religious, Christian origins). The people who adore Trump are those who have lost status for the past few decades; his most ardent foes (professional women, minorities) those who have gained the most. Ironically, Trump keeps asking: What do you have to lose? The last 50 years, answer women and minorities.

This is where the GOP is heading -- backward. You see it in the party's refusal to accept gay marriage, in its idolization of the smokestack industry of the 1950's and in its condescension toward women. If they seem uninterested in finding concrete solutions to real problems it is because they do not wish to accept where we are; they engage in magical thinking to imagine going back. "Make America Great Again" is a reactionary plea for the present to become like the past.

If the center-right is to maintain a viable political movement it will have to banish the reactionaries, flee from their party or stage an intervention. If there is to be a conservative renaissance it will need to come from the groups whom Trump has most alienated and who have the most to lose from his vision -- millennials, women, minorities, the college-educated.

Many Republicans figured this demographic and philosophical reckoning would come in a decade or so. Thanks to Trump, that process has been accelerated. With an electorate that much more closely resembles contemporary America than Trump's America, this political collision is occurring before our eyes, in real time.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Employers big and small are taking measures to get their workers to the polls to vote on Election Day.

General Motors, Patagonia and Western Union have told workers to take the day off so they can vote. Patagonia is taking it a step further and closing its stores.

They are among 330 companies to sign on to a Twitter campaign that maintains a running list of companies giving employees time off to vote, a gesture inspired by California venture capitalist Hunter Walk. The campaign began earlier this summer when Walk asked start-up founders to give their employees time off on Election Day, asking them to tweet or email him to sign on.

The list includes 11 Virginia companies and five in D.C., most of them technology companies.

Arlington cybersecurity company Distil Networks is one of them. Its 33-year-old founder and CEO, Rami Essaid, moved to America from Syria at a young age. He founded his company in 2011 with early help from government technology funding and grew it to a few hundred employees.

Today Essaid's birth country is embroiled in a devastating civil war, and the resultant refu­gee crisis has been front and center in some of the 2016 U.S. presidential election's most chaotic moments.

He had a strong message for employees thinking of avoiding the polls, sent in a company-wide email:

"Once every couple of years we get a chance in the U.S. that many people around the world don't ever get the opportunity to experience; and that is to choose who will represent us nationally and globally.

"As an **immigrant**, I look back to Syria where hundreds of thousands of people are fighting and dying for this very right. As a Syrian-American, I can't take the opportunity to vote for granted and I ask that you don't either. On election day, DO NOT come to work UNTIL you vote."

Essaid finds himself in the final weeks of an election where one candidate, Donald Trump, has recommended "extreme vetting" of **immigrants** and threatened to ban Muslims from entering the country, and Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson seemed not to know what Aleppo was in a television interview.

With his company nestled in Northern Virginia, Essaid's employees are in a pivotal position in this year's election, where Hillary Clinton holds a modest lead in the polls heading into Election Day.

"I think we're getting to the point where people are just over this election, but we're also at the point where apathy could give us some pretty disastrous results," he said, declining to express support for either candidate.

He said he doesn't mind if people take the day off to vote, and his company is sponsoring a happy hour for those sporting an "I voted" sticker on Tuesday.

Other businesses that plan to stay in operation are finding ways to get out the vote. Managers at Contactually, a D.C.-based technology start-up, are cancelling all meetings on Nov. 8 and letting employees set their own hours.

DataRPM, a California technology company with an office in Fairfax, is offering an "exclusive happy hour" for those that vote.

Canvas, a technology company based in Reston, has been pushing employees to vote throughout election season. For months Canvas operated three voter registration tables at the company's office and an associated co-working space. Chief executive James Quigley is giving all his employees the day off, but not before he made them check their voter registrations online, handing out mobile devices for them to do so.

Employees were encouraged to take a picture of themselves at the polls and share it in the company-wide Slack channel, but there's no penalty for failing to do so.

Quigley says he didn't explicitly push employees to vote for one candidate or another, but people were aware of some company leaders' leanings.

"Clearly we live in a very blue area and the company in general has more of those values," Quigley said. "It was clear what some members of our senior staff thought, but we tried to be soft about pushing people one way or the other."

aaron.gregg@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As Hillary Clinton's once-commanding lead in the polls collapses, Democrats are panicking at the possibility that Donald Trump actually could be elected president of the United States.

They can relax. Strip away the incendiary rhetoric, and a Trump presidency in many ways will be exactly what Democrats want — a third Obama term.

While Trump attacks President Obama on the campaign trail as "the worst president, maybe in the history of our country," on issue after issue Trump has mimicked not only Obama's policies but also Obama's own language to argue for them.

Take spending and debt. One of the great liberal achievements of the Obama presidency was the massive 2009 stimulus, which included $550 billion in government spending to fix what Obama called "our crumbling roads, bridges, and schools" — even though it was not paid for with spending cuts elsewhere. This was the bill that helped set off the tea party revolt of 2010. Nearly every Republican in Congress voted no.

Well, in August, Trump said that as president he plans to spend — wait for it — more than $500 billion on new infrastructure projects — which, he boasted, is "at least double" what Clinton plans to spend. Where would Trump get the money? By adding to the national debt. "This is the time to borrow," he told CNBC, because "rates are so low." Trump further explained that "normally, you would say you want to reduce your debt, and I would like to reduce debt, too," but we can't because we have "a tremendous infrastructure problem."

That's Obama's policy — spending money we don't have on "shovel-ready" projects. Apparently, it's Trump's policy, too.

Or take the Middle East. In announcing his drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan in June 2011, President Obama declared that the United States could no longer afford to deploy troops across the world. "Over the last decade, we have spent a trillion dollars on war, at a time of rising debt and hard economic times," Obama said, adding that "it is time to focus on nation-building here at home." At the time, former House speaker Newt Gingrich ripped Obama's speech as "dangerously misinformed," declaring that a "tsunami of violence is building offshore" and "this administration is crippling the United States and every country in the world by failing to protect those who help us."

Well, Donald Trump has said the exact same thing as Obama. "We are spending trillions of dollars in the Middle East, and the infrastructure of our country is disintegrating," Trump has said, adding that "we have to build our own country, and that's what we have to focus on."

Withdrawing from a dangerous world to save money and focus on nation-building here at home — that is the Obama policy. And apparently it will remain U.S. policy in a Trump administration.

Or take American exceptionalism. Back in 2009, Republicans blasted Obama when he declared, "I believe in American exceptionalism, just as I suspect that the Brits believe in British exceptionalism and the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism." Former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani said, "I know this is a horrible thing to say, but I do not believe that the president loves America," adding that Obama's comments show "a stark lack of moral clarity."

Well, you know who shares that lack of moral clarity? Trump. At a Texas tea party event in 2015, Trump said virtually the same thing as Obama: "Look, if I'm a Russian, or I'm a German. . . . I don't think it's a very nice term. We're exceptional; you're not. . . . I think you're insulting the world. . . . I never liked the expression."

At least Obama paid lip service to American exceptionalism; Trump rejects it outright.

And that's just scratching the surface. Obama has slammed "fat-cat bankers on Wall Street." Trump says hedge-fund managers are "getting away with murder." Obama told Republicans in Congress who opposed a minimum-wage hike, "If you truly believe you could work full time and support a family on less than $15,000 a year, try it." Trump says, "I don't know how people make it on $7.25 an hour. . . . I would like to see a [minimum wage] increase of some magnitude." Obama blasts Republicans for what he called efforts at "privatizing Social Security." Trump says, "Every Republican wants to do a big number on Social Security, they want to do it on Medicare, they want to do it on Medicaid. . . . And we can't do that." The list goes on and on.

In some areas, such as Supreme Court nominations, a Trump presidency would probably be a setback for Democrats. But in other areas, Trump may actually be an improvement for liberal Democrats over Obama. On trade, Trump opposes the hated Trans-Pacific Partnership that Obama negotiated. On health care, he supports single-payer and has said, "This is an un-Republican thing for me to say. . . . I am going to take care of everybody . . . the government's gonna pay for it." Even on **immigration**, Trump's inflammatory rhetoric aside, he actually supports giving legal status to almost all of the 11 million illegal **immigrants** in the United States — they just have to "touch back" in their home country briefly to get it. Trump may actually be the president most likely to deliver on the Democratic dream of comprehensive **immigration** reform.

So, don't worry, Democrats. There's no need to move to Canada. On spending, foreign policy, entitlements, the minimum wage, trade, health care and even **immigration**, Trump agrees with you.

Even if Clinton loses, you may get your third Obama term after all.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**After the FBI cleared Hillary Clinton once again late yesterday, Donald Trump did not permit this inconvenient new set of facts to knock him off stride. Instead, he effortlessly converted it into more evidence for the argument he's made all along -- the system and the election are both rigged, and any Clinton victory in this election will by extension be illegitimate.

"You have to understand, it's a rigged system," Trump said last night, after FBI Director James Comey advised Congress that the newly discovered emails will not change the FBI's recommendation against charges. "And she's protected." Trump also dismissed the possibility that the FBI had examined the emails in such a short time: "You can't do it."

In so doing, Trump laid bare the core of his whole argument for the presidency. But he also revealed that in the end, Trump's own argument, objectively described, constitutes the strongest possible argument against electing him.

I'm going to attempt to demonstrate this with a chart -- it is below -- that, I believe, objectively captures the sum total of Trump's arguments, and why those arguments, taken on their own terms, compellingly demand a vote against him.

At the heart of Trump's case for the presidency lies two components. The first is a hyper-exaggerated narrative of national decay and decline -- skyrocketing crime, rotting inner cities, decaying factories, a festering terror threat from within, a border that is being breached by dark hordes of invaders. The second is the notion that our elites are both fecklessly responsible for that perilous state of national decline and too corrupted to fix it -- they've rigged the system against you, undermining American sovereignty to enrich themselves, while allowing American identity to be degraded by **immigrants** who are at best parasitic and at worst a lethal threat.

But Trump's diagnosis runs deeper than that. His argument is not simply that elites are ripping you off from above while enabling those subgroups to rip you off and threaten you from below. Rather, the truly pernicious component of Trump's argument is that our institutions and our democracy have themselves grown so hopelessly corrupted and compromised that they are no longer even capable of arresting and turning around that decline via conventional democratic processes. The only outcome that can change this state of affairs is electing him president. Any other result would only confirm that our system has been so corrupted that it is fundamentally no longer capable of producing legitimate political outcomes.

Trump sometimes expresses this idea explicitly, and sometimes implicitly. But it is the thread that runs through everything he has been saying and promising for months:

Before discussing this chart, let's contrast it with Trump's final restatement of his argument in his two-minute closing ad, which is running in multiple battleground states:

This ad portrays a "global power structure" that conspires with American elites to enrich themselves with trade deals and economic policies that have "bled our country dry." (The antisemitic overtones here have already been widely noted). The ad also pictures literal images of decay and decline in the form of rotting factories. Some of this overlaps with Bernie Sanders-style populism's indictment of a government that has been taken captive by "the billionaire class."

But Trump's spot also blames elites for "massive illegal **immigration**," while displaying images of shadowy, lurking figures and teeming hordes. Trump is scapegoating what historian John Judis calls "outgroups," a key feature of right wing (and, to be fair, previous iterations of left-wing) populism, which tells the people (whoever the target audience happens to be) that they are being squeezed between elites above and parasites below.

Crucially, Trump's ad airbrushes out of his worldview its more obvious authoritarian elements. The Muslim ban is gone, and the ad shows Trump telling a crowd (an overwhelmingly white one) that only "you" can break the power of this corrupt "machine" and "save our country." That seems to suggest that our democratic institutions can break elite corruption and arrest our precipitous national decline.

But the unavoidably authoritarian elements in Trump's worldview have been on display everywhere -- in less controlled settings. Consider the key elements from our chart above:

\* Trump's narrative of national decline is rank propaganda. Trump's regular claims about skyrocketing crime and soaring murder rates are distortions and lies. His relentless claim that the border is being overrun is a Big Lie, too -- **immigration** rates have leveled off and experts have said the border is being managed.

Trump speaks to legitimate economic grievances. But his trade bluster suggests he would likely start destructive trade wars, and his promise to bring back coal mining jobs to suffering communities is a cruel hoax. He is both selling an agenda that is pure fraudulence and exploiting legit grievances with xenophobia, nativism, and white nationalism, all of which rest upon a narrative of national decline that is a fever dream of invention. Which leads to the fact that…

\* Trump has repeatedly and explicitly said that if he is elected, he will have no choice but to resort to measures well outside our political norms and democratic processes. The vow of mass deportations promises unthinkably cruel disruptions that even many Republicans who oppose legalization have rejected. He's banned media organizations from his rallies, egged on supporters against reporters just doing their jobs, and promised to somehow open up libel law to restrict criticism. His proposed ban on Muslims would impose a religious test for entry. He's flirted with closing mosques and a Muslim registry.

In a quote that never got the attention it deserved, Trump even explicitly said this of the terror threat: "We're going to have to do certain things that were frankly unthinkable a year ago." Why should we not believe he means what he says? And who wants to find out what "unthinkable" things Trump has in mind?

\* Trump's narrative charges that elites are complicit in enabling outgroups to fleece you and weaken our American (and white) identity. Trump says the media is covering up the truth about the thousands of American Muslims who celebrated 9/11. That our elections officials are allowing rampant voter fraud in "certain areas" (wink, wink), in order to throw the "rigged" presidential election to the candidate not legitimately chosen by the American people. And that our political leaders are letting in illegal **immigrants** so they too can nefariously influence the election's outcome, a story that the media is also suppressing.

The sheer volume and truly destructive nature of his demagoguery and lies about our institutions is alone -- or should be -- disqualifying.

\* All roads lead to "I alone can fix it." That was probably Trump's single most telling declaration of the campaign. But it must be understood in the broader context of Trump's ongoing claims that our democratic institutions are so corrupted and corroded that they are no longer capable of solving our problems.

Thus, "I alone can fix it" has two interrelated meanings. It means that, if elected, he would likely shred political and constitutional norms and resort to extreme measures to deal with terrorism and **immigration** (which our institutions can no longer cope with) and our treasonous media. It also means that, if he is not elected, it will prove that our system is no longer capable of not just addressing our problems, but of producing political outcomes that are legitimate.

This is intimately bound up with Trump's shifting reactions to the FBI's treatment of Clinton. Back when the FBI originally declined to recommend charges, Trump went on a tear about how the "corrupt" FBI is participating in rigging the election. Then, when the FBI announced its new discovery, Trump said the FBI was heroically trying to correct its original wrong. And now that the FBI has not found anything to derail her candidacy, Trump is back to claiming that she is being "protected." Trump regularly says Clinton is a criminal who never should have allowed to run for office at all. But his argument goes farther still. He is claiming that our institutions cannot legitimately clear his political opponent of criminality.  That is an objective description of his argument.

All of this is plainly designed to badly undermine faith in our institutions -- no matter who wins the election. Trump has explicitly said that he may not accept the outcome if he loses, which raises the prospect of further disruptions. But if he does win, he has already made his intentions -- to conduct his presidency in full accordance with his contempt for those institutions -- absolutely clear. Maybe Trump is just putting on a big show. But why should we not entertain the possibility that he might mean what he says?

There has been a great deal of debate over whether our institutions are strong enough to withstand a Trump presidency. We can only hope that a majority of voters are horrified by the prospect of ever discovering the answer to that question, and make their choice accordingly.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Pope Francis on Saturday condemned the political use of fear and the building of walls, describing the refugee crisis as "a problem of the world" and urging political leaders to do more, according to America magazine.

The pope did not name names and did not refer to the upcoming U.S. presidential election, but he spoke about issues that have come up in the 2016 campaigns, including **immigration** and refugees. The speech, given in Spanish, included a quote from the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.

"No tyranny can be sustained without exploiting our fears," the pope said, according to comments published by the Vatican Radio. "Citizens are walled-up, terrified, on one side; on the other side, even more terrified, are the excluded and banished."

Fear "is fed and manipulated," Pope Francis said. "Because fear — as well as being a good deal for the merchants of arms and death — weakens and destabilizes us, destroys our psychological and spiritual defenses, numbs us to the suffering of others, and in the end it makes us cruel."

Pope Francis gave his remarks Saturday evening during a meeting at the Vatican with participants in the World Meeting of Popular Movements, a collection of grass-roots organizations that include the poor and the unemployed. The pope urged the defeat of "false prophets who exploit fear and desperation, who sell magic formulas of hatred and cruelty or selfish well-being and illusory security," according to comments published by Catholic News Service.

Francis said that mercy is the "best antidote" to fear, according to CNS. It works better than antidepressants, he said, and is "much more effective than walls, iron bars, alarms and weapons. And it is free."

Trump has proposed building a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border to keep undocumented **immigrants** from entering the United States. After he visited the border during a visit to Mexico in February, the pope said that politicians who propose building walls instead of bridges are "not Christian," leading to a scuffle with Trump. Vatican officials said later that the pope was not speaking about specific candidates.

Trump has also proposed a ban on Muslims and refugees from countries experiencing terrorism. A newly named cardinal, Archbishop of Indianapolis Joseph Tobin, made headlines last year when he openly defied Republican Indiana Gov. Mike Pence's decision to try to block Syrian refugees from the state. Pence, who is Trump's vice presidential running mate, joined dozens of governors last year in objecting to the federal government's program to resettle refugees from Syria in the Unites States, citing security risks. The bishops, including Tobin, openly challenged the governors.

"No one should be forced to flee his or her homeland," Francis said on Saturday, according to CNS. "But the evil is doubled when, facing terrible circumstances, the migrant is thrown into the clutches of human traffickers to cross the border. And it is tripled if, arriving in the land where he or she hoped to find a better future, one is despised, exploited or even enslaved."

The Obama administration announced in September that the United States is planning to accept 110,000 refugees in 2017. A vice president at Catholic Relief Services said that aid organization welcomed the news, but that it was not sufficient enough to address "the 65 million globally displaced people around the world right now."

On Saturday, Francis quoted from one of the sermons of King, the late civil rights activist. "Hate for hate only intensifies the existence of hate and evil in the universe," he said.

Francis said politics is not the place for "anyone who is too attached to material things or to the mirror, those who love money, lavish banquets, sumptuous houses, refined clothes, luxury cars." Seeking power or money "sullies the noble cause" of politics as service, the pope said.

"Fight the fear with a life of service, solidarity and humility on behalf of the people, especially those who suffer," he said, according to CNS. "Against the terror, the best remedy is love. Love heals all."

Want more stories about faith? Follow Acts of Faith on Twitter or sign up for our newsletter.

Pope Francis says the Catholic Church will probably never have female priests

Donald Trump is right. Pope Francis's visit to the border is political.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) on Monday told a group of progressive donors he plans to make debt-free college a part of his agenda as Senate majority leader if Democrats win control of the Senate on Tuesday.

The pledge is part of a broader effort to convince progressive supporters of Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) to vote for other Democrats on the ballot on Election Day. Schumer made the appeal as part of a Progressive Change Campaign Committee fundraising email and the last-minute fundraising pitch is the latest sign the Sanders coalition succeeded in shifting the Democratic Party further to the left during the 2016 campaign.

"Major investment in jobs, debt-free college, **immigration** reform, criminal justice reform, closing corporate tax loopholes, a public option, paid family leave, raising the minimum wage, expanding Social Security, and confirming Supreme Court Justices who will overturn Citizens United will all be possible with a Democratic Majority," the letter said.

Those goals could be difficult to achieve if Democrats are only able to win the minimum of five seats necessary for a 51-49 Senate majority. Democrats would still need Republican votes to get the 60 votes necessary to overcome a filibuster. It is unlikely that many Republicans will be willing to back items like a debt-free college plan.

The Monday email aims to convince Sanders supporters to donate to last-minute get-out-the-vote efforts for mainstream Democrats running for Senate. About half a dozen GOP incumbents are in tight races in states like Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, New Hampshire and Missouri. Democrats hope that high turnout from progressives could help put Democrats running in those states over the top.

"As a strategist, I know that progressives have an opportunity to make a big difference the next few years -- if we win," the letter said.

In recent months, Schumer has committed to addressing a number of issues from the Sanders platform, including **immigration**  and criminal justice reform. Last month an interview with CNBC's John Harwood, Schumer said he expected **immigration** would lead his agenda, along with an infrastructure plan funded by international tax reform.

Each of those proposals has some some bipartisan appeal -- but Democrats and Republicans don't agree on all of the critical details. If Democrats do win the Senate, Schumer will have to craft legislation that can satisfy progressives and still pass the Senate and be approved by a GOP-led House. That's no easy task.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Action in Community Through Service food pantry needs volunteers to stock shelves, prepare food bags and make grocery store pickups either on a regular schedule (flexible) or on an on-call basis. To complete an online application, visit actspwc.org.

ACTS Helpline needs volunteers to answer a suicide-prevention hotline. 703-221-1144.

American Association for the Advancement of Science needs scientists, engineers, mathematicians and physicians to assist K-12 STEM teachers. Victor Crawford, 703-732-9004. vicris51@verizon.net.

American Cancer Society's Road to Recovery needs drivers to take patients to appointments. 804-527-3719. leah.seldinsommer@cancer.org.

Beacon for Adult Literacy trains people to help adults with literacy and English-speaking skills. 703-368-7491. beaconliteracy.org.

BEAT Cancer Coalition needs drivers 55 and older to take patients to appointments. Retired and senior volunteer program. 703-369-5292.

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Washington-Manassas needs volunteers. bgcgw.org/prince-william.

Catholic Charities Hogar **Immigrant** Services needs teachers for its English as a second language and citizenship classes. Training provided. 571-208-1572. volunteer.hogar@ccda.net.

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children's Intervention Services, needs Spanish-speaking volunteers to visit children who have been abused and neglected. Ben Gimeno, 703-330-8145, bgimeno@casacis.org.

Discover Prince William and Manassas seeks tourism ambassadors at local events, festivals and a visitors center. jmcelwain@discoverpwm.com.

ESL and **Immigrant** Ministries trains volunteers to teach English to adults. 703-841-0292. office@eslim.org, eslim.org.

First Home Alliance needs volunteers to help with fundraising, planning events, researching and writing grants, and pursuing scholarships. Larry Laws, 703-580-8838 ext. 106. laws@firsthomealliance.org, firsthomealliance.org.

Friends of Feral Cats of PWC needs volunteers and donations of cat food. Call Nancy, 571-719-0657.

Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind needs volunteers to raise and train puppies. 866-282-8046. guidedog.org.

Habitat for Humanity needs help with projects, ReStore and providing lunch to volunteers. 703-369-6708. volunteer@ habitatpwc.org.

Historic Dumfries needs docents for the Weems-Botts Museum to help with events and research projects, gather and transcribe local oral histories, and work on other projects. 703-221-2218.

Keep Prince William Beautiful needs help with its storm-drain program and educational outreach. 571-285-3772. kpwb.org.

Literacy Volunteers of Prince William needs adults to help adult students improve their literacy skills. Training provided. 703-670-5702. lvapw.org.

Mutt Love Rescue needs foster homes for rescued dogs. 703-577-0106. adopt@muttloverescue.org, muttloverescue.org.

Northern Virginia Family Service seeks foster parents. 571-748-2500.

Occoquan needs volunteers for events throughout the year, including the annual arts and crafts shows. Donna Brown, 703-491-2168. dbrown@occoquanva.gov.

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Mondays through Fridays. 703-792-4583.

Prince William Area Free Clinic needs volunteer doctors, pharmacists, physician assistants, nurses, translators and administrative assistants for the Unified Health Center in Woodbridge. 703-496-9403. pwafc.org .

Prince William Cooperative Extension Program needs facilitators for the Parent Education Program's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting groups. Training provided. Janice Brody, 703-792-4678. jbrody@pwcgov.org.

Prince William County Historic Preservation Division needs tour guides and assistance with special events, educational programs and gardening. 703-792-4754. historicpreservation@pwcgov.org .

Prince William Health District seeks volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community health experience necessary. Training provided. Contact Valda Wisdom Brown, valda.wisdombrown@vdh.virginia.gov.

Prince William Trails and Streams Coalition needs volunteers to help build and maintain trails in the county. 703-791-6158. pwtsc.org.

Project Mend-a-House needs help for home-safety repairs. 703-792-7663. lizw@pmahweb.org.

Reset seeks volunteers to lead elementary and preschool students in science and math learning. John Meagher, 703-250-0236. reset@resetonline.org, resetonline.org .

Serve needs drivers for its food-recovery program at its food distribution center, as well as a bilingual (Spanish and English) food-assistance client-intake specialist. Navara Cannon, 571-748-2536, ncannon@nvfs.org.

St. Paul United Methodist Church needs bus drivers on Thursdays to take people to and from a community dinner. Drivers must have a class C license with a P endorsement. 703-494-2445.

Wildlife Rescue League needs hotline volunteers, wildlife transporters and rehabilitators. Training provided. 703-391-8625. volcoord@wildliferescueleague.org.

— Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Every year, Golden Dawn, an anti-**immigrant** Greek neo-Nazi party, holds a rally at a rugged mountain pass once known as the "hot gates," because of the sulfuric springs bubbling beneath. It's the site where a small band of Spartan warriors stalled the might of the advancing Persian empire almost 2,500 years ago. The Golden Dawn members gather, torches in hand, around a bronze statue of the Spartan King Leonidas — who famously perished alongside his 300 companions — sing the national anthem and chant far-right slogans. "Greece belongs to the Greeks!" goes one cry. "People! Army! Nationalism!" is another.

The ancient Battle of Thermopylae, though, doesn't resonate only with them. In a year defined by growing right-wing nationalism on both sides of the pond, it remains a curiously conspicuous rallying cry for myriad populists and conservative movements. And that includes American supporters of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump.

Beginning with the account of Greek historian Herodotus, the clash, which took place in 480 B.C., has become a kind of foundation myth of Western civilization. The heroic Spartan stand -- whose numbers were closer to 7,000 than 300 -- in the face of the mongrel, polyglot Persian hordes is cast as a primordial act of sacrifice for the liberty of a people. The historical consensus, both among ancient chroniclers and current scholars, was that Thermopylae was a clear Greek defeat; the Persian invasion would be pushed back in later ground and naval battles. But its legacy still reverberates millennia later.

"The Spartan chant,'We are what you were; we will be what you are,' " 19th-century French philologist Ernst Renan wrote in his seminal treatise on the idea of a nation, "is, in its simplicity, the abridged hymn of every fatherland."

And consider the opening narration to the 1962 Hollywood film "The 300 Spartans" -- the cinematic precursor to the campy, overly-stylized 2007 "300." At a time when the Cold War was in full swing, it set down the stakes of a clash with the East:

Across the hush of 24 centuries, this is the story of a turning point in history. Of a blazing day when 300 Greek warriors fought here, to hold with their lives their freedom ... and ours.

This is a powerful claim that many in the West intuitively accept: Thermopylae is the Alamo of antiquity, a doomed contest between the brave few and a gargantuan foe that stirred their compatriots to action. Had Xerxes, a Persian emperor, snuffed out all Greek resistance, then the scattered city-states on the western side of the Aegean Sea would have just become one more province of what was a vast, mutli-ethnic empire.

What would happen to our supposed Greek inheritance — the principles of democracy and reason?

Frank Miller, an American graphic novelist whose work gave rise to the "300" film series, sketched the implications most crudely with his book: "The army of Persia—a force so vast it shakes the earth with its march — is poised to crush Greece, an island of reason and freedom in a sea of mysticism and tyranny."

Whatever the historical merits of this belief — and more on that below — the ghost of Leonidas looms large in the right-wing imagination. A host of far-right groups, including neo-Nazi organizations in the United States and Australia, have invoked this history in their own political iconography. The anonymous blogger who translated the anti-**immigrant** writings of Norwegian terrorist Anders Breivik into more than a dozen languages went by the screen name "Angus Thermopylae."

You can get a taste of the phenomenon through a search on Twitter or Google for the phrase "Molon Labe": translated roughly as "come and take it," the laconic response Leonidas is said to have given to an envoy of the Persian emperor who demanded the Spartans lay down their arms.

Since the popularization of the "300" story, "Molon Labe" became a kind of code word for gun-rights supporters in the United States, as well as the tea party movement, a catchall slogan for those irked by the invasive power of the federal government and the supposed leftist aim to take away their weapons. On social media, that messaging now co-exists with #maga — "Make America Great Again" -- and other online slang used by Trump supporters.

One example: Molon Labe Industries, an online store for right-wing paraphernalia that has more than 300,000 subscribers or "likes" on its Facebook page, melds a whole range of right-wing memes, as can be seen in this image of its Facebook page:

The echo of Thermopylae and the lionization of the Spartans is popular among the fringe American ultranationalists and online xenophobes who have come to be known as the "alt-right."

Earlier this year, a YouTube user named "Aryan Wisdom" uploaded a video where scenes from "300" were edited over with speeches from Trump and his political rivals. The Republican nominee, unsurprisingly, is cast here as a Spartan warlord, facing down a callow President Obama and the man behind it all — Xerxes, or in this case, the American financier George Soros.

The video makes the Persians out to be bomb-throwing Muslim terrorists, Obama a feckless lieutenant to dark forces, and Hillary Clinton a slave to the lusts of a "globalist" -- hint: Jewish — elite. It has been watched more than 2 million times.

And myriad Trump supporters invoke Thermopylae in their celebration of the Republican candidate:

Golden Dawn, which overtly clings to the mythic legacy of the Spartans, is now the third biggest political party in Greece, despite a record of racially-instigated violence and Nazi apologia. Last month, it formally endorsed Trump from the floor of the Greek parliament, hailing the "patriotic wind" blowing through Europe and across the Atlantic.

"It's blowing in the United States, where it appears that the next president will be a patriot president," said party spokesman Ilias Kasidiaris. He went on: "The geopolitical balance will change. And most interesting of all is that tomorrow's president of the United States is supported in Greece only by Golden Dawn."

Trump himself may not appreciate having such admirers from afar. But the politics channeled by his campaign are part of a larger far-right populist turn in the West, as WorldViews has documented over the course of the year.

Moreover, the symbolism of Thermopylae is disconcertingly relevant to the ideology of the European far right.

"Ancient Sparta is proto-fascist," Paul Cartledge, a celebrated British classicist and author of "Thermopylae: The Battle That Changed the World," among numerous other works on ancient Greece, said in an interview with WorldViews.

Although the clash between Greeks and Persians may be remembered now as the battle that crystallized Western liberty, the ancient Spartans were no model democrats — even in their time. Their society was communal and militarist. It practiced early forms of eugenics and infanticide. It kept a huge slave population in thrall to its warrior elite. Some contemporary scholars even liken conditions in the city-state to a kind of apartheid.

For all these reasons, Nazi leader Adolf Hitler happened to be a huge admirer of Sparta.

"Sparta must be regarded as the first völkisch state," Hitler once said, referring to a racially ordered polity. "The exposure of the sick, weak, deformed children, in short, their destruction, was more decent and in truth a thousand times more human than the wretched insanity of our day which preserves the most pathological subject."

In his desolation of Europe and mass slaughter of millions, the Nazi leader saw himself marching in the wake of Spartan hoplites.

And what about the Persians? As much as they've come to symbolize an **alien** menace, an Eastern Other, an empire floating in a "sea of mysticism," they weren't all that different from the Greeks they were fighting.

Greek-speaking troops from the western ends of the Persian empire formed a crucial part of Xerxes's army. There's evidence, too, that Greek-speaking cities ruled by the Persians were afforded their own system of democracy. Tyranny, a Greek word, was a practiced form of government in various Greek city-states. Persian-ruled cities like Babylon and Taxila, in what's now Pakistan, were home to great centers of science and learning.

"It's a clash of political civilizations, it's not a clash of religions," Cartledge said, arguing the difference between the two sides was less cultural than it has been made out to be. "Xerxes didn't conduct his campaign on the basis of a crusade."

And, ultimately, for all the heroism of the Persian wars, the Greeks would turn against one another. In the wake of the Persian retreat, the rival powers of Sparta and Athens built regional alliances and mini-empires of their own and soon locked horns in three decades of ruinous conflict that spanned the Mediterranean.

"The Greeks fought each other as much they fought others," Cartledge said.

At a time when nationalist movements are rallying around the mythic, patriotic deeds of the past, it's important to remember how fleeting those moments can be.

More on WorldViews

After Clinton, Trump's real enemy is 'globalism'

Brexit marks the revenge of the nation

Donald Trump's real foreign policy: A clash of civilizations

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Whatever you think of FBI director James B. Comey's letters to Congress regarding Hillary Clinton's emails, the episode and accompanying anonymous FBIleaks underscored something important about America's law enforcement community: its widespread support for Donald Trump. Such support is hardly confined to the FBI. Many police unions have endorsed the Republican presidential nominee, including the National **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement Council and the 330,000-member Fraternal Order of Police.

It's troubling that any reputable group would support Trump. It is particularly damaging for police unions to do so, because these endorsements are both a gratuitous insult and a huge lost opportunity, making it harder for officers to reach out to minority communities that Trump has offended during this election season.

The lost opportunities are particularly obvious here in Chicago, where crime is up and police-community relations are strained. The statements of police union leaders are one of many flash points in the wake of tragic police shootings and the national controversies that arose after the death of Michael Brown, in Ferguson, Mo. Earlier this year, I served on one working group concerned with policing reform in the wake of the Laquan McDonald shooting. As part of that work, I attended various public meetings where activists and community residents lambasted specific collective-bargaining provisions they believe excessively shield bad police officers.

Both police officers and minority community residents have reason to feel embattled and aggrieved. In this angry and difficult time, the FOP undercut its own members by endorsing the most divisive presidential candidate of our lifetime. David Fisher, president of the greater Philadelphia chapter of the National Black Police Association, expressed the views of many. "At a time when we're all trying to unite and bring the world to a calm," he said, "the last person we need is a Donald Trump. And the last thing the police need is to hitch its wagon to a Donald Trump."

I recently spoke with Charles P. Wilson, national chairman of the National Association of Black Law Enforcement Officers. (Wilson is not a member of the FOP.) I asked whether this endorsement would harm the reputation of police in minority communities. Wilson responded with a laugh: "You think so?"

"The vast number of black and Latino officers would not support Donald Trump under any circumstances," he said. "The endorsement shows a lack of understanding, a lack of consideration for the many black and Latino officers who are members of that organization."

Imagine, for example, that you are a police officer patrolling Chicago's Englewood community. Like many officers, you are hoping to elicit the community's cooperation to address the surge in gun and gang violence that has made 2016 such a tough year. Englewood is 96.6 percent African American. And now you labor under the additional burden that your national union endorsed a presidential candidate who brazenly and falsely challenged the citizenship of Chicago's own Barack Obama, the most revered African American politician in our nation's history.

Or suppose that you are patrolling a few miles northwest, in Chicago's Little Village, where almost half the residents are foreign-born, principally from Mexico. You're trying to convince **immigrant** families to provide tips on local crime and gang violence. Now you labor under the additional burden that your national union endorsed a man whose very campaign announcement denounced illegal **immigrants** from Mexico as rapists and criminals, and whose attacks on an Indiana judge of Mexican heritage were described by his own most prominent political ally as "the textbook definition of a racist comment."

Or imagine you're an officer in Chicago's southwest suburbs, where you're working with local Muslim residents in case some youth becomes radicalized by a militant group. Now you labor under the additional burden that your national union has endorsed Donald Trump, a man who has called for a temporary ban on the entry of Muslims into the United States and has repeatedly insulted the parents of an American Muslim war hero.

Or imagine you're an officer trying to convince women who are victims of sexual assault at home or at work to come forward to report these crimes. You're trying to reassure these women that your department will humanely support them. And now you labor under the additional burden that your national union has endorsed a man who boasts of some of the very predatory behaviors you are hoping women will report.

Finally, imagine that you are a recruiter or human resource officer for any big-city department. You're trying to recruit minority and female officers to create a more diverse force. You're trying to convince these men and women that modern policing doesn't match the stereotypes they may hold, that your department is forging a new relationship with the communities that most need effective policing. That's never easy. Now you labor under the additional burden that your national union has endorsed a man who has deeply offended these very communities, and has spoken out in support of precisely the heavy-handed tactics that most offend young men and women you hope to recruit.

The police cannot prevent or solve crimes without the support of the communities in which they work. Public safety is always the joint product of law enforcement and these communities. For this partnership to work, communities must back police. Police must back these communities, too, earning a sense of trust and legitimacy that must never be taken for granted.

Wilson and other minority officers recognize the challenges police face every day. When communities do not support police, it's easy to see why officers might become cynical, passive and reactive, responding to 911 calls but otherwise keeping their heads down without truly engaging the communities they serve.

Minority officers may also see with greater clarity why so many communities feel so distant from police, why good people on each side of a human divide must reach out, and — at minimum — avoid inflicting gratuitous offense. That applies to angry Black Lives Matter activists who are tempted to demonize police. It applies to angry police union officials, too, who are tempted to resist or resent calls for long-overdue reforms.

Imagine the public reaction had the FOP issued a simple statement that said: "Many of our members frankly disagree with Hillary Clinton on policy. But our organization cannot endorse a candidate who offends so many of the people we are sworn to protect and serve." Many minority communities, many minority law enforcement professionals, too, would have taken solace from that. That wouldn't have been so hard. In 2012, the FOP declined to endorse Mitt Romney or Barack Obama.

Instead, this time around, the FOP and some other police organizations committed an unforced error. They went out of their way to embrace a candidate who specifically insults or offends nearly every community that police are now struggling to engage. In so doing, police unions damaged their own legitimacy in a way that no cellphone video of a rogue officer, no angry protester, ever could.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As the most frightening election of my lifetime draws to a close, I find myself thinking of a teenager I met many years ago in Siberia who was moved to tears after sitting for an exam to win a U.S.-sponsored study trip to the United States.

She didn't yet know whether she had won or lost — but it was the first time she had ever felt she was competing for something on her merits, where bribes or connections to people in power would have no effect. That alone made her grateful and admiring of the United States.

She was seeing what, to me, is the real America.

I find myself thinking, too, of the many U.S. Foreign Service officers I met during that same phase of my life, when I was working for The Post as a foreign correspondent. They didn't live glamorous lives, these young and not-so-young diplomats, and they didn't get much glory. They became fluent in the local language in Dushanbe or Seoul or Yerevan, and they spent long days and nights meeting local politicians and activists and artists, writing cables that might or might not get read back in Washington, doing their best to understand other cultures and explain ours.

Many of them could have been earning more, and living more comfortably, in other jobs. But they wanted to serve their country. The quality of their work ranged, I'm sure, but for the most part they were impressive and dedicated. Certainly they were not "stupid." They were no "disaster."

They also were the real America.

I think of the many military men and women I met, in another phase of my career, when I was writing about national security. I would patrol the corridors of the Pentagon every morning for news, and I got to know a lot of Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine officers. Many of them chafed at their desk jobs — they wanted to be back in action, at sea, flying again — but they did their Washington work with amazing diligence. They rose in early-morning darkness to jog and stay fit, worked late to staff their higher-ranking officers, coached their kids' soccer teams on weekends if they could get a few hours off.

Maybe not all of them were star performers. But for the most part they were good-humored, self-sacrificing, patriotic, confident without conceit and well-educated across an astonishing number of fields. They were not "rubble." They were not "losers."

They were the real America.

I find myself thinking, in the midst of all the ugliness, of the crossing guard at my local elementary school, who never misses a morning, and never misses a chance to greet a small child cheerfully. To me, she is America.

I think of the gentleman who lives up the street from me and who, year after year, performs the thankless task of collecting dues and keeping the rolls of our neighborhood association, so the community can do a bit to welcome newcomers or plant a few trees. To me, that is America.

I think of the volunteers who helped me vote 10 days ago at my early-polling station — all ages, all colors, various accents, all polite and professional and committed to helping us exercise our franchise. I think of the Uber driver who picked me up late one night last week, an **immigrant** from Pakistan who works a day job at his local Giant and cheerfully commiserated with me for having to work late.

I think of a young colleague here at work whose parents **immigrated** from a strife-torn country far away and worked ceaselessly to educate their three children, including this talented daughter. She, too, could be earning more — no one becomes a journalist to get rich. But I sense she chose this work because, while she appreciates the opportunities the United States afforded her family, she thinks the country could do better, and journalism is one way to nudge it in the right direction.

To me, that is America too.

I think of a young acquaintance who signed up for Teach For America in a city where he knew no one and then, when his term was up, stayed to start a small nonprofit to help more poor kids go to college. I think of a much older acquaintance who had an honorable career in the private and public sectors and, when it was time to retire, joined the board of one of Washington's most useful nonprofit organizations; and when it was time to move on from that, began volunteering in a soup kitchen, rising at dawn to crack eggs and help make breakfast for people who can use a hot meal.

To me, America is not at heart selfish, petty, hateful or bigoted. One candidate for president may be all of those things, and may suggest that we are like him. But I don't believe most Americans — including most Americans voting for him — share those ungenerous traits.

I don't believe we will elect such a man, either. But if we did, I believe the real America would be strong enough to survive and outlast him and remain — or once again become — the kind of place a teenager in Siberia can admire.

fredhiatt@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Arizona: The Grand Canyon State hasn't voted for a Democratic presidential candidate since Bill Clinton in 1996, but Democrats believe that increased Hispanic voter registration will keep things competitive.

Recent polling has given Republican Donald Trump a slight edge over Democrat Hillary Clinton, but Democrats cite an advantage in early voting as evidence that it could be a close night. On Friday, the final day of early voting, thousands of Arizonans stood in long lines.

Two other races in the state also signal the growing power of the state's Latino voters.

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), the 2008 Republican presidential nominee who has tepidly stood by Trump's candidacy this year, is running for a sixth term. McCain appears headed to victory due partly to modest Latino support.

Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio, a Republican who became a polarizing national figure in the debate over **immigration** and border control, is facing the toughest reelection of his 24-year reign amid tussles with the Justice Department. National liberal and Hispanic groups have targeted the race as a chance to knock off the man they consider the poster boy for unjust **immigration** detention policies.

Colorado: Colorado is one of the most widely swinging battleground states. It cast its vote for Republican George W. Bush in 2004 by a higher percentage than the nation as a whole. Four years later, it did the same thing — except for Democrat Barack Obama.

That pattern is set to hold if the nation votes for Clinton. She's been leading in most polls in Colorado for most of the general election. Her campaign didn't run TV ads in the state for most of this campaign, though she has jumped in with ads in the past few days, as the race has tightened.

Only termed a swing state in the past few elections, Colorado has been shifting to the left rapidly. This year, for the first time in decades, Democratic and unaffiliated voters outnumber Republicans.

The state's growing Latino population, more than 20 percent as well as the Denver area's explosion of younger voters are among the reasons for the shift.

Yet, like other Western swing states, Colorado is starkly divided, with a strong conservative streak as well.

If Clinton wins Colorado, it will be the first time in a century Colorado has voted for the Democratic nominee for president three times in a row.

Florida: The Sunshine State is once again the center of the presidential campaign and has been a frequent stop for Clinton and Trump. Florida is essential to Trump's chances. Barring big upsets elsewhere, failure to win here blocks the Republican's path to the 270 electoral votes he needs to capture the White House.

Clinton and Trump have focused especially on winning Central Florida, which stretches east to west from Daytona Beach on the Atlantic Coast and ending in Tampa. Democrats are buoyed by record-high early voting by Latinos fueled primarily by an influx of Puerto Ricans fleeing the island's economic difficulties. Across Florida, more Latinos had voted by Wednesday than during the entire early voting period in 2012, according to the Clinton campaign.

The politics of South Florida are also shifting as young Cuban-Americans buck their elders and align with Democrats.

The state's closely watched U.S. Senate race pits Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), who used his presidential campaign to trash Congress, against Rep. Patrick Murphy (D-Fla.). Rubio has surged ahead, and Democrats have pared back ad spending, but Murphy could be helped if Clinton pulls far ahead of Trump.

Georgia: The last Democrat to carry Georgia was a fellow southerner, Bill Clinton in 1992, so the Peach State didn't appear particularly ripe for Hillary Clinton when the race began. But it has turned unexpectedly competitive this year.

Several recent polls have shown the contest to be within the margin of error or Trump leading by a modest margin.

Clinton is being buoyed by an overwhelming lead among black voters in Atlanta and elsewhere. She was up 89 percent to 5 percent among African Americans in an NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist poll released last week.

The booming Atlanta suburbs have opened a possible path to victory for Democrats that does not require winning over conservative whites, the bedrock of Trump's constituency.

A key will be how well Clinton can mobilize not only African Americans but also growing populations of Latinos and Asian Americans. Some Democrats acknowledge they could be another election away from being consistently competitive.

Sensing an opportunity, the Clinton campaign stepped up investments in its ground game in Georgia in August, and a supportive super PAC is airing television ads.

Iowa: Donald Trump's strength among white, non-college-educated voters could help swing Iowa to the GOP this cycle, after it voted for President Obama in 2008 and 2012. Iowa is more than 90 percent white.

Trump has a five-point lead, according to a polling average of recent surveys calculated by The Washington Post. The Clinton campaign has touted its robust ground operation in Iowa, but the candidate herself has not held many rallies in the state.

Trump has faced criticism in many battleground states for implementing a late and weak ground operation and relying on operatives who lack the strategic experience to keep pace with Democrats. But in Iowa, Trump has Eric Branstad, the son of Gov. Terry Branstad. The Branstads know Iowa politics well, giving Trump a boost he doesn't enjoy in other important states.

Trump has made several appearances in the Hawkeye State in recent weeks and has frequently sent his quintessentially Midwestern running mate, Gov. Mike Pence, to campaign there.

Despite the buzz, Iowa has just six electoral college votes. Still, it is a must-win for Trump, given his limited path to the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.

Michigan: This industrial, Midwestern state, which dealt a surprise blow to Clinton in the Democratic primary when it backed Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), could be poised for another upset in the general election.

Michigan voters have not supported a Republican for president since 1988. But backlash against globalization has made trade deals a major issue in parts of the state where Trump expects to do best, especially among white, non-college-educated voters.

With national polls tightening in the final days of the campaign, Trump's campaign has made a late play for Michigan, and Clinton and surrogates have recently increased visits in an effort to boost Election Day turnout. Both campaigns are now airing ads statewide. On Monday, Clinton will visit Grand Rapids, and President Obama will visit Ann Arbor.

With an electorate that is 72 percent white, Michigan is one of the least diverse states, meaning Clinton's demographic advantages — she is strong among minorities — could be limited. Clinton is trying to maintain her strength in the state's urban centers, particularly among black voters in Detroit. But theys are key, and there are signs in early voting elsewhere that she is struggling with them.

Nevada: Nevadans have voted for the winner in every presidential election since 1992. But like most swing states, Nevada is starkly divided between red and blue. The state's southern tip, home to Las Vegas and surrounding Clark County, is blue. The northern city of Reno and surrounding Washoe County are purple. And the rural towns dotting the vast expanse of desert in between are red.

Nevada is changing, though. Almost a third of the state is Hispanic, and there's a growing Asian American population as well. Democrats have worked hard to harness the state's new population in their favor, and Nevada is leading the way among Western states trending Democratic.

Nevada has an independent and libertarian streak, and Trump seems to have tapped into that. He's leading or tied three of the past four high-quality polls, suggesting that his populist economic message is resonating with a Nevadans still struggling to recover from the recession.

But early voters — a solid indicator in Nevada — favor Democrats in similar numbers to when President Obama won the state in 2012. This race looks like it could be a nail-biter.

New Hampshire: Tiny and independent-minded, New Hampshire figures most prominently in the presidential election as the site of the nation's first primary vote, typically a few days after the kickoff caucuses in Iowa.

With four electoral votes, it's not a big prize in the general election, but is considered a battleground because of significant Republican strength amid solidly Democratic northeastern states.

New Hampshire has voted Democratic in five of the past six presidential elections. Barack Obama took the state by about 5.5 percentage points over Mitt Romney in 2012, but Clinton looks unlikely to match that margin.

The Democrat has suffered a reversal of fortune in New Hampshire in polls over the past two weeks, falling to a two-point lead over the weekend, according to a poll average calculated by The Washington Post.

Some polls suggest a strong effect from the announcement on Oct. 28 of a renewed FBI inquiry into Clinton's State Department email. She is expected to return to New Hampshire for a final rally Sunday.

In addition, Obama will travel to the state on Monday on the eve of the election — a sure sign that it is closer than Clinton would like.

New Mexico: The Land of Enchantment has been a Democratic stronghold during the past two presidential elections, with President Obama winning by double-digit margins both times. Trump recently visited the state for an evening airport rally as part of an eleventh-hour attempt to put it in play. But not a single public poll has shown Clinton trailing the Republican nominee there.

Trump's anti-**immigrant** rhetoric and repeated vows to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border have made him deeply unpopular among Latino voters. That presents a major challenge for him in New Mexico, where exit poll data showed the electorate was more than a third Hispanic in 2012.

Clinton has been taking no chances with New Mexico down the stretch, opting to air ads in the state during the final week for the first time in the general election.

Democrats have won five of the past six presidential elections in New Mexico. George W. Bush narrowly won here in 2004.

One potentially complicating factor for Clinton and Trump: Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson served two terms as governor and has pockets of support. The most recent poll showed Johnson attracting 7 percent of the vote.

North Carolina: North Carolina has been one of the most heavily traveled states on the campaign trail this year and could tip either way.

The state has historically been favorable turf for Republicans in presidential races. President Obama narrowly carried the Tar Heel state in 2008 but lost by a close margin to GOP nominee Mitt Romney in 2012.

Democrats see longer-term trends in the state working in their favor: an influx of white, college-educated professionals along an urban and suburban corridor stretching from Raleigh to Charlotte, and an uptick in the African American share of the electorate — part of the legacy of Obama's campaigns.

To win in North Carolina, Clinton has been banking on an Obama-like turnout from African American voters. According to exit polls, African Americans accounted for about 18 percent of the electorate in 1996. By 2012, the black share of the vote rose to 23 percent. But early voting among that group got off to a slow start this year, raising a flag about enthusiasm.

Donald Trump is trying to drive up turnout in rural North Carolina, including the east, where tobacco was once king and where the state is still suffering from manufacturing losses.

Ohio: This Rust Belt state's demographics play to Donald Trump's strengths, with a population that is about 80 percent white — and heavy with working- and middle-class Americans who are anxious about the economy.

Although President Obama carried the state in the 2008 and 2012 elections, Ohio has consistently polled in Trump's favor this cycle. After briefly falling to a tie in some polls in mid-October, Trump now leads Clinton by five percentage points, according to a polling average calculated by The Washington Post.

Republicans are bullish that Trump will carry the state, which is a must-win if Trump hopes to take the White House. His considerable strength among white voters in the state, especially those without college degrees, is also bolstered by his double-digit strength among men.

(Trump and Clinton appear to be tied with women voters, according to a recent Quinnipiac poll.) The Clinton campaign has made an aggressive push in Ohio in the final days of the election, hoping to compel enough nonwhite voters to cast ballots to stave off a Trump victory. On Friday night, musicians Beyoncé and Jay Z headlined a concert in Cleveland to get out the vote.

Pennsylvania: With a large population of working-class and middle-class whites, Pennsylvania is an attractive yet elusive prize for Republicans despite having voted Democratic in the past six elections.

Trump has sought to energize the Republican part of the state, which, in past elections, has been outvoted by solidly Democratic Philadelphia in the east and the area around Pittsburgh in the west. Clinton has focused primarily on those two large urban areas this year.

For Democrats, winning Philadelphia has become the key to holding Pennsylvania, and doing so means motivating the large African American population in the city along with whiter suburbs at the periphery. Those "collar counties" have held appeal for Republicans in past elections but have not given Trump much hope this year.

In 2008, Obama won nearly all of the Philadelphia suburbs atop the most populous urban areas.

A polling average calculated by The Washington Post gives Clinton a 5-point advantage, but her campaign may see signs of trouble. She is campaigning twice in the state in the closing days of the race, and Vice President Biden, a Pennsylvania native, was spending the entire weekend there on her behalf.

Utah: Utah, a red state that hasn't chosen a Democrat for president since 1964, isn't likely to do so on Tuesday. But it could be the only state to hand a loss to both Clinton and Trump, thanks to a former CIA agent.

Evan McMullin, a Utah-born Mormon, is running for president as an independent. He claims to be competitive in 34 states, either on the ballot or as a write-in candidate. Some polls have shown him tied with Trump here, with Clinton not far behind.

McMullin's surge reflects the qualms of Utahns, many of them Mormons, about voting for Trump, a brash, thrice-married New Yorker who has made lewd comments about women and wants to bar Muslims from the country. To take advantage, Clinton opened a campaign office and dispatched surrogates.

Mitt Romney, who won Utah with nearly 73 percent of the vote in 2012, strongly disavowed Trump. Others have tried walking a finer line. After a tape emerged of Trump bragging about groping women because he is a "star," Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) said he could no longer endorse him. Nineteen days later, Chaffetz said he would vote for Trump.

Virginia: Although Virginia is considered a swing state, for months Clinton had such a comfortable lead that both campaigns went off the airwaves in the summer. But polls have tightened, and both Clinton and Trump are back on TV, and Trump is scheduled to make a last-minute visit on Sunday.

Clinton's running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, will return to his home state the day before Election Day to try to shore up support among African Americans and others in Richmond, where he was once mayor, and in the Northern Virginia suburbs of Washington, a fast-growing region that is rapidly diversifying and trending Democratic.

Clinton has several advantages, including strength among suburban college-educated women, a sizable portion of the electorate in Fairfax, Loudoun and Henrico counties. And she stands to benefit from higher enthusiasm among Latinos in the state.

Trump has sought to bolster his support among rural voters and made an appeal to the state's heavy presence of active-duty and military veteran.

Obama carried the state in 2008 and 2012. A Democratic win could cement Virginia's status as a blue state in presidential races.

Wisconsin: The state where the Republican Party was formed has not gone to the GOP nominee for president since 1984, but Trump is making a last-minute and unsteady push to try to turn the state red.

Trump had planned to campaign in the state Sunday but abruptly canceled his trip the day before. He had included Wisconsin in his $25 million multistate advertising investment during the final week of the campaign.

Clinton's running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, will barnstorm here Sunday as Democrats hope to maintain the lead they have built.

Trump is wagering that his crusade against sweeping multinational trade deals will boost turnout among conservative white, working-class voters who have experienced firsthand the decline of the manufacturing industry in the United States.

Wisconsin is the home state of Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus and Speaker Paul D. Ryan. The latter has had a rocky relationship with Trump throughout the campaign.

The last time Clinton and Trump faced voters in Wisconsin, neither experienced much success: Both lost by double-digit percentage margins to opponents during the primary.

Correction: A previous version of this article incorrectly said that if Evan McMullin were to win Utah, he would be the first third-party candidate to win a state in 92 years. George Wallace was the last third-party candidate to win a state; he won five states in 1968.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's campaign will be remembered for many reasons, not the least of which is his tenuous relationship to the truth. PolitiFact has repeatedly documented Trump's unprecedented rate of false claims and in 2015 named him the recipient of the Lie of the Year Award.

Despite this, Trump's support remains high in many states even as some of the most important Republican leaders have turned their backs on him. This has left many experts puzzled. Why do so many people continue to support Trump in the face of these false claims?

Many commentators have noted what Thomas Edsall has called the "great democratic inversion," where voters have become more polarized by education — with less-educated voters gravitating to Trump. But focusing only on education obscures another key factor: whether voters have lower levels of knowledge about politics and less interest in using ideas to understand politics. These attributes do not simply reflect voters' level of formal education.

Our research finds that Trump has attracted a disproportionate (and unprecedented) number of "low-information voters" to his campaign. Furthermore, these voters are more likely to respond to emotional appeals — whether about the economy, **immigration**, Muslims, racial relations, sexism, and even hostility to the first African American U.S. president, Barack Obama. They are the ideal constituency for a candidate like Trump.

We define low-information voters as those who do not know certain basic facts about government and lack what psychologists call a "need for cognition." Those with a high need for cognition have a positive attitude toward tasks that require reasoning and effortful thinking and are, therefore, more likely to invest the time and resources to do so when evaluating complex issues. Those with a low need for cognition, on the other hand, find little reward in the collection and evaluation of new information when it comes to problem solving and the consideration of competing issue positions. They are more likely to rely on cognitive shortcuts, such as "experts" or other opinion leaders, for cues.

Drawing on data from the 2016 American National Election Studies Pilot Studies, we measured the need for cognition based on whether respondents agreed or disagreed that "Thinking is not my idea of fun" and "I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities." We measured knowledge of government based on a question asking how long senators' terms were and a question on which of four policy areas the government spends the least (the answer was foreign aid; the other options were Medicare, national defense and Social Security). We focused our analysis on whites because nonwhites were not supporting Trump in sufficient numbers.

Both of these measures were correlated with how much whites liked Trump, relative to Hillary Clinton, This was true even after accounting for education, income, age, gender, partisanship and ideology.

For example, we found that people who did not know either of these questions about government evaluated Trump 20 points more favorably than Clinton, compared with those who knew both of those questions. This was not true in 2012: Knowledge of politics had little relationship with people's views of Mitt Romney and Obama.

Similarly, people who expressed less "need for cognition" evaluated Trump 12 points more favorably than Clinton, while those who expressed more need for cognition evaluated the two candidates roughly equally.

We also found that the effect of political knowledge and need for cognition may affect support for Trump via association with concern about the economy and attitudes toward Muslims, African Americans and **immigrants**. This suggests that voters who know less about politics may be attracted to Trump for these reasons, which also helps explain why they continue to support him in the face of his many mistruths. If they are willing to believe that Obama is a Muslim and that Muslims are inherently violent, for example, why wouldn't they believe that the election is "rigged"?

To be sure, we should use caution in interpreting these findings. These data are from January 2016, and Trump's support may well have shifted. He has lost ground among women in particular. Yet, his core constituency has proven remarkably stable. It is also important to note that "low-information voters" are not the entirety of Trump's base of support. They are, however, a sizable bloc.

People have many good reasons for being mad about how the established political leadership has failed them, whether it is on trade deals, jobs, inequality, health care or other issues. Trump appeals to many of the disaffected. Nonetheless, a core part of his base is made up of low-information voters who appear more susceptible to Trump's appeals based on race and religion and less prepared to challenge his misstatements and untruths.

Richard Fording is professor of political science at the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa and Sanford Schram is professor of political science at Hunter College, CUNY. A full-length analysis of the research reported here is available here.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**However this election turns out, the 2016 campaign for the White House will undoubtedly be remembered for its vulgarity, mean-spiritedness and mendacity. It has been a national embarrassment. But a parallel failing is less noticed: the unwillingness of both candidates — Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump — to come to grips with national problems that are staring them in the face but involve unpopular political choices. I refer, of course, to an aging society and **immigration**.

The most obvious is an aging society. In 1990, those 65 and over comprised 12.5 percent of the population; now, according to Census Bureau projections, that share is racing toward 16 percent in 2020 and 19 percent in 2030. That's one in five Americans. Already, federal spending for older Americans (mainly Social Security, Medicare and nursing-home care under Medicaid) dominates the national budget. It's crowding out spending on other programs, from defense to parks, and is the chief source of chronic budget deficits.

Nor is that all. The economy's slowdown reflects in part the retirement of millions of baby boomers, whose exit from work reduces labor force growth. The generational unfairness is palpable. Younger Americans are seeing more of their taxes diverted to care of the elderly, who often are in better financial shape than the young who are subsidizing them.

What we need — it was obvious even before the Bill Clinton presidency — is a new social contract between generations, one that acknowledges longer life expectancy (justifying higher eligibility ages for Social Security and Medicare benefits) and greater wealth among millions of older Americans (justifying lower benefits for well-to-do retirees).

Neither Clinton nor Trump is having any of this. Clinton promises higher Social Security benefits; Trump pledges not to cut benefits and implies that he might raise them. The reasons are obvious. Older people vote more than the young; they are also sympathetic characters. No one wants to harm Grandma. Why fight these political realities, no matter how strong the case for a new social contract?

As a political issue, **immigration** is similar. What should be done is not popular enough to get done. In 2014, the 42 million foreign-born population comprised 13 percent of the U.S. total, the highest share since the early 20th century. Of these, about 11 million are undocumented **immigrants**, a number that has been relatively stable since 2009, according to the Pew Research Center.

The United States has a long, though difficult, record of successfully absorbing new **immigrants**. To succeed, assimilation needs time. **Immigrants** need to conquer the language, learn new skills and adapt to U.S. habits. If there's a large, constant influx of new **immigrants** — especially low-skilled **immigrants** — assimilation is harder for everyone. Competition for poorly paid jobs intensifies. So does the tendency of **immigrants** to remain in largely ethnic neighborhoods.

All this suggests an obvious **immigration** agenda. First, we need to reduce illegal **immigrants**, both because illegality is bad in its own right and because the constant inflow frustrates assimilation. To further discourage illegal **immigration**, we should make E-Verify — a system for employers to check the **immigration** status of job applicants — mandatory for most businesses. We also need to legalize the vast majority of undocumented workers who have been here for years and don't have a criminal record.

Finally, we need to reform legal **immigration** so that it favors the entry of high-skilled workers, who aid the economy and assimilate more easily.

What we know for a certainty is that these two great population trends — aging and **immigration** — will, to a large extent, shape the United States' future. If elections are about the future and not the past, you would have expected much of the campaign to have been involved in a serious discussion of how to deal with them. You would, of course, have been wrong.

On **immigration**, what we got from Trump was demagoguery that played to the basest fears of many Americans. He would deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants**, a cruel and impractical proposal that he modified repeatedly. He'd also build a wall along our southern border, a policy that — as part of a larger package legalizing most of today's undocumented **immigrants** — may be worth a try. But Trump's proposal was all one-sided. By contrast, Clinton favors "comprehensive **immigration** reform" but is vague on how she would reduce illegal entry.

On aging, there was an unspoken consensus: Don't go there.

But as a society, we're already there. The United States is getting older and will continue to do so. **Immigration** is changing the country ethnically and will continue to do so. The question is how much we control our future or how much it controls us. The inattention of Campaign 2016 to these fateful issues is the real national embarrassment.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MINNEAPOLIS — Donald Trump emphasized his strict opposition to admitting refugees into the United States over concerns about terrorism as he made a closing pitch to voters in a trio of key battleground states Sunday.

While the Republican presidential nominee regularly touts his call to halt the flow of Syrian refugees into the United States, during a campaign stop in Minneapolis, he singled out Somalis, mentioning a mall stabbing rampage in the region carried out by a Somali **immigrant**.

Although Trump's words could resonate with conservative base in the state, particularly those with deep concerns about terrorism and the Islamic State, Minnesota has long been a Democratic stronghold in the presidential contests, meaning that Trump probably needs to win centrist and crossover voters to stand a realistic chance of victory. With his comments about minorities, refugees and **immigrants** having already come under heavy criticism from Democrats, he risked doing further damage to his image in the political middle and left with his latest remarks.

"Here in Minnesota, you've seen firsthand the problems caused with faulty refugee vetting, with large numbers of Somali refugees coming into your state without your knowledge, without your support or approval, and with some of them then joining ISIS and spreading their extremist views all over our country and all over the world," said Trump, using another name for the Islamic State.

Trump said that as president, he would not admit refugees "without the support of the local community where they are being placed."

Dahir Adan, a Somali **immigrant**, went on a stabbing rampage at a St. Cloud mall in September before he was shot dead by a police officer. Trump mentioned the attack in his remarks and portrayed it as symptomatic of a larger problems.

"Everybody's reading about the disaster taking place in Minnesota," he said at one point.

The Twin Cities is home to the nation's largest community of Somali **immigrants**. The FBI's pursuit there of 10 young men from the Somali American community, whom they accused of conspiring to join the Islamic State and kill on its behalf, attracted national attention.

Just as he did in Minneapolis, Trump seized on fears about refugees living in Michigan at a later rally in a suburb of Detroit.

"Here in Michigan you've seen firsthand the problems caused with the refugee program. ... With large numbers of poorly vetted refugees coming into your state — without your knowledge, without your support and without your approval — it puts your security at risk and it puts enormous pressure on your schools and your community resources," he said.

Trump mentioned refugees again later at a stop near Pittsburgh.

Democrat Hillary Clinton campaigned in New Hampshire on Sunday with Khizr Khan, a Muslim American whose son, Army Capt. Humayun Khan, was killed in the Iraq War. Trump attacked the Khans for criticizing him during a speech at the Democratic National Convention, drawing widespread criticism earlier in the campaign.

Trump called last year for a ban on Muslim **immigrants** over concerns about terrorism. While he no longer touts the proposed ban in those words on the campaign trail, preferring instead to say he is focused on blocking the flow of people from countries where terrorism has been a problem, the proposal remains on his website.

Abigail Hauslohner contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As is often the case in presidential contests, the polls have tightened in recent days. How much and why are interesting questions that I'll get into in a moment, but my point today is: Why has the stock market reacted negatively to this tightening? What do markets fear about a Trump victory?

The figure below, from an excellent Vox article on the internal mechanics of different polling methods, shows that the probability of a Trump victory, while well below 50 percent, is increasing in both the popular 538 model and the New York Times Upshot model, though a lot less so in the latter. That's because 538's methods give more weight to new, incoming information while other poll aggregators are less responsive to such information, implicitly waiting to see whether any new swings stick ("waiting to weight"). Both methods are completely legit, and we'll soon see who's made the more accurate prediction.

But check out this next figure. It shows that about when the polls started tightening, equity values fell and volatility rose. According to Bloomberg News, the nine-day decline in the S&P index is the longest negative streak since 1980.

Now, I assiduously avoid interpreting the wiggles and waggles in the stock market, but this is enough of a trend to warrant some speculation. So, here are some hypotheses as to what's behind the losses.

Market Uncertainty: Markets don't like surprises. Forget about ideology, party, policy, scandals and the rest of the stuff the punditry gets wound up about. If something that looked like a pretty sure thing now looks to be more up for grabs, traders get nervous and start hedging, shorting, trading currencies and basically re-positioning themselves for what was an unexpected outcome. That's what the volatility index, which moves up as such trading accelerates, is telling us.

Political Uncertainty: Though it's been hard to break through the dark drama of this benighted election cycle, a fair summary of the political expectations is that a Clinton presidency would not represent a strong break with the past eight years while a Trump presidency would signal exactly that, both in domestic and foreign policy. Moreover, as I've stressed in a number of places, Trump's extremely negative assessment of the economy belies the facts, particularly in the job market. As I've also stressed, that's a far cry from saying everyone's doing great or that a fair share of the economy's growth is consistently reaching the middle class. But from the market's perspective, Trump's inaccurate economic diagnosis signals a big, potential problem.

Trade: While both candidates have been critical of the effects of trade and globalization, Clinton essentially stresses that globalization needs to be reshaped, not restrained. Trump's team, on the other hand, appears to want to significantly dampen trade flows through high tariffs and big fights with trading partners. Markets reasonably view that strategy as a negative for growth.

The Federal Reserve: Trump's criticism of Janet Yellen and the Fed engender two aspects that spook markets. First, the idea of a president trying to muscle the Fed on interest rate decisions is scary, as the central bank's political independence is one of its most important attributes. If the Fed operated like the Congress, we'd be in real trouble. Second, while there are of course those on Wall Street who would like to see the Fed tighten, which is what Trump appears to be calling for, broadly speaking, the markets have reacted badly to signals of higher rates, and, in fact, market forecasters have priced in lower rates of both inflation and interest rates than those in the Fed's model.

**Immigration**: Who knows if a President Trump could really deport millions of **immigrants**, but even the prospect of such an economically disruptive and damaging move has markets on edge. The Mexican peso has been particularly volatile in recent weeks, moving inversely to Trump's electoral fortunes (i.e., Trump up, peso down, and vice versa). Clinton's more welcoming stance on **immigration** is viewed as pro-growth by the markets.

Taxes, budgets: Trump's fiscal plan has been scored to worsen our fiscal accounts much more so than Clinton's, which is mostly paid for (all of which suspends disbelief in terms of what either could get through the next Congress, so there's a bit of a Kabuki dance going on here). It's not clear that markets worry much about the budget deficit either way, but there's an argument that large, sustained deficits would eventually push up interest rates and slow growth, so perhaps that's in the mix here. Suffice it to say that most market participants, to their credit, don't buy the trickle-down nonsense about how phat tax cuts for the rich will pay for themselves through growth effects.

TVF (Trump volatility factor): There's a narrative that suggests a thin-skinned president who overreacts to perceived (or actual) insults wouldn't be great for markets. Basically, a volatile president would create volatile markets, or, if you want the math: d(VIX)/d(TVF)>0 (the first derivative of the volatility index with respect to Trump's volatility is positive).

Of course, it could well be the case that by the time you're reading this, the market has reversed course, which is why you normally don't want to read too much into near-term trends in the indexes. On the other hand, these times are anything but normal.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Handouts at San Diego Catholic church imply Clinton is Satanic, say voting Democratic is a 'mortal sin': https://t.co/EkLPGmjsQJ[https://t.co/EkLPGmjsQJ] pic.twitter.com/o0Cr9AMYcl

SAN DIEGO — The Sunday bulletin of San Diego's Immaculate Conception Catholic Church on Oct. 16 wasn't very different from all the others.

Seven pages. A welcome to newcomers. A Mass schedule.

But there, between the prayers of healing for the ill and the deployed and a reminder about a parent-child chastity luncheon for ages 11 and up, was an extra flier.

On it was printed a memo, written in Spanish and English, and titled, in part, "How to vote like a Catholic."

"It is a mortal sin to vote Democrat . . . immediately after death the souls of those who die in a state of mortal sin descend into hell," the flier said, as reported by the San Diego Union-Tribune.

The flier listed five political topics that will guarantee damnation for anyone who endorses them, the newspaper reported.

What are those mortal issues? Abortion, same-sex marriage, euthanasia, human cloning and embryonic stem-cell research.

Warnings from the church, which is in Old Town, the city's historic district, escalated Oct. 30.

The message that day specifically mentioned Hillary Clinton, linking her to the famed late community organizer Saul David Alinsky, whom it described as a tool of "Satan" and "the devil."

The Alinsky-Hillary Clinton-Satan connection (as a student at Wellesley, she wrote a thesis on Alinsky, who had a following of young activists in the 1960s and '70s) is an old conservative rap on Clinton, most recently resurrected by Ben Carson at the Republican National Convention.

That Sunday's bulletin, which was printed on page 3 and not inserted as a flier, listed 10 key issues through which elected officials "impose sin upon us."

On that expanded list: accepting **immigrants** whose "religious values are to eradicate every belief except those of their own prophet and god," supporting **immigrants** monetarily while the national debt grows, "playing policeman for the world" and supporting gun control.

A spokesman for the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego told the Union-Tribune that the pastor didn't approve the initial flier.

"For all I know someone thought that they were doing a service" by inserting the message into the bulletin, diocese spokesman Kevin Eckery said. "The pastor said it was not something he had reviewed or approved."

Eckery said the messages in the flier and bulletin were wrong.

"It's not a mortal sin to vote for Democrats, number one. And number two, the church doesn't take positions on this, and we're not going to."

In a statement published by NBC San Diego, Bishop Robert McElroy said the church needs to stay out of partisan politics:

Let me stress again that while we have a moral role to play in explaining how Catholic teaching relates to certain public policy issues, we must not and will not endorse specific candidates, use parish media or bulletins to favor candidates or parties through veiled language about selectively chosen issues, or engage in partisan political activity of any kind.

As a condition of their tax-exempt status, churches are forbidden from participating in partisan politics.

Thursday the story was picked up by the Associated Press and other outlets. Reaction on social media was swift and fierce.

"Start paying taxes for all the money you grub…then maybe your political opinion will matter," a woman wrote on the church's Facebook page. "How DARE you prey on the fears of your congregation! 'Religious people' like you are the reason I and many others no longer attend your false house of worship."

"Uh-oh! Someone was caught making political statements when they are not suppose too! Maybe you should pay taxes in order to have your say! Keep your book of fairy tales out of Government!!!" wrote another.

"White clergy telling their non white parishioners they will go to hell if they don't vote for the white raging racist? How nice. Disgusting," wrote someone with the username Lu Vil.

Dennis M. Clausen of Escondido, Calif., wrote to the Union-Tribune with this thought: "Hell is starting to look a lot better if heaven is populated by people like the one who wrote this church bulletin."

Roxana Popescu is a San Diego-based freelance writer.

More from Morning Mix

No, you can't text your vote. But these fake ads tell Clinton supporters to do just that.

Someone in Texas lined a Trump sign with razor blades, then left it at a polling place

Negativity made this elementary school do what America can't: Cancel the election

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The other night I was biking on the dark and lonely Capital Crescent Trail. The leaves rustled. I caught a musky scent. Suddenly, a deer darted in front of me. We almost collided.

At no time during this encounter was I abducted by aliens.

I feel obligated to share this because the relationship between deer crashes and **alien** abductions is key to the wonderfully weird sci-fi-com "People of Earth" (9 p.m. Mondays on TBS).

Greg Daniels of "The Office" and Conan O'Brien are executive producers of the 10-part series, which revolves around reporter Ozzie Graham. He slams into a deer with his car — and now has dreams where he's driving and a deer in the passenger seat says, 'You're about to hit a deer."

Then again, maybe the deer crash is a false memory created by aliens: a gray one with a butt-shaped head, a Nordic-looking one and a reptilian who teleported Graham to their craft.

To make matters worse, Graham, who usually covers issues like gun control, has been assigned a story on a support group for abductees. His slit-eyed editor wants clickbait. The editor also has a motorized desk he drives like a Segway (note to self: Check Amazon to see if such desks really exist).

Graham's angst is apparent in the woebegone face of comedian and actor Wyatt Cenac, formerly of "The Daily Show."

The support group members are predictably offbeat, like the woman who describes her job as "part-time temp at a funeral home." They're all happy because their **alien** abductors told them, "You are special." Graham is scornful. But empathy grows in his heart because … isn't he now one of them?

"People of Earth" is many shows in one: **alien** warlords plot to rule earth, hapless earthlings seek love, intense journalist questions his life. Its warped sense of humor bubbles up from the characters, like the mail deliverer who sees lots of strange stuff on her route — "naked people, mostly."

People of earth, tune in and you will not be disappointed. Also: Watch out for deer when driving and bicycling.

Read Marc's previous columns at washingtonpost.com/muse

More of Marc's TV musings:

This is what makes 'Better Things' a show for parents feeling lost

How 'Empire' became social media's most talked-about TV show

How one actor's silent performance in ABC's 'Speechless' gives a voice to kids with disabilities

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**No matter what happens in Tuesday's presidential election, the candidacy of Donald Trump has been an absolute demographic disaster for the Republican Party.

Why? Because Trump is running historically poorly among Hispanic voters, according to a new Washington Post-Univision national poll. Hillary Clinton is winning 67 percent of Hispanic voters, compared with just 19 percent for Trump

If Trump continues to get somewhere in the neighborhood of one of every five Hispanic votes, it would mark a new low for Republicans in that critical voting bloc. George W. Bush got 44 percent of the Hispanic vote in his 2004 reelection race. John McCain got 31 percent in 2008. Mitt Romney took 27 percent in 2012. That's, um, not a good trend.

Especially when every projection of where the country is headed shows the continuing decline of whites and the continued growth of the Hispanic population. According to projections by the Pew Research Center, whites will make up 46 percent of the U.S. population in 2065. Hispanics will be 24 percent at that time, while African Americans will make up 14 percent of the population. By comparison, 62 percent of the U.S. population in 2015 was white, while 18 percent was Hispanic and 12 percent was black.

Need a more real-world example? In 1984, Ronald Reagan won the white vote by 20 points — and the election with 525 electoral votes. In 2012, Romney matched Reagan's margin among white voters; he won just 206 electoral votes. In 1984, 86 percent of all votes were cast by whites; that number dipped to 72 percent in 2012 — and is projected to drop to 70 percent (or maybe even lower) on Tuesday.

In the wake of that 2012 loss — and the demographic problems it portended — the Republican National Committee issued an autopsy report that had one central recommendation: Find a way to pass some sort of comprehensive **immigration** reform or else. It read (emphasis mine):

"We are not a policy committee, but among the steps Republicans take in the Hispanic community and beyond, we must embrace and champion comprehensive **immigration** reform. If we do not, our Party's appeal will continue to shrink to its core constituencies only. We also believe that comprehensive **immigration**reform is consistent with Republican economic policies that promote job growth and opportunity for all."

"Our party's appeal will continue to shrink to its core constituencies only." Remember those words.

Instead of finding a way to get behind comprehensive reform, rank-and-file Republicans killed even the consideration of such a bill — even after it had passed the Senate. And then the party chose Trump as its presidential nominee.

That's the same Trump who rose to prominence within the Republican Party on a pledge to build a wall on our southern border and make Mexico pay for it. And the same candidate who has openly embraced the sort of grievance politics that led him to, among other things, question whether a judge of Mexican heritage was fit to oversee a case regarding Trump University and to propose a temporary ban on Muslims entering the country.

In short: It's hard to conceive of a candidate who would run more contrary to the party's stated goal of expanding its coalition than Trump. Actually, it's not hard. It's impossible.

What Republican strategists are desperately hoping is that Hispanics will view Trump as an outlier, an isolated case who does not represent the broader views of the GOP. Again, the Post-Univision poll suggests that may be a false hope.

Seventy-six percent of likely Hispanic voters have an unfavorable view of Trump; 66 percent hold that same unfavorable view of the broader Republican Party. Those numbers compare horribly with the way Latino voters regard the Democratic Party: 71 percent have a favorable opinion, compared with 24 percent who have a negative one.

Yes, Hispanics view Trump more unfavorably than they view the Republican Party as a whole. But two-thirds of Hispanic voters have an unfavorable opinion of the Republican Party, and that is still disastrously bad. Those numbers suggest that Trump is not being viewed as something separate from the GOP and that the negative way Hispanics view him is rubbing off on the party he represents.

To go back to where I started: Yes, it is still possible that Trump could win the 270 electoral votes he needs to be president on Tuesday. (The white vote will still make up about 7 in 10 voters in this election.)

But, win or lose, Trump has set back his party among Hispanic voters in ways that may well be irreversible in the near to medium term. The current composition of the Republican Party's electorate is a winner for 1984. It's a near-certain loser for 2024 and beyond.

chris.cillizza@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When in the course of human events a presidential election grows replete with dangerous attitudes, postulates and words, it becomes necessary for one to dissolve his or her neutrality towards a candidate, and decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that citizens declare the causes which impel them to depart from said neutrality.

As stated in our Declaration of Independence, I "hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." And to secure these rights and to overcome the threat of any oppressor, it lies in the hands of citizens, and this writer, the power to disrupt and break any relationship with politicians or candidates with aspirations to govern over us and the decision to act civically against them.

Such civic action, voting in this election cycle, is complex since this writer has failed to bestow his complete confidence in the alternative. But the vote is necessary and our vote is for Hillary Clinton. The only alternative.

Why not Donald J. Trump? Because when a long train of abuses, insults, and threats evinces a design to reduce the people under absolute despotism, it is my right, and it is my duty, as a citizen and political commentator, to help overthrow the oppressive figure that rises before me.

The tale of this American presidential candidate is an account of damages to the democratic and emotional stability of the country told by a tyrant whose words and falsehoods harbor hatred towards fellow citizens and members of the global community.

Trump has tried and convicted in the public square of fanaticism political opponents, judges, media, **immigrants** and other human beings.

Trump has built walls of doubts and fabricated conspiracy theories that damage our judicial and democratic structures while projecting a light of discredit and contempt on many public servants.

Trump has manipulated our American reality to make us believe —as it is the belief of the militants of racist and neo-Nazi organizations attending his rallies— that the first African-American President in US history is pro-Islamist and seeks to destroy the white race.

Trump has insulted our democratically elected politicians and the current leadership of the nation not only with inappropriate words, but by articulating a message that portrays them as less competent and with fewer leadership skills than the leaders of foreign dubious democracies and leaders of countries that maintain a tense relationship with the United States.

Trump has positioned himself against the new Americans by questioning US legal **immigration** practices, opposing laws that would open a door to hope for millions of undocumented **immigrants** with family in the United States, rejecting the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and covering with a mantle of doubt all those who aspire to the American Dream.

Trump has questioned the independence of judicial power, one of the pillars of our democracy.

Trump has grown and enlarged during the course of his presidential campaign relationships with racist groups and individuals that would become disturbing allies in the case that he is elected President of our free and diverse nation.

Trump has threatened to take military action and enact international aggressions that only a dictator would be able to implement.

Trump has called Americans to insurrection and articulated a rhetoric of hostility among the American people of unpredictable consequences.

Trump is a candidate whose character is marked, in words and actions, by the seal that defines a tyrant. This disqualifies him to be the ruler of a free people.

I, therefore, a humble columnist, on behalf of the inalienable right to free public expression bestowed upon me, solemnly request that you vote, but never for the Republican candidate Donald J. Trump. And thus, I, as a free citizen vested with the responsibility of making my vote count and holding my public officials accountable during their time in office, ask that you cast your vote for the Democratic candidate Hillary Rodham Clinton for President of the United States of America.

—————

This is an op-ed by Alberto Avendaño, Executive Editor of El Tiempo Latino a Publication of The Washington Post @AvendanoTV

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The hard-working staff here at Spoiler Alerts has, in their travels, encountered numerous Trump supporters across the land. All of these people are decent, hard-working Americans who genuinely believe that Trump will make America great again and is just the shock that the system needs.

I have noticed one cognitive tic that all of them possess, however. When asked how they feel about Trump's more outrageous policies — bringing back torture, building a wall on the Mexican border — they have a response. It is usually some variant of, "oh, that's just campaign talk" or "he won't really be able to do that, Congress will stop him" or something like that. In other words, Trump supporters focus on the things they like about their candidate and rationalize away the other stuff.

To be fair, in doing this Trump supporters are no different from Clinton supporters or Obama supporters or Romney supporters or whatnot. All partisans develop cognitive crutches to justify voting for an imperfect candidate, to explain away the policy positions they do not like. Given Trump's predilection for contradicting his own policy statements, that would seem to apply with particular force to him. Trump says a lot of crazy stuff that he later contradicts by saying different crazy stuff, and followed by a decent chance that he reverts back to saying his original crazy stuff. Ironically, this matches much of the commentary that argues Trump is just a grifter with no real core values.

The problem is that Trump supporters often use this gambit to explain away Trump's core issues as campaign hyperbole. And there are three logical flaws in that argument.

The first is that Donald Trump really does possess some core values. As Tom Wright noted back in January, a lot of what Trump has said about foreign policy and the global economy matches what he has been saying on this topic for decades:

[Trump] has three key arguments that he returns to time and again over the past 30 years. He is deeply unhappy with America's military alliances and feels the United States is overcommitted around the world. He feels that America is disadvantaged by the global economy. And he is sympathetic to authoritarian strongmen. Trump seeks nothing less than ending the U.S.-led liberal order and freeing America from its international commitments.

There's nothing like winning a presidential election to reinforce a candidate's core beliefs. And if anyone is supremely confident that they have the right philosophy, it's Donald Trump.

The second logical flaw is that winning presidential candidates try to fulfill their campaign promises. They will particularly try to keep their pledges on their signature issues. Trump's signature issues have all been related to foreign policy or foreign economic policy. As I noted a few months ago:

[The] overwhelming bulk of his campaign pronouncements are concentrated on foreign policy, loosely defined: terrorism, NATO, Russia, China, trade, **immigration**, etc. There is practically no domestic policy content to Trump's campaign. If Trump is good at one thing, it is generating free media coverage — and that coverage is focusing on what Trump is saying about world politics.

The thing about presidents and foreign policy is that they have a lot of leeway to do what they want in foreign affairs. As Micah Zenko noted recently in Foreign Policy:

[U]nlike their role in domestic legislation and appropriations, American presidents have tremendous power and authority over the scope and conduct of foreign policy. This has been especially true since 9/11, when the chief's constitutional authorities started being used to justify a range of covert and clandestine actions, as well as expanded military commitments, with very little restraint or oversight from Congress or the courts.

Trump supporters who think a president Trump wouldn't really follow through on his pledges regarding trade, NATO or **immigration** are kidding themselves.

One final flaw: Trump knows so little about actual policy minutiae that he will be unusually reliant upon his staffers to execute his policy wishes. And as Elizabeth Saunders noted over the summer, a lack of foreign policy experience enables advisers to freelance far more.

Let's consider Trump's closest foreign policy advisers for a second. Trump's principal national security adviser is Gen. Michael Flynn. Based on Flynn's behavior as a surrogate, I concluded last month that, "at this point Flynn should be kept as far away from power as humanly possible." His subsequent behavior merely confirms that assessment.

Trump's closest foreign economic policy adviser is Peter Navarro, a real, live economist at the University of California at Irvine. How high-quality is Navarro? Let's go to Adam Davidson's New Yorker profile from last month:

Navarro's responses to critiques tend to be blistering and Trumpian. In an email describing economists who disagree with him about trade, he used the words "stupid" and "stupider" to characterize their views. The next morning, when I asked for clarification, he wrote, "This is why I don't trust you or want to discuss anything on the phone with you. Where did you come up with the 'stupid' thing? Were you recording me on our phone call without my permission?"….

So, to sum up:

\* If you think Donald Trump won't try to fulfill his core foreign policy promises as president then you are fooling yourself.

\* Trump will empower advisers who seem to be even crazier than himself.

Have a great weekend!

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**STERLING HEIGHTS, Mich. — On one level, this Detroit suburb where Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump is scheduled to appear Sunday evening makes plenty of political logic.

It's the hub of Macomb County, with a white working-class electorate that in 1980 gave rise to the term "Reagan Democrats." Trump, it would seem, is looking for a boost from their economic disaffection and frustration with the effects of foreign trade.

Yet Sterling Heights is also synonymous in these parts with religious tensions between one of the state's fastest-growing Muslim populations and a powerful community of Chaldean Christians, a Catholic denomination that includes thousands of people who have fled Iraq over the past decade.

All of it makes Sterling Heights, the state's fourth most populous city, a reminder of what the Trump candidacy has meant for jittery Muslim Americans. The city is currently facing a federal civil rights lawsuit over its planning commission's rejection last year of a proposed mosque, which would have been the third built here since 2011.

"It is unnerving to have him here, so close," Syed Razvi said as he left Saturday evening prayers at the American Muslim Diversity Association mosque. "Before Trump's candidacy, if you meet anybody around here, no problem. Now everybody's like: 'Oh, you're a Muslim. We need to stay away from them.' "

Trump's appearance in Sterling Heights is part of a surprising level of attention being paid to the Wolverine State in the final throes of the 2016 presidential race. Both campaigns say the polls have tightened, and both are spending an outsize amount of time here as a result.

A Detroit Free Press poll published Friday had Clinton at 42 percent to Trump's 38 percent, with Trump gaining four points in the past two weeks.

In addition to his scheduled appearance in Sterling Heights, Trump has also scheduled a rally in Grand Rapids on Monday. Also on the GOP side, Eric and Ivanka Trump; Trump's running mate, Mike Pence; and former Alaska governor Sarah Palin all popped in over the past few days.

Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton, who spoke in Detroit on Friday, is due in Grand Rapids on Monday. Former president Bill Clinton appears Sunday in Lansing. President Obama is scheduled to rally minority voters, which Democrats worry may not turn out in the numbers they need; he will appear in Ann Arbor on Monday, too.

"To rile up his base on one of the last days before the election, I would say Macomb County is a great place for Trump to go," said Susan Demas, editor and publisher of Inside Michigan Politics. "He did very well in the primary in Macomb County, and his support there has really never wavered. He's really tapped in to the anger there with white voters."

Sterling Heights, about 18 miles north of downtown Detroit, has long been a magnet for ethnic **immigrants** from various war-ravaged or oppressed regions. A century ago, many Polish **immigrants** set down roots here; waves of Albanians, Serbian and Macedonian emigres joined them in the 1980s and 1990s. Chaldean migrations have occurred in spurts since the 1970s. They escalated in the past decade after the fall of Saddam Hussein unleashed sectarian violence from al-Qaeda in Iraq and the Islamic State that targeted non-Muslim minorities.

Chaldeans make up roughly 5 percent of Sterling Heights's population of 130,000, and the Detroit area in general is home to the most Chaldeans in the United States, according to the 2010 Census. The Detroit suburbs are also well-known for having the nation's biggest population of Arab Americans and Muslims.

"There's a very strong anti-Muslim sentiment among the old-time residents and the Christian refugees from the Middle East in Sterling Heights," said Dawud Walid, executive director of the Michigan chapter of the Council on American-Islamic Relations. "It's not just a sentiment coming from Republicans. It emanates the Reagan Democrat-type crowd."

Sterling Heights Mayor Mike Taylor (R) took umbrage at that notion, questioning the premise that Trump is actually anti-**immigrant** or anti-Muslim.

"There have been comments made by the Trump campaign regarding Muslims, and I understand what Muslims are concerned about with a Donald Trump presidency," Taylor said. "It's been blown out of proportion. We need to be sure that the refugees are properly vetted and that they have the country's best interest. I'm confident the Muslims in Sterling Heights have the country's best interest at heart."

Perhaps, but in the parking lot at Holy Martyrs Chaldean Catholic Church on Saturday, it was not difficult to find anti-Muslim sentiment as the basis for many worshipers' support of Trump. The harshest of them, including a woman who said Muslims "want to take over and kill us all," refused to give their names.

A group of 12-year-olds emerging from a children's Mass were giddy when told that Trump would be visiting the Freedom Hill Amphitheater six miles away.

"Most of us want Donald Trump to win because he can defeat ISIS and let us go back to our countries," said Ray Poles, whose family emigrated from Iraq in the past year. "I hope we can go see him."

national@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**What does it mean to be an American? This election, more than any other in recent decades, is revolving around a fundamental disagreement over American identity. And its outcome will communicate to the world — and to Americans ourselves — what the answer to that question is. Are we a nation that looks inward, that builds walls, that turns away those fleeing persecution and violence? Or does the United States aspire to be the leader of the free world, a refuge for those seeking asylum and a symbol and destination of hope for those seeking a better life for themselves and their children?

Both impulses have been present in American history. From the rabidly anti-**immigrant** Know-Nothing Party to the Chinese Exclusion Act to the KKK (whose official newspaper has endorsed Donald Trump for president), the American story cannot be told without reference to these spasms of racism and nativism. Before this particular round of nativist resentment, the United States sought a kind of isolation in the 1920s, turning inward as trouble brewed abroad. It placed new restrictions on **immigration**, designed to target populations deemed undesirable.

And now a xenophobic agenda, in which Mexicans are denounced as rapists and religious freedom is seen as no obstacle to banning Muslims from entering the country, has catapulted a populist reality TV star to the top of the Republican Party's presidential ticket. The alt-right has entered the mainstream with its warnings of 'white genocide' and proud sectarian agenda of valuing Christian lives above those of non-Christians, finally warranting a repudiation from the nation's Democratic nominee.

This election could usher in a new Republican Party that increasingly relies on the ugliest forms of populism and nationalism. It could even redefine the United States as a nation by taking the country down the road of illiberal democracy or even authoritarianism. This isn't just alarming for Americans who are committed to democracy, civil liberties and the rule of law; it's also critical moment for the world. This is why in recent comments, Pope Francis made a point of warning against a politics of fear: "Citizens are walled-up, terrified, on one side," he said. "On the other side, even more terrified, are the excluded and banished."

And this election will decide the future of both sides.

In Syria, the mass slaughter carried out by Bashar al-Assad's regime and the totalitarian terror of the Islamic State have created a refugee crisis on an epic scale, with roughly half of the Syrian population displaced. The American response has been entirely inadequate. Despite temporary waves of empathy inspired by images of Alan Kurdi and Omran Daqneesh, Assad engages in crimes against humanity with impunity and American opposition to the resettlement of refugees within our borders remains strong.

And we have a refugee crisis closer to home — right here on own continent. In my short time in Honduras, I witnessed the specter of insecurity haunting the lives of countless people. But certain people — those who cannot or will not pay extortion fees, those who have witnessed crimes, and others — are targeted for death. The police and members of the judicial branch are too often indifferent or even complicit. Those fleeing such threats are refugees. And some of those who have been turned away have been killed upon their return.

But even beyond these refugees, there are people who are desperate for opportunity, stuck in societies where efforts to reduce corruption, ensure security and create jobs struggle to gain traction.

The United States can and should help these people to remain in their countries. That means continuing to increase aid that fosters integral human development and reduces the atrocious malnutrition rate that exceeds 50 percent in Guatemala, while providing assistance to strengthen civil society and ensure greater transparency and good governance so that corruption can be reduced and government can generate the revenue it needs to fulfill its responsibilities. A strategy that focuses on halting migration or security alone will only perpetuate and extend the migration crisis.

In talking to regular Guatemalans, from those who studied teaching and computers but can't find jobs in these areas to small farmers subject to the whims of the market and nature, there was a strong desire to stay with their families and find opportunity without migrating. They showed resolve and resiliency in the face of obstacles that would leave many others nihilistic. I spoke with a 19-year-old man named Minor who helps his father grow coffee on a small plot of land. Despite the labor-intensive, low-profit nature of small-scale coffee farming, Minor does not want to abandon his family and country. His greatest desire is to study agriculture in the United States and return home, applying the lessons he learns to uplift his family and community. Susanna, a 25-year-old who studied to be a teacher but has not been able to secure a job in the field after three years of searching, spoke with passion about her continued desire to help her country and community develop. Angelita, an incredibly poised and talented 18-year-old, cannot find stable employment but was firm in her determination to remain with her family and fight for a brighter future in Guatemala. The United States can play a critical role in addressing the root causes of the migration crisis and help reduce the frequency of people from the Northern Triangle — Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala — making the dangerous trek to the United States.

Those who want to stay and spoke about improving their communities and country also frequently admitted the appeal of traveling to the United States to pick tomatoes or work in a kitchen or even to be a waitress, and many of their friends and family members have migrated. Their desire to do whatever it takes to uplift their families, their enduring hope and persistence in difficult situations is precisely the spirit that represents the best of what it means to be an American. By expanding legal **immigration**, we would not only give these migrants a more secure means to using their gifts and doing jobs that are essential for our country to function, we would also renew the vitality and spirit of America and affirm that this is still the land of opportunity — that democracy and freedom are based on faith and strength, not fear and weakness.

For Americans voting on Tuesday, the question isn't only whether the American people can withstand an anti-**immigrant**, anti-refugee administration, or even whether the rest of the world can. Instead, it's whether our highest ideals can be reconciled with turning away so many who are fleeing violence, seeking a decent standard of living for their families, or trying to reassemble disintegrated families, and what will become of our national identity if we allow the fear of others to shape our policies instead of a belief in the greatness of the American project as a nation of **immigrants**. Depending on the outcome of the election, we could go further down the path of isolationism and nativism.

The alternative story is that this is a nation of **immigrants**; it's at the core of who we are as a people. We don't shut out the rest of the world. We don't turn a blind eye to aggression and atrocities abroad or the desperate plight of those fleeing such violence. Protectionism and isolationism are seen as false choices, offering neither the security nor prosperity they promise.

The United States does not need a xenophobe in chief. We do not need populism that appeals to our worst instincts. To make America great, we need to embrace our responsibilities to foster freedom, democracy and human rights on our own continent and around the world; to welcome refugees and those seeking economic opportunity and even survival; and to embrace a national culture where diversity is seen as a source of pride and strength. Next week's election is a referendum on American identity, and the decision we make as Americans will have lasting implications that will reverberate around the world. Let us hope that the American people make the right decision and choose to be the land of the free and brave, rather than the isolated and afraid.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One of the basic premises of Donald Trump's quest for the presidency has been that his tough talk about **immigration**, Muslims, and trade -- and his all around bluster and Man In The Street's Billionaire showmanship -- would bring a surge of "missing white voters" into the electorate.

A tremendous amount of attention has been lavished on understanding the motives and predilections of these voters. They are variously described as non-college whites, blue collar whites, white nationalists who thrill to Trump's America First rhetoric, Rust Belt whites who have been losers in the globalizing economy, whites who hate both parties and the establishment, whites who believe **immigration** threatens their place in the labor market, whites who are suffering anxiety over cultural and/or demographic change, and so forth.

But what if missing nonwhite voters end up mattering to the election's outcome, too?

The Upshot's Nate Cohn has a deep dive into the whole "missing white voter" phenomenon that suggests this question. To vastly oversimplify, Cohn used national voter registration data, and Upshot polling in North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Florida, to try to determine whether Trump is bringing new white voters into the electorate -- on the scale necessary to overcome the ongoing demographic shifts that are slowly turning the national electorate more nonwhite, to the advantage of Democrats.

Cohn reached two key conclusions: First, there hasn't been a massive surge in new registration among white voters; and second, it's not clear that Trump has a decisive advantage among the missing white voters in any case.

The "missing voters" are actually broken down into two categories in Cohn's study. He looked at approximately 1500 voters in the three swing states who did not vote in 2012, but are all now registered -- either they registered before 2012 and didn't vote, or they have registered since then.

Cohn concluded that white voters in those two categories support Trump in smaller numbers than the white voters who voted in 2012 do, meaning they are not necessarily a natural target for Trump, after all. And, crucially, it is Clinton who actually leads among all the voters (white and nonwhite) who did not vote in 2012:

This is in part because of nonwhite voters. Of the voters who were registered in 2012 but didn't vote (among whom Clinton leads by 42-33), there are more nonwhites than whites. And the voters who are newly registered (among whom Clinton leads by 47-33) are disproportionately young and nonwhite, many of them Latinos.

Now, the big question remains: Which of these voters who did not turn out in 2012 will actually do so this time, and what impact will that have?

We won't have a sense of the answer to this until after Election Day, obviously. But the Associated Press reports that analysts in both parties are seeing signs in Florida's early vote that Democrats are getting people who haven't voted before to do so now in greater numbers than Republicans are. Meanwhile, the Latino share of the early vote is up (Democrats are struggling with flagging African American enthusiasm, but that may still get turned around, and Latinos may help mitigate that).

We don't know why all of this is the case, but it's plausible that Trump's candidacy might have something to do with it. And in very close outcomes in these battlegrounds, marginal shifts in the composition of the electorate could matter.

The big potential flaw in Trump's whole "missing whites" strategy has always been that the measures he's apparently thought would help get those voters out -- in particular, the relentless xenophobia and racist campaign -- risked driving up turnout among nonwhites. It would be quite the ironic outcome if Trump's "missing whites" strategy ended up making "missing nonwhites" matter to the outcome more than they otherwise would have if another Republican had been the nominee. Particularly if it helps deliver a Trump loss.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

UPDATE: Since this piece ran, turnout has been exploding in the early voting among Latinos in several key battlegrounds, and crucially, many are first time voters, i.e., the missing nonwhite vote. As the New York Times puts it:

In Florida, at least 200,000 more Hispanics had voted early as of Friday than did during the entire early voting period four years ago, according to an analysis by Steve Schale, a Democratic strategist who helped run President Obama's two campaigns here.

Or, as Senator Lindsey Graham neatly put it: "So Trump deserves the award for Hispanic turnout. He did more to get them out than any Democrat has ever done."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**After running even with Donald Trump early last week, Hillary Clinton now holds a five-point lead in the latest Post-ABC Tracking Poll overall, as well as clear advantages on several personal attributes.

Enthusiasm for Clinton and Trump now stands at rough parity, both significantly lower than it was among supporters of Barack Obama and Mitt Romney four years ago. But Clinton has a clear advantage in affirmative support, with 55 percent of her backers saying the main reason they are voting for her is because they support her, compared with 43 percent of Trump voters. More Trump voters say they are voting for him mainly because they oppose Clinton.

The Post-ABC poll finds Clinton with a 48 percent to 43 percent lead in overall vote preferences, just on the edge of statistical significance but continuing a clear trend of improvement since the race was locked at 46 percent at the beginning of last week. Clinton has benefited from more united support from non-white voters as well as with "pure" political independents who do not lean toward either party.

Clinton's advantage in the tracking poll is slightly larger than her standing in other national surveys released in the past week. Clinton was up three points in a CBS News/New York Times poll, two points in a Fox News poll, one point in a McClatchy-Marist poll and tied in the IBD/TIPP daily poll released Saturday — results that lean in her favor, but not by a significant margin.

[Read full poll results | Graphic: Who key groups are supporting]

The new Post-ABC poll asked voters which candidate they favored across five personal attributes debated during the campaign, including honesty, empathy, qualifications, moral character and temperament.

Clinton holds clear advantages on four of the five qualities, some by very large margins. By 58 percent to 32 percent, more voters prefer Clinton's personality and temperament, and by 55 percent to 36 percent, more say she has better qualifications for the job than Trump does. The Democratic nominee also holds an eight -point advantage on the question of which candidate has a better understanding of the "problems of people like you," and a seven-point lead when voters are asked which candidate has stronger moral character.

But Trump maintains a 44 percent to 40 percent edge over Clinton on which candidate is more honest and trustworthy, though that result is down from an eight-point edge  earlier this week after the FBI announced the discovery of additional emails that might be relevant to from their investigation of her use of a private server while secretary of state.

While voter preference on candidate qualities seemed clear, they were more closely split on who they trust to deal with major policy issues. A previous wave of the Post-ABC Tracking Poll released this week found neither candidate held a double-digit advantage on trust to handle the economy, terrorism, **immigration**, health care or corruption in government.

There are sizable minorities of Trump and Clinton supporters who do not vouch for some of their personal qualities. About 82 percent of Clinton supporters say she is more honest and trustworthy than Trump, while 18 percent do not, saying neither is better than the other or that they have no opinion. Defections from Trump are sharpest on the issue of personality and temperament, with 27 percent of his backers saying he does not have a better personality and temperament than Clinton; 17 percent say he is not more qualified. Fewer than 3  in 10 of these voters say their vote for Trump is mainly because they support him, while two-thirds say they are mainly voting against Clinton.

Voters' opinions on the personal traits of Clinton and Trump are closely tied to which candidate they support. But the poll finds the connection is closer on the question of which candidate "better understand the problems of people like you." Fully 84 percent of likely voters say they support the candidate who is more empathetic, while only 1 percent choose the opposite. The connection is weakest for temperament, with 77 percent supporting the candidate they prefer on this question while 6 percent choose the opposite (nearly all of them Trump supporters).

The contrast between the candidates' results on personal characteristics helps explain Trump's historically weak standing among white women with college degrees. In the 2012 election, Republican Mitt Romney won that group by six points. Today, the Post-ABC poll finds Clinton leads that group by 16 points, 54 percent to 38 percent.

On all five attributes measured, white college-educated women prefer Clinton to Trump, and are more likely to say so than voters overall. White women college graduates are 12 points more likely than voters overall to say Clinton has better temperament than voters overall, 10 points more likely on "moral character," nine points more likely on empathy, eight points on honesty and seven points on overall qualifications.

In contrast to Trump's struggles on personal traits among college-educated white women, he fared well compared to Clinton when it comes to being trusted to handle some top issues in a previous wave of the Post-ABC Tracking poll this week (where Trump fared slightly better in overall voting). Trump topped Clinton by six points on this group in trust to handle terrorism and national security, five points on handling corruption and four points on the economy, while trailing by seven on **immigration** and health care alike.

This Washington Post-ABC News poll was conducted on cellular and landline phones Nov. 1-4, 2016, among a random national sample of 1,685 likely voters and has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 2.5 percentage points. Sampling, data collection and tabulation by Abt-SRBI of New York.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Melania Trump, the wife of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump and an **immigrant** from Slovenia, was paid for 10 modeling jobs in 1996 before she received legal authorization to work in the United States, the Associated Press reported Friday night.

The AP cited detailed ledgers from Melania Trump's modeling agency as well as a contract she signed with the firm, concluding that she was paid more than $20,000 for the work over seven weeks.

The finding contradicts repeated statements from both Melania and Donald Trump, who have insisted that she scrupulously followed U.S. **immigration** law when she came to the United States as a striving model.

It also creates a potential political embarrassment for the Republican nominee, who has based much of his campaign on a vow to crack down on illegal **immigration** — including deporting people who have violated the terms of their **immigration** status.

The Trump campaign has said that Melania Trump came to the United States in 1996 and then met and began dating Donald Trump in 1998. In 2001, she received a green card that allowed permanent residency, the campaign has said, and became a U.S. citizen in 2006, the year after she and Trump were married.

"I am pleased to enclose a letter from my **immigration** attorney which states that, with 100% certainty, I correctly went through the legal process when arriving in the USA," Melania Trump tweeted in September, when she released a lawyer's letter outlining the history. The campaign provided no documentation of the narrative at the time.

The new information involves Melania Trump's activities in her first weeks after arriving in the United States. The Trump campaign has indicated that she arrived on Aug. 27, 1996, holding a B1/B2 visitor's visa. She then received a work permit on Oct. 18, 1996.

It is illegal to perform work for money while holding a visitor's visa. However, the AP located records showing that she was paid for multiple jobs during the weeks that she held the visitor's permit, including for Fitness magazine and the Bergdorf Goodman department store.

During that time, she also signed what appeared to be a standard management agreement with her agency, Metropolitan International Management, that appeared to have been executed on Sept. 4, 1996.

Neither a Trump campaign spokesman nor Michael Wildes, the lawyer who wrote the letter outlining Trump's **immigration** history in September, responded Saturday to requests for comment. Wildes told the AP that "these documents, which have not been verified, do not reflect our records including corresponding passport stamps," but he did not answer additional questions.

In recent days, Melania Trump has reemerged on the campaign trail after a long absence following a speech she delivered at the Republican National Convention that borrowed language from Michelle Obama. Melania Trump held a rally on Thursday in Pennsylvania, where she issued a call for civility in politics.

In a speech she delivered Thursday in a Philadelphia suburb, she again highlighted her legal **immigration** status. As she spoke of the years she spent getting her visas and green card, several Trump supporters in the audience shouted — "Yes! A legal **immigrant**!"

Experts say many **immigrants** to the United States perform work illegally while holding a visitor's visa, putting them "out of status" and potentially endangering their ability to later become U.S. citizens. It is one reason, they say, that there are so many people living in the country illegally. Trump has promised to deport people who have violated the terms of their visas.

It is considered fraud to lie during the **immigration** process — by entering the United States with a visitor's visa but intending to work and falsely a telling a border control officer otherwise, for example.

If authorities can prove that a person has engaged in fraud, the consequences can be severe. **Immigration** authorities can retroactively seek to revoke citizenship of people found to have violated **immigration** law. But that process is very rare, generally used only in extreme cases, such as when a person is suspected of involvement with terrorism.

Still, the new information "shows a disregard for the rules," said Bruce Morrison, a former Democratic congressman and **immigration** expert. "Technically, it could unravel her status, if it is true."

Paolo Zampolli, a former partner in modeling agency, confirmed to the AP that the documents appeared authentic but that he could not recall additional details. He has told The Washington Post that he paid for Melania to come to New York in 1996 and arranged for her H-1B work visa so she could work at his Metropolitan Models.

She was 26 at the time, far older than the typical Eastern European recruit, usually 18 or 19.

Metropolitan was dragged into nasty contract disputes, and court documents related to them filed in New York detail many lavish parties its young models attended.

Metropolitan, like many modeling agencies, often threw parties, and their guest list included rich and influential men. It was at one of the parties in 1998 that Zampolli said he introduced Melania to Trump.

**Immigration** experts say questions remain about how Melania was able to obtain her green card in 2001, which allowed her to remain in the U.S. permanently.

She has said she was granted the permit because of "extraordinary ability," but experts say that visa category is generally reserved for people whose accomplishment is at the level of a Nobel Prize winner. It would be unusual, they say, for a model with no college degree to qualify.

rosalind.helderman@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — In the seaside cafes of Beirut, the whole thing looks "like a bad joke." To persecuted journalists in Burundi, it amounts to "a total loss of dignity." The government-scripted press of Beijing diagnoses "an empire moving downhill." And the spin doctors of the Kremlin see cause for pure and unambiguous delight.

The U.S. presidential election — America's quadrennial chance to showcase for the world how democracy works in the most powerful nation on Earth — has become instead an object lesson in everything that ails a country long seen as a beacon of freedom and hope.

Debates devoid of issues and deep in the gutter of personal insult. Interference from foreign intelligence services. Endless leaked emails, and FBI investigations that could extend long beyond Tuesday.

Americans may cringe watching their own election at close range. But the world's reaction has been, in a sense, even more poignant and foreboding.

People in small and distant countries who count on the United States to stand up for democratic values have been astonished to see the essential components — a free press, the rule of law, respect for the outcome of elections — trammeled.

Long-standing allies have been left to wonder whether the essential American character has changed, and whether the United States can be relied on when it counts.

Adversaries have looked on with glee, surprised at how easily the country that casts itself as the greatest can be knocked off kilter.

And even though the campaign still has days to go — with the outcome very much in doubt — the damage to American moral standing may already be done.

"I heard the election is being controlled by Russia. Is it true?" asked Anas al-Abed, 27, a Beirut cafe worker who said he has been following the campaign closely ever since he read that the Republican nominee, Donald Trump, had bragged about assaulting women.

"America always spoke to Arab countries as if they had so much to learn," he said. "And now we see their own democracy involves choosing between a woman from a dynasty and a man who says the system is manipulated. If that's democracy, then we don't want it."

This is not the first time that America's international reputation has been dealt a grievous blow. In recent years, the Iraq War brought global perceptions of the United States tumbling, only to be revived by the election of President Obama — who remains broadly popular overseas.

But political analysts worldwide said that never before have they seen a presidential campaign do so much to directly undermine America's core credibility.

"It's very shocking and disturbing to see this happening on such a scale in the richest country on Earth," said Koichi Nakano, a political-science professor at Sophia University in Tokyo.

It is not, of course, happening in a vacuum. Democracies from Southeast Asia to Western Europe are under pressure from within as populism and xenophobia surge. Autocrats from Moscow to the Middle East, meanwhile, are feeling emboldened.

"It isn't just about this election," said Jacob Parakilas, deputy head of the U.S. and Americas program at the London-based think tank Chatham House. "It fits into a broader framework of rising nationalism and the destruction of existing political norms."

But with the breakdown of those norms happening so vividly in America — a nation that proselytizes the virtues of democracy more aggressively than any other — the global swing toward less free and open societies could accelerate no matter who wins Tuesday.

"This campaign makes the implicit argument that the U.S. model of liberal democracy isn't what it's cracked up to be," Parakilas said.

America's top diplomat has acknowledged as much. Speaking to students in London on Monday, Secretary of State John F. Kerry called the campaign "downright embarrassing" and said that it has already damaged American influence.

Thanks to the election, he said, he is greeted with skeptical looks — or worse — when he sits down "with some foreign minister in another country or with the president or prime minister of another country and you say, 'Hey, we really want you to move more authoritatively towards democracy.' "

In the state-controlled media of America's nondemocratic rivals and adversaries, the campaign has only exposed what they long knew the country to be — a declining and morally bankrupt power.

"We are seeing the failure of U.S. democracy," wrote Zhang Zhixin, an expert on American politics at the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations.

The message is not only that America is floundering but also that China, prosperous and stable, is growing strong in its place.

With Philippine President ­Rodrigo Duterte promising to "separate" from the United States and realign with China's "ideological flow," Communist Party-approved writers seem to see an opening for more shifts in China's favor.

A recent piece in Xinhua, the state-controlled news wire, cited work by Li Wen, an academic at the Chinese Academy for Social Sciences, who argued that instability in the United States shows the "twisted mentality of an empire moving downhill."

In Russia, the campaign has not exactly reshaped perceptions of the United States. But it has reshaped Russians' perception of what their country is capable of doing to the United States.

Russian observers barely hide their joy at the notion that Americans think that Moscow has the power to affect the outcome of a U.S. presidential election.

"When we hear that we are sitting here in Moscow and interfering in America's life, that makes us all happy," said Gleb Pavlovsky, a political consultant who served at the Kremlin between 1996 and 2011. "We don't need to do anything; we can just sit here and organize elections in the United States."

Like most Russians, Pavlovsky is unwilling to acknowledge the U.S. administration's accusation that Kremlin-sponsored hackers have been meddling in the campaign.

But in a country where people feel the United States has overplayed its hand as the world's sole superpower, American officials' consternation over Russia's suspected role is seen as payback — and a possible political advantage.

"The feeling is that the chaos, the turbulence that all this is causing in the American electoral process is good for Russia," said Alexei Venediktov, editor in chief of Ekho Moskvy radio. "Whoever wins will have to deal with domestic upheaval and internal problems, rather than paying attention to Russia, and that is a good thing."

To U.S. allies, however, it is potentially disastrous. Trump has struck fear into the hearts of European leaders with suggestions that he may not come to the aid of fellow NATO members if they are attacked. Several have broken with protocol — which calls for strict neutrality — and denounced the Republican nominee, while praising his Democratic opponent, Hillary Clinton.

But Europe is confronting its own backlash against international cooperation.

Across the continent, anti-**immigration** politicians who want to pull their nations out of the European Union have exulted in Trump's success.

"Until about a year ago, when I would meet American counterparts, they'd ask, 'What is happening in Europe?' " said ­Marietje Schaake, a member of the European Parliament. She listed far-right leaders and parties that no longer seem so **alien** in America.

"We're seeing a shared challenge arising: challenges to the open economy and open democracies," she said.

Among some American allies, the U.S. campaign has even been a strange source of comfort because their own politics no longer look so bad.

Israel, known for its bare-knuckles brand of political jousting and for corruption cases that have snared presidents and prime ministers, has been unusually fixated on this year's race.

"Our politicians are perhaps not as crooked or corrupt as yours," said Jonathan Rynhold, a political scientist at Israel's Bar-Ilan University. "Ours are fairly mild by comparison."

In India, too, the effect of such an ugly contest has been surprisingly validating.

"For many middle-class Indians, the U.S. is a model for democracy. But watching the election campaign there now makes Indians feel slightly superior," said Shiv Visvanathan, a government professor at O.P. Jindal Global University.

It has also been deeply disquieting.

"How can such a trigger-happy nation be part of the great nuclear club, and take global decisions?" he asked.

Many in the Arab world are asking similar questions and are particularly unnerved by the rise of Trump, said H.A. Hellyer, a political analyst and author of a book on the 2011 Egyptian uprising.

"The fact he's a genuine contender has damaged American standing almost everywhere — not least within the Arab world and the wider region," Hellyer said. "His discourse, which has attacked Muslims . . . is not marginal. It is now mainstream, and that's deeply troubling."

The worry has also been especially acute in Mexico, where opinions toward Trump are overwhelmingly negative — no surprise given that his signature issue is building a border wall. He also launched his campaign by calling Mexican migrants "rapists."

Mexicans accustomed to feeling indifferent toward the U.S. presidential campaign have found themselves actively rooting for Trump to lose.

"For the first time there is a distinction: There's an American good guy and an American bad guy," said Ilán Semo, history professor at the Iberoamerican University in Mexico City. "It was never like this in Mexico."

The angst over Trump is so deeply felt that the peso plunges every time his poll numbers rise, and there could be an immediate recession in Mexico if he comes to power, said Jonathan Heath, an economist in Mexico City.

Anxiety about the presidential contest extends far south of any potential future border wall.

Latin America has been shifting back toward the political center in recent years after a long period dominated by left-wing populism. But the new crop of pro-business leaders has found that no one in the presidential race is willing to stick up for the principles of free trade and open markets that the United States has been pushing in the region for years.

Political whiplash is happening in Africa, too. For many on the continent, Obama's election had been a triumph, evidence that American democracy could be a model of liberalism and tolerance.

Now, eight years later, Trump's threats to jail his political opponent mimics the behavior of some of the continent's own less-than-democratic leaders.

Among them is President Pierre Nkurunziza of the small central African nation of Burundi. He was sworn in for a third term in August 2015, and exiled activists have been lobbying the United States to help halt the extrajudicial killings and repression that have characterized his new term.

The campaign, however, has offered little cause for optimism in a country such as Burundi, far from America's geopolitical priorities but in dire need of help from a superpower.

Elvis Banyankiye, a 28-year-old Burundian who is now studying in France, said he had once hoped the Americans would do more to pressure his government to stop human rights violations. Watching the U.S. presidential campaign stagger from one new low to the next, his expectations sank.

"The U.S. has been a model for how to conduct elections. We used to see tolerance in the debates," he said. "We are losing confidence in that."

            griff.witte@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As far as the Rev. Terry Jones knows, they were his ideas first.

"We are asking for the immediate halting of all Muslim **immigration** and the removal of all illegal aliens from the United States," the controversial Florida pastor told a Detroit radio station back in 2011. "We are asking for the monitoring of all the mosques in America."

At the time, Jones's demands were dismissed as crazy, part of a set of radical beliefs and xenophobia that impelled Jones to publicly burn Qurans and air mocking videos that provoked violent attacks on embassies and consulates in Egypt, Afghanistan and Libya.

Four and a half years later, those policy prescriptives are a core element of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump's campaign.

The party's standard-bearer has borrowed heavily both in message and in membership from far-right conservative activists whose pronouncements on Islam have long been denounced as dangerous zealotry by mainstream conservative and liberal policymakers alike.

Former president George W. Bush and GOP candidates Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Mitt Romney all repudiated anti-Islam rhetoric as un-American.

Trump has become the first and only major-party presidential candidate to adopt these ideas as his own. With his calls for a complete ban on Muslim **immigrants** or "extreme vetting" on people entering the country, policy prescriptives once relegated to the fringe have become mainstream.

The migration of anti-Islam extremist views to major-party acceptance is, like much in American politics, a fusion of opportunism and ideology. It often has been highly profitable for its practitioners as well.

In 2007, Brigitte Gabriel, a former reporter for Pat Robertson's evangelical television channel and author of a book on the dangers of Islam, founded Act! for America, an organization that touted as its "first accomplishment" its 2008 campaign to shut down a Minnesota Islamic school.

That same year, former newspaper executive Pamela Geller used her increasingly popular libertarian blog AtlasShrugs.com to spread the falsehood during the 2008 presidential campaign that President Obama was born in Kenya and was a secret Muslim.

So did former Reagan administration aide Frank Gaffney Jr., whose neoconservative think tank argued that the country was at risk of falling victim to "civilization jihad" at the hands of the Muslim Brotherhood.

The Egypt-based Islamist movement, Gaffney alleged, harbored a sinister bid to destroy American society and implement Islamic law.

With the Obama rumors, Gaffney, Geller, Gabriel and others found a more direct way to advance a broader opposition to Islam — and a right-wing audience to embrace it. Along the way, Kellyanne Conway, now Trump's campaign manager, contributed polling to sharpen the message.

By 2010, anti-Muslim activists had launched a nationwide media campaign against what they dubbed "the Ground Zero mosque," a proposal to build a mosque and Muslim community center in Lower Manhattan. Act! for America convened its first "National Conference and Legislative Briefing" in Washington, which brought advocates together with lawmakers, including Rep. Peter T. King (R-N.Y.) and then-Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.).

Both went on to hold congressional hearings to examine militants infiltrating the country.

While most mainstream politicians continued to malign the activists — the Conservative Political Action Conference barred Gaffney from speaking in 2010 after he accused two of its members of working with the Muslim Brotherhood — they spread their ideas through a network of small conferences, tea party groups, conservative churches and Jewish groups, and right-wing news outlets such as Breitbart. Former Breitbart chief executive Stephen Bannon is now chief executive of the Trump campaign.

They told their audiences that Islam isn't a religion but a political ideology that is inherently violent and opposed to Judeo-Christian values. They warned that mosques and Muslims should be watched. And they argued that practicing Islam means belief in the oppression of women and the murder of infidels, and that the religion is therefore unconstitutional.

Most important of all, they said, was to stop the advance of what they labeled "creeping sharia," an alleged Muslim plot to impose Islamic law across American institutions.

Sharia is not a codified document like the U.S. Constitution, say religious and legal scholars, but rather a broad and variably interpreted set of ideas and principles for how to live life as a Muslim. It offers an array of guidance, including on prayer practices, marriage, diet and finances. It also draws on tens of thousands of texts and scholarly interpretations, meaning that there is no universally approved body of Islamic law, said Intisar A. Rabb, an Islamic legal scholar at Harvard University.

In the summer of 2010, former House speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) offered a darker vision. In a speech at the American Enterprise Institute, he said sharia is "a mortal threat to the survival of freedom in the United States and the world as we know it."

It was "the pre-eminent totalitarian threat of our time," said Gaffney's Center for Security Policy's report, "Shariah — The Threat to America." Among its authors were former CIA director James R. Woolsey and Joseph E. Schmitz, both of whom are now national security advisers for Trump.

The center's general counsel, David Yerushalmi, drafted a law to ban sharia, and with the help of Act! for America began shopping the draft to lawmakers in Southern states.

Bills to ban sharia now have been introduced in all but 16 states. To date, Tennessee, Arizona, Kansas, Louisiana and South Dakota all have passed some form of legislation to ban "foreign law"— wording adopted in most cases to avoid an explicit violation of the Constitution, which prohibits the favoring or targeting of one religion. Alabama's bill failed, but its voters banned sharia by ratifying a constitutional amendment.

Faiza Patel, the co-director of the Liberty and National Security Program at New York University Law School's Brennan Center for Justice, said "the idea that sharia law poses a threat to the United States is just laughable."

But it makes sense that sharia has worked as a focal point for the anti-Muslim movement. For many Americans, the definition offered by the activists was also their first introduction to the concept.

"The theory that 'the Muslims are coming' " has helped anti-Muslim activists to "malign Muslim individuals and groups, and suggest that they have some sort of terrorist ties," Patel said. "We've seen this with [longtime Hillary Clinton aide] Huma Abedin. And we've seen a concerted campaign against [Muslim lobbyist group] the Council on American-Islamic Relations for some time."

The business of speaking out against Muslims also has been lucrative.

Seven charitable groups provided $42.6 million to "Islamophobia think tanks" such as those run by Gaffney and Gabriel between 2001 and 2009, researchers at the Center for American Progress found.

In 2014, Gaffney was paid more than $308,000, and Gabriel earned at least $240,000, according to the IRS Form 990 filed by their organizations.

The 2014 rise of the Islamic State, with its gruesome beheading videos, created new fears and gave the movement new energy.

The Islamic State was practicing Islamic law when it executed journalists and religious minorities, the anti-Islam activists told their audiences, and so were the gunmen who carried out the 2015 and 2016 terrorist attacks in Paris, Brussels, San Bernardino, Calif., and Orlando.

When the 2016 election cycle rolled around, not everyone in the movement rallied immediately around Trump. Some, including Gaffney, initially joined the campaign of Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), and Ben Carson also won support with references to "civilization jihad."

But Trump ultimately incorporated the message into his presidential platform like no other major-party candidate had before.

In previous presidential campaigns, the Republican candidates "beat back" the movement's conspiracy theories, said Ken Gude, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, who co-authored an updated report on the movement last year. "Now we have a campaign that not only isn't pushing back against them, but is also pushing and advocating those kinds of views."

Walid Phares, one of Trump's foreign policy advisers, was part of a Lebanese Christian militia that took part in massacres during the Lebanese civil war and has previously accused the U.S. government of being beholden to an Islamist agenda. And another top adviser, retired Army Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn, joined the board of Act! for America shortly after joining the Trump campaign. Gingrich and Bachmann are also advisers.

But the "top expert with influence on these issues is Frank Gaffney, who advised Cruz, then provided research to Trump," Phares wrote in an email. He also named Schmitz, Flynn, Gingrich and former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani as key sources on developing policy ideas on Islam.

"A number of these folks are friends of mine," Gaffney said in an interview about Trump's inner circle. "I've had conversations with them, [and] the opportunity to provide input [to the campaign], at least informally."

When Trump in December first called for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States," he cited a widely debunked poll , conducted by Conway for Gaffney's Center for Security Policy, that claims that 25 percent of Muslims surveyed supported violence against Americans and that 51 percent think Muslims should have the choice of being governed by sharia in America.

A large number of Americans have long recognized "the jihad threat," and Trump is giving voice to those sentiments, Geller said. It's only the mainstream media, "a Soros-funded propaganda arm for the far-Left and its Islamic supremacist allies," she said, that has stood in the way of broader acceptance.

On the campaign trail, where Trump warns repeatedly of the dangers posed by Muslims, the candidate is articulating, Gaffney said, "the most serious and thoughtful and necessary policy toward the threat that we face from the global jihad movement of anybody in public life at the moment."

"Anyone who believes sharia law supplants American law will not be given an **immigrant** visa," Trump said at an August campaign rally in North Carolina. The crowd shouted its response: "U.S.A.! U.S.A.!"

abigail.hauslohner@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WINTERVILLE, N.C. — With fewer than five days left before the election, the bitter fight for the presidency descended Thursday on North Carolina, a crucial battleground where Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump attacked one another at competing campaign events.

Clinton urged African American voters hereto turn out, warning them that Trump's vision for his presidency would leave them behind. About 200 miles to the west, in Concord, Trump cast Clinton as a "candidate of yesterday" and complained that he is held to a different standard than his Democratic rival.

Hours later, the Democratic and Republican nominees held dueling events in Raleigh and Selma, respectively, throwing more jabs at one another.

It all came on a whirlwind day on the campaign trail as a full slate of surrogates, including President Obama and Melania Trump, were dispatched to key swing states to make closing arguments for their candidates. Polls show a tightening contest, adding a sense of urgency to each campaign stop.

Clinton told a crowd of about 1,800 on the grounds of Pitt Community College that Trump "has spent this entire campaign offering a dog whistle to his most hateful supporters." She said he "retweets white supremacists and spreads racially tinged conspiracy theories," and noted that Trump had been endorsed by the Ku Klux Klan.

Trump's campaign has rejected the endorsement. Trump's son Eric said in a Thursday radio interview with KHOW in Denver that former Ku Klux Klan grand wizard David Duke "does deserve a bullet," agreeing with an assertion his interviewer made.

Clinton noted that Trump had been repeatedly accused of housing discrimination at his real estate properties and that he had continued to proclaim the guilt of five black and Hispanic men, the Central Park Five, on assault and rape accusations, even after DNA evidence exonerated them.

"Do any of us have a place in Trump's America?" Clinton asked.

At his Concord rally, Trump drew attention to the FBI 's renewed inquiry into Clinton's email practices while she was secretary of state, when she used a private server.

"Now she's got bigger problems. If she were to win, it would create an unprecedented constitutional crisis that would cripple the operations of our government," Trump said. He did not present evidence for his claim.

The GOP nominee also criticized now-interim Democratic National Committee Chairwoman Donna Brazile, after an email released by the anti-secrecy website WikiLeaks indicated that she had provided debate questions in advance to the Clinton campaign. Trump said that if he had done something similar, he would have faced a bigger backlash.

"Headlines: 'Trump to leave race,' " he said, opining about what the media reaction would have been had that happened.

North Carolina's 15 electoral votes will be among the biggest prizes Tuesday night, and Thursday's schedule reflected that. At one point in the afternoon, both Trump's and Clinton's airplanes were at the Raleigh-Durham airport.

After the state voted Republican for seven straight presidential elections, Obama turned the state blue in 2008. But it flipped back to Republican Mitt Romney in 2012, and the GOP further reasserted itself in the 2014 midterms.

Clinton's appeal to black voters in North Carolina has become increasingly urgent as early voting results show turnout among African American voters in the state has fallen from 2008 levels. A combination of fewer early voting sites, lower enthusiasm for Clinton and legal disputes about voter registration records are to blame. But the Clinton campaign has pointed to higher black turnout in recent days, after the number of polling places in the state were dramatically increased, as a sign that the situation is improving.

Trump continued his attack on Clinton at an outdoor rally in Selma, N.C., on Thursday night that attracted more than 15,000 people. Trump was joined on stage by decorated military veterans who support him.

"You know, when I look at these brave admirals and these great generals and these great medal of honor recipients behind me, to think of her being their boss? I don't think so," Trump said.

Trump reiterated his military-related campaign promises, telling the crowd that he would fully fund all branches of the military, push allies to pay more for U.S. protection and only resort to military force when it's vital to the safety of the country, among other things.

Trump again criticized Clinton for using a private email server while secretary of state. As he spoke of Clinton, one man screamed: "Communist!" And the crowd repeatedly chanted: "Lock her up! Lock her up!"

Clinton, meanwhile, held a joint rally Thursday night in Raleigh, N.C., with her former primary rival, Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, and musician Pharrell.

The mostly younger crowed of 5,200 at an outdoor concert venue screamed energetically as Sanders took the stage and delivered remarks that didn't stray very much from the stump speech that had become his staple in the Democratic primary.

Sanders urged the crowd to vote for Clinton based on the issues — particularly economic fairness and access to health care.

"This campaign is not a personality contest," Sanders said. "We're not voting for high school president, we're voting for the most powerful leader in the entire world."

Clinton promised that she and Sanders would work together to push shared priorities in January, including a plan they jointly drafted to make tuition free at public colleges and universities for families making less than $125,000 a year.

"This election has been a lot more fun now that we're on the same side," Clinton said.

She also argued that the best way to reject what she characterized as Trump's divisive rhetoric would be to vote in record numbers.

"The best way to repudiate the bigotry and the bluster and the bullying and the hateful rhetoric and discrimination is to show up with the biggest turnout in American history," she said.

Earlier in the day, Trump and Obama held dueling rallies in all-important Florida, with the president seeking to rally young voters for Clinton, and Trump trying to stoke concerns about Clinton's practices as secretary of state.

Speaking at Florida International University in Miami, Obama called Trump "uniquely unqualified" and "temperamentally unfit" to be president. Later, in Jacksonville, Trump claimed that Clinton is under "criminal investigation" for "pay-for-play corruption" by the FBI , though no such investigation has been announced.

Trump's wife, Melania, made her highest-profile appearance on the campaign trail since her speech at the Republican National Convention. She delivered a speech in a Philadelphia suburb, vowing to be "an advocate for women and children" if she becomes first lady.

In Berwyn, Pa., she talked about her journey from Slovenia to becoming a U.S. citizen. She praised her husband for being "beholden to no one," and told the crowd: "He certainly knows how to shake things up, doesn't he?"

Melania Trump also voiced concerns about online bullying directed at children, saying that "technology has changed our universe," but that "like anything that is powerful, it can have a bad side."

As a candidate for president, Trump has routinely used his Twitter account to attack and belittle critics, rivals and others with whom he takes issue.

Clinton's running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine (Va.), delivered an entire campaign speech in Spanish on Thursday afternoon in Phoenix, where he stressed his belief in an inclusive politics that celebrates diversity. He criticized Trump's controversial rhetoric about **immigrants**, calling the GOP nominee a "payaso," or clown.

Kaine later appeared at a rally in Tucson that also featured former Arizona representative Gabby Giffords. Giffords and her husband have become leading gun control advocates in the aftermath of an assassination attempt against her in 2011 that left her with a brain injury.

The Clinton campaign announced Thursday that her final rally before Election Day will be Monday evening in Philadelphia. She will be joined by Obama, first lady Michelle Obama , and Bill and Chelsea Clinton , the campaign said.

Trump's campaign released a new TV ad that seeks to highlight the renewed scrutiny of Clinton's emails and tie her to disgraced former representative Anthony Weiner, whom the narrator of the commercial calls a "pervert."

Emails were found on a computer belonging to Weiner, who is under investigation for allegedly exchanging lewd messages with a 15-year-old girl, triggered the FBI to revisit Clinton's email practices. Weiner is separated from Huma Abedin, Clinton's long-time aide.

The Trump campaign continued to argue it has its sights set on Democratic-leaning states in the final days of the race. In an interview on MSNBC, Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway said the campaign is trying to make a push into Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin. But polls show Clinton leading in those states.

"I mean, look, if you try to apply conventional political wisdom to Donald Trump , you lose every time," Conway said. "The idea that, well, Michigan or Wisconsin have been elusive to Republican candidates. He's just different. His message on illegal **immigration**, trade and jobs and patriotism. . . . It's just a different messenger."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CLEVELAND — Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton capped a long day on the campaign trail Friday by appearing on a concert stage here with both Jay Z and Beyoncé and urging supporters to "take this energy out with you."

"I want to be a president who helps everybody fulfill their God-given potential," Clinton told the crowd, saying the election offered a stark choice between the vision of her Republican opponent Donald Trump and the country she wants.

"Will we reject a dark and divisive vision for our future and embrace a hopeful, inclusive, unified America?" Clinton asked.

The concert was the latest staged by the Clinton campaign with the aim of boosting enthusiasm for her presidential bid. It came just four days before the election and as polls show the race is tightening and still volatile.

Jay Z was booked as the headliner at Friday night's performance, but he also was joined by his wife, who offered an endorsement of Clinton, noting the historic nature of her bid.

"There was a time when a woman's opinion did not matter," Beyoncé said. "Look how far we've come from having no voice to being on the brink of history."

Clinton took the stage about two hours after Trump held his final event of the day in Hershey, Pa., where he declared "our country's gone to hell."

The GOP nominee pledged to secure the borders, rebuild inner cities and end government corruption during a raucous rally in a Democratic-leaning state he is trying to tip in his direction.

Trump also faced a new controversy Friday night as the Associated Press reported that his wife, Melania, was paid for 10 modeling jobs before she received legal authorization to work in the United States in 1996.

The AP cited detailed ledgers from Melania Trump's modeling agency, as well as a contract she signed with the firm, concluding the modeling assignments would have been outside the bounds of her visa.

Melania Trump, who became a U.S. citizen in 2006, has always maintained that she arrived in the country legally and never violated the terms of her **immigration** status.

There was no immediate response from the Trump campaign.

At his Pennsylvania rally, Trump boasted of tightening poll numbers in several battleground states as he laid out his vision for the country, which he said would include fixing "inner cities," which he said are "so bad."

"They're unsafe," Trump said. "You get shot walking to the store for a loaf of bread. They have no jobs. I say, 'Give me a chance, I will fix it.' … It will be a great thing. We have to fix it."

Trump also knocked Clinton for staging the concert with Jay Z on Friday and for another one last week in Miami with pop star Jennifer Lopez.

"I didn't have to bring JLo or Jay Z," Trump told his crowd of more than 10,000 people. "I am here all by myself. Just me. No guitar. No piano. No nothing."

Trump appeared earlier Friday in Atkinson, N.H., and Wilmington, Ohio, part of a recent string in rural areas, where he is trying to boost turnout by white working-class voters.

Besides reminding supporters of Clinton's scandals, Trump focused on promises to return lost manufacturing jobs, uplift military veterans and protect residents from what he described as dangerous undocumented **immigrants**.

"Don't let the pundits, the politicians or the media tell you what kind of a country you have," Trump said in Wilmington. "Don't let them limit your dreams because they want to limit your dreams. You can have any future you want."

Clinton, meanwhile, brought a new urgency to her message at a rally earlier Friday in Pittsburgh, focusing on the danger that she said a Trump presidency would present to the country and asking supporters to imagine Trump taking the oath of office in front of the Capitol and being in charge of the nation's nuclear arsenal.

"Think about what it would mean to entrust the nuclear codes to someone with a very thin skin who lashes out at anyone who challenges him," Clinton said. "Imagine how easy it would be that Donald Trump would feel insulted and start a real war, not just a Twitter war at 3 in the morning."

Later, at a rally in Detroit, Clinton talked about issues including criminal justice reform, college affordability and systemic racism, all of which are of particular importance to black voters. She also criticized Trump for portraying the lives of black people as being "all about crime and poverty and despair."

Clinton also dispatched her most potent surrogates around the country Friday. President Obama, Vice President Biden and Sen. Bernie Sanders all stumped for Clinton.

In Denver, former president Bill Clinton talked about everything — from his wife's work on special education to the credit ratings of millennials — assuring around 500 Democrats that they were on track to win.

Obama appeared at a pair of North Carolina rallies, including one Friday night in Charlotte.

"This should not be a close race, but it's going to be a close race," Obama said. "It's going to be especially close in North Carolina. . . . We've got to work like our future depends on it, because you know what, our future depends on it."

Earlier in Fayetteville, N.C., Obama continued to assert that Trump is "temperamentally unfit" to be commander in chief and has a long track record of insulting minorities, the disabled, women and others.

"If you disrespected women before you were in office, then you will disrespect women once you take office. If you accepted the support of Klan sympathizers, if you don't denounce them right away because you're not sure, well that's what you're gonna do once you're in office," Obama said.

At Clinton's stop in Pittsburgh, businessman and reality television star Mark Cuban relentlessly needled Trump for potentially not being as wealthy as he claims and for lacking the temperament to be president. Cuban also claimed Trump could be bribed.

"If Donald Trump , who rips off people for thousands, gets offered by some dictator somewhere, some despot somewhere $20 billion, do you think he's going to do what's right for the country or do you think he's going to take the money?" Cuban asked. "Do you think he cares about you or his bank account?"

Trump's surrogates continued to create headaches for his campaign. At the New Hampshire rally, former New Hampshire governor John H. Sununu joked that Clinton's husband does not want to have sex with her.

"Do you think that Bill was referring to Hillary when he said: 'I did not have sex with that woman?'" Sununu said, referring to former president Bill Clinton .

A small crowd gathered at a country club laughed at the joke. One man shouted: "You mean Bill the rapist?" Trump's campaign has yet to respond to the comment.

Sununu was governor of the state in the 1980s and was later White House chief of staff under President George H.W. Bush. He is the father of former senator John E. Sununu and Christopher Sununu, who holds a local office and is running for governor.

While talking about how he plans to win Texas, Trump called the state's agriculture commissioner, Sid Miller, a "wonderful guy." Miller called Clinton the c-word in a tweet.

Also on Friday, two former aides to New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie, who is chairing Trump's transition team, were convicted of all charges related to a plot to create a mammoth traffic jam on the nation's busiest bridge as political retribution. Three people, including the traffic jam's admitted mastermind, testified in federal court that Christie knew about it as it was happening. Christie, on Friday, continued to deny he knew about the plan.

The convictions are a coda to a huge scandal in a state where political misdeeds are as common as the traffic jam that started this one. Known as "Bridgegate," the scheme hobbled Christie as his national star was rising and imperiled his presidential campaign, which ended in February. Since then his approval rating has nose-dived in New Jersey, where only about 20 percent of residents surveyed believe he is doing a good job.

But all of this has had little impact on Christie's standing within the Trump campaign, where the governor is tasked with spearheading Trump's transition to the White House should he win. On Thursday, Christie hosted a $5,000 a person fundraiser for Trump's transition team at a law firm office in Washington.

Clinton campaign chair John Podesta said Christie should step down from the campaign.

"Rather than just crisscrossing the country and hop-scotching, talking about cleaning up the swamp, he might start by draining his own swamp and asking Mr. Christie to resign as the head of his transition," Podesta said of Trump.

At a rally in Ohio, Trump said Clinton should fire Podesta and longtime aide Huma Abedin. The FBI said it found additional emails possibly pertinent to the Clinton investigation on a computer belonging to Abedin's estranged husband, former congressman Anthony Weiner.

Trump's campaign, which has said it will pass massive ethics reform, did not return a request for comment.

Meanwhile, a federal judge on Friday ordered elections boards in three North Carolina counties to restore voter registrations canceled through a so-called "individual challenge law" after the state NAACP sued over thousands of the challenges.

U.S. District Judge Loretta Biggs issued the ruling after an emergency hearing earlier in the week on NAACP allegations that at least three counties purged voter rolls through a process disproportionately targeting blacks.

The ruling could affect several thousand voters in the swing state.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EL PASO — On Wednesday, shortly after El Paso County broke its record for early voting, Andres Villalobos walked into the downtown courthouse and cast a ballot for "Mrs. Clinton and the Democrats." He was 65 years old and had earned American citizenship after years of crossing back and forth across the Mexican border, a few blocks away.

But he had never voted before. Nothing had compelled him to vote until Donald Trump ran for president. If Trump won the presidency, he predicted the absolute worst.

"Maybe chaos," he said. "It would be ugly — very, very bad for the economy, for the city, for everyone. It would be bad for the border. It wouldn't work."

Leonardo Wong, 71, was also casting his first vote. He had registered while renewing the passport that let him walk back and forth across the border, and he had gotten behind Hillary Clinton.

"I don't think everybody's a rapist and everybody's a narco like Trump says," Wong said, referring to Trump's claims that many Mexicans crossing into the United States are violent criminals.

Texas is expected to go Republican this year, as it has in every presidential election since 1980. At Trump's lowest point, when he was buried by his own gaffes and debate performances, the state closed to single digits in polling; the latest polls have him leading by closer to 10 points.

But Democrats have watched a turnout surge wash over the state's most urban, least white areas. In 10 days of early voting, more than 115,000 ballots were cast in El Paso County, blowing past the record set in 2008. Turnout was up by 64 percent over 2012; it was up by close to 40 percent around Houston, Dallas, Austin and San Antonio.

Turnout has also grown in the deep red suburbs, but in El Paso, Democrats are no longer struggling to get their voters to the polls. According to We(Fillintheblank), a student-run political group that conducts the area's only exit polling, Clinton is on track to win 71 percent of the vote in El Paso, better than any Democrat since the Texas Republican Party became competitive.

The Trump candidacy has challenged a Republican project that had succeeded in Texas more than in any state — a coalition between conservative whites and culturally conservative Latino voters. Republicans, who have controlled every statewide office here since 1998, have won supermajorities of white voters and courted enough Latino votes to make the Democratic Party irrelevant.

It was supposed to show Republicans the way to a one-party future. In 1998, during a reelection campaign designed to prove his appeal to voters beyond Texas, then-Gov. George W. Bush campaigned hard in the Rio Grande Valley and El Paso. "I want it to be known that a conservative candidate can carry the Hispanic vote," he told reporters.

He did so, and won El Paso, a feat he did not repeat in his campaigns for president. In Bush's wake, even as the national party abandoned **immigration**reform, Democrats struggled to activate Latinos in Texas the way that they had in California, or Arizona, or the Midwestern states where there were more recent **immigrants**.

The struggle won national attention — the bad kind — in 2014. Battleground Texas, a political action committee created by Obama-campaign veterans, was launched on the theory that early spending and organizing could activate a slumbering nonwhite vote. "Texas isn't as red of a state as people say it is, if you look at the numbers," senior adviser Jeremy Bird said at the launch event.

The numbers did not change. Republican Greg Abbott, elected governor in a landslide two years ago, out-campaigned Democrat Wendy Davis with Latinos. Ads in the Rio Grande Valley played up Abbott's marriage to a Mexican American. Turnout in El Paso fell by more than half of its 2012 total, allowing now-Rep. Will Hurd (R-Tex.) to flip a House seat that Democrats had considered safe.

Then came Trump. Some Texas Republicans had been edging toward his rhetoric, away from the Bush approach. Dan Patrick, the lieutenant governor elected in 2014, did not sound different from Trump on the border, or when he crusaded against college tuition for undocumented **immigrants** in Texas. But voter awareness of Patrick was minimal; Trump blotted out the sun. Rep. Beto O'Rourke (D-Tex.), who in 2012 defeated an incumbent who had relied on the teetering Democratic machine, had never encountered a line for early voting. The line was 45 minutes long this year.

"There wasn't even a whole lot that someone like me needed to do to encourage that," O'Rourke said. "Finally, there was a very clear reason to vote."

In the summer, El Paso County Judge Veronica Escobar began to notice that people who crowded into the semiannual citizenship ceremonies dashed across the courthouse to get registered to vote.

"I think everyone understands how closely tied we are to Mexico," Escobar said, sitting in her office near one of the voting sites. "We lived through the devaluation of the peso, and when it happened, our economy was devastated. Insulting our most important economic partner and wanting to isolate it from us — most people here realize there'd be an economic price, and we would pay it."

The border described by Trump simply did not resemble the one many El Pasoans see. The Republican nominee was not wrong about the drug wars in Ciudad Juarez or the smugglers constantly changing their tactics to get opium and meth into the United States. But El Paso is growing. Unemployment is sinking. Thanks in large part to a policing buildup on the border, someone in Dallas or Houston was twice as likely to be a victim of violent crime. What was Trump talking about?

"He's an embarrassment," said Ana Morales, 31, a victims advocate who works with noncitizens and frets about how a Trump presidency would affect them. "I think he would put up a lot of barriers. There are very vulnerable people who would be hurt by him."

Said Edna Ortega, 42: "It would be like East Berlin. He would bring in an authoritarian type of government — very racist."

Republicans, who do not need El Paso to win the state, said that Trump's impact would be overrated. On Thursday, the local Republican Party headquarters was quiet but active. One volunteer made calls, near signs that advertised the summer social-media campaign to bring Trump to El Paso. (He never came.) Adolpho Telles, the county chairman, insisted that plenty of Democrats were quietly telling him that they would buck the tide and vote for Trump.

"People don't necessarily like the fence idea, the wall idea, whatever you want to call it," he said. "But when the cameras are off, they will tell you: They don't believe in illegal **immigration**. They do believe in securing the border."

In dozens of interviews at the polls, Trump supporters were happy to talk. None said that they were voting Republican because of Trump's **immigration** policy. Mike and Destiny Tipton, 32 and 34, said Clinton's record at the State Department put them off.

"These email things never seem to go away," said Mike Tipton, referring to a later-retracted Fox News report that Clinton risked indictment.

"I'm disappointed with her over the whole Benghazi thing," Destiny Tipton said.

Those sentiments were usually outweighed by genuine terror of Trump — and often admiration for Clinton. Some voters who spoke only Spanish talked about a hypothetical Trump presidency the way that tea party conservatives once discussed President Obama's reelection — a world-shattering event, the end of America as they knew it. At a polling station inside the Bassett Place mall, the Thursday lunch hour found a steady stream of voters entering, filling out their ballots quickly and exiting to explain why they had voted for Clinton.

Frank Noriega, 72, accompanied his wife as she voted for Clinton, then stayed behind to finish some errands. He had long ago decided to oppose Trump. The mystery, to him, was why more people didn't seem to trust Clinton.

"She's out there with regular public. She talks to them," he said. "For all the stuff that's come out, they've never proven she did anything wrong. If they had the proof, she couldn't be running."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At long last, Americans get to decide. More than usual, most people don't like their choices. More than usual, many Americans believe that people who don't agree with them are not only wrong but are also best avoided.

On the eve of the election, America is afraid. People talk about buying guns to protect themselves from troubles to come. They talk about places they steer clear of and people they don't talk to anymore. Casual conversations have blown up into hurtful arguments. Friends vanish from Facebook feeds. People who used to put up yard signs don't for fear of what their neighbors might do. And people who thought things were improving, in their own lives and in their communities, wonder whether they missed the real story, a darker tale of division and despair.

But America is also what it's always been, a green field of possibility, a place where people relish rogues and truth-tellers, and a place where being appalled by politicians is part of the deal, something that can even bring people together.

Only eight years after millions of Americans poured into the streets in spontaneous, joyful celebration of the election of the nation's first black president, optimism seems to have been sucked out of the country's marrow, replaced by a heavy anxiety, a sense that things aren't right and can't easily be fixed.

The candidates for president have made it harder to be optimistic, many Americans say. One candidate said things were so bad that only he could make America great again. The other asked people to consider that the country would be stronger together. But neither captured the hearts or hopes of any broad cross-section of the people. Neither offered any grand idea for a more secure, happier future. There was no New Deal, no Great Society, no Thousand Points of Light.

Yet in the final hours before the vote, Americans remain bullish about their prospects, eager to keep plugging, for themselves and their children. In interviews across the country, whether they're voting for Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton, anyone but them or no one at all, Americans almost uniformly say that the politicians are clueless but that the people will eventually do what needs getting done.

\*\*\*

Melinda Powers opens the heavy door of the industrial oven and carefully removes a fragrant, steaming apple crisp. She inspects it meticulously. At 19, she dreams of opening a bakery. She worries that this election is her obstacle.

To get from the culinary studies program at Newbury College in Brookline, Mass., to a business of her own, Powers expects she'll need her parents' help. But they're fighting over politics right now, and it's bad enough that Powers could see them breaking up, which would probably nix her bakery plan.

Powers's parents met at Winchester Repeating Arms — an Irish American guy who produced gun parts and an **immigrant** woman from Cape Verde who inspected guns. They fell in love on the shop floor.

But the election has driven a wedge between them. He's for Trump; she's for Clinton. "My dad jokingly brings it up all the time," Powers said, "but my mom doesn't think it's funny at all. Trump offends everything she's ever worked for."

Powers's mother is so disturbed by the racism and anti-**immigrant** sentiment she's seen this year that she sometimes threatens to move back to Cape Verde if Trump wins. "My dad obviously doesn't want to leave his Harley-Davidson buddies behind and move to a foreign country where he doesn't speak the language," his daughter said.

The campaign has also divided Powers from her old friends from Blue Hill Regional Technical High School in Randolph. Most of those friends are white, and all but one support Trump. "My white friends think they can say racial stuff more than they used to," Powers said. "They use the n-word a lot more now. . . . There is more hate directed toward other races and toward **immigrants**."

Powers is still an optimist; no matter who wins, she will work hard to achieve her dreams. She says she still believes America is the greatest country. But she'd thought the battles over racism "were fought for me long ago," and now she sees a hate that masquerades as humor. "We can be driving somewhere," she said, "and they'll be like, 'Melinda, sit in the back.' Then they'll laugh. After a while, you do feel slightly left out, because at the end of the day, we are not all the same. I am the different one."

\*\*\*

Optimism, perhaps the most exceptional of American traits, is down. A Washington Post-ABC News poll found earlier in the fall campaign that 42 percent of Americans were bullish about the next year, the lowest number since 2004, the first national election after the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11, 2001.

Yet here was Sheila Rushing, 67, knocking on doors, even on doors of houses that looked empty, with boards slanting over the windows. Rushing had avoided politics for years, a job requirement: The work that got her through divorce, at the Detroit museum of African American history, was a nonprofit, limiting her political activity. But when she retired, she canvassed for the first black president and now for Hillary Clinton.

"I'm doing great," she said. "Glad and blessed. Glad that the Lord woke me up."

Rushing, like many Detroiters, was offended when Trump declared that black Americans were living in "hell." The past eight years were no hell. She had raised her grandson, Armando, after his father died when the boy was 14. He turned 26 on Halloween, and Rushing had helped him through high school and on to Wayne State University to get his degree in criminal justice. And now he's working. Rushing took pride in her own ability to pay off her home note, and she thanked Obama for the bigger Pell grants that got Armando through school.

Rushing learned this fall not to broach the subject of politics with some friends. It was too raw. Still, she knocked on another door. The home was empty but not abandoned. She left a flier with a picture of Clinton and Obama deep in conversation in the Oval Office. "Protect his legacy," it read.

\*\*\*

Nearly half of Americans — 45 percent in a Post-ABC poll in September — believe the United States is "less great" than it has been in the past; 37 percent said it is about the same; and 16 percent said it is greater. The idea that the country has grown less great is much more common among Trump supporters (77 percent) than among Clinton backers (21 percent).

Through the years, pessimism about the country's direction has been stronger among supporters of the party that's out of power. In 2008, as the economy weakened and the war in Iraq dragged on, an NBC-Wall Street Journal poll found that 77 percent of Obama supporters said the nation was in a "state of decline," compared with 57 percent of those backing the Republican, John McCain.

Tony Kadlcek first came to the United States from Czechoslovakia in 1990, soon after the revolution against his country's communist regime. His uncle invited him to visit, and while in Chicago, Kadlcek met the woman who would become his wife. The next year, Kadlcek legally migrated to the United States to be with her. He got a job with the commercial HVAC business that his wife's family owned. He still works there.

But 12 years ago, the couple moved farther from Chicago, to Lisle, a suburb to the city's southwest, because of corruption and crime, he said. Now he drives through Chicago, sees dilapidated buildings and worries about crime. "There were 17 murders" over one October weekend, he said. "Obama promised to be a uniter, but it seems like he divided us. People hate cops; blacks and whites seem more separate now."

Kadlcek, 47, likes his life; he has four kids, makes a good living and owns his own home as well as a six-apartment building that he rents out. But the building's value has not recovered since the economic crisis, and he partly blames Obama. He and his wife, a legal secretary, are fed up with high taxes, debt, corruption and illegal **immigration**. When their kids go to college, they might move to Wisconsin or Indiana. Frustrated about what's happened to the country, he worries about a crackdown on guns; he recently bought an ­"expensive rifle, so that if Hillary wins I'll be grandfathered in." He likes Trump's slogan, Make America Great Again, because it admits the country has gone downhill.

But Kadlcek isn't advertising his support for Trump. In years past, he put bumper stickers on his Cutlass Supreme, going back to Dole-Kemp in 1996. Not this time: "People are afraid if you have a Trump sticker on your car or a Hillary sticker, someone will key it."

\*\*\*

Mae and Daniel Harrison are riveted to the campaign news — well, she is. He can take only so much. Both of them have seen the campaign eat away at relationships. They've argued with fellow shoppers in grocery lines. They avoid Trump supporters. And for the first time in many years, they've felt unwelcome in some places.

"We are fearful of going too far away from home because of what we see," Mae said.

The campaign is all the 74-year-old retired United Methodist pastor talks about these days. When her girlfriends call, she can't help but get into the emails. After a pastor friend from Texas phoned and declared she'd be voting for Trump, Harrison held her tongue. She hasn't called back. Not until after the election.

The Harrisons, who live in Fort Washington in Prince George's County, Md., read the paper, then have the TV on much of the day, CNN and MSNBC mostly. It's Trump and Clinton, and Trump, and Trump. Mae listens as she flits about the house. Daniel sometimes rebels.

"Cut that off, Mae," he tells his wife. "I don't like the sound of his voice."

Watch Netflix instead, he says. Sometimes, she does. But come 6 p.m., the temptation is too much, and she puts the news back on. Daniel gives up and goes upstairs to the computer or to watch a game show.

Daniel, 78, a retired microbiologist, grew up in Louisiana. Mae, a former teacher, came from North Carolina. For two accomplished African Americans from the South, Trump has unearthed a past they thought they had left behind when they moved to a prosperous, majority-black county in the shadow of Washington.

Now, the name-calling and bullying of the campaign has them wondering whether the old hatreds had only gone dormant. At a restaurant in Virginia, a group of bikers stared them down. At the supermarket, Daniel argued with a man who couldn't see how Trump was bringing out hatred. At a church event, Mae sat well away from a black woman who said supportive things about Trump.

She can't stop thinking, even if Clinton wins, what will the backlash look like? How long does this last? When does the healing begin?

\*\*\*

Healing is normally the last thing Brent Beaupre thinks about around the family campfire in Kennebunk, Maine. On sweet summer nights, with three generations gathered, all should be copacetic. But one night this summer, Beaupre's grandmother turned to him and asked, "You're not going to vote for her, are you?"

"Oh, but I am," Beaupre said. He tried to explain himself. And then his grandmother turned to him again and said, "But you're not going to vote for her, are you?"

They went at it. "Can't you see how crazy he is?" Beaupre said.

"Yeah, but she's the biggest criminal ever," his grandmother replied.

"It's like talking to a wall," Beaupre said. "I love these people to death, but there's nothing that permeates."

He's 21, and this will be his first vote, and what he sees is utter alienation of each side from the other. "With the Romney-Obama cycle, you had two incredible intellects who very much knew their subjects," he said. "It was about the defense of our country. It was about the national deficit — real topics. I feel in this election cycle it's about sensationalism, whatever grabs the media."

With his stylish leather shoes and blue Oxford shirt, Beaupre moves with professional efficiency through the sea of denim and sweatshirts on the campus of Suffolk University in Boston. An honors student with a major in finance and a minor in big data, he has been offered a job upon graduation with a major bank.

"I'm a gay man who wants to work in financial services who comes from a conservative household and now lives in a very liberal city," he said. "It's a constant back and forth."

The first in his family to attend college, he's nonetheless worried about the future. "My friends entering the industry have been told point-blank that we should be wary of the economic situation we're in," Beaupre said. "If the economy doesn't do well, our jobs are going to disappear. Everybody's waiting for this election; everything is on hold."

\*\*\*

Business is good for Ryan Snyder. Life is good, too, even if good does mean 12-hour workdays, seven days a week.

Snyder, 33, puts those hours into a little country breakfast-and-lunch spot in Goochland, Va. He bought Satterwhite's Restaurant from his father in January. The place sits at a rural crossroads that's unlikely to stay rural. Four miles away, the Richmond suburbs stretch out — a Whole Foods, a glitzy mall, and, if electric car guru Elon Musk gets his way with state officials, soon a showroom for six-figure Teslas.

For now, Satterwhite's sticks to what it has always been. The menu sticks to old favorites, such as salt herring with biscuits or toast for $7.85. Snyder thinks about adding a few items. Nothing fancy. "If it's not broke," he figures, "don't fix it."

He does think Washington is broken. Congress can't get anything done, and the federal government "gets too involved in a lot of things." And now this unacceptable choice. "I don't think I've heard anyone say, 'I like Hillary' or 'I like Trump,' " Snyder said.

He "can't stand Hillary. I think she's a liar," he said. "And Trump is Trump. You can't go to world leaders and just run your mouth." He won't vote for Clinton. Maybe Trump or Gary Johnson, though he knows the Libertarian Party nominee has no chance. Snyder and his wife have stopped talking about the election; Brittany thinks Trump is a misogynist. Ryan doesn't disagree; he just mistrusts Clinton more.

He expects little from whoever wins. But he remains upbeat about his own prospects. He and Brittany expect their first child in February. In September, they bought their first house, a brick rancher near a big dairy farm, 10 minutes from work.

Things look good outside the restaurant, too. New shopping centers, office parks and housing have gobbled up farmland and attracted more diverse residents. A Hindu cultural center and temple popped up about a mile away.

Some Satterwhite's regulars grumble about the new development, but Snyder likes it fine: "It'll do nothing but increase my business." New development means new people, some of them new to America. Snyder is concerned about terrorists, but he doesn't think it makes sense morally or economically to turn everyone away.

He figures the people at the new Hindu center are "educated and ready to work," he said. "How do you turn that away? We're all **immigrants** in this country, so you can't shut the borders down."

\*\*\*

For many **immigrants**, there is a special urgency to this election, because of Trump's harsh rhetoric about keeping out Mexicans and Muslims, and because there have been so many deportations, with the prospect of many more.

As the sun set Wednesday night, Rosa Rosales walked the bridge from Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, to El Paso eating from a cup of corn and chilis. She paid her 50 cents to reenter the United States, and she was home, where she is a citizen. She had gone across the border to get her medicine.

The politicians fight forever about **immigration**, and Rosales walks the bridge. They fight forever about health care, and Rosales walks the bridge.

A home care nurse, she has no use for Trump or Clinton. She voted early, writing in her senator, Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), mostly because he agreed with her that Obamacare is no good. Too expensive, and it's wrong to punish people who lack insurance, she said.

She supported Obama eight years ago, but when she needs simple care, she crosses the border. If she has something big, like the kidney stone that bedeviled her a few years back, she stays in Texas.

She fears Trump. "He's a racist; he's rude," Rosales said. "He has a lack of respect for women. I'm a Mexican, and I think he will do something against Mexican people."

Rosales crossed the marker between the United States and Mexico and let out a little cheer. She had her dinner and her medicine, and she was okay.

Halfway across the southern edge of the country, Rafael Marin is secretly obsessed with the election. Patrons come into his downtown Miami shop, Richard's Fruit Center, for fresh fruit and smoothies. Marin, 59, plays '80s pop on the radio — no political talk shows. He likes to keep the vibe cheerful and positive.

In the city's busy working-class hub, people hang out drinking Cuban coffee, arguing about the election. But in Marin's shop, he tries to keep things peaceful. He hears "Ugh, those emails?" and he pivots to "Can I get you anything else?"

The rest of the country could learn a lot from downtown Miami, he said: "We all live together, and our language is a mixed language — Spanish, English, all used together . . . a beautiful thing." Son of a Puerto Rican father and a Jewish mother, Marin lives in a city where nearly everyone is an **immigrant** of some sort, coming here from somewhere else. So Marin doesn't get Trump, doesn't want America to be seen as unwelcoming. Marin likes Clinton, marvels at her ability to withstand attacks and investigations.

Whatever happens, he said: "America will be fine; it rises and it falls like the waves. We owe some money, so what? Our credit is good, and we get to live here, in America."

A customer asks in Spanish whether raspberries, pineapple and ginger make a good smoothie. Marin nods in approval. Any blend is a good blend.

A thousand miles to the north, in Barstow, Va., Lynda Trinh Frank recalled the night four decades ago when her family left Saigon and piled into a lifeboat. Frank's mother lined up her six kids and told them they could each take one bag. Frank packed her toothbrush, pajamas and Smurf comic books. Six years later, after time in a refu­gee camp in Arkansas, her family was naturalized and living in Richmond, and Frank renamed herself after Lynda Carter, TV's "Wonder Woman."

Now 50, Frank wonders whether her five half-Vietnamese, half-Caucasian children "will have the same country that we hoped to live in when we came here." She left her job as a telecom consultant with a six-figure salary to be a full-time mom. "I'm here," she said. "I help shape my children." Her kitchen is decorated with children's artwork, Bible verses, and portraits of saints and Jesus.

Frank has instilled antiabortion values in her children from early on. Her youngest daughter, staying home from parochial school with a broken arm, whines; her arm itches and she's bored.

"Could you offer your suffering for the babies?" Frank asks.

"So they won't get killed, Mom?" the 7-year-old replies.

"Exactly," Frank says.

She wants leaders who will reject abortion and lower taxes. She has helped put up Trump-Pence signs. She likes Trump's hard stance against illegal **immigration** and applauds his evolution into antiabortion beliefs.

She worries that America no longer reflects her family's values. "The last eight years, instead of empowering people, it's 'gimme, gimme, gimme,' " she said. "Everything is a race issue. Look, I'm an Asian. I'm ethnic. I'm a minority. I don't say, 'You need to give me a job because I'm Asian and a woman.' No."

\*\*\*

Carol Blaser sits in her Ford Mustang in the lot outside the hair salon where she works in Ann Arbor, Mich. She downs a ­McDonald's cheeseburger, worrying not about the election, but about her son, about his illness — one that, as she said, "nobody runs a 5k for."

Her adult son is mentally ill, in and out of the justice system, 31 now, doing better with good medication. But she frets about him when her clients go on like the talking heads on cable news, yammering about "low-information voters" and "the Paul Ryan effect."

Earlier that day, while cutting the hair of a homebound customer at his townhouse, the man's wife came into the living room to demonstrate their lifelong Democratic support by showing off a vintage 1990s T-shirt that read, "Support Hillary's Husband." "I wish I was that sure," Blaser, 58, said later. "One day I wake up and think I'm going to vote one way; one day I wake up and think I'm going to vote another."

Blaser hasn't spent the past year glued to the TV and Facebook following the twists and turns. She's been too busy with life. Two of her kids got married. Her daughter came out as a lesbian. Her 30-year-old's three kids had birthdays in October.

And she's leaving Delia's Salon, where she has rented a chair for 16 years, because Delia raised the rent by $30, to $230 a week.

Her neighborhood is dotted with Trump-Pence yard signs, and she considers herself conservative, but she voted for Obama twice after going for Republicans Bob Dole and George W. Bush. From what she can glean, Trump is an "idiot about a lot of things," but Clinton is "a conniving little b---h."

"I'm leaning towards Hillary just because she's the least evil, but I don't know if she's evil or not," she said. "I don't know! Do any of us really know what goes on, what they go through?"

Her absentee ballot sits on her counter, "and I keep walking by it and looking at it. I want to fill it out and get it away from me, but I don't know what to do. This damn election."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I won't be going back home to Canada, no matter who wins the election.

If any of you native-born Americans want to decamp to the Great White North after Nov. 8, I am happy to give you a field guide, but you will be on your own. I came to the United States because of a presidential election, and it would be unmannerly to depart because of one.

In 2008, I was living in my home town of Vancouver, B.C., often working for U.S. companies in my role as an author and television producer. When Barack Obama won not just the White House, but the imagination of the civilized world with his message of hope and change, our street in Vancouver had a party. Other neighborhoods in Canada and around the world did the same, unleashing a massive cheer for the USA after the dark and bloody eight years preceding this momentous event.

And my wife and I decided, in the euphoric aftermath of Obama's election, to become part of that hope and change by moving to the United States.  My wife is a U.S. citizen, and our daughter was a year away from entering kindergarten, so it seemed like the perfect time to head south and east, and move into the same Brooklyn neighborhood as my best friend and business partner, with whom I had joked about this dream without ever fully believing that it would be possible. Hope had begot change already.

So, there I was, getting my green card in Montreal in March 2010. The **immigration** officer who approved my application talked to me about my work and my love of hockey. She told me that she was learning French by reading a book on hockey, "Hockey: La Fierté d'un Peuple." I told her that I had written that book. Destiny, it seemed, was also in play.

Indeed, it had been in play for a long time, ever since my father's family **immigrated** to North America from Ireland. They had wanted to go to the United States, where they had family, but circumstances sent them to Canada, which was, as they say, good to them. Still, our family vacations would inevitably take us to California to see relatives, and to where my father dreamed of migrating to open a business. My mother would always back out at the last minute. I don't know why, and by the time I was ready to fulfill my father's dream, Alzheimer's had robbed her of the capacity to tell me.

So we came to New York City. We were welcomed on Day 1 by our neighbors — the mother, African American; the father, white — who invited us from our moving van right into their house for a glass of wine. My daughter met their daughter and so, a best friend. America the Beautiful.

And so it went. The generosity of this country, the warmth of its spirit, its belief that the impossible dream could become possible sustained us as we made our way. To be sure, there was turbulence, but none so severe that gave us pause to say: Hmm, maybe we should go back to the Old Country.

Because we come from Canada, it's hard to tell us from natural-born American citizens. We can speak with strangers and friends alike who don't know or have forgotten that we come from the land up north. And even though, as the great white arch demarcating the border between Canada and the United States at Blaine, Wash., declares on its wall, we are both "Children of a Common Mother," we have found that our American sibling can sometimes confound.

While we appreciate that there are sometimes excellent reasons for wanting to leave your home country and move to another with an electoral outcome being one of those reasons (I mean, I did it), we have plunged into the spirit of our adopted country and so we, too, empowered ourselves with clairvoyance. It is through that lens that we can see some of the blemishes of our chosen homeland in a more forgiving light.

And with such enlightenment, we believe the Founding Fathers didn't understand the Second Amendment to triumph over all the others; that people who want to come to the United States by means legal or not generally do not want to abandon all they hold dear and uproot themselves and their families to create criminal mayhem, so we need better doors, not more walls;  that while life is indeed precious, perhaps we should devote more energy to enhancing the lives of our fellow citizens already with us, so that children don't go to bed hungry, and women and men are helped, not punished, when making tough life decisions; and that the first or second or third recourse of the police in dealing with a human being, either in distress or at a traffic stop, should not be to kill them. We're pretty sure the Founding Fathers would be with us on that one.

And we're certain that they'd be with us in thinking that Obama, the man whose election moved us to move, will be judged by history as a great president, who had vision and imagination and decency, and what he failed to do was not the result of his flaws or of an imperfect democracy, but because people opposed to him had contrary views about to whom our democracy belongs. But that's why we have term limits. So someone else gets a chance to make their American Dream into public policy.

Which brings me to the reason people have invoked my homeland as a destination should Earth reverse on its axis and Donald Trump win the 2016 presidential election. Indeed, we view him in the great tradition of American con artists, and history may judge him as just that, a colorful (and yes, add in whichever pejorative you choose and I will agree) character who supercharged a moment with his own brand of regime change, which, I believe the majority will reject as not the kind of democracy in which they wish to live. When we looked at his plan, such as it is, the idea of democracy as the Founding Fathers envisioned would be, under Trump, a lot like the European society that they had chosen to reject: King Donald, dispatching armies to quash foreign lands, while collecting taxes and paying none.

You might wonder why Canada, in the event of a Trump presidential victory, wouldn't be more appealing for us with the progressive and enlightened Justin Trudeau as prime minister, and I have asked myself that, too. The answer is that while Canada gave birth to me, the United States has given me more fuller expression as a person — given me a kind of intellectual and emotional liberty, and so I want to stay to do my part to make her union more perfect. Especially should we be under a president who challenges the rights and liberties we hold sacred as citizens.

So, I made my choice on Oct. 26 in Federal Plaza in New York City, when I had my application for U.S. citizenship approved during an interview process that was marked from the security guard at the door to the **immigration** officer who dealt with my case by courtesy, respect and great civility. Everyone knew the momentous deed being done, and they made me feel welcome — and valued.  I will be sworn in as an American too late to vote on Nov. 8, but I don't mind. I have voted already by staying here, at home, in the best possible way you can do that on Election Day.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"The trip today is about 24 minutes," announced the captain of our eight-passenger shuttle ferry. That was just enough time, I estimated, to be served and finish the rum punch I planned to order as we left port in St. Maarten.

I settled on a seat in the rocking vessel and squinted across the sparkling Caribbean at our destination. The relatively small, flat island of Anguilla appeared as a scrub-covered outcropping on the horizon, an easily overlooked smudge on the surface of the sea.

Anguilla's laid-back, gracious style, its white-sand beaches and dynamic culinary scene are well promoted. But with no dramatic towering volcanic hills, no waterfall-laced rain forest, no major port with glittering amenities — and one tiny airport — I wondered if white sand and fab food were enough to entice people to this off-the-beaten-path location in the Caribbean's Leeward Island chain. In other words, would reality match the hype? That's what I hoped to find out as I arrived at the Blowing Point Ferry Terminal, cleared **immigration** (in minutes), waited for my luggage (forever), and found a taxi near the ferry kiosks, where scrawny chickens scurried about.

With only one main road and a mere six stoplights, the 16-by-3-mile island isn't difficult to navigate. However, visitors like me, hesitant about left-side-of-the-road driving, may opt for the ease of fixed-rate taxis.

En route to Malliouhana, an Auberge resort perched on a bluff overlooking Meads Bay, I peppered my driver with questions about Anguilla, the main one being, "What is the correct pronunciation?"

"It's An-gwilla, sort of like gorilla. The name comes from its shape. Like an eel," said the driver, who was born and raised on the island.

Like many islands in the Caribbean, Anguilla was colonized in the 17th century by alternating groups of Europeans, primarily from Great Britain and France. After a 1967 revolution to separate itself from the Federation of the West Indies (established in the 1950s with nearby St. Kitts and Nevis), Britain intervened. By December 1980, Anguilla became a British Overseas Territory with some measure of governmental autonomy. The language of the island is English, though most of the population — estimated at 15,000 — speak a melodic Caribbean version.

My driver beeped his car horn and waved at other drivers, and those walking along the road, and it soon became apparent that everyone knew everyone. Since the largest slice of the business pie involves tourism, the majority of the people I met were unfailingly polite and happy to share their opinions of what to see and do on the island, including where to hear traditional soca, calypso, reggae and country music.

I arrived hungry — a good thing, as my visit was planned around experiencing as much of the island's purported tasty offerings as I could schedule in a three-day visit. After check-in and a swim in one of two pools with ocean views, I headed out to dinner.

Before opening Veya, chef Carrie Bogar along with her business partner and husband, Jerry, were looking to escape the gloomy Pennsylvania winters. "We googled, 'Caribbean restaurants for sale,' and packed up the kids and moved," Bogar said.

Located in tropical woodlands, this secluded restaurant has the feel of an exotic treehouse combined with a bohemian lounge. The eclectic menu fuses Caribbean tastes and ingredients with those from other far-flung steamy lands.

"I didn't want to be pigeonholed as just a Caribbean chef, so I started thinking about other countries with warm climates such as [the ones in] North Africa, South America and Southeast Asia," Bogar said.

Open since 2007, Veya is no secret. In high season, reservations must be made weeks in advance to sample Bogar's inventive dishes such as grilled jerk-spiced tuna with rum-coffee glaze or grilled local lobster with passion fruit mustard sauce. For light bites, tapas plates and crafted cocktails are offered in the garden lounge, Meze, along with music by local artists, including the soulful reggae beats of Omari Banks. A former celebrated cricketer, Banks is the son of Bankie Banks, a reggae singer known as the "Anguillan Bob Dylan."

It seems silly that I left the island to head to another island for lunch. But, indeed, I did.

Sandy Island is one of a number of small, uninhabited offshore islands, or cays — all accessible by boat — that are popular with beachcombers, snorkelers and kite surfers. Several of these islands sport casual tiki-style beach shacks that are open for lunch on varying days of the week.

At Sandy Ground in Road Bay, where those arriving by private yacht clear customs and **immigration**, I caught a shuttlecraft named Joy (the others are Happiness and Bliss) along with several young guys clutching beers and snorkeling gear. Frigate birds circled overhead as we cruised toward Sandy Island and in minutes, it seemed, we were jumping into the shallows and wading to shore.

The shaded, open-air restaurant, also known as Sandy Island, specializes in traditional local foods, all prepared on a seaside grill: freshly caught lobster, red snapper, crayfish and mahi-mahi, as well as baby back ribs, barbecued chicken and drunken coconut shrimp. I sat at a picnic table, feet in the white sand, enjoying a margarita mixed at the gaily painted bar while waiting (and waiting) for my meal to arrive. While chatting with guests at nearby tables, I learned that those in the know call ahead to place their orders.

But when on vacation, what's the rush? My succulent lobster with coconut ginger sauce and accompanying rice, beans and salad were worth the wait — in fact, pure bliss, which was the apt name of the shuttle I boarded back to port after post-lunch snorkeling (mask rentals are available) in the crystalline waters around the reef.

My other notable beachside lunch was at Bayside Bar & Grill, a popular spot overlooking boats and swimmers at Crocus Bay. Though tempted to order another lobster, I opted instead for grilled snapper and Creole sauce with corn, rice and peas while others around me, many of them locals, I guessed by their lilting accents, enjoyed barbecued chicken and ribs, rustic pizzas, burgers and salads. Before leaving, I peeked inside the grill's elegant sister property, da'Vida, where the dinner menu is a touch more formal — grilled Angus beef tenderloin, herb-crusted rack of lamb, ginger teriyaki sea scallops — but the vibe remains island-casual.

After a fruit-and-granola breakfast, some hotel guests headed out to play golf at the island's only course while others planned a day of Auberge spa treatments. I chose a day of lollygagging and swimming at a quiet cove, a short hike down a path from my hotel, where it was easy to imagine I was happily shipwrecked on a deserted island.

I planned a last night splurge at Pimms, a candlelit, open-air restaurant at Cap Juluca, a five-star resort with its own mile-long beach.

It can be awkward eating meals alone, especially at a place that blatantly conjures romance. Maybe it was days spent in the sun and the relaxed island vibe, but the staff at Pimms seemed extra-welcoming, the meal of lobster ravioli and grilled Anguilla crayfish extra divine. I sat at a table near the edge of the sea, where curved Moorish arches framed a view of Maundays Bay and the mountains of St. Maarten, the setting sun smearing pink and violet stains across puffy clouds. Anticipating my trip home in reverse — the taxi to the port, the shuttle boat and one last rum punch before airport security — I sighed and began plotting my next visit.

travel@washpost.com

Regis writes about offbeat and luxury travel, food and oysters at necee.com.

 For more dining and lodging suggestions in Anguilla, visit washingtonpost.com/travel

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the early hours after this year's Brexit vote, the top Google searches on the topic by shocked Britons were "what does it mean to leave the EU" and "what is the EU."

Don't let this happen here.

Now that James B. Comey has dedicated the FBI to the election of Donald Trump, a remote possibility is a serious prospect. But we don't have to wonder what the first 100 days of a Trump presidency would look like. Trump has given a clear picture of what he plans, and the rest would be filled in by events beyond Trump's control.

Among things you can expect: a trade war with China and Mexico, a restarting of Iran's nuclear program, millions losing their health insurance, the start of mass deportations, a possible military standoff with China in the South China Sea and North Korea, the resumption of waterboarding, the use of federal agencies to go after Hillary Clinton and other Trump critics, the spectacle of the commander in chief suing women who have accused him of sexual misconduct and a constitutional crisis as the president of the United States attempts to disqualify the federal judge in a fraud suit against him because the judge is Latino.

Oh, and the Fed would be audited, and guns would once again be allowed in schools — thank heavens.

Trump has said that on his first day in office he would label China "a currency manipulator" — kicking off punitive tariffs. Trump said he would seek a 45 percent tariff on Chinese imports. Likewise, he would on his first day announce that he would renegotiate or (more likely) withdraw from the North American Free Trade Agreement. He favors 35 percent tariffs on Mexican imports.

China and Mexico, thrown into recession, would likely retaliate by blocking U.S. businesses from their markets. In the ensuing trade war, American consumers would be unable to purchase products they rely on, and inflation would soar.

American businesses would lose hundreds of billions of dollars in exports. A Moody's report done for The Post predicts a net cost to the United States of 7 million jobs. Recession would come within a year — unless further economic shocks bring about a 1930s-style depression.

And where would such a shock come from? Well, Trump has said he would ask Congress, also on his first day, to repeal Obamacare. This would mean the loss of health insurance for 24 million Americans, and mass chaos.

At the same time, Trump would deliver a shock to labor markets: He would, on his first day, begin the deportation of more than 2 million "criminal illegal **immigrants**." The liberal Center for American Progress calculates this would cost $20.1 billion, and there's only enough funding currently to deport 400,000 per year.

Simultaneously, Trump pledges to deliver an immediate blow to local-government finances, cutting off hundreds of millions of dollars in public safety and other funds to "sanctuary cities." U.S. universities and laboratories would be hit by Trump's pledge to cancel payments to U.N. climate-change programs, the Center for American Progress says. Huge tax cuts that Trump pledged would require either massive cuts in government spending (and resulting job loss) or vast increase in debt.

The backdrop for these economic shocks: international chaos. Many Trump early-days promises — halting **immigration** from terrorist-prone countries, renegotiating NATO terms and the Iran nuclear accord, pulling out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Paris climate-change agreement — would open rifts with allies in Europe, Asia and the Middle East.

As trade wars spread, shocks to the economy mounted and allies retreated, the new president would be distracted by legal proceedings. Though "Crooked Hillary" gets the attention, a judge in New Jersey last month ruled that there is probable cause to investigate a complaint of official misconduct against Gov. Chris Christie — the head of Trump's would-be transition — because of his role in the "Bridgegate" scandal. Ties to Russia by two Trump loyalists are reportedly under federal examination.

Trump University is facing multiple investigations and class-action suits accusing it of fraud. One such suit is scheduled to go to trial on Nov. 28 before U.S. District Judge Gonzalo Curiel. Trump called Indiana-born Curiel "Mexican" and said the judge can't be impartial because of his ethnicity.

Trump has threatened to use the power of the presidency against Curiel, much as he has threatened to use it against Clinton and the media. "They ought to look into Judge Curiel," he said, adding, "We will come back in November. Wouldn't that be wild if I am president and come back and do a civil case? . . . This is called life, folks."

This is life in the early days of a Trump presidency: economic shock, international instability and constitutional crisis as Trump makes the presidency his plaything.

Don't say you weren't warned.

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Is there a proper Jewish blessing for lifting up a building from its foundation and wheeling it someplace else?

At first, Rabbi Gil Steinlauf wasn't sure of the blessing for such a feat of engineering. But then he remembered an unusual spot in the Torah, two sentences in the Book of Numbers bracketed by an upside-down letter on either side.

They're the sentences meant to be said when the ancient Jews lifted their holy ark, the aron ha'kodesh containing the Torah scroll, to carry it through the desert.

"Those two verses really capture the experience of the Jewish people in many generations," Steinlauf said. "Today, so many thousands of years later, another portable sanctuary with its aron ha'kodesh is being lifted and transported again."

Behind him, construction vehicles whirred, and the oldest synagogue in the nation's capital slowly swung into motion.

When Adas Israel was built in 1876, no one imagined the brick structure was meant to be portable. But Washington's first synagogue has turned out to be a building on the move. After almost falling prey to the wrecking ball, the building moved in 1969, and became a museum of local Jewish history at its new location. Now, caught in the construction zone of the new Capitol Crossing project over Interstate 395, the building is being relocated for a second time.

The small brick building's continued survival was enough to bring Paula Goldman to tears on Thursday morning, when she saw the structure lifted off its foundation onto steel beams supported by 11 wheeled dollies underneath.

Goldman, 80, pointed toward the sky as she spoke of her late husband Aaron, who died in 2000. The couple both grew up in Washington's Jewish community, and Goldman served as president of the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington, which owns the old Adas Israel building.

"I said to Aaron, because I always talk to him, 'I'm gonna be here for you,' " she said at the ceremony marking the building's move. "I can't stop crying -- it brings memories of my husband. It brings back the memories of old Washington."

The synagogue was first built at Sixth and G streets NW, just in time for the nation's centennial. The small local Jewish community felt the country's capital ought to have a synagogue before its hundredth birthday.

The 1890s brought a surge of Jewish **immigrants** from Eastern Europe to Washington, and Adas Israel quickly outgrew the modest brick building. The congregation moved down the street in 1908, to what is now Sixth & I synagogue, and vacated that building for Cleveland Park in 1951.

Left behind, the original brick building served many purposes -- several churches used the upstairs sanctuary, while offices, retailers to a decidedly non-kosher barbecue joint occupied the lower level at one point or another, the Jewish Historical Society's deputy director, Wendy Turman, said.

In the late 1960s, when the Metro system was born, WMATA came along to turn the entire block into its headquarters. The old synagogue building, WMATA said, would have to be torn down.

Bernard Glassman was a board member at Adas Israel and an active member of the Jewish Historical Society. He was determined not to let that happen.

The society managed to get the building designated a National Historic Landmark, which afforded it some protection. But it still couldn't stay at 6th and G. WMATA was coming in.

Glassman, now 95, still remembers a call he got from a WMATA official. "This guy was tough. His words were: 'Historic building or not, if you don't get that damn building out of here, you're going to be looking at a pile of bricks.' And I knew he wasn't kidding."

Glassman secured a spot at the corner of Third and G streets NW, and the building moved down the road in 1969 -- the first time. "It was the most important project of my entire life. This is the one thing I accomplished that I'm truly proud of," he said. He never imagined it would have to move again.

But today, Third and G sits right at the center of a massive construction project: the Capitol Crossing development, which will create three city blocks on top of I-395. The developer made a deal with the Jewish Historical Society -- Property Group Partners would pay the cost of moving the building, about $500,000, and would contribute $9 million for the historical society to build a museum alongside the old synagogue at its new location one block south.

Glassman was shocked to find out the Adas Israel building would be relocated. "I was crestfallen. I was not a happy camper. You're messing with my baby!"

The current leaders of the society, however, were pleased with the arrangement. The funds from the developer would go a very long way toward building the new Jewish history museum they have dreamed of, which they will also finance with a capital campaign. In their current quiet phase, treasurer Howard Morse said, they've tallied 20 pledges totaling $1.3 million.

On Thursday, the building moved about 40 feet, just a little ways west of its foundation at the corner of G Street to make way for construction work. Two years from now, it will move once again to the corner of 3rd and F Streets NW, where it will eventually be surrounded by the much-larger structure of the museum.

"We're going to be able to build a museum that really sets the synagogue off as the jewel in the crown," Turman said. "The synagogue is the largest object in our collection."

She spoke of the value of keeping the synagogue itself, not just photographs and documents of that time. "You can go inside and get a sense of what it was like for Jewish **immigrants** in the United States in the 1870s, who were trying to find a place to pray," she said. "When I walk on the floorboards of this building, I know there were people here in 1876. I hear the echoes of their voices."

Hundreds of schoolchildren visit the museum each year to experience that up-close history lesson, she said. They hear about the building's dedication in 1876, attended by President Ulysses S. Grant -- by no means a favorite in the Jewish community, ever since his General Order No. 11 during the Civil War, which immediately expelled all Jews from the Tennessee territory. Grant showed up at the dedication, sat through a three-hour-long Orthodox service, and contributed $10 to the building fund.

This week, experts from Wolfe House and Building Movers cut through the foundation of that building that Grant chipped in to pay for. They gradually elevated it with hydraulic lifts and slid a temporary foundation made of steel beams underneath. They put it on dollies whose wheels were simultaneously steered by a remote-controlled system. As Steinlauf blessed their efforts, the dollies rolled, about a foot a minute, so slowly the motion was almost imperceptible.

Within an hour, the foundation was left empty, and Washington's oldest synagogue had completed the latest step of its wandering.

Correction: An earlier version of this article misstated the name of the treasurer of the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington. He is Howard Morse, not Harold.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Like the sun rising in the east and setting in the west, the steady beat of my heart is something I had counted on all my life — until one day in 2011, when my regular heart rhythm changed to chaos and I landed in the hospital with the first of dozens of episodes of atrial fibrillation.

The most common type of heart rhythm disturbance in the United States, atrial fibrillation — sometimes called AFib — is caused by a disorder in the heart's electrical system that makes its upper two chambers, the atriums, contract fast and irregularly. When this happens, blood can pool in the atriums, where it may clot. If a clot travels to the brain, it can cause a stroke, which is why people with this disorder are often put on blood thinners.

While AFib itself is usually not life-threatening, it dramatically increases the risk of stroke if left untreated and can lead to other problems, including heart failure and chronic fatigue.

Some people with AFib don't know they have it: The National Stroke Association estimates that one-third of Americans who have AFib are undiagnosed. But others are acutely aware when their heart rhythm shifts from steady to disorganized. For many people, being out of rhythm can be frightening, exhausting and sometimes disabling as their heart thumps wildly in their chest.

An **alien** in my rib cage

For me, going into AFib feels as if my heart suddenly leaps into a crazy dance — not the rapid, rhythmic gallop of vigorous exercise or strong emotion but a rough, unpredictable, messy romp, as if an **alien** has invaded my rib cage. More concerning than this weird sensation is the effect AFib has on my ability to do simple tasks. Walking up stairs leaves me breathless; prolonged standing makes me dizzy. This can trigger anxiety, which itself can trigger AFib.

A number of medical conditions are risk factors for AFib, including hypertension, heart disease and diabetes. It also can be related to alcohol and caffeine consumption, electrolyte imbalance and severe infection.

In my case, heart surgery in 2008 at age 54 to replace a congenitally abnormal aortic valve put me at increased risk. Age is also a risk factor, so as the population ages, AFib is becoming more common. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that 9 percent of people 65 and older have the condition.

Like me, many people's adventures in AFib start with occasional bouts that begin suddenly and stop on their own, which is classified as paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. I tried to figure out what was triggering my episodes — so I could perhaps make lifestyle changes that would keep my heart steady — and kept a detailed chart listing date and time of onset, plus duration. Throughout 2012, I experienced about two bouts a month, which typically lasted about 12 hours. Most episodes started in the middle of the night — often around 2 a.m., when I awoke to go to the bathroom. But I was uncertain whether I woke up, then went into AFib, or I first went into AFib during sleep, which woke me up.

Concern about waking up "fibbing" (as I began calling the experience) began to interfere with my ability to fall asleep. A nurse suggested that lying on the left side might trigger episodes, so my husband and I switched sides of the bed to make it more comfortable for me to sleep on my right side.

Stress is a known trigger, and while some episodes occurred after hectic days, others happened after easy days and for no apparent reason — and one even started while I was having a massage.

I developed strategies that allowed me to do almost everything I needed to do regardless of my heart's rhythm. I rarely canceled an appointment or class because I was in AFib: I taught yoga and gave presentations with a chair nearby so I could sit if my racing heart made me lightheaded or tired. Although I usual prefer to take the stairs, in AFib I'd ride the elevator or climb stairs one flight at a time, resting after each flight to catch my breath.

Shock treatment

The frequency of my episodes increased to about five a month in 2013, then to nearly nine a month in 2014. I tried numerous medications to control them, but all were unsuccessful. By the fall of 2014, I was fibbing two or three times a week. That November, I went into AFib for more than a week, a condition classified as persistent atrial fibrillation, and my doctor put me on a blood thinner.

For the first time, I did not revert to normal rhythm on my own, so I was hospitalized for a cardioversion, a procedure that uses electrical current to shock the heart back into order. While the cardioversion got me back in to a normal rhythm, it did nothing to change the underlying structural problem that was causing the AFib. And so I was ready to try a more permanent — and invasive — solution called a cardiac ablation.

Done under general anesthesia, the procedure involved having catheters guided up through the veins in the groin to my heart, where radio-frequency energy was used to destroy heart tissue that had been disturbing the electrical flow. After that January 2015 ablation, I was doing so well that in June my doctors said I could stop taking blood thinners. But in August I awoke in the middle of the night "fibbing" again and was quickly hospitalized, put back on blood thinners and cardioverted back into rhythm.

That episode, though, was an unpleasant surprise: I'd hoped I was cured. But the sobering reality is that atrial fibrillation is almost always a chronic disease. My cardiologist hoped the single episode was just a blip, but six months later it happened again.

I scheduled a second ablation. I had been warned this might be necessary because the heart rhythm specialist had done the minimal amount necessary in the first, hoping that would be sufficient.

I've been in normal rhythm since that second procedure last May. Soon, I'll have an imaging procedure to see how my heart has healed and whether I'll need to stay on blood thinners, possibly for the rest of my life.

Like most medical procedures, cardiac ablation carries risks, including bleeding, infection and damage to blood vessels and the heart. For this reason, I chose an extremely experienced doctor to do it, and my hope of living life free from AFib was worth the potential risks to me.

Now when I feel the steady beat of my heart, I count it as a blessing I'll never again take for granted. Because I know that everything can change in a heartbeat.

health-science@washpost.com

Krucoff is a yoga therapist at Duke Integrative Medicine in Durham, N.C., and co-author of "Relax Into Yoga for Seniors: A Six-Week Program for Strength, Balance, Flexibility and Pain Relief."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Too many Republicans and left-wing Democrats talk as though we are still at 8 percent unemployment and negative growth. We are not. The October jobs numbers dropped unemployment below 5 percent, with 161,000 jobs added. Even better, hourly wages are up 2.8 percent -- the biggest increase in seven years. This comes on top of the news that the economy grew at 2.9 percent in the third quarter. This is not the dystopia Donald Trump imagines, although it is widely believed that we could be creating more jobs and better-paying jobs with better policy choices.

There are a few points to keep in mind. First, we have been getting more efficient at manufacturing, which requires less people to produce goods than it did 20 years ago. Second, wages are going up even as there are fewer manufacturing jobs. The Wall Street Journal reports: "The sectors witnessing the strongest boost in hiring over the past year included education, health and professional and business services in October. The sectors with the weakest performance included manufacturing and mining, largely reflecting the ongoing declines in the energy belt." Third, African American male unemployment is too high, but it's at 8.7 percent, not the ludicrous 58 percent figure Trump throws around. (Male Hispanic unemployment is only 5 percent, by the way.)

Is everyone doing well? No, but let's keep that in perspective and figure out where the problems are.

The labor participation rate is historically low (62.8 percent). This is not merely a function of baby boomers retiring in massive numbers or the recession. To the contrary, Bloomberg reported in 2015 that "the recession seemed to keep more elderly Americans in labor force, probably because people couldn't afford to retire when they had originally planned. A growing number of retirees did contribute to the dwindling labor force, but only because the American population got older. There isn't much evidence that droves of elderly workers got frustrated with their job prospects and retired early."

Are all these missing workers on the disability rolls? Self-employed and not showing up in the figure? We don't really know, but it is interesting to note that more people are going to school instead of working than previously did. ("The share of non-working students increased from 5.8 percent in 2006 to a peak of 7.1 percent in 2012; it comprised mostly individuals younger than 35.") If they are gaining knowledge to improve their earning power and productivity when they leave school, this is a good idea; if they are studying basket-weaving (no basket-weaver complaints, please!), it's not a good thing for the economy. If we do have an inexplicable increase in disability recipients, it behooves us to figure out what's causing it (at a time that work is getting safer and manual labor less necessary) and how to get working-age people back in the workplace.

Now, we do want to be growing faster and increasing productivity, which is how wages go up. Rather than cut top marginal rates to expand the debt or spend taxpayers' money unwisely, we should pursue proposals that will supercharge job and wage growth. We surely don't want to shut off trade or keep out economically productive, innovative **immigrants**. (As the workplace gets older, we need new **immigrant** workers who are on average younger.)

We come back to some rather basic principles:

\* Reform regulation to make it less onerous, less expensive and less time-consuming.

\* Reform the corporate tax system to minimize government distortion (picking winners and losers works against higher productivity by making economic decisions into tax strategies).

\* Attend to needed infrastructure repair and modernization, with proper oversight.

\* We have endemic poverty in many places that requires a holistic approach involving both the public and private sectors.

\* Most of all, invest in our workers so that their skills improve and their wages can rise.

Investing in workers means K-12 school reform, vocational schools, apprenticeships and worker retraining as well as investment in research and development. Debt-free college, in our view, is not a wise use of resources. It is expensive, and money could be better spent on making sure students complete college or in other post-high school education. (Better to treat university presidents like oil executives and demand to know why prices are skyrocketing and whether there is collusion.)

In short, the whining from Republicans about the job numbers and the howling from **immigration** exclusionists and protectionists make them sound as though they all inhabit another economic universe. We have real problems, but let's not make them worse (e.g. by cutting off the supply of STEM workers, starting a trade war). Instead, let's focus on actual problem areas. Oh, and meanwhile, our mountain of debt looms over us, a real threat to our long-term prosperity.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**More people have access via the palm of their hand -- or rather, via the smartphone in the palm of their hand -- to more information than any generation of people has ever enjoyed. People also have access to more urban myths, propaganda, hoaxes, misinformation and outright lies from more sources than at any time in human history. It is the latter that should concern us.

There is the nonsense from talk radio/Sean Hannity/**immigration** exclusionists -- birtherism, massive voter fraud, illegal **immigrants** flooding over the border to murder us in our sleep.

There is also the misinformation that leads us to infantilize and pity Donald Trump supporters. Innocent victims of globalism? Not so much, as others like James Kirchick have pointed out:

Contrary to popular conception, however, the median household income of a Trump primary voter is a healthy $72,000 a year, well above the $62,000 national average and higher than the median incomes of those who supported both Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders. Meanwhile, 44 percent of Trump voters have college degrees, far more than the 29 percent of the general adult population. According to a Gallup working paper based upon interviews with some 87,000 Trump supporters over the past year, the most exhaustive statistical analysis of the Trump phenomenon completed thus far, "There appears to be no link whatsoever between exposure to trade competition and support for nationalist policies in America, as embodied by the Trump campaign." The same study also found "little clear evidence that economic hardship predicts support for Trump, in that higher household incomes tend to predict higher Trump support."

We know about the high association between Trump support and belief that President Obama is a Muslim and between pro-Trump enclaves and "counties in a distinct cluster of Midwestern states — Iowa, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois and Minnesota — [that] 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." It turns out, according to one study, that hostility to women is another strong indicator of support for Trump. ("The higher they were on the sexism scale, the more likely they were to support Trump and the less likely they were to support Clinton. Hostile sexism was nearly as good at predicting support for Trump as party identification was.")

To deny there is a strong racist component to Trump's campaign is to deny reality. The economic dislocation spurred by technological innovation and recession coincided but was not caused by these newcomers. (We have experienced a high-skill manufacturing uptick such that we are at a 15-year high for unfilled manufacturing jobs.)

In the misinformation department, we also have quite a lot of economic quackery. Unfortunately, too many otherwise sensible folks seem certain that the problem is trade and **immigration**, and the solution is to slow down both. That makes for less growth, less innovation and more poverty, but it does not help the high-school dropout in Youngstown, Ohio. (Many on the right peculiarly attribute African American unemployment to the cycle of welfare dependency, abuse of disability benefits and bad life choices, while attributing white hardship to Wall Street greed or globalism or phantom illegal **immigrants**.)

John Cochrane tells us that the quacks have it backward. Too many who should know better suffer from "a mercantilist mentality — thinking jobs are lumps of labor, trade is a competition for exports, and other countries are hurting us when they send us great stuff cheap." He explains:

Economic growth itself depends on globalization, expanding the number of people with whom we trade ideas, skills, and goods. If you live in a village of one hundred, or even a small country of ten million, inventing an iPhone makes no sense. You'll never sell enough to recoup the costs. It only makes sense to innovate if you can sell it in a global market of billions of people. Growth comes from ideas, ideas are hard to come by, and expertise is specialized.

Donald Trump's candidacy is evidence of the ease with which a media-savvy demagogue can bamboozle the unwary and magnify our darkest tendencies. The media has contributed to this, not merely by giving Trump effectively open-mic night (night after night) to spew his nonsense for 18 months. There, too, economic ignorance is profound. When headlines treat the "trade deficit" as a sign of our economic decline or when cable TV news networks flash pictures of the Mexican border whenever covering illegal **immigration** (which is largely a problem of visa overstays given our net outflow of people on the southern border), they contribute to the grip of ignorance and serve up fuel for dangerous demagogues.

The solution to the flood of misinformation is trite but inescapable -- more public education, better journalism, more courageous leaders.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Even as the electoral map shows new signs of volatility, a surge in early voting by Latinos is bolstering Hillary Clinton's prospects in battleground states including Arizona, Florida and Nevada in the closing days of a tightened race against Donald Trump.

Fresh election data suggest that the Democratic nominee appears to be benefiting from upticks in participation by Latinos, who historically vote in lower numbers than the electorate overall. The trend, say advocates seeking to expand the Hispanic vote, is largely motivated by distaste for Trump, who has proposed hardline **immigration** policies and stirred emotions from the outset of his campaign with a series of controversial statements about Mexicans and other Latinos.

"The Trump candidacy and the climate it's created has really heightened the importance and the personal nature of this election for Latinos," said Yvanna Cancela, political director of Culinary Workers Union 226, which represents casino workers in Nevada.

According to the data firm Catalist, one of the largest increases of early voting by Latinos is taking place in Arizona, a traditionally Republican state that Clinton visited for the first time during the general election on Wednesday. Her running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, delivered a speech there in Thursday entirely in Spanish.

Significant upticks are also taking place in Nevada and Florida, two other states where a burgeoning Hispanic vote could prove key in determining the outcome.

With Latinos accounting for about half of its 57,000 members, the culinary union in Nevada has launched an unprecedented door-knocking and phoning effort to urge members and their neighbors to cast their votes early.

In Florida, more Latinos had voted early as of Wednesday than did so during the entire early voting period in 2012, according to the Clinton campaign. Some of the biggest registration gains there have come along the Interstate 4 corridor, which has witnessed a big influx of Puerto Ricans since in the wake of the island's economic difficulties.

More modest increases in Latino participation, meanwhile, are being seen in battleground states including Colorado and Virginia, where most polls show Clinton with a shrinking lead over Trump. Manassas Park, a suburb in the fast-growing Washington region with the highest concentration of Latino voters in Virginia, has seen an uptick in absentee voting, as has surrounding Prince William County, according to the state elections board.

In Texas, a red state where Trump maintains a lead in polling, counties with the highest shares of Latino voters, all located along the Mexican border, have also seen surges in early voting, according to the office of the secretary of state.

Among Hispanics, Clinton maintained roughly a 50 percentage point lead in a new Washington Post-Univision News poll released Thursday, with Trump's deep unpopularity raising questions about how much his candidacy has hampered Republicans' long-term chances to win back support from the nation's largest minority-group voting bloc.

At the same time, early voting among African Americans — another key part of the constituency Clinton is counting upon to prevail — until recent days had been lagging voter participation from four years ago.

Clinton sought to shore up support among black voters during a pair of appearances in North Carolina on Thursday in which she argued that Trump's vision for his presidency would leave them behind.

"He has spent this entire campaign offering a dog whistle to his most hateful supporters," Clinton told a crowd of about 1,800 on the grounds of Pitt Community College. "He retweets white supremacists and spreads racially tinged conspiracy theories."

Clinton noted that Trump has been repeatedly accused of housing discrimination at his real estate properties — and that he repeatedly proclaimed the guilt of five black and Hispanic men, known as the Central Park Five, on assault and rape accusations, even after DNA evidence exonerated them.

"Do any of us have a place in Trump's America?" Clinton asked.

Republicans pointed to some favorable trends in absentee and early voting numbers for their standard-bearer, including upticks in GOP participation in counties in Ohio that Mitt Romney, the party's 2012 nominee, carried. Ohio, which has a large white, working-class population, is among the swing states where Trump has shown the most appeal.

As the race has tightened nationally, Trump has sought to put several Democratic-leaning states in play that share similar demographics, including Wisconsin and Michigan, which figure in his ticket in the race's closing days.

His campaign has also been buoyed by tightening poll numbers in New Hampshire, a largely white state that Clinton until recently appeared to have locked down.

On Thursday, Trump also appeared in North Carolina, a state key to his political fortunes.

In Concord, N.C., Trump cast Clinton as a "candidate of yesterday" and complained that he is held to a different standard than his Democratic rival.

At his rally, Trump continued to draw attention to the FBI's renewed inquiry into Clinton's email practices while she was secretary of state, when she used a private server.

"Now she's got bigger problems. If she were to win, it would create an unprecedented constitutional crisis that would cripple the operations of our government," Trump said.

The GOP nominee also criticized now-interim Democratic National Committee Chairwoman Donna Brazile, after an email released by the anti-secrecy website WikiLeaks indicated that she had provided debate questions in advance to the Clinton campaign. Trump said that if he had done something similar, he would have faced a bigger backlash.

"Headlines: 'Trump to leave race,' " Trump said, opining about what the media reaction would have been had that happened.

Clinton's oft-changing travel schedule provides clues to the day-by-day, hour-by-hour evaluation of the campaign map.

Her campaign is balancing a need to solidify support in Colorado, New Hampshire and Michigan with efforts to counter Trump's momentum in Florida and North Carolina. Bill Clinton made a sudden detour to Detroit on Thursday for outreach aimed at black voters, also a sign of where the campaign sees potential signs of trouble. Hillary Clinton will be there Friday.

Clinton has several ways to assemble the needed 270 electoral votes that do not depend on winning all three of the closest, biggest contests now — Florida, Ohio and North Carolina. But all depend on holding a bedrock of states such as Michigan that have seemed out of play for months.

Both campaigns announced new television ad buys for Michigan for the final week of the campaign. Trump was already advertising there, but Clinton hadn't aired ads in the state since the Democratic primaries.

Trump's slim path to victory most likely depends on peeling off a Democratic-leaning state such as Michigan or Wisconsin atop run-the-table victories in Florida, Ohio, North Carolina and Iowa.

Clinton's effort to pick up Arizona — or at least force Trump to spend time and money there — reflects confidence in her current standing, aides say, as well as a belief that the Latino voting numbers give her a fighting chance.

Kaine delivered an entire campaign speech in Spanish on Thursday evening in Phoenix, where he stressed his belief in a brand of inclusive politics that celebrates diversity. He criticized Trump's controversial rhetoric about **immigrants**, calling the GOP nominee a "payaso," a clown, and specifically criticized his attacks on Judge Gonzalo Curiel and former Miss Universe Alicia Machado.

"For the first time in a long time Arizona is competitive," Kaine said in Spanish, urging voters to vote early — and immediately after the rally. "The power of the Latino vote can make a big difference in many states, in a historic way."

In Arizona, Latinos represented 13.2 percent of all early voters as of Tuesday, up from 11 percent at the same point in 2012 and 8.1 percent in 2008, according to Catalist, a firm that works with Democrats and progressive groups.

In Nevada, Latinos make up 11.8 percent of early voters so far, compared with 10.5 percent in 2012 and 9.1 percent in 2008. And in Florida, they accounted for 14.1 percent of all returned ballots as of Tuesday, up from 9.6 percent at the same point in 2008.

Among the groups seeking to bolster Latino participation this cycle is the Center for Community Change Action, which has targeted the battleground states of Florida, Nevada and Colorado.

Jeff Parcher, the group's communications director, said the aim is to get voters to the polls who haven't been participating in elections.

"These low-propensity voters are never targeted by the campaigns," he said, suggesting that if the drive is successful, it could be a "game changer" in states where the margin is close.

Xochitl Hinojosa, a Clinton spokeswoman, said the uptick in Latino early voting includes states with smaller Hispanic populations as well, such as North Carolina and Ohio.

"From the start of the campaign, we have made it a priority to have a strong Latino vote program that reaches voters where they are because we understand how critical this voting bloc is to winning on Tuesday," she said. "Over the next few days, you'll only see our efforts intensify in an effort to expand participation."
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Jenna Johnson in Florida and North Carolina, Abby Phillip in North Carolina, and Scott Clement, Ed O'Keefe, Sean Sullivan and Karen Tumulty in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump was the first major-party presidential candidate in decades to center his campaign on fear of **immigrants**. #NeverTrump and reluctantly Trump Republicans understand that this is not a winning formula in a country in which the presidential electorate becomes more diverse each cycle. So thoughtful Republicans fret: How will they persuade fellow Republicans to give up their nativism? With so many entrenched anti-**immigrant** voices in the GOP, how will the party survive?

Perhaps it is not Republicans who will have to do the persuading. If early-voting trends are correct, we may see a substantial increase in Hispanic voters, securing key swing states for the Democrats and impairing Republican strongholds such as Arizona.

Marc Caputo reports:

Hillary Clinton is besting Donald Trump by an historic 30-point margin among Florida Hispanics, according to a new bipartisan poll that indicates Latinos could play an outsized role in delivering the White House to a Democrat for the third election in a row.

The days of low turnout among Hispanic voters may be coming to an end. ("If the poll is right and if Hispanics cast 16 percent of the ballots in an election with 72 percent overall turnout, Clinton would build up a margin of 437,000 more votes than Trump. So far, Florida Hispanics have cast about 14 percent of the nearly 4.9 million early and absentee votes as of Thursday morning — far out-pacing their 2012 share of the vote five days before Election Day.")

In Arizona, former governor and anti-**immigrant** advocate Jan Brewer declared that the GOP need not worry about the Hispanic vote. "They don't get out and vote. They don't vote." A turnout of Hispanic voters sufficient to flip the state to Democratic would be especially sweet for the Hispanic community.

So how do things look in Arizona? Fox News Latino reported Thursday, "In Arizona, where more than half the votes have been cast, Democrats trail by 5 percentage points. But at this point in 2012, Republicans had opened a 10 percentage point lead." The report continued, "Turnout rose among all races, but at higher rates among Hispanics." Likewise, the Arizona Republic on Thursday found, "More than 1.37 million early ballots already have been returned, out of 2.3 million sent out, according to the Arizona Secretary of State's office. That means more than 178,000 Latinos in Arizona have already voted. There are 3.5 million registered voters in the state, which means more than a third voted early." Given the extensive Latino voting effort, the uptick is not unexpected.

No wonder, then, that Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.) was in Phoenix on Thursday (not coincidentally, where Trump delivered his major deportation address at the end of August). He accomplished a first in presidential politics — a speech delivered entirely in Spanish. "Hillary and I will introduce legislation for comprehensive **immigration** reform that includes a path to citizenship," he said (according to the English translation). "Too many children in America say goodbye to their parents every morning, not knowing if their mom or dad will be there when they get home." He explained, "Donald Trump wants to create a deportation nation. Trump wants to deport almost 16 million people. He wants to deport 11.5 million undocumented people. And he wants to eliminate citizenship for 4.5 million people who were born in the United States to parents without documents undocumented parents and deport them as well." Kaine also touted Democrats' plan "to connect more Latinos with good jobs that pay good wages … with more opportunities to go to college, launch new ventures, and build wealth that you can pass on to your kids," reeling off a list of agenda items including debt-free college, easier access to capital for small business and free universal preschool.

Whatever you think of the merits of what Democrats are selling, they have made an enormous effort to register and turn out Hispanics. They are going to Hispanic audiences to talk to them, not talk about them (and threaten to kick out their grandmothers), as Trump does to white audiences. Kaine treated them not like drug dealers and job stealers, as Trump does, but like concerned citizens with specific interests and needs.

Republicans have done none of this. In fact, their nominee has gone out of his way to stereotype and frighten Hispanic voters, offering nothing but the threat that millions of their relatives, neighbors and friends will be deported. If Trump loses, it will be Hispanics who deliver the message to GOP nativists: Keep it up and you'll never win the White House. Keep it up and say goodbye to Arizona, Colorado and Nevada's electoral votes, just as you did to California's.

#NeverTrump Republicans have plenty to worry about, but they should not worry that they'll have difficulty delivering the message that xenophobia is killing the GOP. If Democrats and Hispanics have done their job, the message will be delivered on Tuesday with a decisive blow to the nativists' dream of an anti-**immigrant**, white, grievance-based coalition.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton holds a narrow three-point edge over Donald Trump as supporters of each candidate lock in to their candidate as the best equipped to handle a variety of national issues, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News Tracking Poll .

The poll finds that despite the 2016 campaign's vast differences from four years ago, voters are dividing in very similar ways to 2012 when Barack Obama won reelection by a four-point margin.

Voters' rankings of the most important issue in their votes could be seen as a danger sign for Democrats: The economy ranks first at 29 percent, followed by corruption in government, terrorism and national security, health care and **immigration**.

But when asked which candidate voters trust to handle each, Clinton runs equal to or slightly ahead of Trump to handle four of the five issues, including the economy, terrorism, **immigration** and health care. Trump holds a clear 48 percent to 39 percent advantage on dealing with corruption in government.

[ Read full poll results | Graphic: Who key groups are supporting ]

No candidate holds a double-digit edge on any of the five issues tested in the poll, and the vast majority of voters are trusting of their candidate down the line. Fully 75 percent of Clinton voters trust her over Trump to handle all five issues, while 83 percent of Trump's backers are similarly united.

In overall support, 47 percent back Clinton while 44 percent back Trump in the latest four-day wave completed Tuesday, little different from her 47-45 edge in the previous wave but a break from the past six days where Clinton and Trump have been within two points.

Clinton's current three-point edge is not statistically significant, but it provides some evidence that her decline in support tracked by the Post-ABC poll and other national and state surveys might be easing. In the tracking poll wave released Monday, Trump topped Clinton by one point, 46 to 45 percent.

One shift since Trump's high point has been an easing in support among political independents, a group that favored the Republican by as much as 19 points last week. No candidate has maintained a consistently large edge with independents all year, as we noted at the time, and Trump's lead with the group has come back to eight points in the latest wave, 47 percent for him compared to 39 percent for Clinton. Shifts among independents may reflect less switching of support than changing the makeup of independents, given the group's mix of closet partisans and less-engaged voters generally that are less likely to turnout.

Trump's position with independents closely resembles Mitt Romney's five-point winning margin among the group in the 2012 network exit poll , which was not sufficient to overcome Democrats' overall party identification advantage over Republicans.

The Tracking Poll finds several other parallels to the election four years ago in the way groups are angling to vote. While the gender gap showed signs of expanding earlier this year, Clinton's 10-point lead among women is similar to Obama's 11-point margin four years ago, and Trump's six-point edge with men nearly matches Romney's seven-point edge.

Along religious lines, Trump's 79 percent support among white evangelical Protestants is just one point different from Romney's 78 percent support among the same group. Clinton's 63-percent support among likely voters who do not affiliate with a religion is only somewhat short of Obama's 70-percent share with this group.

One persistent break from 2012 voting patterns is the divide among whites by educational attainment. White voters without college degrees favor Trump by a 33-point margin (62-29 percent), slightly larger than Romney's 26-point edge among the group. But white college graduates have moved more sharply in Democrats' direction, with Clinton now holding an 8-point lead (49-41 percent), a reversal from Romney's 14-point winning margin in 2012.

That shift has been tracked all year and continues to be pronounced among white women with college degrees, who favored Romney by six points but support Clinton today by a 19-point margin.

This Washington Post-ABC News poll was conducted on cellular and landline phones Oct. 30-Nov. 2, 2016, among a random national sample of 1,151 likely voters and has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points. Sampling, data collection and tabulation by Abt-SRBI of New York.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**We know a lot about where Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump would try to take America as president. We don't know everything. After a campaign that feels like it started in the middle of the Bush administration — the first Bush — questions remain, large and small, that the candidates have left scattered across their domestic policy agendas.

Those questions are revealing. The details of campaign plans don't always become law, but they're often the starting point for negotiations.

When candidates leave details unspecified, they're being vague on purpose, either to put off tough legislative choices, tough political choices or both. They're also suggesting what parts of their plans they might radically change, or discard altogether, if they reach the White House.

As the race draws to a close, here are the five biggest questions left unanswered by Trump, the Republican nominee, on domestic policy.

[interstitial\_link url="http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2016/11/04/five-things-we-still-dont-know-about-hillary-clintons-agenda/"]Five[http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2016/11/04/five-things-we-still-dont-know-about-hillary-clintons-agenda/"]Five] things we still don't know about Hillary Clinton's agenda[/interstitial\_link]

1. What would he replace Obamacare with?

There's no way around this: The Republican nominee's unanswered questions are often bigger — more fundamental — than his Democratic rival's. Health care is a prime example. Like most in his party, Trump wants to repeal the Affordable Care Act. He promises to replace it with something "better" for consumers.

The details he's released, though, don't add up to what could realistically be construed as a conservative version of Obamacare, one that emphasizes market forces but still seeks to keep millions of Americans from losing insurance coverage in the event of repeal. He would let insurers sell across state lines, rely more on tax-free savings accounts for health care and attempt to reduce prescription drug prices by allowing imports of cheaper drugs from overseas.

Those ideas leave huge problems unsolved in the repealing of Obamacare; a leading conservative health care wonk, Avik Roy, calls them "empty rhetoric." There are several more detailed conservative Obamacare alternatives. By stopping well short of them, Trump is able to make lofty promises about maintaining insurance coverage and keeping costs low, but voters aren't able to evaluate whether he could deliver.

2. How many **immigrants** who are in the country illegally would he deport?

Trump vowed for a year to deport 11 million **immigrants** who remain in the United States illegally, an aggressive stance that was a driving force in his rise to the GOP nomination. He has since softened the stance. Maybe.

In recent months Trump has focused on a pledge to deport violent criminals and **immigrants** who have overstayed their visas, which likely means closer to 5 million people than 11 million. He said in a debate last month that his priority was going after "bad hombres." But as recently as September, he reiterated his desire to deport all **immigrants** here illegally, the full 11 million, in a speech in Arizona.

The difference in those stances is a lot of money spent on **immigration** enforcement and a lot of impact on the economy, particularly the labor market.

3. What tax rate would he make some businesses pay?

Here is the very short version of what tax reporters call the Passthrough Mystery. Trump has proposed reducing the tax rate for businesses to 15 percent. He says that means all businesses, but his plans, after many rounds of revision, say otherwise: that at least some businesses will pay a higher rate, because their profit will be taxed as personal income for their owners.

It's still unclear which businesses would have to do that.

At issue is a corporate structure known as a "passthrough entity," which is popular among small business owners and also the companies in Trump's own business empire. Even some individuals use the structure to report freelance income; for example, Bill Clinton does, for the money he makes from speeches. The question is how many of those entities would pay Trump's 15 percent business rate.

Trump's advisers have set some guidelines — essentially, that income previously considered business income will continue to be considered business income — that tax experts say don't clear up the picture. The more businesses eligible for the lower rate, the more Trump's tax plan will cost, which is why the question matters so much. By some estimates, the answer could mean piling as much as $1 trillion more onto the national debt. over the next decade.

4. What specific government spending programs would he cut?

Trump has promised at least $1 trillion in spending cuts over the next decade as part of his efforts to ensure his tax cuts don't add to the budget deficit. He says he would not cut Social Security or Medicare, and he wants to increase defense spending. That leaves a relatively small corner of the budget as his only choice for cuts: non-defense discretionary spending. He has a method for applying those cuts, called the "penny plan," but it doesn't specify which programs would be chopped, so voters have no idea if he would be taking more from education, scientific research or any other part of the budget.

5. How he would ensure that no family would see a tax increase under his plan?

Trump's tax proposal would, on the whole, cut taxes for Americans at every income level. But, because he gets rid of some deductions, including two that mean big money for large families, studies have suggested his plan could end up raising taxes on millions of families.

Trump's advisers say they'll make sure that's not true — by simply instructing congressional committees writing tax law to ensure no one sees a tax increase under the plan. They haven't said how the committees would do that, and it's not clear how they could, short of allowing taxpayers to choose between a new system and the old one.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The grocery store aisles have become ground zero for this election's politicized brands on social media.

First Skittles found itself unwittingly pulled into the political crosshairs after Eric Trump tweeted a meme comparing the candy to refugees. Then Tic Tac found itself as Donald Trump's preferred breath freshener "just in case I start kissing her," as he said in that lewd hot mic video released in October. And last week, after Richard Yuengling Jr. said his beer company was behind Trump, a social media debate erupted between Trump supporters who said they'd be buying the 187-year-old beer and his critics who said they would boycott it.

Now, following a New York Times story Monday that detailed how Chobani founder Hamdi Ulukaya has come under fire from far right conservatives over his hiring of refugees and advocacy for them, the Greek yogurt brand has seen a wave of attention on social media. Ulukaya, an **immigrant** from Turkey who is of Kurdish descent, employs more than 300 refugees in his factories. He has started a foundation to get businesses involved in solving the crisis. And he has pledged to give away most of his wealth in support of migrants. In response, the Times reported, he has become the target of a series of articles on the conservative website Breitbart and a call for boycotts of his brand on social media. (The Daily Beast also wrote about the far right's campaign against Chobani in early September.)

[Skittles can't seem to escape political controversies]

In recent days a groundswell of support for Chobani has emerged on social media, all but drowning out the #boycott. An analysis by the analytics firm Brandwatch found that the yogurt brand was mentioned more than 9,300 times on Tuesday, the day after the Times' story posted, which was an 8,600 percent bump.

Eighty-five percent of the mentions about CEO Ulukaya and 55 percent of the social media mentions were positive, but that's a misleading number: The "negative" mentions weren't necessarily criticizing the company or CEO, according to Brandwatch. Instead, they were largely condemning the threats being made against the company for employing refugees. ​On Twitter, the hashtags #chobani and #refugees and #buychobani far outpaced #boycott, Brandwatchnoted.

A quick search of the word "chobani" on Twitter confirms the largely positive response. Some praised Ulukaya himself. "I vote with my wallet and look forward to buying a lot more @chobani," wrote one fan. "This is what leadership looks like." Others said they'd be stocking their fridge with more of his yogurt instead. "I eat yogurt nearly every morning. Looks like I've got a new favorite brand," wrote another.

Let's do an anti anti-boycott. chobani employees refugees and himself is a **immigrant** who is creating jobs. #BuyChobani https://t.co/sY9AlMhoLc[https://t.co/sY9AlMhoLc]

Switching to @Chobani in admiration and support! https://t.co/RUqT2Br5lb[https://t.co/RUqT2Br5lb]

Some political voices weighed in: Republican strategist and Trump critic Ana Navarro called it the "insanity of the day," tweeting that she had two Chobani yogurts for breakfast, while former Obama National Security spokesman Tommy Vietor wrote to "please go buy @Chobani products to support them." Others made a clear connection between the brand and an election in which GOP nominee Donald Trump has proposed a ban on Syrian refugees. One supporter declared Chobani his "election-night snack."

Just picked my election-night snack: #Chobani gets threats, calls for boycott for employing refugees https://t.co/r2vlLF5dth[https://t.co/r2vlLF5dth] via @nbcnews

INSANITY OF THE DAY: Chobani targeted b/c founder helping fellow humans...Had 2 for breakfast https://t.co/fEA9IRfw8C[https://t.co/fEA9IRfw8C] pic.twitter.com/Rk2Zq0FZOq

Meanwhile, on the company's Facebook page, comments poured in with support for the CEO's actions, thanking him and the company. Some referred not only to Ulukaya's support of refugees, but his treatment of employees. Before the latest wave of attention, Chobani made headlines this year for giving all of his 2,000 full-time workers awards that could be worth up to 10 percent of the company's future value. And last month, Chobani added six weeks of paid parental leave for both new mothers and fathers at his company, many of whom are factory workers who often don't see such benefits.

A representative for the company declined to comment on what impact the wave of social media attention was having. Ulukaya himself, speaking at a Fast Company conference on Tuesday after the story hit, spoke broadly about the refugee issue, saying it was the right thing to do to help refugees get jobs. "We're looking at this landscape in the world today, and it doesn't matter where you are — in upstate New York, Turkey, Germany, whatever — you just cannot sit still," Ulukaya said, according to a Fast Company report.

[Chobani's CEO is giving up to 10 percent of his company to employees]

He spoke about the role corporations can play in filling the gap where government actions haven't worked; corporate partners that have signed on to his Tent Alliance include big names such as Cisco, Deloitte, IBM and Johnson & Johnson, according to the foundation's website.

"It has never been this important in human history that business owners and innovators are not disconnected from human life, and definitely not disconnected from their own employees and communities," he said at the conference.

Ulukaya also talked about two workers at his yogurt plant who escaped Afghanistan after their father was killed and they left their mother behind, one of whom has become a manager at the factory.

"These are two stories," he said. "I have 600 stories. These are all human beings."

Read also:

What business leaders are doing about the refugee crisis

Howard Schultz wants you to try some civility with your coffee

CEOs are getting more political, but consumers aren't buying it

Like On Leadership? Follow us on Facebook and Twitter, and subscribe to our podcast on iTunes.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — Britain's plan for getting out of the European Union was thrown into doubt Thursday as a senior court ruled that Prime Minister Theresa May will need to get Parliament's approval before she acts.

The surprise decision introduced new uncertainty to a process already fraught with complication and threatened to derail May's timetable of triggering Article 50, the never-before-used mechanism for exiting the E.U., by the end of March.

It also boosted the odds that the prime minister, in office only since July, will have to call a fresh election next year to win the mandate she needs to launch E.U. divorce talks.

The decision drew immediate condemnation from pro-Brexit politicians, who warned of an angry backlash from voters who favor leaving the 28-member bloc and had thought the matter was settled when they opted in a June referendum to get out.

Pro-E.U. leaders, meanwhile, showered the ruling with praise, and the pound jumped on hopes that Brexit might be postponed — or somehow avoided altogether.

A statement from May's office at 10 Downing Street said it was "disappointed" by the ruling and would appeal to the Supreme Court. Justices are expected to take the case next month.

At the heart of the legal dispute is a clash between direct and representative democracy. Although the British opted for Brexit by a margin of 52 percent to 48 percent, a large majority of members in Parliament wanted Britain to stay in the E.U. By giving Parliament a voice, the London-based High Court handed power back to a group that is skeptical or even hostile toward the very idea of Brexit.

Mujtaba Rahman, Europe director for the Eurasia Group political consultancy, said Thursday that lawmakers will be reluctant to incur voters' wrath by going directly against their will and blocking exit plans.

Nonetheless, he described the court's decision as "a severe setback for Theresa May's government."

If the Supreme Court upholds the judgment on appeal, Rahman wrote in a Thursday analysis, then pro-E.U. lawmakers could use the process to "seek to tie May's negotiating hand."

One option for May, in turn, could be to call a general election next year "to ask the public to endorse her negotiating goals — in effect, to use an election to override Parliament," he added.

That would be a sharp break from the plan May has repeatedly outlined. She intends to trigger Brexit on her own, without Parliament's input, and has ruled out an early election.

Thursday's decision instantly threw that plan into disarray. A three-judge panel representing England and Wales dismissed government lawyers' arguments that May has the executive power necessary to launch Brexit talks on her own and sided with a group of plaintiffs who contended that Parliament must weigh in first.

"The most fundamental rule of the U.K.'s constitution is that Parliament is sovereign and can make and unmake any law it chooses," the judges wrote. "As an aspect of the sovereignty of Parliament it has been established for hundreds of years that the Crown — i.e. the Government of the day — cannot by exercise of prerogative powers override legislation enacted by Parliament."

The court's decision stunned British political and legal observers — just as the referendum outcome also defied predictions that voters would favor staying in the E.U. Until Thursday, most analysts had predicted the court would side with the government. The High Court in Northern Ireland had ruled as recently as last week that May's government could bypass Parliament.

Thursday's ruling sparked an immediate rally in Britain's beleaguered currency. The pound has been battered since the referendum and has been one of the worst-performing currencies in the world this year.

Mark Carney, governor of the Bank of England, warned again Thursday of likely inflation next year and said the ruling is "an example of the uncertainty that will characterize this process."

Brexit advocates quickly denounced the decision, saying it amounted to a betrayal of the public's will.

"I now fear every attempt will be made to block or delay triggering Article 50," tweeted Nigel Farage, a longtime Brexit champion. "They have no idea the level of public anger they will provoke."

Suzanne Evans, a candidate to succeed Farage as leader of the U.K. Independence Party, added a condemnation of "activist judges" who "attempt to overturn our will."

"Time we had the right to sack them," she wrote.

Pro-E.U. politicians, meanwhile, pressured May to share with Parliament her negotiating strategy — something she has steadfastly refused to do, insisting she will not give "a running commentary" on the talks.

"So far May's team have been all over the place when it comes to prioritizing what is best for Britain, and it's time they pull their socks up and start taking this seriously," Liberal Democrat leader Tim Farron said in a statement.

Pro-E.U. leaders also pointed to what they described as hypocrisy on the Brexit side. One prominent argument for getting out of the E.U. was to restore the sovereignty of Parliament. But in this case, anti-E.U. leaders want Parliament nowhere near a decision that carries huge ramifications for the country's future.

The court ruling — assuming it is not overturned on appeal — sets up a crucial decision for the 650 representatives in Britain's House of Commons. Members of the ruling Conservative Party were almost evenly split when the country voted June 23 on whether Britain should stay in the E.U. or leave. But solid majorities of the other major parties in Parliament — including Labour, the Scottish National Party and the Liberal Democrats — all opposed an exit.

May, who took office in July following the resignation of David Cameron, has only a narrow majority in Parliament and could struggle to pass legislation authorizing the start of Britain's departure.

An early election could be a way for May to regain the initiative. Dominic Raab, a pro-Brexit Tory member of Parliament, alluded to that possibility in an interview with the BBC, effectively daring pro-E.U. parties to force a new vote. "I don't think those trying to break the verdict of the referendum would be rewarded," he said in reference to polls that show Conservatives well ahead of their rivals.

Some analysts played down the ruling's impact, noting that Parliament is unlikely to risk the ire of voters by undermining Brexit.

"We're moving towards the sovereignty of the people," said King's College London historian Vernon Bogdanor, "which is quite a different concept."

Since taking power, May has often promised that "Brexit means Brexit." But her government has struggled to put together a coherent strategy for the tough negotiations to come with Europe.

The talks — set to last two years once Article 50 has been triggered — are likely to focus on the trade-off between Britain's desire to control E.U. **immigration**into the country and its wish to retain access to the E.U.'s common market.

Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson, a leading Brexit proponent, has said the government's objective "should be having our cake and eating it."

But European leaders have said that will not be possible and that Britain will have to allow **immigrants** if it wants to maintain the market access that is at the core of its trading relationships with Europe.

Johnson on Wednesday appeared to make unwitting reference to the government's struggles, saying in a speech at an awards ceremony sponsored by the conservative Spectator magazine that Britain would make "a titanic success" of Brexit.

George Osborne, Britain's pro-E.U. former treasury chief, quickly interjected, "It sank."

griff.witte@washpost.com

Brian Murphy in Washington and Karla Adam in London contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TEMPE, Ariz.— Hillary Clinton on Wednesday laid out her final argument to voters still wavering over their presidential choice, asking Americans to "imagine" how Donald Trump would conduct himself in the Oval Office.

"Imagine having a president who demeans women, mocks the disabled, insults Latinos, African Americans, the disabled, POWs, who pits people against each other," the Democratic presidential nominee asked a sprawling crowd gathered for a nighttime rally on the campus of Arizona State University .

"We really don't have to imagine what it would be like, because everything he has said and done — both in his career and this campaign -- is a pretty good preview," she added.

The tightness of the race — and the multiple states poised to have a pivotal effect on the outcome — was apparent in the vast distances covered by both candidates and their surrogates Wednesday, as well as the tens of millions of dollars in advertising lined up to fill the airwaves in the last days.

A bullish Trump spent the day in Florida, assuring supporters that he was on the path to victory, while his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, raced through Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado. Trump's children also campaigned in key battlegrounds on his behalf, making stops in Colorado, North Carolina, Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Sen. Ted Cruz of Texas — Trump's long-lasting rival in the primary contest — was set to appear with Pence Thursday in Iowa and Michigan.

Speaking to a crowd of fired-up fans in Pensacola at his third stop of the day, the real estate developer at one point gave himself a lecture about staying on message.

"In six days, we are going to win the great state of Florida, and we are going to win the White House," the GOP nominee said. "It's feeling like it already, isn't it? We've got to be nice and cool, nice and cool. Alright? Stay on point, Donald, stay on point. No sidetracks, Donald."

But in a break from his past rhetoric about curtailing **immigration**, the GOP nominee proclaimed that as president he would allow "tremendous numbers" of legal **immigrants** based on a "merit system."

"They have to come in legally," he added. "And we'll have merit involved, too. Wouldn't it be nice if we went a little bit on the merit system? We take people that are really going to help us to grow our country? Wouldn't that be nice? Somebody said: 'You can't say that, that's not politically correct.' Well, I just said it, folks."

For her part, Clinton urged supporters to reach out to voters thinking "maybe I'll just sit this one out," as she put it, and exhorted them to spend the final hours before Election Day working to persuade everyone they know to vote.

"Think about any issue you care about — it is on the ballot," she told a small, crowded union hall in Las Vegas earlier in the day.

She ended her day in Tempe, with her second-biggest rally of the campaign, addressing an estimated 15,000 supporters gathered on the campus of Arizona State University .

"You can't imagine how happy I am to be here with all of you!" she said, beaming as she took in the teeming crowd.

Throughout the day, she was backed by a full cast of Democratic and liberal heavy-hitters across the country, including President Obama, Vice President Biden, Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) and Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.).

"You win here in Florida, it is all over," Biden urged a crowd in Palm Beach Gardens. "We can go to bed early on election night!"

A few moments later, Obama made the same case to supporters in Chapel Hill, N.C. "So I hate to put a little pressure on you, but the fate of the republic rests on your shoulders," he told the crowd gathered on a sports field at the University of North Carolina.

In a radio interview broadcast Wednesday morning, the president expressed concern about turnout among African Americans, pressing black voters to go to the polls for Clinton to protect the policies he has implemented.

"The African American vote right now is not as solid as it needs to be," Obama said on "The Tom Joyner Morning Show," framing the election as not only a race between Clinton and Trump, but one in which his record is on the line.

"I need everybody to understand that everything we've done is dependent on being able to pass the baton to somebody who believes in the same things I believe in," the president said.

To shore up support among black voters, Clinton released a radio ad Wednesday titled "Disrespect" that says Trump "openly mocks the African American community." The spot will air in Pennsylvania, Florida, Ohio and North Carolina, her campaign said.

The Clinton team dipped into its bulging war chest to increase its ad investments across the country for the final week of the campaign, purchasing airtime in Wisconsin and doubling its television spending in Arizona to $1 million. A Democratic nominee for president has not won Arizona since Bill Clinton in 1996, but polls show a competitive contest there.

In addition, the campaign is expanding its air presence in Colorado, Virginia, Michigan and New Mexico with six-figure buys.

The new spending is fueled by Clinton's large bank account. As of Oct. 19, she had more than $62 million on hand, compared with Trump's $16 million.

This week, the campaign said it raised a record $11.3 million in 48 hours online. Clinton's online fundraising has reached its highest level since she became the Democratic nominee in July, officials said, giving her campaign the resources to blanket the airwaves.

"We're not going to leave any money on the table," said Clinton communications director Jennifer Palmieri.

The surge in donations coincides with news of a renewed FBI inquiry into Clinton's use of a private email server when she was secretary of state, a development that Democrats have criticized as unfair. Fundraising appeals have asked Clinton supporters to "have her back" at a difficult time.

At the same time, the controversy has invigorated Trump and his supporters. His campaign said it had raised $100 million in small-dollar donors in October — meaning it saw a huge flood of contributions in the last 11 days of the month.

Trump has been focusing heavily this week on the FBI 's latest probe, often wildly exaggerating or changing key details. In Orlando, he said that all 650,000 emails that were located on a laptop belonging to Anthony Weiner, the estranged husband of Clinton aide Huma Abedin, belonged to Clinton. Officials have not yet said whether any of the emails are connected to Clinton.

In Orlando, the GOP nominee predicted that Clinton "is likely to be under investigation for many years, probably concluding in a criminal trial."

"Hillary wants to blame everyone else for her mounting legal troubles and I don't see — if you've watched her last few speeches over the last few days, she has become totally unhinged," he said. "Unbelievable. What she's saying and what she's doing, it — actually, it's unbelievable. But she has no one to blame but herself."

Earlier in the day, at a rally in Miami, Trump called his Democratic rival a "very unstable person." He did not substantiate his claim.

Meanwhile, Trump campaign spokesman Jason Miller confirmed Wednesday that the Republican nominee will hold his election night event at the New York Hilton Midtown.

The hotel is a couple of blocks from Trump Tower, where the nominee launched his campaign last year. But the atrium in Trump Tower is a privately owned public space, making it a problematic spot for a private campaign event. The City of New York earlier fined Trump $10,000 for holding campaign events there.

The campaign rented a ballroom in the Hilton but expects to do a small event — at least compared with most of Trump's big rallies, according to one person familiar with the plans who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe strategy.

In 2012, GOP nominee Mitt Romney spent $25,000 on a fireworks show over Boston Harbor that never came to pass because he lost to President Obama. There are no plans for Trump fireworks next Tuesday, the person said. Trump is "superstitious" and doesn't want to jinx things by planning a big victory celebration, the person added.

Trump's decision means that both presidential nominees will be spending next Tuesday night in New York. Clinton and her supporters will gather at the Jacob K. Javits Convention Center in Manhattan — a building with a symbolic architectural feature: a large glass ceiling.

abby.phillip@washpost.com

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

matea. gold@washpost.com

Johnson reported from Miami, Orlando and Pensacola, and Gold reported from Washington. Anne Gearan and David Nakamura in Washington and Juliet Eilperin in Chapel Hill contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is no ordinary election. Time for a reminder of what's at stake:

Climate policy and the clean-energy economy: For anyone who accepts the scientific consensus that global warming poses a clear and present danger, there is only one choice. Hillary Clinton will continue along the path laid out by President Obama and other world leaders. Donald Trump has claimed, ridiculously, that climate change is a hoax invented by the Chinese.

For the first time, the three nations most responsible for spewing heat-trapping carbon dioxide into the atmosphere — China, the United States and India — have all formally agreed to curb emissions. The landmark Paris agreement is the biggest and most important step taken to date. Clinton would honor the accord; Trump would renounce it on his first day in office.

The rest of the world is moving rapidly toward renewable sources of energy, which recently surpassed coal as the largest global source of power-generating capacity. According to the International Energy Agency, last year an estimated 500,000 solar panels were installed worldwide every day. Clinton would encourage the growth of the clean-energy sector, which has the potential to create millions of jobs. Trump promises a renaissance of fossil fuels — mining more coal, pumping more oil — even though the electric-power industry is moving on.

The Western alliance: Since the end of World War II, NATO has been the globe's most important military alliance, a bulwark against Soviet — now Russian — expansionism and a source of peace and prosperity. It is no accident that the United States and Europe are the world's biggest economic powers.

Clinton may be a bit hawkish for some tastes, but she is firmly committed to the NATO security framework. Trump describes NATO as if it were a protection racket.

Trump has repeatedly and consistently expressed a desire for an alliance with Russia, even after it seized Crimea from Ukraine and intervened to save the murderous regime of dictator Bashar al-Assad in Syria. Trump often voices his admiration for Russian President Vladimir Putin — who, according to U.S. intelligence analysts, has deployed an army of Internet hackers against the Democratic Party in a shocking and unprecedented attempt to meddle in our election. Trump has done nothing to refute Clinton's claim that he would be Putin's "puppet" in the White House.

**Immigration** reform: An estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** live in the United States, most of them from Mexico and Central America. Clinton supports common-sense **immigration** reform that would secure the southern border, modernize our system of legal **immigration** and bring undocumented people out of the shadows by giving them legal status and a path toward citizenship. Trump does not.

Trump launched his campaign by saying of Mexican **immigrants**: "They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people." He has called for building a physical wall along the entire border with Mexico and absurdly said that Mexico would somehow pay for it. And he pledges to deport all of the undocumented, in what would amount to a massive campaign of ethnic cleansing. Doing so would require a gargantuan and intrusive deportation force the likes of which this country has never imagined, let alone witnessed.

The social fabric: The country is undergoing inexorable demographic change. By 2044, if not sooner, according to the Census Bureau, there will be no racial or ethnic majority; non-Hispanic whites, in other words, will be less than 50 percent of the population, becoming a minority just like every other group. This is already the case in California, Texas, New Mexico and Hawaii, and nationwide among children younger than 5.

Clinton understands and embraces these changes. Trump, by contrast, has become the champion of those whites who, like King Canute, would hold back the sea. It is no accident that he is avidly supported by the likes of David Duke, the unabashed white nationalist, Holocaust denier and former imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. When Trump says "Make America Great Again," many minorities hear "Make America White Again."

Fiscal sanity: Clinton proposes new spending — including to improve the Affordable Care Act — that would increase the national debt by $250 billion over the next decade, according to the bipartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. Trump's combination of huge tax cuts and increased spending, however, would balloon the debt by a crushing $10 trillion over the same period.

I could go on, but you get the point. Donald Trump gravely threatens our future. He must be stopped.

eugenerobinson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MURRAY, UTAH — Gary Johnson, the Libertarian Party's nominee for president, could not believe what was happening. For months he'd argued that the American public's disgust with the two major parties would cut his path to the White House. He had just watched those candidates disqualify themselves from high office. And he was polling worse than ever — especially in Utah, where those candidates were toxic.

"James Comey would not have done what he did unless there was something underlying all of this," Johnson told a crowd of about 100 people Tuesday at a college auditorium near Salt Lake City. "And if Trump is elected, he could actually go into Inauguration Day on trial for rape! Underage rape! He could be on trial for underage rape, taking the oath of office!"

Both claims were full of holes, from the FBI director's letter to Congress in the Hillary Clinton email case to the flimsiness of the Donald Trump case. At the same time, two time zones away, Johnson's running mate, Bill Weld, was telling MSNBC that he was "vouching for Mrs. Clinton" and far more worried about Trump winning the election.

This was not a bad day in the Libertarian ticket's final run. It was typical.

"We purposely un-coordinate, other than the belief that we believe in each other," Johnson explained. "Hey, he does not want Donald Trump elected. I don't want to see Hillary Clinton elected. So I don't see an issue with him going after Trump. I'm going after Clinton."

In 2015 and 2016, for months at a time, the rise of libertarian-minded candidates sparked questions about whether a "libertarian moment" had arrived. The high-profile presidential run of Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) rattled Democrats who worried about the shifting millennial vote. Johnson, an asterisk in the 2012 campaign, found hundreds of reporters following his 2016 bid. He sought media coverage and inclusion in public polling. He got it.

Paul's campaign ended days after the Iowa caucuses and months after most media stopped covering him. Johnson, who polled as high as the low teens, is tracking to finish in the low single digits and to win no states. The Koch donor network, which seeded libertarian think tanks for decades, has scaled back its 2016 ambitions from an eight-figure ad buy to some rote canvassing in swing states.

In an interview at Salt Lake City's Alfa Club, Johnson acknowledged that "Trump or Clinton will win the election," unless there was a "collective head-jerk" that got voters in Western states looking his way again. Before setting out for a final string of rallies from Atlanta to Portland, Ore., to New Mexico, the state he governed, he described 2016 as a building year for the libertarian movement. He would not run for office again.

"I think the Libertarian Party will grow by leaps and bounds," he said. "It will be a game changer if I can hit 5 percent. Ten million bucks of public financing. No issues regarding ballot access. There are going to be a slew of new Libertarians, who are going to be former elected Democrats and Republicans."

Some of that has happened. Six newspapers endorsed the Johnson-Weld ticket, making it six more than had endorsed the party in a presidential election. One retiring member of Congress, Rep. Scott Rigell (R-Va.), bolted Trump for Johnson. In Murray, Johnson was joined by Mark Madsen, a Utah state senator who had quit the Republican Party for the Libertarians and told the mostly young crowd to run for office.

"Don't start with president," he advised.

But it's less than libertarians expected, and it comes as both the Democratic and Republican parties sprint further from their views. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), not Paul, became 2016's breakout star with young voters; his campaign found millions of them saying they preferred socialism to capitalism. Trump's takeover of the Republican Party moved it further from the Koch sweet spot on **immigration**, policing and entitlements. This has been the year of the alt-right more than the year of the Libertarian — far more.

"You can complain about the candidates or 'the system,' " said Gene Healy, a vice president at the libertarian Cato Institute. "The bigger problem is there's no mass constituency for radical cuts in government — among GOP primary voters or the electorate at large. Any progress toward shrinking government and expanding liberty is going to be slow and incremental, and it's almost certainly not going to emerge from presidential politics."

Still, the candidates gave libertarians plenty to complain about. Paul, who is favored to win an easy reelection to the Senate, attempted to balance an America-first foreign policy with the demands of nervous Republican voters. He opposed the nuclear deal with Iran; his father, former congressman Ron Paul (R-Tex.), supported it. Libertarian-approved campaign promises such as tearing up the tax code and balancing the budget fell flat, while prickly libertarian purists attacked him as a sellout.

"He sent all these mixed messages about arming the Kurds, and people were like, 'I don't know who this guy is,' " said Nick Gillespie, the editor of Reason.com and co-author of a 2009 book about how voters bailing on the two parties could become natural libertarians. "He never came back from that. What would have worked better is a full-throated articulation of a libertarian foreign policy."

The libertarian gripe about Johnson was simpler — he was handed a perfect electoral opportunity and he talked his way out of it. Like Gillespie, Johnson described libertarianism as a goldilocks politics that took what was good about the left and right and junked what was unpopular.

But when the media finally put a camera in front of him, Johnson stumbled. Low-key and self-effacing, with a tendency to describe any policy discussion as "in the weeds," Johnsononly broke through in interviews if he gaffed — which he did.

Johnson never quite recovered from blanking on a question about what he'd "do about Aleppo." When Clinton later erroneously referred to the city as a Syrian border town, Johnson cried bias. He jokingly bit his tongue in an MSNBC interview and blew up at a Guardian reporter who kept informing him that "most economists" opposed his plan to swap the income tax for a national consumption tax.

"I've never had an interview like that," Johnson said in Utah. "Maybe it's because I was burning the candle at both ends."

Yet neither Rand Paul nor Johnson made as many gaffes as Trump; and neither one had to fend off regular questions about federal agents probing their emails. Johnson's polling swoon happened as he was excluded from the presidential debates, while Democrats and NextGen Climate lit into him for saying — in 2012 — that climate change was not a problem in the long run because eventually Earth would be engulfed by the sun.

Between Paul, Johnson and the Koch network, libertarianism had plenty of media space to make a sale. That it might end the election with 5 percent support or less challenges the Libertarians who have spent decades in the ideological snake pit. They warned before the nomination that Johnson and Weld were poor messengers. ("I appreciate you, I like you, I believe in you, but please keep Bill Weld away from the Libertarian Party," Fox Business host Lisa Kennedy Montgomery told Johnson this week.) Fred Smith, the founder of the libertarian Competitive Enterprise Institute, suggested that Libertarians were still not able to reach the people who might listen.

"The only channels big enough to reach the American people are the media, the academy and pop culture, and none are readily accessible to classical liberals," Smith said. "Business does have channels to reach the citizenry, which they use to market product, not to gain societal legitimacy. So libertarian ideas got all dressed up for the last decade or so and found they had nowhere to go. One hope is that postelection this strategic weakness in the array of free-market forces­ will be addressed."

Utah, which Johnson had once invested with time and hope, was proving Smith's point. In the summer, Johnson was threatening to force a three-way race between Clinton, Trump and himself. Evan McMullin, the ex-CIA operative and House Republican staffer who jumped into the race days before the filing deadline, drained almost all his support.

McMullin, a Mormon graduate of Brigham Young University, posed a challenge to Trump but none to the Republican Party as it existed five minutes before Trump. He pitched a "new conservative movement" — pro-life, strong on defense, but more pro-**immigration**.

More worrying for the libertarian movement in the long term is that Johnson's performance may leave Ron Paul as the most successful candidate in its history. That was not a problem on economics, or war, or the movement's other defining issues.

But in his 2008 and 2012 campaigns, Ron Paul seemed hamstrung by his support from white nationalists. The stories sprang up at the worst moments: donations from the founder of Stormfront.org, race-war fear mongering in his old newsletters. This year, Rand Paul and then Johnson studiously rejected all of that, replacing it with talk of criminal-justice reform. "Black lives matter," Johnson said at every stop since the summer.

In the end, the nationalist aspect of Ron Paul's message — the one his son sprinted away from — proved more potent than libertarianism. The same day that Johnson slogged through his Utah schedule, Peter Thiel, the PayPal founder and libertarian donor who had funded a 2012 Ron Paul super PAC, was in Washington making the case for Trump.

"[It's] become sadly clear, in the year of Trump, that a fair proportion of his 2.1 million voters in 2012 were attracted more toward inchoate system overthrow than well-considered libertarianism," said Brian Doherty, author of the movement history "Radicals for Capitalism."

Libertarians, who do not lack for funding, will not give up. Johnson, who was disappointed that the Kochs did not "stand on principle" and back him, nonetheless raised more than any third-party candidate since the 1990s. At the Murray rally, Johnson got a rousing endorsement from Overstock.com founder Patrick Byrne, who praised him for bringing "principle" to the race.

Just a tenth as many people came to the speech as had come to the last big McMullin rally. But those who did skewed young and had a definition of libertarian that could be bent into any shape by the movement's next candidate.

"It's a happy middle between the parties," said June Paxton, 25. Her only caveat: After she put all of her issue stances into an online survey, she learned that she should have been supporting the Green Party.

david.weigel@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has a puncher's chance of being elected president in five days' time. But whether he wins or loses this election, the campaign he has run could make it very, very difficult for Republicans to win future presidential races.

Why? Because Trump is running historically poorly among Hispanic voters, according to a new Washington Post-Univision national poll.

If Trump continues to get somewhere in the neighborhood of 19 percent of the Hispanic vote, it would mark a new low for Republicans in that critical voting bloc. George W. Bush got 44 percent of the Hispanic vote in his 2004 reelection race. John McCain got 31 percent in 2008. Mitt Romney took just 27 percent in 2012. That's, um, not a good trend. Especially when every projection of where the country is headed shows the continuing decline of whites and the continued growth of the Hispanic population.

Need a more real-world example? In 1984, Ronald Reagan won the white vote by 20 points -- and the election with 525 electoral votes. In 2012, Romney matched Reagan's margin among white voters; he won just 206 electoral votes.

In the wake of that 2012 loss — and the demographic disaster it portended — the Republican National Committee issued an autopsy report that had one central recommendation: find a way to pass some sort of comprehensive **immigration** reform or else. It reads (emphasis mine):

We are not a policy committee, but among the steps Republicans take in the Hispanic community and beyond, we must embrace and champion comprehensive **immigration** reform. If we do not, our Party's appeal will continue to shrink to its core constituencies only. We also believe that comprehensive **immigration**reform is consistent with Republican economic policies that promote job growth and opportunity for all.

What you have seen in this election is a candidate in Trump who rose to prominence within the Republican Party on a pledge to build a wall on our Southern border and make Mexico pay for it. And who has openly embraced the sort of grievance politics that had led him to, among other things, question whether a judge of Mexican heritage was fit to oversee a case regarding Trump University and to propose a temporary ban on Muslims entering the country.

In short: It's hard to conceive of a candidate who would run more contrary to the party's stated goal of expanding its coalition than Trump.

What Republican strategists are desperately hoping is that Trump is viewed by Hispanics as an outlier, an isolated case who does not represent the broader views of the GOP. Again, the Post-Univision poll suggests that may be a false hope.

Yes, Hispanics view Trump more unfavorably than they view the Republican Party as a whole. But two-thirds of Hispanic voters have an unfavorable opinion of the Republican Party, and that is still disastrously bad. Those numbers suggest that Trump is not being viewed as something separate from the GOP and that the negative way Hispanics view him is rubbing off on the party he represents.

To go back to where I started: Yes, it is still possible that Trump wins the 270 electoral votes he needs to be president on Tuesday. (The white vote will still make up roughly 7 in 10 voters.) But, win or lose, Trump has set back his party among Hispanic voters in ways that may well be irreversible in the near-to-medium term. The current composition of the Republican Party's electorate is a winner for 1984. It's a near-certain loser for 2024.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Back in May, I explained why Hillary Clinton is a lesser evil than Donald Trump. More recent developments have only strengthened the case for that conclusion. Hillary Clinton is a badly flawed candidate I would not normally vote for. I also have little fondness for the Democratic Party as a whole. But Trump is far, far worse. Notwithstanding FBI Director James Comey's controversial recent announcement about the Clinton e-mail investigation, the gap between the two candidates has actually grown in recent weeks.

I. The Trumpist Agenda.

For many, the principal objection to Trump is his character and temperament. I share those concerns. But his horrendous policy agenda is even more dangerous, particularly his positions on **immigration**, trade, civil liberties, and massacring civilians. Trump's **immigration** policies -- the centerpiece of his agenda if anything is -- imperil the liberties and property rights of large numbers of native-born Americans, as well as **immigrants**.

Also telling is Trump's longstanding admiration for authoritarian rulers like Russia's Vladimir Putin and the perpetrators of the Tiananmen Square massacre in China. To put it mildly, Trump's plan to undermine NATO while throwing in with the authoritarians like Putin, is unlikely to make American foreign policy great again. His likely fiscal policies would increase the already overgrown national debt even more than Hillary Clinton's would.

Many of the issues on which Trump's agenda is particularly awful are ones he has repeatedly stressed throughout the campaign, and therefore ones that he is particularly likely to act on. For example, he has repeatedly emphasized his support for mass deportations, trade wars, and various efforts to undermine freedom of speech so that he could more easily persecute his critics. Presidents are generally more likely to act on central themes of their campaigns than peripheral proposals they and their core supporters have less commitment to. Although Trump has been inconsistent on many issues, the zero-sum thinking underlying his views on issues such as trade and **immigration** has been a core element of his world-view since long before the 2016 campaign.

Over and above specific policies, there is the danger that a Trump victory would lead to the transformation of the GOP from a conservative party to a big government xenophobic nationalist party, similar to France's National Front. This would have a severely harmful effect on the entire political system for years to come. It also undercuts claims that we should elect Trump because he might appoint good originalist judges; in the long run, a Trumpian GOP would be deeply inimical to any such constitutional principles, as they are at odds with much of its agenda.

On all of the above issues, Hillary Clinton is far less dangerous than Trump, and these enormous differences are not outweighed by the very limited set of issues where Trump might potentially have compensating advantages of his own. That is pretty obviously true from that standpoint of political liberals and moderates. But it is also true for libertarians and conservatives who care about individual freedom and limiting the power of government. Most obviously, a Clinton victory would not make either major party significantly worse than it currently is, while a Trump victory might well result in the GOP becoming a white nationalist Republican Party far more hostile to freedom and constitutional restraints on government power than previously. That is likely to have severe negative effects on the political system long after the next administration is over.

Trump is indeed a "change agent," as his supporters like to put it. But the last thing we need is a major change for the worse.

II. The Role of Divided Government.

Recent developments actually increase the likelihood that a Trump victory would be more dangerous than a Clinton win. The most significant is the growing likelihood that a President Clinton would have to contend with divided government, while Trump would enjoy the support of a GOP-controlled Congress. Most experts agree that the Republicans are highly likely to retain control of the House of Representatives. Even if Hillary Clinton wins the presidency, the Democrats are unlikely to get more than a small majority in the Senate. By contrast, if Trump pulls out an upset victory, it will likely be part of a GOP wave than enables the party to maintain a fairly large House majority, and give it a good chance of holding on to the Senate, as well. Even if they narrowly lose the Senate this year, the party is likely to retake it in 2018, when the electoral map will overwhelmingly favor the GOP.

From a pro-free market perspective, most of the really dangerous aspects of Clinton's agenda involve the massive increases in spending and regulation she and the Democrats advocate. But most of that would be dead on arrival in a GOP-controlled House. By contrast, members of Congress rarely resist major items on the agenda of a president of their own party, even if some of it is at odds with their preexisting ideology. Particularly in our current age of polarization and partisan bias, both Republicans and Democrats have a strong tendency to excuse behavior by their own leaders that they would never tolerate from the opposing party.

Contrary to some popular mythology on the right, congressional Republicans successfully stymied most of Obama's legislative agenda since they took control of the House in 2010, and effectively impeded him in other ways, as well. And they are no more fond of Hillary Clinton's agenda than Obama's. They would welcome the opportunity to stymie her programs, and investigate any potential abuses of power.

By contrast, they probably would not do much to impede Trump. For example, congressional Republicans are unlikely to launch investigations into Trumpian abuses, because such efforts might damage the party as a whole, and attract the ire of a large part of its base -- possibly incentivizing strong primary challengers. GOP members of Congress may not be fans of Trump. But they are unlikely to imperil their own political self-interest by challenging him -- especially not after he leads the party to an improbable electoral victory. If anything, such a success would tend to validate the Trumpist agenda in the eyes of ambitious GOP politicians, who would therefore be more likely to fall in line behind it.

Even if Trump does not get the usual strong support from GOP members of Congress, many of the most dangerous aspects of his agenda do not require congressional authorization at all. That includes most of his **immigration** policy, and his plan to launch trade wars that could easily inflict great harm on the economy. It might also be very hard for Congress to keep him from ordering US troops to commit atrocities.

III. Trump is by far the Bigger Crook.

Clinton's edge over Trump is not undermined by her various scandals. She is indeed ethically challenged. But Trump is worse.

As FBI Director James Comey put it back in July, her mishandling of classified e-mail was, at the very least, "extremely careless" and well worthy of censure. Recent revelations that she and Huma Abedin might have mishandled additional e-mails don't fundamentally alter that picture (the new e-mails probably were not even sent by or to Clinton herself). But they certainly don't make her conduct any more excusable. Against any half-way decent opponent, Clinton's ethical lapses would weigh heavily in the opposing candidate's favor.

But if Hillary Clinton may well be crooked, Trump is a far bigger crook. Deliberate mishandling of classified e-mails is a serious matter. But it is not as bad as what appear to be numerous cases of sexual molestation. The revelation of what lies behind Trump's "locker room talk" is yet another reason why the gap between him and Clinton has actually grown since May.

And if you think it's intolerable to have a president whose e-mails are under investigation by the FBI, how about one who will soon have to face a trial for large-scale fraud, and a court status conference over an accusation of raping a 13-year-old girl? The Clinton Foundation has ethical problems, but the Trump Foundation is far worse. And then there is Trump's record of stiffing his employees and contractors, and using eminent domain to kick people out of their homes. Hillary Clinton can be mean and intolerant towards political adversaries. Still, she has a long way to go to match Trump's extensive record of gratuitous cruelty. Despite her numerous flaws, Hillary Clinton was and is the lesser of the two evils nominated by the major parties. That is even more true today than several months ago.

I sympathize with those who throw up their hands and conclude that they can't vote for either Clinton or Trump. It's not quite as bad as having to choose between Sauron and Queen Cersei; but the nation certainly deserves better. Ideally, there would be a superior third party candidate with a real chance to win. But, with the possible longshot exception of Evan McMullin's unusual situation in Utah, neither he nor Gary Johnson have any real shot anymore. Utah is also special because McMullin has a better chance of taking the state away from Trump than Clinton does. Marginal voters who live in states likely to have lopsided margins might also still reasonably indulge a symbolic third party vote. Such cases aside, we should follow the logic of voting for a lesser evil. Despite various possible objections, it is the best option we have -- and the right thing to do.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton maintains a nearly 50-percentage-point lead among Hispanic voters in a new Washington Post-Univision News poll, with Donald Trump's deep unpopularity raising questions about how much his candidacy has hampered Republicans' long-term chances to win back support from the nation's largest minority-group voting bloc.

Clinton is seen unfavorably by 28 percent of Hispanics, but 76 percent of them have unfavorable views of Trump — including 64 percent whose views are "very unfavorable," which is 20 points higher than those who have very unfavorable views toward the Republican Party overall.

The poll finds opportunity for Republicans to expand support, with 51 percent of Latinos who support Trump now or say they would be willing to vote for a Republican presidential candidate in the future. But simply nominating candidates other than Trump probably will not be enough. Republicans may need to revamp the party's stances on several issues to overcome Hispanics' strong Democratic tilt, the poll shows.

In one sign of those broader difficulties, other Republicans up for election this year also trail Democrats by a wide margin: 66 percent of Latinos say they support a Democratic congressional candidate in their district, compared with 24 percent who support GOP candidates.

In the presidential race, over two-thirds of Hispanics who are likely voters (67 percent) support or lean toward Clinton, with just under 2 in 10 (19 percent) supporting Trump, according to the poll, conducted Oct. 26 to 30. Four percent support Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson and 2 percent are for the Green Party's Jill Stein, the poll finds.

Trump's 48-point deficit against Clinton is just a few points behind 2012 Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney's 44-point losing margin among Hispanics, according to exit polling that year. That year's losses prompted calls by party leadership to redouble efforts toward courting Latino voters, in order to stay competitive in presidential races with a racially diversifying electorate.

A similar Post-Univision poll in February found Clinton with 73 percent support among Hispanic registered voters and 16 percent for Trump. In July 2015, 70 percent said they would vote for Clinton and 16 percent for Trump — signaling little movement over the presidential campaign cycle.

This year's election is viewed as more important than previous contests by 78 percent of Hispanic likely voters, and overall enthusiasm remains high. Almost 8 in 10 (78 percent) say they're enthusiastic about voting, with 58 percent "very" enthusiastic about voting.

Knowing that she had strong support among Hispanics starting in the primary season, Clinton's general-election campaign adopted an aggressive bilingual, digital-first general outreach strategy that targets younger Hispanics on Facebook, Snapchat and other digital platforms with predominantly English advertising. In more recent months, the campaign has started airing Spanish-language television and radio ads in parts of Florida and Nevada.

That bilingual focus prompted a flurry of criticism of Clinton's and the party's Hispanic strategies. Despite a uniquely favorable environment with Trump's repeated attacks on undocumented **immigrants**, Democrats openly fretted this fall that Clinton was neglecting a long-standing party goal of marshaling the nation's growing Hispanic population into a permanent electoral force.

Those concerns struck at the heart of a debate among Hispanic operatives about how much emphasis should be placed on newer ways of reaching younger Hispanics, who like millennials overall are more resistant to backing Clinton than older Latinos.

But the new Post-Univision poll suggests the Clinton team's strategy may be working. A 66 percent majority of Latinos younger than 35 support Clinton, compared with 71 percent of seniors — a nearly even margin. A national poll of Hispanic voters conducted this fall by the Pew Research Center found a sizable age gap among the broader population of registered voters, with younger Hispanic voters less supportive of Clinton than their elders.

There's also evidence that the Clinton campaign's focus on shoring up support among English-dominant Hispanics was prudent. The poll found a big gap between respondents who chose to be interviewed in Spanish rather than English. Clinton garners 60 percent support among Latinos who prefer English, compared with 79 percent of those who prefer Spanish. Trump receives 23 percent support among those interviewed in English but only 11 percent among Spanish-speaking respondents.

Hispanic likely voters, like American voters overall, are most likely to say that jobs and the economy are the most important issues in deciding their vote for president (28 percent). Among Hispanics in this poll, that is followed by **immigration** at 15 percent. Education, health care and terrorism all tie for third place at 8 percent each.

Among the four presidential candidates, Clinton fared far better than Trump on all questions of who is best equipped to handle various issues, including the economy (60 percent), **immigration** (66 percent), health care (64 percent) and terrorism (62 percent). Asked which candidate is closer to their opinion on the issues in general, 65 percent said Clinton, compared with 17 percent for Trump.

While Clinton has fallen behind Trump among Americans overall on questions of trust, among Hispanics in this poll she scores 37 points higher than Trump on honesty: 53 percent to 16 percent.

The Democratic Party comes out far more favorably than the Republican Party among Hispanic likely voters — 71 percent have a favorable opinion of the Democratic Party, with 42 percent "very favorable," while just 27 percent have a favorable opinion of the GOP, with only 11 percent "very favorable."

Hispanics also give high marks to President Obama, who earns a 76 percent favorability rating, with 50 percent "very favorable." Clinton is seen as favorable by 69 percent of Hispanics, with 43 percent rating her very favorably. Just 20 percent have a favorable opinion of Trump; 76 percent see the GOP nominee in a negative light.

Independent Latinos favor Clinton over Trump by a wide margin, 54 percent to 22 percent, while 8 percent choose Johnson and 3 percent pick Stein. That is a big factor hurting Republicans: 57 percent of Latinos identify as Democrats in this poll, making independents represent the biggest pool of potentially persuadable voters.

Trump also lacks unity among Latino Republicans, with 70 percent supporting Trump compared with 88 percent of Latino Democrats who back Clinton. By contrast, in congressional races, 86 percent of Republican Latinos support the party's candidate in their district; 90 percent of Latino Democrats support their party's congressional candidate.

The Post-Univision News poll was conducted by landline and cellular phone from Oct. 26 to 30 among 1,008 Hispanic likely voters in the United States, in both English and Spanish. Results have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. Sampling, data collection and tabulation were done by Bendixen & Amandi International with the Tarrance Group.

ed.okeefe@washpost.com
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Scott Clement contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Post reports:

Hillary Clinton maintains a nearly 50 percentage-point lead among Hispanic voters in a new Washington Post-Univision News Poll, with Donald Trump's deep unpopularity raising questions about how much his candidacy has hampered Republicans' long-term chances to win back support from the nation's largest minority group voting bloc.

And yes, he's doing worse by some measures than Mitt Romney. Donald Trump likes to say "the" Hispanics love him. They don't:

In the presidential race, over two-thirds of likely Hispanic voters (67 percent) support Clinton and just under 2 in 10 (19 percent) support Trump, according to the poll conducted Oct. 26 to 30. Another 4 percent support Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson, and 2 percent are for the Green Party's Jill Stein, the poll finds.

But of course they didn't do that. In fact they tripled down, electing a bigoted **immigrant**-basher who incited hatred of Hispanic **immigrants** to grab the nomination.

The problem now for Republicans is even worse than it might seem. Pew Research tracks the increasing number of Hispanic voters: "Since 2012, the number of Hispanic eligible voters has increased by 4 million, accounting for 37 percent of the growth in all eligible voters during that span. The Hispanic share of eligible voters in several key battleground states has also gone up." In short, the GOP is managing to do worse with a bigger share of the electorate. Moreover, the big growth is among young voters, a group Trump that has problems with overall. ("From 2012 to 2016, 3.2 million young U.S.-born Latinos came of age and turned 18, accounting for 80% of the increase in Latino eligible voters during this time.")

According to The Post/Univision poll, Clinton has managed to attract many of those younger Hispanics. ("A 66-percent majority of Latinos younger than 35 support Clinton, compared with 71 percent of seniors — a nearly even margin.") Now, the challenge will be to get them to turn out.

Republicans have been spared the full brunt of this because of traditionally low turnout among Hispanics. The Clinton campaign, however, has gone all out to solve that problem. ("Clinton's general-election campaign adopted an aggressive bilingual, digital-first general outreach strategy that targets younger Hispanics on Facebook, Snapchat and other digital platforms with predominantly English advertising. In more recent months, the campaign has started airing Spanish-language television and radio ads in parts of Florida and Nevada.")

There is some evidence that this is working. Clinton is competitive in deep-red Arizona. That may be due to Hispanic voters: "This year Democrats see evidence that more Hispanic voters are casting ballots early. Through Nov. 1, voters who are believed to be Hispanic cast nearly 12 percent of the early ballots. That's still a small share, but well ahead of the 6 percent at the same point four years ago." Hispanic voting is also up in Florida:

Hillary Clinton's campaign is touting that 99 percent more Latinos have voted in Florida this year than did in 2012. To be exact, 133,000 Hispanic voters have cast their ballot early in Florida so far. Slate reports that 10 percent of early votes in 2012 were cast by Hispanics, four percentage points lower than the number is right now. And according to the Miami Herald, about 820,000 Floridians who registered to vote this year are Hispanic. Among that group, 42 percent are Democrats, 15 percent are Republicans, and 42 percent didn't register with a party. Before 2016, 26 percent of registered Hispanic voters were Republican.

Then there is Nevada. Key to Democrats' success there is the Culinary Workers Union Local 226, with a largely Hispanic membership. Nevada's indispensable political guru Jon Ralston reported last week: "Of Culinary's 57,000 members, more than 30,000 are Hispanic and nearly 7,000 are African-American. And on the eve of the election, nearly 60 percent — 34,000 — of the union's members are registered to vote, a record total for Local 226." He continued: "With 45 organizers, the team in Reno has knocked on more than 62,000 doors, and in the South, that number is an eye-popping 220,000 doors. During a year in which nonwhites have never been more motivated to vote, the Culinary Union remains the most effective Democratic turnout machine."

If Clinton wins in part because of her Hispanic vote in both swing states (Nevada, Florida) and traditionally red states (e.g., Arizona) she'll owe a debt of gratitude to Hispanic voters — but also to the xenophobic, **immigrant**-bashing Donald Trump. It's not clear whether Republicans will ever learn even after another presidential loss that they have to broaden its appeal. And soon it will be too late: We know that voters who pick a party in their first couple of elections generally stick with that party. The GOP cannot say it wasn't warned.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"We will no longer surrender this country, or its people, to the false song of globalism."

That was then-Republican presidential candidate — now nominee — Donald Trump, delivering his first full speech on foreign policy in April. The address latched on to a theme that Trump has voice repeatedly in the months and weeks since. It is the specter looming above whenever he grandstands over the dangers of globalization, the perfidy of jet-setting elites and the pitfalls of multiculturalism. The "nation-state," not the international order, Trump declared in April, was "the true foundation for happiness and harmony."

No candidate in the election cycle had made such a direct nationalist clarion call: By denouncing the "false song of globalism," Trump threw down the gauntlet. Here was the right-wing sovereigntist, championing America First. His opponent, Hillary Clinton, was the "globalist" -- a politician, he argues, in thrall to interests beyond the nation's borders and eager to let the **alien** hordes within them.

For a number of years, the term "globalism" or "globalist" has been bandied about the fringes of American political discourse as a catchall phrase for a host of perceived evils: The collusion of international finance with Washington insiders, the anti-national agendas of multinational corporations and conglomerates, the indifference of "coastal elites" to the concerns of ordinary folks in the hinterland.

"Globalism" didn't always carry this valence. In most contexts, "globalization" has been the more loaded, charged word — and the prompt for outraged left-wing protests at summits of international power-brokers for the past two decades.

Harvard political scientist Joseph Nye laid out the distinction between the terms in 2002.

Globalism, at its core, seeks to describe and explain nothing more than a world which is characterized by networks of connections that span multi-continental distances. It attempts to understand all the interconnections of the modern world — and to highlight patterns that underlie (and explain) them. In contrast, globalization refers to the increase or decline in the degree of globalism. It focuses on the forces, the dynamism or speed of these changes. In short, consider globalism as the underlying basic network, while globalization refers to the dynamic shrinking of distance on a large scale.

But in 2016, the "underlying basic network" -- the simple fact of the world's interconnectedness — seems to have come under attack. It's been fueled by American conspiracy mongers on the far-right, such as Alex Jones of the Infowars website, who has decried "globalism" writ large for at least half a decade.

And it has been made mainstream by Trump, who, while tapping into a long-standing vein of nativism in conservative American politics, has also cloaked his campaign in the rhetoric of right-wing European populism.

"This whole movement has a certain global aspect to it," Trump campaign CEO Steve Bannon said on radio the week before the American election. "People want more control of their country. They're very proud of their countries. They want borders. They want sovereignty. It's not just a thing that's happening in any one geographic space."

That's the mantra intoned earlier this year by those who called for Britain's exit from the European Union.

"We literally have lost our sovereignty, lost our borders, lost our ability to regulate," said Nigel Farage, a leader of Britain's xenophobic United Kingdom Independence Party, on the floor of the European parliament in June. "The problem you've got in the U.S. is illegal **immigration**. Our problem is legal **immigration** to half a billion people."

Farage got his way this year: He was one of the champions of the pro-Brexit movement in Britain, which won a shock referendum in June when Britain voted by a narrow margin to quit the European Union. Trump hailed the referendum as "a great thing" and has gone on to liken himself to "Mr. Brexit."

As other pro-Brexit figures backed away from the mess they created, Farage journeyed to America and campaigned on the trail with Trump. "Anything is possible if enough decent people want to fight the establishment," Farage said at a rally in Mississippi in August.

In recent months, the Republican nominee's many surrogates in the media have also embraced this stance. Fox News host Sean Hannity railed against the globalism that embodied all of Trump's foes, including both the Democratic and Republican establishment. Irked by Trump's struggles in Utah, Lou Dobbs growled against the "globalist," "Mormon mafia." Trump ally and financier Roger Stone warned that "globalists" intend to start a new World War in the Middle East. Some Christian pastors even deemed globalism "demonic" and the "anti-Christ."

Whatever the dubious and rather hysterical ideas underlying these claims, they feed into the broader message conveyed by Trump — that the system, as a whole, is rigged against his supporters.

"The problem is never the populist's imperfect capacity to represent the people's will; rather, it's always the institutions that somehow produced the wrong outcomes," writes Princeton academic Jan-Werner Müller in a new book on populism. "So even if they look properly democratic, there must be something going on behind the scenes that allows corrupt elites to continue to betray the people. Conspiracy theories are thus not a curious addition to populist rhetoric; they are rooted in and emerge from the very logic of populism itself."

To be sure, disquiet about the forces of globalization and growing economic inequality within societies is not unique to the American right-wing. It animated Bernie Sanders's campaign on the left and will have to be reckoned with no matter who wins the election next month.

"I think we haven't organized ourselves for the 21st century globalization," Clinton admitted in an interview with the New Yorker's George Packer.

In a somewhat desperate plea, the conservative Federalist website urged Sanders voters to choose Trump and reject "dynastic globalism." But the idea of "globalism" -- as it has been invoked by Trump and his backers — isn't simply an economic critique. As many now have already noted, the antiglobalist messaging of Trump's supporters in social media and on right-wing talk shows echoes a very dark past.

Trump's denunciation of a cabal of international bankers, his campaign's rejection of cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism, and his supporters' invocation of Nazi-era vocabulary to attack the media borrow from the language of an earlier era of fascism and have drawn charges of anti-Semitism.

"The conspiracy theories Trump has been talking up recently play on long-standing tropes used against Jews for decades or even centuries, and the echoes are unmistakable for many of Trump's alt-right followers and for Jews who are familiar with the history of anti-Semitism," writes Cheryl Greenberg, professor of history at Trinity College.

She goes on: "Whether Trump is intentional about spreading anti-Semitism is, of course, largely beside the point. Like his more overt expressions of racism, sexism and Islamophobia, Trump's anti-Semitic comments have made such conversation acceptable again."

And it's almost certain that, no matter the victor on Nov. 8, the scaremongering over the "globalist" menace will continue.

More on WorldViews

Everybody hates the elites. Even the elites.

The ugly history of the Nazi-era word invoked at a Trump rally

Trump is a problem for the whole world, says top E.U. politician

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**After enduring months of presidential campaign rhetoric stifled on issues yet long on one-ups and personal attacks, the electorate is pondering what's next for America. Photographer T.J. Kirkpatrick set out to give this population a voice: "The country has fractured along political lines, and I looked for a way to counter the partisanship and vitriol." Kirkpatrick's resulting Polaroid images and accompanying interviews are portraits of voters from some of the key battleground states. It's a project he began on the campaign trail in January. "One way to begin breaking down political boundaries is to look someone in the eye and have a conversation. Learn where people are coming from, what's informing their feelings on this election and, more generally, their views on the nation's future." — Dudley M. Brooks

Clodomir Jean-Louis, 27 DES MOINES

People are very passionate about their views and who they want to support. They put a lot of stock into the people running for office, and once they get those people elected they disconnect from the process. That's the most serious crime of being a citizen in a country that requires its citizens to be engaged. In a democratic republic it doesn't work if people don't pay attention. This country has a long history of injustice. We like to focus on the glory of having conquered the westward expansion and having the entire North American continent or piece of it to ourselves. American exceptionalism and all that, but really it's, at the root, based on injustice. This election cycle seems to focus on pieces of that injustice, so I'm hopeful about that because that's a national dialogue we have not seen before. Not on this scale. What I fear for the country is the sort of rhetoric I hear from most of the Republican candidates. Where we have the sort of policies that really alienate us on an international level. We truly are a nation of **immigrants**. America would not exist without **immigrants**, so if you tell **immigrants** to stop coming here, what is America?

Maggie Laube, 49 PERRYSBURG, OHIO

I went to public schools, which were not very conservative, until I hit high school. I went to a Catholic school, which was very conservative. Where you live, you kind of have the same beliefs because you're in the same circumstances, so I saw both sides of it between [the] different schools. I mean, I'm conservative. I think conservative things offer more protection. I don't ever want to be dependent on things like my mom had to be to survive, to make sure we had something to eat and a roof over our head. I want people to be able to sustain themselves. I value my vote. I will always vote. I'm not going to be told by any political party who to vote for. I'm not going to let somebody's money tell me who is going to be the candidate. But I don't think it matters what I believe and what I want. I could vote somebody in; it's not going to mean anything. Once they get in there, they're going to go with whatever keeps them there. We're at a point of pivotal change. I'm not afraid of change, I'm just afraid that what we see now is not a real change. It's just more of the same.

Carmen Mendoza, 44 ARLINGTON, VA.

When Obama came into power, it was the first time I felt like an American, even though I've been here since I was a kid. I always felt like an outsider. Like there's another president, another white guy that's going to take power, and hopefully the decisions they make are good for everybody, not just white middle America. [Obama] was different. He wasn't an old white dude. That's where America is turning. There are people of mixed races now everywhere. It's been there, but people ignored it. He brought all that to the surface. This is the America that made America what it is. You have to look and learn, then go forward. The faces of America are not white, blond kids with ponytails. When I go at my sisters' schools and volunteer, and I see those faces, they're from Somalia and Nigeria and El Salvador and Nicaragua. That's the future of the country, and you have to accept that it's changing. I still have the belief that when people go and vote, they look at their children and they want something better for them. All that rhetoric [Donald Trump] brought with his campaign, I don't think it's actually going to happen. But what he brought is this segregation. I don't think that's going away. He's stirred something in society, and unless something gets done, it's not going anywhere positively. That really terrifies me.

Très Johnson, 46 COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

If you work really hard, you can make something happen. I've spent 21/2 years diving into this business [a coffee shop], and I've created my own livelihood. I get out of my life what I put into it now, and when I talk to **immigrants** when they come into the country, that's what their dream is, too. I was politically active when I was 18 years old. I didn't care about turning 16 and being able to drive, and I didn't care about turning 21 and being able to drink. I cared about turning 18 and being able to be a part of the voting process. And I got to vote one time, and then I lost my rights. My criminal past slowed me down from moving forward. You start to overthink things and don't fix the problems, and then at some point I woke up and I'm like, "Okay, it's time to fix this and not blame the system anymore." So I broke the law 25 years ago. If I want a gun now to protect myself or whatever, I'm not allowed that same right as some meathead militia man that's overtaking government offices. Why does he get to protect himself where I can't? I paid my debt. I've done everything. I have a reconciled relationship with the person that I ripped off. So at what point do I get to be an American again?

Kelly Coffee, 38 AUSTIN

When you don't agree with someone, people take it as personal attacks. There's a mentality in this country of "It's us against them." No matter what side you're on. The media focuses on the sensationalism because, let's be honest, the media is in the business of making money. What sells? Outrageous, sensationalized stories. Then everybody gets more divisive and we're more away from that inclusiveness America was supposed to be about. It's gotten way lost. We've gotten back into a civil war. It's not the North and the South, it's the reds and the blues. We want to blame everybody else for something. We want to blame ISIS for this, we want to blame so-and-so for guns and mass murders. It's easy to point fingers at somebody else instead of yourself. I'm not pessimistic. Things can be better. There's more good in the world than bad. Most people just want to live their lives and pay their bills and love their children. They don't want to be scared. I understand the importance of Barack Obama being president. Not only will little black and African American boys and girls grow up and realize that they can be president, but little white kids will grow up and accept the idea of a black man being president because it won't mean anything to them.

Harry Roberts Sr., 89 ORANGEBURG, S.C.

I've lived all of my life in South Carolina, born in 1927. I like to see the right people going in, the right man going in so that we can get this country back on an even keel, because there's so many things going on. The civil rights is all right, but when they separated the schools down here and the blacks went to school with the whites, trouble started. The mixtures like that and all these foreign people coming in over here, and the government let them come in. They're going to take jobs away from the young people, and it just ain't going to mix. We're going to have a war, right here. All these people that's got their cities and stuff bombed out, we don't have room to accept them. You've got so many young people now that does not have a college education. I like Donald Trump. The things that he's saying is something that we really ought to do. Lower the drug costs, lower the food costs and put the right man in Washington. And of course, the man that goes in, it's going to take him two years to straighten out the things that Obama's done. I'm not prejudiced. Most of my customers are black. The only thing I care about is what color is your money.

Rita Cheng, 49 POTOMAC, MD.

People are very skeptical because they saw their parents lose money in the stock market. They saw their parents lose equity in their home. They saw their parents lose their jobs. I'd like skepticism to come down, and I'd like trust to come up. I don't know how to do that, other than it takes time to rebuild people's trust. I believe America is a place of opportunity. Many people from across the world come here to get educated. Talking about opportunity, one thing that does concern me — I'm a certified financial planner — I'm concerned about debts. I'm concerned about global debts in Japan and in Europe. I'm also concerned about our debt here, because debt can impact our opportunity set. I was the first in my family to go to school. I didn't borrow any money. My parents didn't borrow any money. I worked. I was able to graduate from school debt-free. That's [not] possible today. I'm multicultural: My dad is Chinese, and my mom is Irish and Czech. My dad came here with $17 and landed in Wisconsin. He told me it was so cold and he didn't even have a coat, but he made something of himself. I would like us to really focus on what does make America great. It's not perfect, but we have a lot to be thankful for.

Nelson Vazquez, 60 CLEMSON, S.C.

We have these candidates who are very family-oriented and very positive, and you've got one especially that's very negative, so my overall view is trying to see what comes out of this that can make families stronger. That's really my hope, because with 70 percent of black mothers raising kids without fathers, [40] percent of the Latinos. When your family is stronger, your neighborhood is stronger, your community is stronger, your state is stronger, the country is stronger. But it is still difficult to think that it's going to be all that positive. I left Miami and the big city to be in a community like Clemson, where there's a lot of family values. That was my part in giving my children a good surrounding of other families. I just think that the way that this country was founded, that they had Christian values, that's what brought this country together. And those values coincide with family values, so that would be my biggest hope: that that can improve rather than disintegrate, which is what I think has been happening.

Morris Christie, 61 PHILADELPHIA

I'm a veteran. I fought for people to come here to be free, so how you going to say you don't want people to come here to have a chance? That's wrong. They ain't saying nothing they going to do education-wise, or nothing, you know? Trump's saying: If your mother and father can't send you to college, that ain't their problem. That ain't no leader, and I hate to see how the presidential election is going. What's with politicians? They want to cut funds on this and that, they're shutting the schools, shutting libraries, shutting youth programs. There's only one way for kids to go, and that's the streets. My parents had it hard bringing me up, but I said I was going to amount to something because of the respect I had in my home. Politicians don't care no more about the children's educations, but they're building prisons and jails, and closing youth centers, and closing schools. I hope if somebody do get in office they'll think of the American people instead of overseas all the time. Help us here first. There's people starving in America. I'm going to be honest, what I see coming. We had the Civil War, now it's going to be overthrow the government. If ISIS don't do it, somebody's going to because minimum wages ain't take care of no families now.

Demri Scott, 20 CASTLE PINES, COLO.

What I find pleasure in life is doing what I do for College Republicans: I love doing outreach on [the George Washington University] campus. Sometimes the Republican Party is missing out on the values that it once stood for, and that frustrates me, but [it's] also why I want to be more involved in the party. Politics nowadays is not about policy anymore, especially this election. How do you expect to make your party look good, or expect people to understand your policy, if you're just bashing the other side constantly? It's good to be critical of your political affiliation, and I'm critical of the Republican Party because I care. Many of the girls in my sorority are Democrats and they know I'm a Republican, but they still love me and appreciate me for who I am. We realize we have the same goal, to make America great. Maybe not in Trump's sense, or Hillary's sense, but we respect each other. After November I want the country to be able to look past people's differences. You're not a good or a bad person because you're a Democrat or a Republican. You're a good person because you do good things.

Polaroid photos and interviews  by T.J. Kirkpatrick/Redux

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Oktoberfest without beer and pork sausages? IEDs hidden in the country's forests? That's how Germany's future looks, according to a new video paid for by U.S. neoconservative group Secure America Now.

"Welcome to the Islamic State of Germany," the bizarre video's narrator enthusiastically explains right at the beginning, followed by references to suicide bombers and a manipulated sequence that shows the ISIS flag hanging at the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin. That, however, didn't go down too well in Germany, where commentators and journalists quickly ridiculed the politicized satire. A similar video about France was released in the middle of October, though it attracted far less attention.

Berlin-based newspaper B.Z. called the video "absurd, populist," and its competitor Berliner Morgenpost referred to it as a "gaga video." On Twitter, the video was mocked by commentators calling it "ridiculous" and describing how they first checked whether it had been produced for a comedy show.

Germans are likely to have a few objections. Trying to illustrate refugees living in train stations in the country, the video's producers picked a sequence of an arriving Austrian train, for instance. (To some Germans, worse than calling the country an Islamic State might be the suggestion that it is part of Austria.) Viewers might also wonder about the decision to feature a map highlighting exactly three European cities: Berlin, Paris — and Nantes, a city with roughly 300,000 inhabitants in western France.

The Morgenpost newspaper described the video as an effort to influence the U.S. election campaign in favor of Donald Trump although its producers denied such claims, speaking to the newspaper. Secure America Now, the neoconservative group behind the video, states that it wants to bring "critical security issues to the forefront of the American debate," according to its website. The group also has more than 3 million fans on Facebook.

Although the video has been widely perceived to be pro-Trump in Germany, its producers have suggested that its main goal is to influence Senate races in several states.

Throughout his campaign, however, Trump has repeatedly criticized Germany's decision to take in hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees. In August, he called it a "disaster."

"In short, Hillary Clinton wants to be America's Angela Merkel," Trump said, "and you know what a disaster this massive **immigration** has been to Germany and the people of Germany — crime has risen to levels that no one thought they would ever see. We have enough problems in our country, we don't need another one."

German officials had previously disputed such claims. "**Immigrants** are not more criminal than Germans," a ministry spokesman was quoted as saying.

Read more:

Trump says German crime levels have risen and refugees are to blame. Not exactly.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PENSACOLA, Fla. — After months of declaring that he would curtail legal and illegal **immigration**, Donald Trump proclaimed at a campaign rally on Wednesday night that as president he would allow "tremendous numbers" of legal **immigrants** based on a "merit system."

"I want people to come in. I want tremendous numbers of people to come in," Trump said at a rally here, his third campaign stop in Florida on Wednesday. "And we're going to have that big, beautiful door in the wall. But you know what? They have to come in through a process. They have to come in legally."

Trump was then cut off by loud cheers from the crowd and many of his supporters shouting: "Legally!"

"They have to come in legally," Trump said, continuing. "And we'll have merit involved, too. Wouldn't it be nice if we went a little bit on the merit system? We take people that are really going to help us to grow our country? Wouldn't that be nice? Somebody said: 'You can't say that; that's not politically correct.' Well, I just said it, folks."

This isn't the first time Trump has called for an **immigration** merit system, although the idea is not a regular part of his campaign speeches. It's unclear what sort of "merit" Trump would weigh. His campaign has yet to respond to a request for more information.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

Donald Trump has run what is easily the most dishonest presidential campaign of our lifetimes. The Post fact-checking team's most up-to-date effort to track the lies told by Trump and Clinton documents that Trump has told nearly 60 of the most egregious of falsehoods -- vastly dwarfing the number from Clinton -- and on top of that, he's also indulged in over 20 more very serious episodes of dissembling.

Yet in spite of this, today's Post tracking poll finds that Trump holds an edge of eight points over Clinton on the question of which candidate is viewed as the more honest and trustworthy one, with likely voters picking Trump by 46-38. Tellingly, this does not reflect an increase in perceptions of Trump's honesty, but rather, a drop in the percentage of those who see Clinton as the more honest one: In September, the two were tied on this question.

And the poll (which finds the race dead even) also finds that this drop in perceptions of her honesty is driven primarily by a slide among independents and Democrats:

Independents and Democrats are where Clinton has lost the most ground to Trump on the question of honesty since early fall. At that point Trump held a narrow five-point edge among independents on which candidate is more honest and trustworthy (45 to 40 percent), but in the latest poll Trump leads by 23 points with independents on this question (49 to 26 percent), a shift due mostly to a fall-off among Clinton and a rise in the percentage saying "neither" is honest.

It's hard to know whether this is directly related to the relentless media attention to FBI director James Comey's absurdly vague letter to Congress informing them of newly found emails that might or might not be significant to the previous investigation into Clinton's email use. But it's plausible that it might be.

Donald Trump and Republicans have been dissembling madly about the significance of the newly found emails, claiming that they show a criminal probe of Clinton has been reopened. Just look at this new ad that the Trump campaign rolled out this morning (where it is running is unclear, though it appears to be part of a major TV buy in multiple states):

"Now the FBI has launched a new investigation," Trump's ad says. In a way, it perfectly captures the absurdity of this whole situation that the ad does not say for what she is supposedly being investigated. Instead, it repeats a barrage of charges about the Clinton Foundation and supposed pay-to-play, and then tacks on the claim about the FBI , as if she's being just investigated for general corruption, with the details not mattering in the least.

None of this is to absolve Clinton of her own role in creating this email mess. Rather, the point is that the vagueness of Comey's letter is precisely what made it possible for Trump and Republicans to hype the precise significance of the new discovery into something much greater than the sum of the known facts, as Trump's new ad does. Meanwhile, the media played a role here, too. While news organizations did bear down hard and squeeze out of anonymous sources the key additional information and context we needed to understand just how little FBI agents actually know about these emails, there were screaming headlines for days that probably created the impression for many voters that a criminal probe has been reopened.

To top all of this off, it looks like there is no obvious solution to this problem even if Comey wanted to solve it. As the New York Times reports today, the FBI is unlikely to conclude that there is anything in the new emails discovered on the laptop shared by Anthony Weiner and top Clinton aide Huma Abedin that would cause them to revisit the decision not to recommend charges. But agents may not be able to establish this by Election Day, and it is this lack of clarity that is allowing GOP lies and media-stoked mis-impressions to continue flourishing:

The mood at the F.B.I. is dark, and nobody is willing to predict what the coming days will bring, particularly if agents and analysts do not complete their review of Ms. Abedin's emails by Election Day. Officials said it would take something extraordinary to change the conclusion that nobody should be charged. But the absence of information has allowed festering speculation that the emails must be significant.

And even if Comey were to announce that there's nothing significant here before Election Day, the slide in Clinton's trust numbers in today's Post poll suggests his handling of this may already be influencing the election in some way, though it's unclear how much. As I have argued, what's truly perverse is that much of the media analysis has told us that the new discovery may not be substantively significant, but it will nonetheless be politically significant, which basically creates the impression that voters probably should conclude something is wrong, even if no one knows any of the details yet. That may be on its way to becoming a self-fulfilling prophesy.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* GET READY FOR A LOT OF GOP INVESTIGATIONS:Politico reports:

If the GOP wins either or both chambers of Congress next week, and Clinton takes the White House, she's likely to come under investigation by Capitol Hill from Day One, or possibly before she's even sworn in….Comey's recent decision to revisit the probe of her email setup, and an assortment of Justice sources who've leaked to the press since Friday, have armed GOP lawmakers with more than enough ammunition to rev up their own investigations, say Republican sources on Capitol Hill.

Now the fact that Justice Department officials warned Comey against sending the letter in order to avoid interfering in the election is itself additional fodder for GOP investigations. Perfect!

\* CLINTON LEADS AMONG INDEPENDENTS, POLL FINDS: A new Bloomberg Politics poll finds Clinton leading Trump nationwide among independents by 39-35 in the head-to-head, and by 30-27 in the four-way. This poll was taken after the FBI news broke:

The survey shows 47 percent of likely independent voters say the latest developments around Clinton's e-mail won't have an impact on their vote. A quarter of those polled, meanwhile, say it will make them more likely to support Trump, although those respondents are already heavily concentrated among people voting for him.

If this poll is right, the impact of the FBI story might prove negligible, but the race plainly has tightened, anyway.

\* DEMS HOLD EDGE IN NEVADA EARLY VOTING: CNN reports that the key is Clark County, which has over two-thirds of Nevada's registered voters. Republicans think Trump can only afford to lose that county by six points. But:

As of Tuesday morning, Democrats in Clark County are besting Republicans in early voting by 13.6 points -- or 48,000 votes….That Democratic lead is in large part due to an increasingly diverse electorate…party officials and liberal groups are bullish -- almost risking overconfidence -- that Latino, Asian-American and Pacific Islander turnout will soar past 2012 levels.

If Clinton holds Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Colorado, adding Nevada would be enough to win, barring a surprise Trump pickup in the Midwest.

\* BUT DEMS ARE FALTERING IN FLORIDA EARLY VOTING:The latest numbers from Florida-based Marc Caputo :

As of 5:20 a.m., Floridians had cast a record 4.4 million pre-Election Day ballots, 1.79 million (40.3 percent) by Republicans and 1.77 million (39.9 percent) by Democrats. That's a GOP lead of 21,000 raw votes and 0.5 percentage points six days before Election Day. Compare that to Democrats' lead of 1.8 percentage points (48,604 raw votes of the nearly 2.7 million ballots cast) six days out in 2012. Back then, Obama needed that cushion to beat Mitt Romney in Florida by less than a point.

There may be flagging enthusiasm among Dems in Florida, possibly caused by weak early voting turnout among African Americans.

\* CLINTON HOLDS LEAD IN VIRGINIA: A new Winthrop University poll finds Clinton leading Trump among likely voters in Virginia by 49-43 in the head-to-head, and by 44-39 in the four-way. While that represents a tightening, it appears this piece of Clinton's firewall is holding: the polling averages still put her up eight points in the state.

\* AND CLINTON VISITS ARIZONA TODAY: She's set to campaign in reliably red Arizona, and the Associated Press explains why:

Clinton's campaign says it's buoyed by early voting turnout among Arizona Democrats, as well as Clinton's support among Hispanics turned off by Trump's hardline **immigration** policies. Democrats have been eyeing Arizona as a possible swing state in recent years, but believe Trump's unpopularity with Hispanics has expedited that evolution.

And remember, even keeping it close in Arizona would have long term implications, because of its demographics and its role in the **immigration** debate.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With Breanne Deppisch

THE BIG IDEA: Hillary Clinton leads by 6 points in a fresh poll of Wisconsin likely voters from Marquette Law School. Not one survey this year has shown her trailing. Ronald Reagan was the last Republican to carry the Badger State in a presidential election.

But Donald Trump, eager to expand a very narrow path to the presidency, campaigned in Eau Claire last night, and aides say he will potentially return to Wisconsin multiple times before Tuesday.

-- What's he thinking? The GOP nominee has seen survey data showing that he's performing exceptionally well in the rural parts of Wisconsin, which have been hard hit economically, and his team believes that the FBI announcement about new emails potentially pertaining to its Clinton investigation will bring home recalcitrant Republicans in the Milwaukee suburbs where he has struggled.

Republican strategist Mark Graul, who directed George W. Bush's 2004 campaign in Wisconsin, said Trump could win the state if he outperforms Bush by five points in these rural areas and avoids getting blown out in the southeastern part of the state. "Every time it's about Clinton, Trump starts doing better in Wisconsin," he said. "If this election is about Clinton for the next five days, then Trump has a fighting chance."

Trump's team is also emboldened by evidence that African American turnout has dropped off compared to 2012 and hopeful that college students in the liberal enclave of Madison may not be as enthusiastic as they were in the last presidential campaign, when Barack Obama won the state by seven points.

Encouraged by Reince Priebus, the Republican National Committee chairman from Kenosha, Trump also believes that he benefits from a tightening U.S. Senate race and a get-out-the-vote infrastructure that has been built out by Scott Walker's political team over the past six years. "Wisconsin does not have partisan registration, although there are numerous strong indicators in the early vote electorate so far," said RNC political director Chris Carr. "When examining some of [Mitt] Romney's strongest counties from 2012, turnout appears significantly higher compared to this point in 2012."

-- The Badger State is now seeing a sudden flurry of activity. Both campaigns have gone up on the air with TV ads. Democratic vice-presidential nominee Tim Kaine stopped in Appleton and Madison yesterday afternoon. Sen. Bernie Sanders, who defeated Clinton in Wisconsin's April primary, is flying to Milwaukee tonight for a rally at Turner Hall. Chelsea stumps for her mom today in Eau Claire and Oshkosh and hits Milwaukee tomorrow.

"We got one week till the most important election in my lifetime, and Wisconsin is absolutely key," Kaine said during his speech in Appleton. "You are not a state at the edge or a state in the afterthought zone. You are absolutely key. … We got to have you, Wisconsinites. … If we win Wisconsin, it is very, very difficult for the other side to win this race."

-- I checked in with nearly 20 operatives and veterans of Wisconsin politics to get a sense of what's going on:

-- Everyone agrees that Trump is doing especially well in rural parts of the state. The biggest bright spot for him is the Green Bay media market. It has historically been quite competitive. Obama won the area in 2008 and lost it 51 percent to 49 percent in 2012. But Trump has consistently led by double digits. Aside from the declining manufacturing base, Clinton's unfavorability has been notably higher in polling all year long.

Former Democratic congressman David Obey, who represented northwestern Wisconsin in the House for 42 years before retiring in 2010, acknowledged that Trump will do better than previous Republicans in other sparsely populated swaths of the state. He explained that the realty TV star appeals to "a lot of rural folks who ordinarily would be very, very, very skeptical of someone from a Manhattan penthouse posing as the savior of the middle class."

"But, but, but, there's enough of these frustrated workers to make it somewhat competitive," he continued. "Trump is getting support from people who have been in the lower middle class economically and have not been taken very good care of by government over the past two decades or more. A number of them will, I don't know how best to put it, let their frustrations get the best of them."

Obey said the decline of organized labor helped create this opening for The Donald. "You don't have the transmission belt that can bring information down to the grass roots for a lot of these blue-collar workers," he said. "The labor movement used to be the information transmission belts for those people. They're a much smaller percentage of the workforce than they were 20 years ago. That hurts."

A woman in Eau Claire got in line at 4 a.m. to see Trump speak at 7 p.m. "I've never been so excited about a presidential candidate in my 40-plus years of voting," she said, adding that she is so confident Trump will win that she has already purchased her plane ticket for the inauguration. (Video by Whitney Leaming)

-- Reality check: Trump still has a big league problem in the vote-rich Milwaukee suburbs. Traditionally the Milwaukee suburbs are actually the reddest part of the state and have the highest turnout for Republicans. Trump continues to dramatically underperform Romney in what locals call the WOW counties: Washington, Ozaukee and Waukesha. Like suburbs in other states where Trump has struggled, this area is more highly educated and white-collar than the rural parts of the state.

Charlie Sykes, an influential talk radio host in the Milwaukee area, has been one of the conservative movement's most eloquent Never Trumpers nationally. He's writing in Evan McMullin and has urged listeners to do the same.

"At this point, I think most Wisconsin voters would rather have a root canal, colonoscopy or almost even see the Vikings in the Super Bowl than hear one more word about Trump or Clinton," Republican consultant Wendy Riemann, who served in the Walker administration for nearly five years, said from her native Sheboygan. "Wisconsinites don't like Clinton, but Trump does not represent Midwestern values, and it will cost him greatly in some Milwaukee suburbs."

Trump lost the Wisconsin GOP primary to Ted Cruz by 13 points in April. He lost Waukesha County by 39 points. Our Bob Costa interviewed white, upper-middle-class Republicans at a Starbucks in Waukesha yesterday. Trump continues to have a serious problem there, he relays, though there were also indicators that some holdouts are coming around. The two key quotes from Bob's dispatch:

"You're in a town that's about going to college and raising a family. People are polished and hard-working. He's not one of us," said Andy Schwichtenberg, a 28-year-old stockbroker. "I did try," he added with a sigh. "I went to a rally." But he was not swayed and he was turned off by the crowd, which he noted was packed with guys "who came there on Harleys."

Robin Moore, president of the Republican Women of Waukesha County, argued that the Clinton email news helped. "Republicans here have moved from lesser of two evils to one evil. That's progress," the 53-year-old said. "It's been hard for some women, and those tensions [with Ryan] didn't help. At the end of the day, we have to save the Supreme Court, and we have to stop her."

-- A senior adviser tells me that Trump is likely to go back to this area to shore up his support in the coming days.

-- Obey, the former Democratic congressman, stressed that Trump's weakness among GOP elites goes beyond the WOW counties. He pointed out that retiring Republican Rep. Reid Ribble, whose district includes Green Bay, has refused to support Trump, too. "I think Wisconsin is competitive but I still believe there is a range of competitiveness," Obey said. "While it's reasonably competitive, in the end sanity will prevail and Trump will get the rejection he deserves."

-- In the final stretch, elected Republicans are trying to use the email story to motivate these reluctant and recalcitrant Republicans:

Ron Johnson, the GOP senator in a tough reelection fight with Russ Feingold (D), said in an interview yesterday that Clinton's use of a private email server is "an impeachable offense," should she win. "She purposefully circumvented [the law]," he told the Beloit Daily News. "This was willful concealment and destruction." Johnson cited 18 U.S. Code 793 (f) and 18 U.S. Code 2071, which have to do with the willful destruction or removal from proper custody of information relating to national defense. Johnson homed in on the latter of the two, which reads in part that anyone found to have concealed or removed records "shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States." "I'm not a lawyer, but this is clearly written," Johnson said. "I would say yes, high crime or misdemeanor, I believe she is in violation of both laws."

Speaker Paul Ryan, who confirmed that he cast an early ballot for Trump, cites the emails as a reason for registered Republicans to go to the polls even if they don't like their party's standard bearer. "This is what life with the Clintons look like," Ryan said yesterday on Fox News. "There's always a scandal, one after another. … She can come in with a Democratic Congress — [the] worst of all possible things — if Republicans do not turn out and do not vote." The congressman, who represents Janesville, is campaigning around the country for down-ballot candidates and did not attend Trump's Eau Claire rally. But he'll participate in a bus tour this weekend with Johnson.

Scott Walker yesterday posted a picture on his social media accounts of Obama and Clinton embracing at the Philadelphia convention. This led to a snarkfest on Twitter , with senior members of the Clinton operation thanking their foe for helping with get-out-the-vote efforts. But Walker, the first Republican to drop out of the presidential race last year, knew what he was doing. The incoming chairman of the Republican Governors Association, who appeared with Trump at his rally last night, is trying to gin up the high-propensity Republicans in the WOW counties who remain reluctant to board the Trump Train, people close to him say.

-- The Clinton campaign is ramping up its Wisconsin efforts but still expresses a high degree of confidence about the durability of its lead. Her advisers say their early vote modeling looks strong. The campaign is also spending six figures to air three ads across three media markets (Milwaukee, Madison and Green Bay), but allies note that a massive cash advantage ($62 million to $16 million in the final FEC reports) allows them to easily match Trump's spending.

-- In a related note, Clinton's campaign is also going on television this week in Michigan and New Mexico for the first time, and it is returning to the airwaves in Virginia and Colorado. Brooklyn says all of those states will get a six-figure investment, per Abby Phillip.

-- Where's Hillary? You can read a lot into how the campaign sees the race by looking at where she spends her time. While surrogates are fanning across the state, the candidate herself has not come since the start of the general election. Aides say this is a reflection of their confidence. "Hillary Clinton and our coordinated campaign have been running hard in Wisconsin for months," said Jake Hajdu, her state director.

Obama, in contrast, came several times in 2012. Clinton and the president were scheduled to come to Green Bay together in June, but the event was canceled after the Orlando shooting.

Interestingly, Clinton has gone multiple times to Michigan — another state Trump is trying to put in play. She will go back to Detroit on Friday.

Kaine, though, noted last night when he got to Madison that this was his third trip to the university town since Clinton put him on the ticket. He marveled that one of the campaign's staffers made an "H" out of cheese using an ice cream scooper. "Just for this event," he said. "I mean, don't we have an amazing staff? I mean, talk about attention to detail!"

Former Democratic governor Jim Doyle, Walker's predecessor, said he totally understands why Hillary has not come. "I never want to jinx anything, but I feel pretty good about it," he said, calling on his drive home from Kaine's event. "I don't want to say anything should be taken for granted. And the Clinton campaign is paying attention now, which is good."

The mood on the ground in 2016 just does not compare to previous election — when both sides fought tooth and nail, Doyle said: "[John] Kerry had Bruce Springsteen with 100,000 people. [Bill] Clinton and [Al] Gore had 80,000 for an event. I just don't think we're one of the real battleground states this fall. … I live in Madison, which would be the heart of Bernie country, and I don't see any big anti-Hillary feeling or anything like that. The Bernie people have come home."

-- Another thing working in Trump's favor: There is a strong GOP organization in the Badger State. The 2012 recall fight helped build an impressive voter file and turnout infrastructure. The state GOP has 30 offices open around the state. Not only is the state party full of grizzled veterans from the recall fight, but because Priebus was the former state party chairman, the local operatives have always been able to get whatever resources they want. Ryan, a prolific fundraiser, has also worked to keep the party's coffers flush.

But, as I wrote yesterday, GOTV programs are like special teams units. They are only good for a field goal — not a touchdown.

WHILE YOU WERE SLEEPING:

-- Two police officers are dead in Des Moines following "ambush-style attacks." From Travis M. Andrews: The attack came in two parts. The first shooting occurred at 1:06 a.m. when an Urbandale officer responded to a report of shots fired. This officer was shot and killed while sitting alone in his patrol car. The second shooting occurred precisely twenty minutes later, just two miles away. Police are currently developing suspect information, and will release more details at a press conference this morning."

-- Do you believe in miracles? The Cubs beat the Indians last night, forcing a Game 7 that will decide the World Series. "The authentic hairy scary 103-win Cubs were suddenly fully awake in a 9-3 win that will convince some fans that Game 7 will simply be a continuation of this momentum shift," Thomas Boswell writes. "The best news for the Cubs by far was that their dormant heart of the order — Kris Bryant (four hits, including a homer), Anthony Rizzo (three hits with a homer), Ben Zobrist and Russell — went a scorching 11 for 19 with eight runs and all nine RBI." Tonight's showdown in Cleveland could be a game for the ages. First pitch is at 8 p.m. ET.

POLLING ROUNDUP:

-- A brand new Washington Post-ABC News tracking poll finds Clinton and Trump tied nationally at 46 percent. Trump has opened an eight-point advantage on which candidate is more honest and trustworthy (46-38). A full 59 percent of likely voters said they disapprove of Clinton's handling of questions regarding her private email server.

-- A Bloomberg Politics poll finds Clinton holding a three-point lead over Trump (30-27) among likely independent voters. Clinton leads Trump 39-35 among independent likely voters in a two-way race, with 26 percent saying they remain undecided.

-- A Monmouth University poll in Missouri shows Trump with a strong 14-point lead in the state, but Sen. Roy Blunt is basically tied (47-46) with Democratic challenger Jason Kander. The state's gubernatorial race is also tied, with both Democratic Attorney General Chris Koster and former Navy SEAL Eric Greitens at 46 percent each.

-- A Franklin & Marshall College Poll finds Clinton up 11 points in Pennsylvania.

-- A WRAL News poll in North Carolina shows Trump with a seven-point lead (51-44).

-- A KTVT CBS 11-Dixie Strategies Poll has Trump safely up 13 points in Texas (52-39).

-- The Cook Political Report now ranks Arizona, Florida and Ohio as "toss-ups." It also figures that one electoral vote in both Maine and Nebraska could be up for grabs. Without winning any of those toss-ups, Clinton is still at 293 electoral votes.

-- A Pew Research survey finds that 6 in 10 Clinton supporters have a hard time respecting Trump backers. Nearly the opposite is true for those supporting the Republican nominee, with 56 percent of Trump backers saying they have no trouble respecting a Clinton supporter.

-- A Suffolk University poll finds that 3 in 4 Americans think the news media wants Clinton to win. In an AP/GkF poll released last week, 51 percent of Clinton supporters said the media is biased in her favor, while just 8 percent said it's biased against her.

GET SMART FAST:

\* Iraqi commandos swept into eastern Mosul, outgunning suicide attacks, snipers and roadside bombs as they breached the Islamic State stronghold for the first time in two years. Officials "can only guess" at how hard militants will fight to defend the city, their last major stronghold in Iraq. (Loveday Morris and Mustafa Salim)

\* Meanwhile, Moscow's defense ministry likened the U.S.-backed offensive to the situation in Aleppo, the Syrian city surrounded by Russian-aided government troops. State Department officials called the comparison "ludicrous" and "absolutely insulting." (Karen DeYoung)

\* Syrian President Bashar al-Assad met with a group of Western reporters this week , touting his leadership and blaming U.S. and Islamist militants for bloodshed in the country. Assad "radiated confidence and friendliness" in the meeting, reports the New York Times' Anne Barnard. "It was as if half his citizens had not been driven from their homes and nearly half a million had not been killed in the bloody fighting." Assad told the group he plans to stay in power until the end of his term in 2021.

\* Obama said his administration is considering ways to reroute the Dakota Access oil pipeline, following protests culminating in a series of violent clashes this week. In an interview, the president said White House officials are "monitoring the situation closely." "We're going to let it play out for several more weeks and determine whether or not this can be resolved in a way that I think is properly attentive to the traditions of First Americans," he said. (Derek Hawkins)

\* A deadly gasoline pipeline explosion in Alabama has driven up fuel prices across the U.S. for the second time in less than two months, as it temporarily cuts off more than a third of the supply delivered to the entire East Coast. (Steven Mufson)

\* Less than a week after members of the Bundy family were acquitted for their armed standoff at an Oregon wildlife refuge, they are threatening a second protest. This time, the family objects to Obama's plans to create a national monument in a Nevada wilderness area next to their ranch. (Kevin Sullivan and Juliet Eilperin)

\* Scientists are studying venom from the incredibly deadly blue coral snake – known to take down formidable predators such as king cobras and krait with just a single bite – and believe it could hold the key to a new class of strong, non-narcotic painkillers. (Ben Guarino)

\* NASA is sending a laser-based "nose" to scan for signs of life on Mars. The machine will scan the Red Planet for amino acids and other organic molecules. (Ben Guarino)

\* Venezuelan authorities stopped a Washington Post reporter at a Caracas airport and denied him entry into the country in the latest case of the government blocking a foreign correspondent from covering the country's mounting political and economic turmoil. (Joshua Partlow)

\* Meanwhile, Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro is under fire after suggesting city dwellers take up farming to curb the country's severe food crisis, even though it is almost entirely a result of government mismanagement and sky-high inflation. Many point out that urbanites have no land to farm on, with Venezuelans cultivating just eight out of 4,600 square miles of originally-promised farmland for the project. (Sofia Barbarani)

\* New Jersey rejected a fiscal recovery proposal from Atlantic City , setting the stage for a potential state takeover of the struggling gambling haven. (Wall Street Journal)

\* Federal jurors began deliberations in the "Bridgegate" trial, determining the fate of two top former aides to Christie after six weeks of testimony. (Newark Star Ledger)

\* Parents of an 11-year-old cancer survivor are urging changes to school bullying policies after torment from her peers apparently drove the survivor to suicide. The Columbus girl and her friend were not permitted to plaster "buddies, not bullies" signs across the school. (Lindsey Bever)

\* A Wisconsin high school stands accused of taking its driving safety drill too far after telling students that four of their classmates were killed in a car wreck. Many were crying, texting family members and frantically attempting to make contact with peers involved in the "crash" before they were told it was fake. (Amy B Wang)

\* The number of homeschooled children in the U.S. has spiked, according to new national data, more than doubling numbers from the 1990's. Parents this year said "providing religious and moral instruction" was the primary reason for keeping children in the home. (Emma Brown)

\* When that face-biting teen in Florida was being taken into custody for killing two people this summer, police said the 19-year-old began asking for help. "I ate something bad," he reportedly told officers. "Humans." The newly-released documents come as police continue to investigate the bizarre murders, working to determine whether the teen was under the influence of a powerful synthetic drug. (Sarah Larimer)

\* A Washington state couple is facing charges for allegedly injecting their three young children with heroin, which they had dubbed their "feel-good medicine ." Authorities said even the youngest child, age two, had bruises from the heroin needles. (Lindsey Bever)

\* On a lighter note: Several weeks after she announced plans to send energy drinks to Syrian refugees, Lindsey Lohan is back in the spotlight – this time, for adopting a new foreign accent. Reporters speaking to Lohan about a new nightclub said the actress sounded "like a combination of different countries." (New York Magazine)

THE BATTLEGROUNDS:

-- African Americans are failing to vote at the robust levels they did four years ago in several critical states.  The reasons appear both political and logistical, with lower voter enthusiasm and newly enacted impediments to voting at play.  Fresh numbers from the New York Times' Jeremy Peters, Richard Fausset and Michael Wines :

\* In NORTH CAROLINA, black turnout is down 16 percent and white turnout is up 15 percent.

\* In OHIO, voter participation in the heavily Democratic areas near Cleveland, Columbus and Toledo has been down.

\* In FLORIDA,  the share of African Americans that has gone to the polls in person so far has decreased from 25 percent in 2012 to 15 percent today.

-- Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-Fla.), who is African American, complained to Politico about the Clinton campaign's efforts: "They're not doing enough in the black community. I have been screaming for months about this and nothing changed and now look what's happening."

-- New conventional wisdom: The Clinton email controversy may save the Senate for Republicans. From Karen Tumulty and Paul Kane: "As recently as a week ago, the Republicans' chances of holding on to the Senate appeared to be slipping away. But now, Republicans see a chance to change the subject and remind voters of the drama and perceived moral ambiguity that has surrounded the Clintons for more than a quarter-century. However the latest FBI investigation of Abedin's emails turns out, the fact that they are even at issue goes back to Clinton's initial misjudgment … [which] can be traced to the secretive impulses that have so often driven the candidate and her inner circle. Though it is an implicit acknowledgment of the fact that the Democrat remains more likely than not to win the White House, Republicans are seizing upon an argument that they must retain control of Congress to be a check on Clinton — not only on her agenda but on the behavior of her administration."

-- Some congressional Democrats are having eerie flashbacks to the final weeks of 1996: Bill Clinton was cruising to reelection when a controversy exploded over the fact that Democrats had been taking large donations from foreign entities that are forbidden from donating to U.S. campaigns. A number of those illegal donors had access to the Clinton White House. "That's a good parallel" to the effect that the resurgent email controversy could have today, a senior House Democrat told Karen. In 1996, Bill's big lead held up, BUT House Democrats — who hoped to win the majority after losing it in 1994 — picked up fewer than five seats.

-- Pennsylvania offers the clearest illustration: "Hillary Clinton's latest chapter in her ongoing email scandal, saga, is just a reminder of how much corruption there is in Washington and how disturbing this is," embattled Sen. Patrick J. Toomey (R-Pa.) told voters this week at a diner in the town of Media. He noted that the administration of Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Wolf (D) is resisting a court order to release more than 50,000 emails that Toomey's Democratic opponent, Katie McGinty, sent while she was the governor's chief of staff. "Her devotion to Hillary Clinton is so complete that now she's decided that she has to have her own email scandal," Toomey quipped.

For down-ballot Democrats, Sharon Jankauskas is their nightmare: The 60-year-old nurse practitioner who lives outside Philadelphia said she sees the presidential race as the "lesser of two evils." She plans to vote for Clinton and Toomey. "We can always impeach her and get her out," she told Paul when he asked about Hillary.

Quote du jour: "We used to say in prosecution, it's primacy and recency. The closing argument reintroduces all of the most pertinent issues," said Rep. Patrick Meehan (R-Pa.). "This is almost the personification of the trust issue."

The Republican Party of Pennsylvania updated its scripts for volunteer phone callers and canvassers to identify, and ultimately turn out, voters who support Toomey and Clinton, It's an indicator that local GOP leaders believe the Keystone State is out of reach for Trump, but that the senator can still survive, Jonathan Martin and Alex Burns write in the Times.

-- Warnings of a rigged vote have stoked deep paranoia about the integrity of the electoral process. A great read from the New York Times' Alan Rappeport : "There was the myth of Trump supporters sending wild dogs to scare off black voters in Ohio. In Texas, some of the voting booths supposedly became possessed, switching ballots cast for [Trump] to [Clinton]. And then there was the amateur genealogist said to be committing voter fraud by jotting down names found on gravestones. 'I saw a couple of Seeing Eye dogs, one miniature horse wearing a campaign sign and another rather large but friendly dog on a leash,' [said the chair of Hamilton County's election board]. In Butler County, Ohio, Leah Edwards notified the authorities about voter fraud when she saw a man taking notes and photographing gravestones at a cemetery. 'I can't think of any other reason a person would be doing this,' she said. But the man detained was photographing markers for a "find the grave" memorial project , and later assailed Edwards for her irresponsibility. 'Sorry to dispel your conspiracy theory,' he said. 'If you would have stopped and talked to me, I could have let you know that I am a registered Republican!'"

THE DAILY HILLARY:

-- Libertarian vice presidential candidate Bill Weld "vouched for" Clinton in the wake of Comey's email announcement, stopping short of a full endorsement as he acknowledged an ideological split with his running mate. "Gary and I have not agreed on a number of substantive issues in this campaign," Weld told MSNBC's Rachel Maddow, when asked about a campaign press release criticizing the Democratic nominee. "I do not agree with that release." He added, "I'm here vouching for Mrs. Clinton, and I think it's high time somebody did."

-- The FBI released more than 120 pages of documents pertaining to Bill Clinton's pardon of fugitive Democratic financer Marc Rich, making public a 17-year-old trove of documents just days after James Comey's bombshell announcement. From Rosalind S. Helderman, Tom Hamburger and Sari Horwitz: "The seemingly random reminder of one of the darkest chapters of the Clinton presidency drew immediate rebuke from Clinton spokesman Brian Fallon, who asked whether the agency planned to publish unflattering records about Trump as well. For the second time in five days, the FBI had moved exactly to the place the nation's chief law enforcement agency usually strives to avoid: smack in the middle of partisan fighting over a national election, just days before the vote. The Rich documents provided little new information — and FBI agents called the timing of their release 'coincidental' — but they serve as a reminder of the once-aggressive criminal probe into the matter."

-- This looks bad: The Justice Department official who told Congress Monday that the agency will "dedicate all necessary resources" to the reopened email probe has a close relationship with Clinton campaign chair John Podesta, hacked emails show. From the Washington Examiner: "Peter Kadzik, assistant attorney general, sent his son to seek a job on the Clinton campaign given his personal relationship with Podesta. He was invited to a small birthday gathering for Podesta's lobbyist brother last year. Kadzik also dined with Podesta at his home in January, when the first FBI probe was well underway. In 2008, Podesta raved about Kadzik to Cassandra Butts, a member of President Obama's transition team, and noted Kadzik was 'willing to help' with vetting for Obama's Cabinet."

-- Attorney General Loretta Lynch and James Comey met on Monday to discuss reviewing, "as swiftly as possible," the newly discovered emails that could be related to Clinton's email probe. From NBC: "The Justice Department originally was opposed to the FBI 's plan to notify Congress about the discovery of the new emails.… However, Comey concluded that it was better to inform Congress sooner rather than wait until after the election. "In the end, we decided it was better to keep Congress informed," an FBI official said.

-- "The FBI never asked [Clinton's] top aides to turn over all the computers and smartphones they used while Clinton was secretary of state, an omission that is now triggering questions from Republican lawmakers," Politico 's Josh Gerstein reports: "While the FBI made a concerted effort to obtain all the computers that were used as Clinton's private server and ultimately asked two of Clinton's lawyers for laptops used to review her email messages, investigators never requested or demanded all equipment her top staffers used for work purposes during her four years at State.… The decision left the FBI at least partially dependent on the aides' attorneys' decisions about which messages were work-related and therefore might have contained classified information the agents were looking for. GOP lawmakers say the decision not to demand the aides' electronics, or even to ask for them, raises doubts about how the FBI and prosecutors handled the probe."

-- Republicans are starting to talk about the new email development in paid media. The pro-Trump super PAC Future 45 is launching a $10 million campaign around Comey's announcement. The spot, which goes on the air today, opens with footage of Richard Nixon saying people have "got to know whether or not their president's a crook." It concludes with the question, "How can we elect someone who is under FBI investigation?" (Julie Bykowicz/AP)

-- Clinton campaign manager John Podesta signed a $7,000-a-month contract with the foundation of a major Clinton donor in 2015 who "made a fortune" selling types of mortgages that critics say contributed to the housing collapse. From Politico 's Ken Vogel and Danny Vinik: "In February of last year, as Podesta was working to lay the groundwork for Clinton's soon-to-launch campaign … he signed the contract with the Sandler Foundation, which was started by Herb Sandler and his late wife Marion Sandler. The contract … is still active, according to Herb Sandler, who said that it calls for Podesta to provide advice on grant-making and other foundation functions. It's unusual for the full-time chairman of a general-election presidential campaign to maintain an active side deal with a major donor to that campaign — let alone to raise money from that donor for the campaign. But the hacked emails show that Podesta did both, while also maintaining a close personal relationship with Sandler."

-- Clinton made her most direct appeal yet for women to reject Trump's candidacy, recounting at length his history of degrading statements about women and allegations of unwanted sexual advances during an event in Florida. From John Wagner:  Clinton, who called Trump "someone who wants to bully us," was introduced at the rally by former Miss Universe Alicia Machado,  whom Trump berated as "Miss Piggy" after she gained weight and became the subject of a massive online attack the aftermath of the first presidential debate. "It's really clear that he does not respect women," Machado said. "He just judges us on our looks. He thinks he can do whatever he wants and get away with it."

THE DAILY DONALD:

-- Most unhelpful endorsement of the year? The official newspaper of the Ku Klux Klan formally came out for Trump, devoting an entire front-page spread to defending his message. "America was founded as a White Christian Republic," the article reads, "and as a White Christian Republic it became great." (Peter Holley)

-- The Post's David Fahrenthold tracked town a $20,000 Trump portrait that the real estate developer bought in 2007 using money from his charity: "On Tuesday, artist Michael Israel — the 'speed painter' who painted the portrait of Trump — released the first public photos of the portrait. Israel painted the piece in just five or six frenetic minutes, during a charity gala at Trump's own Mar-a-Lago Club in Palm Beach, Fla. Afterward, Israel auctioned the portrait off. Trump's wife Melania won the auction, with a bid of $10,000. Then the auctioneer convinced her to double it. Half of the proceeds went to Israel, the painter, and half went to the charity that hosted the event, then called the Children's Place at Home Safe, [which] helps children and families harmed by domestic violence." Tax experts say that if Trump hung the painting at one of his homes or businesses — as he appears to have done in other instances — he may have violated laws against "self-dealing."

-- Sean Hannity issued an apology after falsely claiming on his radio show that President Obama deleted tweets endorsing Clinton. The false information could be disproven with a simple Twitter search. From CNN's Brian Stelter:  "The progression of events illustrates how fake news stories expand and spread from fringe web sites to nationally syndicated radio shows with millions of listeners. In this case, the fake news originated on a dubious site called 'Your News Wire,' which publishes a mix of true, slanted and made-up news. Then, like a game of telephone, by the time the story got to Hannity, even the fake facts were wrong."

-- A largely on-script Trump appeared in Pennsylvania yesterday, showing flashes of a cohesive closing argument. From Jenna Johnson, John Wagner, and Sean Sullivan: Stumping alongside Mike Pence and a spate of other Republican lawmakers, Trump called for the eradication of the Affordable Care Act and renegotiation of a sweeping trade pact. He also attempted to strike a more "uplifting" tone, offering streamlined policy initiatives and more traditional campaign accoutrements seemingly geared towards moderate voters. "If we unlock the potential of this country and its incredible people, no dream is outside of our reach," he said, reading a script someone handed him.

-- Trump urged people who already voted for Clinton to go back and change their votes. He noted that state laws in places like Wisconsin allow early voters to change their ballots if they go back in person. "A lot of things have happened over the last three days," Trump said in Wisconsin, per Jenna Johnson. "This is a message for any Democratic voters who have already cast their ballots for Hillary Clinton and who are having a bad case of buyer's remorse — in other words, you want to change your vote — Wisconsin is one of several states where you can change your early ballot if you think you've made a mistake. A lot of stuff has come out since you voted." Trump's campaign also began circulating this information on Twitter earlier in the day, with his director of social media tweeting out phone numbers that voters in each state can call to change their vote. It seems certain this ploy won't have any sort of tangible effect; the email thing helps Trump with Republicans, not the kinds of people who already went to vote for Clinton. The country is too polarized for that.

-- Trump's campaign sought to play down the news that pollster Tony Fabrizio is being stiffed of $767,000. Communications director Jason Miller said Fabrizio is still "very much" a part of the team and said the campaign is simply questioning the payment amount. "We are making sure that Mr. Trump is paying the correct amount," a campaign official said. (Matea Gold)

-- Trump really has no idea how government actually works, cont.: He vowed yesterday to call a special session of Congress to repeal and replace Obamacare as soon as he's elected. Outside Philadelphia, he said: "I will ask Congress to convene a special session so we can repeal and replace," he said. "We will do it and we will do it very, very quickly." The Los Angeles Times notes the Constitution gives the president the authority "on extraordinary occasions, to convene both houses or either of them." But the last one was nearly 70 years ago. Not to mention, if Trump won, Congress would come into session anyway! Asked about his plan by a pool reporter, Trump said he has not reached out to Congress yet, adding: "We will very soon."

-- Our Amy Goldstein, who covers the health beat, looked at what both candidates say they would do with the health-care system. To put their views in perspective, in part through analyses from experts across the ideological spectrum, she annotated each candidate's official position using the Genius app. Check it out here.

-- The places in the U.S. most unsettled by rapid demographic change are the very areas most drawn to Trump, according to an analysis on the front page of today's  Wall Street Journal : "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. [Census data] shows 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. In 88% of [these] rapidly diversifying counties, Latino population growth was the main driver. 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%.… That shift helps explain the emergence of [Trump] as a political force, and signals that tensions over **immigration** will likely outlive his candidacy."

-- In that vein, Trump is outperforming traditional Republicans in the North Country of both Maine and New Hampshire, where gun rights are sacrosanct and good jobs vanished along with the paper mills that traditionally propped up the economy. From the AP's Patrick Whittle: "Maine awards two electoral votes for the statewide winner, and one for each of the state's two congressional districts. The proving ground is the 2nd District, which covers the state's vast northern and eastern reaches. Rural Maine has lost thousands of well-paying jobs to paper and textile mill closures, including the Madison mill this year, and it's a place where many people hunt for sport and food. The district also is the home base of Republican Gov. Paul LePage, a Trump supporter popular with — and twice elected by — rural Maine conservatives."

-- Newly uncovered video footage shows Trump with reputed mob figure Robert LiButti, contradicting his recent claims that he "never knew" the high-stakes gambler.From Yahoo 's Michael Isikoff: LiButti can be seen standing alongside Trump in the front row of a 1988 "WrestleMania" match in Atlantic City. According to LiButti's daughter, who also attended the event, they were Trump's guests at the event. Video footage shows him sitting in a front-row seat alongside Trump and then-wife Ivana during the event. "The "WrestleMania" event is just one of many times that Trump was close to Bob," says author David Cay, who extensively interviewed LiButti before his death in the early 90's. Trump has consistently downplayed his relationship with the gambler, saying in 1991 "If he was standing here in front of me, I wouldn't know what he looked like." Earlier this year, Trump said in an email: "During the years, I very successfully ran the casino business, I knew many high rollers. I assume Mr. LiButti was one of them, but I don't recognize the name."

-- Donald has spent his life trying to overcompensate for something... --> "Trump's Math Takes His Towers to Greater Heights," by the  New York Times's  Vivian Yee: "Of the many rivals [Trump] has accumulated over four decades in business and, now, presidential politics, one of the earliest was a New York City skyscraper with the boldness to stand taller than his own. In 1979, as Mr. Trump inspected a model of the black-and-gold Fifth Avenue high-rise that would come to serve as his home, office, fortress and personal monument, he could find only one flaw to spoil the moment: the GM building, which, in real life, was 41 feet higher and a few blocks away.…'My building looks a little small,' he said, according to a model maker. Assured the scale was accurate, Mr. Trump had an inspiration on his next visit. ' Can you make my building taller?' Mr. Trump asked. No, he was told. 'Well, can you make the G.M. building shorter?' [They] sawed off the top third [of the GM building], leaving Trump Tower — in the one-thirty-second-scale model, at least — the tallest in the neighborhood. As a review of his Manhattan building portfolio shows, Mr. Trump repeated his Trump Tower innovation at least seven more times."

THE SENATE:

-- More headaches for North Carolina Sen. Richard Burr. The day after he took heat for blocking his state's second biggest newspaper from covering his events and apologized for a joke about putting a bulls eye on a picture of Hillary…

McClatchy reports that the Intelligence Committee chairman played a central role 11 years ago in relaxing U.S. controls over the export of bomb-grade uranium: "In 2005, the Republican lawmaker won passage of controversial legislation to ease restrictions on U.S. shipments abroad of highly enriched uranium – material that terrorists could employ to build a Hiroshima-type nuclear bomb. … In 2012, Congress reversed course and passed new restrictions. … Parties that support relaxed export controls have showered Burr with upward of $100,000 in campaign contributions since he first pressed his amendment in 2003."

CNN posted audio of the senator promising to block any Clinton SCOTUS nominee, no matter who, which gives lie to his bromides about bipartisanship. It also contradicts his insistence earlier in the year that the next president should get to pick Antonin Scalia's replacement. "If Hillary Clinton becomes president, I am going to do everything I can do to make sure four years from now, we still got an opening on the Supreme Court," he tells volunteers now.

-- Nevada Republican Senate candidate Joe Heck said he still does not know who he is voting for. "Well, I can tell you I'm not voting for Hillary Clinton," Heck told the Las Vegas NBC affiliate. "We still have six days before I walk into the booth. On November 8th, I'll have a decision."

-- The Juice --> "Van Hollen campaigns hard for Senate seat that is within reach," by Jenna Portnoy: "It's a good time to be Rep. Chris Van Hollen. His party is favored in the race for the White House, he's overwhelmingly expected to win the seat of retiring Sen. Barbara Mikulski, and — no matter which way the balance of power in the upper chamber falls — he stands to benefit. If Democrats win control of the Senate … a possible President [Clinton] would need allies there who have relationships in the House of Representatives … and who can negotiate good-faith deals with leadership. That means Van Hollen, a polite and well-liked policy wonk who was a top lieutenant to [Nancy Pelosi], should find multiple ways to flex his budget, foreign affairs and political muscles. While his [Senate] opponent touts the surprise 2014 victory of Gov. Larry Hogan as proof she can win in deep-blue Maryland, experts say the Democrats' 2-to-1 voter registration advantage is a much steeper hurdle when the White House is also in play."

SOCIAL MEDIA SPEED READ:

The Daily News endorses HRC on its cover today:

Trump offered support for Darrell Issa in his tough reelection fight in California:

Here's how Issa's Democratic challenger replied:

Yes, it really was Issa's birthday.

It's fall in D.C.:

Trump canvasser positions are available in Florida:

Bad news for the GOP down the road?

Still lots of Halloween-themed posts yesterday. Here's the White House dressed up for Halloween:

Montana Sen. Steve Daines's spokeswoman, Katie Waldman, dressed up:

Donald Trump Jr.'s family trick-or-treated on the Upper East Side:

Trump Jr. entertained this costume idea:

Lena Dunham as a grabbed ... well, you know:

Josh Gad as Ken Bone:

Kirsten Gillibrand as a witch:

The Romneys:

Charles Rangel:

Pat Toomey's son:

Sean Duffy's kids:

And Elizabeth Warren's family:

GOOD READS FROM ELSEWHERE:

-- New York Times Magazine , " When Hillary and Donald Were Friends ," by Maureen Dowd: "In this historically dreadful and mesmerizing election … the New York aspect has been largely overshadowed.  As the Clintons fashioned a new life [here], Trump was transforming himself as well — from a risk-taking developer facing bankruptcy to a low-risk licenser of his name for other people's projects, from a brazen builder to a gilded reality-TV star … He had come out of Queens, a pushy New York kid with family money but no social tools to climb the society ladder. The story of how [Trump] and [Clinton] rose and reinvented themselves and embraced and brawled is the story of New York itself. It is a tale of power, influence, class, society and ambition that might have intrigued Edith Wharton, whose family once owned a grand home down the block from what is now Trump Tower."

-- The Stanford sexual assault victim who delivered a powerful testimony against former swimmer Brock Turner was named Glamour's "Woman of the Year." In an essay, she recounts what she's dealt with since the case became public: "So now to the one who said, I hope my daughter never ends up like her, I am learning to say, I hope you end up like me, meaning, I hope you end up like me strong. I hope you end up like me proud of who I'm becoming. I hope you don't 'end up,' I hope you keep going. And I hope you grow up knowing that the world will no longer stand for this. Victims are not victims, not some fragile, sorrowful aftermath. Victims are survivors, and survivors are going to be doing a hell of a lot more than surviving."

DAYBOOK:

On the campaign trail: Clinton holds a rally in Tempe, Ariz.; Kaine is in Dubuque and Des Moines, joined at the latter event by Bill Clinton; Obama speaks in Raleigh, N.C.; Biden speaks in Tampa and West Palm Beach, Fla.; Sanders is in Kalamazoo and Traverse City, Mich. and Milwaukee, Wis.; Warren is in Carson City and Reno, Nev.; and Bill Clinton also stops in Sioux City and Waterloo, Iowa. Trump is in Miami, Orlando and Pensacola, Fla.; Pence is in Mesa, Ariz., Las Cruces, N.M., and Loveland, Colo.

At the White House: See above.

On Capitol Hill: The Senate and House are out.

NEWS YOU CAN USE IF YOU LIVE IN D.C.:

-- A Maryland commuter bus collided with a school bus in Baltimore, killing six and injuring 10 others. No children were aboard either vehicle, as the school bus had not yet begun picking up children, but both drivers and four commuter bus passengers were killed. (Lynh Bui and Dana Hedgpeth)

-- A Virginia woman was dragged into a ditch and sexually assaulted after a car crash in Fredericksburg. The woman was reportedly driving on a highway around 3 a.m. on Monday when her car was struck by another vehicle, authorities said. The driver of the other vehicle then proceeded to pull her from her car and drag her into a nearby ditch. She was sexually assaulted over a two-hour period. (Martin Weil)

-- A group of eight youths beat up and robbed a man in front of his Pennsylvania Avenue hotel on Monday night. Police said the victim was talking on his cellphone around 7:30 p.m. when he was punched and knocked to the ground by a young male. The rest of his assailants — four male and four female – repeatedly kicked and punched him before taking off with his cellphone. The attack occurred about 7:25 p.m. in the 2400 block of Pennsylvania Avenue NW, near the Melrose Georgetown Hotel at Washington Circle. The victim said the kids were wearing masks. (Peter Hermann)

-- The D.C. Council voted to give initial approval to "death with dignity" legislation, moving forward a measure that would allow physicians to prescribe fatal drugs to terminally ill residents. City officials said they expect the bill to become law when it is officially voted on later this month. (Fenit Nirappil)

-- The Washington Redskins left tackle Trent Williams was suspended for four games after violating the NFL's substance-abuse policy. They did not specify his infraction, though several sources said Williams had missed the drug test. (Liz Clarke and Mike Jones)

-- The Capitals beat the Jets 3-2.

-- Today gets a "nice day" stamp from the Capital Weather Gang: "High pressure centered over the southeast United States is perfectly placed to give us a light but mild breeze from the south-southwest. That sends morning temperatures rising steadily through the 50s and into the 60s. And with partly to mostly sunny skies, afternoon highs top out in the mid-70s to near 80. The record highs for the day (in the mid-80s) seem out of reach."

VIDEOS OF THE DAY:

Trump's closing ad frames the election as a "choice" between "two Americas":

Another new Trump ad calls the Clintons corrupt:

Clinton released another spot targeting Trump over his comments about women:

Here's a sneak peek at Russ Feingold's closing ad, which goes up today:

Samantha Bee brutally mocked Trump for his frequent use of the phrase "some people are saying":

Seth Meyers took a closer look at the latest drama surrounding Clinton's emails:

Huma Abedin, who has not been by Hillary's side since Friday, went trick-or-treating with her son:

Nathan Lane floated a potential line-up of shows for Trump TV:

Joe Biden tried to be funny as he made a pitch for early voting:

Trump stopped at a Wawa:

This video assembled all of Trump's compliments of Clinton:

Vice News sat down with Kaine:

Rep. Martha McSally (R-Ariz.) released an ad starring her dog:

Finally, check out these clips of the Obamas' last White House Halloween (click to watch):

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was the stuffed sheep's fault. Fuzzy, faded, beloved by Andrea Villa's 4-year-old charge, remarkable to others only for its talent for disappearing. The toy known as Sheepy would go missing at least once a week, inspiring fits of crying from the little girl and a frantic search by her parents and Villa, their Colombian au pair. Desperate to break the cycle, Villa turned to a tactic she'd learned from watching "Supernanny": The little girl would put Sheepy in a special spot by the window each time she was done playing with it.

The strategy worked, until one day it didn't, exacerbating simmering tensions that resulted in Villa's expulsion from the house in Northern Virginia where the 28-year-old had worked for three months.

Villa, now 32, chuckles ruefully at the memory. Petite, with bright green eyes and a penchant for equally bright clothing, she's sitting in her tidy Alexandria, Va., apartment. It's sparely furnished but for a few mementos: a framed certificate from Georgetown University, a purple vase of fabric flowers. Since that incident in 2012, Villa has graduated from business school and, under her student visa, is learning about payroll, invoices and estimates at a painting company. By all measures, she's come a long way from the time she lost her job, her residence and, potentially, her visa status in one swoop. But the memory still stings.

"I felt awful," she recalls. "Scared. I was thinking, 'Where will I stay? Maybe I have to go back to Colombia.' "

Thousands of 18- to 26-year-old foreigners become au pairs annually under a 12-month State Department cultural-exchange program. In 2015, 17,588 au pairs worked in the United States, according to State Department data, with 3,062 of them in the District, Maryland and Virginia. (The top five participating states are New York, California, New Jersey, Virginia and Massachusetts.) Drawn by promises of American adventure, educational opportunity and the warm embrace of a host family, the au pairs provide up to 45 hours of child care a week in exchange for room, board and a weekly stipend of $195.75, about $10,000 a year. At 45 hours, that would work out to $4.35 an hour. The federal minimum wage is $7.25; many state minimum wages are higher.

That stipend amounts to systematic wage theft, according to a 2014 lawsuit filed in Colorado on behalf of five au pairs against 15 sponsor agencies that then administered the program. The origin of the weekly compensation is a major element of the suit: The plaintiffs allege that the agencies set the stipend based on incorrectly interpreted federal regulations; the agencies respond that they set the stipend based on State Department guidelines. Twelve of the now 16 sponsor agencies failed to return calls or declined to answer questions for this article; of the four that responded, none commented on pending litigation or the setting of stipends. The State Department also declined to comment directly on pay issues, citing the pending legal action.

The plaintiffs plan to seek class-action status for the suit, which had nine named plaintiffs as of press time and which they believe could cover as many as 50,000 current or former au pairs. In March, U.S. District Judge Christine Arguello affirmed the magistrate judge's ruling that the case can go forward.

Many au pairs have wonderful, formative experiences, seeing much of the States and building lifelong relationships. But others say they have been subjected to mistreatment by host families or agencies. One Arlington, Va., au pair — who worked up to 75 hours a week, plus nights, caring for a colicky baby — became the subject of American University law professor Janie Chuang's critique of the au pair program, published in the Harvard Journal of Law and Gender in 2013. Another local au pair, Edna Valenzuela, was featured in news accounts after her agency initially refused to extend her visa so she could receive free, potentially life-saving treatment following a cancer diagnosis — despite the support of her host family, the fact that she could not receive the care at home and the assurances of the American doctor who was treating her that she'd be able to continue working. (She is now cancer-free as a result of the treatment she was able to receive in the States.)

Critics of the au pair program — including current and former participants, advocates for migrant and domestic workers, private attorneys and legal scholars — say au pairs are vulnerable to sexual harassment and assault, though few are willing to press charges and only a handful have gone to court. Two au pairs have wound up as victims of human trafficking, according to a 2012 decision on a federal human-trafficking case in Chicago.

"These are the people who care for our children," says Chuang. "How much do they have to suffer for us to care about them?"

This story, however, focuses on experiences such as Andrea Villa's, which illustrate the more common disputes involving wages, hours and clashing assumptions — and the tenuous positions of au pairs who speak up about them.

It is important to note that not all au pairs are responsible, loving caregivers. And there have been at least four court cases filed since the mid-1990s that allege that au pairs have physically or sexually abused the children in their care, in addition to the widely reported 1997 case against English au pair Louise Woodward, who was convicted of shaking her small charge to death.

Yet the very nature of the au pair program, critics argue, makes it most susceptible to misuse by agencies and host parents. "The agency, they are making money with our work," says Villa. "But the families are their customers, so the agencies aren't on our side if we have a problem."

As the reporting for this story demonstrates, dozens of au pairs claim they have been mistreated. It's not clear how common their experiences are; language barriers and au pairs' concerns about being sent home can make it difficult to quantify the problem. But what is clear is that the way the program is structured makes it tough for au pairs who believe they are being mistreated to find recourse.

Part of the problem is categorization. The program, launched with a pilot in 1986 under the U.S. Information Agency, is officially classified as an "exchange visitor program" and is housed at the Department of State. Yet in practice, critics say, it functions more like a guest-worker program. Government agencies have questioned the setup almost since its inception. In 1987, an interagency panel of representatives from the State Department, Labor Department, **Immigration**and Naturalization Service and USIA determined that full-time child-care work programs did not qualify as cultural-exchange programs. The au pair agencies fought efforts to reclassify the program, however, and Congress declined to move it out of USIA or reduce its participants' hours. The same debates have continued: As recently as 2012, the State Department's own Office of Inspector General questioned "the appropriateness of allowing what are essentially work programs to masquerade as cultural exchange activities."

Parents who think they are obtaining "one of the most affordable childcare options available, especially if you have a gaggle of kids," in the words of one agency, GreatAuPair, are hiring au pairs being told by the same agency that they will have the opportunity to visit "great cities, improve your English, and learn more about American culture." This can lead to clashing expectations and disputes.

The State Department declares the Exchange Visitor Program, under which the au pair program falls, "first and foremost an educational and cultural exchange. The primary goal is to allow participants the opportunity to engage broadly with Americans" and, if there is a work component, "learn new skills or build skills that will help them in future careers." The 16 designated U.S. au pair agencies, most of them for-profit businesses, recruit, select and train au pairs, connect them with host families and oversee their visa status. Although the department's au pair program brochure concludes with a disclaimer — "Please Note: No guarantee of performance or competency is made by the designation of sponsor organizations" — it instructs au pairs who have concerns to turn first to their sponsoring agency.

Critics such as Chuang say oversight of the program is inadequate. The approximately 100-employee Office of Private Sector Exchange is tasked with monitoring all 15 of the J-1 Visa Exchange Visitor Programs, which include more than 300,000 participants coming to the United States annually to work, study or teach.

The State Department initiated a routine internal review of the au pair program in January 2014 and completed it a year later but has not released any results. Officials said they were unable to comment on the content or timing of any new rules. In the interim, the department has made changes to its oversight of the au pair program. The offices that monitor and sanction non-compliant agencies no longer rely on sponsor fees for their funding, which had presented a potential conflict of interest noted by the department's inspector general. The department also implemented a system of "meet and greets," wherein au pairs meet with department staffers, without the presence of agency representatives, to discuss their experiences. It has conducted more than 90 such meetings so far this year.

Andrea Villa laughs when she is read a State Department letter sent to new au pairs. "[Y]ou are among many young adult exchange visitors serving as your country's citizen ambassador in the United States."

"I wasn't a citizen ambassador," she says.

What was she?

"I was a Cinderella."

Villa's first au pair experience involved a family she had stayed with in 2009 as an exchange student taking English at the International Center for Language Studies in Washington. The Clarks lived in Arlington, had twin girls she adored and were warm and genuinely interested in her life. When they asked her in 2011 to return as their au pair, she leaped at the chance. The Clarks turned to Au Pair International, based in Boulder, Colo., to handle the process; in Bogota, Villa says, she completed the process through Cultural Travel Colombia.

Villa went through a barrage of tests and certifications: English-language interview, CPR- and first-aid certification, a psychological-assessment test, swimming test, even a pregnancy test. But the most startling requirement was the $1,600 fee that Villa says she was asked to pay to begin the application process — more than twice the average monthly salary in Colombia. Villa emailed the Clarks, who were just as surprised. It didn't make sense to them that she should have to pay to get a job when they were already paying a U.S. agency thousands of dollars. Nevertheless, the Clarks told Villa they would cover the expense.

"I was so lucky," says Villa. "All the other au pairs have to pay because they don't have someone to fight for them."

The high cost of participating in the program can be a significant hurdle for prospective au pairs, who are required by agencies to pay for a range of incidentals, which may include "processing fees," embassy-interview fees, visa-application fees and even airfare supplements. Some, such as Villa, also report paying overseas recruitment fees. Three of the top five sending countries are Brazil, Colombia and Mexico; recruitment fees there can place a large financial burden on economically vulnerable participants.

Legislative efforts to do away with recruitment fees have run into opposition from the agencies, which have encouraged host families to join them in lobbying against bills that the agencies argue would increase costs. Using an au pair for child care is a good deal, especially in high-cost areas such as Washington. Factoring in agency fees of up to $8,500, the fixed au pair stipend and $500 toward the au pair's required course work at a post-secondary institution, families pay roughly $19,000 a year. Even considering the expense of supplying room and board, that's a considerable savings over the average cost for a full-time nanny in Washington, which, according to the New America think tank, is $33,366 — the highest in the nation.

In addition to unexpected recruitment fees, au pairs are often startled by the predominance work takes after they arrive. "They do say you have to work 45 hours a week, help the family," says Caroline Nascimento da Silva, a Brazilian who worked as an au pair in Arlington. "But they don't emphasize it." Au pairs also can experience difficulties obtaining the cultural and educational experiences they've been promised. Families who live in the suburbs do not always make transportation available, for example, and the $500 host parents pay toward educational expenses doesn't stretch far beyond basic English-as-a-second-language classes in the Washington region.

When their year-long experience comes to a close, au pairs have the option to extend for up to 12 more months. Villa was eager to stay in the States to continue her course work, she says, but the Clarks no longer had enough hours for her. So, at the suggestion of Au Pair International, she put up a profile on Care.com, a website that connects caregivers and families, to find another match. When a new family got in touch, Villa was relieved. The husband, wife and two daughters, 4 and 6, also lived in Northern Virginia and seemed kind. Eager to nail down her visa, she did not wait to see if anyone else would contact her.

The new family, who declined through an intermediary to be interviewed for this story, timed Villa's arrival to coincide with the last week of their exiting au pair, Yuka Yamada, who is from Japan. Villa got her first inkling of trouble on Yamada's last day, when the children's computer broke and, Yamada says, the host mother accused Yamada of allowing the children to do the damage, or doing it herself.

"They didn't ask me to pay, but I felt terrible to be accused of doing that," Yamada says via Skype from China, where she's now studying Chinese. "I didn't touch the computer." Although she remains in touch with the family and characterizes her relationship with them as good, she regrets that fraught exit. "It was my last day of my year there, and I cried that it was ending that way."

Yamada says that she occasionally worked over the mandated maximum number of hours, for which she was paid, and that she willingly agreed to sometimes walk and feed the family's dog. Having been bitten by a dog as a child, Villa did not want to care for the large Saint Bernard, however, and the family acquiesced. She also balked at the extra hours. Her first hosts, the Clarks, suggested she ask for an additional $12 to $21 an hour for the overtime. Villa says the second host father agreed to $6, which disappointed her.

The days with the second family could stretch to 12 hours, and those days into 60-hour weeks, Villa alleges. She says she would wake up at 6:30, feed the girls breakfast, drop the older girl off at school, bathe, care for and feed lunch to the younger one, pick up the older one at school, feed the girls snacks, and manage their activities and homework until their parents came home around 7 and made dinner. In between, she says, she would clean the kitchen and vacuum the whole house — chores she believed went beyond the au pair responsibilities to do light housework related to the children.

After her long workdays, Villa would collapse in her basement room. She had little energy to study, she says, and had the gnawing sense that the parents saw her less as a member of their family and more as someone who could be squeezed for more work.

Villa's state concerned her first host mother, Eva Clark. "It just seemed they were really taking advantage of her," says Clark. "I could see her getting very down, and Andrea's a very upbeat, positive, super-helpful, super-friendly person."

Interviews with au pairs suggest that working over the maximum is commonplace, even though agencies can in theory be sanctioned under State Department rules if they fail to ensure host families' compliance with the 45-hour ceiling. It is also a potential violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which applies to au pairs and requires that employers keep time records of employees' hours.

Au pairs have an opportunity during monthly check-ins with local agency representatives to report any problems regarding hours or cultural or educational opportunities. But it can be difficult for the au pairs to speak up. According to interviews and the class-action lawsuit, they often feel isolated, reliant on host families for food and transportation (even to those monthly check-in meetings), and uncertain how and when to draw the line. Others have taken out loans for recruitment fees, making them even more reluctant to risk being sent home in debt if they anger their host families or agencies.

Some worry that they will face long-term consequences if they come forward. When an agency marks an au pair's status as "terminated" (indicating a program violation instead of the routine "completed" designation), it could affect her ability to return to the States in the future, a fear that has kept au pairs from speaking out, according to Julia Beebe of domestic-workers' rights group MataHari. "The **immigration** lawyers and other advocates we've spoken with don't feel confident that a protesting au pair won't be deported," she says. "We don't feel like we can offer them a guarantee that they can speak out publicly without fear of retaliation."

Three months into Villa's stay with the second family, Sheepy went missing. The little girl, wailing, went upstairs to her mother. Her big sister followed. Not wanting to intrude, Villa says, she went to her room, where she began to receive texts from the girls' mother, questioning her tactic with the stuffed toy and telling her it wasn't her job to help raise the girls. The next morning, Villa alleges, the girls' father reprimanded her for going to her room rather than remaining upstairs to fold laundry or do other housework.

Villa felt overworked, underappreciated and undermined in her authority to care for the girls. She called her agency, which contacted the host family, then called her back and told her she'd have to leave by the end of the week. But when she got home, her host father told her to leave the next day.

Although her local agency representative offered Villa a place to stay at her house, Villa declined. She stayed with friends while she scrambled to find a new family through the rematch process, a high-stakes undertaking in which she had to find a new job within a "reasonable period" (as stated in her contract) or fly home at her own expense. Permission to rematch is a matter of agency "discretion," her contract says, as is agency assistance in finding a new family or temporary housing.

Villa says that in her case, the local agency representative told her to put her profile back up on Care.com and did not offer any further assistance in finding a new family. Au Pair International, Villa's agency, did not respond to multiple calls and requests for comment.

"I felt awful," she says now. "Awful." Her former host mother was alarmed as well. Clark says she called Villa's agency twice but received no response. She says she looked for a way to contact the State Department but couldn't find the proper channel. "I thought, 'Who can I possibly call to get help? There's got to be some sort of monitoring of this program that we can report them to or at least get them to look into the situation.' And I couldn't find any help."

Since that time, the State Department website for the program has added a hotline and an email address for reporting abuse. Au pair advocates would also like to see a central list of host families who have been accused of violating program rules and a system for collecting confidential feedback from all au pairs.

In 2011, the Office of Private Sector Exchange, which oversees the au pair program, began to keep a record of complaints — logging 237 so far, though spokesman Nathan Arnold says, "Not every incident will be reported to the department." The complaints were mostly centered on "expectation management," involving issues such as hours and pay, according to Deputy Assistant Secretary Keri Lowry, who declined to speak on specifics.

Records from the class-action lawsuit and incidents that resulted in official complaints to the State Department reveal a wide range of allegations. One au pair said she was told to cook for the family while not being allowed to eat with them. Another said she was barred from eating the family's food and left behind to care for the children while the parents went away for days. Another said she was exposed to racist jokes, and another said she was forced to start work at 4 a.m. MataHari's Beebe says her organization has received 35 complaints since August 2015 for issues that include working far over the maximum 45 hours a week and sexual harassment.

Villa did find a rematch, via an au pair friend who was heading home and recommended Villa to take her place. Her next family was gracious and inviting, and Villa "felt so blessed to be moving into that house. It was like coming back to life." She took care of one 7-year-old boy and had time to study in between her work hours. But even today, visiting the old neighborhood can leave her shaken.

In November 2014, Colorado nonprofit Towards Justice filed suit against the au pair agencies after Colombian au pair Johana Paola Beltran told them she had paid $2,500 in recruitment fees and had been asked to cook her host family's dinner every night and feed their eight chickens, but had not been allowed to eat with the family. Her lawyers, unfamiliar with the au pair program, were shocked at her paltry stipend. "How and why is that happening in a functional capitalist society?" asked Nina DiSalvo, Towards Justice executive director. In 2015, Boies, Schiller & Flexner came on as co-counsel for the suit.

The plaintiffs allege that the agencies violated anti-trust laws by colluding to set au pair wages; misled families and au pairs into thinking that the stipend was set by the State Department rather than the agencies themselves; and fixed the wage to a sum that violates federal, state and local minimum wage laws. It seeks damages including back pay for its potential class of 50,000 current and former au pairs.

Meanwhile, MataHari has been actively working to organize nannies and au pairs since 2015. "Once [au pairs] start understanding the program, they start wondering why they're getting paid so minimally," says Beebe. "They're meeting other ladies — nannies — in the park getting paid four times as much with fewer kids, and then they become very interested in learning their rights."

Advocates have called for moving oversight of the au pair program to the Department of Labor, or for reducing the number of required work hours to 30. When asked about moving the program under Labor, State Department spokesman Arnold responds that State believes it belongs under cultural exchange. "Our discussions with au pairs indicate that they are motivated to come to the United States mainly in order to practice their English, learn about the country through living with a host family for a year, and through travel," he says.

"Sometimes I think America has a double face, especially the **immigration** system," Villa says, reflecting on her experience. "They say this program is for you to come and learn English and travel while you take care of kids. But ... no one will make sure you have a good family and a good schedule. The au pair doesn't have protections."

Villa, who is considering joining the class-action lawsuit, is thinking through her own solutions. "Maybe this is crazy, but I think about opening an au pair agency," she says. "Instead of paying the agency $6,000, the family pays $3,000. And then pays $3,000 for the au pairs' education. The au pairs work 30 hours a week and are paid more. I don't know if it is possible, but it would be good."

Noy Thrupkaew is a freelance writer based in Los Angeles. Editor's note: For this story, reported in cooperation with the Investigative Fund at the Nation Institute, writer Noy Thrupkaew drew on thousands of pages of legal documents and court transcripts, news articles, academic studies, a survey of 150 former and current au pairs, and interviews with au pairs, host families, workers' rights advocates, government officials and au pair agency staff.To learn more about the experience of au pairs, tune in to "Reveal," an investigative public radio program and podcast from the Center for Investigative Reporting and PRX. You can find this episode at revealnews.org/podcast starting Nov. 5. E-mail us at wpmagazine@washpost.com.For more articles, as well as features such as Date Lab, Gene Weingarten and more, visit The Washington Post Magazine.Follow the Magazine on Twitter.Like us on Facebook.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE PICTURE that accompanied a New York Times article about the founder of Chobani yogurt showed him with a giant American flag in the background. That was fitting, because Hamdi Ulukaya epitomizes the American success story — **immigrating** here, working hard, overcoming adversity, building a successful business and now giving back by helping others. Unfortunately, there is another strand to his story, and it is one of xenophobia that too often has marked the country's reaction to waves of **immigration**. Even more distressing is that this ugliness has been enabled by the rhetoric of a presidential candidate who extols brute nationalism as a badge of honor.

Mr. Ulukaya, a Turkish **immigrant** of Kurdish descent who has built a flourishing business making a popular Greek yogurt, has become the target of racist attacks on social media and negative articles on alt-right websites. Mr. Ulukaya's sin? Employing some refugees at his plants in upstate New York and in Twin Falls, Idaho, and advocating that other companies do more to assist **immigrants**.

The attacks have been encouraged by a series of conspiratorial articles. "American Yogurt Tycoon Vows to Choke U.S. With Muslims" headlined one article on the far-right website WND. Breitbart, the conservative website whose former executive chairman Stephen K. Bannon is now running Donald Trump's presidential campaign, ran what the Times characterized as misleading articles tying the hiring of refugees to two rape cases in Idaho as well as a spike in tuberculosis in the state. Now there are calls to boycott Chobani.

It is hard not to see the events as an outgrowth of the overheated debate about **immigration** in the presidential race. That Mr. Trump has opposed resettling refugees, summarily dismissed one nationality as criminals and rapists, and proposed a ban on **immigrants** of a certain religion has helped to feed the hate. It is no mere coincidence that Mr. Ulukaya, an **immigrant**, was targeted while other executives who have aided refugees were not.

Here is what should not get lost. Chobani has annual yogurt sales of about $1.5 billion. It employs about 2,000 people. Mr. Ulukaya, by all accounts, has proved to be a generous employer, paying more than the minimum wage and offering paid parental leave and Chobani shares to employees. He is, in short, a perfect rebuke to those who want to scare the United States into shutting the door to **immigrants**. Thankfully, much like other people who came to this country and encountered prejudice, he shows no sign of being deterred.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republicans in presidential and Senate races since the 1960s have hung on outside red strongholds by turning out rural and suburban whites. When that plan began to falter based on changing demographics, Republicans in effect doubled down. The GOP House rejected **immigration** reform. Donald Trump and his closest competitor ran races aimed at "solving" white grievances, particularly for those with less education. (The solutions were and are preposterous, but that's whom the candidates were aiming to win over.)

The result, Trump told us, was going to be a new, bigger — also whiter, not coincidentally — coalition that took aim at foreigners, trade, **immigration** and rampant disaffection from politics and even society in general. The ignored, the losers in globalization, became the core of his low-information voter base.

So far, it doesn't seem like that's working. If you want to find out why, a good place would be the middle- and upper-middle-class suburbs outside big cities. As the Wall Street Journal reports:

Mr. Obama won the four counties outside Philadelphia that year by 9 percentage points. By contrast, Mrs. Clinton led by 36 points in those counties — 61 percent to 25 percent — in a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC News/Marist poll.

Those suburbs have filled up with tens of thousands of college-educated workers. They are winners in the 21st century economy because they've developed the skills to fill those high-paying tech jobs. Their concerns are issues like college tuition, health care costs and personal security. In short, these are precisely the sort of voters to whom Clinton is appealing with her laundry list of proposals and professional demeanor.

Trump in these voters' eyes is a crude throwback to their parents' generation — a groper, a bigot and a loud know-nothing. Trump is saying everyone is a loser and globalism is a bust. That's not how these voters see things.

The other, less well-known phenomenon is the degree to which suburbs are becoming multiethnic. We are seeing whether "diverse 'mixing bowl' communities — among them Raleigh, Atlanta and the Washington, D.C., suburbs — are growing large and Democratic enough to shake up the political balance in historically conservative North Carolina, Georgia and Virginia."

In Northern Virginia, the answer has been clear for several election cycles. Unless Republicans can break through in populous northern suburbs with professionals, married women and more educated voters (as gubernatorial candidate Bob McDonnell did in Virginia in 2009) they wind up racking up huge vote deficits that cannot be made up elsewhere in the state. That's how Virginia came to vote for President Obama twice, for both Democratic U.S. senators and for a Democratic governor.

Fairfax, the largest of the northern counties, in 2000 was 70 percent white; in 2014 whites made up only 63 percent of the population. Moreover, the northern counties are growing faster than the rest of the state — making the demographic shift even more prominent.

To recap, Republicans used to do well in suburbs, which for a time were largely white enclaves. The appeal of a misogynistic, racist bully in these environs, one can see, is rather limited. These generally are not Trump's kind of white voters (e.g. high school educated only). And he's managed to offend and/or frighten nonwhite voters who live there. Democrats have long held a dominant position in major urban centers. Thanks to Trump, they may gain similar prominence in suburbs.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton is set to campaign in Arizona tonight, and all indications are that the Clinton campaign is making a serious play for this reliably red state that Democrats have long dreamed of flipping into their column.

The Clinton campaign confirms, for instance, that it has doubled its planned ad spending to $1.2 million for the final week.

Winning Arizona is certainly a heavy lift, and some are suggesting that it could prove a waste of time. And she may not win it. But the Clinton campaign is not only campaigning in Arizona today because it is hoping to pull off a surprise heist of its 11 electoral college votes.

A win in Arizona would also constitute a larger victory over Trumpism writ large, one with potentially lasting ramifications for both the Republican Party and for the **immigration** debate that is likely to unfold between Clinton and Republicans, if she is elected president.

"If we're able to defeat Trumpism in Arizona, that will probably mean its ultimate long-term death," Seth Scott, the Arizona state director for the Clinton campaign, tells me.

As I've argued, defeating Trump in Arizona would be significant, because the state represents in miniature a confluence of broader national trends. Arizona is where Trump delivered his hate-filled **immigration** speech, where notorious Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio faces a tough relection fight, and where the hardline state law SB 1070 passed in 2010, igniting a national debate over what is widely seen as a discriminatory enforcement model. It's also where Democrats are simultaneously trying to harness demographic shifts (the population of Latinos is growing) to turn it into a purple state.

With states like New Mexico, Colorado, and Nevada now turning purple-to-bluish, Arizona is in the next round of dominoes that Democrats eventually hope to knock down. As **immigration** advocates on both right and left have argued, defeating Trumpism there might signal to Republicans that a hardline position on **immigration** is a long term demographic and political loser for the party.

"If we're able to defeat Donald Trump in the state of SB 1070, that's going to give a long pause to others who want to follow in his footsteps," Scott says, adding that if Trump loses in Arizona, it will perhaps suggest that it is increasingly hard for Republicans with a hardline **immigration** position to succeed politically in Latino-heavy states. Indeed, arguably even if Clinton gets close in Arizona, it could be a harbinger of where things are going.

To be sure, it's going to be very hard to pull off a win, and might only be possible if Clinton has a great night on Election Day. Clinton's only hope for victory is probably to run up huge turnout among Latinos while also over-performing among GOP-leaning independents and Republican college educated whites, particularly women, many in the suburbs around Phoenix and Tucson. In this sense, the story in Arizona mirrors the demographic dynamics in the national election.

George Khalaf, the head of Data Orbital, a Republican polling firm based in Arizona, tells me he projects an electorate that will be around 41 percent Republican; 33 percent Democratic; and 26 percent independent. He thinks that requires Clinton to win between 55 percent and 60 percent of independents, and over 10 percent of Republicans.

"It is definitely a possibility that she can peel off some suburban Republicans in Maricopa County," Khalaf tells me, but he thinks she is unlikely to get a big enough chunk of Republicans overall. He adds that a super-charged Latino turnout could perhaps shift the composition of the electorate a little further in her direction, but says he doubts it would make the basic math much less formidable for her.

But Democrats in the state view things differently. They expect an electorate that is more evenly divided -- one third Republican, one third Democratic, one third independent. They also say Latino registration is outpacing 2012.

Scott, the Clinton campaign's state director, says he expects Latinos to make up a larger share of the electorate than the 17 percent they comprised in 2012, in part because many younger Latinos have turned 18 in the interim and are being targeted to register. In an interesting twist, Scott also says that Trumpism is helping them win over college educated whites. "A lot of these typically moderate but reliably Republican folks are crossing over," Scott says. "These are the folks who are very pro-**immigration** reform."

A CNN poll today found Clinton trailing Trump by five in Arizona. FiveThirtyEight gives her only a 33 percent chance of winning there, and the Upshot puts her odds at 35 percent.

Still, Khalaf, the GOP strategist, tells me that he thinks Clinton might be able to get within two or three points, substantially better than Obama's decisive loss there to Mitt Romney in 2012. And if so, that could also signal where things are headed in the long term -- as Khalaf says, it "could be symbolic." He notes that the Clinton team really appears to be seriously contesting the state; indeed, he reports seeing Clinton ads running at two times or three times the frequency that Trump ads are.

"They're definitely playing here," Khalaf says.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There was something in the water in the Chena River in Fairbanks, Alaska. Two employees of the Alaskan Bureau of Land Management, Craig McCaa and Ryan Delaney, caught whatever it was on video. It was big. Maybe 12 or 15 feet long. The Bureau of Land Management posted the mysterious film to Facebookat the end of October.

"Our Fairbanks employees captured this strange 'thing,' swimming in the Chena River," the post read. Hashtag Wild Wednesday, it added.

The wildness continued beyond Wednesday. Perhaps it was the whiff of authority, coming from a government agency. Perhaps it was the proximity to Halloween. Perhaps it was fueled by the American love for cryptids — unsubstantiated mythological critters, like Bigfoot — and tabloid love for implausible characters — like Bat Boy or Hillary Clinton's adopted **alien** baby.

Perhaps it was the way the thing seemed to ripple through the water, with an aquatic slither not unlike a snake.

The thing gained a name in the comments section. And so the Alaskan Ice Monster was born.

It was a cousin of the Loch Ness monster, or maybe Nessie herself had slipped past **immigration**. It was the Chena Chomper, a sea monster, a massive sturgeon, a zombie salmon, a wayward shark, a scabby whale, a pet alligator dumped in the river, an icy moose hide, an arthropod of unusual size or a giant arctic crocodile. It was a "beavegator," whatever that was. If you looked closely, it had tentacles. And gills. Or an armored tail. But definitely tentacles.

The video was not altered, the bureau said on Facebook, except to add appropriately thematic music.

"It's strange thing. I don't know what I would have done if I had come by in a canoe or something," McCaa told Alaska Dispatch News last week. "But looking from it above on the University Avenue bridge I didn't feel too threatened."

In the end, the story turned out to be more yarn than tail.

Experts at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game chimed in. It was nothing biological, just junk. Specifically, the bureau said in a Facebook update Sunday, the thing was "frazil ice stuck to a rope that is probably caught on a bridge pier."

The natural phenomenon of frazil ice occurs during bursts of cold. Instead of forming a crust, the small and supercooled disks mix into flowing rivers and streams, giving the water a slushy appearance. There's ice, but no monster.

When the Alaskan agency employees returned to the scene on Oct. 31, the area had warmed, and the thing vanished along with the river ice and snow.

More from Morning Mix

Dakota Access: Obama says Army Corps is weighing whether to 'reroute' pipeline

Stanford sexual assault survivor named Glamour 'Woman of the Year'

Saudi college student in Wisconsin dies after assault

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Affordable? Hardly. "In response major insurers such as Aetna Inc. and UnitedHealth Group Inc. have pulled back from their sales of coverage under the law, leaving about 30% of counties with only one participating insurer. The Obama administration said last week premiums would increase by an average of 25% across the roughly three dozen states that use HealthCare.gov; in many states the market leader is raising rates by a far greater average."

**Immigration** exclusionists can hardly claim they lacked the chance to make their case. "With the exception of Iowa and maybe Ohio, it is hard to think of any swing state where Trump's anti-**immigration** rhetoric will provide a November boon for Republicans. It has, however, put them on track to lose four or more swing states. There is no doubt that Trumpism is pushing America's growing number of Latino voters ever more into the arms of Democrats."

It is hardly worth pointing out Congress would already be in session."Trump calls for special session of Congress to repeal ObamaCare." I doubt he could pass a sixth-grade civics test.

Democrats are hardly a shoe-in to win the Senate majority. "The Republicans' problem is that, unless they win the Nevada Senate race, they'll need to win at least four of the five tightest contests. That is possible, of course, but it is also very challenging, especially since Clinton is expected to carry three of those five states. [FBI Director James B.] Comey's letter to Capitol Hill gives GOP strategists reason for hope, and a race-by-race assessment of the competitive contests suggests that anything from a Democratic gain of as few as three to as many as eight seats is possible."

The battle for Mosul has hardly begun. "As Iraqi forces and Kurdish Peshmerga fighters advanced on Mosul, they retook small villages and towns and mostly bypassed pockets of Islamic State resistance. Now they face the grim possibility of street-to-street, house-to-house fighting, with the potential for some of the city's more than one million civilians getting caught in the crossfire."

It's hardly exciting, but it may be accurate: "If turnout patterns are similar to 2012 or prior years, Clinton should win by about the same margin that Obama won by in 2012. This is because we aren't seeing enough Romney voters switching to either Clinton or third party candidates to generate a double-digit victory for Clinton. Clinton was probably never leading by double digits, nor has she fallen as far as some recent polls suggest. The truth is more prosaic: Most voters knew how they were going to [vote] before the campaign began, real swings are rare and usually fairly small."

That's hardly the comparison he was shooting for. "The nation's leading law enforcement agency must preserve investigations from any taint of political motive or extralegal influence. So it may be especially painful to Mr. Comey that today, after his second sensational public statement on the F.B.I.'s investigation of Hillary Clinton's email, some critics and historians are comparing him to [J. Edgar] Hoover."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Myron Haughton was picked up by authorities, he was an illegal **immigrant** with three felony convictions. Yet the Maryland resident convinced an **immigration** judge last year that he was a changed man, a husband and father who should be granted permanent residency, not be deported.

So why is he still behind bars?

That question places­ Haughton, of Silver Spring, in the thick of a debate playing out in courts across the country. He and more than 1,000 other **immigrants** in similar circum­stances say they should have a chance to return to their homes and families while fighting deportation.

The government — which is appealing the **immigration** judge's ruling in Haughton's case — firmly disagrees that he or any of the others deserves a bond hearing.

Recently, a U.S. district judge in Virginia sided with Haughton, 29, saying that his detention, already lasting more than a year, had become unreasonable and that he deserved a bond hearing. Although she was the first judge in Virginia to take that position in such a case, six of the nation's federal appeals courts have ­issued similar rulings.

The broader controversy could be resolved this term by the Supreme Court, which is scheduled to consider the case of California inmates contesting prolonged detention in such instances. A decision, assuming the high court can put together a majority, is eagerly awaited.

According to the American Civil Liberties Union, the cases­ of about 4,500 detainees nationwide have been pending for more than six months. The ACLUestimates that 5,000 to 10,000 **immigrants** are being held because of criminal histories. Many of them, like Haughton, face consequences that they and their supporters consider disproportionate to their transgressions.

"Myron Haughton is as American as any other American," his attorney, Alfred Robertson, said. "He deserves to be with his family. Although he's made mistakes in the past, he's already paid for those mistakes."

Haughton's childhood was marked by trauma. He was abused by his stepmother in Jamaica, according to court records, and by his mother after he came to Maryland, illegally, at the age of 11. When a teacher noticed his bruises, he was sent to live with an aunt. But two years later, the aunt returned him to his mother, and the abuse resumed.

At 16, Haughton ran away from home and began living on the streets of Silver Spring with a group of petty criminals who broke into cars and unoccupied homes. Haughton was arrested after a break-in committed soon after his 18th birthday. He briefly escaped juvenile detention by stealing a teacher's car keys and driving through a fence; then he pleaded guilty in 2006 to burglary and theft.

Haughton served 18 months of a five-year prison sentence and then was released on probation. He soon met Tatiana Barrow. She was raised in a Russian orphanage after being removed from her parents' home because of neglect, and she was adopted by U.S. citizens at age 15.

Barrow and Haughton have two children — Adelina and Ayden, now 6 and 4. Haughton took care of the children and worked odd jobs, limited by his lack of legal status. Court records show that he received traffic tickets over the years for driving without a valid license.

It was one such incident that sparked his current troubles. In December 2013, he was arrested in Virginia's Prince William County and charged with driving without a valid license. When **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) learned that he was in the country illegally, he was transferred to federal custody and slated for deportation.

Haughton was detained in the Arlington County jail until September 2014 as **immigration** officials struggled to put together the documents they needed to send him back to Jamaica. During that time, Barrow and Haughton were married. He was released under supervision for a year, until the paperwork was in order, and then he was taken back into custody in rural Farmville, Va. From jail, he applied for permanent residency through his wife, a U.S. citizen.

Barrow told an **immigration** court that because of the cost of day care, she had been living "paycheck to paycheck" since her husband's incarceration and had fallen months behind on her rent. She also said the separation caused the family emotional strain.

"Because we grew up — he grew up with abuse, I grew up in an orphanage — . . . we don't want this for our kids," she told the court.

In May, an **immigration** judge agreed that separating the family would cause "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" and granted Haughton permanent residency. The government appealed the decision. Haughton remained in custody but has asked a federal court for a bond hearing.

The Supreme Court ruled in 2003 that mandatory detention of noncitizens with certain criminal records is constitutional for "the brief period necessary for their removal proceedings." At issue now is whether the many months that **immigrants** are spending in detention centers meet that standard.

The government argues that Congress chose to make detention mandatory and that delays caused by a detainee's appeals should not be used to justify the detainee's release.

"It is a statistical certainty . . . that some of those criminal aliens will abscond and that some will commit further crimes that detention would have prevented," Solicitor General Donald B. Verrilli Jr. wrote in his brief to the Supreme Court.

A study by Syracuse University found that 14 percent of **immigration** detainees released on bond failed to return to court during fiscal 2015.

Advocates argue that the cases­ that last the longest are those in which the **immigrant** in question has the best chance of winning permanent residency — and thus is probably least deserving of indefinite detention.

"A large percentage are lawful green-card holders who committed a crime that ICE thinks might make them deportable," said César Cuauhtémoc García Hernández, a professor at the University of Denver's Sturm College of Law. "These are people who are fully incorporated into U.S. society. . . . It's hard to justify treating them differently because they're not citizens."

Haughton is not a green-card holder, and the government contends that his detention is not extraordinary or unwarranted. His continuing imprisonment is attributable to his own "belated decision to seek an adjustment of status," prosecutors argued in one court filing. ICE "vigorously disputes" the decision to grant him permanent residency, Assistant U.S. Attorney Lauren Wetzler wrote.

Yet U.S. District Judge Leonie M. Brinkema found that Haughton deserved a bond hearing, using a multi-part test as four federal appeals courts have done in similar cases. Advocates would rather see the Supreme Court adopt a standard applied by two other appellate courts and require bond hearings for all detainees after six months. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit, which includes Maryland and Virginia, is not one of those six appeals courts.

"It really is night and day with the kind of remedy and the kind of system you end up with," said Michael Tan, an **immigration** lawyer with the ACLU. In California, where the six-month rule applies, he said thousands have received hearings. In Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, where there is no firm time limit, only about two dozen **immigrants** have.

The Supreme Court could embrace one of the standards applied by the federal appeals courts, set yet another standard or rule that bond hearings are not required at all.

The justices could also decide whether the burden of proof in such a hearing would fall on the government or on the detainee, an issue that has divided lower courts. Prosecutors in Virginia are fighting Brinkema's decision to force the government to prove that Haughton is a flight risk or a danger.

Another question is what the court will make of the government's admission that the statistics it relied on in 2003 were wrong. The solicitor general had said that appealed cases take an average of 233 days to complete, or a little less than eight months. In fact, the office acknowledged in August that, on average, cases took 382 days, or more than a year.

In 2015, according to the Justice Department, the average case took 313 days, but that does not include the time a person spent in detention before filing or any post-decision court action.

Haughton is scheduled to get his bond hearing before an **immigration** judge on Wednesday, after 395 days in detention.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Venezuelan authorities stopped a Washington Post reporter at the Caracas airport late Monday night and denied him entry, in the latest case of blocking a foreign correspondent from covering the mounting political and economic turmoil in the South American country.

**Immigration** officials told Joshua Partlow, 38, a dual U.S.-Canadian national, that he lacked a required work visa. Partlow and many other foreign correspondents with non-U.S. passports had routinely visited Venezuela in the past without work visas.

Venezuela is mired in its worst recession in decades, and opposition groups have organized protests in recent weeks that have drawn hundreds of thousands of people. Another demonstration had been called for Thursday, although it was postponed late Tuesday.

Carlos Lauria, program director for the Americas at the New York-based Committee to Protect Journalists, said Venezuela adopted a regulation in 2004 requiring visiting correspondents to apply in advance for authorization from the Communications Ministry. But that has rarely been enforced in recent years.

"They are enforcing this selectively now, I think, because they don't want coverage of the protests," Lauria said in a telephone interview.

He said journalists from Spain, Peru and other countries have also been turned back at the Caracas airport in the past few weeks because they lacked authorization. The committee's own representative was also denied entry to the country in late August, with officials saying he lacked press credentials from Venezuela.

American journalists have also been prevented from working in Venezuela. In August, the Miami Herald reported that its correspondent, Jim Wyss, was detained by Venezuelan **immigration** authorities on arrival at the Caracas airport even though he had a valid journalist visa. An ABC News correspondent, Matt Gutman, was picked up by security forces last week while reporting on poor conditions at a hospital and ordered to leave the country, according to news reports.

Partlow, based in Mexico City, had entered Venezuela three times over the past year using his Canadian passport to cover developments in the country. On Monday night, he was instructed to stay in the Caracas airport and board the next flight to Miami, which left Tuesday morning.

"This is a moment when the world should be watching Venezuela, and the barring of a Washington Post journalist at such a key juncture is both arbitrary and outrageous," said The Post's foreign editor, Douglas Jehl.

A spokesman at the Communications Ministry said Tuesday that he did not know the details of Partlow's case. He said visiting correspondents were required to apply at least five days ahead of their trips for authorization from the ministry. Asked why officials had not previously enforced that requirement, he replied that "the ministry doesn't have power over that" and said **immigration** authorities applied the law. He said he was not authorized to provide his name.

Another Post correspondent, Nick Miroff, a U.S. citizen, has tried repeatedly in the past year to get a visa to report from Venezuela but has not received a response from authorities. Venezuela's government announced in February 2015 that it would require American visitors to get visas.

Lauria said that governments have the right to establish requirements for visiting journalists but that the committee was still waiting to see whether journalists would receive permission in a timely manner to report in Venezuela under its newly adopted practices.

Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro's popularity has shrunk amid an economic crisis that has caused widespread food shortages in the oil-rich country. The government is also under fire for marginalizing the political opposition, most recently by blocking a referendum to recall the president. The Vatican is coordinating talks between the government and opposition leaders in an effort to ease tensions.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In perhaps the most painful gaffe of his 2008 campaign, speaking to a group of donors in San Francisco, President Obama offered an infamous description of voters in postindustrial small towns in Pennsylvania and the Midwest: "They get bitter, they cling to guns or religion or antipathy to people who aren't like them or anti-**immigrant** sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to explain their frustrations."

President Obama was drawing on a common wisdom that had been making the rounds among pundits from David Brooks on the right to Thomas Frank on the left. According to this narrative, the frustration of Americans living in postindustrial heartland towns led them to ignore their economic interests and embrace the cultural conservatism offered by the GOP.

This narrative started with the stark red and blue maps of counties and congressional districts that began to appear every other November since 2000. The maps seemed to reveal "two Americas." Blue America, according to Brooks, was located "around big cities on the coasts," while people in Red America "tend to live on farms or in small towns or small cities far away from the coasts."

This understanding of the Democrats as the party of metropolitan America and the Republicans as the party of smaller postindustrial cities and towns is deeply ingrained in the American political discourse, and has shaped many analyses of the upcoming presidential election.

It is also completely wrong.

Despite his name, race and untoward comments about small-town America, Obama went on to win large majorities in exactly the small, overwhelmingly white postindustrial cities and towns that, according to mythology, are populated with Republicans.

Let us begin with some examples.

When Sarah Palin excoriated Obama's "bitter clinging" remarks in her convention speech in 2008, she drew attention to the contrast between San Francisco and Scranton, Pa. Yet Obama's vote share in Scranton a few months later was well above 70 percent — not much different from his vote share in San Francisco.

As can be seen in the map below, Scranton was not a fluke. Obama also won similar majorities in all of Pennsylvania's medium-sized industrial agglomerations, including Allentown, Bethlehem, Reading, Lancaster and York. He won smaller industrial towns such as Hazelton, Bloomsburg, Johnstown, Uniontown and Washington, just to name a few. In fact, it is difficult to find a Pennsylvania town with a substantial industrial history where Obama did not win a decisive majority.

When Obama chose a Midwestern industrial town to stage a "damage control" speech after his comments about small-town America, he chose Terre Haute, Ind. He went on to win by a majority approaching 70 percent. Again, Terre Haute is not unusual. The list of small Indiana towns with roots in early 19th-century industrialization is a list of Democratic strongholds: Anderson, Muncie, Richmond, Marion, Fort Wayne, Goshen, Kokomo and Evansville, to name only a few.

The maps reveal that the core downtown neighborhoods of industrial Indiana towns like Terre Haute are the same deep shade of blue as Indianapolis or Chicago.

The same is true for the industrial towns of Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin and well beyond. Along the shores of the Great Lakes, and along the places where rail lines or canals intersected and gave birth to industrial activity and towns in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Democrats win majorities today that are as comfortable as their majorities in big cities.

In collaboration with some colleagues, I have assembled a Web map from precinct-level election data that allows users to zoom in and out, focus in on specific towns or neighborhoods and superimpose census data on income and race, allowing readers to examine their own favorite postindustrial towns.

One of the most striking lessons from exploring these maps is that the red nonmetropolitan counties on election-night maps are internally heterogeneous, but always following the same spatial pattern: Democrats are clustered in town centers, along Main Street, and near the courthouses schools, and municipal buildings where workers are often unionized. They live along the old railroad tracks from the 19th century and in the apartment buildings and small houses in proximity to the mills and factories where workers were unionized in an earlier era.

In the graphs above, using the same Indiana towns displayed in the maps above, I plot the Democratic vote share against the distance of each precinct from the town's city hall. Within two or three miles of the town center in any direction, one finds strong — even overwhelming — Democratic majorities. Only as one moves away from Main Street and downtown does one begin to find majority-Republican precincts in the newer single-family houses on the edge of town.

Readers can use the Web map to zoom in on any of the Indiana or Pennsylvania towns mentioned above, or pick some postindustrial towns in Illinois, Michigan or Ohio, and see that these towns demonstrate the same pattern. Democrats dominate the 19th- and early 20th-century buildings around Main Street and give way to Republicans in the suburban single-family homes that were built decades later on the outskirts of town, often in proximity to the interstate and suburban-style shopping areas, and in the rural areas that lie beyond.

This pattern is strongest in the towns with the highest levels of early 20th-century industrialization and population growth, such as Terre Haute, Muncie and Fort Wayne, and somewhat weaker in less industrialized towns such as Marion, Ind.

In other words, the same political geography found in big cities is also on display in smaller postindustrial towns. There is a fascinating fractal-like relationship between population density — which is the upshot of early industrial activity — and Democratic voting. As one zooms in to lower and lower levels of geographic aggregation, the relationship only reappears in finer detail.

Just where did the myth of Republican-dominated industrial towns in the heartland come from? Part of the answer lies in the hopes of Republicans and the corresponding fears of Democrats that small towns in the Midwest will come to resemble many small towns in the Deep South, where elections have come to resemble racial head counts.

But perhaps more important, we have gazed for too long at election-night maps of counties or congressional districts that lacked sufficient granularity to differentiate between towns and their surrounding suburbs and rural peripheries. We also obsess over polls that lead us to assess categories like "low-education nonmetropolitan whites," blinding us to the difference between deep-blue Johnstown, Pa., for instance, and the red county of Cambria in which it is located.

The distinction between industrial towns and their surrounding rural peripheries is especially important in the 2016 presidential election. The Republican presidential candidate has adopted a nativist, anti-trade platform that seems explicitly tailored not only to white rural voters — who have been voting reliably Republican for years — but also to white voters in postindustrial towns who have been voting overwhelmingly Democratic for decades. This strategy is based on the notion that Obama's description of "anti-**immigrant**" and "anti-trade" sentiment among small-town voters was correct.

Given his difficulties among educated voters — especially women — in large metropolitan areas, victory for the Republican candidate seems to require a major transformation of the maps displayed above, such that deep-blue industrial towns begin to resemble their Republican rural surroundings.

In other words, the best hope for the Republicans in the 2016 presidential election is that Brooks was not so much wrong as prescient when describing a "red America" that includes the cities and towns of the heartland. Only time will tell, but this would require a rather extraordinary electoral transformation.

Jonathan Rodden is professor of political science and senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Although romance novels may be best known for fantasy and extravagance, they can also take on real-life issues, from the domestic to the political. This month, a single romance anthology shows how well the genre can speak to important matters in our past and present.

Daughters of a Nation, from authors Kianna Alexander, Alyssa Cole, Lena Hart and Piper Huguley, is a powerful, timely anthology of historical romance stories featuring black suffragettes. Each of the stories in this self-published book offers an important moment in American voting history and the brave women who fight tirelessly for change and win love in the balance.

Hart's "In the Morning Sun," set in the Reconstruction era, tells the story of Madeline Asher, who heads for Nebraska after a brutal attack, committed to teaching freed men to read and write and fight for the vote. She does not expect her long-lost love, Union veteran James Blakemore, to appear, scarred but alive. This is an emotional tale of an interracial couple separated by war and reunited in a battle of a different kind, changed but still perfect for each other — and strong enough to stand together in their passionate fight for civil rights.

The heroine of Huguley's "The Washerwomen's War" is Mary "Maime" Frances Harper, daughter of the real-life abolitionist and suffragette Frances Harper. Maime is fighting for rights and fair pay for black washerwomen in 1881 Georgia. She vows never to become a minister's wife — a vow she reaffirms after she re-connects with the handsome Rev. Gabriel Whitman, a man she has scorned once before and who now warns against her impassioned work to aid workers in their strike. Of course, heroines do not back down, and Gabriel soon finds Maime and her fearless advocacy irresistible. Huguley — a beloved voice in inspirational romance stories — paints a beautiful portrait of love, faith and politics.

"A Radiant Soul" by Alexander is set in 1881 North Carolina, where heroine Sarah Webster is visiting from the Wyoming Territory. In the West, Sarah was a vocal and public advocate for women's suffrage, a detail she keeps from her family and friends back east. At first glance it seems that she is the perfect match for Owen Markham, who is working with Sons of the Diaspora to enforce the 15th Amendment. The two are immediately drawn to each other and then are quickly at odds: Owen believes that the fight for women's suffrage distracts from the work of his organization. What ensues is a thoughtful look at politics and passion and the frustration that can arise when the two fail to coincide.

The stunning "Let Us Dream" is the capstone of the anthology — a meditation on gender, race, sex, **immigration** and bias that, despite being set in Harlem in 1917, easily echoes the political and social climate of today. Cole's heroine, cabaret owner Bertha Hines, is willing to do almost anything to ensure that the men of New York give women the right to vote, including using her cabaret to tempt them into doing the right thing. When she hires chef Amir Chowdhury, a Muslim Indian **immigrant** disillusioned with the American Dream, the two are soon working together to protect themselves and their future. Cole seamlessly layers powerful, relevant issues — feminism, race, sexual politics and social justice — with deft storytelling. Bertha and Amir are beautiful, brilliant people who are attracted to each other on all levels, which makes the romance sexy, smart and incredibly scintillating. "I love it when you talk unionizing and naturalization," Bertha says to Amir at one point. So will readers.

bookworld@washpost.com

Sarah MacLean reviews romance novels monthly for The Washington Post. Her most recent book is "A Scot in the Dark."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Wall Street Journal reports:

A group of 370 economists, including eight Nobel laureates in economics, have signed a letter warning against the election of Republican nominee Donald Trump, calling him a "dangerous, destructive choice" for the country. …

The letter, however, does not ridicule only Trump. The ideas the economists debunk have become popular on both the right and the left:

[Trump] has misled voters in states like Ohio and Michigan by asserting that the renegotiation of NAFTA or the imposition of tariffs on China would substantially increase employment in manufacturing. In fact, manufacturing's share of employment has been declining since the 1970s and is mostly related to automation, not trade.

Republicans used to reject trade know-nothingism; now it's an article of faith in a party given over to populism, nativism and self-delusion.

The economists have other complaints about Trump that apply equally to many others in the GOP: "He uses **immigration** as a red herring to mislead voters about issues of economic importance, such as the stagnation of wages for households with low levels of education. Several forces are responsible for this, but **immigration** appears to play only a modest role. Focusing the dialogue on this channel, rather than more substantive channels, such as automation, diverts the public debate to unproductive policy options." It also overlooks the key role of **immigrants** in innovation, job growth and reducing the debt (because most are young and therefore help pay for retirees).

And the economists rap Trump for being utterly unconcerned with the national debt. "He claims he will eliminate the fiscal deficit, but has proposed a plan that would decrease tax revenue by $2.6 to $5.9 trillion over the next decade according to the non-partisan Tax Foundation." That takes dead aim at a number of supply-side cranks who worship at the altar of marginal tax rates to the exclusion of virtually every other economic concern. Far too many "respectable" Republicans have cheered Trump's ridiculous tax plan.

In short, the economic gurus confirm what we've been arguing for years. It is not just Trump, but also the right as a whole that has too often resorted to "magical thinking and conspiracy theories over sober assessments of feasible economic policy options." In the right-wing media bubble, magical thinking becomes conventional wisdom. The line between charlatan and "respected Republican" gets erased. Too few people who know better are willing to challenge the mob. Let's face it: Trump never would have done as well as he did had not ground been eroded by non-facts, ignorance and wishful thinking.

There are genuine policy differences between the right and the left -- and within the right itself -- but those are distinct from well-established economic realities (e.g. tax cuts do not pay for themselves; legal **immigration** is important for our sustained growth and technological advantage). If the right wants to recover from Trump, it first has to discard the nonsense on which he based his campaign.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump has focused much of his White House bid on border security, asserting **immigrants** are entering the United States at a "record pace " and having "anchor babies" to stay on American soil.  Evidence supports neither of those points.

The estimated number of unauthorized **immigrants** here hasn't budged since 2009 (and has actually dropped since 2007). Giving birth, meanwhile, doesn't create a fast-track to citizenship. Over the last seven years, the country has deported more than a half-million parents of American kids.

But throughout his campaign, Trump has suggested the law creates incentives for foreigners to give birth in U.S. hospitals.  "Someone could be pregnant for nine months, come across the border, have the baby, and now it's ours and we have to take care of that baby forever," he said last year in Dallas .

In a 2015 interview with Fox News host Bill O'Reilly, Trump argued that so-called "anchor babies," a term widely viewed as derogatory, shouldn't receive legal protection. "We have to start a process where we take back our country," he said. "Our country is going to hell."

What the Republican nominee sees as an urgent problem, though, is actually on the decline. About 275,000 babies were born to unauthorized parents here in 2014, or about 7 percent of the 4 million U.S. births that year, according to an analysis of the latest data from the Pew Research Center . That's a drop from 295,000 in 2013 and a plummet from 330,000 in 2009.

The Constitution's 14th Amendment grants automatic citizenship to anyone born in the United States. In recent years, some Republican politicians, including Trump and Jeb Bush, have challenged the 148-year-old rule, arguing it attracts illegal **immigration**. (Fifty-seven percent of Americans disagree with that idea, Pew found, while 39 percent favored ending the birthright measure.)

While doctors in border towns confirm that some women come to the United States to give birth in a more stable environment , the story of **immigrant** fertility is more complicated than what any political rhetoric covers.  Roughly 11 million undocumented **immigrants** live in the United States, constituting 4 percent of the population.

They "accounted for a higher share of births because the **immigrant** population overall (lawful and unauthorized) includes a higher share of women in their childbearing years," the Pew authors wrote, "and hashigher birthrates than the overall U.S. population."

More on Wonkblog:

Why American women are having fewer babies than ever

The economics of having your baby at home

After Planned Parenthood closures, poor women started having more babies

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Billionaire tech investor Peter Thiel reiterated his support for Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump Monday morning, telling a room of journalists that a Washington outsider in the White House would recalibrate lawmakers who have lost touch with the struggles of most Americans.

Thiel said it was "both insane and somehow inevitable" that political leaders would expect this presidential election to be a contest between "political dynasties" that have shepherded the country into two major financial crises: the tech bubble burst in the early 2000s, and the housing crisis and economic recession later that decade.

The support Trump has enjoyed is directly tied to the frustration many across the country feel toward Washington and its entrenched leaders, and they shouldn't expect that sentiment to dissipate regardless of whether Trump or Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton wins at the ballot box on Nov. 8, he said.

"What Trump represents isn't crazy and it's not going away," he said.

Thiel was clear Monday, as he has said in the past, that he does not support all of Trump's actions and words. In particular, he called the "Access Hollywood" tape in which Trump made remarks about unwanted sexual advances on women "clearly offensive and inappropriate." He said he didn't support Trump's words about Muslims "in every incidence."

But Thiel also criticized the media's coverage of Trump's bombastic remarks. He said that while the media takes Trump's remarks "literally" but not "seriously," he believes Trump supporters take them seriously but not literally. In short, Trump isn't actually going to impose religious tests on **immigrants** or build a wall along the Mexican border, as he has repeatedly said, but will simply pursue "saner, more sensible" **immigration** policies.

"His larger-than-life persona attracts a lot of attention. Nobody would suggest that Donald Trump is a humble man. But the big things he's right about amount to a much needed dose of humility in our politics," Thiel said.

While the Silicon Valley tech corridor and suburbs around Washington have thrived in the last decade or more, many other parts of the country have been gutted by economic and trade policies that closed manufacturing plants and shipped jobs overseas, Thiel said, reiterating a previous talking point.

[What Peter Thiel says Silicon Valley gets wrong about America]

"Most Americans don't live by the Beltway or the San Francisco Bay. Most Americans haven't been part of that prosperity," Thiel said Monday. "It shouldn't be surprising to see people vote for Bernie Sanders or for Donald Trump, who is the only outsider left in the race."

Thiel later said he had hoped the presidential race might come down to Sanders and Trump, two outsiders with distinct views on the root cause of the nation's economic malaise and the best course of action to fix it. "That would have been a very different sort of debate," he said.

Thiel's prepared remarks seemed more of an admonishment of the state of the country today than a ringing endorsement of Trump's persona and policies. He decried high medical costs and the lack of savings baby boomers have on hand. He said millennials are burdened by soaring tuition costs and a poor outlook on the future. Meanwhile, he said, the federal government has wasted trillions of dollars fighting wars in Africa and the Middle East that have yet to be won.

Trump is the only candidate who shares his view that the country's problems are substantial and need drastic change to be repaired, Thiel said. Clinton, on the other hand, does not see a need for a hard reset on some of the country's policies and would likely lead the U.S. into additional costly conflicts abroad, he said.

A self-described libertarian, Thiel amassed his fortune as the co-founder of digital payment company PayPal and data analytics firm Palantir Technologies. He has continued to add to that wealth through venture capital investments in companies that include Facebook, Airbnb, Lyft and Spotify, among many others.

Thiel offered a full-throated endorsement of Trump at the Republican National Convention in July. During a six-minute prime-time speech, Thiel told millions of television viewers to disregard social issues that "distract" from the flagging U.S. economy and government's lack of innovation, which he described as more pressing concerns. "[Trump] is a builder, and it is time to rebuild America," Thiel said at the time.

He backed up that support earlier this month with a $1.25 million donation to political groups supporting Trump, putting Thiel among the largest single donors to the Republican nominee. In August 2015, Thiel gave $2 million to then-Republication candidate and fellow tech executive Carly Fiorina.

To call Thiel an anomaly in liberal-leaning Silicon Valley would be an understatement. Tech executives there have voiced ardent support for and opened their wallets to Clinton, including names like Apple CEO Tim Cook, Facebook COO Sheryl Sandberg and Google Chairman Eric Schmidt.

Facebook co-founder Dustin Moskovitz and his wife, Cari Tuna, pledged a staggering $20 million to political groups aligned with Clinton in September. Once fully allocated, the contribution will put the pair among the top political donors for the entire election cycle.

An open letter signed by 150 tech executives this summer stated plainly that "Trump would be a disaster for innovation," at least in part because of what they called anti-**immigrant** policies. Many of the tech industry's biggest companies were started by **immigrants**, including Thiel, whose family moved to the U.S. from Germany when he was an infant.

Thiel said he "didn't think there was going to be this sort of visceral reaction" in Silicon Valley to his support for Trump, saying that his past embrace of fringe ideas in business and technology were better received than political views similar to those of "half" the country.

"This is the first time I've done something that's actually conventional," Thiel said. "It's the first time I've done something big in my life that is just what half the country believes in and it's been the most controversial thing ever."

Thiel's remarks took place at the National Press Club in Washington, perhaps an odd choice of venue for a businessman whose relationship with the media is somewhat tenuous. The billionaire secretly bankrolled wrestler Hulk Hogan's invasion of privacy lawsuit against Gawker Media, which Thiel called a "sociopathic bully" during Monday's talk.

The lawsuit and resulting judgement helped push the company to bankruptcy earlier this year as retribution for a 2007 blog post that publicly outed Thiel as gay. The case caused much consternation in journalism circles about the ability of a wealthy man with a vendetta to take down a news outlet. Thiel said the circumstances of the Gawker case — a sex tape published without Hogan's consent — are unique and that he doesn't expect other wealthy individuals to follow his lead.

"Wealthy people shouldn't do that. I think if they tried they won't succeed," Thiel said.

Read more from The Washington Post's Innovations section.

Peter Thiel: U.S. innovation in 'staggering decline' and Donald Trump will rebuild it

Why this Facebook co-founder is donating big money to Hillary Clinton

Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton took to the debate stage and made sweet, sweet music

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Twice on Sunday, Donald Trump told audiences at rallies that electing Hillary Clinton risked a truly spectacular shift in the composition of the United States.

"When you're working for Hillary, she wants to let people just pour in. You could have 650 million people pour in and we do nothing about it," Trump said. "Think of it. That's what could happen. You triple the size of our country in a week."

Well, no. For a lot of reasons.

Before we get into the important question of the mechanics of having 650 million people roll up to enter the United States, an exercise that will hopefully make clear just how hyperbolic this particular schmear of hyperbole happens to be, let's stop and consider the comment. Donald Trump uses hyperbole the way some politicians use touching voter anecdotes — to reinforce a broader political point. He says completely outrageous and completely untrue things because he feels as though they bolster his broader point: **Immigrants** are risky. Is it true? Not the point. The point is oh no, **immigrants**.

This particular claim turns his normal **immigration** hand-wringing upside down. Usually he wants to curtail new **immigration** because, in his formulation, scattered among the some-of-them-who-are-good-people are a number of ne'er-do-wells who bring drugs and commit crimes and are adherents of the Islamic State. He's repeatedly pledged that "the good ones" could leave the country and come back, as a sop to those who criticize him for rejecting new **immigrants**out of hand. The "650 million" claim is a warning about having too many "good ones." It's a parent's warning about taking it easy on your Halloween candy, except the warning is that if you eat all your candy in one night and all the leftover candy in the house and also eat all of the candy collected by every kid in the tri-state area and also have a fudge IV inserted overnight, you will get sick.

So: 650 million people! That's a lot.

The population of the planet is about 7.1 billion, meaning that Trump figures one out of every 10 citizens of the world wants to live here for some reason. (About 319 million already do.) The United States would jump from the third-most populous country to ... the third-most populous. (China and India are very big.)

Where would those people come from? If literally every person in South America suddenly decided that Reno was a more appealing place to live than Rio, we could see 422 million people slowly make their way up to the United States. Add in everyone from Central America and we're at nearly 600 million. If every Canadian decided to move south, we hit 633 million, still a bit short. If every non-American in the Western Hemisphere decided to move to the United States, we'd be talking about 677 million people.

Let's assume that most of the new **immigrants** Trump is warning about are coming from Central and South America. (He seems less concerned about Canadian **immigration**, downplaying the need for a wall that the Trudeau administration would pay for.) That means they can simply pack up cars or trucks with their belongings and head on in. After all, Trump's argument is that the Clinton administration would welcome them; there's no need to trudge through the Arizona desert to enter the United States if you're allowed to come in.

The Department of Transportation has data on the number of border crossings each month. In July, 12.7 million people crossed the Southern border in personal vehicles or in buses. Six million crossed the border in Texas; 4.9 million in California and 1.5 million in Arizona. So far this year, 83 million people have crossed the border with Mexico.

Trump sort of paints himself into a corner with the "in a week" part of his comment. If we're assuming that all 600 million people from Central and South America want to relocate to the United States in a week, it would mean that each of the 25 busiest border crossings with Mexico would need to operate at 44 times the weekly capacity during July of the crossing in San Ysidro, Calif., the crossing that currently handles the most traffic. All moving in one direction, mind you; the Border Patrol would probably need to put the kibosh on anyone wanting to head south during that week. Or, of course, people could rent all-terrain vehicles and head across the border willy-nilly. With that backlog at the border crossing, it would be tempting to skip the wait. And this only accommodates 600 million people.

How many cars are we talking about? Let's assume that we squeeze four people and their belongings into each car. (That's higher than the average crossing the border; in July, most crossings had an average of two people in each passenger vehicle.) The most popular car in Brazil is the Fiat Palio, each of which is at least 12 feet long.

The line of Palios carting all of the new **immigrants** into the United States would therefore be 1.8 billion feet long, enough to stretch around the Earth 86 times. If each car started in Panama City, Panama, it would mean 106 lanes of traffic heading up to El Paso, with no room between the cars' bumpers from the Texas border to the Panamanian capital.

If everyone in Central America, South America and Canada came to the United States, 17 million more would have to come from somewhere else, meaning that they'd have to either fly or take a boat. (Of course, a lot of the 600-plus million who came from Central and South America would skip the thousands-of-miles-long line of cheap Italian compacts and fly or sail themselves.) The busiest airport in the country is in Atlanta, where just under 2 million people flew in and out in an average week in 2015. So we'd need nine airports to handle an equivalent capacity in this mega-week of **immigration**, just to accommodate those 17 million extra people.

If more of those new **immigrants** to the United States wanted to fly here, we've got a bit of a problem. The top 45 busiest airports in 2014 handled an average of 24.8 million people a week in 2014. If each of them somehow magically were able to deal with 10 times their normal influx of passengers — allowing flights at all hours and allowing planes to land in much closer sequence, say — we'd hit less than half of the one-week **immigration** total that Trump foresees.

**Immigrants** hoping to come by boat have a few options. If they're coming from Cuba, say, any number of boats might work. If they're coming from Europe, Africa or Asia, they need something a bit more robust. The largest cruise liner in the world is the Harmony of the Seas, which carries 5,500 passengers in luxurious comfort. If those 17 million people wanted to cross the ocean on a fleet of Harmony of the Seases, we'd need 3,090 of them. If my math is right, they'd displace a collective volume of about 100,000,000 liters of water (assuming a weight of 71,500 tons apiece). The good news is that the oceans are large enough to handle the slight rise in ocean level that would result.

Once all of these **immigrants** arrive that week, there would be a lot of ancillary problems. Traffic coming away from the borders and airports would be a mess for a long time. There were about 2.2 million rental cars in the United States in 2015; it's safe to assume that many rental car companies would be out of inventory for a while.

Another complication is housing. The Census Bureau estimates that there are currently 17 million vacant housing units in the country, meaning that the new **immigrants** would have to squeeze 38-to-a-home on average. We can offset that a bit by filling up each of the 5 million hotel rooms in the country. But that only helps a little.

I guess what I'm trying to say is that even if Hillary Clinton wanted to allow a tenth of the world to move to the United States, which she doesn't, it couldn't really happen, even if you gave her more than a week to get the job done.

It's almost like ... maybe ... Donald Trump just says things for effect sometimes?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It might seem as if the United States' allies, from Mexico to Britain to Japan, are holding their breath while not-so-silently praying that Donald Trump does not become president. They've been watching Trump's campaign "with disbelief, a good portion of dismay and distinctly growing apprehension," as Sweden's former foreign minister and Post columnist Carl Bildt put it.

That's true — but not entirely so. There are, in fact, a number of important U.S. allies, in and outside NATO, who either openly or quietly are rooting for Trump to win. They offer a road map of some of the trouble a Clinton administration would face as it tried to rebuild U.S. leadership in Europe, the Middle East and Asia.

Let's start with the two NATO heads who have publicly endorsed Trump: President Milos Zeman of the Czech Republic and Prime Minister Viktor Orban of Hungary. Zeman, an admirer of Vladi­mir Putin, holds a mostly ceremonial position, and the Czech government disagrees with him. But Orban is the leader of a powerful political current in Central Europe: nationalistic, xenophobic and autocratically minded. He gave a speech praising Trump for, among other things, favoring a halt in Muslim **immigration** and opposing "the policy of exporting democracy."

Orban is a role model for Slovakian Prime Minister Robert Fico, known for declaring that "Islam has no place in Slovakia ," and Poland's de facto leader, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, whose party has been accused by the European Union of dismantling democratic checks and balances.

Earlier this year Kaczynski and Orban plunged into a public feud with Bill Clinton after the former president undiplomatically but accurately remarked that Poland and Hungary "have now decided this democracy is too much trouble." Orban responded by saying that Clinton, like "the leaders of the Democratic Party," was the pawn of a "shadow empire" controlled by George Soros, the Jewish U.S. financier who was born in Hungary. For his part, Kaczynski suggested Clinton needed a mental-health examination.

Imagine Hillary Clinton's first NATO summit: She could find herself seated between a statesman whose boss called her husband mentally ill and one who believes that the Democratic Party is controlled by a Jewish cabal. Kaczynski meanwhile will be expecting Clinton to deliver on plans to station U.S. troops and missile defenses in Poland, regardless of his insults to the former president, or to Polish democracy.

He might have asked Benjamin Netanyahu what happens when a foreign leader takes sides in a U.S. presidential election. After making obvious his support for Mitt Romney in 2012, the Israeli prime minister found himself a perennial target for leaks and insults from the Obama White House, especially during his own reelection race.

This year Netanyahu has been conspicuously silent. But sources say he's inclined to agree with the right-wing media close to his Likud party that have tilted in Trump's favor. True, Trump has made anti-Semitic statements and attracted a neo-Nazi following. But he's far less likely to pressure Netanyahu about Palestinian statehood than Clinton, who once called the Israeli leader to deliver a blunt chewing-out over the expansion of a Jewish neighborhood near Jerusalem.

Even more partial to Trump is Egyptian President Abdel Fattah al-Sissi. The dictator met both candidates in New York last month: While Clinton brought up his human rights record and called for the release of an imprisoned U.S. citizen, Trump offered unqualified support. So never mind Trump's hostility to Islam or plans to restrict Muslim **immigration**; the Sissi regime is pulling for him. So is Turkish strongman Recep Tayyip Erdogan, another NATO ally, who, as the Wall Street Journal's Yaroslav Trofimov reported, likes Trump's tolerance for his mass repression of opponents following a coup attempt.

There are some common themes here. The less committed a U.S. ally is to liberal democracy, and the more hostile to **immigrants**, the more likely its government is to favor Trump. Allies uncomfortable with subtlety in U.S. diplomacy — whether it is support for human rights in pro-U.S. dictatorships, or a Palestinian state, or outreach to Iran — tend to see Trump as refreshingly one-sided. The ranks of the horrified are mostly restricted to Western Europe and northeast Asia — though Latin Americans, who have endured the destructive populism pioneered by Hugo Chávez, tend to see Trump as a U.S. version of that pestilence.

In short, there is a constituency in the world for Trump's brand of U.S. chauvinist nationalism, even if its slogan is "America First." Not a few traditional American friends would welcome a U.S. administration that ignores human rights, favors curtailing global movements of people and capital, and divides friends and enemies into unambiguous camps. If Trump loses, Orban, Sissi and their like may lose some momentum, but they will still be out there. Clinton will need a strategy for managing them.

Twitter:@jacksondiehl

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**How is Donald Trump's presidential campaign like the Brexit vote last June in which British voters decided to leave the European Union?

In many, many ways, as commentators have noted.

Both are right-wing populist movements that have beaten expectations. Both Trump and Brexit leaders have drawn support from largely white, older, "left-behind" voters unhappy with the political establishment. **Immigration** has been a big issue on both sides of the Atlantic. And although there are important differences — one being that Trump appears unlikely to prevail on Election Day — Trump went so far as to call himself "Mr. Brexit" over the summer.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/05/heres-what-plato-had-to-say-about-someone-like-donald-trump/"]Here's[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/05/heres-what-plato-had-to-say-about-someone-like-donald-trump/"]Here's] what Plato had to say about someone like Donald Trump[/interstitial\_link]

But here's a similarity that few have noticed: In advance of the poll, both campaigns have claimed that the votes would be riddled with flaws. Their supporters also planned to intervene in the electoral process and stop the "fraud."

The Brexiteers warned that the referendum would be rigged and that ineligible **immigrants** would vote

Trump has been claiming, without evidence, that the vote will be rigged against him and has called on his supporters to monitor the polls. Several Brexit campaigners did the same — including United Kingdom Independence Party leader Nigel Farage, now a Trump supporter.

Such tactics weren't new for Farage's team, which alleged fraud when he lost his 2015 race for a seat in Parliament from Thanet South.

As the Brexit referendum approached, Farage was keen to point out that ineligible "E.U. migrants" were being sent poll cards.

There was then an organized Brexiteer campaign to have voters take their own pens to the polling stations. If citizens used the pencil provided by electoral officials, they warned, their votes could be rubbed out and changed. The hashtag #Pencilgate was born. One poll found that more than half of "Leave" voters thought that the referendum would be rigged.

More was to follow. Just as the polls closed and before the result was known, Farage argued that the government's late extension of the voter registration deadline had "got 2 million voters ... [and] tipped the balance" in favor of the "Remain" campaign. The extension occurred because the government's central electoral registration website crashed just before the original deadline. Last-minute legislation added 48 hours to the deadline.

But we found no evidence of electoral irregularities

Trump's claims about U.S. voter fraud have been repeatedly exposed as baseless. Similarly, my recent research with Alistair Clark show that this type of voting irregularity are scarcely a problem Britain's referendum. The problems with the electoral machinery lie elsewhere.

At last year's general election, we surveyed poll workers about the challenges they faced running the election. Poll workers at British elections are mostly a mix of local government employees and civic-minded volunteers, often retired, who are paid a small fee for the day.

They reported that a common challenge was unregistered voters showing up at the polls, expecting to vote. Two-thirds of polling stations turned away at least one citizen, presumably because they were missing from the electoral register. Millions of people are missing from the electoral register in Britain, as a U.K. parliamentary group has pointed out. But fewer than 1 percent of poll workers suspected electoral fraud might have taken place in their polling station (see Table 2 of the chapter).

During the Brexit referendum, we conducted a second study in which we surveyed and interviewed middle-management electoral officials. The research was published in an independent report, conducted for and funded by the Electoral Commission, the organization charged with overseeing the referendum.

All told, 382 independent nonpartisan local organizations were involved in delivering the survey. That made a coordinated conspiracy in their replies implausible. Respondents were ensured that their responses would be confidential so that concerns could be raised, if they were held. While no method is perfect, the data provided the most systematic picture yet of the quality of the British electoral machinery.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/25/how-will-trump-supporters-react-if-he-loses/"]How[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/25/how-will-trump-supporters-react-if-he-loses/"]How] will Trump supporters react if he loses?[/interstitial\_link]

Again, few mentioned electoral fraud as a problem. Some inexperienced election agents needed to be educated about the "dos" and "don'ts." #Pencilgate was only a challenge when voters threw pens, as they did at some polling officials. But few suspected voter fraud by mail, electoral fraud or voters impersonating someone else in order to vote more than once.

Many electoral officials, by contrast, were concerned about the capacity of their teams to ensure that legitimate citizens were able to vote. They faced a public confused about whether they were already registered and were bogged down by large number of duplicate applications (see tables 1 and 2 of the report). Legitimate would-be voters were again turned away from the polls (Table 10), sometimes because they had been removed as a result of recent government reforms to "clean up" the register and prevent electoral fraud.

Most said that they didn't have enough funds to undertake core tasks (see Table 7 of the report). These are problems which are often reported in the United States, too.

Baseless claims of voter fraud have a long history

Trump, of course, is not the first American politician to invoke voter fraud for political ends. U.S. history is steeped with politicians claiming widespread election fraud to justify measures that might keep voters who lean toward the other party away from the polls.

Indeed, the Brexiteers may well have been aware of this tradition when employing their own tactics earlier in the year.

On Nov. 8, don't be surprised if Trump supporters borrow the Brexit strategy of using hashtags to warn of voting irregularities that don't actually exist.

Toby S. James is a senior lecturer at the University of East Anglia. He is currently writing "Comparative Electoral Management" (Routledge) and is the author of "Elite Statecraft and Electoral Administration" (Palgrave, 2012). He runs the academic research website www.electoralmanagement.com[http://www.electoralmanagement.com].

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I normally see my therapist, Mario, every week. Over the years, he's become like a big brother to me, the kind of mensch who looks out for you, listens, remembers every detail, gives you smart and sensitive feedback, and cares.

Perfect, right?

Well, it has been. Until late September turned into October. That's when the nightmare began: This psychotic, all-encompassing, toxic presidential election began driving me absolutely over-the-top crazy. It was more than Mario could handle in 50 minutes once a week.

The touchy issues being bandied about in newspapers, social media and personal conversations — particularly, **immigration** and minorities' and women's rights — sent me into hyper, unstoppable rants. (Admittedly, being home alone with a sinus infection, bronchitis and unlimited time spent in the company of CNNand MSNBC didn't help my outlook.) Political malaise gradually dominated our sessions, compelling me to request an extra weekly appointment until Nov. 9.

Are you beginning to see the real cost of this election? For me, it means paying my therapist double.

And I'm not alone in my angst.

An ABC News poll of likely voters found nearly half reported the election was a source of stress in their lives. And a survey for the American Psychological Association found many respondents felt the same way.

"We're seeing that it doesn't matter whether you're registered as a Democrat or Republican: U.S. adults say they are experiencing significant stress from the current election," Lynn Bufka, APA's associate executive director for practice research and policy, said in a statement.

And of course, Bufka said, all the political arguments you overhear or get into, the provocative or nasty comments on social media and the constant media bombardment only make it worse.

This is the psychological landscape that confronted me — and Mario. We are both **immigrants** and political refugees — I from Cuba, he from Argentina — so we understand each other based on shared background, identity and language.

Mario considers himself my "keeper" and is there for me through all my weeks' meshugas: career, love, health and the daily struggle of being an adult in the world.

But these past few weeks have been something else.

At the beginning of October, once my favorite month, I came down with what felt like the worst flu in the history of humanity: body aches, exhaustion, sore throat, coughing, laryngitis, fever, runny nose, migraines. My teeth hurt; every sound but the purr of my cat, Lilly, deafened me; and the smell of coffee made me sick. (That last one meant that whatever I had was Really Serious.)

I'm the creator of a beauty site, MoreLovely.me, and even sitting at my desk writing about fun things such as red lipstick, French cologne and lavender bath oil was impossible; it required sustained verticality.

This is what put me in front of the TV and into the initial stages of CNN commentator psychosis. Days passed, and my confined contagion consisted of sleep, Cream of Wheat, applesauce, tea, emails, texts from my mother telling me to hydrate, Facebook, feeding Lilly, TV news, more TV news and multiple phone sessions with Mario, who said to watch Comedy Central instead of the news. I was too far over the edge to listen.

What ailed me wasn't some mild form of free-floating election blues. No. This election and its coverage consumed me. It changed me physiologically. I'd watch and read the news and grind my teeth. I'd squeeze my hair. I'd drop my head into Lilly's belly and refuse to budge despite her literally sharp protests. Even my favorite TV commentator, Van Jones, couldn't make it better, and he is awesome.

Mario upped the anti-anxiety meds Ativan and Xanax, and added a short-term dose of the antidepressant Lexapro, and I continued to talk him and vent. A lot. I became artificially calmer and less depressed, but I was still politically possessed.

The aftermath of each debate, and then that appalling Al Smith dinner, sent me into psychic paroxysms. I'd spend every last of my 100 weekly therapeutic minutes in a Munchian position: that solitary, abstracted being, screaming alone on a lonely bridge.

Certain words, phrases and names sent me into Pavlovian freakouts: rigged, temperament, locker room, sue, access, Hollywood, "Access Hollywood," polls, down-ballot, Kellyanne, Billy, Rudy.

When I was able to go to Mario's office and our sessions' time was up, I'd drop into the patients' sofa like an exhausted, post-tantrum toddler.

And so I came to pay my therapist double to exorcise this political malignancy from my being so I could, you know, function.

Sort of.

Is that right? Is that fair? I didn't ask for this sicko election. It was foisted upon me. I am innocent. And I want my money back. I want both candidates to reimburse me for all that extra mileage, all those extra minutes and all those pricey pills.

Or maybe just Huma Abedin. I doubt her check would bounce.

I've been taking my prescriptions faithfully: cefdinir 300 mg (for the bacteria); promethazine-codeine syrup (for the cough); and Ativan 0.5 mg., Xanax 0.25 and Lexapro 20 mg. (for the election). I take them all twice a day, except for the Lexapro, which is once a day. And thank goodness; I've gained almost 10 pounds since I started taking it. (Unfortunate Lexapro side effect.)

I'm slowly starting to feel better, though, and Mario says the weight will drop off once I vote and stop the Lexapro. Also, I turned off the TV. Silence is the best sound ever.

By next weekend, I'll bet I'll love coffee again and have the energy to shave my hairy legs and write about fancy beauty products.

And if I start getting pyscho election coverage flashbacks when I go vote on Nov. 8 or have the urge to discuss politics with Van on Twitter, I'm resistant. An Ativan refill awaits.

health-science@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Action in Community Through Service food pantry needs volunteers to stock shelves, prepare food bags and make grocery store pickups either on a regular schedule (flexible) or on an on-call basis. To complete an online application, visit actspwc.org.

ACTS Helpline needs volunteers to answer a suicide-prevention hotline. 703-221-1144.

American Association for the Advancement of Science needs scientists, engineers, mathematicians and physicians to assist K-12 STEM teachers. Victor Crawford, 703-732-9004. vicris51@verizon.net.

American Cancer Society's Road to Recovery needs drivers to take patients to appointments. 804-527-3719. leah.seldinsommer@cancer.org.

Beacon for Adult Literacy trains people to help adults with literacy and English-speaking skills. 703-368-7491. beaconliteracy.org.

BEAT Cancer Coalition needs drivers 55 and older to take patients to appointments. Retired and senior volunteer program. 703-369-5292.

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Washington-Manassas needs volunteers. bgcgw.org/prince-william.

Catholic Charities Hogar **Immigrant** Services needs teachers for its English as a second language and citizenship classes. Training provided. 571-208-1572. volunteer.hogar@ccda.net.

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children's Intervention Services, needs Spanish-speaking volunteers to visit children who have been abused and neglected. Ben Gimeno, 703-330-8145, bgimeno@casacis.org.

Discover Prince William and Manassas seeks tourism ambassadors at local events, festivals and a visitors center. jmcelwain@discoverpwm.com.

ESL and **Immigrant** Ministries trains volunteers to teach English to adults. 703-841-0292. office@eslim.org, eslim.org.

Friends of Feral Cats of PWC needs volunteers and donations of cat food. Call Nancy, 571-719-0657.

Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind needs volunteers to raise and train puppies. 866-282-8046. guidedog.org.

Habitat for Humanity needs help with projects, ReStore and providing lunch to volunteers. 703-369-6708. volunteer@ habitatpwc.org.

Historic Dumfries needs docents for the Weems-Botts Museum to help with events and research projects, gather and transcribe local oral histories, and work on other projects. 703-221-2218.

Keep Prince William Beautiful needs help with its storm-drain program and educational outreach. 571-285-3772. kpwb.org.

Literacy Volunteers of Prince William needs adults to help adult students improve their literacy skills. Training provided. 703-670-5702. lvapw.org.

Mutt Love Rescue needs foster homes for rescued dogs. 703-577-0106. adopt@muttloverescue.org, muttloverescue.org.

Northern Virginia Family Service seeks foster parents. 571-748-2500.

Occoquan needs volunteers for events throughout the year, including the annual arts and crafts shows. Donna Brown, 703-491-2168. dbrown@occoquanva.gov.

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Mondays through Fridays. 703-792-4583.

Prince William Area Free Clinic needs volunteer doctors, pharmacists, physician assistants, nurses, translators and administrative assistants for the Unified Health Center in Woodbridge. 703-496-9403. pwafc.org .

Prince William Cooperative Extension Program needs facilitators for the Parent Education Program's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting groups. Training provided. Janice Brody, 703-792-4678. jbrody@pwcgov.org.

Prince William County Historic Preservation Division needs tour guides and assistance with special events, educational programs and gardening. 703-792-4754. historicpreservation@pwcgov.org .

Prince William Health District seeks volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community health experience necessary. Training provided. Contact Valda Wisdom Brown, valda.wisdombrown@vdh.virginia.gov.

Prince William Trails and Streams Coalition needs volunteers to help build and maintain trails in the county. 703-791-6158. pwtsc.org.

Project Mend-a-House needs help for home-safety repairs. 703-792-7663. lizw@pmahweb.org.

Reset seeks volunteers to lead elementary and preschool students in science and math learning. John Meagher, 703-250-0236. reset@resetonline.org, resetonline.org .

Serve needs drivers for its food-recovery program at its food distribution center, as well as a bilingual (Spanish and English) food-assistance client-intake specialist. Navara Cannon, 571-748-2536, ncannon@nvfs.org.

St. Paul United Methodist Church needs bus drivers on Thursdays to take people to and from a community dinner. Drivers must have a class C license with a P endorsement. 703-494-2445.

Wildlife Rescue League needs hotline volunteers, wildlife transporters and rehabilitators. Training provided. 703-391-8625. volcoord@wildliferescueleague.org.

— Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Angry Trump kept coming back.

Alexandra Avila's work computer usually displayed a smiling picture of her daughter. But when she logged in one morning last summer, she was greeted by a "belligerent looking picture of Donald Trump," a lawsuit says.

Again and again, she switched the desktop back to her daughter's photo. But two co-workers got an IT employee to break into Avila's computer to re-upload a sneering, pointing picture of Trump, according to the lawsuit.

"One co-worker told Alexandra that Mr. Trump was saying 'F-- you!' specifically to her," the lawsuit says.

The harassment only got worse for Avila, who was born in the United States and is of Mexican descent.

The people Avila worked with at Sedgwick Claims Management Services in Iowa bombarded her with racist memes, embarrassing her on group chats of more than a dozen people, the suit says.

One pictured a Hispanic man in an oversized sombrero. "No books," it said. "Only Manuels."

Avila's co-workers signed her up to volunteer for Trump's campaign, according to her lawsuit.

Once, a supervisor asked the team to vote on what food they wanted for a congratulatory potluck.

"Alex can't vote," a co-worker replied. "She's an illegal **immigrant**."

Avila started working in 2012 for Sedgwick Claims Management Services, which administers employee benefit programs for other companies. "At Sedgwick," the Memphis-based company likes to note, "caring counts."

Sedgwick employs 14,000 people in about 275 offices in the United States, Canada, the U.K. and Ireland, according to company literature.

Avila worked in Sedgwick's Iowa office, in Johnson County, where less than 6 percent of people identify as Hispanic, according to census data. Every day, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Avila handled family leave requests for Walmart employees.

She was fired by the company last November.

Her harassment and discrimination lawsuit was filed Monday and names her company and two former supervisors as defendants.

The supervisors did not respond to requests for comment.

Sedgwick Claims Management Services said in a statement sent to The Washington Post that "we are aware that a suit has been filed by Alexandra Avila, a former colleague in our Coralville, Iowa, office. Prior to her dismissal for cause in 2015, Ms. Avila never reported any such activity to management or our colleague resource team. Sedgwick consistently maintains fair employment and workplace harassment practices, and we are confident the facts will prove Ms. Avila's case has no merit.

"Our company fosters a diverse, inclusive workplace in which all colleagues are encouraged to achieve their full potential; this is the foundation of our success."

Avila's alleged workplace troubles paralleled Donald Trump's political rise: According to the lawsuit, the harassment started in earnest after Trump announced he was running for president in June 2015.

During a speech declaring his candidacy, he made incendiary comments about Mexicans and **immigration**.

"When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best," the man who would become the Republican nominee for president said. " ... They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people."

As the Associated Press noted, Trump's rhetoric has contributed to racial tensions across the country.

"Build a wall" chants have been used by high school students to taunt Latino opponents at sporting events in multiple states, including Iowa, Wisconsin and Indiana, the AP noted.

"With the political climate the way that it is, it's a little more charged," said the principal of the Iowa school whose players were taunted. Dan Marburger, the principal at Perry High, told CNN that some of his students, at a school with an usually high percentage of minorities for that part of the state, feel that "this inflamed rhetoric is happening and it's okay. No one is stopping it. They see it in a presidential campaign and now it's okay for everyone to say this. It's almost a sense that you feel that you don't belong in your own country."

The only Hispanic person on her team of about a dozen, Avila was born in California and moved to Iowa as a child, her attorney said.

Trump's comments about Mexicans bothered Avila, and she confided in her co-workers, according to the lawsuit.

"Alexandra's coworkers knew she was upset by Mr. Trump's bigoted remarks, so they needled her about them," the lawsuit says.

The ensuing harassment took all forms — a snide illegal **immigrant** comment here, a dancing Trump GIF there, according to the lawsuit.

Avila told supervisors about the comments and messages, but they did not take action, the lawsuit says. Sometimes, they laughed too.

"It just kept getting worse and worse," Avila's attorney, Paige Fiedler, told The Washington Post. "She tried to pretend that these things weren't bothering her for a while because she had to work with these people. She's not someone who likes to make waves. … Until she got fired, I don't think she ever would have gone and complained outside the company."

The lawsuit says Avila was fired after a supervisor claimed she lied on timecards, although the suit says her supervisors' attitudes toward Hispanics factored into Avila's termination.

The lawsuit claims that she and other employees often worked overtime or through their unpaid lunch break and that a supervisor told them "to find a way to get all their work done and that they were not allowed to write down any overtime hours."

The 2015 meeting where Avila was fired marked the first time she had heard about the timecard issue, the lawsuit says.

She was terminated and escorted out of the building; her now-former employers said they would send her personal property to her home, the lawsuit says.

Even though she was fired, the harassment did not stop, Avila claims.

When the company mailed her a box with some of her belongings, a piece of paper was included that read: "Just call me La Trumpa."

On the back of the paper, someone had written: "Illegal **immigrants** can't vote or work. Good luck finding a job."

In January, the lawsuit alleges, Sedgwick employees "continued to harass Alexandra on her Facebook page — greeting her with 'Hola Alex' and inviting her to a rally to see Donald Trump, 'the next president of the United States.'"

In the lawsuit, which was filed Monday, Avila is suing for harassment and discrimination based on race and national origin. Her attorney said she is also entitled to damages for wage theft and emotional distress.

Fiedler said Avila sobbed as she recounted how she had to replace her daughter's picture on her computer's desktop over and over again:

"The fact that they went into her computer and they replaced this beautiful, beautiful picture of her child and they replaced it with a photo of Donald Trump yelling and shaking a finger at her, really struck her and makes her feel violated," the lawsuit says.

Read more:

White supremacist stabs interracial couple after seeing them kiss at bar, police say

After blaze at firefighter's home, investigators arrest his neighbor — a former firefighter

'The ice cream is as bitter and cold as the owner': After tirade, Internet turns on woman's business

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republican supporters of Donald Trump and Latino **immigrants** backing Democrat Hillary Clinton during this contentious presidential campaign will converge at polling sites on Nov. 8, and that has election workers in Prince William County preparing for the worst.

"If something is amiss and you feel the need to call 911 right away, call 911 right away," Michele L. White, general registrar of the Northern Virginia county's elections office, told about 30 election workers during a recent training session for Election Day duty. "Please use your sixth sense; don't hesitate."

In a highly volatile campaign, in which Trump has called for his supporters to be on the lookout for voter fraud and civil rights leaders are pushing back against what they see as voter intimidation, election officials are changing their routines in an attempt to minimize conflict at polling places.

Nowhere in Virginia is that more apparent than in Prince William County, home to a fast-expanding Latino community as well as an active group of conservatives who have been vocal about their opposition to illegal **immigration**. More than 20 percent of residents are Latino, a ratio greater than twice the state average. At the same time, the chairman of the Board of County Supervisors is Corey A. Stewart (R-At Large), a 2017 candidate for governor who has celebrated Trump's heated rhetoric against illegal **immigration** and likes to say, "I was Trump before Trump was Trump."

Hoping to ease tensions during an Election Day that is expected to draw about 80 percent of the county's 270,000 registered voters, election officials are taking measures to speed up voting and minimize disruptions.

For the first time, each of the county's 91 precincts will have "line chasers" whose job will be to check IDs outside the polling station to ensure that everyone is in the right place and that lines move quickly. Those people will also keep an eye out for potential disturbances, officials said.

Inside the stations, precinct chiefs will monitor election observers from both major parties — essentially watching the poll watchers. If those observers are overzealous in their scrutiny of voters, they may be kicked out of the polling station, county officials said.

Also for the first time, every polling station will be in direct contact with county officials through walkie-talkie radios to coordinate actions in the event of an emergency. All election workers will be wearing neon yellow or orange construction vests, so voters know where to turn for help.

"Honestly, I expect people to behave themselves in public; I know my expectations may be unrealistic at this point," said Rosanna West, a precinct chief who will oversee voting in the Bristow Run district, the county's busiest with 4,796 registered voters. "I try to keep a smile on at all times."

Keith A. Scarborough, secretary of the county electoral board, said the more aggressive measures stem from the "bad karma" brought on by this presidential race. Election officials around the country are taking novel steps, including those in Denver who for the first time trained their poll workers on how to respond to an active-shooter situation.

For weeks, Trump has warned that the general election will be "rigged." He has called on his backers to "get everybody to go out and watch" polling sites on Election Day, particularly in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Ohio. But generally, he said that voting locations should "have the sheriffs and the police chiefs and everybody watching."

Scarborough, a Democrat, said those suggestions coming from the top of a ticket may fuel suspicions and compel people to try to interfere with voting in unprecedented ways.

"We have one of the major candidates talking about having a rigged election," Scarborough said. "That's never happened before. There's a lot of bad rhetoric coming down."

The groups that plan to send volunteers to the polling stations say they want to avoid conflict.

**Immigration** activists are deploying several dozen volunteers to Prince William and nearby Manassas — mainly, they say, to guard against voter intimidation. Other nonprofit organizations, including the progressive New Virginia Majority, also plan to send volunteers.

"We're just going to go from polling station to polling station, making sure that everything is okay," said Fernanda Durand, spokeswoman for the CASA in Action **immigrant** advocacy group.

John Fredericks, chairman of the Trump campaign in Virginia, estimated that about 1,200 people have signed up to work as poll watchers.

"We've got more volunteers coming in by the day than we can figure out where to put them," Fredericks said. "We don't expect any confrontations with anybody legitimate. If the Hillary campaign decides to hire people to do things like throw eggs or start fights, I guess our volunteers will have to deal with it in a professional manner."

The county's electoral board briefly considered asking private groups that host polling stations to impose a one-day ban against guns on Election Day but abandoned the idea when Del. Robert G. Marshall (R-Prince William) raised objections, citing the state's "open carry" gun law.

Under that law, weapons are already prohibited inside public schools, of which 70 in Prince William will function as polling stations. Prince William schools will also be closed on Election Day.

Scarborough said election officials are being instructed to treat a voter carrying a gun in the same way they would treat one with a loud hat or T-shirt: Ignore it.

"They're legally entitled to do that," he said. "As long as they don't do anything to cause disruption."

Kimball Brace, chief of the county's newly created Sudley precinct just north of Manassas, said he anticipates some disturbances.

The precinct of 2,054 voters is in the heart of Prince William's rapidly growing Latino **immigrant** population.

"I would imagine we'll have a target on the door or something along that line," Brace said.

To guard against confrontations outside the polling station, Brace — a former general registrar in the county elections office — said he is prepared to move the line of voters completely inside Sudley Elementary.

"If I'm hearing reports of people feeling like they're being intimidated or that sort of thing, then we end up going outside and talking to people," he said. "Ultimately, under Virginia law, we do have the right to call 911."

At a recent county training session, several polling station workers said they were unsure what they will face on Election Day.

"I'm expecting hecticness," said Ross Fontana, 17, who decided to help with elections in the Manassas area upon the advice of his high school government teacher.

Safiya Samman, 70, who has worked several previous elections in Prince William, said she expects some hostilities to be directed toward her because she is a Muslim who covers her head with a hijab.

During the state elections last year, one voter angrily refused her help when there was a problem with a ballot scanner.

"I just stepped back, and I waited," said Samman, a U.S. citizen for 41 years.

But, she said, she is eager to work this presidential election.

"I want them to see my face," Samman said. "To see that we're all part of this."

antonio.olivo@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Opponents of Question B, the Montgomery County ballot proposal for term limits, received two big infusions of cash this month, according to campaign finance reports filed Friday.

Service Employees International Union Local 32 BJ, which represents about 7,000 commercial office cleaners who live and work in the county, contributed $5,000 to "No on B," the political committee organized to oppose term limits. The measure would amend the county charter to restrict council members and the county executive to three consecutive terms.

Another donation, for $1,500, came from County Executive Isiah Leggett's campaign committee. Leggett (D), serving his third term, has announced he will not run again.

No on B reported a total of $11,000 in the bank through Oct. 23.

"I'm pleased where we stand," No on B chair Tom Moore said in an email Saturday.

Voters for Montgomery County Term Limits reported just under $2,200 in contributions and $4,600 in the bank. Major donors were developer James Gingery ($1,000) and Howard Cohen ($500), head of Federal Health Counsel, a health lobbying firm. He lives in Potomac, according to federal lobbying reports.

Spokeswoman Ann Hingston said the pro-term-limits group was not discouraged by the nearly 3-to-1 gap in cash on hand.

"It doesn't worry us at all. We still have checks coming in," Hingston said, adding that those donations will be reflected in subsequent reports. The committee has picked up endorsements from the Montgomery County Civic Federation, an umbrella organization of neighborhood groups, and the Parents Coalition of Montgomery County.

Both sides are using the money primarily for yard signs, fliers, T-shirts and other relatively low-cost campaign items.

Local 32 BJ is the second union to take a formal position against term limits. The Montgomery County Education Association, which represents about 12,000 classroom teachers, educators and support staff, is recommending a no vote in its Apple Ballot, which is mailed to registered Democrats and distributed at the polls.

"This is simply a Republican/Trumpian war on competent government," 32 BJ's vice president, Jaime Contreras, said of the pro-term-limits push. "Because they can't win at the ballot box, they are trying to obstruct, which is a direct and unacceptable threat to democracy."

Local 32 BJ, which has a predominantly Latino membership, has pushed hard for a bill sponsored by County Council member Hans Riemer (D-At Large) that would require large employers to provide janitors a minimum workweek of 30 hours so that they can qualify for employer-provided health care. While some union members could acquire insurance through the Affordable Care Act, undocumented **immigrants** in the rank-and-file are not eligible. The bill is pending.

The large donation is also a response to Help Save Maryland, a group critical of current **immigration** policies whose founder, Brad Botwin, was active in gathering signatures for the ballot measure. The group has been described as a "nativist-extremist" group by the Southern Poverty Law Center.

bill.turque@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Arlington County voters headed to the polls Nov. 8 will have few choices when it comes to the school board: Just two candidates, both endorsed by the Arlington County Democratic Party, are running for two at-large board positions.

Incumbent Nancy Van Doren and newcomer Tannia Talento would be part of a board that faces some challenges. The high-achieving district is struggling with overcrowding, a byproduct of a surge in enrollment, which is expected to grow from about 26,000 to 30,000 students in the next five years.

The school system is on track to build a new middle school in Rosslyn and retrofit an aging school to make it suitable for additional middle school students. It also plans to build a new elementary school and remodel some facilities. And the board will be redrawing enrollment boundaries for the district's three comprehensive high schools in the coming year.

Voters also will weigh in on a $139 million school bond referendum, borrowed money that would be used to construct and remodel school buildings.

Van Doren, 56, who is the school board chair, was appointed to the panel in 2014 to fill a seat vacated by Noah Simon, who stepped down so he could spend more time with his family.

Van Doren, the former president of the Thomas Jefferson Middle School PTA, was elected that fall to serve the rest of the term.

In her two years on the board, Van Doren, a strong advocate of career and technical education, helped draft a capital improvement plan that addresses the school system's projected enrollment growth. She also helped develop a program to serve children with dyslexia.

Van Doren supported the opening of Arlington Tech, a novel four-year program for high school students centered on hands-on courses.

Van Doren, who previously worked in corporate communications for an insurance company and in business development for a newspaper, has a lengthy record as a school volunteer, serving on numerous parent advisory committees.

She said Arlington must focus on boosting achievement among its lowest performers, including English-language learners and special-needs students, while building out school facilities to accommodate enrollment growth.

"The biggest challenge is continuing to improve outcomes for all Arlington students, because I think we are so close to actually closing the achievement gap," Van Doren said.

Talento, 40, is the daughter of Guatemalan **immigrants**. She grew up in the D.C. area, attending schools in the District, Virginia and Maryland.

She said she decided to run for school board because she recalled her own experience as a student at Suitland High in Prince George's County.

As a high school student, she said, she cared for her ailing mother, helped raise younger siblings and worked part time.

When she thought she needed to drop out because of family responsibilities, she went to her counselor, who told her to "tough it out," she recalls. Instead, Talento called the county Board of Education, where someone told her about an alternative program that would allow her to graduate a few months late.

"I really had to advocate for my education," Talento said.

Talento went on to work as a clerk, research assistant and legal secretary at a D.C. law firm. She attended night classes at Northern Virginia Community College, but she did not receive a degree.

In 2009, she left her job at the law firm to focus on raising her daughter and son, who now attend Washington-Lee High School. At that time, she also became involved in parent advisory committees.

Talento has served on committees that advise the superintendent, including a mathematics advisory committee, a committee that focused on education for English-language learners, and others that gave input on planning and curricula. She also has helped struggling students navigate the school system, teaching them to advocate for themselves, she said.

Talento said she hopes to focus on building a better relationship between the school district and **immigrant** parents, who may struggle with English or lack an Internet connection, making it difficult for them to connect with teachers and school officials.

She also hopes to boost awareness of mental-health issues in the school community if she is elected.

moriah.balingit@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**We must soon make a choice for which future generations of Virginians and Americans will forever hold us responsible. Dominion Virginia Power plans to construct 44 massive electric transmission towers across and near the historic James River within close sight of Jamestown Island, the first permanent English settlement in the New World and arguably one of our nation's most historically significant places.

This thoughtless plan would negatively affect not only Jamestown Island but also the much-admired Colonial Parkway and the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail. This wanton act of vandalism must not happen for the sake of this generation and succeeding generations. The Army Corps of Engineersis mulling the question at this moment.

This is personal for me. I write as a direct descendant of one of the early émigrés to Jamestown: Lt. Col. Walter Chiles (1609-1653). Chiles was a merchant and served in the House of Burgesses and on the royal governor's council. But in a larger sense, I write on behalf of all Americans, whether they arrived in Virginia in the 17th century, arrived unwillingly from Africa in the 18th and 19th centuries or arrived yesterday from Syria, Nicaragua or India. We are a nation of **immigrants**, and Jamestown was the beginning of the American **immigration** story. The Jamestown story is all of our stories.

Jamestown Island is a national historical park, a unit of America's "best idea," as American author Wallace Stegner called the national park system. Regrettably, many of our national parks are under threat from unsympathetic development on their borders, climate change and chronic underfunding. We must not permit Jamestown to join these ranks.

Today, Jamestown Island's historic setting remains virtually unchanged since the 17th century. Colonial National Historical Park's millions of visitors each year can stand on the island and see the identical view those brave men and women saw more than 400 years ago. This must be preserved for generations yet to come and not marred with 44 transmission towers — some as tall as the Statue of Liberty — covered in blinking lights.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is considering this misbegotten idea and will soon decide whether to provide the permit needed for Dominion Virginia to proceed. We all recognize and respect the need to meet increased demand and to provide more cost-effective electricity for our fellow citizens. But this must not be done at so egregious a cost to one of our nation's most significant and precious historic places. Credible industry experts have identified reasonable alternatives, including burying the lines under the river or adding capacity to other transmission line corridors, but Dominion summarily rejects these alternatives. The Corps must require Dominion to explore these by undertaking the federal environmental impact statement process, which requires a full review of the project's effects and any reasonable alternatives.

To date, thousands of citizens and federal and state agencies, local governments and nonprofit organizations have voiced opposition to this project. There are other ways to solve the commonwealth's and the nation's energy challenges. The Army Corps of Engineers and Dominion have a higher responsibility to the nation, to our history and to future generations.

The Old Dominion deserves better from Dominion Virginia Power.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**'You have raised your voices in an unmistakable chorus," President Bill Clinton said on Inauguration Day in 1993. "I earned capital in this campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it," President George W. Bush said upon being reelected in 2004. Most succinct was President Obama in 2009: "I won."

With just over a week until the 2016 election results are tallied, it seems overwhelmingly likely that Hillary Clinton will be the next president of the United States. And her campaign clearly has mandate-building in mind as it makes its final push. Not content to merely fight for Florida or Ohio, just one of which would be needed to deny Donald Trump the presidency, the Clinton team has deployed surrogates like Michelle Obama to places like Arizona in hopes of running up the score. It is quite likely that if Clinton takes the stage to give a victory speech, she will make a claim similar to those of the presidents before her: that Americans have clearly endorsed her vision for the country.

Some political pundits and supporters are already laying out the case for her. "Clinton is in a position to notch a resounding victory by historical standards," Frank Bruni wrote in the New York Times. Similarly, Damon Linker argued in the Week: "The wider Clinton's margin of victory and the closer she comes to winning an outright majority of the votes cast, the more persuasive her claim of a mandate will be. And if she actually crosses the 50 percent threshold, she'll have one of the strongest claims to a mandate in nearly a century." Running mate Tim Kaine told CNN: "Donald is still going to whine if he loses. But if the mandate is clear, I don't think many people will follow him."

Would a big Clinton win actually mean a mandate, though? In an election where voters are more disappointed than ever in the choices they face, where an astonishing number will cast a ballot primarily as a way to oppose a different candidate and where core issues have taken a back seat to tabloid headlines, even a legitimate landslide wouldn't necessarily clarify what, exactly, Clinton had been sent to the White House to do.

Mandates are often talked about in relationship to the decisiveness of victory. But in practice, the two may not have much to do with each other. Political scientist Julia Azari, the author of "Delivering the People's Message: The Changing Politics of the Presidential Mandate ," describes presidential mandates as "elite constructions," more about credible claims than objective facts. They are grand narratives about support for a particular agenda — and serve as a threat that Congress ought to go along with that agenda or else face the wrath of the voters. They are a product of those eager to leverage election results to further political goals. Consider that when Bill Clinton invoked that "unmistakable chorus," only 43 percent of voters had raised their voices for him.

Bush's presidency offers another good example of the disconnect between mandate and margin of victory. Despite his narrow win in 2000, his administration governed as if it had a mandate, and in its first term it enacted many of the policies he ran on, including tax cuts, education reform and Medicare Part D. After Bush's reelection, when he defeated Sen. John Kerry by more than two percentage points in the popular vote and by 35 electoral votes, Bush decided to devote his "political capital" to fixing entitlements. The effort failed. Peter Wehner, who headed up the Bush White House's Office of Strategic Initiatives, says the White House had a "false sense of comfort" about the public willingness to rally behind the president's proposals.

Even electoral landslides such as Lyndon B. Johnson's defeat of Barry Goldwater in 1964 do not protect presidents from political challenges, with Johnson's "mandate" curdling into a loss of Democratic seats in Congress in 1966 and his loss of control of his own party by the 1968 election.

The Clinton camp seems concerned that Trump's repeated claims that the election is "rigged" could chip away her mandate. But though doubts about legitimacy make a president more likely to assert a mandate — Azari's research has found that mandate claims have risen as trust in government and other institutions has declined — whether or not a president has a mandate is not the same as a question of legitimacy. Presidents can be fairly and legitimately elected and yet not have a mandate to push through their agendas.

A bigger factor undercutting Clinton's claim to a mandate is the unprecedented level of negativity that voters feel toward both candidates in this election. According to Pew, a majority of Trump supporters say their vote is mostly about taking a stand against Clinton, and nearly half of Clinton's voters say their vote is mostly to oppose Trump. Compare that with the 2012 election, which at the time felt like an incredibly negative race. Both Mitt Romney and Obama had positive net-favorables in polls, meaning more people liked them than disliked them. Only 10 percent of voters in the exit polls that year said their vote was primarily cast as a way to stop the opponent. At the very least, Obama could claim that the vast majority of those voting for him affirmatively wanted him to be president; it would be harder for Clinton to say the same.

Yes, voters may choose to stay home, vote for a third-party candidate or write in someone else if they dislike both Trump and Clinton. But the stakes may feel too high in this election — especially in swing states — to cast a protest vote just to feel good; better to hold one's nose and do the unpleasant thing to stave off an even graver threat to one's way of life. (No wonder the American Psychological Association found half of Americans expressing election-related stress.)

The concept of a mandate also relies on the idea that voters do not elect just a particular person but one with a specific vision. On this front, too, the Clinton campaign is lacking. While she does discuss policy a great deal, she rarely articulates clear priorities or which issues she would tackle first. And the media frenzy around Trump has pushed all positive messaging about policy agendas out of the headlines. "I don't know that voters could name what her policies are," says former Obama speechwriter Jon Favreau.

Of course, elections are often more about personalities than policies, and voters may be drawn to candidates for a variety of reasons that may not overlap. But this election seems to be especially short on substance. Gallup has asked voters for decades whether or not presidential candidates are "talking about issues you really care about." Typically as Election Day approaches, more and more voters say yes; in 2016, the trend has been the opposite. And whereas about three-quarters of voters said yes at the equivalent point in previous election years, less than half said yes in this month's survey.

Even on the few issues that have broken through, it's unclear that there's overwhelming support for Clinton. Take **immigration**. Kaine has expressly used the term "mandate" in this context, telling voters at a rally in Nevada that a Clinton win would affirm a strong preference for **immigration** reform over Trump's vision of a "deportation nation." But while support for mass deportation is low , and a majority of voters reject Trump's proposal to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, The Washington Post's most recent polling shows voters fairly evenly divided between trusting Trump or Clinton on **immigration** issues, and Pew polling has found that the plurality of voters think there should be equal weight on border security and a path to citizenship.

If elections are a chance to sell voters on an issue agenda, both candidates have completely squandered that opportunity.

Some progressives have tried to head off debate about Clinton's mandate by arguing that mandates are meaningless, given the toxic relationship between the parties. "The truth is that the people who have to approve or reject the president's agenda don't give a damn about mandates one way or the other — they'll support what they want to support and oppose what they want to oppose, whether because of their sincere beliefs or the political demands of their districts and states," Paul Waldman wrote in the American Prospect. And in New York magazine, Jonathan Chait called mandates "an archaic holdover" from a time when "crossing the aisle was common" and members of Congress could be influenced by "moral pressure" to pass the agenda of a president from the opposing party.

Actually, Azari's research — going back to 1928 — shows that it is in a moment like this that mandates matter most. When party polarization is low, there isn't much need for talk of mandates. In periods of intense polarization, invoking mandates helps presidents defend what they want to do, especially when they can't do it alone.

And research has shown that legislators do change their voting behavior, at least temporarily, in response to perceptions of a mandate. "For some it is a means of insulating themselves from the changing electoral landscape," write the authors of a 2003 paper published in the American Journal of Political Science. "These members' responses to the mandate election are, we believe, an attempt to stave off the possibility of electoral defeat. For other members the mandate provides new opportunities to vote their ideological preferences."

It's true that after this election, there will be little incentive for either side to bend to the will of the opponent on any particular policy issue, even in defeat, and it will be shocking if the next president gets anything resembling a honeymoon period.

But even if a Clinton win does not come with a clear mandate for her specific agenda, it should send a wake-up call to Republicans. It will at a minimum be a repudiation of the way Trump has conducted himself, and the anger and division he has sown, in this campaign. Clinton may be seen as unlikable and untrustworthy, and she may not represent significant majorities on key issues, but in polls she is at least viewed as having the temperament to serve as president. If she has a mandate at all, it would be to use that temperament to thaw relations with Capitol Hill and to take steps toward progress on the sorts of major challenges — tax reform, entitlements, infrastructure — both parties agree are facing us, even though they hold deep disagreements on how to solve them.

To the extent that any presidential election is ever about choosing an individual for the express purpose of enacting an explicitly articulated policy agenda, this election is most certainly not about that. Voters are fed up and frustrated, disappointed in their choices, and disheartened by how little they have heard about the issues that matter to them.

Clinton will probably win the White House in a large, legitimate victory in the ugliest election America has seen in decades — even if the "unmistakable chorus" is not exactly singing in unison. But once the cacophony of the election has died down and governing begins, the new president will have to work to earn the support of the people on the issues that matter most.

Twitter: @KSoltisAnderson

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**La tercera edición del **Immigration** Film Festival se clausuró el domingo 23 de octubre dejando en el aire las preguntas y el drama humano reflejados en excelentes películas y emocionales documentales sobre el tema de la inmigración y la crisis de los refugiados.

Del 20 al 23 de octubre diferentes salas del área metropolitana acogieron cortometrajes, cine de ficción y documentales de largo formato sobre un tema crucial en nuestro tiempo. Sin duda, como me ha repetido en muchas ocasiones Patti Absher quien encabeza el "Equipo Ejecutivo" del Festival, "quienes vienen a ver estas películas no pueden quedarse indiferentes ante la situación de los millones de personas en Estados Unidos y de los cientos de millones en todo el mundo que huyen de las guerras, de la pobreza, de los desastres naturales y de la represión política salvaje para buscar un mejor futuro y una mejor vida".

Y para aproximarle a la audiencia estos temas cada proyección del Festival fue seguida de paneles de discusión y, en muchos casos, contando con la presencia de directores y directoras de las películas.

"¿Cómo se siente uno al tener que dejar su hogar, despedirse de sus amigos o seres queridos para iniciar un viaje a lo desconocido?", se pregunta Absher y la secunda Judith Johnson quien este año ejerció como Presidenta del **Immigration** Film Fest (IFF).

"¿Cómo sobrevivir en un lugar extraño, con otra lengua, con otros hábitos culturales?"

Estas y otras preguntas llevaron a un equipo de voluntarios a iniciar este Festival.

A Absher y Johnson se unieron otros voluntarios llenos de compromiso: Julie Campbell, Charlotte Jones Carroll, Rod Brana, Aldo Bello y Kathleen Madigan.

Todos ellos cargados de entusiasmo más que de recursos (El Tiempo Latino se ha asociado con el Festival en los últimos dos años) pero con una visión y una misión bien clara.

"Un festival que muestre el rostro humano del tema de la inmigración y los refugiados. Un Festival que entretenga, inspire y empodere a las personas. Incluso un Festival que ayude a motivar a las personas a construir mejores comunidades en las que se reconozcan las contribuciones de nuestros inmigrantes más recientes. Ése es nuestro Festival", escribieron los organizadores.

Es injusto destacar una u otra película de las mostradas en el IFF, pero yo me quedaría con tres momentos de los que fui testigo.

Uno sería la proyección del documental "Llévate mis amores" del director mexicano Arturo González Villaseñor en el que se cuenta la ayuda que "Las Patronas", un grupo de mujeres, que proporcionan comida y todo tipo de auxilio posible a los inmigrantes que cruzan por su sector mexicano montados sobre el tren La Bestia. En breve, El Tiempo Latino publicará la entrevista y el video que hicimos con Villaseñor en la que se refleja la actitud de un joven artista cinematográfico comprometido con los temas de su tiempo.

Otro momento fue la sesión dedicada a destruir mitos sobre el tema migratorio que encabezó el productor y director Aldo Bello, quien en la edición del año pasado fue galardonado por su documental "Dreamer, an American Story".

Y finalmente, el sábado 22 de octubre tuve el privilegio de moderar un panel de discusión sobre un excelente documental en el que se retrata la vida de las personas en el mayor campamento de refugiados que existe en el mundo, ubicado en Jordania a poca distancia del territorio sirio arrasado por la guerra. "After Spring", que es el título del documental, provocó un intenso diálogo con la audiencia que alabó el trabajo de las directoras Ellen Martínez y Steph Ching, presentes en la sala de George Washington University.

Martínez y Ching hablaron de "la generación perdida" que contemplaron en el campamento de refugiados, hablaron de las duras condiciones de vida —el calor puede ser tal que se puede freir un huevo en una sartén sobre el suelo sin necesidad de fuego o energía extra— . Expresaron además que para ellas este documental era "personal" (Martinez fue a High School en Damasco, Siria, y Steph hablódel drama humano como lo que la lleva a hacer este tipo de trabajo. Fue un evento que encapsuló la filosofía de este Festival necesario.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Adam Crapser was born in South Korea, but, when he was 3 years old, an American couple adopted him.

Until recently, he lived in Vancouver, Wash., with his daughters and his pregnant wife. He has a son by an ex-girlfriend. He used to own a barbershop, but decided to become a stay-at-home dad, sometimes playing guitar and ukulele and watching a rescue dog.

But that will all soon change — Crapser is being deported back to South Korea, away from his family, away from the place he's spent 37 of his 41 years of life.

He's being held in an **immigration** detention center in Tacoma, Wash.

"He will be deported as soon as **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement makes the necessary arrangements," Crapser's attorney Lori Walls told the Associated Press. "Adam, his family, and advocates are heartbroken at the outcome."

Crapser's deportation is a sad denouement to a life in the United States that's been anything but easy.

After being abandoned near Seoul, Crapser and his older sister were adopted by an unnamed couple. All he brought with him across the ocean were a pair of green rubber shoes, a Korean-language Bible and a stuffed dog.

That couple, as the New York Times magazine noted in an extensive profile of Crapser, abandoned the children to the foster system after many episodes in which they forced Crapser to sit in the dark basement as punishment.

He and his sister were split up, and after several foster homes, he found himself adopted by Thomas and Dollar Crapser, who had adopted two other children and were also caring for several other foster children.

According to Crapser, that family was more abusive than the first. They would slam children's heads on door frames, tape their mouths shut with duct tape and hit them with 2-by-4s. Eventually, they would be convicted in 1992 of several counts of criminal mistreatment and assault.

Before that, though, they kicked Crapser out of the house after an argument. It happened so quickly, he left his Bible and rubber shoes — the last remnants of his birth country — in the house.

He was caught breaking into that house, trying to retrieve the items and pleaded guilty to burglary. Twenty-five months in prison followed.

In the years following, Crapser committed a number of infractions. He was found guilty of unlawful firearm possession and, later, assault after getting into a fight with his roommate. In 2013, he called his son by an ex-girlfriend despite a protection order she had taken out against him.

"I made a lot of mistakes in my life, and I'm not proud of it," Crapser told the New York Times magazine. "I've learned a lot of lessons the hard way."

In the past few years, he'd been working to put his life back on track by getting married and focusing on family.

Now, that's over.

Difficult as his life here has been, he followed the court's ordered punishment for his crimes. Returning to a country that the AP described as "completely **alien**to him" was not a punishment handed down from a judge.

But that's what's happening.

He ended up on the radar of federal **immigration** officials after he applied for a green card in 2012. They dug into his background and found a criminal record, which as the AP noted, makes him eligible for deportation.

In fact, it's a circumstance created by the very parents who adopted, then abandoned, him in the first place. No family that adopted him, nor the adoption agency, ever registered the boy for U.S. citizenship.

Simple paperwork left undone.

Dae Joong Yoon, executive director of the National Korean American Service & Education Consortium, told the AP this isn't uncommon — as many as 35,000 intercountry adoptees don't have U.S. citizenship, through no fault of their own but that of their parents and the agencies that handled their adoptions.

The Child Citizenship Act of 2000 fixed part of this problem by automatically granting citizenship to children adopted by U.S. citizens, but, as NBC noted, it only applied to those under the age of 18 at the time of its passing.

Crapser and many others, thus, were left in their strange limbo.

Currently Congress is considering the Adoptee Citizenship Act of 2015, which would grant citizenship to all children who have been adopted by U.S. citizens.

But it'll be too late for Crapser, who still hopes it will pass.

"While I am disappointed in the judge's ruling and worried about my family's future, I hope that what has happened to me will further demonstrate the importance of passing the Adoptee Citizenship Act," Crapser said in a statement obtained by NBC.

Emily Kessel of the Adoptee Rights Campaign finds his deportation "appalling."

"We do not choose our families," Kessel told NBC. "But the U.S. does choose to bring adoptees into the U.S. with a promise of placing these children in safe homes to grow up like any other American … Adoptees are not disposable. We urge the community to call members of Congress and underline the need for a legislative fix now."

More from Morning Mix:

German couple lured women to 'horror house' with dating ads, tortured them to death, police say

UW-Madison student charged with sexual assault involving 5 women

Megyn Kelly and Kelly Ripa: Is this the steely Fox star's big chance?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TOKYO — It sounds like a sadly familiar story. A plan for the family to stick out the war in Syria while the children finish their education — but then a missile strikes their home.

Jamal, 24, remembers running to the basement after the first explosion and hearing the horrifying sounds above. His younger sister went into shock, prompting his terrified mother to slap her. Like so many other Syrians, they decided they had to leave.

But Jamal and his sister and mother didn't follow other Syrians to Europe or North America. Instead, after a brief stay in Egypt, they flew to Japan in October 2013. The next year, they were granted refugee status.

In their new home, that makes them an oddity. According to recent figures from the Japanese Ministry of Justice, as of 2015, only six Syrians have been accepted as refugees in the country. Jamal's family — who asked not to be fully identified, because of concerns about relatives in Syria — make up half that number.

The situation isn't much better for refugees from other nations. Last year, Japan received a record 7,586 applications for refugee status. Just 27 were granted.

This unusual situation has helped make Jamal's a sought-after voice. He's frequently interviewed by Japanese reporters and gives lectures to students about his experiences. "I always start my presentations talking about Syria," he said recently over coffee in the suburbs of Tokyo, "because most Japanese people think that it is just a desert or something."

To be fair, back in Syria there was a lot Jamal didn't know about Japan, either. His closest interaction with Japanese culture came through anime, which he watched online with Arabic subtitles.

Jamal's family had planned to head to Sweden, where a cousin was living. But the Swedish visa was denied, and an uncle who was married to a Japanese woman helped them get to Japan instead.

Tokyo was overwhelming. Jamal's family didn't speak the language or understand the culture. Tensions soon boiled over in his uncle's house, so they moved out. Not yet able to work legally, Jamal found sketchy, sometimes dangerous demolition jobs. After a nail went through his foot, he got tetanus and spent a week in the hospital.

"It was the worst period in my life," he said. Later, he worked 15 hours a day, six days a week, at a burger chain. By then he was legally able to work, but it was still grueling; the commute took an additional hour and a half.

He eventually found a job teaching English to kindergarten-age children. After the family's refugee status was approved, he began taking full-time language lessons, and he now speaks Japanese at a conversational level. He has made friends through soccer, playing for two local clubs. Like his Japanese teammates, Jamal heads out to the izakayas for post-match beer and food — though the beer is alcohol-free and he avoids pork because of his faith. He attends Friday prayer at Tokyo Camii, the largest mosque in Japan.

Nation looks inward

Japan isn't used to outsiders. Less than 2 percent of the population was born in a foreign country.

As the Syrian crisis got worse, Tokyo stepped up its donations to UNHCR, the United Nations' refugee agency. In 2014, it gave $181.6 million, making it the second-largest donor after the United States.

But it balked at taking in refugees. Last year, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe told reporters that the country needed to look after its own. While other wealthy nations have resettled thousands of Syrians from refugee camps in the Middle East, Japan has not offered a single resettlement place.

Only a small number of Syrians are in the country — around 500, according to the Japan Association for Refugees, one of a handful of groups that work with refugees in the country. Most arrange temporary visitor visas through friends and acquaintances to allow entry to the country. Some visitors apply for refugee status, though the vast majority of the requests are denied.

This has put Japan at odds with the U.N. refugee agency, which generally considers all Syrians to be eligible for refugee status. In a recent interview, Yasuhiro Hishida, assistant to the director of Japan's Refugee Status Recognition Office, noted that almost all Syrians are allowed to temporarily stay in Japan for humanitarian reasons, even if they are not granted refugee status.

Jamal could not explain why his family was the exception.

He said he understands Japan's apprehension about refugees, to an extent. Friends who have ended up in Germany have told him about dangerous Syrians they've met in the country. "If you are at home," he said, "and somebody knocks your door and says, 'I want to come in,' you wouldn't let him come, right? You need to know him."

But Japan should still do more than it's doing now, Jamal said. "If, for example, they accepted all the Syrians who are living here — 500 or so — it wouldn't have such a big impact, because they are separated in each prefecture."

Yet a recent survey conducted by Ipsos MORI found that just 18 percent of Japanese believed that refugee integration could be a success, while 46 percent disagreed.

A small step

Jamal said that the polite nature of Japanese society shields him from verbal or physical abuse. In comments on YouTube videos of his media appearances or lectures, however, Japanese users accuse him, sometimes in unprintably vulgar terms, of being a terrorist or stealing taxpayers' money.

Even so, that same Ipsos MORI poll found that 37 percent of the respondents said they didn't know how Japan should respond to refugees, by far the largest proportion of any of the 22 countries polled.

"It seems that people see it as a fire on the other side of the shore, so to speak," said Hidenori Sakanaka, a former head of the Tokyo **Immigration** Bureau. "There are no huge voices over here saying we should accept refugees or not in Japan."

Sakanaka now runs the Japan **Immigration** Policy Institute, a rare pro-**immigration** voice in Japan. He has argued that Japan should accept 10 million **immigrants** over the next 50 years, with perhaps as many as 500,000 refugees. That position puts him at the fringes of mainstream debate in Japan. Yet Sakanaka said he does see a shift in that debate. He pointed to the announcement by Abe's government in May that it would allow 150 Syrian students to continue their education in Japan. These Syrians will not be considered refugees, but they may be able to apply for refugee status once they arrive.

"It's an embarrassingly small number, but at the same time it's one outstanding step," he said.

Jamal hopes to return to his studies next year and wants to find a career as a translator. His aim is to become fluent in three languages. His sister attends Japanese high school and speaks the language fluently, while his mother has been working at Uniqlo and has learned enough of the language to get by. Jamal's father has been able to join them, although he has not received refugee status.

While his parents bitterly miss Syria, Jamal said he can't imagine leaving Japan. "I've started here, so I can't go start from zero again in another country," he said. "I'll build my future here."

adam.taylor@washpost.com

Yuki Oda contributed to this report.

Read more

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Early Thursday morning, a new and powerful effort was underway to explore a mystery 1,500 light-years away. West Virginia's Green Bank Telescope was hard at work, sucking up information about a strange winking star.

The giant radio telescope is the biggest of its kind, with a 330-foot-wide parabolic dish, making the device the largest steerable telescope on Earth. The Green Bank Telescope is tucked away among the sleepy Allegheny Mountains in West Virginia, where state and federal laws enforce an electromagnetic quiet zone to keep interference to a minimum.

For astronomers and space buffs, the star in question, KIC 8462852, has been anything but quiet. The new Green Bank Telescope effort, announced Tuesday, is the deepest probe of KIC 8462852 yet, part of University of California at Berkeley's Breakthrough Listen program — the $100 million project backed by Russian billionaire Yuri Milner with support from Stephen Hawking.

"We can look at it with greater sensitivity and for a wider range of signal types than any other experiment in the world," said Andrew Siemion, of Berkeley's Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Research Center, in a news release.

Last year, scientists led by Louisiana State University astronomer Tabetha S. Boyajian published a lightning rod of a study: Observations taken from the Kepler spacecraft revealed that KIC 8462852, also known as Tabby's Star after Boyajian, did not behave like other stars.

Specifically, Tabby's Star flickered.

The star's flux — its brightness — dipped by as much as a fifth over the course of Kepler's observations, The Washington Post reported last October. By way of comparison, should a planet as huge as Jupiter swoop in front of KIC 8462852, in a move known as a transit, such a gas-giant-size journey would dim the star only by 1 percent. (Tabby's Star is also known as the WTF Star — for Where's the Flux. Though, we suspect the abbreviation could stand for something else too.)

What's more, the extreme dimming did not follow a constant pattern. The dips varied in duration, as though the star were blinking fast and slow. For a star of its size and age, this was unprecedented behavior.

If you are familiar with what happens when a space-science mystery meets an unprecedented observation, you might be able to guess where speculation went. Even some astronomers, meticulous by profession, were not afraid to float the a-word: Could the dimming, however unlikely, be signs of **alien** life?

"Aliens should always be the very last hypothesis you consider," Penn State University astronomer Jason Wright told the Atlantic magazine, "but this looked like something you would expect an **alien** civilization to build."

One popularly cited idea was a Dyson structure, a hypothetical device that could collect energy from a sun using a network akin to orbiting solar panels. Tabby's Star gained yet another nickname, the "**alien** megastructure" star.

When asked during a live chat Wednesday afternoon about the meaning of a non-natural source of flicker, Siemion said that "the implications could be as far-reaching and awe-inspiring as could possibly be imagined," paraphrasing "Contact."

To be clear, scientists remained incredibly skeptical that the dimming had a technological cause. "I don't think it's very likely — a one in a billion chance or something like that," said Berkeley SETI's chief scientist, Dan Werthimer, on Tuesday. That there was a star acting in an unprecedented way was itself not unprecedented, as the 1967 discovery of pulsars showed.

Since the fall of 2015, various scientists, astronomers and SETI researchers have pointed a host of devices at Tabby's Star. In November, the SETI Instituterevealed it had failed to detect narrow or broadband radio signals using the 42 antennas of the Allen Telescope Array, near San Francisco.

"So far," as The Post's Rachel Feltman wrote at the time, "we've got nothing."

Later that month, Iowa State University scientists argued that a natural cause, a collection of comets, could explain the winks of Tabby's Star.  That explanation has been a source of debate, leading one astronomer to declare in January that all hypotheses published thus far had been unsatisfactory. Where's the Flux, indeed.

"It's been looked at with Hubble, it's been looked at with Keck, it's been looked at in the infrared and radio and high energy, and every possible thing you can imagine, including a whole range of SETI experiments," Siemion said. "Nothing has been found."

Enter the Green Bank Observatory. Pointed at Tabby's Star, the telescope has embarked on a project to comb hundreds of millions of individual radio channels. The telescope's observations Thursday were associated with human technologies, exploring a spectrum from 1 to 12 gigahertz, which would include some cellphone operating frequencies up to those of television satellites. At the end of the three eight-hour nights, spaced out over two months, the astronomers will have collected about a petabyte of data (a million gigabytes, or the data equivalent to what 20 million four-drawer filing cabinets can hold).

If there are two things for certain about KIC 8462852, it is that the star remains fascinating, and that scientists 1,500 light-years away are committed to taking the hardest look at Tabby's Star they can.

More from Morning Mix
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton on Thursday proposed a $500 million federal grant program to fight bullying in schools, describing the problem as a crisis that threatens the academic progress and mental and emotional health of too many children.

States could use the money for a range of efforts, from teacher training to suicide prevention programs to hiring more counselors and psychologists. But to be eligible, they would have to invest more themselves: They would get $4 in federal funds for every $1 in new resources they expend.

To qualify for the money, states also would have to pass "comprehensive" anti-bullying laws that address cyberbullying and verbal bullying and that explicitly protect children from bullying on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity — the latter a lightning rod at a time of great division over the treatment of transgender children at school.

"We know that bullying is a real problem in our classrooms, our playgrounds and online. And teachers have reported that this election has made it worse," Clinton said at a campaign rally in Winston-Salem, N.C., on Thursday afternoon. "We're going to launch a major new effort to help states and communities and schools and families end bullying wherever it takes place."

Bullying rates have been on a downward trend during the past decade, a period in which schools, communities, nonprofit organizations and the Obama administration all worked to shine a light on the problem.

But abusive behavior remains a problem both in person and online: In 2013, 22 percent of students between the ages of 12 and 18 said they had been victims of bullying, according to the latest federal data available. Victims of bullying are more likely to abuse drugs and struggle with academics and depression, researchers say, and cellphones and social media have helped transform bullying from a schoolyard phenomenon into a 24/7 problem.

Clinton and her supporters argue that the problem of bullying has grown in the past year because of what they have dubbed the "Trump effect," the result of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump's rhetoric about Muslims, **immigrants**, women and disabled people trickling down into schools. Clinton's campaign claims that Trump has inspired children to hurl insults and threats more frequently.

The campaign released a television ad Thursday featuring Bryce, a young man with muscular dystrophy, watching a clip of Trump mocking a disabled reporter. "His entire platform is hatred," Bryce says. "I don't want bullies in my life, and I especially don't want one in the White House."

Trump's campaign did not respond to a request for comment.

Anne McQuade, a New Hampshire teacher of students learning English as a second language, said her students — all **immigrants** and refugees — have become afraid that their family members will be deported. McQuade said that one Muslim student came to her in tears after being called a terrorist as she stepped off the school bus in her neighborhood.

"These beautiful, hopeful kids, they come to our country to find a better life, and we say to them, 'Welcome to America,' " she told reporters on a conference call organized by the Clinton campaign. "But they watch television and they're exposed to angry social media, and they hear a different message."

Clinton's proposed grant program would be administered by the Education Department, handing that agency more authority at a time when Congress has sought to scale back its power. The bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, passed last year, shifts power over public schools back to the states after a broad backlash against an era of intensive federal intervention in education.

That new law consolidated or eliminated many federal programs — including some that addressed similar goals as Clinton's "Better than Bullying" initiative — in an effort to give states more latitude in how they spend federal dollars. It is not clear whether Congress would be eager to authorize a new federal program.

Clinton campaign officials said that they want to give states flexibility and resources to attack the bullying problem as they see fit and that the program would be funding with the tax plan that Clinton has set forth.

Susan Swearer, a professor at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln who studies bullying, said that research has showed that the most effective programs work to curb bad behavior before it starts by talking to all students about the importance of kindness and the detrimental effects of bullying.

"It's important for schools to have a clear plan and a system that impacts all students and adults at the school," Swearer said. "A whole-school assembly or one talk in the fall isn't going to alter bullying behavior."

Swearer applauded Clinton's focus on bullying and said that it is noteworthy that the issue has been raised during a presidential campaign.

"We really do need to have systematic and comprehensive federal support," Swearer said. "Schools that are financially strapped don't have resources to implement programming that we know is effective."

emma.brown@washpost.com

moriah.balingit@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When the Justice Department announced two months ago that it wanted to end the use of private prisons, Cibola County Correctional Center was exactly the kind of facility that officials desired to shut down. After a history of questionable deaths and substandard medical care, the New Mexico facility lost its contract. In recent weeks, it was emptied of inmates.

But the vacancies won't last for long.

As soon as this week, U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement — which is separate from the Justice Department — is going to begin moving **immigrant**detainees into the facility under a new set of agreements with Corrections Corporation of America, a county official said.

The country's **immigration** enforcement agency is expanding its use of for-profit prisons, even while another government agency says the facilities are less safe and effective than government-run prisons. The move illustrates the difficulties of ending the government's reliance on private prisons and jails, especially as **immigration** authorities deal with an influx of detainees.

In addition to inking a new contract for up to 1,116 beds at Cibola County, **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, recently extended a contract with Corrections Corporation of America for a 2,400-bed facility in Texas. The agency also seems to be eyeing jail space in Youngstown, Ohio, where Corrections Corporation of America has posted advertisements for several job openings, according to the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Justice Department's announcement in August that it would eventually stop using private prisons was a significant critique of the industry. Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates wrote that for-profit facilities "do not maintain the same level of safety and security" as government-run prisons.

Yates referred to an inspector general report that found private facilities had higher rates of assaults and eight times as many contraband cellphones confiscated each year on average. The report listed many examples of mayhem at private facilities, including a May 2012 riot at the Adams County Correctional Center in Mississippi in which 20 people were injured and a correctional officer was killed. That incident, according to the report, involved 250 inmates who were upset about low-quality food and medical care.

Jennifer D. Elzea, an ICE spokeswoman, said in a statement the agency was "committed to providing a safe and humane environment for all those in its custody." She said the agency used various contractors and other arrangements to house inmates "to meet the agency's detention needs while achieving the highest possible cost savings for the taxpayer."

The Department of Homeland Security, of which ICE is a part, said soon after the Justice Department's announcement that it would consider whether to follow suit. The department has created a subcommittee to study the issue, and its evaluation is due Nov. 30. If DHS ultimately decides to end its use of private prisons, the long-term future of a facility such as Cibola would be unclear.

Gang- and drug-related violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras has been driving a surge of asylum seekers from Central America, who are winding up in the detention centers. Until two years ago, such asylum seekers were generally not held in detention.

For the first years of the Obama administration, the United States kept fewer than 100 beds for family detention, but — under pressure to show border security was of concern — had plans to expand to more than 3,000 beds by the end of 2014.

As of August, ICE had an average daily population of 33,957 across the facilities it uses, according to data provided by the agency.

On Wednesday, the ACLU sent a letter to that subcommittee blasting **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement for moving forward with private prison contracts while the advisory council's review was ongoing.

Singling out the Cibola facility in particular, the advocacy organization wrote that the case "illustrates how CCA is literally operating a revolving door — shuttling out prisoners one month, shuttling in **immigration** detainees the next month."

"It's astonishing that a prison that was found unfit and unsuitable for federal prisoners is now going to be used to lock up **immigration** detainees," said Joanne Lin, legislative counsel with the ACLU's Washington Legislative Office.

Lin acknowledged that **immigration** detention rates have "exploded," which she attributed to the government's tough stance on detaining asylum seekers crossing the southern border. Those detainees are not criminals, but often people who have fled countries where violence has grown rampant.

A Corrections Corporation of America spokesman did not return messages seeking comment.

In the meantime, demand remains for the facilities to remain open, one way or another.

Cibola County Board of Commissioners Chair T. Walter Jaramillo said local authorities had been pushing for the private prison deal since the Bureau of Prisons decided to end its contract to use the facility this summer.

"It's employment," Jaramillo said, adding the contract would prevent 350 people from losing jobs. "It's all about the economics in the community."

At the time of the Justice Department's directive, the Bureau of Prisons had just 13 contract facilities, including Cibola, totaling a little more than 22,000 inmates.

Facilities contracted by both the Bureau of Prisons and ICE house those in the country without documentation. The Bureau of Prisons is responsible for those convicted of federal crimes, while ICE detains illegal **immigrants** convicted of state offenses that render them deportable and those pursuing asylum or other claims in **immigration** court.

The private-prison industry has been lobbying against the Justice Department's directive to end the use of its facilities. The industry has argued that the government's comparison of for-profit facilities to government-run prisons was unfair because they house different populations.

Officials have said the successful implementation of the directive depends on continued reductions in the federal prison population. As the inmate population goes down, the Bureau of Prisons plans to modify or allow contracts with private prison operators to expire, with the goal of ultimately ending their use entirely.

matt.zapotosky@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Khizr Khan's speech at the Democratic National Convention was everything Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign wanted: a real emotional connection with voters, a bit of stagecraft that made for a memorable visual, and a story of patriotism and sacrifice coupled with a ringing endorsement. Three months later, Khan is still winning over voters for the Clinton team; he spent Wednesday campaigning for her in Virginia, and recently appeared in a powerful ad in which he told the story of his son's heroic sacrifice as a U.S. Army captain in Iraq.

Then there's Alicia Machado, the first winner of the Miss Universe contest after Donald Trump purchased it, and whom Clinton mentioned during the first presidential debate in September (and also subsequently produced an advertisement with). Again, Clinton had found an enthusiastic ally — an American voter with a compelling story.

In both cases, the Clinton campaign got an added bonus: Trump took the bait, and got roped into an extended fight that distracted him from the issues and attacking Clinton herself.

Of course, it wasn't blind luck that put the Khans onstage, or drew Machado into the conversation about Trump's treatment of women. Rather, they involved efforts by the Clinton campaign that appeared to have been planned well in advance. Turns out, they were.

Emails released by WikiLeaks show that the Clinton campaign was aware of Machado's story in December 2015. It's unclear precisely when the campaign contacted her and persuaded her to film an ad, but Clinton's official Twitter account congratulated her on her impending U.S. citizenship in May, retweeting a taped interview with "Inside Edition" in which Machado detailed the way Trump demeaned her in the 1990s.

Still, the campaign held its cards close. Clinton herself didn't bring up Machado until the first presidential debate on Sept. 26, followed quickly by press interviews, then an ad. The timing worked out perfectly for the Clinton campaign; they made Trump's treatment of women an issue right before the Oct. 7 release of his comments while at an "Access Hollywood" interview more than a decade ago.

That, in turn, led to Trump facing tough questions from the debate moderators just two days later — and offering answers that prompted at least 11 more women to come forward. In the space of a few weeks, Machado's story became just one of many dominating the headlines just weeks before Election Day, as millions of Americans cast early votes.

Machado wasn't the only Clinton surrogate to grab headlines. Khizr Khan had been profiled by The Washington Post in 2005, after his son Humayun was killed while serving in the U.S. Army in Iraq, and he'd spoken out against Trump in a few interviews in the winter of 2015.

Although the campaign probably knew Khizr Khan's speech would resonate in the arena and with viewers on television, it never could have predicted Trump's aggressive response. After all, who insults a Gold Star family?

He did, though, and that opened the door for the Clinton campaign to retell their story in an emotional ad (and on the trail). Suddenly, a speaker with virtually no name recognition was transformed into a months-long campaign storyline.

The Trump campaign has proven less adept at finding such voters and showcasing their stories. Of course, the Trump team faced additional challenges in long-term planning — including, for months, a skeleton communications staff. Some of the Trump campaign's strategies were also undoubtedly affected by a shifting chain of command, and a candidate who could never quite seem to stay on message.

Pat Smith, whose son Sean died in the 2012 attacks in Benghazi, Libya, was given a speaking slot at the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, where she emotionally accused Clinton of being directly responsible for her son's death (although as she addressed the convention, Trump spoke on Fox News Channel, pulling their cameras away from Smith's remarks). Trump also brought her to the final presidential debate as a guest. But the campaign has not made a sustained effort to highlight her story — or the stories of other ordinary people that he has used to make the case on one of his signature issues: **immigration**.

In theory, "angel moms" -- mothers whose sons or daughters were killed by illegal **immigrants**, whose stories he occasionally told at rallies — bolstered his argument for stronger **immigration** laws. But the sustained campaign effort that the Clinton team used to tell Machado's story, and that of the Khans, just wasn't there. The same goes for Jamiel Shaw, the father of a Los Angeles teenager who was killed by an illegal **immigrant** in 2008.

Trump also held a news conference with several of former president Bill Clinton's accusers — although, coming without warning immediately before a presidential debate, it felt more like a tactic intended to knock Hillary Clinton off her game rather than a voter outreach effort.

Khizr Khan's story won't be a decisive factor in the election, nor will Machado's, or the "angel moms," or Shaw's. But their stories do help voters connect with candidates. They humanize the campaign, and show us how proposed policies affect real people, or how a candidate's decision-making affected them in a real-life situation.

When you look at whose stories have connected the most with voters, it's hard not to put the Khans and Machado at the top of the list.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The callers in India, claiming to be officials with the Internal Revenue Service or **immigration** services, would present those who answered the phone with an ultimatum. Pay us, or we'll fine you, deport you or arrest you.

Their network was expansive, and their work lucrative. Justice Department officials announced charges against 61 people and entities Thursday and said the call center scheme had scammed at least 15,000 victims out of more than $250 million.

Phone scams are not new, but the breadth and sophistication of this one is notable. Justice Department officials said the defendants — 24 of them based in the United States — ran at least five call center groups overseas. Leslie Caldwell, the assistant attorney general in charge of the Justice Department's Criminal Division, said she hoped the efforts of U.S. and Indian authorities would put a dent in the robust industry of phone scammers.

"We have seen a drop-off in the success rate of these scams," Caldwell said.

U.S. authorities said they arrested 20 people in this country and carried out nine search warrants Thursday. A few others involved were already in custody. Earlier this month, in a separate case, police in Mumbai raided a call center and detained 770 employees for questioning. The Justice Department said that it was focused on a network of call centers in Ahmedabad and that some of the centers' owners have been charged.

A grand jury in federal court in the Southern District of Texas returned an indictment in the case on Oct. 19. Officials announced the unsealing of it on Thursday. The charges against those involved include conspiracy to commit identity theft, impersonation of an officer of the United States, wire fraud and money laundering.

Bruce Foucart, assistant director of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement's homeland security investigations, said the scammers conducted online research on potential targets using Facebook and other online sources and bilked "savvy, successful and law-abiding people." He said they went to "frightening lengths" to ensure the success of their scheme.

In one instance, Foucart said, scammers convinced a Southern California woman with cancer that police would show up at her workplace for purported unpaid tax bills stemming from her medical treatment. She paid the scammers $7,000, Foucart said.

In another instance, he said, when a man did not respond to phone demands for four years of purported back taxes, the scammers called 911 posing as the man and told the dispatcher he was armed and wanted to kill police. Armed officers showed up at the man's house, where his daughter was home alone, Foucart said.

"They convey authority and a sense of urgency that leaves their victims terrified," he said.

Those involved had a network of U.S.-based co-conspirators who would liquidate and launder the ill-gotten gains by buying prepaid debit cards, which they often registered using the personal information of identity-theft victims. They also would send wire transfers using fake names and use money transferring methods known as "hawalas," in which money is effectively moved internationally outside the U.S. banking system.

Caldwell said the scammers were able to display their numbers on caller ID systems as being from the U.S. government, though she said no government agency would call demanding money as they did.

"If you get one of these calls," she said, "it is not the U.S. government calling you."

Authorities said callers also sometimes would defraud victims by offering small, short-term loans or telling them they were eligible for grants, then requesting a processing fee or a good-faith deposit to demonstrate the victims' ability to pay it back. The callers would pocket that money and never provide the grant or loan, authorities said.

Caldwell said that authorities would seek to recover the money that was stolen, but that doing so might be difficult, and that it is possible that victims would not be repaid.

matt.zapotosky@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump says Sen. John McCain is "not a war hero" and "a loser" http://t.co/UAyy8APgHH[http://t.co/UAyy8APgHH] pic.twitter.com/cR7vgfDfuh

The New York Post pronounced Donald Trump's presidential candidacy dead on July 19, 2015. Barely a month into his campaign, the Manhattan billionaire had committed a kind of Republican blasphemy, declaring that the party's 2008 White House nominee, John McCain, is "not a war hero."

"DON VOYAGE!" the tabloid's cover blared in all-caps. "Trump is toast after insult."

Trump was, of course, not toast, which only gave the New York Post more opportunities to lampoon him. When Ted Cruz won the Iowa caucuses in February, for example, the paper said Trump had been "CRUZ-IFIED."

Today's cover: Iowans didn't just vote for Ted Cruz — they denied Donald Trump https://t.co/bYabYMNOnN[https://t.co/bYabYMNOnN] pic.twitter.com/ZyOfdMX80Z

And it was the New York Post that in July published nude photos of Trump's wife, Melania, from her modeling days. The photographer who snapped the images initially claimed that he took them in New York in 1995, prompting scrutiny of Melania Trump's **immigration** history. The former Melania Knauss, a native of Slovenia, had previously said she first came to the United States legally in 1996. The photographer later recanted and said the pictures were shot in 1996.

EXCLUSIVE: Melania Trump like you've never seen her before https://t.co/GZwLuejORJ[https://t.co/GZwLuejORJ] pic.twitter.com/ukdet3CJRY

Yet in the home stretch of the general election, the Rupert Murdoch-owned New York Post appears to be going all in to Make America Great Again. The paper's covers over the past month have alternated between slamming Hillary Clinton and casting Trump as exactly the sort of political outsider he wants to be in the eyes of voters — a brawler who stands and fights against all forms of the "establishment."

Today's cover: Clinton cronies steered millions to foundation — and Bill's wallet https://t.co/29e6xziSeD[https://t.co/29e6xziSeD] pic.twitter.com/t35rJfYYNP

Today's cover: The State Department's "shadow government" https://t.co/SviIlAoCGe[https://t.co/SviIlAoCGe] pic.twitter.com/lpFrzAGcC3

Tomorrow's Cover: Donald Trump launches an all-out attack after multiple women accuse him of sexual assault https://t.co/juq3rYptyK[https://t.co/juq3rYptyK] pic.twitter.com/3i2NuvINkK

Today's cover: Donald Trump launced a nuclear poltical war against his GOP critics https://t.co/JCIp1DcZOs[https://t.co/JCIp1DcZOs] pic.twitter.com/mPyEJIe75Y

Today's @nypost cover: JAIL TO THE CHIEF #debate #frontpagestoday pic.twitter.com/kKV8DhjtWJ

Today's cover: Trump survives round one -- and that's bad news for Clinton https://t.co/hdUTtNbMij[https://t.co/hdUTtNbMij] pic.twitter.com/0SxUDGto99

Murdoch was initially critical of Trump, particularly on the subject of **immigration**.

Mexican **immigrants**, as with all **immigrants**, have much lower crime rates than native born. Eg El Paso safest city in U.S. Trump wrong.

So FBI says 267000 illegal aliens incarcerated. Who are the other two million presently incarcerated? Seems like social breakdown.

New York magazine reported last month that the Fox News owner personally ordered tough questions for Trump ahead of the first Republican debate.

A few days before the first GOP debate on Fox in August 2015, Murdoch called [Roger] Ailes, [the network's chairman at the time] at home. "This has gone on long enough," Murdoch said, according to a person briefed on the conversation. Murdoch told Ailes he wanted Fox's debate moderators — [Megyn] Kelly, Bret Baier and Chris Wallace — to hammer Trump on a variety of issues.

But Murdoch ultimately decided to support Trump after watching the primary race unfold and meeting with the real estate mogul several times, New York magazine reported. Murdoch tweeted in March that the Republican Party should rally behind Trump, and the New York Post endorsed Trump in April.

As predicted, Trump reaching out to make peace with Republican "establishment". If he becomes inevitable party would be mad not to unify.

The endorsement included some reservations about Trump, such as "policies that seem made on the fly" and campaign rhetoric that "has too often been amateurish, divisive — and downright coarse."

"Should he win the nomination," the tabloid's editorial board wrote, "we expect Trump to pivot — not just on the issues, but in his manner. The post-pivot Trump needs to be more presidential: better informed on policy, more self-disciplined and less thin-skinned."

Trump has not pivoted, and the New York Post has not yet made a general-election endorsement. But it seems quite clear that a newspaper that thought Trump's campaign was dead 15 months ago is now breathing life into his final bid.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Texas Tribune reports:

Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump held a three-percentage-point lead over Democrat Hillary Clinton on the eve of early voting in Texas, according to the latest University of Texas/Texas Tribune Poll. … While 93 percent of Democrats support Clinton, 83 percent of Republicans and 46 percent of independents support Trump. Only 19 percent of independents said they support Clinton. And there is a big divide on racial and ethnic lines: Trump led Clinton 57 percent to 28 percent among white voters, but Clinton led 95 percent to 4 percent among black voters and 56 percent to 33 percent among Hispanic voters.

This is remarkable not only because Texas is a deep-red state but also because, if there is any place that should be anxious about illegal **immigration**, it is Texas. Come to think of it, Arizona is another border state. And yet Trump is struggling in both places. Trump's build-the-wall and mass deportation proposals don't sell in Arizona and Texas.

We've long remarked that the anti-**immigrant** nuttery is strong in places with virtually no illegal **immigration**. The Post reported in 2014 on a Pew research report:

California, the most populous state, is home to the most [illegal **immigrants**]: nearly 2.5 million undocumented **immigrants**. Texas is home to nearly 1.7 million. Six states — Maine, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont and West Virginia — have fewer than 5,000 undocumented **immigrants**. Nationally, there are 11.2 million such **immigrants** in all.

When you look at states in which less than 1 percent of the population is illegal **immigrants**, you'll find hotbeds of furor (West Virginia, Kentucky, Mississippi). The coal country folks think illegal **immigrants** are putting them out of work? In Ohio, illegal **immigrants** make up less than 1 percent of the population; in Pennsylvania, the number is 1.3 percent.

Moreover, we know that illegal **immigration** is on the decline, despite Trump's pearl-clutching. The 2014 Pew study found: "Mexicans are a majority of unauthorized **immigrants** (52% in 2012), but both their numbers and share have declined in recent years, according to the Pew Research estimates. Although the U.S. population of unauthorized **immigrants** was stable from 2009 to 2012, the number of Mexicans in this population fell by about half a million people during those years. According to the new Pew Research Center estimates, there were 5.9 million Mexican unauthorized **immigrants** in 2012, compared with 6.4 million in 2009. The decline likely resulted from both an increase in departures to Mexico and a decrease in arrivals from Mexico."

This tells us a few things:

\* Trump's anti-**immigrant** extremism plays poorly in places with direct experiences with large numbers of illegal **immigrants**.

\* The combination of Hispanic voters and white voters disdainful of Trump's bigotry and misogyny undermines the notion that this is a winning issue for the GOP.

\* The anti-**immigration** fervor is stoked in places and among people who are not affected by illegal **immigration** and have little, if any, experience with crime (which Trump would have us believe is epidemic) committed by illegal **immigrants**.

\* Illegal **immigration** from Mexico has been declining. Trump still focuses on such **immigrants**, even as Asians become the largest share of the illegal-**immigrant** population.

To be clear, the anti-**immigration** fetish is not based on economic or safety concerns, at least not real ones. Trump is whipping up bigotry, plain and simple, using made-up facts and hysterical rhetoric. Texas and Arizona can make a powerful statement on Election Day, rejecting xenophobia and undermining the "myth of the white voter." In doing so, these red states may accelerate a much-needed fumigation of the GOP -- and demonstrate an appetite for inclusive candidates from the center-right.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Long derided as uncool, the keyboard synthesizer has made something of a comeback. Part of that renewed interest has been driven by the rediscovery of '80s horror film soundtracks. Such films as "Halloween III" and "Sorcerer" used electronics to generate moody tones and **alien** textures — far from the ebullient sounds of new-wave pop. The music was very distant from rock-and-roll, but undeniably heavy.

So it's not surprising that "RR7349," the new album by Survive, is out via renowned metal imprint Relapse. The Austin-based quartet's instrumental compositions are eerie, but undeniably hooky. Pulsing bass lines and robotic squelches provide the foundation for broody minor-key melodies. The songs could slot with just about any cinematic action sequence: helicopters touching down, frenzied flight from a malevolent **alien**, etc.

If the music gives you a feeling of déjà vu, it's not just because Survive draws from familiar source materials. Band members Kyle Dixon and Michael Stein also provide the score for the popular and similarly retro-minded Netflix series "Stranger Things." It's an appropriate pairing: The show applies modern longform television narrative tropes to a story inspired by '80s horror and sci-fi classics. Like Survive, it's a fresh spin on an old formula.

—

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK — Hillary Clinton urged Hispanic campaign volunteers to ratchet up efforts to drive record Hispanic turnout in the election, citing as motivation the words of former Arizona governor Jan Brewer.

On a bilingual conference call with supporters on Wednesday night, Clinton reminded them that Brewer had dismissed the prospect that Clinton might win the election because Hispanic voters "don't vote."

"Former Arizona governor Jan Brewer said over the weekend that Republicans didn't have to worry about the vote, Donald Trump didn't have to worry about the election, because Latinos don't get out to vote," Clinton said. "Not only is that insulting, but she may not be paying attention."

"So let's prove the former Arizona governor Jan Brewer is wrong and let's make sure we have the biggest turnout of Latino voters in history," she added.

Brewer's comments to the Boston Globe instantly became what the campaign called "bulletin board material," a source of motivation to push for higher turnout.

Clinton cited encouraging signs in early voting in Nevada and Florida that indicate high turnout among Democrats. The campaign has said that 133,000 Hispanic voters have already cast their ballot in Florida, a 99 percent increase over this point in 2012. And the campaign also said that early voting returns indicate strong turnout among Latinos and women, both groups they expect to lean toward Clinton.

Amanda Renteria, Clinton's national political director, added that the campaign has been pleasantly surprised by the initial trends in early voting in states like Arizona and Texas, where Democrats had previously not had a shot at winning in presidential races.

Clinton also cited the support of celebrity chef Jose Andres who appeared with her at a rally in Tampa earlier in the day.

"Jose is an **immigrant** and he would not tolerate the kind of hateful language that Trump was using about **immigrants**," Clinton added.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Donald Trump says he'd deport 16 million people. How do you even begin to quantify that?" — Hillary Clinton campaign, post on Twitter, Oct. 23, 2016

This tweet, and an accompanying Web ad, by the Clinton campaign claimed that Trump says he would deport 16 million people. Cracking down on illegal **immigration** is one of Trump's main campaign promises, one he has made since his June 2015 announcement speech. Trump has vowed to deport people living in the United States illegally, but he has wavered on exactly how many. The undocumented population is estimated at about 11 million people — so how does the Clinton campaign add up to 16 million? We checked their math.

The Facts

Part of the difficulty with fact-checking Trump based on his words and promises is that Trump often makes contradictory statements or speaks in vague terms that leave room for interpretation.

Trump said on multiple occasions during his presidential campaign that he would deport people who are living in the country illegally. Earlier in his campaign, he indicated he would round up the 11 million undocumented people "in a humane way" and deport them. Then later, he said he would prioritize some of them.

"If they've done well, they're going out and they're coming back in legally. . . . We're rounding 'em up in a very humane way, in a very nice way. And they're going to be happy because they want to be legalized. And, by the way, I know it doesn't sound nice. But not everything is nice," Trump said in September 2015 on CBS's "60 Minutes," when asked what he would do with the 11 million to 12 million illegal **immigrants** in the country.

In November 2015, Trump said on MSNBC's "Morning Joe," "You're going to have a deportation force, and you're going to do it humanely."

Throughout the primaries, Trump repeated that all illegal **immigrants** "have to go" and "will go out" and that "some will come back, the best, through a process." He praised the Eisenhower-era "Operation Wetback," an aggressive federal effort (named after an offensive word for Mexicans) to remove illegal Mexican **immigrants** from the Southwest.

Then, in August 2016, it seemed as though Trump was changing his mind on deportations. Trump assembled a panel of Hispanic advisers, who wanted him to reconsider his stance on mass deportations. His campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, had said that Trump's stance on mass deportations was "to be determined."

On Aug. 31, 2016, Trump delivered a major **immigration** speech and clarified that under his presidency, all people in the country illegally would be subject to deportations but that he would prioritize certain removals — including visa overstays and "criminal aliens," who are noncitizens convicted of crimes. Trump still left room for deporting all 11 million: "Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation."

Trump's deportation priorities announced Aug. 31 would target between 5 million and 6.5 million undocumented **immigrants** for swift removal, according to The Washington Post's analysis.

Interestingly, in 2012, Trump had a different view on deporting undocumented **immigrants**, CNN's KFile found. Trump said in a June 2012 interview with CNBC that he was "probably down the middle on that" and that "I also understand how, as an example, you have people in this country for 20 years, they've done a great job, they've done wonderfully, they've gone to school, they've gotten good marks, they're productive — now we're supposed to send them out of the country, I don't believe in that."

Trump campaign spokesman Steven Cheung told PolitiFact: "Mr. Trump's plan does not call for deporting 16 million. It says we will deal with those who are not priorities at a later date."

To add up to 16 million, the Clinton campaign is including U.S.-born children of illegal **immigrants**. In 2010, there were 4.5 million people who were born in the United States to parents who arrived illegally, according to the Pew Research Center.

Trump has suggested he would deport families with undocumented parents and U.S.-born children. This is from an August 2015 interview on "Meet the Press":

Trump: "We have to make a whole new set of standards. And when people come in, they have to come in legally — " Host Chuck Todd: "So you're going to split up families?" Trump: "Chuck." Todd: "You're going to deport children — " Trump: "Chuck. No, no. We're going to keep the families together. We have to keep the families together." Todd: "But you're going to keep them together out — " Trump: "But they have to go. But they have to go."

Trump also has said that he believes it is wrong for the children of illegal **immigrants** (also referred to as "anchor babies") to automatically receive citizenship if they are born in the United States. He said he would "test it out in the courts" because he thought he could make a case that "they do not have American citizenship." (He said he might make an exception if a child had parents who are "very bad people.") But as we have noted before, most scholars say a change in birthright citizenship would require a constitutional amendment.

In an earlier version of Trump's **immigration** plan, he proposed ending birthright citizenship, PolitiFact found. "This remains the biggest magnet for illegal **immigration**," the plan read. Birthright citizenship is no longer mentioned in his current **immigration** proposal, and he did not address it in his August 2016 **immigration** speech.

So, bottom line: It's not entirely clear what Trump's actual, current plan is for children of undocumented parents. The Trump campaign did not respond to our request to clarify his stance on birthright citizenship and to address whether he would deport 16 million people.

The Clinton campaign did not respond to our request for any clear evidence that Trump would deport all 4.5 million U.S.-born children of undocumented **immigrants**.

The Pinocchio Test

Trump presented his most coherent and comprehensive proposal for deportations during his Aug. 31, 2016, speech on **immigration** policy. He said that all 11 million are subject to deportation but that he would prioritize the removal of some of the illegal population. According to The Post's analysis, Trump would prioritize about half of the roughly 11 million population for swift removal.

To add up to the 16 million in the tweet and video, the Clinton campaign adds the 4.5 million U.S.-born children of undocumented parents. The children automatically receive citizenship because they were born in the United States. Trump's concrete plan on the 4.5 million children is unclear. In August 2015, Trump has suggested that he would deport families — the parents and their children — if the parents were in the country illegally. He also has called for an end to birthright citizenship.

But it's a mystery if this is still Trump's current stance. He didn't mention it in his Aug. 31 speech, and his campaign has not clarified, either. So without a clear sense of his stance on the deportation of U.S.-born children of undocumented parents, Clinton's tweet and video are spinning Trump's words and stance out of context. We award Two Pinocchios.

Two Pinocchios
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump spoke with CNN's Dana Bash for five and a half minutes on Wednesday. During that brief conversation, he managed to complain about "insulting" and "rude" questions, CNN underselling his chances, and not getting enough credit for leading in Florida even though he's being outspent "50 to 1."

"You know, in the old days, you'd get credit if you would spend less money and have victory," Trump said. "That would be a good thing."

This, of course, is nothing new for Trump. His entire campaign these days is built on the premise that the system is rigged -- rigged both against average Americans but also against him personally. And as the polls suggest a loss is imminent, he's taken to offering plenty of excuses for it, up to and including massive yet-to-occur voter fraud.

But the sheer volume of these grievances in recent days is remarkable.

The Fix looked over the CNN interview and the other four most recent Trump campaign appearances for which we have a full transcript, all of them rallies on Florida: Tallahassee and Sanford on Tuesday, and Tampa and St. Augustine on Monday.

Over the course of those five appearances, Trump spent about 15 percent of the time -- 3,300 words out of nearly 22,000 spoken -- litigating his problems with the media and a political system that he argues is aiding his opponent in myriad unfair ways.

This is admittedly a subjective exercise, but The Fix went through these transcripts seeking out not just instances in which Trump argues the system is "rigged," but that it's rigged against him personally and/or in his opponent's favor.

The high water mark was Tuesday in Sanford, Fla., when Trump spent about one-fifth of his lengthy speech explaining why things were unfair to him. He even began his speech with a gripe.

"I was just coming in, watching Fox say there are very few people here. Do you believe these people?" he said. "They'll do anything, every one of them. Every one of them. I'll tell you what: The media, folks, is no good. They're no good -- very dishonest."

It progressed from there. Among Trump's complaints:

\* That the media ignores Trump supporters: "When they interview the people standing on the line and they say, 'Trump, Trump, Trump, Trump, Trump.' They say, 'All right, let's get out of here. This is bad. This is bad news.'"

\* That he wasn't given enough credit for predicting Brexit: "And I said, 'It's going to happen.' And they criticized me."

\* That media coverage is suppressing his vote: "It's called voter suppression, because people give up."

\* That Hillary Clinton was somehow provided the questions prior to the last debate and there is a double standard: "Can you imagine if I got the answers or the questions to a debate? It would be the electric chair, right? No, no, it would be the biggest story in the world."

\* That the premium increases under Obamacare are being undersold: "Now, they said 25 percent. Forget -- you'll take 25 percent. It's going to be 60, 70, 80, 90 percent."

\* That the Washington establishment is working against him: "The fact that the Washington establishment has tried so hard to stop our campaign which is actually a movement."

\* That fact-checkers don't give him the benefit of the doubt: "They'll check facts with me and I'm like 99 percent right and they'll say, 'And therefore, he lied.' ... What a group of people we have. What a group of dishonest scum we have, I'm telling you."

The complaints are generally similar from speech to speech, though Trump does mix in a new one every so often. The idea that the media coverage and the polls are suppressing his vote is a rather new one. Trump has also argued with gusto in recent days that his opponent shouldn't even be allowed to run against him.

And it all serves a political purpose: To reinforce the idea that very powerful forces are doing whatever they can to prevent him from becoming president.

That's a message that serves Trump both in the case he's making to voters and in the excuses he may offer after the election -- assuming he does lose and maybe doesn't concede. If the system is rigged against you and everything was unfair, after all, your loss wasn't really a legitimate one, and your movement must continue to fight back.

In other words: Expect many more grievances in the days and weeks ahead.

And just so we're showing our work, here is a full transcript of Trump's Sanford appearance, with the grievances portions highlighted:

TRUMP: This is a big crowd.

(APPLAUSE)

I was just -- I was just coming in, watching Fox say there are very few people here. Do you believe these people?

AUDIENCE: No.

TRUMP: Well, they'll do anything, every one of them; every one of them.

I'll tell you what, the media, folks, is no good. They're no good; very dishonest.

(APPLAUSE)

In 14 days, we're going to win the state of Florida. We're going to win back the White House.

(APPLAUSE)

We are going to win Florida. And by the way, the lines at the voting booths are record.

(APPLAUSE)

And I notice that a lot of the people on lines -- you see the pictures -- they're wearing the red hat, the white hat, this hat. They're wearing all -- they're wearing buttons all over the place. I think those are people that are inclined to vote for us. Do you agree?

(APPLAUSE)

So this was supposed to be a rally in that hangar. And after the first hour, they realized that wasn't going to work too well. That's fantastic. Thank you, everybody. Look at that.(APPLAUSE)

TRUMP: We're going to have a big victory. The lines are record- setting, which I knew they'd be. And a lot of people are being very surprised. It's very, very surprising. We're getting a big vote. So it's going to be a little early to tell you what those numbers are, but it's a big, big vote in the state of Florida.

We are leading Iowa. We are leading Ohio. We are doing great in North Carolina. Pennsylvania, we are going to a lot. I think we're going to do great there. They put the miners out of work. We're putting the miners back to work. I think we're going to do great there.

(APPLAUSE)

Seventy-five percent of the American people think our country is on the wrong track. Every poll says it. We are going to fix it and we are going to get our country back on the right track very, very quickly.

(APPLAUSE)

Together, we are going to deliver real change that once again puts America first.

(APPLAUSE)

That begins with immediately repealing and replacing the disaster known as Obamacare.

(APPLAUSE)

You saw what happened yesterday. The rates are going through the sky. We all knew that. I knew it before it was passed. I have been saying this for a long time. My first day in office, I'm going to ask Congress to put a bill on my desk getting rid of this disastrous law, and replacing it with reforms that expand choice, freedom, affordability. You're going to have such great health care at a tiny fraction of the cost and it's going to be so easy.

(APPLAUSE)

It's just been announced that Americans are going to experience another massive double-digit hike. Now, they said 25 percent. Forget -- you'll take 25 percent. It's going to be 60, 70, 80, 90 percent. In the great state of Arizona, it is over 100 percent. It is crazy. One in five Americans trapped in Obamacare will only have a single insurer to negotiate with in your state. Congratulations. Lots of fun. You're going to have to brush up on your negotiation ability, believe me. Even Bill Clinton admitted Obamacare is the craziest thing in the world, where people wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half. And then he was forced to take it back the following day because that night he suffered greatly. He suffered.

(LAUGHTER)

Because Hillary Clinton wants to double-up and triple-up on Obamacare, the numbers will go through the roof. Your taxes will double and triple, and in the end it's not affordable. You can't do it.

The Democratic governor of Minnesota said the Affordable Act -- remember this -- the Affordable Care Act is no longer affordable. He doesn't know what to do. But I -- I said this before it was passed. It couldn't have worked in a million years. Insurers are leaving. Companies are fleeing. And by the way, it's putting your companies out of business. It's putting your small businesses out of business.

And Hillary Clinton -- here is another thing you can say. I'm going to repeal it and replace it. She is going to expand it and it's going to get more and more expensive. And it's no good anyway because the deductibles are so high -- I mean, unless you have a really long- term serious problem at the highest level, you're never going to be able to use it, folks.

Hillary Clinton wants to double-down on Obamacare and make it even worse. She wants to put the government totally in charge of your health care despite the fact it's no good. It'll be much more expensive than even today.

(BOOING)

Repealing Obamacare and stopping Hillary's health care takeover is one of the single most important reasons that we must win on November 8th.

(APPLAUSE)

Boy, this is a big crowd, by the way. A lot of people. That's a lot of people.

(APPLAUSE)

AUDIENCE: Trump! Trump! Trump!

TRUMP: Thank you. You know, it is funny, because you know, you listen to this phony media. I get a call an hour ago. They say, "Sir, we have a problem." I said, "Oh, here we go. What is it?" They said this, and I laugh, but they said, "The people don't fit into the hangar." I said, "But that's a good problem, isn't it?" Change has to come from outside our corrupt system. The fact that the Washington establishment has tried so hard to stop our campaign which is actually a movement. This is a movement, folks.

(APPLAUSE)

And this is the last time we're going to have a chance. Four years, it's over. It's over. In four years, you don't have a chance. All these characters who want to run in four years, they can forget it. They're wasting their time. You don't have even a little bit of a chance. This is it. And we're really close.

We're going to win Florida, by the way.

(APPLAUSE)

No, no. These guys won't tell you that because they don't want to hear about it. But when they interview -- these are the most corrupt people. When they interview the people standing on the line and they say, "Trump, Trump, Trump, Trump, Trump." They say, "All right, let's get out of here, this is bad. This is bad news."

These are the most dishonest, almost as dishonest as crooked Hillary.

(APPLAUSE)

I love those pink signs, "Women for Trump."

(APPLAUSE)

I love the signs behind me, "Blacks for Trump." I like those signs.

(APPLAUSE)

"Blacks for Trump." You watch. You watch. Those signs are great. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

Going to be a lot of Brexit happening in about two weeks. Lot of Brexit.

(APPLAUSE)

Remember that. Everybody went to bed. They said, "Oh gee, I think it's not going..."

And I said, "It's going to happen." And they criticized me: "Can you believe this guy? Can you believe this guy?" Just like crooked Hillary. She had a rally -- you know her rallies last for about 15 minutes and there are very few people. But she talked about how we want peace at our rallies and this and that. She hired people -- thugs -- to go into my rallies -- 1,500 -- right? Listen to this -- $1,500 and an iPhone. "Go into the rally and beat people up."

AUDIENCE: Lock her up. Lock her up. Lock her up.

TRUMP: "Go into the rally and beat people up." And you remember in Pennsylvania, different places, in Chicago, remember that one? Where they were fighting. They found out our people are not so easy to beat up, that's for sure. But do you remember? Remember they went in and there was a policeman with blood pouring down his face. There was another one with a badly gashed -- this was all thugs put in there. And then I'm listening to her talk about peace at our rallies -- "We want peace."

This is one of the great phonies of all time and she shouldn't be allowed to run for president with what she's done, I'll tell you right now.

(APPLAUSE)

The fact that the Washington establishment has tried so hard to stop this movement is only more proof that our campaign represents the kind of change that only arrives once in a lifetime. This is once in a lifetime.

(APPLAUSE)

I'm telling you. I opened the door. I looked out the window. I said, "Wow, it's so different from what they report." These people up here, they are the worst. And you know what it's called? By the way, you know what it's called, don't you? It's called voter suppression, because people give up. People give up.

And we're going to win Florida and we're going to win Iowa, and we're going to win Ohio. Right?

(APPLAUSE)

And I think we're going to win Pennsylvania...

(APPLAUSE)

... and we're going to win North Carolina. We're going to have a lot of victories. Just keep it going, folks. We're fighting the crooked establishment and just about the biggest part of the crooked establishment are these people right back there with the phony cameras.

(BOOING)

TRUMP: They're a bunch of phony low-lifes. And remember Obama last week? The campaigning president. He doesn't get you jobs. He gives you lousy healthcare that you're going to pay so much for you're not going to be able to afford it. You can't afford it now. He can't beat ISIS. He's a lousy president.

And you remember when I said that some of the voting is rigged? OK, everybody knows. Check out Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis. And he said this is a threat to our system. This is terrible, this is a threat. OK, I figured, gee whiz, wow, that's pretty bad. Except last night on television -- last night I'm watching Obama from eight years ago and he's basically saying that the whole thing is fixed.

(LAUGHTER)

Before he won his first race, he was talking about voting and he said, remember, I come from Chicago, you know, I mean, you know -- give me a break, this guy's such a phony guy. What a phony.

(APPLAUSE)

What a phony group. Take a look, you got to look at it, you got to look at it. A clip last night, in fact. It was on Sean Hannity, you got look at it. And you see that -- I said I don't believe that he would have said that after knowing (inaudible). But basically, he said it's rigged and he said, I know because I come from Chicago. Give me a break, what a phony guy.

Real change begins with ridding Washington of corruption, of which there's plenty going around.

(APPLAUSE)

And believe me, folks. Believe me, folks, I've been saying it for a long time. The system, the whole system is rigged. The whole system is rigged. Go back to Obamacare for a second. Remember Obama, you can keep your plan, you can keep your doctor. He said it 28 different times, keep the plan, keep the doctor. Keep your plan, keep your doctor. He lied. Remember he had Jonathan Gruber of MIT, where my uncle was a professor for 35 years -- but he had Jonathan Gruber from MIT and he was the architect of the plan.

And remember, he called the American people stupid, stupid for going along with Obamacare. Then he tried to take it back. He couldn't take it back, it was a disaster. The problem is, folks, they all have a memory, including us. Two weeks and we forget. But I don't forget. And you know what, I bring it up. Jonathan Gruber said the American people are essentially stupid for approving and allowing Obamacare to happen.

And you know what? We've got to show them on November 8th that we're not stupid. We're not stupid.

(APPLAUSE)

And here's another beauty, a breaking news story today provides one of the most shocking revelations to date. As you may remember, President Obama claimed to have no knowledge whatsoever of Clinton's -- Hillary Clinton's illegal email server. I have no knowledge of it, I don't know. This guy, he's as bad as she is. And he's got to stop campaigning and bring us some jobs, OK?

(APPLAUSE)

That jeopardized national security, her email server. But newly public emails, WikiLeaks, prove otherwise. A Clinton spokesman, Josh Waren (ph), sent an email saying, quote, "looks like the president just said he found out Hillary Clinton was using her personal email when he saw it on the news."

Oh, that's nice. But Cheryl Mills, Clinton's chief of staff, the State Department, replied, quote -- listen to this -- "We need to clean this up. He has the e-mails from her." They do not say state.gov, they don't say it. In other words, Mills was saying Obama, he had to know that Hillary was using an illegal server, but he claimed otherwise.

So that means Obama is now into the act. And now I understand that despite his hatred of the Clintons -- because I know one thing, Bill hates him -- but despite his hatred, now I understand why he pushed her, because he didn't want to get caught up in the big lie. He's caught up now, folks.

TRUMP: We have to investigate the investigation -- this investigation. So listen to this. Crooked Hillary Clinton bleached and deleted 33,000 emails, lied to Congress under oath, made 13 iPhones disappear, some with a hammer, then told the FBI she couldn't remember 39 times. Bad memory.

AUDIENCE: Lock her up! Lock her up! Lock her up!

TRUMP: Incredible. But we have also just learned that one of the closest people to Hillary Clinton, with longstanding ties to her and husband, the closest -- the closest person, I can tell you that, gave more -- listen to this -- just happened yesterday.

Gave more than $675,000 to the campaign of the wife of a top FBI official who oversaw the investigation into Mrs. Clinton's illegal e- mail server. In other words -- in other words...

(BOOING)

... the man who was in charge of the investigation of Hillary Clinton accepted essentially from Hillary Clinton $675,000 that went to his wife.

(BOOING)

Never happened before. Never happened. Not in this country's history. This is a disgrace. And she shouldn't be allowed to run for president. She shouldn't be allowed. She's a crook.

Remember this. Remember this. Just remember this. So important. Donna Brazile, head of DNC, got the answers to a debate and the questions to a debate. So she has the questions. She gave them to crooked Hillary. And I don't know if you saw Donna Brazile the other night on television. What a -- what a mess that was, the way she -- she didn't know what to do.

Well, how did you get them? Well, it was sent by Russia, Russia.

(LAUGHTER)

You know, they're always using Russia, like I have -- I have nothing to do with Russia. They were sent by Russia and Donald Trump, you know. These people -- and yet they have more -- because Hillary Clinton gave them 20 percent of our uranium -- gave Russia for a big payment. And her man has to do with Russia -- the whole thing -- they're a bunch of crooks. I'm telling you, our country is in such trouble. So Donna Brazile has the questions. She gives them to crooked Hillary. OK. Now, here's what I'd like. Wouldn't it be great if crooked Hillary -- you know, it's funny. I wonder if she had the questions the other night to our debate, because everybody tells me I killed her in that debate, which I think I did.

(APPLAUSE)

Which I think I did.

So Donna Brazile gives her all of the questions. And what happens? Hillary should turn them in, of course. Right? "Listen, I can't do this; it's" -- she didn't turn them in. She used them. And we found out through WikiLeaks that this happened.

And nobody goes after her. Can you imagine if I got the answers or the questions to a debate? It would be the electric chair, right? No, no, it would be the biggest story in the world. And they're not doing anything with Donna Brazile. And they're not doing anything with crooked Hillary Clinton. She got the answers to a debate. She got the questions to debate.

And she didn't turn herself in, meaning, "I'm sorry; I'm not supposed to have this." By the way, what a great act that would have been if she did it. We would have all been shocked if she did it. But wouldn't that have been nice?

The criminal conduct of Hillary Clinton threatens the foundations of democracy. I mean that.

(APPLAUSE)

But we're going to turn it around, folks. I've proposed a contract with the American voter that will give the government back to the people.

(APPLAUSE)

And just so you understand -- and you know this. I didn't need this. I didn't need this. I was doing very well on the other side. I was, you know, definitely doing well. I didn't need this, but I'll tell you I love our country. I had to do it. I see where our country is going, and it's not good. It's really bad.

(APPLAUSE)

My contract begins with a plan to end the rampant government corruption, and to put the special interests out of business. It's all about special interests. I want everyone in Washington to hear and to heed the words I'm about to say.

TRUMP: If we win on November 8th, we are going to Washington, D.C. and we, together, are going to drain the swamp.

AUDIENCE: Drain the swamp!

(APPLAUSE)

TRUMP: Under my contract with the American voter, we are proposing a series of ethics reforms on day one to end government corruption. They include a constitutional amendment to impose term limits on all members of Congress.

(APPLAUSE)

Important. A lifetime ban on government officials lobbying for a foreign government. Do you believe this?

(APPLAUSE)

They get out, the lobby for -- they make a fortune. A total ban on foreign lobbyists raising money for American elections. Thank you very much, we don't need your money.

(APPLAUSE)

Under my contract, I'm also going to take a series of actions on day one to protect American workers. We are living through the greatest jobs theft in the history of the world. They are taking our companies, they are taking our jobs, and our politicians, many of whom are stupid and many of whom are corrupt, are allowing it to happen. We're not going to allow it any longer.

(APPLAUSE)

Our nation has lost one-third of its manufacturing jobs since NAFTA, a deal signed by Bill Clinton and supported strongly by Hillary Clinton. And by the way, the single worst trade deal ever made in history anywhere. Listen to this. Hard to believe. I've told you before I thought this was a typographical error. We've lost 70,000 factories since China entered the World Trade Organization, WTO, another Bill and Hillary backed disaster.

But they've been nicely paid. Look at all the money they have pouring in; $250 million and they've been in government. It's a good government job. My contract includes the following. We will renegotiate NAFTA or withdraw from the deal to get a much better one for our workers and our companies.

(APPLAUSE)

It's a one-way street. You know what I call it? It's a one-way highway right into Mexico. They get our jobs, they get our money, they get our plants and factories. You know what we get? Drugs and unemployment. That's what we get. We get nothing. It's a defective agreement, too, totally defective.

We will withdraw from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, another beauty. The deal Hillary Clinton called the gold standard and then during the debate, she lied. She said, "I never said that." Unfortunately at the next debate, they announced she did say it. And she also said she never was secretary of State when they talked about the red line in the sand. "I wasn't secretary of State then," right? Remember? "I wasn't" -- she lied, she was.

Even the so-called fact checkers -- who are really crooked as hell themselves, by the way. These fact checkers, they'll check facts with me and I'm like 99 percent right and they'll say "and therefore, he lied." I've gone through them where I've said OK, finally. They say "and therefore, he lied." Oh, boy, these people are bad. What a group of people we have. What a group of dishonest scum we have, I'm telling you.

(APPLAUSE)

Hillary's Wall Street donors want it and she'd approve it. If she ever got the chance, she will approve TPP so fast and she intends to. Tim Kaine has even left the door open to passing TPP by another name. Let's change the name.

And by the way, folks. We're going to win. But regardless, don't let it happen. It's too complicated. You do one deal with another. One, one, one. Make individual deals with individual nations, deal with the ones we want to deal with. You've got to see what this thing looks like, a piece of Swiss cheese. And if they default, you send them a letter of default and by the time that 30 day notice ends, you'll have a new deal that's even better. TRUMP: This deal is too complicated, it's almost 6,000 pages long and here's the thing. All of these other countries, they've read every single word, every comma, every period, every paragraph. I'll bet we have nobody that even reads these things, OK? And you're talking about bigger than running big companies. These are bigger deals. You can take a modest-size trade deal, it's bigger than these big companies. And we have people that are political hacks negotiate it.

Not anymore. We have the greatest -- I am endorsed by some of the greatest business people in the world. We are going to use our great business people to make these deals.

(APPLAUSE)

We will lift the restrictions on the production of American energy, which is getting clobbered with the EPA, and by the way, and with the restrictions -- including shale, oil, natural gas, and clean coal. We are putting our miners back to work.

(APPLAUSE)

Hillary want to shut down American energy and put the miners out of work. She said it, "We want the mines and the miners out of work." That's nice; horrible. We are going to put the miners, the steel workers, and so many of our other workers that are being clobbered by the stupidity of our government's leadership -- we are going to put them back to work. That includes the steel workers.

(APPLAUSE)

It's going to happen fast, too. It doesn't take long time, folks. It's going to go fast.

Additionally, on the first day, I will take the following actions to restore the rule of law. These include I will cancel every illegal Obamacare executive order. We will cancel all federal funding to sanctuary cities. Out.

(APPLAUSE)

We will suspend **immigration** from regions comprised of radical Islamic terrorists, including the suspension of the Syrian refugee program which is taking in thousands and thousands of people that we have no idea where they come from, no idea who they are. And crooked Hillary Clinton wants to have that increased by 550 percent over and above the crazy Obama numbers. OK?

(BOOING)

Tell you what: You vote for her, you're crazy. OK? She is the worst.

Next, I will work with Congress to introduce a series of legislative reforms and will fight for their passage in the first 100 days of my administration. And this legislation quickly includes Middle Class Tax Relief and Simplification Act.

(APPLAUSE)

So essentially a middle class family with two children will get about a 35 percent tax reduction. Isn't that nice? It's about time. The middle class in our country has been devastated. And by the way, crooked Hillary wants to raise your taxes up to the sky. She wants to raise. We are the highest taxed in the world. She wants to raise your taxes right up to the sky.

And the Off-Shoring Act establishes tariffs to companies from laying off their workers and relocating to other countries, which is a disaster for us. We have companies -- all -- I could name 100 if you have all day. I could name a thousand. They close. They move to Mexico or some other place. They make their product. They sell it to us. We end up with unemployment all over. We end up with no taxes. We end up with closed plants, and they make a fortune in the other countries.

So here is the story, folks, and I say it whether it's cars, air conditioners. They want to close up and put our people out of work. Go someplace else build a new plant. And you know the friend of mine who said all -- that he's never seen. It's the eighth wonder of the world. He said the plants and factories that he is building in Mexico, "Donald, " he's the biggest, "is the eighth wonder of the world."

I said: "What about the United States?" He goes, "Not so much." Nothing. It's so sad. It's so sad. So they want to build something and they want to have their new plant and they want to have non-U.S. workers. That's fine. Everything is fine. But they are going to pay a 35 percent tax every time that air conditioner or car comes across the border

(APPLAUSE)

And you know what? Nobody is going to move. Here is the story folks. Couple of politicians said, "I have never thought of that"; couldn't think of it. They have been working at this thing for 10 years, they never thought. So either they're taken care of or they're stupid, right? Or both?

So here what's going to happen, though. Nobody is going to move. And if they do move, that's OK too cause we are going to make a fortune, OK? So its not the worst thing in the world. TRUMP: American Infrastructure Act -- $1 trillion in public- private infrastructure investments. This includes help for projects like expanding the Orlando Sanford International Airport. You like that idea? Why not? It's true. They have been looking to do it for a long time.

End illegal **immigration**.

I have to tell you, our infrastructure, folks, is a mess. We are like a third-world country. We have an infrastructure that's so bad, our roads, our highways, our schools, our tunnels, our bridges. Look at our bridges. Half of them have reports that they are in serious danger.

We will build the wall and we will impose tough mandatory minimum -- remember this -- tough mandatory minimum prison sentences for deported illegal **immigrants** who try to reenter the country. They keep coming back and back and back.

(APPLAUSE)

And if they know they go away for five years if we catch them, they're not coming back, folks How simple is it? How simple is it?

Thousands of Americans have been killed by illegal **immigrants**. In January of last year -- and you probably heard this story. Everybody's heard this story. Grant (inaudible), 21-years-old, a beautiful, beautiful young person was working at a convenience store in Mesa, Arizona when he was shot in the face point-blank by an illegal **immigrant** for no reason.

The killer was out on bond. He was roaming free, despite many previous arrests and violence. And the word from other people that knew him, please do not let him go free. Shot this young man right in the face.

In another incident, 25-year-old Spencer (inaudible) was sitting in his car at a stoplight after dropping off his girlfriend. An illegal **immigrant** in a pickup truck pulled up beside Spencer and without saying anything and for no reason, took out a gun, pointed it at his head and pulled the trigger, killing him instantly.

The killer had been deported four times. We weren't supposed to take him back. We took him back. He had a massive lengthy criminal record. And people said please don't take this guy back. Dead. By the way, hundreds of stories, hundreds. I've spent a lot of time with Spencer's mom, Julie. A member of the Remembrance Project, one of the great groups of people, they are devastated. They are devastated.

Sixty-year-old Margaret (inaudible) was shot to death by an illegal **immigrant** last July in Ohio. Earlier that day, her killer attempted to rape a 14-year-old girl, shot a third woman in the arm while he was with her children and did massive other damage to other people. Police encountered the man more than three weeks before the crime spree, but federal authorities refused to take him into custody even though they knew he was very dangerous. They didn't want to get involved.

So you have carnage. This crime wave ends when Donald Trump becomes president. Believe me.

(APPLAUSE)

Hillary Clinton, on the other hand, is totally for open borders -- there goes your country -- which would mean the destruction of our country. It would really mean that. You got to have to have borders. If you don't have borders, we don't have a country.

She also wants to expand illegal executive amnesty, which would be really -- shred -- it would shred our Constitution.

Restoring National Security Act, which will eliminate the Obama- Clinton defense sequester, allow us to rebuild our military and gives veterans -- how many veterans?

(APPLAUSE)

The right to seek private medical care when they can't get proper service. The veterans are waiting on (ph) line for six, seven, eight days. They can't even get to see a doctor. Twenty-two suicides a day from our veterans. Do you believe that number? Twenty-two a day.

Under my plan, not only will we modernize our Navy's cruisers, but we'll also invest in the technologies of the future being developed right here in central Florida. My plan also includes major investments in space exploration, also right here. You know what we call this place.

(APPLAUSE)

Over the last eight years, the Obama-Clinton administration has undermined our space program tremendously. That will change. So many good things come out of it, including great jobs. And it will change very quickly under a Trump administration and it will change before it is too late. TRUMP: Do you ever see what's going on with space, with Russia and different places and us? We're like -- we're like watching. Isn't that nice? So much is learned from that, too.

As a cornerstone of my policy, we will substantially expand public-private partnerships to maximize the amount of investment and funding that is available for space exploration and development.

(APPLAUSE)

This means launching and operating major space assets right here that employ thousands and spur innovation and fuel economic growth. I will free NASA from the restriction of serving primarily as a logistics agency for low-earth orbit activity. Big deal.

(APPLAUSE)

Instead, we will refocus its mission on space exploration. Under a Trump administration, Florida and America will lead the way into the stars. With a victory in November, everything will change. Just think about what we can accomplish in the first 100 days.

(APPLAUSE)

In closing, we're going to have the biggest tax cut since Ronald Reagan, and actually even bigger.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to eliminate every unnecessary job-killing regulation. They're choking our businesses to death. We're going to provide school choice and put an end to common core and bring our education local.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to support our great men and women of law enforcement.

(APPLAUSE)

We will save our Second Amendment, which is totally under siege.

(APPLAUSE)

And appoint justices to the Supreme Court of the United States who will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

(APPLAUSE)

Republicans have to finally get smart and come together. This is our last chance. This is bigger than me or any of us. It's about our country. This is about ending Obamacare. This is about the Supreme Court. This is about rebuilding our military and taking care of our vets, strengthening our borders and keeping our companies and jobs from leaving our beloved country.

(APPLAUSE)

This is about restoring the rule of law, saving our Constitution, and keeping radical Islamic terrorists the hell out of our country.

(APPLAUSE)

I invite all Americans -- Republicans, Democrats, independents, first-time voters -- to join this incredible movement, a movement the likes of which has never been witnessed in this country before -- never, never, never been anything like this.

Let's not blow it, folks -- November 8th. Get out sooner if you can. It's a movement powered by our love for America and our love for our fellow citizens. We're in a divided country. We're going to bring everybody together, not just the people here. We're going to bring everybody together. We're going to fix our inner cities.

I'll tell you what, our inner cities are so, so bad right now. The danger, the crime, the lack of education, no jobs. African Americans are living in hell in our -- in the inner cities. I mean, they're living -- they're living in hell. You walk to the store for a loaf of bread; you get shot.

We're going to fix our inner cities. We're going to fix.

Remember this, remember this, just remember this, so important. For years, the Democrats have controlled the inner cities; some up to 100 years; some over 100 years; unbroken. I say to the African American community and to the Hispanic community: What the hell do you have to lose? I will fix it. We will make them good. We'll make them safe. We'll bring back jobs. We'll create good, good schools and education.

TRUMP: I will fix it. We will fix our inner cities. Hillary Clinton's been lying about the inner cities for years. She's not going to do anything. Frankly, you want to know the truth? She doesn't have the energy to do anything.

(APPLAUSE)

She doesn't have the energy. I'm going to fight for every citizen of every background from every stretch of this nation. I'm going to fight for every person in this country who believes government should serve the people, not the donors and not the special interests.

(APPLAUSE)

I'm going to fight to bring us all together as Americans. Just imagine what our country could accomplish if we started working together as one people, under one God, saluting one American flag.

(APPLAUSE)

Once again, we will have -- right -- once again, we will have a government of, by and for the people.

(APPLAUSE)

Of, by and for the people.

(APPLAUSE)

Folks, folks, we want to end Obamacare, we want to go to a plan that's so much better and so much less expensive, right? We want to have borders and we want people to come into our country. We welcome people, but they have to come in through a legal process. So, we're going to have a wall, but it's going to have a big, beautiful door and people are going to come into our country, but they're going to come in legally.

And by the way, just in case there's any question, yes, Mexico will pay for the wall 100 percent.

(APPLAUSE)

Think about, when you get in the voting booth, the United States Supreme Court. Just think about it because, I'll tell you what, you put the wrong justices on the Supreme Court and this country will never ever be the same. It will never be what you had hoped it would be, so just think about the United States Supreme Court. And we're going to bring -- so importantly, I got into this because of the border and the terror, but because of the border and because of trade.

And the trade is so easy for me. It's so obvious what's happening when our companies are flocking out. We're going to fix our trade, we're going to bring jobs back to our country, including this area, right here, which has been devastated.

(APPLAUSE)

Together, if we win on November 8th, and I really believe we will, we better.

(APPLAUSE)

We will make America wealthy again, we will make America strong again, we will make America safe again and we will make America great again.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you very much. God bless you. Go out and vote. God bless you.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Rep. Loretta Sanchez is running out of time to catch up to Attorney General Kamala Harris, who according to a new poll is leading in their California race for the U.S. Senate by 22 points.

With less than two weeks until election day, a poll released Wednesday by the Public Policy Institute of California showed Harris to be the choice of 42 percent of likely voters, compared to 20 percent for Sanchez. A second poll by the Hoover Institute on Wednesday showed Harris leading Sanchez by 19 points, 41 to 22 percent.

Both polls show that more than a third of voters either are undecided or don't plan to vote in the race to replace Sen. Barbara Boxer (D), who is retiring after nearly 24 years. During more than a year of campaigning, the dynamics of the race have remained the same: Sanchez running a distant second behind Harris, but with a large share of voters not committed to any candidate.

Harris, who is midway through her second term as state attorney general, and Sanchez, a 20-year House member from Orange County, are both Democrats. They're facing off on Nov. 8 because California election rules call for the two leading vote getters in the primaries to advance to the general election, even if they're from the same party. Harris won the June primary with 40 percent of the vote. Sanchez came in a distant second with 19 percent, but far ahead of several lesser-known Republican candidates.

"We're not taking anything for granted and we're working hard for every vote," Nathan Click, spokesman for Harris's campaign said. "This weekend, on Sunday, we're launching our statewide bus tour and Kamala is going to continue meeting with Californians and working hard for every vote."

Campaign aides for Sanchez did not return phone calls and emails seeking comment.

Sanchez has sought to sell her candidacy to Republicans and independents by touting her membership on the House Armed Services and Homeland Security committees. She also is counting on strong support from Hispanic voters to help her quest to become the first Latina elected to the Senate.

The Public Policy poll shows Harris with a slight lead among Republican likely voters — 24 percent to 21 percent — but 36 percent of GOP voters said they would not vote for either Democrat. Harris dominates with Democratic voters, 56 to 22 percent.

Sanchez holds an 8-point lead among Latino voters in the Public Policy poll, but Harris dominates by double digits with all other demographic groups, including white voters by 39 percent to 17 percent and African American, Asian American and other voters of color by 60 percent to 11 percent. Harris also leads with both men and women, and voters across all income levels.

When the 18 percent of all likely voters who say they will skip the Senate race are excluded, Harris's lead over Sanchez grows to 27 points — 51 to 24 percent.

Although a Public Policy survey taken a month ago showed Harris with a 7-point lead, the new survey is similar to a July poll that had Harris up by 18 points.

"However you look at this final poll of ours, there is very strong support for Harris," said Mark Baldassare, president and CEO of the Public Policy Institute of California.

The low-key race has not generated much voter interest. When the two candidates met for a debate earlier this month, the most memorable moment was at the end when Sanchez did a hip-hop dance move called the "dab."

"There was a debate, but it wasn't something that was highly noticed or that people paid a lot of attention to," Baldassare said. "There's not been a lot of advertising, campaigning or coverage for that matter of this election."

The latest Public Policy poll was based on a survey of 1,704 randomly selected adults conducted from Oct. 14 to Oct 23. It has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.4 percent.

The Hoover Institute poll also shows Harris with wide leads in most categories, including 57 percent to 24 percent among Democrats, and a one-point edge among Latinos, 34 percent to 33 percent, with 32 percent undecided. Sanchez leads among Republican voters 21 to 15 percent, but 64 percent of GOP voters said they were undecided.

Whalen said Republican voters are "trying to adjust to the oddness of this being the first time you have a high profile race that features two Democrats and no Republicans."

He also noted that the Public Policy poll showed Republican support for Trump at 70 percent, not as strong at the 88 percent of Democrats who support Clinton.

"Loretta Sanchez has the unfortunate job of trying to count on Republican votes in a year when Republican voters are dispirited," Whalen said.

The Hoover poll was an online survey of 1,250 likely voters done that took place Oct. 4-14 and has a margin of error of 3.28 percent.

The contest for the first open Senate seat in California in nearly a quarter century was expected to be one of the marquee races this cycle. But Harris, 52, became the instant front-runner when several high profile Democrats declined to run after she declared her candidacy. She won the backing of the California Democratic Party and has been endorsed by President Obama, Vice President Biden, Boxer and Sen. Dianne Feinstein. She also has raised more money than Sanchez and won the endorsements of some of the state's largest labor unions and progressive organizations representing **immigrants**, women and the environment.

Harris, whose mother **immigrated** from India and whose father was born in Jamaica, would become the second black woman elected to the Senate since Carol Moseley Braun of Illinois left in 1999.

Sanchez, whose mother and father are Mexican **immigrants**, has the support of 18 Democratic House members from California. Republican Rep. Darrell Issa also has said she would be the best choice for the Senate and a few former GOP elected officials, including Richard Riordan, who was mayor of Los Angeles from 1993 to 2001, have endorsed Sanchez.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ECONOMIC DESTITUTION and horrific drug violence in Central America, combined with a broken-down **immigration** system, are creating the conditions for a new migrant crisis. Illegal crossings have spiked for children and families from the Northern Triangle — Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala — reawakening fears of an emergency similar to the one that rattled Americans two years ago.

In such a situation, messaging matters. And the messages on **immigration** being received by desperate Central American families are counterproductive in the extreme.

Despite some effective U.S. programs aimed at gangs and drug crime, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala remain three of the world's bloodiest nations, each with stratospheric homicide rates. That helped drive the spike in unaccompanied minors who flooded through Mexico and into the United States in 2014.

The Obama administration dampened that flow mainly by jawboning it, cautioning migrants about the danger they faced from smugglers and the likelihood of deportation, while pressing Mexico to interdict Central Americans as they headed north. Barely a year later, that policy was in shreds after federal courts rejected the administration's attempt to deter underage border-crossers by detaining them, and Mexico proved an ineffective buffer.

Worse, the logjam in U.S. **immigration** courts made a mockery of President Obama's warning that migrants would be sent back. In fact, relatively few are. Cases are pending for more than half the 117,000 minors sent to **immigration** courts over the past nearly three years. Of that total, just 23,000 underage migrants were ordered deported — most of them no-shows at their hearings — and just a fraction have been located and removed.

The effect has been to signal Central American youths, who often arrive with their mothers, that if they can make it across the border they will be able to stay in the United States for at least a few years.

Hillary Clinton, who initially joined Mr. Obama in advising underage migrants to stay home, hasn't helped by switching positions. In March, she promised not to deport migrant children or their family members. It's no excuse that she flip-flopped under pressure from Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), who favored an open door for Central American youths. She has through her remarks contributed to the spike in illegal border crossings by minors, which have already reached 2014 levels.

Some measures to address the problem over the long term are underway: Congress has appropriated $750 million to help lift Central America from its misery. More immediately, however, U.S. officials should be unclogging **immigration** courts by hiring more judges and implementing a "rocket docket" to hasten minors through the system, not just to a preliminary hearing.

Terrible conditions in Central America cannot mean a suspension of border security. If images of thousands of migrants pouring northward become common, so will centrist support for mass deportations. That would be the worst outcome, and the end of any hope for an overhaul of the **immigration** system.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TAMPA, Fla. — Hours after Donald Trump appeared at the grand opening of his new hotel in Washington, D.C., the celebrity chef who once had big plans for a restaurant there spent the afternoon with Hillary Clinton instead.

José Andrés appeared on Wednesday afternoon at an outdoor rally with Clinton and sharply criticized Trump for his rhetoric about **immigrants**.

"Today I could be in a certain hotel in Washington, D.C. opening a restaurant inside,"Andrés said. "Here I am, not even mentioning him.

"We're not supposed to mention him until he apologizes to every Latino… every Mexican and every person he has insulted," he added.

You know it is going to be an amazing day when you are boarding a plane to #Tampa to join @HillaryClinton early voting rally!! #ImWithHer

Andrés's divorce from his deal with Trump's D.C. hotel probably couldn't have been messier.

A naturalized U.S. citizen who proudly employs **immigrants** at his many restaurants in the city, Andrés was incensed by Trump's anti-**immigrant** rhetoric and pulled out of the project, a Spanish-Japanese fusion restaurant.

Trump sued, and Andrés countersued, and that matter still isn't settled. But Andrés has now become one of Trump's adversaries in his political fight with Clinton.

"Someone talks about making America great again? What? Who are you?"Andrés added. "Where've you been?"

Andrés has already campaigned on Clinton's behalf and hasn't been shy about prodding the real estate businessman online.

Clinton is in the midst of a two-day Florida swing aimed at ginning up early voting ahead of Election Day.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lev Golinkin's Oct. 22 op-ed, "My mom, an **immigrant**, is vetted every day," told a story that is unfortunately too common. He described how his refugee mother had a successful career as a psychiatrist in Ukraine, only to work as a night security guard in the United States. Mr. Golinkin's mom is not alone. In fact, nearly 2 million **immigrants** and refugees who come to the United States with a college education and in-demand skills are unemployed or working survival jobs. The barriers to meaningful employment for refugees — even those who are highly educated and have specialized skills — are vast and often insurmountable without support.

We need to help refugees and **immigrants** find their place in the U.S. workforce because, as a country, we have as much to gain from them as they do from us. As Mr. Golinkin put it, "**Immigrants** respect and cherish this land, not because they're **immigrants**, but in spite of it." We are a nation built by **immigrants**. Let's draw on this proud heritage and help refugees fully integrate into the economic and social fabric of this country they now call home.

Nikki Cicerani, New York

The writer is president and chief executive of Upwardly Global.

Lev Golinkin's op-ed about his mother's **immigration** from Ukraine and her loving acceptance of the United States was a mean-spirited criticism of this country and its treatment of **immigrants**. Despite the many ways Mr. Golinkin's mother was hindered by her non-native status, such as her inability to practice psychiatry, she loves America.

I suggest Mr. Golinkin remember the Statue of Liberty's welcome to **immigrants**: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." He just might better understand his mother's loyalty to and love of America.

Jim Pembroke, Washington

Lev Golinkin's tribute to his mother brought tears to my eyes and rekindled memories of my own mother, who came to this country in the 1920s. In 1953, she took my brother and me to visit relatives in Germany. Her first act upon returning home to the United States was to kneel and kiss the ground of her beloved Vereinigten Staaten.

Alfred Duncker, Gaithersburg

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Newt Gingrich should have known better than to attempt to bully Megyn Kelly. But he proceeded with the plan in any case.

"I want to hear you use the words 'Bill Clinton, sexual predator.' I dare you. Say, 'Bill Clinton, sexual predator,' " said Gingrich in what will go down as one of the most memorable exchanges of the 2016 campaign. It may even rank with the 50-odd risible exchanges between CNN correspondents and that network's platoon of Donald Trump apologists.

No way was Kelly, Fox News's most precious asset, going to take dictation from Newt Gingrich, a sly and bumptious Trump surrogate with an expertise in red-herring deployment. The request to Kelly derived from the former House speaker's dismay with what he sees as an imbalance in coverage of the 2016 race: "Let me point out something to you," said Gingrich, zeroing in on how the network newscasts spent far more time on Trump-groping allegations than on revelations about the Clinton camp via WikiLeaks. "The three major networks spent 23 minutes attacking Donald Trump that night and 57 seconds on Hillary Clinton's secret speeches. You don't think this is a scale of bias worthy of Pravda and Izvestia?"

Kelly shot back, "If Trump is a sexual predator, that is -- "

The dash above is inserted to note that Kelly never had a chance to finish the thought, because Gingrich interrupted her. Like a boor. "He's not a sexual predator. You can't say that. You could not defend that statement. I'm sick and tired of people like you using language that's inflammatory, that's not true. … I think it's very unfair of you to do that, Megyn. "

Kelly objected that Gingrich didn't know whether it was true. The former speaker's obnoxiousness was such that it took Kelly a while to clarify what she was trying to say -- that if it's true that Trump forces himself on women (as he claimed to do in that "Access Hollywood" tape), then that's a story worthy of time on her program.

Pulling back from the specifics of this cinematic clash, a couple of themes emerge. Claiming media bias requires demonstrating different treatment of comparable stories. Here, Gingrich appears to be claiming that the stories from women of Trump's past confirming his boasts about predatory behavior deserved something closer to equal coverage to the stuff coming out of WikiLeaks regarding Hillary Clinton. This is the specific topic that Gingrich believes was undercovered: "Hillary Clinton in a secret speech in Brazil to a bank that pays her $225,000 saying her dream is an open border where 600 million people could come to America, that's not worth covering?"

That 600 million figure amounts to some fancy footwork by Gingrich; as FactCheck.org points out, Clinton in her time as secretary of state spoke of "open borders" in the context of unfettered international trade.

So there's little in the way of equivalence here. Just as there was little in the way of equivalence in Fox News host Howard Kurtz's criticism of the New York Times for printing a list of all of Donald Trump's Twitter insults, while refraining from publishing what he saw as a "comparable compilation of all the insults…in Clinton camp emails revealed by Wikileaks." That wouldn't be comparable.

And even if Clinton was a bit wobbly on her **immigration** stances, it would be hard to fault the media for gorging on the details regarding Trump's alleged sexual assaults. After all, that's a 236-pound character issue, something that transcends **immigration** or economic policy or even the Supreme Court. In his blustering appearance, however, Gingrich skated over those details, accusing Kelly of being "fascinated with sex and you don't care about public policy." Kelly's retort: "You know what, Mr. Speaker, I'm not fascinated by sex, but I am fascinated by protection of women and understanding what we're getting in the Oval Office."

What Kelly saw, rightly, as a big story has nothing to do with sex. It has to do with this: "We walked into that room alone, and Trump shut the door behind us. I turned around, and within seconds he was pushing me against the wall and forcing his tongue down my throat." Those sentences come from Natasha Stoynoff, the former People magazine reporter who alleges that Trump attacked her more than a decade ago as she was working on a story about Trump's wedding anniversary with Melania Trump.

That's an alleged crime, not sex.

As Gingrich prattled on about Bill Clinton's very own deplorable record with women -- "He'll be in the East Wing," he quipped -- Kelly responded that her program had covered that matter as well, though she noted that Bill Clinton wasn't on the ticket. Indeed, Kelly has provided some solid coverage of the race via interviews with people like Gingrich and Kellyanne Conway, while her adjacent prime-timers on Fox News -- Bill O'Reilly and Sean Hannity -- have embarrassed the network and all of journalism by welcoming the candidate himself for charade interviews (in O'Reilly's case) and transparent cheerleading interviews (in Hannity's more-honest-but-still-bankrupt approach). Save for an awful soft-focus interview in May on the Fox Broadcasting Co., Kelly hasn't been able to secure an interview with Trump. She's proving the important point that journalism can thrive without access.

In the case of Trump, perhaps that's the only way it can thrive.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republicans understood, or some of them did, after the 2012 presidential election that the GOP could not continue to put off Hispanic voters. The GOP nevertheless nominated an openly xenophobic candidate bent on demonizing Hispanics. The very fact that the border problem is minor (net **immigration** now flows from the United States to Mexico) compared with the visa overstays (many from Asia) suggests Donald Trump is fixated on keeping certain illegal **immigrants** out -- the ones he calls "murderers" and "rapists." If the GOP had a problem with Hispanics before this election, we can only imagine where it will be after the election.

Remember: Texas and Arizona, two red states with large Hispanic populations, are now in play and are winnable by Hillary Clinton, in part because of her strength with Hispanic voters. Trump this month has not had more than a four-point lead in polling. In Arizona, Clinton is ahead in the RealClearPolitics average. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) is leading comfortably in his reelection race.

Then there is Nevada, a state Trump won in the primaries and that is absolutely winnable in the general election. Nevada political guru Jon Ralston reports:

Of Culinary [Union]'s 57,000 members, more than 30,000 are Hispanic and nearly 7,000 are African-American. And on the eve of the election, nearly 60 percent — 34,000 — of the union's members are registered to vote, a record total for Local 226. . . .

And the vast majority of them will be voting for Clinton. Trump is both a motivator (compelling Hispanic voters to organize) and a totally unappealing candidate for the large majority of Hispanics. With early voting, Clinton is building a "firewall" of support, Ralston says. Early vote tallies show a 24,500 raw vote lead for Democrats.

Trump's plan to deport 11 million people -- which he reiterated at the third presidential debate in Las Vegas -- is a political disaster, not only in the animus it generates among minorities but in the negative effect on women, college-educated voters and young voters who perceive him as mean-spirited and prejudiced. Rounding up millions of people by force, separating families and destroying local economies turns out to be a loser among voters. (But everyone on the talk radio show hosts' call boards loves it! Seriously, that's how these people think.)

Even in states where Republicans didn't bank on winning, the party's overt xenophobia may cost it House seats. "Republican insiders there and in Washington say that Trump's unpopularity in ethnically diverse California is now threatening to crater their party down ballot — hurting members who were previously presumed safe from top of the ticket headwinds," writes David Drucker. He identifies at least four at-risk seats in districts with large numbers of Hispanic voters.

The anti-**immigrant** crowd would like to spin their concern as merely preventing illegal **immigration**. That charade has been dispelled this election cycle. In rejecting legal **immigration**, Republicans adopt an entirely anti-free-market approach, directly counter to our economic needs. Congratulations: They've allowed the Democrats to become the more sensible party on economic growth, technology and international economic leadership.

Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.), the man behind Trump's virulent anti-**immigration** approach, now wants to eliminate all H-1B visas. This is economic illiteracy of the worst kind. (Maybe he has no high-tech employers in Alabama?) A robust legal **immigration** program is an essential ingredient in any pro-growth plan. But now Republicans have adopted the stupid position, **immigration** exclusion.

**Immigration** and the overt hostility to large segments of the electorate will contribute to Trump's embarrassing defeat. The GOP's plunge into xenophobia is also a very good reason for Republicans who believe in tolerance, diversity, scientific progress and economic growth to leave the GOP. Meanwhile, the GOP commits electoral and intellectual suicide. To each his own.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

Will the GOP change in the After Trump (AT) era? This morning, the news is filled with speculative pieces about the battle among Republicans that is likely to unfold over that question, if and when Donald Trump loses the election, possibly by a large margin.

The New York Times reports this morning that Trump allies are actively laying plans to punish the GOP leadership for failing to fully embrace Trumpism -- and, crucially, to keep Trumpism's legacy very much alive as a malevolent and disruptive political force inside the Republican Party. The Times notes that Trump campaign CEO Stephen Bannon is intent on forcing out House Speaker Paul Ryan, while other leading congressional supporters of Trump are warning the GOP leadership not to dare moderate on **immigration**, which could stir the great Trumpian masses to rise up in rage.

In other words, the battle lines will roughly divide between GOP leaders, party strategists, and establishment figures who are urging one set of lessons to be drawn from the defeat (that the party needs to make peace with cultural and demographic change), and Trump supporters who are urging that a very different set of lessons be drawn (that the party must embrace Trump's species of ethno-nationalism and xenophobic, America First populism). As one congressional expert puts it: "I expect civil war within the GOP after November 8th, as party elites inside and outside of Congress jockey to assign blame and claim the GOP mantle going forward."

Putting aside the question of whether Ryan really needs to fear the threat of his ouster, all of this is terrible news for those who hope for a more functional opposition party that might be able to work with Hillary Clinton on matters such as **immigration** reform and fixing the problems with Obamacare.

The big question underlying all of this: whether defeat might crush or at least marginalize Trumpism as a force inside the party, by driving home to most mainstream GOP lawmakers, particularly in the House, that the party is staring in the face of long-term demographic doom, and that only cutting loose Trumpism can change that. (As I've suggested, a Trump loss in a place like Arizona might really help focus the minds of mainstream Republicans.) You'd think a large enough defeat could accomplish that. But conservative writer Philip Klein makes the case that, paradoxically enough, Trump's loss could actually strengthen the hold on GOP voters of the arguments some Trump supporters will make about his loss, making moderation even harder:

There will be people arguing that Trump isn't the problem at all, but that the GOP establishment didn't do enough to help him….There will also be Trump supporters who will argue that massive, systemic, voter fraud was to blame for Trump's defeat, and they'll want tougher voter ID laws, which will cut against establishment Republican efforts at minority outreach.

Those conclusions would be completely divorced from reality, but unfortunately, the polling suggests that they might find a willing audience among GOP voters. A recent Bloomberg poll found that 51 percent of Republicans and GOP-leaners say Trump better represents their view of what the GOP should stand for, while only 33 percent picked Ryan -- meaning they might be open to the argument that Ryan, not Trump, was the problem that led to the latter's inglorious defeat. Meanwhile, another poll shows that two thirds of Republicans think voter fraud is a bigger problem than voter disenfranchisement is -- meaning they'll be open to Trump's argument that the election was stolen from them, and will likely demand that GOP leaders continue to push to restrict voting, further alienating nonwhites (something those leaders might be inclined to do in any case).

Meanwhile, as one libertarian policy analyst recently suggested, Republican voters might be inclined to draw exactly the wrong lesson from an outcome that underscores the GOP's worsening demographic challenges: that the answer is to redouble opposition to **immigration**, since it is swelling the ranks of Latinos voting Democratic. That, too, would be a delusional conclusion to reach, but it's certainly a real possibility -- after all, polls showed that lots of Republican voters supported Trump's various prescriptions and pronouncements on **immigration**.

All of this means that the various interwoven fantasies Trump has played upon -- that the GOP leadership's lack of spine is to blame for the party's failure to "win" more; that voter fraud is rampant; that dark hordes flooding over the southern border constitute an existential threat to the country -- could conceivably be strengthened by a Trump loss.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* DEMS HAVE LONG TERM PLAN FOR TAKING BACK HOUSE: The Post has a good report on the current state of play in the battle for the House. It is very unlikely Dems will flip the 30 seats they need to get the majority back. But note this:

Democrats' long-term plan for reclaiming the House majority has anticipated a "demographic pivot" where well-educated, wealthy suburban dwellers who tended to vote Republican become increasingly Democratic over time. Trump, party strategists argue, has accelerated that pivot to the point that districts thought to be out of reach until 2018 or beyond are now in play.

One question will be whether Trumpism continues to stain the GOP after the election in the minds of those voters, and if so, whether that helps Dems ultimately get back the Lower Chamber.

\* CLINTON HOLDS WIDE NATIONAL LEAD, POLL FINDS: The latest ABC News national tracking poll finds Clinton leading Trump among likely voters by 49-40, though that's a slight tightening from previous days. The breakdowns:

Clinton leads by 17 points among women, while men divide essentially evenly, 42-45 percent, Clinton-Trump….Trump leads by 7 points among whites, Clinton by 49 points among nonwhites. Trump's best group demographically remains white men who don't have a four-year college degree, a 61-29 percent advantage over Clinton. She counters with virtually the same margin, 60-32 percent, among college-educated white women.

That lopsided margin among college educated white women could have lasting implications. By the way, the averages have the spread a bit tighter (six points) than ABC does, so keep that in mind.

\* UNDECIDED VOTERS VARY FROM STATE TO STATE: Nate Silver breaks down the polling and concludes that the number of remaining voters varies, depending on the state, which could matter in the final two weeks:

The fewest undecideds are in Florida, North Carolina, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Nevada….These are states where both parties have their bases, with voters split heavily along racial, religious and educational lines….Maine, Michigan, Colorado, Iowa, and New Hampshire have more undecided voters than the others….they have something in common: a lot of white voters, and particularly a lot of middle-class whites, which is one group that's still relatively torn between the candidates.

Of course, if much of the vote is locked down in those first five states, and Clinton is up, Trump won't have a path. But we don't know whether that's the case yet.

\* NEW POLL FINDS TRUMP LEADING IN FLORIDA: Here's a rare sighting: A good poll for Trump. The Bloomberg Politics survey finds Trump leading among likely voters in Florida by 45-43 in the four-way, and by 46-45.

This is the best poll for Trump in the state in a long time. According to HuffPollster, Clinton has led in around 20 of the most recent polls (two were tied), and a poll hasn't shown Trump up since mid-September. The averages put Clinton up slightly over three points.

\* WILL PAUL RYAN SURVIVE? Congressional reporter Billy House reports that the hard-right Freedom Caucus is making noises about ousting Ryan after the elections, but Ryan will probably be able to hang on, anyway:

Ryan's anguished on-again, off-again support of Trump has left him in no man's land inside the Republican Party -- tainted by his endorsement of the nominee while facing a possible revolt by Trump backers for having largely abandoned him. Ryan is likely to withstand any attempt…to oust him…but Trump's attacks on Ryan may have done lasting damage to his stature among the party's base, just as he weighs a possible White House run in four years.

Needless to say, Trump will do everything he can to incite his mob of supporters to blame Ryan for his loss. The coming civil war should be interesting to watch.

\* TRUMP LAYS GROUNDWORK TO BLAME RYAN: He's already going there in this interview with Reuters:

"The people are very angry with the leadership of this party, because this is an election that we will win 100 percent if we had support from the top. I think we're going to win it anyway."

Of course, it would never occur to Trump that his own behavior might have had something to do with the fact that Ryan broke with him (finally, after months of racism and hate).

\* AND McCONNELL GOES QUIET ON TRUMP'S 'RIGGED' LIES: The Associated Press tried to get Mitch McConnell to comment on Trump's claims that the election is "rigged." No luck:

Asked if he agreed with Trump that the election is "rigged," McConnell laughed and walked away. McConnell's silence is especially notable in light of Trump's recent complaints about the election system and hints he might not ultimately accept the results….McConnell has offered no reaction, passing up the opportunity to defend the nation's democratic institutions.

Of course, GOP leaders have been validating the myth of rampant "voter fraud" for years amid efforts to restrict voting, so this isn't that surprising.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If we do not experience some cataclysmic event, Donald Trump will lose badly and many Republicans will lose their seats. Trump may or may not concede, and the nutty cheering section (from Bill O'Reilly to Breitbart) can cry foul and blame whomever they please. (Surely not themselves!) But it will hardly matter. There will be much discussion on the right, some thoughtful and some ridiculous, about what went wrong, who is to blame, how to fix the GOP, etc. But is all that really necessary?

Surely there is a sufficient body of people in the center-right who are entirely and thoroughly disgusted with the existing GOP. The once Grand Old Party has come to embody the heinous qualities that liberals unfairly attributed to all Republicans (e.g. hostile to women, the poor and **immigrants**) and as a political matter has atrophied and accommodated itself to charlatans, snake-oil salesmen and alt-right bigots. Don't try to reason with this crowd; just up and go.

Center-right Americans committed to a strong national security policy, free markets with a humane safety net and corrupt-free politics can just leave the GOP and start something new. No furrowed brows and sweating over whether to fire Reince Priebus would be needed. No need to figure out how to expel the evangelical charlatans who believe in nothing but their own power. No need to figure out how to keep talk-radio hecklers and fake Fox News figures from spreading nonsense and making the party dumber by the year. No need to wrest control of early primaries from states that favor fringe candidates.

Plant a flag, announce your principles and then decide whom you want to invite. Save all the energy that otherwise would be wasted on another useless autopsy report and arguing with people who threw away every conviction to support Trump.

Instead, these refugees from the GOP can draft a simple statement rejecting the politics of division, misinformation, anger, racism and misogyny. They should not be shy about going on record to condemn the nomination of someone as patently unfit for public office as Trump. They should vow to support candidates of principle and good character.

The charter for the New Party, or whatever it is called, should not be a laundry list of positions but rather a commitment to practice civil politics and to respect fellow Americans. Conservative habits -- moderation, gradualism, tolerance, humility, rational balancing of conflicting concerns, respect for institutions that comprise civil society (from families to churches to volunteer groups) -- should be front and center. It is these ideals and habits of mind, even more than issue positions, that will separate the New Party's politics from the old Republican Party.

Anti-intellectualism should be rejected as should the nostalgia for a bygone America that never really existed. The new movement must embrace modernism -- which, yes, entails a global economy, a diverse American population, a refusal to cut ourselves off from the world and a commitment to government reform of the tax code, anti-poverty measures, criminal justice, **immigration**, education, health care, etc. The New Party cannot blow on the embers of the Reagan Revolution in a vain effort to rekindle a 40-year-old flame.

Like moving across the country, starting a new political movement or party allows one to leave behind broken furniture and crazy relatives. One can escape from the bullies, the phonies and the know-nothings. A movement that rejects Trump enablers need not, must not, import into a new enterprise the same noxious elements and aversion to reality that crippled the GOP.

That, it seems from our vantage point, is what the Evan McMullin/Mindy Finn ticket and other #NeverTrump forces have been hinting at: the chance to start over with fresh ideas, fresh leaders and a fresh appreciation for the importance of integrity, public service and character.

And what is left behind? Goodness knows. Let Reince Priebus, Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, Heritage Action, the Freedom Caucus and the people who embraced and shilled and worked for Trump (although they had once deemed him unfit) squawk to their heart's delight in their echo chamber. They can clean up their own mess -- or not. Yes, it's time for the sane and sober Republicans to pack their bags and go.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Secretary of State Hillary Clinton allowed thousands of criminal aliens to be released because their home countries wouldn't take them back, because they're smart. They don't want to take back killers and drug dealers and all of the people that we're sending back. It was just reported, and Hillary took it -- she said, 'All right, look, bring them back, bring them back. They won't take them. Bring them back.'" — Donald Trump, remarks in Fletcher, N.C., Oct. 21

"There are at least 23 countries that refuse to take their people back after they've been ordered to leave the United States, including large number of violent criminals. … Due to a Supreme Court decision, if these violent defenders cannot be sent home, our law enforcement officers have to release them into your communities." — Trump, remarks in Phoenix, Aug. 31

This is a good example of how politicians can start earning Pinocchios through subtle — and not so subtle — changes in language. In August, during a speech on **immigration**, Trump correctly identified a problem: Undocumented **immigrants** who had committed crimes must be released if the home country will not take them back because the Supreme Court ruled that they could not be held indefinitely.

But look how Trump's language has changed as the presidential race heads into its final weeks — now, it's all Hillary Clinton's fault. In fact, he even appears to quote her as saying "bring them back."

The Facts

The Supreme Court ruled in 2001, in Zadvydas v. Davis, that the United States can hold foreigners with deportation orders for only six months if their home country refuses to accept them. Between 2010 and 2014, 121 illegal **immigrants** released from detention were later charged in homicides, to the increasing irritation of lawmakers in Congress.

A section of the **Immigration** and Nationality Act — 243 (d) — does give the secretary of state the power to discontinue the granting of certain types of visas to countries that refuse to accept undocumented **immigrants** convicted of crimes. Such action was taken in 2001, against Guyana, and then most recently, on Oct. 1, against Gambia. When visas were denied to Guyana in 2001, within two months the country agreed to accept 112 illegal **immigrants** with removal orders.

But it should be little wonder that such draconian action occurs relatively rarely — and is levied against relatively small countries with little economic power. China, for instance, is another one of the 23 countries — and one can imagine that U.S. diplomats would be wary of banning visas from China when China and the United States have such a complex and important economic relationship. (Indeed, 1,900 travel document requests for criminal **immigrants** have been pending with China since 2008.) This reluctance has existed in both the George W. Bush and Obama administrations, under various secretaries of state.

"Use of this authority must be considered in light of both the potential impact it could have on U.S. foreign and domestic policy interests, particularly with respect to adverse effects on bilateral relations with a foreign partner, and whether visa restrictions will be an effective tool in gaining the country's compliance," Daniel H. Ragsdale, deputy director of U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE), told Congress in June.

In testimony before Congress on Sept. 22, ICE Director Sarah Saldana said the agency, working with the State Department, "has ramped up its efforts to improve the cooperation of recalcitrant countries."

"In April, May and July 2016, I sent letters to DOS [the Department of State] to explore additional options regarding cooperation from Guinea, Cuba, Liberia, China, Afghanistan, Mali and the Gambia," she said. "ICE, along with DOS, has also been more active in meeting with foreign governments to try to improve cooperation," she added, citing the removal of eight Guinean nationals on Aug. 18.

So Trump has identified a real problem, one that U.S. officials say they are trying to address. But his criticism goes off the rails when he suggests that Clinton decided to allow these illegal **immigrants** to stay here. Presumably he remembers that he once noted a Supreme Court decision made it impossible to hold these people indefinitely.

Trump could argue that Clinton failed to invoke section 243 (d), a step that Secretary of State John F. Kerry has now taken. But actually, under Clinton, the State Department and ICE in 2011 signed a memorandum of understanding to increase pressure on recalcitrant countries. The MOU outlined a series of increasingly tougher steps that could be taken when dealing with countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals, including:

• issue an official protest, known as a démarche, or series of démarches; • hold a joint meeting with the country's ambassador to the United States, assistant secretary for consular affairs and director of ICE; • consider whether to provide notice of the U.S. government's intent to formally determine that the subject country is not accepting the return of its nationals and that the U.S. government intends to exercise authority under section 243(d) to encourage compliance; • consider visa sanctions under section 243(d) of the INA; • and call for an interagency meeting to pursue withholding of aid or other funding.

In other words, under Clinton, the State Department and ICE agreed on a process that would gradually increase pressure on countries that refused to accept the return of criminal **immigrants**. At the end of that process, section 243(d) could be invoked.

Documents provided by ICE to lawmakers demonstrate how slowly the wheels of diplomacy can turn. In the case of Guinea, a démarche was issued in July 2010, a meeting with the ambassador was held in August 2011, another meeting was held in May 2012, a delegation from Guinea arrived in the United States in June 2012 to discuss the situation, a proposed MOU with Guinea was drafted and sent in April 2013 but received no response, more meetings were held in June 2015 with a new ambassador from Guinea, and in February 2016, a teleconference was held to discuss the removal of 15 individuals. Finally, in August, eight criminals were sent back -- six years after an official protest about Guinea's attitude was first issued.

One could argue that the process is too cumbersome, with the State Department apparently placing ICE's concerns relatively low on its priority list. Still, five years later, the process set in place under Clinton finally has resulted in 243(d) sanctions against at least one country. Congressional pressure clearly also has played an important role.

One of the worst offenders is Cuba, as there are 35,000 Cubans that ICE would like to deport. The Obama administration did not make the issue a priority when relations were normalized with Cuba. That could be a fair criticism — but that happened after Clinton left the State Department.

The Trump campaign did not respond to a request for comment. Update, 4:15 p.m.: The Trump campaign provided this statement:

"Mr. Trump has explained that 243(d) 'commands the Secretary of State to stop issuing visas to these countries' and noted that 'Secretary Hillary Clinton ignored this law and refused to use this powerful tool to bring nations into compliance.' In 2010 alone, Secretary Clinton's decision to ignore federal law allowed 4,927 illegal **immigrants** — 3,882 of whom are convicted criminals — to be released into the United States."

Update, Oct. 26: Julie Kirchner, a Trump policy advisor, accused The Fact Checker of spreading "lies and misinformation" in a Medium post on this issue.

The Pinocchio Test

Trump would be well advised to return to his original language on this issue. He had framed it correctly as a situation created by the Supreme Court that has lacked high-level attention and focus since at least 2001. But when he suggests that Clinton herself is to blame, literally ordering criminal illegal **immigrants**back to the United States, he ends up with Three Pinocchios. Clinton in theory could have invoked 243(d), but that's a dramatic step that is taken after other, less draconian efforts are exhausted. Moreover, under Clinton, the State Department and ICE formalized a process for increasing pressure on recalcitrant countries.

Three Pinocchios
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GILBERT, Ariz. — Sen. John McCain is already thinking about life after Donald Trump.

The Arizona Republican turned a recent question about millennial farmers into a soul-searching answer about the Republican Party's future once, presumably, Trump loses the presidential election.

"Speaking as a proud Republican, we're going to have to look at our party and look at how we can get back to the party of Abraham Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan," McCain told leaders of the Arizona Farm Bureau. "Ronald Reagan used to say if a fellow agrees with me 80 percent of the time, then I'm with him."

He lamented the purist ideological approach that many conservatives now apply.

"You've got to be 110 percent, otherwise you're out," McCain said. "We've got to be a big-tent party."

McCain, 80, can afford to think about his party's future, largely because he is improbablywell ahead in his bid for a sixth term. Following a competitive August primary against a tea party conservative in which he barely cleared 50 percent, the senator is now leading Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D-Ariz.) by about 10 percentage points in a state where some polling shows Hillary Clinton pulling ahead of Trump.

An Arizona Republic poll found McCain with a solid establishment coalition, garnering more than 75 percent of Republican voters, 50 percent of independents and 25 percent of Democrats. It's a surprising turnaround for a man whose introduction on the national stage came as an anti-establishment truth-teller riding his "Straight Talk Express" in an unsuccessful bid for the 2000 Republican presidential nomination.

Trump has targeted the senator in this year of deep anti-establishment fervor, first by slamming the former Vietnam prisoner of war as not being a "war hero" because he was captured. Yet McCain made a clean break from Trump only after the release early this month of a2005 videotape in which Trump openly bragged about lewd sexual advances.

Public polling is split on whether that decision has cost McCain among deeply conservative voters. But Democratic strategists continue to privately say this race is not among their top targets. The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and its liberal super PAC allies have not spent on the airwaves here in the general election, believing that Kirkpatrick can topple McCain only if Clinton routs Trump in the presidential race.

To that end, Clinton's campaign hasgone all-in trying to win Arizona, something only one Democrat, Bill Clinton, has done in a presidential race since Harry S. Truman in 1948.

Clinton's campaign dispatched Michelle Obama to the state for a rally Thursday — Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.) was in Flagstaff on Tuesday — and has invested $2 million to be spent largely on the ground. The key demographic will be the state's burgeoning Hispanic vote, which might top 20 percent for the first time and is largely against Trump's nativist campaign.

Kirkpatrick is trying to lasso this late burst of activity to pull off what would be the biggest upset of the election season. She is focusing on highlighting McCain's shifting positions on issues, with TV ads showing McCain sounding like Trump in his last reelection rodeo, in 2010, as he called for a "danged fence" along the border. McCain's back-and-forth on Trump's candidacy plays into the idea that he is not taking firm stands.

"They can't believe John McCain didn't stand up for himself when Trump insulted him, and they really believe if he can't stand up for himself, he's not going to stand up for voters in Arizona," Kirkpatrick said after an event with several dozen retired federal workers in Tempe.

But McCain has built a modern campaign organization that has helped shield him from the turmoil of the presidential race, modeled in large part after the 2014 reelection bid by Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), now the Senate majority leader, who like McCain first had to fend off a primary challenge from the right.

The octogenarian has a small army of college and high school interns who knock on doors in search of likely McCain supporters. It's a more aggressive and data-driven approach than Senate campaigns have normally taken, having previously relied more heavily on state Republican parties and the Republican National Committee for get-out-the-vote operations.

Another prince of the Republican establishment, Sen. Rob Portman (Ohio), a former member of House GOP leadership and an adviser to both Bush presidents, used a similar model. It has helped position Portman for a surprisingly easy victory over former governor Ted Strickland, who was essentially abandoned by Democrats in the late summer because he fell so far behind.

McCain and Portman have adopted the overwhelming-force doctrine in their campaigns, amassing huge stockpiles of campaign cash and dispensing it early and often. Even as McCain navigated a primary challenge that did not conclude until the end of August, his campaign ran a heavy dose of ads portraying Kirkpatrick as a liberal ally of President Obama and Hillary Clinton.

One such ad shows Kirkpatrick walking away from angry voters during the run-up to her vote for the 2010 Affordable Care Act, then cuts to images of McCain's time as a POW.

Polls over the summer showed Kirkpatrick within a few points of McCain in a head-to-head matchup, but Democrats in Washington think those numbers were false positives. They suggest that McCain's vote was underestimated because some conservatives were unwilling to support the incumbent until his primary was over. They cite a similar dynamic in the presidential primary, with Sanders supporters unwilling to back Clinton before that contest ended.

Following his primary victory, McCain quickly pivoted to the general election. During the primary, his campaign literature called only for making "the border stronger, safer and more secure," without mentioning a 2013 **immigration** bill he co-authored. But this week, McCain, unprompted, brought up his support for a path to U.S. citizenship for undocumented **immigrants**.

"Sooner or later we're bound to take up **immigration** reform again, because there's 11 million people that are in this country illegally," he told the farm leaders. "We're going to have to address it."

Some Arizonans have grown tired of McCain's pivots. Jim Keyser, the head of the local federal employees union, said he backed McCain as recently as 2008 in his race against Obama. "It's time for a change," said Keyser, 69. "He's been there forever."

Joyce Vogt, 45, became upset when she asked McCain about Trump's behavior toward women and its contribution to "rape culture."

The senator handed the microphone to his wife, Cindy McCain, who has worked for years fighting sex trafficking and other issues related to abuse of women.

"He dodged it. He handed it off to his wife," Vogt said after an event with business leaders in Chandler, southeast of Phoenix. "He needs to retire."

For now, however, more voters appear to be taking the view of Stefanie Smallhouse, vice president of the state's farm bureau. She is happily voting for McCain and reluctantly backing Trump.

"When people ask me and talk to me about the election, I just tell them I'm voting for the Supreme Court," she said.

Smallhouse told McCain that she suffers "extreme anxiety" and sleepless nights, disgusted by Trump's behavior but fearful of more Democratic regulations on farm policy.

"I've heard more people express exactly what you just expressed in my campaign than I've ever heard before," he said, trying to ease her concerns.

Of course, by his own actions, McCain is effectively rejecting a Trump presidency. He's not certain Clinton will win, but he's ready to begin the conversation about what Republicans do after the race is over.

As he searched for answers, he acknowledged that there were no easy solutions.

"Stay engaged," McCain told the audience.

paul.kane@washpost.com

Correction: An earlier version of this article misspelled Stefanie Smallhouse's name.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The 2016 election has turned into a nightmare for the Republican Party.

With Donald Trump ensnared in a wave of scandals, allegations, and feuds — many of his own making — a considerable number of Republican elected officials have taken the unusual step of withdrawing support for their party's presidential nominee. In a race that should have been tight but winnable, Hillary Clinton now has a considerable lead in national and state polls.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/08/03/the-democrats-are-surprisingly-unified-that-should-help-hillary-clinton/"]The[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/08/03/the-democrats-are-surprisingly-unified-that-should-help-hillary-clinton/"]The] Democrats are surprisingly unified. That should help Hillary Clinton.[/interstitial\_link]

If Trump does indeed lose, some party officials may interpret a Trump defeat simply as a repudiation of the candidate's weaknesses. But whatever damage Trump's actions have done to his support, that conclusion ignores the considerable problems within the GOP coalition that long predated 2016.

Specifically, Republicans for decades have had trouble winning over black, minority and female voters. All the way back in 1976, then-Kansas Sen. Bob Dole said in a speech to the Republican Governors Association that the GOP had an "anti-people image" and would need to reach out to "women, the young, the blacks, the Hispanics, the ethnics," and "the Indians."

But in the past 40 years, the GOP has largely failed to heed Dole's call. To be sure, the party's considerable strength among white (male) voters allowed it to win three landslide presidential races in the 1980s, take Congress in 1994 and achieve major victories in 2010 and 2014. But if Trump loses, Democrats will have won five out of seven presidential elections since 1992. That is largely a product of their overwhelming support among black, Hispanic, and Asian American voters, and considerable advantages among women and young people.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/09/08/how-different-are-the-democratic-and-republican-parties-too-different-to-compare/"]How[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/09/08/how-different-are-the-democratic-and-republican-parties-too-different-to-compare/"]How] different are the Democratic and Republican parties? Too different to compare.[/interstitial\_link]

As the GOP's post-2012 "autopsy report" acknowledged, older white male voters are a shrinking demographic, making outreach to minority and female voters essential. But how does the party appeal to voters who are currently voting for Democrats without embracing policy positions, such as **immigration** reform, that are unacceptable to a major subset of its current base?

What the GOP can learn from the 1956 Democrats

Some answers might come from an unlikely source: the 1956 Democratic Party, which had to deal with a similar coalitional challenge.

At first glance, 1956 may not seem to have been a particularly bad election for Democrats. Although Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower won a predictable reelection victory in a landslide, Democrats maintained their small majorities in the House and Senate.

But they had seen a major drop in support of black and union voters, part of the backbone of the party's coalition. Eisenhower, for instance, managed to win nearly 40 percent of black votes in 1956.

Liberals feared this shift would be permanent, robbing Democrats of a crucial base. They laid the blame at the feet of the party's complicated national coalition.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/09/01/the-republican-partys-civil-war-actually-began-decades-ago/"]The[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/09/01/the-republican-partys-civil-war-actually-began-decades-ago/"]The] Republican Party's civil war actually began decades ago[/interstitial\_link]

At the time, the Democratic Party consisted of two ideological wings: a minority of (Southern) conservatives and a majority of liberals. Throughout the New Deal years, this coalition provided the party with majorities in the House, Senate and electoral college. But to keep conservatives on board, liberals had to make considerable concessions — most notably in terms of civil rights and labor issues.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/24/poll-60-of-republicans-believe-illegal-**immigrants**-vote-43-believe-people-vote-using-dead-peoples-names/"]Poll[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/24/poll-60-of-republicans-believe-illegal-immigrants-vote-43-believe-people-vote-using-dead-peoples-names/"]Poll]: 60% of Republicans believe illegal **immigrants** vote, and 43% believe people vote using dead people's names.[/interstitial\_link]

By 1956, black and union voters had had enough. Liberal Democrats realized that they could no longer please Southern conservatives and Northeast liberals at the same time.

The Democrats' response to a fractious coalition

To solve this problem, liberals, including Democratic National Committee Chairman Paul Butler, used the DNC to provide a radical solution.

For the first time, the DNC claimed the right to set policy positions for the national party and used this to rebrand the Democratic Party as a solidly liberal organization, supporting civil rights, pro-union legislation, the creation of Medicaid and increased government spending.

Each of these ran counter to the wishes of Southern Democrats. But liberals thought that the greater good of the party required it to drop these voters and elected officials to remain competitive among a larger group of voters across the country.

They didn't do this behind closed doors. In a TV interview a few weeks before the 1958 midterms, Butler told Southern conservatives that "if they did not like the party's official stand in favor of [civil rights] they could find asylum either with the Republicans or in a third political party."

As political scientist James Sundquist concluded, the "uncompromisingly liberal stand" of the DNC helped convince liberal voters that the "outright defiance" of Southern Democrats on civil rights "was not the Democratic Party's position." Similarly, political scientist Philip Klinkner argues that the DNC's shift to the left helped "the party to formulate what was ultimately a successful agenda for the 1960 campaign."

Of course, the 1956 response did not magically solve the Democrats' problems. The party's move to the left meant its Southern support in presidential elections began to collapse. Eventually, this expanded to House and Senate races, ending the Democrats' perpetual majorities in Congress. The shift also allowed the GOP to move into the vacuum left behind and develop its "Southern strategy" in the presidential election campaigns of Richard M. Nixon and Ronald Reagan.

Liberals argued, however, that if the party had not shifted, the Democrats would have been in even worse shape.

Republicans had begun to be competitive in the South, with Eisenhower winning close to 50 percent of the vote in both 1952 and 1956. Liberals argued that the party's coalition was untenable, and that it would cost it the dominant position in the North, leave it with conservative Southern Democrats in Congress who voted with Republicans on many issues, and lose any plausible path to a majority in the electoral college. Democrats would thus become a permanent minority party.

2016 Republicans may face a similar dilemma

If Trump loses in November, Republican leaders have a similar choice. They can continue along the same path they have followed in recent years, or they can try to actively compete for a growing segment of the voting population. The latter will require Republican leaders in Congress or the Republican National Committee to fully embrace policy positions that would allow them to genuinely compete for minority votes.

Doing so, of course, would not play well with a core element of the GOP's base — and could hurt the party in 2018 and 2020. It also is unlikely that minority voters will flock to the GOP the moment the party changed its positions. The risk is losing electoral strength in the short term in exchange for uncertain improvement in the long term.

The question Republicans may need to ask is whether, without change, the party is setting itself up for an even worse future.

Boris Heersink is a PhD candidate in the Woodrow Wilson Department of Politics at the University of Virginia.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Agustin Gomez has waited. The Las Vegas resident says he has held a green card for 17 years. But this March, frustrated by Donald Trump's **immigration**rhetoric, the 40-year-old cook felt inspired to finally become a U.S. citizen so he could vote for Hillary Clinton. "She's better for the country," Gomez said. "The other Trump guy, he's bad about Mexican people. There's too much discrimination by him. That's why I want to vote."

Last week, after months of waiting, Gomez finally heard back from U.S. Citizenship and **Immigration** Services about the scheduled date for his naturalization interview. The rub: the appointment is on Nov. 8, the day he hoped to cast his ballot for Clinton.

"Maybe next election I can vote," he said, with just a hint of regret.

Gomez is just one of the thousands of applicants affected by the growing naturalization backlog. According to USCIS data covering April to June of this year, released by USCIS on Sept. 30, delays will leave around a half-million applicants with pending naturalization applications and thus unable to vote in the upcoming presidential election — a race in which **immigration** was a defining issue.

According to a National Partnership for New Americans report, since this time last year, nearly 930,000 people have applied for citizenship, up 32.1 percent over the same period in 2015. According to the report, the backlog has grown at about the same rate, up 31.2 percent since 2015.

[What is the core dilemma of U.S. **immigration** policy?]

It's just one of the issues plaguing the agency: Earlier this year, Department of Homeland Security Inspector General John Roth slammed USCIS for failing to modernize its information technology. Last month, Roth issued a report critiquing the agency for improperly approving more than 850 citizenship petitions — leading a number of congressional Republicans to demand that the agency beef up protective measures to ensure only those eligible become citizens.

A DHS official explained the naturalization situation this way: "USCIS uses statistical forecasting models to plan for the potential increased volume of work. USCIS anticipated that there would be a spike in applications this year, as we usually see in an election year, but the increase in N-400 applications has exceeded expectations." Despite this, the official maintained that "the current pending workload does not equate to a backlog."

But, according to NPNA's deputy director, Tara Raghuveer, the current delay in processing citizenship petitions reveals a predictable failure in USCIS's forecasting. Historically, naturalization rates increase both in election years and periods in which the N-400 filing fee goes up, she says. Both factors are currently at play — according to the USCIS website, filing fees are set to go up by 21 percent. Given that this cost increase takes place at the same time as a major-party presidential candidate has been stoking anti-**immigrant** sentiment, USCIS could have anticipated, and better prepared for, the influx of citizenship petitions.

"Across the country, hundreds of thousands of people are going to be disenfranchised **immigrant** voters. That's not right. That corrodes the basis of our American democratic administration and prevents people from being civically engaged," Raghuveer said.

NPNA and other organizations urged applicants to file naturalization applications before May 1, to give their applications time to be processed, allowing them to become citizens, and voters, in time for the November election.

According to Oscar Chacon, executive director of Alianza Americas, an organization that has partnered with NPNA, many of those who applied for citizenship this year were motivated to vote on **immigration** reform. Many were Latinos who felt threatened by Trump's harsh anti-**immigrant** rhetoric, including his first campaign speech, in which he referred to at least some Mexican **immigrants** as drug dealers and rapists and vowed to build a border wall and make Mexico pay for it.

"Becoming a citizen is now the only option that we have," Chacon said. "There are people who are very happy to attack us. When they attack, one of the ways we can indeed respond is that we can show how invested in the U.S. not only economic system, but also political system, we are by voting in increased numbers."

[The GOP is breaking. It's not Trump's fault.]

Some of the naturalization backlog is centered at **immigration** offices in battleground states including Pennsylvania, Florida and Nevada. In Nevada, citizenship applications have increased 53.8 percent since 2015, while the backlog has grown 89.4 percent and left more than 6,800 people unsure if their voices will be heard come November.

"That makes it somewhat more regrettable there hasn't been an expedited way of processing applications in the USCIS because we could become a more powerful voting bloc in these particular states," Chacon said.

According to the DHS official, although USCIS has responded to the backlog by paying staff overtime, and by reshuffling applications to other, less busy field offices, many of those who hoped to vote in November won't be eligible in time.

"Speed it up," says Sylvia Puente, executive director of the Latino Policy Forum, who says USCIS's efforts are too little, too late. "Have people work longer hours to speed up the process. I understand that it's a lot of requirements and lot of background checks, but I think they have to really do what they can to bring in people." Like Raghuveer, she expressed frustration that 95 percent of USCIS funding comes from fees — including $680 for N-400s — even though Congress could provide additional funding that would help speed up the process and support a quintessentially American activity: becoming American.

Citizenship petitions are already cost-prohibitive. Applicants pay the fees, learn English, study for the required civics test and go through a background check in the hopes of becoming citizens and exercising the franchise. Right now, though, the system that is supposed to reward **immigrants** who play by the rules is the same one that is holding them back.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Warning: Thar be spoilers ahead.

On the CW's "Supergirl" Monday night, Lynda Carter quickly made an impact in her debut as the American president. And Carter, whose 1970s spin as TV's Wonder Woman remains iconic, seemed at home in her new world of small-screen DC superheroes.

The new story line: Carter's president aims to sign an **alien** amnesty bill (the nods to real-life **immigration** legislation are strong here). Aliens hide in the shadows in National City, and her new law would allow extraterrestrial beings to reveal themselves without fear of persecution.

The biggest shocker was Carter's POTUS revealing herself to be some sort of **alien** herself. In the episode's final scene, we see her walking away with glowing eyes and skin that turns red (similar to how the Martian Manhunter was introduced on "Supergirl" last season).

This twist signals that Carter should be a frequent presence this season, as viewers try to solve the mystery of her character's identity.

The episode also offered a few fun Easter eggs of tribute to Wonder Woman. When a flame-emitting **alien** tries to assassinate the president by incineration, Supergirl catches on fire in protecting POTUS. As Supergirl's costume burns, she extinguishes the flames by spinning — just as Carter's Wonder Woman would. And when Supergirl gushes to the POTUS that she was excited to see Air Force One, Carter says, "You should see my other jet" -- a nod to Wonder Woman's invisible plane.

Mon-El, who rocketed to Earth in "Supergirl's" first-season finale, is revealed to be an **alien** from the planet Daxam. He is shocked to learn that his planet was destroyed along with Krypton. Supergirl initially suspects that Mon-El is the **alien** trying to kill the POTUS, because while she was growing up on Krypton, Daxamites and Kryptonians were rivals.

Supergirl interrogates Mon-El with a fist-swinging first attack, convinced that he's guilty of the assassination attempt. She eventually realizes the error of her prejudice.

Now, knowing he can't go home, Mon-El will lean on Supergirl to find his way in a new world he doesn't understand. His presence provides the opportunity to give Supergirl a superpowered love interest, but given the history of their respective races, that may develop further down the road.

A past Supergirl love interest, James Olsen, is now running Catco — with Cat Grant taking a leave of absence from her company. It will be interesting to see how James balances running a media company, now that we know he'll soon be suiting up as classic DC superhero the Guardian sometime this season. It will be interesting to see whether James can be a vigilante and run a media company.

Speaking of classic DC Comics characters, Detective Maggie Sawyer, one of DC's highest-profile gay characters, made her debut on "Supergirl." Just like in the comic books, Sawyer is a police officer who specializes in meta-human crimes. She also has already begun a somewhat flirty friendship with Supergirl's adopted sister, Alex.

Sawyer frequents an underground bar that is a safe haven for aliens who don't want to reveal their outer-space origins. The bartender, an **alien** herself, turns out to be Miss Martian; she reveals herself to the Martian Manhunter when he visits the bar in a rare attempt to be his **alien** self and not hide behind the human guise of Hank Henshaw. For the first time since "Supergirl" began airing, Henshaw is not the only green Martian on Earth.

It looks as though Superman's departure after appearing in the first two episodes of "Supergirl" was done to make room for all these new plot points. Somehow, "Supergirl's" producers introduced a lot of new characters in one episode without making the show feel overcrowded.

"Supergirl" is now set up to have the geeky, character-packed second season that many fans anticipated when the show moved from CBS to the CW for this fall.

Read more:

Comic-Con: DC dazzles with Hall H footage of 'Justice League,' 'Wonder Woman' and 'Suicide Squad'

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"My father will accept it 100 percent if it's fair — if it's fair. . . . Fourteen percent of all noncitizens in this country are registered to vote."

— Eric Trump, interview on ABC's "This Week," Oct. 23

After refusing to commit to accepting the results of the presidential election, Republican nominee Donald Trump now says he would accept them — under certain conditions. He said that he would accept a "clear election result," and that he would challenge a "questionable" one. And he said he would accept the results if he wins.

Eric Trump, one of the nominee's three sons, repeated his father's stance in an interview. He cited a series of Four-Pinocchio claims to show what an "unfair" election could mean. He then said that "14 percent of all noncitizens" are registered to vote, which is a version of a claim we debunked last week and is worth explaining again.

The Facts

This figure comes from research that was published two years ago in the Monkey Cage, a blog hosted by The Washington Post. The Trump campaign is using this research to falsely claim that illegal **immigrants** are voting in and tipping elections.

Old Dominion University professors Jesse Richman and David Earnest studied voting participation rates of noncitizens by using data from 2008 and 2010 collected through the Cooperative Congressional Election Studies. This data set comes from a YouGov-Polimetrix opt-in Internet survey. Researchers were able to cross-check 40 percent of the data they collected from 2008.

Based on results from 339 noncitizen respondents in 2008 and 489 in 2010, researchers found that more than 14 percent of noncitizens in the 2008 and 2010 samples said they were registered to vote.

Eric Trump goes even further, applying this statistic to the general noncitizen population. If his claim were accurate, then about 3.2 million of the estimated 23 million noncitizen population would be registered to vote. But researchers warned that "it is impossible to tell for certain whether the noncitizens who responded to the survey were representative of the broader population of noncitizens."

A number of researchers were skeptical of the findings and methodology, and they published critiques of it. Some critiques are now being incorporated into a revision of the original study.

The original column on Monkey Cage includes this editor's note at the beginning of the article: The post occasioned three rebuttals (here, here and here) as well as a response from the authors. Subsequently, another peer-reviewed article argued that the findings reported in this post (and affiliated article) were biased and that the authors' data do not provide evidence of non-citizen voting in U.S. elections.

Stephen Ansolabehere, who created and runs the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (used in the research by Richman and Earnest), and two other researchers offered the most thorough critique. They replicated the research by interviewing the same panel of respondents about their voting patterns in 2010 and 2012. They found that people had identified as a citizen one year, but noncitizen the next — indicating misclassification.

They concluded that all of the cases of noncitizen voting "are nearly certainly citizen voters who are misclassified as being noncitizens. Hence, their predicted vote rates of noncitizens in fact reflect the behavior of citizens." Because the citizen group is large compared with the noncitizen group in the survey, even a small classification error could be substantial, they found.

Ansolabehere responded to Trump's comments about noncitizen voters in an Oct. 19 Monkey Cage post, recapping his critique "that this study is wrong and that there is absolutely no evidence from the data that non-citizens voted in recent presidential elections."

Richman said that Ansolabehere's critique was thoughtful and useful, and that he is working on a revision based on the critiques raised in the response. But Richman said his results are valid and rejected claims that his findings were entirely spurious. Richman wrote a response to the use of his data by the Trump campaign, clarifying that his research does not support claims of massive voter fraud by illegal **immigrants**.

The Pinocchio Test

If a statistic sounds too fantastic to be true, then it's probably false.

Eric Trump uses a statistic from widely criticized research to make a point that "unfair" election practices are taking place. He asserts that 14 percent of noncitizens are registered to vote, but this is an unreliable data point from a disputed sample and is not representative of the larger noncitizen population. It's pretty shocking that he would seize on a disputed statistic from a small sample — and then apply it to the entire country. We award Four Pinocchios.

Four Pinocchios

(About our rating scale)

Send us facts to check by filling out this form

Check out our guide to all Trump and Clinton fact checks

Sign up for The Fact Checker weekly newsletter

https://www.sharethefacts.co/share/1cd2b556-8954-4600-ac5d-4d43b4ca3b65[https://www.sharethefacts.co/share/1cd2b556-8954-4600-ac5d-4d43b4ca3b65]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**More than two months have passed since members of the anarchist collective INDECLINE unveiled life-size statues of Donald Trump in the flesh in public spaces across the country.

Tossed into the wild during the most unpredictable election cycle in modern history, each statue in the naked Class of 2016 has followed its own, unpredictable journey.

A brief recap:

In New York, naked Trump lasted all of three hours before the statue was dismembered and carted away in a truck by city workers.

In Seattle, the statue has been "on tour" following its rescue by "a liberal couple who own an antique shop," according to an INDECLINE spokesman.

In Cleveland, the statue's creator brokered a deal with police to auction off naked Trump and donate the proceeds to charity. That auction takes place this week.

In San Francisco, naked Trump remains in police custody and may lead to felony charges for the collective, the spokesman said.

In Miami, a Trump statue overlooking I-95 was kidnapped, beheaded and later returned, though the statue now "looks like Frankenstein," the spokesman said, noting that the group has declined to press charges.

A similar, yet more mysterious fate awaited a Trump statue that greeted motorists outside the Holland Tunnel in New Jersey. The statue disappeared without a trace one night last month and hasn't been seen since.

And finally, this weekend in Los Angeles, a statue that began its lowly journey on Hollywood Boulevard ended up at Julien's Auctions, where the nude sculpture of the Republican presidential nominee was purchased for $22,000 by an anonymous buyer at the celebrity-filled street-art auction.

The statue was the auction's leading offering alongside works from Banksy, Keith Haring, Jean-Michel Basquiat and Andy Warhol.

"It's going to be hard to top this," the INDECLINE spokesman said. "We're still a few weeks out from actual election but — after months of planning the statues and creating them — this had a finality to it."

"When you get John Stamos walking in and taking photos with a Trump statue, you know that it has taken on a life of its own."

A portion of the proceeds from the sale of the piece — titled "The Emperor Has No Balls" -- will benefit the National **Immigration** Forum, a leading pro-**immigrant** advocacy group, according to the auction house.

The auction house originally estimated that the sculpture would sell for $10,000 to $20,000. The auction's description of the work suggests that, in the eyes of collectors and artists, at least, the statues have quickly evolved from prankish punk-rock protests to symbols of free speech and populist rebellion.

This "Naked Trump" was rescued by La Luz de Jesus Gallery director Matt Kennedy, and is one of the only remaining examples not confiscated or destroyed. The explicit statue quickly became a symbol of political protest art and garnered international coverage when the gallery refused to hide or censor the statue, choosing instead to display it prominently and in public view.Unlike monuments of most political figures in cities across the globe, the Trump statues are far from flattering. They're oddly shaped, lack one key element of the male reproductive system and dramatically play down another.

The eyes scowl, the mouth pouts, and the veiny, almost reptilian skin looks like it was torn off a human-size frog and dipped in bronzer.

The job of conceptualizing and creating the statues fell to a Las Vegas-based artist who goes by the name "Ginger." Ginger told The Washington Post last month that he has a long history of designing monsters for haunted houses and horror movies.

In addition to doing makeup for a Busta Rhymes video, Ginger's résumé includes another source of great pride for the artist: He's a regular keynote speaker at haunted-house conventions across the country. (We checked and, yeah, they're a thing.)

"When the guys approached me, it was all because of my monster-making abilities," he said, referring to INDECLINE members. "Trump is just yet another monster, so it was absolutely in my wheelhouse to be able to create these monstrosities."

And that's not the only reason the sculptor considered himself the ideal candidate. Ginger's mother gave birth to him via C-section and — before doctors had time to remove him from the womb — his hand popped out of the slit in his mother's abdomen, covered in maternal slime, he said, prompting a nurse to faint.

"Before I was out of the womb, I was scaring people," he said.

The Emperor Has No Balls. Los Angeles #INDECLINE . . . . . . (photo: @birdmanphotos)

A photo posted by INDECLINE (@indeclineofficial) on Aug 18, 2016 at 9:21am PDT

MORE READING:

Why Donald Trump desperately needed to stay out of the spotlight, in 1 chart

What Evan McMullin is attempting is kind of unprecedented
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Of course there is large scale voter fraud happening on and before election day. Why do Republican leaders deny what is going on? So naive!"

--Donald Trump, post on Twitter, Oct. 17, 2016

"Go sit there with your friends [at polling places] and make sure it's on the up and up. Because you know what, that's a big, big problem in this country and nobody wants to talk about it."

--Trump, campaign rally, Sept. 30, 2016

Trump has made several claims alleging a "rigged" election system. We looked at two of the Republican presidential nominee's claims: that there is widespread voter fraud, and that undocumented **immigrants** are voting and swaying elections. We'll rate the two separately, starting with the first claim.

The Facts

The Trump campaign pointed to a 2012 Pew Center on the States study of ways to make the election system more accurate, cost-effective and efficient. At an Oct. 17 rally, Trump cited the three main findings of the speech to back up his claim that voter fraud is common across the country:

\* About 24 million (1 in every 8) voter registrations were significantly inaccurate or no longer valid because people moved, had died or were inactive voters.

\* More than 1.8 million records for people who are deceased, but whose registrations were still on voter rolls.

\* About 2.75 million people were registered to vote in more than one state. This could happen if voters move to a new state and register to vote without notifying their former state.

\* Outdated technology, shrinking government budgets and paper-based registration systems contributed to inaccuracies and inefficiencies.

But the study does not say that these problems indicated signs of isolated or widespread voter fraud. Yet Trump used the 1.8 million figure to inaccurately claim at the rally: "More than 1.8 million deceased individuals right now are listed as voters. Oh, that's wonderful. Well, if they're going to vote for me, we'll think about it, right? But I have a feeling they're not going to vote for me. Of the 1.8 million, 1.8 million is voting for somebody else."

The campaign pointed to three instances of voting irregularities — in Pennsylvania, Colorado and Virginia. But they were isolated instances that do not amount to widespread voter fraud — and do not show they are as common as he says they are.

Trump's campaign then sent lists of nearly 300 instances of voting irregularities between 2004 and 2016. Some of the cases involved indictments and guilty pleas of actual voter fraud, where someone illegally mailed an early ballot or cast a ballot at a polling place to defraud the system.

But the lists also included unsupported allegations of fraud, investigations into potential fraud and reports of less nefarious activities, such as people voting incorrectly and voting machines malfunctioning.

Even if all 300 instances were confirmed cases of actual voter fraud, they would make up such a small portion of total ballots cast in that 12-year period that it would be preposterous to call voter fraud a widespread or a "big, big" problem.

More than 1 billion ballots were cast from 2000 through 2014. There were 31 incidents of specific, credible allegations of voter impersonation at the polls, according to research by Loyola Law School professor Justin Levitt, who has been tracking such data for years. So the problem that Trump is warning his voters to watch for at the polls — to make sure things are "on the up and up" -- happens at the rate of 31 out of 1 billion ballots cast.

Out of 2,068 allegations of fraud cases in 2000 to 2012, there were guilty verdicts in 159 cases, according to an analysis by News21, a journalism project of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education.

Coordinated voter fraud has happened, but on a much smaller scale. In 1994, a federal judge invalidated the results of a state Senate race. Democratic campaign workers forged absentee ballots, which ultimately tipped the election by 461 votes. Democrats on the three-member elected board of elections intentionally failed to enforce the election law, even though they were aware of the fraud.

But it would be certainly nearly impossible to do something like that to tip a presidential election, our colleague Sari Horwitz found. We're talking about a nationwide effort of local, state and federal election officials colluding to commit a felony. Lawyers for both major parties and every poll watcher would have to be in on it.

A handful of people have tried to vote on behalf of dead people — usually their family member or spouse — but there is no evidence such voter rolls are being manipulated on a large scale. And there is no evidence of widespread voter fraud with people double voting.

The Pinocchio Test

Trump uses "voter fraud" has become a catchall phrase for all voting irregularities. Confirmed instances of actual voter fraud do exist, but Trump makes a totally unsupported extrapolation of these isolated cases to say they are indicative of a widespread fraud in the U.S. election system. We wonder whether it ever occurred to Trump that "nobody is talking about" the "big, big problem" of voter fraud because that "big, big" problem doesn't exist. Trump earns Four Pinocchios.

Four Pinocchios

https://www.sharethefacts.co/share/87957f0e-edb5-4958-98ee-31e01d278e6b[https://www.sharethefacts.co/share/87957f0e-edb5-4958-98ee-31e01d278e6b] "Then there's the issue of illegal **immigrants** voting. The following comes from a 2014 report from The Washington Post: … 'Non-citizen votes could have given Senate Democrats the pivotal 60th vote needed to overcome filibusters in order to pass health-care reform and many other reforms, and other Obama administration priorities.' Now, it continues: "It is 'possible that non-citizen votes were responsible for Obama's 2008 victory in North Carolina. Obama won the state' by 14,000 votes, so a turnout by 5.1 percent of North Carolina's adult citizens.'"

-- Trump, campaign rally, Oct. 17, 2016

Trump claims that illegal **immigrants** are voting in and tipping elections. During an Oct. 17 rally, Trump read excerpts from research that was published two years ago in the Monkey Cage, a blog hosted by The Washington Post. The campaign lists this research as the evidence for Trump's claims regarding illegal **immigrant** votes.

But Trump is incorrectly using the data, and does not note that there have been critiques of this research. Some critiques are now being incorporated into a revision of the original study.

Old Dominion University professors Jesse Richman and David Earnest studied voting participation rates of noncitizens by using data from 2008 and 2010 collected through the Cooperative Congressional Election Studies. This data set comes from a YouGov-Polimetrix opt-in Internet survey. Researchers were able to cross-check 40 percent of the data they collected from 2008.

In the October 2014 column, researchers shared their findings based on results from 339 noncitizen respondents in 2008 and 489 in 2010. Using these numbers, they found that 6.4 percent of noncitizens voted in 2008 and 2.2 percent of noncitizens voted in 2010. But the raw numbers are small: just 21 voters in 2008 and 8 voters in 2010.

Researchers then used these rates to extrapolate that the participation of noncitizens was "large enough to plausibly account for Democratic victories in a few close elections."

A number of researchers were skeptical of the findings and methodology, and they published critiques of it.

Stephen Ansolabehere, who creates and runs the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (used in the research by Richman and Earnest), and two other researchers offered the most thorough critique. They replicated the research by interviewing the same panel of respondents about their voting patterns in 2010 and 2012. They found that people had identified as a citizen one year, but noncitizen the next — indicating misclassification.

They concluded that all of the cases of noncitizen voting "are nearly certainly citizen voters who are misclassified as being non-citizens. Hence, their predicted vote rates of non-citizens in fact reflect the behavior of citizens." Because the citizen group is large compared with the noncitizen group in the survey, even a small classification error could be substantial, they found.

Ansolabehere responded to Trump's comments in an Oct. 19 Monkey Cage post, saying "there is absolutely no evidence from the data that non-citizens voted in recent presidential elections."

Richman said Ansolabehere's critique was thoughtful and useful, and that he is working on a revision based on the concerns raised in the response. But Richman said his results are valid and rejected claims that his findings were entirely spurious. There were 10 people who twice answered they were noncitizens but had voted in 2012, Richman said.

But Richman said that people like Trump who are using the study to make an unsupported claim of massive vote fraud are taking the findings out of context.

"One should keep in mind that such elections can be swayed by any number of factors that arguably bias election results toward, or against, particular parties and candidates," Richman said. "Put another way, our results suggest that almost all elections in the U.S. are not determined by non-citizen participation, with occasional and very rare potential exceptions."

[Update: During this speech, Trump also read a portion of the Monkey Cage article that "more than 14 percent of non-citizens in both 2008 and 2010 samples indicated that they were registered to vote." Then the point was misused by Eric Trump to say that 14 percent of all noncitizens were registered. We awarded the claim Four Pinocchios.]

The Pinocchio Test

As the researcher of the study notes, Trump's citing of these findings to back up his claim that illegal **immigrants** are voting and swaying elections is unfounded. Yet again, Trump takes isolated instances to extrapolate to a much larger trend, and earns Four Pinocchios.

Four Pinocchios

(About our rating scale)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CHATTANOOGA, Tenn. — Behind the closed door of a private study room in their campus library, three members of the College Republicans broached a subject that had become taboo among many of their friends: whether their club should publicly support Donald Trump.

"This could be our last chance if we don't vote for him," said Derek Kukura, 24, a junior at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga who heads the club, arguing that for all of Trump's flaws, the real estate tycoon and GOP presidential nominee would be better than letting another liberal politician cement big-government policies. "Maybe we should tell people."

"Not me," said Tucker McClendon, 21, shaking his head so furiously that his bowl cut flopped. "I don't want to be associated with it."

Nicholas Chapin, 18, said he planned to cast his first presidential vote for Trump — but he was in no hurry for the group to advertise it. "Maybe we should wait for another election," he said.

The age of Trump has complicated a rite of passage for many young conservatives. Instead of getting their first taste of canvassing, working phone banks or rallying for a cause, they are grappling with the baggage of a nominee whose words and record are fueling emotional debates about racism, misogyny and sexual assault. The campaign has split college Republican clubs nationwide and turned those willing to stand up for Trump into targets for criticism and ridicule.

GOP clubs at Harvard and Princeton made headlines over the summer when they declined to endorse Trump, citing his proposal to ban Muslims from entering the United States and his comments about Mexican **immigrants**. The head of the National College Republican Party followed suit. And last week, following a Washington Post report about a 2005 video in which Trump bragged about sexually assaulting women, a student group at the overwhelmingly conservative Liberty University in Lynchburg, Va., derided him as a man "who constantly and proudly speaks evil."

Here at UT-Chattanooga, a picturesque campus in the shadow of the Appalachians of eastern Tennessee just north of the Georgia state line, conservatives have felt unsettled ever since controversy erupted over a public display of support for Trump in April, a political lifetime ago.

A small group of students wrote "Trump 2016" on the sidewalk of a busy thoroughfare, part of a national "chalking" movement designed to show solidarity among young people with the campaign. The pro-Trump chalkers scrawled the campaign slogan "Make America Great Again" and drew an illustration of the U.S.-Mexico border wall that Trump promised he would build.

A freshman named Hailey Puckett posted a picture of the image online.

"Super proud of our art work, but I have a feeling half of UTCs campus is gonna hate it," she tweeted.

Within 26 minutes, Puckett recalled, her Twitter feed was filled with people asking her how she could do such a thing. Some called for her to step down from her position in student government.

Some students interpreted the message as a symbol of segregation between races on campus and in the country. Students were running to the site of the chalk with buckets in hopes of washing it away.

Some conservatives, taken aback by the response, worried that the campus was no longer a safe space for their beliefs.

Trump backers on campus looked to Kukura, who had recently revived the campus chapter of the College Republicans, to take a stand. He declined.

"We were a new club and we didn't want to take sides," he said.

Months later, the idea of standing up publicly for Trump has only become more toxic. Kukura said he has stopped checking his Facebook feed as often because he has grown tired of the vitriolic back-and-forth.

This was not how Kukura had originally envisioned his view of the 2016 campaign. He had grown up in a small Minnesota town and was enrolled in a local community college, but was eager to follow his parents when they retired outside Chattanooga. From blue state to red state, he thought, moving to Tennessee would be a fitting start to a budding political career — and heading the College Republicans chapter would be an ideal first step.

Kukura, who describes himself as more of a Jeb Bush Republican, was unsure about Trump until he spent three weeks during the summer in Italy, learning about Machiavelli. In the sandwich shops and on the streets, he said, strangers told him that "Trump might be good for the United States, but bad for the world."

"They had a perspective that we might not be able to see because we're so close to it," Kukura said. Trump's focus on putting "America first" appealed to him, he said, because he thought politicians weren't doing enough to tackle the drug epidemic or to reduce the national debt. The threat of terrorism seemed palpable to him — after all, four Marines were killed in a terrorist attack at a military recruitment center in 2015, a few miles away.

But, Trump was not an easy sell for college students. Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton had taken up the call by her former rival, Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.), for tuition-free public college, and surveys have shown Clinton making up ground among the young voters she had been struggling with.

Kukura and his friends didn't like the sound of free college, mostly because they rejected the stereotype that their generation felt too entitled. Nonetheless, it bothered them that they never heard Trump utter a word about how to make college more affordable.

Chapin, one of Kukura's fellow College Republicans, thought about the folks in the state whom Trump had captivated and declared him the candidate for the "angry white man." He sighed: "Instead of feeling like it's my generation's first election, it feels like my parents' last."

McClendon, who said he plans to vote for independent candidate Evan McMullin, has argued that as young white men in the South, he and his friends have a duty to reject the sort of hateful rhetoric that characterized many of their forebears.

"The man is a racist and a bigot," McClendon said of Trump.

Across campus, Trump's candidacy has prompted a larger discussion about whether this generation should even care about electoral politics.

"It's kind of become like a big joke," said Fallyn Iles, 20, a nursing major. Earlier that day, she said, her friends were sharing a cartoon on social media of Trump electrocuting Clinton.

"It shouldn't be funny, but it kind of is."

Her friend Brittany Lockwood, 20, a political science major from Memphis, chimed in. "I did not think, until this past year, I would have ever considered voting Democratic. Now I am."

Lockwood said she wondered why others around her were so easy to dismiss Trump's comments about women and minorities.

"This is the South, so there are a lot of times people kind of use other reasons to discriminate against minorities and people of color," Lockwood said. "It's one thing to support Trump, but when I find out about a friend supporting him, it raises a lot of questions and concerns with me that they are looking for an excuse to be racist."

Michelle Deardorff, a political science professor, said she understands why tensions amplified so quickly after the April chalking incident. She said the students had not grown up with the idea of friendly political discussions, but were accustomed to mirroring fiery disagreements that devolved in name-calling. She found herself quoting John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty" to students, preaching about the importance of differing views in a democracy.

"This is a campus that is not used to talking about race, and this election has provoked the conversation," Deardorff said.

After the chalking, administrators asked Deardorff to convene a town-hall meeting to address students' feelings. Puckett, 19, a nursing major, sat in the last row. At the event's conclusion, she said she had no idea that the wall would be interpreted as racist. She said she simply believed in tougher **immigration** laws. The event turned out to be a cleansing moment for Puckett and others at the school.

"I listened to many people after the experience telling me why they felt uncomfortable with what I said, but mostly how I said it," she said. "I learned more in that one week than I have in my entire life."

Among her lessons: Politics can become "too touchy of a subject."

"It honestly has changed my willingness to talk about politics in front of certain people, but I do not like that," she said.

At least the College Republicans had one another.

One recent evening, Kukura placed a sign in the student center that read, "College Republicans: The Best Party on Campus." Half a dozen students attended their first meeting of the year, amid empty chairs and empty tables.

"So, I'm just curious," Kukura said to the group. "What do you guys think of Trump?"

"I abstain," McClendon said.

"I'm not absolute on all his policies, but I'm voting for him," one said. "She lies too much."

"I feel good if he'll take advice from Mike Pence," said another.

"Even though he's crude, he's a kick-ass, take-names guy, and that's what our country needs."

"The Supreme Court is the most important thing," said Brittany Self, 21, a communications major who was wearing a Marco Rubio T-shirt. "It just can't be her."

But when Kukura mentioned that the group could make some phone bank calls before the election, Self sounded less eager.

She was happy to work the phones, she said, but only for local candidates — not for Trump.

robert.samuels@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Even if he loses, Donald Trump isn't going away. But the man and the political phenomenon he has unleashed over the past 16 months are already posing a difficult chicken-or-egg question: Has Trump transformed America, or simply revealed it?

Trump's slash-and-burn march to the Republican nomination and on into this fall is perhaps the ultimate blending of entertainment and politics, a coarse yet mesmerizing new show that appears to have changed political language and deepened divisions in an already polarized nation. But is this a singular moment, tied exclusively to Trump's larger-than-life personality and searing rhetoric, or has he loosed into the culture a new virus of confrontation and anger?

"Win or lose, the Trump effect will be felt long after the election," said David Nevins, chief executive of Showtime, who has spent decades reflecting the nation's mood on TV shows such as "24," "Friday Night Lights" and "Homeland." "Trump and his followers are in many ways a rebuke to the elites who are perceived as controlling popular culture. The people who feel left out, passed over, now have a champion, even though he's actually one of the New York media power establishment."

Admire him or loathe him, many Americans are fascinated by Trump, and that fascination is feeding a wave of new work that will aim to entertain and challenge the public in the coming years. Trump's ability to embrace — or manipulate — average Americans' anxieties is inspiring more raw and rough rhetoric in politics, darker and more somber popular music, and in TV, movies and other arts, an edgier, more nervous set of characters and themes.

Social media exposes rifts

Has Trump granted Americans license to express overt racism or new levels of acrimony? "It seems like a plausible narrative, but I seem to recall all kinds of sketchy things said about races and genders and groups aired publicly on a weekly basis before, say, the summer of 2015," said John McWhorter, a Columbia University professor who studies public rhetoric. "He is distinct only in being someone of such prominence saying such things. I think the real change was Facebook and Twitter in 2009. Trump is just a symptom."

Even as offensive language and ethnic insults became routine at Trump rallies, McWhorter saw the real culprit as social media. Twitter and Facebook became the foundations of daily communication for many Americans between 2007 and 2009, "revolutionizing conversation about, well, everything," and pushing political chatter in a far meaner direction, McWhorter said.

In this view, the Trump effect is not unique to the man, but is a natural, almost inevitable result of economic and social forces unleashed by swift, powerful technological change that had, even before Trump's candidacy, made the country meaner, more confrontational and more divided.

The populism Trump represents and the social strains that made millions of Americans eager for someone like him appear regularly throughout American history. Previous bursts of populism have usually burned through in less than a generation, fading away as economic expansion, war or political reform eased people's sense of insecurity.

The frustration and resentments evident among Trump's supporters have roots, some historians say, as far back as Pat Buchanan and Ross Perot's third-party insurgencies in the 1990s. Others say Trump's success is the result of disorienting, displacing changes in the world beyond politics, in the technological revolution that has altered the way Americans relate to one another and in the arc of millions of work lives.

On college campuses, battles over clashing world views, identity politics and the definition of free speech have raged for years. Online, many Americans had already spent years swimming in a virtual ocean of pornography, foul language and sexual misbehavior — long before Trump's coarse language about women and the allegations about his inappropriate advances became campaign issues.

Although much of the country had moved toward acceptance of same-sex marriage, the issue continued to divide many people by faith, family tradition and cultural expectations. The tea party, the Occupy movement, and Barack Obama's 2008 campaign all demonstrated a popular hunger for thoroughgoing change and a realignment of the political parties.

"Trump didn't appear out of nowhere," said Chris Buskirk, a Trump supporter and talk radio host in Arizona who runs a conservative website called American Greatness. "He's amplified things that were already happening anyway. In two years, politicians are going to look at Trump and say, maybe I can be more revealing, more authentic."

Buskirk, 47, said Trump's blunt rhetoric and coarse language would have been startling decades ago but today only mirrors a society in which many people feel stifled by new limits on what can be said at work or school. "We'd all like a high level of public discourse," he said, "but a 3 a.m. tweetstorm isn't among my worries about the next generation." Buskirk views Trump as a breakthrough candidate who has spread optimism that "change is still possible when the American people act on their own behalf. Trump supporters see not his coarseness or vulgarity, but a sense that an ordinary person can rise up and make a difference."

Donald Trump, ordinary person? "Yeah, it doesn't compute in a certain way," Buskirk quickly conceded, "but even though he's a billionaire, he's a guy from Queens, not the Upper East Side, and he talks like average Americans talk."

Effect on pop culture

In TV, movies and the theater, programming decisions are starting to reflect Trump's impact. Showtime's "Billions," a drama pitting a crusading prosecutor against a morally shady hedge fund operator, "would never have caught on without Trump," Nevins said. "Two years earlier, I wouldn't have put it on. But with Trump the billionaire running against the billionaire class, we're confronting all these questions of when our aspiration and our worship of wealth and business comes in conflict with our anger at what the big guys are getting away with."

As the writers putting together the next season of the political thriller "Homeland" thought about "how to reflect the Trump era," Nevins said, they searched, as ever, for "the edge of what you can get away with on television. That's a line that's constantly moving, not so much sexually as what qualifies as subversive or dangerous." And Trump's campaign has pushed that line in a coarser, angrier direction.

R.J. Cutler, a documentary filmmaker who has focused on political culture in movies such as "The War Room" and "The World According to Dick Cheney," is developing a TV series set in small-town America, in post-election 2017, "when any bad thing seems possible, when we no longer know the ground rules about the weather, about democracy, about very basic things."

Trump didn't emerge from the blue, Cutler said. A figure like him — charismatic, media-savvy, offering "believe me" solutions and bountiful blame — was inevitable. "Trump arose out of the perfect storm — the power of television at its most pervasive, the maturation of social media, and the world's greatest huckster," Cutler said. "Trumpism isn't going away. Even if he only wins 37 percent of the vote, that's tens of millions of people, and in a way, it's even better for Trump if he loses because then his policies never have to be tested."

If Trump loses, he can say, as he has been for weeks now, that the system is rigged — the voting apparatus, the media, the parties' domination. That opens the door to Trump or a would-be successor to lead a movement of disaffected Americans against both major parties and the elites that support them.

But couldn't a post-Trump exhaustion set in, making it harder for a lasting movement to develop? No one interviewed for this article argued that Trump or his followers would simply vanish following a loss, but some wondered if many Americans might crave escapism over another round of battle.

The widespread unhappiness with this year's choices — Trump and Hillary Clinton are the least liked presidential candidates in modern times, polls consistently show — is part of a national spirit that's been growing grumpier for years. Pop music, which often reflects the mood of the country, has been trending slower and darker, following a period of much more energetic hits around the start of the economic recovery in 2009, said Sean Ross, who analyzes pop music and radio play for Edison Research.

"This was the summer of unhappy popular music," Ross said. "There's an almost complete dearth of up-tempo, major-chord happiness. There's no tempo right now in country, pop, R&B, anywhere."

In the summer hit, "Stressed Out," the indie group Twenty One Pilots sang, "I was told when I get older, all my fears would shrink, but now I'm insecure and I care what people think. Wish we could turn back time, to the good ol' days . . . but now we're stressed out . . ."

The Chainsmokers' hit, "Don't Let Me Down," tells a story of being "stranded, reaching out. . . . I think I'm losing my mind now."

The exception to the trend proved the rule, Ross said: Justin Timberlake's "Can't Stop the Feeling" was "the only up-tempo tune of the summer and it was immediately scooped up by an anxious audience." Ross said the current popularity of slow, low-energy songs is the most striking run of such music since the early 1980s — also a time of severe economic stress.

Since Trump became a mainstay of TV viewing, that soundtrack has accompanied notably harsher debate in politics and beyond. For generations, candidates could assume that voters wanted leaders who could achieve consensus. Trump capitalized on the ideological polarization of the past two decades and the more recent cultural shift toward the kind of hot takes that go viral on social media.

The result is a new pressure on politicians to be at once entertaining, provocative, and even outrageous. The shift is evident in the media, advertising, even sports. "There's no place in 2016 for considering the other guy's point of view, unless you want to be called a wishy-washy, namby-pamby flip-flopper," Sports Illustrated columnist Steve Rushin wrote last month. "There will never be a sports talk show called 'You May Be Right,' no TV roundtables called 'Point Well Taken.' "

The muzzles are off

Trump supporters say he has liberated them to speak out against political correctness, whether in opposition to same-sex marriage or in defense of police officers accused of racial animus. "Trump has given some people permission to say things they were afraid to say," said John Lott Jr., president of the Crime Prevention Research Center and an opponent of gun control who joined dozens of researchers and academics on a pro-Trump petition. "People are just tired of having their motives questioned, of being demonized. Trump's letting people give voice to that feeling."

Over the past year, Trump's blunt, provocative rhetoric has morphed from outrageous to virtually ordinary for many Americans, said Frank Luntz, the longtime Republican consultant who uses focus groups of voters to analyze not only what they believe but also how they express it.

"Early on, people were horrified by his offensive statements," Luntz said. "But as time went on, they came to enjoy it and absorb it. There's no filter anymore. I hear Trump's words over and over: 'We have to keep them out.' Trump has liberated their inner voice, and I'm shocked at what I hear now."

Luntz sees no indication that the rougher rhetoric is a passing fad. "The more coarse language gets, the more coarse it stays," he said. "We don't go back. We don't suddenly become civil and good to each other."

In Luntz's focus groups recently, the tone of disagreements has deteriorated into the kind of attacks that once would have silenced the room. " 'You're an idiot' has become relatively common," he said. "It's gotten to the point where I cannot stop people from yelling at each other."

Luntz has seen a sharp increase in parents telling him that their children are using Trump-inspired smears at school. "It's 'Lyin' Thomas' and 'Little David' in fifth or sixth grade," he said. "That's when you know you have a problem."

Teachers around the country report not only a disturbing rise in the number of kids who mimic Trump's insults, but also a burst of fear among **immigrant**children about the threat of deportation, even when their families are legal U.S. residents.

In the Roxbury section of Boston, Karene Hines, an eight-grade English teacher, was startled recently to see a boy shaking with fear. She asked what was wrong, and the boy, whose family **immigrated** legally from Colombia, said that a Trump campaign sign that the owner of the neighborhood laundromat had posted had freaked him out: "He thought it meant that the INS was going to sweep through and he'd be rounded up even though he is legal," Hines said.

"These kids are always asking, 'Why does he hate us? We haven't done anything,' " the teacher said. "These are kids who before Trump were interested in the latest sneakers, the Red Sox, the Patriots. Now they're hyperfocused on Trump. One boy brought me his cellphone to show me Trump's tweets. They know his insults by heart. They're scared."

Both of the nation's major teachers unions — which have endorsed Clinton — and the Southern Poverty Law Center have been collecting such reports as evidence of a Trump effect in which the candidate's comments about minorities and women show up in classrooms and schoolyards.

Fear has not been limited to children. Psychiatrists and counselors say people on both sides of the nation's ideological divide are losing sleep and expressing concerns likely to extend beyond Election Day.

When a patient recently complained that he's being kept awake by his fear that a President Trump might start a nuclear war, Washington psychiatrist Bernard Vittone added the man to a growing list of people "whose main anxiety is Trump anxiety." The doctor, who runs the National Center for the Treatment of Phobias, Anxiety and Depression, said that in three decades of practice, "I've never had people come in like this, about four a week, coming in scared, actually frightened, about a candidate winning an election. They may hate Clinton, but they're not scared of her. They may have hated Bush, they may have hated Obama, but they were never scared."

Vittone said he normally treats such patients with cognitive behavioral therapy, in which "you try to get people to look at things more realistically. But in this case, I can't really dispel their anxiety because they have facts and quotes from Trump that they spout back at me that totally nullify my attempts to ease their fear." The psychiatrist tends to treat Trump-fearing patients with anti-anxiety medication.

A darker future?

Such frayed nerves reflect a loss of trust and community that predates Trump's political emergence. In a culture in which characters on reality-TV shows lash out at one another for sport, in a society in which bonds of trust have frayed as relationships become distanced from physical proximity, "along comes Donald Trump to give us permission to say out loud the things we've been saying anonymously online," said playwright Joshua Harmon, whose short play, "Ivanka: A Medea for Right Now," will be read at Washington's Studio Theatre next month as part of a flash festival of Trump-related plays at five D.C. theaters. "He's closer to how a lot of people are living than Hillary Clinton. A lot of men talk exactly like Trump online; he's just the first person to do that while running for president."

In most of popular culture, there's a long lag between social change and the art that bubbles up from the streets. Playwrights, novelists and songwriters say that when Trump-inspired works begin to appear, they will probably focus on the sense that, as Harmon said, "People are immersed in their own worlds now. We were already being horrible to each other on social media, so we were kind of ripe for someone to come along and further dehumanize us."

Many new works may be dark or tragic. "This doesn't feel like something that people will look back and chuckle about," Harmon said.

Very little in the culture points toward any 'what was that all about?' reckoning if Trump loses. More likely, Trumpism will continue to be the agitator that propels the nation's political machinery.

For many, Trump's lasting impact is directly tied to his domination of the news media this year. "The depressing and dangerous change that Trump brought is this: The media have surrendered their airtime to him," said Doug McGrath, a satirist and playwright whose show, "Beautiful," is running on Broadway. "There seems to be no calculation other than 'can we get him on and can we keep him on?' " Even before Trump came along, cable news had morphed from traditional reporting to "mainly people yelling at each other," as McGrath put it.

Now, Trump has taken that coarsening of the culture and exacerbated it. "In Trump, we have the candidate himself making jokes about his own penis size, or calling women terrible names," McGrath said. "He has obliterated the idea that tone matters, . . . that there is such a thing as going too far. For the next person who tries it, it will seem less shocking because this has been accepted by the media who report it in detail (mostly without shock or complaint) and by the rest of us who grumble but keep watching."

marc.fisher@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There are two ways of thinking about a political mandate. One is programmatic, the other political.

The former requires a candidate to run on a specific program and make his or her candidacy about achieving specific aims. Novel idea, I know. George W. Bush comes to mind. He lost the popular vote in 2000 and won by a small percentage in his second race but nevertheless pushed ahead with No Child Left Behind, Social Security reform and comprehensive **immigration** reform (the latter two unsuccessfully) because he had made these major issues in his campaign.

Both because candidates run on fewer specifics and because the parties are more ideologically rigid, the idea of a mandate for this or that policy objective becomes harder to claim. In an election like 2016 when so many voters will choose Hillary Clinton because she is not Donald Trump, the best one might claim is a negative mandate -- no tax cuts for the rich, no border wall, no disengagement from NATO, etc. A more generic mandate -- a style of governance, a general approach to foreign policy, a list of priorities -- is more attainable, although the devil is usually in the details when it comes to legislation.

The other kind of mandate is political. If a presidential candidate wins big, sweeps in dozens of lawmakers and other officials up and down the ticket and reclaims the majority in one or both houses, the president will be perceived as having a different sort of political mandate -- political heft, influence and the ability to demand loyalty from his or her party. It's also a warning shot to the losing side that the public is not with them, so they best tread softly. (President Obama famously refused to recognize his own "shellacking" in 2010, but that's the exception that proves the rule.)

What does all that mean for Clinton if she wins comfortably or perhaps by a landslide? She arguably has run on three or four big ideas: American leadership in the world; working "together" with Republicans; **immigration** reform; and investment in human (e.g., training) and physical capital (e.g., infrastructure spending). Whether Republicans agree to play ball with her on those issues -- or even touch **immigration** reform -- depends in large part on the post-Trump civil war already breaking out on the right. It's going to include a whole list of factors:

\* Does the GOP keep the House majority, and does House Speaker Paul Ryan keep his job?

\* Do GOP losses in the House and Senate give the most obstructionist elements a bigger say (because moderate members lost) in governing or refusing to govern?

\* Are Trump's most visible backers (Sen. Jeff Sessions, Sen. Ted Cruz, the Freedom Caucus) chastened?

\* Do Republicans eyeing 2020 (Sen. Marco Rubio, Cruz, Sen. Tom Cotton) perceive it is in their self-interest to accomplish some things or simply to obstruct?

\* Are the causes Trump ran on (e.g., **immigration** restriction, supply-side economics) discredited in the near and/or long term?

We have opined that, left to their own devices, Ryan and Clinton could figure out significant areas of overlap on policy objectives (corporate tax reform, infrastructure repair, getting tough with Russia). They don't, of course, operate in a vacuum. Moreover, we don't even know if Ryan will be the speaker or even if Republicans will have the speakership (i.e., the majority), nor do we know how constrained Ryan will be in striking deals. Ironically, if the Democrats win both houses, the net result could be more obstruction as Republicans dig in to fight left-wing legislative items Nancy Pelosi/Clinton/Sen. Chuck Schumer are pushing. (This would duplicate the first couple of years of the Obama administration.)

In short, Clinton may lack a specific mandate for this or that legislative proposal, but provided she wins big and faces at least one house with a GOP majority, her slogan "stronger together" is going to be put to the test. For the country's sake, we should hope she is more adept at dealmaking than Obama.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump was certainly not the first American child of **immigrants** to try to cobble together a more interesting backstory once he got to Europe.

When the real estate developer announced plans for a golf resort in Aberdeen, Scotland, he began promoting the project with a coat-of-arms that someone in the Trump Organization designed: a shield with three chevrons and two stars, with a helmet above the shield and a crest of a lion waving a flag (a remarkable feat for an animal that lacks opposable thumbs). I know how to describe the various parts of the crest because Scotland takes its coats-of-arms very seriously. So seriously that one must register a coat-of-arms (which applies only to an individual, not a family), and the cost of registration increases as you add various elements (like that helmet). Trump was using an unauthorized coat-of-arms, and Scotland got mad.

Let's note that Trump is not entirely Scottish. As TV host John Oliver made famous last year, Trump's family name was originally Drumpf, via his paternal grandfather, who **immigrated** from Germany. Trump's mother was born in Scotland, but she was a MacLeod by birth. The MacLeods have a crest, but it shows a cow surrounded by a belt or something and, critically, doesn't include the word Trump.

So Trump made his own coat-of-arms (which is different than a crest) and started using it, and Scotland got upset and demanded he stop using it until it was registered. Trump registered the coat-of-arms, and four years later (such things don't progress rapidly, it seems) was granted the right to use it.

But we're not here today to talk about Trump's fight to use a made-up coat-of-arms to make his golf course seem fancier. We're here to talk about the etymology of words derived from Latin.

A spokesperson for Trump International described the coat-of-arms to the New York Post when it was approved in 2012.

Three chevronels are used to denote the sky, sand dunes and sea — the essential components of the [golf resort] site — and the double-sided eagle represents the dual nature and nationality of Trump's heritage. The eagle clutches golf balls, making reference to the great game of golf, and the motto 'Numquam Concedere' is Latin for 'Never Give Up' — Trump's philosophy.

It is funny to think of a two-headed eagle trying to hold a golf ball.

It is funnier, though, to realize that the primary focus of the past three weeks of Trump's presidential campaign -- if he loses, it's probably because the vote is rigged and he won't accept the results -- is right there in that golfing-eagle coat-of-arms. Numquam concedere. Never give up. Or, even better, "never concede." The verb to concede is derived from concedere. A bit on the nose.

Well, except that "never concede" is not the best translation of numquam concedere. Gareth Williams, who teaches Latin poetry at Columbia University, suggested in an email that the better translation is "never give in." But, still!

If you go to the website for Trump's course in Scotland, you can see the coat-of-arms in all of its extravagance at the top-center of the page. The main page for Trump Golf uses a different crest, with a banner at the bottom reading "Trump" and only two chevrons for some reason. (Maybe it left out the sky?) When Trump bought a course in Ireland two years ago, planning to rebrand it as Trump International Golf Links, Ireland, he repurposed his Scottish coat-of-arms, putting "Ireland" under it instead of "Scotland."

Never give up a good brand logo once you've paid the money to get it approved. Never concede.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Walter Russell Mead writes:

Should Secretary [Hillary] Clinton make it to the White House, her first and biggest job will be to stop and then reverse the deterioration in America's global position that her predecessor permitted. She will have to convince both friends and foes that the President of the United States is no longer a punching bag, and that the United States of America is back on the stage. She will need, and she will deserve, the support of patriotic Americans in both political parties as she undertakes this necessary mission. President Obama's mismanagement of foreign affairs is creating a genuine international emergency; the White House and Congress will have to work together to restore American prestige and stop the slide toward chaos and war.

It is hard to argue with that, but why is Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.) -- an enthusiastic backer of Donald Trump -- retweeting portions of the piece from which the above excerpt was taken? Mead is essentially saying Donald Trump would be worse than President Obama. "[Russian President Vladimir] Putin clearly hoped that his interference could muddy the waters of the American presidential race; the Russians believe that Trump is if anything less capable than Obama, and that a Trump presidency would give Russia four more years to work at dismantling American power and the European Union," Mead writes. "As Putin now contemplates the likely frustration of those hopes, he is likely to think harder about how he can use the time remaining on Obama's watch to further weaken the United States and erode its alliance system."

Either Cotton has poor reading comprehension, is afflicted with a terrible case of moral dissonance or has been flat-out lying when telling voters that Trump would be a better president than Clinton. ("I'm confident that with a Republican president and a Republican Congress, America will be safer and more prosperous," Cotton said in August. "I still believe that Donald Trump with a Republican Congress would be best for America.")

In sum, Obama may be feckless in responding to Russian aggression, but he doesn't fawn over Putin. Obama may be an inconsistent, churlish ally, but he doesn't suggest breaking up NATO. Cotton agrees with Mead's compelling argument that Trump would be worse. Nevertheless,  Cotton -- one of Obama's most ardent critics -- says we should pick the guy who is worse than Obama. Huh?

Cotton seems interested in running for president in 2020, but right now he seems to be repeating the very errors Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) made, most egregiously in defending the indefensible Trump. (Why didn't Cotton support the hawkish independent conservative Evan McMullin, whose foreign policy views align with Cotton's?) Being from Arkansas, arguably a redder state than Texas these days, Cotton also has adopted the Trump/Cruz anti-**immigrant** hard-line position. (He might have stuck with Cruz's pre-presidential campaign position, namely support for expanded legal **immigration** and a path to legalization for those already here.) Cotton should not make the mistake of assuming that the entire country thinks like Arkansas -- or that it will be forgiving of his glaring hypocrisy.

After the election, Cotton should apologize for supporting Trump, vow to work with the new president where he agrees with her and respectfully oppose her and offer alternatives where he does not. Cotton, like Cruz, opposes any tax increase and wants to expand military spending. One of those has to give; especially with a Democrat in the White House. If Cotton wants to set an example and recover stature on national security after playing footsie with Trump, he'll support a reasonable package of entitlement reform, tax increases and defense spending increases.

Cotton is not the only Republican to have tied himself in knots trying to defend Trump. Intellectual and moral corruption has been the defining feature of the GOP in 2016. Cotton still can redeem himself by coming clean on Trump, refusing to follow the Cruz path-to-nowhere (i.e., obstruction and extremism), supporting the president when she is right (in his view) on foreign policy and avoiding the talk-radio positions (e.g. build the wall, deport millions, roll back gay marriage) that lack public support. He might even show leadership on entitlement reform. In other words, let's see whether Cotton can be bigger than a junior senator from Arkansas. Otherwise, he's just a taller, more polite Ted Cruz.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Europe today is a mess. The strongest countries face lackluster economic growth, while the weakest, like Greece, are struggling to recover from depression-like downturns. Politically, things are even worse, as disillusionment with European and domestic institutions and elites is at record levels, and support for far-left and far-right parties is growing, creating political instability.

What's to blame for this mess? Some blame neoliberalism — the adoption of pro-market policies — saying that it caused the crisis and left democratically elected governments unable to respond. Others blame the European Union, which they say is undemocratic and undermines national sovereignty. Under this explanation, the E.U. weakened voters' faith in their democratically elected governments and led them to support far-left and -right parties.

These explanations aren't wrong, but they don't provide the full picture. One key cause for Europe's current crisis is the decline of the center-left. As I argue in a new article for the Journal of Democracy, even people who aren't on the center-left themselves should recognize the role that it played in underpinning stability. From World War II onward, the center-left either ran the government or provided the loyal opposition in nearly every European democracy. No longer. Center-left parties have dwindled into shadows of their former might.

Germany's Social Democratic Party (SPD), once the most powerful party of the left in Europe, currently gets support in the low 20s in opinion polls. The British Labour Party, the author of the post-World War II British welfare state, is a mess. It reacted to a disappointing 2015 election outcome by making far-left backbencher Jeremy Corbyn its leader, only to be convulsed a year later by efforts to oust him. The French Socialists are in government but in disarray, led by the colorless President François Hollande, whose prospects of reelection are dismal. Even the once-dominant Scandinavian center-left has been reduced to vote shares of 30 percent or less.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/05/18/european-powers-forced-artificial-borders-on-the-middle-east-they-did-the-same-thing-to-europe-itself/"]European[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/05/18/european-powers-forced-artificial-borders-on-the-middle-east-they-did-the-same-thing-to-europe-itself/"]European] powers forced artificial borders on more places than the Middle East[/interstitial\_link]

The decline of the center-left has contributed to Europe's contemporary economic and political problems and hindered finding viable solutions to them. The left is no longer able to play its historic stabilizing role.

After World War II, European societies were built on principles that owed a lot to center-left ideas. There was widespread agreement after the war that the political chaos and social upheaval associated with the Great Depression had been the consequence of unregulated markets, so the idea that they should be left unregulated again was an anathema. And so, when European political economies were rebuilt, they were designed to ensure that capitalism was reined in by governments. This postwar order worked remarkably well: The three decades after 1945 remain Europe's period of fastest growth ever.

Politically, this order's effects were equally important. Workers and employers became more willing to cooperate, and in place of the centrifugal dynamics of the interwar years, when tough times drove voters to the extremes, good times during the postwar years drove voters back to the center. Thanks to a new relationship between democratic governments and capitalism, Europe was able — for the first time in its history — to combine economic growth, well-functioning democracy and social stability.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/07/05/is-europe-failing-or-is-it-failing-forward/"]Is[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/07/05/is-europe-failing-or-is-it-failing-forward/"]Is] Europe failing, or is it 'failing forward'?[/interstitial\_link]

By the 1970s, however, this order had begun to fray and, after the 2008 financial crisis, it was in full-fledged meltdown. The center-left was unprepared to offer new ideas for promoting growth while protecting citizens from the harsher aspects of free markets. Instead, it kept on trying to defend outdated policies or proposed watered-down versions of neoliberalism that barely differentiated it from the center-right.

The center-left has also been challenged by increased diversity. The postwar order rested on and helped cement a sense of social solidarity, where strong welfare states gave citizens a sense that their governments were looking after them and the gains from economic growth were distributed reasonably fairly.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/30/brexit-might-undermine-europes-democratic-order/"]Brexit[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/30/brexit-might-undermine-europes-democratic-order/"]Brexit] might undermine Europe's democratic order[/interstitial\_link]

By the last decades of the 20th century, however, diversity had significantly undermined social solidarity. And here the left found itself split between its traditional emphasis on solidarity and the voices of multiculturalism, which often emphasized differences among, rather than commonalities among, different social groups. This fragmented the left, leaving it unable to deal coherently with new issues such as mass **immigration**, making it harder to build majority coalitions, win elections or generate the social solidarity necessary to support the rest of the center-left agenda or healthy democracy more generally.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/29/no-brexit-is-not-the-end-of-the-liberal-world-order/"]No[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/29/no-brexit-is-not-the-end-of-the-liberal-world-order/"]No], Brexit is not the end of the liberal world order[/interstitial\_link]

This decline has implications that go far beyond the center-left itself. It has created space for political alternatives. First is the neoliberal right, which sees the solution to Europe's economic problems as involving more cuts to the welfare state, more leeway for markets and more limits on state regulation of the economy. Whatever the absolute merits or defects of these proposals, they offer little new to those suffering from inequality, stagnating incomes and job loss and ignore the anger and sense of alienation characterizing significant swaths of European and American society.

The second alternative is the populist right. Unlike neoliberals, the populist right takes seriously the downsides of globalization and forthrightly addresses the economic fears of those who see themselves as losing out to forces beyond their control. In addition, the populist right favors maintaining the social safety net and an activist state. It pairs this, however, with anti-liberal, if not antidemocratic, positions, including a penchant for economic autarky, a scapegoating of **immigrants** and hostility toward minority groups.

The third choice is the far left, represented by Corbyn's Labour, Syriza, Podemos and various anti-globalization movements. Like the populist right, these groups take seriously the downsides of globalizationm but see little upside. Indeed, these groups often paint capitalism as the source of all current problems. Like the populist right, these groups have been very good at mobilizing discontent with trenchant criticisms but have offered few viable solutions to economic problems and are not well placed to make appeals to voters worried about social and cultural change.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/07/07/the-real-reason-the-u-k-voted-for-brexit-economics-not-identity/"]The[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/07/07/the-real-reason-the-u-k-voted-for-brexit-economics-not-identity/"]The] real reason the U.K. voted for Brexit? Jobs lost to Chinese competition. Here's the data to prove it.[/interstitial\_link]

These approaches offer very different understandings of the problems faced by European states today and have led to centrifugal tendencies that make it more difficult to reach political compromise or engage in effective government. Particularly worrisome is a tendency we also see here in the United States of white, disaffected and poorly educated voters to flee the center-left for the populist right. During the recent Brexit referendum, many traditional Labour supporters voted to leave the E.U., but this political shift, in Europe by the working class in particular, has been a prominent feature of European politics for many years.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/03/11/its-not-just-trump-authoritarian-populism-is-rising-across-the-west-heres-why/"]It's[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/03/11/its-not-just-trump-authoritarian-populism-is-rising-across-the-west-heres-why/"]It's] not just Trump. Authoritarian populism is rising across the West. Here's why[/interstitial\_link]

More broadly, the rivalry between the center-left and center-right helped to build the foundations of popular democracy in Europe. Now that the center-left is in decline, it is difficult to build common ground with other established parties or to organize democratic politics in a reasonably stable way. In addition, the decline of the center-left has reflected and furthered the decline of the postwar order. This order generated unprecedented prosperity, diminished class conflict and undercut support for extremism. Europe's center-left was an architect and mainstay of this order, and it is hard to imagine it being revived or a replacement for it being constructed without a strong center-left. And without broad-based agreements to reform European economies, welfare states, **immigration** and integration policies, and the European Union, Europe's current mess is likely to be long-lasting indeed.

Sheri Berman is a professor of political science at Barnard College.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With Breanne Deppisch

THE BIG IDEA:

LAS VEGAS—Katy Perry's glamor, Tom Steyer's money, Univision's megaphone and organized labor's muscle, along with a late assist from Barack Obama, each helped lubricate Harry Reid's well-oiled political machine over the past 48 hours.

The media tends to focus on the lack of enthusiasm for Hillary Clinton relative to President Obama, which is real, but a few thousand more ballots were cast in Nevada on Saturday -- during the first day of early voting -- than during the kickoff day four years ago, when there was a similar flurry of activity to propel Democrats to the polls. And that was before Air Force One touched down yesterday afternoon.

It is a testament to the power of the organization that Reid, the retiring Senate Minority Leader, has built over three decades, which he is now using to get Clinton and his hand-picked successor, Catherine Cortez Masto, across the finish line.

As much as 60 percent of the vote will be cast before Nov. 8 in the Silver State. Democrats have for several cycles dominated early voting, running up the score so that Republicans struggle to overcome it on Election Day.

Since handily winning the Republican caucuses here in February, Donald Trump has been stronger in Nevada than most other battlegrounds. The race remains tight here, a function of the relatively high percentage of low-income whites without college degrees.

"Let's face it, Nevada is always close," Obama, who carried the state twice, said during a rally at a high school in North Las Vegas. "Nevada always makes you a little nervous because you don't know what's going to happen. But that's what makes it exciting."

The bulk of Nevada's Democratic voters are concentrated in Clark County, which includes Vegas. During a two-week window, the race is on to lock in Clinton's narrow advantage in the polls by getting as many of her supporters as possible to one of 97 early voting sites. The Reid machine, fully activated, is a sight to behold.

-- Unions play a huge role. Reid kicked off his Saturday with a 9 a.m. speech at the Iron Workers Union in the suburb of Henderson. Cortez Masto joined him. Then she went to the Carpenters Union training center at 10:15 a.m. and the SEIU's office on Sunset Boulevard a little after noon. A taco truck parked out front served dual purposes: the promise of free lunch built a crowd while trolling the Trump surrogate who warned during a recent cable interview that a Clinton victory would mean a taco truck on every corner. A shuttle bus ferried people to the nearest polling location.

-- A few hours later, pop star Katy Perry drew a diverse, young crowd of 500 to the courtyard in front of the student union at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The 31-year-old didn't sing, but she did get right to the point. Perry talked about how she likes to procrastinate as much as anyone else, but that's not okay when it comes to early voting ("Let's cut the crap. … We've all got excuses. Don't put it off"). She then lamented about how their votes in Nevada matter more than hers does in California. "I'm not just here to see a Cirque show," she said. "You guys are important!"

Perry wore a blue leather dress, red heels and a white T-shirt that said "Nasty Woman" – which is what Trump called Clinton during their debate right here on the campus of UNLV last Wednesday night. As she spoke about how she's been campaigning for the Democratic nominee since "the cornfields of Iowa," a guy in the audience yelled that Clinton should appoint her to be an ambassador. "Not yet," she replied. "I've got to put out a record – or four!"

Then Perry introduced Cortez Masto. "It's important to not just vote for president," the singer concluded. "We've got a crew. We've got a clique. We all run together. We need to vote for the right senators too"

She announced at the end of her speech that she would take sophomore Kendra Patterson, the president of the campus Black Student Organization, to vote for the first time. Perry and her entourage piled into three black Escalades and headed for the nearest polling place.

NextGen, the climate change-focused super PAC bankrolled by liberal billionaire Tom Steyer, had a dozen volunteers working the Perry rally in orange t-shirts. They handed out waters and had a coach bus in front of the student union to shuttle anyone who wanted a ride to go vote.

-- Early voting also gives Democrats more opportunities to turn out Latinos who have never voted before. Mi Familia Vota and Voto Latino co-hosted a four-hour block party Saturday afternoon in the parking lot of a mall that has an early voting site. There was live Spanish music and all-you-can-eat plates of free tacos from a popular local eatery. There were two bouncy houses, face painting and popcorn for the kids. Steyer's group helped pay for the event, and Univision Radio– a co-sponsor – promoted it on the air. Staffers directed attendees to go inside the mall to vote. At around 6 p.m. Saturday, there were about 100 people in line for tacos and another 50 voting inside. They waited in a line between a candy store and a cosmetics shop.

-- The Clinton team is investing heavily in door-to-door canvassing to run up their early vote numbers. Pilar Grullon, a field organizer for the Nevada Democratic Party, led a training session for 40 volunteers before Perry arrived at UNLV. The native of the Dominican Republic said her mom worked two jobs to make ends meet but that her family still relied on public assistance – including food stamps and Medicaid – to get by. She recently became the first in her family to graduate from college. "All of those services that my family depended on are at risk in this election," she said.

Grullon spent 15 minutes giving volunteers tips on how to give "a little extra push" to registered Democrats who might be reluctant to vote early. Everyone got "commit cards" to get people to write down exactly when and where they will vote. And they got leaflets with the number for a hotline that Clinton supporters can call to get a free ride to the polls. "You walk through, and you make a plan with the voter at every door," Grullon said.

She encouraged volunteers to be forceful: "If a mom tells you her daughter is voting for Hillary, don't take her word for it. … Note that, and someone else will come back to find her. … Be scrappy. If there's a gate, wait for someone to come to the gate. … If they speak Spanish and you can't, mark it down and someone else will go. … Don't engage anyone who wants to talk smack about our candidates. It is a waste of your time." For good measure, she even told everyone to smile.

-- Part of the Democratic strategy is to unashamedly pester people until they vote. The campaigns find out who voted at the end of each day. So they can stop targeting a potential supporter once they've cast a ballot. During the training session, Grullon urged her door knockers to tell people that they won't get bothered once they've cast a ballot. "If you don't want somebody to knock on your door or call you anymore, go vote," she said. "And it will stop. Seriously."

This turns out to be a powerful incentive in a state where almost every commercial is about the election. Beatriz Martinez, 27, voted Saturday inside a temporary trailer that has been set up in a Target parking lot in Las Vegas. Asked why she went on the first day, she said: "We got tons of texts saying early voting started this morning – from the Clinton campaign people, from the climate change people, from the party people." She and her boyfriend, a law student, supported Bernie Sanders in the caucuses but rallied behind Clinton after she wrapped up the nomination.

Martinez also brought her dad with her to vote. The 58-year-old was born in Mexico and speaks Spanish. He became a U.S. citizen more than a decade ago but had never voted before Saturday. The chance to vote against Trump changed that. He was very excited.

At the end of Saturday, Democratic staffers celebrated news that 39,148 people had voted in Clark County – compared to 33,187 in 2012. Of those, 55 percent were registered Democrats and 27 percent were registered Republicans.

-- Hitting the churches. The work continued early Sunday. Ruben Kihuen, a state senator challenging Republican Rep. Cresent Hardy, arrived at a Baptist church just before 8 a.m. to warn that all the progress of the Obama years could unravel if Democrats do not win. "I was trying to convey the sense of urgency of getting to the polls," he said in an interview after the service, as he headed to a second church to deliver the same closing argument. "This election could be won during early voting if you run a strong campaign."

-- Five hours later, Obama arrived in Kihuen's congressional district for a rally aimed primarily at turning out African Americans. The president took the stage at Cheyenne High School after Boyz II Men performed "The End of the Road." Speaking in front of a giant sign that said "VOTE EARLY," Obama told an audience of 5,100: "You've got the winning hand. You've got blackjack. But you've got to make sure to turn over the card by voting. … This game does not start on November 8th. The game ends on November 8th." Bringing back a fictional character whom he invoked often in campaigns past, POTUS added with a hint of nostalgia: "I need you to call up cousin Pooky and say, 'Pooky, it's time to vote!'"

"I need you to call up cousin Pooky and say, 'Pooky, it's time to vote.' I need you to go call Jesse and say, 'Jesse, come on. Don't be sitting on the couch. It's time to vote.' Everybody has got to vote early. That's how we won in '08. That's how we won in 2012. That's how we're going to win in 2016!"

-- The Republican effort to push early voting pales in comparison, and it certainly lacks the star power. The RNC-led victory program has 66 staffers spread across eight offices in Nevada, more than in 2012. The state Democratic Party declined to provide a staff count but said it has 17 field offices. But even GOP operatives marvel at the Reid machine. They are trying to play catch up, but they acknowledge that their only hope to carry Nevada is to win big among those who vote on Election Day. Starting this weekend, the GOP's field staff pivoted to knocking on the doors of registered Republicans who are probably with Trump but do not routinely vote.

Rep. Mark Amodei, the chairman of Trump's campaign in Nevada, hosted a modest early vote kickoff event at the RNC's Reno office on Saturday morning. Republican Senate candidate Joe Heck, meanwhile, campaigned with Ted Cruz in Reno and Elko, less populated but redder areas of the state. Heck, a congressman from Vegas, alienated many Trump supporters by rescinding his support. So he campaigned with the Texas senator in an effort to shore up his conservative base.

-- Many Republicans familiar with Nevada worry about this nightmare scenario: If Trump loses decisively along the Eastern seaboard—New Hampshire, Virginia, North Carolina and/or Florida—the networks could declare that Clinton is the president-elect before polls even close in Nevada. Many core GOP voters typically cast their ballots while commuting home from work. What if a couple percent of them decide that the election is over and it's not worth waiting in line? Because Republicans are so reliant on these voters, and Democrats will have so many votes locked in from early voting, it could lead to a down-ticket bloodbath. At the very least, it could tip a close Senate race to Cortez Masto.

-- Happening today at 10 a.m. Eastern – The 202 goes live with Gary Johnson: I just landed after taking the red eye back from Vegas so I can interview the Libertarian presidential nominee. Join us in-person at The Washington Post Live Center or watch a livestream of our hour-long conversation here.

WHILE YOU WERE SLEEPING:

-- Fighting resumed in eastern Aleppo, appearing to shatter Moscow's "humanitarian pause" in air raids that allowed rebels and civilians to temporarily flee the Syrian city. (Hugh Naylor)

-- Scoop: "Plans to send heavier weapons to CIA-backed rebels in Syria stall amid White House skepticism," by Greg Miller and Adam Entous: "As rebel-held sections of Aleppo crumbled under Russian bombing this month, the Obama administration was secretly weighing plans to rush more firepower to CIA-backed units in Syria. The proposal, which involved weapons that might help those forces defend themselves against Russian aircraft and artillery, made its way onto the agenda of a recent meeting President Obama held with his national security team. And that's as far as it got. Neither approved nor rejected, the plan was left in a state of ambiguity that U.S. officials said reflects growing administration skepticism about escalating a covert CIA program that has trained and armed thousands of Syrian fighters. … The operation has served as the centerpiece of the U.S. strategy to press [Assad] to step aside. But U.S. officials said there are growing doubts that even an expanded version could achieve that outcome because of Moscow's intervention. Obama, officials said, now seems inclined to leave the fate of the CIA program up to the next occupant of the White House."

-- Bill Murray received the Mark Twain Prize for American Humor at the Kennedy Center, playfully accepting the nation's top honor for comedy after a two-hour salute. From Peggy McGlone: "My theme tonight is what is it like to be beloved," a straight-faced Murray told the crowd as he accepted his award. "It's hard to listen to all those people be nice to you. You just get so suspicious." (Murray actively avoided receiving the award for weeks before the event, telling The Post's Geoff Edgers, "I really thought if I don't answer the phone for awhile, maybe they'll just move on to someone else.") The program will be broadcast Friday at 9 p.m. on PBS.

GET SMART FAST:​​

\* The Mosul offensive has sparked fear among E.U. authorities, who worry thousands of fighters may return home after traveling to wage jihad in Syria and Iraq. An estimated 5,000 European residents have traveled to support ISIS. (Michael Birnbaum)

\* French authorities began demolishing the country's notorious "Jungle" refugee camp, seeking to relocate the thousands of migrants who have spent months – or even years – living in the tent encampment in Calais . ( James McAuley )

\* Venezuela's National Assembly will push for impeachment proceedings against President Nicolás Maduro, vowing in an extraordinary session to put him on trial for violating democratic principles . A rowdy meeting was interrupted when about 100 pro-government protesters stormed in, shouting and brandishing signs before being escorted out. ( Reuters )

\* Federal authorities arrested more than 100 people at an oil pipeline protest in North Dakota, the latest chapter in a months-long standoff between law enforcement and activists, who say the pipeline will affect historically significant Native American tribal lands. (CNN)

\* At least 11 were killed and dozens injured after an L.A. tour bus crashed near Palm Springs. Photos of the gruesome crash showed a badly mangled tour bus, with its front end crushed into the back of a semi-truck trailer. Officials said at least 30 people were taken to the hospital. (Amy B Wang)

\* Thousands of ambitious candidates are competing for spots in the Secret Service, as part of the agency's most ambitious recruiting campaign in more than a decade. But despite the avalanche of applications, officials said the process has been complicated by a hard-to-pass polygraph test  and "huge, huge" rates of stimulant abuse among applicants. ( USA Today )

\* Striking Jim Beam employees returned to work in Kentucky after a weeklong standoff. Workers at the world's largest spirit producer requested less overtime and more full-time hires. (USA Today)

\* Police in Michigan are baffled by the death of a young husband and wife who were found dead in their apartment next to untouched bags of Taco Bell. There were no signs of a break-in or physical trauma and no evidence that the two had overdosed. A neighbor who passed by the open door thought they were sleeping. (Kristine Guerra)

\* A 58-story high rise in San Francisco has been dubbed the city's "leaning tower" after alarmed residents found it was sinking into the ground – at an angle. But unlike Italy's famed tilting tower, several newly-released documents show both developers and city officials knew the building was sinking before it opened in late 2009. ( AP )

\* Hundreds of Rhode Island women gathered for a "yoga pants parade," marching past the house of a man who said in a local newspaper that women over 20 should not wear the tight-fitting pants.  Attendees said the letter – which compared adult women wearing yoga pants in public to men wearing  Speedos to the grocery store – invoked bigger issues about shaming and policing of women's bodies. ( Boston Globe )

-- AT&T announced a planned $85.4 billion acquisition of Time Warner on Saturday, a blockbuster merger that would radically reshape the media landscape. (Brian Fung)

\* Trump vowed to block the merger as president, calling it "an example of the power structure" he is fighting. "The very corporations that have gained from shipping America's factories and jobs offshore are the very same media conglomerate now pushing [Clinton's] agenda," said Trump economics adviser Peter Navarro. (Wall Street Journal)

\* Clinton's camp urged close scrutiny of the deal, saying there is "a lot of information that needs to come out" before a conclusion can be reached. (Buzzfeed)

THE DAILY HILLARY:

-- Today's A1, "How mega-donors helped raise $1 billion for Hillary Clinton," by Matea Gold and Anu Narayanswamy: "Determined not to fall behind in the money race, [she has] ramped up her appeals to rich donors and shrugged off restrictions that President Obama had imposed on his fundraising team. Even as her advisers fretted about the perception that she was too cozy with wealthy interests, they agreed to let lobbyists bundle checks for her campaign, including those representing some foreign governments ... Top aides wooed major donors for super PACs, taking advantage of the leeway that campaigns have to legally collaborate with the groups on fundraising. An analysis by [The Post] found that more than a fifth of the $1 billion donated to help her bid was given by just 100 wealthy individuals and labor unions — many with a long history of contributing to the Clintons. "

-- Gov. Terry McAuliffe's super PAC donated nearly $500,000 to the campaign of Dr. Jill McCabe, the wife of an FBI official who later helped oversee Clinton's email investigation. From the Wall Street Journal's Devlin Barrett: "Campaign finance records show Mr. McAuliffe's political-action committee donated $467,500 to the 2015 state Senate campaign of Dr. Jill McCabe, who is married to Andrew McCabe, now the deputy director of the FBI." McCabe was the third largest recipient of funds from the governor's super PAC. The governor's office strongly denied any potential connection, saying McAuliffe "supported Jill McCabe because he believed she would be a good state senator": "This is a customary practice for Virginia governors," a spokesman said in a statement. "Any insinuation that his support was tied to anything other than his desire to elect candidates who would help pass his agenda is ridiculous."

-- An increasingly confident Clinton touted herself as "listmaker in chief" at a North Carolina rally on Sunday, dismissing Trump with a few jokes as she focused primarily on her to-do list as president. From Anne Gearan: "We've got challenges, don't get me wrong," Clinton said at an outdoor rally on a sparkling fall afternoon. "I've laid out a whole agenda about dealing with those challenges," she said, adding that she is sometimes criticized for the detail of those proposals. She spent relatively little time marking out the ways she claims Trump is unfit to be president, or even comparing herself with him, and she delved happily into discussions of technical education, student debt, infrastructure spending and economic growth."

-- HRC will rally in the Tar Heel State alongside Michelle Obama on Thursday, their first side-by-side appearance this year.

-- The WikiLeaks emails show how many cooks are in Hillary's kitchen. The Boston Globe's Annie Linskey notes that there were at least 37 messages exchanged about just one tweet on the minimum wage. And the team considered 84 possible slogans before settling on "Stronger Together." Also, seemingly everyone in Clinton's orbit offers suggestions for how the candidate could connect better with average voters. Former Michigan Gov. Jennifer Granholm, for example, wanted Clinton to try working in some low-wage service jobs to combat the perception that she is "out of touch." Among her suggestions: Clinton could make hotel beds, clear tables at a Denny's, mop floors in a school, or work in a day-care center or a nursing home for a day.

-- The New Yorker endorsed Clinton, praising the Democratic nominee as a "distinctly capable candidate": "The election of Hillary Clinton is an event that we would welcome for its historical importance, and greet with indescribable relief."

THE DAILY DONALD:

-- Trump held a rare Sunday rally in Naples, Fla., halting from his teleprompter speech to suddenly ask the crowd if he was "right to run for president." From Jenna Johnson: "When I'm president, if companies want to fire their workers and leave — Are you okay? Listen. When I'm president, this is to me, like, this is why I started. Are we glad that I started? Are we happy?" Trump said, as the crowd encouragingly cheered him on. "Well, I'll let you know on the evening of Nov. 8 whether I'm glad."

-- The Trump brand continues to take a huge hit because of the campaign, so the Trump Organization has decided to launch a new brand of hotels that will NOT carry his name. From Bloomberg's Hui-Yong Yu  James Nash: "Scion, a line of hotels that will target younger clients, was unveiled last month in a press release that quoted three different Trump Organization executives, but not the candidate. The new brand is planned for use at city and resort locations … intended to appeal 'to a new and different type of guest in more locations around the globe.' He's now a polarizing figure. When he was putting his hotels together, he wasn't,' said [consultant Bruce Himelstein]. 'There's definitely an impact.'"

-- Trump received his first major newspaper endorsement from the Las Vegas Review-Journal, a paper owned by casino billionaire and Trump donor Sheldon Adelson. In a statement, the paper's editorial board acknowledged Trump "has his flaws" but will "bring needed disruption and change to Washington."

-- Facebook co-founder Dustin Moskovitz has now given $35 million to anti-Trump efforts. "If the first $20 million yielded cheers, the second $15 million generated stunned silence," Gabriel Debenedetti reports in Politico. "The deeply private 32-year-old — who is worth $12.7 billion … is a long-time philanthropist but political newcomer. He hasn't started to build contacts with local operatives. And he hasn't said a word publicly about his political involvement."

-- Former Apprentice staffers said Trump forced them to come to work in the days immediately following Superstorm Sandy, even though a state of emergency was in effect following the deadly storm. From The Daily Beast's Gideon Resnick and Asawin Suebsaeng: "We all had to come in right after Sandy," a former staffer recounted. "We were in his building, and we fought with [a] manager, who said, 'It's not from me, it's from [Donald Trump] himself'…" "We had to work straight through it," another staffer said. "The city was shut down, no traffic lights, etc. I would bike from [Brooklyn] to [Trump] Tower," he said of his first days back at work. (Meanwhile, Trump was publicly taking credit for giving storm refugees shelter in Trump Tower -- something that he was required to do by law.)

-- Breitbart News is planning to announce the hiring of former Red Sox pitcher and Trump supporter Curt Schilling to host a political talk show, six months after he was fired from ESPN for sharing an anti-transgender Facebook post. The news also comes as Schilling weighs whether to challenge Elizabeth Warren for her Senate seat in 2018. (New York Magazine)

-- Trump traveled to Gettysburg Saturday to deliver what was billed as a "closing argument" for his campaign and outline plans for the first 100 days of a Trump administration – but he spent most of the speech airing a litany of grievances instead. From Jenna Johnson and Jose DelReal: Trump vowed to sue the women who have accused him of sexual assault -- branding them all "liars" -- and blasted the media for attempting to "poison" the minds of American voters. After more than 13 minutes on the subject, Trump read several numbered lists of things that he would do on his first day in office or during his first 100 days. ("Nearly all were things that he has repeatedly promised to do, but this was the first time he listed them in a speech," Johnson and DelReal note.)

Tim Kaine slammed Trump's speech as evidence of the "self-interested campaign" he has run: "At the end of the campaign, all along, he's been running a self-interested, me-first campaign, not an America-first campaign," Kaine told reporters in Pittsburgh. "And here he is saying that in the first 100 days I'm not changing, I may be POTUS, but I'm really going to focus on settling scores, and, oh, by the way, now that I'm president, I could really settle some scores." (Abby Phillip)

-- Trump said in a 2012 interview that he does NOT believe in deporting undocumented **immigrants**. Asked on CNBC's "Squawk Box" about his views on **immigrant** labor, Trump said he was "probably down the middle": "I understand how, as an example, you have people in this country for 20 years, they've done a great job, they've done wonderfully, they've gone to school, they've gotten good marks, they're productive — now we're supposed to send them out of the country, I don't believe in that," he said. (Clip uncovered by  CNNs' Andrew Kaczynski)

SUNDAY SHOW HIGHLIGHTS

-- Kellyanne Conway conceded that Trump's campaign "is behind" on "Meet the Press," but she pointed to enthusiasm at her client's campaign events as evidence that he can still win.  "Let me tell you something: You go out on the road with Donald Trump, this election doesn't feel over," Conway added on CNN's "State of the Union." Later, Conway distanced herself from Trump's lengthy tirade against women who accused him of sexual misconduct, telling host Jake Tapper, "Well, he delivers his own speeches. This is his candidacy. He's the guy who's running for the White House."

She outlined a potential path for the Republican nominee on "Fox News Sunday, saying they are focused on winning the states of Florida, Ohio, Iowa, North Carolina and, possibly, Nevada, while protecting the traditionally-red states of Arizona and Georgia. (Jenna Johnson)

-- RNC Chairman Reince Priebus sought to minimize Trump's claims of a "rigged" election, telling John Dickerson that he merely "wants to reserve all options." "He's saying he wants to reserve all options, and 'if there is grounds for a recount, I will exercise my options,'" Priebus said on CBS. "He is not willing to not concede if he loses and there's no fraud."

-- Eric Trump said his father would accept election results if they are "fair": "I think what my father is saying is 'I want a fair election,'" the younger Trump said on ABC's "This Week," rattling off statistics that reportedly show "2 million people on the voter rolls right now who are dead" and "14 percent of all noncitizens in this country are registered to vote." "If it's a fair outcome he will absolutely accept it, there's no question about it." (Amy B Wang)

-- Tim Kaine suggested Clinton would be open to exploring new Asian trade deals as president, despite her opposition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership.  "You never close the door if you can get a deal that's going to be good for American workers and our economy," the Virginia senator told Chuck Todd. "We aren't against trade."

THE BATTLEGROUNDS:

-- " As Clinton builds a lead, write-in campaigns flower and falter ," by David Weigel: "According to the [FEC], just 136,040 write-in votes were cast and tabulated in the 2012 election. But this year, that number could be much higher, with multiple campaigns underway to normalize the act of writing in a name. Evan McMullin, the independent conservative candidate who entered the race too late to appear on many ballots, will be an 'official write-in candidate' in most of the country. Several fringe candidates have earned similar status, and some of Sanders's die-hard fans are spreading the word that many states will also count any ballot with his name scrawled across it. … Although Clinton's favorability rating has ticked up in recent weeks, many voters are already casting ballots in an environment where both major presidential candidates are unpopular. One problem: Write-in votes are not treated the same as filled-in ballots. In many states, the votes are not counted or reported at all. In others, a misspelling or an alternate name — say, 'Evan McMullen,' or 'Bernie' instead of 'Bernard Sanders' — would not be tallied."

-- Obama will today endorse 30 more House candidates, is addition to some 150 state legislative candidates across 20 states later in the week. From Politico's Edward-Isaac Dovere: "The endorsements—which will come along with a variety of robocalls, social media, mailers, photos of Obama with the candidates taken … and even a few radio ads—are Obama's biggest investment in state races ever by far, and come as he gears up to make redistricting reform at the state level the political priority of his post-presidency."

-- From VIRGINIA, "They crossed the border illegally, and can't vote. But they can knock on doors," by WaPo's Antonio Olivo: "Unable to vote in the presidential election, a group of undocumented **immigrants** is knocking on doors in Northern Virginia in support of [Clinton] and other Democratic candidates, convinced that the outcome of the vote will determine whether they can secure a path to citizenship in the country they have known since childhood. The vote-seekers are some of the 750,000 recipients of temporary legal status under the Obama administration's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. Four years after the DACA program was launched, many of the beneficiaries are still in a kind of limbo, unsure about whether their status would be renewed under a President Trump and concerned that their family members could be deported."

-- From NORTH CAROLINA, "Trump message clashes with GOP's most-endangered governor," by Politico's Elena Schneider: "North Carolina Gov. Pat McCrory is desperate to talk about his economic achievements after a year mired in contentious debate over social issues, including the state's transgender 'bathroom law.' The only problem? [Trump] keeps coming to town and telling voters how terrible the economy is. It's the most glaring example this year of the disconnect between Trump's apocalyptic rhetoric and the message of achievement that many Republican incumbents are trying to use to win reelection. It has been known to happen before — there was reportedly friction between affable Mitt Romney's campaign and some recovery-touting GOP governors in 2012. But the gap between McCrory's 'Carolina Comeback' theme and Trump's doom-and-gloom assessments yawns particularly wide, as McCrory faces the toughest reelection challenge of any governor in the country in 2016."

-- From PENNSYLVANIA, "GOP frets over Trump's down-ballot impact," by the Boston Globe's Tracy Jan: "Here in the Pennsylvania suburbs, a political shift is underway: Republican leaders worried about [Trump's] presence atop the ticket are focusing as much of their attention on state races as they are on their presidential nominee's fate in a crucial swing-state battleground. With Trump trailing in the polls, the question of the hour is what effect his lack of support might have on other GOP candidates on the ballot." Polls show Sen. Pat Toomey clinging to a narrow lead over Katie McGinty … [But] Trump has fallen more than six points behind Clinton in Pennsylvania — and is 28 points behind in the Philadelphia suburbs … creating a whirlpool that could swallow the Republican senator."

-- Trump is making a final push in FLORIDA, hunkering down in the Sunshine State as the race enters its final stretch. From the Wall Street Journal's Beth Reinhard and Janet Hook: "He is slated to headline five rallies over three days in the nation's largest battleground, where more than a million voters have already mailed in ballots. [But] in one potentially ominous sign for Mr. Trump, Democrats are holding their own against Republicans in mail-in ballots in Florida, a mode of voting that the GOP traditionally dominates … The more traction Democrats gain in early voting, the harder it will be for Mr. Trump to catch up, even if polls narrow near Election Day." Trump will continue a push in northern and central parts of Florida for the next two days, while the Clinton campaign seeks to drive up turnout in the more liberal southern region.

-- Also in the Sunshine State, former Colombian President Alvaro Uribe campaigned with Marco Rubio yesterday. He joined the senator at a Miami restaurant as he seeks to shore up support among expat Colombian voters. (Miami Herald)

-- Several outside Republican groups are now explicitly breaking with Trump, urging voters to elect a divided government rather than giving Clinton a blank check. From the New York Times' Alexander Burns and AmyChozick: The Congressional Leadership Fund is slated to begin running ads that attack Democratic candidates as "rubber stamps" for Clinton. Meanwhile, the Chamber of Commerce and the Senate Leadership Fund have launched a wave of Senate commercials asking voters to limit Clinton's power by supporting down-ballot Republicans instead.

Here's an example from Missouri:

POLLING ROUNDUP

-- An ABC News tracking poll finds Clinton up 12 nationally among likely voters (50-38). Clinton holds a 20-point advantage among women and has a three-point edge with men. Trump's rhetoric has caused problems: 69 percent said they disapprove of Trump's response to questions about his treatment of women, while 59 percent reject his suggestion that the election is "rigged" in Clinton's favor. And he could face turnout problems: ABC's survey found a seven-point drop among Republicans who plan to vote on Election Day.

-- A CBS News/YouGov poll conducted in Texas after the third debate showed Clinton within striking distance, trailing him by just 3 points in the state. The majority of his Texas backers are over age 45, the survey found. Meanwhile, he's down by at least eight points among voters under 45. The CBS poll found Clinton up just 3 points in Florida (46-43), however.

WAPO HIGHLIGHTS:

-- "Iceland, a land of Vikings, braces for a Pirate Party takeover," by Griff Witte: "The party that could be on the cusp of winning Iceland's national elections on Saturday didn't exist four years ago. Its members are a collection of anarchists, hackers, libertarians and Web geeks. It sets policy through online polls — and thinks the government should do the same. It wants to make Iceland 'a Switzerland of bits,' free of digital snooping. It has offered Edward Snowden a new place to call home. And then there's the name: In this land of Vikings, the Pirate Party may soon be king. The rise of the Pirates — from radical fringe to focal point of Icelandic politics — has astonished even the party's founder, a poet, Web programmer and former WikiLeaks activist. But this, after all, is 2016. [The win] would offer a vivid illustration of how far Europeans are willing to go in their rejection of the political mainstream, adding to a string of insurgent triumphs emanating from both the far left and far right."

SOCIAL MEDIA SPEED READ:

Let's start with this face from Hillary Clinton as she watches the Cubs win:

Clinton, an Illinois native, grew up as a Cubs fan. Here are photos of her with legendary Cubs announcer Harry Caray:

Obama's reaction:

Bill Murray, also a Cubs fan, was in D.C. to collect the Mark Twain prize at the Kennedy Center. Here he is crashing the White House press briefing room to talk about his team:

Here's a quick look at the state of the race:

Katy Perry was out on the campaign trail for Clinton:

As was Bill Clinton:

A top lawyer at the powerhouse firm Gibson Dunn reiterated his offer to represent pro bono anyone who Trump sues for accusing him of sexual misconduct:

The Los Angeles Times wrote about the time Trump threatened to sue the paper in 2008 for an accurate story about Trump University:

A flashback to October 1968:

Meanwhile, Trump is once again criticizing the U.S. military:

Newt Gingrich called Trump's Gettysburg speech "historic":

The old, very awkward Trump-Pence logo was back:

Breitbart is no fan of Paul Ryan's:

And the Drudge Report continues to get nastier and nastier toward HRC:

Meanwhile, a supporter told Mike Pence to tell Trump he's "tired of the crap":

RNC strategist Sean Spicer voted early:

Dinesh D'Souza received widespread criticism for this tweet:

Like this, from GOP operative Doug Heye:

Let's recap what it's like to be a reporter at a Trump rally:

Plus, a note from Jake Tapper on that word "lugenpresse":

Ryan Seacrest hosted the USO gala in D.C.:

John Kerry, Ban Ki-moon and other leaders attended a screening of Leonardo DiCaprio's climate change documentary, "Before the Flood":

Shelley Moore Capito and Cheri Bustos are enjoying the first taste of fall:

And finally, Jason Chaffetz is courting the Instagram likes with this photo:

DAYBOOK:

On the campaign trail: Clinton stumps with Elizabeth Warren in Manchester, N.H., while Kaine campaigns in Miami and Palm Beach, Fla. Biden stumps for Clinton in Dayton and Toledo, Ohio. Trump is in St. Augustine and Tampa, Fla.; Pence stops in Salisburg and Greensboro, N.C.

At the White House: Obama is in California for fundraisers. He appears on ABC's "Jimmy Kimmel Live" tonight.

On Capitol Hill: The Senate and House are out.

NEWS YOU CAN USE IF YOU LIVE IN D.C.:

-- Partially sunny and breezy, today should be a quintessentially perfect fall day. The Capital Weather Gang forecasts: "A cold front sneaks through the region early on. It kicks up the wind a bit but has little effect on temperature. With lots of sunshine, highs still aim for the upper 60s."

-- The Redskins lost to the Detroit Lions 17-20.

-- A D.C. police officer was arrested and charged with driving under the influence while on duty. Authorities said they were alerted to Arthur Thompson's impairment by a supervisor investigating a citizen complaint early Sunday. (Spencer S. Hsu)

-- "No worries for incumbent Rep. Don Beyer in Va. as Election Day approaches," by Patricia Sullivan: "Rep. Don Beyer (D-Va.) has some quirky ideas about what legislation he would pursue if he wins a second term in Congress next month. He wants to push for a billion-dollar economic development project in hard-hit coal communities far from his suburban Northern Virginia district. He longs to revise the federal budget process … And he'd like to see larger, multi-member congressional districts, as was allowed before 1842. 'I don't want to be naive and I don't want to be Don Quixote,' said the affable auto dealer … 'But I want to talk to 200 people about this in the next two years.' When you are the incumbent Democrat in one of the country's deepest blue districts, you can afford to dream. A bilingual millennial who describes himself as leaning libertarian on many social issues, Hernick, 35, has tried to appeal to young voters who want Congress to address the national debt, end political gridlock and speed the pace of change."

VIDEOS OF THE DAY:

Sen. Al Franken (D-Minn.) provided The Post with a list of his 10 favorite political sketches on "Saturday Night Live." Among them are Jon Lovitz as Michael Dukakis in 1988, saying "I can't believe I'm losing to this guy."

Here's the SNL take from this weekend on the final presidential debate:

For his opening monologue as SNL host, Tom Hanks spoke to America like a dad:

In this sketch, Hanks plays Doug, a white contestant (and Trump supporter) on Black Jeopardy:

PBS debuted its behind-the-scenes Hamilton documentary, "Hamilton's America," with cameos from Obama, George W. Bush, Paul Ryan, Elizabeth Warren and others. Here's the extended trailer:

As a bonus, here are two 2016-themed Hamilton parodies from YouTube (the song is "The Election of 1800"):

Bad Lip Reading imagined the latest presidential debate as a poetry slam:

Mark Cuban has a new business idea, per this Funny or Die video -- putting people into voluntary comas for the duration of a Trump presidency:

Wyclef Jean dressed up as Sanders, Clinton and Trump for the video version of his updated track, "If I Was President":

Terry Tate is back as the office linebacker -- only this time, he's taking down Trump:

The Human Rights Campaign released this digital ad in Florida featuring a survivor of the Pulse nightclub shooting:

ICYMI, Clinton released a powerful ad featuring the Khan family:

Last but definitely not least, in this political ad, the wife of a candidate defending his seat on the Travis County Commissioners Court implores voters to reelect him so that he'll get out of the house:

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MCALLEN, TEX. -- A dispatcher's voice crackled over the scanner, and Raquel Medina turned up the sound. Traffic north of the river. An agent had spotted footprints in the dirt.

Medina gunned the engine of her green and white U.S. Border Patrol truck, drove down a dirt road, pulled over and plunged into the mesquite brush. It was 106 degrees.

She darted through spiny bushes that reached above her 5-foot-8-inch frame. A branch caught her curly brown hair, coiled in a bun. Those could be families up ahead, in which case there would be no need for the handcuffs dangling from her right hip. Or children traveling alone. They could be men smuggling drugs or inked with teardrop tattoos, meaning they had killed someone or had done time.

The chase unfolding in broad daylight by the Rio Grande has become more and more common along the busiest stretch of the U.S. border with Mexico.

The river valley became a conduit two years ago for a wave of men, women and children fleeing gang and drug violence in Central America. It has not let up since. The Border Patrol apprehended 186,855 migrants here this fiscal year, when crossings crept up after a year-long drop.

Donald Trump, the Republican presidential nominee, promises to build a "big, beautiful" wall to seal the country off from Mexican **immigrants** he has classified as "rapists." In a testy exchange over illegal **immigration** at last week's debate with Democrat Hillary Clinton, Trump called many migrants "bad hombres" who should not be here. Clinton opposes a wall. Instead, she emphasizes bringing undocumented **immigrants** who are already here "out from the shadows."

For Medina and the 17,500 agents on the front lines who comprise the human wall, the reality is personal -- terrifying, heart-rending, defeating all at the same time.

She is a woman in a mostly male profession, a native of the border whose choice of work reflects both a sympathy for and a skepticism of those coming across. It is through her eyes that the challenges of the border, blurred by politics this year, are more vivid.

When she reached a clearing on a late-September afternoon, Medina joined another agent and a German shepherd whose job is to follow the migrants' scent. They spotted seven men running in a field ahead, a barbed wire fence between them. Medina was the first one over.

She frisked the men for weapons -- they had none -- and commanded them to empty their pockets and take off their shoelaces.

"Do you have drugs?" Medina asked in Spanish. They all shook their heads.

The men had hitchhiked from Central America and met in Mexico. Each had paid a smuggler about $10 to cross the river. One had lived, undetected, for nine years in New Jersey before running a stop sign and getting deported.

"A lot of people don't know what goes on at the border," Medina often says. "They're clueless."

"I was clueless."

A descendant of Mexican **immigrants**, Medina, 40, had spent her whole life 12 hours northwest in El Paso, another border town, when she became an agent. When she was growing up in the 1980s, migrants used to pass her parents' house, and her mother always left a bell on the front porch. When they rang, she greeted them with burritos, water and extra clothes for their trip north.

Back then, America was not at war over illegal **immigration**.

Her own history had always made Medina wonder about the people who left these footsteps she tracks through the brush. "I thought, 'Where are they going? What are their stories?'"

Six years ago, she was managing a Nike store when she saw a recruiting poster for the Border Patrol at the airport. As an anthropology major at Texas State University, Medina developed a fascination with other cultures and loved to travel. After her divorce, she wanted a more stable career. In South Texas, a federal job is a good job.

Her parents were anxious. The border was more dangerous than ever, and their daughter would be working alone. Her mother begged her to teach high school instead, but when the Border Patrol made an offer three years later, she joined.

It was late 2013, just as hundreds of women and children a day started streaming across the Texas border to the Rio Grande Valley, seeking asylum amid escalating violence in Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. By summer 2014, the Border Patrol had apprehended 50,000 unaccompanied children in the Rio Grande Valley. The agency was looking to hire people just like Medina: Latinas who spoke Spanish and could put children and women at ease.

To this day, she has neither drawn her gun nor fired it. But she is always fearful. "I mean, every night you go out there you're scared."

When she got her first assignment to the valley, she felt she had to prove herself to the male agents, show that she had their backs. To the migrants, too, she knew that being a woman had the potential to make her look weak.

She sees things differently today than she did as a girl. "Now I understand that not everyone comes across to work here," she said. "There are definitely some bad people."

Some migrants are carrying knives and rucksacks stuffed with marijuana when she apprehends them. After a shift like that, Medina said, she feels as though she has made a difference.

Yet for her, the politics of border security are beside the point. She doesn't vote. Never has.

She began her shift as she always does, with a 5 a.m. alarm and a fruit smoothie in her small apartment 15 minutes from the McAllen station. After 6 a.m. muster, she pulled her gun belt, Camelbak water bottle and green bullet-proof vest from her locker, where a photo of her cat, Toby, and her family are taped to the door.

Medina sprayed herself with sunblock and slid a bottle of Repel 100 for mosquitoes into the pocket of her green uniform before getting into her SUV. She checked the siren and drove into the pre-dawn darkness.

Through the windshield of her Chevy Suburban passed the ranch lands and sugar cane fields of the valley. Two Border Patrol trucks drove by on the other side of the road, heading in from the midnight shift.

Medina looked up at bumper-to-bumper trucks crossing the Anzalduas International Bridge to Mexico, carrying produce and farm and building supplies for this growing region driven by the North American Free Trade Agreement. It's a place built by Latino **immigrants**. At the local Stripes convenience store, where she often stops for breakfast, everyone orders in Spanish.

She drove toward the river, arriving at a levee flanked by the border fence built after the 9/11 attacks. It's the closest thing that exists to Trump's wall.The reddish metal barrier is 18-feet in some places, just three-feet in others. Sometimes it disappears altogether.

Just one-third of the southern border is guarded by fencing. In the Rio Grande Valley, it's one-fifth.

A Border Patrol truck was parked in a gap in the fence, watching. Medina rolled down her window. "Anything going on?" she asked.

The agent told her about a wall breach at sensor 216 earlier that morning, resulting in two "gotaways." The migrants had scaled the fence, probably with a rope ladder.

"A fence and a wall are not going to stop them," Medina said.

What does stop them? Agents like her, patrolling in her SUV, watching for footprints. Overhead surveillance blimps like the silver one that hovered nearby, which used to be deployed by the U.S. military in Afghanistan. Sensors buried in the ground. Helicopters. Dogs.

Now the river came into view: the muddy brown Rio Grande, snaking 316 miles through impassable brush.

The lights of the homes, warehouses and fast-food restaurants of the valley began to glow. On the scanner came word that a group of UAMs -- unaccompanied minors in Border Patrol speak -- had turned up north of the river.

Medina headed that way. She likes to be there when children are apprehended. She tries to imagine what they've gone through to get here, and hopes she can provide some kind of comfort in a bad situation.

As she pulled up, she saw three teenage girls with long brown hair wearing skinny jeans and a tall boy with an Elvis Presley haircut. The girls were all 13, sisters and their cousin, who wore a pink Hello Kitty T-shirt.

They had been told to pull their identity cards from their pockets and remove their shoelaces and belts. An agent wrote down their names and where they came from on a clipboard.

At this spot the morning before, 43 people who had slipped through were caught.

The teenagers' meager possessions, which included four uneaten Snickers bars, went into a clear plastic bag with "Department of Homeland Security" printed in black letters on the front. Medina told them in Spanish to eat the candy before it got thrown away.

The girls had survived on sandwiches for 13 days on multiple bus rides from El Salvador and were trying to get to Miami, where the cousin's mother lived. The boy, 15, came from Guatemala, hoping to find his brother in Boston. Gangs were threatening them at school, they all said.

They had turned themselves in as soon as they saw the Border Patrol, instructed by the coyote they paid to bring them here that this was how to get asylum in the United States.

"I think their goal is just to land on U.S. soil," Medina said.

The girls were smoothing their hair. "No se preocupe. Se ve bien," Medina told them gently. "Don't worry, it doesn't matter. You look good."

"They always worry how their hair is going to look," she said.

The boy and girls were escorted in a van to the station, where they would be fingerprinted and interviewed. Probably, because they were minors, they would get to stay in the United States.

On the radio in her SUV, Medina heard the agent monitoring the surveillance blimp announce that two groups of migrants were amassing on the Mexican side of the river.

"As soon as he calls that they're crossing, we'll go help them out," Medina said.

It might take hours, as the smugglers waited to collect enough people to try crossing over.

Now that the activity had quieted, she started sign-cutting -- a painstaking way of detecting whether the migrants left marks in the grass or dirt. She crept along at 12 miles per hour, her driver's side door open, scanning for fresh footprints or matted-down grass.

Tire marks and old footprints cluttered the road. So Medina found four tractor tires left by an agent on the previous shift and attached them with a heavy chain to the rear bumper of her SUV. The Suburban dragged them, clearing the old footprints.

Now the road would be smooth for the next agent.

By 2:30 p.m., the radio chatter said that one of the groups amassing at the border was now crossing the river. Medina drove south to meet a team of agents waiting to apprehend them. The rafts made landfall, but immediately turned back, probably sensing danger.

"I think a lot of people, they think we can catch everybody," Medina said.

It was time to head back to the station, where she washed off the dust and mud that built up on her SUV. She filled the gas tank, and returned her gun belt and vest to her locker.

At home, leftover chicken waited in the fridge, and the novel she was reading, "White Oleander," the story of a child who is separated from her mother and learns to survive in the foster home system, waited on her nightstand.

Over the past 24-hours the Border Patrol had apprehended 651 migrants in the Rio Grande Valley.

Now, it was time for sleep. Her 6 a.m. shift was just hours away.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The 2016 presidential campaign has become a referendum on the process of American electoral democracy itself.

Republican candidate Donald Trump's baseless claims of a "rigged" election and his refusal to promise to accept the outcome of November's vote have focused renewed attention on allegations of voter fraud.

Meanwhile, Trump has been criticized for calling on his supporters to "go out and watch" polling places, statements that have been interpreted as attempts to intimidate minority voters. Along with the implementation of stricter voter identification laws in several states, activists and politicians on the left have called out these efforts as voter suppression.

But to what extent do Americans believe voter fraud and voter suppression occur? And are there differences that fall along party lines, as we might expect?

In a poll conducted immediately after the third presidential debate (for more on our methodology, see here, data collected using Pollfish), we asked respondents a series of questions to assess their views of the electoral process.

Although there is no evidence of major fraud in U.S. elections, Trump has a receptive audience for his claims, as other polls have found.

Eighty-four percent of Republicans believe that a "meaningful amount" of voter fraud occurs in U.S. elections, along with 75 percent of independents. Even a majority of Democrats — 52 percent — believe voter fraud is occurring.

But what do people mean when they say they believe voter fraud is happening? Are they talking about people voting multiple times, "dead people" voting, voting by illegal **immigrants** or something else?

In the figure below, we find that nearly 60 percent of Republicans believe that illegal **immigrants** are voting, a claim that has been circulated by Trump in recent days and debunked by political scientists. The share of independents and Democrats who believe non-citizens are voting is considerably lower, but not insignificant.

One odd thing about this belief — the most widely believed method of voter fraud — is that it seems like an especially unlikely type of fraud. By going through the voter registration process, illegal **immigrants** would risk generating records that would presumably increase their chances of getting deported.

We also found that 43 percent of Republicans believe people vote under the names of registered voters who have died, and that 36 percent believe that election officials are manipulating vote totals. We did not find very many people who believe double-voting — or someone voting twice — is common.

On the other hand, rhetoric about voter suppression is not resonating with Democrats the way voter fraud does with Republicans.

More Republicans (30 percent) than Democrats (27 percent) say that voter suppression occurs through the purging of eligible voters from the registration rolls. And 34 percent of Republicans believe that intimidation is used to suppress the vote, something that just 24 percent of Democrats believe.

We do find a small partisan difference in the direction we would assume regarding voter ID laws. Thirty-two percent of Democrats believe voter ID laws contribute to voter suppression, while that number is 26 percent among Republicans (see the graph below).

But two things are clear — a majority of Democrats do not consider voter ID laws as voter suppression, even though this is a prominent part of Democratic elite rhetoric, and the responses are not nearly as polarized along party lines as on questions about voter fraud.

Sam Corbett-Davies is a PhD candidate at Stanford University in computer science. Find him on Twitter @scorbettdavies. Tobias Konitzer is a PhD candidate in communication at Stanford University. Find him on Twitter @KonitzerTobias. David Rothschild is an economist at Microsoft Research. Find him on Twitter@DavMicRot.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Action in Community Through Service food pantry needs volunteers to stock shelves, prepare food bags and make grocery store pickups either on a regular schedule (flexible) or on an on-call basis. To complete an online application, visit actspwc.org.

ACTS Helpline needs volunteers to answer a suicide-prevention hotline. 703-221-1144.

American Association for the Advancement of Science needs scientists, engineers, mathematicians and physicians to assist K-12 STEM teachers. Victor Crawford, 703-732-9004. vicris51@verizon.net.

American Cancer Society's Road to Recovery needs drivers to take patients to appointments. 804-527-3719. leah.seldinsommer@cancer.org.

Beacon for Adult Literacy trains people to help adults with literacy and English-speaking skills. 703-368-7491. beaconliteracy.org.

BEAT Cancer Coalition needs drivers 55 and older to take patients to appointments. Retired and senior volunteer program. 703-369-5292.

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Washington-Manassas needs volunteers. bgcgw.org/prince-william.

Catholic Charities Hogar **Immigrant** Services needs teachers for its English as a second language and citizenship classes. Training provided. 571-208-1572. volunteer.hogar@ccda.net.

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children's Intervention Services, needs Spanish-speaking volunteers to visit children who have been abused and neglected. Ben Gimeno, 703-330-8145, bgimeno@casacis.org.

Discover Prince William & Manassas seeks tourism ambassadors at local events, festivals and a visitors center. jmcelwain@discoverpwm.com.

ESL and **Immigrant** Ministries trains volunteers to teach English to adults. 703-841-0292. office@eslim.org, eslim.org.

Friends of Feral Cats of PWC needs volunteers and donations of cat food. Call Nancy, 571-719-0657.

Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind needs volunteers to raise and train puppies. 866-282-8046. guidedog.org.

Habitat for Humanity needs help with projects, ReStore and providing lunch to volunteers. 703-369-6708. volunteer@ habitatpwc.org.

Historic Dumfries needs docents for the Weems-Botts Museum to help with events and research projects, gather and transcribe local oral histories, and work on other projects. 703-221-2218.

Keep Prince William Beautiful needs help with its storm drain program and educational outreach. 571-285-3772. kpwb.org.

Literacy Volunteers of Prince William needs adults to help adult students improve their literacy skills. Training provided. 703-670-5702. lvapw.org.

Mutt Love Rescue needs foster homes for rescued dogs. 703-577-0106. adopt@muttloverescue.org, muttloverescue.org.

Northern Virginia Family Service seeks foster parents. 571-748-2500.

Occoquan needs volunteers for events throughout the year, including the annual arts and crafts shows. Donna Brown, 703-491-2168. dbrown@occoquanva.gov.

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Mondays through Fridays. 703-792-4583.

Prince William Area Free Clinic needs volunteer doctors, pharmacists, physician assistants, nurses, translators and administrative assistants for the Unified Health Center in Woodbridge. 703-496-9403. pwafc.org .

Prince William Cooperative Extension Program needs facilitators for the Parent Education Program's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting groups. Training provided. Janice Brody, 703-792-4678. jbrody@pwcgov.org.

Prince William County Historic Preservation Division needs tour guides and assistance with special events, educational programs and gardening. 703-792-4754. historicpreservation@pwcgov.org .

Prince William County Office of Elections needs student volunteers to participate in its electoral page program. pwcvotes.com.

Prince William Health District seeks volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community health experience necessary. Training provided. Contact Valda Wisdom Brown, valda.wisdombrown@vdh.virginia.gov.

Prince William Trails and Streams Coalition needs volunteers to help build and maintain trails in the county. 703-791-6158. pwtsc.org.

Project Mend-a-House needs help for home-safety repairs. 703-792-7663. lizw@pmahweb.org.

Reset seeks volunteers to lead elementary and preschool students in science and math learning. John Meagher, 703-250-0236. reset@resetonline.org, resetonline.org .

Serve needs drivers for its food-recovery program at its food distribution center, as well as a bilingual (Spanish and English) food-assistance client-intake specialist. Navara Cannon, 571-748-2536, ncannon@nvfs.org.

St. Paul United Methodist Church needs bus drivers on Thursdays to take people to and from a community dinner. Drivers must have a class C license with a P endorsement. 703-494-2445.

Wildlife Rescue League needs hotline volunteers, wildlife transporters and rehabilitators. Training provided. 703-391-8625. volcoord@wildliferescueleague.org.

— Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In her Oct. 19 op-ed, "The GOP paved Trump's ugly path," Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) failed to mention the principal Republican culprits who caused Donald Trump to get the Republican presidential nomination: former House speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and House Judiciary Committee Chairman Robert Goodlatte (R-Va.).

In 2013, by a vote of 68-32, the Senate passed an **immigration** reform bill, but Boehner and Goodlatte never allowed the House to vote on it.

Mr. Trump's signature issue has been to prevent what he calls hordes of Mexican rapists, criminals and freeloaders from crossing the border into the United States. Had the **immigration** reform legislation been enacted, it is unlikely that Mr. Trump's anti-**immigrant** rantings would have captured the imagination of so many Republican voters in the primaries.

Lee Hurwitz, Rockville

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Unable to vote in the presidential election, a group of undocumented **immigrants** is knocking on doors in Northern Virginia in support of Hillary Clinton and other Democratic candidates, convinced that the outcome of the vote will determine whether they can secure a path to citizenship in the country they have known since childhood.

The vote-seekers are some of the 750,000 recipients of temporary legal status under the Obama administration's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. They are acutely aware that Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has pledged to deport the nation's 11 million illegal **immigrants** and that under a GOP-controlled Congress, past attempts at **immigration** reform have failed.

"All DACA recipients should take this on as an added responsibility, to change the power structure," said Luis Angel Aguilar, 28, who received his protected status in 2013 and is helping to coordinate the effort. "Our voices need to be heard," he said.

Four years after the DACA program was launched, many of the beneficiaries are still in a kind of limbo, unsure about whether their status would be renewed under a President Trump and concerned that their family members could be deported.

The uncertainty was underscored earlier this year when the U.S. Supreme Court let stand a federal court injunction against an expanded version of DACA and Obama's Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents program, which could benefit an additional 4 million people.

"The only way to resolve this is through the election," said Kim Propeack, political director of CASA In Action. "There's been a recent uptick of despair and energy around that 4-4 vote."

The Maryland-based group is behind the Virginia campaign and a similar one in central Pennsylvania. Similar efforts are underway in Arizona and other battleground states. The Clinton campaign launched a separate effort earlier this year, "My Dream, Your Vote," in which young undocumented **immigrants**, many of them brought to this country as children, urged Latino voters in North Carolina, Nevada, Florida and elsewhere to cast ballots for the Democratic nominee.

In Virginia, where Clinton is leading by double digits, the group has turned its focus to the suddenly close race in the 10th Congressional District, where Republican incumbent Barbara Comstock (R-Va.) faces an aggressive challenge from Democrat LuAnn Bennett.

CASA is also targeting voters in Prince William County, where more **immigrants** live and where Trump also has more support.

In the 10th District, which stretches west from McLean, through Loudoun County, toward the West Virginia border, Comstock backed Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) in the state's GOP primary. She has kept her distance from Trump and, after the revelation of a 2005 recording of the nominee's remarks about women, she declared that he would not get her vote.

But Trump's history of controversial remarks about women, Mexican **immigrants** and Muslims have nonetheless weighed Comstock down among voters in the largely wealthy district that includes steadily growing Latino and Asian **immigrant** populations. Although the incumbent initially was favored, several political analysts have recently said the race is a toss-up.

The **immigrant** advocates who are working to take down Comstock are modeling their efforts after a largely successful campaign last year to stir up anti-Trump sentiments in Prince William County in favor of Jeremy McPike (D-Prince William), who beat Manassas Mayor Harold "Hal" Parrish II, a Republican, in a race for an open state Senate seat. Several of the people who knocked on doors last week also were involved in the earlier campaign.

"Did you know Barbara Comstock compared **immigrants** to FedEx packages?" Nayely Lopez, 29, asked a voter in Herndon, referring to a statement that the congresswoman made about a desire for tougher **immigration** laws while campaigning two years ago. "Just put a label on us so they can track us."

The voter said she had not heard about the statement, and she took a Bennett flyer.

Like other DACA recipients, Lopez said she has become more confident in taking political stances as her life has improved.

A native of Mexico who arrived in Virginia when she was 13, Lopez grew up with fears of being deported. Although she was an A-student in high school, she said she had to turn down college scholarship offers because she was in the country illegally.

She found work answering phones inside a tax preparer's office in Fredericksburg, Va., and worked her way up through several promotions. After receiving protected status under DACA in 2012, Lopez opened her own tax preparation office.

The single mother, who has a 12-year-old daughter, said she is concerned about relatives who are not protected under DACA and also worries that a more anti-**immigrant** administration could mean her work authorization, and her livelihood, gets stripped away.

"I still have family that doesn't have legal status," she said. "For me, this is very personal."

But, in a swing state where Trump has recently renewed efforts to win over voters, that does not guarantee sympathy. At a home in Herndon, Pat Blizard, 78, told Lopez that she already voted for Trump with an absentee ballot.

"I'm sorry," Blizard said, noting that she was frustrated with the spread of Spanish-speaking residents throughout the region. "I'm originally from Spain. My father never let us speak Spanish. He said, 'You live here.' "

Lopez thanked her and moved on. "I understand people have other ideas," she said, noting that an aunt had married a U.S. citizen who also supports Trump. "We discuss that a lot in my family."

Jennifer Romero, 19, thought about her own relatives as she hustled through a different Herndon neighborhood of quiet cul-de-sacs with large two-story houses. She and a younger brother received protected status under DACA in 2014. Her parents, from Mexico, remain undocumented and vulnerable to deportation.

"That's the fear," said Romero, who lives in Stafford. "It's like they'd take away what little we have."

On a different afternoon in Woodbridge, the group tried to secure a few extra votes for Clinton and to get people to oppose a state constitutional amendment on the November ballot that would prohibit union organizing.

Aguilar scrolled through his smartphone to find likely Democratic voters through an online campaign database. At one stop, he encountered Mohammad Zoki Moqami, 44, whose family had recently arrived as refugees from Afghanistan.

"I cannot vote," Moqami said apologetically.

"I can't vote either," Aguilar said, before mentioning Trump's remarks about Muslims.

Handing Moqami a flyer, he urged: "Tell all your friends who can vote."

antonio.olivo@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GETTYSBURG, Pa. — Speaking near what he called the "hallowed ground" of a Civil War landmark, Donald Trump sought to look to the future of his potential first 100 days in office, but he first he returned to the past, vowing to sue the women who have accused him of sexual assault and accusing the media of biased reporting.

In his first campaign appearance of the day, the Republican presidential nominee gave a speech in a ballroom at the Eisenhower Hotel and Conference Center near Gettysburg National Military Park, the site of a bloody Civil War battle and a famous 1863 speech by President Abraham Lincoln.

"It is my privilege to be here in Gettysburg, hallowed ground where so many lives were given in service to freedom — amazing place," Trump said soon after taking the stage. "President Lincoln served in a time of division like we've never seen before. It is my hope that we can look at his example to heal the divisions we are living through right now."

But Trump spent the first part of his speech airing a litany of grievances. He branded as "liars" the nearly one dozen women who have come forward in recent weeks to accuse him of groping them against their will and vowed to sue them after the election. The allegations — including one from an adult film actress that was announced on Saturday — followed the release of a 2005 "Access Hollywood" recording in which Trump bragged about being able to force himself on women against their will because of his celebrity.

"Every woman lied when they came forward to hurt my campaign. Total fabrication," Trump insisted Saturday. "The events never happened. Never. All of these liars will be sued after the election is over." (In many cases, the women accusing Trump of misconduct have provided the publications with the names of witnesses and others who have supported their accounts.)

The nominee blasted the media and said that the women and news organizations are attempting to "poison" the minds of American voters. He also said, without providing evidence, that the accusations were the doing of the Democratic National Committee and Hillary Clinton's campaign. He added later that "we'll probably find out about their involvement" through litigation and that he was "so looking forward to doing that."

He also accused reporters of not sufficiently covering his crowd sizes.

"The dishonest mainstream media is also part, and a major part, of this corruption. They're corrupt," he said. "They lie and fabricate stories to make a candidate that is not their preferred choice look as bad and even dangerous as possible. At my rallies, they never show or talk about the massive crowd size and try to diminish all of our events."

The media routinely offers crowd estimates for both Republican and Democratic campaign events.

After spending more than 13 minutes on the attack, Trump read several numbered lists of things that he would do on his first day in office or during his first 100 days. Nearly all were things that he has repeatedly promised to do, but this was the first time he listed them in a speech.

In June, Trump gave a similar speech where he laid out just eight chief goals: Appoint judges who will uphold the U.S. Constitution, push for changes to the **immigration** system in order to protect American workers, challenge countries that benefit too much from trade deals, stop the flow of jobs out of the country, lift restrictions on energy production, repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, push for tax reform and impose new ethics rules for the office of the secretary of state.

In Saturday's speech, Trump listed more than two dozen things he wants to do, including amending the Constitution to create term limits in Congress, renegotiating the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade deals, overwriting "every unconstitutional executive action, memorandum and order issued by President Obama" and suspending **immigration** from "terror-prone regions."

Meanwhile, in California, an adult film actress named Jessica Drake stepped forward to accused Trump or someone acting on his behalf of offering her $10,000 and the use of his private jet if she would agree to come alone to his hotel suite at night after a golf tournament in Lake Tahoe in 2006.

At a news conference, Drake said she met Trump while working a booth at the tournament for her employer, Wicked Pictures. Trump then invited her and two other women to his suite in the evening, where, while wearing pajamas, Drake said he kissed the women each in turn without their permission.

According to Drake, after the group left his suite, a man called and asked her to return alone. When she declined, Drake said she was then called by Trump, who asked her to come to his suite for dinner and a party. "What do you want?" she said he asked. "How much?"

Later, she said Trump, or a man calling on his behalf, phoned again, this time with the monetary offer, which she said she declined.

Trump's campaign issued a statement calling Drake's account "totally false and ridiculous" and indicating that Trump "does not know this person, does not remember this person and would have no interest in ever knowing her."

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

jose.delreal@washpost.com

DelReal reported from Washington. Rosalind S. Helderman in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton is pouring $1 million into Indiana and Missouri in the campaign's final weeks — not because the Democratic presidential nominee thinks she can carry those reliably Republican states, but because she believes that, with an extra push, Democrats can win the Senate and governors' races there.

In Michigan, the Clinton campaign is propelling a late surge by Democratic state legislative candidates to regain their House majority. In parts of Maine, Nebraska, Virginia and other states, Clinton volunteers are touting Democratic congressional candidates in their phone calls and fliers to voters. And as Clinton rallied supporters across Pennsylvania on Saturday with running mate Tim Kaine, she touted Senate hopeful Katie McGinty and attacked her GOP opponent, Sen. Patrick J. Toomey, as beholden to presidential nominee Donald Trump .

"Katie is exactly the kind of partner we need in the Senate," Clinton said at a Pittsburgh rally. "We have got to get things done for the people of Pennsylvania and America. And Katie will help us break through the gridlock, actually make a difference in people's lives."

Emboldened by polls predicting an electoral-college landslide in the presidential race, Clinton is shifting her strategy to lift up other Democrats coast to coast. She and her party are rushing to capitalize on a turbulent turn in Trump's candidacy, which has ruptured the Republican Party, to make down-ballot gains that seemed unlikely just a month ago.

For Clinton, the move is opportunistic and has governing implications. If elected, a mandate may not be enough for her to muscle a progressive agenda on **immigration** and other issues through a Republican-controlled Congress. She would almost certainly govern more efficiently with Democratic majorities.

"Hillary recognizes, as we look at the past eight years, how important it is to have allies and like-minded elected officials who can just help get things done," Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook said.

Flush with cash, the Clinton campaign is steering resources and deploying thousands of field staffers and volunteers to help Democrats secure the Senate majority and pick up seats in the House. It also is targeting a handful of governorships and state legislative races where wins could give the party an advantage in redrawing congressional districts following the 2020 Census.

Mook estimates the campaign has spent more than $100 million, in coordination with the Democratic National Committee , to benefit other Democrats.

"As we're traveling in these last 17 days, we're going to be emphasizing the importance of electing Democrats down the ballot," Clinton told reporters Saturday night.

The shift is evident not only in Clinton's spending decisions, but also in her message. For months, Clinton talked about Trump as a singular threat, frustrating other Democratic leaders who saw an opportunity to turn voters' revulsion toward Trump into a broader rejection of the Republican Party. They argued that years of GOP extremism and strident opposition to President Obama had paved the way for Trump's nomination.

But Clinton is starting to adjust her message slightly to condemn the GOP writ large — and Obama is doing so more pointedly, shaming Republican politicians who have stood by Trump as he mocked and denigrated Americans over their gender, race or religion. Obama's target last Thursday was Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), who has been favored to win reelection.

"How can you call [Trump] a 'con artist' and 'dangerous,' and object to all the controversial things he says, and then say, 'But I'm still going to vote for him'? " Obama said at a Clinton rally in Miami Gardens, Fla. "C'mon, man."

Recent polls show Rubio's race against Democrat Patrick Murphy tightening to a dead heat. Still, Democrats have withdrawn most of their financial support. With 10 media markets, Florida is one of the most expensive states in which to advertise, and party officials calculated their money is better spent elsewhere.

Democrats are well-positioned to win the Senate majority. There are nine competitive Senate races — eight of which Republicans are defending, most in presidential swing states. Democrats need to net at least four seats to control the chamber if Clinton wins the presidency, in which case Kaine would serve as the tiebreaker.

Steve Schmidt , a top strategist for George W. Bush's and John McCain 's presidential campaigns, said Republican senators can hang on if Trump loses their states narrowly — but that a Trump loss of eight or 10 or more percentage points could spell defeat.

"It's the difference between falling out a second-floor window and a ninth-floor window," Schmidt said. "One of them, you might break an ankle; the other one, you're probably going to die."

In the House, Democrats face a much taller order. To win the majority they would need to flip 30 seats, which party strategists concede is unlikely because it would require both a surge in Democratic turnout to 2008 and 2012 levels as well as a depressed Republican vote. Democratic leaders, including House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (Calif.), have suggested a 20-seat gain would be a good outcome.

As of Friday, the party's two largest House campaign organs — the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and the House Majority PAC, a super PAC aligned with Democratic leaders — had reserved airtime in only 31 Republican-held districts. Three seats now in GOP hands are expected to flip without an influx of national money.

But Democrats are also playing defense in seven districts they hold. If they keep all seven seats, they still would need to win nearly 90 percent of the remaining contests to secure the majority. Ali Lapp, the super PAC's executive director, called that scenario "aspirational," but added, "This election is extremely volatile."

A late-breaking wave could alter the landscape. While senators often can insulate themselves from the national environment by establishing their own brands, House races tend to be proxies for the national parties. About half of this year's targeted House races are in presidential battleground states, while many others are in states that favor Clinton, such as California, Illinois and New York.

Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.) said Clinton's growing lead in national polls should help. "The most important thing she could do is keep her eye on the prize, understand that she has to get people to vote for her," he said. "She does well, we do well."

Republican leaders have advised incumbents to localize their races as much as possible. While GOP officials concede they are poised to lose seats, they say Democrats failed to recruit enough top-tier challengers to fully capi­tal­ize on Trump's unpopularity.

GOP candidates are buoyed by record fundraising hauls by House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) and House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.). But McCarthy last week sounded the alarm, pleading with safe incumbents to spread their campaign cash to help colleagues endangered by Trump.

Even if Democrats fall short, picking up seats would shrink the size of the GOP majority, potentially creating problems for Ryan because it could strengthen the power of conservative hard-liners inside the conference while also enhancing the prospects for more progressive legislation.

"**Immigration** reform was in the deep freeze, somewhere with Boehner's frozen peas and ice cubes," said Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), referring to the last Republican House speaker, John A. Boehner of Ohio. "So even if we don't take back the House, getting closer in the House makes all the difference."

Clinton decided early in her campaign to run a robust, coordinated campaign that assists down-ballot Democrats in ways Obama's did not always, including sharing office space in the states. "I want to bring as many Democrats with me to Washington as I possibly can," she said in Iowa in July 2015.

But it was not until after a video surfaced Oct. 7 showing Trump bragging in a 2005 "Access Hollywood" interview about sexually assaulting women that Clinton's advisers decided to make late investments.

Private polls reviewed by Clinton strategists showed Democratic Senate and gubernatorial candidates rising in Indiana and Missouri. The Clinton team concluded that in Missouri, for instance, a well-funded ground game to turn out African Americans could be the deciding factor.

"We saw new opportunities popping up," Mook said. "We felt a moral obligation to help."

Missouri has emerged as a top priority for a Democratic Party hungry for new stars. Jason Kander — a 35-year-old military veteran who gained attention for a television ad showing him touting support for tougher gun laws while assembling an AR-15 blindfolded — is giving a surprisingly strong challenge to Sen. Roy Blunt (R-Mo.). Recent polls show the race effectively tied.

Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), who is poised to succeed retiring Sen. Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) as leader of Senate Democrats, said Kander is "smart, he's hard-working, and he has the right image for Missouri."

Both parties agree Democrats are poised to pick up Senate seats in Illinois and Wisconsin. Toomey and Sens. Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.) and Richard Burr (R-N.C.) are in danger. Ayotte in particular has struggled to navigate Trump, saying in a recent debate that the nominee was "absolutely" a role model for children. She later revised her position to say neither Trump nor Clinton set good examples.

In some states, Republican senators are trying to portray themselves as counterweights to a Democratic president. In New Hampshire, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is airing an ad touting Ayotte as someone who "works across the aisle to get things done," while speculating of her Democratic opponent, Maggie Hassan, "just imagine what she'd do unchecked in Washington with a new president."

It is unclear whether there will be a national push to portray Republicans as a "check" on a President Clinton, as the GOP did in 1996 to protect the House and Senate majorities when presidential nominee Robert J. Dole was losing badly.

"If we see it working in other places, then we'll absolutely go there," said Rob Engstrom , the Chamber's political director. "It's not effective everywhere."

The only Democratic Senate seat Republicans hope to snatch away is Reid's. Republican Joseph J. Heck had been weathering the season relatively well, but after the "Access Hollywood" video came out he withdrew his endorsement of Trump, sparking a backlash from Nevada conservatives.

Democrat Catherine Cortez Mastro is trying to saddle him with Trump's baggage nevertheless. An ad airing frequently on Las Vegas airwaves juxtaposes video of Trump attacking undocumented **immigrants** and a disabled journalist with Heck's previously supportive comments of the nominee.

Cortez Mastro hopes to benefit from the robust turnout operation Clinton is preparing in Nevada, especially among Latino voters — as does Ruben Kihuen, a Mexican-born **immigrant** who is challenging Rep. Cresent Hardy (R-Nev.) in a majority-minority Las Vegas-area district.

Republicans have a structural advantage because of the way congressional districts have been drawn to favor them, but Trump's declining popularity in suburban areas presents fresh opportunities for Democrats.

Mook pointed out Reps. Barbara Comstock (R-Va.) and Mike Coffman (R-Colo.), who represent suburban bellwether districts, as ripe for defeat. Comstock has kept her distance from Trump from the start, while Coffman's posture has been more confusing. In a debate last week, when asked whether Trump was a "sexual predator" in light of allegations of unwanted kissing and touching, Coffman said, "Oh, I don't know."

"He's in real hot water," Mook said. "We're going to be doing a lot of voter turnout, and I think we can make a huge difference."
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Abby Phillip in Pittsburgh and Paul Kane in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Rep. Barbara Comstock received a friendly but subdued reception from the Muslim community Friday night at a candidates forum that focused on Islamophobia, **immigration** and improving relations with law enforcement.

Comstock (R-Va.), in the midst of a tightening race for reelection in her Northern Virginia district, told a crowd of several hundred at the ADAMS Center in Sterling that she fights for their rights and rejects the "very unpleasant" rhetoric of the presidential campaign.

But the liberal-leaning audience gave a warmer reception to Democratic challenger LuAnn Bennett, clapping loudly and nodding as she called for comprehensive **immigration** reform and said the United States needs to accept more refugees from Syria.

The forum came the same day Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton's campaign released a powerful ad featuring Khizr Khan, a Virginia resident and father of a Muslim American Army captain killed in Iraq in 2004, in which he says through tearful eyes, "I want to ask Mr. Trump: Would my son have a place in your America?"

Earlier in the day, Bennett announced that she had won the endorsement of the American Muslim Women PAC. At the forum, Comstock said she was endorsed by the Emerge USA PAC, which is dedicated to protecting minority rights. Both groups support Clinton.

Members of the civically engaged ADAMS — which stands for All Dulles Area Muslim Society — Center mosque represent a key voting bloc in the 10th Congressional District, which has been held by a Republican for decades, but this year is considered a "toss-up" tilting Republican by independent analysts.

The district is anchored by Loudoun County, home to many college-educated women and minorities who polls indicated are cool to Republican nominee Donald Trump's candidacy. It includes Loudoun County, Manassas, Manassas Park and Clarke and Frederick counties as well as parts of Fairfax and Prince William counties, where the GOP presidential nominee has more support.

Last year, Trump called for a ban on foreign Muslims entering the United States — a position he later softened — and his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, wants to keep Syrian refugees out of Indiana.

The day after Trump proposed the ban in December, Comstock panned the idea as "unconstitutional" and "un-American," and she later criticized Trump's negative comments about the Khan family and U.S. District Court Judge Gonzalo Curiel, the U.S.-born judge whose Mexican heritage Trump said disqualified him from hearing his cases.

But Comstock, who supported Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) in the GOP primaries, avoided saying for whom she would vote on Nov. 8 until earlier this month when a 2005 video surfaced in which Trump bragged about groping women. She quickly rebuked him, said she would not vote for him and urged him to drop out of the race.

"This has not been a pleasant political year for anybody," she said at the forum. "What you have heard has been very unpleasant. This is why I did stand up in those first days."

Asked about **immigration** changes, Comstock said she favored immediate passage of policies lawmakers can agree on — such as visas for skilled workers — instead of a comprehensive approach.

"We are a nation of **immigrants**. We are also a nation of laws," she said.

When moderators noted that she did not support a House resolution sponsored by Rep. Don Beyer (D-Va.) condemning hate crimes against Muslims, Comstock said she would look at the measure. Earlier, she noted that the First Amendment guarantees religious freedom.

"It's first for a reason," she said.

Comstock praised the center's active Scout troops, food banks, health clinic and job fair and presented the group with an American flag that was flown over the U.S. Capitol.

The format of the event consisted of sequential interviews with each candidate, who answered questions from moderators and the audience.

Comstock made no reference to Bennett during her interview, but Bennett sought to draw a contrast between her positions and Comstock's record.

She said Comstock voted against bringing more Syrian refugees to the United States, drawing one of the few boos of the evening.

Bennett said the United States should take more than the 10,000 Syrian refugees President Obama has accepted under a resettlement program, while continuing to implement a "long and complicated and hard" vetting process.

Asked about **immigration**, she rebuked the House for failing to pass sweeping **immigration** changes before Comstock took office but provided no plan of her own.

Although she never mentioned Trump, Bennett alluded to the national political climate and said Clinton needs Democrats in Congress to further her policies.

"The hateful rhetoric that we have heard in this election has been the most destructive thing to our democracy that I have seen in my lifetime," she said.

During the lighthearted final minutes of each candidate's interview, they were asked to name their favorite book. Comstock said the Bible; Bennett said she could not think of one on the spot and would get back to them.

jenna.portnoy@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GETTYSBURG, Pa. — Donald Trump traveled Saturday to the site of the bloodiest battle of the Civil War, where he suggested that the United States is nearly as divided now as it was then. But instead of laying out his vision for uniting the country, as President Abraham Lincoln once did here, Trump declared that the system is rigged against him, that election results cannot be trusted, that Hillary Clinton should have been barred from running for president, that the media is "corrupt" and that he will sue all of the women who have accused him of sexual assault.

"It is my privilege to be here in Gettysburg, hallowed ground where so many lives were given in service to freedom — amazing place," Trump said, soon after taking the stage more than an hour later than expected in a ballroom at the Eisenhower Hotel and Conference Center. "President Lincoln served in a time of division like we've never seen before. It is my hope that we can look at his example to heal the divisions we are living through right now. We are a very divided nation."

Trump told the crowd of about 500 locals who are active in the Republican Party that he didn't have to run for president, but he did so because the country is in trouble, and he can fix things because he's an outsider who knows how the "very broken system" works. He described himself as being able to deliver "the kind of change that only arrives once in a lifetime."

Trump said the system is "totally rigged and broken" because Clinton has been allowed to run for president, even though he says that she broke "so many laws on so many different occasions." Trump also implied that what he called rampant voter fraud could cost him the election and said the media was "dishonest."

"They're corrupt. They lie and fabricate stories to make a candidate that is not their preferred choice look as bad, and even dangerous, as possible," Trump said. "At my rallies, they never show or talk about the massive crowd size and try to diminish all of our events. On the other hand, they don't show the small size of Hillary's crowds but, in fact, talk about how people are there — very small crowds, you know it, they know it, everybody knows it."

Media outlets often provide crowd estimates for campaign events by both Clinton and Trump.

Trump also accused media outlets of giving voice to women accusing him of improper behavior or sexual assault without fact-checking their claims, even though in many cases the women have provided the publications with the names of witnesses and others who have supported their accounts.

"Every woman lied when they came forward to hurt my campaign," Trump said, as the crowd cheered. "Total fabrication. The events never happened. Never. All of these liars will be sued after the election is over."

After spending more than 13 minutes listing his grievances, Trump read several numbered lists of things that he would do on his first day in office or during his first 100 days. Nearly all of the items were things that he has repeatedly promised to do, but this was the first time that he listed them in a speech.

In June, Trump gave a similar speech where he laid out just eight chief goals: Appoint judges who will uphold the U.S. Constitution, push for **immigration**reform, challenge countries that benefit too much from trade deals, stop the flow of jobs out of the country, lift restrictions on energy production, repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, push for tax reform and impose new ethics rules for the office of the secretary of state.

In his speech Saturday, Trump listed more than two dozen things that he wants to do, including amending the Constitution to create term limits in Congress, renegotiating the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade deals, overwriting "every unconstitutional executive action, memorandum and order issued by President Obama," and suspending **immigration** from "terror-prone regions."

Trump's priorities were organized along four central themes: ethics reforms in Washington; protecting American workers; domestic security and rule of law; and legislative measures he will propose to Congress, including repealing the Affordable Care Act.

Late Friday night, a handful of campaign aides had a conference call with reporters to preview Trump's speech. Though the call lasted more than 30 minutes, the aides — who spoke on the condition of anonymity — provided little information about what Trump would actually propose in the speech.

When asked why Trump selected Gettysburg as the setting for his address, an aide said that Trump "has spoken before about Abraham Lincoln" and that "Abraham Lincoln is going to be an important figure in terms of Mr. Trump's vision for the Republican Party." But also: unity, military veterans and African American voters.

"Gettysburg was the moment where the war turned," the aide said. "It was a symbol of sacrifice. It's obviously a very fitting location."

Trump was joined in Gettysburg by his top two campaign aides, Steve Bannon and Kellyanne Conway, along with former New York City mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani and retired Lt. Gen. Keith Kellogg. As Trump spoke, Conway and Giuliani stood to the side of the stage and watched.

After his speech, Trump visited the Gettysburg National Military Park, where a small crowd of onlookers had gathered to see him.

DelReal reported from Washington.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Social studies teachers have long used presidential elections to provide engaging, real-time lessons about democracy, helping them bring to life what students read in textbooks about American politics, history and civics.

But this election cycle, unique in so many ways, also has proven to be a dicey challenge for classroom consumption, with teachers struggling to explain and dissect developments that have at times been far too lurid for young minds. Just the language of the campaign — including allegations of sexual assault, lewd comments about women, attacks on each candidate's supporters — would be the kind of talk that would land a child in the principal's office.

"This is the first time I've really said to myself, 'I can't cover this election like I want to because it's not school-appropriate,' " said Kris Goldstein, who teaches government to seniors at Tokay High School in Lodi, Calif. It was a realization he had after Republican nominee Donald Trump attacked a critic by urging people to watch her sex tape. "There's certain things I don't want to be talking about."

Many teachers say they have shifted their lesson plans to keep things G-rated and to ease anxiety among minority and **immigrant** students, some of whom feel like they are in the line of fire. Some teachers have avoided classroom discussion of the election altogether; others say their students are too captivated to avoid it.

They want to assign students to watch the third presidential debate scheduled for Wednesday night, but they also fear what their students may see and hear.

During the most recent presidential debate, audience member Patrice Brock noted that much of the back-and-forth could be rated for "mature audiences," and she asked Trump and Hillary Clinton whether they feel they're "modeling appropriate and positive behavior for today's youth," noting that some teachers assign the debates as homework.

Brock, 42, of Eureka, Mo., said in an interview that her question arose from concern for her nieces — ages 12 and 15 — who have been watching the debates. Brock said she thinks those who seek public office should be role models for young children, but the acrimonious tone and lack of manners in the first presidential debate disturbed her.

"I want our kids to think that our president is cool — and that they're good," Brock said.

At Burgundy Farm Country Day in Alexandria, Va., Scout Osborne, who teaches a class of fourth- and fifth-graders, asked students to watch 15 minutes of the debate with their families as homework. She also told parents that they could screen the debate ahead of time and pick which 15 minutes students would watch to avoid inappropriate topics.

The election has proven deeply polarizing among her young students, who started the school year bickering about politics in the classroom. She decided to turn the election into an extended lesson on how to "argue respectfully," including listening to classmates without interrupting and not raising their voices. The presidential debates have provided important teaching moments — but not in the way she would have hoped.

After the first presidential debate, her students noticed that the candidates regularly interrupted each other, Osborne said: "They picked up pretty quickly that's not how we would do things in our classroom."

And some teachers say the lack of substance in the presidential campaign has been frustrating.

Goldstein, in California, asked his students to watch the debate, identify four policy issues and then write each candidate's stance on them. Several students found they couldn't complete the assignment, and Goldstein couldn't blame them: He found that there wasn't much national policy to analyze.

Many civics teachers remain nonpartisan in the classroom and urge their students to do their own research and exploration to develop their views. But now they also have to underscore that children should not necessarily emulate — or even repeat the talking points — of certain candidates. Teachers have cautioned their students against speaking disrespectfully about any group, whether it be emulating Trump by calling Mexicans "rapists" and drug dealers, or parroting Clinton, who called some Trump supporters "deplorables."

"The challenge that this election has presented is that sometimes the things that are said during the course of the campaign occasionally will conflict with how I like my students to conduct themselves in class, especially with regards to treating each other respectfully," said Michael Palermo, who teaches government at Yorktown High School in Arlington, Va. "If you're going to express your views in class, you have to do so in way that is respectful of your classmates and doesn't demean any individual or any group."

In a post on his blog, where he gave tips for how to teach the election, Palermo said he would still treat a student chanting "Build a wall!" at a group of Hispanic students as bullying, even though it has become a regular chorus at Trump rallies.

"Just because it's part of the political discourse now doesn't make it any more acceptable," Palermo said.

Teachers cite Trump's stances on **immigration** as raising anxiety among **immigrant** students who fear they could be deported should he be elected president, and Palermo said what they're hearing related to the election is "trauma-inducing" to some students. It was such a concern among teachers in Arlington — an overwhelmingly Democratic stronghold with a growing population of **immigrant** students — that the school system organized a professional development session on how to help teachers whose students might be unsettled.

Teachers aiming to elevate the conversation and to focus on the issues are grappling, too, with whether to address comments by the Republican nominee captured in a leaked videotape in which he spoke of groping women.

Shannon Geraghty, a teacher at Forest Park High in Woodbridge, Va., said she picked up a copy of the New York Daily News the day after the scandal broke and noted that the tabloid's headline — "GRAB THEM BY THE P---Y," with images of cats filling the space between the 'P' and the 'Y' — might be off-limits for the classroom.

"When I couldn't even bring in the newspaper to show my students, that's just a different level, a different low," Geraghty said.

Presidential politics has at times been too prurient for the classroom, but rarely during a campaign. Palermo started his teaching career just as the news of President Bill Clinton's affair with a White House intern was unfolding. He found it difficult to ignore in class when Clinton faced impeachment, but he said he managed to avoid the racier aspects of the story, instead focusing on the mechanics of impeaching a president.

For other teachers, the election has proved too polarizing and too juvenile for them to turn it into an educational lesson. Mary Akeley, a fifth-grade teacher at Burgundy Farms Country Day, decided to shift from contemporaneous elections and instead focus on elections in the Iroquois nation.

Although Burgundy Farms had a schoolwide mock election in 2012, some classes are avoiding talk about the candidates this time, Akeley said. Instead, a mock election in her classroom will feature three other well-known figures: suffragette Susan B. Anthony, abolitionist Frederick Douglass and environmentalist Rachel Carson.

And although the election has proven a challenging topic, some teachers admit its unusual nature has had a positive side effect: Students are enthralled in ways teachers have never seen. Geraghty said one student hosted a debate-watching party for his classmates; another came to school early after the first debate, eager to dissect it with her. Osborne said even her most shy students have come out of the woodwork to share their views.

Goldstein said he thinks an educated citizenry is central to a functioning democracy, but he wishes there were a more civil presidential campaign on which to model it.

"It's not what I would want them to see from our political process, honestly," Goldstein said. "But it is captivating their attention."

moriah.balingit@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For the first time in four decades, the federal government is poised to add a new ethnic category to the U.S. census form, adding a box for people of Middle Eastern and North African descent.

Details are still being negotiated, but as the form is currently envisioned, people would be able to check the new box in addition to race identifiers, such as "white" or "black." Within the new category, they would also be able to specify national origins, such as Saudi or Israeli, and ethnic affiliations, such as Berber or Kurdish. The new form would go to Congress for final approval in 2018 in time for the 2020 Census.

The move comes after more than 30 years of lobbying, but also at a time of rising Islamophobia and calls by Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump to ban people from Muslim lands. Some are questioning whether the new designation could lead to profiling or otherwise put them in danger.

The proposed addition would create a race and ethnicity category called MENA for people with roots in the Middle East and North Africa. It has been championed by organizations representing Arab Americans and others with roots in the geographical swath from Iran to Morocco, who complain of being ignored in the decennial count.

The region comprises a jumble of ethnic and racial categories, including people who identify as white or black, Arab or Aryan.

Sanaa Mehdi, 30, is originally from Morocco, but when filling out the census form in the past, the D.C. resident has checked off "white." "That was the closest it came," she said, though she would have liked a more specific option. "I think it's a good thing to be able to choose where you're from exactly."

But to many, counting people with roots in majority-Muslim countries feels like a double-edged sword.

"If this helps provide some hard data, it's useful," said Ibrahim Hooper, spokesman for the Council on American-Islamic Relations. "But unfortunately in today's environment, we have to have concerns about the possible misuse of this data. We've had too many problems in the post-9/11 era when the American government singles out Arab Americans or Muslim Americans for profiling."

The Census Bureau has been testing different versions of a new form to see how likely respondents are to check the MENA category. A public comment period will end Oct. 31, and a final decision on the form will be made by the Office of Management and Budget.

"This is a big deal," said William Frey, a demographer at the Brookings Institution. "The last time they did anything like this was with Hispanics before the 1980 Census."

Historically, many people from the Middle East and North Africa have put down "white" when there has been no other option, a practice that dates back a century, when people from the region, concerned about legislation to restrict **immigration** by Asians and deny them U.S. citizenship, pushed to be counted as white instead of Asian.

In modern times, however, the lack of a distinct classification has held them back, advocates say, noting that census data is used to decide how congressional districts are drawn and how funds are allocated for federal aid programs.

"To be a community that's invisible has been a real problem for us," said Maya Berry, executive director of the Arab American Institute. The institute estimates there are around 3.7 million Arab Americans in the United States with origins in almost two dozen countries, but it does not know exactly how many or where they live.

"Whether it's a local school district trying to make decisions about English-as-a-second-language classes, or Voting Rights Act protections, or health research . . . we'd love to be able to say, 'This estimate is based on this data,' " Berry said. "It means we could have our category the same way 'Hispanic' does. . . . People will be able to finally see themselves in the census."

Advocates for Iranian Americans, whose numbers ballooned after the 1979 Islamic revolution, have similarly relied on estimates to count their constituents, with numbers ranging from 300,000 to well over a million.

"Not having an accurate sense of how many Iranian Americans are in the country really diminishes the sense that we are a group that should be listened to, that exists, that deserves respect," said Jamal Abdi, policy director for the National Iranian American Council.

An effort to persuade people to write in "Iranian" in advance of the 2010 Census "was nuts. The number ended up being lower than it had been in 2000," Abdi said. "I think it had something to do with post-9/11 fears of that data being used against people."

Abdi said similar concerns are arising now. Legally, people are protected from being identified through the census. But "when you have a candidate who's talking about violating this law, that gives people pause," Abdi said. "That's the real pushback that we get from the community — that people are worried about how this data will be used."

Hooper cited the Department of Homeland Security's "special registration" program for men from Muslim countries in 2002 and 2003 as well as the New York Police Department "gathering data to spy on American Muslims in an entire region, what they called the 'demographics unit.' So demographics can be a powerful tool when wielded by any government. . . . What would Donald Trump do with this kind of data if he was elected?"

The identity of a person filling out a census form is anonymous, but the Census Bureau came under fire in 2004 after it was revealed to have shared data on where Arab Americans lived by city and Zip code with DHS.

A law passed in the wake of the terrorist attack in San Bernardino, Calif., in 2015, which restricts people born in or holding dual citizenship with certain Middle Eastern nations from the United States' visa waiver program, has added to the fears. For example, a British citizen born in Syria or a French Iranian dual national must now apply for a visa to travel here.

"Historically, the U.S. is not supposed to discriminate based on heritage, but they have this new law that does just that," Abdi said.

Berry said she understood the concerns but noted that "those who have wanted to surveil us . . . have done so effectively without a census category."

Pouriya Samari, 35, a D.C. resident from Iran, agreed. "Don't you think they already know where we live?" he said. "Any information they want, they already have. And why should I be afraid? One, I know I have the right to be here; and two, they don't take names."

The Census Bureau's working MENA classification includes people with origins in Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates or Yemen, as well as those who identify as Amazigh or Berber, Arab, Assyrian, Bedouin, Chaldean, Copt, Druze, Kurdish or Syriac.

Groups that could be added in the future include Turks, Sudanese, Somalis, Afghans, Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Cypriots, Djiboutians, Georgians, Mauritanians, South Sudanese and Turkish Cypriots, census officials said.

Maz Jobrani, an Iranian American actor and comedian who made a video trying to persuade people to write in "Iranian" for the 2010 Census, said that while he supports the new category, other Iranians might perceive it as a slight.

"Some Iranians are very Iranocentric; they really want it to be known that they are separate from Arabs, and when you're talking about race, Iranians are quick to remind you that Iranians are white," he said. "But I think it's good to have some kind of minority status, and if that means that we've got to get together with others from the same region, I think there's some good that can come of that."

If a MENA box does appear on the next census, it may take time for communities to embrace it, Jobrani added.

"When you first come here to America, you are kind of a third-class citizen. People have a tendency to put their heads down and not make any noise and just get through their daily lives," he said. "But then you have their children who grow up here and say, 'How can I sit back and complain about everything being run by old white men if I don't get involved?' It's realizing that your voice counts."

tara.bahrampour@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is close to announcing changes in its leadership structure that will shape the group's lobbying strategy as it prepares for a new Congress and president in a political climate that is increasingly hostile to the business community's agenda.

The impending changes, expected to be announced in the coming weeks, will address how the powerful business lobby plans to fill the role of longtime chief lobbyist Bruce Josten, who is slated to retire at the end of the year, Chamber leaders said. It is unclear whether the changes will result in replacing Josten directly or will be one step in a broader reshuffling of top-level executives at the Chamber.

The move comes at an important juncture for the Chamber and the broader business lobby in Washington as populist movements in both parties have put in peril many of the top items on their agenda, including trade deals and **immigration** reform. For years, the business community could count on the strong support of Republicans, but that alliance has frayed in recent years with tea party Republicans complaining about corporate influence and "crony capitalism."

"Members [of Congress] want to know what the Chamber says, but it isn't going to dictate their vote on a regular basis like it once would have," said Dan Holler of Heritage Action for America, one of several conservative groups that have emerged as a strong counterweight to the business lobby with congressional Republicans on issues such as renewing the Export-Import Bank 's charter.

How the Chamber decides to replace Josten will offer a clue as to what degree it will restructure its lobbying strategy and operations to deal with the changing political climate.

"The country is moving in a more populist mood, versus a what's-good-for-business-is-good-for-America kind of thing," said longtime lobbyist Rick Hohlt.

Chamber officials were tight-lipped about the upcoming announcement and the specifics of plans for its lobbying operation after Josten's departure.

"Bruce is irreplaceable, but filling his job and his job functions is not," said Tom Collamore, the Chamber's senior vice president of communications and strategy.

The future of the Chamber's president and chief executive Tom Donohue , 78, has also long piqued the interest of the influence industry, and even longtime allies and friends wonder whether or when he may start dialing back his involvement.

When asked about Donohue's future, Collamore said the Chamber's chief will continue steering the group's strategy in the post-election "lame duck" session, the next Congress and the first 100 days of the new administration.

Succession planning at the Chamber has been the topic of much speculation on K Street for years — Josten and Donohue occupy two of the most coveted jobs downtown — but the rumor mill is buzzing extra loudly these days. To many in the influence industry, the thought of replacing Josten, a key player in Donohue's transformation of the Chamber from a sleepy association to a lobbying and fundraising powerhouse, is almost unimaginable. Josten has led the Chamber's lobbying arm for 22 years, and Donohue has helmed the group for 19.

"Tom is the Chamber outside Washington, Bruce is the Chamber inside Washington," said one Republican lobbyist familiar with the Chamber's workings who asked not to be named, to preserve relations with the organization. "Together they're a phenomenal act."

Suzanne Clark, executive vice president at the Chamber and a trusted adviser to Donohue, is said to be well positioned to take on a more senior role, according to former Chamber staffers and others familiar with its operations. Clark was a close aide to Donohue from 1997 to 2007, ultimately becoming chief operating officer overseeing the organization's day-to-day operations. She left in 2007 to lead research and analysis firms and returned to the Chamber in 2014.

The challenges facing the Chamber have been on display over the past two years with regard to two important initiatives for the business community, the Export-Import Bank and the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal (TPP), both of which have been curtailed or stalled despite well-funded efforts to push them through by business groups.

Although the Ex-Im Bank's charter was renewed last year, the credit export agency has not been able to review large deals, the result of a lack of a quorum on the bank's board of directors — a process that's been halted by Senate Banking Committee Chairman Richard Shelby (R-Ala.). And the TPP, which the Chamber aggressively lobbied in favor of, is all but dead unless the next president revives it, and even Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton , who supported the pact as secretary of state, now opposes it.

The Chamber also lobbied Republicans hard on **immigration**, with Donohue saying the group would "pull out all stops" to push legislation through Congress in 2014, but the momentum died in the House and the political environment is now even less hospitable to moving overhaul legislation.

The Chamber has in recent years adjusted its political strategy in recognition that some Republicans pose as big a threat to its agenda as Democrats.

In 2014, it broke with tradition by taking sides in GOP primary races, spending $12 million to back establishment candidates over tea party challengers. The strategy was successful, with the Chamber emerging undefeated in those races. They continued the strategy this year with some success, helping defeat a tea party firebrand, Rep. Tim Huelskamp, in the Kansas primary by backing his opponent, Roger Marshall.

The Chamber is dedicating plenty of money this election cycle, spending $16.7 million on eight toss-up Senate races — including backing Sens. Rob Portman in Ohio and Pat Toomey in Pennsylvania — more than 2.5 times what it spent on elections at this point in 2014, according to an August report by the Brennan Center for Justice.

It is also spending at least $1 million in ads to back Rep. Todd Young over Democratic former senator Evan Bayh in Indiana — despite Bayh's pro-business record and previous gig for the Chamber giving speeches and appearing at events on its behalf after he left office in 2011.

One thing remains constant for the Chamber as it ponders its upcoming lobbying challenges — it has plenty of money to push its agenda.

It is the perennial top spender on K Street, shelling out nearly $85 million in 2015 to lobby the federal government.

Tom Hamburger contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I doubt my mother would pass the "extreme vetting" process Donald Trump has in mind for refugees seeking a new life in the United States. After 26 years in this country, she still speaks with a heavy accent, misplaces tenses, mumbles. She doesn't know the Pledge of Allegiance. Her job as a night security guard requires staying awake and making sure the doors stay locked, the perfect position for an **immigrant** like her.

Before coming to America, Mom was a psychiatrist, working in a busy clinic in the Ukrainian city of Kharkiv. The city's population was more than a million, but after 30 years as a doctor, she couldn't run an errand without bumping into a former patient or grateful family member. It used to annoy me as a child, and I'd tug on her arm, impatient to move on. Once we came to the United States, that was no longer a problem.

We know a handful of ex-Soviet refugees with medical degrees who managed to remain doctors once they came to the United States. Most didn't. They landed at JFK airport; they received three months' assistance from a refugee resettlement group, secondhand furniture and driving lessons, if they were lucky; and then the bills came. Medical boards and years of sleepless residency are a gantlet for 20-somethings who speak fluent English and have no children. Mom was pushing 50, had no money and couldn't speak the language. At first she tried to become a nurse, then a nursing aide, then an EKG technician. The closest she got to returning to the medical field was a stint helping an old woman take her meds.

I don't blame the United States for this. You become a refugee because something has gone terribly wrong, because your life reached a point where your best option meant abandoning your goals, roots, identity and the graves of your forefathers, and placing yourself at the mercy of strangers. Not even the land of opportunity can magically make up for all that, which is why the United States has the best-educated taxi drivers and home health aides in the world. For many, menial labor and humiliation are the price of admission to America. You scrub, you drive, you dream that your children will do better, and you try not to think of the past.

I don't want Americans to pity my mother; the most obnoxious sound in the world is the cooing tone some people reserve for talking to toddlers and **immigrants**. I don't even need Americans to respect her. The only way for them to comprehend the full extent of her sacrifice would be to go through the process themselves: sever all ties and live as perpetual strangers in a foreign land, where the minimum wage is the best hope and dignity comes at a premium. People often ask if it bothers me that Americans take things for granted. I always reply that I think that's fantastic. One out of every 113 people on the planet is stateless or internally displaced. We don't need more.

My one wish is for Americans to appreciate the degree to which my mom and the millions of other stuttering, thick-accented **immigrants** in menial jobs have already been vetted, and continue to be vetted, every day. They've been stripped of their personalities, skills, jokes, opinions, dignity and dreams by the language barrier. They've been questioned about who they are and what they're doing in this country — by police, store clerks, employers, customers and the ghosts of their past. They've been vetted since they set foot on U.S. soil, they're vetted every time they open their mouths, and they'll continue to be vetted, in an extreme fashion, for the rest of their lives.

When I was a teenager, soaking up English and reveling in my freedom, I was frustrated because I didn't think my mother loved America in the same blind way that I did. Didn't she realize this was the land of new beginnings? How could she retain nostalgia for her old life? Then I grew up and imagined having my education nullified, my career and aspirations destroyed, my communication ability reduced to the level of a child's, and then having to go on knowing that, as far as some were concerned, the lowest, native-born drug dealer would always have a greater claim to this country than I did. And the sickening magnitude of my mom's sacrifice hit me. I'm in awe that she loves the United States at all.

And yet she does, as do so many others. That's the best-kept secret about America. **Immigrants** respect and cherish this land, not because they're **immigrants**, but in spite of it. In spite of being reduced to Trojan horses, rabid dogs and poisoned Skittles. In spite of the Trumps in their lives. In spite of all the vetting.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX

Donald Trump is running against democracy itself.

Here, in the land of Barry Goldwater, democracy is fighting back.

Only once since 1948 has Arizona gone Democratic in a presidential election, and that was the Ross Perot-skewed 1996 contest. But Trump's manifold charms — most recently his threat to ignore the results of the election — have given Hillary Clinton a five-point lead in this red state, according to a new Arizona Republic/Morrison/Cronkite News poll. Disgust with Trump sent thousands of white, black and brown Arizonans on Thursday afternoon into the Phoenix Convention Center (where Trump weeks ago pledged mass deportation of illegal **immigrants**) to hear Michelle Obama denounce Trump's assault on the democratic process.

"We are fortunate to live in a country where the voters decide our elections," the first lady said. "The voters decide who wins and loses. Period. End of story. And when a presidential candidate threatens to ignore our voices and reject the outcome of this election, he is threatening the very idea of America itself, and we cannot stand for that. We do not keep American democracy 'in suspense.' "

The crowd roared its approval.

Obama's speech (she crossed the country to give the remarks, then immediately flew back to Washington) is part of a push by the Clinton campaign to expand the electoral battleground into reliably Republican states such as Texas, Georgia, Utah, Alaska and, particularly, Arizona, that have been put into play by Trump's outrages. The Clinton campaign, which already has 32 offices and 160 staffers in Arizona, announced this week that it is spending an additional $2 million here and dispatched Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), Chelsea Clinton and the first lady to campaign in the state. The campaign is considering sending the candidate herself.

As a matter of math, Arizona is irrelevant: If Clinton is doing well enough to win here, she will already have locked up the election elsewhere. But if Trump is to be denied in his bid to subvert democratic institutions by claiming a rigged election, he needs to be defeated resoundingly, removing all doubt. Clinton needs to run up the score.

The need to deal Trump a humiliating defeat has a sociological basis in the "degradation ceremony," in which the perpetrator (Trump) is held by denouncers (officeholders and others in positions of influence) to be morally unacceptable, and witnesses (the public) agree that the perpetrator is no longer held in good standing.

Psychologist Wynn Schwartz, who teaches at Harvard Medical School, explained to me that what's needed to have a successful degradation of Trump is an epic defeat. "If it is lopsided enough," he said, "you don't have critical masses of people who feel disenfranchised" or "who feel justified in saying that it was stolen."

But if Clinton's victory is narrow, the degradation ceremony fails, because a large chunk of the population feels swindled and remains loyal to Trump. "The margin matters a lot," Schwartz said.

Trump's recent actions — talking about a "rigged" election while laying the foundation for a Trump TV network — suggest that he will attempt to defy the degradation ceremony that a loss typically confers. Hence the importance of a landslide.

Arizona would offer an ideal rebuke. Carolyn Goldwater Ross, granddaughter of the conservative icon, introduced Obama on Thursday by saying, "I come from a long line of Republicans and I've stayed independent. . . . But this time it's different." She submitted that Trump violates her grandfather's "basic values."

Apparently, many Arizonans agree. Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio, the anti-**immigrant** icon and Trump backer, is trailing his Democratic opponent by 15 points in polling by the Republic. The newspaper endorsed Clinton, its first embrace of a Democrat for president in its 126-year history. Arizona's junior Republican senator, Jeff Flake, is an outspoken Trump critic, its senior Republican senator, John McCain, has been attacked by Trump, and former Republican attorney general Grant Woods has endorsed Clinton.

A growing Latino population has the state trending gradually Democratic, but not enough to put Arizona in play in 2016 in ordinary circumstances. That's all about Trump.

"Trump accelerated what's happening anyway," Moises Mejia, a Mexican-born engineer at Thursday's rally, told me. Mejia, who took one of his sons out of school to attend the rally, said he comes from a Republican family and agrees "with the Republicans' principles, but they've taken it so far they've lost a lot of us in the middle."

The first lady, in her fiery speech, reached out to Republicans offended by Trump's disregard for the democratic process. "Our democracy is revered around the world, and free elections are the best way on Earth to choose our leaders," she said. "This is how we elected John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, two George Bushes, Bill Clinton and Barack Obama."

That's right. This isn't Trump vs. Clinton but Trump vs. Democracy. And the way to degrade the threat is to defeat Trump, convincingly.

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the debate on Wednesday night, Donald Trump compared America's lackluster economic growth to that of India and China. For the United States, the comparison didn't look good.

"They're growing at 8 percent," Trump said of India. "China is growing at 7 percent. And that for them is a catastrophically low number. We are growing -- our last report came out -- and it's right around the 1 percent level. And I think it's going down. ... Look, our country is stagnant."

Later, Trump pledged that his economic plan would restore America's growth to much higher levels:

"But we're bringing it from 1 percent up to 4 percent. And I actually think we can go higher than 4 percent. I think you can go to 5 percent or 6 percent. And if we do, you don't have to bother asking your question, because we have a tremendous machine. We will have created a tremendous economic machine once again."

The implication was this: India and China are beating us at a game where we used to excel.

But there's a simple economic reason that China and India are growing so fast and that America's growth rate has sunk so low. It's not our terrible trade deals. It's that countries at different stages of development have different growth rates. And many poorer countries have been rapidly catching up to rich ones through a fascinating process that economists call convergence.

To understand that, you need to look at the long run of history, which economic historians divide into a few distinct periods. The first encompasses most of recorded history, in which life for the vast majority of people was nasty, brutish and short. Most people worked as subsistence farmers, eking out what they needed to survive, if that.

But around 1700, something interesting started to happen. England pitched into the Industrial Revolution, pulling a few countries in Europe, North America and Oceania with it. These country grew, actually quite modestly, but for a sustained period of time. For the rest of the world, however, life remained nasty and short.

This is what economists call the great divergence. Between 1870 and 1990, the ratio of per capita incomes between the richest and the poorest countries increased by a factor of five, according to economist Lant Pritchett.

As Harvard professor Ricardo Hausmann has written, when the Declaration of Independence was issued in 1776, people in the richest country in the world, probably the Netherlands, were only about four times wealthier than those in the world's poorest countries. Two centuries later, the average Dutchman was 40 times richer than the average Chinese and 24 times richer than the average Indian.

But since about the 1970s, the world has shifted into a new era. Political, social and technological barriers fell, connecting economies across national borders. And many of the countries at the bottom of the economic heap, including India and China, began growing faster than those at the top.

Economists call this phase convergence, a period of time in which the gap between the West and the rest is collapsing. Today, the average Dutchman is only four times richer than the average Chinese and 11 times richer than the average Indian.

There are a few reasons why this is happening. One powerful one is that some poor countries can now take advantage of new technologies that have been developed in rich countries in the past. They don't have to innovate to boost their economies; they merely have to take technology that has been developed elsewhere and apply it at home, in what's called catch-up growth.

In poorer countries that have little in the way of infrastructure, technology and manufacturing, the productivity of workers is relatively low. So introducing just a little outside technology or investment can lead to a big boost in growth. That means some countries have grown as much in the last 50 years as the U.K. and the U.S. did over 400 years. China, for example, has seen its living standards rise eightfold in 30 years — an increase that took the U.S. 122 years and Japan about 80.

But China and India still have a long way to go. Even with their currently rapid rates of growth, they are nowhere near catching up to the U.S. in terms of wealth.

It's worth remembering that a major reason that countries like India and China are growing so quickly is that they are growing from a very low base. In 2015, per capita GDP in the U.S. was $55,805. In China, it was $7,990. In India, it was only $1,747. In order to achieve 6 percent growth, a worker in the U.S. would have to generate an additional $3,350 of economic activity. In China, each worker would have to come up with $474. In India, it would be only $105.

In fact, it takes 50 years of 7 percent annual growth for a country to raise its per capita income from $500 to $20,000, economist Michael Spence has noted.

For a developed country like the U.S., those levels of growth are almost impossible. The U.S. hasn't had consistent 4 percent gains since the late 1990s, when it was in the midst of the information technology revolution. The U.S. hasn't seen growth above 5 percent since the mid-1980s, when central bankers normalized monetary policy following a terrible recession.

Economic growth can come from two sources: how many workers an economy has and how productive they are. Productivity is growing sluggishly in the U.S., and without another technological revolution akin to the invention of the Internet, it seems likely to stay that way.

Meanwhile, America's population is aging. The U.S. labor force has basically stagnated, and labor force participation is declining. The U.S. could increase growth by having people work more hours, slashing weekends, raising the retirement age, or reviving child labor. It could also drastically increase the number of **immigrants** it accepts. Economist Giovanni Peri of the University of California has estimated that increasing U.S. economic growth from 2.5 percent to 4 percent without altering productivity would require roughly tripling the flow of legal **immigrants** coming into the U.S.

At our current level of wealth, the U.S. doesn't need 6 percent growth. Even slow rates of growth will continue to raise living standards over time. Instead, policy makers should focus on improving quality of life for Americans and making sure economic gains are shared.

You might also like:

There's a devastatingly simple explanation for America's economic mess

Why so many of America's sushi restaurants are owned by Chinese **immigrants**

The real reason Donald Trump's favorite airports are so much better than America's

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**During Wednesday night's debate, Hillary Clinton sought to play down a claim Donald Trump made about her — that she had supported building a wall along the Mexican border. "I voted for border security, and there are some limited places where that was appropriate," she said.

I'll admit that I thought: Why is Clinton trying to soft-pedal her past support for border fencing?

This is why:

Look at that bottom one.

On Thursday when the Pew Research Center illustrated the many differences between Trump and Clinton supporters, the border wall was actually the biggest difference among the many issues it showed. While 79 percent of Trump backers wanted a wall across the whole U.S.-Mexico border, just 10 percent of Clinton backers did. The gap was bigger than it was on racial issues like affirmative action, gender issues, diplomacy and the fundamentally partisan issue that is the size of government.

The really interesting thing about that is that this issue didn't used to be polarizing — even this decade. As recently as 2011, Pew data showed 62 percent of Republicans and 39 percent of Democrats supported building a fence along the entire border.

And then came Trump.

By September 2015, with Trump upping the rhetoric on his big, beautiful border wall that Mexico would definitely/somehow pay for, the gap had yawned. At that point, Republicans who supported the fence increased from 62 percent to 73 percent, and the Democrats who supported it dropped from 39 percent to 29 percent. A 23-point gap became a 44-point gap.

Today, with Pew now asking a slightly different question — about a border "wall" rather than a border "fence" — 8 in 10 Trump supporters and just 1 in 10 Clinton supporters like the idea.

There's really no real policy reason the gap on this issue might have grown over the past five years. Illegal **immigration** has slowed significantly since the recession hit in 2008, which is perhaps part of the reason Democrats feel less urgency to build a big wall or fence. But even as recently as 2015, 3 in 10 Democrats liked the idea of a fence. Today, 83 percent oppose a wall.

And we've seen this effect on other **immigration** issues. As I wrote last month, Trump's constant rhetoric about illegal **immigrants** seems to have pushed the American people as a whole to actually like **immigrants** more. Even during his campaign, there has been a steady decline in the number of people saying we should deport every undocumented **immigrant**.

But even as that has happened, Trump supporters appear to have dug in even further.

This is what happens when a polarizing man seizes upon an issue that isn't necessarily polarizing in our increasingly tribal political system.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

Donald Trump's lies about "voter fraud" and our "rigged election," and his continued refusal to say whether he'll accept the results, appear to be having their desired effect -- in one way, at least. A new poll finds that around half of Trump supporters either think he should contest the outcome or haven't decided whether he should or not -- suggesting that a whole lot of Trump voters may be open to any post-election efforts to keep his following engaged by railing at the outcome as illegitimate.

But in another sense, Trump's lies may be failing to produce the outcome he's apparently hoping for.

One good way for Americans to repudiate Trump's efforts to shake faith in our democracy -- and let's be clear, this is exactly what he is trying to do -- is by voting. And the early signs are that this is exactly what they are doing.

CNN reports this morning that a comprehensive look at the early voting is "promising for Clinton in battleground states." CNN, which partnered with a data firm to dig into the numbers, notes that more than 3.3 million people have voted so far. Some highlights:

Democratic early turnout has stayed steady in North Carolina compared to 2012, while Republicans have dropped by about 14,500. In Nevada, Democrats have a smaller early voting deficit today than they did at this point in 2012. And Democrats are slightly ahead in Arizona in the early vote so far, though they are lagging Republicans in the tally of how many Arizonans have requested ballots.

So Dems have improved their early voting edge in North Carolina and Arizona, both of which are being closely watched for signs that Democrats are increasingly putting them in play. CNN does find that the Democrats' early voting edge has narrowed in Iowa and Ohio, which suggests they may be having trouble energizing their voters in the Rust Belt, where Trump is doing better in relatively whiter states than he is in more diverse ones.

But CNN reports that early voting has increased relative to 2012 in two other bluish states. In Wisconsin, where a court struck down efforts to limit voting, the early vote has more than tripled, and in Virginia, there has also been an increase, though a more modest one. Though CNN does not report a partisan breakdown on those numbers, CNN concludes that these developments are "likely good news for Clinton," since she's held a steady advantage in both states all along. Meanwhile, absentee ballot numbers are showing signs of a surge of interest among female voters in Georgia and North Carolina.

Only Trump himself knows -- or maybe he doesn't -- how far he will ultimately push his efforts to cast the outcome as illegitimate. Yesterday he said that he'd accept a "clear" outcome -- which perhaps suggests he may now recognize that contesting a big loss may prove untenable. But even if that is so, it would still be consistent with a strategy in which his current efforts to sow doubts about the integrity of the process are designed to depress turnout. Trump's repeated call on his supporters to monitor polls could lead to voter intimidation, and more generally, he seems to be trying to cast a dispiriting pall -- in the form of broad intimations of corruption -- over the whole process.

Trump's railing about how our election will be rigged in "certain areas" -- i.e., nonwhite areas -- is also obviously designed to energize his supporters. But will it? Nate Silver reports today that the transition to "likely voters" in the polls is not helping Trump as much as it might have helped another Republican, which suggests Trump's efforts to drive up turnout among blue collar whites might not be having its intended effect. It's also possible that Trump's lack of a turnout operation -- and Clinton's massive investments in one of her own -- may now be showing up in the numbers. And Catherine Rampell suggests still another possibility that is supported by academic research: Trump's "rigged election" claims could end up dampening enthusiasm among marginal voters, many of which happen to be his own supporters.

If all this accurately hints at where things are going -- and truthfully, we don't know what's going to happen -- Trump's ugly game could end up backfiring in two ways: both by driving up turnout among Democrats and by restraining it among Trump voters, in effect rigging the election against himself. Or maybe just the former will happen, and we'll have a very high turnout election on both sides. That would perhaps be the best repudiation of Trump's efforts to undermine faith in our democracy that we can hope for.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* DEADLOCKED IN GEORGIA: A new Atlanta Journal-Constitution poll finds Trump and Clinton in a dead heat among likely voters in Georgia, 44-42. This helps explain why:

The vast majority of Republicans — 85 percent  — say they will back their party's nominee. But only 4 in 10 independents, a traditionally conservative voting bloc in Georgia, say they are behind Trump….Trump has built a solid lead among men, with a 50-35 margin, while women favor Clinton by a 48-37 vote. Some 64 percent of women have an unfavorable view of Trump, while 66 percent of men have a negative perception of Clinton.

The averages put Trump's edge at under three points. Flipping Georgia with the help of changing demographics is a long term Dem dream, and even if Clinton gets close it may alarm Republicans.

\* CLINTON HOLDS WIDE LEAD IN VIRGINIA: A new Wason Center for Public Policy poll finds Clinton leading Trump among likely voters in Virginia by 45-33. Key findings: Clinton wins 57 percent of northern Virginia and leads among college educated whites by 41-33; among women by 47-25; and among millennials by 45-24.

And that's how demographic change -- plus Trump -- nudge a longtime red state into the blue column.

\* PANICKING REPUBLICANS THINK RACE IS OVER: The Post reports that Republicans think Trump is finished, and are scrambling to salvage their down-ballot candidates. Note this, from GOP strategist Steve Schmidt:

"The question is, how close will Clinton get to 400 electoral votes? She'll be north of 350, and she's trending towards 400 — and the trend line is taking place in very red states like Georgia, Texas and Arizona."

Smart Republicans will be watching the numbers in those states very closely.

\* THE MAP IS SLIPPING AWAY FROM TRUMP: Politico breaks down just how grim Trump's prospects in the electoral college have become, using Politico's state polling averages:

Clinton leads Donald Trump by 5 points or greater…in Colorado, Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. If the Democratic nominee won those six states, plus all the other reliably Democratic states…she would eclipse the 270-electoral-vote threshold and win the presidency. Even if Trump ran the table in the remaining battleground states — Florida, Iowa, Nevada, North Carolina and Ohio — he would fall short of the White House if he cannot flip another state where Clinton currently leads in the polls.

Remember when Trump talked about putting states like New York and Connecticut in play?

\* 'NASTY WOMAN' BECOMES A BIG MEME: Trump called Clinton a "nasty woman" at the debate, and Farah Stockman charts what has happened since:

"Nasty Woman" T-shirts began selling on the internet. Naral Pro-Choice America advertised "NastyWoman" stickers….Streams of Janet Jackson's 1986 hit "Nasty" increased 250 percent on Spotify after the debate, according to a Spotify spokesman. More than 8,000 people had taken up the phrase on Twitter by midafternoon, wielding it as a badge of honor.

As Stockman writes, the barb energized "many whose passions she had not yet stirred." In other words, Trump may have succeeded in activating more voter enthusiasm for Clinton.

\* YEP: CLINTON IS CONTESTING ARIZONA, AND HERE'S WHY: Mother Jones' Pema Levy reports that the Clinton campaign is sinking serious resources into winning Arizona, and for good reason:

Arizona could serve a strategic purpose…it has a large and increasingly politically active Latino population….If she wins Arizona, Clinton could bring Republicans to the table on **immigration** reform by proving to them that they have no shot at the White House — that even formerly safe red states will turn blue — if they continue to hold the Trump line on **immigration**.

This is what I've been tellin' ya: Winning there would constitute a meaningful victory over Trumpism that could resonate as Republicans seek to remake their party after a Trump loss.

\* AND WHAT IF CLINTON ISN'T AN AWFUL CANDIDATE? Paul Krugman says what must not be said:

The person tens of millions of viewers saw in this fall's debates was…self-possessed, almost preternaturally calm under pressure, deeply prepared, clearly in command of policy issues…maybe ordinary citizens noticed the same thing; maybe obvious competence and poise in stressful situations can add up to a kind of star quality, even if it doesn't fit conventional notions of charisma.

Pundits who hyped both candidates' historically high negatives got this election wrong. It has been about the gap in perceptions of the candidates' basic decency (or lack of it) and fitness for the job.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Every four years, while the rest of the nation heads to the polls, Washington's coterie of lobby firms works overtime to tend to a mad rush of demands from corporate clients who all want to know the same thing: How do we best lobby a new president? A new Congress?

That season is now upon us. The fall and winter that bookend a presidential election are the busiest months for K Street's hired guns. Late October is particularly harried, as they scramble to draw up contingency plans mapping out all potential outcomes of the election — presidential, House and Senate — and how companies should adjust their lobbying strategies accordingly. The most likely scenario at the moment looks to be a Democratic White House, a Republican-led House and an apparent Democratic majority in the Senate.

"The period from November to March around a presidential transition is probably the busiest time for lobby and public affairs firms," said GOP lobbyist Stewart Verdery, who runs the lobby firm Monument Policy Group. "Trying to figure out how to engage a new administration, who the appointments are, changes with [congressional committee] chairmen. That's a huge amount of work for clients. At least 60 percent of business development work is done in the next couple months."

The momentum is reflected in the latest quarterly revenue figures reported by lobby firms Thursday. Many firms reported year-over-year revenue gains compared with 2015. Verdery's firm picked up three new clients in the past six weeks and has earned $4.4 million in revenue so far in 2016 — up 7 percent compared with this time last year.

No matter who wins the White House, Congress is poised to tackle a handful of issues critical to the business community, like **immigration**, tax reform and infrastructure spending, said lobbyists of both parties.

"There's going to be lots of business opportunities to focus on," said Republican lobbyist Marc Lampkin, who heads the lobbying group at Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck. "You're very likely to get, in the first six months, an overhaul of the tax code. You're going to have some examination of both legal and illegal **immigration**. For the business community, legal **immigration** for a number of years has been a top priority. There's going to be lots of businesses that are going to want to have an impact in Washington."

Companies should also be paying attention to leadership changes in key congressional committees — particularly if Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) takes over the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, said Democratic lobbyist Zach Williams, a partner at Forbes-Tate. The firm earned $7.1 million so far in lobbying revenue this year — up 8 percent compared with last year.

The subcommittee, which is currently chaired by Sen. Rob Portman (R-Ohio) with McCaskill as ranking member, recently opened an inquiry into the drugmaker Mylan over the high price of the allergy auto-injector EpiPen.

"With McCaskill with the gavel, you're looking at a much more aggressive investigatory arm," Williams said.  "There's going to be a lot more companies brought in, whether it's drug companies or others."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It is tempting to laugh at Donald Trump's eruptions and outrages because he is such a cartoonish buffoon. But he gave chilling evidence Wednesday night of why he poses a grave and urgent threat to our democracy — and why he must be defeated.

There have been many bitterly contested elections in our nation's 240-year history, but never has the loser refused to accept the outcome and claimed the presidency was stolen by fraud. Trump threatened, in advance, to do just that. "I'll keep you in suspense," he said, proving once again that he cares more about protecting his fragile ego than serving the country he asks to lead.

Debate moderator Chris Wallace gave Trump two opportunities to say that he would accept the people's verdict. Both times he defiantly refused — and in the process disqualified himself as a candidate for the nation's highest office.

Not that he hadn't already given us a thousand and one reasons why he should never be president, mind you. But how can any Republican official support a man who so challenges the very legitimacy of our democratic system? To all who, like House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.), have shown disdain for Trump but made the political calculation not to fully renounce him, I ask this: Why should anyone, ever again, take seriously your idealistic rhetoric about the United States being a "city upon the hill" and a beacon to the world? You are supporting a man who spits on your ideals.

That moment completely overshadowed the rest of the debate, as far as I'm concerned. Trump must not be president and deserves to lose in a landslide on Nov. 8. Voters should send him back to his Trump Tower aerie and administer the cruelest possible punishment: ignore him.

Hillary Clinton, meanwhile, once again demonstrated her preternatural poise and command of the issues — and, yes, also her ability to get under Trump's exceedingly thin skin.

Those praising Trump's performance in the first half-hour of the debate are grading him on a generous curve. For a short while he was able to enunciate standard GOP positions — against abortion, against gun control — without making any major pratfalls, but also without any notable sophistication or subtlety. Clinton defended Roe v. Wade and advocated sensible gun restrictions in terms that seemed intended to appeal to Trump's female voters, if he has any left.

On **immigration**, Clinton outlined the sensible centrist solution — border control, deporting criminals, and providing a path to legalization and citizenship for the millions of undocumented migrants already here — that should have been adopted long ago. Trump, by contrast, began to go off the rails, first denying but then later affirming his pledge of mass deportations. And when he talked about **immigrants** who commit crimes, he called them "bad hombres" — an apparent attempt to drive his party's Latino support even closer to zero.

When the debate turned to Trump's bizarre admiration for Vladimir Putin, he said that the Russian leader, "from everything I see, has no respect for this person," indicating Clinton.

"Well, that's because he'd rather have a puppet as president of the United States," Clinton snapped back. This, incredibly, is what followed:

Trump: No puppet. No puppet.

Clinton: And it's pretty clear . . .

Trump: You're the puppet!

Clinton: It's pretty clear you won't admit . . .

Trump: No, you're the puppet.

Any kindergarten teacher could see that Trump would have benefited at that point from a spell in the timeout chair. Unfortunately none was furnished by the Commission on Presidential Debates, so he blathered on and went steadily downhill from there. He lost the ability to wait his turn, instead interrupting with "no" or "wrong" when Clinton was making a point. He denied ever saying that nations such as Japan and South Korea should develop their own nuclear weapons rather than rely on the U.S. shield, even though there is videotape of him saying precisely that in an interview with moderator Wallace.

He maintained that all of the women who have accused him of groping or making other unwanted sexual advances are lying, saying improbably, "Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody."

"Everybody" would be closer to the truth.

We knew that Trump is unfit to be commander in chief. We knew that he is only superficially acquainted with his own proposed policies, foreign and domestic. What we didn't know is that he has such utter contempt for American democracy. He's not a statesman, he's a spoiled brat, and the nation should turn him over its collective knee.

eugenerobinson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MIAMI GARDENS, Fla. — With presidential pre-election polls heavily favoring Democrat Hillary Clinton, President Obama aimed his attacks Thursday at Sen. Marco Rubio and other Republican officials who have supported GOP nominee Donald Trump, despite his controversial campaign and derogatory remarks about **immigrants** and women.

The president was appearing at Florida Memorial University, a historically black college and the kind of place where voters turned out for him in large numbers in 2008 and 2012. "There's only one way we lose this election — if we don't turn out," Obama said. "We got to turn out big and not leave any doubt."

Much of Obama's speech was focused on questioning the honesty and ethics of Republican politicians who have condemned Trump but still back him. He was especially critical of Rubio (R-Fla.), who is in a tough battle for the state's Senate seat with Democrat Patrick Murphy.

"How can you call him a con artist and dangerous and object to all the controversial things he says and say I am still going to vote for him?" Obama asked of Rubio. "C'mon, man. You know what that is. It is the height of cynicism."

He returned to the subject a few minutes later, noting that Rubio had said during the Republican primaries that Trump was unfit to handle the country's nuclear codes and was a con man. "Why does Marco Rubio still plan to vote for Donald Trump? Why does he support Donald Trump?" Obama asked.

Obama also mocked Republicans who recently pulled their endorsements after The Washington Post revealed a video in which Trump can be heard boasting that he had groped women. The president insisted that such a late disavowal of the candidate was meaningless and accused Republicans of lacking standards. He said his political opponents had criticized him for not taking a tougher stand against Russian aggression, but gave Trump a pass for praising Russian President Vladimir Putin.

"Now all of a sudden you are okay with your nominee having a bromance" with Putin, Obama said.

Obama attacked Republicans for sticking with Trump when he made controversial remarks about Mexicans. "Where were you when your party's nominee called **immigrants** murderers and rapists?" he asked.

The Clinton campaign's biggest worry is that young and minority voters will not turn out for Clinton in the same numbers that they have backed Obama.

"Trump can't hear you from here," Obama said when the crowd began to boo at the mention of the Republican nominee's name. "But he can hear you when you go to the ballot box and vote."

Obama briefly addressed Trump's claims that the election is rigged and that he might not accept the results. On Thursday, Trump joked to cheers at a rally in Delaware, Ohio, that he would "totally accept the results of this great and historic presidential election — if I win." Trump then said more seriously that he would accept a "clear" result, but reserved the right to challenge anything "questionable."

Obama warned that the Republican's words risked undermining the country's institutions and overturning centuries of tradition. "That is not a joking matter. That is dangerous," Obama said. "When you try to sew the seeds of doubt in people's minds ... then you are doing the work of our adversaries."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The final debate of the 2016 presidential race came as Hillary Clinton threatened to shut the door on Donald Trump and as Donald Trump threatened to unleash a torrent of attacks and accusations about the "rigged" election process.

As the two met in Las Vegas on Wednesday night, we posted the transcript below, along with our analysis, fact checks and comments via annotation. To see an annotation, click on the highlighted text. To make your own, sign up for a Genius account.

WALLACE: Good evening from the Thomas and Mack Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I'm Chris Wallace of Fox News, and I welcome you to the third and final of the 2016 presidential debates between Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump.

WALLACE: This debate is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. The commission has designed the format: Six roughly 15-minute segments with two-minute answers to the first question, then open discussion for the rest of each segment. Both campaigns have agreed to those rules.

For the record, I decided the topics and the questions in each topic. None of those questions has been shared with the commission or the two candidates. The audience here in the hall has promised to remain silent. No cheers, boos, or other interruptions so we and you can focus on what the candidates have to say.

WALLACE: No noise, except right now, as we welcome the Democratic nominee for president, Secretary Clinton, and the Republican nominee for president, Mr. Trump.

(APPLAUSE)

Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump, welcome. Let's get right to it. The first topic is the Supreme Court.

You both talked briefly about the court in the last debate, but I want to drill down on this, because the next president will almost certainly have at least one appointment and likely or possibly two or three appointments.

WALLACE: Which means that you will, in effect, determine the balance of the court for what could be the next quarter century.

First of all, where do you want to see the court take the country? And secondly, what's your view on how the Constitution should be interpreted? Do the founders' words mean what they say or is it a living document to be applied flexibly according to changing circumstances? In this segment, Secretary Clinton, you go first. You have two minutes.

CLINTON: Thank you very much, Chris. And thanks to UNLV for hosting us.

You know, I think when we talk about the Supreme Court, it really raises the central issue in this election, namely, what kind of country are we going to be? What kind of opportunities will we provide for our citizens? What kind of rights will Americans have?

And I feel strongly that the Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful corporations and the wealthy. For me, that means that we need a Supreme Court that will stand up on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community, that will stand up and say no to Citizens United, a decision that has undermined the election system in our country because of the way it permits dark, unaccountable money to come into our electoral system.

I have major disagreements with my opponent about these issues and others that will be before the Supreme Court. But I feel that at this point in our country's history, it is important that we not reverse marriage equality, that we not reverse Roe v. Wade, that we stand up against Citizens United, we stand up for the rights of people in the workplace, that we stand up and basically say: The Supreme Court should represent all of us.

That's how I see the court, and the kind of people that I would be looking to nominate to the court would be in the great tradition of standing up to the powerful, standing up on behalf of our rights as Americans.

And I look forward to having that opportunity. I would hope that the Senate would do its job and confirm the nominee that President Obama has sent to them. That's the way the Constitution fundamentally should operate. The president nominates, and then the Senate advises and consents, or not, but they go forward with the process.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, same question. Where do you want to see the court take the country? And how do you believe the Constitution should be interpreted?

TRUMP: Well, first of all, it's great to be with you, and thank you, everybody. The Supreme Court: It's what it's all about. Our country is so, so -- it's just so imperative that we have the right justices.

Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some very, very inappropriate statements toward me and toward a tremendous number of people, many, many millions of people that I represent. And she was forced to apologize. And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made.

We need a Supreme Court that in my opinion is going to uphold the Second Amendment, and all amendments, but the Second Amendment, which is under absolute siege. I believe if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don't think will happen, we will have a Second Amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now. But I feel that it's absolutely important that we uphold, because of the fact that it is under such trauma.

I feel that the justices that I am going to appoint -- and I've named 20 of them -- the justices that I'm going to appoint will be pro-life. They will have a conservative bent. They will be protecting the Second Amendment. They are great scholars in all cases, and they're people of tremendous respect. They will interpret the Constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted. And I believe that's very, very important.

I don't think we should have justices appointed that decide what they want to hear. It's all about the Constitution of -- of -- and so important, the Constitution the way it was meant to be. And those are the people that I will appoint.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, thank you.

WALLACE: We now have about 10 minutes for an open discussion. I want to focus on two issues that, in fact, by the justices that you name could end up changing the existing law of the land. First is one that you mentioned, Mr. Trump, and that is guns.

Secretary Clinton, you said last year, let me quote, "The Supreme Court is wrong on the Second Amendment." And now, in fact, in the 2008 Heller case, the court ruled that there is a constitutional right to bear arms, but a right that is reasonably limited. Those were the words of the Judge Antonin Scalia who wrote the decision. What's wrong with that?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I support the Second Amendment. I lived in Arkansas for 18 wonderful years. I represented upstate New York. I understand and respect the tradition of gun ownership. It goes back to the founding of our country.

But I also believe that there can be and must be reasonable regulation. Because I support the Second Amendment doesn't mean that I want people who shouldn't have guns to be able to threaten you, kill you or members of your family.

And so when I think about what we need to do, we have 33,000 people a year who die from guns. I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole. There's other matters that I think are sensible that are the kind of reforms that would make a difference that are not in any way conflicting with the Second Amendment.

You mentioned the Heller decision. And what I was saying that you referenced, Chris, was that I disagreed with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that case, because what the District of Columbia was trying to do was to protect toddlers from guns and so they wanted people with guns to safely store them. And the court didn't accept that reasonable regulation, but they've accepted many others. So I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment.

WALLACE: Let me bring Mr. Trump in here. The bipartisan Open Debate Coalition got millions of votes on questions to ask here, and this was, in fact, one of the top questions that they got. How will you ensure the Second Amendment is protected? You just heard Secretary Clinton's answer. Does she persuade you that, while you may disagree on regulation, that, in fact, she supports a Second Amendment right to bear arms? TRUMP: Well, the D.C. vs. Heller decision was very strongly -- and she was extremely angry about it. I watched. I mean, she was very, very angry when upheld. And Justice Scalia was so involved. And it was a well-crafted decision. But Hillary was extremely upset, extremely angry. And people that believe in the Second Amendment and believe in it very strongly were very upset with what she had to say.

WALLACE: Well, let me bring in Secretary Clinton. Were you extremely upset?

CLINTON: Well, I was upset because, unfortunately, dozens of toddlers injure themselves, even kill people with guns, because, unfortunately, not everyone who has loaded guns in their homes takes appropriate precautions.

But there's no doubt that I respect the Second Amendment, that I also believe there's an individual right to bear arms. That is not in conflict with sensible, commonsense regulation.

And, you know, look, I understand that Donald's been strongly supported by the NRA. The gun lobby's on his side. They're running millions of dollars of ads against me. And I regret that, because what I would like to see is for people to come together and say: Of course we're going to protect and defend the Second Amendment. But we're going to do it in a way that tries to save some of these 33,000 lives that we lose every year.

WALLACE: Let me bring Mr. Trump back into this, because, in fact, you oppose any limits on assault weapons, any limits on high- capacity magazines. You support a national right to carry law. Why, sir?

TRUMP: Well, let me just tell you before we go any further. In Chicago, which has the toughest gun laws in the United States, probably you could say by far, they have more gun violence than any other city. So we have the toughest laws, and you have tremendous gun violence.

I am a very strong supporter of the Second Amendment. And I am -- I don't know if Hillary was saying it in a sarcastic manner, but I'm very proud to have the endorsement of the NRA. And it's the earliest endorsement they've ever given to anybody who ran for president. So I'm very honored by all of that.

We are going to appoint justices -- this is the best way to help the Second Amendment. We are going to appoint justices that will feel very strongly about the Second Amendment, that will not do damage to the Second Amendment.

WALLACE: Well, let's pick up on another issue which divides you and the justices that whoever ends up winning this election appoints could have a dramatic effect there, and that's the issue of abortion.

TRUMP: Right.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, you're pro-life. But I want to ask you specifically: Do you want the court, including the justices that you will name, to overturn Roe v. Wade, which includes -- in fact, states -- a woman's right to abortion?

TRUMP: Well, if that would happen, because I am pro-life, and I will be appointing pro-life judges, I would think that that will go back to the individual states.

WALLACE: But I'm asking you specifically. Would you like to...

TRUMP: If they overturned it, it will go back to the states.

WALLACE: But what I'm asking you, sir, is, do you want to see the court overturn -- you just said you want to see the court protect the Second Amendment. Do you want to see the court overturn Roe v. Wade?

TRUMP: Well, if we put another two or perhaps three justice on, that's really what's going to be -- that will happen. And that'll happen automatically, in my opinion, because I am putting pro-life justices on the court. I will say this: It will go back to the states, and the states will then make a determination.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I strongly support Roe v. Wade, which guarantees a constitutional right to a woman to make the most intimate, most difficult, in many cases, decisions about her health care that one can imagine. And in this case, it's not only about Roe v. Wade. It is about what's happening right now in America.

So many states are putting very stringent regulations on women that block them from exercising that choice to the extent that they are defunding Planned Parenthood, which, of course, provides all kinds of cancer screenings and other benefits for women in our country.

Donald has said he's in favor of defunding Planned Parenthood. He even supported shutting the government down to defund Planned Parenthood. I will defend Planned Parenthood. I will defend Roe v. Wade, and I will defend women's rights to make their own health care decisions.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton... CLINTON: And we have come too far to have that turned back now. And, indeed, he said women should be punished, that there should be some form of punishment for women who obtain abortions. And I could just not be more opposed to that kind of thinking.

WALLACE: I'm going to give you a chance to respond, but I want to ask you, Secretary Clinton, I want to explore how far you believe the right to abortion goes. You have been quoted as saying that the fetus has no constitutional rights. You also voted against a ban on late-term, partial-birth abortions. Why?

CLINTON: Because Roe v. Wade very clearly sets out that there can be regulations on abortion so long as the life and the health of the mother are taken into account. And when I voted as a senator, I did not think that that was the case.

The kinds of cases that fall at the end of pregnancy are often the most heartbreaking, painful decisions for families to make. I have met with women who toward the end of their pregnancy get the worst news one could get, that their health is in jeopardy if they continue to carry to term or that something terrible has happened or just been discovered about the pregnancy. I do not think the United States government should be stepping in and making those most personal of decisions. So you can regulate if you are doing so with the life and the health of the mother taken into account.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, your reaction? And particularly on this issue of late-term, partial-birth abortions.

TRUMP: Well, I think it's terrible. If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby.

Now, you can say that that's OK and Hillary can say that that's OK. But it's not OK with me, because based on what she's saying, and based on where she's going, and where she's been, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb in the ninth month on the final day. And that's not acceptable.

CLINTON: Well, that is not what happens in these cases. And using that kind of scare rhetoric is just terribly unfortunate. You should meet with some of the women that I have met with, women I have known over the course of my life. This is one of the worst possible choices that any woman and her family has to make. And I do not believe the government should be making it.

You know, I've had the great honor of traveling across the world on behalf of our country. I've been to countries where governments either forced women to have abortions, like they used to do in China, or forced women to bear children, like they used to do in Romania. And I can tell you: The government has no business in the decisions that women make with their families in accordance with their faith, with medical advice. And I will stand up for that right.

WALLACE: All right. But just briefly, I want to move on to another segment...

TRUMP: And, honestly, nobody has business doing what I just said, doing that, as late as one or two or three or four days prior to birth. Nobody has that.

WALLACE: All right. Let's move on to the subject of **immigration**. And there is almost no issue that separates the two of you more than the issue of **immigration**. Actually, there are a lot of issues that separate the two of you.

Mr. Trump, you want to build a wall. Secretary Clinton, you have offered no specific plan for how you want to secure our southern border. Mr. Trump, you are calling for major deportations. Secretary Clinton, you say that within your first 100 days as president you're going to offer a package that includes a pathway to citizenship. The question, really, is, why are you right and your opponent wrong?

Mr. Trump, you go first in this segment. You have two minutes.

TRUMP: Well, first of all, she wants to give amnesty, which is a disaster and very unfair to all of the people that are waiting on line for many, many years. We need strong borders.

In the audience tonight, we have four mothers of -- I mean, these are unbelievable people that I've gotten to know over a period of years whose children have been killed, brutally killed by people that came into the country illegally. You have thousands of mothers and fathers and relatives all over the country. They're coming in illegally. Drugs are pouring in through the border. We have no country if we have no border.

Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders. The border -- as you know, the Border Patrol agents, 16,500-plus ICE last week, endorsed me. First time they've ever endorsed a candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what's going on. They know it better than anybody. They want strong borders. They feel we have to have strong borders.

I was up in New Hampshire the other day. The biggest complaint they have -- it's with all of the problems going on in the world, many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and by Barack Obama. All of the problems -- the single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern border. It's just pouring and destroying their youth. It's poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people. We have to have strong borders. We have to keep the drugs out of our country. We are -- right now, we're getting the drugs, they're getting the cash. We need strong borders. We need absolute -- we cannot give amnesty.

Now, I want to build the wall. We need the wall. And the Border Patrol, ICE, they all want the wall. We stop the drugs. We shore up the border. One of my first acts will be to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones -- we have some bad, bad people in this country that have to go out. We're going to get them out; we're going to secure the border. And once the border is secured, at a later date, we'll make a determination as to the rest. But we have some bad hombres here, and we're going to get them out.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, thank you. Same question to you, Secretary Clinton. Basically, why are you right and Mr. Trump is wrong?

CLINTON: Well, as he was talking, I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Las Vegas, Carla, who is very worried that her parents might be deported, because she was born in this country but they were not. They work hard, they do everything they can to give her a good life.

And you're right. I don't want to rip families apart. I don't want to be sending parents away from children. I don't want to see the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country.

We have 11 million undocumented people. They have 4 million American citizen children, 15 million people. He said as recently as a few weeks ago in Phoenix that every undocumented person would be subject to deportation. Now, here's what that means. It means you would have to have a massive law enforcement presence, where law enforcement officers would be going school to school, home to home, business to business, rounding up people who are undocumented. And we would then have to put them on trains, on buses to get them out of our country.

I think that is an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation. I think it's an idea that would rip our country apart.

I have been for border security for years. I voted for border security in the United States Senate. And my comprehensive **immigration** reform plan of course includes border security. But I want to put our resources where I think they're most needed: Getting rid of any violent person. Anybody who should be deported, we should deport them.

When it comes to the wall that Donald talks about building, he went to Mexico, he had a meeting with the Mexican president. Didn't even raise it. He choked and then got into a Twitter war because the Mexican president said we're not paying for that wall.

So I think we are both a nation of **immigrants** and we are a nation of laws and that we can act accordingly. And that's why I'm introducing comprehensive **immigration** reform within the first 100 days with the path to citizenship.

WALLACE: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. I want to follow up...

TRUMP: Chris, I think it's...

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: I think I should respond to that. First of all, I had a very good meeting with the president of Mexico. Very nice man. We will be doing very much better with Mexico on trade deals. Believe me. The NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made of any kind, signed by anybody. It's a disaster.

Hillary Clinton wanted the wall. Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts. Now, she never gets anything done, so naturally the wall wasn't built. But Hillary Clinton wanted the wall.

WALLACE: Well, let me -- wait, wait, sir, let me...

TRUMP: We are a country of laws. We either have -- and by the way...

WALLACE: Now, wait. I'd like to hear from...

TRUMP: Well -- well, but she said one thing.

WALLACE: I'd like to hear -- I'd like to hear from Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: I voted for border security, and there are...

TRUMP: And the wall.

CLINTON: There are some limited places where that was appropriate. There also is necessarily going to be new technology and how best to deploy that.

But it is clear, when you look at what Donald has been proposing, he started his campaign bashing **immigrants**, calling Mexican **immigrants** rapists and criminals and drug dealers, that he has a very different view about what we should do to deal with **immigrants**.

Now, what I am also arguing is that bringing undocumented **immigrants** out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy will be good, because then employers can't exploit them and undercut Americans' wages.

And Donald knows a lot about this. He used undocumented labor to build the Trump Tower. He underpaid undocumented workers, and when they complained, he basically said what a lot of employers do: "You complain, I'll get you deported."

I want to get everybody out of the shadows, get the economy working, and not let employers like Donald exploit undocumented workers, which hurts them, but also hurts American workers.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: President Obama has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it, nobody talks about it. But under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country. They've been deported. She doesn't want to say that, but that's what's happened, and that's what happened big league.

As far as moving these people out and moving -- we either have a country or we don't. We're a country of laws. We either have a border or we don't.

Now, you can come back in and you can become a citizen. But it's very unfair. We have millions of people that did it the right way. They're on line. They're waiting. We're going to speed up the process, big league, because it's very inefficient. But they're on line and they're waiting to become citizens.

Very unfair that somebody runs across the border, becomes a citizen, under her plan, you have open borders. You would have a disaster on trade, and you will have a disaster with your open borders.

WALLACE: I want to...

TRUMP: But what she doesn't say is that President Obama has deported millions and millions of people just the way it is.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to...

CLINTON: We will not have open borders. That is...

WALLACE: Well, let me -- Secretary...

CLINTON: That is a rank mischaracterization.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: We will have secure borders, but we'll also have reform. And this used to be a bipartisan issue. Ronald Reagan was the last president...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, excuse me. Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: ... to sign **immigration** reform, and George W. Bush supported it, as well.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to clear up your position on this issue, because in a speech you gave to a Brazilian bank, for which you were paid $225,000, we've learned from the WikiLeaks, that you said this, and I want to quote. "My dream is a hemispheric common market with open trade and open borders." So that's the question...

TRUMP: Thank you.

WALLACE: That's the question. Please quiet, everybody. Is that your dream, open borders? CLINTON: Well, if you went on to read the rest of the sentence, I was talking about energy. You know, we trade more energy with our neighbors than we trade with the rest of the world combined. And I do want us to have an electric grid, an energy system that crosses borders. I think that would be a great benefit to us.

But you are very clearly quoting from WikiLeaks. And what's really important about WikiLeaks is that the Russian government has engaged in espionage against Americans. They have hacked American websites, American accounts of private people, of institutions. Then they have given that information to WikiLeaks for the purpose of putting it on the Internet.

This has come from the highest levels of the Russian government, clearly, from Putin himself, in an effort, as 17 of our intelligence agencies have confirmed, to influence our election.

CLINTON: So I actually think the most important question of this evening, Chris, is, finally, will Donald Trump admit and condemn that the Russians are doing this and make it clear that he will not have the help of Putin in in this election, that he rejects Russian espionage against Americans, which he actually encouraged in the past? Those are the questions we need answered. We've never had anything like this happen in any of our elections before.

WALLACE: Well?

TRUMP: That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders, OK? How did we get on to Putin?

WALLACE: Hold on -- hold on, wait. Hold on, folks. Because we -- this is going to end up getting out of control. Let's try to keep it quiet so -- for the candidates and for the American people.

TRUMP: So just to finish on the borders...

WALLACE: Yes?

TRUMP: She wants open borders. People are going to pour into our country. People are going to come in from Syria. She wants 550 percent more people than Barack Obama, and he has thousands and thousands of people. They have no idea where they come from.

And you see, we are going to stop radical Islamic terrorism in this country. She won't even mention the words, and neither will President Obama. So I just want to tell you, she wants open borders.

Now we can talk about Putin. I don't know Putin. He said nice things about me. If we got along well, that would be good. If Russia and the United States got along well and went after ISIS, that would be good.

He has no respect for her. He has no respect for our president. And I'll tell you what: We're in very serious trouble, because we have a country with tremendous numbers of nuclear warheads -- 1,800, by the way -- where they expanded and we didn't, 1,800 nuclear warheads. And she's playing chicken. Look, Putin...

WALLACE: Wait, but...

TRUMP: ... from everything I see, has no respect for this person.

CLINTON: Well, that's because he'd rather have a puppet as president of the United States.

TRUMP: No puppet. No puppet.

CLINTON: And it's pretty clear...

TRUMP: You're the puppet!

CLINTON: It's pretty clear you won't admit...

TRUMP: No, you're the puppet.

CLINTON: ... that the Russians have engaged in cyberattacks against the United States of America, that you encouraged espionage against our people, that you are willing to spout the Putin line, sign up for his wish list, break up NATO, do whatever he wants to do, and that you continue to get help from him, because he has a very clear favorite in this race.

So I think that this is such an unprecedented situation. We've never had a foreign government trying to interfere in our election. We have 17 -- 17 intelligence agencies, civilian and military, who have all concluded that these espionage attacks, these cyberattacks, come from the highest levels of the Kremlin and they are designed to influence our election. I find that deeply disturbing.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: And I think it's time you take a stand...

TRUMP: She has no idea whether it's Russia, China, or anybody else.

CLINTON: I am not quoting myself.

TRUMP: She has no idea.

CLINTON: I am quoting 17...

TRUMP: Hillary, you have no idea.

CLINTON: ... 17 intelligence -- do you doubt 17 military and civilian...

TRUMP: And our country has no idea.

CLINTON: ... agencies.

TRUMP: Yeah, I doubt it. I doubt it.

CLINTON: Well, he'd rather believe Vladimir Putin than the military and civilian intelligence professionals who are sworn to protect us. I find that just absolutely...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: She doesn't like Putin because Putin has outsmarted her at every step of the way.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: Excuse me. Putin has outsmarted her in Syria.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: He's outsmarted her every step of the way.

WALLACE: I do get to ask some questions.

TRUMP: Yes, that's fine.

WALLACE: And I would like to ask you this direct question. The top national security officials of this country do believe that Russia has been behind these hacks. Even if you don't know for sure whether they are, do you condemn any interference by Russia in the American election?

TRUMP: By Russia or anybody else.

WALLACE: You condemn their interference?

TRUMP: Of course I condemn. Of course I -- I don't know Putin. I have no idea.

WALLACE: I'm not asking -- I'm asking do you condemn?

TRUMP: I never met Putin. This is not my best friend. But if the United States got along with Russia, wouldn't be so bad.

Let me tell you, Putin has outsmarted her and Obama at every single step of the way. Whether it's Syria, you name it. Missiles. Take a look at the "start up" that they signed. The Russians have said, according to many, many reports, I can't believe they allowed us to do this. They create warheads, and we can't. The Russians can't believe it. She has been outsmarted by Putin.

And all you have to do is look at the Middle East. They've taken over. We've spent $6 trillion. They've taken over the Middle East. She has been outsmarted and outplayed worse than anybody I've ever seen in any government whatsoever.

WALLACE: We're a long way away from **immigration**, but I'm going to let you finish this topic. You got about 45 seconds.

TRUMP: And she always will be.

CLINTON: I -- I find it ironic that he's raising nuclear weapons. This is a person who has been very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons. He's...

TRUMP: Wrong. CLINTON: ... advocated more countries getting them, Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia. He said, well, if we have them, why don't we use them, which I think is terrifying.

But here's the deal. The bottom line on nuclear weapons is that when the president gives the order, it must be followed. There's about four minutes between the order being given and the people responsible for launching nuclear weapons to do so. And that's why 10 people who have had that awesome responsibility have come out and, in an unprecedented way, said they would not trust Donald Trump with the nuclear codes or to have his finger on the nuclear button.

TRUMP: I have 200 generals...

WALLACE: Very quickly.

TRUMP: ... and admirals, 21 endorsing me, 21 congressional Medal of Honor recipients. As far as Japan and other countries, we are being ripped off by everybody in the -- we're defending other countries. We are spending a fortune doing it. They have the bargain of the century.

All I said is, we have to renegotiate these agreements, because our country cannot afford to defend Saudi Arabia, Japan, Germany, South Korea, and many other places. We cannot continue to afford -- she took that as saying nuclear weapons.

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: Look, she's been proven to be a liar on so many different ways. This is just another lie.

CLINTON: Well, I'm just quoting you when you were asked...

TRUMP: There's no quote. You're not going to find a quote from me.

CLINTON: ... about a potential nuclear -- nuclear competition in Asia, you said, you know, go ahead, enjoy yourselves, folks. That kind...

TRUMP: And defend yourselves.

CLINTON: ... of language -- well...

TRUMP: And defend yourselves. I didn't say nuclear. And defend yourself.

CLINTON: The United States has kept the peace -- the United States has kept the peace through our alliances. Donald wants to tear up our alliances. I think it makes the world safer and, frankly, it makes the United States safer. I would work with our allies in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, and elsewhere. That's the only way we're going to be able to keep the peace.

WALLACE: We're going to -- no, we are going to move on to the next topic, which is the economy. And I hope we handle that as well as we did **immigration**. You also have very different ideas about how to get the economy growing faster. Secretary Clinton, in your plan, government plays a big role. You see more government spending, more entitlements, more tax credits, more tax penalties. Mr. Trump, you want to get government out with lower taxes and less regulation.

TRUMP: Yes.

WALLACE: We're going to drill down into this a little bit more. But in this overview, please explain to me why you believe that your plan will create more jobs and growth for this country and your opponent's plan will not. In this round, you go first, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, I think when the middle class thrives, America thrives. And so my plan is based on growing the economy, giving middle-class families many more opportunities. I want us to have the biggest jobs program since World War II, jobs in infrastructure and advanced manufacturing. I think we can compete with high-wage countries, and I believe we should. New jobs and clean energy, not only to fight climate change, which is a serious problem, but to create new opportunities and new businesses.

I want us to do more to help small business. That's where two- thirds of the new jobs are going to come from. I want us to raise the national minimum wage, because people who live in poverty should not -- who work full-time should not still be in poverty. And I sure do want to make sure women get equal pay for the work we do.

I feel strongly that we have to have an education system that starts with preschool and goes through college. That's why I want more technical education in high schools and in community colleges, real apprenticeships to prepare young people for the jobs of the future. I want to make college debt-free and for families making less than $125,000, you will not get a tuition bill from a public college or university if the plan that I worked on with Bernie Sanders is enacted.

And we're going to work hard to make sure that it is, because we are going to go where the money is. Most of the gains in the last years since the Great Recession have gone to the very top. So we are going to have the wealthy pay their fair share. We're going to have corporations make a contribution greater than they are now to our country.

That is a plan that has been analyzed by independent experts which said that it could produce 10 million new jobs. By contrast, Donald's plan has been analyzed to conclude it might lose 3.5 million jobs. Why? Because his whole plan is to cut taxes, to give the biggest tax breaks ever to the wealthy and to corporations, adding $20 trillion to our debt, and causing the kind of dislocation that we have seen before, because it truly will be trickle-down economics on steroids.

So the plan I have I think will actually produce greater opportunities. The plan he has will cost us jobs and possibly lead to another Great Recession.

WALLACE: Secretary, thank you. Mr. Trump, why will your plan create more jobs and growth than Secretary Clinton's?

TRUMP: Well, first of all, before I start on my plan, her plan is going to raise taxes and even double your taxes. Her tax plan is a disaster. And she can say all she wants about college tuition. And I'm a big proponent. We're going to do a lot of things for college tuition. But the rest of the public's going to be paying for it. We will have a massive, massive tax increase under Hillary Clinton's plan.

TRUMP: But I'd like to start off where we left, because when I said Japan and Germany, and I'm -- not to single them out, but South Korea, these are very rich, powerful countries. Saudi Arabia, nothing but money. We protect Saudi Arabia. Why aren't they paying?

She immediately -- when she heard this, I questioned it, and I questioned NATO. Why aren't the NATO questioned -- why aren't they paying? Because they weren't paying.

Since I did this -- this was a year ago -- all of a sudden, they're paying. And I've been given a lot -- a lot of credit for it. All of a sudden, they're starting to pay up. They have to pay up. We're protecting people, they have to pay up. And I'm a big fan of NATO. But they have to pay up.

She comes out and said, we love our allies, we think our allies are great. Well, it's awfully hard to get them to pay up when you have somebody saying we think how great they are.

We have to tell Japan in a very nice way, we have to tell Germany, all of these countries, South Korea, we have to say, you have to help us out. We have, during his regime, during President Obama's regime, we've doubled our national debt. We're up to $20 trillion.

So my plan -- we're going to renegotiate trade deals. We're going to have a lot of free trade. We're going to have free trade, more free trade than we have right now. But we have horrible deals. Our jobs are being taken out by the deal that her husband signed, NAFTA, one of the worst deals ever. Our jobs are being sucked out of our economy.

You look at all of the places that I just left, you go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places. We're bringing our jobs back.

I am going to renegotiate NAFTA. And if I can't make a great deal -- then we're going to terminate NAFTA and we're going to create new deals. We're going to have trade, but we're going -- we're going to terminate it, we're going to make a great trade deal.

And if we can't, we're going to do it -- we're going to go a separate way, because it has been a disaster. We are going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively. They're going to start hiring people. We're going to bring the $2.5 trillion...

WALLACE: Time, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: ... that's offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again, because...

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: ... right now, our country is dying at 1 percent GDP.

CLINTON: Well, let me translate that, if I can, Chris, because...

TRUMP: You can't.

CLINTON: ... the fact is, he's going to advocate for the largest tax cuts we've ever seen, three times more than the tax cuts under the Bush administration. I have said repeatedly throughout this campaign: I will not raise taxes on anyone making $250,000 or less.

I also will not add a penny to the debt. I have costed out what I'm going to do. He will, through his massive tax cuts, add $20 trillion to the debt.

Well, he mentioned the debt. We know how to get control of the debt. When my husband was president, we went from a $300 billion deficit to a $200 billion surplus and we were actually on the path to eliminating the national debt. When President Obama came into office, he inherited the worst economic disaster since the Great Depression. He has cut the deficit by two-thirds.

So, yes, one of the ways you go after the debt, one of the ways you create jobs is by investing in people. So I do have investments, investments in new jobs, investments in education, skill training, and the opportunities for people to get ahead and stay ahead. That's the kind of approach that will work.

WALLACE: Secretary...

CLINTON: Cutting taxes on the wealthy, we've tried that. It has not worked the way that it has been promised.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to pursue your plan, because in many ways it is similar to the Obama stimulus plan in 2009, which has led to the slowest GDP growth since 1949.

TRUMP: Correct.

WALLACE: Thank you, sir.

You told me in July when we spoke that the problem is that President Obama didn't get to do enough in what he was trying to do with his stimulus. So is your plan basically more -- even more of the Obama stimulus?

CLINTON: Well, it's a combination, Chris. And let me say that when you inherit the level of economic catastrophe that President Obama inherited, it was a real touch-and-go situation. I was in the Senate before I became secretary of state. I've never seen people as physically distraught as the Bush administration team was because of what was happening to the economy.

I personally believe that the steps that President Obama took saved the economy. He doesn't get the credit he deserves for taking some very hard positions. But it was a terrible recession.

So now we've dug ourselves out of it, we're standing, but we're not yet running. So what I am proposing is that we invest from the middle out and the ground up, not the top down. That is not going to work.

That's why what I have put forward doesn't add a penny to the debt, but it is the kind of approach that will enable more people to take those new jobs, higher-paying jobs. We're beginning to see some increase in incomes, and we certainly have had a long string of increasing jobs. We've got to do more to get the whole economy moving, and that's what I believe I will be able to do.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, even conservative economists who have looked at your plan say that the numbers don't add up, that your idea, and you've talked about 25 million jobs created, 4 percent...

TRUMP: Over a 10-year period.

WALLACE: ... growth is unrealistic. And they say -- you talk a lot about growing the energy industry. They say with oil prices as low as they are right now, that's unrealistic, as well. Your response, sir?

TRUMP: So I just left some high representatives of India. They're growing at 8 percent. China is growing at 7 percent. And that for them is a catastrophically low number.

We are growing -- our last report came out -- and it's right around the 1 percent level. And I think it's going down. Last week, as you know, the end of last week, they came out with an anemic jobs report. A terrible jobs report. In fact I said, is that the last jobs report before the election? Because if it is, I should win easily, it was so bad. The report was so bad.

Look, our country is stagnant. We've lost our jobs. We've lost our businesses. We're not making things anymore, relatively speaking. Our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world.

I've visited so many communities. This has been such an incredible education for me, Chris. I've gotten to know so many -- I've developed so many friends over the last year. And they cry when they see what's happened. I pass factories that were thriving 20, 25 years ago, and because of the bill that her husband signed and she blessed 100 percent, it is just horrible what's happened to these people in these communities.

Now, she can say that her husband did well, but, boy, did they suffer as NAFTA kicked in, because it didn't really kick in very much, but it kicked in after they left. Boy, did they suffer. That was one of the worst things that's ever been signed by our country.

Now she wants to sign Trans-Pacific Partnership. And she wants it. She lied when she said she didn't call it the gold standard in one of the debates. She totally lied. She did call it the gold standard. And they actually fact checked, and they said I was right. I was so honored.

WALLACE: I want you to give you a chance to briefly speak to that, and then I want to pivot to one-sixth of the economy...

TRUMP: And that will be as bad as NAFTA.

WALLACE: ... which is Obamacare. But go ahead, briefly.

CLINTON: Well, first, let me say, number one, when I saw the final agreement for TPP, I said I was against it. It didn't meet my test. I've had the same test. Does it create jobs, raise incomes, and further our national security? I'm against it now. I'll be against it after the election. I'll be against it when I'm president.

There's only one of us on this stage who's actually shipped jobs to Mexico, because that's Donald. He's shipped jobs to 12 countries, including Mexico.

But he mentioned China. And, you know, one of the biggest problems we have with China is the illegal dumping of steel and aluminum into our markets. I have fought against that as a senator. I've stood up against it as secretary of state.

Donald has bought Chinese steel and aluminum. In fact, the Trump Hotel right here in Las Vegas was made with Chinese steel. So he goes around with crocodile tears about how terrible it is, but he has given jobs to Chinese steelworkers, not American steelworkers.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

CLINTON: That's the kind of approach that is just not going to work.

TRUMP: Well, let me just say -- let me just say.

CLINTON: We're going to pull the country together. We're going to have trade agreements that we enforce. That's why I'm going to have a trade prosecutor for the first time in history. And we're going to enforce those agreements, and we're going to look for businesses to help us by buying American products.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton? Go ahead, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Let me ask a simple question. She's been doing this for 30 years. Why the hell didn't you do it over the last 15, 20 years?

CLINTON: No, I voted.

TRUMP: You were very much involved -- excuse me. My turn. You were very much involved in every aspect of this country. Very much. And you do have experience. I say the one thing you have over me is experience, but it's bad experience, because what you've done has turned out badly.

For 30 years, you've been in a position to help, and if you say that I use steel or I use something else, I -- make it impossible for me to do that. I wouldn't mind.

The problem is, you talk, but you don't get anything done, Hillary. You don't. Just like when you ran the State Department, $6 billion was missing. How do you miss $6 billion? You ran the State Department, $6 billion was either stolen. They don't know. It's gone, $6 billion. If you become president, this country is going to be in some mess. Believe me.

CLINTON: Well, first of all, what he just said about the State Department is not only untrue, it's been debunked numerous times.

CLINTON: But I think it's really an important issue. He raised the 30 years of experience, so let me just talk briefly about that. You know, back in the 1970s, I worked for the Children's Defense Fund. And I was taking on discrimination against African-American kids in schools. He was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings.

In the 1980s, I was working to reform the schools in Arkansas. He was borrowing $14 million from his father to start his businesses. In the 1990s, I went to Beijing and I said women's rights are human rights. He insulted a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, called her an eating machine.

TRUMP: Give me a break.

CLINTON: And on the day when I was in the Situation Room, monitoring the raid that brought Osama bin Laden to justice, he was hosting the "Celebrity Apprentice." So I'm happy to compare my 30 years of experience, what I've done for this country, trying to help in every way I could, especially kids and families get ahead and stay ahead, with your 30 years, and I'll let the American people make that decision.

TRUMP: Well, I think I did a much better job. I built a massive company, a great company, some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, worth many, many billions of dollars. I started with a $1 million loan. I agree with that. It's a $1 million loan. But I built a phenomenal company.

And if we could run our country the way I've run my company, we would have a country that you would be so proud of. You would even be proud of it.

And frankly, when you look at her real record, take a look at Syria. Take a look at the migration. Take a look at Libya. Take a look at Iraq. She gave us ISIS, because her and Obama created this huge vacuum, and a small group came out of that huge vacuum because when -- we should never have been in Iraq, but once we were there, we should have never got out the way they wanted to get out. She gave us ISIS as sure as you are sitting there. And what happened is now ISIS is in 32 countries. And now I listen how she's going to get rid of ISIS. She's going to get rid of nobody.

WALLACE: All right. We are going to get to foreign hot spots in a few moments, but the next segment is fitness to be president of the United States. Mr. Trump, at the last debate, you said your talk about grabbing women was just that, talk, and that you'd never actually done it. And since then, as we all know, nine women have come forward and have said that you either groped them or kissed them without their consent.

Why would so many different women from so many different circumstances over so many different years, why would they all in this last couple of weeks make up -- you deny this -- why would they all make up these stories?

Since this is a question for both of you, Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump says what your husband did and that you defended was even worse. Mr. Trump, you go first.

TRUMP: Well, first of all, those stories have been largely debunked. Those people -- I don't know those people. I have a feeling how they came. I believe it was her campaign that did it.

Just like if you look at what came out today on the clips where I was wondering what happened with my rally in Chicago and other rallies where we had such violence? She's the one and Obama that caused the violence. They hired people -- they paid them $1,500, and they're on tape saying be violent, cause fights, do bad things.

I would say the only way -- because those stories are all totally false, I have to say that. And I didn't even apologize to my wife, who's sitting right here, because I didn't do anything. I didn't know any of these -- I didn't see these women.

These women -- the woman on the plane, the -- I think they want either fame or her campaign did it. And I think it's her campaign. Because what I saw what they did, which is a criminal act, by the way, where they're telling people to go out and start fist-fights and start violence.

And I'll tell you what, in particular in Chicago, people were hurt and people could have been killed in that riot. And that was now all on tape, started by her. I believe, Chris, that she got these people to step forward. If it wasn't, they get their 10 minutes of fame. But they were all totally -- it was all fiction. It was lies, and it was fiction.

CLINTON: Well...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: At the last debate, we heard Donald talking about what he did to women. And after that, a number of women have come forward saying that's exactly what he did to them. Now, what was his response? Well, he held a number of big rallies where he said that he could not possibly have done those things to those women because they were not attractive enough for them to be assaulted.

TRUMP: I did not say that. I did not say that.

CLINTON: In fact, he went on to say... WALLACE: Her two minutes -- sir, her two minutes. Her two minutes.

TRUMP: I did not say that.

WALLACE: It's her two minutes.

CLINTON: He went on to say, "Look at her. I don't think so." About another woman, he said, "That wouldn't be my first choice." He attacked the woman reporter writing the story, called her "disgusting," as he has called a number of women during this campaign.

Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger. He goes after their dignity, their self-worth, and I don't think there is a woman anywhere who doesn't know what that feels like. So we now know what Donald thinks and what he says and how he acts toward women. That's who Donald is.

I think it's really up to all of us to demonstrate who we are and who our country is, and to stand up and be very clear about what we expect from our next president, how we want to bring our country together, where we don't want to have the kind of pitting of people one against the other, where instead we celebrate our diversity, we lift people up, and we make our country even greater.

America is great, because America is good. And it really is up to all of us to make that true, now and in the future, and particularly for our children and our grandchildren.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody.

(LAUGHTER)

Nobody has more respect...

WALLACE: Please, everybody.

TRUMP: And frankly, those stories have been largely debunked. And I really want to just talk about something slightly different.

She mentions this, which is all fiction, all fictionalized, probably or possibly started by her and her very sleazy campaign. But I will tell you what isn't fictionalized are her e-mails, where she destroyed 33,000 e-mails criminally, criminally, after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

What happened to the FBI, I don't know. We have a great general, four-star general, today you read it in all of the papers, going to potentially serve five years in jail for lying to the FBI. One lie. She's lied hundreds of times to the people, to Congress, and to the FBI. He's going to probably go to jail. This is a four-star general. And she gets away with it, and she can run for the presidency of the United States? That's really what you should be talking about, not fiction, where somebody wants fame or where they come out of her crooked campaign.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, every time Donald is pushed on something which is obviously uncomfortable, like what these women are saying, he immediately goes to denying responsibility. And it's not just about women. He never apologizes or says he's sorry for anything.

So we know what he has said and what he's done to women. But he also went after a disabled reporter, mocked and mimicked him on national television.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: He went after Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the parents of a young man who died serving our country, a Gold Star family, because of their religion. He went after John McCain, a prisoner of war, said he prefers "people who aren't captured." He went after a federal judge, born in Indiana, but who Donald said couldn't be trusted to try the fraud and racketeering case against Trump University because his parents were Mexican.

So it's not one thing. This is a pattern, a pattern of divisiveness, of a very dark and in many ways dangerous vision of our country, where he incites violence, where he applauds people who are pushing and pulling and punching at his rallies. That is not who America is.

And I hope that as we move in the last weeks of this campaign, more and more people will understand what's at stake in this election. It really does come down to what kind of country we are going to have.

TRUMP: So sad when she talks about violence at my rallies, and she caused the violence. It's on tape.

WALLACE: During the last...

TRUMP: The other things are false, but honestly, I'd love to talk about getting rid of ISIS, and I'd love to talk about other things...

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: ... but those other charges, as she knows, are false.

WALLACE: In this bucket about fitness to be president, there's been a lot of developments over the last 10 days since the last debate. I'd like to ask you about them. These are questions that the American people have.

Secretary Clinton, during your 2009 Senate confirmation hearing, you promised to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest with your dealing with the Clinton Foundation while you were secretary of state, but e-mails show that donors got special access to you. Those seeking grants for Haiti relief were considered separately from non-donors, and some of those donors got contracts, government contracts, taxpayer money.

Can you really say that you kept your pledge to that Senate committee? And why isn't what happened and what went on between you and the Clinton Foundation, why isn't it what Mr. Trump calls pay to play?

CLINTON: Well, everything I did as secretary of state was in furtherance of our country's interests and our values. The State Department has said that. I think that's been proven.

But I am happy, in fact I'm thrilled to talk about the Clinton Foundation, because it is a world-renowned charity and I am so proud of the work that it does. You know, I could talk for the rest of the debate -- I know I don't have the time to do that.

But just briefly, the Clinton Foundation made it possible for 11 million people around the world with HIV-AIDS to afford treatment, and that's about half all the people in the world who are getting treatment. In partnership with the American Health Association...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: ... we have made environments in schools healthier for kids, including healthier lunches...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, respectfully, this is -- this is an open discussion.

CLINTON: Well, it is an open discussion. And you...

WALLACE: And the specific question went to pay for play. Do you want to talk about that?

CLINTON: Well, but there is no -- but there is no evidence -- but there is...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: I think that it's been very well...

WALLACE: Let's ask Mr. Trump.

CLINTON: There is a lot of evidence about the very good work...

TRUMP: It's been very well studied.

CLINTON: ... and the high rankings...

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Please let me Mr. Trump speak.

TRUMP: ... and it's a criminal enterprise, and so many people know it.

WALLACE: Please let Mr. Trump speak.

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: It's a criminal enterprise. Saudi Arabia giving $25 million, Qatar, all of these countries. You talk about women and women's rights? So these are people that push gays off business -- off buildings. These are people that kill women and treat women horribly. And yet you take their money.

So I'd like to ask you right now, why don't you give back the money that you've taken from certain countries that treat certain groups of people so horribly? Why don't you give back the money? I think it would be a great gesture.

Because she takes a tremendous amount of money. And you take a look at the people of Haiti. I was at a little Haiti the other day in Florida. And I want to tell you, they hate the Clintons, because what's happened in Haiti with the Clinton Foundation is a disgrace. And you know it, and they know it, and everybody knows it.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, very quickly, we at the Clinton Foundation spend 90 percent -- 90 percent of all the money that is donated on behalf of programs of people around the world and in our own country. I'm very proud of that. We have the highest rating from the watchdogs that follow foundations. And I'd be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people and bought a six- foot portrait of Donald. I mean, who does that? It just was astonishing.

But when it comes to Haiti, Haiti is the poorest country in our hemisphere. The earthquake and the hurricanes, it has devastated Haiti. Bill and I have been involved in trying to help Haiti for many years. The Clinton Foundation raised $30 million to help Haiti after the catastrophic earthquake and all of the terrible problems the people there had.

We have done things to help small businesses, agriculture, and so much else. And we're going to keep working to help Haiti...

WALLACE: All right.

CLINTON: ... because it's an important part of the American experience.

TRUMP: They don't want you to help them anymore.

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: I'd like to mention one thing. Trump Foundation, small foundation. People contribute, I contribute. The money goes 100 percent -- 100 percent goes to different charities, including a lot of military. I don't get anything. I don't buy boats. I don't buy planes. What happens -- the money goes to them.

WALLACE: Wasn't some of the money used to settle your lawsuits, sir?

TRUMP: No, it was -- we put up the American flag. And that's it. They put up the American flag. We fought for the right in Palm Beach to put up the American flag.

WALLACE: Right. But there was a penalty that was imposed by Palm Beach County, and the money came from your foundation...

TRUMP: There was. There was. And, by the way...

WALLACE: ... instead of Mar-a-Lago or yourself, sir.

TRUMP: ... the money -- the money went to Fisher House, where they build houses -- the money that you're talking about went to Fisher House, where they build houses for veterans and disabled vets.

WALLACE: I want to get into one...

CLINTON: But, of course, there's no way we can know whether any of that is true, because he hasn't released his tax returns. He is the first candidate ever to run for president in the last 40-plus years who has not released his tax returns, so everything he says about charity or anything else, we can't prove it. You can look at our tax returns. We've got them all out there.

But what is really troubling is that we learned in the last debate he has not paid a penny in federal income tax. And we were talking about **immigrants** a few minutes ago, Chris. You know, half of all **immigrants** -- undocumented **immigrants** in our country -- actually pay federal income tax. So we have undocumented **immigrants** in America who are paying more federal income tax than a billionaire. I find that just astonishing.

WALLACE: I want...

TRUMP: So let me just tell you very quickly, we're entitled because of the laws that people like her passed to take massive amounts of depreciation on other charges, and we do it. And all of her donors -- just about all of them -- I know Buffett took hundreds of millions of dollars, Soros, George Soros, took hundreds of millions of dollars...

WALLACE: We...

TRUMP: Let me just explain.

WALLACE: But, no, we heard this...

TRUMP: Most of her donors have done the same thing as I do.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, we -- OK.

TRUMP: You know what she should have done?

WALLACE: Folks, we heard this...

TRUMP: And you know, Hillary, what you should have done, you should have changed the law when you were a United States senator...

WALLACE: Folks, we heard this...

TRUMP: ... because your donors and your special interests are doing the same thing as I do, except even more so.

CLINTON: Well, you know...

TRUMP: You should have changed the law. But you won't change the law, because you take in so much money. I mean, I sat in my apartment today on a very beautiful hotel down the street known as Trump...

CLINTON: Made with Chinese steel.

TRUMP: But I will tell you, I sat there...

(LAUGHTER)

... I sat there watching ad after ad after ad, false ad. All paid for by your friends on Wall Street that gave so much money because they know you're going to protect them. And, frankly, you should have changed the laws.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: If you don't like what I did, you should have changed the laws.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, I want to ask you about one last question in this topic. You have been warning at rallies recently that this election is rigged and that Hillary Clinton is in the process of trying to steal it from you.

Your running mate, Governor Pence, pledged on Sunday that he and you -- his words -- "will absolutely accept the result of this election." Today your daughter, Ivanka, said the same thing. I want to ask you here on the stage tonight: Do you make the same commitment that you will absolutely -- sir, that you will absolutely accept the result of this election?

TRUMP: I will look at it at the time. I'm not looking at anything now. I'll look at it at the time.

What I've seen -- what I've seen is so bad. First of all, the media is so dishonest and so corrupt, and the pile-on is so amazing. The New York Times actually wrote an article about it, but they don't even care. It's so dishonest. And they've poisoned the mind of the voters.

But unfortunately for them, I think the voters are seeing through it. I think they're going to see through it. We'll find out on November 8th. But I think they're going to see through it.

WALLACE: But, sir, there's...

TRUMP: If you look -- excuse me, Chris -- if you look at your voter rolls, you will see millions of people that are registered to vote -- millions, this isn't coming from me -- this is coming from Pew Report and other places -- millions of people that are registered to vote that shouldn't be registered to vote.

So let me just give you one other thing. So I talk about the corrupt media. I talk about the millions of people -- tell you one other thing. She shouldn't be allowed to run. It's crooked -- she's -- she's guilty of a very, very serious crime. She should not be allowed to run.

And just in that respect, I say it's rigged, because she should never...

WALLACE: But...

TRUMP: Chris, she should never have been allowed to run for the presidency based on what she did with e-mails and so many other things.

WALLACE: But, sir, there is a tradition in this country -- in fact, one of the prides of this country -- is the peaceful transition of power and that no matter how hard-fought a campaign is, that at the end of the campaign that the loser concedes to the winner. Not saying that you're necessarily going to be the loser or the winner, but that the loser concedes to the winner and that the country comes together in part for the good of the country. Are you saying you're not prepared now to commit to that principle?

TRUMP: What I'm saying is that I will tell you at the time. I'll keep you in suspense. OK?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, let me respond to that, because that's horrifying. You know, every time Donald thinks things are not going in his direction, he claims whatever it is, is rigged against him.

The FBI conducted a year-long investigation into my e-mails. They concluded there was no case; he said the FBI was rigged. He lost the Iowa caucus. He lost the Wisconsin primary. He said the Republican primary was rigged against him. Then Trump University gets sued for fraud and racketeering; he claims the court system and the federal judge is rigged against him. There was even a time when he didn't get an Emmy for his TV program three years in a row and he started tweeting that the Emmys were rigged against him.

TRUMP: Should have gotten it.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: This is -- this is a mindset. This is how Donald thinks. And it's funny, but it's also really troubling.

WALLACE: OK.

CLINTON: So that is not the way our democracy works. We've been around for 240 years. We've had free and fair elections. We've accepted the outcomes when we may not have liked them. And that is what must be expected of anyone standing on a debate stage during a general election. You know, President Obama said the other day when you're whining before the game is even finished...

(APPLAUSE)

WALLACE: Hold on. Hold on, folks. Hold on, folks.

CLINTON: ... it just shows you're not up to doing the job. And let's -- you know, let's be clear about what he is saying and what that means. He is denigrating -- he's talking down our democracy. And I, for one, am appalled that somebody who is the nominee of one of our two major parties would take that kind of position.

TRUMP: I think what the FBI did and what the Department of Justice did, including meeting with her husband, the attorney general, in the back of an airplane on the tarmac in Arizona, I think it's disgraceful. I think it's a disgrace.

WALLACE: All right.

TRUMP: I think we've never had a situation so bad in this country.

(APPLAUSE)

WALLACE: Hold on, folks. This doesn't do any good for anyone. Let's please continue the debate, and let's move on to the subject of foreign hot spots.

The Iraqi offensive to take back Mosul has begun. If they are successful in pushing ISIS out of that city and out of all of Iraq, the question then becomes, what happens the day after? And that's something that whichever of you ends up -- whoever of you ends up as president is going to have to confront.

Will you put U.S. troops into that vacuum to make sure that ISIS doesn't come back or isn't replaced by something even worse? Secretary Clinton, you go first in this segment. You have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, I am encouraged that there is an effort led by the Iraqi army, supported by Kurdish forces, and also given the help and advice from the number of special forces and other Americans on the ground. But I will not support putting American soldiers into Iraq as an occupying force. I don't think that is in our interest, and I don't think that would be smart to do. In fact, Chris, I think that would be a big red flag waving for ISIS to reconstitute itself.

The goal here is to take back Mosul. It's going to be a hard fight. I've got no illusions about that. And then continue to press into Syria to begin to take back and move on Raqqa, which is the ISIS headquarters.

I am hopeful that the hard work that American military advisers have done will pay off and that we will see a real -- a really successful military operation. But we know we've got lots of work to do. Syria will remain a hotbed of terrorism as long as the civil war, aided and abetted by the Iranians and the Russians, continue.

So I have said, look, we need to keep our eye on ISIS. That's why I want to have an intelligence surge that protects us here at home, why we have to go after them from the air, on the ground, online, why we have to make sure here at home we don't let terrorists buy weapons. If you're too dangerous to fly, you're too dangerous to buy a gun.

And I'm going to continue to push for a no-fly zone and safe havens within Syria not only to help protect the Syrians and prevent the constant outflow of refugees, but to, frankly, gain some leverage on both the Syrian government and the Russians so that perhaps we can have the kind of serious negotiation necessary to bring the conflict to an end and go forward on a political track.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, same question. If we are able to push ISIS out of Mosul and out of Iraq, will -- would you be willing to put U.S. troops in there to prevent their return or something else?

TRUMP: Let me tell you, Mosul is so sad. We had Mosul. But when she left, when she took everybody out, we lost Mosul. Now we're fighting again to get Mosul. The problem with Mosul and what they wanted to do is they wanted to get the leaders of ISIS who they felt were in Mosul.

About three months ago, I started reading that they want to get the leaders and they're going to attack Mosul. Whatever happened to the element of surprise, OK? We announce we're going after Mosul. I have been reading about going after Mosul now for about -- how long is it, Hillary, three months? These people have all left. They've all left.

The element of surprise. Douglas MacArthur, George Patton spinning in their graves when they see the stupidity of our country. So we're now fighting for Mosul, that we had. All she had to do was stay there, and now we're going in to get it.

But you know who the big winner in Mosul is going to be after we eventually get it? And the only reason they did it is because she's running for the office of president and they want to look tough. They want to look good. He violated the red line in the sand, and he made so many mistakes, made all the mistakes. That's why we have the great migration. But she wanted to look good for the election. So they're going in.

But who's going to get Mosul, really? We'll take Mosul eventually. But the way -- if you look at what's happening, much tougher than they thought. Much, much tougher. Much more dangerous. Going to be more deaths that they thought.

But the leaders that we wanted to get are all gone because they're smart. They say, what do we need this for? So Mosul is going to be a wonderful thing. And Iran should write us a letter of thank you, just like the really stupid -- the stupidest deal of all time, a deal that's going to give Iran absolutely nuclear weapons. Iran should write us yet another letter saying thank you very much, because Iran, as I said many years ago, Iran is taking over Iraq, something they've wanted to do forever, but we've made it so easy for them.

So we're now going to take Mosul. And do you know who's going to be the beneficiary? Iran. Oh, yeah, they're making -- I mean, they are outsmarting -- look, you're not there, you might be involved in that decision. But you were there when you took everybody out of Mosul and out of Iraq. You shouldn't have been in Iraq, but you did vote for it. You shouldn't have been in Iraq, but once you were in Iraq, you should have never left the way.

WALLACE: Sir, your two minutes are up.

TRUMP: The point is, the big winner is going to be Iran.

CLINTON: Well, you know, once again, Donald is implying that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq. I said it was a mistake. I've said that years ago. He has consistently denied what is...

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... a very clear fact that...

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... before the invasion, he supported it. And, you know, I just want everybody to go Google it. Google "Donald Trump Iraq." And you will see the dozens of sources which verify that he was for the invasion of Iraq.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: And you can actually hear the audio of him saying that. Now, why does that matter? Well, it matters because he has not told the truth about that position. I guess he believes it makes him look better now to contrast with me because I did vote for it.

But what's really important here is to understand all the interplay. Mosul is a Sunni city. Mosul is on the border of Syria. And, yes, we do need to go after Baghdadi, and -- just like we went after bin Laden, while you were doing "Celebrity Apprentice," and we brought him to justice. We need to go after the leadership.

But we need to get rid of them, get rid of their fighters. There are an estimated several thousand fighters in Mosul. They've been digging underground. They've been prepared to defend. It's going to be tough fighting. But I think we can take back Mosul, and then we can move on into Syria and take back Raqqa.

This is what we have to do. I'm just amazed that he seems to think that the Iraqi government and our allies and everybody else launched the attack on Mosul to help me in this election, but that's how Donald thinks. You know, he always is looking for some conspiracy.

TRUMP: Chris, we don't gain anything.

CLINTON: He has all the conspiracy theories...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Iran is taking over Iraq.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, it's...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Iran is taking over Iraq. We don't gain anything.

CLINTON: This conspiracy theory, which he's been spewing out for quite some time.

TRUMP: If they did it by surprise...

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Wait, wait, wait, Secretary Clinton, it's an open discussion.

CLINTON: He says...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: We could have gained if they did it by surprise.

WALLACE: Secretary, please let Mr. Trump speak.

CLINTON: ... unfit, and he proves it every time he talks.

TRUMP: No, you are the one that's unfit. You know, WikiLeaks just actually came out -- John Podesta said some horrible things about you, and, boy, was he right. He said some beauties. And you know, Bernie Sanders, he said you have bad judgment. You do.

And if you think that going into Mosul after we let the world know we're going in, and all of the people that we really wanted -- the leaders -- they're all gone. If you think that was good, then you do. Now, John Podesta said you have terrible instincts. Bernie Sanders said you have bad judgment. I agree with both.

CLINTON: Well, you should ask Bernie Sanders who he's supporting for president. And he has said...

TRUMP: Which is a big mistake.

CLINTON: ... as he has campaigned for me around the country, you are the most dangerous person to run for president in the modern history of America. I think he's right.

WALLACE: Let's turn to Aleppo. Mr. Trump, in the last debate, you were both asked about the situation in the Syrian city of Aleppo. And I want to follow up on that, because you said several things in that debate which were not true, sir. You said that Aleppo has basically fallen. In fact, there -- in fact, there are... TRUMP: It's a catastrophe. I mean...

WALLACE: It's a catastrophe, but there...

TRUMP: ... it's a mess.

WALLACE: There are a quarter of...

TRUMP: Have you seen it? Have you seen it?

WALLACE: Sir...

TRUMP: Have you seen what's happening to Aleppo?

WALLACE: Sir, if I may finish my question...

TRUMP: OK, so it hasn't fallen. Take a look at it.

WALLACE: Well, there are a quarter of a million people still living there and being slaughtered.

TRUMP: That's right. And they are being slaughtered...

WALLACE: Yes.

TRUMP: ... because of bad decisions.

WALLACE: If I may just finish here, and you also said that -- that Syria and Russia are busy fighting ISIS. In fact, they have been the ones who've been bombing and shelling eastern Aleppo, and they just announced a humanitarian pause, in effect, admitting that they have been bombing and shelling Aleppo. Would you like to clear that up, sir?

TRUMP: Well, Aleppo is a disaster. It's a humanitarian nightmare. But it has fallen from the -- from any standpoint. I mean, what do you need, a signed document? Take a look at Aleppo. It is so sad when you see what's happened.

And a lot of this is because of Hillary Clinton, because what's happened is, by fighting Assad, who turned out to be a lot tougher than she thought, and now she's going to say, oh, he loves Assad, she's -- he's just much tougher and much smarter than her and Obama. And everyone thought he was gone two years ago, three years ago. He -- he aligned with Russia.

He now also aligned with Iran, who we made very powerful. We gave them $150 billion back. We give them $1.7 billion in cash. I mean, cash. Bundles of cash as big as this stage. We gave them $1.7 billion.

Now they have -- he has aligned with Russia and with Iran. They don't want ISIS, but they have other things, because we're backing -- we're backing rebels. We don't know who the rebels are. We're giving them lots of money, lots of everything. We don't know who the rebels are. And when and if -- and it's not going to happen, because you have Russia and you have Iran now. But if they ever did overthrow Assad, you might end up with -- as bad as Assad is, and he's a bad guy, but you may very well end up with worse than Assad.

If she did nothing, we'd be in much better shape. And this is what's caused the great migration, where she's taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees, who probably in many cases -- not probably, who are definitely...

WALLACE: Let me...

TRUMP: ... in many cases, ISIS-aligned, and we now have them in our country, and wait until you see -- this is going to be the great Trojan horse. And wait until you see what happens in the coming years. Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, you have talked about -- and in the last debate and again today -- that you would impose a no-fly zone to try to protect the people of Aleppo and to stop the killing there. President Obama has refused to do that because he fears it's going to draw us closer or deeper into the conflict.

And General Joseph Dunford, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says you impose a no-fly zone, chances are you're going to get into a war -- his words -- with Syria and Russia. So the question I have is, if you impose a no-fly zone -- first of all, how do you respond to their concerns? Secondly, if you impose a no-fly zone and a Russian plane violates that, does President Clinton shoot that plane down?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, first of all, I think a no-fly zone could save lives and could hasten the end of the conflict. I'm well aware of the really legitimate concerns that you have expressed from both the president and the general.

This would not be done just on the first day. This would take a lot of negotiation. And it would also take making it clear to the Russians and the Syrians that our purpose here was to provide safe zones on the ground.

We've had millions of people leave Syria and those millions of people inside Syria who have been dislocated. So I think we could strike a deal and make it very clear to the Russians and the Syrians that this was something that we believe was in the best interests of the people on the ground in Syria, it would help us with our fight against ISIS.

But I want to respond to what Donald said about refugees. He's made these claims repeatedly. I am not going to let anyone into this country who is not vetted, who we do not have confidence in. But I am not going to slam the door on women and children. That picture of that little 4-year-old boy in Aleppo, with the blood coming down his face while he sat in an ambulance, is haunting. And so we are going to do very careful, thorough vetting. That does not solve our internal challenges with ISIS and our need to stop radicalization, to work with American Muslim communities who are on the front lines to identify and prevent attacks. In fact, the killer of the dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando, the Pulse nightclub, was born in Queens, the same place Donald was born. So let's be clear about what the threat is and how we are best going to be able to meet it.

And, yes, some of that threat emanates from over in Syria and Iraq, and we've got to keep fighting, and I will defeat ISIS, and some of it is we have to up our game and be much smarter here at home.

WALLACE: Folks, I want to get into our final segment.

TRUMP: But I just have to...

WALLACE: Real quick.

TRUMP: It's so ridiculous what she -- she will defeat ISIS. We should have never let ISIS happen in the first place. And right now, they're in 32 countries.

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: We should have -- wait one second. They had a cease-fire three weeks ago. A cease-fire, the United States, Russia, and Syria. And during the cease-fire, Russia took over vast swatches of land, and then they said we don't want the cease-fire anymore.

We are so outplayed on missiles, on cease-fires. They are outplayed. Now, she wasn't there. I assume she had nothing to do with it. But our country is so outplayed by Putin and Assad, and by the way -- and by Iran. Nobody can believe how stupid our leadership is.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, Secretary Clinton -- no, we need to move on to our final segment, and that is the national debt, which has not been discussed until tonight.

Our national debt, as a share of the economy, our GDP, is now 77 percent. That's the highest since just after World War II. But the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget says, Secretary Clinton, under your plan, debt would rise to 86 percent of GDP over the next 10 years. Mr. Trump, under your plan, they say it would rise to 105 percent of GDP over the next 10 years. The question is, why are both of you ignoring this problem? Mr. Trump, you go first.

TRUMP: Well, I say they're wrong, because I'm going to create tremendous jobs. And we're bringing GDP from, really, 1 percent, which is what it is now, and if she got in, it will be less than zero. But we're bringing it from 1 percent up to 4 percent. And I actually think we can go higher than 4 percent. I think you can go to 5 percent or 6 percent. And if we do, you don't have to bother asking your question, because we have a tremendous machine. We will have created a tremendous economic machine once again. To do that, we're taking back jobs. We're not going to let our companies be raided by other countries where we lose all our jobs, we don't make our product anymore. It's very sad. But I'm going to create a -- the kind of a country that we were from the standpoint of industry. We used to be there. We've given it up. We've become very, very sloppy.

We've had people that are political hacks making the biggest deals in the world, bigger than companies. You take these big companies, these trade deals are far bigger than these companies, and yet we don't use our great leaders, many of whom back me and many of whom back Hillary, I must say. But we don't use those people. Those are the people -- these are the greatest negotiators in the world. We have the greatest businesspeople in the world. We have to use them to negotiate our trade deals.

We use political hacks. We use people that get the position because they gave -- they made a campaign contribution and they're dealing with China and people that are very much smarter than they are. So we have to use our great people.

But that being said, we will create an economic machine the likes of which we haven't seen in many decades. And people, Chris, will again go back to work and they'll make a lot of money. And we'll have companies that will grow and expand and start from new.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, first, when I hear Donald talk like that and know that his slogan is "Make America Great Again," I wonder when he thought America was great. And before he rushes and says, "You know, before you and President Obama were there," I think it's important to recognize that he has been criticizing our government for decades.

You know, back in 1987, he took out a $100,000 ad in the New York Times, during the time when President Reagan was president, and basically said exactly what he just said now, that we were the laughingstock of the world. He was criticizing President Reagan. This is the way Donald thinks about himself, puts himself into, you know, the middle and says, "You know, I alone can fix it," as he said on the convention stage.

But if you look at the debt, which is the issue you asked about, Chris, I pay for everything I'm proposing. I do not add a penny to the national debt. I take that very seriously, because I do think it's one of the issues we've got to come to grips with.

So when I talk about how we're going to pay for education, how we're going to invest in infrastructure, how we're going to get the cost of prescription drugs down, and a lot of the other issues that people talk to me about all the time, I've made it very clear we are going where the money is. We are going to ask the wealthy and corporations to pay their fair share.

And there is no evidence whatsoever that that will slow down or diminish our growth. In fact, I think just the opposite. We'll have what economists call middle-out growth. We've got to get back to rebuilding the middle class, the families of America. That's where growth will come from. That's why I want to invest in you. I want to invest in your family.

And I think that's the smartest way to grow the economy, to make the economy fairer. And we just have a big disagreement about this. It may be because of our experiences. You know, he started off with his dad as a millionaire...

TRUMP: Yeah, yeah, we've heard -- we've heard this before, Hillary.

CLINTON: I started off with -- my dad was a small-business man.

TRUMP: We've heard this before.

CLINTON: And I think it -- you know, it's a difference that affects how we see the world and what we want to do with the economy.

WALLACE: Time.

TRUMP: Thank you, Hillary. Could I just respond?

WALLACE: Well, no, sir, because we're running out of time...

TRUMP: Because I did disagree with Ronald Reagan very strongly on trade. I disagreed with him. We should have been much tougher on trade even then. I've been waiting for years. Nobody does it right.

WALLACE: OK.

TRUMP: And frankly, now we're going to do it right.

WALLACE: All right. The one last area I want to get into with you in this debate is the fact that the biggest driver of our debt is entitlements, which is 60 percent of all federal spending. Now, the Committee for federal -- a Responsible Federal Budget has looked at both of your plans and they say neither of you has a serious plan that is going to solve the fact that Medicare's going to run out of money in the 2020s, Social Security is going to run out of money in the 2030s, and at that time, recipients are going to take huge cuts in their benefits.

So, in effect, the final question I want to ask you in this regard is -- and let me start with you, Mr. Trump, would President Trump make a deal to save Medicare and Social Security that included both tax increases and benefit cuts, in effect, a grand bargain on entitlements?

TRUMP: I'm cutting taxes. We're going to grow the economy. It's going to grow at a record rate of growth.

WALLACE: That's not going to help in the entitlements.

TRUMP: No, it's going to totally help you. And one thing we have to do: Repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare. It's destroying our country. It's destroying our businesses, our small business and our big businesses. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

You take a look at the kind of numbers that that will cost us in the year '17, it is a disaster. If we don't repeal and replace -- now, it's probably going to die of its own weight. But Obamacare has to go. It's -- the premiums are going up 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent. Next year they're going to go up over 100 percent.

And I'm really glad that the premiums have started -- at least the people see what's happening, because she wants to keep Obamacare and she wants to make it even worse, and it can't get any worse. Bad health care at the most expensive price. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

WALLACE: And, Secretary Clinton, same question, because at this point, Social Security and Medicare are going to run out, the trust funds are going to run out of money. Will you as president entertain -- will you consider a grand bargain, a deal that includes both tax increases and benefit cuts to try to save both programs?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, I am on record as saying that we need to put more money into the Social Security Trust Fund. That's part of my commitment to raise taxes on the wealthy. My Social Security payroll contribution will go up, as will Donald's, assuming he can't figure out how to get out of it. But what we want to do is to replenish the Social Security Trust Fund...

TRUMP: Such a nasty woman.

CLINTON: ... by making sure that we have sufficient resources, and that will come from either raising the cap and/or finding other ways to get more money into it. I will not cut benefits. I want to enhance benefits for low-income workers and for women who have been disadvantaged by the current Social Security system.

But what Donald is proposing with these massive tax cuts will result in a $20 trillion additional national debt. That will have dire consequences for Social Security and Medicare.

And I'll say something about the Affordable Care Act, which he wants to repeal. The Affordable Care Act extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund. So if repeals it, our Medicare problem gets worse. What we need to do is go after...

TRUMP: Your husband disagrees with you.

CLINTON: ... the long-term health care drivers. We've got to get costs down, increase value, emphasize wellness. I have a plan for doing that. And I think that we will be able to get entitlement spending under control by with more resources and harder decisions.

WALLACE: This is -- this is the final time, probably to both of your delight, that you're going to be on a stage together in this campaign. I would like to end it on a positive note. You had not agreed to closing statements, but it seems to me in a funny way that might make it more interesting because you haven't prepared closing statements.

So I'd like you each to take -- and we're going to put a clock up, a minute, as the final question in the final debate, to tell the American people why they should elect you to be the next president. This is another new mini-segment. Secretary Clinton, it's your turn to go first.

CLINTON: Well, I would like to say to everyone watching tonight that I'm reaching out to all Americans -- Democrats, Republicans, and independents -- because we need everybody to help make our country what it should be, to grow the economy, to make it fairer, to make it work for everyone. We need your talents, your skills, your commitments, your energy, your ambition.

You know, I've been privileged to see the presidency up close. And I know the awesome responsibility of protecting our country and the incredible opportunity of working to try to make life better for all of you. I have made the cause of children and families really my life's work.

That's what my mission will be in the presidency. I will stand up for families against powerful interests, against corporations. I will do everything that I can to make sure that you have good jobs, with rising incomes, that your kids have good educations from preschool through college. I hope you will give me a chance to serve as your president.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: She's raising the money from the people she wants to control. Doesn't work that way.

But when I started this campaign, I started it very strongly. It's called "Make America Great Again." We're going to make America great. We have a depleted military. It has to be helped, has to be fixed. We have the greatest people on Earth in our military. We don't take care of our veterans. We take care of illegal **immigrants**, people that come into the country illegally, better than we take care of our vets. That can't happen.

Our policemen and women are disrespected. We need law and order, but we need justice, too. Our inner cities are a disaster. You get shot walking to the store. They have no education. They have no jobs. I will do more for African-Americans and Latinos than she can ever do in 10 lifetimes.

All she's done is talk to the African-Americans and to the Latinos, but they get the vote, and then they come back, they say, we'll see you in four years. We are going to make America strong again, and we are going to make America great again, and it has to start now. We cannot take four more years of Barack Obama, and that's what you get when you get her.

WALLACE: Thank you both.

(APPLAUSE)

Secretary Clinton -- hold on just a moment, folks. Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump, I want to thank you both for participating in all three of these debates.

That brings to an end this year's debates sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. We want to thank the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and its students for having us. Now the decision is up to you.

While millions have already voted, Election Day, November 8th, is just 20 days away. One thing everyone here can agree on: We hope you will go vote. It is one of the honors and obligations of living in this great country. Thank you, and good night.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republican Donald Trump refused to say whether he would accept the results of November's presidential election if he lost – a startling break with American democratic tradition, and the most striking moment of Wednesday night's final presidential debate.

Trump, who came into the debate trailing badly in polls, said that he believed the system was rigged, blaming the news media for "poisoning" minds against him and the FBI for not recommending charges against rival Hillary Clinton for her use of a private email server to handle government business while she was secretary of state.

When the moderator, Fox News' Chris Wallace, asked whether Trump would accept a loss and allow for a peaceful transfer of power, Trump replied: "I will tell you at the time," meaning after Election Day on Nov. 8. "I will keep you in suspense."

Clinton interjected.

"Chris, let me respond to that," Clinton said. "That's horrifying."

The third presidential debate began relatively low-key, with quiet – but vague – discussions of gun regulation, the Supreme Court and abortion policy. But it shortly moved into unprecedented territory, with Trump disputing the U.S. intelligence community's assertion that Russia had hacked Democratic emails, and saying that the U.S. was being outplayed and outsmarted by Russian leader Vladimir Putin.

Trump had spent part of the past week focusing on an anti-corruption message, promising to "drain the swamp" in Washington by reining in lobbyists and imposing term limits on Congress. There was relatively little of that in Wednesday night's debate, however. Nor was there very much about Bill Clinton, whom Trump had signalled would be the target of attacks accusing him of sexual harassment, infidelity and even sexual assault.

Instead, Trump often found himself on the defensive, denouncing reports that he had groped or harassed women as "lies" and "fiction."

Indeed, the closing minutes of the debate played out as Democrats would have hoped – and Republican elites would have feared – when Trump was nominated. Clinton made a closing statement that sought to reach for unity, despite the wide distrust of Democrats and her particularly. "I'm reaching out to all Americans," she said, in rhetoric that matched the intent but never the power of President Obama's from 2008. "We need everybody to help make our country what it should be."

Trump, by contrast, finished the last debate of 2016 as a very different character than he was when he swaggered and bullied a Republican field that had underestimated him. In the last minutes against Clinton, he was left interrupting, contradicting and muttering, having lost the ability to dominate a debate.

"Such a nasty woman," Trump said at one point, as Clinton talked about fiscal policy. It almost sounded as if he was talking to himself.

Earlier in the debate, Trump rejected the accounts of women who have accused him of groping them or kissing them without their consent, calling those reports "lies" and fiction.

"I didn't even apologize to my wife, who's sitting right here, because I didn't do anything," Trump said, when asked by Wallace about nine women who have come forward in recent days. "I think they want, either fame, or her campaign did it," he said, referring to Clinton. He added that Clinton had been running a "sleazy campaign," and sought to turn the debate to other issues: reports that Democratic staffers had sought to organize violent protests outside Trump rallies, and the long-running scandal about Clinton's private email server.

Clinton said that Trump's treatment of women reflected a broader flaw in his personality, noting past episodes in which Trump seemed to mock a reporter with a physical disability, and when Trump feuded with the family of fallen U.S. soldier Humayun Khan.

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

About an hour into the debate, the two candidates also sparred over their respective charitable foundations. Trump attacked the Clinton Foundation, saying that it was wrong to accept large donations from foreign governments, including Middle Eastern countries which Trump criticized for their treatment of women, as well as of gay men and lesbians.

"It's a criminal enterprise," Trump said, referencing what he said was Clinton's favoritism toward Clinton Foundation donors while she was secretary of state. "I'd like to ask you right now, why don't you give back the money right now?"

Clinton responded with criticism of Trump's charity, the Donald J. Trump Foundation. The Washington Post has uncovered examples where Trump used his charity's money to buy things for himself or his businesses, including large portraits of himself.

"I'd be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people and bought a six-foot portrait of Donald," Clinton said. "I mean, who does that?"

Trump sought to defend his foundation, saying it was small, and that he took no money for running it. Wallace, the moderator, pressed Trump about episodes where Trump spent money out of the foundation to settle lawsuits involving his for-profit businesses. In one case in particular, Trump's beachfront Mar-a-Lago Club had agreed to pay $100,000 to Fisher House, a charity that helps military veterans, as part of a legal settlement with the town of Palm Beach, Fla. The Trump Foundation paid that debt instead, effectively saving Trump's business $100,000. Tax experts have called that a classic example of "self-dealing," a violation of federal tax law.

"The money, the money, went to Fisher House," Trump said, seemingly not understanding the legal implications of using his charity to pay off a business obligation. "They build houses for our veterans."

In another testy exchange earlier in the evening, Clinton accused her opponent of being a "puppet" of Russian leader Vladimir Putin.

"It's pretty clear, he'd rather have a puppet as president of the United States," Clinton said, noting that Russian hackers had been blamed for releasing internal Democratic emails, apparently in an effort to help Trump's cause.

"You're the puppet," Trump replied.

His logic, apparently, was that Putin had outmaneuvered Clinton – who was previously secretary of state – and President Obama in nuclear treaties, and in Middle Eastern conflicts like the one in Syria.

"She doesn't like Putin because Putin has outsmarted her at every step of the way," Trump said.

Both Clinton and Wallace pressed Trump about those hacks, which U.S. intelligence agencies have blamed on Russia. Trump said he was not convinced. He seemed to attack the smarts and credibility of those intelligence agencies, saying that the hacks could have been carried out by China or another party.

Together, these arguments – praising the smarts of a foreign power, and doubting those of American personnel – made a bleak argument with few parallels in recent presidential debates.

"Hillary has no idea," Trump said. "Our country has no idea."

Trump also seemed to back off a key piece of his policy platform, giving up on the idea of a mass deportation of illegal **immigrants**.

The promise of mass deportation had been a bedrock part of Trump's campaign during the GOP primaries. But during the debate, Trump offered another plan: He would first round up "the bad ones" among illegal **immigrants**.

"All of the drug lords, all of the bad ones – we have some bad, bad people in this country, who have to go out," Trump said. "Once the border is secured, at a later date," he said, he would make a decision about what to do with other illegal **immigrants**.

Clinton, in her response, sought to pin Trump's past comments on him anyway – recalling his earlier comments in support of a "deportation force." Clinton also mocked Trump for visiting Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto but not raising another key issue of his campaign: a plan to build a border wall, and to make Mexico pay for it by imposing controls on money remitted by Mexican **immigrants**.

"Didn't even raise it," Clinton said. "He choked."

Trump said his meeting with Peña Nieto had been pleasant, and he thought he would have good relations with Mexico as president. "Under her plan, you have open borders," Trump said, citing an excerpt from an email from Wikileaks, the source of which has been identified as hackers affiliated with Russia.

Clinton defended her statement, saying she had been referring to open movement of energy and the electrical grid. She then sought to turn the debate to the Wikileaks releases themselves.

"Will Donald Trump admit and condemn that the Russians are doing this, and make it clear that he will not have the help of Putin in this election, that he rejects Russian espionage in this election?" she said.

"That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders," Trump replied.

At the beginning of Wednesday night's debate, Trump said that he would appoint Supreme Court justices who would overturn the Roe v. Wade decision that legalized abortion nationwide.

"That will happen automatically, in my opinion. Because I am putting pro-life justices on the court," Trump said, in response to a question from moderator Chris Wallace. Trump said he wanted to leave the decision about whether to legalize abortions to individual states.

Clinton said she did not want to limit abortions further, saying she felt that the government should not be allowed to intrude in such decisions.

"You can regulate [abortion], if you are doing so with the life and the health of the mother taken into account," Clinton said. She called abortion "one of the worst possible decisions that any woman or her family has to make."

The first 20 minutes of the debate featured little of the insults or accusations of the first two presidential debates. Instead, the two candidates discussed the Supreme Court and gun regulations in quiet – and often quite vague – terms. There were no mention of the sex scandals that have dominated headlines for days before the debate, focused on both Trump and on Bill Clinton, the Democratic nominee's husband.

Things heated up, however, when the discussion turned to **immigration**, Wikileaks and Russia, and on temperament, with the two presidential hopefuls trading jabs and talking over each other and Wallace.

Trump — who has fallen dangerously behind in polls — came into Wednesday night facing a key choice: Would he use the third and final presidential debate to make a last-ditch lunge for the political center? Or would he use this moment to fulfill a long-held dream of the far right, and prosecute a litany of long-nurtured grievances against both Bill and Hillary Clinton before a national audience?

In the hours before the debate, the answer seemed to be the second. News reports indicated that Trump had invited a series of guests that seemed designed to play to his own political base.

He invited Malik Obama, the president's half-brother and an avowed Trump supporter. He invited Pat Smith, the mother of an American killed in the 2012 attacks on U.S. diplomatic buildings in Benghazi, Libya — during Hillary Clinton's term as secretary of state. Reports from Politico and NBC News indicated that he had also invited former Alaska governor and vice-presidential nominee Sarah Palin (R).

The debate began at 9:03 p.m. Eastern time at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, with Wallace, of Fox News, moderating the 90-minute forum.

In theory — according to the Commission on Presidential Debates — the topics of the night would focus on pressing policy issues. **Immigration**. The Supreme Court. The economy. National debt and entitlements. Turmoil abroad. Each candidate's fitness for the presidency.

But Trump's invited guests — and his rhetoric in preceding days — seemed to indicate that he would seek to focus the debate on questions about the moral character of Clinton, her husband, and her campaign.

Clinton will probably face questions — from Wallace, and from Trump — about a trove of hacked emails belonging to her campaign chairman, John Podesta, that were released by WikiLeaks. She will probably also face renewed questions about the FBI's decision not to criminally charge her for using a private email server during her tenure at the State Department.

The election has taken a strikingly personal and troubling turn in recent weeks, as Trump has escalated his attacks on Clinton and her family while responding to scrutiny over his own treatment of women. Trump has assailed former president Bill Clinton's past marital indiscretions and has accused him of sexually assaulting women.

Those efforts appear likely to spill over onto the debate stage: On Wednesday afternoon, the Trump campaign confirmed that Leslie Millwee, who recently accused Bill Clinton of sexually assaulting her in 1980, will be at the debate as a guest of the Republican nominee.

Millwee went public with her allegations earlier Wednesday via Breitbart, the conservative website that was run until recently by Trump campaign chief executive Stephen Bannon. Her accusations were widely circulated within the hard right's online community.

Also in recent days, Trump has complained that the election is rigged in Clinton's favor and has insisted that voter fraud is widespread, which is not supported by evidence. Republican and Democratic leaders alike have condemned such rhetoric.

Since the first debate, on Sept. 26, Trump's chances have taken a remarkable nosedive. Clinton has taken leads in a variety of key battleground states, and Trump's lead has eroded even in states that previously seemed safe. At least one recent poll has shown Trump behind in three states won by GOP nominee Mitt Romney in 2012 — Georgia, Arizona and Utah.

Also, since the second presidential debate 10 days ago in St. Louis, a growing list of women have come forward to accuse Trump of sexual harassment and assault. Those revelations came after the release of a damaging 2005 "Access Hollywood" video in which Trump bragged about kissing and groping women against their will because of his celebrity status. Many of the women said that they were compelled to speak out after hearing Trump during the St. Louis debate deny that he had ever forced himself on women. He has denied the accusations.

The Trump campaign has been tight-lipped about how the real estate developer has been getting ready for the third debate. But he was notably resistant to mock debates while preparing for the first two debates, and Trump has regularly mocked Clinton for taking time off the campaign trail for debate prep.

Trump skipped his walk-through of the debate venue Wednesday morning, according to a campaign aide. When asked why he did so, and whether an aide acted as a stand-in, the aide responded that "his debate team is taking care of it."

Clinton arrived at her hotel in Las Vegas around 3 p.m. Tuesday. Aides said they expected that she would stay out of public view until she appeared on stage Wednesday. Much of the intervening time would be spent in her hotel on debate preparations, they said. An entourage of aides and consultants made the flight with her Tuesday from an airport near her home in Westchester County, N.Y.

The former secretary of state has been deep in preparations since Saturday, huddling with her top aides at a hotel near her home in Chappaqua, N.Y., before flying to Las Vegas to continue studying. Although Clinton has emerged as the clear electoral college favorite in recent polls of battleground states, she remains tainted in the eyes of many voters by persistent questions about her trustworthiness.

Inside the Clinton campaign, aides say they believe that this debate is a critical opportunity for the former secretary of state to make a "closing argument" to voters about her vision for the country. Her objective Wednesday, they say, is less focused on baiting or driving down Trump's standing with voters, which the campaign says it believes is near or at its basement levels.

Meanwhile, Trump's running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, campaigned in Colorado on Wednesday before heading to Las Vegas for the final debate.

"Hillary Clinton's plan? More of the same. Not just the same; more of the same," he said in Durango, Colo.

Trump has been badly damaged by a string of controversies this month. The lewd remarks in the "Access Hollywood" video shook his support among Republican leadership, and the recent string of sexual assault allegations have intensified scrutiny of his character and temperament.

On Monday, Trump's wife, Melania, defended him during several national television interviews. She played down his lewd comments as "boys' talk" and made note of the timing of the assault allegations, suggesting that they are part of a coordinated effort to hurt her husband's election chances.

The Clinton campaign has also forcefully condemned Trump's rhetoric on the "rigged" election, and has accused Trump of trying to distract from the string of sexual assault allegations that have rocked his campaign.

"He's trying to distract from the bad story line of his verbal and physical assaults on women," campaign communications director Jennifer Palmieri told reporters traveling on Clinton's plane to Las Vegas on Tuesday. "Because he's losing and he wants to blame somebody else," Palmieri said, "and that's what losers do."

Trump's campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, broke with Trump on Wednesday and said she does not believe there is pervasive voter fraud.

"No, I do not believe that," she said during an interview with MSNBC. "So, absent overwhelming evidence that there is, it would not be for me to say that there is."

The Republican nominee's campaign met with shock and outrage last week in St. Louis for inviting several women to the debate who had accused former president Bill Clinton of sexual improprieties. The campaign, which had organized a news conference with the women before the debate, had also sought to seat the women in the family box.

The Commission on Presidential Debates ultimately intervened and prevented the arrangement, which would have had the former president shaking hands with his accusers on national television. The Clintons have long denied the allegations.

The Clinton campaign, meanwhile, announced that Republican business executive Meg Whitman and billionaire entrepreneur Mark Cuban, a longtime Trump antagonist, would be seated in the debate audience as its guests. The decision signals that Clinton is likely to also make the economy and Trump's stewardship of his own businesses a factor in tonight's debate.

jose.delreal@washpost.com

abby.phillip@washpost.com

John Wagner contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS — A defiant Donald Trump used the high-profile setting of the final presidential debate here Wednesday night to amplify one of the most explosive charges of his candidacy: that if he loses the election, he might consider the results illegitimate because the process is rigged.

Questioned directly as to whether he would accept the outcome should Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton prevail on Nov. 8, Trump demurred. "I will keep you in suspense," the Republican nominee said. Clinton called Trump's answer "horrifying," saying he was "talking down our democracy."

After a sober start, the candidates shifted gears into a series of fiery exchanges over their fitness to serve as president and character traits. But over the course of the third and final debate, they delved deeper into their substantive differences than they did in the first two forums and offered a clearer contrast in the directions they would take the country. They drew sharp distinctions on the economy, trade, terrorism, **immigration** and hot-button social issues including abortion and guns.

Russian President Vladimir Putin loomed as an unseen third presence onstage. Clinton and Trump sparred over which of them would be more effective as commander in chief in dealing with his aggression and Russian cyberattacks. Clinton labeled Trump as Putin's "puppet" — prompting Trump to snap back, "You're the puppet!" — while Trump charged that Putin had "outsmarted and outplayed" her when she was secretary of state.

After Clinton cited the findings of 17 U.S. intelligence agencies that the Russian government had committed espionage — including by hacking the emails of Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta — to interfere in the U.S. election, Trump said he did not agree with that conclusion.

"Hillary, you have no idea," Trump said. "Our country has no idea."

Clinton and Trump clashed intensely about each other's character deficiencies in an urgent bid to persuade undecided voters just 20 days before Election Day and as people in many states already have begun casting ballots.

Trump was trying to present himself in a more presidential light than at the other two debates, but at times he could not contain his impulses to jab and insult.

As Clinton was needling Trump for not paying taxes, Trump interjected, "Such a nasty woman."

The animus between the two had reached such a critical mass that the candidates dispensed with the traditional gesture of shaking hands, before and after the debate.

Trump responded angrily to a question about the chorus of women who have stepped forward in recent days to accuse him of unwanted kissing and groping, in some cases recalling episodes dating back decades. "I didn't know any of these women," Trump insisted, dismissing all of their stories as "lies."

Clinton sought to claim the moral high ground by recounting Trump's recent mockery of the women's appearances and physiques on the campaign trail.

"Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger," Clinton said. "He goes after their dignity, their self worth, and I don't think there's a woman anywhere who doesn't know what that feels like. We now know what Donald thinks, what he says and how he acts toward women. That's who Donald is. I think it's up to all of us to demonstrate who we are."

Trump's retort: "Nobody has more respect for women than I do."

In the debate hall, the audience laughed, prompting moderator Chris Wallace, of Fox News Channel, to admonish them. "Please, everybody," he said.

The 90-minute debate, held on the sprawling campus of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, addressed a variety of issues that have received scant attention on the campaign trail, such as the Supreme Court and abortion rights.

The debate opened with a discussion of one of the most consequential decisions awaiting the next president: filling at least one vacancy on the Supreme Court. Clinton cast herself as a champion for progressive values, saying she would appoint justices who would defend women's rights and gay rights and help to overturn the Citizens United ruling that has opened the floodgates to money in politics.

"I feel strongly that the Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful, corporations and the wealthy," Clinton said.

Trump said he would appoint conservative justices who would be strict constitutionalists — "so, so important, the Constitution the way it was meant to be." And he accused Clinton of wanting to appoint justices who would severely restrict gun rights, saying the Second Amendment is "under absolute siege."

In her retort, Clinton noted that because she lived in Arkansas for 18 years and represented Upstate New York in the Senate, she has an appreciation for gun traditions. "But I also believe that there can and must be reasonable regulation," Clinton said.

Clinton's agenda of gun restrictions is especially popular among suburban women, who are among the key swing demographics in this election.

Clinton and Trump sparred intensively over abortion rights, with Trump acknowledging that if he gets two or three appointees to the Supreme Court, the landmark Roe v. Wade decision would be overturned "automatically."

Trump went on to describe late-term abortion procedures in graphic language, suggesting that many women end their pregnancies in the final one to four days. "You can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb," he said.

Clinton used the moment to make a gender-based argument, telling Trump: "You should meet with some of the women I've met with, women I've known over the course of my life. This is one of the worst possible choices that any woman and her family could possibly make. . . . The government has no business in the decisions that women make with their families."

One of the sharpest differences between the candidates was on **immigration** and border security. Trump tried to put Clinton on the defensive, saying the country would fall apart if the border with Mexico is not strengthened.

"We have no country if we have no border," Trump said, vowing to build a wall. "Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders."

Expounding upon the influx of illegal drugs into the United States, Trump used a Spanish word in declaring, "We have some bad hombres here and we're going to get them out."

Clinton said she opposes mass deportations, as Trump has proposed, because "I don't want to rip families apart." And she portrayed Trump as a hypocrite because he has used undocumented workers to grow his real estate empire, including to build Trump Tower, his iconic showpiece in New York.

Clinton also accused Trump of getting weak in the knees when he met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto in Mexico City this summer because he did not bring up his vow that he would make the Mexican government pay for the border wall.

"He choked," Clinton said. "And then got into a Twitter war because the Mexican president said, 'I'm not paying for that wall.' "

Trump seemed to argue for a hands-off policy in Syria, effectively conceding that the rebel-held portions of Aleppo — which are under heavy bombardment from Syrian government forces and their Russian allies — were already lost. "It has fallen, I mean, from any standpoint. What do you need, a signed document? I mean, from any standpoint," Trump said.

He criticized Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad as "a bad guy," but praised him for outsmarting President Obama and others who had called for Assad to step down. "He's just much tougher, and much smarter, than her and Obama," Trump said.

In the end, Trump's argument for U.S. policy in Syria was to leave Assad alone, or seek to partner with him and the Russians to fight the Islamic State.

"He's a bad guy. But you may very well end up with worse than Assad" if he was ever deposed, Trump said. "If she did nothing, we'd be in much better shape."

Trump again and again tried to cast Clinton as corrupt, saying the global charitable foundation run by her family is actually "a criminal enterprise" because it has accepted millions of dollars from foreign governments and multinational corporations.

Clinton defended the foundation's work and argued that Trump's charitable endeavors often work to his own benefit.

"I'd be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people to buy a 6-foot portrait of Donald," Clinton said, referencing a report in The Washington Post. "I mean, who does that?"

The dynamic of the presidential race has reversed since the two candidates met on Sept. 26 for their first debate. At that point, Trump was cutting into Clinton's lead in the polls and surveys indicated that Trump's supporters were more enthusiastic than hers.

Though both campaigns have hit bumps since then, Clinton has moved ahead in the national polls and has a lead in nearly every swing state as well. Trump's lead has eroded even in states that previously seemed safe. At least one recent poll has shown Trump behind in three states won by GOP nominee Mitt Romney in 2012: Georgia, Arizona and Utah.

The election has taken a strikingly personal and disturbing turn in recent weeks, as Trump has escalated his attacks on Clinton and her family while responding to scrutiny over his own treatment of women. Trump has assailed former president Bill Clinton's past marital indiscretions and has accused him of sexually assaulting women.

In the hours before the debate, Trump signaled that he would aggressively prosecute long-held grievances against the Clintons in a play to his base. Trump invited several controversial guests to sit in the audience for the debate, including Malik Obama, the president's half brother and an avowed Trump supporter.

Trump also invited Pat Smith, the mother of an American killed in the 2012 attacks on U.S. diplomatic buildings in Benghazi, Libya — during Hillary Clinton's tenure as secretary of state. Smith delivered one of the more emotional speeches at the Republican National Convention this summer, blaming Clinton for the death of her son.

Another Trump guest was Leslie Millwee, who recently accused Bill Clinton of sexually assaulting her in 1980. Millwee went public with her allegations earlier Wednesday via Breitbart, the conservative website that was run until recently by Trump campaign chief executive Stephen K. Bannon. Her accusations were widely circulated within the hard right's online community.

karen.tumulty@washpost.com
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David A. Fahrenthold and Jose A. DelReal in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Gazing from New Jersey across the Hudson River toward Manhattan, a city still riding out a "Hamilton" craze, is one founded by Alexander Hamilton himself: Paterson . Though it's not the kind of place that lands on glossy lists of hot vacation destinations, it's a city that tells a story of resilience and reinvention, played out along streets designed by Pierre L'Enfant and immortalized by William Carlos Williams. More important, the food is fabulous.

As a food writer who haunts family-run markets instead of T-shirt shops in search of vacation souvenirs, Paterson was a dream come true: neighborhoods crammed with bakeries, bodegas and butcher shops; the streets filled with the mingling scents of coffee, garlic and toasted pistachios. The city was also devoid of bearded bartenders sporting man-buns, an anti-hipster enclave that puts the focus on communities and businesses built by generations of **immigrants**, evidenced by the names of local politicians on yard signs in advance of a city council election: Akhtaruzzaman; Guzman; Cleaves; Khalique.

Boasting 52 ethnic populations among its 146,000 residents — including Bangladeshis, Syrians, Albanians, Peruvians, Dominicans, Jamaicans, Italians, African Americans, Jews and one of the largest Muslim populations in the United States — Paterson is rich in traditional foods, including tiny takeouts late at night dishing up the Peruvian fried rice known as arroz chaufa, in the Little Lima neighborhood, Dominican mamey milkshakes at El Sabor and the tiny cups of espresso served each Saturday morning at San Remo, where Rep. Bill Pascrell Jr. (D) holds court with his constituents.

It was the unrelenting nagging of John Lawrence — a family friend and native Patersonian who worked on Capitol Hill for 38 years before retiring as House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi's chief of staff — that prompted me to plan a weekend jaunt to northern New Jersey with our respective spouses. In the weeks leading up to what can only be described as The Paterson Pilgrimage, our email inboxes were populated with messages from John : "Well, here we are nearly in April, and you know what that means! Can you stand the excitement?" Itineraries were created, hotel rooms booked, dogsitters scheduled.

We arrived at lunchtime, just as Hamilton did on his first visit in 1778, when he picnicked on cold ham, tongue and, according to an aide-de-camp, "some excellent grog" with George Washington and the Marquis de Lafayette along the banks of the Passaic River overlooking the 77-foot natural waterfalls. Eschewing the tongue, John led us to Libby Lunch, a counter located steps away from Hamilton's picnic spot, home of the Hot Texas Weiner. It is a deep-fried hot dog topped with a cinnamon-and-cayenne-spiked meaty Bolognese known locally as "Greek sauce," along with spicy mustard and chopped onions.

"As far as I know, the Hot Texas Weiner has no relationship to Texas," John told us, "but Libby's is the kind of place where you'll find a judge and a guy who just got off a street-cleaning detail sitting at the counter together. It's the perfect place to start understanding the city."

Just outside Libby's is Paterson's pride and joy, the Great Falls of the Passaic River. It is the centerpiece of local officials' campaign to establish Paterson as a tourist destination and the impetus for Hamilton's plan to create a manufacturing center that would lessen America's dependence on European factories. Now a national park nestled amid abandoned redbrick mills, the falls are majestic in their natural beauty, one of the most powerful waterfalls east of the Mississippi.

"If Thomas Jefferson had lunched here," John quipped, "he would have just seen a bucolic landscape. Hamilton saw a natural source of power upon which to build an economy."

Paterson lies in the valley under the Passaic Falls/its spent waters forming the outline of his back. He / lies on his right side, head near the thunder / of the waters filling his dreams! Eternally asleep, / his dreams walk about the city where he persists/incognito.

So begins the epic Williams poem "Paterson," published in five volumes between 1946 and 1958, setting the scene for Hamilton's vision of industrializing the land along the banks of the Passaic River, harnessing the natural power of the Great Falls to welcome a flood of manufacturers, producing cotton, firearms, and locomotives, not to mention so much silk that Paterson came to be called "Silk City" during the 19th century. (Literary footnote: The Pulitzer Prize-winning poet also wrote the introduction to "Howl," the most famous book by a fellow poet­-son of Paterson, Allen Ginsberg.)

Okay, Hamilton didn't technically found the city, but as treasury secretary in 1791, he chartered the Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures, or S.U.M., promoting the establishment of a planned city that he called a "national manufactory." Rather than naming his brainchild after himself, Hamilton chose to solidify support for his plan by conferring that honor on William Paterson, who was then governor of New Jersey and signed the 1792 charter that established the Town of Paterson. The original plan for the city, dreamed up by French engineer Pierre Charles L'Enfant, envisioned an ambitious system of aqueducts, raceways, and radiating roads; L'Enfant was later dismissed in favor of Hamilton's friend Peter Colt, who eschewed grand plans in favor of practical solutions that would get mills quickly up and running.

"There's a sense of civic pride here today that I don't remember when I was growing up," John said as we wandered along the rocky banks of the Passaic after lunch. "Certainly the interest in 'Hamilton' on Broadway has helped. People are recognizing the historic significance of this city."

From the falls, we headed to Little Ramallah, a bustling neighborhood with Turkish, Syrian, Palestinian, Lebanese and Jordanian flavor and a Main Street lined with halal butchers and shawarma shops. John came prepared with a large cooler packed with ice, which he filled with fresh sausages, baklava and marinated chicken kebabs from Fattal's Syrian Bakery. I loaded up on gallons of Lebanese olive oil, monster-size jars of sumac, fresh green almonds and sour plums, and spreadable halvah mixed with cocoa, a Middle Eastern version of Nutella.

We feasted on kibbe, baba ghanouj and fateh — a delicious mishmash of chickpeas, yogurt and toasted pine nuts served on a toasted pita — at Syraan Restaurant, just down the street from Fattal's. I had one request: a visit to Gelotti for dessert. Only a fan of "The Real Housewives of New Jersey" would want to go there. Now you know my guilty secret. The handmade gelato, especially the Cassata Siciliana — a ricotta-based confection spiced with cinnamon and studded with candied fruits — did not disappoint.

Ricotta took center stage the next morning at Cyndia's, a popular local breakfast spot in the nearby borough of Totowa, where ricotta pancakes were topped with fresh apricot jam. Then we made our way up Garrett Mountain to Lambert Castle, the former home of one of Paterson's manufacturing barons, where we had a clear view of the Passaic Valley and the Manhattan skyline 15 miles away. Filled with exquisite architectural details and period furnishings, it also boasts the world's largest spoon collection, totaling more than 5,400 items. This strangely fascinating trove featured nautical and religious motifs, as well as spoons made from shells and animal horns, or boasting mechanical parts, such as miniature windmills with moving blades.

Before heading home, we toured east Paterson, which was a largely Jewish neighborhood when John — and his father before him — was growing up, the landscape retelling the saga of the city's burgeoning **immigrant** population. Driving past his childhood home, John pointed out the Jewish bakery that is now a Jamaican restaurant and the mom-and-pop grocery store whose shelves are now filled with Hispanic and Middle Eastern products.

"There's a lot of symbolism there," John said. "Paterson has a permanent cultural mix, but it's a changing kaleidoscope of colors."

travel@washpost.com

Hartke is a food writer and editor based in Washington, D.C.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**DELAWARE, Ohio — Donald Trump said Thursday that he would accept the results of the presidential election "if I win," but he doubled down on his threat to legally challenge the results if he loses.

"America is a constitutional republic with a system of laws. These laws are triggered in the case of fraud or in the event of a recount where it is needed. Of course, I would accept a clear election result, but I would also reserve my right to contest or file a legal challenge in the case of a questionable result. Right?" Trump said at a Thursday afternoon rally at the Delaware County fairgrounds in this town just north of Columbus.

Trump opened his rally by making a "major announcement" and, at first, it sounded as though he might soften the stance he took during the final presidential debate on Wednesday night in Las Vegas, when he refused to say that he would accept the results of the election — a stance that even his staff members have declined to back.

"Ladies and gentlemen, I want to make a major announcement today: I would like to promise and pledge to all of my voters and supporters, and to all of the people of the United States, that I will totally accept the results of this great and historic presidential election — if I win," Trump said, as the crowd cheered.

Trump said that he will follow all laws and traditions but that he would not give up his right to legally challenge the results if he believes that voter fraud swayed the results. He suggested that it was unfair for the debate moderator to ask him to commit to accepting the results of the election.

"That was sort of an unprecedented question," Trump said. "If Al Gore or George Bush had agreed three weeks before the election to concede the results and waive their right to a legal challenge or a recount, then there would be no Supreme Court case and no Gore v. Bush," Trump said. He added, "In effect, I'm being asked to waive centuries of legal precedent designed to protect the voters."

As Trump has fallen in the polls, he has said that the electoral system is rigged against him and that rampant voter fraud could rob him of votes, even though documented cases of such fraud are rare. Trump said Thursday that undocumented **immigrants** are illegally voting in elections, even though only U.S. citizens are allowed to register to vote, and that Democrats are voting on behalf of people who have died, even though most jurisdictions regularly update their voter rolls.

"This is having nothing to do with me but having to do with the future of our country," Trump said. "We have to have fairness."

Trump accused Hillary Clinton's campaign of doing whatever it takes to get her elected — measures that he said could involve voter fraud. He mentioned reports that Clinton received some of the questions ahead of a debate during the primaries and said that she should resign from the race for cheating. He also referenced reports that Democratic operatives with no direct connection to the Clinton campaign hired people to violently disrupt Trump's rallies.

"This criminal behavior that violates centuries of tradition of peaceful democratic elections. A campaign like Clinton's that will incite violence is truly a campaign that will do anything to win," Trump said, going on to call Clinton "a candidate who is truly capable of anything, including voter fraud."

In accusing Clinton of cheating at previous debates, Trump pointed to an email leaked by WikiLeaks from the spring in which interim Democratic National Committee Chair Donna Brazile seemed to suggest that she had insight into a question that would come up at a primary forum against Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.), Clinton's Democratic primary rival. Brazile has denied that CNN provided her any questions in advance. She has refused to verify the authenticity of the email.

Trump said: "But I ask you, why shouldn't Hillary Clinton resign from the race? She was given these questions, studied these questions, got the perfect answer for these questions, and never said that she did something that was totally wrong and inappropriate."

He said Thursday that Brazile should resign her post.

"It was just learned that Hillary Clinton was given the exact questions to a previous debate, word for word, by Donna Brazile, who is now under tremendous pressure to resign from the DNC, as she should be," he said. "She should resign. How could a woman do that? That is cheating at the highest level."

Trump said that he doesn't expect to have to challenge the results of the election because he expects to win, even though he is trailing far behind Clinton.

"Bottom line," he said, "we're going to win. We're going to win. We're going to win so big. We're going to win so big."

Trump's comments about voter fraud and his promise to challenge the results if he feels as though he lost unfairly were met with roaring cheers from a crowd of about 1,000. Several people said before the rally that they don't trust the U.S. election system.

"I think he's absolutely right," said Kris Madigan, 60, a Trump supporter who lives in Westerville, Ohio. "I think that the media and the Clintons and Obama have all rigged the system and they're trying to make us all believe that she's the winner."

Madigan continued: "I believe there's illegal **immigrants** voting, dead people, people voting two and three times. Maybe throwing our votes away. I don't know. I don't trust the system at all."

Bob Schwarz, 74, agreed and said that "mainstream Republicans" have let voters down by minimizing the threat of voter fraud. He said he's confident that Republican leaders in Ohio have cleaned up voter rolls in the state, but he suspects that's not happening in all states.

"Here in Ohio, I think it's going to be clean, but there are other places in the country that, you know, I'm just concerned about," Schwarz said, naming New York City and Philadelphia as examples.

Chris Wilcox, 24, said that it is "really intelligent" for Trump to raise concerns about voter fraud and to threaten to challenge any questionable results.

"I think that it's very American to say: 'Look, if there's evidence of voter fraud, then we're going to take a look at it,' " said Wilcox, who lives in Richwood, Ohio, and is the assistant manager at a sporting goods store. "I think very much he will accept the results if there isn't any evidence of voter fraud. So I think it's kind of blown out of proportion."

Jose A. DelReal contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In his videotaped quasi-apology issued several hours after The Washington Post made an "Access Hollywood" tape public, the most contrite portion of what Donald Trump had to say came down to this: In the months since he had launched his most unorthodox campaign for the White House, he had traveled the country and learned a lot. The experience had transformed him.

What Trump made clear in the final presidential debate Wednesday night is that his journey has been limited.

The campaign began with a speech staged at Trump Tower — a building constructed with the aid of workers who were in the country illegally, according to the New York Times and PolitiFact. That speech was most notable for Trump's promises to deal with the undocumented in a decisive way, a manner required, Trump said, because Mexico has dispatched the dregs of its society — "rapists" and "criminals" — to the United States.

Wednesday night, in his final opportunity to address the general public and those who have not attended his rallies, Trump said much the same. He punctuated his rationale for mass deportation of those in the country illegally with just two words: "bad hombres."

And that, folks, is the Trump campaign in two key moments representative of his political way.

There are those who will disagree, those who view these two statements as nothing more than unimportant or inoffensive language that was considered perfectly acceptable in 1950s-era Westerns, as Trump surrogate Jeffrey Lord suggested on CNN. But Trump began his campaign as a candidate whose politics and vision for how to improve American life centered around which groups should be removed, watched, policed heavily and have their constitutional rights be subject to an overdue edit. And on Wednesday, Trump marked the final four weeks of his bid for the White House with more of the same. Only now, in a nod to his understanding of the general-election audience's sensibilities, Trump avoided the term "rapist" and instead made reference to "bad hombres."

It is that vision that Trump has repeatedly promised to transform into a muscular, deportation-centered **immigration** policy, a temporary ban on Muslim **immigration** and a call for the widespread application of police tactics such as stop-and-frisk. What Trump appears to have learned in the past 16 months is how to express that vision more creatively and succinctly.

Just to be clear, these are Trump's own words on two occasions:

When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.

Many moments in Trump's quest for the White House have been described as remarkable. And certainly, there is a long list of Trump public comments, favored phrases and claims that, many a political pundit and consultant has noted, probably would have ended other campaigns. But leaving aside the many personal insults Trump has lobbed at individuals on the basis of their religion, race and ethnicity, he has never, ever backed away from his promise to govern by way of group assessments and, with this, make America great.

That Trump's political philosophy of group blame, suspicion and presumed guilt did not end his campaign but instead helped him defeat a field of more than a dozen Republican competitors with more traditional conservative ideals and political résumés is no more meaningless than the intricacy of his chosen hairdo. It signals that Trump's is a philosophy with real appeal to a substantial and, as his surrogates often point out, record-setting number of Republicans who participated in the primary process. That Trump's only real adjustment in his political plans, promises and policy ideas is a matter of language, not substance, that has helped him keep the support of 35 to 40 percent of Americans is certainly worth noting.

Clinton may be leading with voters of color, young Americans of all races and ethnicities, and groups that have traditionally been critical to most Republican presidential victories — married white women and white, college-educated men and women, according to polls. But Trump's America is not small or somehow insignificant.

For these Americans, the candidate who will call undocumented Mexicans **immigrants** rapists, suggest that stop-and-frisk is what America's crime-ravaged, war-zone-like black communities really need, and argue that a temporary ban on Muslim **immigration**, along with some type of ongoing surveillance of Muslims in the United States, is needed, truly sounds like the man with a plan that would make America great again.

That is the essence of what has carried Trump this far. That is the heart of his campaign. That is the stuff that Trump has learned, which remains within bounds for a substantial share of American voters.

And when one thinks of the Trump political trajectory that way, Trump's decision to begin his campaign by describing undocumented Mexican **immigrants** as rapists and criminals, and end it by leaving millions of Americans with the idea that these same people are simply "bad hombres," makes perfect sense.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump spent much of the GOP presidential primary hyping his "deportation force" and promising to deport millions of people. In the general election he publicly agonized: Did he really want to forcibly round up 11 million people? In his Arizona speech he sure sounded like he wanted to kick everyone else, but he and his spinners continued to fudge. Their "priority" would be kicking out criminals. But must everyone else go too?

At the third debate we got Donald Trump's final answer: "As far as moving these people out and moving -- we either have a country or we don't. We're a country of laws. We either have a border or we don't."

And we got Hillary Clinton's best rebuttal to the no-legalization/mass-deportation crowd:

I don't want to rip families apart. I don't want to be sending parents away from children. I don't want to see the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country.

She is right on two counts -- that is what he is proposing (he did not quibble with her characterization) and Americans do not want that.

It turns out the country is overwhelmingly with her on this one. The talk-radio demagogues and the more respectable anti-**immigrant** publications and pundits always insisted the country was with them. That is false, and Trump's signature issue gets a big thumbs-down from the voters. (It actually got a thumbs-down among GOP primary voters as well, as evidenced by exit polling.) Recent polling shows just how unpopular his mass deportation and wall are.

A recent survey for the Chicago Council on Global Affairs found that "an overall majority of Americans (58 percent) say that illegal **immigrants** currently working in the United States should be allowed to stay and pursue a path to citizenship." The most recent Fox News poll finds that 74 percent of all respondents say we should give illegal **immigrants** a pathway to legal status; only 18 percent want to deport as many as possible. The anti-**immigrant** outfits such as the Federation for American **Immigration** Reform and the conservatives who spout its made-up facts represent a fairly small minority of voters.

We do wish Speaker of the House Paul D. Ryan (Wis.), who personally believes in **immigration** reform and understands it is part of a pro-growth agenda, would recognize his party is hugely out of step with voters. One wishes he had the nerve to confront the small group of backbenchers who oppose any feasible **immigration**-reform plan. It might go some distance in redeeming him for his atrocious lack of moral courage in endorsing -- and sticking with -- Trump. And with a closely divided Senate, there might actually be a bill that addresses both border security and a path to legalization.

Right now, House hardliners, Trump, Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) and most of the right-wing media (including conservative pundits who badly misrepresent the extent of illegal **immigration** and distort the impact of **immigration** on native-born workers) do not represent the country's thinking on **immigration**. The **immigration** restrictionists might want to reconsider the efficacy of maintaining such an unpopular position (which is unwise economically to boot) that alienates large segments of the country.

On the other hand, the rump GOP could stay where it its with its sliver of a sliver of an aging electorate. The sane center-right -- in the mold of the Gang of Eight and conservative independent Evan McMullin -- could embrace responsible reform on this and a host of issues that are actually popular with voters and in accord with conservative principles. They stand to pick up many groups that have viewed the GOP as anti-**immigrant** and/or economically short-sighted. As the old white males who comprised Trump's base (and Fox News's TV audience) literally die off over the ensuing decades, there will be insufficient numbers to stand on the hill of irrational and unpopular stances like **immigration** restrictionism. By then, however, the GOP could be long gone, which it will if it doesn't wise up on this and a host of other issues.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Last night, Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump told millions of debate watchers that "some bad hombres" have **immigrated** to our country illegally. Soon after, we found ourselves explaining the difference between hombre and ombré to thousands of people.

hombre: a man ombré: having colors or tones that shade into each other #debatenight

I'm a lexicographer at Merriam-Webster, where I track the words people are interested in. Over the debate, we saw a spike in look-ups for the word "bigly," along with "amnesty" (used about illegal **immigration**) and "regime" (Trump used the word to describe the Obama administration). People wanted to know the definition of "rigged," "sleazy," "a lepo" (a mishearing of Aleppo) and "entitlements."

It's one more example of the way Americans are turning to the dictionary to help them decode the presidential campaign and the rhetoric of the day.

In 1996, Merriam-Webster took a gamble and put its dictionary online, available for all to use without a fee. For the first time in 175 years, we had real-time information about how people were using their dictionaries: what words they looked up and when.

It was fascinating. Everything we assumed about how people use the dictionary was wrong. People didn't look up extremely difficult words, the sorts of terms that you think dictionaries are for — National Spelling Bee words. People looked up words that they were familiar with, whose meanings they had some vague knowledge about. What they were looking for, it seemed, was nuance and explication. What exactly does "pragmatic" mean; what parts of your personality are covered by "disposition"?

Many look-ups are driven by the news cycle. When there's an earthquake, "temblor" and "epicenter" spike; during a hurricane, "inclement" jumps. Other times, things surprise us. When quarterback Peyton Manning announced his retirement, people did not look up "quarterback" or "retirement": they looked up "revere," from Manning's statement that he reveres football.

This pattern became even more defined during the election. We don't, for instance, look up key policy words: no "economics" or "security." Instead, we seek out words that catch us by the ears. One of the biggest searches we've seen this election cycle is "bigly," an unusual, old-fashioned word supposedly used quite a bit by Republican nominee Donald Trump (as in "We're going to cut taxes bigly"). In many cases Trump isn't actually saying "bigly," but no matter. That's what people hear, so that's what they look up. Thanks to our real-time tracking tools, lexicographers can watch a word's lookup rank jump in real time, tracking parallel to the news.

Before social media, that's where the line of inquiry typically ended: Look up a word and get its definition as dictionary nerds watch behind the scenes. It was fascinating information, and it sparked plenty of conversations in our office. But we were the only ones who noticed. What if, we thought, we started sharing it?

We gave it a whirl. Merriam-Webster joined Twitter in 2009, and began tweeting lookups not long after. To our surprise, people talked back — and haven't stopped.

Yes, "bigly" is in the dictionary. #GOPDebate pic.twitter.com/OCf3CRs7Bp

@MerriamWebster No way. Did y'all just add that? — J Paul (@JudePaul\_) February 26, 2016

@vplus@rebeccaballhaus "Big league," also in the dictionary. https://t.co/TwopcL52is[https://t.co/TwopcL52is]

Lexicographers are notoriously introverted. But as we've gotten more into social media, we've seen in our daily conversations a mostly hidden truth: Language is personal. We play with it, argue over it, feel deeply about it. Turn to someone nearby and say "moist." Of course, it's hard to say anything about this election without getting accused of being political. But we only note that a word spike exists; we don't offer a lot of color commentary. Still, sometimes people complain that we are in the tank for Clinton or Trump. Others accuse of distracting from the issue at hand.

The truth, though, is that we're in the tank only for the English language. It doesn't matter whether a dictionary user is politically left or right, whether they live in Manhattan, N.Y., or Manhattan, Kan. When they look up "temperament" or "bigot" to verify that a candidate's use jibes with their understanding of the word, or when they look up "dystopian" or "deplorable" because they feel hopeless about whichever political prospect lies ahead, they aren't alone. The lookups provide an unfiltered and unprecedented look at the collective mind of the electorate, and in sharing them, we all learn something — even the dictionary:

Spiking now @MerriamWebster: "acid-washed" (https://t.co/BfQAgcfX8i[https://t.co/BfQAgcfX8i]). We…don't know what he means by acid-washing emails? — Kory Stamper (@KoryStamper) October 10, 2016

— Leonard Davidman PhD (@DrLennyDavidman) October 10, 2016

Most people assume that the dictionary is a static, fixed thing — the place where English is codified, formalized, memorialized. But in reality, the dictionary is an ever-changing cross-section of a living language. It follows its speakers like a dog tailing a messy eater, gobbling up everything it can.

Social media has given us retiring word nerds a place to geek out, to share knowledge, to have a meaningful connection with other people who love this confusing and brilliant language just as much as we do. During the first presidential debate, Hillary Clinton said "words matter." It's only natural that we'd agree. But we're finding more and more that it's the people behind the words that matter the most.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I honestly don't believe the debates are over. You will have to demonstrate to me slowly and gently over a period of months that there aren't any more debates, because I am too afraid to believe that they have really stopped.

However, here is what I hope is my final recap for this election season.

CHRIS WALLACE: Hello. I have come to your world from a different reality, Fox News, a fact that will become apparent as this debate goes on. This is the final presidential debate of the season, or, depending on whom you vote for, the final presidential debate of all time. If you play your cards right, all future elections can be settled by the spear! Now, let's bring out the candidates.

HILLARY CLINTON: Hello. I am dressed as Saruman the White. My best moments this evening will occur when I am forced to defend the basic principles of democracy, a terrifyingly low bar that this election season has set. Thank you for making it so easy, but also, eeegh.

DONALD TRUMP: \*low guttural hiss\* Tonight I have worn my RED tie.

WALLACE: Who would you put on the Supreme Court? Why?

CLINTON: I would definitely put human people on the Supreme Court, judges who were people and supported people, not corporations. I think people are people and corporations are faceless entities you sometimes give speeches to. All I want are judges who will not drag us screaming backward into the past.

TRUMP: I disagree. The subtext of my whole campaign is that the past was great! Especially for my core voters. The rest of you people, not so much. I know that the Supreme Court needs changing because one time, Ruth Bader Ginsburg was mean to me. If Hillary Clinton is elected, it is important that we keep the Second Amendment intact. This is not the most threatening thing I will say all evening.

WALLACE: Okay, let's talk about the Second Amendment. Hillary?

CLINTON: Thank you. Listen, I love the Second Amendment. I lived in Arkansas for 18 (twitch) WONDERFUL years. I oppose the way the Heller decision was applied, because I believe in toddlers. Hooray, toddlers.

TRUMP: The only thing that can stop a bad toddler with a gun is a good toddler with a gun. And Hillary was so upset about Heller! Look at her! What was Heller?

WALLACE: And now let's talk about abortion. Donald, will your judges overturn Roe v. Wade?

TRUMP: Maybe? Yes. Probably.

CLINTON: (cracks knuckles) First off, no. Second off, I support Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood. It is nice that this is finally coming up at a debate with a woman in it. Do you think that women do this for fun? This is not fun. This is a decision you get to make about your own life and your own body, with your family, taking your faith into account, and I can't imagine why you would want the government making it for you.

WALLACE: Ah, but didn't you support partial-birth abortions?

TRUMP: I read somewhere that a baby can -- you can just RIP a baby out of a lady's tummy at nine months! In the ninth month. On the final day.

CLINTON: I think you're describing a C-section.

TRUMP: And if that baby from his mother's womb untimely ripped gets Birnam Wood to come to Dunsinane with him, you don't get to be king of Scotland any more.

CLINTON: I honestly did not expect you had read "Macbeth" but, okay.

TRUMP: That is a recent medical text, I think.

CLINTON: It's a fictional play about a Scottish king.

TRUMP: I think it is just deplorable how women, they get these big bats, huge, and they just KNOCK THE STORKS OUT OF THE SKY before the baby even has a chance.

CLINTON: You don't know where babies come from, do you?

WALLACE: Let's move on. **Immigration**. Why are you right about it, and why is your opponent wrong?

TRUMP: Listen, every week ICE endorses me. We need a wall, Chris. That's the bottom line. The wall itself would be a kind of line on the bottom of our country. It would keep the White Walkers out and also stop the pollution of our blood. New Hampshire especially needs this wall.

CLINTON: You do realize New Hampshire is not anywhere near our southern border, correct? Don't answer that. It will only depress me further. I recently met an inspiring young human anecdote who reinforced my position on borders. I want them to be strong, and I want the chain bookstore of the same name to reopen. Can I say also that when you went to Mexico, you conveniently forgot to mention this at all? You choked, Donald.

TRUMP: (sniffling) You are mean. I would have mentioned the wall, but I forgot what the word was. I told Prime Minister Peña Nieto many times to build a "biblioteca" but it turns out that is something different. We agreed that NAFTA was bad, though. I think. I could not tell because he was not speaking English. Look, I have been to South of the Border many times--

CLINTON: That is not in Mexico.

TRUMP: President Obama deported millions of people.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, didn't you say you wanted a hemispheric open market during one of your SECRET SPEECHES to OMINOUS CORPORATIONS?

CLINTON: WIKILEAKS IS THE WORK OF RUSSIAN SPIES AND THAT'S ALL I'M GOING TO SAY ON THE SUBJECT. Wait, no, I will say one more thing: the rest of that sentence made it very clear that I was talking about energy markets.

TRUMP: I just need to interrupt because it sounded like Secretary Clinton was about to say something mean about Vladimir Putin. Vladimir Putin is a great man, so smart, strong, broad shoulders, lovely smile, looks great astride a steed. He respects me. I think. I would like to think that. It would make me proud to have the respect of a man like that. Do you want to read a story that I wrote about him? It is called VLADIMIR AND ME and in it we go to South of the Border together and hold hands and look at my wall and he compliments me like a true friend and marvels at the size of my hands.

WALLACE: Maybe after the debate.

CLINTON: Hard pass.

TRUMP: My point is, Vladimir does not respect this woman.

CLINTON: That's because you are his puppet.

TRUMP: "No puppet. No puppet. You're the puppet."

CLINTON: Wow.

TRUMP: But I would be HONORED to be the puppet on his large, masculine hand.

CLINTON: This is an even vaster conspiracy, but it is not the work of the right wing. It is the work of the Russians. Yes, I know that coming from me this is hard to take, but, like, don't take it from me -- take it from our intelligence agencies!

WALLACE: No, but, seriously, do you condemn foreign intervention in this election?

TRUMP: Yes.

CLINTON: Yup definitely me me me I definitely condemn it!

TRUMP: (sighs) I'm not actually friends with Vladimir. Not when I'm awake. He's not my best friend. He's not my only friend. I have friends, though.

WALLACE: Are you okay?

TRUMP: He has missiles. He's so smart.

WALLACE: How did we get here? Weren't we talking about **immigration**, like, a second ago?

CLINTON: Can I just say that it's terrifying that Donald Trump keeps saying he thinks nuclear weapons should be on the table?

TRUMP: Liar.

CLINTON: It's a direct quote from you.

TRUMP: That is how I know it's a lie.

CLINTON: (to camera) Allies, please, relax, in a few weeks everything will be in my capable hands. Do not pay attention to what this man is saying. Look at my exciting and fashion-forward suit! Please, pay no attention to the man in front of the curtain. He speaks for nobody. He is sad and alone.

WALLACE: Why is your plan for the economy better than your opponent's plan?

CLINTON: My plan will grow us 10 million jobs from the middle out!

TRUMP: Instead of challenging this EXTREMELY optimistic appraisal, I would like to go back to picking on our allies.

CLINTON: (to camera) Look away.

TRUMP: I think we should be meaner than our allies. Why would they pay their fair share when we are being nice to them? We should say mean things, like, Saudi Arabia, what are you wearing? and Japan, you have \*interesting\* eyes. Things of that nature.

CLINTON: (bangs head against lectern) Chris, may I speak?

WALLACE: Would it help if I attacked you instead of him?

CLINTON: N-no -- why? Why would you do that?

WALLACE: You want to do more of what President Obama did, and we know that what he did was bad.

TRUMP: FACTCHECK RATING MOSTLY TRUE!

CLINTON: Donald, factchecking is my thing. You don't get to factcheck.

TRUMP: NAFTA and the Trans-Pacific Partnership are both bad.

CLINTON: For crying out loud, I'm against the TPP now and I will be against it when I'm president. Yes, I said it. Not if. When.

TRUMP: I have a question.

CLINTON: (turns to face him) Yes, Donald?

TRUMP: You have so many good ideas, it sounds like. Why didn't you do any of them in your 30 years of experience? I was always doing bad things, using Chinese steel, like you said, but you never even stopped me. Why didn't you stop me? Someone should have, I feel. I look at myself and I think, "Why didn't anyone stop this sooner?"

CLINTON: So do I, Donald. But, speaking of my 30 years of experience, yes, I have 30 years of experience. My worst quality is that I work too hard, I think. I believe in women's rights and also GOOGLE ALICIA MACHADO.

TRUMP: You built ISIS.

CLINTON: And it's in 32 countries! And you say I never accomplish anything! (to camera) But seriously ISIS is not my fault.

WALLACE: Before we talk about "foreign hot spots," let's have the MOST AWKWARD TRANSITION OF THIS DEBATE to, uh, domestic hot spots. Donald. Tell us why your accusers would suddenly all come forward and make up these awful stories?

TRUMP: First off, thank you for framing the question like that. I don't know why, but I agree with your premise! Also, Hillary is responsible for all the violence at my rallies. It's on a tape, somewhere, along with her founding ISIS.

CLINTON: Do I have to remind America of how your first denial was that the women were not attractive enough for you to assault them? Do I?

TRUMP: I didn't say that.

CLINTON: I HAVE THE RECEIPTS ON THIS ONE, DONALD. I may get kind of sketchy when asked about my foundation, but, by god, I can quote you until the cows come home.

TRUMP: If "cows" was a reference to my accusers, I agree.

CLINTON: It was not.

TRUMP: Literally no one respects women more than I do.

CLINTON: (laughs)

(Audience laughs louder. The laughter builds and builds into 15 minutes of hysteria)

TRUMP: You know what isn't fiction? Emails.

CLINTON: Instead of accepting the premise that we should talk about my emails, what if I ran through all the things you've done wrong that I have highlighted in commercials? Cool by you?

WALLACE: No. Tell us, was your foundation engaged in pay-to-play?

CLINTON: You know what, the Clinton Foundation is great, and it does just, you know, so much good, for children, like the toddlers whom I wanted to save from guns earlier.

WALLACE: That isn't--

CLINTON: We gave lunches to children!

WALLACE: That's not--

CLINTON: Delicious, healthy lunches! Lunches that my dear friend, Michelle Obama, would have looked at and APPROVED!

WALLACE: You're still not--

CLINTON: When they go low, we go high, as Michelle so rightly said!

WALLACE: Donald--

TRUMP: Well, exactly, Chris. I was in Little Haiti the other day, and the people there, they said the Clinton Foundation was bad.

WALLACE: (looks at Trump) That's it? I set you up like that, and that's it?

TRUMP: Yup.

WALLACE: Then I guess I should also ask about your foundation.

TRUMP: Listen, the only thing the Trump foundation does is put up flags. That is 100 percent of what we do. We would be called PFLAG but it was taken.

CLINTON: (mutters) And six foot paintings of you.

TRUMP: Look, if you don't think it should be legal, you should have outlawed it when you were in the Senate.

CLINTON: Yes. Me. One senator. Personally. I should have.

WALLACE: Donald, I hate that I have to ask this, because it is 2016 and we are in America, but will you abide by the results of this election?

TRUMP: I will get back to you on that. The media is rigging it. They keep taking words out of my mouth and printing them where people can read them and form opinions about them.

WALLACE: So… no? Keep in mind that if you say "no" you are invalidating, like, every premise of our life in a democratic society.

TRUMP: (shrug)

WALLACE: Like, there's this thing we have, called a peaceful transition of power…

TRUMP: Never heard of it.

CLINTON: Can I say something? This is literally horrifying. I would be shaking and quivering with fear and hiding behind the lectern if I had not purged myself of all lesser emotions 30 years ago. All I feel now is vengeance and righteous anger. Now I am going to tell you some specifics about military operations that are ongoing, as though I am not shaken to my core by what was just said, but -- somewhere deep inside me, a little girl with glasses is weeping unconsolably. But, uh, Mosul, huh?

TRUMP: Mosul is so sad. I really hope that Mosul is a real place, because I am just going to repeat it over and over. I hope this isn't one of those Agrabah things where you trick me into saying a fake name. Listen. I know how to fix all the military things. We just stop telling people what we are going to do. We surprise them. It works for my birthday parties; it can work in Iraq.

CLINTON: asdfkj

TRUMP: How did you even make that sound without a keyboard?

CLINTON: You bring these things out in me. Please, just vote for me, everyone. This man is spouting horrible nonsense conspiracy theories.

TRUMP: Bernie Sanders is right that you have bad instincts, and John Podesta is right that you don't know how to make risotto.

WALLACE: Anyone want to talk about Aleppo?

CLINTON: I would be happy to talk about Aleppo, but honestly, it would pain me for people around the globe to have to hear him talk about Aleppo.

WALLACE: Point taken.

TRUMP: We should be considered with every leppo.

WALLACE: Any concluding remarks?

CLINTON: My father was a small-business man with a squeegee and a dream. From him, I took a natural, humanlike cadence and the ambition to make a difference in the world. Please, America, I beg you: You can end this. Vote for me, and you will never have to hear Donald Trump's opinions on a national stage again.

TRUMP: "Such a nasty woman."

CLINTON: I rest my case.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There has been a great deal of concern about the U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program. Are we letting terrorists into the United States? How much do we know about the Syrians being admitted? Is our vetting process strict enough?

For more than two decades, I've devoted my professional life to refugee resettlement, working and collaborating with nongovernmental organizations, the U.N. Refugee Agency and the U.S. government. Now I lead one of the few global agencies involved both with refugee resettlement for displaced communities and in the policy sphere.

Here are the facts:

First, we handpick refugees to be considered for resettlement. Our staff gets to know these refugees over a long period before we make a decision that an individual or family should be considered for resettlement. We regularly visit them where they live and often show up unannounced. We get to know them much better than I know most of my neighbors.

Second, the most at risk are identified. The U.N. Refugee Agency, which works hand in hand with governments, has resettlement criteria to help distinguish those whose needs are most urgent. The categories include people in danger, those with life-threatening medical conditions, survivors of torture, vulnerable women and unaccompanied children.

Third, refugees go through multiple interviews and security checks.

Once we are certain that individuals should have a chance to resettle, we conduct in-depth interviews, gathering their history of persecution, the reasons they can't return home, the threats they face and extensive biographical information.

Additional staff members with extensive backgrounds in law and **immigration** consult on each case during this initial identification and referral step. Once a case dossier is complete, it gets submitted to a U.S. embassy. At this point, the U.S. resettlement process begins.

A U.S. government-contracted agency then conducts multiple additional interviews of individuals regarding their history of flight and persecution and to gather further biographical details. People trained to detect fraud and inconsistencies do these interviews to consider the veracity of the story from different perspectives. A refugee's appearance is cross-referenced with the U.N. Refugee Agency photo taken at the time the person registered as a refugee in the country of asylum (often many years before the resettlement process starts).

Then the U.S. government sends an adjudication officer from the Department of Homeland Security who is specially trained on conditions in the refugee's home country and in fraud detection. Officers sometimes interview family members separately as one of many tactics for discerning the truth. They bring a hard-line security orientation to the process. Our authorities cross-check what refugees say against extensive data available.

If conditionally approved for resettlement, a refu­gee then goes through background checks with the FBI and all 15 other national security agencies, along with the National Counterterrorism Center and the Defense Department. Refugees also undergo a health screening, and those with communicable diseases are generally held back until they are fully treated. The entire resettlement process takes an average of two to three years, and security checks are rerun continuously throughout this time. The process stops if new information comes to light. No other category of **immigrants** goes through such an intensive review.

You might well call this the strictest vetting. Our government has not been lax about this. The program is not run by incompetent government people, as some appear to believe.

The United States has brought in 3.3 million refugees since 1975, including some 800,000 since the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001. They are not terrorists, and you have a better chance of getting killed by lightning than being harmed by a refu­gee carrying out such an attack. Rather, refugees have started businesses and helped to revive depressed downtown areas in places such as Lewiston, Maine; St. Louis; and Utica, N.Y.

As U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has said, "Perhaps no issue on the global agenda is more susceptible to grandstanding demagogues than that of refugees . . . 'Us' versus 'them' is a timeless, irresponsible unifier used to obscure our common humanity by those with dangerously self-serving interests."

A global refugee crisis is unfolding on a scale that we have never seen before. Some 65 million people have been displaced by violence. We can resettle more than the 12,500 Syrians who have arrived this year. It is not our capacity or our security systems that are being tested; it is us and our deepest beliefs. Do we stand for justice, freedom, inclusiveness and other values that underpin the United States' leadership in the world? Are we or are we not a decent people?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS — At one of the last debates during the Republican primary, rival Ted Cruz turned to Donald Trump and asserted he was too cozy with Hillary Clinton to take her on — much less take her down — in a presidential debate. Trump shot back that he was "the last person that Hillary Clinton wants to face."

By May, Trump was getting downright cocky. "I sort of wish we had more than three," he boasted on CNBC.

But at the end of the third debate Wednesday night, it was clear that Cruz had been correct, if for different reasons: Trump proved to be no match for Clinton.

For the first hour or so of a competition here that he desperately needed to turn into a referendum on Clinton, Trump advanced a methodical contrast of their views on guns and the Supreme Court and offered an aggressive, if shaky, critique of Clinton's record on **immigration**, abortion and other matters. But he appeared rattled at times by her jabs and then fell back into a habit that has tripped him up time and again: making the debate about himself and his controversial views.

"I will look at it at the time," he said in a response to a question from moderator Chris Wallace about whether he would accept the results of the election, echoing his unsubstantiated claims on the campaign trail of a "rigged" contest. Later, he added: "I will tell you at the time. I will keep you in suspense."

The real estate businessman and reality TV star long billed himself as the ideal messenger to prosecute a devastating case against Clinton before tens of millions of onlookers — a political outsider with a knack for piercing insults who could sow serious doubts about her character.

Instead, during nearly 300 minutes spent debating Clinton over the past month, Trump repeatedly missed chances to communicate a clear case against her. Instead, he mostly shone a spotlight on his own weaknesses and stumbled through unforced errors — feeding concerns about his treatment of women, his readiness for the presidency and his temperament for the job.

For Trump, the debates have been at the center of the most destructive two-month period of his campaign, when he has faced multiple accusations of unwanted sexual advances against women and blowback over his vulgar comments on a hot microphone about forcing himself on women sexually. He now trails Clinton by a wide margin in nearly all national and battleground state polls, and party leaders fear it is too late for him to recover.

For the GOP, the debates have amounted to an enormous missed opportunity to mount its case against Clinton, which has been years in the making and which many Republicans were once confident would be their key to victory. The Republican nominee struggled throughout the debates to keep a consistent focus on Clinton rather than himself, just as he has in the rest of the campaign.

At times Wednesday night, Trump showed flashes of the debater many Republican leaders have been eager to see emerge. He landed a blow against her shift on trade and raised a recently revealed video showing a Democratic operative bragging about disrupting Trump rallies.

But for the most part, Trump was repeatedly on the defensive on issues that have dogged him throughout the year.

"I don't buy boats, I don't buy planes," he said in response to a question about his charitable foundation, which has come under heavy scrutiny over its questionable practices.

Clinton seemed keen on getting under Trump's skin by needling him with certain words. She said he "choked" during his meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto by not pressing his proposal to build a wall on the southern border of the United States and make Mexico pay for it.

She later said Vladi­mir Putin preferred a "puppet as president of the United States," referring to Trump's repeated praise of the Russian president as a strong leader. "You're the puppet," he shot back.

"I never met Putin. This is not my best friend," Trump said a few minutes later, while casting doubt on the finding by U.S. intelligence agencies that Russia is behind a series of hacks aimed at disrupting the U.S. elections.

When Trump emphasized his hard-line views on **immigration** and border security, he opened himself up to Democratic attacks when he remarked, "We have some bad hombres here, and we're going to get them out."

"'Hombres'? The only bad hombre here is @realDonaldTrump and his racist, xenophobic rhetoric," Catherine Cortez Masto, the Democratic nominee for a closely contested U.S. Senate seat in Nevada, wrote on Twitter.

In the hours leading up to Wednesday's debate, Trump's unpredictability flared up. He skipped his morning walk-through, according to a campaign aide. Details surfaced about his motley guest list, which ranged from President Obama's estranged half-brother Malik Obama, to Leslie Millwee, who emerged in recent days to accuse former president Bill Clinton of sexually assaulting her more than three decades ago.

Trump's debate problems started at Hofstra University in New York on Sept. 26. For weeks leading up to the eagerly anticipated matchup, polls showed he was chipping away at the lead that Clinton had gained after the Republican and Democratic conventions. But he failed to capi­tal­ize, missing chance after chance to scold Clinton for labeling half of his supporters a "basket of deplorables" or to raise her use of a private email server as secretary of state.

He lingered in talk about the "birther" controversy that many Republicans wish he would have dropped long ago. Trump reignited feuds with comedian and actress Rosie O'Donnell and with Alicia Machado, the 1996 Miss Universe winner from Venezuela who has said Trump called her "Miss Piggy" and "Miss Housekeeping."

Two days before the second debate, The Washington Post reported on a 2005 tape on which Trump can be heard bragging about forcing himself physically on women sexually. The comments were a focal point at the debate in St. Louis, where he apologized for the remarks but also dismissed them as "locker room talk."

While Trump won some credit for putting Clinton on defense over her emails and the Clinton Foundation, the second faceoff was still in large part about him and he did little woo skeptical moderate voters.

In the week and a half since then, a series of women have come forward accusing Trump of making sexual advances without their consent. He once again denied all the allegations Wednesday night and tried to move past them, declaring that no one has more respect for women than he does.

But toward the end of the debate, Trump, who desperately needs to improve his image among female voters, attacked Clinton in a way that could further complicate the task.

"Such a nasty woman," he said with disdain in his voice.

sean.sullivan@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The final presidential debate once again demonstrated Donald Trump's thin grasp of the facts and his willingness too make poorly sourced or inaccurate claims. Hillary Clinton, for the most part, was more factually accurate.

Here's a round-up of 24 of the more notable claims. As is our practice, we do not award Pinocchios when we do a roundup of claims in debates.

"We have 33,000 people every year who die from guns."

Clinton is essentially right: There were nearly 34,000 firearm deaths in the United States in 2013, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. But it is worth noting that more than 60 percent were from suicides, not gun violence.

"What I said was that I disagree with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that [Heller] case."

This is consistent with what Clinton has said about the Heller decision.

The Supreme Court's 5-4 ruling in 2008 in Heller v. District of Columbia held that the Second Amendment of the Constitution affords private citizens the right to keep firearms in their homes and that such possession need not be connected to military service.

In a private fundraiser in 2015, Clinton was recorded as saying that the Supreme Court was "wrong on the Second Amendment" and called for reinstating the assault-weapons ban, which expired in 2004. "The idea that you could have an open carry permit with an AK-47 over your shoulder walking up and down the aisles of a supermarket is just despicable," she said.

On her campaign website, Clinton calls for more comprehensive background checks, repealing the gun industry's immunity from lawsuits for negligence, revoking the licenses of gun dealers who knowingly supply weapons to straw purchasers and gun traffickers, and toughening laws and regulations to prevent domestic abusers and the mentally ill from obtaining guns. She also calls for a renewal of the assault-weapons ban.

None of these proposals would restrict a person from buying a gun to keep at home for self-defense (unless that person was convicted of domestic abuse).

"I disagreed with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that case, because what the District of Columbia was trying to do was to protect toddlers from guns and so they wanted people with guns to safely store them. And the court didn't accept that reasonable regulation, but they've accepted many others. So I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment." --Clinton

Clinton was referring to the Supreme Court's decision in Heller v. District of Columbia. But the major issue in the case was not whether children would have access to guns; it was whether D.C.'s ban on private possession of handguns violated the Second Amendment.

D.C. had the strictest gun law in the country, prohibiting ownership of handguns and requiring shotguns and rifles to be unloaded and disassembled when they are stored. The court ruled in a 5-4 decision that D.C.'s ban violated the Second Amendment.

"We hold that the District's ban on handgun possession in the home violates the Second Amendment, as does its prohibition against rendering any lawful firearm in the home operable for the purpose of immediate self-defense," Justice Antonin Scalia wrote.

One of the arguments that the city government made was that handguns cause accidents that frequently involve children. The city also cited the use of handguns in domestic violence and argued that handguns are particularly vulnerable to theft, and therefore can end up with criminals.

"I feel that the justices that I am going to appoint -- and I've named 20 of them -- the justices that I'm going to appoint will be pro-life. They will have a conservative bent." --Trump

Trump is now strongly against women's right to abortion, but he once supported it.

In 1999, Trump publicly said he was a supporter of abortion rights as a matter of women's choice. In an interview on NBC's "Meet the Press," Trump was asked whether he would ban abortions, or at least "partial-birth" abortions. He said he would not, and that he is "pro-choice in every respect."

"I'm very pro-choice," Trump said in that 1999 interview. "I hate the concept of abortion. … But still, I just believe in choice."

But now on the presidential campaign trail in 2016, Trump is a vocal opponent of women's rights to abortion — even to the point of saying that women who receive illegal abortions should be subject to "some sort of punishment." Trump explains that he hadn't given it much thought from a policy perspective when he was a businessman. And now that he is a presidential candidate, he says he is decidedly antiabortion.

Trump likes to say his evolution on abortion views is like Ronald Reagan's, but we have awarded Two Pinocchios to that claim for lack of context.

"In the ninth month you can take the baby and rip the baby right out of the womb, just prior to the birth of the baby."

Trump asserted that abortions can take place just one day before birth. This doesn't really happen.

Most abortions take place early in the pregnancy. One-third take place at six weeks or pregnancy or earlier; 89 percent occur in the first 12 weeks, according to the Guttmacher Institute, which supports abortion rights. Only 1.2 percent of abortions—about 12,000 a year— take place after 21 weeks. (The Supreme Court has held that states may not prohibit abortions "necessary to preserve the life or health" of the mother.)

On top of that, Guttmacher says that 43 states already prohibit some abortions after a certain point in pregnancy, such as fetal viability, in the third trimester or after a certain number of weeks. So this is already a rare procedure that is prohibited in much of the country. In fact, there are only four doctors left in the United States who are even willing to perform third trimester abortions.

"That [Clinton's plan] is a plan that has been analyzed by independent experts which said that it could produce 10 million new jobs. By contrast, Donald's plan has been analyzed to conclude it might lose 3.5 million jobs."

Mark Zandi, a well-respected economist at Moodys Analytics, did issue a report saying that if Trump's economic plans were fully implemented, 3.5 million jobs would disappear, incomes would stagnate, debt would explode, and stock prices would plummet. (This compares to an anticipated increase of 6 million jobs under current Obama administration policies.) Zandi, in another report, also said that if Clinton were able to fully implement her economic plans, the economy would add an additional 3.2 million jobs during the first four years of her presidency. Combined with anticipated job creation under current law, that adds up to 10.4 million jobs.

But both reports were highly dubious that either candidate would be able to get their plans through Congress, including Trump even if Congress was controlled by Republicans--because so many of his positions are such a departure from Republican principles. Even so the report said the U.S. economy would likely suffer under a Trump presidency. (The report was issued in June and Moodys has not issued an updated report that would reflect additional policies announced by trump, including a revised tax plan, but the report said Trump's trade policies would be especially damaging.)

"He shipped jobs to 12 countries, including Mexico."

This is correct. Trump has a long history of outsourcing a variety of his products and has acknowledged doing so. We know of at least 12 countries where Trump products were manufactured: China, the Netherlands, Mexico, India, Turkey, Slovenia, Honduras, Germany, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Vietnam and South Korea.

Further, Trump products transited other countries through the packaging and shipping process — meaning workers in more than 12 countries contributed to getting many of Trump's products made, packaged and delivered to the United States.

Check out our complete inventory of Trump's products made overseas.

"Just like when you ran the State Department, $6 billion was missing. How do you miss $6 billion? You ran the State Department, $6 billion was either stolen. They don't know. It's gone, $6 billion."

We had previously given Trump Four Pinocchios for this false claim, apparently aimed at rebutting rebut news stories about the nearly $1 billion loss that he claimed in a 2005 tax return that was made public by the New York Times.

Trump misunderstands a $6 billion figure that appeared in a 2014 management alert from the State Department Inspector General. The alert summarized a variety of recent audits that indicated paperwork deficiencies in closing out contracts that were issued in Iraq, Afghanistan and Africa. But no money is missing or lost, a point that the IG emphasized in a letter to The Washington Post in 2014. Instead, the alert highlighted missing paperwork, not dollars.

Trump is also wrong to blame Clinton. We examined the audit reports referenced in alert and concluded that easily two-thirds, or perhaps more, concerned contracts that predated Clinton's tenure at State.

"I started with a $1 million loan … but I built a phenomenal company."

Trump consistently lowballs the help he got from his father, suggesting he got his start when he obtained a $1 million loan. "My father gave me a small loan of a million dollars," he told NBC in October, which he claimed he had to pay back with interest. "A million dollars isn't very much compared to what I built."

But that ignores the fact that he joined his father's thriving real estate business after college and that he relied on his father's connections as he made his way in the real estate world.

For instance, Fred Trump — along with the Hyatt hotel chain — jointly guaranteed the $70 million construction loan from Manufacturers Hanover bank, "each assuming a 50 percent share of the obligation and each committing itself to complete the project should Donald be unable to finish it," according to veteran Trump chronicler Wayne Barrett in his 1992 book, "Trump: The Deals and the Downfall."

Trump also benefited from three trusts that had been set up for family members. In 1976, Fred Trump set up eight $1 million trusts, one each for his five children and three grandchildren, according to a casino document. (That today would be worth about $4 million in inflation-adjusted dollars.) The casino document lists several other loans from Trump's father to his son, including a $7.5 million loan with at least a 12-percent interest rate that was still outstanding in 1981.

The Wall Street Journal on Sept. 23 reported that a 1985 casino-license document showed that Donald Trump owed his father and father's businesses about $14 million.

In a 2007 deposition, Trump admitted he had borrowed "a small amount" from his father's estate: 'I think it was like in the $9 million range." And as Trump's casinos ran into trouble, Trump's father also purchased $3.5 million gaming chips, but did not use them, so the casino would have enough cash to make payments on its mortgage — a transaction which casino authorities later said was an illegal loan.

"She destroyed 33,000 emails criminally, criminally, after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress."

Trump is technically correct on the timeline, but Clinton's staff had requested the emails to be deleted months before the subpoena, according to the FBI's August 2016 report. Moreover, there's no evidence Clinton deleted the emails in anticipation of the subpoena, and FBI director James B. Comey has said his agency's investigation found no evidence that any work-related emails were "intentionally deleted in an effort to conceal them."

PolitiFact compiled a helpful timeline of events relating to Clinton's release of her emails, based on the FBI report. From their timeline:

On July 23, 2014, the State Department agreed to produce records pertaining to the 2012 attacks in Libya, for the House Select Committee on Benghazi's investigation. In December 2014, Clinton aide Cheryl Mills told an employee of the company that managed her server to delete emails on her server unrelated to government work that were older than 60 days.

On March 4, 2015, the Benghazi Committee issued a subpoena requiring Clinton to turn over her emails relating to Libya. Three weeks later, between March 25 and March 31, the employee had an "oh s—" moment and realized he did not delete the emails that Mills requested in December 2014, he told the FBI. The employee then deleted the emails and used a program called BleachBit to delete the files.

For our list of 15 fact checks on the Clinton email controversy, go here.

"If you look at your voter rolls, you will see millions of people that are registered to vote … that shouldn't be registered to vote."

Trump cited a 2012 Pew Center on the States study as the source of this claim during the debate, while indicating that there may be potential voter fraud during this election. But this study looked at ways to make the election system more accurate, cost-effective and efficient. It did not say that these problems indicated signs of isolated or widespread voter fraud.

About 24 million (1 in every 8) voter registrations were significantly inaccurate or no longer valid because people moved, had died or were inactive voters. More than 1.8 million records for people who are deceased, but whose registrations were still on voter rolls. About 2.75 million people were registered to vote in more than one state. This could happen if voters move to a new state and register to vote without notifying their former state. Outdated technology, shrinking government budgets and paper-based registration systems contributed to inaccuracies and inefficiencies.

CLINTON: Well, you know, once again, Donald is implying that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq. I said it was a mistake. I've said that years ago. He has consistently denied what is…

Clinton suggested people Google "Donald Trump Iraq" to find evidence that he supported the war in Iraq. You would probably find our many fact checks. We have awarded this claim Four Pinocchios, compiled a timeline of all of Trump's comments prior to the invasion in March 2003, and even a video documenting how this is a bogus claim.

Trump expressed lukewarm support the first time he was asked about it on Sept. 11, 2002, and was not clearly against it until he was quoted in the August 2004 Esquire cover story titled "Donald Trump: How I'd Run the Country (Better)."

But by the middle of 2004, many Americans had turned against the war, making Trump's position not particularly unique. In light of Trump's repeated false claim that the Esquire article shows he was against the war in Iraq, Esquire has added an editor's note to its August 2004 story, saying, "The Iraq War began in March 2003, more than a year before this story ran, thus nullifying Trump's timeline."

On Obamacare, "the premiums are going up 60, 70, 80 percent."

Premiums are expected to increase overall in 2017, but Trump is cherry-picking from the highest proposed increases in the insurance marketplace.

State-by-state weighted average increases range from just 1.3 percent in Rhode Island to as high as 71 percent in Oklahoma. But the most common plans in the marketplace will see an average increase of 9 percent, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation's July analysis. These plans have been used as the benchmark to calculate government subsidies.

The vast majority of marketplace enrollees (about eight in 10) receive government premium subsidies. They are protected from a premium increase (and may even see a decrease) if they stay with a low-cost plan. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, "anecdotal examples of premium hikes or averages across insurers can provide a skewed picture of the increases marketplace enrollees will actually face."

"We take care of illegal **immigrants** -- people who come into our country illegally -- better than we take care of our vets." --Trump

This is an absurd comparison that has received Four Pinocchios.

Broadly speaking, people who are in the United States illegally aren't granted the same rights as people here legally — both civilians and veterans. Unauthorized people, who are not granted any deferred-action status that deems them lawfully present in the country, are not eligible to receive Social Security benefits or any other federal means-tested benefits.

And even though the unauthorized population can't collect the benefits, they paid about $12 billion into the cash flow of the Social Security program in 2010, according to the Social Security actuary. (Some undocumented **immigrants** could theoretically collect benefits — illegally — if they've overstayed their visas or falsely obtained a Social Security number.) That means the U.S. government gets far more than it pays out when it comes to unauthorized **immigrants**.

To support this claim, Trump's campaign has cited cited three instances of veterans being treated "worse" than illegal **immigrants**: consequences for criminal convictions, cost to the government, and wait times. We explored each point in depth and found each lacking in evidence.

"I do not add a penny to the national debt." --Clinton

This lacks some context. Clinton is saying she would not add to the debt already projected to grow.

The national debt is projected to grow by $9 trillion over the next decade. But Clinton's plan would not add significantly more to the debt, according to the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, which has analyzed the economic impact of every proposal by both nominees. She would add $200 billion over a decade, which is a relatively small amount compared to the debt. Trump's plans would add $5.3 trillion to the debt.

That $200 billion could be canceled out by Clinton's business tax reform plan, which is estimated to generate $275 billion in revenues. At that point, indeed, her plan would "not add a penny to the national debt" beyond its currently projected growth.

If the full $275 billion is generated, it would even result in a modest deficit reduction. But since Clinton has not released a detailed plan for the business tax reform plan, the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget has not been able to score it yet.

"We are encouraged that Clinton continues to largely pay for her new spending and that Trump has made substantial improvements to his plan, including a less costly tax plan and new spending cuts," the group wrote in its analysis. "Unfortunately, neither candidate has presented a proposal to address our growing national debt and put it on a more sustainable path, nor have they offered a proposal for shoring up the Social Security, Medicare, or Highway trust funds. As it currently stands, Donald Trump's proposals would still substantially worsen the debt."

"The Border Patrol agents -- 16,500 -- plus ICE last week, endorsed me. First time they've ever endorsed a candidate." --Trump

How can a federal agency, the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, endorse a candidate? Trump is actually referring to the National **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement Council, which is the union representing ICE officers. The National Border Patrol Council, the organization representing 16,500 Border Patrol agents, also endorsed Trump. Both unions said this was the first time they endorsed a presidential candidate.

"I know [Warren] Buffett took hundreds of millions of dollars." --Trump

This answer was in reference to the a recent New York Times report that Trump had reported a $916 million loss in 1995, which would have been large enough to allow Trump to avoid paying any federal income taxes for up to 18 years. As he did in the second debate against Clinton, Trump named Buffet to say that Clinton's wealthy supporters had also avoided taxes.

But Buffet has rejected this claim. He said he never took advantage of the same tax rules that may have allowed Trump to use his loss of $916 million to avoid paying any federal income taxes.

"I have paid federal income tax every year since 1944, when I was 13. (Though, being a slow starter, I owed only $7 in tax that year.) I have copies of all 72 of my returns and none uses a carryforward," Buffet said in a statement.

For more, here's what we know about Trump and his taxes so far.

"We at the Clinton Foundation spend 90 percent -- 90 percent of all the money that is donated on behalf of programs of people around the world and in our own country."

Clinton is correct. The Clinton Foundation does not dole out grants, like a typical foundation, but instead directs the donations it raises directly for specified charitable activities. So simply only looking at the grants does not tell the whole story about the foundation's activities.

The American Institute of Philanthropy's "Charity Watch" gives the Clinton Foundation an "A" rating for its efficiency (the top rating is A+). It says the foundation spends 88 percent of its expenses on programs and 12 percent on overhead. It also says the Clinton Foundation spends just $2 to raise $100.

"What she doesn't say is that President Obama has deported millions and millions of people just the way it is." --Trump

Interestingly, this is a fact-checked talking point by **immigration** activists who had criticized Obama for deporting too many people.

But this is misleading, because it is based on statistics that include both removals and voluntary returns, as reported by the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement. A "return" means that the person can leave the country and re-enter later with a visa.

The Los Angeles Times, which dug into Obama's deportation record, found in 2014 that **immigration** data show "**immigrants** living illegally in most of the continental U.S. are less likely to be deported today than before Obama came to office."

"Hillary Clinton wanted the wall. Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts. Now, she never gets anything done, so naturally the wall wasn't built. But Hillary Clinton wanted the wall." --Trump

Not exactly. Clinton supported the Secure Fence Act of 2006, which authorized the construction of fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border. The fence is mostly vehicle barriers and single-layer pedestrian fence. Trump has called for a border wall of precast concrete, as tall as 30 to 60 feet.

In a January 2016 interview with Jorge Ramos, Clinton said the fence is different from Trump's wall. "So we do need to have secure borders and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barrier. … I voted for border security and some of it was a fence." PolitiFact found that Trump has said the fencing under the Secure Fence Act of 2006 "was such a little wall, it was such a nothing wall."

"I questioned it, and I questioned NATO. Why aren't the NATO questioned -- why aren't they paying? Because they weren't paying. Since I did this -- this was a year ago -- all of a sudden, they're paying. And I've been given a lot -- a lot of credit for it."

This is a ridiculous statement. Trump repeatedly made misleading claims about the burden-sharing in the NATO alliance. His comments made little impact on NATO, and he has received no credit for any changes in defense spending by NATO countries. All countries are supposed to spend two percent of the gross domestic product on defense spending, a goal few have met--which has long been an issue in the alliance.

"She's taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees, who probably in many cases -- not probably, who are definitely in many cases, ISIS-aligned, and we now have them in our country." --Trump

Trump has no evidence to make this claim. The United States accepted about 13,000 Syrian refugees in the 2016 fiscal year, and Clinton wants to increase that number. But refugees spend as long as two years being vetted by U.S. counter-terrorism experts. So not only would be difficult to infiltrate the system but it would be time-consuming, compared to simply getting a tourist visa to enter the country.

The State Department says that about 78 percent of those accepted have been women in children; 58 percent are children, split roughly between girls and boys.

"The NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made of any kind, signed by anybody. It's a disaster." --Trump

This is such an over-the-top statement. There are estimates from left-leaning groups that claim as many as one million jobs were lost by NAFTA. But these are not universally accepted estimates, with many economists say that the job losses in manufacturing cannot be easily blamed just on NAFTA.

Manufacturing was already under stress before the agreement was reached in 1993, while the U.S. economy has transitioned away from manufacturing toward services. Advocates of the agreement instead point to the export-related jobs that they say have been created through the trade with Mexico and Canada. The Congressional Research Service in 2015 concluded the "net overall effect of NAFTA on the U.S. economy appears to have been relatively modest."

No one really knows the job impact of various trade agreements, but both sides will argue vigorously over the figures. Then-President Bill Clinton famously declared that "I believe that NAFTA will create a million jobs in the first 5 years of its impact."

Two years later, after a financial meltdown in Mexico and collapse of the peso evaporated any job gains from NAFTA, the economist who generated million-job forecasts famously said he would stay away from job forecasting in the future.

"Those stories [of women saying Trump assaulted them] have been largely debunked. Those people -- I don't know those people. I have a feeling how they came. I believe it was her campaign that did it." --Trump

Trump has no evidence that the Clinton campaign was behind the stories; indeed, The Washington Post approached Kristin Anderson after receiving a tip and spent days trying to convince her to go on the record.

Trump also falsely claims that the allegations by women who have come forward in recent days have been debunked. That's not the case at all, as many have provided corroboration from friends or relatives who heard about Trump's alleged behavior at the time it happened. Here are some examples:

Kristin Anderson Her allegation: While at a Manhattan nightclub in the early 1990s, Trump slid his fingers under her miniskirt, moved up her inner thigh and touched her vagina through her underwear.

Corroborators:

\* Kelly Stedman, a friend. She said she was told about the incident at a women's brunch a few days later. The women found themselves "laughing at how pathetic it was" on Trump's part.

\* Brad Trent, a New York photographer. He says he heard the story from Anderson at a dinner in 2007. "It was just girls saying stories about how they got hit on by creepy old guys," Trent said of the conversation around the table.

Natasha Stoynoff Her allegation: While interviewing Trump in 2005 for an article for People magazine about the first anniversary of his third marriage, Trump lured her into a room at Mar-a-Lago and abruptly kissed her, forcing his tongue down her throat. He then said they were going to have an affair.

Corroborators:

\* Marina Grasic, who has known Stoynoff for more than 25 years. She said she got a call from her friend the day after the attack, detailing exactly how Trump pushed Stoynoff against a wall.

\* Liz McNeil, at the time a reporter for People (she is now an editor). She said that she heard about the incident the day after Stoynoff returned from her assignment. "She was very upset and told me how he shoved her against a wall," she said.

\* Mary Green, another People reporter (now editor) who had just returned to New York. "In an early conversation we had in her office, she told me about what happened with Donald Trump," Green said. "She was shaky, sitting at her desk, relaying that, 'He took me to this other room, and when we stepped inside, he pushed me against a wall and stuck his tongue down my throat. Melania was upstairs and could have walked in at any time.'"

\* Liza Hamm, part of a "tight-knit' group of friends. "Natasha has always been a vivacious person who wants to believe in the best of people, and this experience definitely messed with that outlook," she said.

\* Paul McLaughlin, Stoynoff's former journalism professor. He saidStoynoff called her at the time of the alleged incident seeking advice on how to handle it: "She didn't know what to do, she was very conflicted, she was angry, she was really confused about how to deal with this." After a discussion, he said, Stoynoff decided it would be best if she kept the incident to herself.

Rachel Crooks Her allegation: Trump in 2005 kissed her directly on the lips after she introduced herself and said she was a receptionist who worked for a company that did business with Trump.

Corroborators:

\* Brianne Webb, her sister. She said Crooks called her immediately about the incident as soon as she returned to her desk. "Being from a town of 1,600 people, being naive, I was like, 'Are you sure he didn't just miss trying to kiss you on the cheek?' She said, 'No, he kissed me on the mouth.' I was like, 'That is not normal.' "

\* Clint Hackenburg, her boyfriend at the time. After he asked her that evening how her day had gone, "she paused for a second, and then started hysterically crying."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If you've endured 11 primary debates and now three general election debates featuring Donald Trump, you deserve a medal -- or condolences. No, he never improved, learned anything or developed a presidential temperament. He knows as little about domestic and foreign policy as he did the first time he stepped on a debate stage.

Considering how badly he's going to lose, the good news is that this is the last time you will have had to endure his presidential debate antics. You know the routine -- interrupt and insult the opponent, complain about the moderator, provide no details, exhibit weird hand gestures, string together fragments of ideas in no particular order, praise Vladimir Putin, denigrate anyone and everyone else in public service except people who have said nice things about him, demonstrate the vocabulary of a fourth-grader, repeat lies debunked many times before and most of all deny, deny, deny your own vile rhetoric and behavior.

Here are 10 takeaways from Wednesday's Las Vegas debate:

1. Trump was peculiarly subdued, low energy, as he once said of Jeb Bush. Hillary Clinton was happy to talk policy and generally ignore Trump.

2. On **immigration**, Trump outrageously declared that we have some "bad hombres" in the United States. Clinton did an effective job describing Trump's extreme mass deportation plan. (Trump didn't dispute her characterization.) Given that more than 70 percent of voters disagree with his **immigration** approach, this was a winning issue for her.

3.  Clinton lured Trump from a discussion of "open borders" into a discussion of Vladimir Putin. She declared that Trump would "rather believe Vladimir Putin" than our intelligence and military agencies sworn to defend us. Remarkably, Trump refused to specifically concede Russia is hacking Democrats on his behalf. That was just the beginning of a painful interchange for Trump in which he was forced to defend his comments on NATO and nuclear weapons. "This is just another lie!" Trump spat out. "I'm just quoting you," Clinton said quietly. She provided a powerful reminder that Trump is completely unfit to be commander in chief.

4. Given a chance to talk about jobs, Trump bizarrely reverted to a discussion about NATO. Clinton effectively slammed him on big tax cuts for the rich. Trump insisted we could grow at 8 percent because India (a partially developed country!) does.

5. Trump's meltdown occurred about 50 minutes in the debate when asked about female accusers. He claimed the women's stories had been debunked. That's a lie. He accused Clinton of putting the women up to it, and actually bragged that he had NOT apologized to his wife, because the claims were not true. Clinton calmly recited his own words, rebuking him for demeaning women to make himself feel big. With Trump insisting it was all "fiction" (but accusing Clinton of instigating violence at his rallies) and desperately trying to change the topic to Clinton's emails, she plowed forward, condemning Trump for inciting violence, insulting a federal judge, etc.

6. As the conversation moved to the Clinton Foundation and potential conflicts of interest, Clinton took the opportunity to praise the Clinton Foundation's work. She then pivoted to list the misconduct documented in The Post's David A. Fahrenthold's reporting. When he tried to insist he had given generously to charity (and falsely denied using his foundation's money to settle business disputes), he gave Clinton the opportunity to slam him for not releasing his tax returns. Trump once again crowed about not paying taxes and seemed to blame Clinton for not taking away the tax provision he used (!).

7. Trump, in the end, always does himself in, as he did when he repeatedly refused to promise he would concede the election if he lost. "I will look at it at the time," he said. Wallace sounded incredulous; Clinton blasted him and recounted that whenever things don't go his way he claims things are "fixed." Hers was a calm and devastating performance. There is a certain rough justice in his pounding the final nail in his political coffin. He has always been his worst enemy.

8. When the conversation turned to Iraq, Trump tried to insist for the umpteenth time he opposed the Iraq War; Clinton pointed out he did not. He outrageously argued the effort to retake Mosul was aimed to help Clinton in the election, which Clinton promptly brushed away with a reminder that nutty conspiracy theories are nothing new for him. Later in the discussion on Syria, he seemed almost to concede the election, telling Clinton "Lotsa luck" with her no-fly zone plan.

9. Chris Wallace was masterful, asking more substantive questions than were asked in the other debates combined. He was forceful in pinning down the candidates without unduly interfering. His performance should be studied by future moderators. Actually, the debate commission might consider giving him all the debates to moderate.

10. Clinton needed simply not to have a disaster in order to lock down the election. Instead, she was error-free and eviscerated Trump, helping to remind voters what a nut he is. She won hands down and now has a shot to win by a very large margin.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump, talking about **immigration**, said there are some "bad hombres" in the United States.

"We have some bad hombres here, and we're going to get them out," Trump said during the final presidential debate.

Building a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border has been a central tenet of Trump's campaign. Trump has said he wants to deport the 11 million undocumented **immigrants** in the country, but last month said he would prioritize the deportation of 5 million to 6.5 million people.

"One of my first acts will be to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones — we have some bad, bad people in this country that have to go out," Trump said. He argued that building a wall will help stem the tide of heroin into the United States, something experts said is unlikely.

Trump said once the border is secured, "we'll make a determination as to the rest."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Many Americans value environmental protection and want to see more of it. But Jill Stein, the Green Party presidential candidate, is drawing only 1 to 3 percent in recent polls, even in an election where many voters dislike the major candidates and are looking for alternatives.

Stein certainly has worked to differentiate herself from the two major party candidates. In July, she asserted that electing Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton — probably the choice of most pro-environment voters — would "fan the flames of … right-wing extremism" and be as bad as electing Donald Trump .

While Stein makes anti-establishment statements like this, her German counterparts have been advancing a green agenda in local, regional and national government for the past 30 years. Most recently, Winfried Kretschmann was reelected this year as head of government in Baden-Württemberg, one of Europe's technologically and industrially most advanced regions.

I grew up in Germany and have taught about Germany and Europe in the United States for the past 15 years, so I have seen Green Party politicians at work in both countries. In my view, there are two reasons why the U.S. Green Party remains so marginal. Structurally, the American electoral system is heavily weighted against small political parties. But U.S. Greens also harm themselves by taking extreme positions and failing to understand that governing requires compromise — a lesson their German counterparts learned several decades ago.

Both European and North American Green Parties evolved from activist movements in the 1960s that focused on causes including environmentalism, disarmament, nuclear power, nonviolence, reproductive rights and gender equality. West German Greens formed a national political party in 1980 and gained support in local, state and federal competitions. Joschka Fischer, one of the first Greens elected to Germany's Bundestag (parliament), served as the nation's foreign minister and vice chancellor from 1998 to 2005.

The German Green Party's rise owed much to the country's electoral system. As in many continental European democracies, political parties win seats in German elections based on the percentage of voters that support them. For example, a party winning a third of the popular vote will hold roughly a third of the seats in the parliament after the election. Proportional representation makes it possible for small parties to gain a toehold and build a presence in government over time.

In contrast, U.S. elections award seats on a winner-takes-all basis. The candidate with the most votes wins, while votes cast for candidates representing other parties are ignored. As a result, American voters choose their leaders within a de facto two-party system in which other parties often have trouble even getting their candidates' names onto ballots.

U.S. Greens have won only a handful of state-level races, and have never won a congressional seat. Their greatest success came in 2000, when Ralph Nader and Winona LaDuke won 2.7 percent of the popular vote in the presidential election.

Many observers argued that Nader's only real impact was to throw the election to conservative Republican George W. Bush, but Nader and many of his supporters strongly disagreed, and the question of whether challengers can act as more than spoilers in U.S. elections remains controversial today.

As green politicians have helped to shape political priorities in Berlin, Brussels and other European capitals and regions, many observers have debated whether these former activists are selling out by participating in the political process — and whether joining that process helps or hurts the green movement.

During the 1980s and early 1990s, Green Party conventions in Germany were dominated by fierce infighting between moderate "Realos" (realists) and radical "Fundis" (fundamentalists). The Realos, who prioritized electability over ideology, eventually prevailed.

In order to graduate from an opposition party to a ruling party that controlled cabinet posts, German Greens had to develop a capacity for compromise. To gain power, they had to form coalitions with center-left Social Democrats. But coalitions require consensus — especially in parliaments with proportional representation.

Interacting with centrist politicians, unionists, church representatives and the media taught Realos to act less like activists and more like politicians. In 1998, the Green Party formed a so-called red-green coalition with the Social Democratic Party (SPD), a party that has traditionally championed the working class, and won a large majority in the Bundestag.

Working through this alliance, former activists initiated reform of an antiquated **immigration** and citizenship law and worked toward recognition of same-sex unions. They implemented an environmentally driven tax code and brokered a deal with the nuclear energy industry to cancel projects for new plants and phase out nuclear power by 2022.

Many Green Party supporters thought Realos were too eager to compromise. Some even physically attacked their party leaders when the coalition government supported use of military force in a NATO -led campaign against Serbia in 1999. Many critics viewed this decision as the remilitarization of German foreign policy under the leadership of Joschka Fischer of the Green Party, then serving as foreign minister.

However, these compromises did not erode broad public support for the Greens. On the contrary, in 2002, the red-green coalition was reelected and the Green Party received more votes than it had in 1998. When the coalition government broke down in 2005, it was due to Chancellor Gerhard Schröder's lack of leadership within his own SPD.

Although the Green Party has not regained control of Germany's federal government since 2005, its positions have become part of the nation's mainstream political culture. Notably, after the 2011 nuclear plant meltdown in Fukushima, Japan, a center-right German government decided to accelerate the phaseout of nuclear power in response to rising public concern. To reach this goal, Angela Merkel 's centrist government has implemented an ambitious policy bundle known as the Energiewende that seeks to transition Germany to a non-nuclear, low-carbon energy future.

Massive governmental support for alternative energy sources has encouraged Germans, especially in rural areas, to invest in solar power, wind turbines and biomass plants. These green policies did not harm, and may have buoyed, Merkel's status as one of the most popular German chancellors before this year's controversies over **immigration**. Germany reformed its renewable energy law this year in response to new European Union rules governing electricity markets and will shift from subsidies to market-based mechanisms, but the Energiewende remains highly popular.

There is no easy way for the U.S. Green Party to emulate its German counterparts. Because the American political system makes it difficult for third parties to participate, Green Party candidates do not have opportunities to learn the trade of politics. They have remained activists who are true to their base instead of developing policy positions that would appeal to a broader audience. By doing so, they weaken their chances of winning major races even in liberal strongholds.

As a result, green ideas enter American political debates only when Democrats and Republicans take up these issues. It is telling that major U.S. environmental groups started endorsing Clinton even before she had clinched the Democratic presidential nomination over Bernie Sanders, who took more aggressive positions on some environmental and energy issues during their primary contest. And although Sanders identifies as an environmentalist, he sought the Democratic Party nomination instead of running as the Green Party candidate.

This suggests that running on a third-party ticket in the United States is still not a winning route to shaping a message aimed at a broad electorate. Instead, climate change, dwindling energy resources and growing human and economic costs from natural disasters will do more to promote ecological consciousness and political change in mainstream America than the radical rhetoric of the U.S. Green Party.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"A good Catholic," Pope Francis says, "meddles in politics, offering the best of himself, so that those who govern can govern." It seems like a straightforward proposition put forth by the universal leader of the Catholic Church, a sentiment that has been communicated in some way or another by his recent predecessors.

But this past week, meddling in politics has become a "scandal" for some of my fellow Catholics, who've tried to spin a 2011 private email conversation between friends into something far more nefarious. In the alleged stolen email threads, John Podesta — who now chairs Hillary Clinton's campaign — and some of his progressive colleagues have a candid conversation about the internal workings of the Catholic Church.

Since the release of these stolen five-year-old emails by WikiLeaks weeks before the November election, many conservative critics have suggested that these conversations represent damning evidence of a wide-ranging "anti-Catholic" conspiracy to undermine and destroy the church. Ross Douthat of the New York Times cast them as an entry in a "Catholic civil war," and prominent Republicans, including House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.), and members of Donald Trump's campaign have called upon Clinton to apologize for the supposed bigotry in the conversation. Others claimed the progressive Catholic groups mentioned are fake, or worse, secretly anti-Catholic.

It's absolute malarkey. And I would know: Since November 2013 — nearly three years after the emails were sent — I've been the executive director of Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good (CACG), one of the groups mentioned in the emails.

I take accusations of being part of an anti-Catholic conspiracy personally, because there's nothing that matters to me and my colleagues more than our faith in Jesus Christ and our love for the Catholic Church. In short, it's everything to me. So let's set the record straight: Every day, our group works tirelessly to promote the social mission of Pope Francis and the Catholic Church in American politics, media and culture.

My group lives in the almost impossible position of trying to exhort fellow Catholics to respond to the social teaching of the church, which guides us to lift up the poor and oppressed, while working within a generally secular progressive movement that isn't friendly to our views on the sanctity of life. For nearly a decade, the abortion rights community has railed against CACG's consistent support for the dignity of the unborn child. In 2009, Catholics for Choice released a scathing 30-page report on how we were working to build an antiabortion movement within progressive politics. Then, in 2013, conservative Catholic activist Bill Donohue called us a "bogus Catholic entity" because we said Rush Limbaugh was wrong to rip Pope Francis as a practitioner of "pure Marxism." Our group was once derided as "radical right wingers" and a "lapdog for liberals" by two different national commentators in a single month; and this past summer, I was accused of being a "feminist" on Fox News one week and a "mansplainer" in the Huffington Post the next week.

If we're nothing but surrogates for the Democratic Party and shills for Clinton bent on collapsing the church from within, we probably should be fired, because we're doing a pretty bad job.

In July, we fought tooth and nail to stop the Democratic Party​ from ditching the Hyde Amendment. When they refused to, we said it was growing evidence that Democrats were slowly defying their progressive ideals to become a "party of exclusion." Catholics are right to strongly protest Clinton and the Democratic Party's hard-line position on abortion. As we've said time and again, we think there's nothing progressive about abortion. But if conservatives are going to be quick to deride Clinton's campaign as "anti-Catholic," they should take an honest look at Trump before doing so.

In March, a group of conservative Catholic intellectuals wrote in the National Review that Trump was "manifestly unfit" to be president of the United States and that his campaign was "offensive to any genuinely Catholic sensibility." Trump has no history of any antiabortion action — indeed, he's self-identified as "very pro-choice" in the past — and as recently as March maintained that women who have abortions should be punished, a view held by few if any in the mainstream antiabortion movement. Trump has been openly hostile toward **immigrants** and refugees throughout his campaign, going so far as to suggest banning Muslims from entering the United States. Meanwhile, Pope Francis has called on Christians worldwide to accept refugees into their countries and homes, and has invited several Syrian refugees to live in the Vatican. As for that border wall Trump has promised? When, back in February, the pope said that good Christians build bridges instead of walls, Trump called him "disgraceful." And that wasn't the only time Trump had taken shots at a pope: In a February of 2013 radio interview, he said Pope Benedict XVI -- a meek, thoughtful pope considered by many Catholics, myself included, to be a hero of our faith -- "should just give up and die. He looks so bad."

Trump's entourage hasn't been much better. Steve Bannon, Trump's campaign chief executive, claimed that Catholics only support hospitality toward **immigrants** and refugees because "the church is dying"; and Trump spokeswoman Katrina Pierson tweeted in 2011 that it's "sad" that Catholics believe the Catholic Church was founded by Jesus. Trump's running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, attempted to pressure local Catholic charities into refusing refugees aid during his tenure as governor. Add in Trump's recently released lewd remarks and the mounting allegations of sexual assault levied against him, and it's impossible to argue that Trump is a good ambassador for Catholic values in public life.

To me, it's pretty clear: If conservatives want to fight for Catholic values in this election, then perhaps they should save their fire for a candidate who doesn't praise Russian President Vladimir Putin and slam the pope.

Catholics can ​disagree on our​ politics. And we should: That's a sign of a healthy culture of debate within the church. Genuinely Catholic politics should challenge both Democrats and Republicans — because our love of Jesus Christ and the Catholic Church always goes before politics. To me, there's no doubt that Trump's vision for the United States represents a greater threat to the practice of our faith than those of us who take seriously Pope Francis's message on the dignity of life, the scandal of poverty and the need to tackle **immigration** reform and climate change.

Given Trump's trouble with Catholics at the polls, it's no surprise that he and his allies are fabricating a falsehood about anti-Trump Catholics trying to divide and destroy the church we love.

Don't fall for it for a second. No candidate has won the White House without winning the Catholic vote since 1972. And if Donald Trump continues down the same path this year, he'll lose both in record fashion.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

A new poll released today by the Arizona Republic shows Hillary Clinton leading Donald Trump by four points -- in Arizona. The Clinton campaign is now investing real money in the state, and this is widely being touted as a sign that the map is expanding in ways that portend a sizable victory for her.

But a Clinton win in Arizona would also have important value in its own right: It would represent a significant victory over Trumpism writ large, with potentially far reaching ramifications for the future of Trumpism in America.

Trump, you may recall, chose Arizona as the site for his big **immigration** speech, which represented -- along with his convention speech -- one of the most comprehensive statements explaining Trumpism in all its xenophobic, hate-drenched glory. That speech employed a variety of distortions and lies to portray a country under siege by dark hordes flooding across the border, and proposed a dramatic expansion of deportations. Arizona is also home to notorious Sheriff Joe Arpaio -- a high-profile Trump supporter who is up for reelection and is a national symbol of a hard line **immigration** response.

More broadly, Arizona in many ways represents a laboratory of how **immigration** politics and demographic change are slowly altering the national electoral map. This border state passed the draconian, nationally-denounced SB 1070 anti-illegal-**immigration** measure in 2010, once again showcasing the power of white backlash. But at the same time, the state also continues to diversify, making it a dream long-term flip for Democrats.

This is why people on both left and right who want a saner approach to **immigration** relish a Trump defeat there. It would show in particularly vivid terms that restrictionism born amid white backlash is doomed to long-term political failure and thus that the GOP must cut it loose -- just as California's notorious mid-1990s Proposition 187 may have helped ultimately put the state GOP there on a path into the demographic wilderness.

"Arizona has always been one of those states that is a bridge too far," Frank Sharry of America's Voice tells me. "Latinos haven't turned out in sufficient numbers to overcome the structural advantage that the GOP has with the aging white vote. But this year, the Latino community may be hyper-mobilized by the chance to take out Arpaio and by the candidacy of Trump."

Sharry noted that demographic change -- with an assist from Trumpism -- has already nudged Colorado and Virginia, where Clinton leads comfortably, into the bluish column. "The next two targets have always been Arizona and Georgia, because of the demographics," Sharry said. "A Trump loss in Arizona would show that Trumpism is dramatically accelerating the shift of red states to purple states."

Alex Nowrasteh, an analyst with the Cato Institute, advocates for reform from a libertarian perspective, but he agrees with Sharry. Nowrasteh noted that hard-liners would see Clinton's strength in Arizona as a sign that more **immigration** restrictions are needed -- to keep Dem-supporting Latinos out. But the right lesson for Republicans to draw, he said, is that the GOP must make peace with **immigration** reform.

"A Clinton victory in Arizona could confirm the biggest fear of Republicans -- that **immigration** will turn red states blue," Nowrasteh told me. "But opposition to **immigration** reform and support for laws like Prop 187 and SB 1070 create a self-fulfilling prophecy." Nowrasteh argued that such measures, by stoking xenophobia, prevent the GOP from moderating to keep pace with inevitable demographic change, hurting the party over the long term: "The reality is that nativism turns these states blue."

If Trump loses, there is likely to be a struggle among Republicans over Trumpism's legacy. Hillary Clinton and top Dems have signaled that they will move quickly to push for **immigration** reform if she wins. Surely some Republicans will argue that embracing reform is a good way to quickly expunge the stench of Trumpism from their party. It's unclear whether that will carry the day, but those pushing for it might seize on a Trump loss in Arizona to bolster their case.

To be clear, Clinton very well may still lose Arizona. But even a strong Clinton showing there would send a signal about where things are headed. And there are other ways to deliver a decisive victory over Trumpism. For instance, if this election produces very high turnout, that would represent a strong rebuke to Trump's ongoing efforts to employ "rigged election" claims to suppress turnout and undermine faith in our democracy. Which brings us to our next item.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* TRUMP'S VOTER INTIMIDATION SCHEME MAY FIZZLE: Trip Gabriel reports that Trump's call on his supporters to monitor polling places is stirring fears of voter intimidation. However:

But as Mr. Trump casts doubt on the integrity of the presidential election, there are no signs of a wave of Trump poll watchers building. Like much else about his campaign, his call to "get everybody to go out and watch" the polls seems to be a Potemkin effort, with little or no organization behind it.

As I've noted, the whole point of Trump's "rigged election" line is to create disruptions on Election Day, to depress turnout and undermine faith in our democracy. But large voter turnout would repudiate that nicely.

\* CLINTON LAUNCHES CLOSING ARGUMENT AD: The Clinton campaign is up with a new TV ad in seven battleground states that has the feel of a closing argument. It stays positive, and it doesn't mention Trump, only featuring Clinton saying, "this is not an ordinary time and this is not an ordinary election," before reiterating her message that she would "heal our country and bring it together."

The closing argument will basically be that this election is a referendum on American pluralism, tolerance, and democracy, and that Trump represents a unique threat to all of it.

\* CLINTON LEADS BIG IN ANOTHER NATIONAL POLL: A new Bloomberg Politics poll finds Clinton leading Trump among likely voters nationally by 47-38 in the four-way, and by 50-41 in the head-to-head matchup. Note:

After trailing among men throughout the summer, Clinton is now winning 46 percent of their support in a hypothetical two-way race, compared to 44 percent for Trump. She's ahead among women by 17 points and has a 1-point edge among white women, 46 percent to 45 percent….Among whites with college degrees — a longtime Republican stronghold — she expanded her lead to 13 points.

One big question will be whether a sizable victory for Dems among college educated whites has long term ramifications.

\* MAJORITY 'CONCERNED' ABOUT SEX TAPE, GROPING: Another key nugget from the new Bloomberg Politics poll: Likely voters say by 56-40 that Trump has not put the sex tape and charges of unwanted advances to rest, and that these things will be a concern to them as they vote. This will also certainly help drive a yuuuuge gender gap.

\* TRUMP'S LATEST PUSHBACK ON GROPING CHARGES: Katie Zezima reports that sexual assault is now central in the presidential campaign. Trump has said he'd never make advances on such unattractive women, and here's how his general counsel is now spinning this:

"I think what Mr. Trump is really trying to say is that they're not somebody that he would be attracted to and therefore the whole thing is nonsense."

Wow, that makes it a whole lot better! Imagine defending this guy?

\* AND THE BOGUS TRUMP-FAIL EXCUSE OF THE DAY: Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway, asked on CNN about his sliding poll numbers, offered up this:

"She has so many advantages. She has endless money, she has a lot of the media….I'm mystified as to why she can't get to those 52, 53 percent numbers in some of these states, given the disadvantages we're handed every day."

Mark our words, "why didn't she win by more???" will be the way Republicans downplay the significance of a Clinton victory, no matter how large it is.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In his Oct. 16 Outlook essay, "After Trump," E.J. Dionne Jr. argued with good reason that we need to understand "why Trump happened," but I believe his analysis overplayed the role of economic anxiety and underemphasized cultural factors in explaining Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's rise.

The Post has explained that Mr. Trump's supporters have not been disproportionately harmed by trade deals and **immigration**, and as other studies have also shown, their median annual household income is about $70,000.

In my view, what is more telling is that they tend to lack advanced education and to hold a lot of views that are simply not factually correct about a wide range of issues, even though they have legitimate grievances, as do many other Americans. For example, they seem to be either unaware of or confused about the many positive developments of the Obama administration and look to the wrong factors — trade and **immigration** — in trying to explain why things are not as good as they should be (which actually has a lot more to do with automation, the rise of computers, outsourcing, etc.).

And with respect to culture, it is true many such people lament the end of their old neighborhood, but they also appear to lament the loss of the America that existed before the important social advancements of the past several decades, such as the increased role of women and minorities in society and the greater acceptance of issues such as gay marriage.

Louis Golino, Rockville

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ruth Ebenstein  is an American Israeli writer, historian and health and peace activist — and mother of three boys in elementary school. Born in California and reared in Michigan, she moved to Jerusalem days after graduating from Northwestern University and has lived there since. Ebenstein and her husband planned a sabbatical year at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Mich., and said they were both excited to share with their children the dynamism and vigor of a U.S. presidential election.

That was before. Now, the kids are in school and the campaign debates have gotten ugly. She said the rhetoric and subject matter are inappropriate for her sons, and she and her husband wondered how they would keep them appropriately engaged and provide avenues for them to think about the issues for themselves.

Laura Pasek, her middle son's third-grade teacher at the Hebrew Day School of Ann Arbor, offered a creative, exhilarating, well-crafted solution. Ebenstein said Pasek's efforts have galvanized the entire school and reminded her of "the hope, joy and empowerment that can be found in educating our children." In this post, Ebenstein explains just how Pasek decided to teach her students about elections without getting into the muck of the current one.

By Ruth Ebenstein

"Guess what we heard in the campaign speech today, Mom?" said Eitan, my 8-year-old son, dropping his olive-green backpack and recorder in the passenger's side of the front seat of our SUV.  He plopped down next his two brothers in the back seat and cleared his throat.

"Always stand on principle even if you stand alone."

Such lofty language, I thought to myself. Which candidate said that?

"I liked the rebuttal even better," quipped Yuval, my 10-year-old. He ruffled pages in his notebook to find a quote he'd written down.

"I like the dreams of the future better than the history of the past. I will make sure that America is safe."

Looking in the rearview mirror, I locked eyes with my boys.

"Donald Trump?!"

The back seat erupted into rolling laughter.

"No, Mom!"

"John Adams — and Thomas Jefferson!"

Ahhh.

They were quoting from the speeches of the presidential election of 1800, when incumbent John Adams, a Federalist, faced off with Vice President Thomas Jefferson, a Democratic-Republican.

That was the solution that Eitan's General Studies teacher had come up with to teach her young students about the elections — without teaching this presidential election.

"I felt that some of the messages coming out of this campaign were inappropriate for kids ages 8 to 10," said Laura Pasek, a third- and fourth-grade teacher at Hebrew Day School in Ann Arbor, Mich. "And their methods of engagement did not model respectful and intellectual debate."

So she found a creative way to authentically engage my son and his classmates in how a national conversation ought to take place: by looking into our past. "My curriculum already included the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, so I thought, 'Why not move it up three years to the election of 1800?' " she said.

The fit was even better than she initially realized. The major issues of the time included the **Alien** and Sedition Acts, slavery, states' rights vs. federal power, some of which still hound our country today. Adams supported Congress's passing a law that **immigrants** had to live in the country for 14 years rather than five to vote so that foreigners wouldn't influence the election and the political process in general. Another common element: an emotional and hard-fought election campaign that reflected a bitter partisan battle.

Ms. Pasek began the election simulation by writing this quote on the blackboard:

"You're not entitled to your opinion. You're entitled to your informed opinion."

My son and his classmates rolled up their sleeves and dived into learning the election process from start to finish: primaries, conventions, debates, elections, inauguration. Lessons were woven into every subject: writing, reading, debating, social studies, and even math (in terms of understanding the electoral votes).

Working in a collaborative way, students created campaign slogans, logos, and mock interviews with historical figures such as James Madison, in addition to Adams and Jefferson. They covered school hallways with colorful campaign posters: "Big Ideas, Big Dreams! Vote Thomas Jefferson" and "Vote John Adams! John is fond to make a new beginning."

The simulation is being informed by the research of University of Michigan Professor Jeff Stanzler, director of the Interactive Communications & Simulations (ICS) group, which creates and facilitates Web simulation for a worldwide network of upper elementary, middle school and high school students, and his colleagues, professors Michael Fahy and Jeff Kupperman.

In September, they advised Ms. Pasek on how to adapt their program to get younger students to take on the perspective of historical figures. Other perks of living in a university town: Richard Primus, a constitutional law professor at the University of Michigan, broke down the election process and election context into terms the third- and fourth-grade students could understand. Serendipitously, the election of 1800 falls into his area of expertise. Eve Brensike Primus, his wife and a criminal law professor, taught the class debating skills and strategies, as well as debate etiquette. Their daughter, Jessica, a third-grader in Ms. Pasek's class, has assumed the role of Thomas Jefferson for the duration of the campaign.

As the students created campaign ads for television, print and radio, they learned how hard it is to not slide into negative campaigning. "John Adams wants to turn this country into a dump" was deemed negative without being respectful, informative and relevant; it was subsequently taken down. The students did not realize the irony of their chosen location: they'd posted it in the school bathroom.

Engaging, open-ended questions have filled the classroom. If Benjamin Franklin had been alive in 1800, who would he have supported? What would James Madison have said about Thomas Jefferson? What would John Adams have done had he been elected for a second term in office? Authenticity lends well to student engagement. My son and his classmates study YouTube videos of President Obama and other excellent orators to learn their skills. The fascination with Hamilton, the current Broadway runaway hit and the historical persona upon which is based, have only fueled greater interest.

"Because the election of 1800 was really nasty, it's almost like we get to redo it," said Ms. Pasek. "Students are making claims that aren't historically accurate, but rather reflect their own thinking, like the John Adams camp promising to abolish slavery if elected to a second term."

On Oct. 20, the third- and fourth-graders at Hebrew Day School will hold their own live presidential debate, where they will discuss major issues of 1800. Colonial wigs have been ordered. Patriotic fabric bunting border decorations will line the stage. And of course, a requisite Betsy Ross flag.

I think back to those tenuous times, the fragile days when the American Constitution had been in effect for a mere 11 years. Jefferson's win marked the first peaceful transition of political power between opposing parties in U.S. history. His inaugural address called for reconciliation, declaring that "We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists."

So who are you going to vote for? I ask my sons.

"Thomas Jefferson," Eitan said, a smile stretched across his face. "He was the first to introduce ice cream to the United States."

"True," granted Yuval. "But you can't deny this: He signed the Declaration of Independence that 'all men are created equal,' yet he owned hundreds of slaves."

On Nov. 4, their entire school — kindergarten to fifth grade — will cast their ballots for John Adams or Thomas Jefferson.

But I can already tell you who the winner is: our kids.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**IN AN editorial Tuesday, we described how Donald Trump is attacking both halves of a fundamental and long-standing equation of American democracy: that the loser recognizes the winner and that the winner lets the loser remain in the political arena. By claiming his loss could happen only as a result of cheating, and threatening to jail Hillary Clinton if he wins, Mr. Trump is rejecting a pillar of our republic.

But that is not the only pillar under assault: Mr. Trump's blanket indifference to truth is similarly an attack on democracy. All politicians fudge the truth at times. But their misrepresentations usually have at least some connection to reality. Without basic acceptance that facts and evidence matter, authentic debate becomes impossible, as does governance.

Put simply, both sides must agree that two plus two equals four before they can argue about budget numbers. Mr. Trump would not concur if he concluded it was in his interest for two plus two to equal five. He invents alternate realities and encourages his supporters to inhabit them.

For example: Thousands of New Jersey Muslims celebrated the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. Or: Many people saw bombs all over the San Bernardino shooters' apartment and neglected to report them. Both claims are false; Mr. Trump nevertheless repeats them and uses them to justify unjustifiable policy, such as banning Muslim **immigration**.

His war on reality has escalated as his poll numbers have declined. After the recent firebombing of a North Carolina GOP building, he immediately and with no evidence accused Clinton allies of being responsible. If it emerges that the culprits had no connection to Ms. Clinton, he will no doubt invent one. His fables about illegal **immigrants** pouring across the border to cast illegal votes are equally reprehensible.

Over the weekend, Gov. Mike Pence (R-Ind.), Mr. Trump's running mate, tried to return the candidate to the territory of dishonest but tenuously connected to reality: Mr. Trump's insistence that the election is being "rigged" against him refers to biased media coverage, Mr. Pence maintained. Mr. Trump responded by doubling down on the ridiculous assertion that large-scale voter fraud is occurring.

On Wednesday, Mr. Trump and Ms. Clinton are scheduled to debate for the last time. We hope there will be discussion of real issues. But Mr. Trump's falsehood-per-minute tally in his last encounter with Ms. Clinton, from the size of the trade deficit to his position on the Iraq War, was astonishing. Given Mr. Trump's indifference to the truth, we are skeptical that the final meeting can be much of a debate either, in any conventional sense.

As with his threat to imprison his opponent if he defeats her, Mr. Trump's total dismissal of reality and wanton embrace of conspiracy theories should be disqualifying.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Their public conference had been interrupted by a demonstration march and a bomb threat, so the white nationalists decided to meet secretly instead. They slipped past police officers and protesters into a hotel in downtown Memphis. The country had elected its first black president just a few days earlier, and now in November 2008, dozens of the world's most prominent racists wanted to strategize for the years ahead.

"The fight to restore White America begins now," their agenda read.

The room was filled in part by former heads of the Ku Klux Klan and prominent neo-Nazis, but one of the keynote speeches had been reserved for a Florida community college student who had just turned 19. Derek Black was already hosting his own radio show. He had launched a white nationalist website for children and won a local political election in Florida. "The leading light of our movement," was how the conference organizer introduced him, and then Derek stepped to the lectern.

"The way ahead is through politics," he said. "We can infiltrate. We can take the country back."

Years before Donald Trump launched a presidential campaign based in part on the politics of race and division, a group of avowed white nationalists was working to make his rise possible by pushing its ideology from the radical fringes ever closer to the far conservative right. Many attendees in Memphis had transformed over their careers from Klansmen to white supremacists to self-described "racial realists," and Derek Black represented another step in that evolution.

He never used racial slurs. He didn't advocate violence or lawbreaking. He had won a Republican committee seat in Palm Beach County, Fla., where Trump also had a home, without ever mentioning white nationalism, talking instead about the ravages of political correctness, affirmative action and unchecked Hispanic **immigration**.

He was not only a leader of racial politics but also a product of them. His father, Don Black, had created Stormfront, the Internet's first and largest white nationalist site, with 300,000 users and counting. His mother, Chloe, had once been married to David Duke, one of the country's most infamous racial zealots, and Duke had become Derek's godfather. They had raised Derek at the forefront of the movement, and some white nationalists had begun calling him "the heir."

Now Derek spoke in Memphis about the future of their ideology. "The Republican Party has to be either demolished or taken over," he said. "I'm kind of banking on the Republicans staking their claim as the white party."

A few people in the audience started to clap, and then a few more began to whistle, and before long the whole group was applauding. "Our moment," Derek said, because at least in this room there was consensus. They believed white nationalism was about to drive a political revolution. They believed, at least for the moment, that Derek would help lead it.

"Years from now, we will look back on this," he said. "The great intellectual move to save white people started today."

\*\*\*

Eight years later, that future they envisioned in Memphis was finally being realized in the presidential election of 2016. Donald Trump was retweeting white supremacists. Hillary Clinton was making speeches about the rise of white hate and quoting David Duke, who had launched his own campaign for the U.S. Senate.

White nationalism had bullied its way toward the very center of American politics, and yet, one of the people who knew the ideology best was no longer anywhere near that center. Derek had just turned 27, and instead of leading the movement, he was trying to untangle himself not only from the national moment but also from a life he no longer understood.

From the very beginning, that life had taken place within the insular world of white nationalism, where there was never any doubt about what whiteness could mean in the United States. Derek had been taught that America was intended as a place for white Europeans and that everyone else would eventually have to leave. He was told to be suspicious of other races, of the U.S. government, of tap water and of pop culture. His parents pulled him out of public school in West Palm Beach at the end of third grade, when they heard his black teacher say the word "ain't." By then, Derek was one of only a few white students in a class of mostly Hispanics and Haitians, and his parents decided he would be better off at home.

"It is a shame how many White minds are wasted in that system," Derek wrote shortly thereafter, on the Stormfront children's website he built at age 10. "I am no longer attacked by gangs of non whites. I am learning pride in myself, my family and my people."

Because he was home-schooled, white nationalism could become a focus of his education. It also meant he had the freedom to begin traveling with his father, who left for several weeks each year to speak at white nationalist conferences in the Deep South. Don Black had grown up in Alabama, where in the 1970s, he joined a group called the White Youth Alliance, led by David Duke, who at the time was married to Chloe. That relationship eventually dissolved, and years later, Don and Chloe reconnected, married and had Derek in 1989. They moved into Chloe's childhood home in West Palm Beach to raise Derek along with Chloe's two young daughters. There were Guatemalan **immigrants** living down the block and Jewish retirees moving into a condo nearby. "Usurpers," Don sometimes called them, but Chloe didn't want to move away from her aging mother in Florida, so Don settled for taking long road trips to the whitest parts of the South.

Don and Derek always stayed on those trips with Don's friends from the white power movement, and soon Derek had heard many of their stories. There was the time his father, then 16, was shot in the chest while working on a segregationist campaign in Georgia. There was the day in 1981 when he and eight other extremists made plans to board a boat stocked with dynamite, automatic weapons and a Nazi flag. Their plan, called Operation Red Dog, was to take over the tiny Caribbean island nation of Dominica, but instead Don had been caught, arrested and sentenced to three years in prison. He learned some computer programming in federal prison and eventually launched Stormfront in 1995 under the motto: "White Pride World Wide."

Over the years, his website attracted all kinds of extremists: skinheads, militia groups, terrorists and Holocaust deniers. According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, a hate-watch group, a handful of the people who posted on Stormfront had gone on to commit hate crimes, including killings. One message board user shot and wounded three children at a Jewish day-care center in Los Angeles in 1999. Another killed his Jewish neighbor in 2000 in a town near Pittsburgh. "We attract too many sociopaths," Don posted, and he decided that more moderation would give Stormfront greater mainstream credibility.

By then Stormfront had become his full-time job, even though he wasn't making much money and the family was getting by on Chloe's salary as an executive assistant. Each morning, she would go to work, and Don would go to his crowded desk in their single-story house, where he recruited authors and academics from the alternative right to post on his site.

In 2008, he banned slurs, Nazi symbols and threats of violence, even as other parts of his own language remained unchanged. He didn't have friends so much as "comrades." Everyone was either "with us" or "against us," "sympathetic" or an "enemy," so Derek strengthened his relationship with his father by becoming his greatest ideological ally.

Derek learned Web coding and designed the Stormfront site for children. He was interviewed about hate speech on Nickelodeon, daytime talk shows, HBO and in USA Today. "The devil child," was how Don sometimes referred to him, with pride and affection.

But Don also read through nasty emails his son received from strangers who were offended by the Stormfront children's page, and he began to worry about a 13-year-old who was becoming so familiar with the two-way transaction of prejudice and hate.

"You will rot in hell," read one email, in 2002.

"I WISH you were in the same room as me right now," read another. "You would have to eat through a straw, you low life scumbag."

Don told Derek to stop checking his messages. He would later remember wondering: "Did I foist this onto him? Is he just doing this for me?" He asked Derek whether he wanted to shut down the children's page, but Derek said the emails didn't bother him. That was the enemy. Who cared what they thought?

\*\*\*

After that, Don began to see something different when he looked at his son: not just a child born into the movement but also an emerging leader, with drive and conviction that seemed entirely his own. Don had spent more than four decades waiting for whites to have a racial awakening in America, and now he began to think that the teenager living in his house could be a potential catalyst.

"All of my strengths without any of my weaknesses," Don would later say about Derek back then. "He was smarter than me. He had more insight. He never held himself back."

So many others in white nationalism had come to their conclusions out of anger and fear, but Derek tended to like most people he met, regardless of race. Instead, he sought out logic and science to confirm his worldview, reading studies from conservative think tanks about biological differences between races, IQ disparities and rates of violent crime committed by blacks against whites. He launched a daily radio show to share his views, and Don paid $275 each week to have it broadcast on the AM station in nearby Lake Worth. On the air, Derek helped popularize the idea of a white genocide, that whites were losing their culture and traditions to massive, nonwhite **immigration**. "If we say it a thousand times — 'White genocide! We are losing control of our country!' — politicians are going to start saying it, too," he said. He repeated the idea in interviews, Stormfront posts and during his speech at the conference in Memphis, when he was at his most certain.

Derek finished high school, enrolled in community college and ran for a seat on the Republican committee, beating an incumbent with 60 percent of the vote. He decided he wanted to study medieval European history, so he applied to New College of Florida, a top-ranked liberal arts school with a strong history program.

"We want you to make history, not just study it," Don and Chloe sometimes reminded him.

New College ranked as one of the most liberal schools in the state — "most pot-friendly, most gay-friendly," Don explained on the radio — and to some white nationalists, it seemed a bizarre choice. Once, on the air, a friend asked Don whether he worried about sending his son to a "hotbed of multiculturalism," and Don started to laugh.

"If anyone is going to be influenced here, it will be them," he said. "Soon enough, the whole faculty and student body are going to know who they have in their midst."

\*\*\*

At first they knew nothing about him, and Derek tried to keep it that way. New College was in Sarasota, three hours across the state, and it was the first time Derek had lived away from home. He attended an introductory college meeting about diversity and concluded that the quickest way to be ostracized was to proclaim himself a racist. He decided not to mention white nationalism on campus, at least until he had made some friends.

Most of the other students in his dorm were college freshmen, and as a 21-year-old transfer student, Derek already had a car and a legal ID to buy beer. The qualities that had once made him seem quirky — shoulder-length red hair, the cowboy hat he wore, a passion for medieval re-enactment — made him a good fit for New College, where many of the 800 students were a little bit weird. He forged his own armor and dressed as a knight for Halloween. He watched zombie movies with students from his dorm, a group that included a Peruvian **immigrant** and an Orthodox Jew.

Maybe they were usurpers, as his father had said, but Derek also kind of liked them, and gradually he went from keeping his convictions quiet to actively disguising them. When another student mentioned that he had been reading about the racist implications of "Lord of the Rings" on a website called Stormfront, Derek pretended he had never heard of it.

Meanwhile, early each weekday morning, he would go outside and call in to his radio show. He told friends these were regular calls home to his parents, and in a way, that was true. Every morning, it was Derek and his father, cued in by music from Merle Haggard's "I'm a White Boy." Derek often repeated his belief that whites were being wiped out — "a genocide in our own country," he said. He told listeners the problem was "massive, nonwhite **immigration**." He said Obama was an "anti-white radical." He said white voters were "just waiting for a politician who actually talks about all the ways whites are being stepped on." He said it was the "critical fight of our lifetime." Then he hung up and went back to the dorm to play Taylor Swift songs on his guitar or to take one of the college's sailboats onto Sarasota Bay.

He left after one semester to study abroad in Germany, because he wanted to learn the language. He kept in touch with New College partly through a student message board, known as the forum, whose updates were automatically sent to his email.

One night in April 2011, Derek noticed a message posted to all students at 1:56 a.m. It was written by someone Derek didn't know — an upperclassman who had been researching terrorist groups online when he stumbled across a familiar face.

"Have you seen this man?" the message read, and beneath those words was a picture that was unmistakable. The red hair. The cowboy hat.

"Derek black: white supremacist, radio host…new college student???" the post read. "How do we as a community respond?"

\*\*\*

By the time Derek returned to campus for the next semester, more than a thousand responses had been written to that post. It was the biggest message thread in the history of a school that Derek now wanted badly to avoid. He returned to Sarasota, applied for permission to live outside of required student housing and rented a room a few miles away.

A few of his friends from the previous year emailed to say they felt betrayed, and strangers sometimes flipped him off from a safe distance on campus. But, for the most part, Derek avoided public spaces, and other students mostly stared or left him alone, even as their speculation about him continued on the forum.

"Maybe he's trying to get away from a life he didn't choose."

"He chooses to be a racist public figure. We choose to call him a racist in public."

"I just want this guy to die a painful death along with his entire family. Is that too much to ask?"

"I'd like to see Derek Black respond to all of this. …"

Instead of replying, Derek read the forum and used it as motivation to plan a conference for white nationalists in East Tennessee. "Victory through Argumentation: Verbal tactics for anyone white and normal," he wrote in the invitation. He had spoken at several conferences, including the one in Memphis, but only now did he feel compelled to create another event as white nationalism continued to spread. The white genocide idea he had been championing had finally become a fixture of conservative radio. David Duke had started trying to build a relationship with "our friends and allies in the tea party." Donald Trump had riveted the alt-right with his investigation into Obama's birth certificate, and one Gallup poll suggested that only 38 percent of Americans "definitely" believed Obama was born in the United States.

"A critical juncture to keep increasing the profile of our movement," Derek said on the radio, so he registered 150 attendees and scheduled speeches by his father, Duke and other separatist icons.

Another New College student learned about the conference and posted details on the forum, where gradually a new way of thinking had begun to emerge.

"Ostracizing Derek won't accomplish anything," one student wrote.

"We have a chance to be real activists and actually affect one of the leaders of white supremacy in America. This is not an exaggeration. It would be a victory for civil rights."

"Who's clever enough to think of something we can do to change this guy's mind?"

One of Derek's acquaintances from that first semester decided he might have an idea. He started reading Stormfront and listening to Derek's radio show. Then, in late September, he sent Derek a text message.

"What are you doing Friday night?" he wrote.

\*\*\*

Matthew Stevenson had started hosting weekly Shabbat dinners at his campus apartment shortly after enrolling in New College in 2010. He was the only Orthodox Jew at a school with little Jewish infrastructure, so he began cooking for a small group of students at his apartment each Friday night. Matthew always drank from a kiddush cup and said the traditional prayers, but most of his guests were Christian, atheist, black or Hispanic — anyone open-minded enough to listen to a few blessings in Hebrew. Now, in the fall of 2011, Matthew invited Derek to join them.

Matthew had spent a few weeks debating whether it was a good idea. He and Derek had lived near each other in the dorm, but they hadn't spoken since Derek was exposed on the forum. Matthew, who almost always wore a yarmulke, had experienced enough anti-Semitism in his life to be familiar with the KKK, David Duke and Stormfront. He went back and read some of Derek's posts on the site from 2007 and 2008: "Jews are NOT white." "Jews worm their way into power over our society." "They must go."

Matthew decided his best chance to affect Derek's thinking was not to ignore him or confront him, but simply to include him. "Maybe he'd never spent time with a Jewish person before," Matthew remembered thinking.

It was the only social invitation Derek had received since returning to campus, so he agreed to go. The Shabbat meals had sometimes included eight or 10 students, but this time only a few showed up. "Let's try to treat him like anyone else," Matthew remembered instructing them.

Derek arrived with a bottle of wine. Nobody mentioned white nationalism or the forum, out of respect for Matthew. Derek was quiet and polite, and he came back the next week and then the next, until after a few months, nobody felt all that threatened, and the Shabbat group grew back to its original size.

On the rare occasions when Derek directed conversation during those dinners, it was about the particulars of Arabic grammar, or marine aquatics, or the roots of Christianity in medieval times. He came across as smart and curious, and mostly he listened. He heard a Peruvian **immigrant** tell stories about attending a high school that was 90 percent Hispanic. He asked Matthew about his opinions on Israel and Palestine. They were both still wary of each other: Derek wondered whether Matthew was trying to get him drunk so he would say offensive things that would appear on the forum; Matthew wondered whether Derek was trying to cultivate a Jewish friend to protect himself against charges of anti-Semitism. But they also liked each other, and they started playing pool at a bar near campus.

Some members of the Shabbat group gradually began to ask Derek about his views, and he occasionally clarified them in conversations and emails throughout 2011 and 2012. He said he was pro-choice on abortion. He said he was against the death penalty. He said he didn't believe in violence or the KKK or Nazism or even white supremacy, which he insisted was different from white nationalism. He wrote in an email that his only concern was that "massive **immigration** and forced integration" was going to result in a white genocide. He said he believed in the rights of all races but thought each was better off in its own homeland, living separately.

"You have never clarified, Derek," one of his Shabbat friends wrote to him. "You've never said, 'Hey all, this is what I do believe and this is what I don't.' It's not the job of someone who's potentially scared/intimidated by someone else to approach that person to see if they are in fact scary/intimidating."

"I guess I only value the opinions of people I know," Derek wrote back, and now he was beginning to count his Shabbat friends among those he knew and respected. "You're naturally right that I deemphasize my own role," he wrote to them.

He decided early in his final year at New College to finally respond on the forum. He wanted his friends on campus to feel comfortable, even if he still believed some of their homelands were elsewhere. He sat at a coffee shop and began writing his post, softening his ideology with each successive draft. He no longer thought the endpoint of white nationalism was forced deportation for nonwhites, but gradual self-deportation, in which nonwhites would leave on their own. He didn't believe in self-deportation right now, at least not for his friends, but just eventually, in concept.

"It's been brought to my attention that people might be scared or intimidated or even feel unsafe here because of things said about me," he began. "I wanted to try to address these concerns publicly, as they absolutely should not exist. I do not support oppression of anyone because of his or her race, creed, religion, gender, socioeconomic status or anything similar."

The forum post, intended only for the college, was leaked to the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), which kept a public "Intelligence File" on Derek and other racist leaders, and the group emailed Derek for clarification. Was he disavowing white nationalism? "Your views are now quite different from what many people thought," the email read.

Derek received the message while vacationing in Europe during winter break. He was staying with Duke, who had started broadcasting his radio show from a part of Europe with lenient free-speech laws. "The tea party is taking some of these ideas mainstream," Duke said on a broadcast one morning. "Whites are finally coming around to my point of view," he said another day, and even if Derek now thought some of what Duke said sounded exaggerated or even alarming, the man was still his godfather. Derek wrote back to the SPLC from Duke's couch.

"Everything I said (on the forum) is true," he wrote. "I also believe in White Nationalism. My post and my racial ideology are not mutually exclusive concepts."

\*\*\*

But the unstated truth was that Derek was becoming more and more confused about exactly what he believed. Sometimes he looked through posts on Stormfront, hoping to reaffirm his ideology, but now the message threads about Obama's birth certificate or DNA tests for citizenship just seemed bizarre and conspiratorial. He stopped posting on Stormfront. He began inventing excuses to get out of his radio show, leaving his father alone on the air each morning to explain why Derek wouldn't be calling in. He was preparing for a test. He was giving those liberal professors hell. Except sometimes what Derek was really doing was taking his kayak to the beach, so he could be alone to think.

He had always based his opinions on fact, and lately his logic was being dismantled by emails from his Shabbat friends. They sent him links to studies showing that racial disparities in IQ could largely be explained by extenuating factors like prenatal nutrition and educational opportunities. They gave him scientific papers about the effects of discrimination on blood pressure, job performance and mental health. He read articles about white privilege and the unfair representation of minorities on television news. One friend emailed: "The geNOcide against whites is incredibly, horribly insulting and degrading to real, actual, lived and experienced genocides against Jews, against Rwandans, against Armenians, etc."

"I don't hate anyone because of race or religion," Derek clarified on the forum.

"I am not a white supremacist," he wrote.

"I don't believe people of any race, religion or otherwise should have to leave their homes or be segregated or lose any freedom."

"Derek," a friend responded. "I feel like you are a representative of a movement you barely buy into. You need to identify with more than 1/50th of a belief system to consider it your belief system."

He was taking classes in Jewish scripture and German multiculturalism during his last year at New College, but most of his research was focused on medieval Europe. He learned that Western Europe had begun not as a great society of genetically superior people but as a technologically backward place that lagged behind Islamic culture. He studied the 8th century to the 12th century, trying to trace back the modern concepts of race and whiteness, but he couldn't find them anywhere. "We basically just invented it," he concluded.

"Get out of this," one of his Shabbat friends emailed a few weeks after Derek's graduation in May 2013, urging Derek to publicly disavow white nationalism. "Get out before it ruins some part of your future more than it already irreparably has."

Derek stayed near campus to housesit for a professor after graduation, and he began to consider making a public statement. He knew he no longer believed in white nationalism, and he had made plans to distance himself from his past by changing part of his name and moving across the country for graduate school. His instinct was to slip away quietly, but his advocacy had always been public — a legacy of radio shows, Internet posts, TV appearances, and an annual conference on racial tactics.

He was still considering what to do when he returned home to visit his parents later that summer. His father was tracking the rise of white nationalism on cable TV, and his parents were talking about "enemies" and "comrades" in the "ongoing war," but now it sounded ridiculous to Derek. He spent the day rebuilding windows with them, which was one of Derek's quirky hobbies that his parents had always supported. They had bought his guitar and joined in his medieval re-enactments. They had paid his tuition at the liberal arts college where he had Shabbat dinners. They had taught him, most of all, to be independent and ideological, and to speak his beliefs even when doing so resulted in backlash.

He left the house that night and went to a bar. He took out his computer and began writing a statement.

"A large section of the community I grew up in believes strongly in white nationalism, and members of my family whom I respect greatly, particularly my father, have long been resolute advocates for that cause. I was not prepared to risk driving a wedge in those relationships.

"After a great deal of thought since then, I have resolved that it is in the best interests of everyone involved to be honest about my slow but steady disaffiliation from white nationalism. I can't support a movement that tells me I can't be a friend to whomever I wish or that other people's races require me to think of them in a certain way or be suspicious at their advancements.

"The things I have said as well as my actions have been harmful to people of color, people of Jewish descent, activists striving for opportunity and fairness for all. I am sorry for the damage done."

He continued to write for several more paragraphs before addressing an email to the SPLC, the group his father had considered a primary adversary for 40 years.

"Publish in full," Derek instructed. Then he attached the letter and hit "send."

\*\*\*

Don was at the computer the next afternoon searching Google when Derek's name popped up in a headline on his screen. For a decade, Don had been typing "Stormfront" and "Derek Black" into the search bar a few times each week to track his son's public rise in white nationalism. This particular story had been published by the SPLC, which Don had always referred to as the "Poverty Palace."

"Activist Son of Key Racist Leader Renounces White Nationalism," it read, and Don began to read the letter. It had phrases like "structural oppression," "privilege," "limited opportunity," and "marginalized groups" — the kind of liberal-apologist language Don and Derek had often made fun of on the radio.

"You got hacked," Don remembered telling Derek, once he reached him on the phone.

"It's real," Derek said, and then he heard the sound of his father hanging up.

For the next few hours, Don was in disbelief. Maybe Derek was pulling a prank on him. Maybe he still believed in white nationalism but just wanted an easier life.

Derek called back, and this time his mother answered. She said that she didn't want to speak to him. She handed the phone to Don, and his voice was shaky and tearful. Derek had never heard him that way. "I can't talk," Don said, and he hung up again.

Later that night, Don logged on to the Stormfront message board. "I'm sure this will be all over the Net and our local media, so I'll start here," he wrote, posting a link to Derek's letter. "I don't want to talk to him. He says he doesn't understand why we'd feel betrayed just because he announced his 'personal beliefs' to our worst enemies."

For the next several days, Don couldn't bring himself to post anything more. "I was a little depressed anyway, but at that point I wanted to quit everything," he said later, remembering that time. "What's the point? I didn't do much of anything for probably 10 days. It was the worst event of my adult life."

He logged back onto Stormfront a week later. "After a miserable seven days, I feel the need to vent," he wrote. "I only know what Derek tells me, which has been baffling. I've decided he really believes this crap. Derek repeated his belief that family ties are separate from politics. I said that obviously wasn't true with a family centered around political activism."

Hundreds of posts quickly followed. Some offered Don condolences. Others said that Derek was a traitor or that Don could no longer be trusted, either. Don wrote a few posts in response, sometimes defending Derek and other times distancing himself, until after a few weeks it all hurt too much.

"I'm closing this thread," Don wrote, finally, describing it as an "open wound."

\*\*\*

Derek returned home a few weeks later for his father's birthday, even though his mother and his half-sisters had asked him not to come. "I think I might be getting disowned," Derek had written to one college friend. But he was about to leave Florida for graduate school, and he wanted to say goodbye.

He arrived at his grandmother's house for the party, and he would later remember how strange it felt when his half-sisters would barely acknowledge him. His mother was polite but cold. Don tried to invite Derek inside, but the rest of the family wanted him to leave. "I got uninvited to my own party," Don later remembered. "They said if I wanted to see him, we both had to go."

They left and went for a drive, first to the beach and then to a restaurant, where they sat at a booth near the back. Derek still had his dry sense of humor. He still made smart observations about politics and history. "Same old Derek," Don concluded, after a few hours, and that fact surprised him. His grief had been so profound that he'd expected some physical manifestation of the loss. Instead, he found himself forgetting for several minutes at a time that Derek was now "living on the other side."

Don asked Derek about the theories that had emerged on the Stormfront message thread. Was he just faking a change to have an easier career? Was this his way of rebelling?

When Derek denied those things, Don mentioned the theory he himself had come to believe — the one David Duke had posited in the first hours after Derek's letter went public: Stockholm syndrome. Derek had become a hostage to liberal academia and then experienced empathy for his captors.

"That's so patronizing," Derek remembered saying. "How can I prove this is what I really believe?"

He tried to convince Don for a few hours at the restaurant. He told him about white privilege and repeated the scientific studies about institutionalized racism. He mentioned the great Islamic societies that had developed algebra and predicted a lunar eclipse. He said that now, as he recognized strains of white nationalism spreading into mainstream politics, he felt accountable. "It's not just that I was wrong. It's that it caused real damage," he remembered saying.

"I can't believe I'm arguing with you, of all people, about racial realities," Don remembered telling him.

The restaurant was closing, and they were no closer to an understanding. Derek went to sleep at his grandmother's house. Then he woke up early and started driving across the country alone.

\*\*\*

Every day since then, Derek had been working to put distance between himself and his past. He was still living across the country after finishing his master's degree, and he was starting to learn Arabic to be able to study the history of early Islam. He hadn't spoken to anyone in white nationalism since his defection, aside from occasional calls home to his parents. Instead, he'd spent his time catching up on aspects of pop culture he'd once been taught to discredit: liberal newspaper columns, rap music and Hollywood movies. He'd come to admire President Obama. He decided to trust the U.S. government. He started drinking tap water. He had taken budget trips to Barcelona, Paris, Dublin, Nicaragua and Morocco, immersing himself in as many cultures as he could.

He joined a new online message group, this one for couch surfers, and he opened up his one-bedroom apartment to strangers looking for a temporary place to stay. It felt increasingly good to trust people — to try to interact without prejudice or judgment — and after a while, Derek began to feel detached from the person he had been.

But then came the election campaign of 2016, and suddenly the white nationalism Derek had been trying to unlearn was the unavoidable subtext to national debates over refugees, **immigration**, Black Lives Matter and the election itself. Late in August, Derek watched in his apartment as Hillary Clinton gave a major speech about the rise of racism. She explained how white supremacists had rebranded themselves as white nationalists. She referenced Duke and mentioned the concept of a "white genocide," which Derek had once helped popularize. She talked about how Trump had hired a campaign manager with ties to the alt-right. She said: "A fringe movement has essentially taken over the Republican Party."

It was the very same point Derek had spent so much of his life believing in, but now it made him feel both fearful for the country and implicated. "It's scary to know that I helped spread this stuff, and now it's out there," he told one of his Shabbat friends.

He also wondered whether he would ever be able to completely detach himself from his past, when so much about it remained public. He was still occasionally recognized as a former racist in graduate school; still written into the will of a man he had befriended through white nationalism; still the godson of Duke; still the son of Chloe and Don.

Late this summer, for the first time in years, he traveled to Florida to see them. At a time of increasingly contentious rhetoric, he wanted to hear what his father had to say. They sat in the house and talked about graduate school and Don's new German shepherd. But after a while, their conversation turned back to ideology, the topic they had always preferred.

Don, who usually didn't vote, said he was going to support Trump.

Derek said he had taken an online political quiz, and his views aligned 97 percent with Hillary Clinton's.

Don said **immigration** restrictions sounded like a good start.

Derek said he actually believed in more **immigration**, because he had been studying the social and economic benefits of diversity.

Don thought that would result in a white genocide.

Derek thought race was a false concept anyway.

They sat across from each other, searching for ways to bridge the divide. The bay was one block away. Just across from there was Mar-a-Lago, where Trump had lived and vacationed for so many years, once installing an 80-foot pole for a gigantic American flag.

"Who would have thought he'd be the one to take it mainstream?" Don said, and in a moment of so much division, it was the one point on which they agreed.

eli.saslow@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BRUSSELS — As Europe reels from a historic rush of migrants, leaders are searching for new ways to reverse the flow by stepping up deportations.

The quest led to a deal with Afghanistan that envisions a whole new terminal at the Kabul airport to take deportees. It sent German Chancellor Angela Merkel last week on a whistle-stop tour of African capitals, where she promised an influx of euros in exchange for willingness to take back migrants. And it resulted in an agreement with Turkey that critics say means European nations are biting their tongues about Ankara's human rights abuses to halt the flow of refugees to Greece.

The efforts come amid a global backlash to **immigrant** flows, which have been increased by war and poverty. In the United States, Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has built his fiery candidacy on an anti-Mexican, anti-Muslim message. In Britain, the government floated a plan to force businesses to declare how many noncitizens they employ following the June vote to sever ties with the European Union. And across Europe, populist anti-migrant parties are surging in the polls.

With the increased cross-border traffic, countries are struggling to deal with the people they have rejected for asylum. Until now, many people who are inside Europe illegally have been able to remain in a limbo that can stretch for years. But that old, lenient model — which has commonalities with that in the United States — is giving way to mounting anti-**immigrant** pressure.

The risks are significant. If Europe significantly steps up deportations to unstable nations, it could further destabilize those governments, setting off a reaction in which yet more people could flee for safer shores. But E.U. leaders are laying the groundwork to do it despite the fears.

"We had to find ways to stop illegal migration," Merkel said during a trip to Ethiopia, where she balanced criticisms of a fresh government crackdown on the opposition with bargaining over doing more to stop migrant flows to Europe. "That is why we said, 'We must speak to Turkey,' because many of these people came from there. We also have to speak with African countries to bring about legality."

European countries are increasingly making clear that their aid comes with strings attached. Merkel, who will face voters next year, is under pressure to show toughness against migrants after she threw open Germany's doors last year to a wave of refugees from the Syrian conflict. French President François Hollande is also gearing up for a campaign that is expected to turn on terrorism and migration issues.

The shift could blunt European soft power across the developing world; E.U. leaders had long prided themselves in being less transactional and more idealistic in dealing with development aid than their counterparts in the United States.

Among policymakers, "the idea is if we are spending all this money, why should we not have them also cooperate on deportations?" said Elizabeth Collett, director of Migration Policy Institute Europe, a Brussels-based think tank. "Over the last six to 12 months, the idea has gained a lot of ground."

In Africa, E.U. diplomats have been working to strike bargains with Mali, Senegal, Niger and Nigeria, which along with Ethiopia are major sources of economic migrants to Europe. Ethiopia recently declared a national state of emergency, spurring international concerns that the government is engaged in harsh retaliation against its opponents.

In Turkey, a springtime deal that all but halted migrant flows to Greece is imperiled following the government's harsh response to a July coup attempt. E.U. leaders pledged $6.7 billion in aid plus visa liberalization for Turkish citizens in exchange for Turkey's willingness to take back migrants who landed in Greece.

The agreements have sparked criticism from human rights advocates who say that the world's largest economic bloc is abdicating its responsibility to help other nations in need.

"The E.U. is pushing people back, keeping people out, instead of using its power to help legal returns and offer support," said Iverna McGowan, the head of Amnesty International's European Institutions Office.

But Afghanistan is the most unstable of the nations with which Europe has pursued migration-related deals, even as leaders have tried to paint a bright picture of the situation.

"It's a sense of partnership that provides us space for working together," E.U. foreign policy chief Federica Mogherini said last week of the E.U. deal with Afghanistan, which committed the war-torn country to accepting an unlimited number of deportees from Europe. The terms of the deal were announced the same day that the E.U. pledged Afghanistan $1.5 billion of development aid a year through 2020.

Mogherini said there was no connection, but Afghan officials said they had been pressured to make the deportation deal in exchange for financial support, and German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier said his nation's pledge of $470 million a year was indeed connected to migration issues.

"Both sides will explore the possibility to build a dedicated terminal for return in Kabul airport," according to the text of the agreement, which lays out tough terms for the Afghan government while offering few obvious benefits in return. Last year, 3,290 Afghans were deported from Europe, according to E.U. figures. Internal E.U. documents leaked in March suggest leaders would like to clear out as many as 80,000 more Afghans.

Defenders of the deals say that Europe's asylum system should be equipped to deal with these challenges. Under internationally practiced asylum law, people who would face danger at home should not be sent back. They would be able to make that case in court.

But there are obvious gaps in the system: In 2015, for example, 60 percent of Afghan asylum applicants in the E.U. were granted protection, according to the U.N. refugee agency. This year, that number has dropped to 35 percent, even though the situation in Afghanistan has deteriorated, suggesting that the courts are facing political pressures.

"If the bar is being raised and it's much harder for Afghans to get protection in Europe, that would be a concern," said William Spindler, a spokesman for the U.N. refugee agency. The agency has declined to issue a blanket warning that anybody leaving Afghanistan should automatically be considered a refugee. People who leave for economic reasons are not considered to have a right to stay in other countries.

On a more basic level, the Afghanistan deal has the potential to cast more Afghans back into a nation that is convulsing in a worsening conflict.

"It's not unlawful, but it makes no sense to do so if the E.U. wants to stabilize Afghanistan," said Gerry Simpson, a senior researcher on refugees at Human Rights Watch. "By doing this, they are fueling the flames for the situation on the ground and for more Afghan refugees to come."

michael.birnbaum@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lagging support among Hispanic voters for Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton and congressional candidates in crucial races has stoked deep concern that the party and the presidential campaign are doing too little to galvanize a key constituency.

While Clinton holds a significant lead over Republican rival Donald Trump in every poll of Hispanic voters, less clear is whether these voters will turn out in numbers that Democrats are counting on to win. Clinton trails President Obama's 2012 performance in several ­Latino-rich states, including Florida, Nevada, Colorado and Arizona. In those same states, on which Democrats' prospects of retaking the Senate hinge, some down-ballot Democrats remain unknown to many Hispanic voters.

That reality has prompted a flurry of criticism of Clinton's and the party's Hispanic strategies. Despite a uniquely favorable environment with Trump's repeated attacks on undocumented **immigrants**, Democrats are increasingly worried that the opportunity is slipping away to meet a long-standing party goal of marshaling the nation's growing Hispanic population into a permanent electoral force. The concerns are compounded by Trump's recent surge in several battleground states.

"We're not seeing the Democratic Party take advantage of this moment in time, really looking to leverage more engagement in a more strategic way with our community," said Janet Murguia, president of the National Council of La Raza.

One top criticism is that Clinton waited until this month to launch a sustained campaign of traditional, Spanish-language ads in key markets. Previously, the campaign's Hispanic strategy centered on reaching millennial voters through new media such as Facebook and YouTube. Its television outreach was produced primarily in English and aimed at bilingual households. According to critics, Clinton missed a chance to deploy a broader effort to target the Hispanic electorate such as the one that Obama pioneered four years ago.

"This approach may end up being vindicated on Election Day," said Fernand Amandi, a veteran strategist who led Obama's research, messaging and paid media operation for the Hispanic vote in 2012. "I just find it to be more risky than replicating what we know worked, which is the sustained approach that the Obama campaign put in place."

Clinton aides and her allies insist that they are facing a very different opponent than Obama's, along with new challenges posed by a Hispanic electorate that grows younger and less reliant on traditional modes of communication with each passing cycle.

The dispute goes to the heart of a debate among Hispanic operatives about how much emphasis should be placed on newer ways of reaching younger Hispanics, who like millennials overall are more resistant to backing Clinton than older Latinos.

"A lot of it has evolved to include outreach that isn't obvious to people who are used to doing it old school," said veteran Democratic strategist Maria Cardona. "The Clinton campaign and the DNC are very strategically focused on Latino millennials."

Much of the upset is also focused on down-ballot House and Senate races. Even Clinton has said any hope that Democrats can retake majorities rests on Hispanic turnout. Yet neither the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee nor the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee employ Hispanic outreach coordinators, according to Albert Morales, who held that job until March for the Democratic National Committee.

"The DSCC has never really had a robust or a Hispanic engagement effort that I ever coordinated with, and that's saying a lot being at the DNC under three different chairmen," Morales said. "I couldn't name one. If you were to ask me, name a Hispanic staffer who's been at the DSCC, I couldn't name it. That's pretty sad."

As a result, critics say, the party is failing to capi­tal­ize on anger at Trump in a way that would help down-ballot candidates.

For instance: According to recent polls, just 40 percent of Hispanic voters say they believe that Trump will make good on his campaign pledge to deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. That means that a key argument of the Democrats' case against him isn't sinking in.

"What really scares me is the non-motivation down-ballot of targeting Latinos for Senate and congressional races," said Chuck Rocha, a Democratic political consultant who worked on the presidential campaign of Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont.

In Florida, Republican Sen. Marco Rubio has a seven-point edge among Latinos against Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy, according to a poll released by Univision News last week. Rubio's Cuban American heritage may be Murphy's biggest hurdle, but Murphy is also widely unknown among Hispanics: 6 in 10 said they didn't know enough about him to register an opinion, the poll said.

Arizona tells a similar story. Democratic Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick, who is hoping to unseat incumbent Republican Sen. John McCain, is unknown by 4 in 10 Hispanics, even though she leads 50 percent to 35 percent among them, according to the same Univision survey.

In Nevada, where former Democratic attorney general Catherine Cortez Masto hopes to become the first Latina elected to the Senate, she's leading Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R) among Hispanics 58 percent to 24 percent — but 38 percent of Hispanics don't know enough about her to register an opinion.

"You can never do too much, there's more to be done, yes," said Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.). "I think there's more to do around the country, but it's just expensive."

DSCC spokeswoman Lauren Passalacqua said the committee is rolling out a more focused strategy in the closing weeks in key states. She also noted that Cortez Masto and Kirkpatrick are already airing Spanish TV ads.

According to the DCCC, which coordinates House races for Democrats, Spanish-language television and radio ads are on the air in a House race in Texas and another in Florida, with more likely to go up soon. The committee's biggest effort this cycle has been to hire local, Spanish-speaking organizers earlier than ever to register and turn out voters in key districts.

"This is a new approach that we believe will work," said Rep. Ben Ray Luján (D-N.M.), the first Latino chairman of the committee.

Also of concern to Rocha and others is the lack of messaging on bread-and-butter topics beyond **immigration** such as the economy, education and health care — issues that are important to most voters, including Hispanics.

In contrast, Obama's first Spanish-language ads in 2012 were focused on health care and education, including Head Start and Pell Grants, which provide aid to poor students who attend college.

"Being part of the Bernie team for so long and seeing how the message of free college and raising the minimum wage resonated, I just don't see that out there now that I'm working on these races where there's a lot of Latinos," Rocha said.

Obama also targeted the intricacies of the Latino community, according to Freddy Balsera, a Miami-based political consultant who crafted much of Obama's Spanish-language advertising campaign in 2008.

"When we were talking to a Latino voter in Colorado, we were discussing issues that mattered to them there. We did the same thing in Florida and took it a step further by talking to South Florida Hispanics with an announcer who was more Cuban-sounding. It was a more Puerto Rican-sounding voice in Orlando," Balsera said. "We really, really localized the message and understood there's not a pan-Hispanic community. And as such, there's no universal pan-Hispanic messages."

Veterans of Obama's 2012 race said the campaign determined in early 2011 that they needed an aggressive strategy to turn out minority voters — especially Hispanics — in anticipation of a drop-off in support among white voters. It involved early, heavy advertising on Spanish-language television, including one voiced in Spanish by Obama and others by Cristina Saralegui, who has been described as the "Spanish Oprah." Those efforts were paired with targeted grass-roots outreach and an aggressive field program.

Clinton aides said they began putting Latino organizers on the ground in May, both in Hispanic-rich battlegrounds and in other states with smaller but potentially pivotal Latino populations, including Wisconsin, Iowa, Georgia, Ohio and Nebraska.

The effort includes programs targeting various groups within the Hispanic community, including undocumented **immigrant** children, or dreamers, and their families, small-business owners, and a program targeted at Latino faith leaders.

Soon, the campaign plans to bus Puerto Rican supporters from New York into Pennsylvania, where they will canvass in towns and neighborhoods, including Bethlehem, Lancaster and North Philadelphia, that are full of Puerto Rican transplants. Also under consideration is flying Puerto Ricans from the island to knock on doors in Florida.

But in the general election, the campaign's investment in the kind of targeted advertising that was pioneered in 2012 has been smaller and has come later. And the question of language has been a key spark in the debate.

Until recently, much of Clinton's television advertising to Hispanic voters has been in English, a concerted decision aimed at reaching bilingual households.

"All of these tactics complement each other. One part of course is Spanish-language ads. But the other part targets English-dominant Hispanics," said Lorella Praeli, Clinton's director of Latino Outreach. "We're also very comfortable spending time in the Spanglish space — that's the way that we communicate."

A new Spanish-language radio ad released this week and airing in Florida, Nevada and Ohio, is voiced by Clinton's running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.). In Spanish, Kaine touts his work as a Jesuit missionary in Honduras — part of the senator's backstory that Clinton campaign aides believe will resonate with Hispanics, who are predominantly Catholic and who generally revere Pope Francis, the first Jesuit pontiff.

That kind of Spanish delivery can matter, said Federico de Jesus, who served as Obama's Hispanic communications director during the 2008 campaign, noting that they received positive feedback in 2008 when Obama's Spanish ads included him approving the ad in Spanish: "Soy Barack Obama y yo apruebo este mensaje."

This year, Clinton's Spanish ads only have her saying, "Soy Hillary Clinton and I approve this message."

"It's fine that she did only part of it, but it's different," de Jesus said.

Amandi, the veteran strategist of Obama's 2012 campaign, questioned the wisdom of waiting to engage in Spanish until the end.

"The question I would ask is what message does that send to the Spanish-dominant Hispanic voters?" Amandi asked. "That they're not as important as the English-language Hispanic voters by waiting this late in the cycle to engage with them?"

ed.okeefe@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

Donald Trump once again escalated his "rigged election" rhetoric at a rally in Wisconsin last night, and many observers are now warning that if he keeps it up, the smooth functioning of our democracy could be undermined, not just by lack of voter confidence in the integrity of the outcome, but also by outright disruptions on election day.

This is a bit like warning that an arsonist may end up succeeding in reducing his target to ashes.

It is now becoming clear that the prospect of undermined public faith in the election's integrity, and even disruptions on election day, is not an unintended byproduct of Trump's snowballing claims of a rigged election. Rather, making these things happen is very likely the explicit goal of those claims.

In Wisconsin, Trump again alluded to a plot to "rig the election at the polling booths":

"People that have died 10 years ago are still voting. Illegal **immigrants** are voting," Trump said. "So many cities are corrupt, and voter fraud is very, very common."

Trump also quoted from a recent Pew study finding that over 1.8 million deceased individuals are still listed as voters. "I have a feeling they're not gonna vote for me," Trump said of that 1.8 million. "Of the 1.8 million, 1.8 million is gonna vote for someone else." (This study actually urged voting reforms that would maximize participation, which Trump is trying to discourage, but put that aside for now.)

The claim that "illegal **immigrants** are voting" is of a piece with Trump's recent assertion that the Obama administration is allowing them to "pour" over the border to vote in the presidential election. This, combined with Trump's ongoing warnings of rampant voter fraud, and his calls to his supporters to monitor polling places "in certain areas" (read: nonwhite areas), appear to be part of an ongoing strategy to turn the election into a big sh\*t show in the final stretch. As Trump's own advisers have suggested, making the last days of the election as ugly as possible could help depress the enthusiasm of Hillary Clinton's supporters, perhaps dragging down turnout.

But Democrats think Trump's whole scheme goes further still: they think Trump is making an explicit effort to encourage disruptions on election day, because the specter of such disruptions could itself depress turnout. As one Democratic lawyer put it: "If you wind up spending a lot of time talking about election fraud and law enforcement, you're generating a message that can have a very discouraging effect on the electorate."

Disruptions on election day, should they happen, could also serve another obvious objective harbored by Trump. As many have already observed, Trump has spent months preparing to tell his millions of followers that the election was stolen from them, should Clinton win, and will also likely tell them that Clinton is an illegitimate president. Disruptions and possibly violence would further the impression of a messy election day that could help him make that case.

No one really knows what Trump is thinking. But it's not unreasonable to speculate that Trump is ultimately trying to cast our entire democratic process as illegitimate, laying the groundwork to press this argument long after election day.

"What he is doing has many objectives, such as suppressing turnout and undermining the legitimacy of a Clinton presidency," Democratic strategist Simon Rosenberg argues to me. "Whether there is also a more malevolent motive -- to wound our democracy itself -- remains to be seen."

If so, you can draw a line from Trump's claim during his convention that only "I alone can fix" our system -- which was widely denounced as a fundamentally undemocratic sentiment -- straight to his current claims that the election is rigged against him.

The Clinton campaign, perhaps not wanting to play into Trump's effort to create the impression of a looming election day mess, is sticking to a public line emphasizing that everything will go smoothly, with record turnout. If Clinton does win, this, despite Trump's best efforts, is probably what will end up happening. And Trump's rantings will look increasingly marginal and buffoonish as we move past this ugly election and, hopefully, on to better times ahead.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* CLINTON LEADS IN ANOTHER NATIONAL POLL: The new NBC News/Survey Monkey Tracking Poll finds Clinton leading Trump by 51-43 in the head-to-head match-up, and by 46-40 in the four-way. And as always:

Men without college degrees support Trump by an 18-point margin, 52 percent to 34 percent. But men with college degrees go for Clinton over Trump by 12 points, 48 percent to 36 percent.

And women without college degrees also support Clinton, by 46-40. But non-college men will alone put Trump over the top!

\* CLINTON SEEMS TO HOLD LARGE NATIONAL LEAD: Nate Silver takes stock of yesterday's batch of national polls showing Clinton up by large margins, and concludes:

Overall, the results are most consistent with a race in which Clinton leads by about 7 percentage points nationally. States in the Midwest and the Northeast for the most part look as they did in 2012, when President Obama beat Mitt Romney by just under 4 points nationally. But, in the West and in the South, where demographic shifts are unfavorable for Trump, Clinton is poised to have the best Democratic performance since at least 1996, if the polls are correct.

Clinton is doing better against Trump in the more diverse states than in the Rust Belt. Yet even there, Trump may not end up outperforming Romney, despite his magical powers with blue collar whites.

\* TRUMP COULD SINK TO HISTORIC POLLING LOWS: Politico's Steven Shepard games out just how low Trump might sink in the national polls, and concludes he might "earn a smaller percentage of the vote than any major-party nominee in at least 20 years":

In matchups that include third-party candidates, Trump is winning, on average, 39.6 percent of the vote compared to 46.2 percent for Hillary Clinton in the dozen national polls using live-telephone interviewers conducted since September 26….That leaves Trump perilously close to a historic rebuke from American voters for a major-party candidate.

But the election is "rigged," so it doesn't count.

\* AS LEAD EXPANDS, CLINTON CAMPAIGN FACES DILEMMA: The New York Times reports that the Clinton campaign is juggling two goals: Win by as big a margin as possible; or redirect money to down-ballot Dems:

The double-barreled assault illustrates her priorities three weeks before Election Day. She hopes to hand Mr. Trump a loss so humiliating that it jars him and Republicans, removing any doubt about the wisdom of running on a grievance-oriented platform. But she also is demonstrating to the congressional Democrats with whom she may soon be working that she is also is dedicated to expanding their ranks.

As I've reported, Democrats want Clinton to do both, too: it's about margin and money. And a decisive defeat of Trumpism would be an added plus.

\* REPUBLICANS WORRY ABOUT CLINTON IN ARIZONA: The Clinton campaign has announced that they will make a major play for Arizona, and David Drucker reports:

Clinton has pulled ahead in some public and private polling, and Republican operatives based in Arizona concede that her campaign's decision to invest more than $2 million there down the stretch is a smart move that could pay off…."They expect to win — likely pushing for 46ish percent and a win with a plurality, which is looking more and more likely," said a GOP strategist who requested anonymity in order to speak candidly about the race.

And of course, even if she doesn't win, getting Trump to spend precious time and resources in this once-secure state with time running out is alone a positive.

\* HOW BAD WOULD TRUMP'S FOREIGN POLICY ADVENTURES GET? The Truman National Security Project is rolling out a new online tool called ¨Choose Your Own Trumpventure," which allows you to game out the major consequences of a Trump presidency in five areas: The Mideast; relations with Russia; potential trade wars; the wall on the southern border; and rising Islamophobia at home.

The idea is to dramatize the fact that a Trump presidency could have potentially catastrophic international consequences, if we take his own policy prescriptions at his word. Judging by the polls, this is one area in which a majority of Americans is concluding he is unacceptable.

\* AND THE TRUMPISM OF THE DAY, I'M-A-WINNER EDITION: Asked by ABC News if Paul Ryan even wants him to win the White House, Trump replied:

"Well, maybe not, because maybe he wants to run in four years or maybe he doesn't know how to win. Maybe just doesn't know how to win. I mean, who can really know. But I know I'm in his territory and they are all screaming for Trump."

One wonders how Trump will handle it if and when those screaming crowds become a distant memory.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As the grotesquerie masquerading as a presidential campaign slouches toward its end, a final spectacle — a "debate" — is slated for Wednesday. It is hard to imagine a worse circumstance. Trump, more at ease with insults than ideas, is in the midst of a mortifying public self-immolation. The Clinton campaign has heated itself into a faux Cold War lather over WikiLeaks' release of hacked campaign emails. And as a final measure, the "moderator," Chris Wallace, is supplied by Fox News, a virtual guarantee that the scandalous will supplant the substantial.

It is probably a fool's errand to suggest that Wallace explore real issues rather than raking the muck over again. But opinions have already hardened on everything from Clinton's "damned emails" to Trump's predation. Rather than ask Trump about his libido or Clinton about the "deplorables," why not pose fundamental questions that have received far too little attention in this campaign?

Wallace has already released a list of topics for the debate: debt and entitlements, **immigration**, economy, Supreme Court, "foreign hot spots" and fitness to be president. Of course, previous debate moderators also released seemingly substantive lists of topics, to no avail. That said, though we've already heard a lot about **immigration** ("Build the wall"), the Supreme Court and fitness for the presidency, some of these could be used to frame real concerns.

For example, "foreign hot spots" might start with the hottest spot of all: the Earth. Bizarrely, we are headed into the last debate without a single question on climate change, and there were no questions on the topic in the 2012 debates either. Last year was the hottest year on record; this year is worse. The Pentagon considers climate change a clear and present danger that will destabilize far more countries than al-Qaeda and its offshoots will. The two candidates have totally contrasting positions that voters should hear. The Democratic platform calls for a "World War II style mobilization" against climate change — a phrase often used by Clinton's primary opponent Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.). Is Clinton ready to lead that charge, and if so, what will it entail? Trump says climate change is a hoax and calls for unleashing oil and coal production. What would he do about global warming: ignore it, deny it or choose to act?

On the economy, Wallace could probe the issue where the two candidates stand united against the bipartisan elite consensus of the past decades. Both oppose the Trans-Pacific Partnership that President Obama and Republican leaders in Congress support. Both say it is a bad deal. Both say our trade policies haven't worked for working people. So ask, "Would you urge the Congress to vote down the TPP? How would you change trade strategies going forward?"

Finally, it would be a true disservice to the country if the debate doesn't center on the growing fears that the United States is careening into a reckless face-off with Russia and lurching deeper into war in the Middle East.

So ask Clinton: The Obama administration has broken off discussions with Russia about Syria, saying there is "nothing more for the United States and Russia to talk about." Secretary of State John F. Kerry has called for a war-crimes investigation of Russia and Syria. Vice President Biden boasts that the United States will send a message "at the time of our choosing" to Vladi­mir Putin to retaliate for the alleged Russian hacking of the Democratic National Committee and your campaign emails. The Russian Ministry of Defense warned Washington against carrying out airstrikes aimed at Syrian forces. Yet you have called for establishing a "no-fly zone" and enforcing "safe zones" in Syria, which you admit will entail severe Syrian civilian casualties and could risk war with Russia. Are you willing to take that risk? Do you think we should ramp up or cool down tensions with Russia? Do you agree that there is nothing to talk about, or should we listen to allies who are pleading with us to talk with the Russians?

Ask Trump: In the last debate, you criticized the Obama administration for not being serious about the Islamic State. You argued that the United States should cooperate with Russia, Iran and the Syrian government to take out the Islamic State. How is that a more effective approach to fighting the terrorist group?

We need a debate worthy of the challenges we face as a nation. Trump prefers tweeting on the weight of Miss Universe or the guilt or innocence of the Central Park Five. The Clinton campaign wants to turn the hacking of documents that ended up in the hands of WikiLeaks into the next Watergate.

But the next president will have to deal with real crises, not campaign detritus. After 14 years of war, the United States seems to be getting drawn in even deeper into endless conflicts. It may be impossible to have a policy discussion amid all the spitballs, but surely it is worth a try.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This was a Donald Trump rally like no other.

On the same day that the Republican presidential nominee told a mostly white crowd in Maine that he would unite the United States under "one god," he appeared in front of a crowd of thousands of people of Indian extraction and lit a Hindu ceremonial candle.

"I am a big fan of Hindu and a big fan of India," he said, to loud cheers from a crowd composed of many American citizens, but also many, who are at various stages along the path to citizenship or just visiting from India.

The rally, in Edison, N.J., was organized by the Republican Hindu Coalition, whose founder, Shalabh Kumar, is one of Trump's biggest fundraisers. Trump repaid Kumar's generosity with a remarkably warm speech toward Hindus and India in which he said the two nations would be "best friends."

"There won't be any relationship more important to us," said Trump.

At the end of a week in which Trump faced a seemingly ever-growing number of sexual assault allegations, the rally in New Jersey provided a welcome diversion. The nominee stuck entirely to praise for India and its prime minister, Narendra Modi, as well as his standard policy positions, which he read from a teleprompter.

In a statement days before the rally, Kumar defended Trump against the allegations, saying, "The Hindu and Indian people do not abandon their friends in times of crisis. With India and Pakistan on the brink of war, and lives at stake in the global war on terror, Mr. Trump is the president we need at this time."

Hindu supporters of Trump at the event said they find common ground with the candidate on his perceived toughness against "radical Islamic terror," as well as promises of low taxes. On the other hand, Trump has often said he would curtail **immigration** to the United States, which seemed at odds in a room filled with **immigrants** and those hoping to become Americans. The organizers printed hundreds of signs for attendees to hold, including many that said "Trump for faster green cards."

More than half of the two-dozen-odd attendees interviewed for this article were not (yet) American citizens. And while the smattering of white people in the audience wore Trump campaign paraphernalia, much of the rest of the crowd donned sequined and starched Indian attire.

Many who were present said they were not aware that the event was meant to have any political overtones. For more than two hours before Trump's speech, the convention center where the rally took place witnessed a celebration of Bollywood culture, much of which took place in Indian languages. That cinematic masala, or verve, is what many said made the event alluring — not Trump.

"I am here to see Prabhudeva," said Kashyap Patel, 29, who is a green-card holder working for a pharmaceuticals company in Piscataway, N.J. Prabhudeva is a major celebrity, known for his intricate dancing style and commonly thought of as India's answer to Michael Jackson. "I think most people came for entertainment purposes. My focus is to see Prabhudeva and then leave."

That Prabhudeva and other household-name Indian stars would effectively introduce Trump came as a surprise to many on Indian social media, as well as to many in the Indian-American community, which leans overwhelmingly Democratic. Roughly 70 percent plan to vote for Hillary Clinton compared with 7 percent for Trump, according to most recent polls.

But Trump won major applause for comparisons between himself and Modi, who he called a "great man," as well as his condemnation of the Islamic State, which included a jab at Clinton.

"We will stand shoulder to shoulder with India in sharing intelligence and keeping our people safe mutually," he said. "This is so important in the age of ISIS, the barbaric threat Hillary Clinton has unleashed on the entire world."

The national security messaging made its way into part of the Bollywood routine, too. One onstage skit featured two dancing couples who were abruptly interrupted by robed, bearded men with fake machine guns masquerading as terrorists. Only after they carried out a mock execution, did men and women dressed as police officials come on stage and "shoot" them. Then the police officials and couples danced a number before transitioning into the American national anthem. The event itself was billed as a charity event for Hindu victims of terrorism in both Kashmir and West Bengal, Indian states that have seen major incidents of communal violence.

The linkage of Islam and terrorism was made more explicit by Hindu supporters of Trump who were passing out fliers outside the convention center. A man named Vincent Bruno caught the attention of many who were milling about while waiting to enter when he confronted a small group of protesters. Bruno is a gay man, married to a Venezuelan, who converted to Hinduism from what he called "paganism" because he found the former religion to be more "refined and intact"

"If you support Muslims, you support rape culture," he said, during a nearly three-minute long attempt to shout out the protesters, who were carrying signs that said "South Asians Dump Trump."

Back inside, the few white Trump supporters seemed to be enjoying the music and dance. Ruth Janiszak, 68, said the rally in New Jersey was her first for Trump, though she'd been an active Republican for decades. Her son Steve had found out about the rally almost by accident, he said, because it was mostly advertised to the Indian-American community.

"Bollywood is real different for people like us," she said, adding that she had only ever had good experiences with Indian Americans in her years as a private piano instructor. "We all believe in a God. I'm just glad they're turning out."

As for Trump, she said she was tired of him straying away from the issues. Trembling with anger, she said Clinton was "a terrible disgrace" and "a crying shame."

"We need to close **immigration** right now, and get to work assimilating the ones who we already let in. We cannot let anymore in until we figure out what is going on," said Janiszak, who claimed her own family had been in America since 1658, "before it was a country."

After what he found to be a satisfying speech by Trump, Steve Janiszak said the event proved to him that "it can be good that people come from other countries."

"I don't want to get into terms and all," he said. "But people make Trump out to be a racist and a xenophobe, and he's not."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Regarding the Oct. 2 front-page article "Hungary intends to stop migrants with 'hunters' near border wall":

Hungary's civilian border patrol — to call them "hunters" is an incorrect translation — provides additional protection on what has become one of Europe's most sensitive frontiers in the struggle against illegal **immigration** and human trafficking. The Western Balkan migration route, and specifically Hungary's southern border, became the busiest transit route for illegal **immigration** into the European Union in 2015, according to the European Union's border protection agency, Frontex. Yet Hungary is supposedly "instilling . . . fear" and "mainstreaming racism."

The article failed to mention that last year, before the border fence was built, the Islamic State exploited the porous borders into the European Union.

If anyone would like a glimpse at a "world where the build-a-wall mentality to keep migrants out rules the land," the United States' southern border, which is reinforced in several places by a wall and other barriers, is a good place to start.

Zoltán Kovács, Budapest

The writer is the spokesman for the Hungarian government.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**More women and children from Central America illegally crossed into the United States in 2016 compared with two years ago, when President Obama ordered an emergency government response to address the escalating border crisis.

A total of 137,366 unaccompanied minors and families with children were apprehended by Border Patrol agents along the border with Mexico in fiscal 2016, which ended Sept. 30, an increase of several hundred from 2014, according to statistics released Monday by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

The surge comes after a significant drop in 2015 and has reignited questions about the efficacy of the administration's **immigration** policies. The vast majority of those who have entered the United States illegally are from three Central American nations: Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras.

Human rights groups have said that most of the **immigrants** are fleeing gang violence and organized crime in their homelands and deserve refugee status. But the Obama administration has said that the **immigrants** are eligible for deportation if they fail to win political-asylum protections in a U.S. **immigration** court.

"We are determined to treat migrants in a humane manner," Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson said in a statement. "At the same time, we must enforce our **immigration** laws consistent with our enforcement priorities."

After the 2014 crisis, during which Border Patrol stations in Texas were overwhelmed by the influx of Central American women and children, Obama ordered a governmentwide response, which included $750 million in aid to the Central American nations, additional temporary shelters and more **immigration** judges to process the asylum cases.

The administration also created a program to allow asylum seekers to apply for legal protections in the United States from within their home nations, hoping to discourage would-be **immigrants** from making the often-dangerous journey north under the guidance of human smugglers.

So far, only a few thousand children have won refugee status through the new system.

Sen. Thomas Carper (D-Del.), ranking member on the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, traveled to Mexico, Guatemala and El Salvador last week to discuss the migration crisis with officials in those nations, his office said.

"Often we focus too much attention to the symptoms of problems rather than trying to fix the underlying causes," Carper said in a statement.

How to address the undocumented Central American **immigrants** has become an issue in the 2016 campaign. Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton has suggested that she would consider a policy of not deporting undocumented **immigrants** who do not violate other laws. Republican nominee Donald Trump has said he would seek to deport most, if not all, of the estimated 11 million people living in the United States illegally.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**He is preaching to the converted. He is lashing out at anyone who is not completely loyal. He is detaching himself from and delegitimizing the institutions of American political life. And he is proclaiming conspiracies everywhere — in polls (rigged), in debate moderators (biased) and in the election itself (soon to be stolen).

In the presidential campaign's home stretch, Donald Trump is fully inhabiting his own echo chamber. The Republican nominee has turned inward, increasingly isolated from the country's mainstream and leaders of his own party, and determined to rouse his most fervent supporters with dire warnings that their populist movement could fall prey to dark and collusive forces.

This is a campaign right out of Breitbart, the incendiary conservative website run until recently by Stephen K. Bannon, now the Trump campaign's chief executive — and it is an act of retaliation.

A turbulent few weeks punctuated by allegations of sexual harassment have left Trump trailing Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton in nearly every swing state. Trump's gamble is that igniting his army of working-class whites could do more to put him in contention than any sort of broad, tempered appeal to undecided voters.

The execution has been volatile. Since announcing last week that "the shackles have been taken off me," Trump, bolstered by allies on talk radio and social media, has been creating an alternate reality — one full of innuendo about Clinton, tirades about the unfair news media and prophecies of Trump's imminent triumph.

The candidate once omnipresent across the "mainstream media" these days largely limits his interviews to the safe harbor of the opinion shows on Fox News, and most of them are with Sean Hannity, a Trump supporter and informal counselor.

Many Republicans see the Trump campaign's latest incarnation as a mirror into the psyche of their party's restive base: pulsating with grievance and vitriol, unmoored from conservative orthodoxy, and deeply suspicious of the fast-changing culture and the consequences of globalization.

"I think Trump is right: The shackles have been released, but they were the shackles of reality," said Mike Murphy, a veteran GOP strategist. "Trump has now shifted to a mode of complete egomaniacal self-indulgence. If he's going to go off with these merry alt-right pranksters and only talk to people who vote Republican no matter what, he's going to lose the election substantially."

Even retired neurosurgeon Ben Carson, a Trump supporter and adviser, acknowledged the difficulties for Trump. He said the nominee's understanding of what motivates his base is "what got him through the primaries. The problem for him is that you have to expand that in order to win a general election. What's out there is powerful, but not enough."

For Bannon and legions of Trump fans, Trump's approach is not only a relished escalation of his combativeness, but also a chance to reshape the GOP in Trump's hard-line nationalist image.

"This is a hostile takeover," said former House speaker Newt Gingrich (R), a Trump ally. "They believe the media is their mortal enemy and the country is in mortal danger, that Hillary Clinton would end America as we know it."

Gingrich continued: "This is not only about beating Hillary Clinton. It's about breaking the elite media, which has become the phalanx of the establishment."

Trump's strategy was crystallized by his defiant speech Thursday in West Palm Beach, Fla., in which he brazenly argued that the women who have accused him of unwanted kissing and groping were complicit in a global conspiracy of political, business and media elites to slander him and extinguish his outsider campaign.

"It's a global power structure," he said. Trump went on to describe himself as a populist martyr — "I take all of these slings and arrows gladly for you" — and posited: "This is not simply another four-year election. This is a crossroads in the history of our civilization that will determine whether or not we the people reclaim control over our government."

Two days earlier, Trump was in Panama City Beach on Florida's culturally conservative panhandle sketching out his universe. His rally was outdoors after sunset. The amphitheater's capacity was 7,500, and there were large pockets of empty space, but a man came on the loudspeakers with an announcement: This was a record crowd of 10,000 people, with an additional 10,000 outside the perimeter.

When Trump strode out, he one-upped his announcer. "I guess we have 11,200 here, and outside we have over 10,000 people!"

So it went for the next 50 minutes as Trump told a patchwork of exaggerations and falsehoods about what he deemed his criminal opponent and the libelous news media conspiring to elect her.

"The election of Hillary Clinton will lead to the destruction of our country," Trump said. "Believe me."

One of his believers was Chris Ricker, 49, an electrician. Trump's slogans are his slogans — Ricker's ­T-shirt read: "Hillary Clinton for Prison" — and Trump's enemies are his enemies. "I watch Fox News 100 percent, but can you put down that I hate Megyn Kelly?" he asked.

Pointing at the crowd, Ricker said: "See this right here? This is a revolution."

Ricker got to talking about Clinton and her "secret microphone" at the first debate. He was indignant when a reporter stated that Clinton had no such device: "Dude, where are you at? You haven't seen the videos? There was somebody sitting backstage giving her answers. It's all corrupt."

By week's end, a new conspiracy was born. Trump insinuated during a rally Saturday in Portsmouth, N.H., that Clinton may be taking drugs.

"We should take a drug test prior [to the next debate], because I don't know what's going on with her," Trump said. "At the beginning of her last debate she was all pumped up at the beginning, and at the end it was like, 'Oh, take me down.' "

The impact of Trump's provocations could extend beyond Election Day. Again and again, Trump has ominously predicted a "stolen election." In Pennsylvania, for instance, he has instructed his rural white supporters to go to Philadelphia, a city with a large black population, to stand watch for voter fraud.

On Friday in Charlotte, another diverse city, Trump said: "The election is rigged. It's rigged to like you have never seen before. They're rigging the system."

Departing from the norms of American democracy, Trump appears to be laying the foundation to contest the results, should he lose, and delegitimize a Clinton presidency in the minds of his followers.

Trump's echo chamber is not altogether new. It is a more nationalistic and racially charged strain of the one most elected Republicans have inhabited for two decades. Conservative talk radio and Fox News, which rose to prominence in the late 1990s, became for party leaders a retreat and a source of power.

But in recent years this echo chamber has evolved from being an arm of the party into an unpredictable and sprawling orbit of the American right. Starting with the tea party movement in the early years of Barack Obama's presidency, fury over what activists saw as a capitulating GOP establishment created a vacuum for someone or something to take hold.

Enter Trump, who promised total disruption and whose movement has been fueled not only by talk radio and television personalities, but also by a galaxy of blogs, websites and super PACs that saw money to be made and influence to be gained. Together they fed on false theories such as challenging President Obama's birthplace in Hawaii, and the connective tissue for their working-class rage has been the threat of illegal **immigration**.

Obama described this world as a "swamp of crazy that has been fed over and over and over and over again."

"Donald Trump, as he's prone to do, he didn't build the building himself, but he just slapped his name on it and took credit for it," Obama said Thursday in a speech in Columbus, Ohio.

Trump's worldview extends beyond what is published on Breitbart, which specializes in turbocharged coverage of illegal **immigration** and unproved theories about Obama and Clinton. Still, Bannon, who has been traveling with Trump daily, shares with him the latest Breitbart material and helps him hone lines slamming the Clintons. He tells Trump that he is the American incarnation of populist movements rising in capitals around the world, such as Brexit in Britain.

Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) — who has excoriated the "masters of the universe" obsessed with open borders — is another conduit and confidant, as is Trump's policy maven and speechwriter, Stephen Miller, a former Sessions adviser.

Then there is Roger Stone, Trump's longtime adviser and provocateur who has published conspiratorial writings about the Clintons. From Stone one can trace Trump's political bloodline to Alex Jones, who runs the website Infowars.com, which has trafficked in stories about the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks being a tyrannical government conspiracy.

Trump sat for an interview with Jones in late 2015 in which Jones spoke about the United States becoming a "third-world nation" and "globalists that want to have a world government." Trump nodded along.

Jones more recently has called Obama and Clinton "demon possessed," smelling of sulfur and attracting flies. At the second debate, Trump picked up on that characterization, labeling Clinton "the devil." And it was Stone, in a recent interview with Infowars, who introduced the unfounded theory advanced on the stump by Trump that Clinton was "jacked up on something" in the second debate.

Clinton has admonished Trump for taking what she calls "a radical fringe" into the political mainstream, and her advisers have watched with disgust as Trump has crafted a closing message rooted in dark conspiracies.

"It would be laughable that a Republican nominee for president would have allowed his campaign to be overtaken by Breitbart and Infowars, except that it is a very dangerous and cynical thing to do to try to convince voters of these lies," said Jennifer Palmieri, the Clinton campaign's communications director.

Trump may not be a fleeting example of how an outsider will use this alt-right ecosystem to build a base of national support from outside of the Republican mainstream. Carson said he saw firsthand how these forces could propel a political outsider to the top tier of the presidential nominating contest.

"There were a lot of people who supported me who recognized that the Democrats and the Republicans were often one and the same," Carson said. "They saw them as one establishment, and they put the media together with it."

philip.rucker@washpost.com

robert.costa@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Whatever the outcome for the term-limits proposal on next month's Montgomery County ballot, neither supporters nor opponents are likely to be accused of trying to buy the contest.

The two political committees organized around Question B — Voters for Montgomery County Term Limits and No on B — raised a total of $12,000, according to state campaign finance reports filed late Friday.

A little over $9,000 was collected by No on B, which opposes the charter amendment to limit the county executive and County Council members to three terms. About 70 percent of that amount is from incumbent council members, their family members or staff.

Council members Roger Berliner (D-Potomac-Bethesda), Marc Elrich (D-At Large), Sidney Katz (D-Gaithersburg-Rockville), George L. Leventhal (D-At Large), Nancy Navarro (D-Mid-County) and Hans Riemer (D-At Large) put up a total of $6,000 from their campaign treasuries. Casa de Maryland, the **immigrant**advocacy group, donated $1,000. Smaller contributions came from Leventhal's father, Carl Leventhal, and staff aides to Riemer, Elrich and Navarro.

The committee's major expense, $5,000, was the fee for attorney Jonathan Shurberg, who led an unsuccessful court fight to get the question removed from the ballot. The group had about $4,000 cash on hand through Oct. 9.

"This was not going to be a $50,000 or $100,000 campaign," said the committee's chairman, Tom Moore. He said most of the push will come on Election Day from other groups opposed to Question B, including the Montgomery County Democratic Central Committee and the Montgomery County Education Association, which are expected to recommend a no vote on sample ballots.

"I think we're in a pretty good position," Moore said.

Donations to Voters for Montgomery County Term Limits were minimal but suggest that an unusual coalition of real estate interests, neighborhood groups and Republican activists — all with various grievances against council incumbents — may be forming around the issue.

The committee reported donations of $2,890, nearly all of which was still on hand as of Oct. 9. The largest donation, $1,000, is from Charles K. Nulsen III, president of Washington Property, a Bethesda firm that owns apartment and office buildings throughout the county. Despite unhappiness in the real estate community with the council's decision to raise property and recordation taxes, Nulsen appears to be the sole developer presence in the report.

Smaller contributors included Paula Bienenfeld ($20), immediate past president of the Montgomery County Civic Federation, an umbrella group of neighborhood associations that recently endorsed Question B; Dwight Patel ($100), second vice chairman of the Montgomery County Republican Party; and Brad Botwin ($75), founder and director of Help Save Maryland, listed as a "nativist-extremist" group by the Southern Poverty Law Center for its positions on **immigration**. Help Save Maryland has been critical of policies that have made the county more hospitable for illegal **immigrants**.

Another report is due Oct. 28.

bill.turque@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump, having disgraced the Republican Party, polluted the presidential campaign and shamed and embarrassed the nation, now wants to bring those talents to the federal government.

If his racist, misogynistic, narcissistic campaign does win, two unions representing thousands of federal law enforcement officers will have been accomplices. Even as dozens of Republican stalwarts flee Trump, no longer able to stomach the latest vulgar demonstration of his character, the National Border Patrol Council and the National ICE Council remain in his throng.

That puts them at odds with their parent organization, the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), and its parent, the AFL-CIO, which strongly support Democrat Hillary Clinton.

It's ironic, make that disturbing, that organizations representing law enforcement officers would cling to a man who bragged about sexual assault and mused about jailing his political opponent if he wins.

Interviews with leaders of both organizations revealed no plans to dump Trump. Their one-issue tunnel vision allows them to ignore indications that a Trump administration, with Mike Pence as vice president, would push proposals that are anathema to unions, including those representing cops. Two prominent Trump advisers have urged him to push for civil-service law changes that would allow a Trump administration to fire feds faster.

The two unions are dissatisfied with the Obama administration's policy on border security, their sole focus. Yet their endorsement of Trump means they support a man whose **immigration** platform is best known for banning Muslims — or the current euphemism "extreme vetting" — and getting Mexico to pay for a wall along the border. Do the police unions consider this good **immigration** policy? Do they care that a Muslim ban is illegal?

The National Border Patrol Council endorsement "came down to one issue, and that was border security," said spokesman Shawn Moran.

As the endorsement statement explains, "We don't need a person who has the perfect Washington-approved tone."

Their single-subject approach to candidate appraisal allows them to miss a number of other issues that would directly and negatively affect their members' interests. If Trump wins, he presumably will be guided by the Republican platform. And Pence has said and done a number of things as a member of Congress and governor of Indiana that are abhorrent to labor organizations and public employees.

Among other things, the platform calls for a 10 percent reduction in the federal workforce and a compensation system where pay and benefits "reflect those of the private sector," often code in conservative circles for compensation cuts.

The platform targets federal workers who are behind in their taxes, when the delinquency rate is twice as high for the general population, and calls for increased privatization of federal jobs. Regarding labor generally, the AFL-CIO called the platform "union-busting."

AFGE President J. David Cox Sr. noted the campaign walks, mailings and phone calls his labor organization is doing for Clinton but added that AFGE is a democracy and its members can support whomever they want. He said about 70 percent choose Clinton.

In addition to the platform, Trump is getting counsel from high-profile advisers that can't please the two police unions.

Former House speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) urged Trump to do battle with federal labor organizations. According to a September New Yorker article, Gingrich recommended "getting permission to fire corrupt, incompetent and dishonest workers — that's the absolute showdown."

Gingrich predicted a fight with unions would lead to an "ongoing war" similar to the 2011 labor standoff with Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker (R) when he pushed restrictions on public employees' collective-bargaining rights. "You have to end the civil-service permanent employment," Gingrich told the magazine. "You start changing that and the public-employee unions will just come unglued."

In an email exchange about the federal workforce with The Washington Post, Gingrich said that "the absence of accountability is breathtaking."

Another top Trump adviser, New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie (R), also urged the candidate to propose changing federal civil-service procedures, which can be lengthy and cumbersome, to make it "a lot easier to fire those people."

The Trump-Pence campaign did not reply to a request for comment on the recommendations.

Speaking of Pence, his AFGE rating for his last term in Congress was zero. He did not support the union's position on any of 19 selected measures, covering issues that apparently are important to the Border Patrol and ICE rank and file. Beyond the federal workplace, the AFL-CIO complains, Pence supports "right to work" laws and opposes increasing the minimum wage and expanding workers' rights.

Pence has "a very strong record of being against any type of government employee," Cox said.

What the platform and Pence's record portend for federal employees apparently means little to the two police unions.

"We're law enforcement officers, so we put public safety first before anything and everything," said Chris Crane, president of the National ICE Council.

Despite organized labor's overwhelming support for Clinton, Crane said the Democrats "don't help unions." Morale at **Immigration** and Customs Enforcementis bad, according to Crane, who said that "the Obama administration has been horrible to our employees."

Views such as that make the two federal law enforcement unions oddities among the labor movement.

"Clearly," Cox said, "we believe that Hillary Clinton is the best choice for federal employees, with a demonstrated record of support for federal employees."

Read more:

[Christie on Trump's plan to fire feds faster and clean out Obama's people]

[GOP platform calls for recycling — of old proposals]

[Democrats' platform barely mentions feds, but their unions strongly support Clinton]

[Border Patrol agents' union endorses Trump]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The chart below represents the actual stated beliefs of the Republican Party's nominee for President of the United States.

It is now clear that as a loss looms, Donald Trump will only escalate his rolling claims that the election is rigged against him. The conspiracy now includes the media, numerous women who allege inappropriate sexual advances, their friends and relatives, **immigration** officials, international bankers, and elections officials across the country.

Yesterday, Trump tweeted that "the election is absolutely being rigged" on Hillary Clinton's behalf, not just by the news media, but also "at many polling places." Trump had called on his supporters to monitor the polls in "certain areas" (wink, wink) where "bad things happen."

The New York Times reports today that elections officials in both parties are rushing to reassure voters that the election won't be "rigged," and some fear violence. Anecdotal reporting and polling suggest many Trump voters believe his claims.

If Trump loses, he'll likely continue to tell millions of supporters that the election was stolen from them, perhaps to maintain or monetize his following. Imagine Trump as a conspiracy merchant in the mold of Glenn Beck, who famously sketched out hallucinatory conspiratorial charts only he could understand.

In that spirit, I have created this chart, to help you keep track of the evolving global conspiracy to stop Trump. Details about each group of conspirators are below:

. Here's an explanation for each numbered group of conspirators:

(1) Half dozen female accusers and (2) The news media. At least half a dozen women have now come forward to allege unwanted sexual advances from Trump. He has angrily denied it all. Yesterday he upped the ante, explicitly charging that the media is coordinating with the Clinton campaign to broadcast these stories, even though they're known to be false, to swing the election against him.

But the reporting indicates that many of the women told friends or relatives of these advances at the time or years ago, and these confidantes confirmed this to news outlets. That means either Trump's female accusers told friends and relatives these false tales years in advance, in anticipation of a Trump run deep in the future, or that these confidantes are now falsely claiming to have been told of them, as part of the plot to stop him.

(3) Elections officials across the country. Trump has told largely white audiences that due to the possibility of a rigged election, they should monitor the voting in "certain areas" where "bad things happen," adding: "you know what I'm talking about." This sounds a lot like code for saying elections officials will permit voter fraud in nonwhite areas.

But in a tweet yesterday, Trump went even further, seeming to suggest that the news media is somehow complicit in this broad scheme, which is in keeping with previous suggestions that the media won't report on efforts to defraud him.

(4) International bankers. Trump recently charged that Clinton "meets in secret with international banks to plot the destruction of U.S. sovereignty." His spokesman confirmed that this was meant as a reference to something that actually happened: a Clinton speech to a bank revealed by Wikileaks.

Though the spokesman denied any anti-Semitic overtones to Trump's remarks, the Anti-Defamation League found them impossible to ignore, and the broader tale Trump is telling here smacks of globalist conspiracy rhetoric.

(5) The FBI. Trump has repeatedly castigated the FBI for not recommending criminal charges against Clinton over her email arrangement. But he has gone further, citing this failure as evidence that the Department of Justice "rigged" the probe explicitly to help Clinton win the election.

(6) Debate organizers. Trump has charged that at the first debate his microphone was faulty, strongly insinuating that this was done deliberately, as if to hamper his performance. During the second debate, Trump repeatedly insinuated in conspiratorial tones that the moderators were going soft on Clinton in various ways.

Trump has since explicitly said that the Commission on Presidential Debates is rigging the contests against him on Clinton's behalf.

(7) **Immigration** officials. Trump recently suggested that the Obama administration is deliberately allowing undocumented **immigrants** to "pour" over the southern border so they can vote in the presidential election. For good measure, he added that the media would not report this fact, once again suggesting the media is complicit in the broader conspiracy against him.

Just to repeat: These are the actual stated views of the Republican Party's nominee for President of the United States.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Last week I participated in a wide-ranging interview with Mark Halperin sponsored by Bloomberg News on various economic issues in this election cycle. In this post, I'd like to focus on the discussion we had about presidents and economic growth rates (around minute 42 in the video).

Our discussion followed one Halperin had with a top Trump economic adviser, Peter Navarro, who claimed Trump's economic agenda would lift the growth rate of real GDP from its current trend of about 2 percent to 3.5 percent. To give you some context, that would constitute a huge jump. At 2 percent, real GDP doubles about every 35 years; at 3.5 percent, that window shrinks to about 20 years.

It would also constitute as close to an impossibility as one can get in economics. Trump's jump to 3.5 percent is pure snake oil. The best I can say about it is that it's half-a-percent less oily than Jeb Bush's claim that he could get to 4 percent, which led Mike Huckabee to outdo him with a 6 percent claim.

Halperin, a political reporter (who asked very good economic policy questions) pushed this point with me, essentially arguing, "Okay, so you don't believe Trump's 3.5 percent; does that imply Hillary Clinton is fine with 2 percent?"

My answer was: No, but she and her economic team are honest enough not to make up some BS target or get into a meaningless bidding war. I can make a case, as I said in the interview and will elaborate below, that her agenda could boost growth, especially relative to that of her opponent. But that requires some basic background on the underlying sources of economic growth.

A recent paper by economists Jim Stock and Mark Watson provides useful grounding in the numbers. Since 2010, real GDP has grown at about 2 percent per year. Looking back to comparable periods over the past three expansions, the growth rate was 3.75 percent, so there's the slowdown. It's big, it's real, it's important. In no way am I diminishing its salience.

A helpful fact here is that real GDP growth is the sum of productivity growth plus labor force growth (really, total hours worked, but for our purposes it amounts to the same thing).

If you've followed recent economic statistics, you immediately see the problem. Both labor force participation and productivity have significantly slowed. The former is largely, though not wholly, a function of demographics. The labor force participation rate has fallen by about three percentage points since 2007, and much analysis typically assigns two of those points to the retirement of aging boomers.

That's baked in the cake, and there's nothing a president could or should do to change it. There are, however, a couple of things he/she could do to replace the lost labor supply: welcoming **immigration** policy and work supports targeted at those with marginal labor force attachments or facing barriers to labor force entry, like people with criminal records who want and need to get back to work.

In terms of the candidates' **immigration** agendas, this one isn't close. In fact, economist Mark Zandi argues that Trump's plan is recessionary in no small part because of his deportation of millions of workers. Clinton also expands some important pro-work wage subsidies to low-wage workers, especially parents. Both candidates have plans to help families pay for child care, but Trump's is tilted toward the wealthy and, thus, less effective as a work support.

My broader point is that there's no magic wand that a president can wave to change the demographic composition of the workforce, such that you get anything like a percentage point more growth.

And productivity is even harder to move, as Marc Levinson points out in this important and timely analysis of some of the same ground I cover here. "Whoever sits in the Oval Office next year will swiftly find that faster productivity growth — the key to faster economic growth — isn't something a president can decree." Levinson offers the stiff reality check that other productivity experts have in recent work: The slowdown is happening all across advanced economies, so it's foolish to assert that it's President Obama's or, for that matter, House Speaker Paul Ryan's fault; many big-time productivity game-changers, from industrial automation to air-conditioning to computerization, are in our past; even educational attainment gains, Levinson argues, will be marginal in the future. By this line of thinking, we've basically picked the low-hanging productivity-enhancing fruit.

This may well be too pessimistic, though not at all because of anything the next president will have in his or her toolbox. It's because when it comes to innovation, we have virtually no ability to see around corners. As far as I can tell, none of the experts predicting our productivity future predicted the speedup around 1995 or the slowdown 10 years later.

That said, I can think of two things the next president can do that I'm confident will boost productivity growth at the margins, both in the near term and the longer term: investment in infrastructure and human capital. The former is a matter of smoothing commerce by fixing roads, bridges and ports; of providing broadband to areas that lack it; of boosting R&D of the type that gooses "general purpose" innovation, the sort of investments private firms won't make because there's no obvious return on such investments, like that which led to GPS, to the Internet or to decoding the genome.

The latter — human capital investment — starts with quality preschool, moves through affordable college, and provides specific sectoral training to help workers displaced from an old sector move to a new one.

To be crystal clear, I'm not making Trumpian claims here. I'm confident, based on their record, that these investments will make a difference, an important one in my estimation. But I'm too modest and realistic to quantify them and I know they're not the stuff of doubling GDP growth.

So am I really saying presidents are irrelevant to growth?

Not at all. Especially in a recession, presidents can play a critical role in crafting, selling and moving countercyclical policy. Much research shows such interventions by team Obama were growth-inducing in their first term. Moreover, Stock and Watson find that growth was dinged in 2012-2013 as stimulus pivoted too soon to austerity. But these are temporary measures that pull demand forward in time, helping to offset the pain of recession. They're not likely to change the underlying growth rate.

I'll tell you where presidents really make a difference: It's in whom growth reaches. Note that my conversation with Halperin starts out by pointing out that in the age of inequality, it is wrong to assume that faster GDP growth necessary leads to faster growth in middle-class incomes. For that to happen, you need to increase the bargaining power of those for whom growth has long been a spectator sport. Their voice needs to be heard in tax policy, in trade negotiations, in unions, in labor standards such as minimum wages and overtime.

So when you hear the candidates throwing around GDP numbers, run from the room. When you hear them talking about whose back they've got, pay very close attention.

[Bonus for those who made it to the end: the above picture of the candidates seems right out of this lovely duet.]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Over the past year, it has become fashionable to draw parallels between Donald Trump and foreign leaders, especially populist leaders in Europe and Latin America. One of those leaders is former Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez.

For example, the San Diego Union-Tribune's editorial board asserts that Venezuela has fallen apart due to "the obstinance and delusions of Chávez" and that "Trump could be our Chávez." Others have also made this comparison, including political scientists Javier Corrales and Jennifer McCoy.

There is no doubt that Chávez deployed populist rhetoric involving race, class and nation, just as Trump has done. But beyond populist language, the parallels between Chávez and Trump quickly evaporate.

To begin with, Chávez and Trump have entirely dissimilar backgrounds. While Donald Trump's father became wealthy in real estate and initially funded his son's business endeavors, Chávez's parents taught elementary school in a rural area. To escape to the capital city of Caracas and pursue a baseball career, Chávez joined the Venezuelan military.

During his campaign for the 1998 elections, Chávez ran on a populist platform, criticizing the Venezuelan oligarchy, encouraging participatory democracy and promoting the construction of a new constitution that would include all citizens.

After Chávez won the election, his government did write a constitution that for the first time recognized the country's Afro-Caribbean and indigenous populations. Among other measures, the constitution allowed for intercultural education, recognized indigenous languages and designated three positions for indigenous persons in the National Assembly. Chávez also discussed his Afro-Caribbean and indigenous heritage during public speeches, lending symbolic significance to this heritage in a country that had long featured white political leaders.

This recognition and even celebration of racial and ethnic minorities finds little parallel in Trump's campaign. Trump has supported stop-and-frisk policies that a federal court found to be racially discriminatory and condoned violence against Black Lives Matter protesters at his political rallies. In fact, the better comparison to Trump is the racially charged imagery used to denigrate Chávez and his supporters.

Trump has also periodically called for **immigration** policies targeting Muslims and has renounced the idea of bringing Syrian refugees into the country. In stark contrast, Chávez often referred to Middle Eastern citizens as brothers of the Venezuelan people, and he provided food, medicine and other aid to Palestine and Syrian refugee camps in Lebanon. In recent years, Chávez's successor has also offered to take in as many as 20,000 Syrian refugees.

The difference between Trump and Chávez mirrors the difference between what scholars call exclusionary and inclusionary populism. That is, while some populists — like Trump — have drawn lines between native-born citizens and **immigrants**, other populist leaders have sought to include and empower marginalized or vulnerable populations.

The differences also extend to economics. While Trump has advocated reducing taxes for corporations and the wealthy, Chávez imposed greater state control over corporations and prioritized the poor. In 2001, for example, Chávez passed legislation that allowed the state to expropriate idle land held by large rural landowners and redistribute it to Venezuelan peasants and cooperatives. Chávez also gave the government complete control over the oil industry. With the large oil profits in the 2000s, the Chávez government targeted extreme poverty, illiteracy and substandard housing.

Given these policies, it is curious that more analysts have not drawn parallels between Chávez and Bernie Sanders. Of course, when a super PAC allied with Hillary Clinton pointed out that Sanders had worked with the Venezuelan government on its distribution of heating oil to low-income communities in the United States, Sanders quickly, and mistakenly, lambasted the attempt "to link [him] to a dead communist dictator."

In the end, there is little substantive similarity between Chávez and Trump. With the Venezuelan economy in a free fall and the Venezuelan government appearing more inept than ever, the urge to compare Trump to Chávez appears hard to resist. These comparisons, however, obscure much more than they illuminate.

Timothy M. Gill is a post-doctoral fellow at the Center for Inter-American Policy and Research at Tulane University, and his research examines U.S. foreign policy toward Venezuela under the Chávez government.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was a small sign, showing an American flag and a stern eagle, occupying a rectangle of window no larger than a hoagie roll. But glued to the front of Geno's Steaks, the Philadelphia cheesesteak shop, it cried out for reaction with just eight words: "This Is America When Ordering Please 'Speak English.'"

Posted by Geno's owner, Joseph Vento, in December 2005 — before sparking a debate about language, discrimination and **immigration** in the early summer of 2006 — it sat in the storefront window for a decade, until at some point Vento's son Geno took it down.

After the sign's absence was noticed by a Billy Penn reporter on Wednesday, the shop acknowledged it was removed without fanfare before July's Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia. On Thursday, Philadelphia Daily News columnist Helen Ubiñas wrote about ordering cheesesteaks at Geno's for the first time in years — "Dos, con Whiz, por favor." It worked.

Spanish would not fly in 2006, however. Only English would.

Even in death, Joey Vento finds new ways to be bigoted. Never saw that sign before

A photo posted by Passyunk Post (@passyunkpost) on Aug 13, 2012 at 7:39am PDT

The sign, of course, was not just about language. Here was Wolf Blitzer on CNN, in June 2006: "The cheesesteak is a symbol of Philadelphia, but now it's a symbol of the battle over illegal **immigration** as well, and that battle is raging in the City of Brotherly Love."

Vento argued his message was tough love from a colorful son of Italian **immigrants** to South Philly. On the subject of **immigrants** who did not speak English, Vento told the Associated Press in 2006, "They don't know how lucky they are."

"All we're asking them to do is learn the English language," he said. "We're out to help these people, but they've got to help themselves, too."

For many, however, the sign was more divisive than encouraging.

Rachel Lawton, then acting executive director of Philadelphia's Commission on Human Relations, told the AP in 2006 that the message discriminated against non-English-speaking patrons and therefore violated the city's Fair Practices Ordinance.

A spokeswoman for the American Civil Liberties Union told the Philadelphia Inquirer that although the cheesesteak shop "has a right to express its opinion, however offensive," it was close to making a "public accommodation" unavailable to everyone.

In an editorial at the time, the Inquirer concluded the move was "boneheaded."

Some began to wonder why the story had such legs; Vento himself began to decline interviews shortly after word of his sign spread to national news.

But food has always been wrapped up in identity. (On as much as gut level as a cultural one: You chomp it up, after all, and squeeze it into becoming a part of you.) Fights over food often reflect political debates du jour, which, recently, have been pastries with a controversial swirl.

In 2015, the Oregon bakery that refused to bake a wedding cake for a same-sex couple paid out $144,000 in damages; a Colorado bakery did not discriminate in 2014, courts ruled, for refusing to write "Homosexuality is a detestable sin" per a customer's request; a gay pastor was caught faking a slur on a Whole Foodscake; a California bakery responded to a wave of social media backlash for posting a Facebook photo of a transgender "Ken doll cake" in August.

It continues: In October, a Portland shop was accused of racism after naming a cupcake with an Oreo baked inside "Mr. President."

As for Geno's, by 2008, the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations had ruled its message was not discriminatory. Vento died in 2011, though the sign remained. In a 2013 statement to Philadelphia Magazine, the public relations firm Neff Associates explained why the message outlived the man who made it famous.

"As you know, Geno's is under new management since the passing of Joey Vento. Geno Vento, Joey's openly gay son is the new owner and operator and I think it is important to inform you, that he does not share all of the polarizing views his Father was famous for," wrote Neff director Kylie Flett.

Flett added: "I can also tell you that we STRONGLY recommended to Geno Vento that the 'speak english' sign be removed also. Our recommendation is currently under consideration by the Geno's Team. Unfortunately, Joey's dying wish to his son was for the sign to remain, and Geno at this time is choosing to respect his Father's request." A sign that read, "press 2 for deportation," was removed by 2013.

And by the time of the convention, Geno Vento had "decided to move on from the sign," a representative for the steak shop said to the Associated Press.

"It's not about a sign," read a statement from Geno's Steaks to the AP on Thursday. "It's about what you do and what your mark in life is, and Geno wants to change that mark in life."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**They each died while on a walk.

A Silver Spring man dragged a mile by a car after trying to cross a busy road toward a bus stop.

A 76-year-old Korean **immigrant** known at her church for handing out parish bulletins, killed in another hit-and-run in Reston.

A 5-month-old boy, being pushed by his mother in a stroller in a crosswalk in Loudoun County, when an SUV fatally struck him and injured her.

Eight pedestrians were fatally struck by vehicles in the Washington region in August, part of a growing number of deadly incidents authorities reported nationally. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the number of pedestrians killed jumped 9.5 percent between 2014 and 2015, the highest number since 1996.

"The odds are not in your favor when you're a pedestrian," said Deborah A.P. Hersman, president of the National Safety Council, an advocacy group.

Around the District, the number of pedestrian fatalities over the past five years remained relatively steady at around 50 to 60 each year, according to police and transportation officials. This year, there have been at least 30.

Officials point to various causes, including speeding, intoxicated drivers, pedestrians darting across roads, and drivers and pedestrians distracted by electronic devices.

Nationwide, lower gas prices and upticks in the economy may be putting more drivers on the road, transportation experts say, while a push to encourage "walkable communities" — where people walk, bike and ride public transportation — has more pedestrians afoot.

In the suburbs, that has meant more people walking in areas only now being retrofitted with sidewalks and bike lanes.

"More and more, we're seeing pedestrians in areas where drivers aren't always expecting them," said Tom Gianni, chief of Maryland's Highway Safety Office.

Adjusting to the shift involves engineering such additions as medians and traffic lights, enforcing traffic laws, and educating drivers and pedestrians.

For Mindy Schulz, the Loudoun mother whose infant son was killed, talking about that late August day is difficult. But she said she hopes that sharing some of her experience will build a "human connection to the unfathomable grief" endured by families in the pedestrian crashes and encourage road safety.

Some neighbors and friends have tended a memorial of flowers and messages near where her son, Tristan, was killed. Others started a campaign of blue ribbons and magnets reading "Drive Safe — Save a Life for Tristan."

"Grief of this magnitude is not just sadness," she said in an email. "It is not just something to 'get through' or 'get over. . . . The longing and emptiness are forever."

10:09 a.m., Aug. 2, Alexandria

Jeremais Herrera Rodriguez had a stomach-churning sense he said he hadn't felt before.

"If something happens to me, I want you to promise me that our family will be taken care of," Herrera Rodriguez, 44, said abruptly to his stepdaughter, Sandy Castro, 25.

Herrera Rodriguez wasn't one to joke about such things.

He had **immigrated** from Guatemala nine years earlier, leaving his wife, son and two daughters. His wife uses a wheelchair because of arthritis, and the cost of her treatments and private schooling for his children were beyond a farmhand's means.

Herrera Rodriguez was illiterate and hoped that education would spare his children the hunger and humiliation he had suffered. He worked days as a dishwasher at Warehouse Bar & Grill in Alexandria. At 4 p.m., he'd call his wife. An hour later, he would start a busboy job at Chart House, also in Alexandria, where he worked until midnight. He did this six days a week.

On Aug. 2, Herrera Rodriguez was cleaning outside the Warehouse's kitchen door. Nearby, a 92-year-old man was trying to back into a parking space but pinned an attendant before accelerating and hitting Herrera Rodriguez, police said. The man was charged with reckless driving.

Castro's phone was on vibrate when a friend tried to reach her about the accident, and she realized only later that she had missed calls. "I felt my whole world crashing on me."

She remembered her promise to Herrera Rodriguez a day earlier. His co-workers and the community covered the cost of returning her father home, but Castro is daunted by what lies ahead.

"I ask myself, will God give me the strength?"

— Arelis R. Hernández

9:24 p.m., Aug. 4, Montgomery County

A 911 call about a struck pedestrian sent Montgomery County officers scrambling to a six-lane road, where they found a gray Converse sneaker, a pack of Big Red gum and a blood trail.

But no pedestrian.

Within minutes, another 911 call, from Homecrest Road. There, police found the body of Julius Newton, 77, wearing a matching Converse and, beside him, another pack of Big Red. His body had been dragged a mile by the car that hit him.

The hit-and-run death remains unsolved.

The 5-foot-9, 150-pound retiree had left his townhouse to walk about a mile to a 7-Eleven for snacks for himself and his family and, weighed down by the bags, probably tried to cross Layhill Road to take the No. 26 bus home.

Newton made it across two lanes. The car – thought to be a Honda Accord from between 1993 and 1997 — slowed, then sped off.

"By running, by not stepping forward, all the driver is doing is making things worse for me and my family," said Quanzet Newton, a grandson.

His grandfather was born in North Carolina and came to Washington as a teen.

He operated a forklift, then worked in a Frito-Lay plant. In retirement, he enjoyed gospel performances and daily walks, including the runs for treats.

"I have something for you," he'd tell neighborhood kids and relatives, handing them a stick of gum.

"This right here is for you."

— Dan Morse

2:20 a.m., Aug. 18, Washington

Armin Amin worked his whole life to run his own restaurant, his family said. In 2014, he finally achieved that goal when Chaplin's opened in the Shaw neighborhood.

Amin, 44, left the restaurant that morning to walk a friend to her car when he was struck by a Mercedes-Benz. The police investigation is continuing.

"How can we move on?" his mother, Aziza Amin, said a few weeks after the crash.

Amin, the son of **immigrants** from Iran, grew up in Potomac.

A big, gregarious guy known for hosting up to 50 people at Thanksgiving, he had wanted to open a restaurant since he was 18 and worked a number of jobs in the industry.

His sister, Arzin Amin, called him a "gentle giant" some knew as "Big Daddy Persia."

"I didn't just lose my brother," she said. "I lost my best friend."

Amin's death didn't just leave his close-knit family and 11-year-old daughter bereft. Chaplin's is struggling, too.

"My partner and I are doing our best to fill his shoes, but we built this restaurant — Chaplin's and company — together," Ari Wilder, one of Amin's partners, said.

Jana Tayengco, who was with Amin when he was killed, said he was the kind of guy who would buy dinner for homeless people on the street, even remembering their preferred orders.

"He was just the most generous, the best person I knew," she said.

". . . He did things for so many people that no one knew about."

Amin's father, Samad Amin, found it hard to describe the pain.

"I lost my heart," he said.

— Justin Wm. Moyer

2:40 a.m., Aug. 19, Washington

David Narvaez was many things: a Habitat for Humanity volunteer, a Johns Hopkins-trained economist, a bartender.

Walking through Dupont Circle, he became the victim of an unsolved hit-and-run.

Nancy Paddleford, Narvaez's mother, said hundreds came out for his funeral in Northfield, Minn., where he grew up.

"It was a tremendous outpouring because he was . . . very open to other people and listened and talked well," she said.

Narvaez, 29, had started bartending at Lucky Bar in Dupont after he graduated from Johns Hopkins, and he had passed a key exam in his quest to become a financial analyst less than two weeks before he was killed.

Paul Lusty, the owner of Lucky Bar, said Narvaez worked there for a year and a half and was "a fantastic guy."

"He was just a sweet, laid-back, smart gentleman, and we miss him dearly," he added.

— Justin Wm. Moyer

5:19 p.m., Aug. 28, Fairfax County

Hung Soon Seo, known as Clara to friends at St. Paul Chung Catholic Church in Fairfax, would pass out bulletins for the 8 a.m. Sunday Mass, arriving as much as an hour early.

She would stay and distribute the church notices again before the 10 a.m. service — a routine that made Seo familiar to many despite her quiet demeanor, said Agnes Suk, the church secretary and bookkeeper.

At 76, Seo was struck and killed by a hit-and-run driver near the intersection of North Shore Drive at Village Road in Reston. The investigation continues.

Like Seo, Suk's father, Kwang, lived at Lake Anne Fellowship House, an apartment community for disabled seniors. Suk said her father recalled passing Seo near an elevator less than an hour before she was struck.

Seo came to the United States from South Korea in 1988. She joined her church in 2002 and volunteered with the church "prayer teams," Suk said, visiting nursing homes to deliver food and pray with residents. "She was willing to help any other people," said Theresa Kim, a close friend of Seo's who said Seo liked to sing, travel and cook traditional Korean food.

Though frail, Kim said, her friend had a hearty spirit.

— Jasper Scherer

6:17 a.m., Aug. 30, Fairfax County

Aaron Nelson McCullough, 56, served honorably in the Army, his brother said. He could talk with anyone and meticulously studied up on presidential elections.

But Carl McCullough also said his brother struggled with drugs and alcohol for decades.

Those two sides will be how Carl McCullough remembers his brother, who was struck by an SUV while crossing Route 1 in the Alexandria section of Fairfax County.

Carl McCullough said the incident occurred about eight blocks from his brother's home, where he lived alone, and as he was crossing the road to catch a bus to work at Blue & White Carry Out. He was divorced and is survived by a daughter.

"Whatever group of people were around, he was a social person," Carl McCullough said. "He was an intelligent person. He was an ardent reader of National Geographic."

Aaron McCullough grew up in Concord, N.C., the youngest of 10 children, his brother said. He served in the Army as a younger man and later joined the National Guard.

Aaron McCullough moved to Virginia when he got into trouble with drugs and drinking about 25 years ago, his brother said.

Aaron McCullough had gone through rehab here.

Carl McCullough said police told him that the SUV driver would not be charged.

— Justin Jouvenal

8:10 a.m., Aug. 31, Loudoun County

Mindy Schulz had just dropped her 7-year-old son, Hayden, off at school and decided to get some exercise and fresh air with her 5-month-old boy, Tristan.

Less than a mile from their Lansdowne home, as she pushed him in his stroller through a crosswalk along Riverside Parkway, they were struck by an SUV.

Schulz was injured. Her baby died.

"It hurts at a level so visceral, so primal, that just surviving the pain and darkness of that loss feels insurmountable," Schulz wrote in an email. "This is what we try to process every moment of every day."

The crash remains under investigation.

In an obituary she wrote, she described Tristan as "the absolute joy in our hearts," noting how eager her son Hayden was for the baby's arrival.

"He was just learning his voice, and boisterously had much to say about everything!" his mother said. She said he enjoyed bouncing and "was so proud of himself as his legs grew stronger to stand."

His mother wrote that Tristan "reserved his biggest laughs for his dad, especially at pre-bath playtime." And his biggest smiles "were only for his big brother."

"His warmest cuddles, coos and sweet smiles were reserved for his mamma whose arms are empty now without her baby boy."

Schulz keeps a few things on her nightstand in her son's memory.

There is a sleeper with teddy bears on it that he wore, and a small sculpture of a family with a blue-winged angel baby. There is also a small black velvet bag. Inside, she said, are "my baby's ashes."

— Dana Hedgpeth

9 p.m., Aug. 31, Montgomery County

When the surgeon general urged Americans to walk more, Simon Eng, a captain with the U.S. Health Service and a pharmacist, took up his boss's challenge.

At 65, he bought a Fitbit and spent nights logging steps in his Potomac neighborhood as he trained for next year's Army 10-miler road race.

Eng was less than a mile from his home on Bells Mill Road when he was hit by a Lexus LS 430 sedan.

The driver stopped and the investigation continues.

About 100 neighbors, friends and federal co-workers gathered days later to mourn a man they recalled as reliable, helpful and always ready with a smile and something funny to say.

"I am going to miss him for a very long time," said Sukhamaya Bain, who worked with Eng at the Food and Drug Administration.

Eng served 25 years in the public health service after completing a pharmacy degree from the University of Maryland and a doctorate from the University of Florida.

Colleagues said that Eng knew hundreds throughout his agency and mentored many. "He was one in a million," said his supervisor at the agency, Bing Cai.

For his wife and two sons, Eng took care of paying the bills and maintaining the family cars, the lawn and his prized garden. He doled out warm advice, including to four sisters from his native Hong Kong.

"He was just in that mode his entire life.

"He was trying to help people," his son, David Eng, 30, said.

— Clarence Williams

dana.hedgpeth@washpost.com

Jennifer Jenkins and Victoria St. Martin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BETTENDORF, Iowa — One thousand, four hundred and eighty-four days before the 2020 presidential election, a ballroom full of Iowa Republicans got a chance to size up a future contender. Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.), just 39 and with a Harvard red/Army green résumé that would have blown away the 2016 presidential field, was finishing four days of Iowa campaign stops with the keynote speech at Scott County's Republican dinner. Here, in mid-October, was the future of the GOP.

It was upstaged by the present. Indiana Gov. Mike Pence (R), being watched more closely than ever as Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's poll numbers cratered, arrived at the dinner early, bringing an entourage of about a dozen reporters and half as many TV cameras. "Your featured speaker tonight, which is not me, is really, I think, one of the most courageous, remarkable leaders in the Congress in many, many years," Pence said.

Fifteen minutes later, he was gone, and so were most of the members of the media. Just four print reporters and one local news station stayed as Cotton introduced himself to Iowa, talking up his wife's birth in Sioux City ("Tonight, I had the honor to meet for the first time my wife's godmother") and the places he'd seen when helping elect Sen. Joni Ernst (R-Iowa). He mentioned the stakes of the election. He did not mention Trump.

"Iowa, there's nothing normal about Bible-believing Christians being tarred as bigots because they simply want to live their faith in their day-to-day life," Cotton said. "There's nothing normal about a country that won't secure its borders, but will admit a million **immigrants** a year -- the population of Iowa added every three years, at a time when our country and too many of our fellow citizens are out of work or haven't had a pay raise in years."

No Republican, least of all Cotton, will broach the possibility that the 2016 election is lost. Even in his awkward, elongated effort to cleave Trump from vulnerable House candidates, House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) has given no indication of what many Republican strategists believe -- that in January, Hillary Clinton will become the 45th president of the United States.

Implicitly, those strategists think that the Trump nomination might be a black-swan event. The most respected figures in the party, now working other races or groaning into TV monitors, will return to rebuild on Nov. 9. The Republican National Committee's post-2012 autopsy (sample advice: "embrace and champion comprehensive **immigration** reform") would be recovered from the evidence room.

"It's too early to think 2020," said A.J. Spiker, a former Iowa GOP chairman who backed Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky) for president and has since called on Trump to quit. "There are still people naive enough to think that Trump can actually win the election. It would politically make more sense to come here in the spring or summer than to come out now."

Cotton's tour of Iowa suggested a more complicated Republican future. Bookended by two fundraising dinner speeches that lacerated the Obama administration, it included lower-profile Cotton campaign stops for Republicans who hope to overcome any Trump backlash down the ballot. On Friday, Cotton was adding to the chorus of Republicans hinting that Trump might want to relinquish the nomination; by Tuesday, he was saying that Trump was contrite about his newly revealed groping fantasies, and that the party needed to focus on winning.

That meant populist domestic policies that resembled Trump's, and peace-through-strength foreign policies that resembled Cotton's. "After traveling your state for four days, I don't hear that the American people are angry," he said in Bettendorf. "Calling the American people 'angry' is saying they're like stubborn little kids, like my son when he didn't get his way. In reality, it's the American people who act like grown-ups and the leaders in Washington who act like little kids. People are tired of their very real anxieties being dismissed as unfounded."

For most people in the audience, Cotton was making his first impression. In interviews, a few Republicans said they'd seen Cotton on Fox News Channel; most had not heard of him. Questions about what might happen in the party after a Trump loss were, at first dismissed, then answered with praise for Mike Pence.

"He'll make an outstanding vice president," said Jaclyn Dooley, 68.

"The speech he gave tonight was fantastic," said Shane Swift, 45. "I'm a little less concerned about the election after the debate on Sunday -- Trump did much better."

Another Cotton event, a few hours earlier, was illustrative of how he and the Republicans on the ballot this year are navigating the Trump situation. Among Republican voters, there is little appetite for bailing on the nominee. Among all voters, there's rampant skepticism about Trump, leaving Republicans to explain why they are different.

Cotton navigated that skepticism at Cobham, a Davenport defense contractor that opened its doors to him and Sen. Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa), who is facing a long-shot reelection challenge. The senator from Arkansas took every opportunity to remind Cobham workers that, unlike many politicians they'd met, had served in war. Opening up a pair of safety glasses, he said that he'd worn something like them in Afghanistan. To open up the town-hall meeting with employees, Cotton praised them for taking their "mission" seriously. "As I walked the floor, I saw American flags, I saw yellow ribbons, I saw young men in uniform," he said.

When the questions began to come in, Cotton joked that he'd "jump on a grenade" for Grassley if they kept coming so hot. The first question was about Trump; the last was about Grassley's refusal to hold hearings for Supreme Court nominee Merrick Garland. In between, one Cobham employee asked if Cotton and Grassley could really work with a President Hillary Clinton, or if they'd just oppose her.

Cotton began by explaining that Republicans really did want to work with the president. "There'll be more instances where I disagree with Hillary Clinton," he said. "I'm sure there'll be some cases where we work together. I don't want any president to fail, though, because it's hard for the United States to succeed if the president is failing." Seconds later, he pivoted, explaining why even a good-intentioned Clinton would have to be stopped from stumbling into disaster: "The last time a Clinton was in the White House, they signed an agreement with North Korea that allowed the country to get nuclear weapons in just 12 years."

Another question, on criminal justice reform, could have driven a wedge between Grassley and Cotton -- never mind the Democrats. As Cotton stood a few feet away, Grassley said that his own criminal justice reform bill was "not going through the Senate like it should," and that someone needed to fix the problems of "minorities" being incarcerated unfairly by mandatory minimums.

"One of the reason the bill's not moving is misinformation," Grassley said. "A lot of people think if this bill passes, it's going to open up the prison doors. It doesn't do that."

Grassley did not say it, but Cotton was one of the Republicans in opposition -- and his opposition had included a defense of mandatory minimums. When he took back the microphone, Cotton stuck to his guns.

"Elected leaders, community leaders, shouldn't jump to conclusions," Cotton said. "They shouldn't try to fan the flames of tension. In Ferguson, [Mo.], even the Department of Justice concluded that [police action] was justified under the circumstances. If it turns out that law enforcement officer acted inappropriately, then as we did in the Army, the first people who want to see appropriate action taken are law enforcement officers."

After the town-hall event -- and after Grassley and Cotton had done 22 push-ups to raise awareness of the suicide rate among veterans -- the two of them fielded questions from a skeptical press corps. Both senators agreed that criminal justice reform would not pass in this year's lame-duck session. Both reiterated that Trump was the Republican nominee in a binary choice election, but that did not require defense or apology from every Republican.

Cotton's vision of cooperation was such a stand-out town-hall moment that The Washington Post asked him to expand on it. If Clinton won the election, did Cotton favor further investigations of the scandals that had plagued her campaign?

"I do think it may be appropriate for the next attorney general, whoever may be the next president, to look into the investigation as it occurred in the FBI over the last year and a half," Cotton said. "As new facts come to life and we learn how many people received immunity agreements, or the fact that electronic devices were destroyed immediately after they were searched by the FBI, I think it raises some questions about whether Hillary Clinton has been completely forthcoming."

Once again, the low-key, insistent Cotton had taken a position parallel to that of Trump. He had done so without Trump's table-banging, expressing it as if any one presented with the world of 2017 would make the same conclusions. His big speech in Bettendorf, with a friendlier audience, had hit the same notes.

"I, for, one do not accept failure," Cotton said. "And I will never use political correctness to cover it up."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**RICHMOND — Corey Stewart had just been canned. And in a year of outsider politics, maybe that wasn't such a bad thing.

Right after he was fired as Donald Trump's Virginia campaign co-chairman, Stewart trumpeted his ouster in a news release — one issued on letterhead for his 2017 bid for governor.

Stewart was one of Trump's earliest and most vocal supporters in a key presidential swing state, one that appears likely to go Democrat Hillary Clinton's way. He also is one of at least four Republicans running for governor next year.

Stewart's association with — and dismissal from — Team Trump will probably shape his prospects in 2017, political strategists say. But there is little agreement on whether it will help or hurt.

Stewart embraced the brash businessman with more enthusiasm than any of his gubernatorial rivals, some of whom only grudgingly got on board after Trump locked up the nomination. That close association could damage Stewart in a state on track to reject Trump.

Yet his firing — over something Stewart cast as a gutsy stand against "establishment pukes" at the Republican National Committee who he said were undermining Trump — could endear him to anti-establishment Republicans and tea party types in the GOP primary. If nothing else, his ejection has insulated Stewart from any Election Day wreckage. Still a Trump supporter but now lacking any campaign role, he can say that a Trump defeat could have been avoided if party leaders had heeded his calls for more staffers and money.

Stewart was warned that his actions against the RNC would cost him the campaign job, and he acted anyway. But he insists that he did so without regard for his gubernatorial hopes. As chairman of the Prince William Board of County Supervisors, he has faced controversy many times, first drawing national attention a decade ago with a crackdown on illegal **immigrants** that lines up neatly with Trump's hard-line approach.

"I didn't calculate it that way," he said in an interview Friday. "Take a look at my entire political career. I've said things that nobody else would say and I've done things nobody else would do. It doesn't always benefit me. But I can't be anything else."

Some Trump campaign officials have accused Stewart of trying to leverage his ouster for 2017, particularly with his claim that his firing had been engineered by a rival for the nomination. His campaign has already turned his termination into a fundraising pitch.

"As one of the first supporters of Donald Trump, Chairman Corey Stewart was FIRED by the Trump campaign for being loyal and supportive of his candidate," says a fundraising appeal emailed to supporters. "Virginia needs someone who will stand up to the establishment and stand up for what he feels is right."

The Trump campaign dismissed Stewart on Monday after he took part in a protest in front of committee headquarters in the District. It had been aimed at warning the national party against abandoning Trump after a damaging recording of Trump bragging about groping women.

Stewart said that shortly before the rally began, Trump deputy campaign manager David Bossie texted him a warning: Stop the rally or face "dire consequences." Stewart went ahead with the demonstration.

"I knew it might result in my being removed as Chairman," Stewart soon wrote to supporters on his 2017 campaign letterhead. "I chose to go forward with it because this country is too important to stand idly by as our own party throws the election to Hillary Clinton."

In interviews later with The Washington Post and other news outlets, Stewart blamed his firing on GOP strategist Ed Gillespie, a Republican gubernatorial hopeful who narrowly lost a 2014 Senate race to Sen. Mark R. Warner (D-Va.).

"I was fired for personal reasons by Dave Bossie," Stewart said on MSNBC. "He's the deputy campaign manager. He's good friends with Ed Gillespie, who I'm running against for governor of Virginia next year."

Chris Leavitt, executive director of Gillespie's political action committee, said Gillespie had nothing to do with Stewart's firing.

"Contrary to Corey's latest conspiracy theory, he alone is responsible for his firing," Leavitt said. "That's a fact he himself made abundantly clear at the time and the Trump campaign has repeatedly said."

John Fredericks, a conservative radio host who became Trump's acting Virginia chairman after Stewart's exit, called allegations of Gillespie's involvement "completely false and delusional."

"As everybody knows, I'm not a Gillespie enthusiast," said Fredericks, who crossed party lines to endorse Warner over Gillespie in 2014. "But I'm a big fan of the truth."

Stewart had vigorously defended Trump amid a string of controversies, including Trump's criticism of the "Mexican" judge presiding over a fraud case against the now-defunct Trump University. The federal judge, Gonzalo Curiel, was born in Indiana to parents who **immigrated** from Mexico.

Yet Stewart has not always supported Trump in ways that the campaign found helpful. In July, Trump's campaign disavowed comments Stewart made on Facebook that placed responsibility for the killing of police officers in Dallas on Clinton and Virginia Lt. Gov. Ralph Northam, the lone Democrat running for governor in 2017.

"Corey said certain things and did things that were counter to the Trump message, that were designed, it appeared, to further burnish his credentials with tea party voters in Virginia and the hardest-core Trump supporters — at the expense of gaining votes in Virginia for the candidate on Nov. 8," Fredericks said.

Stewart was the only prominent Virginia Republican to defend Trump after the recent release of a 2005 recording of Trump talking about using his celebrity status to force himself on women. He said Trump had "acted like a frat boy, as a lot of guys do."

"The Trump campaign asked, when this [video] went down, that all the surrogates take a breath for 24 hours to figure out how to respond," Fredericks said. "Corey was making statements Friday night. . . . Sometimes he was on the Trump team and sometimes he was on the 'Corey Stewart for governor' team."

Yet Shaun Kenney, the state GOP's former executive director, said the episode could play well for Stewart among grass-roots Republicans frustrated with ­finger-in-the-wind politicians.

"Stewart appears to be a rod of iron in a sea of spaghetti noodles masquerading as backbone," he wrote on the conservative blog Bearing Drift. "In an odd twist, Stewart gained from this incident — lost a title; gained some trust."

laura.vozzella@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The urgent task of progressives in this election is to defeat Donald Trump. But even if we succeed, we have a long-term responsibility: to understand why Trump happened and to face up to how failures on the left and center-left have contributed to the flourishing of a new far right, not only in the United States but also across Europe.

The left, you might fairly protest, has enough problems without being blamed for the rise of a dangerous figure who is, first and foremost, a creation of the conservative movement's radicalization and the Republican leadership's pandering to extreme views over many years. When I watch GOP leaders bemoaning their party's fate under Trump (or belatedly jumping off his ship), I am reminded of John F. Kennedy's warning that "those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside."

But progressives should resist complacency bred by the idea that the anger on display in this election will soon subside as older voters uneasy with change decline in numbers. Throughout the West, social-democratic and left-liberal parties are facing defections, divisions and decline. Their economic model — combining a market orientation with welfare states, strong unions and regulations — is no longer delivering the broadly shared prosperity that was once its hallmark. Yes, part of the problem, particularly in the United States, comes from a weakening of social protections thanks to conservative policy victories and the resistance of congressional Republicans to social reform. Nonetheless, even if Trump loses big, the left and center-left have a lot of work and rethinking to do.

The grievances of Trump supporters have been well-covered this year (although it should not have taken both the Trump and Bernie Sanders campaigns to bring them to the fore). Many voters fear that the social and economic world that has defined their lives is irretrievably passing away.

The left is in trouble precisely because it has not responded adequately to this fear or managed to tame the forces that produced it. This is not just a political mistake but also a moral failing.

It is tempting to discount the Trump movement as primarily a backward-looking reaction among less-well-off white voters who can abide neither the cultural changes of the past half-century nor the increasingly diverse country that has come into being since we changed our **immigration** laws in the mid-1960s. And it's true that racism and nativism have taken particularly vicious forms in this campaign — remember, Trumpism was born in birtherism.

But we can condemn prejudice and still understand the adversity afflicting Trump supporters. And we should acknowledge that those who are angry about what's happened to their lives are not all delusional bigots.

Technological change has undercut incomes and living standards for a significant share of our fellow citizens. An influx of **immigrants** has shocked certain communities, leading them to experience a genuine sense of displacement and powerlessness in the face of change they cannot control. There are struggles for power as new groups gain political ascendancy and older groups, once a majority, become minorities. There are also battles over material resources as newcomers are perceived as taking jobs (sometimes for lower wages) from groups that once dominated particular fields.

Supporters of **immigrant** rights need to be sensitive to who pays the highest cost for a more open society. Some remedies are obvious, including additional federal funds to communities whose local budgets have taken a hit as they provide services to large numbers of new residents. Broad egalitarian measures, including a higher minimum wage, can lift the incomes of lower-skilled **immigrants** and the native born alike. Those who — rightly, in my view — support a generous refugee policy can take care to help those fleeing oppression and violence locate in areas with the capacity to absorb them, and not expect a small number of communities to take an outsize number of those in need. And advocates of **immigration** reform need to do a far better job of making the case that the rights of the native born are strengthened, not weakened, when millions of undocumented residents are allowed to earn equal rights themselves.

Also feeding populist rebellions on the left as well as on the right is the fact that supporters of an open global economy have simply not been attentive enough to the costs of change. Every trade deal is defended in the same way: There will be a majority of "winners" and a minority of "losers," and the losers will be assisted and compensated. But the assistance and compensation are never adequate, and the trade deals have focused far more on protections for investors than for workers.

We have added hundreds of millions of new workers to the global labor market. This has created a downward-trending bidding war for less-skilled labor, which is particularly tough on the least advantaged workers in the most advanced economies. A much-cited study by three well-known economists, David Autor, David Dorn and Gordon Hanson, found that import growth from China cost 2.4 million American jobs in the 2000s. It must also be stressed that deindustrialization has undercut the opportunities for African Americans in inner cities, as the sociologist William J. Wilson has written. Progressives have an obligation to underscore that angry white Trump voters have grievances and interests in common with their fellow citizens of color.

Yes, trade creates jobs, but it can also destroy them. Those who lose out dramatically will notice trade's impact more readily than those who gain ground gradually.

The global economy is not going away, and the United States draws some real advantages in the worldwide competition it fosters. But unless there are what Jared Bernstein and Lori Wallach have called "new rules of the road" on trade deals, advocates of an open economy will face ever more ferocious opposition. Just as it has often fallen to capitalism's critics to save the system, so might critics of free trade push its advocates to more sustainable approaches.

Progressives and moderates alike also need to recognize that arguments can be sensible as far as they go but still send signals of indifference to those who are losing out. Take a group we might call the "schoolers." They say again and again that there's nothing wrong with our economy that can't be solved by giving more education and more training to more people. The core insight here is certainly right: We must do far better in preparing workers for the economy as it exists.

But especially for older white workers, a lot of this talk sounds like a put-down. They can be forgiven for thinking they're being blamed for following the rules that applied when they first entered the workforce: A high school degree and hard work would be enough to allow them to live well and their kids to live even better.

Trump is blowing smoke when he claims he can reopen the old factories and mines. But his promise, however empty, sounds more sympathetic than technocratic talk about "the skills gap." And the education argument should not be used to draw attention away from another problem, the declining bargaining power of workers in a world where unions are weaker. Progressives need new approaches to empowering workers, as David Madland argued recently in a paper for the Center for American Progress.

Then there is the paradox of "cosmopolitanism," a word that captures another aspect of the reaction. Attacks on "rootless cosmopolitans" are the stuff of old forms of anti-Semitism. Trump, whether consciously or not, veered toward a classic anti-Semitic trope on Thursday, when he declared that Hillary Clinton "meets in secret with international banks to plot the destruction of U.S. sovereignty in order to enrich these global financial powers."

But there is a another, positive understanding of the idea of cosmopolitanism, offered by Princeton philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah. He writes that "two strands . . . intertwine in the notion of cosmopolitanism. One is the idea that we have obligations to others, obligations that stretch beyond those to whom we are related by the ties of kith and kind, or even the more formal ties of a shared citizenship. The other is that we take seriously the value not just of human life but of particular human lives, which means taking an interest in the practices and beliefs that lend them significance."

This should be an aspiration for all of us. And it means that those who live cosmopolitan lives must go about "taking an interest in the practices and beliefs" of those whom the late Rev. Andrew Greeley called "neighborhood people." Being "citizens of the world" is not high on their priority list. They love the particular patch where they were raised or that they have adopted as their own.

I suspect that many of Trump's backers are neighborhood people. Economic change, including globalization, is very hard on them. It can disrupt and empty out the places they revere, driving young people away and undermining the economic base a community needs to survive.

Liberals and conservatives alike insufficiently appreciate what makes neighborhood people tick and why they deserve our respect. Liberals are instinctive cosmopolitans in the citizens-of-the-world sense. They often long for the freedom of big metropolitan areas. Free-market conservatives typically say that if a place can't survive the rigors of market competition, if the factories close, the people left behind are best off if they find somewhere else to live.

Let it be said that there are no simple answers for the plight of neighborhood people who find themselves under siege. Ghost towns are another old story. There are limits to how much a local economy can be propped up when it is pummeled by globalization's gales.

But if there are limits to what can be done to help such places help themselves, this does not mean that nothing can be done. Neighborhood people are the forgotten men and women of an integrating planet. Their affections and loyalties are civic gifts. We should nurture them, not cast them aside.

The far right is still a long way from winning majorities. The center-left's constituency is younger and more diverse and thus much more like the United States of the future. My reading of the polls is that unless we repeal both women's suffrage and the remaining parts of the Voting Rights Act, Trump will lose. The video portraying his disgusting misogyny and the latest round of harassment charges against him have further tilted the electoral playing field Clinton's way.

But to roll back the far right, progressives need fresh thinking about how an innovative economy can make those innovations work on behalf of the many and not just the few. We also need to tend to non-economic matters such as patriotism and a sense of belonging. Citizens worry not only about their pocketbooks but also about how to build community and how to rear children in a challenging time.

Progressives regularly preach empathy and insist that the best way to solve a problem is to deal with its underlying causes. These principles apply as much to the struggles of our political opponents as they do to the problems faced by our allies. Defeating Trump is the first step. Giving an ear and a heart to the legitimate concerns of his supporters is the next.

Liberal elitism will never pave the way for liberal egalitarianism.

Twitter: @EJDionne

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I generally don't think of Maryland as a home to manufacturing. But if you drive to Glen Burnie, the Chesapeake Bay Candle factory has 80 full-time employees who are creating an average of more than 500,000 home fragrance candles a month.

Factory tours are one of the most fun parts of this job. I visited Chesapeake Bay's cavernous $6 million factory on a hot summer day, watching as the two assembly lines churned out their scented glimmers.

The hangar-size factory includes a research-and-development department as well as a darkened quality-control room where samples are tested to ensure that they burn cleanly and evenly (soot is bad).

A flock of workers surround the assembly line, plucking bent-over wicks from the warm, gooey wax and standing them upright so a customer can more easily fire it up.

Outside, there are eight loading docks where tractor-trailers from Target, T.J. Maxx, Avon, Bed Bath & Beyond and Kohl's pick up thousands of candles for retail sales.

Chesapeake's founder and chief executive, Mei Xu, 49, a Chinese **immigrant**, created this oasis of productivity while trolling the aisles at the flagship Bloomingdale's store on Manhattan's Upper East Side in the 1990s.

Xu was working in New York at a firm that exported medical equipment. She would walk a few blocks to Bloomingdale's, where she burned her free time searching for inspiration in the housewares and fashion departments.

"Bloomingdale's is where I found my entrepreneurial spirit," the businesswoman said.

Since the company's start two decades ago as an experiment in an Annapolis basement with wax poured into soup cans, Chesapeake Bay Candle has sold more than 350 million candles. The United States is its biggest market, followed by Europe and Asia.

The company employs 50 people at its Rockville headquarters in addition to the 80 in Glen Burnie, from which it ships $15 million in candles. Factories in China and in Vietnam employ an additional 1,200 people.

U.S. sales are at $60 million. The cost of manufacturing each candle starts at about $2 and increases from there depending on the fragrance and size. Gross profit margin after cost of goods sold is in the neighborhood of $20 million. Chesapeake pays for labor, leases, overhead and insurance from that amount. The bottom line is a profit in the single-digit millions, by my estimate.

The most interesting thing about the candle business is the psychology behind Xu's sales strategy. The typical buyer is a woman 25 to 55 who believes that scent is a key ingredient of a gracious home.

"She likes the ambiance," Xu said of her hypothetical customer. "She wants the house ready for the kids coming home, friends coming over for the weekend or a family dinner and celebration."

"Scents are a big part of memories," she added. "When we smell a fragrance, such as a pumpkin pie or a cookie, it brings back memories from when we grew up. Mother baking at Thanksgiving or your first romantic walk with your wife."

With prices that range from $2.99 to $50, candles can also be a poor man's substitute for a vacation. For that, you get caramel, fig, spice, noble fir, falling snow, spiced apple, cinnamon and the ever-popular juniper.

"When the economy is bad, people can afford candles when they can't travel. We see a big surge on anything that has scents like coconut, which reminds them of a tropical island. It takes them somewhere, and we bring it home."

I hate to say this, but hurricanes are good for business. Xu said she sees sales spike before the big cyclones hit, which she attributes to a fragrance's calming effect. I'm guessing the ability to provide light without electricity also doesn't hurt.

"People want to have a sense of normalcy in the midst of chaos."

Xu was born in Hangzhou, a city centered near China's east coast that recently hosted the G-20 summit of world leaders. It is also the home of Alibaba, the Chinese version of Amazon.com that the colorful entrepreneur Jack Ma founded.

Xu's mother ran an elementary school, and her father was an engineer for a steel manufacturer. "I guess I have the factory blood in my system," she said.

You wouldn't know it from her start. She went to boarding school at age 12 to study diplomacy. She later studied at the prestigious Beijing Foreign Studies University, where she specialized in American studies and met her future husband, a geophysicist. They divorced but share ownership of the candle business.

After graduating in 1989, she wanted to continue her education, so she applied to the University of Maryland, where she majored in journalism.

She and her then-husband settled in Washington after graduation. During the week, she commuted to New York, where she worked exporting high-tech American-made medical devices to Chinese hospitals.

After her Bloomingdale's epiphany, she resigned from her New York job and moved back to Washington, hankering to start her own company.

"We knew a lot of companies in China that wanted to export around the world," Xu said. "So I used my contacts back home."

Xu eventually focused on home-product sales, where she saw a niche. The couple took fans, silk flowers, candles, calligraphy and several other categories of decorations to a wholesale gift show in North Carolina to test the waters with store owners.

It was the candles that sold, and a global business was born.

The fledgling firm had to move quickly to fill the inventory, using contacts in China to find a factory. They raised $100,000 in working capital from friends and family and found a warehouse in Laurel to store and ship the candles. They bought a 1-800 number.

By Christmas 1994, Xu and her then-husband had sold $500,000 worth of candles.

The self-described "global thinker" next went on a fact-finding trip to Germany, where she attended one of the largest housewares shows in the world. Two things happened: She discovered the importance of fragrance, and she decided to go with a minimalist design, allowing the scent to sell the candle.

The business took off. The couple worked with her sister in China to start the first factory in 1995. It gave them a lead over other candle manufacturers in fragrance technology and design.

They made and sold their candles from China until 2008. That's when the United States was in the midst of a financial crisis, and American retailers demanded lower prices and a shorter lead time for putting candles on the shelves.

The company eventually built a domestic factory to fulfill its retailers' needs and leased a warehouse in Glen Burnie, beginning what would become a $6 million investment.

On the August day I visited, they were pouring Pumpkin Bliss candles for T.J. Maxx and Vanilla Buttercream for the Avon crowd.

When I checked in with her last week, Xu was heading into a nearly three-hour meeting to discuss taxes. Chesapeake Candle pays a lot of taxes, she said.

She said her company is one of the few to start manufacturing in Maryland over the past 20 years. The Chinese **immigrant** is proud of that.

thomas.heath@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The "Crusaders" knew they wanted to kill Muslims — and with luck, use the "bloodbath" to ignite a religious war — but for months they couldn't settle on a plan.

The easiest way would be to grab guns, go to the predominantly Somali-Muslim apartment complex they'd been surveilling and start kicking in doors, court documents said. They would spare no one, not even babies.

In the end, they decided to set off bombs similar to the one Timothy McVeigh used in 1995 to kill 168 people in Oklahoma City. They planned to strike after the Nov. 8 election, investigators said.

Curtis Allen, Gavin Wright and Patrick Eugene Stein face federal charges of conspiring to use a weapon of mass destruction to blow up an apartment complex, a mosque and Muslim **immigrants** from Somalia, the Department of Justice announced Friday.

Federal court documents reveal how the trio's hatred and Islamophobia coalesced into a plan for domestic terrorism.

It was ultimately undone by an FBI confidential informant and Allen's girlfriend, who showed authorities Allen's supply room after he allegedly hit her during a fight.

Earlier this year, investigators were tipped off by the informant, who had attended meetings of a group calling itself the Crusaders. Allen, Wright and Stein were the leaders and the chief architects of the plan, investigators say.

The informant said the group's focus was an apartment complex in Garden City, Kan., that had an apartment-turned-mosque attended by Muslims from Somalia. The Crusaders referred to them as cockroaches.

"They chose the target location based on their hatred of these groups, their perception that these groups represent a threat to American society, a desire to inspire other militia groups, and a desire to 'wake people up,'" according to a criminal complaint unsealed this week.

As they hatched a plan, Stein took the lead on surveillance. Sometimes he rode alone, sometimes he would have the confidential informant drive him. He would survey potential targets at the apartment complex, the mosque or a nearby mall.

Inside the vehicle he kept a pistol, an assault rifle and ammunition, a bullet-resistant vest and a night vision scope.

Here's a 2015 Facebook post/pic of accused Kansas domestic terrorist Gavin Wright (complete with a Snoopy emoji he added) pic.twitter.com/8kvFGW2w1G

The surveillance wasn't covert.

"Stein, at various times, yelled at Somali women dressed in traditional garb, calling them "f---- raghead b----," the complaint says.

On trips, he also admiringly discussed the Oklahoma City bombing and the fuel oil and ammonium nitrate device McVeigh exploded in front of it.

All the while, the three men mulled their plans, using high-tech and simple methods to avoid detection. They used an app called Zello to encrypt their phone calls. Sometimes, they met in an open field.

Their conversations blurred between active planning and hate speech.

"Make sure if you start using your bow on them cockroaches, make sure you dip them in pig's blood before you shoot them," Stein said in an April 2016 Zello call that was recorded by the confidential informant. Consuming pork is forbidden by Islam.

At a meeting a month later, Allen suggested the group make hundreds of signs saying "'I support illegal **immigration**, I go against the constitution on a daily basis, I do not have any care for my fellow citizens in the state or in the town that I represent.' ... and then for everyone of them that we blow the top of their head off we just put that around their neck."

Their plans began to solidify over the summer as they narrowed down their targets. In August, they settled on the apartment complex in Garden City, a Somali-Muslim enclave, the complaint says. They planned to use cars to set off explosions at the exits to the complex. The explosions would boom around prayer time, when most people would be gathering.

At some point, Allen began watching YouTube videos to learn how to make explosives.

He also got to work on a manifesto. But federal investigators, monitoring recordings of their meetings, already knew the group's guiding philosophies:

"The only f---- way this country's ever going to get turned around is it will be a bloodbath and it will be a nasty, messy motherf----," Stein said in June.

"Unless a lot more people in this country wake up and smell the f---- coffee and decide they want this country back ... we might be too late, if they do wake up ... I think we can get it done. But it ain't going to be nothing nice about it."

In September, the feds strengthened their case. Stein met with a man who said he could get the group guns. But the gunrunner was really an FBI employee, and the guns Stein fired in a rural part of Finney County, Kan., were from the FBI lab in Quantico, Va.

The Crusaders had other problems. Allen was arrested Tuesday for domestic battery. His girlfriend said Allen beat her during an argument over money. She told the officers who responded that Allen had access to a gun.

One of the last conversations investigators recorded of the Crusaders was when Stein told an undercover agent that Allen's girlfriend "needs to disappear."

But it was already too late for the group. She showed officers the room where Allen had been making ammunition and said she believed he had been mixing explosives, too. Police say it was hexamethylene triperoxide diamine, which is used to create homemade blasting caps.

Investigators closed in on Allen on Tuesday, trailing a GMC Yukon that Allen had been driving and stopping it near Highway 83. Inside the SUV, they found AR-15 and AK-47 magazines, and bullets for a handgun — a weapons cache they believe was linked to the planned attacks.

The men were arrested last week and face life in prison if convicted.

Read more:

Three Kansas men calling themselves 'Crusaders' charged in terror plot targeting Muslim **immigrants**

This mayor won't stop posting racist Obama memes. He won't resign, either.

'We saw these guys just dripping with blood': A quiet night at a Minnesota mall turns to panic

Georgia officials were set to approve a new mosque — until an armed militia threatened to protest

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Three Kansas men have been accused of plotting attacks targeting an apartment complex home, a mosque and many Muslim **immigrants** from Somalia, authorities said Friday.

Curtis Allen, Gavin Wright and Patrick Eugene Stein face federal charges of conspiring to use a weapon of mass destruction, the Justice Department announced.

"These charges are based on eight months of investigation by the FBI that is alleged to have taken the investigators deep into a hidden culture of hatred and violence," acting U.S. attorney Tom Beall said in a statement. "Many Kansans may find it as startling as I do that such things could happen here."

According to the FBI complaint made public Friday, the investigation was prompted by a paid confidential informant who had attended meetings with a group of individuals calling themselves "the Crusaders" and had heard plans discussed for attacks on Muslims, whom the men called "cockroaches."

The three men charged Friday were ultimately identified as the architects of the attack plan through a combination of recordings, social media and reporting from the confidential informant, according to the complaint.

The members of the group routinely expressed their hatred for Muslims, Somalis and **immigrants**. In one call, Stein allegedly said the country could be turned around only with "a bloodbath." The individuals said they wanted to "wake people up" and inspire other militia groups to act.

The FBI says that as part of this alleged plot, the men conducted surveillance in Garden City, Kan., a small city about 200 miles west of Wichita, and other places in southwestern Kansas.

At one point, Stein was being driven around by the confidential informant, who told the FBI that Stein yelled and cursed at Somali women in traditional garb.

During the period of surveillance, Stein was armed with an assault rifle, extra magazines, a pistol, a ballistic vest and a night vision scope, the complaint said.

The three men had been plotting "to use a weapon of mass destruction" since February, according to the FBI complaint.

But they considered a variety of attacks — acting quickly and violently with a few guns or plotting a more complex plan that would maximize casualties. The simplest plan, a frustrated Stein suggested at a meeting in June, was grabbing a gun and driving to Garden City, where the men would "start kicking in the doors of the Somali apartments, and kill them one by one."

In June, Stein allegedly met with members of the Crusaders and brought up the Orlando nightclub shooting, carried out by a Florida man who pledged loyalty to the Islamic State during the attack.

The FBI said its informant met in July with the three men charged Friday at a business owned by Wright and where Allen worked. They discussed potential targets, at one point putting pins on them in Google Maps, and "brainstormed various methods of attack, including murder, kidnapping, rape, and arson," the FBIsaid.

"We're going to talk about killing people and going to prison for life," Allen said at one point, according to the complaint. "Less than sixty days, maybe forty days, until something major happens. We need to be preemptive before something happens."

"The only good Muslim is a dead Muslim," Stein responded, according to the documents.

At another point in the conversation, Stein allegedly remarked, "If you're a Muslim I'm going to enjoy shooting you in the head," before telling the group: "When we go on operations there's no leaving anyone behind, even if it's a one-year old, I'm serious. I guarantee you if I go on a mission those little f---- are going bye bye."

Allen and Wright are both 49 years old, while Stein is 47. No attorneys were listed for the three men on Friday evening.

The trio are scheduled to appear Monday morning a Wichita courtroom. If convicted, they face life in prison.

On Friday, the Council on American-Islamic Relations called for officials in law enforcement to offer "stepped-up protection for mosques and other Islamic institutions."

"We ask our nation's political leaders, and particularly political candidates, to reject the growing Islamophobia in our nation," CAIR National Executive Director Nihad Awad said in a news release.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The private prison industry is lobbying against a Justice Department directive to end the use of their facilities, encouraging legislators to question the policy change and legally protesting one significant contract reduction.

The moves by the GEO Group and others demonstrate the practical and political hurdles that stand in the way of the Bureau of Prisons actually ending its use of for-profit facilities to manage federal inmates. The private prison industry claims that the decision to do so was based on faulty research and that officials need contractors because of overcrowding in the federal prison system.

"We think the private sector facilities did very well, that they were comparably secure, and in some important respects, they were better," said George Zoley, chairman and chief executive of the GEO Group, which operates six facilities.

The private prison industry, which generates billions of dollars in revenue, has become a powerful lobbying force on Capitol Hill, and officials say they have tried since the Justice Department announcement to rally legislators to their side. Last month, six Republican representatives from Texas, California and Georgia sent a letter asking the Justice Department and the Bureau of Prisons to "step back" from the directive until they provided Congress with more information.

"We are concerned that the DOJ's instructions put politics ahead of policy when it comes to maintaining flexibility in our prison system, encouraging vital criminal **alien** law enforcement and providing the best value for our taxpayers," the lawmakers wrote.

Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah), chair of the House Oversight Committee, wrote in a separate missive with two other Republicans that the Justice Department's plan would "undermine the effectiveness of the system's rehabilitation programs."

The directive by Deputy Attorney General Sally Q. Yates in August that said the Bureau of Prisons should end its use of private facilities was greeted with widespread praise by advocates who have long been calling for the end of for-profit incarceration. Its effect, though, was limited to the 13 privately run facilities, housing a little more than 22,000 inmates, in the federal Bureau of Prisons system.

Officials said it was unclear precisely how soon the contract prisons could be phased out. One of those 13 prisons in New Mexico has since had its inmates moved out, and the population in the rest stood just above 21,600 on Friday, according to the Bureau of Prisons website.

Justice Department spokeswoman Dena Iverson said in a statement that Yates's directive was "in effect and the Bureau of Prisons is committed to implementing it."

"Since August, the overall prison population has continued to decline and the Bureau continues to modify its contracts to reflect the reduced need for bed space in private facilities," Iverson said. "As private prison contracts come up for renewal in the coming months and years, BOP will be terminating or renegotiating those contracts consistent with the continuing decline in the overall prison population."

Yates has not minced words in criticizing the privately run facilities. "They simply do not provide the same level of correctional services, programs, and resources; they do not save substantially on costs; and as noted in a recent report by the Department's Office of Inspector General, they do not maintain the same level of safety and security," she wrote in her directive. That report found, among a litany of problems, private facilities had higher rates of assaults — both by inmates on other inmates and by inmates on staff — and had eight times as many contraband cellphones confiscated each year on average than government prisons.

A cornerstone of Yates's memo was the revelation that the Bureau of Prisons would amend a solicitation for a 10,800-bed contract to one for a maximum 3,600-bed contract. That, Yates wrote, would allow the Bureau of Prisons over the next year to discontinue housing inmates in at least three private prisons, and by May 1, 2017, the total private prison population would stand at less than 14,200 inmates.

The GEO Group initially tried to compete for that modified contract, but earlier this month, it lodged a formal protest with the Government Accountability Office.

The company argued that the reduced request was an "improper and illogical change" that did not take into account what the Bureau of Prisons actually needs, given its problems with overcrowding. It asked the Government Accountability Office to recommend that the Bureau of Prisons issue a new solicitation for the 10,800 beds initially sought.

"We believe the need is still there, because the Bureau of Prisons is still overcrowded, and these communities have extended themselves financially," Zoley said.

The GEO Group is one of three companies that operate private facilities for the Bureau of Prisons. The others are Corrections Corporation of America and Management and Training Corporation. Issa Arnita, a spokesman for Management and Training Corporation, said while the company had not lodged formal protests, it believed "phasing out the use of contractors will result in greater overcrowding in public BOP facilities and an increased cost to the BOP and ultimately taxpayers." Jonathan Burns, a Corrections Corporation of America spokesman, said that company was "aware of and monitoring the issue."

The private industry already had criticized the inspector general's report for what it said was an unfair comparison to public facilities, which hold an eclectic mix of inmates, to private ones, which hold predominantly "criminal aliens." The report acknowledged that investigators did not "know the extent to which demographic factors" might have played a role in contributing to some problems, and it said investigators were "unable to compare the overall costs of incarceration between BOP institutions and contract prisons in part because of the different nature of the inmate populations and programs offered in those facilities." But the inspector general's report was not the first public critique of private facilities, and some problems, such as concerns over medical care, seem to have little to do with inmate population.

Justin Long, a Bureau of Prisons spokesman, said the bureau supported the deputy attorney general's directive and believed it could be practically implemented over time. That is largely because of declining inmate populations. In fiscal 2016, the bureau saw a population decline of more than 13,500 inmates and sits now at 191,965 — 205 fewer than the year before.

Long said the decline in population has led to a reduction in overall crowding, from 40 percent to 15 percent, as of Oct. 6. He said officials believed the inmate population would shrink further in 2017.

The vast majority of those incarcerated in the United States are housed in state prisons — rather than federal ones — and Yates's memo does not apply to any of those, even the ones that are privately run. Nor does it apply to **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Marshals Service detainees, who are technically in the federal system but not under the purview of the federal Bureau of Prisons. Advocates have said, though, that it could serve as a catalyst for broader reform.

matt.zapotosky@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Fans of science fiction find themselves in the genre for a number of reasons. It could be a love of all the accoutrements that mark the genre: new species, **alien**warfare, spaceships and gripping anti-heroes. But, it also serves as a crystal ball — showing humanity through imagined reactions to new technology, races or otherworldly locales, often in a way that's stirring and a little bit scary — in a good way!

The Washington Post will be publishing an ever-rotating list of some of the best science fiction we've read, populated by staff and reader suggestions and moderated by us here at Book World. Leave your most recently read science fiction books in the comments.

Title: The Saga of Seven Suns

Author: Kevin J. Anderson

What's it about? "The Saga of Seven Suns" is a seven-book space opera, following humanity in the near future after it has colonized other planets across the galaxy with the help of a more technologically advanced species called the Ildrians. After humans accidentally anger a hidden, ancient race of aliens, the universe is thrown into war. The series kicks off with "Hidden Empire."

Recommended by: @KTHunter\_Author on Tumblr.

--

Title: The Queen of Blood

Author: Sarah Beth Durst

What's it about? "The Queen of Blood" takes place in a magical world where people coexist with the spirits who help maintain and nurture nature – and often want to destroy humans. The only person who can restore balance is the Queen, who detects she's losing her powers. Meanwhile, an academy grooms young women to take the Queen's place, and among them is Daleina, who discovers a conspiracy to assassinate other heirs to the throne. Author Nancy Hightower commended the world-building in the book and called it "an enthralling tale filled with an intriguing ensemble of characters."

Recommended by: Hightower, who reviews the best science fiction and fantasy every month for The Washington Post.

--

Title: The Three-Body Problem

Author: Cixin Liu, translated by Ken Liu

What's it about? In this award-winning novel, Liu reimagines history after the Cultural Revolution, following academic Ye Wenjie, who is sent to work in a top-secret military base after her father is murdered by Red Guards. Forty years later, a nanomaterials researcher is asked to infiltrate a group of elite scientists to spy after a number of the world's greatest scientists commit suicide, including Ye's daughter. To get in the group, Wang must play an online virtual reality game in which players attempt to prevent an apocalypse from wiping out a civilization. Wang finds out about a massive conspiracy harkening all the way back to the Cultural Revolution.

Originally published in China in 2008, the English translation won the 2015 Hugo Award for best novel.

Recommended by: Washington Post staff

--

Title: Good Morning, Midnight

Author: Lily Brooks-Dalton

What's it about? "Good Morning, Midnight" is a post-apocalyptic novel that follows Augustine, a 78-year-old scientist at the top of the Arctic archipelago, and Sullivan, a mission specialist on a deep space flight to Jupiter. Both have left their families out of curiosity about the natural world and have devoted their lives to these desolate places. When all communication in the world goes dead, both scientists must re-evaluate what is important to them as they journey to reconnect with whatever society is left.

Recommended by: Nancy Hightower, who reviews the best scifi and fantasy every month for The Washington Post.

--

Title: Children of Men

Author: P.D. James

What's it about? In this book, later made into a movie, the human race has become infertile, and the last generation to be born has reached adulthood. England, ruled by the Warden, has become a society where the ill are encouraged to commit suicide, **immigrants** practically enslaved and criminals exiled. An Oxford professor and cousin of the Warden, Theo Faron, is apathetic about the future. But then he meets a woman, leader of a group of revolutionaries, who may hold the key to the survival of the human race, and wants his help getting an audience with The Warden.

It's "an interesting look at how fragile society is and what children would bring."

Recommended by: @drinking-tea-at-midnight on Tumblr

--

Title: The Diamond Age: Or, A Young Lady's Illustrated Primer

Author: Neal Stephenson

What's it about? Stephenson's novel takes place in a future world powered by nanotechnology, where society is organized into phyles, or tribes, of people of varying cultures and social statuses. The story follows a young girl from the lowest class in society named Nell, who by accident is the recipient of an illegal copy of an interactive book called the Young Lady's Illustrated Primer intended for a wealthy lord's daughter. "The Diamond Age" explores the effect of the book on Nell, and two other girls who received a copy and as a result, its effect on the world around them.

Recommended by: @dreamawhile on Tumblr

--

Title: Parable of the Sower and Parable of the Talents

Author: Octavia Butler

What's it about? A two-book series about a dystopian United States where society has reverted to near anarchy due to scarcity of resources and poverty. Protagonist Lauren Olamina, a preacher's daughter, has lived all her life relatively protected from the decay of society in a gated community in Los Angeles, and has developed an ability that allows her to feel the pain and emotions of others. After her community is destroyed, Olamina travels north with other survivors and tries to start a new community and a new religion called Earthseed.

Recommended by: @monroepubliclibrary on Tumblr.

--

Title: Infomocracy

Author: Malka Older

What's it about? In a futuristic world where mini-democracies vote on which global government they want to join, an organization called "Information" oversees everything from the elections to the media. As another election, held every 10 years, approaches, someone is trying to sabotage the election process by taking out Information's communication system as two parties jockey to stay in the lead. Political operative Ken, Information agent Mishima, and anarchist Domaine team up to find out who is responsible for sabotage.

Recommended by: Nancy Hightower, who reviews the best science fiction and fantasy every month for The Washington Post.

--

Title: The Second Angel

Author: Philip Kerr

What's it about? In the year 2069, most of Earth's population has been infected by a slow-acting deadly virus. The only cure is clean blood, housed on the moon and only affordable to the wealthy elite. When wealthy systems designer Dana Dallas finds out his infant daughter needs clean blood to survive, and is denied, Dallas's actions spark a chain of events that puts him at war with powerful, dangerous enemies.

It's "one of the more believable near-future dystopias."

Recommended by: @proactivevoice on Tumblr.

--

Title: Super Extra Grande

Author: José Miguel Sánchez Gómez, aka Yoss

What's it about? When two ambassadors involved in peace talks with **alien** capitalists accidentally get swallowed by an extra –large sea worm, veterinarian Jan Amos Sangan Dongo has to figure out how to rescue them without causing political unrest. In this intergalactic space satire, Yoss derides racist and sexist stereotypes and critiques western environmental policies.

Recommended by: Nancy Hightower, who reviews the best science fiction and fantasy every month for The Washington Post.

--

Title: Stranger in a Strange Land

Author: Robert Heinlein

What's it about? Heinlein's classic novel, a Hugo Award winner in 1962, tells the story of Valentine Michael Smith, who was born and raised on Mars and is the only survivor of the first manned mission to the planet. A true innocent, Smith learns about human culture, morality and society – and with the support of his friends, eventually founds his own church based on the principals he learned from Martians.

Recommended by: @empathyfarmer on Tumblr.

--

Title: The City and the city

Author: China Mieville

What's it about? Part police procedural, part science fiction, Mieville's novel is about two cities occupying the same geographical space, where citizens must "unsee" the other city and its people or suffer the consequences. That complicates what should be a routine investigation for Inspector Tyador Borlu: a woman's body is found in his city of Beszel, but the crime was committed in the neighboring city of Ul Qoma, launching a journey both psychological and physical between two rival cities.

"It's a fantastic and disorienting read."

Recommended by: @disorderedthinking on Tumblr.

--

Title: Hystopia

Author: David Means

What's it about? Eugene Allen, who has just returned from the Vietnam War is writing a fiction book about an alternate universe where JFK has survived and the Vietnam War dragged on for years, leaving thousands of veterans. A government organization, the Psych Corps, erases soldiers' traumatic memories. One of these veterans, Rake, goes on a killing spree and then kidnaps Meg, a woman with the same name as the novelist's sister in real life.

Hystopia is a novel within a novel, told from many points of view: Psych Corps agents pursuing Rake and Meg, other veterans helping them - and in the real world, the editors, friends and family of Eugene Allen. The novel is complex without being confusing, weaving our protagonist's battle with mental illness and his fictional universe into "a beautiful, haunting tale of loss."

Recommended by: Nancy Hightower, who reviews the best science fiction and fantasy every month for The Washington Post.

--

Title: The Madness Season

Author: C.S. Friedman

What's it about? Set several hundred years after **alien** conquerers have taken over Earth, those most likely to rebel - humanity's best and brightest - have been exiled. Humanity has fallen into subservience. However, there is one man who survived the conquest all those years ago: Daetrin, a vampire. He is immediately banished from earth, and Daetrin is forced to confront his suppressed nature.

It's "just an amazing character portrait in a very unique setting, im more of a fantasy reader but this is without a doubt one of my favorite sci fi books ever."

Recommended by: @seekerofpatterns on Tumblr

--

Title: Contact

Author: Carl Sagan

What's it about? Set in 1999, astrophysicist Ellie Arroway picks up a message from outer space that she believes is from an intelligent life form. She and a multinational team travel out into deep space to meet them, despite opposition from religious groups and others in the scientific community who fear a Trojan horse or a hoax. Written in 1985, this book was later made into a movie released in 1997.

"Real science makes science fiction magical."

Recommended by: @iamgettingalife on Tumblr

--

Title: Station Eleven

Who: Emily St. John Mandel

What's it about? It follows the Traveling Symphony, a group of musicians and actors who roam around Michigan 20 years after a fearsome plague has killed most of humanity. It jumps back and forth in time to talk about fame, the nature of celebrity, and the miracle of our strange and brilliant existence.

"It'll probably make you cry."

Recommended by: @vividlasagna on Tumblr

--

Title: The Sparrow: A Novel

Author: Mary Doria Russell

What's it about? Father Emilio Sandoz is a Jesuit linguist on a secret expedition to another planet, an experience so harrowing that he begins to question the existence of God. What started out as a small mistake snowballs into a horrible catastrophe, and he becomes one of the first to make contact with intelligent extraterrestrial life.

Recommended by: @missmireille on Tumblr

--

Title: Annihilation: A Novel

Author: Jeff Vandermeer

What's it about? It's "short, creepy, with an Asian protagonist." In the first volume of this trilogy, readers follow the all-female twelfth expedition to Area X, a strange place cut off from the rest of civilization. Members of other expeditions often have come back changed. The women of the twelfth group discover a massive topographic anomaly and new life forms, but it's the secrets the members are keeping from each other that threaten to change everything.

Recommended by: @bananacreamphi on Tumblr

--

Title: The Lost Time Accidents

Author: John Wray

What's it about? Walter "Waldy" Tolliver is a man who has quite literally fallen out of time. Trapped in an extra chronological space, he writes letters to a mysterious lover and documents the history of his family's involvements with "the Accidents," or holes in space. Waldy, an omniscient narrator, explores the intersection of time travel, mental illness and unrequited love in this expansive novel and spans generations obsessing over the meaning of time.

--

Title: Lightless

Author: C.A. Higgins

What's it about? Althea is a computer scientist on an experimental military spacecraft who, rather than bonding with her crewmates, finds herself emotionally connecting with the ship's artificial intelligence. She finds herself doing whatever she can to protect it when a pair of fugitive terrorists come on board and gain access to the ship, Ananke. As the ship begins to malfunction, claustrophobia and suspicion set in amid those on the ship and Althea questions what it means to be independent and sentient.

--

Title: Quantum Night

Author: Robert Sawyer

What's it about? This fast-paced science fiction thriller separates humanity into three groups: Zombies who do what they are told, psychopaths who try to manipulate and control the zombies, and humans who have a communal consciousness. The protagonist, Jim Marchuk is a psychologist who studies psychopaths, works with a team of scientists try to find a way to make the zombies truly human again without turning them into psychopaths.

--

Title: 2312

Author: Kim Stanley Robinson

What's it about? "2312" painstakingly documents an unraveling conspiracy that has the potential to upend the tense relationships between several human-populated planets in the solar system in the year (you guessed it) 2312. Readers will follow the 135-year-old Swan Er Hong, a world-builder turned performance artist, as she investigates her grandmother's death, a journey that grows in scope as she travels across space. Admittedly, this was a difficult book to read, but the ideas – from the use of AI technology to the fluidity of human gender – are infectious and will have you mulling over the book for days.

--

Title: Lock In: A Novel of the Near Future

Author: John Scalzi

What's it about? A fun mix between a police procedural and science fiction thriller, Scalzi explores a world where a highly contagious virus called Haden's Syndrome has caused 1 percent of the population to be trapped, awake, in their bodies. In the 25 years since, people have adapted by using humanoid robotic personal transport units controlled by brains to work and live in the physical world. FBI agent Chris Shane, a so-called Haden, investigates a Haden-related murder with veteran agent Leslie Vann. What begins as an investigation into a murder case leads Shane and Vann to explore a burgeoning new human culture.

Don't forget: leave recommendations in the comments in this format, and we'll select the best ones.

everdeen.mason@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"I was Trump before Trump was Trump."

That boast by Corey Stewart, chairman of the Prince William County Board of Supervisors and a Republican candidate for governor next year, always had a creepy ring to it.

Stewart became notorious a decade ago for his campaign against foreign-born people in his county, or, at least, people who might have dark skin and could be foreigners.

Whipping up fears about "illegal" aliens who might be infesting the county, Stewart pushed for police to check the **immigration** status of anyone they detained.

His move was widely criticized as profiling. Hispanics largely avoided Prince William County. Stewart was the subject of a biting documentary about race in America.

So, because the two men share extreme views on race and **immigration**, it seemed a natural fit when Stewart became co-chairman of the Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's Virginia campaign.

Until Monday, that is. In a typically bizarre move, the Trump campaign unceremoniously fired Stewart after he defied warnings that he not appear at a protest at the Republican National Committee headquarters in the District.

"We're putting together a very strong effort in Virginia. Clearly, Mr. Stewart was more concerned about his own personal agenda than the campaign of Mr. Trump," said Trump spokesman Jason Miller.

Stewart had taken it upon himself to go after establishment Republicans at a time when many in the GOP are heading for the exits given Trump's endless controversies, topped off by the release of a 2005 recording of lewd comments he made about women. Stewart has gone as far as to refer to such GOP officials as "pukes."

One wonders just how much stranger the Trump campaign can become nationally and in Virginia. Anything seems possible, but the future does not look bright for Stewart.

Next year, he will be competing against several strong GOP candidates for governor, including former RNC chairman Ed Gillespie, Rep. Robert J. Wittman (R-1st) and state Sen. Frank W. Wagner of Virginia Beach.

None of these individuals has any of the baggage Stewart brings.

Not one has claimed to have been Trump before Trump was Trump. That could be the new acid test for GOP candidate sanity.

Peter Galuszka is a regular contributor to All Opinions Are Local.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Every night, they had the same routine.

The Georgetown University business student would settle in for his cram session — soda, chips, books lined up.

And the janitor would come in to start his night shift — polishing each of the windows in the study room, moving amid all those books and chips and sodas. Invisible.

"There was this space, like ice separating us," said Oneil Batchelor, an **immigrant** from Jamaica. The janitor worked around the students — many of them in their 20s like him, many with entrepreneurial ambitions like him — for nearly a decade before one of them finally broke that ice last year.

A nod one night. A hello the next.

And within weeks, Batchelor and the student, Febin Bellamy, were having long talks about being **immigrants**, about wanting to be entrepreneurs, about politics and history and music. Bellamy even went to Batchelor's church and met his 6-year-old daughter.

After he formed that bond with the once-invisible worker, Bellamy couldn't stop noticing the others.

"Once you see it, you can't unsee it," the 22-year-old said.

The minimum-wage cafeteria workers dishing up food, the locker-room attendant scrubbing the stinkiest places, the maintenance man doing back­breaking work in the garden while students maneuver around him, heads bowed to their phones.

It's not just affluence, age and pedigree that create this yawning gap at a school where tuition and room and board run more than $65,000 a year.

"Everybody's in their own world," Bellamy said. "A lot of students have good hearts and were raised right. It's just not always easy for them to get to know people around them."

Each of those workers has a story. Many of them are **immigrants**, and their collective histories of war and flight and families left behind offer a master class in geo­politics. No tuition needed.

Bellamy understands because these are his people. His family **immigrated** to the United States from India when he was 5. When they got to New York, his mother worked as a nursing assistant and his father as a customer service rep while they were going to college at night and raising a family in the few hours left over.

Bellamy started at a community college and then transferred to Georgetown as a junior. He knows the scrap and fight the folks fixing pipes and cleaning bathrooms have inside them.

So he had a brainstorm. What if he found a way to introduce the workers to the students? And that idea went from a class project in April to a fundraiser making real change today.

He did it in the language his peers understand: a Facebook page. He calls it Unsung Heroes, and he began posting little profiles of workers around campus.

Students learned that the guy who cleans the business school windows, Batchelor, left a place of little opportunity in Jamaica 20 years ago and dreams of opening his own jerk-chicken joint someday.

They learned that one of the cooks at the Leo O'Donovan Dining Hall, José Manzanares, saw family members killed in El Salvador's civil war and escaped when he was a teenager.

They realized that every time Memuna Tackie, the woman vacuuming the carpet at the stately Riggs Library, asked a question about an English word, they were helping the **immigrant** from Ghana study for her citizenship test.

The guy who runs the cash register at the dining hall? Umberto "Suru" Ripai hasn't seen his family in what is now South Sudan for 45 years.

And that crossing guard who smiles at all the students, even when they don't smile back? Anthony "Tracey" Smith's dad was killed in a crosswalk. Smith decided he wanted to protect pedestrians, and that's why he took the job at Georgetown.

The stories got shared. And liked. And loved.

"I walk through campus now, and people are waving at me, saying hi all the time," Batchelor said.

It gets even better.

The students also learned about some of the hopes percolating, as windows are washed and floors are scrubbed. And they're helping.

Turns out that Batchelor really is a gifted cook. Students who read about him encouraged him to hold fundraisers serving his now-famous-on-campus chicken. They raised $2,500, got him catering gigs and helped him put up his own web page, Oneil's Famous Jerk.

"It's like the door has cracked open in front of me," he said. "And I can smell the air coming through. The inspiration."

That cafeteria cashier at Leo's? The same students who once silently handed their meal cards to Ripai just raised more than $5,500 on a GoFundMe page for him to go to South Sudan to visit. That's enough money for two round-trip tickets. He's planning his journey now.

Smiling yet?

Bellamy hopes to expand Unsung Heroes to other campuses nationwide. A social entrepreneur, he calls it.

I call it awesome.

Talk about an antidote to the divisiveness and bile of this election season.

Say all you want about tax returns and emails and locker rooms. This is what makes America great, Americans.

petula.dvorak@washpost.com

Twitter: @petulad

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's attacks on illegal **immigrants**, Mexican holidays — even a primary opponent's Mexican-born wife — have sparked unprecedented anger and record levels of opposition among Hispanics, who are expected to vote in record numbers this year.

But according to the latest data, the numbers may not be as overwhelming as many Latino leaders and Democrats had hoped.

At least 13.1 million Hispanics are expected to cast ballots, according to estimates. That would mark a 17 percent jump in turnout and an 8.7 percent increase in the Latino share of the vote — but those numbers are on par with increases seen in the 2008 and 2012 presidential elections, experts say. Citizenship applications jumped 8 percent this year, similar to four years ago. Voter registration numbers are climbing in battleground states such as Florida, but that is also on par with 2012.

"Organizations did a lot this year, did capture more people, but it doesn't appear to be a large increase," said Mark Lopez, director of Hispanic research at the nonpartisan Pew Research Center.

"I would go so far as to say that we would have seen an uptick in voter registration even if Donald Trump were not running," he added.

Trump launched his campaign by accusing Mexico of sending rapists and criminals across the U.S. border. He attacked the Mexican-born wife of vanquished opponent Jeb Bush and the Mexican heritage of a federal judge. He posted a photo of himself eating a taco bowl on Cinco de Mayo, a move meant to curry favor with Hispanics that backfired. More recently, he attacked the physical appearance of a Venezuelan-born beauty queen.

This year, as registration rates among Latinos surged in California and naturalization rates jumped in Texas, many Hispanic leaders pointed to Trump's moves as reasons for the uptick and suggested a Latino voter wave would upend the election.

That could still happen, but most projections expect modest turnout. Nearly 190,000 Latinos registered to vote for the first time this year in Colorado, Florida and Nevada, up from about 170,000 four years ago but down from 203,000 by this point in 2008, according to Catalist, a data firm that works with progressive groups and Democrats.

Of the 27 million Latinos eligible to vote, about 13.1 million are expected to cast ballots, according to an estimate published by the nonpartisan National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials. More recent data suggests that fewer Latinos may show up.

A Pew poll found that 69 percent of registered Latinos said they are "absolutely certain" to cast ballots, compared with 77 percent in 2012. One of the sharpest declines is among those ages 18 to 35. Just 62 percent of Latino millennials say they are absolutely certain to vote this year, compared with 74 percent in 2012.

That trend should be worrying to Democrats, who will rely heavily on Hispanics in several battleground states, said Simon Rosenberg, who spent years developing Hispanic voter strategies for Democrats before establishing NDN, a liberal think tank.

"There are tens of millions of new voters in the American electorate, and the Democratic Party is still struggling to realize what they represent," Rosenberg said. "I think the party is still working through how to best speak to and reach out to this emerging, massive new set of voters."

The Democratic National Committee and Hillary Clinton's campaign are hoping to register 3 million new voters this year but declined to say how many Hispanics they hope to sign up. The campaign is using a variety of tactics, including a "My Dream, Your Vote" campaign that will send the children of undocumented **immigrants** — known as "dreamers" — to canvass Hispanic neighborhoods encouraging those who are eligible to vote. The campaign has also distributed voter-registration information to small businesses willing to provide the material to customers.

Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook said Thursday that mail-in ballot requests from key states including Florida and North Carolina bode well for Democrats. He boasted to reporters that "all the data that we're seeing is reinforcing that this will be the biggest election and biggest turnout in our history."

Nonpartisan groups say that Trump and his threats to deport tens of millions of undocumented **immigrants** were a factor.

Trump is "causing people to be more engaged and more involved and wanting to make sure they'll turn out," said Jared Nordlund, who runs voter-registration programs in Florida for the National Council of La Raza. "But they're not scared, just more aware."

In February, Univision — the nation's largest Spanish-language broadcaster — boasted of plans to register 3 million new Latino voters, but network officials conceded this week that they fell far short of that goal. The network said it focused primarily on ensuring that public-service announcements encouraging people to register and vote were seen or heard on its TV, radio and digital properties and said that about 300,000 people attended voter-registration fairs and other public events designed to promote voting.

Telemundo, the nation's second-largest Spanish-language broadcaster, said it directly registered 12,300 new voters through a registration campaign and a network-built app.

Larger groups said they struggled to raise money for more ambitious projects. The National Council of La Raza registered at least 65,550 voters, down from 98,000 in 2012, according to Clarissa Martínez-de-Castro, the group's deputy vice president for research, advocacy and legislation.

"Everyone knows it's a good thing if Americans are registered and voting, but there now isn't a lot of investment in making sure that happens, unless it's tied to a political or candidate agenda," she said.

Mi Familia Vota (My Family Votes), a nonpartisan group backed by labor unions and Latino organizations, registered about 100,000 new voters in Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Nevada and Texas but had to scale back amid a funding shortfall.

"This can be really tough work. You go out in the 100-degree heat in Arizona or Nevada and see how easy it is," said Ben Monterroso, the group's executive director.

Both groups said smaller-than-expected grants came from philanthropic organizations such as the Ford Foundation and the Open Society Foundation, which is backed primarily by liberal donor George Soros. Representatives for both foundations said they have shifted attention from voter-registration campaigns to more ambitious get-out-the-vote operations that are underway across the country.

Other registration campaigns reported modest success. Dominicanos USA, based in the Northeast, said it registered about 35,000 new, mostly Dominican American voters in New York, New Jersey and Rhode Island. The League of United Latin American Citizens, one of the nation's oldest Hispanic organizations, said it signed up close to 20,000 new voters, including thousands in Iowa. And when a Trump campaign surrogate warned that the "dominant" Latino culture could lead to "taco trucks on every corner," the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce launched a campaign encouraging taco truck vendors to hand out registration forms. The "Guac the Vote" campaign spread across the country primarily through social media, the group said.

Voto Latino, which signs up most new voters through an app, says it helped register more than 101,000 new voters. The group spreads the word through partnerships with Telemundo, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute and hundreds of other groups, including the Mexican rock band Maná.

Often referred to as the "Latin American U2," the band allowed Voto Latino volunteers to canvass at "Latino Power Tour" shows. The band mentions the registration campaign during the concert along with onstage criticisms of this election season.

At the start of a recent concert in Las Vegas, an animated video showed the mock construction of a brick wall along the Mexican border. In the video, workers lay bricks that say "odio" — hate — and "racismo" — racism — but the wall eventually crumbles amid green vines and flowers. The crowd cheered as it realized that the video was criticizing Trump.

Maná drummer Alex González said the band eagerly partnered with Voto Latino because it knows that most elections in Latin America are "complicated with corruption."

"Here in the United States your vote is counted," he said. "It's very important."

But Fher Olvera, the band's lead singer, said he is much more concerned about the fate of American politics.

"I see the news on the TV, it looks like a reality show," he said. "And this is not a reality show. . . . This is the biggest presidential election in the world. Come on, be a bit more serious, Americans."

ed.okeefe@washpost.com

Scott Clement contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Saturday at a convention center in Edison, N.J., GOP presidential nominee Donald Trump is scheduled to give an address unlike any he has given before — in front of a crowd of fervent supporters who will be mostly nonwhite.

The address, hosted by the Trump campaign and the Republican Hindu Coalition, is part of a charity benefit for Hindu victims of terrorism. With Bollywood-style entertainment and Indian celebrity guest appearances, the spectacle will provide welcome optics for a campaign that has provoked almost nothing but backlash from minority voters.

The event is also unusual because the Indian American community overwhelmingly leans Democratic, with 70 percent planning to vote for Hillary Clinton compared with 7 percent for Trump, according to the most recent polls.

But some Trump supporters are working to improve those numbers, arguing that business-minded and socially conservative Indian Americans are a natural fit for the Republican candidate. Trump's tough talk on national security, and on Pakistan in particular, has also invigorated some Hindu Americans who see Islamic extremism as the gravest threat facing both the United States and India.

"Trump really is colorblind," said Shalabh Kumar, the electronics magnate who founded the Republican Hindu Coalition, or RHC. "What better way to show that than a rally of thousands of people who are brown?"

Together with his immediate family, Kumar has given almost $2 million to super PACs that support Trump. He is spending between $3 million and $5 million of his own money on the event in New Jersey. Like many of the Indian American community's leaders, Kumar comes from a business background. Admiration for Trump's business background is the bedrock of what support he has among Indian Americans, and belief in his promise to root out "radical Islamic terror" is the topsoil that lies above it.

Undeterred by numerous recent allegations of sexual assault against the candidate, Kumar said Saturday's event would go on. "The Hindu and Indian people do not abandon their friends in times of crisis," he said. "With India and Pakistan on the brink of war, and lives at stake in the global war on terror, Mr. Trump is the president we need at this time."

**Immigrants** who grew up in India are well acquainted with a broken governing system. Sujeeth Draksharam, a Houston-area civil engineer who is now the Republican precinct chair for Fort Bend County, says Democrats remind him of the Indian politicians he so despised in his native country.

"We've seen pay-to-play in India. Oh, man — that's a great scheme right there," Draksharam said. "I've seen terrorism and corruption. People here, in the land of plenty, they don't know what they have, and maybe that's why they vote Democrat. Maybe we've seen enough of life to know what's real."

"For us, when it hits in the wallet, or in an attack, that's when we realize we're Republicans," he added.

Kumar agreed that Trump's hard line on Muslims is a source of support for him among some Indian Americans. "A lot of Hindus see it that way," he said. "Butchers and killers have declared war on India, on the U.S. and on civilization. You better recognize the war and win it."

Recent voter surveys, however, indicate that Kumar is overestimating that pull, as well as the community's conservative leanings. In a spring 2016 survey, 70 percent opposed a ban on Muslims entering the United States, a plan Trump proposed last year before altering it this year to include unidentified nations with terrorism problems.

But it is **immigration** reform that is one of the biggest draws of the Democratic Party for Indian Americans. More than 60 percent of Indian Americans now in the United States arrived after 2000, according to Devesh Kapur, the director of the University of Pennsylvania's Center for the Advanced Study of India and a contributing author in the forthcoming book "The Other One Percent: Indians in America."

The Democratic Party's tradition of "big tent" politics and its embrace of cultural diversity appeals to many recent **immigrants**. Shekar Narasimhan, of Fairfax, Va., said he thinks that Indians are actually being driven further into the Democratic fold by Trump's antagonism toward **immigrants**. "It is as if a GPS is telling us, 'Go left, young man!' " Narasimhan said.

Like Kumar and Draksharam, Narasimhan came to the United States as a young man to obtain a master's degree. But while the others veered toward business, Narasimhan took his MBA to rural eastern Kentucky, where he lived for four years working on an affordable housing project. The racism that he encountered informed his political inclinations. In 2006, his son was called a "macaca" in public by then-Sen. George Allen (R-Va.) at a campaign stop. At the time, The Washington Post noted that his son was Fairfax County-born and raised — "a tournament chess player, a quiz team captain, a sportswriter at his college newspaper, a Capitol Hill intern and an active member of the Hindu temple his parents helped establish in Maryland."

"What it said to me was, you can integrate and be part of the fabric and still not be accepted," said Narasimhan. "Trump is not a foreign object to me. I'm hearing his dog whistles and thinking, I have to do something about this."

Narasimhan, now in commercial real estate, is raising money for the Clinton campaign. He thinks Kumar's touting of Trump's business acumen is absurd.

"Other businessmen tell me that he doesn't mean all the nasty things he says and that he's a good businessman and we should follow him," said Narasimhan. "I say, 'Do you really believe that? He may be wealthy, but that's different than being a good businessman. And, the big and — he's an **immigrant** basher.' "

Kumar acknowledged that "sometimes, the way he speaks, you could have reservations." But he recalled a meeting he had with Trump on July 9 armed with more than 500 questions from fellow Indian Americans.

"I was pleasantly surprised," Kumar said. "He knows about Hindus. He has investments in India. He called us peaceful people. He said he'd never had a problem with us."

max.bearak@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**So you still think it's impossible to get a mortgage because lenders' standards continue to be super-strict and your profile doesn't quite fit the standard underwriting molds? You're right: It can be tough. But it's no longer impossible, thanks to new programs that are becoming available from national and regional lenders for applicants who qualify.

Check out terms like these:

●Minimum down payments of 3 percent or even 1 percent, sometimes without monthly mortgage insurance premium charges.

●Debt-to-income levels that stretch as high as 45 to 50 percent.

●Looser definitions of what qualifies as income.

●Underwriting flexibility that acknowledges that growing numbers of Americans live with extended families and have multiple resident earners who can contribute to household expenses.

Things have loosened up in recent months — and that's good news for buyers with moderate incomes and not a lot of down-payment cash who are stuck paying rising rents and see no clear path to homeownership. It's all part of a nascent effort by major lenders and mortgage investment giants Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to reach out to creditworthy borrowers: millennials, **immigrant** families and first-time buyers of all backgrounds.

The key term here is "creditworthy." The new low-down-payment loans are not for people with subprime credit histories or FICO scores in the tank. Unlike mortgages during the bubble years of 2004 through 2007, they come with mandatory full documentation underwriting, buyer education counseling programs and the sort of hands-on servicing that was painfully absent a decade ago.

Take Quicken Loans' 1-percent-down program, for example. If you are qualified on credit and income, Quicken, the largest independent mortgage lender in the country, may give you a "grant" of two-thirds of the 3 percent mandatory down payment. You've got to come up with the remaining one-third — 1 percent of the house price. Quicken does not require its grant money to be repaid. But it does vet you thoroughly upfront and requires a minimum FICO credit score of 680. In addition, you need to have household income below the median for your county, and your household debt-to-income ratio cannot exceed 45 percent. Quicken also offers a 3-percent-down alternative. Both programs compete directly with Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgages that require 3.5 percent down and come with mortgage insurance premiums that are noncancelable for the duration of the debt.

Quicken chief executive Bill Emerson told me that although the company's 1 percent and 3 percent plans are relatively new, "our data shows they are performing very well" and are expected to continue doing so because they are carefully underwritten. They've got average FICO scores of 739 and average debt-to-income ratios of 36 percent. Roughly 90 percent of all borrowers funded have been first-time home purchasers, according to Emerson.

Or consider the 3-percent-down program offered by Bank of America in partnership with Freddie Mac and Self-Help Ventures Fund, an affiliate of Self-Help Credit Union, a community development lender. This program does not require borrowers to have any specific amount of cash reserves — a common problem for millennials and families with modest incomes. There's also no private mortgage insurance or required monthly premium payments, although the fixed interest rate is marginally higher — currently about 4.5 percent — than on a standard conventional loan, according to Deborah Momsen-Hudson, director of secondary marketing at Self-Help Credit Union.

Another variation of the new low-down-payment concept comes from two mortgage companies specializing in lending to minority and moderate-income first-time borrowers: Alterra Home Loans and New American Funding. Partnering with Freddie Mac, the companies jointly launched the "Your Path" pilot program last month. Minimum down payments are 3 percent; earnings from second jobs held by borrowers can be counted if the employment has been continuous for at least 12 months (half the usual 24-month requirement); and incomes from non-borrower residents can be used to extend the maximum debt-to-income ratio of 45 percent to 50 percent.

Jason Madiedo, chief executive of Alterra, told me the target borrowers are people supplementing family incomes with multiple jobs, where total incomes often don't fit traditional underwriting requirements. They "are typically Hispanic or other **immigrants**," he said. "They're hard-working, stable and responsible. They simply want to achieve their dream of homeownership."

He's betting they do great on repayments. But just in case, the company is servicing the loans intensively — checking in monthly, at least — to make sure all is well.

Ken Harney's email address is kenharney@earthlink.net.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For many economists, it's the simplest and most effective way to make the world richer and reduce poverty. For those in government, it's a political landmine.

Politicians on both sides of the Atlantic fervently oppose more **immigration**. In Europe, anti-**immigrant** parties are on the rise, fueled by the wave of refugees spilling out of the Middle East. In Britain, concerns over migration weighed heavily in the vote to leave the European Union.

In the United States, Donald Trump has made anti-**immigration** appeals a cornerstone of his candidacy, while Hillary Clinton has supported an overhaul of **immigration** laws that would allow people already in the U.S. to apply for citizenship while also enforcing border security. Last Friday, WikiLeaks released a leaked email purportedly showing that Clinton told Brazilian bankers in a private speech that she has a "dream" of a "hemispheric common market, with open trade and open borders," sparking criticism from Republicans. Clinton's campaign manager responded in a televised interview that the candidate "absolutely" opposes "throwing open our borders."

From the perspective of many economists, however, it's a shame more politicians don't support giving people the greater freedom to move across national borders. Some economists have suggested that allowing people to work where their labor is most highly valued — something that is hardly realistic, given the political environment in the developed world— could double the size of the global economy. More than a dozen studies reviewed by economist Michael Clemens, a senior fellow at the pro-**immigration** Center for Global Development, suggested that eliminating barriers to global mobility would increase world gross domestic product by between 67 and 147 percent.

Clemens says the benefits are huge even for a more modest loosening of restrictions on **immigration**. His research suggests that allowing just 5 percent of the people now living in poor countries to work temporarily or permanently in richer countries would add trillions of dollars to the global economy. The economic gains would be greater than those from dismantling every remaining barrier to trade and investment around the world.

Not all economists agree with these arguments. Harvard economist George Borjas, for example, has made the case that more **immigration** into developed countries would produce large gains for some groups, such as wealthy executives and investors, but that native workers would lose out. "In the end, **immigration**will almost certainly improve the economic well-being of some Americans, but other Americans will be worse off," he has written.

Others argue that there are strong non-economic reasons to oppose additional **immigration**, such as concerns over national security or national identity.

What's the case for benefits?

The argument is essentially two-fold.

First, the same worker can create more economic value in some places than in others, because of differences in factors that affect the productivity of businesses, such as natural resources, infrastructure, technologies and laws. For example, a worker skilled in math is more likely to excel in a country with computers, while a natural entrepreneur will thrive in a region where laws make it easy to start businesses.

Differences in productivity are reflected in the vastly different wages people can earn for similar types of work across the world. According to estimates by Clemens, Claudio Montenegro and Lant Pritchett, who examined a data set of more than 2 million workers, the average Peruvian can make 2.6 times as much in the United States as in Peru, while a Haitian can make seven times more.

"Right now, you have a ton of human talent, billions of people, stuck in countries where it's hard to get anything done," says Bryan Caplan, a professor of economics at George Mason University. "Think about what you could accomplish in Haiti. Not very much -- it's a messed-up place. There are so many people trapped in these places."

Second, many economists say that an influx of **immigrants** can expand an economy, potentially even raising wages for the native born.

While economic studies have produced varying results, most have shown that **immigrants** have a neutral or positive impact on the job prospects of native-born Americans. An expansive study released by the National Academies of Sciences in September found that **immigration** has mostly helped the U.S. economy in recent decades and had little effect on the wages or employment of native-born Americans.

According to the study, the main group negatively affected by newly arriving **immigrants** was actually earlier waves of **immigrants** with similar language skills. To a lesser extent, new **immigrants** also competed for work with the lowest-skilled Americans, such as high-school dropouts. But in general, **immigration** left the native population slightly better off.

Angel Gurría, the secretary-general of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, said in a recent interview in Washington that the effects of migration are net positive, even fiscally. "How is it possible? Well, take a country like Spain. They were growing fast, there was a lot of construction, and they imported 5 million **immigrants** from Latin America," he said. Millions of **immigrants** came into the country legally and paid taxes under bilateral agreements.

"They actually financially saved the social security system, or at least deferred for five or 10 years the time of reckoning. Because young people pay taxes, but they don't get sick, and they don't use retirement funds," he said.

Borjas, the Harvard professor, has argued, however, that unrestricted **immigration** can place a fiscal burden on a state, and that the gains from **immigration**depend largely on whether receiving countries build enough infrastructure to accommodate them. **Immigrants** aren't just perfect cogs in the machine of the economy, he says -- they are real people, and their presence raises real questions about how they and their descendants fit into a society.

Polls of economists' views reflect this debate. In a survey of more than 40 of the nation's most prominent economists, half agreed that the average U.S. citizen would be better off if a large number of low-skilled foreign workers were legally allowed to enter the United States each year. Twenty-eight percent said they were uncertain, and 9 percent disagreed.

However, they also recognized the costs of such policies. Nearly half of the economists also agreed that, unless they were compensated by others, many low-skilled Americans would be worse off.

A moral case

Beyond economics, some argue there's a moral case for allowing more **immigration**.

"**Immigration** restrictions are government-required discrimination against people who have done nothing more than be born in another country," Caplan says.

Alex Tabarrok of George Mason University, a colleague of Caplan's, has also made the case for looser border restrictions, arguing that freedom of movement and access to opportunity are basic human rights. Limits on **immigration** defy every standard moral framework, he says, and eliminating them would result in an increase in global human freedom comparable to the abolition of slavery and the recognition of the rights of women.

"Closed borders are one of the world's greatest moral failings," he writes.

Not all economists see things in such an unbridled way.

For example, Larry Summers, a former Treasury secretary who's in the mainstream of Democratic economic thinking, has said that what the world needs is "responsible nationalism."

"A new approach has to begin from the idea that the basic responsibility of government is to maximize the welfare of citizens, not to pursue some abstract concept of the global good," he wrote in an opinion piece for The Post.

While Clemens says he is troubled by the idea of discriminating against people based on where they are born, he doesn't advocate "open borders," a term that is often used as a synonym for anarchy -- no background checks, no deportation and no restrictions on **immigration**. In reality, few politicians are advocating even moderately higher levels of **immigration**, and the world won't see anything like open borders anytime soon. But he says people still should recognize the substantial trade-offs of the current system.

Clemens draws an analogy with the rights of women. In the United States, laws prevented women from owning property, inheriting wealth and entering many professions until the late 1800s. Although some male workers may have suffered from the entry of women into the workforce during the 20th century, no one would deny that it has provided enormous benefits to the country and the economy. Yet restrictions on women had still persisted for millennia.

"The ability of societies to create and maintain institutions that have vast economic and social costs is not in doubt," he said.

You might also like:

Why trying to help poor countries might actually hurt them

The big myth about refugees

What America's **immigrants** looked like when they arrived on Ellis Island
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Politics is an enduring feature of human life, but political parties are mortal. This week we watched the beginning of the end of one of the United States' great, illustrious parties. The Republican Party, as we knew it, is dying.

The death of a party is not so unusual. Scholars divide U.S. history according to six distinct party systems, each responding to a particular political era. Sometimes parties retain their names but morph ideologically, like the Democratic Party, which went from being Southern, pro-slavery and pro-Jim Crow to the opposite. On other occasions, parties collapse entirely, as did the Whig Party in the mid-19th century, torn apart by divisions over slavery. (In fact, in an interesting parallel, the fall of the Whigs was hastened by the rise of a party called the Know-Nothings, dedicated to stopping what was then seen as uncontrolled **immigration**.) Whatever the form of the Republican Party's collapse, it will be messy.

Sunday's debate may have been the watershed moment. As many commentators and some of his own strategists noted, it was pretty obvious what Donald Trump needed to do — apologize, be contrite, and then strike broad themes of change, bringing back jobs and putting the nation first. Ideally, he would have reached out to women — the group of voters he desperately needs to win the election.

Instead, Trump did the opposite. He minimized his behavior as "locker-room banter," accused Bill Clinton of much worse and paraded the former president's accusers at a news conference. Since then, things have spiraled downward. Trump's strange, self-defeating strategy has led to speculation that his real ambitions lie beyond the election, when he may set up a conservative media network to rival Fox News.

It's quite possible. But in any event, what it means for the Republican Party is simple: Donald Trump is not going away. Many Republicans have nurtured a fantasy that their party has been briefly taken over by a strange historical aberration who will lose the election, and then somehow things will go back to normal. Trump has now made it clear that he will not go gently into the night.

In fact, he has declared war on the GOP establishment. His goal is surely to take over the Republican Party and remake it into a populist, protectionist, nationalist party, the kind that his Breitbart-oriented advisers have been dreaming about for years.

There will be a fight for the soul of what's left of the Republican Party. We can see the battle lines. People such as House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (Wis.), backed by most serious conservative intellectuals, will try to restore the party to its Reaganesque ideology — with free markets, limited government, entitlement reform and an assertive foreign policy. Others, such as Trump's running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, backed by Christian conservatives, will try to bridge divides and keep everyone in a big tent. But then there is Trump, who has — for now, at least — the crowds, the energy and a powerful message. Political scientist Justin Gest recently surveyed white Americans on whether they would support a party committed to "stopping mass **immigration**, providing American jobs to American workers, preserving America's Christian heritage, and stopping the threat of Islam." Sixty-five percent said yes.

The Republican establishment could have stopped Trump but instead surrendered to him months, perhaps years, ago. When they want to criticize opponents for being weak-kneed, Republicans often recall Neville Chamberlain and his policy of appeasing Adolf Hitler. And yet that is exactly the approach that the party's senior leaders took with Trump — appeasing him in the hope that doing so would satisfy his appetites. They tolerated, excused and covered up for Trump as he began his political career with "birther" racism, launched his presidential campaign with anti-Mexican slurs and heightened it with anti-Muslim bigotry, and thrilled crowds with policies that would be unconstitutional or amount to war crimes — all while demeaning and objectifying women. Winston Churchill said of appeasers: "Each one hopes that if he feeds the crocodile enough, the crocodile will eat him last."

Trump will lose the election. Forget his dismal polls last week. He has almost never been ahead of Hillary Clintons for a single week since they were both nominated. The major models predicting the election have only once or twice put his chances over 40 percent.

But Trump will not sit in loyal opposition to Clinton. He tells his legions that the election will be rigged. He says that the media are lying and that reporting cannot be believed. He warns that the country will be utterly destroyed if Clinton wins. He is fueling a toxic movement of protest and insurgency.

Trump will lose. And he will destroy the Republican Party. The frightening question is what he will do to the country in the process.

comments@fareedzakaria.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ivo H. Daalder, U.S. ambassador to NATO from 2009 to 2013, is president of the Chicago Council on Global Affairs.

Is the United States retreating from the world? Anyone watching the presidential campaign can be forgiven for thinking that Americans want little to do with what occurs beyond their borders.

Republican nominee Donald Trump is touting an America First approach, proposing to build walls to stem **immigration** and raise tariffs to bar the import of foreign goods. Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton has turned against the very trade agreements she once championed as the nation's diplomat-in-chief. And both are vying to replace President Obama, who came to office on the promise of ending U.S. foreign wars but who has often been reluctant to lead in addressing some of the world's most pressing problems.

Yet, while politicians seem to think that the American public wants to turn inward, recent polling done by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs paints a very different picture of Americans' attitudes on foreign policy. One of the key indicators of their attitudes about foreign engagement — whether the United States should play an active role in world affairs or stay out — shows that Americans by a nearly 2-to-1 majority favor an active U.S. role (64 to 35 percent). This is very much in line with findings over the past four decades that we have asked this question.

Americans' generally positive attitude toward increased global engagement is also reflected in more specific findings on how the United States should engage with the world. For example, Americans support maintaining existing military alliances, with 89 percent saying that doing so is very or somewhat effective at achieving U.S. foreign policy goals. This general support extends to specific alliances. Thus, despite Trump's repeated denunciation of NATO, three-quarters of Americans (and 60 percent of his supporters) believe the United States should maintain or increase its commitment to the Atlantic Alliance.

Contrary to much of the 2016 campaign rhetoric, moreover, Americans also generally support the other main pillar of engagement overseas: international trade. Indeed, a solid 65 percent of Americans think globalization is mostly a good thing. Democrats are most positive (74 percent); but nearly half of core Trump supporters (49 percent) also agree. And while both major candidates have come out against the Trans-Pacific Partnership, fully 60 percent of Americans support this important trade pact with Asia — including a notable 56 percent of those who supported Bernie Sanders during the Democratic primaries and 49 percent of Trump's core supporters.

Although campaign rhetoric has often stressed U.S. weakness abroad, the average American still believes that the United States is by far the most influential country in the world. The public as a whole rates U.S. global influence an average of 8.5 on a zero to 10 scale. For comparison, Americans overall ranked China second, with a mean influence of 7.1, the European Union third at 7 and Russia fourth at 6.2 on the 10-point scale.

Moreover, for most Americans the criticism of the United States heard throughout much of the campaign has not stuck. A majority (61 percent) says that the United States "has a unique character that makes it the greatest country in the world," compared to 38 percent who say that "every country is unique, and the United States is no greater than other nations."

Given these findings, what accounts for the perception that Americans are turning inward, if not isolationist? Part of the reason is that Trump has been able to mobilize a sizable minority that feels strongly about the threat posed by **immigration** and Islamic fundamentalism and, to a lesser extent, by foreign trade.

According to our polling, fully 80 percent of core Trump supporters believe large numbers of **immigrants** and refugees coming to the United States constitute a critical threat (a view shared by just 43 percent of Americans overall). As a result, 92 percent of his supporters favor building a wall on the border with Mexico. Fears of Islamic fundamentalism have also been rising, especially among Republicans, more than three-quarters of whom see it as a critical threat to the country — the highest percentage since the question was first asked in 1998. And while a majority of Americans believe trade has generally been good for the American economy, for consumers like them, and for overall living standards (though not for American job security), larger majorities of core Trump supporters believe trade has had a negative impact on all these measures.

Donald Trump has proven adept at mobilizing anti-**immigrant** and anti-trade sentiment among a minority of Americans into a strong movement that seeks to put the United States first in global affairs. Yet, his is not the majority's view. Most Americans favor the measured, open engagement to the world that has been at the core of U.S. foreign policy for the past 70 years. That is good news for those who believe an active American role abroad is vital to U.S. security and prosperity. What they need now is a strong voice to make that case.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Desierto" is a parable for our troubled times. The new film by Jonás Cuarón, the 33-year-old son of Mexican filmmaker Alfonso Cuarón, is set along the U.S.-Mexican border, where a psychopathic American vigilante (Jeffrey Dean Morgan) is methodically murdering illegal Mexican migrants with a high-powered sniper rifle. One of those migrants (Gael Garcia Bernal, who also was executive producer of the film) becomes enmeshed in a high-stakes showdown with his adversary.

Cuarón, who shared a screenwriting credit with his father for the Oscar-nominated 2013 film "Gravity," has an extended filmmaking family. Aside from his father, his uncle is writer, director and producer Carlos Cuarón; his mother is actress and writer Mariana Elizondo; and his half-brother is actor Diego Cataño. While in Washington for last month's Latin American Film Festival, Cuarón sat down to talk about the deep roots of "Desierto" (Spanish for "desert") and its sudden relevance.

Q: You've said the idea for "Desierto" predates "Gravity" and, in fact, may have inspired it. How so? A: Years ago, I showed the first draft of "Desierto" to my dad. He liked the concept — about a solitary character in a harsh, unforgiving environment — so we adapted it to space. That sort of nonstop action movie has many layers of meaning. In its own way, "Desierto" is a little bit based on "Duel," [Steven] Spielberg's first film about this truck just chasing this car the whole movie. Eventually, the truck becomes a metaphor for whatever you want. It could be the bully at school. It could be your boss harassing you. We liked the idea of doing a whole movie with almost no dialogue — it's pure action — but that spoke of other stuff through visual metaphor, through cinematic language.

Q: So after "Gravity," you revisited your original idea? A: Yes, but it was still hard to raise the money. I took so long that Gael would make fun of me and say, "By the time you're done, it's not going to be relevant." Sadly, a couple of months before releasing the movie at the 2015 Toronto Film Festival, my wife showed me this video with Donald Trump announcing his candidacy, and he did it saying incredibly racist things.

Q: Is he the elephant in the room here? A: What happened is, we opened in Toronto, and since Trump was just starting in the political scene, obviously the press kept trying to get me and Gael to comment on him. Back then, Gael and I had a rule that we didn't want to mention his name, to give him more power. My wife, who's from the U.S., told me, "Look, you can avoid talking about him, but he's becoming a reality." I started listening and following the campaign more closely. And I started noticing that the campaign was filled with this rhetoric of hatred. Sometimes these politicians speak so much that I worry that society doesn't see the violence in their speech. In May of this year, when "Desierto" opened in Mexico, I decided to edit a video using images from the film to illustrate that speech Trump gave.

Q: Did you conceive of Trump's words as an advertisement for the film? A: No, it was just a video I did on my own, because I feel images are more powerful than words. If you just illustrate what this guy Trump is saying, it's pretty horrific. Once I edited the video, I showed it to Cinépolis, the distributor in Mexico. They became very interested. They launched it through the website of Carmen Aristegui, this journalist in Mexico that I really admire. It went mini-viral.

Q: Was your initial reluctance to bring up Trump's name because he was — A: A joke? Yes. Look, all of what I said in the video is my own view on it. In October of last year, when we were in Toronto, it made sense to not talk about him. I believe that Jeffrey's character is more of a metaphor for what the rhetoric of hatred could lead to.

Q: So it's not just about what's going on with **immigration** here in the states? A: You hear it everywhere. When I showed the movie in France, all the journalists kept wanting to pinpoint Trump, yet in France they have [politician] Marine Le Pen. To me, what's scary is that this speech is getting legitimized, this hatred.

Q: I read that in an early version of the film, you had Jeffrey's character listening to American talk radio, not country music, in his truck. Why was that changed? A: In that scene where he's listening to the music, I originally cut a version where he was listening to a political talk show, and I edited it with a real podcast. I showed it to my dad, and I remember my dad's reaction. He thought I had scripted this. But I had just stolen it from the Internet. My dad was like: "Oh, you should take that out. It seems fake. People don't actually say those things."

Q: You also shot a lot of scenes that fleshed out the backstory of Jeffrey's character, but you didn't use them. Why? A: Two things happened when I tried them in the editing room. One: It lost the drive of the movie. And two: I didn't feel like there was any point in trying to justify Jeffrey's character. No matter what backstory we tried, the film made his actions horrible.

Q: How do you balance the need to have a villain with the need to make him a recognizable human being? A: A lot of the things that were in those backstories, to me, ended up being in the movie, but in a subtle way. It's important that we get a glimpse that he's not in a good economic situation. He has drinking problems. All those things were part of the character, because I do believe the real danger in all this political hate speech is when it starts being directed toward the most vulnerable parts of society. Sooner or later, those vulnerable people are going to be looking for a solution, and they can easily be manipulated. When I first started this story, 10 years ago, I was traveling through Arizona. It's a really poor state.

Q: It's the home of Joe Arpaio, the sheriff who got in hot water for racial profiling. A: I was traveling with my brother to a film festival in Tucson, where the Mexican Consulate invited us to tour their facility. Arizona is where the largest migratory flux happens in the U.S. I became interested in the subject back then. It took three years to find the right approach to the subject.

Q: Who is the film's target audience? Americans or Mexicans? Conservatives or liberals? A: For me, there's a very wide audience. "Desierto" has all these thematic readings, but in the end it's a pure horror movie. It follows the formula of a bad guy who starts chasing you and killing your friends, one by one. I've always been a fan of '70s genre films in the U.S. — movies that spoke to deeper subject matter, but disguised under the mask of genre.

Q: Is "Desierto" a political film? A: I've been curious about how the American audience will react to a movie where the hero is a foreigner — a migrant — and the bad guy is an American. In a way, that's the opposite of the genre formula. That's why I chose Gael. When you hear the speeches about **immigration** that refer to migrants as this faceless entity on the other side of the wall, bringing an actor like Gael to portray the migrant, to me, is interesting, because his is a face that creates empathy.

Q: In the closing credits you offer special thanks to such Mexican filmmakers as Guillermo Arriaga, Alejandro González-Iñárritu, Guillermo del Toro, Rodrigo Garcia, Gerardo Naranjo and Emmanuel Lubezki. What have they done for you? A: What makes the Mexican film community so strong is that they support the new generation. All the people in the credits gave me notes and criticism that really helped me. The first people I go to when I need notes are my dad and my uncle. But it's also helpful to get notes from other directors.

Q: Do all those names also deliver a subliminal message? Look at what else comes out of Mexico. A: That's true, but completely unintentional. I didn't mean it that way.

michael.osullivan@washpost.com

Desierto (R, 94 minutes). At area theaters.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Desierto" is a stark, economical thriller. Its conflict is elemental and the characters are defined with bold strokes. Director Jonás Cuarón, the son of acclaimed filmmaker Alfonso Cuarón, draws from the primal motives of "Gravity." (He wrote that screenplay with his father.) Instead of science fiction, however, this earthbound tale has a poignant political message — and not a subtle one.

A truck passes through the desert. In it, Moises (Gael García Bernal) and about a dozen other men and women are trying to cross the border into the United States. The van breaks down, so they are forced to continue on foot. On the American side, Sam (Jeffrey Dean Morgan) hunts rabbits with his dog and a high-powered rifle. Illegal **immigrants** frustrate Sam — we know he reported tracks to the indifferent authorities — so when Sam spots the small band of border crossers, he takes matters into his own hands. He shoots them dead, one by one, but Moises and a few others escape.

The film is a sustained cat-and-mouse chase, with helpless innocents trying to avoid their inhumane pursuer. "Desierto" gives equal time to Moises and Sam, establishing just enough back story so we can understand who they are. Sam is not just a deplorable villain, but a broken man who uses his victims as an outlet for misguided rage. Moises is not just an illegal **immigrant**, but a thoughtful father whose empathy is constantly challenged. The chase is exhausting, almost as if the desert is a character in the film, and yet there are dialogue-driven moments in which the heroes and villain evolve from caricatures to people.

Cuarón's larger point — one that he pursues with every frame — is that border crossers deserve our sympathy. They have dreams, flaws and feelings. Sam only sees them from a distance. (There are many shots of him peering through the scope of his rifle.) The act of killing invigorates Sam: In a chilling scene, he laughs to himself after hitting his targets, shouting that this land is his. His entitlement is a contrast to the desperation of the victims, who seek only opportunity. All the actors, including Morgan, find nuance despite the simple, stripped-down requirements of the script by Cuarón and Mateo Garcia.

There are no surprises in "Desierto." Every interaction, no matter how brutal, plays out exactly as you might suspect. Moises proves himself resourceful, outsmarting Sam during a pivotal scene, and the final confrontation is more poignant than vengeful. But the utter lack of surprise is not a bad thing, exactly, since awaiting the inevitable is its own kind of breathless suspense. Even if a beautiful and impenetrable wall was built on the border, people like Moises — decent and frightened — would find a way here because, sometimes, the promise of a better life is worth it.

goingoutguide@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Action in Community Through Service food pantry needs volunteers to stock shelves, prepare food bags and make grocery store pickups either on a regular schedule (flexible) or on an on-call basis. To complete an online application, visit actspwc.org.

ACTS Helpline needs volunteers to answer a suicide-prevention hotline. 703-221-1144.

American Association for the Advancement of Science needs scientists, engineers, mathematicians and physicians to assist K-12 STEM teachers. Victor Crawford, 703-732-9004. vicris51@verizon.net.

American Cancer Society's Road to Recovery needs drivers to take patients to appointments. 804-527-3719. leah.seldinsommer@cancer.org.

Beacon for Adult Literacy trains people to help adults with literacy and English-speaking skills. 703-368-7491. beaconliteracy.org.

BEAT Cancer Coalition needs drivers 55 and older to take patients to appointments. Retired and senior volunteer program. 703-369-5292.

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Washington-Manassas needs volunteers. bgcgw.org/prince-william.

Catholic Charities Hogar **Immigrant** Services needs teachers for its English as a second language and citizenship classes. Training provided. 571-208-1572. volunteer.hogar@ccda.net.

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children's Intervention Services, needs Spanish-speaking volunteers to visit children who have been abused and neglected. Ben Gimeno, 703-330-8145, bgimeno@casacis.org.

Discover Prince William & Manassas seeks tourism ambassadors at local events, festivals and a visitors center. jmcelwain@discoverpwm.com.

ESL and **Immigrant** Ministries trains volunteers to teach English to adults. 703-841-0292. office@eslim.org, eslim.org.

Friends of Feral Cats of PWC needs volunteers and donations of cat food. Call Nancy, 571-719-0657.

Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind needs volunteers to raise and train puppies. 866-282-8046. guidedog.org.

Habitat for Humanity needs help with projects, ReStore and providing lunch to volunteers. 703-369-6708. volunteer@ habitatpwc.org.

Historic Dumfries needs docents for the Weems-Botts Museum to help with events and research projects, gather and transcribe local oral histories, and work on other projects. 703-221-2218.

Keep Prince William Beautiful needs help with its storm-drain program and educational outreach. 571-285-3772. kpwb.org.

Literacy Volunteers of Prince William needs adults to help adult students improve their literacy skills. Training provided. 703-670-5702. lvapw.org.

Mutt Love Rescue needs foster homes for rescued dogs. 703-577-0106. adopt@muttloverescue.org, muttloverescue.org.

Northern Virginia Family Service seeks foster parents. 571-748-2500.

Occoquan needs volunteers for events throughout the year, including the annual arts and crafts shows. Donna Brown, 703-491-2168. dbrown@occoquanva.gov.

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Monday-Friday. 703-792-4583.

Prince William Area Free Clinic needs volunteer doctors, pharmacists, physician assistants, nurses, translators and administrative assistants for the Unified Health Center in Woodbridge. 703-496-9403. pwafc.org .

Prince William Cooperative Extension Program needs facilitators for the Parent Education Program's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting groups. Training provided. Janice Brody, 703-792-4678. jbrody@pwcgov.org.

Prince William County Historic Preservation Division needs tour guides and assistance with special events, educational programs and gardening. 703-792-4754. historicpreservation@pwcgov.org .

Prince William County Office of Elections needs student volunteers to participate in its electoral page program. pwcvotes.com.

Prince William Health District seeks volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community health experience necessary. Training provided. Contact Valda Wisdom Brown, valda.wisdombrown@vdh.virginia.gov.

Prince William Trails and Streams Coalition needs volunteers to help build and maintain trails in the county. 703-791-6158. pwtsc.org.

Project Mend-a-House needs help for home-safety repairs. 703-792-7663. lizw@pmahweb.org.

Reset seeks volunteers to lead elementary and preschool students in science and math learning. John Meagher, 703-250-0236. reset@resetonline.org, resetonline.org .

Serve needs drivers for its food-recovery program at its food distribution center, as well as a bilingual (Spanish and English) food-assistance client-intake specialist. Navara Cannon, 571-748-2536, ncannon@nvfs.org.

St. Paul United Methodist Church needs bus drivers on Thursdays to take people to and from a community dinner. Drivers must have a class C license with a P endorsement. 703-494-2445.

Wildlife Rescue League needs hotline volunteers, wildlife transporters and rehabilitators. Training provided. 703-391-8625. volcoord@wildliferescueleague.org.

— Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THU 13

Skillet The Christian rock band behind the double-platinum single "Monster" performs. With Sick Puppies and Devour the Day. 7:30 p.m. The Fillmore, 8656 Colesville Rd., Silver Spring. 301-960-9999. www.fillmoresilverspring.com[http://www.fillmoresilverspring.com]. $29.50.

John Crist and Blayr Nias The comedians poke fun at their pasts as a home-schooled son of a preacher and a bad girl next door, respectively. 8 p.m. Amp by Strathmore, 11810 Grand Park Ave., North Bethesda. 301-581-5100. www.ampbystrathmore.com[http://www.ampbystrathmore.com]. $15-$25.

FRI 14

Joe Louis Walker The D.C. Blues Society presents the singer and guitarist, who was inducted into the Blues Hall of Fame in 2013 and has won four Blues Music Awards, including the 2016 contemporary blues male artist of the year award. 7:30 p.m. American Legion Post 41, 905 Sligo Ave., Silver Spring. 202-413-3609. www.dcblues.org[http://www.dcblues.org]. $25, in advance $20.

"Still Life" Morgan Thorson's ensemble choreography delves into the subject of extinction in this world premiere. Friday and Saturday at 8 p.m. American Dance Institute, 1570 E. Jefferson St., Rockville. 855-263-2623. www.americandance.org[http://www.americandance.org]. $30, seniors $20, students $15.

"Urban Studies" Oil paintings by Cathy Abramson depicting ordinary moments in Washington-area life are shown with new works by gallery artists. Continues with a reception Friday 6-9 p.m. Through Nov. 5. Waverly Street Gallery, 4600 East-West Hwy., Bethesda. 301-951-9441. www.waverlystreetgallery.com[http://www.waverlystreetgallery.com]. Free.

SAT 15

Bethesda Row Arts Festival The fine-arts and crafts festival features the work of 190 artists. Live acoustic music at Elm Street and Woodmont Avenue. The festival also offers an art sale benefiting the National Institutes of Health's children's charities. Saturday 11 a.m.-6 p.m., Sunday 10 a.m.-5 p.m. Bethesda Row, 4801 Bethesda Ave., Bethesda. 301-637-5684. www.bethesdarowarts.org[http://www.bethesdarowarts.org]. Free; artwork $45-$20,000.

Spooktacular & Fall Festival Activities include trick-or-treating, a bounce house, a kids' hay maze, sand art, face painting, balloon twisting, hayrides, ghost stories, scarecrow making, mini-pumpkin decorating and other crafts. 1-4 p.m. Plaza at Fair Hill Shops, 18100 Town Center Dr., Olney. 240-453-3000. www.fairhillshops.com[http://www.fairhillshops.com]. Free.

Talija Art Company The Serbian troupe performs Balkan music and dance. 6 p.m. St. Luke Serbian Orthodox Church, 10660 River Rd., Potomac. 301-299-2704. www.svluka.org/talija[http://www.svluka.org/talija]. $30, in advance $25.

Chelsey Green and the Green Project The band, anchored by violinist-violist Green, plays a variety of genres, including R&B and gospel. 8 p.m. BlackRock Center for the Arts, 12901 Town Commons Dr., Germantown. 301-528-2260. www.blackrockcenter.org[http://www.blackrockcenter.org]. $27-$35, youth $15-$21.

SUN 16

Kensington Fall Festival The event features live music, children's entertainment, a moon bounce, belly dancing, food trucks and more than 60 vendors. 11 a.m.-4 p.m. Kensington Town Center, 10417 Armory Ave., Kensington. 301-933-2912. www.kensingtonfallfestivalmd.com[http://www.kensingtonfallfestivalmd.com]. Free.

World of Montgomery Festival The eighth annual event celebrates cultural heritages of the community with a parade, food demonstrations, two music and dance stages, art, and hands-on activities. This year focuses on the countries that Montgomery County's four largest **immigrant** populations are from: China, El Salvador, Ethiopia and India. Attendees can assemble welcome baskets for new **immigrants** on-site. Noon-4 p.m. Montgomery College, 51 Mannakee St., Rockville. 301-897-5437. www.worldofmontgomery.com[http://www.worldofmontgomery.com]. Free.

"Noise, Body, Music" The second exhibition in the 2016 VisArts Emerging Curator Program, which pairs an experienced curator (Jacqueline Maria Milad) with an emerging curator (Eames Armstrong), includes video, sound and photography relating to bands and performers. Closes Sunday with a reception and performance by Analog Tara, Mothershiester of Anthology of Booty and Rex Delafkaran. 2-4 p.m. VisArts at Rockville, Kaplan Gallery, 155 Gibbs St., Rockville. 301-315-8200. www.visartsatrockville.org[http://www.visartsatrockville.org]. Free.

MON 17

"In a Lonely Place" Humphrey Bogart stars in the noir thriller about a murder suspect who falls in love with his neighbor who can provide an alibi. Opens Saturday at 2 p.m., continues Monday at 5:15 p.m., Tuesday at 7:30 p.m., Wednesday at 5:15 p.m. AFI Silver Theatre, 8633 Colesville Rd., Silver Spring. 301-495-6700. www.afi.com/silver[http://www.afi.com/silver]. $13, seniors $10, children $8.

TUE 18

"The Human Image: Work, Play and Conflict in the Third World" Photojournalist Ben Barber's exhibition includes images of war in Afghanistan and agriculture in Thailand. Closes Tuesday. Jewish Community Center of Greater Washington, 6125 Montrose Rd., Rockville. 301-881-0100. www.jccgw.org[http://www.jccgw.org]. Free.

WED 19

Christie Dashiell The jazz singer performs songs from her new album, "Time All Mine." 7:30 p.m. Mansion at Strathmore, 10701 Rockville Pike, North Bethesda. 301-581-5100. www.strathmore.org[http://www.strathmore.org]. $17.

Julie Scoggins The blue-collar comic performs. With David Wingfield. 8 p.m. Amp by Strathmore, 11810 Grand Park Ave., North Bethesda. 301-581-5100. www.ampbystrathmore.com[http://www.ampbystrathmore.com]. $15-$25.

New at VisArts "For the Moment," Lillian Bayley Hoover's exhibition of oil paintings depicting banal scenes, and Amy Wike's messages knitted into Morse code in "This Is a Sentence" open. Through Nov. 20. VisArts at Rockville, 155 Gibbs St., Rockville. 301-315-8200. www.visartsatrockville.org[http://www.visartsatrockville.org]. Free.

— Compiled by from staff reports

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For Our Future, a progressive super PAC, has raised $60 million to continue work toward its goal of mobilizing 9.5 million African American, Latino and millennial voters in several battleground states before Election Day.

The super PAC is focusing on personal contact with voters, funding grass-roots groups to knock on doors rather than buying up radio and television airtime, in Florida, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. Since July 1, groups working with For Our Future have knocked on more than 3.8 million doors.

For Our Future is giving money to grass-roots groups already working in diverse communities to have face-to-face conversations with voters about issues, such as racial justice, **immigration** reform, income inequality and climate change. Like other groups doing direct voter contact, those working with For Our Future say that voters were turned off by talking about the presidential candidates.

"Through research and listening to what people were saying at the doors we have found that face-to-face conversations about issues like racial justice, education, **immigration** and climate transcend the negativity," said Amanda Brown, campaign director of For Our Future. "Our core message is to remind people that voting is an exercise of power that elevates individuals, their communities and the issues that most affect their lives with the politicians they choose to serve them."

Tom Steyer, the billionaire environmental activist, has given $20 million to For Our Future since it launched in May. The other contributors are the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association and the AFL-CIO.

"We are doing old-fashioned democracy — with the latest digital tools — of neighbors talking to neighbors about the issues that matter most to them and the importance of voting [in] this election," Steyer said in a statement.

Some of the groups working with For Our Future are national organizations such as the National Council of La Raza and VoteVets.org, others are statewide groups, including Wisconsin Jobs Now and Equality Pennsylvania, and still others are digitally based, such as PushBlack and Color of Change PAC. That group has been hosting "text-a-thon" events, in which volunteers make contact with potential voters via text messages.

Canvassers are trained to talk to voters about why it's important to vote for candidates who represent their interests. For instance, African Americans who say they are concerned about racial justice are reminded that the next president will appoint an attorney general who will oversee those issues. Millennials are asked to consider which candidate and political party would side with them on wages and the environment. Voters also are assured that the groups will continue to work with them after the election to hold officials accountable.

Those voters, including people of color, millennials and young women, have been less enthusiastic about Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton's campaign, causing panic among progressives during the past few months when polls showed a competitive race with Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump.

But even as Clinton appears to be pulling away in recent days, after a 2005 video surfaced of Trump making vulgar comments about women, activists say it's important that voters show up to vote not just to be encouraged to go to the polls. In addition to the presidential race, For Our Future and its partner groups are stressing the importance of down-ballot races, and not just Congress. Local races also are important, activists argue, because those officials are more directly responsible for monitoring police departments and making sure drinking water is safe.

Correction: An earlier version of this post incorrectly gave the name for the National Education Association.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I recently joined 145 other scholars and writers in declaring support for Donald Trump for president.

For every Trump supporter who agreed to join us, several others declined, believing that coming out publicly in favor of Trump would harm their careers. I've been upfront about my conservative views for more than 30 years, since before I got tenure, so any harm to me is probably already priced in. I debated economist James Galbraith in front of thousands in the University of Texas's University Lecture Series in 2008, for example, arguing in favor of Republican presidential candidate Sen. John McCain (Ariz.). And I edited one of the few textbooks for courses in contemporary moral problems that represent views from the left and right in equal measure. I'm fortunate to teach at a university committed to diversity in all its forms, including diversity of thought.

But the left has come to dominate college campuses over the past 20 years, and I can't blame anyone whose views are not already well-known for declining to become a target. Just last week, a professor from another institution shared a Facebook post hoping for all Trump supporters to be destroyed "immediately and forever." Who wants to be subject to such expressions of hostility?

Other professors used to ask me questions about politics: "You're smart. You're knowledgeable. How can you support" whichever Republican was running for president that year? Far from being dismissive, that used to lead to interesting and revealing conversations. I still have extended and productive political discussions with some old friends who disagree with me. Indeed, they were Bernie Sanders supporters, and the diagnoses Trump and Sanders give are not far apart, even if their prescriptions are quite different.

Conversing across ideological lines is increasingly rare this election cycle. Two friends, seeing my name on the list just published, compared me with Martin Heidegger — and not because they think "Reduction in the Abstract Sciences" is on a par with "Being and Time." The background assumption, which I find baffling, appears to be that occasionally uncouth language is the moral equivalent of genocide.

Many of my colleagues in academia find it hard to imagine why a reasonable person would support Trump. Most of the people who talk politics with me are those who agree with me or are on the fence, undecided about whether to vote for Trump, Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton or the Libertarian Party's Gary Johnson. People who definitely oppose Trump don't even want to debate the issues with me anymore.

Political conversations with students are rare, too. I try my best to keep politics out of the classroom. Once, a student said to me, "You're a conservative, aren't you?" I responded that I was disappointed that he could tell, because I try to present views on all sides fairly, keeping my own views in the background. He answered: "I know. That's how I could tell." Periodically, conservative students seek me out, relieved to find someone on the faculty with whom they can talk openly. But most students appear to pay little attention to politics, and those who do don't tend to talk to faculty about it. There are exceptions. Recently, a liberal student challenged my interpretation of why different regions tend to vote Democratic or Republican in presidential elections. That led to a constructive conversation and some refinements in my (and I hope his) understanding of the red-state/blue-state divide.

So why, given the response it gets me from colleagues and friends, do I support Trump?

Ask yourself: Are you better off than you were a decade ago? Is the United States better off? Is the world safer? Is this country on the right track? I am among the nearly two-thirds of Americans who answer no.

We're in the seventh year of the slowest economic recovery since 1949. The proportion of working-age adults who are employed is the lowest in decades. Young African Americans face an unemployment rate of over 20 percent. The national debt has almost doubled; an American baby born today already owes more than $60,000. We've lost our Standard & Poor's AAA credit rating. Cities and states face debt and pension crises of their own. Meanwhile, business profits and durable goods orders are down, productivity is sluggish and 2 percent growth is the new normal. Economic inequality has increased; incomes are down; prices are up.

The president's signature "accomplishment," Obamacare, is in a death spiral. Racial tensions are leading to riots. Violent crime is up sharply over the past 18 months. Life expectancy is falling for large segments of our population. The administration is conducting a war on fossil fuels, endangering our electric grid, while shoveling funds to green-energy boondoggles run by donors. The IRS, the FBI and the Justice Department are protecting political allies, punishing opponents and defying court orders. Title IX is used on campus to destroy due process and stifle speech. In the past 10 months, we've suffered terror attacks in San Bernardino, Calif., Orlando, St. Cloud, Minn., and Burlington, Wash., leaving 68 dead. Europe's experience shows that if we continue these policies, we will suffer many more.

The Middle East is in shambles. We gratuitously overthrew a stable government in Libya, creating a terrorist haven and getting our ambassador killed. We threw away victories in Iraq and Afghanistan. Syria is a humanitarian disaster. We sabotaged Iran's Green Revolution and halted sanctions, propping up and then funding with planeloads of cash a leading global sponsor of terrorism actively seeking nuclear weapons — all in a quest to reach an agreement so adverse to U.S. interests that it was not even submitted to the Senate. Iran is reportedly already violating it.

This is not bad luck. It results directly from policies of the Obama administration that Clinton wants to continue. The problem is not implementation, but deep inadequacies in her progressive worldview. It's a worldview I encounter up close on campus, a worldview that intrigues intellectuals with its promise of rationality and tempts them with the possibility of power. As Dostoevsky warned, however, in practice, it indulges the moral narcissism of an elite and encourages disrespect for everyone else.

Progressives try to counter corporate economic power by centralizing political power in executive-branch agencies. They try to cure centralization with more centralization. But this leads to elitism and regulatory capture. When corporations, well-funded nonprofits or well-connected donors team up with government agencies, the rest of us lose. The federal government is the ultimate monopoly. The administrative state is largely unaccountable; you can't vote the regulators out of office. Under the Obama administration, federal regulations have strangled some industries outright and curtailed innovation in others. No one voted to destroy the coal industry or stop enforcing **immigration** law. Clinton promises more of the same. She promises to appoint Supreme Court justices who will remove the Bill of Rights's safeguards against excessive government power. She shows contempt for ordinary people, their rights and their concerns, treating any who oppose her as enemies. Only Trump promises to rein in the excesses of the administrative state and return us to constitutional governance. He pledges to issue a moratorium on new regulations and to reduce "the anchor dragging us down," the regulatory burden whose growth since 1980 has cost us as much as one-fourth of our gross national product.

Progressivism sacrifices the future for the present, and the present for special interests and personal gain. That is why economies stall and birth rates collapse in countries where progressive policies hold sway. Our economy works by allowing the market to channel accumulated capital to investments that fuel productivity gains and innovation, leading to technological advances, more affordable products, higher wages and increased opportunities. Trump's tax cuts would increase investment, boost productivity and wages and increase innovation and opportunities for all Americans.

Finally, progressivism rests on an implausible view of international relations. It seeks to diminish the nation-state and the reach of American power. The Obama-Clinton policy requires us to push traditional allies away and seek relationships with avowed enemies. Protecting Americans from harm and maintaining state secrets are evidently a low priority. Trump would bring a much-needed dose of realism to foreign policy, restoring damaged friendships with Britain and Israel, restoring the integrity of our borders and protecting U.S. interests in international agreements.

Trump has been giving serious speeches detailing his vision on the economy, foreign policy, crime, **immigration** and other central issues facing the country. He has been explaining policies that would strengthen the United States, revive the economy, and restore our social capital, especially in inner cities. Clinton, meanwhile, has been doing her best to distract us from the issues. Admittedly, Trump offers her many such opportunities. But our country's direction is too important to decide on the basis of who is more vulgar than whom. Clinton's policies portend nothing but a weaker economy, a weaker society and a weaker America. I want a president who's on our side. I plan to vote for someone who can change course and return us once again to the task of making America great.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was October 1998, and Hillary Clinton's midterm campaign swing for Democratic candidates brought the first lady on a Saturday afternoon to a middle-school gymnasium in Janesville, Wis. A 28-year-old conservative upstart from the town was running for Congress — and Clinton, rallying 1,200 people with a rip-roaring denunciation of Republicans, was trying to stop him.

Clinton's efforts failed, of course. Paul D. Ryan went on to win, and he has held his House seat in Wisconsin's industrial southeastern corner for nearly two decades as he has risen to become the highest-ranking Republican in the country.

Clinton and Ryan did not know each other then, and they barely have a personal rapport now. When they served together on Capitol Hill, they did not collaborate. They have crossed paths only a few times, in perfunctory meetings while she was secretary of state. Clinton, 68, and Ryan, 47, also have no apparent social ties — although they do share a book agent, Washington super-lawyer Robert Barnett.

Nonetheless, their relationship could become Washington's most important in determining whether the federal government functions over the next four years, should Clinton win the presidency and Ryan retain his majority — as polls show is probable, although not certain, for both.

Ryan's uneasy relationship with Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump — one that appeared to reach its breaking point this week — has been front and center in this year's melodrama of a campaign. It's less clear what a Clinton-Ryan relationship would look like.

"It's fine," Ryan said flatly when asked about his relationship with Clinton at a late-September breakfast hosted by the Economic Club of Washington. "I've only had two or three conversations with her. . . . I can't really say I know her very well."

The relationship would hinge on how Clinton decides to begin her presidency. She could claim an electoral mandate and launch a pitched battle to pass the more progressive parts of her agenda. Or she could start with a relatively incremental push on a menu of domestic issues on which she and Ryan have shared interests, including infrastructure investment, criminal-justice issues and anti-poverty measures.

"Do they want to begin it at loggerheads or with some signal to a very frustrated electorate that there is ground to be gained by focusing on the overlap between their two agendas?" asked William A. Galston, an official in President Bill Clinton's administration and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.

Mixed views about partnership

There is a glaring fault line between optimism and pessimism about Clinton and Ryan forging a productive partnership. Some see the pair as policy wonks with pragmatic instincts who are poised to break the logjam. Others say their political caution and entrenched ideologies would prevent them from defying their bases to resolve disputes and build agreements.

"To assume Washington is going to work next year is to assume she's not Clinton and he's not Ryan," said former House speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), who has been advising Trump and had made legislative pacts with Bill Clinton on issues such as welfare and spending.

"Paul Ryan will not be dealing with Bill Clinton," Gingrich said. "I had a guy I could talk to who had been the governor of Arkansas and dealt with that state's legislature and helped to found a centrist organization," he added, referring to the Democratic Leadership Council. "Hillary, on the other hand, is someone who is hard left. They are totally different people with different instincts."

The other power broker in the Clinton-Gingrich negotiations, Republican former Senate leader Trent Lott (Miss.), has a far different assessment.

Lott pointed to the lessons Hillary Clinton took away from watching her husband negotiate with Congress, as well as the warm relationships she built with Lott and other Republicans when she served in the Senate. He said Ryan has an even temperament and eagerness to shed his party's reputation as obstructionist, as evidenced by the budget deal he struck with Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.) in late 2013.

"Paul Ryan's nature is to try and find a way to make things work," Lott said. "And Hillary has seen how important communication is. She understands they're not just a bunch of rogues up there. . . . You've got to be willing to give a little to get a little. That's how Bill Clinton and I made deals across the board."

Ryan's biggest obstacle to partnering with Hillary Clinton would probably be the House Freedom Caucus, a group of dozens of hard-line conservatives whose threats of rebellion led Ryan's predecessor, John A. Boehner (R-Ohio), to resign and who have become a thorn in Ryan's side.

One member, Rep. Dave Brat (R-Va.), who ousted then-House Majority Leader Eric Cantor in a primary two years ago, vowed to work with Clinton on issues such as fighting terrorism, but he said, "I don't see a love fest."

"For us, it's not about Paul Ryan," Brat said. "It's about constraining anyone who's opposed to stopping the expansion of the federal government."

House Republican leaders have said that if Clinton is elected, they intend to continue their investigation into her use of a private email server as secretary of state, forecasting a stormy atmosphere. "Next year could be very much like 1998, when we impeached Bill Clinton," Gingrich said.

Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), who worked with Ryan on the House Budget Committee, said "the jury is still out" on the prospects for common ground.

"The question for Paul Ryan is, is he going to be a speaker who wants to try and govern with President Clinton or continue to kowtow to the tea party faction?" Van Hollen said. "I think that battle within the Republican caucus is unavoidable. . . . If he wants to get stuff done, he's going to have to be willing to have that showdown."

On top of the possible tensions between the speaker and Clinton could be a Senate with a narrow majority, with Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) or Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) as majority leader, depending on election results this fall.

People who know Ryan said his amiable disposition can do only so much to help him connect with Clinton. "He'd be gracious and a gentleman, sure — less confrontational than Newt, and he'd be smoother than John Boehner," said William J. Bennett, a close friend of Ryan's and a former education secretary under President Ronald Reagan. But, Bennett said, "these aren't people who are going out to dinner."

Further complicating Ryan's calculations could be his political ambitions — namely, whether Ryan, the GOP's vice-presidential nominee in 2012, would try to position himself to run against Clinton in 2020.

Clinton probably would face similar pressures. She is distrusted by the Democratic Party's liberal wing, which fueled the formidable primary challenge of Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.).

Sanders, Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) and their followers have signaled they would try to halt any move to the middle by a President Clinton on bedrock programs such as Social Security and Medicare, which Ryan has long targeted for sweeping changes.

Finding mutual goals?

For Republicans, Clinton presents potentially a far different negotiating partner than President Obama. Obama came to office with little record of bipartisanship and with a disdain for the social rituals that have historically greased relations at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. Clinton's allies said she would be more sensitive to the political realities of divided government.

"One of my favorite expressions about leadership is, 'The best way to persuade is with your ears,' and she truly understands that — the need to listen," said Democratic former Senate leader Thomas A. Daschle (S.D.).

Daschle led Senate Democrats through Clinton's first four years in the chamber, and he recalled her painstakingly cultivating alliances across the aisle. For instance, she befriended Sen. Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.), who only a few years earlier had argued the impeachment case against her husband. They traveled together overseas and worked on issues such as military benefits. And in 2006, when Clinton appeared in Time's "100 Most Influential People" issue, it was Graham who penned a glowing tribute.

"How do you build relationships?" Daschle asked. "It's inclusion. It's invitations to Camp David. It's regular meetings at the White House. It's socializing. It starts with that."

In his failed attempts at a "grand bargain" with Boehner, Obama's approach was to appeal to Boehner's sense of reason and convince him that a deal was best for the country, even if he suffered a backlash on the far right. But Clinton's associates said she would approach similar talks like a mechanic, understanding Ryan's constraints and identifying areas of mutual advantage.

One such area could be an infrastructure spending bill, which Clinton has said would be an immediate priority. Ryan, too, has in the past year privately reached out to top Democrats about beginning infrastructure talks, which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other pillars of the Republican establishment have championed.

Clinton also would seek to work immediately on an overhaul of **immigration** law, an issue that Ryan has advocated but that has become anathema in parts of the Republican conference. It is possible that a Trump loss in November could shift political winds in the GOP, creating momentum for Ryan to consider starting discussions.

"It's got to be done in stages and pieces, not some big, massive bill that ends up collapsing under its own weight," Ryan said at the Economic Club about the prospect of an **immigration** pact next year.

There are other areas of mutual agreement, such as on criminal justice. Clinton and Ryan have expressed concern about mass incarceration and advocated changes to sentencing laws, and there are bipartisan efforts afoot.

Another issue is fighting poverty, something Clinton and Ryan prioritize, although they have clear disagreements on the solutions. Ryan sees it as his personal mission and thrust it to the forefront of the GOP policy agenda. His confidants said he would feel invested in reaching an anti-poverty accord with Clinton.

Bob Woodson, a veteran community organizer who has mentored Ryan, said he could envision Clinton and Ryan touring beleaguered urban neighborhoods together.

"Paul and I have taken many of these kinds of trips, and he does it in a way where politics isn't part of it," Woodson said. "It won't be easy. She's going to want more government; he's going to want more choice in education and different ways of spending money to tackle these problems. But he's the kind of person who could sit down and come up with five or six concrete steps where there is overlap."

Clinton's selection of Ken Salazar, a former Interior Department secretary and senator from Colorado, as co-chairman of her transition team was seen by some in Washington as a telling signal. "Ken was well known for his ability to work across the aisle," Daschle said. "Just selecting Ken was a strong statement about her desire to govern."

Ryan's friends say a glimmer of hope may be the speaker's aversion to the caustic animus toward the Clintons within his party's ranks — a trait they say traces to his days as a staff member. The Midwesterner has never been comfortable about Clinton conspiracies or sordid accusations, despite his opposition to the Clintons' policies.

"He wasn't like a lot of conservatives his age in the '90s who wanted to dig up Clinton dirt and scandals," said Vin Weber, a former Minnesota congressman who worked with a just-out-of-college Ryan at Empower America, a think tank that has since shuttered. "Rather than talk about Monica Lewinsky, he'd want to crusade against tax increases."

Ryan's unease about Clinton barbs has been evident on the campaign trail and in private fundraisers, where he goes after her policies but not after her personally.

"He's with his party, but he never said that he can't work with her," Weber said. "That's a key distinction. He's certainly not for her — but he has never said he's unwilling to engage."

Read more:

Trump declares war on GOP, says 'the shackles have been taken off'

Here's how good a shot Democrats have of actually winning the House

'Donald Trump will protect you': Some fear he is running to be a dictator

robert.costa@washpost.com

philip.rucker@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ATLANTA — Elizabeth Matherne had been practicing **immigration** law for four years in the far northern suburbs of this city when a new group of people came pleading for help. A flood of Central American newcomers fleeing violence in their home countries were resettling in Atlanta, applying for asylum and jamming the six phone lines at her office. She'd never seen such demand for her services.

But Matherne only felt rattled. Atlanta was fast becoming America's toughest **immigration** court, she told the callers, a place where asylum applicants had "lotto number" odds. And that left Matherne with a brutal choice: She could either accept money from cash-strapped clients likely to end up with only debt and deportation orders, or she could stop and risk sabotaging her business — and her cause.

"A crisis of conscience," she called it.

This was the curse of being an **immigration** lawyer in America's least-forgiving place for new arrivals seeking asylum. Just as the massive flow of Central Americans into the U.S. **immigration** system was making Matherne's job more urgent, it was also making it increasingly impossible to do.

Across the nation, new migrants from Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras were showing up in federal courts designed to hear **immigration** cases, telling stories about dire and sometimes life-threatening gang violence in their countries. But they did not easily meet the traditional standards for asylum, which is reserved for persecuted peoples. Lawyers working in **immigration** courts around the country said in interviews that the ambiguity surrounding these cases has opened the door for a more arbitrary version of **immigration** justice.

Although the **immigration** court system has long faced differences across its 58 venues — reflecting the backgrounds of **immigrants** seeking reprieve, the availability of lawyers to help and the views of local judges — the Central American surge has made those variations more stark. Over the past five years, the asylum grant rate — at 48 percent nationally, according to government data — has risen in New York from 76 percent to 84 percent, reflecting a more generous attitude toward not just Central Americans but also other **immigrants**.

In Atlanta, however, it has fallen from 23 percent to 2 percent.

As a result, in the South's largest city, Central Americans are running into a near-impermeable legal wall.

Before the surge of Central Americans began in 2014, **immigration** lawyers could choose from a range of cases. But in cities such as Atlanta, they are increasingly forced to take on Central American clients or none at all. That is because the newly arriving men, women and children have been moved to the front of the line by the Obama administration. Central Americans now account for almost half of **immigration** cases, up from a quarter in 2012. Many other cases have been pushed to 2019.

The Central American surge is changing the profile of border crossings. A decade ago, nearly 9 in 10 people apprehended at the border were Mexican. Today, although the overall number of ­border-crossers has declined, 40 percent are from the three most violent countries in Central America.

Cases are typically heard in the court closest to where the migrants resettle, and for many ­undocumented Central Americans, Atlanta is a popular destination for its job opportunities and Spanish-speaking neighborhoods. A separate batch winds up having cases heard via video­conference in the Atlanta court while being detained in a facility in Ocilla, Ga.

For Matherne, practicing **immigration** law was a little rebellion against the conservative Southern culture in which she grew up. She was raised in Chamblee, Ga., and her father listened to Rush Limbaugh and talked about "illegals" taking over the country. She was pulled onto a different path, selected for a DeKalb County 1990s integration program and bused to a majority-black high school. "It just gave me an ability to put myself in other people's shoes that most white people don't have," Matherne said.

She came to view herself as a spunky fighter who defied conventions: pregnant at 21, married to a Marine veteran at 22, a law degree at 27. She became a public defender in Orlando at 28 and was seen by colleagues as the most empathetic in the office — every criminal with a redeeming side.

"Elizabeth always thinks she needs to save people, and when she can't save them, it breaks her," said Brandy Alexander, a lawyer who worked with Matherne in Orlando.

Judges ‘being so dismissive’

For years, Matherne had carved out a comfortable living by handling a variety of **immigration** matters — green-card applications, helping spouses stuck overseas, the occasional asylum seeker. The sign that something had changed came with the simple task of trying to spring clients, usually new arrivals held by **immigration** authorities, from detention.

For years, judges had granted bond without much thought, but that began to change in 2014, as Central Americans — ones that Matherne took on as clients — entered the system.

The soft-spoken Guatemalan whose land had been seized under threat. Denied.

A Salvadoran forced by gang members to perform oral sex at knifepoint, now with a scar across his face. Denied.

An anti-drug detective who defected from a unit in which other men were helping gangs. Denied.

They were men who had thought they had futures in the United States.

"You graduate law school, pass the bar; you think you're given a key to help the world," she said. "I genuinely believed these people could die if they're sent back. And you're talking to somebody" — the judge — "who is not listening."

Though the judges did not need to justify their actions, Matherne and other lawyers had explanations for them. One was legal: Unlike for those fleeing religious persecution, for example, the precedent supporting Central American asylum was shaky, particularly for politically conservative courts in the Southeast. The other was practical: Judges were seeing so many similar cases that they were afraid to open the floodgates. Indeed, the Obama administration had grown so concerned about the influx of Central Americans that it had taken steps of its own — building new detention facilities and carrying out deportation sweeps — to deter future migrants.

Some of the disparities in asylum rates reflect differences in the makeup of those walking through the door. In 2015, Central Americans were almost four times as likely to be denied asylum than granted it. Mexicans tended to lose at an even greater clip. Eritreans and Somalis, almost always fitting the traditional profile of an asylum seeker, fared better. Chinese **immigrants**, often wealthy enough to have lawyers, were among the most successful, including political dissidents and women who said they faced forced abortion because of the nation's one-child policy.

But differences among **immigrants** seeking asylum are only part of the reason for the national disparities, lawyers say. Lawyers in New York, Arlington, Va., and Boston — all places with generous approval rates — say they have also seen a massive surge in Central Americans seeking asylum. And they say they tend to win.

In Atlanta, the odds were never easy, but with the tough new reality, Matherne felt there was no conceivable way to reliably win. So for the first time in her career, she started pushing most clients away. She blocked out 10 to 20 hours every week for consultations. Yes, I believe you, she'd say. Your case might have merit in some parts of the country. But it probably won't work here.

The asylum seekers did not have many other options. Only a few dozen of Atlanta's 12,000 lawyers work in **immigration**. A study published last month found that having a lawyer boosted one's chances of success in **immigration** court more than fivefold but that only 47 percent of migrants in Atlanta's court had attorneys. That was lower than in any other big city.

"We just don't have the capacity," said Keren Sohahong-Kombet, one person on a list of lawyers that court administrators give to new arrivals.

Among the country's 277 **immigration** judges — appointed by the attorney general — five work in Atlanta. Compared with those in other cities, they tend to be older. All are men. Four have served since at least the George W. Bush administration. Two are former prosecutors with the U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agency. Their reasons for rejecting most asylum claims remain unknown, and individual judges are prohibited from giving interviews. A staffer at Atlanta's **Immigration** Court referred all questions to the Justice Department's Executive Office for **Immigration** Review (EOIR).

An EOIR spokeswoman declined to specifically address the Atlanta situation but said in a statement that the office "takes seriously any claims of unjustified and significant anomalies in **immigration** judge decision-making and takes steps to evaluate disparities in **immigration** adjudications."

A personal crisis

With **immigration** law, Matherne could stand outside a detention center after a client was released and reunited with a family. Or she could spend dozens of hours preparing a client for an asylum case and rejoice as a judge agreed with her argument. She wrote about her best cases on her résumé. The results were in capital letters: "GRANTED."

But in the aftermath of the asylum surge, Matherne's business turned into what she called a "house of cards." She needed 150 new cases a year to cover her costs, including an employee. Instead, she had a growing folder of hundreds of cases marked "Consultations — Not Retained." Her caseload shrank, her revenue collapsed, and she cut her own salary to zero.

For the first time in her life, she spiraled downward.

Her husband, a tax accountant, could support the family's mortgage payments and groceries. But how could she justify the long hours when she wasn't making a cent? She was either working, she said, or home and too grumpy to talk. Her youngest son was struggling to read — something for which she blamed herself because she carved out so little time for him.

She argued with her husband. She stopped quilting and painting. She saw a psychologist.

"I felt dead inside," she said.

Most of all, she second-guessed her handling of the asylum cases. She didn't want to "con people" or file "bulls--- asylum claims" or sustain a career on money from people who were wasting it. (Lawyers typically charge about $5,000 for an asylum case.)

But she also hated to back away.

"You perceive yourself as a fighter," she said, "and yet how are you so unwilling to take this fight?"

Turning away

Matherne was preparing a workshop on how to represent unaccompanied minors when she concluded something ominous: The Central American surge wasn't going away.

In the PowerPoint presentation she put together, she detailed what was happening: thousands of deportations, skyrocketing backlogs in court. Eighty-eight percent of court hearings were conducted in Spanish.

"I saw the storm clouds," Matherne said.

And she decided that her job had deteriorated beyond repair.

"So I started ripping the Band-Aids off," she said.

She talked with her husband. "Start over," he said. "Simple. Do something that will make you happy."

She started to tell callers she was no longer taking cases.

She enrolled for online classes to become a law librarian.

"Others keep going for years as zombies," she said. "I couldn't keep going if I didn't think I could win."

Matherne still shows up in court from time to time with her last clients.

But several months ago, Matherne asked the **Immigration** Court to remove her from an official list of lawyers who take cases. She had been on the list for six years, but when the court updated its pamphlet, the change was immediate.

Atlanta had one fewer **immigration** lawyer, and the phone calls stopped.

chico.harlan@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Back in the late 1950s, my friends and I would regularly camp out in my back yard. Naturally, we told scary stories about the Hook or the Beast With Five Fingers. Sometimes we'd discuss whether any of our teachers could be Russian spies. Sooner or later, though, we would always lie back in the cool grass and stare up at the night sky. Where's the Big Dipper? Could that be Venus? Is that a plane over there? We'd all look hard at the lighted dot skimming along high overhead. Was it a plane? It seemed to be flying really fast. Then someone would say, "What would you do if the aliens landed here right now?"

". . . Flying Saucers Are Real!" is the just-published catalogue of the magnificently kitschy UFO collection compiled by science fiction writer Jack Womack. Sometime next year, the Georgetown University library — which recently acquired the collection — will mount an exhibit featuring such loony, nostalgia-laden volumes as "Flying Saucers Are Watching You," "Flying Saucers Have Landed," "Are The Invaders Coming?," "The White Sands Incident" and "The Elvis-UFO Connection." Till then, this oversize paperback deliciously chronicles one of the 20th century's most extraordinary popular delusions and the madness that accompanied it.

The main focus is on books, pamphlets and other written material from the heyday of the saucer craze, the two decades following June 24, 1947, when pilot Kenneth Arnold reported seeing nine reflective disklike objects moving at 1,200 miles an hour over the Cascade Mountains of the Pacific Northwest. As Womack writes, "The words 'flying saucers' first appeared in a no-byline Hearst International release datelined June 26. By June 27, Arnold's story had gone worldwide." Yet there was much more of that story still to come.

A few weeks after Arnold's initial sighting, the editor of Fate magazine asked him to speak with a man who had also spotted saucers above Puget Sound. Quickly agreeing, Arnold left a debriefing with two military intelligence officers to meet Harold Dahl, who told him of how six flying discs had ejected shards of a mysterious metal over his boat. Dahl retrieved some of the metal and gave it to his boss, Fred Crisman. "The next day," as Womack summarizes, "a man dressed in a black suit driving a brand new 1947 Buick sedan" stopped Dahl and "told him they needed to talk." The stranger added, "I know more about your experience than you will want to believe" and later warned him not to speak to anyone else.

Nonetheless, Dahl then told Arnold that the saucers were piloted by manlike beings made visible by A-bomb radiation. At this point the two intelligence officers who had been debriefing Arnold asked to accompany him when he interviewed Dahl's boss about the weird metal. At the meeting, however, Crisman failed to bring any of the **alien** scraps and the officers left, infuriated. "Next morning," as Womack writes, "Arnold saw the Tacoma Times headline: SABOTAGE HINTED IN CRASH OF ARMY BOMBER AT KELSO. Both officers were on board, both were dead. The reporter said an unidentified source claimed the plane was shot down because it carried 'classified material.' "

There, in a nutshell, are nearly all the darkly suggestive "X-Files" elements that would feed what William Gibson — in his introduction to the catalogue — calls the flying saucer meme. In my own case, by the time I was 14 I had already read, wide-eyed, Frank Edwards's "Flying Saucers — Serious Business" and retired Marine Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe's "Flying Saucers From Outer Space," had learned from radio talk shows about the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP) and the Air Force's Project Blue Book, which was gathering UFO data, and knew that somewhere in the western desert of Arizona and New Mexico strange aircraft had crashed and **alien** bodies had been recovered, then spirited away to secret, underground laboratories.

". . . Flying Saucers Are Real!" also features plenty of fuzzy contemporary photographs of circular objects in the sky, one collection of these being described by Womack as "the most complete compilation of lens flares, camera smudges, film imperfections, blurs, and jiggled shots ever published." Saucer "contactees," a group that gradually grew more numerous, would frequently testify to intimate body probes or sometimes announce that they were now apostles of a cosmic gospel of peace and love. The cover of John W. Dean's "Flying Saucers Close Up" even bears an official **alien** imprimatur: "Spacemen urged the author to compile this book, supplied much of the information and approved the work." In still another instance, the Office of Naval Research was sent a paperback of M.K. Jessup's "The Case for the UFO," annotated with handwritten comments by purported extraterrestrials.

But were the saucers really from outer space? Maybe they originated from inside a hollow earth. Could they actually have been engineered by the Russians or by aging Nazis in Argentina — or even by American scientists working at some top-secret facility? More chilling still, could Basil Tyson be right in titling his book "UFOs Satanic Terror"? One paperback actually includes an illustration of Jesus ascending into heaven with the help of a mother ship's tractor beam. And finally, did a Venusian named — I kid you not — Valiant Thor actually meet with the president in an underground bunker in Washington? Can you prove it didn't happen? As Womack needlessly stresses, "In Saucerdom, there are ultimately no limits to what you want to believe."

In his 1956 book, "The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects," Edward J. Ruppelt, former head of Project Blue Book, examined all the evidence and concluded that further study of UFOs would be a complete waste of time. Oh, ye of little faith! The very existence of the Womack collection demonstrates incontrovertibly that UFOs are, if nothing else, the stuff that dreams are made of. Keep watching the skies!

mdirda@gmail.com

Michael Dirda reviews books on Thursdays in Style.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Correction: The post previously included a list of George W. Bush administration officials who announced their opposition to Trump on Wednesday. They did not, however, announce their support for Clinton.

The list of Republicans supporting Hillary Clinton is growing quickly. For months, we have been keeping track of all of the GOP politicians, administration officials, business leaders and donors who have crossed over to back Clinton over Donald Trump.

Below is that list as it stands:

\* George H.W. Bush (?) -- Kathleen Kennedy Townsend said in a Facebook post that Bush told her this in-person. The president's office isn't confirming it, but she stands by it. "That's what he said," she told Politico

\* Rep. Richard Hanna (N.Y.), a moderate Republican who is retiring this year, told Syracuse.com that he will support Clinton and that Trump is unfit to lead. He cited Trump's criticism of Khizr Khan. "I think Trump is a national embarrassment," Hanna said. "Is he really the guy you want to have the nuclear codes?"

\* John Warner, former senator from Virginia -- "Loose lips sink ships. Got that, Trump? Loose lips sink ships." Warner added: "You can't pull up a quick text like 'National Security for Dummies.'"

\* Christine Todd Whitman, former New Jersey governor and George W. Bush administration official: "Why Clinton is the only choice for president"

\* Chris Shays, former congressman from Connecticut — "I have friends who are up for office and they say, you know, if you don't support Donald Trump, you're hurting us because then we have to answer the question. And now I'm going one step further. So I am hurting them. But, you know, there's a time when you put your country first."

\* Sherwood Boehlert, former congressman from New York

\* Connie Morella, former congresswoman from Maryland

\* David Durenberger, former senator from Minnesota

\* Claudine Schneider, former congresswoman from Rhode Island

\* William Milliken, who served as governor of Michigan from 1969 to 1983 — "Because I feel so strongly about our nation's future, I will be joining the growing list of former and present government officials in casting my vote for Hillary Clinton for president in 2016."

\* Larry Pressler, former three-term Republican senator from South Dakota who lost an independent campaign for his old seat in 2014 — "I can't believe I'm endorsing Hillary Clinton for president, but I am. If someone had told me 10 years ago I would do this, I wouldn't have believed them."

\* Grant Woods, former attorney general of Arizona -- "Hillary Clinton is one of the most qualified nominees to ever run for president. Donald Trump is the least qualified ever."

\* Henry Paulson, treasury secretary

\* Carlos Gutierrez, commerce secretary

\* Rosario Marin, U.S. treasurer -- "I will stand up for my community against the menace of a tyrannical presidency that does not value the countless contributions of **immigrants**."

\* John Negroponte, director of national intelligence and deputy secretary of state under Bush, five-time ambassador and Reagan deputy national security adviser

\* Richard Armitage, deputy secretary of state and adviser to Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush — Trump "doesn't appear to be a Republican, he doesn't appear to want to learn about issues. So I'm going to vote for Mrs. Clinton."

\* Brent Scowcroft, chairman of the President's Intelligence Advisory Board and adviser to three previous Republican presidents — "The presidency requires the judgment and knowledge to make tough calls under pressure. ... [Clinton] has the wisdom and experience to lead our country at this critical time."

\* James Clad, deputy assistant secretary of defense -- "There is no choice: In razor sharp contrast to her opponent, Secretary Clinton is ready, steady and prepared. With a proven preference for bipartisanship, she must win this election."

\* Richard Painter, chief White House ethics lawyer -- "I'm a Republican, but I believe that Hillary Clinton is the only qualified major party candidate in the race and she should become president.

\* William Reilly, Environmental Protection Agency adminstrator

\* Alan Steinberg, regional EPA administrator

\* Robert Blackwill, former deputy national security adviser and ambassador to India

\* Scott Evertz, former director of the Office of National AIDS Policy

\* Lezlee Westine, former White House director of public liaison and deputy assistant to the president — "Our nation faces a unique set of challenges that require steady and experienced leadership. That is why today I am personally supporting Hillary Clinton."

\* Shirin Tahir-Kheli, special assistant to the president and ambassador and senior adviser for women's empowerment under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice

\* Ashley J. Tellis, special assistant to the president and senior director for strategic planning and Southwest Asia

\* David A. Gross, State Department coordinator for international communications and information policy

\* James Kunder, assistant administrator for Asia and the Near East at USAID

\* Matthew Waxman, senior official in the State Department and Defense Department

\* Kori Schake, National Security Council and State Department aide

\* William Sanchez, special counsel for the Justice Department

\* Timothy P. Stratford, assistant U.S. trade representative for China

\* Daniel Twining, former State Department staff and foreign policy adviser to John McCain

\* Deborah Loewer, retired Navy rear admiral and director of White House situation room

\* Mark Lagon, former U.S. ambassador-at-large to combat trafficking in persons

\* Louis Sullivan, health and human services secretary under George H.W. Bush -- "I am a Republican, but I am voting for Hillary. I'm not that fired up about Hillary, but I detest Donald Trump so much."

\* Frank Lavin, former Reagan political director and ambassador to Singapore — "It might not be entirely clear that Hillary Clinton deserves to win the presidency, but it is thunderingly clear that Donald Trump deserves to lose. From this premise, I will do something that I have not done in 40 years of voting: I will vote for the Democratic nominee for president."

\* Doug Elmets, former Reagan spokesman — "I could live with four years of Hillary Clinton before I could ever live with one day of Donald Trump as president." Elmets spoke at the Democratic National Convention, along with other Republicans now backing Clinton.

\* Jim Cicconi, former Reagan and George H.W. Bush aide — "Hillary Clinton is experienced, qualified and will make a fine president. The alternative, I fear, would set our nation on a very dark path."

\* Fred T. Goldberg Jr., former assistant U.S. treasury secretary and IRS commissioner under George H.W. Bush

\* Charles Fried, former U.S. solicitor general under Reagan and current Harvard Law professor — "Though long a registered Republican, this will be the third consecutive presidential election in which my party forces the choice between party and, in John McCain's words, putting America first. ... It is to [Mitt] Romney's credit that this year, like John Paulson and George Will, he is standing up against the brutal, substantively incoherent, and authoritarian tendencies of Donald Trump."

\* Pete Teeley, press secretary to then-Vice President George H.W. Bush, former U.S. ambassador to Canada and U.S. representative to UNICEF

\* Richard Howill, former deputy assistant secretary of state and ambassador to Ecuador under Reagan

\* William Ruckelshaus, former Environmental Protection Agency head, deputy attorney general and acting FBI director

\* Carla Hills, U.S. trade representative under George H.W. Bush, Housing and Urban Development secretary under Gerald Ford

\* Nicholas Rostow, special assistant to Reagan and George H.W. Bush on national security

\* Phil Brady, Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations

\* Michael Browne, deputy undersecretary of transportation under Gerald Ford

\* Robert Kagan, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, former Reagan State Department aide and adviser to the presidential campaigns of John McCain and Mitt Romney

\* Max Boot, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and adviser to GOP presidential candidates — "I'm literally losing sleep over Donald Trump. She would be vastly preferable to Trump."

\* Peter Mansoor, retired Army colonel and former aide to former CIA director David Petraeus — "It will be the first Democratic presidential candidate I've voted for in my adult life."

\* Meg Whitman, former Hewlett-Packard chief executive and California gubernatorial nominee — "Donald Trump's demagoguery has undermined the fabric of our national character. America needs the kind of stable and aspirational leadership Secretary Clinton can provide."

\* Marc Andreessen, venture capitalist — "[Silicon] Valley wouldn't be here, we wouldn't be doing any of this if we didn't have the amazing flow of **immigrants**that we've had in the last 80 years. And the idea of choking that off just makes me sick to my stomach."

\* Harry Sloan, head of Global Eagle Acquisition — "He is unprepared and temperamentally unfit to be our president. Most of my Republican friends feel the same way. As a businessman, a father and a conservative, it is clear to me that Hillary Clinton is the right choice in this election."

\* Dan Akerson, former chairman and chief executive of General Motors — "Serving as the leader of the free world requires effective leadership, sound judgment, a steady hand and, most importantly, the temperament to deal with crises large and small. Donald Trump lacks each of these characteristics."

\* Chuck Robbins, chief executive of Cisco

\* Hamid Moghadam, chairman and chief executive of Prologis — "Our country is about tolerance and inclusion and that's why, as a lifelong Republican supporter, I endorse Hillary Clinton for president in this election."

\* William Oberndorf, donor of $3 million to GOP candidates since 2012 — "If it is Trump vs. Clinton, and there is no viable third-party candidate, I will be voting for Hillary Clinton."

\* Mike Fernandez, $4 million to GOP candidates in recent years — "If I have a choice — and you can put it in bold — if I have a choice between Trump and Hillary Clinton, I'm choosing Hillary. She's the lesser of two evils."

\* David Nierenberg, finance chairman to Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign

\* Mark Salter, former top adviser to John McCain — "Whatever Hillary Clinton's faults, she's not ignorant or hateful or a nut. She acts like an adult and understands the responsibilities of an American president. That might not be a ringing endorsement. But in 2016, the year of Trump's s campaign, it's more than enough."

\* Sally Bradshaw, former top Jeb Bush adviser, told CNN that she had left the Republican Party to become an independent because of Trump's presence at the top of the ticket — and that if the race were close in her home state of Florida this fall, she would be voting for Clinton. "As much as I don't want another four years of [President Barack] Obama's policies, I can't look my children in the eye and tell them I voted for Donald Trump."

\* Maria Comella, former spokeswoman for two of Trump's top backers, Chris Christie and Rudy Giuliani — "Instead of speaking out against instances of bigotry, racism and inflammatory rhetoric whether it's been against women, **immigrants** or Muslims, we made a calculus that it was better to say nothing at all in the interest of politics and winning elections."

\* Kurt Bardella, former top aide to Rep. Darrel Issa (R-Calif.) and ex-spokesman for Breitbart News -- "A big reason why I decided that Hillary Clinton is the candidate who I'm voting for -- the first Democrat I'm voting for in my life -- is because this is a time where what's going on is much bigger than partisanship, bigger than Republican or Democrat, or single issues that traditionally these campaigns are about."

\* Mike Treiser, former Mitt Romney aide — "In the face of bigotry, hatred, violence, and small-mindedness, this time, I'm with her."

\* Craig Snyder, former chief of staff to then-Republican Sen. Arlen Specter (Pa.) and an ex-colleague of former top Trump adviser Roger Stone and current top Trump adviser Paul Manafort.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A generation ago, globalization shrank the world. Nations linked by trade and technology began to erase old boundaries. But now barriers are rising again, driven by waves of migration, spillover from wars and the growing threat of terrorism.

The numbers are clear: In 2015, work started on more new barriers around the world than at any other point in modern history. There are now 63 borders where walls or fences separate neighboring countries – nearly quadrupling in just 15 years.

In many ways, the barrier-building is being driven by fear.

"We are fencing out the south, and much richer countries are fencing themselves in," said Elisabeth Vallet, a barriers expert at the University of Quebec at Montreal.

Most of the new walls are being erected within the European Union, which until recently was nearly borderless. Britain is going further, rolling up its bridges to the continent by voting to exit the E.U. Intended to counter migrants and terrorist attacks, these moves are not limited to Europe. In the Middle East, Tunisia is erecting a desert barrier with lawless Libya to insulate itself from unrest and an Islamic State-led insurgency.

This new age of barriers is not just about chain links and concrete. It also reflects the rise of populist politicians. The effectiveness of their nationalist rhetoric suggests that even as globalization was working its magic on trade, mobility and investment, a seditious resentment was brewing among those left behind.

In the United States: Concrete Divisions

Donald Trump has made no secret of his plan to build a wall along the entire U.S.-Mexico border — and persuade Mexico to pay for it.

The Republican presidential nominee has been remarkably vocal about the proposal, one that 6 in 10 voters disagree with. The wall, he argues, is needed to curb illegal **immigration**, reduce gang violence near the border and stop drugs from reaching the United States.

For now, fences cover just 700 miles of the nearly 2,000-mile-long border. Hillary Clinton, the Democratic nominee, opposes completing the wall — but as a senator, she voted for the 2006 bill that led to construction of most of the existing fence.

The idea of "completing the wall" has been part of political rhetoric since the first 14-mile stretch was completed 23 years ago, jutting eastward from the Pacific Ocean.

But opinions remain divided on whether a barrier spanning the entire border is necessary — or even feasible. And nowhere does the debate roil more loudly than in the dusty cantinas and lively migrant shelters in the arid reaches of the border region.

Mile by mile, the landscape and culture along the border varies wildly. West of El Paso, through New Mexico, Arizona and California, where most of the existing fence has been built, the border is largely a series of straight lines drawn by men. But to the east, in Texas, it follows the winding path of the Rio Grande. Most of the border land here is still unfenced.

Fencing is just one part of the effort by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to secure the country's borders. The number of Border Patrol officers has doubled in recent years. Where no fencing exists, cameras and sensors do.

Barrier construction in this area would be difficult because of the region's isolation and rough terrain. The federal government owns very little land in Texas, so a bigger fence would require the use of private land, adding to the legal and logistical challenges.

But most challenging of all, the Rio Grande is a natural feature — not a man-made boundary. Rivers erode the land they pass. They flood. They dry up. They sometimes change course. A completed border barrier would have to navigate these natural challenges.

Data released by CBP officials suggests illegal **immigration** has decreased since 2001, but it's difficult to show which specific policies made a difference. The Great Recession, which began in 2008, almost certainly deterred some economic migrants, researchers say.

Today, most deaths reported by the Border Patrol occur in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, where most of the border remains unfenced, and in the Tucson area, which is mostly fenced. Border enforcement has pushed migrants off existing routes into more deserted areas. In southern Arizona, migrants walk dozens of miles through the desert, carrying water in plastic jugs.

**Immigration** is a complicated issue; a barrier along the border addresses just one part of it. An estimated 12 million undocumented **immigrants** already live in the United States, representing 5 percent of the labor force.

Emma Sanchez embodies the intertwined nature of border protection and **immigration** policy. She is married to a U.S. veteran and has two American children but was deported 10 years ago after being found without documents.

Every Sunday, dozens of deported mothers like her meet for a church service at Friendship Park, the only binational meeting place between the United States and Mexico. Situated at the west end of the border, on the coast of the Pacific Ocean between San Diego and Tijuana, the park provides divided families a chance to catch up with their loved ones — if only for a few hours, and only through an 18-foot-tall steel and mesh fence.

In Europe: Fenced Out

It is in Europe, not the American Southwest, where the cauldron of migration has truly begun to boil over.

Until the upheaval of 2015, Europe was home to the world's most open frontiers. But within months, a messy effort to halt a mass flow of migrants fleeing wars in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan cascaded into the construction of more border fences than anywhere else on the globe.

The sheer numbers of migrant arrivals — nearly 5,000 a day to southern Europe alone — was shocking, though at first, the newcomers had arrived largely unhindered,. Some Europeans welcomed the refugees, arguing that they had a moral duty to aid people displaced by war.

Yet a backlash quickly grew. The European Union had no system in place to properly vet the newcomers — at time when jihadists who fought in Syria with the Islamic State were seeking to reenter Europe. The fact that the influx also included economic migrants passing themselves off as asylum seekers did not help.

Hungary began building a fence in June 2015, with completion of the its barrier rerouting migrants toward neighboring countries. By early 2016, Austria and other nations had banded together to halt migrant transit through the Balkans, and the E.U. signed a deal with Turkey to stop asylum seekers from crossing the Aegean Sea.

The combined moves left nearly 60,000 migrants trapped in Greece, with the single largest bottleneck forming in Idomeni, a border town that formerly served as a waystation for those heading deeper into Europe.

This coordinated effort largely worked. With the completion of each new fence, the flood of migrants entering that country slowed to a trickle. A combination of barriers and diplomacy sent a deterrent message to desperate migrants across the Middle East and beyond.

Even now, though some in Europe are now asking whether the new walls are enough. To prevent migrants from crossing the English Channel, Britain is funding construction of a wall in Calais, France. Austria is preparing to erect more barriers if migrant numbers again begin to surge.

There is reason for uneasiness. The E.U. deal with Turkey to halt the flow across the Aegean Sea is in danger of falling apart. European nations are charging Ankara with human rights abuses following a failed July coup attempt. Turkey has threatened to scrap the deal unless the E.U. honors its pledge to grant Turkish citizens visa-free access to the bloc.

The heavy weight of terrorism also hangs over the discussions, after revelations that attackers in Paris and Brussels entered Europe disguised as migrants. A wave of sexual assaults in Germany last New Year's Eve has further inflamed anti-**immigrant** sentiment.

And yet, a continent that prided itself as the global standard-bearer for human rights is also confronting a moral dilemma. A plan to resettle migrants stranded in Greece has broken down as European countries reneged on pledges to accept them and Greek officials have been slow to process asylum claims.

Although the E.U. offered to relocate 66,000 migrants, it has so far absorbed only a fraction of that number.

Those left behind appear willing to take fresh risks despite the new obstacles rising in their paths. Many will employ dangerous smugglers — precisely a pattern the Europeans say they were trying to break.

Europe's new barriers have made it impossible for hundreds of thousands of Syrians to escape relentless war. Their message is clear: Keep out.

To see the full project, which includes video, sound and interactive graphics, please visit wapo.st/barriers.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TOKYO — Donald Trump may or may not be the next American president.

But even the possibility has unleashed a torrent of books here dedicated to a Trump presidency, with titles like "Collapsing America: The World Will Go Mad If There's A President Trump" and "Trump Fever: America's 'Anti-intellectualism.'"

There's even a gossipy book called "Special Live US Presidential Election" that features a cartoon of Trump, as a joker, flipping the bird on the front.

Japan, the United States' biggest ally in Asia, hasn't been much of an election issue in recent decades. So, viewed from Tokyo, this season has been noteworthy in that Japan often gets a mention, almost always from the Republican presidential candidate. Trump has repeatedly said that the countries' security alliance is "not a fair deal" because the United States is obligated to come to Japan's defense, but not vice versa.

In the first debate with Hillary Clinton, Trump said that the United States was losing "billions and billions of dollars" to Japan.

"They should be paying us, because we are providing tremendous service, and we're losing a fortune," he has said.

This is not true. Japan pays about $2 billion a year to host American military bases and 54,000 American military personnel on its territory, or $4.5 billion if you take into account all base-related expenses, including rents and salaries for local staff. For its part, the United States has budgeted $5.5 billion for its military presence in Japan in the current year.

Analysts have pointed out that unless the United States disbanded the military units stationed in Asia, bringing them home to American soil wouldn't save much money.

But the attention on Japan this election season has given rise to a little Trump publishing industry here. These are some of the two dozen-odd books that have been published this year.

Collapsing America: The World Will Go Mad If There Is President Trump

Kumi Yokoe, a fellow at Princeton and George Washington universities who spent three years at the Heritage Foundation until 2014, wrote this book to try to explain Trump's popularity.

"It's really hard to understand America right now," Yokoe said in an interview. "I want to make Japanese people understand what's going in the U.S., even if they don't want to know. If we make a mistake now, it's going to hurt our alliance."

She uses "generation theory" to explain that the election of President Obama in 2008 was a turning point for the United States and how the rise of minorities and millennials has changed demographics.

Japanese politics has been dominated by the right for decades — the conservative Liberal Democratic Party has been in power for all but four of the last 61 years. The Tokyo elite has grown comfortable with the old Republican establishment, which has traditionally been strongly supportive of military alliances.

But Trump has shaken up that relationship.

"Trump is beyond imagination for Japanese people," Yokoe said. "You can feel that people are refusing to even think about President Trump. Japanese people couldn't imagine that Trump would win the nomination, let alone the presidency."

So Yokoe wrote her book — in March this year, even before Trump had secured the Republican nomination — to help Japanese people understand the presidential election and "consider how to get along with the U.S. from now on."

In a chapter entitled "Will President Trump Come True?" she says that under a President Trump, all countries and allies — including Japan — will become scared of what comes next.

Trump, a businessperson, wouldn't be able to stand the United States being on the losing end of any transaction or relationship, she writes. He would analyze the cost of the Japan-U.S. alliance and try to get Japan to pay for much more than it does now. He might even start off by saying the alliance isn't necessary if it doesn't make sense economically.

Trump could also insist that Japan, which has lived for seven decades under a pacifist constitution imposed by the United States, become actively involved in military operations.

"It's possible that he might request Japan's cooperation in an operation to destroy ISIS, giving the reason that the defeat of ISIS would be in Japan's national interests," Yokoe writes.

Trump seems to doubt the long-standing American position that the Japan-U.S. alliance is in America's interests, Yokoe writes, boiling Trump's position down to: "No free-riding."

"The idea that the U.S. benefits from 'peace in Asia' so the U.S. should share some of burden to maintain the alliance doesn't seem to have occurred to Trump," she writes. "He considers the alliance from a cost-effectiveness standpoint."

In any case, if Trump becomes the next president, she wrote, Japan would have to become capable of defending itself.

Trump Will Destroy U.S.-Japan Relations

This book by Yoshiki Hidaka, a veteran TV reporter who is currently visiting senior fellow at the Hudson Institute in Washington, explores the reasons behind Trump's rise and the huge political storm it has created in the United States.

Hidaka offers a prediction on the presidential election — that Trump will win — and says that with this book, he hopes to help Japanese people "foresee the danger that the Trump phenomenon will bring to Japan" and help them to be prepared.

"Because conservative Republican power has clashed with real estate king Donald Trump, an **alien** in a way who's invaded the presidential election, the country that's been leading the world has been in the biggest confusion since its foundation," he writes.

"Since the U.S., which has long been the foundation of stability for the international community, has started falling apart due to this historical political confusion, I expect global-scale shocks will continue in 2016." He warns that the U.S.-Japan alliance was now in danger.

In a chapter entitled "The U.S. Will Shut Itself Away Within Its Walls," Hidaka laments the decline of American neoconservatives.

"Neoconservative people considered Japan as a friend in their battle against communism," he writes.

Like Yokoe, Hidaka notes that the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a free-trade deal with the United States and Japan at its core, won't happen if Trump becomes the next president (although on the campaign trail Hillary Clinton has also been strongly opposed to the deal).

The United States has lost its global dominance and with it goes the protection that it has provided to Japan for 70 years, he writes. "The situation that Japan should most fear is about to become reality."

Trump Fever: America's "Anti-intellectualism"

Masahiro Miyazaki, a veteran political commentator and China-watcher, tried to explain what the Trump phenomenon means for the United States and the world, and its impact on Japan.

Miyazaki notes that Japan's foreign ministry considered Trump a "peculiar fringe candidate" and "a temporary phenomenon" right up until he beat Marco Rubio in the Florida primary.

Trying to explain Trump's popularity, Miyazaki notes that the candidate has a lot in common with Pat Buchanan, who twice sought the Republican presidential nomination in the 1990s: against globalism, in favor of strengthening controls on illegal **immigrants**, correcting unfairness in the U.S.-Japan alliance and asking Japan to shoulder more of the cost. "It strikes the right chord not only with white voters, but also the young generation," Miyazaki writes.

Not that Miyazaki has better things to say about Hillary Clinton. "Hillary is a politician who changes her political views like a chameleon, depending on where public opinion goes, so she could easily go back on her promise to maintain the U.S.-Japan alliance."

Like Yokoe, Miyazaki notes that the old political calculations no longer apply when it comes to relations with the United States. "Some Japanese think the Republican Party is the one that's friendly to Japan, and it's the Democrats who are tough, but that analysis is doubtful."

President Trump and Truths of the U.S.: The Era of President Donald Trump

In this book, commentator Takahiko Soejima looks into Trump's background and tries to glean insights from his interactions with Japanese people throughout his career. He notes that Trump took classes with the famous Japanese inventor and engineer Yoshiro Nakamatsu while he was at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania.

He also recounts the tale of Akio Kashiwagi, a Japanese real estate investor who was known as a big gambler and was invited by Trump to play in a major baccarat game at his now-closed casino in Atlantic City in 1990.

In the first round, Kashiwagi won, to the tune of $6 million. But three months later, in the second round, he lost $10 million.

Two years later, Kashiwagi was stabbed to death in Japan, apparently because he was unable to pay back a large gambling debt. (The case was never solved.)

Soejima also notes Trump's ability to hold multiple views at one time. "Japan should pay more for the U.S. bases. Japanese are cunning," Soejima quotes Trump as saying, at the same time as this: "I love Japanese people. Many Japanese live at the Trump Tower."

Overall, Soejima comes down on Trump's side, suggesting there would be "World War III" if Clinton won.

"Trump has started saying honestly, 'The U.S. no longer has that much power.' I like this attitude of Trump," he writes.

Read more:

Here's what Donald Trump needs to know about 'the inner workings of Russia'

61 not-very-positive things foreign leaders have said about Donald Trump

Here's what people around the world think of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Is race or class the more politically significant division in the United States? Donald Trump's rise has gotten the nation talking again about both in American politics. Some observers have examined Trump's support among white working class voters, focusing on how economic conditions can explain his candidacy. Others have pointed to his followers' enthusiasm for his comments about race, even suggesting that racial attitudes make up the "central dividing line" in American politics.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/09/28/can-trump-win-black-votes-what-we-know-from-5-decades-of-black-voting-data/"]Can[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/09/28/can-trump-win-black-votes-what-we-know-from-5-decades-of-black-voting-data/"]Can] Trump win black votes? Here's what we know from 5 decades of black voting data[/interstitial\_link]

Here's what fewer people haver tried to untangle: How do race and class intersect to shape Americans' political views? Are political differences between whites and ethnic or racial minorities consistent at every income level, or do political attitudes change with income — and if so, how is that influenced by race?

Our new analysis reveals that race and class intersect in interesting ways in structuring political attitudes. On all major political issues, the gap between African-Americans and whites is generally wide and remains so even at the highest levels of income. On the measures we examined, both low-income and affluent African-Americans are significantly more liberal than their white counterparts.

That changes when we look at Latinos. At lower income levels, Latinos are to the left of whites, and are both more liberal and more likely to be Democrats. But that changes with affluence: wealthier Latinos are politically similar to wealthier whites.   In other words, race and class aren't entirely separate; they interact in shaping attitudes.

Here's how we did our research

We drew these conclusions by examining responses to the 2012 and 2014 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) surveys, which include samples that allow us to examine white, black and Latino respondents at various levels of income. In all, our data set has 13,724 black respondents and 11,258 Latino respondents, including individuals at the highest income levels. These large samples allow us to investigate the intersection of race and class in a way that little previous research has been able to do.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.amazon.com/Science-Trump-Explaining-Unlikely-Candidate-ebook/dp/B01IL9DTG8″]This[https://www.amazon.com/Science-Trump-Explaining-Unlikely-Candidate-ebook/dp/B01IL9DTG8″]This] book helps explain the rise of Donald Trump[/interstitial\_link]

Attitudes toward Obamacare. To gauge policy attitudes, we first examined respondents' support for the Affordable Care Act (ACA), with black and white respondents presented in the left-hand panel of the graph below. The large divide in support is not surprising.

As the chart shows, class has little to do with the divisions between whites and African Americans. Wealthy African American respondents support the ACA just as firmly as African Americans in the lowest income bracket, with about 75 percent in support. Similarly, whites of all income levels are equally divided about "Obamacare," with around half at every income level saying they support the ACA.

That's different for Latinos. In the right-hand graph below, you can see that the Latino-white gap gets smaller and almost completely closes at higher income levels. While lower- and middle-income Latinos support the ACA more than do whites at those income levels, the wealthiest Latinos are just as likely to oppose the ACA as the wealthiest whites.

Attitudes toward the federal budget. Respondents were asked how they would reduce the deficit and given the options of a) cutting defense spending, b) cutting domestic spending, or c) increasing taxes. The graph below shows the percent who say they would cut domestic spending. (There's no need to graph them all; the patterns were about the same for cutting defense spending or raising taxes).

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/10/new-state-laws-discourage-registering-**immigrants**-how-will-that-affect-the-latino-vote/"]New[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/10/new-state-laws-discourage-registering-immigrants-how-will-that-affect-the-latino-vote/"]New] state laws discourage registering **immigrants**. How will that affect the Latino vote?[/interstitial\_link]

Low-income voters — whether white, black or Latino — all overwhelmingly reject budget cuts to domestic social programs. But attitudes diverge as income increases. Among households with an income of about $100,000/year and above, about half of whites say they would cut domestic spending — while upper-income African Americans actually reject domestic spending cuts more emphatically.

Once again, Latinos' attitudes are different. Lower-income Latinos reject domestic spending cuts even more strongly than lower-income whites. But that changes for those who have about $125,000 in household income. After that, about an equal percentage of whites and Latinos — roughly half — start to say they would cut domestic programs.

Democrat or Republican? In the graph below, we can see that at every income level, roughly the same percentage of whites identify with the Democratic Party. What you can't see is that that's different for Republicans: the higher the income, the more whites switch from identifying as independent to Republican.

Nor is there very much difference by income level among African Americans. About 80 percent of working-class African Americans identify as Democrats, falling to about 70 percent among the wealthiest. But even the wealthiest African Americans are about 20 percentage points more likely to be Democrats than the wealthiest whites.

Once again, there's a bigger difference between lower-income and higher-income Latinos — and less difference from whites among the wealthy. Nearly 60 percent of working-class Latinos are Democrats, compared with about half of those earning $250,000 a year. The white-Latino gap goes from 20 percentage points at the lowest income level to essentially zero at the highest.

That's not so among Latinos, the wealthier of whom are more conservative and more Republican than those at lower incomes. High-income Latinos have views similar to high-income whites, and could therefore be valuable Republican constituency.

Whether that opportunity will exist after a Republican presidential nominee who is openly hostile toward Latinos is another question altogether.

Sean McElwee is a policy analyst at Demos. Find him on Twitter @SeanMcElwee.

Jesse Rhodes is associate professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. Find him on Twitter @JesseRhodesPS.

Brian Schaffner is professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. Find him on Twitter @b\_schaffner.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS — The British government announced Monday that the country will begin accepting eligible children from the Calais migrant camp in northern France within "a week at the most."

Speaking in Parliament on Monday evening, Home Secretary Amber Rudd told British lawmakers that she expects aid organizations to give her a list in the coming days of the children who qualify by having relatives in Britain and who are stranded in Calais seeking to enter the country. Some have been stuck for more than a year; others have since disappeared.

Rudd's deadline follows the French government's recent pledge to demolish what is known as Calais's "Jungle" camp before the end of the year. Although no details have been provided, the leaders of humanitarian organizations said that the planned demolitions could begin Monday morning.

When the French government demolished a crowded portion of the Jungle earlier this year, 129 unaccompanied children vanished, according to census figures collected by Help Refugees, a British aid organization. There is no official census of the Jungle's population.

Charlotte Morris, an official at Safe Passage UK, the group drafting Rudd's list, said that she and her colleagues are working to ensure that the same does not happen this time. Already, Morris added, the group has lost contact with 50 of the 178 children in Calais with family in Britain that they had reported to the Home Office in August.

"We know of one for sure that's definitely disappeared," Morris said. "It just goes to show you what kind of danger these kids are in."

During this next round of demolitions, she said, Safe Passage will provide a number of children in the Jungle with emergency packs containing cellphones, chargers and food. The transfers are likely to take place via Eurostar or bus.

Clare Moseley, the leader of Care4Calais, another aid organization in the Jungle, doubted the British government's promise to ferry children across the English Channel so quickly. "There's no way they're going to bring these children over in a couple days," she said, insisting that only questions remain.

"In terms of the children, where are they going to put them in the meantime? Where will they be in the demolition? Will they be safe? Safeguarded?"

In Britain and France, the issue of unaccompanied children — mostly from Afghanistan and Sudan — living in the squalor of a sprawling migrant camp between two of Europe's wealthiest capitals has become one of the most widely denounced aspects of the region's historic migration crisis.

There are roughly 85,000 eligible children across Europe, only 1,000 of whom are in Calais, according to Morris.

For some, the situation has eerie overtones of World War II. Before the Nazi Holocaust, Britain welcomed some 10,000 Jewish children from Central Europe in the famous "Kindertransports" — a humanitarian legacy that British survivors have sought to rekindle even amid the anti-**immigrant** rhetoric and spike in hate crimes that have followed the Brexit vote.

Earlier this year, one Kindertransport survivor, Alf Dubs, 84, a member of Britain's House of Lords, successfully sponsored an amendment to an **immigration**bill to bring 3,000 unaccompanied children to Britain in a similar fashion. But since his amendment passed in May, only about 50 such children have actually crossed the English Channel.

On Monday, Rudd blamed French bureaucracy for the delay. Meanwhile, Bernard Cazeneuve, France's interior minister, appealed to Dubs and his supporters. As he told France's RTL radio before meeting in London with Rudd, "I solemnly ask Britain to live up to its moral duty."

In an interview, Dubs said he had heard nothing regarding the logistics to follow the upcoming transfers.

Speaking from experience, he said, "the important thing to get right is a safe family environment."

"A lot of them don't show it, but they are quite shocked," he added, referring to a recent visit to the Jungle. "They need a sympathetic environment in which they can feel safe and secure, and to recover from the trauma they've suffered."

james.mcauley@washpost.com

Read more:

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Donald Trump launched his presidential campaign, he promised to build "a great, great wall on our Southern border." Since then, pundits and scholars have pointed out the wall would be extremely expensive, ineffective, and harmful to the local ecosystem and economy. Even so, Trump has doubled down on his promise to build an "impenetrable" border wall.

But if Trump is elected and tries to build a wall along the Southern border, support is likely to plummet once people see that to do so would require taking hundreds, if not thousands, of properties from ordinary homeowners and small businesses.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/08/16/donald-trump-is-making-the-border-wall-less-popular/"]This[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/08/16/donald-trump-is-making-the-border-wall-less-popular/"]This] poll says Trump is making the border wall less popular[/interstitial\_link]

How much private land would the federal government need to take to build a wall with Mexico?

The border between the U.S. and Mexico is 1,954 miles long. Large chunks of land along that border — especially in Texas — are privately owned. Building the wall would require the federal government to take property from hundreds of American citizens living along the border.

Consider what happened when the U.S. built the existing segments of the national border fence. In 2006, Congress passed the Secure Fence Act. The federal government then built roughly 650 miles of fencing along the Southern border. Roughly 100 miles of this were in Texas, where the government had to take property from more than 400 border residents.

But government "takings" are quite unpopular. Here's how I measured this:

In a recent article, I find that government use of eminent domain — taking property for "public use" — is unpopular in the best of circumstances. It's extremely unpopular when the public benefit isn't clear. People are more likely to support takings for projects that will be used by — or at least will be open to — the public.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/09/americans-arent-biased-against-latino-**immigration**-heres-what-they-actually-fear/"]Americans[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/09/americans-arent-biased-against-latino-immigration-heres-what-they-actually-fear/"]Americans] aren't biased against Latino **immigration**. Here's what they actually fear[/interstitial\_link]

That includes the traditional "narrow" uses of eminent domain for such purposes as building roads, schools, and hospitals. There's less support for "broad" use takings, when the public won't actually use the land, even if there's supposed to be some indirect benefit like economic growth or more jobs.

So how unpopular is it for government to take private property?

Having government take private property was unpopular no matter what — but respondents were much more opposed to, and angrier at, property being taken for a "broad" use.

Surprisingly, here's what didn't matter: whether government was taking a home or a vacant lot. What people cared about was how the government would use the property. Opposition didn't grow from sympathy for individuals forced from their homes. People care about why property is taken, not what kind of property is being taken.

  What does that mean for Trump's border wall?

Taking private property to build a wall is a clear example of a "broad" use taking. The public won't use it, and any benefits would be indirect.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/03/08/trumps-not-the-only-one-who-wants-a-wall-border-walls-are-trending/"]Trump's[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/03/08/trumps-not-the-only-one-who-wants-a-wall-border-walls-are-trending/"]Trump's] not the only one who wants a wall. Border walls are trending.[/interstitial\_link]

Those who distrust the government are especially opposed to takings of all kinds, but especially to broad-use takings. And so some of those who support Trump because of his "outsider" status may be particularly angry about takings for a border wall.

Trump also has a history of using eminent domain for private gain, so there seems to be little reason to suspect he wouldn't use it to build a border wall. In the early 1990s Trump asked Atlantic City's Casino Reinvestment Development Authority (CRDA) to take properties from several homeowners so he could build a limousine parking lot for his Trump Taj Mahal; when that was challenged, Trump and the CRDA lost in state court. In 1994, Trump lobbied the city of Bridgeport, Conn., to take waterfront properties from five small business to sell it to Trump Enterprises Connecticut so he could develop the land into offices and an entertainment destination. That plan also failed.

Trump has even tried to use this power abroad, attempting (and failing) to force individuals living near his golf course in Scotland to give up their homes so he could expand his development. And in 2005, Trump was asked about the Supreme Court's widely reviled decision in Kelo v. New London, which declared it constitutional for governments to take property for economic development. Trump answered:

I happen to agree with it 100 percent. If you have a person living in an area that's not even necessarily a good area, and … government wants to build a tremendous economic development, where a lot of people are going to be put to work and … create thousands upon thousands of jobs and beautification and lots of other things, I think it happens to be good.

But if he tried to build a border wall, many Americans would likely disagree.

Logan Strother is a PhD candidate in the department of political science at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University, and a visiting scholar at the Truman School of Public Affairs at the University of Missouri.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's tax plan gives rich households — those in the top 1 percent, with an average income of $2.4 million — a tax cut of $215,000 next year and more than $300,000 once it's fully phased in.

Hillary Clinton raises taxes on those same households by $118,000 initially and $164,000 upon full phase-in.

Trump's plan loses $6.2 trillion in revenue over a decade.

Clinton's plan raises $1.4 trillion.

Trump's plan cuts the corporate tax rate by more than half, and it allows the top rate on many partnerships and other "pass-through" businesses to go from a 40 percent rate today to a 15 percent rate.

Clinton hasn't yet proposed any changes to corporate tax rates, but she makes it harder and more expensive for U.S. multinational businesses to "invert" (incorporate abroad to avoid U.S. taxes), eliminates tax subsidies for fossil fuels, and imposes a "risk fee" on large, highly leveraged banks, as well as a tax on high-frequency traders who cancel big-batch orders.

Trump offers a tax deduction against child-care expenses that provides the biggest benefits for the richest taxpayers.

Clinton significantly amps up the progressivity of the child tax credit by including those with very low earnings, who currently get nothing from this credit, and doubling the value of the credit for kids under 5.

In other words, we're talking about tax policy from different universes. In fact, were an **alien** — a space **alien**, not an undocumented worker! — to land here and look at Trump's plan, it would conclude that America's most pressing economic problem is that really rich people simply don't have enough income.

No one who's paying attention will be surprised by any of this, I suppose. It's the same argument President Obama had with Mitt Romney, though of course it dates to well before then, back at least to when Reagan Republicans realized they could tell people, "Don't worry, tax cuts will pay for themselves," and folks believed them!

Moreover, there's no reason to believe that Congress will enact these plans wholesale, though the sad truth is I'm sure many lawmakers would be much more likely to try to cut taxes for their contributors than raise them, followed by dramatic hand-wringing about the growing budget deficit.

And then there's the fact that this is perhaps . . . not sure about this . . . out on a limb here . . . not the most issues-driven campaign in recent history.

So why pay any attention to this at all?

Here's why. No question, the next president won't get much of what he or she ran on. But if history is precedent, they will get something. So let's get a little into the weeds and think about what could come to fruition out of these proposals.

First off, we have to acknowledge a couple of big problems with Trump's plan. For all his team's tax-cutting zealotry, it actually managed to propose to raise taxes on a fairly broad group — more than 7 million families with children — of lower- and middle-income tax filers. Tax professor Lily Batchelder recently identified this problem, which occurs for technical reasons in the Trump plan ("for most married households with at least three dependents and most unmarried households with at least one dependent," the repeal of personal exemptions is not offset by higher standard deductions; the Tax Policy Center (TPC) confirmed her findings on this point).

Second, as I wrote weeks ago, Trump's pass-through loophole is a real problem. Recall that in the last debate Trump said he would close the carried-interest loophole, an indefensible tax break that allows hedge fund managers to pay about a 24 percent rate on much of their salaries instead of a 40 percent rate. Well, over to the TPC (my bold):

"Under the proposal, carried interest would be treated as labor income subject to ordinary income tax and payroll tax. However, hedge funds and private equity partnerships, which earn a substantial portion of income in the form of carried interest, would qualify for the special 15-percent business tax rate and thus would retain a substantial tax advantage on their income compared with wage earners."

Trump taketh away a little and giveth back much more! And it's not just financial managers who would tap this new loophole. Anyone with a decent salary and a tax lawyer would declare themselves to be a small business and pay 15 percent on their income instead of Trump's top rate of 33 percent. The TPC assumes that "eventually half . . . of high-wage workers would become pass-through entities."

So, if any of these lousy ideas should come up in the future, they should be firmly blocked.

Conversely, Clinton's new child tax credit expansion is a real improvement, and it highlights a contrast between the two plans: If you're trying to help less advantaged kids, refundable tax credits work much better than tax deductions.

Clinton's plan doubles the existing child tax credit (CTC), from $1,000 per child to $2,000, for children under 5. And for all families that can claim the CTC, it makes a critical adjustment so the lowest-earning families, which currently get little to nothing from the credit, begin to benefit from it at dollar one of their earnings; the current credit doesn't start to kick in until they hit $3,000 in earnings.

This extension would boost the incomes of 14 million low-income, working families and lift 1.5 million people out of poverty, including 400,000 kids.

A tax deduction, however, is a quite different beast, since you get to deduct a portion of a designated expense against taxes owed at your top rate. Under Trump's child-care plan, for every dollar you spend on child care, those in the top tax bracket get to deduct 33 cents on the dollar; those in the lowest bracket, 12 cents. Those with no tax liability . . . zero.\*

So what are the chances of a good idea like this CTC expansion becoming law? For the record, I predict that some sort of a deal on infrastructure is the most likely policy to see enactment under the next president's first 100 days. That package, which may well involve some haggling over the repatriation of corporate earnings held abroad, could include some aspect of this CTC expansion, perhaps along with the boost to the earned-income tax credit that is needed to stop millions of childless workers from being taxed into poverty, an idea with bipartisan support. That could be the basis of a sound deal.

Okay — I grant you, that's a lot of gnarly tax policy. But wasn't that better — or at least more wholesome — than a lot of what we've been arguing about in recent days?

\*Many other families also probably wouldn't gain anything from this part of Trump's plan because, if they took advantage of it, they'd lose access to a provision already in the tax code — the child- and dependent-care credit — that's worth more to them. While Trump would provide a bump in the earned-income credit to help low-income families with child-care expenses, it would be far less than wealthy families' deductions or Clinton's CTC expansion.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Every day except for Sunday, between 5 and 6 a.m., long passenger vans materialize on the rural roads and highways connecting Lenoir, Greene and Wayne counties in eastern North Carolina. The vans, Our Lady of Guadalupe pendants hanging from rearview mirrors, circle through suburban neighborhoods and mobile-home parks, stopping to pick up passengers along the way: men, women and teenagers looking to make quick, flexible money with few questions asked.

Eddie Ramirez has already been up for an hour. A stocky 17-year-old with black slicked-back hair and a mustache, he stands in front of the trailer he shares with his mom and checks his cellphone: 5:22 a.m. Eighteen minutes to go.

It's dark and most of his neighbors are asleep. Dim lights appear in a couple of bathrooms and kitchens.

"Going to work?" a young female neighbor leaving her trailer calls out to Eddie in Spanish, smiling.

"Yeah," Eddie responds.

"Where at?"

"In tobacco."

She lets out a quiet laugh, nods and gets in her van.

Eddie started working in the fields when he was 12, like generations of kids who grew up around here. Only, decades ago, they were probably working a small plot of land and working for their families. By contrast, Eddie has no idea whose crops he is tending, or who owns the land. Once in a while, he gets to work with his best friend, Fernando Rodriguez. But Fernando is working sweet potatoes for two more weeks. Instead, Eddie is bringing a friend named Anthony. Everyone calls Anthony "Winky," a nickname his mother gave him as a baby.

Winky is 16. It's his first time working in the tobacco fields, and he's nervous. He has heard about how backbreaking it can be. But after McDonald's and Bojangles' turned him down, he figured he'd try it.

"I hope they have water out there," says Winky.

"They do, man," says Eddie.

Eddie doesn't mention he found the work unbearable at first but stuck with it because it was a way to make money without risking getting in trouble with police. Without a green card or U.S. citizenship, he didn't have many other options. And by now he knows what to expect: intense heat, long rows (each one can take about an hour) and a whole lot of suckers (smaller leaves that shoot out from the stem). The suckers, along with the flower that grows on top of the plant, have to be removed; otherwise they will stunt the growth of the plant and quality of the leaf. Harvesting and curing take place later in the season.

"Are there snakes?" Winky asks.

"Sometimes," Eddie says, chuckling as Winky buries his face in his hands.

A white van pulls up near Eddie's trailer. In the driver's seat is Cesar, Eddie's crew leader, who hires workers. He doesn't work directly for the farmer but is part of a chain of farm labor contractors. He rolls down the window, flashing a smile. The boys run to the van with their gloves, hats and plastic-bag lunches and hop in. On the radio, an announcer warns of a heat index of 105 to 109.

Trailing the van is a caravan of vehicles with more workers. Only Cesar knows where the field is. As they fly down country roads, hundreds of acres of tobacco plants, green or bleached and plump in the summer sun, surround them in all directions.

Tobacco has been grown in eastern North Carolina for centuries. And time spent working in the fields is a prized symbol of tradition. Having children as young as 12 spend their summers breaking the flowers off rows of tobacco plants is about as alarming to families here as having a paper route. It is also completely legal under federal child labor laws, which bar kids younger than 14 from most jobs but allows them to work in agriculture without a work permit for an unlimited number of hours, outside school hours, with a parent's permission. But after the release of a 2014 Human Rights Watch report on the hazards of nicotine poisoning for children and teenagers working in tobacco, what some see as tradition is now a lightning rod for controversy that has pit anti-child-labor advocates against farmers who feel their heritage is under attack.

"When these Human Watch people came out ... they were completely way the hell off-base," says Kendall Hill, a third-generation tobacco farmer in Kinston. "This state was built on the backs of kids working in tobacco, learning how to work.

"There ain't nothing hard about anything in tobacco except it's just hot. But you know where else is hot? The man laying asphalt. The man nailing shingles."

In response to the report, two associations of tobacco growers, which combined represent more than half of all U.S. growers, adopted policies to ban hiring children under 16 to work in tobacco farming. The parent companies of Philip Morris and R.J. Reynolds announced they would not allow farms producing tobacco for them to hire workers under 16. But more than a year later, the outcome has been less than ideal, both advocates and farmers say. Melissa Bailey, co-founder of farmworker advocacy group NC FIELD, has seen kids traveling farther to find work. She calls it the "worst unintended consequence."

"Telling a really poor family that this isn't okay is one thing," Bailey says, referring to the potential hazards of tobacco farming. "Being able to substitute the loss of income is something completely different."

"The man with the money rules," Hill says. "The tobacco companies tell this guy over here: 'If you have any child labor on your farm, you are not going to sell your tobacco to us.' So is that man going to hire any kids? Hell, no. ... But kids want to work."

When summer rolls around, Eddie and his friends are outside, waiting in the pre-dawn darkness for a ride they can't afford to miss.

Like his friends, Fernando started working on tobacco farms when he was 12. He is 15 now but looks younger, which sometimes is a problem. Once while he was on a job, a worker told him to pull his hat down over his face.

"I was like, 'Why did you tell me to do that?' He was like, 'Because of the farmer. If he notices you're too young or anything he'll make you go home.' "

More than once he has been told to stay home because a farmer was out in the fields surveying workers, but he just waited a few days until the crew moved on to another farm.

Fernando lives a few doors down from Eddie in a small white house with his mom, who also grew up working in the fields. She has a job as an assistant manager at a gas station, but it pays barely enough to cover their bills. So she works in the fields on her days off.

One weekday in July, she has already left for work when Fernando gets up at 5 a.m. Rubbing the sleep from his eyes, Fernando pulls a washcloth — bright red and thick with frost — out of the freezer to put in his cooler. Later, when he's working in the midday sun, he'll wrap it around his head.

In the living room, four small dogs roam around a large green bowl of dog food on the floor next to a pile of laundry. Fernando spreads mayonnaise on some sliced white bread and a piece of baloney. He sits at a table, eating the sandwich as he reads texts from his girlfriend that he can't respond to. Yesterday he was working on a row of sweet potatoes when a shower of liquid sprayed over from the next field. On his break he discovered pesticides had soaked his pants, damaging the phone's screen.

Federal regulations require that farmworkers have access to drinking water, toilets and hand-washing stations, and when working around pesticides, protective gear. But not all farmers provide them.

Fernando recalls that the first time he worked in a tobacco field, the pesticides made him itch: "When you break the flowers, the chemicals ... go everywhere. If they get on you, it burns really bad ... makes your skin [feel] like it's crawling."

He has also felt queasy after handling tobacco plants, a possible symptom of nicotine poisoning. But he still thinks kids his age should be allowed to work.

"To me it's kind of messed up," he says. "You got all these other people coming out here. People my age can do it. I don't see the problem with it. It's just more help."

While working, Fernando listens to music on headphones to make the time go by faster. Someday he wants to leave fieldwork and become a singer, a fact he doesn't share with kids at school. "I don't like to tell people right away that I'm in choir," he says. "They'll look at me funny."

Not Eddie, though. When the two met on the bus in middle school, they realized they had a lot in common. Both lived with single moms. Both of their dads had been deported. And they both worked in the fields to help support their families.

In May, when Fernando sang with their school's varsity choir, Eddie was there. After the performance of spiritual hymns and songs in Gaelic, the audience went crazy, which gave Fernando goose bumps. He was so excited he fist-bumped a guy next to him.

On the drive home, he and Eddie talked about the coming summer. Fernando's choir had been invited to sing at Carnegie Hall. He said he was relieved they were traveling by bus. He'd never flown before and was scared.

That's how Ritchie Valens died: in a plane crash with Buddy Holly, Fernando said. "He was a farmworker like us."

Somewhere near Jacksonville, N.C., Eddie is moving down a row of chest-high plants, assessing one at a time. He uses a latex-gloved hand to break off the fluted white flowers at the top of the stalk. The plants are wet from a late-night rain, and as the bouquet jerks to the right, nicotine-laced water splashes Eddie's face. He wipes it with his shirtsleeve, but he's completely drenched. He's not wearing a black plastic trash bag like the two middle-aged women in the next row. Oh well, he thinks, too late. He moves on to the suckers.

Other teenage boys listen to rap music on their phones as they work. Some light cigarettes and talk about girls, sex and partying. Eddie works faster than the other kids his age and even some who are older. "El gordo sabe," they joke: The fat one has it down. It's moments like these when Eddie prefers to concentrate on his paycheck.

Asked if there are minors here, Cesar said no. Several growers interviewed for this story, including one who leases land that Eddie worked on, said they hire only temporary adult workers from Mexico through the Department of Labor's H-2A visa program. The truth is it's possible some growers may not know for certain who is in their fields because they are not doing "the necessary due diligence," says Miguel Coleta, sustainability officer for Philip Morris International, which declined to renew contracts with at least 20 growers in the wake of the Human Rights Watch report. Graham Boyd, executive vice president of the Tobacco Growers Association of North Carolina, says farmers who turn a blind eye are "the exception."

But the ban on workers under 16 can be hard to enforce because labor practices have changed along with tobacco production in the United States in the past half-century, say farmers and labor advocates. In the 1940s, a sharecropper in North Carolina might have relied on his family to farm 10 or 20 acres. "That's the only way that we could survive," Kendall Hill, now 77, says. "Everybody worked."

Today, by contrast, the scale of production is far larger, and it isn't uncommon for growers to tend hundreds or thousands of acres. They may not even know exactly where each field is located. Growers don't always know how many workers they will need at the start of the season. When H-2A workers aren't enough, locals are hired on a temporary, as-needed basis. They answer signs handwritten in black Sharpie that crew leaders tape to the windows of Mexican tiendas: "Looking for people to de-flower tobacco by the hour. In Dunn NC. Payments weekly. For more information call Luis."

With the proliferation of contractors and subcontractors, the relationship between a farmer and migrant and seasonal workers looks less like the close ties between relatives and neighbors that Hill remembers and more like the arms-length transaction between the owner of a company and workers in an offshore factory. Often if a crew leader has many workers, he or she will hire a driver to pick them up — a middleman for the middleman, Bailey says. This multi-tiered supply chain worries her.

"The farmer wants to say they're all H-2A, they're all temporary workers," she says. "That's ridiculous. I mean our schools are full of [kids working in the fields]. You don't even know if ... [some farm labor contractors are] really contractors. For all you know they're just some guy that has a connection ... who just says, 'I'm short 10 workers, can you find 10 more?' and they'll find 'em and that's it.

"If one of these kids gets bit by a snake or passes out from heat exposure, and they call 9-1-1, where are they going to tell the ambulance to go?"

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health estimates that in 2012, 2,700 youth of the roughly 259,000 hired to work on farms were injured on the job. Those numbers do not include kids like Eddie and Fernando, hired by crew leaders. And they are unlikely to include most cases of green tobacco sickness, or acute nicotine poisoning — which can be a side effect of handling wet tobacco leaves that workers and farmers often refer to as the "green monster" or the "mean green."

One study by a Wake Forest School of Medicine public health scientist found about 24 percent of adult tobacco farmworkers reported symptoms. Experts say children and adolescents are more vulnerable to the illness because of their smaller size and still-developing bodies.

The potential harm from nicotine poisoning was one reason that in 2011, the U.S. Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division drafted changes to child labor regulations that would have made it illegal for minors under 16 to work on tobacco farms. The rules had not been updated since the 1970s, and the department wanted to bring safety standards for a broad range of agricultural work in line with stricter rules for non-agricultural jobs. The regulations would not apply to children working on farms owned by their parents.

But the following year, Labor officials announced they were shelving the proposal and would not pursue it for the duration of the Obama administration. In a statement, they said the decision was made in response to "thousands of comments" from stakeholders, including members of Congress, who said enforcement of the exemption for family farms would be up to the "whims" of the Labor Secretary."You've got a president of the United States ... from Chicago, ... and you have to think to yourself, do you have any idea what it's like not just to run an agricultural business in a rural state ... but to raise a family in one?" then-Rep. Denny Rehberg (R-Mont.) told the Hill newspaper.

The Labor Department's decision was one factor that inspired Human Rights Watch researchers led by Zama Coursen-Neff to focus on tobacco farming. Their 2014 report, "Tobacco's Hidden Children," drew from the testimonies of more than 140 child and adolescent farmworkers in four major tobacco-producing states, including North Carolina and Virginia. Most were poor Latino kids who said they worked in the fields to help their undocumented **immigrant** parents put food on the table. The majority reported nausea, headaches, vomiting and dizziness after touching wet, green tobacco plants — common symptoms of green tobacco sickness.

The report caught the attention of lawmakers, including Alfonso Lopez, a Democratic Virginia state delegate who represents parts of Arlington and Fairfax counties. In 2015, he introduced a bill to stop the use of labor under 18 on tobacco farms. Some lawmakers and farmers objected bitterly to a New York-based group trying to dictate how they should raise their children. At a tense public meeting on the bill in Richmond, a delegate asked an anti-child-labor advocate who was testifying whether he thought the parents of lawmakers who worked on farms as kids were "stupid."

Afterward, the bill was tabled and effectively killed. "I was taken aback that there wasn't more willingness to engage on the subject and a willingness to see both sides of the issue," says Lopez.

"We're not saying that the farming parents of yesteryear were evil people," says Coursen-Neff, looking back. "We're saying ... looking at what we know now is happening to these kids who work in agriculture, not [to] let poor Hispanic kids do the most dangerous, dirty jobs in America."

Eddie and Fernando's neighborhood is a grassy square block of mobile homes and small white houses with porches and chain-link fencing.

Fernando stands with his mom, Jessica Rodriguez, outside a neighbor's trailer. Her dyed-red hair is pulled back from her face, showing her green eyes and fair skin. Fernando has her features, but his olive complexion is tanner. He looks beat.

"Hi, Miss Diane!" Fernando and Jessica yell out to Winky's mom as she walks by.

"How you doing, Fernando? How's work going for you?" she says.

"Exhausting."

"I see you got a self-made tan on you," she says, laughing. "Winky tried [working in tobacco] for three or four hours — he quit."

" Whaaaat?!" Jessica squeals in disbelief.

Jessica says she started working on a friend's family farm when she was 11.

"Everybody helped everybody; that's how it was. You helped your neighbors, you helped your kinfolk, you helped your family," she says.

Fed up with not understanding what other workers were saying in the tobacco fields, she became bilingual by listening to Mexican music and reading Spanish-language newspapers.

When Fernando's father was deported to Mexico about nine years ago, she was left to support three children alone and brought each of them to work with her in the fields once they were old enough. Fernando is the only one who keeps going back.

"He wanted name-brand shoes, he wanted name-brand clothes. I thought it was time for him to learn where dollars come from," she says. "At 12 years old, that's the only job you can get.

"I mean, what even is child labor? I've heard of it, but I don't know what it is. I was always told that as long as the parents are okay with what they're doing, then they can do it."

Eddie says his mom would prefer he do something else for work. But his options are limited because of his **immigration** status. Memories of his journey from Honduras to the United States are hazy. He was 7. His father had already made the trip and had been working for a year and a half. His mom waded into the choppy current of the Rio Grande holding Eddie, who remembers the water coming up almost to his neck. Soon after the family was reunited in Florida, Eddie's dad was deported. Eddie and his mom eventually moved to North Carolina, where friends said there were more crops and more harvests, which meant more work. Once he was 10, Eddie says, he started to notice how difficult it was for his mom to make ends meet.

"We didn't have no clothes, food, we were struggling to pay the bills. ... I said, 'You know, Mom, one day I'm a get you out of this.' ... She was like, 'What are you talking about? Don't do nothing stupid, Eddie.' "

Gang members in his neighborhood saw an opportunity in Eddie. They promised him new shoes and video games, plus the support his overworked mother and absent father couldn't provide.

"They look for young people, you know, because they start brainwashing you," he says.

After witnessing several fights, Eddie decided gang life wasn't for him, and he and his mom moved to a different town to get away from the gang. That's when Eddie started working in the tobacco fields.

Five years later Eddie says that's behind him now. He can buy his own school supplies and didn't have to do anything illegal to get the money.

"I'm used to working now, you know?" he says. "Everything I got here, I worked for it."

At lunch, in the fields, Eddie sits on an old yellow school bus reconfigured to transport pesticides. He eats a bean-and-egg sandwich he brought from home.

Workers hired through the H-2A visa program are sitting on the other side of the bus. They peer around the tanks of chemicals to tell Eddie and another worker named Junior that there's soap and water in the back if they want to wash their hands.

"Órale, gracias," says Eddie.

"It's starting to burn right here, right here and right here, bro," Eddie tells Junior, pointing to his cheeks and his forehead. Junior is a 33-year-old originally from Mexico who has been living off and on in the United States his entire life.

He speaks English with no detectable accent. "You got to wear gloves, and if you don't wear gloves, don't be rubbing your face or whatever. ... Most places ... they give you like a safety ... whatever you call it, I don't know what it's called, but ... here you don't," Junior says, laughing.

Eddie points to the field and to the large plastic drums of chemicals on the truck.

"This plus that, that make it twice as dangerous, bro. And the sun, too, bro," Eddie reminds him. "We can get sick here anytime."

"I know," Junior says. He takes a bite of his lunch — chicken wings made by his sister.

Eddie is barely eating. Working in the fields always takes away his appetite. But he forces himself so he'll have something in his stomach for later.

"Shoot, man, I been doing this since I was 12, bro. I don't even know how I made it here," Eddie says.

"Have you ever tried to get you another job?" asks Junior.

"Yeah, bro."

"It's hard, huh?"

"It's hard, bro. Especially when you don't got no papers — no papeles."

"I know that's right."

Junior looks at Eddie and sees something of himself in the teenager. Growing up undocumented, it didn't matter how much he studied. He never had a bank account or was able to build credit and buy a house or a decent car — the building blocks of a good life.

Eddie listens intently but says nothing. He remembers what a school counselor told him once: We're all **immigrants** here. You might be where you are right now, and that's a part of life. But hard work pays off.

At 1 p.m., lunch is over. Time to move to another field. Everyone piles into vehicles. The caravan pulls away. And just like that, there is no trace anyone was ever there. Just tire tracks in the mud and the tobacco plants, pruned the way the farmer wanted.

Alexandra Hall is a freelance journalist in Washington. To comment on this story, email wpmagazine@washpost.com or visit washingtonpost.com/magazine.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a year the GOP should have retaken the White House, it is now behind in the presidential race by a virtually insurmountable margin. Its unhinged nominee spends his time attacking House Speaker Paul D. Ryan ("Our very weak and ineffective leader, Paul Ryan , had a bad conference call where his members went wild at his disloyalty") and declaring: "It is so nice that the shackles have been taken off me and I can now fight for America the way I want to." It is not clear which shackles he has had on, or which he is shedding. The ones labeled "fundamental decency" were taken off long ago. Maybe the "pretense of sanity" shackles are now going by the wayside. Yes, this is the personal meltdown that the #NeverTrump forces predicted.

The White House is gone. The Senate majority is likely to go. Maybe the House will fall. Is there any good news for Republicans? I suppose that depends on the definition of "Republicans." Let's assume it is Republicans who understood early on that Trump was a disaster and would have voted (or did vote) for practically any other alternative. Well, the glass is not exactly half-full, but here is the positive news.

First, the right-wing echo chamber is exposed as a dark, twisted and irrational place, unrepresentative of anything close to a majority of Americans. The Trump campaign is now a right-wing talk show, a never-ending episode of "Hannity." Republicans understand these people -- Rush Limbaugh, Ann Coulter, Laura Ingraham, the anti-**immigrant** voices, the conspiratorialists -- have to be banished or abandoned just as surely as the John Birchers (with whom they have a lot in common). (The silly sycophants such as Hugh Hewitt can simply be ignored henceforth.) Fox News has to stop shoveling nonsense or lose the under-68-year-old set. If the echo-chamber monitors and their devoted audience won't leave, the rest of what was the GOP has to go and try to organize the sane center-right. A close election would not perhaps have had such an effect. This dumpster fire may.

Second, as much as many Republicans are reluctant to admit there has been a deep strain of misogyny and racism on the right, there is little denying it now. It's evident in the birthers and the irrational opposition to **immigration**. It is why many believe there must be a new party that repudiates those sentiments. They have been exposed and now they must be excised. There is a reason the GOP has been losing elections; it has become inaccessible to women, minorities, millennials, urban dwellers and college-educated voters.

Third, Reince Priebus, Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) and a slew of conservative ringleaders of out-of-touch right-wing groups have been exposed -- and found to be politically incompetent and soulless. The purpose of politics is winning; they don't know how. They led to the party's ruin. Now they can be tossed overboard.

The evangelical Christians who have had a grip on the presidential nominating system especially in early states has been disgraced. Ralph Reed this week went to Liberty University , whose leader, Jerry Falwell Jr ., championed a hateful candidate who embodies everything Christians were supposed to oppose. Reed proclaimed:

Some, including brothers and sisters in the faith, point to the recently unearthed comments by Donald Trump in a 2005 interview in which he made demeaning comments about women as evidence confirming this argument. Those eleven-year-old comments were offensive and inappropriate. As a father of two daughters, including one who is with me here today, I did not appreciate them. I am glad that Mr. Trump has apologized for them. As a Christian, I believe, as the apostle Paul wrote to Timothy, that we should treat older women as our mothers and younger women as our sisters, in all purity. I also believe that someone who is faithful in small things will be faithful in large things, and one who is unfaithful in small things will be unfaithful in larger things. As Secretary of State, Trump's opponent set up a home-brewed email server and, according to the FBI , was careless and negligent in handling classified material.

That's a religious abomination and a political disaster. "Clinton has done bad things too" is the sort of amoral argument knaves and con men use to disguise their offenses. You'd get better moral advice from a fortune cookie than from this crowd. On the political front, he insists: "Donald Trump has released a list of 20 outstanding conservative jurists who would likely form the top candidates to replace the late Antonin Scalia on the Supreme Court, as well as fill future vacancies. No nominee of either party has ever released such a list prior to the election." Really, you take his word on that, Mr. Reed? I thought "someone who is faithful in small things will be faithful in large things, and one who is unfaithful in small things will be unfaithful in larger things." Anyone who courts this clique is a fool. (By the way, a home server is not in the same moral universe as sexual assault.)

So the right is afflicted with an insane media bubble; misogyny and racism; and rotten leadership. That's the good news? Yup. There is no choice at this point but to go forward, and in a different direction.

A smart reader asks: "What are the groups and the likely initial and potential long-term numbers that would be drawn to and that would support a new GOP or center-right conservative party? Where would the deplorables go?"

To begin with, we think many voters really are "redeemable," meaning if offered better ideas and leadership, they'd seize it. Second, some of the problem is generational. As we have observed, millennials are more informed, tolerant and economically savvy than their elders.

However, going forward the alternative to the Democratic Party has to offer an alternative to a broader cross-section of Americans, both in ideology and demography. The cross-section must include the very people Trump has chased away -- women, minorities, millennials, urban dwellers and college-educated voters. The center-right cannot win with the Trumpkins' baggage; it will have to win without it and without them. That means going where the voters are.

We know the successful model -- and the pols who succeed in offering it. Ohio Gov. John Kasich, Maryland Gov. Larry Hogan, New Mexico Gov. Susana Martinez and former Indiana governor Mitch Daniels are among those who never endorsed Trump and have won and governed successfully in purple and blue states. They are problem-solvers. They are inclusive. They are ethically sound, normal people. They understand government is not evil but needs reforms. They understand international leadership and economic competitiveness have to be at the top of the agenda. This is not a matter purely of ideology. Sen. Rob Portman (R-Ohio) is much more conservative than, say, Hogan. Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), another #NeverTrumper, is much more conservative than Gov. Charlie Baker of Massachusetts. But Flake will come out smelling like a rose, and Portman is going to win handily in a state the GOP will need to win in future presidential races.

That's the way forward. Understand, however, that with a united Democratic Party and a right in disarray for some time, Democrats will win a lot of elections for a while. That's what happens when one party blows itself up. The question is whether what replaces it can be better and more successful. We will find out.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Justice Department will pursue a criminal contempt-of-court case against firebrand Arizona sheriff Joe Arpaio, who a federal judge has said willfully defied his orders to stop detaining suspected undocumented **immigrants** without legal basis.

At a hearing in federal district court in Arizona on Tuesday, prosecutors with the Justice Department's Public Integrity Section told a judge they intend to proceed to trial against the Maricopa County sheriff on criminal charges, a department spokesman said. The judge ordered them to file the appropriate paperwork by Wednesday and set a trial date of Dec. 6, the spokesman said.

Mel McDonald, Arpaio's attorney, said that Arpaio "vehemently denies that he was ever knowingly and willfully contemptuous of any court order" and said that he intends to fight the allegations.

The development thrusts Arpaio — a prominent Donald Trump supporter whose extreme stance on **immigration** has drawn condemnation from those who say his enforcement policy is racist, and praise from those who view him as tough on illegal **immigration** — back into the public eye as the presidential election approaches. He was ordered years ago to stop enforcing federal **immigration** law by detaining people believed to be in the country illegally without state charges.

In August, U.S. District Judge G. Murray Snow ruled that Arpaio was violating the court's order and that he should be referred to another judge for criminal contempt proceedings. Snow's order, which will form the basis of the charge against Arpaio, says the sheriff's office "continued to stop and detain persons based on factors including their race, and frequently arrested and delivered such persons to [**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement] when there were no state charges to bring against them."

"Sheriff Arpaio did so based on the notoriety he received for, and the campaign donations he received because of, his **immigration** enforcement activity," Snow wrote.

The hearing Tuesday marked the first time the Justice Department had announced that it would go forward with the case. The department also said it would not bring charges against three Arpaio associates because of "procedural defects" with their cases.

McDonald said he hopes to get the Dec. 6 date pushed back and to present the case to a jury rather than a judge. Prosecutors requested the judge set a cap on the possible penalty at six months. Arpaio is 84.

Read more:

Editorial: Joe Arpaio, America's scofflaw sheriff

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Supreme Court on Tuesday said it would consider a long-running lawsuit against former attorney general John D. Ashcroft and other top officials filed by **immigrants** who say they were racially profiled and illegally detained after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.

The court will be even more shorthanded than usual: Justices Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan recused themselves from the case, meaning it could be heard by a minimum quorum of six justices. The nine-member court has a vacancy because of the death of Justice Antonin Scalia in February.

The case was filed by six men on behalf of hundreds of mainly Muslim noncitizens who were detained on civil **immigration** charges for as long as eight months. They never were charged with terrorism but were held in harsh conditions at the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn.

Besides Ashcroft, they attempt to sue former FBI director Robert Mueller and former **Immigration** and Naturalization Service commissioner James W. Ziglar.

Ashcroft "ordered that respondents were to be held in these conditions (and their deportations delayed) until they were cleared of any connection to terrorism," the men said in a brief filed with the Supreme Court. "Mueller oversaw the clearance operation, and would not authorize release of Respondents even after the New York field office cleared them, awaiting a CIA name check. Respondents and others languished for months in solitary confinement even after they had been cleared."

The suit has been mired in legal maneuvering in the lower courts. A panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit said it could proceed, and the government asked the full circuit to reconsider. The judges split 6 to 6.

Those who said the suit could advance said the men "plausibly" alleged that Ashcroft "ratified the rogue acts of a number of field agents" aimed at men who were Arabs, Muslims or both.

The dissenters said the decision did not comport with the Supreme Court's earlier decisions that protected Ashcroft from similar lawsuits.

The Obama administration asked the Supreme Court to intercede in this case, as well.

In its petition to the court, the Justice Department said that unless the justices stopped the suit, "the nation's highest ranking law-enforcement officers" could be subjected to "compensatory and even punitive damages in their individual capacities because they could conceivably have learned about and condoned the allegedly improper ways in which their undisputedly constitutional policies were being implemented."

Rachel Meeropol, a lawyer at the Center for Constitutional Rights, which represents the men, said the justices should have simply let the case proceed.

"No one is above the law. To suggest that the most powerful people in our nation should escape liability when they violate clearly established law defies the most fundamental principle of our legal system," she said.

"At a time when racial and religious profiling are put forward as serious policy proposals for dealing with everything from **immigration** to terrorism, it is more important than ever that the high court affirm that government officials, especially those at the highest levels, can be held accountable when they break the law," she said. "We look forward to making that argument before the justices."

As is customary, Sotomayor and Kagan did not say why they recused themselves. But Sotomayor was a judge on the 2nd Circuit before she was confirmed to the Supreme Court. As President Obama's solicitor general, Kagan might have dealt with some aspect of the litigation.

The combined cases against the officials will be called Ziglar v. Turkman.

robert.barnes@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ted Leonsis is no stranger to politics. He once served as mayor of Orchid, Fla. When he first moved to Washington, he worked as an intern for his local congressman. And as he has built his business portfolio -- which includes the Washington Wizards, Capitals, among many other entities -- he has contributed to a variety of political campaigns, including the presidential bids of George W. Bush, John Kerry, Rudy Giuliani, Barack Obama and even Bill Bradley.

But he's never dipped his toes into the political waters quite like this. Leonsis is hosting a political fundraiser for Hillary Clinton on Friday at his Potomac home, where guests will pay up to $25,000 for an "intimate performance" from James Taylor.

"I always stayed above the fray," Leonsis said in an interview Tuesday. "But this time, there was one compelling issue for me, and it had to do with my heritage."

Leonsis, 59, said when **immigration** became such a divisive and volatile topic of this election, he felt he had to do more than cut a check. He explained that his grandparents **immigrated** here from Greece, changing the family name from Leoutsakos to Leonsis.

"They were **immigrants**, but they essentially were refugees," Leonsis said. "The Yugoslavs and the Turks were overrunning Greece and they left with everything they had in a trunk and took a steamer to New York."

His grandparents settled in Lowell, Mass., working in mills, and his parents eventually found their way to Brooklyn, where Leonsis was born. When Donald Trump, the Republican nominee, began routinely talking on the campaign trail about building a wall along the Mexico border or banning Muslims or refugees, Leonsis couldn't help but think of his own family background.

"All I could think of was, imagine if we had a president back then who said, 'No you can't come in,'" Leonsis said. "It really bothered me."

Leonsis says there's another side of the issue that's important to consider. Leonsis made his name in the technology world, as an executive at AOL and as an investor in many successful startups.

"Most of the great tech companies have some kind of **immigrant**, entrepreneurial, start-up feel about them," he said. "Intel, Apple -- Steve Jobs' father was an **immigrant**. Google, now Alphabet — the founder, Sergey Brin, his father was a Russian **immigrant**. So the wealth, the jobs, the technology that's created by **immigrants** — and we're an **immigrant** nation, a start-up nation.

"So that one issue to me, I said, I have to work to make sure that we're welcoming, that we have a place for the next Sergey Brin. Could you imagine putting a putting a wall up and stopping people from coming in? The unintended consequence of that to me was damning. So on this one, I said, 'I'll help all I can.'"

Leonsis publicly endorsed Clinton's bid of the White House in June. He said he has met the former Secretary of State and is friendly with the candidate and former President Bill Clinton, but Friday's fundraiser isn't a personal favor as much as a chance to have a positive impact on next month's election.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Democrats are maintaining a wide lead over Republicans among Hispanic voters nationwide, but Hillary Clinton has softer support among younger Hispanics and Donald Trump's anti-**immigrant** rhetoric is not necessarily a liability, according to one of the most comprehensive polls this year of the nation's largest minority group.

Trump's comments about Mexican **immigrants** have resonated widely, according to the survey by the nonpartisan Pew Research Center. Three-quarters of Hispanic registered voters say they have discussed the comments with family, friends and co-workers in the past year. Of those voters, 74 percent say they are "absolutely certain" they will vote, Pew said.

But 21 percent of registered Latinos who have talked about Trump's rhetoric with friends and family say they still plan to vote for him — a signal that a notable percentage of Latinos are not dissuaded by the Republican presidential nominee's talk. Trump receives less support among Latino voters who have not talked about him, 12 percent.

The share of Latino registered voters who say they are "absolutely certain" they will vote next month is down to 69 percent in this poll, compared with 77 percent who said so in a similar 2012 poll. One of the sharpest declines is among Latino millennials — those ages 18 to 35 this year. Just 62 percent say they are absolutely certain to vote this year, compared with 74 percent in 2012.

That seems to be a contributing factor in the softer support for Clinton. Her support among millennial Latinos is 18 percentage points lower than among those who are older (48 percent vs. 66 percent). In addition, Pew finds that nearly two-thirds of Latino millennials who support Clinton say their support is more a vote against Trump than a vote for her. Among older Latinos, 65 percent say their support for Clinton is more a vote for her than a vote against Trump.

Those generational divides have been reflected among voters overall this year, as Clinton has struggled to build rock-solid support among younger voters, who are signaling increased interest in voting for minor-party candidates such as Libertarian Gary Johnson and Green Party nominee Jill Stein.

Among Latinos overall, roughly six in 10 favor Clinton (58 percent), while 19 percent favor Trump; 10 percent are backing Johnson; and 6 percent prefer Stein.

Clinton's lead over Trump among Latino registered voters is smaller than Obama's four years ago — she's up 39 points vs. Obama's 44-point edge in the 2012 exit poll and his 48-point lead in a similar survey by Pew in 2012.

More than half of Latino registered voters (54 percent) say the Democratic Party is more concerned about Latinos compared with the Republican Party (11 percent), but 28 percent don't think there's any difference between the parties. Democrats held a bigger advantage in a similar Pew poll four years ago — 61 percent to 10 percent over Republicans.

The Pew Research Center's annual National Survey of Latinos was conducted from Aug. 23 through Sept. 21 among 1,507 Latino adults, including 804 registered voters. The margin of sampling error for overall results among registered voters is plus or minus 4.6 percentage points.

Scott Clement contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump is a man on his heels. And as both voters and members of his own party start to desert him, he's increasingly prone to lash out. He has now suggested that he would put Hillary Clinton in jail as president and is going after Bill Clinton's indiscretions as hard as ever, following a Washington Post report of a 2005 video in which he made extremely lewd and sexually aggressive comments about women.

Trump wasn't able to drive home his Clinton attacks too much during Sunday night's debate, but in the friendlier confines of his rallies Monday, he let loose.

Below is the annotated transcript from his appearance in Ambridge, Pa. — his first rally since the debate and since The Post released the lewd video on Friday. To see annotations, click on the highlighted yellow text. To make your own, make sure you have a Genius account.

TRUMP: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

And we love Big Ben. Big Ben's a friend.

(APPLAUSE)

We play golf together. He once hit a shot that went head (ph) right into a tree. It was a massive tree like this. The ball hit the tree so hard, I swear I said, Ben, within two years, that's tree's going to be dead. And you know what? Two years later, he's shooting the same. It's because we have (inaudible) here.

(LAUGHTER)

But two years later, that tree was dead.

(LAUGHTER)

He is a strong guy, and he's good guy too. Big Ben.

(APPLAUSE)

So I'm thrilled to be back in Pennsylvania. Great place. I went to school in Pennsylvania. November 8th, we're going to win this state, and we're going to win back the White House.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to take on the special interests, the corrupt media — and it is corrupt — and the career politicians that have stolen your jobs, your wealth and stolen our middle class. They've stolen our middle class. We're going to make Pennsylvania rich again by bringing back our jobs. We'll bring back our jobs.

(APPLAUSE)

And Hillary Clinton doesn't have a clue about how to bring back jobs, that I can tell you (inaudible). She doesn't have a clue. If she wanted to, she couldn't do it. You know, in New York state, she ran for the Senate. And you know what, the state New York is a disaster for jobs. And she said, "I'm going to bring back 200,000 jobs." Guess what? Right down the tubes, worse today than ever before.

How many have watched the debate last night?

(APPLAUSE)

Good (inaudible). We had a lot of fun. And I would say that Hillary is highly overrated.

(APPLAUSE)

It was fun watching (inaudible). I mean, most of us (inaudible) unanimous decisions. But some of these people, they were so pain — it was like a painful experience. But we're fighting for you, so what's good for me is good for you. And I mean that totally 100 percent.

(APPLAUSE)

And we're going to talk about a lot of things today, but I always want you to remember this above all else. We're going to bring back the jobs to Pennsylvania. We're going to bring back steel. Your steel has been stolen from you in this area.

(APPLAUSE)

Natural gas, the EPA is killing you and killing your companies and you're losing your jobs. Let me tell you, that's going to turned around on day one if I win. On day one. Your jobs are coming back to Pennsylvania, and they're coming back to this area. And that means we're going to take care of our steelworkers and we're going to take care of our miners, believe me. I'm going to take care of you.

(APPLAUSE)

We laid out a goal, uplifting vision for America. Lower taxes, better trade deals — I'll give you a purse (ph).

(LAUGHTER)

And millions and millions of new jobs. But all crooked Hillary can do was talk about small, petty things last night. During the course of 90 minutes, she was exposed and her values were exposed. She had no defense. All she could do was lie. She lied so much last night. They don't like to catch her on the lies.

I explained how Hillary Clinton oversaw the disasters in Libya, including the drawing of the infamous red line. Remember she said, oh, I had nothing — well, it turned out she was there, by the way. Remember, she said she wasn't there?

(BOOING)

The red line was actually drawn in August of 2012. No, she was there. She lied about it. She said she wasn't involved in that catastrophe. But that was just one of many.

Of course, the moderators didn't call her out and they didn't call out this lie that she told. Hillary Clinton said she didn't delete her emails after a congressional subpoena. But she did. That was another lie. That was a hard one to believe. How did she say no to that one?

The subpoena — well, the subpoena was sent on March 4, 2015. Crooked Hillary's emails were bleached and destroyed. Now, nobody bleaches them. You know what? Bleaching is so expensive. It's really a very expensive process. But when you bleach them, it pretty much means they're gone. Although I've always heard you can't get rid of emails. I've been told you can't. I wonder if the NSA has her emails, do you think?

AUDIENCE: Yeah!

TRUMP: Do you think? I don't think they looked too hard for her emails. What do you think, folks? Do you think — I don't know.

AUDIENCE: Lock her up!

TRUMP: I'll tell you, I bet — I don't know this for a fact, but I'll bet within the FBI — you know, you have some of the greatest Americans in the world that are so proud of the FBI — and I'll bet you they are sick to their stomachs at what's happening. Sick to their stomachs.

(APPLAUSE)

Anyway, her emails were destroyed somewhere between March 25th and March 31st after the congressional subpoena was received. You know, if you are suing somebody privately and they delete and get rid of all your stuff that you subpoena, you got a very big consequence. You know what the consequence is, right?

Here's — here's the United States Congress — United States Congress subpoenaing to see emails and other things and they're gone. And now, by the way, did you read yesterday? Two boxes of emails and materials are now missing.

AUDIENCE: Lock her up! Lock her up! Lock her up!

TRUMP: Very, very sad. Special prosecutor, here we come, right?

(APPLAUSE)

If I win, we're going to appoint a special prosecutor because we cannot allow this to happen to our country. We can't. We're like a third-world nation.

Hillary had no defense for her contract (ph) and didn't even try to defend the ridiculous (inaudible) that these were 30,000 emails about yoga and wedding planning.

(BOOING)

Let's see. You have 30,000 — 33,000 emails deleted, right? I would bet she had three for yoga and maybe five for the wedding, right? What about the rest?

She had no defense when I brought up her failures in Iraq, Syria and Libya. She had no defense when I brought up her failures as a senator from New York promising to create the 200,000 jobs for upstate New York. But instead, the jobs were shipped to Mexico and other countries.

She had no defense for calling on millions of Americans and then saying that they were deplorable — that's you, deplorable. That's me, it's all of us. And you know what's worse? Irredeemable. I don't know, which is worse? Would you rather be deplorable? Irredeemable means you have no chance, right? We're deplorable and irredeemable. I don't think so.

I think we have the greatest people on Earth. The smartest people.

(APPLAUSE)

We have the smartest. We have the most loyal people. That's one thing every poll points out that, boy, Trump's people, it's like the most loyal ever.

(APPLAUSE)

And one thing I know, we're going to get out and vote and we're going to be voting. And you remember the primaries. Donald Trump is behind, voting begins tomorrow, should be very interesting, but it looks like Mr. Trump will not be able to win this state, but he's put up a good fight. Next day, Donald Trump wins by 22 points. Everyone...

(APPLAUSE)

Crazy deal. Mr. Brexit, Mr. Brexit. Remember I said Brexit's going to happen because I have a lot of property over there. Brexit's going to happen. They all laughed. They said Donald Trump said that Brexit's going to happen. Isn't he ridiculous? Anyway, three days later, they vote, Brexit happens. They never say anything. They never said anything.

TRUMP: But that's all right. This is like Brexit, folks. You watch. We want our independence back. We want our borders strong. We don't want people coming in from Syria that we have no idea who the hell they are.

(APPLAUSE)

As I said last night — and I mean this — she's got hatred in her heart. She wants to divide America. I want to bring us together as one people.

(APPLAUSE)

And by the way, we have thousands and thousands of people outside. You know, that, right? Do you know how lucky you are? Do you know how lucky you are?

(APPLAUSE)

And I guess they're not allowing them in. I don't know why because there's thousands of people. Where is the fire marshal? Let some more people come in, I see some seats over there. Let some people — fire marshal, we need your help.

(APPLAUSE)

Where's our fire marshal? Let them come in. We've got 3,000 or 4,000 people standing out there. See, I guess they figure you folks are taking the seats in the very back. We ought to let some more people come in.

(APPLAUSE)

I always get a kick — I mean, I know a lot about fire and fire marshals, but you have a room with four walls and a roof and nothing to burn. Let the people in.

(APPLAUSE)

Hillary also had no defense for Obamacare, which is a total disaster. I'm going to repeal and replace your disastrous Obamacare. Much cheaper, much better.

(APPLAUSE)

Hillary had no defense for her secret speeches to Wall Street and international banks that she hid from the public and which were exposed by WikiLeaks. And by the way, just as I'm walking on the stage, Mayor Giuliani said you're not going to believe this, look at this, we have all of these new charges. You see it just came down today. WikiLeaks, some new stuff, some brutal stuff. I mean, I'd read it to you, but to hell with it, just trust me. It's real bad stuff.

(APPLAUSE)

The speech transcripts contain scandalous revelations about Hillary Clinton that disqualify her from seeking public office.

(APPLAUSE)

And she is. She's disqualified just on the fact that she did that with her emails. Think of it; deleting 33,000 — think of it. How can you do it? These transcripts also shine a spotlight on how this corrupt establishment works, where politicians meet in secret with the big banks, collect massive sums of money, then betray the American worker, which is you and me and sort of all of us, we're all workers. We're all working, we just work differently.

You know, I tell this to people. We have people in this room right now that made more money 18 years ago than they're making now. They work a lot harder right now than they did 18 years ago. Their job was better 18 years ago and they're older. And the only thing I say is I'm older also, and I've never worked this hard either, folks, I will tell you. That's for sure.

(APPLAUSE)

My campaign is powered by my money and also small donations from millions of visitors to our website who just want their country back. They want America back.

(APPLAUSE)

Last night, I asked Hillary Clinton why she doesn't take some of the hundreds of millions of dollars that she made (ph) -- so I'll over $100 million into the campaign of my money. Is that smart or is that stupid?

AUDIENCE: Smart!

TRUMP: Take some of the money she made selling favors to special interest and invest them in her campaign, instead of having to rely on even more corporate donations.

She looked like, oh my god, why did he bring this up? She had no answer. She was flabbergasted, I can tell you. In the secret speeches released by WikiLeaks, this is yesterday and the day before, Hillary — not as good as today, buy the way — Hillary Clinton — but I say that because the press will try not to pick them up because they try and protect her.

I'll tell you what, the only thing she's got going in the media. Without the media, she would not have a chance.

(APPLAUSE)

Hillary Clinton told her Wall Street donors that you need to have a public position and a private position. In other words, you need to be dishonest to run for office. In other words, have one for the public and one for the people that are giving you the money. Right? And that is very much right in that whole thing. I mean, it's crazy.

How did Hillary Clinton try to defend this shocking admission? She did not deny — she said this awful thing. Instead she blamed honest Abe Incon (ph). Honest Abe!

(BOOING)

So Hillary Clinton for lying, blamed Abe Lincoln, commonly known as honest Abe. He's spinning in his grave. The speeches also show that crooked Hillary supports cutting Medicare and Social Security benefits, one more example of how Hillary Clinton's public position is a lie.

She wants to knock the hell out of your Social Security, she wants to knock the hell out of your Medicare/Medicaid. And I'm going to save them, okay? This is a little reversal for the Democrat/Republican, but I am going to save them (ph) because we're going to make — we're going to make our country rich again. We're going to bring back our jobs. We're going to make good trade deals.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to have countries that we are defending all over the world pay a little bit more money, if that is okay.

(APPLAUSE)

Which, in all fairness, until I came along, you never even heard about that. Right? And then when I say that they say, oh, Trump does not want to defend Japan. No, I'd love to defend, but let them pay a little more money, right, isn't that good?

We're dying (ph), we're going to have $20 trillion in debt, $20 trillion. So some of these countries that we do such a good job for, where we defend them — and we love doing it, but they got to help us out a little bit. Right?

Most shockingly, these speeches show Hillary Clinton saying, quote, my dream is a hemispheric common market (ph) with open trade — you know what that does to your community? That's the end. And open borders!

(BOOING)

In other words, she wants the United States to surrender to global governance (ph) with no controls over trade or **immigration**. Great. Can you imagine? Seriously. Can you imagine?

She's saying she's for NAFTA, which she was. You know, her husband signed NAFTA. But she's also for Trans-Pacific Partnership

By the way, NAFTA is the worst trade deal ever made in the history — not of this country, but of the world. What it's done to Pennsylvania and Ohio and update New York and New England. Poor New England, what it's done to New England.

So she's for radical, unlimited **immigration**. In other words, people are going to pour in (ph), but that's what she's for. I'm building a wall, and she's for, like, come on across. Slight difference.

(APPLAUSE)

A slight difference. We're going to build a wall. Who is going to pay for the wall?

AUDIENCE: Mexico!

TRUMP: By the way, they may not know it yet, but I think they're getting the idea. But when you think of it, she wants to have people pour across. Now, the border patrol agents, 16,500, endorsed me recently. And last week...

(APPLAUSE)

Never endorsed a presidential candidate before in long history. And last week, ICE endorsed. ICE is — these are great people. These are people that want to do their jobs, but they're told to stand back, don't do your job. These are great people. You know, it'd be a lot easier for them if they didn't endorse me because they could just take it nice and easy. But they want — so, we got ICE, we have the border patrol agents, we have Sheriff Joe from Arizona. We love Sheriff...

(APPLAUSE)

And Hillary Clinton's got nothing. So she wants people to pour across the borders. She wants thousands and thousands of people to come in from Syria. I mean, 550 percent more than our President Obama.

(BOOING)

A Trump administration will completely renegotiate NAFTA or we will walk away and make a brand-new deal that's far better where actually businesses start coming to Pennsylvania and to Ohio.

(APPLAUSE)

Unbelievable. And we will stop the disastrous Trans-Pacific Partnership, which would be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing could be as bad. But we'll stop it. And we'll make deals. But this is a complex deal with many countries. You have to see the arrows all over the place. Once you sign it, it's 5,000 pages, more than that long. Once you sign it, it's a mess.

I like free trade. We make one deal, two deals, three — we make it with individual countries, and if they don't behave, we terminate them. We send them what's called a notification of termination.

(APPLAUSE)

But that will never happen because during that 30-day period, we'll renegotiate a better deal for our country, okay? And you the other way, you can't terminate. There's too many — it's — people go crazy. You have to be like a grand chessmaster, and we don't have any of them.

Hillary Clinton's radical call for open borders, meaning anyone in the world can enter the United States without any limit at all, would end the United States as we know it today.

(BOOING)

No one who supports open borders should be able to run for president, because we won't have a country.

(APPLAUSE)

And by the way, weeks ago, I called out Hillary Clinton for supporting open borders, and the media said I was wrong. Now, I've been proven right. Where is the media rushing to correct these false stories? Because in the WikiLeaks, it was all about open borders, free trade for everybody. See, I like free trade, but we want smart trade. It's got to be — it shouldn't even be called free trade, it should be called smart trade. I don't like the term free trade.

(APPLAUSE)

Because free trade, to have it really work, you need really, really smart people negotiating your details. And all these other countries have smart people. For them, it's important. For us, we have people, they don't know what they're doing. No less than Bernie Sanders declared that open borders would be the end of America. Bernie Sanders said open borders means there would be no United States, doing away with the concept of nation-state. Sanders also explained how open borders would make everybody in America poorer by radically reducing wages. Maybe that's okay with him. Not okay with me.

By the way, how many ways can Hillary Clinton betray Bernie Sanders? She really has betrayed him. I mean, look, even if we don't agree with him, I mean — you know, Bernie Sanders would have been a legend. He would have gone down as a legendary figure in history if he didn't make the deal with the devil. But he made the deal with her, and now he's just another guy.

(APPLAUSE)

She attacked his supporters as basement dwellers, she admitted in secret she's in favor of entitlement cuts and she's for open borders and open trade. Your state has lost 1 in 3 manufacturing jobs. Since Bill and Hillary Clinton's NAFTA and China deals happened.

I'm going to stop foreign cheating, the product dumping, which by the way, is killing your steel industry, and in this case has already killed much of your steel industry. How many people agree with me that China — because this is such a big steel area, or was — we're gonna bring it back, don't worry about it.

But how many people agree with me that China had so much to do and stupid politicians with the killing of the steel industry in the state of Pennsylvania?

(APPLAUSE)

Between that and currency manipulation, which they do like grand masters and we do like we're playing bad games of checkers, we're going to start making things in America again. And we're going to start making things in Pennsylvania again. Don't let them tell you you're doing well because you're doing lousy.

(APPLAUSE)

Pennsylvania steel will build our future and Pennsylvania energy — our miners, we're bringing our miners back — will power our future.

(APPLAUSE)

Congressman, get up there, will you? Do we know our Congressman? Look at this guy. I tell you, they say he was a hell of a (ph) football player. They say he was — I don't know if he'd be so good today. Would you be good today? I don't know. But he has been such an incredible supporter, and so great, and he's standing next to my daughter Tiffany who came today.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you, Congressman. Thank you.

We have such great support in these areas. That includes, though, clean coal, shale oil and natural gas we have to protect. Pennsylvania workers will be hired to do the job. Hillary Clinton would rather give your jobs to people that pour into the country illegally. I explained how she favors a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees coming into our land. We have nothing — we know nothing about them.

And by the way, we all have hearts. We know what's going on. It's horrible. When you look at Syria, when you look at the migration. We'll build safe zones and we'll get others to pay, like the Gulf states. They have nothing but money and they're not putting up their fair share. They have nothing but money. They'll pay. And we'll lead it, but they'll pay.

(APPLAUSE)

I also exposed how Hillary Clinton is personally responsible for the release of thousands of dangerous criminal aliens into the United States. As secretary of State, Hillary Clinton refused to make foreign countries take back their own criminal aliens by canceling visas, a duty vested in her by the law. And I must tell you, she refused to use forceful diplomatic action.

So we'll have a killer, and he'll be from another country, let's say someplace in South America, and we'll catch him because our ICE people are great and our border patrol people are amazing, so we'll catch him. And what happens is we'll want to bring him back to whatever country that person comes from.

This could be a killer, a drug dealer, somebody else, a gang member, the head of a gang. Hillary Clinton would say, "We can't force him back into that country." The hell we can't.

(APPLAUSE)

I guarantee you that under my administration, there will not be one bad guy that is not forced back into his country. Not one. There won't be any. You won't be reading about it. We will put such pressure on those countries to take these people back.

But Hillary Clinton did say — I'm sorry Madam Secretary, if you can believe this. This was prior to her naps (ph). I'm sorry, Madam Secretary. But they won't take this killer back. "Oh, that's okay. Well, bring him back and let him out on our streets." And you know what happens, right?

The Remembrance Project. You know what that is, right? The Remembrance — these are the most incredible mothers and fathers and sisters and brothers who have lost their loved ones to killers, to killers, illegal **immigrants** that killed their loved ones. And it's a sad thing to see, that I can tell you.

Her refusal to take such diplomatic action has caused the release of thousands of criminals into our community. One foreign national and convicted killer who should have been sent back to his home country in 2012 was instead set free by Clinton's watch. Six months after his release, he killed again, murdering a 25-year old beautiful Casey Chadwick. You probably heard about it.

In just one single year of Hillary Clinton's tenure, 2010, nearly 4,000 convicted criminal aliens were released into American communities because their home countries just said, "No, we're not taking them back. We're not taking them back. Yes, we're supposed to legally. We're not doing it." So we took them.

Another revelation from those secret speeches is that Hillary Clinton knew that the State Department and their devices were under threat of hacking, and yet she traveled overseas with her totally insecure telephone. Remember the ones that she banged the hell out of when she wanted to get rid of (ph)...

(LAUGHTER)

"No I wasn't trying to (inaudible)." Who banged their phones. When you throw away your cellphones, does anybody bang them with a hammer? This is still more evidence that she lied to the FBI, just like she lied to Congress. And she lied to us.

One more very important issue where I exposed the hypocrisy of Hillary Clinton, and the media, was on Hillary Clinton's treatment of women. I was getting beaten up for 72 hours on all the networks for inappropriate words 12 years ago. Locker room talk, whatever you want to call it. But I said to myself, wait a minute. And I just saw a very inappropriate words, but Bill Clinton sexually assaulted innocent women and Hillary Clinton attacked those women viciously.

One of them said more viciously than he attacked them. If they want to release more tapes saying inappropriate things, we'll continue to talk about Bill and Hillary Clinton doing inappropriate things. There are so many of them, folks. You probably saw yesterday, we brought four wonderful women to St. Louis.

(APPLAUSE)

And honestly, it was both very beautiful and very sad. They really — they've been trying to get their feelings out for so long and the media wouldn't take it. One thing with me, the media takes it. Whatever. So they were able to get what they wanted to get out.

To quote Juanita Broaddrick, "Hillary Clinton threatened me after Bill Clinton raped me." She's been struggling to get the media to pay attention to her for many, many years. So last night, I decided we would expose the hypocrisy of the Clintons and the media and our politicians to the entire world.

(APPLAUSE)

As I outlined last night, Bill Clinton was the worst abuser of women ever to sit in the Oval Office. He was a predator. Hillary Clinton systematically attacked and discredited the victims of Bill Clinton's sexual harassment and assault. These things aren't written by the media, but they're true. Written by many books.

These victims include names like Kathleen Willey, Juanita Broaddrick, Paula Jones, Connie Hamzy, Eileen Wellstone, Sandra Allen James and Cristy Zercher. And there are many, many more. For decades, Hillary Clinton has been deeply familiar with her husband's predatory behavior, and instead of trying to stop it, she made it possible for him to take advantage of even more women. She put even more women in harm's way and then she goes out and says, "I love women. I'm going to help women. I'm gonna help women." She's a total hypocrite.

The hypocrisy of the media and our politicians is hard to believe. They condemn my words, but they ignore and defend the — and this is the way it is — the reprehensible actions of Hillary and Bill Clinton that have destroyed and hurt so many lives.

But perhaps the greatest window into the character of Hillary Clinton can be found in what she did as a lawyer when she was defending a man who raped a 12-year-old little girl.

(BOOING)

Desperate to win her case, Hillary Clinton blamed the 12-year-old victim. Her name was Kathleen Shelton. She was with us yesterday. She was right sitting front row at the debate. As the lawyer for the rapist, Hillary Clinton said the little girl was emotionally unstable and had a quote, "tendency to seek out older men and engage in fantasizing."

This is — Hillary ruined that little girl's life, destroyed her life, then years later she was recorded laughing about it on videotape. She was laughing at the girl. There's nothing Hillary Clinton won't do or say to obtain power, and it's about time people started to understand that.

(APPLAUSE)

But the hypocrites in the media don't want to talk about what Hillary Clinton has done to these victims. They don't want to talk about what their other political heroes have done to other innocent girls and women. People like Kennedy, Chappaquiddick. We remember that. Driving his car into a pond instead of calling the police, possibly saving her life. In fact, almost definitely being able to save her life. He went home and went to sleep. Did not report the incident to the police for 10 hours, yet he was hailed as a hero.

TRUMP: The last 72 hours has framed what this election is all about. It's about the American people fighting back against corrupt politicians who don't care about anything except staying in power and keeping their donors happy.

(APPLAUSE)

What I want to say to every American right now is that I accept the mantle of this responsibility for all of us, for all of us.

(APPLAUSE)

We have an absolute incredible situation taking place, folks. And I will never stop fighting for you against the Washington establishment that has betrayed each and every one of you, betrayed the country. Our government has lost its virtue. Right now, it's just about protecting the powerful, and you know what I mean. And I know it better than anybody else. And I'm doing this because I just think it's so damn unfair.

(APPLAUSE)

And it's ultimately going to lead to the destruction of our country. And we're doing it. The Clintons have corrupted our government at the very highest levels. Rank and file — incredible people by the way, incredible people — rank and file FBI agents are shocked at the corruption that they're witnessing at levels of the FBI that nobody would have thought it was possible.

The Department of Justice, where Bill Clinton gets into the back of an airplane for 39 minutes just prior to a determination being made. Of course, you and I know the determination was made a long time ago. But gets on with the attorney general because he happened to be in Arizona playing golf. It was 110 degrees out, right? Nobody saw him on the golf course. Just happened to be there. Oh, there's the attorney general. Let me get back on the plane.

So they spend 39 minutes in the back of the plane. They talked about two things; golf and grandchildren. Thirty-nine minutes. So I give the grandchildren five minutes, I give the golf three minutes, right? What else do you think might have been talked about? They can't believe, these FBI people, these people for life in the FBI — these are people that are unbelievable people. They love this country so much. And they're seeing things that they've never seen before where guilty, guilty, guilty, guilty, no charge, no problem.

They see all of this stuff going on and these people much be sick to their stomachs. What have we seen in the email scandal? What have we seen in third-world-level corruption? This is really what it is. It's third-world — we're like in a third-world country right now. And this November is our one chance, November 8th, our one chance to save our country. It's the last chance we're going to have, folks.

(APPLAUSE)

I've traveled around this country talking about change. But my travels, the places I've been, the people I've met, they've also changed me. I'm not proud of everything that I've done in life. I mean, who among us is? Is anybody totally proud of every single element? Some we are. But let me tell you what I'm very proud of. I'm proud that I've always treated the blue-collar worker — and I consider myself in a certain way to be a blue-collar worker — that make this country run with tremendous respect.

The waiters and waitresses, the cops and firefighters, the receptionist and the custodians, we treat them with dignity and respect. These are great people. These are great people.

(APPLAUSE)

And our police and law-enforcement officials, we have to be thankful for them because they have done an amazing job.

(APPLAUSE)

I'm proud of the tens of thousands of jobs that I've created, and I'm proud that I provide equal play and equal pay for equal work. And I have to do that, I have to do that. I've promoted women to the highest positions in my companies over the years, and they have done an incredible job.

I'm proud of our unbelievable movement, because that's what we have is a movement. Men and women who only want a better future for their children. That's what they want, that's what we want.

(APPLAUSE)

I know that if my father and my mother were alive today, they would be very, very proud of me, and they'd be proud of everybody in this room and all of the other stadiums and all of the other rooms that we're in. We have the greatest people in the world. The greatest people. And we are going to make America great again. And it's going to happen fast too, I can tell you.

(APPLAUSE)

My parents knew what was in my heart. They would know the love that I have for all the hard-working people in this country and the love that I have for my country itself. I'm glad that I have the chance today to open my heart to all of you and tell you how much I want to make our country so much better, so much stronger, so much safer, so much wealthier. We have to do all of those things.

A woman came up to me and said, Mr. Trump, please, sir, leave out wealthy; it doesn't sound good. I said, can I use rich instead? Rich. No, no, that doesn't sound good. I said, here's the problem, countries all over the world are ripping off the United States. They're taking our wealth, they're taking our jobs, they're taking our future. We have no choice.

We want to save our Social Security and our Medicare and our Medicaid. We want to save our wealth. We want to keep our taxes as low as possible. Right now, they're far too high. Our taxes are going to be cut massively by me, if I get in. And Hillary's going to raise taxes.

(APPLAUSE)

Our regulations, which are killing our companies, are going to be cut massively by me. And I'll tell you what. You look at your energy companies, your natural gas, your coal companies, your steel companies, they can't do business, they can't compete with the rest of the world because the regulations are so horrible and so massive.

So we're going to cut taxes. Hillary's going to raise taxes. We're going to cut taxes big league for the middle class, big league for business. We're going to grow again. Companies aren't going to be leaving our shores. They're not going to be leaving us for Mexico and other places. We're going to have companies coming back and new companies being formed. It's going to happen very quickly.

(APPLAUSE)

My whole life I've been a fighter, and now I'm going to fight for you. We're going to fight.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to bring back our military. You know, our military needs enhancement. It's so depleted. We're going to fight for our veterans who are being horribly mistreated, not taken care of properly. In many cases, illegal **immigrants** are being taken care of much better than our veterans.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to fight for our Second Amendment, which is under siege. (APPLAUSE)

We're going to take care of that one easily. We're going to fight to have Supreme Court justices that believe in our Constitution appointed to the Supreme Court.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to fight for all of our businesses, but we're going to fight for the steel businesses that have been taken away from us. We're going to fight from those — for those miners whose jobs have been (inaudible).

You know, when I was in West Virginia, I met incredible people and a lot of miners. And I said to them, did you ever think of maybe moving to another area and going into another profession?

AUDIENCE: Hell no!

TRUMP: They said, Mr. Trump — just like she goes, hell no.

(LAUGHTER)

But just like — it's just like that. They say, Mr. Trump, we love being miners, we love mining. Our grandparents did it, our great parents — grandparents did it, our fathers. We love mining. And I realized the love that they had for mining.

And as you remember, weeks before Hillary Clinton made a statement someplace else before going to West Virginia and trying to get their vote, if you can believe this, she said we are going to close the mines and we're going to put the miners out of work. Then she went to West Virginia and she tried to convince them, well, she didn't mean it. Let me tell you, folks, we're going to take care of our mines, we're going to take care of our miners. We're going to have clean coal, clean coal, we're going to have them. But we're going to bring back our (inaudible).

(APPLAUSE)

And we're going to protect a great new resource, something that really over the last fairly short period of time, from an energy standpoint, has become so important, and something so important to this area; natural gas. So we are going to keep our people working and we're going to have a lot more people working.

We are going to get rid of Obamacare. We are going to get rid of Common Core. We're going to bring our education local.

(APPLAUSE)

We are going to make great and lasting trade deals, not the horrible trade deals. This year on trade, we will have almost an $800 billion trade deficit. Think of it. Who negotiates these deals? Who's negotiating? In other words, countrywide. With China, we're going to lose almost $500 billion.

But think of this, countrywide we do all this work. We're going to have a trade deficit of $800 almost billion. It's not going to happen anymore, folks. It's not going to happen anymore.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to trade — we're going to trade, but I say we're going to now have a two-lane. You now, we have a one — we have a one-lane superhighway going into Mexico, right? You know that. Hello.

AUDIENCE: Hi!

TRUMP: We have a one-lane highway going into Mexico. We're going to make it maybe for a little while, to get some of it back, a one-lane highway coming back. But ultimately, it's going to be like this. We want to be fair.

We're going to bring Pennsylvania steel and manufacturing back. We're going to unleash trillions in new energy, and we're going to put our miners back to work. We're going to protect our hunters and save our Second Amendment.

(APPLAUSE)

Hillary Clinton wants to do big, big damage, big, big damage to the Second Amendment.

We're going to fix your schools and your inner cities and reduce crime and poverty and joblessness. And we're going to liberate millions of African Americans and Hispanic Americans from poverty. What they're going through is unbelievable.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to make Pennsylvania and Ohio, and so many other places within our country, the manufacturing hub of the world once again. We're going to be able to do it. It's going to be not even hard to do.

But to do these things, we must push aside the politicians and the special interests who have betrayed us. They've betrayed us. So this year, we have an election coming up on November 8th. So important that you get out and vote. So important that you watch other communities, because we don't want this election stolen from us. We don't want this election stolen from us.

We do not want this election stolen. We have a movement like they've never seen before. Bill O'Reilly and others have said this is the single greatest phenomena they've ever seen. We have a movement like no other. We're going to make that movement incredible. And what we're going to end up with is this: a country that's not divided, a country that loves itself and loves its people.

(APPLAUSE)

We're going to make a country where people are proud to come in, people are proud to come through the borders, people want to come through because they respect us and they respect our values. We are going to make a country that's wealthy again. We're going to make a country that's safe again. We're going to make a country that know what it's doing and — and functions on common sense again — functions on common sense.

(APPLAUSE)

Our future is in our hands. On November 8th, you're going to look back and you're going to say I believe, years from now, that was the most important day and the most important vote that you have ever cast because we're going to turn our country around, we're going to take back our country, we're going to take back the White House.

(APPLAUSE)

We are going to work so hard and we are going to make America great again.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, everybody.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**New Iberia, La.

For an illustration of how cruel the country's latest wave of nativism has grown, look to Louisiana.

Here, a little-noticed new state law has effectively made it illegal for thousands of refugees to get married.

It all started last year. Having lost the fight over gay marriage, the state's religious right decided that the sacred institution of wedlock was once again under attack — this time, by devious **immigrants**. Undocumented workers and even terrorists had newly discovered they could exploit Louisiana's marriage laws to gain citizenship, legislators claimed, leading to a supposed epidemic of "marriage fraud."

The response? Make it more difficult for **immigrants** to get married, of course.

So, as of this year, any foreign-born person wanting to get married in Louisiana must produce both an unexpired visa (even though a federal court has ruled that marriage licenses cannot be denied based on **immigration** status), as well as, somewhat inexplicably, a birth certificate.

No birth certificate, no marriage, no excuses.

The law has indeed placed marriage off-limits to **immigrants** in the country illegally, as intended. But it's hurt plenty of legal **immigrants**, too. Louisiana is home to thousands of refugees, predominantly Vietnamese and Laotians who received asylum in the 1970s and 1980s after fleeing war and communism in their homelands.

Today these Louisianans often have green cards and even U.S. citizenship, but no access to their original birth documents, if such documents even exist.

The law received little attention when it went into effect in January. Which means people such as Out Xanamane often learn about it only when they get turned away at the courthouse.

Xanamane was born in a village near Savannakhet, Laos, in 1975, the year the country fell to communism. Born at home, he never received a birth certificate.

He remembers little of his early childhood, except that there were bombs and land mines everywhere. In the decade before his birth, the U.S. military dropped 2 million tons of explosives on the tiny nation, making the country one of the most heavily bombed per capita in history.

Xanamane's family arrived in Louisiana in 1986, after spending time in refugee camps in Thailand and the Philippines. He has lived in the United States ever since and is now a U.S. permanent resident in the process of applying for citizenship.

It wasn't until he got sick this summer that his lack of birth certificate was ever an issue.

In July, he was diagnosed with liver cancer, the same illness that claimed his brother's life two years ago. The diagnosis meant a lot of changes for his family, the most pressing of which was he really, really needed the state to recognize his marriage.

Xanamane and his significant other, U.S.-born citizen Marilyn Cheng, were married in a Buddhist temple in 1997. But like many in the local Laotian community, they never sought an official marriage license, and never felt they needed to. They have called each other "husband" and "wife" for two decades, have four children and assumed they probably had a common-law marriage at the very least.

They didn't; Louisiana doesn't recognize common-law marriage.

The couple discovered this when Cheng's employer, under whose health-insurance plan Xanamane was covered for the past two years, abruptly asked for a copy of their marriage license after bills for his cancer treatments came in. Suddenly all the marriage-related legal protections they'd taken for granted — health coverage, hospital visitation rights, Social Security survivor benefits — vanished.

Within days they went to the courthouse, armed with Xanamane's green card, refugee documents and driver's license. Twice they were turned away.

"They told me I have to go back to Laos and get my birth certificate," said Xanamane, who has never returned to his country of birth. "But there isn't any birth certificate there, either."

They contacted friends, family, lawyers, public officials, judges, other parishes in the state. No one could help.

Out of options, and with Xanamane's access to medical care hanging in the balance, the couple opted for a last-minute destination wedding in a more enlightened state: Alabama. They packed their kids and Xanamane's sister into the car and drove seven hours to Montgomery, a jurisdiction that happily took appointments for courthouse marriage ceremonies and accepted green cards as proof of identity.

On Aug. 8, 2016 — the 19th anniversary of their Buddhist marriage ceremony — Xanamane and Cheng were legally declared husband and wife. Then they turned around and drove seven hours home.

It's not clear whether the champions of the Louisiana law intended to make marriage less accessible to people like Xanamane, or if they're merely indifferent to an unintended consequence of their anti-**immigrant** reflexes. The organization that legislators told me lobbied for the bill, the Louisiana Family Forum, did not return my calls; the state representative who introduced the law, Valarie Hodges, declined an interview request.

All we know is that both claim to be a voice for "traditional families" — a category that, in 2016, apparently no longer includes **immigrants**.

crampell@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This past weekend, following reports of Donald Trump's lewd comments on a 2005 tape, several of Utah's most prominent Republican politicians -- including Gov. Gary Herbert and Rep. Jason Chaffetz -- said they could not support his presidential bid. Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah), a longtime Trump critic, urged him to leave the ticket before Election Day. So did the Deseret News editorial board, weighing in on presidential campaign politics for the first time in its history.

On Tuesday, Hillary Clinton's campaign released a Web ad -- "We are Mormons for Hillary" -- making a direct appeal to Mormon voters, whose influence can be felt in several 2016 swing states, including Arizona and Nevada.

Over the summer, Donald Trump acknowledged that he had a "terrible problem" in Utah, traditionally one of the most Republican states in the country at the presidential level. Polls confirmed that Hillary Clinton is within striking distance of the real estate mogul in a state the past several GOP presidential tickets have won by 30-40 points or more. Looking for a deeper explanation than "Mormons don't like him," I reached out to Salt Lake Tribune political reporter Robert Gehrke, one of The Fix's best state-based political reporters, for his perspective. Our conversation, conducted via email and edited only for grammar, is below.

FIX: Mitt Romney won Utah by 48 points in 2012. It is considered one of the most Republican states in the country. So, why should we believe this is a real race between Trump and Clinton? Or shouldn't we?

Gehrke: Earlier polls showed Clinton either leading or tied with Trump. The most recent poll had Trump with a 12-point lead. [Update: the most recent poll now has Trump up by 9; an average of recent polls has him up by 15.] There are some issues with how that poll was conducted and I would guess Trump's lead is actually in the single digits. But that's a big deal for a state that hasn't voted for a Democrat since Lyndon B. Johnson in 1964. This state should not be that close.

And keep in mind, those polls were all done before Evan McMullin got into the race. Nationally, McMullin may end up being a blip on the radar, but he was born in Utah, is a graduate of Brigham Young University and is a Mormon. He has the potential to play a significant factor in how this state ends up going because he gives disenchanted Republicans a more comfortable alternative than Libertarian Gary Johnson.

So is it a real race? Probably not the type of nail-biter that will have candidates and surrogates pouring in for rallies. But, as you noted, Trump is showing some real weakness here, and there is the potential that, with the third-party candidates possibly playing spoilers, it could come down to the wire.

One more thing that is important is what Trump's weakness in Utah could mean for true swing states. Four years ago, Utah Republicans were being bused by the hundreds to Nevada and Colorado to knock on doors — Mormons are good at that — and register voters in those true battleground states. There is no way that magnitude of support turns out for Trump this time though.

FIX: Most people ascribe Trump's seeming struggles in the state to skepticism toward him from the Mormon community. Is that right? Or is there more happening?

Gehrke: That is a huge part of it. While Mormons make up about 60 percent of the state's overall population, they account for about 85 percent of the Republican voters, and Pew has found that Mormons are the most reliably Republican voting bloc in the country — even more so than evangelicals. So you really can't separate Trump's "tremendous problem" with Utah Republicans with his "tremendous problem" with Utah Mormons.

It boils down to a style and substance that Mormons don't like. Nobody wins in Utah by being in full-tilt attack mode. His **immigration** policy is a problem for members of a faith who serve two-year missions, many overseas, proselytizing for their church and don't see **immigrants** generally as rapists and job-stealers. Trump's approach to Muslims has been cited as a problem for a faith that was chased out of one state after another and still has a culture steeped in that refugee mentality. Church leaders took the unusual step of issuing a statement embracing religious pluralism after Trump's Muslim comments.

And I have heard from many people that his personal conduct — the third marriage and brash nature, along with some doubts about where he is on abortion issues — doesn't sit well with social conservatives. There are people in Utah who marry younger women over and over. We call them polygamists, not presidents.

FIX: Spencer Cox — the state's Republican lieutenant governor — has been an outspoken voice in the Never Trump movement. How have the other major Republican elected officials in the state handled it?

Gehrke: They've handled Trump much like one would handle radioactive waste or a rabid porcupine. [State] House Speaker Greg Hughes is pretty much Trump's only full-throated supporter. Gov. Gary Herbert came around and endorsed once Trump added [Indiana Gov. Mike] Pence to the ticket. Sen. Orrin Hatch is on board because he doesn't want Clinton choosing Supreme Court justices.

Cox, as you mentioned, is the highest-ranking elected official to say he wouldn't vote for Trump, and State Sen. Mark Madsen has endorsed Gary Johnson.

Rep. Mia Love, who spoke at the GOP convention four years ago in prime time, avoided it this year and Rep. Jason Chaffetz was conveniently out of the country on a congressional trip. Maybe the best Trump endorsement came from Rep. Chris Stewart, who compared him to Mussolini but said he'll probably vote for him anyway.

And then there's Mitt Romney, who lives here now and who Utahans have always claimed as their own, who obviously hasn't hidden his contempt for Trump. If the race is still tight six weeks from now, I'd expect to see Romney ads in heavy rotation here.

FIX: Do you see any evidence of the Clinton or Trump campaigns building a real ground operation in the state? If so, who and how much?

Gehrke: There hasn't been much activity yet. Clinton will be opening a field office in the state and there are some rumblings that the national party will be putting some resources in, partly for Clinton but more for Democrat Doug Owens who is running against Love. Trump this week has been ramping up his field office and is signing a lease on some office space and has begun hiring staff. Again, it will likely be nowhere near as robust as the Romney operation in 2012, but it may be an unfair comparison.

So both are still in the formative stages and my impression is it's more part of their respective "50-state strategies." We'll have to see how those operations mature.

FIX: Finish this sentence: "Donald Trump wins Utah on November 8th if \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_." Now, explain.

Gehrke: " ... the third party candidates peel off less than 25 to 30 percent of the vote."

Trump's saving grace right now is that Hillary Clinton is less popular in Utah than Trump is. Keep in mind, Bill Clinton finished third in the state behind Ross Perot in 1992. So at this point it's a matchup of Zika against Ebola and Zika is coming out ahead.

My gut tells me that Clinton has a ceiling in Utah that is probably somewhere around 35 percent. So to win Utah, it becomes an issue of keeping Trump below that ceiling. The Clinton campaign can't do that on its own.

Fortunately for Team Clinton, we've seen Gary Johnson polling around 16 percent — this is the same guy who got 1.3 percent of the vote in Utah when he was on the ballot four years ago, so that speaks to the Trump discontent — and now, we've added the McMullin wild card. I could see McMullin sucking votes from both Trump and Johnson and finishing somewhere in the double digits.

Is it enough to hold down Trump's numbers [so] that Clinton can win Utah with a small plurality? It would be a hell of a thing. Guess that's why they play the game.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With Breanne Deppisch

THE BIG IDEA: The crowd cried "no" when Michelle Obama, campaigning for Hillary Clinton in Pennsylvania yesterday, said that "it's almost time for my family to end our time at the White House."

The first lady—working hard to get millennial, minority and female voters to rally behind a Democratic nominee whom she battled so fiercely eight years ago—tried to assuage them.

"It's okay. It's okay. It's okay," she said. "Look, two terms is a good thing for the country! Right? Two terms is good. And we're not going anywhere! We're going to keep working and doing our good stuff. So we will be near."

"We love you, Michelle," a member of the audience yelled out, and the crowd cheered. Then someone else yelled to ask what will happen to Sunny and Bo, the first pets.

-- Mrs. Obama received a rock star's reception at both colleges she visited Wednesday in the Keystone State's two urban centers. In fact, the crowd's energy level felt higher at the 52-year-old First Lady's events than during a joint rally in New Hampshire with Hillary Clinton, 68, and Bernie Sanders, 75.

There were also more people. Michelle drew 3,600 to La Salle University in Philadelphia and 3,000 more to the University of Pittsburgh a few hours later. Clinton and Sanders got 1,200 at the University of New Hampshire in Durham, where they spoke about college affordability.

-- Watching the crowd's reaction to Michelle begged the question: why again didn't she run for Senate in Illinois the way HRC did in New York in 2000? She would have cleared the Democratic primary field and totally annihilated Republican incumbent Mark Kirk (almost certainly by a bigger margin than the overrated Tammy Duckworth will).

The answer is that the Princeton- and Harvard Law-educated mother of two does not want to be an elected official. And frankly, that's the core of her appeal. Because she has less of a political patina than her husband and because you know she does not need to be there for Hillary the way he does, she comes across as more authentic.

This dynamic helps explain why so many people were so moved by her hug with George W. Bush last weekend:

"As someone who doesn't do a lot of politics, the first lady has a particularly powerful voice for undecided voters and she has a particular appeal with young people," Clinton communications director Jennifer Palmieri said during a gaggle on Hillary's plane between events. "But it's not limited to young people. And we saw in the convention, she takes the argument for why Hillary's the right person for our kids to a high moral ground that is very compelling."

-- Moreover, the first lady is not dragged down by the dramas and controversies that inherently bog down any president. Yesterday, for example, was a rough day for Barack Obama:

For the first and probably only time of his eight year presidency, Congress voted overwhelmingly to override POTUS' veto of a bill that will let the families of 9/11 victims sue Saudi Arabia.

He then faced a series of tough, pointed questions from military personnel and veterans during a town hall that aired last night on CNN. At an Army base near Richmond, they pressed him on his refusal to use the phrase "Islamic terrorism," his decision to open combat jobs up to women and the performance of the Department of Veterans Affairs. (Greg Jaffe has the blow-by-blow.)

Finally, the outgoing commander-in-chief had to make the politically difficult announcement that he is sending 600 more troops into Iraq. In 2011, he believed a big part of his legacy would be ending the war there. Now there are 5,000 U.S. troops preparing to assist an offensive to retake Mosul in the coming weeks.

-- Michelle, meanwhile, got to take a victory lap. She was at her best when eviscerating Donald Trump for leading the birther movement and now refusing to apologize. She holds back less than the president when addressing the conspiracy theories that he was not born in the United States. "There are those who questioned and continue to question for the past eight years whether my husband was even born in this country. And let me say: hurtful, deceitful questions deliberately designed to undermine his presidency -- questions that cannot be blamed on others or swept under the rug by an insincere sentence uttered at a press conference."

-- Just like at the convention, she never mentioned Donald by name but no one could mistake exactly whose "erratic and threatening" behavior she was talking about. "We need an adult in the White House," she said. "Experience matters. Preparation matters. Temperament matters. … The presidency is not an apprenticeship."

Then Michelle referenced the issues du jour from Monday's debate: "If a candidate thinks that not paying taxes makes you smart, or thinks that it's good business when people lose their homes; if a candidate regularly and flippantly makes cruel and insulting comments about women, about how we look, about how we act, well, sadly, that's who that candidate really is."

-- The first lady also passionately made the case that a vote for a third-party candidate is tantamount to a vote for Trump. There is no "perfect candidate," she said. "When I hear folks say they don't feel inspired, I have to disagree. Either Hillary Clinton or her opponent will be elected president this year. And if you vote for someone other than Hillary or if you don't vote at all, you are helping to elect Hillary's opponent."

-- The Trump campaign argued in a statement that FLOTUS's swing shows Clinton is in "panic mode" about Pennsylvania. The first lady, trying to shake a sense of urgency into a mostly college-aged audience, agreed that the election is "going to be close." She noted that Barack won Pennsylvania by about 300,000 votes, but that breaks down to 17 votes per precinct.

Watch the full, 25-minute Pittsburgh speech here:

-- In some ways, Michelle is reprising the role she played in 2008 as her husband's main emissary on college campuses. Her speeches yesterday were similar – with a few newsy sections added in – to what she said two weeks ago at George Mason University in Virginia during her solo debut on the trail.

But for someone who has been so reluctant to enter the political fray, she really is going all in. Michelle's two appearances came the same day that the Clinton campaign went up with a commercial featuring her making a direct-to-camera appeal. "Our children watch everything we do," she says. "Hillary will be a president our kids can look up to."

FLOTUS has become almost ubiquitous in the home stretch of this campaign. She is on the October covers of both InStyle and Essence magazines, for instance, and she appeared on Stephen Colbert's show last week.

-- Polls show she is popular generally but especially so with constituencies critical to Clinton's victory. Two in three American adults viewed her favorably in an August Gallup poll. In a Fox News poll last month, 54 percent of women said they felt strongly favorable toward her, with an additional 13 percent saying they felt somewhat favorable. "Between Trump's string of negative comments about women — comments the Clinton campaign has documented in a series of TV ads — and his current fight with former Miss Universe Alicia Machado, Michelle Obama's harsh words for the Republican nominee could take an already difficult situation for him and make it that much worse," my colleague Chris Cillizza writes.

-- What a difference two years make.

Yesterday morning, Barack Obama called into Steve Harvey's radio show to say this his "legacy is on the ballot" in November. "The notion somehow that, 'Well, you know, I'm not as inspired because Barack and Michelle, they're not on the ballot this time and, you know, maybe we kinda take it easy' — my legacy is on the ballot," POTUS said, repeating the phrase twice for maximum impact.

The Fix's Aaron Blake notes that Obama made a very similar point almost two years before to the day. "Make no mistake: These policies are on the ballot," he said during a speech. "Every single one of them." During the midterms, with his approval rating underwater and the battle for the Senate mostly playing out in red states, Republicans used the sound bite in dozens of commercials. Congressional Democrats grumbled. The media covered it as a gaffe.

Now that the main challenge is activating the base, some of the Democrats who were peeved two years ago want the president to say it more often and more loudly.

Guy Cecil was the executive director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee in the 2014 cycle, when vulnerable incumbents ran so far away from the president that they ultimately hurt themselves with the base. It wasn't just red states like Arkansas but purple ones like North Carolina, where many African Americans stayed home.

Cecil now runs Priorities USA, the Clinton super PAC. The group yesterday went on the air in Ohio, North Carolina and Florida with a 30-second ad built entirely around Obama's speech to the Congressional Black Caucus earlier this month, in which the president said he will "consider it a personal insult … if this community lets down its guard and fails to activate itself in this election." Watch:

WHILE YOU WERE SLEEPING:

-- Shutdown averted after a Flint compromise:  Congress staved off an Oct. 1 government shutdown by passing a stopgap spending measure after House Republicans agreed to address the drinking-wat er crisis in Michigan. From Mike DeBonis:

\* The bill extends current government funding levels until early December , giving appropriators time to negotiate 2017 spending measures.

\* It provides year-long funding for veterans programs, $1.1 billion to address the Zika virus and $500 million in emergency flood relief for Louisiana and other states.

\* The House approved the bill in a 342-85 late-night vote , hours after senators voted 77-21 to pass the measure.

\* Lawmakers have now recessed until after the Nov. 8 election.

\* "All told, the short-term spending bill was a triumph for Democrats, who were able to exact numerous concessions from Republican leaders who were determined to avoid a distracting government shutdown in the middle of campaign season. That has prompted grumbling from House conservatives, in particular, and increased GOP pressure on Mitch McConnell and Paul Ryan to draw a harder line when the stopgap expires in December."

-- Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas plans to attend the funeral for Shimon Peres in Jerusalem.Abbas made a formal request for permission to attend the funeral by sending a request to the military chief of the occupied West Bank. While Abbas has appeared at world forum alongside Israeli leaders such as Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, an appearance by Abbas at a national event, such as a state funeral in Jerusalem, is rare.

GET SMART FAST:​​

\* A teenager with a handgun opened fire at an elementary school in South Carolina, not long before authorities say they found his father shot to death in a home nearby. He shot two male students and a female teacher 40 miles west of Greenville before being quickly taken into custody. One of the students was shot in the leg and the other in the foot, while the teacher was struck in the shoulder. One of the students is in critical condition. The cops said it was not racially motivated. Everyone involved was white. (Mark Berman)

\* The Obama administration warned Russia to halt airstrikes on Aleppo, threatening to end coordinated counterterrorism talks unless Moscow suspends its operation. (Karen DeYoung)

\* A Dutch-led investigative team said Wednesday that the surface-to-air missile that downed a passenger jet over eastern Ukraine in 2014, killing all 298 people aboard, came from Russia and was fired from territory held by pro-Moscow separatists.  Investigators stopped short of directly accusing Russia of complicity in the attack on the Boeing 777 and declined to name any suspects publicly. But the briefing was seen by Russia and the West as a virtual indictment of Moscow. (Andrew Roth in Kiev)

\* Russian government hackers targeted journalists who investigated the plane crash,  according to a new analysis, defacing personal websites and posting the personal information of reporters who probed Moscow's alleged involvement in the shoot-down. (Ellen Nakashima)

\* The FBI said hackers have attempted more intrusions into voter registration databases since this summer, urging state officials to ramp up security against possible other attacks. (Matt Zapotosky)

\* A federal court struck down New Hampshire's ban on taking selfies and Snapchat pictures while in the voting booth, delivering a victory to free speech advocates and millenials across the state. (Robert Barnes)

\* Health insurance premiums for federal employees and retirees will rise an average of 6.2 percent next year. The increase corresponds roughly with the general trend for employer-sponsored health plans. (Eric Yoder)

\* The Muslim boy who was arrested after bringing a homemade clock to school is now at the center of a defamation lawsuit, after his father accused Fox News, Glenn Beck, and the city's mayor, among others, of making libelous statements about the family. The complaint alleges the defendants misled the public and further fanned "the flames of fear and anger toward Muslims and **immigrants**." (Kristine Guerra)

\* Protesters in El Cajon, Calif., gathered for a second night after an unarmed black man was fatally shot by police officers. Officers said the slain 38-year-old pulled out a vape smoking device from his pocket and was "acting erratically" in the moments leading up to his death. (LA Times)

\* The South Korean attacker who slashed U.S. Ambassador Mark Lippert last year at a breakfast forum has been sentenced to 12 years in prison for attempted murder. Officials said there was "no doubt" the man – an apparent North Korean sympathizer – intended to kill Lippert, judging by the magnitude of the attack and the size of his 10-inch knife. The man previously received a two-year sentence for lobbing a piece of concrete at the Japanese ambassador. (Anna Fifield)

\* The 22-year-old boater with Asperger's Syndrome who survived a week adrift at sea after his mother's death has become the focus of a multi-state investigation. Police are looking at the case with new eyes after it emerged that the man was also a suspect in the 2013 shooting death of his grandfather – who left a multi-million dollar estate to his four adult daughters – and made relatives so skittish they hired armed security guards to protect them in their homes. (Boston Globe)

\* A man suspected of killing two people and kidnapping another during a two-day Texas crime spree had been deported to Mexico three times in the last ten years, the feds acknowledged. **Immigration** officials said 40-year-old Juan Navarro Rios was forced out of the country "multiple times" for criminal offenses before his capture this week. (Derek Hawkins)

\* Reps. Tim Murphy and Michael Burgess helped resuscitate an unconscious, unbreathing man found on the floor of a Rayburn elevator . The Republican lawmakers performed CPR and used a defibrillator. (Politico)

\* Tyson announced a 130,000-pound chicken nugget recall after customers began finding pieces of plastic in their food. Officials said the foreign objects likely came from a piece of broken machinery in their processing plant. But still, ick. (Eater)

\* Montreal banned pitbulls, seeking to wipe out the "dangerous breed" after a 55-year-old woman was mauled to death in June. (Ben Guarino)

\* A South African marine park is desperately searching for an endangered African penguin named Buddy, after two men stole him from his enclosure and released him into the Indian Ocean. Park officials says the bird, who was raised in captivity, is likely doomed unless he can be found in the next two weeks. (Cleve R. Wootson Jr.)

GARY JOHNSON IS STILL NOT READY FOR PRIMETIME:

-- The Detroit News endorses Johnson in today's edition, backing a non-Republican candidate for the first time in its 143-year history. "We recognize the Libertarian candidate is the longest of long shots with an electorate that has been conditioned to believe only Republicans and Democrats can win major offices," the Editorial Board wrote. "But this is an endorsement of conscience, reflecting our confidence that Johnson would be a competent and capable president and an honorable one."

-- About the time their editorial posted,  Johnson had what he called another "Aleppo moment" during an MSNBC town hall with Chris Matthews. He was asked to name his favorite foreign leader – and could not come up with a single name. "I guess I'm having an Aleppo moment," the former New Mexico governor apologized sheepishly. "In the whole world!" Matthews replied, listing off countries to jog his memory. "Anybody in the world!" After a painful 50-second exchange, Johnson picked former Mexican president Vicente Fox (though he couldn't remember Fox's name), the center-right leader who has made headlines this year for being one of Trump's most vocal detractors. His running-mate, William Weld, said Angela Merkel. It was cringe-worthy. (David Weigel)

POLLING ROUNDUP:

-- An NBC News/SurveyMonkey poll finds that 52 percent of Americans thought Clinton won the debate, 21 percent thought Trump won and 26 percent thought neither of them prevailed. Clinton's performance strengthened her image among supporters – 50 percent of Democrats and Democrat-leaning voters said they now think better of her.

-- Monmouth University reports that 7 percent of voters have ended friendships over this year's divisive campaign and 70 percent agree that the election is "bringing out the worst" in people.

THE DAILY DONALD:

-- George F. Will, in a must-read column, explains why Trump's rise reflects "the decay of American conservatism": "Urban without a trace of urbanity, Trump has surrounded himself with star-struck acolytes (Mike Pence marvels at Trump's anatomical — 'broad-shouldered' — foreign policy) and hysterics (Rudy Giuliani: 'There is no next election! This is it!'). When Ferdinand VII regained Spain's throne in 1813, he vowed to end 'the disastrous mania of thinking.' Trump is America's Ferdinand. [And] the ease with which Trump has erased Republican conservatism matches the speed with which Republican leaders have normalized him. The beginning of conservative wisdom is recognition that there is an end to everything: Nothing lasts. If Trump wins, the GOP ends as a vehicle for conservatism. And a political idea without a political party is an orphan in an indifferent world."

-- Trump's "senior policy adviser" Sam Clovis said during a radio interview that voters don't care about policy and that providing them with substance would bore them "to tears." "Our approach has been to provide outlook and constructs for policy because if we go into the specific details, we just get murdered in the press. What we're dealing with [is] we're chasing minutia around," Clovis said on the Alan Colmes Show. He made clear they will never discuss specifics: "I think the American people, the American voter, will be bored to tears if that is in fact the way this thing goes. That's not what they're looking for. They're not, and we outta know better by now." (Buzzfeed)

-- Trump's "senior economic adviser" said separately that voters don't care about his unreleased tax returns and that they would think it was "smart" if he managed to shirk all federal income taxes. "Most people do not care about Mr. Trump's tax returns," Curtis Ellis said on the John Fredericks Show. "The only tax return they care about is the one they are forced and required to file on April 15, and they would rather not think about that." He continued, "If Mr. Trump did not pay any taxes one year — as Hillary Clinton tried to plant that as a fact when it was speculation — he was right. If he didn't, most people would think he's a smart guy. He knows how to get around the system because the government's only going to waste his tax dollars anyway, so I'd rather he spend that money making the casino nicer [than] giving it to these jerks." (Buzzfeed)

-- Inside Trump's totally dysfunctional debate prep, per the New York Times' Patrick Healy, Ashley Parker and Maggie Haberman: "There were nearly a dozen people preparing Mr. Trump, including the retired Army generals Michael Flynn and Keith Kellogg, neither of whom has experience in presidential debates. There were early efforts to run a more standard form of general election debate-prep camp, led by Roger Ailes, the ousted Fox News chief, at Mr. Trump's golf course in Bedminster, N.J. But Mr. Trump found it hard to focus during those meetings, according to multiple people … That left Mr. Ailes, who at the time was deeply distracted by his removal from Fox and the news media reports surrounding it, discussing his own problems as well as recounting political war stories, according to two people present for the sessions. The team had primed Mr. Trump to look for roughly a dozen key phrases and expressions Mrs. Clinton uses when she is uncertain or uncomfortable, but he did not seem to pay attention during the practice sessions, one aide said, and failed to home in on her vulnerabilities during the debate."

-- Donald is angry at allies who have conceded that he lost. From CNN's Gloria Borger, Dana Bash and Eric Bradner: "In a conference call with surrogates Wednesday afternoon, Trump aides made clear the Republican nominee is upset that his allies publicly acknowledged they pushed him to change his preparation and tactics before his next bout with Hillary Clinton. And he wants them to stop it immediately. The message was 'not subtle,' a source familiar with the call said. When Trump was told Tuesday that he should do some things differently, he responded that his approach is what his base likes. Another challenge: There are a large number of voices -- sometimes disparate -- in Trump's orbit. Two advisers said that played a big role in what they saw as Trump's lack of a laser focus on the debate and his belief beforehand that he didn't need to rely on traditional prep. Trump gravitated toward those who played to his instincts."

-- More excuses: Newt Gingrich pushed a rumor (with no evidence) that Clinton received the debate questions ahead of time, doubling down on claims of moderator bias against Trump. "This was the Holt-Clinton vs Trump debate, and you have to see it as tag-team," Gingrich told Sean Hannity last night. "And there are rumors that Hillary was actually given the questions in advance. I don't know if it's true but it would not shock me because they all operate in the same circle. They go to the same cocktail parties, they all know each other, her operatives and the news media producers on the left are all close friends, and this whole thing is a setup."

-- Another new grievance: Trump now accuses Google of tweaking its algorithm to conceal "bad news" about his opponent.

-- Trump also singled out people who were not Christian conservatives at a campaign rally in Iowa, asking the audience, "should we keep them in the room?" The comment, which Trump made in jest, came as Trump was applauding activists for supporting him. "We have our Christian Conservatives for Trump today, and they're in the room. Let's go. That's what we want. That's beautiful," Trump said, holding up a sign a pro-Trump group uses. He then asked rallygoers to raise their hands if they were Christian conservatives — before asking non-Christian conservatives to do so as well, and a few raised their hands. "Raise your hand, Christian conservatives, everybody. Raise your hand if you're not a Christian conservative. I want to see this, right. Oh, there's a couple people, that's all right," Trump said smiling, waving his hand in the air. "I think we'll keep them. Should we keep them in the room? Yes? I think so." (Jose A. DelReal)

-- Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) joked that Trump would put him in Gitmo for refusing to endorse him if he wins. The Mormon also rebuked Trump for getting into a war of words with Machado. "That's Trump being Trump," he told CNN's Manu Raju. "That's what so frustrating to have a Republican candidate whom you hope can challenge the philosophy of the Democratic candidate or their record. Instead, he's going down rabbit holes -- talking about beauty pageants. It's not surprising, he's done that all along." Flake said he's not surprised the Arizona Republic endorsed Clinton, the first time the paper's editorial board has ever backed a Democrat for president. "I don't blame them for not endorsing Donald Trump. For all the reasons I talked about before," he said. "It's tough for anyone who really thinks about what Donald Trump will do long term to the party." He reiterated that he will not vote for Clinton: "I can always write somebody in, but I can't vote for Donald Trump."

-- Trump also attacked Clinton for saying during the debate that "implicit bias is a problem for everyone." "First she calls our supporters — many of them cops, soldiers, firefighters — deplorable and irredeemable," Trump said, using two teleprompters for assistance.  "Then in our debate this week, she accuses the entire country — including all of law enforcement — of implicit bias, essentially suggesting that everyone, including our police, are basically racist and prejudiced. You heard that. And I'm standing there in front of this massive crowd of people ... And I said to myself: 'Did she really say that?' She said it. It's a bad thing she said." As Trump spoke, the crowd repeatedly booed Clinton and some shouted: "Lock her up! Lock her up!" (Jenna Johnson)

-- He's not as rich as he says. A new Forbes investigation into Trump's wealth pegs his fortune at $3.7 billion -- down $800 million from last year. From Jennifer Wang: "A softening of New York City's real estate market, particularly in retail and office, where valuations are trending down, has diminished his estimated net worth. New information was also a factor. Of the 28 assets or asset classes scrutinized … 18 declined in value, including his trademark Trump Tower on Manhattan's Fifth Avenue, his downtown jewel 40 Wall Street and Mar-a-Lago, his private beachfront club in Palm Beach." (Read more.)

-- A music store owner who was stiffed by Trump on a $100,000 piano contract recounts his experience in a Post op-ed: "I was thrilled to get a $100,000 contract from Trump," J. Michael Diehl writes. "It was one of the biggest sales I'd ever made. I asked my lawyer if I should ask for payment upfront, and he laughed. 'It's [Trump]!' he told me. 'He's got lots of money.' But when I requested payment, the Trump corporation hemmed and hawed. After a couple of months, I got a letter telling me that the casino was short on funds. They would pay 70 percent of what they owed me. There was no negotiating. I didn't know what to do — I couldn't afford to sue the Trump corporation, and I needed money to pay my piano suppliers. Losing $30,000 was a big hit to me and my family. The profit from Trump was meant to be a big part of my salary for the year. [And] I had fewer pianos in the showroom and a smaller advertising budget. Because of Trump, my store stagnated for a couple of years. It made me feel really bad, like I'd been taken advantage of. I was embarrassed. "

-- Who paid for Trump's Mexican helicopter ride? From Time's Zeke J. Miller: "A couple days after the trip to Mexico City, his campaign posted a video on YouTube showing his arrival at Los Pinos, the official residence and office of Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto. The video shows Trump step from a gleaming white Mexican Air Force helicopter that transported him from the Mexico City airport on Aug. 31. The details of who paid for the helicopter trip, however, remain shrouded in mystery, raising concerns in the capitals of Mexico and the United States. The Trump campaign's August filing with the [FEC] includes no listed reimbursement to the Mexican government for the use of the helicopter, nor any other associated costs of the trip. … The office of Peña Nieto also declined any comment on the cost of the helicopter flight, and whether there was a reimbursement." Campaign finance experts say U.S. election law likely prohibits the Mexican government from picking up the tab of Trump's helicopter flight.

TRUMP'S PROBLEM WITH WOMEN KEEPS GETTING WORSE:

-- Donald struggled to move beyond the controversy surrounding his treatment of former Miss Universe Alicia Machado, whose weight gain he publicly disparaged. He said yesterday that he actually "saved her job." From Jose DelReal: "I saved her job because they wanted to fire her for putting on so much weight," Trump told Bill O'Reilly. "And it is a beauty contest, you know. I mean, say what you want, they know what they're getting into. It's a beauty contest. And I said don't do that." He repeated the claim several times throughout the day, bemoaning that he was now being criticized for his remarks. "They wanted to fire her. I saved her job because I said that's going to be ruinous. And I've done that with a number of the other young ladies, where I've saved their job," he said. "And you know what happened? Look what I get out of it. I get nothing."

-- The Machado story continues to buzz online. While much of the chatter focused on whether or not Trump has paid federal taxes, our analytics partners at Zignal Labs report that one in ten of all Trump stories and tweets yesterday mentioned the former Miss Universe:

But what was being said about Machado depended on the the side of the political fence, or wall, from which it was coming. Right-wing sites went after the beauty queen, while women's sites and magazines rallied to her defense. This word cloud shows the range of conversation:

-- Bigger picture, this donnybrook underscores a larger issue: Trump just can't stop himself from talking about "fat poeple." From Katie Zezima and Jose A. DelReal:  "He has a serious weight problem: He can't seem to stop criticizing the girth of others. For decades, Trump has commented on other people's bodies, particularly women who he believes had gained too much weight or were, in his word, 'fat.' Trump called actress Rosie O'Donnell a 'fat pig' … He said singer Jennifer Lopez has a 'fat a—' and said reality television star Kim Kardashian had 'gotten a little large' during her pregnancy. He kept a 'fat photo' of one employee whose weight fluctuated in a drawer … [But] Trump's obsession with weight carries some irony for a candidate who boasts about his unhealthy eating habits, dining regularly on McDonald's hamburgers and buckets of KFC fried chicken on his private jet. By his own public accounting of his medical health, Trump is just five pounds shy of being considered obese under the body mass index. 'I work out on occasion … as little as possible,' Trump said at a 1997 news conference during which he mocked the weight of reporters."

-- Trump had owned the Miss Universe franchise for just months when he slammed Machado for gaining too much weight. But the episode marked only the first of many such scandals, small and large, to blow up during Trump's 19 years at the helm. From Caitlin Gibson: "Trump's reactions varied dramatically, but he rarely hesitated to put himself at the center of the action, seeming to relish a role as a moral arbiter, issuing emphatic public statements and, sometimes, final judgments. He sent one Miss USA to rehab in the middle of her reign. He fired a Miss Universe for missing too many events. A handful of lower-level contestants drew public scoldings from him; others received his benevolent public defense. None of their perceived crimes or misdemeanors had ever really posed much of a threat to the reputation of these pageants … But their sagas invariably drew ample media attention, bringing a dusty old format into the reality TV age — and offering an unusually tabloid-friendly venue for Trump to cement his tough-talking businessman image even before his reality show 'The Apprentice' debuted."

-- The backstory of Trump's weird feud with Rosie O'Donnell dates back to a monologue she delivered that got under his skin. From the New York Times' Liam Stack: "O'Donnell mocked his haircut, tousling her hair to mimic a comb-over, and put on a cartoonish Queens accent. She criticized his many bankruptcies and his record of not paying contractors … She said he was like a snake-oil salesman. Soon some of the other co-hosts joined in, to the laughter and applause of the studio audience. He threatened to sue. He unleashed a verbal fusillade on 'Entertainment Tonight,' calling Ms. O'Donnell 'disgusting' and 'a slob' with 'a fat, ugly face.' He said he wanted to take her to court so he could 'take some money out of her fat-ass pockets' and wondered aloud why anyone would choose to be in a romantic relationship with her. 'We're all a little chubby, but Rosie is just worse than most of us,' he said. 'But it's not the chubbiness. Rosie is a very unattractive person, both inside and out.'"

"In 2014, Ms. O'Donnell told People magazine that his attacks were probably the worst bullying she had experienced. 'It was national, and it was sanctioned societally. Whether I deserved it is up to your own interpretation,' she said. Mr. Trump did not let that interview pass by unremarked. Soon after, he tweeted at her, '@Rosie—No offense, and good luck on the new show, but remember, you started it!'"

-- In the spin room after Monday night's debate, Trump patted himself on the back for not bringing up Bill Clinton's infidelity. But his surrogates have no problem doing it for him.  From  Jenna Johnson : "Former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, one of Trump's closest advisers, said Hillary Clinton is 'too stupid' to be president because she appeared to not know her husband was unfaithful to her. David Bossie, Trump's deputy campaign manager, accused Clinton of being an 'enabler.' And Arkansas Attorney General Leslie Rutledge (R) questioned Hillary Clinton's treatment of women' involved with her husband. Meanwhile,  Trump's son Eric Trump said Tuesday that it 'took a lot of courage in so many regards' for his dad to 'restrain himself'  and not 'take the bait' when Clinton accused him of 'sexism' in the final minutes of the debate."

If  Eric Trump thinks that is "courage," he must not know many men and women in uniform...

-- "Trump has advocated policies that are confused or senseless … yet these don't get him into deep political trouble," NYT's Nicholas Kristof observes. "Instead, his vulnerability seems to be something more elemental: He's a jerk. Something about Trump is paradigmatic of the most atrocious kind of seventh-grade boy: The boasts about not doing homework, the habit of blaming others when things go wrong, the penchant for exaggerating everything into the best ever, the braggadocio to mask insecurity about size of hands or genitals, the biting put-downs of others, the laziness, the self-absorption … Yet if Trump's Achilles' heel proves to be not his oafish policies but rather his churlish manner, so be it. There are important policy reasons to reel at the thought of Trump in the White House, but voters perhaps flinch even more at his personal conduct: We already run into enough jerks in daily life, so why would we want one as our head of state?"

THE DAILY HILLARY:

-- Good read on why she stayed with Bill --> "Enabler or family defender? How Hillary Clinton responded to husband's accusers," by Shawn Boburg: "Hillary Rodham moved to Arkansas in 1974, and [longtime Arkansas friend Jim] Blair said rumors of Bill's womanizing were not a dealbreaker for Hillary before she agreed to marry him in 1975. 'She knew he liked attention, and he liked attention from anyone,' Blair said. 'From the barber, the shoeshine boy, the homeless man. It didn't matter.' Bill Clinton was elected governor of Arkansas in 1978 and served as attitudes were shifting about the relevance of politicians' sex lives. Not long after, Bill Clinton's then-chief of staff Betsey Wright confronted him and told him to come clean with his wife … In her treatment of the [subsequent] accusers, Trump has called Clinton an enabler. Her friends say it's much more benign. 'I think she felt that she had committed her life to this guy,' Blair said. 'They can debate politics from breakfast until bedtime and never get tired of it. She wanted to spend the rest of her life with him. She loved him. It's as simple as that.'"

-- James Comey rejected the idea the FBI would reopen its probe into Clinton's private email server, shooting down a last-ditch effort by GOP House Judiciary Committee members. "We are honest people and ... whether or not you agree with the result, this was done the way you want it to be done," the director said. (Matt Zapotosky)

-- A spokeswoman for Chelsea Clinton apologized after the former first daughter said marijuana could have possibly deadly interactions with other drugs, prompting outrage from advocates for decriminalizing the drug. "We also have anecdotal evidence now from Colorado, where some of the people who were taking marijuana for those purposes, the coroner believes, after they died, there was drug interactions with other things they were taking," Clinton told audience members at a Youngstown State town hall. A spokeswoman said she "misspoke." (Christopher Ingraham)

-- AOL founder Steve Case became the latest billionaire to endorse Clinton, praising her in a Post op-ed as someone who "represents the best choice for the United States — and our best hope to remain the most innovative and entrepreneurial nation in the world." "I am well aware that millions of people are angry about their prospects and fearful that the forces of globalization and digitization have left them behind," he acknowledged. "I also recognize many are frustrated by politics and feel we need an outsider to shake things up … But I don't think Trump is the answer."

THE BATTLEGROUNDS:

-- Los Angeles Times, "Trump could not be a worse political fit" for Colorado, by Mark Z. Barabak: "Colorado, with its recent history of swinging between parties, was expected to be one of the main battlegrounds this presidential election, its sprawling Denver suburbs the front line of door-to-door political combat. Instead, the intersection of mountain and plains has become something of an afterthought. Few states have undergone as rapid a political transformation than Colorado, which as recently as 2004 was written off by Democrats who saw no point competing for its nine electoral votes." Since then, Obama has won Colorado twice and it is Republicans who must make the case for Trump to fight on. The rising influence of Latino voters accounts for part of the change. More significant has been the state's rapid population growth. "The result has been horrendous traffic, a super-heated Denver housing market and a moderation of the state's traditional Western conservatism as the state absorbs a flood of younger, more left-leaning transplants. In many ways, Colorado could not be a worse political fit for Trump."

-- Atlanta Journal-Constitution, "With clock ticking, Kasim Reed urges Clinton campaign to pony up in Georgia," by Greg Bluestein: "With polls showing [Trump] widening his lead in Georgia, Atlanta Mayor Kasim Reed has a plea for [Clinton's] campaign: Show us the money. In an interview … he said that the Clinton campaign's six-figure investment in Georgia won't be nearly enough to turn Georgia blue. And he said the state is closer to flipping than North Carolina, where Clinton and her daughter Chelsea are visiting three times this week. Reed has long called for Clinton's campaign to pour millions into Georgia. But with the election in six weeks – and a major campaign decision slated for as early as Wednesday – Hizzoner's plea takes on a special urgency." "I see my role as being an advocate for my state," Reed said. "Georgia is going purple. It's just which cycle? It's why I'm hopeful we can get the resources that we need." On the funding required to put the state in play, he said "Democrats can't win Georgia without spending more than a million dollars."

-- Trump really is getting smoked on newspaper endorsements.Philip Bump and Cal Borchers looked through archives to figure out when the last time several conservative, anti-Trump editorial boards backed a Democrat: "The main trend worth noting is that seven of the nine newspapers listed here endorsed Mitt Romney in 2012; six of them backed John McCain in 2008. None are backing Trump this year. In five cases, the newspapers had endorsed the Republican candidate going back to at least Richard Nixon. ... There are some interesting exceptions. In 1968, the Republic couldn't decide between Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon, so it didn't endorse anyone. In 1964, the Dallas Morning News was undecided between Lyndon B. Johnson and Barry Goldwater."

-- Massachusetts is a prime example of how bad things can get for Republicans, EJ Dionne writes in his column. "The state was at the forefront of a long-term trend: the steady movement of moderate suburbanites, particularly in the Northeast, away from the Republican Party. For many of them, Barry Goldwater's right-wing candidacy in 1964 sealed the deal." Take the town of Lexington: in 1956, Eisenhower won 76 percent of the vote. In 1960, it resisted JFK; Nixon won it with 57 percent. But in 1964, Goldwater received just 31 percent. "He was simply too extreme for sober, old-fashioned Republicans. Politically, Massachusetts has never been the same since. Trump is not yet in Goldwater territory, and he might never get there. But unless the Donald of the first debate gives way to a completely different version, he threatens to create another GOP suburban catastrophe pretty much everywhere outside the Deep South. If Trump doesn't adjust, many of the party's enablers will soon have to realize that their best survival strategy is to run as far away from him as possible."

-- "Ted Cruz wants to be a senator again," Paul Kane reports. "The Texas Republican, four months after withdrawing from the Republican presidential primary, has spent the past few weeks with his head down going about his work -- relatively quietly, at least, by the standard he set in his first three years in the Senate. He's trying to round up support for an Internet freedom bill, deferring to colleagues at press conferences and shepherding bipartisan legislation to help his hometown of Houston's space industry. He's even hosting fundraisers next week for Republican colleagues who publicly derided his penchant for picking what they thought were losing fights with [Obama]. Having spent most of 2015 and 2016 on the trail, Cruz is finally tasting the Senate majority and fears what Democrats would do if they reclaim control post-November. 'I think early on Ted was more interested in standing out, exclusively,' said Sen. Lindsey Graham. 'Now … he also likes the fact that he can collaborate and be helpful.'"

WAPO HIGHLIGHTS:

-- "Before Duterte was the Philippines' president, he was 'the Death Squad mayor,'" by Emily Rauhala: "Since taking power in Manila, [Rodrigo] Duterte has made international headlines for all the wrong reasons. His call to 'kill all' the country's criminals has unleashed an extraordinary wave of violence, with police fatally shooting more than a thousand suspects, and plainclothes assassins dumping an even greater number of bodies on the streets. When President Obama raised the issue, Duterte lectured him about U.S. colonialism and used a slang term that translates, roughly, as 'son of whore.' When a longtime Duterte critic, Sen. Leila de Lima, opened a Senate investigation on extrajudicial killing, he publicly urged her to hang herself. When she presented a witness who claimed that he killed for Duterte … once feeding a man to a crocodile, she was ousted from her role as chair of the Senate Committee on Justice and Human Rights. [And] as the political class falls in line, the cost of crossing him grows. 'The truth is, I'm not safe,' she said."

-- "Darkness and fear in Aleppo as the bombs rain down," by Liz Sly and Louisa Loveluck: "The bombings at night are the worst. There is no electricity in the rebel-held portion of eastern Aleppo, and the warplanes flying overhead target any light piercing the blackness beneath. Entire families sleep in one room, because they prefer to die together than to create orphans, widows or bereaved parents. Such is the tenor of life in rebel-held Aleppo, which had become accustomed to regular airstrikes in the four years … but nothing like the intensity of the past week.  At least 1,700 bombs struck eastern Aleppo in the first week after the cease-fire's collapse, according to the White Helmets civil defense group … Still, they keep raining down, with new bunker-buster bombs designed to be used against military installations blasting apartment buildings that house families. Shaban, who is 33 … spends the evenings sitting in the dark with his new wife, listening to the bombs. They talk about their fears.  She is afraid of becoming pregnant, he said, and of bringing a child into the world in which they live."

SOCIAL MEDIA SPEED READ:

The New Yorker's new cover:

The official account for the Republican Party of Florida tweeted out a link to a bogus story on InfoWars, a fringe web site best known for its insistence that 9/11 was an inside job. It's still up as of this morning. Clearly Jeb Bush and Co. are not at the wheel any more...

The picture with Donald Trump Jr.'s now-infamous "Skittles tweet" has been removed. David Kittos, the British-based photographer who took the photo and who also left Cyprus as a refugee when he was 6 years old, has filed a copyright claim over the tweet.

"We have the smartest people," Trump said repeatedly yesterday.

A scene from Trump's Iowa rally:

Meanwhile, Ted Cruz -- in tuxedo -- appeared with Reince Priebus and other GOP heavies at the American Enterprise Institute annual gala:

Newt Gingrich carried water for Trump in his continuing attacks on a former Miss Universe:

Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) suggested that Trump be forced to weigh in publicly so he too could be fat-shamed:

Dana Perino doesn't think the discussion is helpful:

There's also this:

Meanwhile, over in Clinton world, Juanita Broaddrick had quite a tweetstorm, calling Bill Clinton "probably" a sexual predator:

A day-in-the-life of a campaign reporter:

Breitbart, which is run by the CEO of Trump's campaign, is lashing out in a deeply personal way against our colleague Anne Applebaum. The site called her a "Polish, Jewish, American elitist":

Here's an odd photo post from Cheri Bustos -- that's got to be Debbie Dingell:

Did you celebrate National #DrinkaBeer Day?

GOOD READS FROM ELSEWHERE:

-- New York Times, "Baltimore vs. Marilyn Mosby," by Wil S. Hylton:  Over the last year and a half, the halo around Baltimore's state attorney Marilyn Mosby has faded as her office failed to convict any of the police officers charged in Freddie Gray's 2015 death. "She is now being sued for defamation by five of the officers she indicted and has become a go-to grievance for the voluble right, being subject to more or less constant assault on the conservative airwaves, accused of criminal misconduct by [Trump] and featured on the cover of the police magazine Frontline under the headline 'The Wolf That Lurks' … Still, in the case of Freddie Gray, the uncomfortable truth remains that if, like Mosby, you believe that a man was killed by police negligence, you must also accept that the officers accused of killing him went free. The question that lingers around Mosby, then, is really one of shading: whether the failure to convict was a result of her own mistakes or of the larger forces arrayed against her. Whether, that is, the fatal error was personal or systemic, whether it was pride or destiny that stopped her, whether the tragedy is Shakespearean or Greek …"

-- Buzzfeed, "The Plan To Save Capitalism From Donald Trump," by Ben Smith: "At a private gathering of wealthy Republicans this June, a banker named Edward Conard made a radical proposal: To save capitalism from [Trump], American business leaders would need to abandon old allies and make an 'odious' new deal with low-wage workers. His solution was — to the audience — hair-raisingly radical in its simplicity. It was a kind of roadmap for one future of the Republican Party, assuming the party (or at least the Wall Street wing of it) survives Trump. His plan requires replacing the religious right in the Republican coalition with the new populists, and mollifying them with new restrictions on trade and **immigration** — all in exchange for the holy grail of lower marginal tax rates. Conard argued that capitalism needs new allies, and the new demographic would have to be the working class white voters leading the populist takeover of his party, a condition viewed in Utah with the pain and forbearance with which you talk about a close relative who has cancer. Conard called the disease 'Trumpism.'"

-- Politico, " Bill Clinton's unfinished business in Israel ," by Michael Crowley: "In January 2003, Bill Clinton attended the 80th birthday of former Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres, his friend and partner in pursuit of Middle East peace during the 1990s. Onstage at a gala celebration in Israel, a twinkly-eyed Clinton sang along with a teenage pop star to John Lennon's homage to world peace, 'Imagine.' In the closing months of his presidency, Clinton came closer than any other president to a peace deal between Israel and the Palestinians. Associates say he has long been haunted by his inability to finish a process that Peres helped to start in the early 1990s, one that led Clinton to pronounce himself 'a failure.' Moreover, many believe that Clinton hasn't given up his idealistic dream for peace, despite a growing global consensus that the peace broken is broken—perhaps beyond repair. Some even assume that Clinton … has thought about throwing another harpoon at his elusive white whale should his wife become the next president …"

-- Bloomberg, " The Computer Voting Revolution Is Already Crappy, Buggy, and Obsolete ," by Michael Riley, Jordan Robertson, and David Kocieniewski: "For the members of Congress, who in 2002 provided almost $4 billion to modernize voting technology … this probably wasn't the result they had in mind. But voting by computer has been a technological answer in search of a problem. Those World War II-era pull-lever voting machines may not have been the most elegant of contraptions, but they were easy to use and didn't crash." Georgia, which in 2002 set out to be an early national model for computerized voting, shows the unintended consequences: it spent $54 million to buy 20,000 touchscreen voting machines – and today, the machines are past their expected life span of 10 years. "After California declared almost all of the electronic voting machines in the state unfit for use … San Diego County put its decertified machines in storage. It has been paying the bill to warehouse them ever since: No one wants to buy them, and county rules prohibit throwing millions of dollars' worth of machines in the trash bin."

"[Now], the muddle is about to collide head-on with one of the most incendiary presidential campaigns in modern U.S. history. The real threat isn't a thrown election. Rather, the risk is a violation of trust: that Election Day mishaps borne of outdated, poorly engineered technology will confirm and amplify the fear pervading this campaign."

DAYBOOK:

On the campaign trail: Trump campaigns in Bedford, N.H.; Pence is in York, Pa. Clinton campaigns in Des Moines, Iowa.

At the White House: Obama and Biden attend a visit of the U.S. Olympic and Paralymic teams in the East Room. Later, Biden tapes an interivew with Jimmy Fallon and speaks at a DSCC event. Obama departs Washington for Jerusalem.

On Capitol Hill: The Senate meets at 10 a.m. to consider the Gold Star Families Voices Act.

NEWS YOU CAN USE IF YOU LIVE IN D.C.:

-- Yet another day of storms ahead! The Capital Weather Gang forecasts: "Waves of heavy rain and the rumble of thunder are likely to persist through the day. Areas of flooding are certainly possible although it's difficult to pinpoint where and when. In between bouts of rain, some dry intervals and brightening skies are possible. Day time rain amounts of 1-3 inches are likely with locally higher and lower amounts."

-- The Nationals lost to the Arizona Diamondbacks , 3-0.

-- Alarming: Metro police are investigating a kidnapping incident after a woman was nabbed while waiting for her bus to arrive in Petworth. The perpetrators forced the woman to take them to her Hyattsville apartment, where they proceeded to steal valuables and cash. (Faiz Siddiqui)

-- "' Poster child for bigotry': Howard County Sheriff is accused of racism in a county renowned for tolerance ," by Michael E. Miller: "When Money Magazine named Columbia, Md., the 'best place to live' in America earlier this month, it splashed a glossy photo of a smiling local black family on its cover. 'Why we love it,' the publication gushed: 'A planned community that prizes economic and social diversity.' Before the issue could even hit newsstands, however, another report threatened to paint a very different picture of the place. Black sheriff's deputies 'are not too smart, but they get the job done.' 'There's no watermelon there for you!' 'Are you getting the chicken special?' These are a few of the "negative comments, gestures, and/or derogatory epithets against African-Americans' allegedly made by Howard County Sheriff James F. Fitzgerald, according to a [county investigation] .... The report also detailed sexist and anti-Semitic remarks by Fitzgerald, who allegedly referred to former county executive Ken Ulman (D) as 'little Kenny Jew-boy.' The report has shaken a community renowned for its racial tolerance and inclusivity."

-- "Tampon tax" activists testified before the D.C. Council yesterday, urging members to phase out a sales tax on diapers, tampons and pads across the city. Some speakers argued that taxes on feminine hygiene products were like a "tax for being a woman," saying that jurisdictions should not classify them as "luxury goods." The push comes after three states – Illinois, Connecticut and New York – repealed tampon taxes earlier this year. (Fenit Nirappil)

VIDEOS OF THE DAY:

The Daily Show took a fun look at what it is like to be a fact checker this election cycle, featuring our colleague Glenn Kessler -- watch the segment here.

Starting this weekend, Alec Baldwin will play the role of Trump on "Saturday Night Live." Here's a teaser from NBC:

This will be quite an event to watch -- Clinton and Mary J. Blige:

Trump has a long history of over promising and under delivering. Here's a video with nine of the things that Donald has promised to do on his first day in office:

The Clinton campaign is out with a new video of all the things Trump "did not say" from the debate:

Seth Meyers pretended to moderate a presidential debate:

On Conan O'Brien, Sharon Osbourne talked about Trump:

Obama explained why he won't say "radical Islamic terrorism":

This archived footage shows Trump with Alicia Machado during her reign as Miss Universe:

More brain freeze moments from the not-ready-for-primetime Gary Johnson:

Sen. Steve Daines (R-Mont.) hung out with his fellow GOP freshmen:

Tim Tebow made his baseball debut as a New York Mets prospect – and hit a home run on his very first at bar. Also on display was the Heisman winner-turned-instructional-league player's trademark humility: "I'm just getting a little bit better every day," he said afterwards. (Cindy Boren)

Finally, check out this hilarious moment from a Yankees game:

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's presidential campaign fired its Virginia state co-chairman, Corey Stewart, on Monday after he took part in a protest in front of Republican National Committee headquarters, a move with repercussions in both the national campaign and the 2017 governor's race.

The messy parting of ways came just weeks before the election and was the latest sign of turmoil in a campaign that has recently been in a free-fall. Stewart and senior Trump campaign officials blamed each other for problems in Virginia, where polls show Democrat Hillary Clinton leads comfortably.

"Former Virginia State Chairman Corey Stewart is no longer affiliated with the Donald J. Trump for President campaign," said Trump's deputy campaign manager, David Bossie, in a statement. "He is being replaced, effective immediately. Corey made this decision when he staged a stunt in front of the RNCwithout the knowledge or the approval of the Trump campaign."

Stewart acknowledged that he was let go for supporting the rally in front of RNC headquarters in the District, which was aimed at warning the national party against abandoning Trump. He said he did not organize the rally but wholeheartedly backed it and helped spread the word about it.

Shortly before the rally began, Bossie texted, warning him to stop the rally, Stewart said.

"He threatened me," Stewart said. "I let everybody know he was threatening me. They said, 'there are going to be dire consequences' unless I shut down the rally."

Stewart said he did not respond to the message but knew that it meant that he would be fired if he went forward with his plans. He went ahead to make his point, that establishment Republicans — he referred to them at the event and on Facebook as "establishment pukes" — were trying to undermine Trump.

Stewart said he never heard back from the campaign afterward and only learned from a media report that he had been fired.

"I wanted to call them out and, look, there's not a lot of time left," Stewart said. "The truth needs to be told. Paul Ryan, the Mitt Romneys, the Reince Priebuses, they don't want Trump to win. They're sabotaging the campaign."

Stewart was the only prominent Virginia Republican to defend Trump after the release last week of a video in which the presidential candidate made lewd remarks about women. Trump "acted like a frat boy, as a lot of guys do," he said at the time.

Stewart complained that money raised by Republicans in Virginia was spent by the RNC on down-ticket races in other states.

"We've been raising money in Virginia for Trump, and the RNC has broken all its promises to help its campaign in Virginia because Virginia doesn't have any critical down-ticket races," he said.

The RNC chairman, Reince Priebus, pledged complete loyalty to Trump in a Monday conference call with RNC members and swatted down rumors the national party was redirecting its resources to down-ballot races, according to a person on the call.

"We're putting together a very strong effort in Virginia. Clearly, Mr. Stewart was more concerned about his own personal agenda than the campaign of Mr. Trump," said Trump spokesman Jason Miller.

Stewart said he will continue to support Trump, blaming Bossie for his firing and for what Stewart described as Trump's waning fortunes in Virginia.

"David Bossie's been a real problem," Stewart said. Bossie "basically refused to support the efforts in Virginia. I can say this now because I'm not a member of the campaign anymore."

Stewart claimed the campaign "invested nothing in Virginia. We couldn't even get signs. We couldn't get literature to go door knocking with until recently."

Stewart originally served as Trump's campaign chairman, while John Fredericks, a conservative Virginia radio host, was vice chairman. A few weeks ago, the titles changed so that Stewart and Fredericks were both identified as co-chairs.

"I will continue in the role as co-chairman and spokesperson of the Trump campaign in Virginia as of right now," Fredericks said. "No decision has been made at this time."

Fredericks said Stewart had participated in the rally to boost his own profile ahead of his gubernatorial bid in Virginia next year — despite warning that he risked further alienating establishment Republicans from Trump.

"Behavior like we saw today with this protest is simply counter to winning Virginia's 13 electoral votes," Fredericks said. "It didn't gain us one vote. It's alienating people. It makes no sense."

The Trump campaign has struggled to implement an effective ground game in key swing states such as Virginia. The responsibility had largely fallen on the RNC. Compared with the Democrats, the Republicans have been slower to open up field offices across the country.

With his actions Monday, Stewart could endear himself to conservative Republicans as he seeks his party's nomination for governor in 2017. But the strategy is not without risks, particularly since the GOP has decided to pick its nominee in a statewide primary, which tends to favor more moderate candidates, instead of a closed convention.

As the elected chairman of the Prince William Board of County Supervisors, Stewart drew national attention a decade ago promoting a crackdown on undocumented **immigrants**, a policy that presaged the tempest caused by Trump's own anti- **immigrant** barbs. At his urging, Prince William authorized police officers to check the **immigration** status of anyone they detained. After a public uproar, the county watered down the policy so that an **immigration** check would be done only after an arrest.

"I was Trump before Trump was Trump," Stewart has frequently boasted.

In June, Stewart wholeheartedly backed Trump's racially tinged criticism of a federal judge presiding over a fraud case against the now-defunct Trump University, even as some leading Republicans condemned Trump's comments.

Stewart was the rare Virginia Republican willing to back Trump well before the real estate mogul locked up the nomination, with other elected officials staying neutral in the primary or backing other contenders. They seemed well suited to each other, both of them blunt-talking foes of illegal **immigration**. But at times, Stewart's rhetoric pushed the limits even for Team Trump.

In July, Trump's campaign disavowed comments Stewart made on Facebook, which placed responsibility for a police massacre in Dallas on Clinton and another Democrat, Virginia Lt. Gov. Ralph Northam. Like Stewart, Northam is running for governor in 2017.

sean.sullivan@washpost.com

laura.vozzella@washpost.com

Philip Rucker and Robert Costa contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Among the wealthy donors seeking to influence this year's presidential election, billionaire entertainment investor Haim Saban stands apart.

Not only have he and his wife lavished $10 million on a ­pro-Hillary Clinton super PAC, but Saban is also majority owner and chairman of Univision, which runs the country's most-watched Spanish-language television network and reaches a large share of a key voting bloc.

So when Saban asked last year to speak to top campaign officials, shortly after Donald Trump had described Mexican **immigrants** as rapists and drug dealers in his presidential announcement speech, he immediately got their attention.

"Haim thinks we are under reacting to Trump/Hispanics," campaign chairman John Podesta wrote to top campaign aides after speaking with Saban, according to hacked emails posted by WikiLeaks. "Thinks we can get something by standing up for Latinos or attacking R's for not condemning."

The campaign's vice chair, Huma Abedin, wrote that Saban had called her, as well, concluding, "If Haim is raising it, it means he's hearing it from his Univisioncolleagues."

The emails reveal how a major donor had access to the highest levels of the Clinton campaign and was able to press top aides about an issue of major interest to his company. At the time, Trump's rhetoric on illegal **immigration** was garnering extensive coverage on Univision's news programs.

In a statement, Saban said he separates his roles of Clinton supporter and media owner.

"As an **immigrant** myself, I am appalled by Mr. Trump's disturbing, un-American and non-inclusive stance," said Saban, who grew up in Israel. "I've been a supporter of Hillary Clinton and the Democratic Party long before my affiliation with Univision, and one thing has nothing to do with the other."

Daniel Coronell, president of Univision News, said Monday that Univision News is editorially independent from the parent company, Univision Communications.

"Mr. Saban has always respected that independence and has never tried to get involved or made any requests to our news division," he said.

The messages from Saban were part of a cache of correspondence apparently obtained from Podesta's private emails. U.S. intelligence officials have blamed previous hacks of political organizations on the Russian government, including stolen Democratic National Committee emails published over the summer by WikiLeaks. According to WikiLeaks' Twitter feed, the organization released 2,086 emails Monday hacked from Podesta, adding to 2,050 that were released Friday.

The Clinton campaign has refused to authenticate individual emails, warning that Russian hackers have a history of doctoring stolen emails. Clinton seemed to confirm the legitimacy of the WikiLeaks documents in Sunday night's debate when she answered a question about an email regarding her paid speeches.

In response for a request for comment about the Saban emails, Clinton campaign spokesman Glen Caplin noted that the Trump campaign was touting the release of the latest hack.

"It is absolutely disgraceful that the Trump campaign is cheering on a release today engineered by Vladimir Putin to interfere in this election," Caplin said.

The emails show that Saban's calls to Clinton officials spurred them into action.

"Haim is right — we should be jamming this all the time," responded communications director Jennifer Palmieri, looping in her deputies. "Can we think about what else we should do? Issue a broader challenge?"

The staff then developed plans about how to push more aggressively on the issue of Trump's remarks — including by possibly having Clinton do interviews on Univision television and radio, the emails show.

A month later, the former secretary of state sat down for an interview with Univision anchor Maria Elena Salinas.

In another exchange, Saban forwarded an email from Lionsgate Co-Chairman Rob Friedman, who had written the Univision chairman to praise a Democratic debate hosted by Univision and The Washington Post in March.

Friedman called the moderators "thoughtful, tough and incisive," adding: "I thought it made Hilary appear direct and strong in her resolve. I felt it advanced our candidate. Thanks for Univision."

Saban forwarded the note to Podesta and other top campaign officials, writing: "Ok. I like this one."

But Saban also indicated in the emails that he took a hands-off approach to the network. In an Aug. 23, 2015, email to Abedin, he noted that a story on a conservative blog described "Univision's pro-Hillary boosterism."

"I have nothing to do with it," he wrote. "i NEVER tell our news dep. What to cover.,,,unlike some of my peers."

WikiLeaks has indicated that it holds more than 50,000 emails from Podesta, raising the possibility that releases may continue on a near-daily basis until Election Day.

Other emails released Monday show interoffice sniping among Clinton allies, including a 2011 email in which a key aide to former president Bill Clinton said daughter Chelsea Clinton was "acting like a spoiled brat kid."

Another email shows Clinton's staff dramatically understating the importance of the news that she had used a private email account while secretary of state, after the New York Times revealed the information in March 2015. Clinton's aides discussed the possibility that she would appear on a panel moderated by comedian Larry Wilmore at a Clinton Global Initiative event and make a statement about the emails.

"It would be just light-hearted enough while giving her the opportunity to address this seriously, be a little conciliatory as discussed," the aide wrote. "Goal would be to cauterize this just enough so it plays out over the weekend and dies in the short term."

Clinton did not appear at the session, and her campaign continues to grapple with the email issue nearly 18 months later.

matea.gold@washpost.com

rosalind.helderman@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A decision Monday by House Speaker Paul D. Ryan to not campaign with or defend Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump through the November election sparked a public feud with his party's standard-bearer within a matter of hours, suggesting that a widening split within the GOP could reverberate long after the presidential race is decided.

Ryan's move — and a blunt assessment of the race that he and other congressional leaders delivered during a conference call with House GOP lawmakers Monday morning — underscored the perilous choice Republican officials now face in the wake of Friday's release of a 2005 videotape in which Trump made lewd comments about women:

They can remain in line with their nominee, which would please their base but could alienate swing voters critical to maintaining their hold on Congress. Or they could renounce Trump and offend Republicans eager for a direct confrontation with Hillary Clinton and her husband.

For his part, the speaker — who canceled an appearance with Trump after the videotape surfaced Friday — did neither. He won't publicly campaign with Trump, but he also did not rescind his endorsement of his party's controversial nominee or back away from his pledge to vote for him.

One GOP lawmaker said Ryan (R-Wis.) was confronted on the call by at least a half-dozen members from districts ranging from California to Ohio who bristled at any attempt to distance the party from Trump.

"He got huge pushback like I've never seen before from members from across the country just saying that was the wrong move — and even if it cost them the House," said one lawmaker on the call who spoke on the condition of anonymity to candidly describe the private discussion.

Late in the call, after several members had criticized GOP leaders, Ryan got back on the line to assure them that he was not planning to rescind his endorsement. But that appeared to do little to assure the pro-Trump contingent.

"A number of people said: You can't have it both ways. You've either got to get out and be wholly supportive . . . or it really doesn't matter," the GOP lawmaker said.

The lawmaker, who represents a safe Republican district where Trump is popular, told The Washington Post that he had heard much the same from his own constituents: "They're just so fed up with Washington, D.C., that all the rest of this stuff is a side point. . . . They're willing to overlook a whole lot to try to take back the country."

But Rep. Charlie Dent — a moderate who does not support Trump — also spoke up on the call, saying, "Our nominee should step aside, though I realize it is probably logistically impractical at this moment."

Dent said he warned his fellow Republicans: "Does anyone on the call not think there are worse revelations to come? I would be shocked if there were not more revelations, and what's our plan when the next one hits?"

Trump lashed out at Ryan on Monday, tweeting that the speaker "should spend more time on balancing the budget, jobs and illegal **immigration** and not waste his time on fighting Republican nominee." Within a matter of minutes, more than 6,300 people had favorited the tweet.

Paul Ryan should spend more time on balancing the budget, jobs and illegal **immigration** and not waste his time on fighting Republican nominee

The widening chasm between GOP establishment leaders and Trump, who is now emboldened given his assertive debate performance Sunday night, has moved the party into uncharted territory in the final weeks of an already volatile and unpredictable presidential contest. Trump's running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, and his campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, took to the airwaves Monday to make it clear that Trump intends to remain on the offensive for the duration of the campaign. And Trump's senior communications adviser, Jason Miller, tweeted that "nothing's changed" after the congressional call, because his candidate has always been a Washington outsider.

Re: today's Congressional call: Nothing's changed. Mr. Trump's campaign has always been powered by a grassroots movement, not Washington. — Jason Miller (@JasonMillerinDC) October 10, 2016

And in an interview Monday, former House speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), a close ally of Trump's, said his performance would make it more difficult for Republicans to abandon him. "They've really raised the ante on Republicans who want to cut and run," he said. "How can you have watched that debate without knowing he won?"

Some Republican lawmakers, such as Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (Calif.), questioned during the conference call Monday why GOP leaders hesitate to back Trump, citing Clinton's weakness as a candidate.

In an email Monday, Ryan spokeswoman AshLee Strong said that "there is no update on [the speaker's] position at this time" in regards to endorsing Trump. But she added, "The speaker is going to spend the next month focused entirely on protecting our congressional majorities."

In withdrawing his public support from Trump, Ryan is essentially giving other Republican lawmakers license to do the same if they oppose Trump's statements and are concerned about their reelection chances. After the 2005 video emerged, Ryan said he was "disgusted" by Trump's comments but did not withdraw his support.

"You all need to do what's best for you and your district," Ryan said on the conference call, according to two participants who spoke anonymously because of the private nature of the call.

With this move, Ryan at least partially joined a growing group of high-profile Republican lawmakers who have renounced their support of Trump following the disclosure Friday by The Post of an 11-year-old videotape of the businessman talking casually about kissing and groping women. That group includes Sens. Kelly Ayotte (N.H.) and John McCain (Ariz.), both in tough reelection races, and Rep. Jason Chaffetz (Utah).

Republicans who participated in the post-debate conference call Monday morning are becoming increasingly worried about their chances of holding on to their 30-seat House majority as Trump lags dangerously behind Clinton in the polls. One described the tone of the call as "nervous."

An NBC News-Wall Street Journal survey released Monday showed Trump taking a big dip after the release of the videotape, with Clinton leading Trump by double digits among likely voters, 46 percent to 35 percent, in a four-way contest. Democrats had a seven-point lead on the question of which party voters would like to see control Congress.

Rep. Greg Walden (R-Ore.), chairman of the House GOP campaign arm, briefed lawmakers on the House battlegrounds, warning that the "ground is shifting," according to a lawmaker on the call. Walden said that Republicans should continue to poll their races and that winning would be equivalent to "landing an airplane in a hurricane: You have to trust the instruments."

The speaker plans to spend the next month, he told lawmakers on the conference call, "only campaigning for House seats and not . . . to promote or defend Trump," according to a GOP lawmaker. Ryan plans to campaign in 17 states and 42 cities in October to help preserve his majority.

One member who spoke out during the call -- Rep. Bill Johnson (R-Ohio), a low-key lawmaker who represents struggling industrial areas along the eastern Ohio River -- issued a statement late Monday saying he would "continue to support the top of our Republican ticket" while also saying he would "continue to admire and support Speaker Ryan's leadership in a very challenging time."

"I am a husband, father of two daughters, and I have four granddaughters," he said. "And, while I find Donald Trump's locker room comments from ten years ago offensive, indefensible and regrettable, they don't change the fact that Hillary Clinton has proven she'll put personal politics over our national security.

The House GOP call was an opportunity for members to check in after a chaotic weekend in which dozens of GOP lawmakers revoked their support for Trump after the release of the video. Lawmakers spent the weekend fielding a barrage of questions about their support for Trump, without any formal guidance from party leaders.

Ryan typically holds weekly sessions for his members, referring to the confabs as "family meetings" where members are invited to speak their minds. The meetings have become a mainstay for a House GOP that has been plagued by infighting and crises for more than a year.

Pence made his first campaign appearance since news of the videotape had broken, telling a group in Charlotte on Monday that it had been "an interesting few days." He lauded Trump for apologizing during the debate for his vulgar remarks about forcing himself on women in 2005.

"It takes a big man to know when he's wrong and admit it," said Pence, adding, "Donald Trump last night showed that he's a big man."

The governor also brought up his Christian faith in his explanation of why he continues to stand by Trump, saying he believes in "grace" and "forgiveness."

Pence made a similar pitch Monday while speaking on Fox News Channel's "Fox and Friends," even as he made clear that his former colleagues in Congress should remember that voters, rather than elected officials, will determine who succeeds President Obama.

"My hope is that people across the country, including elected officials, believe in redemption as much as I do," he said. "I'm happy to talk to any of my friends in leadership. But really, this election is really in the hands of the American people."

Democrats suggested that any effort by Republicans to distance themselves from their nominee at this point in the race would not shield them from the repercussions of his candidacy this fall.

"I understand why they're doing that, but Paul Ryan and other leaders in the Republican Party — there was a time where they could have spoken out. That time was this summer. And obviously it's too late now," Clinton communications director Jennifer Palmieri told reporters aboard the campaign's plane Monday while en route to Detroit. "Somewhat of a civil war is breaking out in the Republican Party, but I think that Donald Trump didn't become the nominee of his party on his own. These leaders help legitimize him and I think they have a lot to answer for, and the voters, I imagine, will hold them accountable."

And even as the actions Trump described in the 2005 videotape continued to spark renewed controversy this week, Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) told a reporter from the Weekly Standard that when it came to Trump's allusions to forcibly kissing women and grabbing them by their genitals, " I don't characterize that as sexual assault."

After someone tweeted in response that Sessions's comments were akin to when then-Rep. Todd Akin (R-Mo.) torpedoed his 2012 Senate bid to unseat Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) by referring to "legitimate rape," McCaskill said that was "not fair to Todd Akin."

That's not fair to Todd Akin. No comparison. This much worse. https://t.co/3a9EYqkoKT[https://t.co/3a9EYqkoKT]

Paul Kane in Washington, Philip Rucker in St. Louis, Sean Sullivan in Charlotte and John Wagner in Detroit contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The question came from a member of the audience. It was rather politely phrased.

A woman who identified herself as one of the nation's 3.3 million Muslims stood and asked Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump what he would do to help people like her after an election in which people like her have been labeled a "threat." Islamophobia is on the rise, the woman said.

What she did not mention, but the moderators did, is that Trump is the candidate in the race who proposed a temporary ban on all Muslim **immigration** and then modified that to a ban on all **immigration** from countries with a history of terrorist activity. He has repeatedly described the more than 4.7 million Syrian refugees set adrift in the world by conflict in that country as mysteriously rich in "big strong men," and a "Trojan horse," through which terrorists will enter the United States. In answering the woman's question, he did it again.

But here is the thing. The essence of what Trump said in response to this woman's question is worth noting because it was itself full of the kind of ideas and suppositions which fuel Islamophobia. His comments were riddled with false information, a reference to an act of terrorism perpetrated by an American-born Muslim man and his wife who was neither Syrian nor admitted to the United States as a refugee. And before he was done, Trump described himself as the only candidate with a simple solution to a complex challenge: He would resolve the problem — which problem, it's not clear — by using the right language. He would say the words, "radical Islamic terror."

This is the heart of what Trump said, from a transcript of the debate:

QUESTION: Hi. There are 3.3 million Muslims in the United States, and I'm one of them. You've mentioned working with Muslim nations, but with Islamophobia on the rise, how will you help people like me deal with the consequences of being labeled as a threat to the country after the election is over?

It was, in many ways, no worse than the moment that a black man stood and asked Trump if he could be a devoted president to all Americans and Trump prattled on about what he would do to repair the nation's war zone-like inner cities and what he would do for "the Latinos," and "the Hispanics," but made no mention at all of what he might do to develop an understanding of nonwhite Americans that is not built on stereotypes and other politically convenient fictions.

And it was much like the moment when Trump responded to the very first debate question about the candidate's ability to demonstrate "appropriate behavior" by answering a different question, then shortly thereafter pivoting to mentions of Bill Clinton's infidelity and sexual misconduct and crimes of which Clinton has been accused.

In a debate in which most professional political watchers had described the most critical thing Trump could do as demonstrate contrition, it was fairly clear he'd opted against their advice.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Pretend that you're an **alien** in a spacecraft above Earth. You are looking down and watching the pulse of planet Earth. The breath, the respiration."

That's what Elizabeth Cottrell, a research geologist at the National Museum of Natural History and the director of its Global Volcanism Program, imagines when she looks at a new visualization of Earth's eruptions, earthquakes and gas emissions. As she rotates the globe with a click of her mouse, blue dots signifying tremors and red triangles for volcanoes flare up and fade away, carving the planet's surface in predictable patterns. The animation emits a "ping" with each earthshaking event.

"You are looking at what we believe are all the volcanic eruptions that have occurred on our planet in the last 50-plus years, and all the earthquakes," Cottrell says. "And starting in 1978 with the launch of UV active satellites, you are seeing all the sulfur dioxide emissions from the volcanoes."

The data for the animation comes from Cottrell's program and the U.S. Geological Survey, as well as remote sensing satellites operated by NASA. According to Cottrell, the "E3 App" (three "E"s for eruptions, earthquakes and emissions) is the first visualization to consolidate all three data sets.

"That's where the scientific power of a database like this comes in," she said. "Because  you can start to look at the correlations."

For example, researchers who attempt to develop methods for forecasting quakes and volcanic eruptions might look at the app and find patterns that are difficult to recognize when looking at plain old numbers on a page. Forms of tectonic activity are almost always linked — earthquakes can trigger eruptions; movement of magma to the surface will send tremors through the Earth; some erupting volcanoes spew out huge plumes of sulfur and carbon, while others quietly belch gases all the time. The visualization aims to highlight links between the different phenomena that could prompt research on earthquake intervals, eruption size, tsunami probabilities and other characteristics of these events.

Findings from the Deep Carbon Observatory, a global research program aimed at understanding the way carbon cycles through the Earth, suggest that measuring the ratio of gas to carbon around volcanoes could help predict when they will erupt.

"Potentially, we can now see an eruption coming just by looking at gas emissions," geochemist J. Maarten de Moor, the lead author of a new study in the Journal of Geophysical Research, said in a statement.

Not shown on the app are years of data on quakes and eruptions before 1960, which the Global Volcanism Program has been collecting for almost 50 years. Using scientific observations, witness testimony, historical accounts and information from the geologic record, they are trying build a database of the planet's volcanic and earthquake activity since the beginning of the Holocene Epoch some 10,000 years ago.

It's a no simple task. Volcanic eruptions spew lava everywhere, creating a telltale rock signature that makes it easy for researchers to figure out when and where the outburst happened, even millennia after the fact. But earthquakes may shudder through the ground without leaving a lasting mark, and gas emissions can be as ephemeral as a cloud.

Identifying the links between the three E's could help Cottrell and her colleagues reconstruct what may have been happening in the ground and the atmosphere as prehistoric volcanoes erupted.

But beyond all the scientific applications, "It's just so cool," Cottrell gushed.

From the ground, it's easy to think of earthquakes and eruptions as dangerous, destructive and inimical to life. And it's true that these phenomena can be disastrous for the people who live through them. But tectonic activity is also part of what makes our planet habitable, according to Cottrell. It's a sign of the internal dynamo that produces Earth's protective magnetic field. It created the continents on which we now live. It may have supplied the fuel that gave rise to the very first organisms.

When earthlings go out in search of other habitable planets, we will measure the abundance of various elements to determine if they could house life. Oxygen is a sign of photosynthesis. Carbon could keep a planet warm. And something like sulfur could indicate volcanic activity and an internal dynamo that's still spinning.

If an **alien** spacecraft ever turned its spectrometers toward Earth, Cottrell said, its engineers may measure the emissions from volcanoes and think, "That's the atmosphere of a planet that is still alive."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If **immigrants** and Latinos are so important to this upcoming presidential election, why isn't any group trying to register and mobilize them to vote?

On Oct. 3, Latino Decisions released results of a poll of Latino voters, with fairly predictable results. Most respondents — 67 percent — rate Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton favorably, while 77 percent hold a dim view of Republican nominee Donald Trump.

But here's a surprising statistic: Only 38 percent said that any organization has encouraged them to register or vote. That's more than the 31 percent who said they were asked during the last presidential election, but below the typical rates for whites, which was 43 percent (based on post-2012 election survey data).

Other minority and **immigrant** groups have similar experiences. This year, only 30 percent of Asian Americans said that any group or party had gotten in touch to urge them to register or vote.

Why?

The nonprofit groups that work closely with **immigrants** keep their distance from electoral politics

Most of the nonprofit groups that work with recent **immigrants** offer such services as language classes, job training, housing placement and public health support. They stay away from anything election-related, even voter registration. In my new book "**Immigrants** and Electoral Politics," I show that's partly because they fear that doing anything political could jeopardize their nonprofit tax status.

I took up this research in part because very little scholarship had investigated these groups' political activities.

**Immigrants** and certain ethnic minority groups historically vote at low levels, lower than white and African American citizens. In 2012, 64 percent of non-Hispanic white eligible voters, and African Americans, turned out on Election Day, compared with 48 percent of Hispanic Americans and 47 percent of Asian Americans. And these groups are the best positioned to connect **immigrants** to the political process. Doing so would help them further acculturate, connect with the larger society, and have their voices heard in our civic realm.

To examine these issues, I studied **immigrant** organizations based in six states. I included two states that were traditional **immigration** centers, New York and Illinois, as well as two states where recent migration patterns have put **immigrants** in regions not used to absorbing them at such high rates, Florida and North Carolina. Finally, I looked at two states with very different types of **immigrant** communities: New Jersey with its large South Asian population, and Michigan with a long history of **immigration** from Middle Eastern countries.

Using data from the Urban Institute's National Center for Charitable Statistics, I surveyed more than 1,000 nonprofit organizations (nearly all designated as 501(c)(3)s by the IRS) in these states during the 2012 campaign. My goal was to find what, if anything, they were doing that was related to the election.

Most **immigrant**-serving groups did nothing related to the election

Sixty percent of the organizations that responded to my survey said they did nothing related to electoral politics. That is about the same as the percentage of Latino and Asian American voters who said no group contacted them to encourage them to register or vote.

The groups gave several reasons. Some feared losing their protected 501(c)(3) tax status from the IRS. Some lacked the staff time or simply believed the community was disinterested in politics. The 40 percent of organizations that did engage in electoral politics used a variety of tactics. Some have been proven to work to register **immigrant** citizens and get them to vote. As you can see in the graph below, these groups reported monitoring election news (25 percent), registering voters (19 percent), mobilizing residents (14 percent) often using new databases of registered voters, and translating voter information (6.2 percent).

The factors that get these groups involved in electoral work included: regularly engaging with government, having a larger number of paid employees and serving **immigrants** in general rather than just a single nationality. Factors that don't seem to matter include the size of the organization's budget and whether that district's election is very competitive.

New state laws discourage **immigrant** registration

Some **immigrant** groups are reluctant to try to connect their communities to electoral politics in part because of new laws about registering voters. New voter-identification laws are well-known and have been widely challenged. But here's what's less well-known: State policymakers have targeted organizations that register new voters, adding onerous penalties and regulations.

For instance, in 2011, Florida passed a law that imposed steep fines on any organization that submitted incorrect voter registration information. It was unclear at the time whether this meant hundreds of falsified identities or simply a misspelled name. The new law also gave groups only 48 hours to submit new voter registrations once they'd been filled out and signed — far less than the two weeks previously allowed.

In 2012, a federal judge in Florida struck down this part of the law, finding that the new rules were harsh and impractical. But the damage was done. Prominent organizations, such as the League of Women Voters and Rock the Vote, stopped registering voters in that state, while **immigrant** organizations in Florida were significantly less likely to register voters than similar groups in states that had not enacted such laws, controlling for other factors.

In other words, just as voter identification laws have been shown to disproportionately deter younger and minority voters, tightening rules on voter registration appears to deter nonpartisan organizations that cater to **immigrant** groups.

If neither our political parties nor nonpartisan groups are going to register **immigrants** as they once did, then **immigrant** communities will remain on the margins of U.S. politics.

Heath Brown is assistant professor of public policy at the City University of New York, John Jay College and the Graduate Center, and author of "**Immigrants**and Electoral Politics: Nonprofit Organizing in a Time of Demographic Change" (forthcoming 2016, Cornell University Press).

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton faced off Sunday night in the second of three debates in the 2016 presidential election.

Following a Washington Post report of Trump speaking in very lewd and sexually aggressive terms in a 2005 video, Trump has apologized but promised, in response, to raise Bill Clinton's indiscretions -- and Hillary Clinton's role in allegedly targeting his accusers -- at the debate. Then he appeared with the accusers who have spoken out against Bill and Hillary Clinton just before the debate. We've posted the complete transcript here with our thoughts, analysis and fact checks via annotation. To see an annotation, click on the highlighted yellow text. To make your own annotations, make sure you have a Genius account.

RADDATZ: Ladies and gentlemen the Republican nominee for president, Donald J. Trump, and the Democratic nominee for president, Hillary Clinton.

(APPLAUSE)

COOPER: Thank you very much for being here. We're going to begin with a question from one of the members in our town hall. Each of you will have two minutes to respond to this question. Secretary Clinton, you won the coin toss, so you'll go first. Our first question comes from Patrice Brock. Patrice?

QUESTION: Thank you, and good evening. The last debate could have been rated as MA, mature audiences, per TV parental guidelines. Knowing that educators assign viewing the presidential debates as students' homework, do you feel you're modeling appropriate and positive behavior for today's youth?

CLINTON: Well, thank you. Are you a teacher? Yes, I think that that's a very good question, because I've heard from lots of teachers and parents about some of their concerns about some of the things that are being said and done in this campaign.

And I think it is very important for us to make clear to our children that our country really is great because we're good. And we are going to respect one another, lift each other up. We are going to be looking for ways to celebrate our diversity, and we are going to try to reach out to every boy and girl, as well as every adult, to bring them in to working on behalf of our country.

I have a very positive and optimistic view about what we can do together. That's why the slogan of my campaign is "Stronger Together," because I think if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness that sometimes sets Americans against one another, and instead we make some big goals -- and I've set forth some big goals, getting the economy to work for everyone, not just those at the top, making sure that we have the best education system from preschool through college and making it affordable, and so much else.

If we set those goals and we go together to try to achieve them, there's nothing in my opinion that America can't do. So that's why I hope that we will come together in this campaign. Obviously, I'm hoping to earn your vote, I'm hoping to be elected in November, and I can promise you, I will work with every American.

I want to be the president for all Americans, regardless of your political beliefs, where you come from, what you look like, your religion. I want us to heal our country and bring it together because that's, I think, the best way for us to get the future that our children and our grandchildren deserve.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, thank you. Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

TRUMP: Well, I actually agree with that. I agree with everything she said. I began this campaign because I was so tired of seeing such foolish things happen to our country. This is a great country. This is a great land. I've gotten to know the people of the country over the last year-and-a-half that I've been doing this as a politician. I cannot believe I'm saying that about myself, but I guess I have been a politician.

TRUMP: And my whole concept was to make America great again. When I watch the deals being made, when I watch what's happening with some horrible things like Obamacare, where your health insurance and health care is going up by numbers that are astronomical, 68 percent, 59 percent, 71 percent, when I look at the Iran deal and how bad a deal it is for us, it's a one-sided transaction where we're giving back $150 billion to a terrorist state, really, the number one terror state, we've made them a strong country from really a very weak country just three years ago.

When I look at all of the things that I see and all of the potential that our country has, we have such tremendous potential, whether it's in business and trade, where we're doing so badly. Last year, we had almost $800 billion trade deficit. In other words, trading with other countries. We had an $800 billion deficit. It's hard to believe. Inconceivable.

You say who's making these deals? We're going the make great deals. We're going to have a strong border. We're going to bring back law and order. Just today, policemen was shot, two killed. And this is happening on a weekly basis. We have to bring back respect to law enforcement. At the same time, we have to take care of people on all sides. We need justice.

But I want to do things that haven't been done, including fixing and making our inner cities better for the African-American citizens that are so great, and for the Latinos, Hispanics, and I look forward to doing it. It's called make America great again.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump. The question from Patrice was about are you both modeling positive and appropriate behavior for today's youth? We received a lot of questions online, Mr. Trump, about the tape that was released on Friday, as you can imagine. You called what you said locker room banter. You described kissing women without consent, grabbing their genitals. That is sexual assault. You bragged that you have sexually assaulted women. Do you understand that?

TRUMP: No, I didn't say that at all. I don't think you understood what was -- this was locker room talk. I'm not proud of it. I apologize to my family. I apologize to the American people. Certainly I'm not proud of it. But this is locker room talk.

You know, when we have a world where you have ISIS chopping off heads, where you have -- and, frankly, drowning people in steel cages, where you have wars and horrible, horrible sights all over, where you have so many bad things happening, this is like medieval times. We haven't seen anything like this, the carnage all over the world.

And they look and they see. Can you imagine the people that are, frankly, doing so well against us with ISIS? And they look at our country and they see what's going on.

Yes, I'm very embarrassed by it. I hate it. But it's locker room talk, and it's one of those things. I will knock the hell out of ISIS. We're going to defeat ISIS. ISIS happened a number of years ago in a vacuum that was left because of bad judgment. And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS.

COOPER: So, Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: And we should get on to much more important things and much bigger things.

COOPER: Just for the record, though, are you saying that what you said on that bus 11 years ago that you did not actually kiss women without consent or grope women without consent?

TRUMP: I have great respect for women. Nobody has more respect for women than I do.

COOPER: So, for the record, you're saying you never did that?

TRUMP: I've said things that, frankly, you hear these things I said. And I was embarrassed by it. But I have tremendous respect for women.

COOPER: Have you ever done those things?

TRUMP: And women have respect for me. And I will tell you: No, I have not. And I will tell you that I'm going to make our country safe. We're going to have borders in our country, which we don't have now. People are pouring into our country, and they're coming in from the Middle East and other places.

We're going to make America safe again. We're going to make America great again, but we're going to make America safe again. And we're going to make America wealthy again, because if you don't do that, it just -- it sounds harsh to say, but we have to build up the wealth of our nation.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Right now, other nations are taking our jobs and they're taking our wealth.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: And that's what I want to talk about.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, do you want to respond?

CLINTON: Well, like everyone else, I've spent a lot of time thinking over the last 48 hours about what we heard and saw. You know, with prior Republican nominees for president, I disagreed with them on politics, policies, principles, but I never questioned their fitness to serve.

Donald Trump is different. I said starting back in June that he was not fit to be president and commander-in-chief. And many Republicans and independents have said the same thing. What we all saw and heard on Friday was Donald talking about women, what he thinks about women, what he does to women. And he has said that the video doesn't represent who he is.

But I think it's clear to anyone who heard it that it represents exactly who he is. Because we've seen this throughout the campaign. We have seen him insult women. We've seen him rate women on their appearance, ranking them from one to ten. We've seen him embarrass women on TV and on Twitter. We saw him after the first debate spend nearly a week denigrating a former Miss Universe in the harshest, most personal terms.

So, yes, this is who Donald Trump is. But it's not only women, and it's not only this video that raises questions about his fitness to be our president, because he has also targeted **immigrants**, African- Americans, Latinos, people with disabilities, POWs, Muslims, and so many others.

So this is who Donald Trump is. And the question for us, the question our country must answer is that this is not who we are. That's why -- to go back to your question -- I want to send a message -- we all should -- to every boy and girl and, indeed, to the entire world that America already is great, but we are great because we are good, and we will respect one another, and we will work with one another, and we will celebrate our diversity.

CLINTON: These are very important values to me, because this is the America that I know and love. And I can pledge to you tonight that this is the America that I will serve if I'm so fortunate enough to become your president.

RADDATZ: And we want to get to some questions from online...

TRUMP: Am I allowed to respond to that? I assume I am.

RADDATZ: Yes, you can respond to that.

TRUMP: It's just words, folks. It's just words. Those words, I've been hearing them for many years. I heard them when they were running for the Senate in New York, where Hillary was going to bring back jobs to upstate New York and she failed.

I've heard them where Hillary is constantly talking about the inner cities of our country, which are a disaster education-wise, jobwise, safety-wise, in every way possible. I'm going to help the African-Americans. I'm going to help the Latinos, Hispanics. I am going to help the inner cities.

She's done a terrible job for the African-Americans. She wants their vote, and she does nothing, and then she comes back four years later. We saw that firsthand when she was United States senator. She campaigned where the primary part of her campaign...

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Mr. Trump -- I want to get to audience questions and online questions.

TRUMP: So, she's allowed to do that, but I'm not allowed to respond?

RADDATZ: You're going to have -- you're going to get to respond right now.

TRUMP: Sounds fair.

RADDATZ: This tape is generating intense interest. In just 48 hours, it's become the single most talked about story of the entire 2016 election on Facebook, with millions and millions of people discussing it on the social network. As we said a moment ago, we do want to bring in questions from voters around country via social media, and our first stays on this topic. Jeff from Ohio asks on Facebook, "Trump says the campaign has changed him. When did that happen?" So, Mr. Trump, let me add to that. When you walked off that bus at age 59, were you a different man or did that behavior continue until just recently? And you have two minutes for this.

TRUMP: It was locker room talk, as I told you. That was locker room talk. I'm not proud of it. I am a person who has great respect for people, for my family, for the people of this country. And certainly, I'm not proud of it. But that was something that happened.

If you look at Bill Clinton, far worse. Mine are words, and his was action. His was what he's done to women. There's never been anybody in the history politics in this nation that's been so abusive to women. So you can say any way you want to say it, but Bill Clinton was abusive to women.

Hillary Clinton attacked those same women and attacked them viciously. Four of them here tonight. One of the women, who is a wonderful woman, at 12 years old, was raped at 12. Her client she represented got him off, and she's seen laughing on two separate occasions, laughing at the girl who was raped. Kathy Shelton, that young woman is here with us tonight.

So don't tell me about words. I am absolutely -- I apologize for those words. But it is things that people say. But what President Clinton did, he was impeached, he lost his license to practice law. He had to pay an $850,000 fine to one of the women. Paula Jones, who's also here tonight.

And I will tell you that when Hillary brings up a point like that and she talks about words that I said 11 years ago, I think it's disgraceful, and I think she should be ashamed of herself, if you want to know the truth.

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Can we please hold the applause? Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, first, let me start by saying that so much of what he's just said is not right, but he gets to run his campaign any way he chooses. He gets to decide what he wants to talk about. Instead of answering people's questions, talking about our agenda, laying out the plans that we have that we think can make a better life and a better country, that's his choice.

When I hear something like that, I am reminded of what my friend, Michelle Obama, advised us all: When they go low, you go high.

(APPLAUSE) And, look, if this were just about one video, maybe what he's saying tonight would be understandable, but everyone can draw their own conclusions at this point about whether or not the man in the video or the man on the stage respects women. But he never apologizes for anything to anyone.

CLINTON: He never apologized to Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the Gold Star family whose son, Captain Khan, died in the line of duty in Iraq. And Donald insulted and attacked them for weeks over their religion.

He never apologized to the distinguished federal judge who was born in Indiana, but Donald said he couldn't be trusted to be a judge because his parents were, quote, "Mexican."

He never apologized to the reporter that he mimicked and mocked on national television and our children were watching. And he never apologized for the racist lie that President Obama was not born in the United States of America. He owes the president an apology, he owes our country an apology, and he needs to take responsibility for his actions and his words.

TRUMP: Well, you owe the president an apology, because as you know very well, your campaign, Sidney Blumenthal -- he's another real winner that you have -- and he's the one that got this started, along with your campaign manager, and they were on television just two weeks ago, she was, saying exactly that. So you really owe him an apology. You're the one that sent the pictures around your campaign, sent the pictures around with President Obama in a certain garb. That was long before I was ever involved, so you actually owe an apology.

Number two, Michelle Obama. I've gotten to see the commercials that they did on you. And I've gotten to see some of the most vicious commercials I've ever seen of Michelle Obama talking about you, Hillary.

So, you talk about friend? Go back and take a look at those commercials, a race where you lost fair and square, unlike the Bernie Sanders race, where you won, but not fair and square, in my opinion. And all you have to do is take a look at WikiLeaks and just see what they say about Bernie Sanders and see what Deborah Wasserman Schultz had in mind, because Bernie Sanders, between super-delegates and Deborah Wasserman Schultz, he never had a chance. And I was so surprised to see him sign on with the devil.

But when you talk about apology, I think the one that you should really be apologizing for and the thing that you should be apologizing for are the 33,000 e-mails that you deleted, and that you acid washed, and then the two boxes of e-mails and other things last week that were taken from an office and are now missing.

And I'll tell you what. I didn't think I'd say this, but I'm going to say it, and I hate to say it. But if I win, I am going to instruct my attorney general to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation, because there has never been so many lies, so much deception. There has never been anything like it, and we're going to have a special prosecutor.

When I speak, I go out and speak, the people of this country are furious. In my opinion, the people that have been long-term workers at the FBI are furious. There has never been anything like this, where e-mails -- and you get a subpoena, you get a subpoena, and after getting the subpoena, you delete 33,000 e-mails, and then you acid wash them or bleach them, as you would say, very expensive process.

So we're going to get a special prosecutor, and we're going to look into it, because you know what? People have been -- their lives have been destroyed for doing one-fifth of what you've done. And it's a disgrace. And honestly, you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, I want to follow up on that.

(CROSSTALK)

RADDATZ: I'm going to let you talk about e-mails.

CLINTON: ... because everything he just said is absolutely false, but I'm not surprised.

TRUMP: Oh, really?

CLINTON: In the first debate...

(LAUGHTER)

RADDATZ: And really, the audience needs to calm down here.

CLINTON: ... I told people that it would be impossible to be fact-checking Donald all the time. I'd never get to talk about anything I want to do and how we're going to really make lives better for people.

So, once again, go to HillaryClinton.com. We have literally Trump -- you can fact check him in real time. Last time at the first debate, we had millions of people fact checking, so I expect we'll have millions more fact checking, because, you know, it is -- it's just awfully good that someone with the temperament of Donald Trump is not in charge of the law in our country.

TRUMP: Because you'd be in jail.

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton...

COOPER: We want to remind the audience to please not talk out loud. Please do not applaud. You're just wasting time.

RADDATZ: And, Secretary Clinton, I do want to follow up on e- mails. You've said your handing of your e-mails was a mistake. You disagreed with FBI Director James Comey, calling your handling of classified information, quote, "extremely careless." The FBI said that there were 110 classified e-mails that were exchanged, eight of which were top secret, and that it was possible hostile actors did gain access to those e-mails. You don't call that extremely careless? CLINTON: Well, Martha, first, let me say -- and I've said before, but I'll repeat it, because I want everyone to hear it -- that was a mistake, and I take responsibility for using a personal e-mail account. Obviously, if I were to do it over again, I would not. I'm not making any excuses. It was a mistake. And I am very sorry about that.

But I think it's also important to point out where there are some misleading accusations from critics and others. After a year-long investigation, there is no evidence that anyone hacked the server I was using and there is no evidence that anyone can point to at all -- anyone who says otherwise has no basis -- that any classified material ended up in the wrong hands.

I take classified materials very seriously and always have. When I was on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I was privy to a lot of classified material. Obviously, as secretary of state, I had some of the most important secrets that we possess, such as going after bin Laden. So I am very committed to taking classified information seriously. And as I said, there is no evidence that any classified information ended up in the wrong hands.

RADDATZ: OK, we're going to move on.

TRUMP: And yet she didn't know the word -- the letter C on a document. Right? She didn't even know what that word -- what that letter meant.

You know, it's amazing. I'm watching Hillary go over facts. And she's going after fact after fact, and she's lying again, because she said she -- you know, what she did with the e-mail was fine. You think it was fine to delete 33,000 e-mails? I don't think so.

She said the 33,000 e-mails had to do with her daughter's wedding, number one, and a yoga class. Well, maybe we'll give three or three or four or five or something. 33,000 e-mails deleted, and now she's saying there wasn't anything wrong.

And more importantly, that was after getting a subpoena. That wasn't before. That was after. She got it from the United States Congress. And I'll be honest, I am so disappointed in congressmen, including Republicans, for allowing this to happen.

Our Justice Department, where our husband goes on to the back of a airplane for 39 minutes, talks to the attorney general days before a ruling is going to be made on her case. But for you to say that there was nothing wrong with you deleting 39,000 e-mails, again, you should be ashamed of yourself. What you did -- and this is after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

COOPER: We have to move on.

TRUMP: You did that. Wait a minute. One second.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you can respond, and then we got to move on.

RADDATZ: We want to give the audience a chance.

TRUMP: If you did that in the private sector, you'd be put in jail, let alone after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you can respond. Then we have to move on to an audience question.

CLINTON: Look, it's just not true. And so please, go to...

TRUMP: Oh, you didn't delete them?

COOPER: Allow her to respond, please.

CLINTON: It was personal e-mails, not official.

TRUMP: Oh, 33,000? Yeah.

CLINTON: Not -- well, we turned over 35,000, so...

TRUMP: Oh, yeah. What about the other 15,000?

COOPER: Please allow her to respond. She didn't talk while you talked.

CLINTON: Yes, that's true, I didn't.

TRUMP: Because you have nothing to say.

CLINTON: I didn't in the first debate, and I'm going to try not to in this debate, because I'd like to get to the questions that the people have brought here tonight to talk to us about.

TRUMP: Get off this question.

CLINTON: OK, Donald. I know you're into big diversion tonight, anything to avoid talking about your campaign and the way it's exploding and the way Republicans are leaving you. But let's at least focus...

TRUMP: Let's see what happens...

(CROSSTALK)

COOPER: Allow her to respond.

CLINTON: ... on some of the issues that people care about tonight. Let's get to their questions.

COOPER: We have a question here from Ken Karpowicz. He has a question about health care. Ken?

TRUMP: I'd like to know, Anderson, why aren't you bringing up the e-mails? I'd like to know. Why aren't you bringing...

COOPER: We brought up the e-mails.

TRUMP: No, it hasn't. It hasn't. And it hasn't been finished at all.

COOPER: Ken Karpowicz has a question.

TRUMP: It's nice to -- one on three.

QUESTION: Thank you. Affordable Care Act, known as Obamacare, it is not affordable. Premiums have gone up. Deductibles have gone up. Copays have gone up. Prescriptions have gone up. And the coverage has gone down. What will you do to bring the cost down and make coverage better?

COOPER: That first one goes to Secretary Clinton, because you started out the last one to the audience.

CLINTON: If he wants to start, he can start. No, go ahead, Donald.

TRUMP: No, I'm a gentlemen, Hillary. Go ahead.

(LAUGHTER)

COOPER: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think Donald was about to say he's going to solve it by repealing it and getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. And I'm going to fix it, because I agree with you. Premiums have gotten too high. Copays, deductibles, prescription drug costs, and I've laid out a series of actions that we can take to try to get those costs down.

But here's what I don't want people to forget when we're talking about reining in the costs, which has to be the highest priority of the next president, when the Affordable Care Act passed, it wasn't just that 20 million got insurance who didn't have it before. But that in and of itself was a good thing. I meet these people all the time, and they tell me what a difference having that insurance meant to them and their families.

But everybody else, the 170 million of us who get health insurance through our employees got big benefits. Number one, insurance companies can't deny you coverage because of a pre-existing condition. Number two, no lifetime limits, which is a big deal if you have serious health problems.

Number three, women can't be charged more than men for our health insurance, which is the way it used to be before the Affordable Care Act. Number four, if you're under 26, and your parents have a policy, you can be on that policy until the age of 26, something that didn't happen before.

So I want very much to save what works and is good about the Affordable Care Act. But we've got to get costs down. We've got to provide additional help to small businesses so that they can afford to provide health insurance. But if we repeal it, as Donald has proposed, and start over again, all of those benefits I just mentioned are lost to everybody, not just people who get their health insurance on the exchange. And then we would have to start all over again.

Right now, we are at 90 percent health insurance coverage. That's the highest we've ever been in our country. COOPER: Secretary Clinton, your time is up.

CLINTON: So I want us to get to 100 percent, but get costs down and keep quality up.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

TRUMP: It is such a great question and it's maybe the question I get almost more than anything else, outside of defense. Obamacare is a disaster. You know it. We all know it. It's going up at numbers that nobody's ever seen worldwide. Nobody's ever seen numbers like this for health care.

It's only getting worse. In '17, it implodes by itself. Their method of fixing it is to go back and ask Congress for more money, more and more money. We have right now almost $20 trillion in debt.

Obamacare will never work. It's very bad, very bad health insurance. Far too expensive. And not only expensive for the person that has it, unbelievably expensive for our country. It's going to be one of the biggest line items very shortly.

We have to repeal it and replace it with something absolutely much less expensive and something that works, where your plan can actually be tailored. We have to get rid of the lines around the state, artificial lines, where we stop insurance companies from coming in and competing, because they want -- and President Obama and whoever was working on it -- they want to leave those lines, because that gives the insurance companies essentially monopolies. We want competition.

You will have the finest health care plan there is. She wants to go to a single-payer plan, which would be a disaster, somewhat similar to Canada. And if you haven't noticed the Canadians, when they need a big operation, when something happens, they come into the United States in many cases because their system is so slow. It's catastrophic in certain ways.

But she wants to go to single payer, which means the government basically rules everything. Hillary Clinton has been after this for years. Obamacare was the first step. Obamacare is a total disaster. And not only are your rates going up by numbers that nobody's ever believed, but your deductibles are going up, so that unless you get hit by a truck, you're never going to be able to use it.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, your time...

TRUMP: It is a disastrous plan, and it has to be repealed and replaced.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, let me follow up with you. Your husband called Obamacare, quote, "the craziest thing in the world," saying that small-business owners are getting killed as premiums double, coverage is cut in half. Was he mistaken or was the mistake simply telling the truth?

CLINTON: No, I mean, he clarified what he meant. And it's very clear. Look, we are in a situation in our country where if we were to start all over again, we might come up with a different system. But we have an employer-based system. That's where the vast majority of people get their health care.

And the Affordable Care Act was meant to try to fill the gap between people who were too poor and couldn't put together any resources to afford health care, namely people on Medicaid. Obviously, Medicare, which is a single-payer system, which takes care of our elderly and does a great job doing it, by the way, and then all of the people who were employed, but people who were working but didn't have the money to afford insurance and didn't have anybody, an employer or anybody else, to help them.

That was the slot that the Obamacare approach was to take. And like I say, 20 million people now have health insurance. So if we just rip it up and throw it away, what Donald's not telling you is we just turn it back to the insurance companies the way it used to be, and that means the insurance companies...

COOPER: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: ... get to do pretty much whatever they want, including saying, look, I'm sorry, you've got diabetes, you had cancer, your child has asthma...

COOPER: Your time is up.

CLINTON: ... you may not be able to have insurance because you can't afford it. So let's fix what's broken about it, but let's not throw it away and give it all back to the insurance companies and the drug companies. That's not going to work.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, let me follow up on this. TRUMP: Well, I just want -- just one thing. First of all, Hillary, everything's broken about it. Everything. Number two, Bernie Sanders said that Hillary Clinton has very bad judgment. This is a perfect example of it, trying to save Obamacare, which is a disaster.

COOPER: You've said you want to end Obamacare...

TRUMP: By the way...

COOPER: You've said you want to end Obamacare. You've also said you want to make coverage accessible for people with pre-existing conditions. How do you force insurance companies to do that if you're no longer mandating that every American get insurance?

TRUMP: We're going to be able to. You're going to have plans...

COOPER: What does that mean?

TRUMP: Well, I'll tell you what it means. You're going to have plans that are so good, because we're going to have so much competition in the insurance industry. Once we break out -- once we break out the lines and allow the competition to come...

COOPER: Are you going -- are you going to have a mandate that Americans have to have health insurance?

TRUMP: President Obama -- Anderson, excuse me. President Obama, by keeping those lines, the boundary lines around each state, it was almost gone until just very toward the end of the passage of Obamacare, which, by the way, was a fraud. You know that, because Jonathan Gruber, the architect of Obamacare, was said -- he said it was a great lie, it was a big lie. President Obama said you keep your doctor, you keep your plan. The whole thing was a fraud, and it doesn't work.

But when we get rid of those lines, you will have competition, and we will be able to keep pre-existing, we'll also be able to help people that can't get -- don't have money because we are going to have people protected.

And Republicans feel this way, believe it or not, and strongly this way. We're going to block grant into the states. We're going to block grant into Medicaid into the states...

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: ... so that we will be able to take care of people without the necessary funds to take care of themselves.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

RADDATZ: We now go to Gorbah Hamed with a question for both candidates.

QUESTION: Hi. There are 3.3 million Muslims in the United States, and I'm one of them. You've mentioned working with Muslim nations, but with Islamophobia on the rise, how will you help people like me deal with the consequences of being labeled as a threat to the country after the election is over?

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, you're first.

TRUMP: Well, you're right about Islamophobia, and that's a shame. But one thing we have to do is we have to make sure that -- because there is a problem. I mean, whether we like it or not, and we could be very politically correct, but whether we like it or not, there is a problem. And we have to be sure that Muslims come in and report when they see something going on. When they see hatred going on, they have to report it.

As an example, in San Bernardino, many people saw the bombs all over the apartment of the two people that killed 14 and wounded many, many people. Horribly wounded. They'll never be the same. Muslims have to report the problems when they see them.

And, you know, there's always a reason for everything. If they don't do that, it's a very difficult situation for our country, because you look at Orlando and you look at San Bernardino and you look at the World Trade Center. Go outside. Look at Paris. Look at that horrible -- these are radical Islamic terrorists.

And she won't even mention the word and nor will President Obama. He won't use the term "radical Islamic terrorism." Now, to solve a problem, you have to be able to state what the problem is or at least say the name. She won't say the name and President Obama won't say the name. But the name is there. It's radical Islamic terror. And before you solve it, you have to say the name.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, thank you for asking your question. And I've heard this question from a lot of Muslim-Americans across our country, because, unfortunately, there's been a lot of very divisive, dark things said about Muslims. And even someone like Captain Khan, the young man who sacrificed himself defending our country in the United States Army, has been subject to attack by Donald.

I want to say just a couple of things. First, we've had Muslims in America since George Washington. And we've had many successful Muslims. We just lost a particular well-known one with Muhammad Ali.

CLINTON: My vision of America is an America where everyone has a place, if you're willing to work hard, you do your part, you contribute to the community. That's what America is. That's what we want America to be for our children and our grandchildren.

It's also very short-sighted and even dangerous to be engaging in the kind of demagogic rhetoric that Donald has about Muslims. We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lines. I've worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America. I've met with a lot of them, and I've heard how important it is for them to feel that they are wanted and included and part of our country, part of our homeland security, and that's what I want to see.

It's also important I intend to defeat ISIS, to do so in a coalition with majority Muslim nations. Right now, a lot of those nations are hearing what Donald says and wondering, why should we cooperate with the Americans? And this is a gift to ISIS and the terrorists, violent jihadist terrorists.

We are not at war with Islam. And it is a mistake and it plays into the hands of the terrorists to act as though we are. So I want a country where citizens like you and your family are just as welcome as anyone else.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton.

Mr. Trump, in December, you said this. "Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what the hell is going on. We have no choice. We have no choice." Your running mate said this week that the Muslim ban is no longer your position. Is that correct? And if it is, was it a mistake to have a religious test?

TRUMP: First of all, Captain Khan is an American hero, and if I were president at that time, he would be alive today, because unlike her, who voted for the war without knowing what she was doing, I would not have had our people in Iraq. Iraq was disaster. So he would have been alive today.

The Muslim ban is something that in some form has morphed into a extreme vetting from certain areas of the world. Hillary Clinton wants to allow hundreds of thousands -- excuse me. Excuse me..

RADDATZ: And why did it morph into that? No, did you -- no, answer the question. Do you still believe... TRUMP: Why don't you interrupt her? You interrupt me all the time.

RADDATZ: I do.

TRUMP: Why don't you interrupt her?

RADDATZ: Would you please explain whether or not the Muslim ban still stands?

TRUMP: It's called extreme vetting. We are going to areas like Syria where they're coming in by the tens of thousands because of Barack Obama. And Hillary Clinton wants to allow a 550 percent increase over Obama. People are coming into our country like we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is, and she wants 550 percent more. This is going to be the great Trojan horse of all time.

We have enough problems in this country. I believe in building safe zones. I believe in having other people pay for them, as an example, the Gulf states, who are not carrying their weight, but they have nothing but money, and take care of people. But I don't want to have, with all the problems this country has and all of the problems that you see going on, hundreds of thousands of people coming in from Syria when we know nothing about them. We know nothing about their values and we know nothing about their love for our country.

RADDATZ: And, Secretary Clinton, let me ask you about that, because you have asked for an increase from 10,000 to 65,000 Syrian refugees. We know you want tougher vetting. That's not a perfect system. So why take the risk of having those refugees come into the country?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I will not let anyone into our country that I think poses a risk to us. But there are a lot of refugees, women and children -- think of that picture we all saw of that 4-year-old boy with the blood on his forehead because he'd been bombed by the Russian and Syrian air forces.

There are children suffering in this catastrophic war, largely, I believe, because of Russian aggression. And we need to do our part. We by no means are carrying anywhere near the load that Europe and others are. But we will have vetting that is as tough as it needs to be from our professionals, our intelligence experts and others.

But it is important for us as a policy, you know, not to say, as Donald has said, we're going to ban people based on a religion. How do you do that? We are a country founded on religious freedom and liberty. How do we do what he has advocated without causing great distress within our own county? Are we going to have religious tests when people fly into our country? And how do we expect to be able to implement those?

So I thought that what he said was extremely unwise and even dangerous. And indeed, you can look at the propaganda on a lot of the terrorists sites, and what Donald Trump says about Muslims is used to recruit fighters, because they want to create a war between us.

And the final thing I would say, this is the 10th or 12th time that he's denied being for the war in Iraq. We have it on tape. The entire press corps has looked at it. It's been debunked, but it never stops him from saying whatever he wants to say.

TRUMP: That's not been debunked.

CLINTON: So, please...

TRUMP: That has not been debunked.

CLINTON: ... go to HillaryClinton.com and you can see it.

TRUMP: I was against -- I was against the war in Iraq. Has not been debunked. And you voted for it. And you shouldn't have. Well, I just want to say...

RADDATZ: There's been lots of fact-checking on that. I'd like to move on to an online question...

TRUMP: Excuse me. She just went about 25 seconds over her time.

RADDATZ: She did not.

TRUMP: Could I just respond to this, please?

RADDATZ: Very quickly, please.

TRUMP: Hillary Clinton, in terms of having people come into our country, we have many criminal illegal aliens. When we want to send them back to their country, their country says we don't want them. In some cases, they're murderers, drug lords, drug problems. And they don't want them.

And Hillary Clinton, when she was secretary of state, said that's OK, we can't force it into their country. Let me tell you, I'm going to force them right back into their country. They're murderers and some very bad people.

And I will tell you very strongly, when Bernie Sanders said she had bad judgment, she has really bad judgment, because we are letting people into this country that are going to cause problems and crime like you've never seen. We're also letting drugs pour through our southern border at a record clip. At a record clip. And it shouldn't be allowed to happen.

ICE just endorsed me. They've never endorsed a presidential candidate. The Border Patrol agents, 16,500, just recently endorsed me, and they endorsed me because I understand the border. She doesn't. She wants amnesty for everybody. Come right in. Come right over. It's a horrible thing she's doing. She's got bad judgment, and honestly, so bad that she should never be president of the United States. That I can tell you.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Mr. Trump. I want to move on. This next question from the public through the Bipartisan Open Debate Coalition's online forum, where Americans submitted questions that generated millions of votes. This question involves WikiLeaks release of purported excerpts of Secretary Clinton's paid speeches, which she has refused to release, and one line in particular, in which you, Secretary Clinton, purportedly say you need both a public and private position on certain issues. So, Tu (ph), from Virginia asks, is it OK for politicians to be two-faced? Is it acceptable for a politician to have a private stance on issues? Secretary Clinton, your two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, right. As I recall, that was something I said about Abraham Lincoln after having seen the wonderful Steven Spielberg movie called "Lincoln." It was a master class watching President Lincoln get the Congress to approve the 13th Amendment. It was principled, and it was strategic.

And I was making the point that it is hard sometimes to get the Congress to do what you want to do and you have to keep working at it. And, yes, President Lincoln was trying to convince some people, he used some arguments, convincing other people, he used other arguments. That was a great -- I thought a great display of presidential leadership.

But, you know, let's talk about what's really going on here, Martha, because our intelligence community just came out and said in the last few days that the Kremlin, meaning Putin and the Russian government, are directing the attacks, the hacking on American accounts to influence our election. And WikiLeaks is part of that, as are other sites where the Russians hack information, we don't even know if it's accurate information, and then they put it out.

We have never in the history of our country been in a situation where an adversary, a foreign power, is working so hard to influence the outcome of the election. And believe me, they're not doing it to get me elected. They're doing it to try to influence the election for Donald Trump.

CLINTON: Now, maybe because he has praised Putin, maybe because he says he agrees with a lot of what Putin wants to do, maybe because he wants to do business in Moscow, I don't know the reasons. But we deserve answers. And we should demand that Donald release all of his tax returns so that people can see what are the entanglements and the financial relationships that he has...

RADDATZ: We're going to get to that later. Secretary Clinton, you're out of time.

CLINTON: ... with the Russians and other foreign powers.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Well, I think I should respond, because -- so ridiculous. Look, now she's blaming -- she got caught in a total lie. Her papers went out to all her friends at the banks, Goldman Sachs and everybody else, and she said things -- WikiLeaks that just came out. And she lied. Now she's blaming the lie on the late, great Abraham Lincoln. That's one that I haven't...

(LAUGHTER)

OK, Honest Abe, Honest Abe never lied. That's the good thing. That's the big difference between Abraham Lincoln and you. That's a big, big difference. We're talking about some difference.

But as far as other elements of what she was saying, I don't know Putin. I think it would be great if we got along with Russia because we could fight ISIS together, as an example. But I don't know Putin.

But I notice, anytime anything wrong happens, they like to say the Russians are -- she doesn't know if it's the Russians doing the hacking. Maybe there is no hacking. But they always blame Russia. And the reason they blame Russia because they think they're trying to tarnish me with Russia. I know nothing about Russia. I know -- I know about Russia, but I know nothing about the inner workings of Russia. I don't deal there. I have no businesses there. I have no loans from Russia.

I have a very, very great balance sheet, so great that when I did the Old Post Office on Pennsylvania Avenue, the United States government, because of my balance sheet, which they actually know very well, chose me to do the Old Post Office, between the White House and Congress, chose me to do the Old Post Office. One of the primary area things, in fact, perhaps the primary thing was balance sheet. But I have no loans with Russia. You could go to the United States government, and they would probably tell you that, because they know my sheet very well in order to get that development I had to have.

Now, the taxes are a very simple thing. As soon as I have -- first of all, I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. Many of her friends took bigger deductions. Warren Buffett took a massive deduction. Soros, who's a friend of hers, took a massive deduction. Many of the people that are giving her all this money that she can do many more commercials than me gave her -- took massive deductions.

I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. But -- but as soon as my routine audit is finished, I'll release my returns. I'll be very proud to. They're actually quite great.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

COOPER: We want to turn, actually, to the topic of taxes. We have a question from Spencer Maass. Spencer?

QUESTION: Good evening. My question is, what specific tax provisions will you change to ensure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share in taxes?

COOPER: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

TRUMP: Well, one thing I'd do is get rid of carried interest. One of the greatest provisions for people like me, to be honest with you, I give up a lot when I run, because I knock out the tax code. And she could have done this years ago, by the way. She's a United States -- she was a United States senator.

She complains that Donald Trump took advantage of the tax code. Well, why didn't she change it? Why didn't you change it when you were a senator? The reason you didn't is that all your friends take the same advantage that I do. And I do. You have provisions in the tax code that, frankly, we could change. But you wouldn't change it, because all of these people gave you the money so you can take negative ads on Donald Trump.

But -- and I say that about a lot of things. You know, I've heard Hillary complaining about so many different things over the years. "I wish you would have done this." But she's been there for 30 years she's been doing this stuff. She never changed. And she never will change. She never will change.

We're getting rid of carried interest provisions. I'm lowering taxes actually, because I think it's so important for corporations, because we have corporations leaving -- massive corporations and little ones, little ones can't form. We're getting rid of regulations which goes hand in hand with the lowering of the taxes.

But we're bringing the tax rate down from 35 percent to 15 percent. We're cutting taxes for the middle class. And I will tell you, we are cutting them big league for the middle class.

And I will tell you, Hillary Clinton is raising your taxes, folks. You can look at me. She's raising your taxes really high. And what that's going to do is a disaster for the country. But she is raising your taxes and I'm lowering your taxes. That in itself is a big difference. We are going to be thriving again. We have no growth in this country. There's no growth. If China has a GDP of 7 percent, it's like a national catastrophe. We're down at 1 percent. And that's, like, no growth. And we're going lower, in my opinion. And a lot of it has to do with the fact that our taxes are so high, just about the highest in the world. And I'm bringing them down to one of the lower in the world. And I think it's so important -- one of the most important things we can do. But she is raising everybody's taxes massively.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes. The question was, what specific tax provisions will you change to ensure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share of taxes?

CLINTON: Well, everything you've heard just now from Donald is not true. I'm sorry I have to keep saying this, but he lives in an alternative reality. And it is sort of amusing to hear somebody who hasn't paid federal income taxes in maybe 20 years talking about what he's going to do.

But I'll tell you what he's going to do. His plan will give the wealthy and corporations the biggest tax cuts they've ever had, more than the Bush tax cuts by at least a factor of two. Donald always takes care of Donald and people like Donald, and this would be a massive gift. And, indeed, the way that he talks about his tax cuts would end up raising taxes on middle-class families, millions of middle-class families.

Now, here's what I want to do. I have said nobody who makes less than $250,000 a year -- and that's the vast majority of Americans as you know -- will have their taxes raised, because I think we've got to go where the money is. And the money is with people who have taken advantage of every single break in the tax code.

And, yes, when I was a senator, I did vote to close corporate loopholes. I voted to close, I think, one of the loopholes he took advantage of when he claimed a billion-dollar loss that enabled him to avoid paying taxes.

I want to have a tax on people who are making a million dollars. It's called the Buffett rule. Yes, Warren Buffett is the one who's gone out and said somebody like him should not be paying a lower tax rate than his secretary. I want to have a surcharge on incomes above $5 million.

We have to make up for lost times, because I want to invest in you. I want to invest in hard-working families. And I think it's been unfortunate, but it's happened, that since the Great Recession, the gains have all gone to the top. And we need to reverse that.

People like Donald, who paid zero in taxes, zero for our vets, zero for our military, zero for health and education, that is wrong.

COOPER: Thank you, Secretary.

CLINTON: And we're going to make sure that nobody, no corporation, and no individual can get away without paying his fair share to support our country.

COOPER: Thank you. I want to give you -- Mr. Trump, I want to give you the chance to respond. I just wanted to tell our viewers what she's referring to. In the last month, taxes were the number-one issue on Facebook for the first time in the campaign. The New York Times published three pages of your 1995 tax returns. They show you claimed a $916 million loss, which means you could have avoided paying personal federal income taxes for years. You've said you pay state taxes, employee taxes, real estate taxes, property taxes. You have not answered, though, a simple question. Did you use that $916 million loss to avoid paying personal federal income taxes for years?

TRUMP: Of course I do. Of course I do. And so do all of her donors, or most of her donors. I know many of her donors. Her donors took massive tax write-offs.

COOPER: So have you (inaudible) personal federal income tax?

TRUMP: A lot of my -- excuse me, Anderson -- a lot of my write- off was depreciation and other things that Hillary as a senator allowed. And she'll always allow it, because the people that give her all this money, they want it. That's why.

See, I understand the tax code better than anybody that's ever run for president. Hillary Clinton -- and it's extremely complex -- Hillary Clinton has friends that want all of these provisions, including they want the carried interest provision, which is very important to Wall Street people. But they really want the carried interest provision, which I believe Hillary's leaving. Very interesting why she's leaving carried interest.

But I will tell you that, number one, I pay tremendous numbers of taxes. I absolutely used it. And so did Warren Buffett and so did George Soros and so did many of the other people that Hillary is getting money from. Now, I won't mention their names, because they're rich, but they're not famous. So we won't make them famous.

COOPER: So can you -- can you say how many years you have avoided paying personal federal income taxes?

TRUMP: No, but I pay tax, and I pay federal tax, too. But I have a write-off, a lot of it's depreciation, which is a wonderful charge. I love depreciation. You know, she's given it to us.

Hey, if she had a problem -- for 30 years she's been doing this, Anderson. I say it all the time. She talks about health care. Why didn't she do something about it? She talks about taxes. Why didn't she do something about it? She doesn't do anything about anything other than talk. With her, it's all talk and no action.

COOPER: In the past...

TRUMP: And, again, Bernie Sanders, it's really bad judgment. She has made bad judgment not only on taxes. She's made bad judgments on Libya, on Syria, on Iraq. I mean, her and Obama, whether you like it or not, the way they got out of Iraq, the vacuum they've left, that's why ISIS formed in the first place. They started from that little area, and now they're in 32 different nations, Hillary. Congratulations. Great job.

COOPER: Secretary -- I want you to be able to respond, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, here we go again. I've been in favor of getting rid of carried interest for years, starting when I was a senator from New York. But that's not the point here.

TRUMP: Why didn't you do it? Why didn't you do it?

COOPER: Allow her to respond.

CLINTON: Because I was a senator with a Republican president.

TRUMP: Oh, really?

CLINTON: I will be the president and we will get it done. That's exactly right.

TRUMP: You could have done it, if you were an effective -- if you were an effective senator, you could have done it. If you were an effective senator, you could have done it. But you were not an effective senator.

COOPER: Please allow her to respond. She didn't interrupt you.

CLINTON: You know, under our Constitution, presidents have something called veto power. Look, he has now said repeatedly, "30 years this and 30 years that." So let me talk about my 30 years in public service. I'm very glad to do so.

Eight million kids every year have health insurance, because when I was first lady I worked with Democrats and Republicans to create the Children's Health Insurance Program. Hundreds of thousands of kids now have a chance to be adopted because I worked to change our adoption and foster care system. After 9/11, I went to work with Republican mayor, governor and president to rebuild New York and to get health care for our first responders who were suffering because they had run toward danger and gotten sickened by it. Hundreds of thousands of National Guard and Reserve members have health care because of work that I did, and children have safer medicines because I was able to pass a law that required the dosing to be more carefully done.

When I was secretary of state, I went around the world advocating for our country, but also advocating for women's rights, to make sure that women had a decent chance to have a better life and negotiated a treaty with Russia to lower nuclear weapons. Four hundred pieces of legislation have my name on it as a sponsor or cosponsor when I was a senator for eight years.

I worked very hard and was very proud to be re-elected in New York by an even bigger margin than I had been elected the first time. And as president, I will take that work, that bipartisan work, that finding common ground, because you have to be able to get along with people to get things done in Washington.

COOPER: Thank you, secretary.

CLINTON: I've proven that I can, and for 30 years, I've produced results for people.

COOPER: Thank you, secretary.

RADDATZ: We're going to move on to Syria. Both of you have mentioned that.

TRUMP: She said a lot of things that were false. I mean, I think we should be allowed to maybe...

RADDATZ: No, we can -- no, Mr. Trump, we're going to go on. This is about the audience.

TRUMP: Excuse me. Because she has been a disaster as a senator. A disaster.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, we're going to move on. The heart-breaking video of a 5-year-old Syrian boy named Omran sitting in an ambulance after being pulled from the rubble after an air strike in Aleppo focused the world's attention on the horrors of the war in Syria, with 136 million views on Facebook alone.

But there are much worse images coming out of Aleppo every day now, where in the past few weeks alone, 400 people have been killed, at least 100 of them children. Just days ago, the State Department called for a war crimes investigation of the Syrian regime of Bashar al-Assad and its ally, Russia, for their bombardment of Aleppo.

So this next question comes through social media through Facebook. Diane from Pennsylvania asks, if you were president, what would you do about Syria and the humanitarian crisis in Aleppo? Isn't it a lot like the Holocaust when the U.S. waited too long before we helped? Secretary Clinton, we will begin with your two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, the situation in Syria is catastrophic. And every day that goes by, we see the results of the regime by Assad in partnership with the Iranians on the ground, the Russians in the air, bombarding places, in particular Aleppo, where there are hundreds of thousands of people, probably about 250,000 still left. And there is a determined effort by the Russian air force to destroy Aleppo in order to eliminate the last of the Syrian rebels who are really holding out against the Assad regime.

Russia hasn't paid any attention to ISIS. They're interested in keeping Assad in power. So I, when I was secretary of state, advocated and I advocate today a no-fly zone and safe zones. We need some leverage with the Russians, because they are not going to come to the negotiating table for a diplomatic resolution, unless there is some leverage over them. And we have to work more closely with our partners and allies on the ground.

But I want to emphasize that what is at stake here is the ambitions and the aggressiveness of Russia. Russia has decided that it's all in, in Syria. And they've also decided who they want to see become president of the United States, too, and it's not me. I've stood up to Russia. I've taken on Putin and others, and I would do that as president.

I think wherever we can cooperate with Russia, that's fine. And I did as secretary of state. That's how we got a treaty reducing nuclear weapons. It's how we got the sanctions on Iran that put a lid on the Iranian nuclear program without firing a single shot. So I would go to the negotiating table with more leverage than we have now. But I do support the effort to investigate for crimes, war crimes committed by the Syrians and the Russians and try to hold them accountable.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: First of all, she was there as secretary of state with the so-called line in the sand, which...

CLINTON: No, I wasn't. I was gone. I hate to interrupt you, but at some point...

TRUMP: OK. But you were in contact -- excuse me. You were...

CLINTON: At some point, we need to do some fact-checking here.

TRUMP: You were in total contact with the White House, and perhaps, sadly, Obama probably still listened to you. I don't think he would be listening to you very much anymore.

Obama draws the line in the sand. It was laughed at all over the world what happened.

Now, with that being said, she talks tough against Russia. But our nuclear program has fallen way behind, and they've gone wild with their nuclear program. Not good. Our government shouldn't have allowed that to happen. Russia is new in terms of nuclear. We are old. We're tired. We're exhausted in terms of nuclear. A very bad thing.

Now, she talks tough, she talks really tough against Putin and against Assad. She talks in favor of the rebels. She doesn't even know who the rebels are. You know, every time we take rebels, whether it's in Iraq or anywhere else, we're arming people. And you know what happens? They end up being worse than the people.

Look at what she did in Libya with Gadhafi. Gadhafi's out. It's a mess. And, by the way, ISIS has a good chunk of their oil. I'm sure you probably have heard that. It was a disaster. Because the fact is, almost everything she's done in foreign policy has been a mistake and it's been a disaster.

But if you look at Russia, just take a look at Russia, and look at what they did this week, where I agree, she wasn't there, but possibly she's consulted. We sign a peace treaty. Everyone's all excited. Well, what Russia did with Assad and, by the way, with Iran, who you made very powerful with the dumbest deal perhaps I've ever seen in the history of deal-making, the Iran deal, with the $150 billion, with the $1.7 billion in cash, which is enough to fill up this room.

But look at that deal. Iran now and Russia are now against us. So she wants to fight. She wants to fight for rebels. There's only one problem. You don't even know who the rebels are. So what's the purpose?

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Mr. Trump, your two minutes is up.

TRUMP: And one thing I have to say.

RADDATZ: Your two minutes is up.

TRUMP: I don't like Assad at all, but Assad is killing ISIS. Russia is killing ISIS. And Iran is killing ISIS. And those three have now lined up because of our weak foreign policy.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, let me repeat the question. If you were president...

(LAUGHTER)

... what would you do about Syria and the humanitarian crisis in Aleppo? And I want to remind you what your running mate said. He said provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength and that if Russia continues to be involved in air strikes along with the Syrian government forces of Assad, the United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike the military targets of the Assad regime.

TRUMP: OK. He and I haven't spoken, and I disagree. I disagree.

RADDATZ: You disagree with your running mate?

TRUMP: I think you have to knock out ISIS. Right now, Syria is fighting ISIS. We have people that want to fight both at the same time. But Syria is no longer Syria. Syria is Russia and it's Iran, who she made strong and Kerry and Obama made into a very powerful nation and a very rich nation, very, very quickly, very, very quickly.

I believe we have to get ISIS. We have to worry about ISIS before we can get too much more involved. She had a chance to do something with Syria. They had a chance. And that was the line. And she didn't.

RADDATZ: What do you think will happen if Aleppo falls?

TRUMP: I think Aleppo is a disaster, humanitarian-wise.

RADDATZ: What do you think will happen if it falls?

TRUMP: I think that it basically has fallen. OK? It basically has fallen. Let me tell you something. You take a look at Mosul. The biggest problem I have with the stupidity of our foreign policy, we have Mosul. They think a lot of the ISIS leaders are in Mosul. So we have announcements coming out of Washington and coming out of Iraq, we will be attacking Mosul in three weeks or four weeks.

Well, all of these bad leaders from ISIS are leaving Mosul. Why can't they do it quietly? Why can't they do the attack, make it a sneak attack, and after the attack is made, inform the American public that we've knocked out the leaders, we've had a tremendous success? People leave. Why do they have to say we're going to be attacking Mosul within the next four to six weeks, which is what they're saying? How stupid is our country? RADDATZ: There are sometimes reasons the military does that. Psychological warfare.

TRUMP: I can't think of any. I can't think of any. And I'm pretty good at it.

RADDATZ: It might be to help get civilians out.

TRUMP: And we have General Flynn. And we have -- look, I have 200 generals and admirals who endorsed me. I have 21 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients who endorsed me. We talk about it all the time. They understand, why can't they do something secretively, where they go in and they knock out the leadership? How -- why would these people stay there? I've been reading now...

RADDATZ: Tell me what your strategy is.

TRUMP: ... for weeks -- I've been reading now for weeks about Mosul, that it's the harbor of where -- you know, between Raqqa and Mosul, this is where they think the ISIS leaders are. Why would they be saying -- they're not staying there anymore. They're gone. Because everybody's talking about how Iraq, which is us with our leadership, goes in to fight Mosul.

Now, with these 200 admirals and generals, they can't believe it. All I say is this. General George Patton, General Douglas MacArthur are spinning in their grave at the stupidity of what we're doing in the Middle East.

RADDATZ: I'm going to go to Secretary Clinton. Secretary Clinton, you want Assad to go. You advocated arming rebels, but it looks like that may be too late for Aleppo. You talk about diplomatic efforts. Those have failed. Cease-fires have failed. Would you introduce the threat of U.S. military force beyond a no-fly zone against the Assad regime to back up diplomacy?

CLINTON: I would not use American ground forces in Syria. I think that would be a very serious mistake. I don't think American troops should be holding territory, which is what they would have to do as an occupying force. I don't think that is a smart strategy.

I do think the use of special forces, which we're using, the use of enablers and trainers in Iraq, which has had some positive effects, are very much in our interests, and so I do support what is happening, but let me just...

RADDATZ: But what would you do differently than President Obama is doing?

CLINTON: Well, Martha, I hope that by the time I -- if I'm fortunate...

TRUMP: Everything.

CLINTON: I hope by the time I am president that we will have pushed ISIS out of Iraq. I do think that there is a good chance that we can take Mosul. And, you know, Donald says he knows more about ISIS than the generals. No, he doesn't.

There are a lot of very important planning going on, and some of it is to signal to the Sunnis in the area, as well as Kurdish Peshmerga fighters, that we all need to be in this. And that takes a lot of planning and preparation.

I would go after Baghdadi. I would specifically target Baghdadi, because I think our targeting of Al Qaida leaders -- and I was involved in a lot of those operations, highly classified ones -- made a difference. So I think that could help.

I would also consider arming the Kurds. The Kurds have been our best partners in Syria, as well as Iraq. And I know there's a lot of concern about that in some circles, but I think they should have the equipment they need so that Kurdish and Arab fighters on the ground are the principal way that we take Raqqa after pushing ISIS out of Iraq.

RADDATZ: Thank you very much. We're going to move on...

TRUMP: You know what's funny? She went over a minute over, and you don't stop her. When I go one second over, it's like a big deal.

RADDATZ: You had many answers.

TRUMP: It's really -- it's really very interesting.

COOPER: We've got a question over here from James Carter. Mr. Carter?

QUESTION: My question is, do you believe you can be a devoted president to all the people in the United States?

COOPER: That question begins for Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Absolutely. I mean, she calls our people deplorable, a large group, and irredeemable. I will be a president for all of our people. And I'll be a president that will turn our inner cities around and will give strength to people and will give economics to people and will bring jobs back.

Because NAFTA, signed by her husband, is perhaps the greatest disaster trade deal in the history of the world. Not in this country. It stripped us of manufacturing jobs. We lost our jobs. We lost our money. We lost our plants. It is a disaster. And now she wants to sign TPP, even though she says now she's for it. She called it the gold standard. And by the way, at the last debate, she lied, because it turned out that she did say the gold standard and she said she didn't say it. They actually said that she lied. OK? And she lied. But she's lied about a lot of things.

TRUMP: I would be a president for all of the people, African- Americans, the inner cities. Devastating what's happening to our inner cities. She's been talking about it for years. As usual, she talks about it, nothing happens. She doesn't get it done.

Same with the Latino Americans, the Hispanic Americans. The same exact thing. They talk, they don't get it done. You go into the inner cities and -- you see it's 45 percent poverty. African- Americans now 45 percent poverty in the inner cities. The education is a disaster. Jobs are essentially nonexistent.

I mean, it's -- you know, and I've been saying at big speeches where I have 20,000 and 30,000 people, what do you have to lose? It can't get any worse. And she's been talking about the inner cities for 25 years. Nothing's going to ever happen.

Let me tell you, if she's president of the United States, nothing's going to happen. It's just going to be talk. And all of her friends, the taxes we were talking about, and I would just get it by osmosis. She's not doing any me favors. But by doing all the others' favors, she's doing me favors.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, thank you.

TRUMP: But I will tell you, she's all talk. It doesn't get done. All you have to do is take a look at her Senate run. Take a look at upstate New York.

COOPER: Your two minutes is up. Secretary Clinton, two minutes?

TRUMP: It turned out to be a disaster.

COOPER: You have two minutes, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, 67 percent of the people voted to re-elect me when I ran for my second term, and I was very proud and very humbled by that.

Mr. Carter, I have tried my entire life to do what I can to support children and families. You know, right out of law school, I went to work for the Children's Defense Fund. And Donald talks a lot about, you know, the 30 years I've been in public service. I'm proud of that. You know, I started off as a young lawyer working against discrimination against African-American children in schools and in the criminal justice system. I worked to make sure that kids with disabilities could get a public education, something that I care very much about. I have worked with Latinos -- one of my first jobs in politics was down in south Texas registering Latino citizens to be able to vote. So I have a deep devotion, to use your absolutely correct word, to making sure that an every American feels like he or she has a place in our country.

And I think when you look at the letters that I get, a lot of people are worried that maybe they wouldn't have a place in Donald Trump's America. They write me, and one woman wrote me about her son, Felix. She adopted him from Ethiopia when he was a toddler. He's 10 years old now. This is the only one country he's ever known. And he listens to Donald on TV and he said to his mother one day, will he send me back to Ethiopia if he gets elected?

You know, children listen to what is being said. To go back to the very, very first question. And there's a lot of fear -- in fact, teachers and parents are calling it the Trump effect. Bullying is up. A lot of people are feeling, you know, uneasy. A lot of kids are expressing their concerns.

So, first and foremost, I will do everything I can to reach out to everybody.

COOPER: Your time, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Democrats, Republicans, independents, people across our country. If you don't vote for me, I still want to be your president.

COOPER: Your two minutes is up.

CLINTON: I want to be the best president I can be for every American.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, your two minutes is up. I want to follow up on something that Donald Trump actually said to you, a comment you made last month. You said that half of Donald Trump's supporters are, quote, "deplorables, racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic." You later said you regretted saying half. You didn't express regret for using the term "deplorables." To Mr. Carter's question, how can you unite a country if you've written off tens of millions of Americans?

CLINTON: Well, within hours I said that I was sorry about the way I talked about that, because my argument is not with his supporters. It's with him and with the hateful and divisive campaign that he has run, and the inciting of violence at his rallies, and the very brutal kinds of comments about not just women, but all Americans, all kinds of Americans.

And what he has said about African-Americans and Latinos, about Muslims, about POWs, about **immigrants**, about people with disabilities, he's never apologized for. And so I do think that a lot of the tone and tenor that he has said -- I'm proud of the campaign that Bernie Sanders and I ran. We ran a campaign based on issues, not insults. And he is supporting me 100 percent.

COOPER: Thank you.

CLINTON: Because we talked about what we wanted to do. We might have had some differences, and we had a lot of debates...

COOPER: Thank you, Secretary.

TRUMP: ... but we believed that we could make the country better. And I was proud of that.

COOPER: I want to give you a minute to respond.

TRUMP: We have a divided nation. We have a very divided nation. You look at Charlotte. You look at Baltimore. You look at the violence that's taking place in the inner cities, Chicago, you take a look at Washington, D.C.

We have an increase in murder within our cities, the biggest in 45 years. We have a divided nation, because people like her -- and believe me, she has tremendous hate in her heart. And when she said deplorables, she meant it. And when she said irredeemable, they're irredeemable, you didn't mention that, but when she said they're irredeemable, to me that might have been even worse.

COOPER: She said some of them are irredeemable.

TRUMP: She's got tremendous -- she's got tremendous hatred. And this country cannot take another four years of Barack Obama, and that's what you're getting with her.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, let me follow up with you. In 2008, you wrote in one of your books that the most important characteristic of a good leader is discipline. You said, if a leader doesn't have it, quote, "he or she won't be one for very long." In the days after the first debate, you sent out a series of tweets from 3 a.m. to 5 a.m., including one that told people to check out a sex tape. Is that the discipline of a good leader?

TRUMP: No, there wasn't check out a sex tape. It was just take a look at the person that she built up to be this wonderful Girl Scout who was no Girl Scout.

COOPER: You mentioned sex tape.

TRUMP: By the way, just so you understand, when she said 3 o'clock in the morning, take a look at Benghazi. She said who is going to answer the call at 3 o'clock in the morning? Guess what? She didn't answer it, because when Ambassador Stevens...

COOPER: The question is, is that the discipline of a good leader?

TRUMP: ... 600 -- wait a minute, Anderson, 600 times. Well, she said she was awake at 3 o'clock in the morning, and she also sent a tweet out at 3 o'clock in the morning, but I won't even mention that. But she said she'll be awake. Who's going -- the famous thing, we're going to answer our call at 3 o'clock in the morning. Guess what happened? Ambassador Stevens -- Ambassador Stevens sent 600 requests for help. And the only one she talked to was Sidney Blumenthal, who's her friend and not a good guy, by the way. So, you know, she shouldn't be talking about that.

Now, tweeting happens to be a modern day form of communication. I mean, you can like it or not like it. I have, between Facebook and Twitter, I have almost 25 million people. It's a very effective way of communication. So you can put it down, but it is a very effective form of communication. I'm not un-proud of it, to be honest with you.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, does Mr. Trump have the discipline to be a good leader?

CLINTON: No.

TRUMP: I'm shocked to hear that.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: Well, it's not only my opinion. It's the opinion of many others, national security experts, Republicans, former Republican members of Congress. But it's in part because those of us who have had the great privilege of seeing this job up close and know how difficult it is, and it's not just because I watched my husband take a $300 billion deficit and turn it into a $200 billion surplus, and 23 million new jobs were created, and incomes went up for everybody. Everybody. African-American incomes went up 33 percent.

And it's not just because I worked with George W. Bush after 9/11, and I was very proud that when I told him what the city needed, what we needed to recover, he said you've got it, and he never wavered. He stuck with me.

And I have worked and I admire President Obama. He inherited the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. That was a terrible time for our country.

COOPER: We have to move along.

CLINTON: Nine million people lost their jobs.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we have to...

CLINTON: Five million homes were lost.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we're moving.

CLINTON: And $13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out. We are back on the right track. He would send us back into recession with his tax plans that benefit the wealthiest of Americans.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we are moving to an audience question. We're almost out of time. We have another... TRUMP: We have the slowest growth since 1929.

RADDATZ: We're moving to an audience question.

TRUMP: It is -- our country has the slowest growth and jobs are a disaster.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Secretary Clinton, we want to get to the audience. Thank you very much both of you.

(LAUGHTER)

We have another audience question. Beth Miller has a question for both candidates.

QUESTION: Good evening. Perhaps the most important aspect of this election is the Supreme Court justice. What would you prioritize as the most important aspect of selecting a Supreme Court justice?

RADDATZ: We begin with your two minutes, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Thank you. Well, you're right. This is one of the most important issues in this election. I want to appoint Supreme Court justices who understand the way the world really works, who have real-life experience, who have not just been in a big law firm and maybe clerked for a judge and then gotten on the bench, but, you know, maybe they tried some more cases, they actually understand what people are up against.

Because I think the current court has gone in the wrong direction. And so I would want to see the Supreme Court reverse Citizens United and get dark, unaccountable money out of our politics. Donald doesn't agree with that.

I would like the Supreme Court to understand that voting rights are still a big problem in many parts of our country, that we don't always do everything we can to make it possible for people of color and older people and young people to be able to exercise their franchise. I want a Supreme Court that will stick with Roe v. Wade and a woman's right to choose, and I want a Supreme Court that will stick with marriage equality.

Now, Donald has put forth the names of some people that he would consider. And among the ones that he has suggested are people who would reverse Roe v. Wade and reverse marriage equality. I think that would be a terrible mistake and would take us backwards.

I want a Supreme Court that doesn't always side with corporate interests. I want a Supreme Court that understands because you're wealthy and you can give more money to something doesn't mean you have any more rights or should have any more rights than anybody else.

So I have very clear views about what I want to see to kind of change the balance on the Supreme Court. And I regret deeply that the Senate has not done its job and they have not permitted a vote on the person that President Obama, a highly qualified person, they've not given him a vote to be able to be have the full complement of nine Supreme Court justices. I think that was a dereliction of duty.

I hope that they will see their way to doing it, but if I am so fortunate enough as to be president, I will immediately move to make sure that we fill that, we have nine justices that get to work on behalf of our people.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. Thank you. You're out of time. Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Justice Scalia, great judge, died recently. And we have a vacancy. I am looking to appoint judges very much in the mold of Justice Scalia. I'm looking for judges -- and I've actually picked 20 of them so that people would see, highly respected, highly thought of, and actually very beautifully reviewed by just about everybody.

But people that will respect the Constitution of the United States. And I think that this is so important. Also, the Second Amendment, which is totally under siege by people like Hillary Clinton. They'll respect the Second Amendment and what it stands for, what it represents. So important to me.

Now, Hillary mentioned something about contributions just so you understand. So I will have in my race more than $100 million put in -- of my money, meaning I'm not taking all of this big money from all of these different corporations like she's doing. What I ask is this.

So I'm putting in more than -- by the time it's finished, I'll have more than $100 million invested. Pretty much self-funding money. We're raising money for the Republican Party, and we're doing tremendously on the small donations, $61 average or so.

I ask Hillary, why doesn't -- she made $250 million by being in office. She used the power of her office to make a lot of money. Why isn't she funding, not for $100 million, but why don't you put $10 million or $20 million or $25 million or $30 million into your own campaign?

It's $30 million less for special interests that will tell you exactly what to do and it would really, I think, be a nice sign to the American public. Why aren't you putting some money in? You have a lot of it. You've made a lot of it because of the fact that you've been in office. Made a lot of it while you were secretary of state, actually. So why aren't you putting money into your own campaign? I'm just curious.

CLINTON: Well...

(CROSSTALK)

RADDATZ: Thank you very much. We're going to get on to one more question.

CLINTON: The question was about the Supreme Court. And I just want to quickly say, I respect the Second Amendment. But I believe there should be comprehensive background checks, and we should close the gun show loophole, and close the online loophole. COOPER: Thank you.

RADDATZ: We have -- we have one more question, Mrs. Clinton.

CLINTON: We have to save as many lives as we possibly can.

COOPER: We have one more question from Ken Bone about energy policy. Ken?

QUESTION: What steps will your energy policy take to meet our energy needs, while at the same time remaining environmentally friendly and minimizing job loss for fossil power plant workers?

COOPER: Mr. Trump, two minutes?

TRUMP: Absolutely. I think it's such a great question, because energy is under siege by the Obama administration. Under absolutely siege. The EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, is killing these energy companies. And foreign companies are now coming in buying our -- buying so many of our different plants and then re-jiggering the plant so that they can take care of their oil.

We are killing -- absolutely killing our energy business in this country. Now, I'm all for alternative forms of energy, including wind, including solar, et cetera. But we need much more than wind and solar.

And you look at our miners. Hillary Clinton wants to put all the miners out of business. There is a thing called clean coal. Coal will last for 1,000 years in this country. Now we have natural gas and so many other things because of technology. We have unbelievable -- we have found over the last seven years, we have found tremendous wealth right under our feet. So good. Especially when you have $20 trillion in debt.

I will bring our energy companies back. They'll be able to compete. They'll make money. They'll pay off our national debt. They'll pay off our tremendous budget deficits, which are tremendous. But we are putting our energy companies out of business. We have to bring back our workers.

You take a look at what's happening to steel and the cost of steel and China dumping vast amounts of steel all over the United States, which essentially is killing our steelworkers and our steel companies. We have to guard our energy companies. We have to make it possible.

The EPA is so restrictive that they are putting our energy companies out of business. And all you have to do is go to a great place like West Virginia or places like Ohio, which is phenomenal, or places like Pennsylvania and you see what they're doing to the people, miners and others in the energy business. It's a disgrace.

COOPER: Your time is up. Thank you.

TRUMP: It's an absolute disgrace. COOPER: Secretary Clinton, two minutes.

CLINTON: And actually -- well, that was very interesting. First of all, China is illegally dumping steel in the United States and Donald Trump is buying it to build his buildings, putting steelworkers and American steel plants out of business. That's something that I fought against as a senator and that I would have a trade prosecutor to make sure that we don't get taken advantage of by China on steel or anything else.

You know, because it sounds like you're in the business or you're aware of people in the business -- you know that we are now for the first time ever energy-independent. We are not dependent upon the Middle East. But the Middle East still controls a lot of the prices. So the price of oil has been way down. And that has had a damaging effect on a lot of the oil companies, right? We are, however, producing a lot of natural gas, which serves as a bridge to more renewable fuels. And I think that's an important transition.

We've got to remain energy-independent. It gives us much more power and freedom than to be worried about what goes on in the Middle East. We have enough worries over there without having to worry about that.

So I have a comprehensive energy policy, but it really does include fighting climate change, because I think that is a serious problem. And I support moving toward more clean, renewable energy as quickly as we can, because I think we can be the 21st century clean energy superpower and create millions of new jobs and businesses.

But I also want to be sure that we don't leave people behind. That's why I'm the only candidate from the very beginning of this campaign who had a plan to help us revitalize coal country, because those coal miners and their fathers and their grandfathers, they dug that coal out. A lot of them lost their lives. They were injured, but they turned the lights on and they powered their factories. I don't want to walk away from them. So we've got to do something for them.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: But the price of coal is down worldwide. So we have to look at this comprehensively.

COOPER: Your time is up.

CLINTON: And that's exactly what I have proposed. I hope you will go to HillaryClinton.com and look at my entire policy.

COOPER: Time is up. We have time for one more...

RADDATZ: We have...

COOPER: One more audience question.

RADDATZ: We've sneaked in one more question, and it comes from Karl Becker.

QUESTION: Good evening. My question to both of you is, regardless of the current rhetoric, would either of you name one positive thing that you respect in one another?

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, would you like to go first?

CLINTON: Well, I certainly will, because I think that's a very fair and important question. Look, I respect his children. His children are incredibly able and devoted, and I think that says a lot about Donald. I don't agree with nearly anything else he says or does, but I do respect that. And I think that is something that as a mother and a grandmother is very important to me.

So I believe that this election has become in part so -- so conflict-oriented, so intense because there's a lot at stake. This is not an ordinary time, and this is not an ordinary election. We are going to be choosing a president who will set policy for not just four or eight years, but because of some of the important decisions we have to make here at home and around the world, from the Supreme Court to energy and so much else, and so there is a lot at stake. It's one of the most consequential elections that we've had.

And that's why I've tried to put forth specific policies and plans, trying to get it off of the personal and put it on to what it is I want to do as president. And that's why I hope people will check on that for themselves so that they can see that, yes, I've spent 30 years, actually maybe a little more, working to help kids and families. And I want to take all that experience to the White House and do that every single day.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Well, I consider her statement about my children to be a very nice compliment. I don't know if it was meant to be a compliment, but it is a great -- I'm very proud of my children. And they've done a wonderful job, and they've been wonderful, wonderful kids. So I consider that a compliment.

I will say this about Hillary. She doesn't quit. She doesn't give up. I respect that. I tell it like it is. She's a fighter. I disagree with much of what she's fighting for. I do disagree with her judgment in many cases. But she does fight hard, and she doesn't quit, and she doesn't give up. And I consider that to be a very good trait.

RADDATZ: Thanks to both of you.

COOPER: We want to thank both the candidates. We want to thank the university here. This concludes the town hall meeting. Our thanks to the candidates, the commission, Washington University, and to everybody who watched.

RADDATZ: Please tune in on October 19th for the final presidential debate that will take place at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Good night, everyone.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A reactionary is someone who wishes to return, usually unrealistically, to an earlier and more appealing era. We have two reactionaries running for president. Both peddle agendas that promise to re-create a reassuring past. We are being fed different varieties of nostalgia. Neither will work.

Donald Trump is the most explicit. He pledges to "make America great again." What does this mean? For starters, it suggests that non-Hispanic whites will recapture political power that has shifted to **immigrants** and their children. Many would simply be tossed out of the country. After this, Trump will reinvigorate the economy by tearing up many, perhaps all, of our trade agreements, which he blames for our economic problems.

To ensure the economy's revival, Trump would resort to the standard Republican cure for slow growth: massive tax cuts. These would cost roughly $5 trillion over a decade, reckons the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

Of course, most of this is unlikely. Legal **immigrants** account for three-quarters of all **immigrants**, reports the Pew Research Center. The proportion is higher for their children. Indeed, **immigrants** and their offspring now account for most U.S. population growth. Between now and 2065, they will represent almost 90 percent of growth, projects Pew .

As for the economy, Republicans talk casually about increasing annual economic growth to 3.5 percent to 4 percent, which is slightly above the 3.2 percent average from 1950 to 2015 . But it's way above the recent average of 2 percent. Although raising it doesn't sound hard, it is. Part of the decline stems from the retirement of baby-boom workers; that won't change much. Most of the rest reflects stagnant productivity — the disappointing impact on growth of technology, management and worker skills — and is hard to influence in an $18 trillion economy.

Turn now to Hillary Clinton, who — like Trump — is busy resurrecting the past and calling it the future. The Democratic political formula is unchanging: Create handouts that make more Americans grateful for and dependent on government. Clinton has proposed raising Social Security benefits, paying tuition for most students at state colleges and universities, funding universal preschool programs and helping parents cover child-care costs.

All this is self-serving behavior. It's using the public's money to bribe the public, as is sometimes said. Actually, Democrats (and Republicans, too) have gone one step further. They bribe the public with borrowed money (budget deficits) and taxes on the wealthy. Clinton has ruled out tax increases on the middle class, defined as less than $250,000 of income for a family.

Democracy increasingly becomes a cynical game in which the few subsidize benefits for the many. Government isn't disciplined, because the many have little reason to discipline it. If most government appears "free" to most people, why bother?

Of course, a progressive tax system (the rich pay more) is desirable, and many social programs are needed. But most could do with modernization. Two major programs — college student loans and Obamacare — have serious weaknesses. You might think a responsible government, before embarking on more social engineering, would fix existing programs. Perish the thought.

So the public is left contemplating two competing, but twisted, visions of the past. Trump evokes the early decades after World War II, when U.S. companies dominated the world. Germany, Japan, South Korea, Mexico and China weren't major factors then. They are now and won't meekly retreat. The United States runs chronic trade deficits because the dollar serves as the main global currency. This raises its exchange rate, putting U.S. manufacturers at a disadvantage.

Clinton offers warmed-over 1960s activism based on the false optimism that government can easily regulate social change. This was and is a delusional simplification. What we are likely to get are new bureaucracies presiding over new grants, regulations and tax breaks that make government more intrusive and confusing.

One irrefutable sign of this campaign's unseriousness is the virtual absence of any discussion of America's aging. In 1960, fewer than 1 in 10 Americans was 65 or older; now it's 1 in 7, and by 2060, the ratio may be 1 in 4 , says the Population Reference Bureau. This trend is unavoidable, but it is missing in action. How does it affect the economy and politics? How can we prevent spending on the elderly from crowding out other important functions of government, including defense, which is being squeezed in an increasingly dangerous world?

So it is with many subjects: **immigration**, tax changes, balancing the budget (the main reason for this: to make people weigh the benefits of more government against the costs). We get no discussion or simplistic discussion. The past takes precedence over the future. There's a reactionary celebration of the past that, no matter who wins, has one sure consequence: disappointment.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The revelation of Donald Trump's despicable 2005 comments about groping women has some Republicans once again pondering ways to try to get him off their ticket. Though they face long odds, I very much hope they succeed. I urged the party to dump Trump at the GOP Convention, when it would have been much easier to do it; perhaps some way can be found even now. But whether Trump stays in the race or not, the problem here goes beyond him and his personality. It also encompasses the dangerous policies he has been advocating.

What makes Trump dangerous is not just his execrable character, but the horrendous Trumpist agenda of European-style big-government nationalism, mass deportations, discrimination on the basis of religion, undermining constitutional rights, trade wars, speech restrictions, and murdering civilians. Barring some dramatic reversal, Trump will not be elected president in November. But even if he leaves the political scene, that agenda may not leave with him.

Some of Trump's political success has been due to his celebrity status, to his effective channeling of public anger against an unpopular political establishment, and to a desire for "change." But some also reflects the fact that many of his worst proposals are popular with a large part of the Republican base. The fear and ignorance that Trump effectively exploited could potentially be used by other politicians and demagogues seeking to follow in his footsteps.

To take only the most obvious examples, many Republicans agree with Trump's calls for mass deportations, for discrimination against Muslims, and for a protectionist trade policy. It is no accident that Trump's campaign first took off after he made the notorious speech denouncing Mexican **immigrants** as "criminals" and "rapists." The speech was effective in part because over 70% of Republicans agree with the claim **immigration** increases crime, and do not know that social science research consistently shows that **immigrants** (including Mexican **immigrants**) actually have much lower crime-rates than native-born citizens.

Such misperceptions helped make the GOP susceptible to Trump's demagoguery in the first place. And he may not be the last demagogue to exploit them. Preventing such a recurrence is just one of several reasons why many conservatives would do well to rethink their highly restrictionist position on **immigration**, which is deeply at odds with many of their other professed principles, such as commitments to free markets, color blindness, and constitutional originalism. In the vast majority of cases, reasonable conservative fears about **immigration** are either overblown or can be addressed by means less draconian than walls, deportations, and other similar policies.

Overcoming the Trumpist agenda is likely to prove a more difficult challenge than repudiating one badly flawed presidential candidate. Sadly, Trump is just the most prominent manifestation of the xenophobic nationalism that has gained ground in the United States and many European countries in recent years. That movement and the policies associated with it pose a serious threat to the freedom and well-being of native-born Westerners as well as **immigrants**. The struggle to counter this growing menace will not be an easy one. And it is may well continue long after Trump's increasingly likely defeat.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There's a lot of irony in Matt Drudge accusing someone else of overly hyping a threat for political purposes.

On Thursday afternoon, while Hurricane Matthew was still over the Bahamas, the political commentator and news aggregator tweeted skepticism about the dire warnings of weather forecasters. (Drudge regularly deletes his new tweets, so we've included an image of it below.)

"The deplorables," he wrote, referring to supporters of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, "are starting to wonder if [the government] has been lying to them about Hurricane Matthew intensity to make exaggerated point on climate."

The tweet (and a similarly dismissive article on his site the Drudge Report) was quickly lambasted as irresponsible: Suggesting that the storm wasn't that dangerous might convince people that there was no need to evacuate, leaving them at risk from the storm's effects.

But the political conspiracy at the heart of the idea is also worth calling out. Drudge, like the presidential candidate he supports, is prone to assuming that there's a broad conspiracy of political actors working to hide the truth from the American people.

In this case Drudge's idea (offered in ) is that meteorologists and scientists from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Hurricane Center were producing exaggerated data to make the threat of climate change seem worse. That data includes things like wind-speed measurements from sensors all over the Caribbean and on the Florida coast. The data look like this, and are made publicly available for analysis. Those measurements help provide future predictions and estimates, like this one. The predictions on Thursday were for high-speed gusts, not sustained winds; Florida so far seems to have gotten lucky, in that the eyewall — where winds are fastest — has remained offshore.

It's natural that Drudge's assumption would be that someone was hyping a threat for political purposes. That's what Drudge does nearly every day. Between September 2013 and June 2014, for example, he promoted stories about the "knockout game" 19 times, according to Drudge Report Archives. The "knockout game" was a purported trend in which young men (mostly black) were dared to go punch someone (often white) without provocation. There was no basis to the suggestion that this was a broad trend, and the subtext behind the weird media frenzy was hard to miss.

More regularly, Drudge hypes stories about undocumented **immigrants** ("Illegal **Alien** in Phoenix Deadly Crash Drank 12 Beers and Used Cocaine..."), the Islamic State ("ISIS to send 'serial killers' to the West in bloody new terror tactic") and crime ("Murder Rates Soar In 25 Largest Cities..."). His relationship with Trump is symbiotic, however unintentionally: He hypes the purported danger, and Trump promises to fix it.

The difference between Drudge's hype and the warnings of the weather forecasters, of course, is that there actually is a massive hurricane on Florida's coast. It actually is an immediate risk to life and property. Drudge criticizing forecasters for basing warnings on worst-case scenarios is the flip side to Drudge constantly hyping one-off polls that show Trump with significant leads in the presidential race. He's cherry-picking the best-case scenario to reassure his readers; the scientists are isolating the worst case to potentially save lives.

It's also worth noting that there may be a link between climate change and more powerful hurricanes. The Washington Post's Chris Mooney interviewed a researcher Thursday who explained how a warmer climate may have helped power Matthew. Hurricanes have occurred for millennia, of course, but more atmospheric warmth (or, put another way, energy), warmer, higher seas and more atmospheric moisture can help create bigger, more powerful storms when they happen, scientists say. "These storm traits aren't proof of anything, of course," Mooney writes of Matthew. "They're merely consistent with the notion of warming making storms worse."

Conservatives, though, are much less likely to accept the scientific consensus that climate change is occurring, much less that it's caused by human activity and greenhouse gas emissions. In a recent Pew Research survey, only 11 percent of conservative Republicans said that they felt that scientists understood what was causing the Earth to warm, and only 15 percent said they trusted scientists to give accurate information about the causes. Conservative Republicans were also the most likely to say that the news media was exaggerating the threat climate change poses.

Drudge takes advantage of that skepticism — on climate change, yes, but also more broadly. There's no higher-profile member of the media who's been more effective at sowing distrust of the media overall. In this case, the distrust that Drudge sowed held real risks for readers. But his habit of doing precisely what he was criticizing — hyping outliers and worst-case scenario to score political points — is why he's got so many fans, and helps explain a lot about American politics in 2016.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump suggested without evidence Friday that the Obama administration was letting illegal **immigrants** into the country to vote — part of a series of unsubstantiated complaints by the GOP nominee that the election is "rigged" against him and that his backers should monitor polling locations in "certain areas."

Trump's allegations were a dramatic escalation of the usual partisan warfare over ballot access issues and came as Florida Gov. Rick Scott (R) denied a request by Hillary Clinton's campaign to extend voter registration because of Hurricane Matthew. The storm caused the extension of voter registration deadlines in South Carolina, while officials in Georgia have urged residents in storm-affected areas to register online instead of going to registration centers.

In Nevada, state Democrats also threatened Friday to file suit if the voter registration deadline is not extended beyond Saturday to comply with a federal law requiring deadlines to fall within the 30 days before an election.

Voting experts say they are increasingly troubled by Trump's tone amid fresh strain on voting systems nationwide, warning that his comments could undermine trust in an election system renowned as largely efficient and free of corruption.

"We've never seen anything like this coming from a presidential candidate," said Richard L. Hasen, a law and political science professor at the University of California at Irvine who is the co-author of a leading casebook on election law.

Hasen said Trump's comments about undocumented **immigrants** illegally voting is a continuation of his "irresponsible" pushing of the discredited idea that voter fraud is rampant and undetected, especially in poor and minority areas. Hasen said voter impersonation fraud is rare and that in his years of research, he has yet to find a single election where such cases compromised the results.

"It just doesn't happen in the United States," he said.

Daniel A. Smith, a political science professor at the University of Florida, added that Trump is "trying to undermine the election system, which is very decentralized, which has very good people."

"If anything, it's putting a damper on the ability to register and creating some paranoia that is unfounded," Smith added.

Trump's latest comments came during an event on border security held on the 25th floor of Trump Tower on Friday.

Art Del Cueto of the National Border Patrol Council, which represents U.S. Border Patrol agents and has endorsed Trump, claimed that agents were instructed not to deport undocumented **immigrants** with criminal records.

"Why?" Trump asked.

"So they can go ahead and vote before the election," Del Cueto responded.

Trump replied: "Big statement, fellas." Motioning to the small group of reporters, he added, "You're not going to write it. That's huge. But they're letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote."

The union later clarified that U.S. Citizenship and **Immigration** Services has authorized extra overtime for employees processing a higher volume of U.S. citizenship applications before Election Day. It also claimed in a statement to have "text messages from upper level managers" saying that criminal prosecution cases were being put on hold so that **immigration** judges could make rulings on citizenship applications.

The Obama administration has focused on targeting for deportation undocumented **immigrants** who have committed felonies. Marsha Catron, a spokeswoman for the Department of Homeland Security, said that "our borders are not open to illegal migration. We must and we will enforce the law in accordance with our enforcement priorities. Our actions reflect that commitment."

Only U.S. citizens can vote in federal elections. To apply for citizenship, an individual must be a legal resident for at least three to five years and meet other requirements.

Trump has repeatedly warned his supporters that he might lose the election because the system is "rigged" against him, and his campaign is recruiting election observers.

During rallies held in white suburbs of diverse cities, Trump has often urged his followers to go to neighborhoods other than their own and "watch" the voters there. Many voting rights activists have accused Trump of encouraging voter intimidation.

"You've been reading the same stories as I've been reading, so go to your place and vote, and then go pick some other place, and go sit there with your friends and make sure it's on the up and up," Trump said at a rally in the Detroit suburbs Sept. 30.

Because of Hurricane Matthew, South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley (R) announced that the state plans to accept voter applications online and by email until Sunday and by mail until Tuesday.

The Clinton campaign began pressing Florida election officials to do the same.

"Our hope would be that a little more time will be given," Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook told reporters Thursday. "We certainly expect that the governor and local officials will make that possible."

But Scott declined, saying that "everybody has had a lot of time to register. On top of that, we've got lots of opportunities to vote: Early voting, absentee voting and Election Day. So I don't intend to make any changes."

Scott's decision could keep thousands of Floridians from participating in the election, according to Smith, who is studying the voting habits of people who register to vote in the later months of an election season.

About 50,000 individuals successfully registered to vote in the final five days of Florida's registration period in 2012, according to state data analyzed by Smith. Thirty-nine percent of registrants were Democrats; 39 percent independents; and 22 percent Republicans. About 47 percent of the registrants were white; about 19 percent Hispanic; and 18 percent black.

Three out of four people who registered in the last five days of the registration period ended up voting, Smith said. "While they may have been last-minute in terms of registration, they certainly had the election on their mind."

Hasen said problems with registrations could lead to even bigger problems on Election Day and noted that after Superstorm Sandy in 2012, some jurisdictions in New Jersey relaxed the voting rules in ways that violated state law and might have even led to some fraudulent voting.

"Just imagine if any of this happens in Florida after Matthew," Hasen wrote in a column for Slate this week. "We already have Donald Trump telling voters that the election is rigged. Any attempt to try to accommodate, or fail to accommodate, voters will be second-guessed, challenged, and likely litigated."
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Sean Sullivan in New York contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Arriving just in time for the Nov. 8 elections is a "report" whose cover features a 1950s-style flying saucer approaching bucolic Virginia. The report is making its rounds in the state blogosphere.

Titled "**Alien** Invasion of Virginia, the Discovery and Coverup of Noncitizen Registration and Voting," the report by two-right wing groups claims that a spot check of records in several Virginia voting districts reveals 1,046 people who were not U.S. citizens but were registered to vote.

It claims that 200 ballots were cast before they could be removed from voting rolls. The localities involved are Prince William, Loudoun, Stafford, Bedford, Hanover and Roanoke counties and the cities of Alexandria and Fairfax.

The report is the work of the so-called Public Interest Legal Foundation and the Virginia Voters Alliance, which complain that there is no formal program to root out voter registrations of non-U.S. citizens. Such registrants could be charged with perjury.

Apparently, the two "public interest" groups hounded voting registrars to review voting documents in which the registrant checks a box as to whether he or she is a U.S. citizen or not. In some cases, the applicant apparently checked "no" but was allowed to register to voter.

In other cases, the registrant's voting status was declared "cancelled" later because either voting officials discovered that the applicant was not a citizen or the applicant called in to say he or she wasn't.

For months, conservative Virginia legislators, such as House Speaker William Howell (R-Stafford), and their supporters have been trying to find evidence of massive fraud that they insist exists. They have pushed voter-identification measures, claiming they are critically needed.

Until now, however, hard evidence of fraud hasn't materialized, other than a case of 19 deceased persons allegedly being registered by a James Madison University student.

Now, we have the aliens from outer space report. It is already being cited as a big cause for alarm.

Wrote one conservative Virginia blogger: "The implications of this report are so earth-shaking — remember that Attorney General Mark Herring defeated Mark Obenshain by only 165 votes out of 2.2 million cast — that even a somnambulant mainstream media cannot ignore it."

I scrolled through the report, noting that very few of the surnames seem to be of Anglo-Saxon origin; they are Hispanic or Muslim. The two voting fraud groups included everyone's name, address and telephone number.

I noticed one man on the list seemed to be a U.S. soldier because one of his addresses seemed to be near Fort Belvoir and he also had listed an A.P.O. (Army Post Office) number.

I scrolled down to Valeria I. Oropeza of Woodbridge.  She had registered to vote on Dec. 4, 2012, and in 2015 signed an affidavit that she was a U.S. citizen.

A handwritten note at the bottom of her file reflected that her registration had been canceled on Oct. 29, 2015, because she was a non-citizen.

Since her number was listed, I telephoned Oropeza, who said that she was registered to vote and that she had been a U.S. citizen since 2008. She had no explanation why her name was in the report.

I checked more into the Public Interest Legal Foundation and found that its leader was J. Christian Adams, a former Justice Department lawyer who is author of a book titled: "Injustice: Exposing the Racial Agenda of the Obama Justice Department."

Voter registration has been a major issue this election year across the country. In Virginia, it drew attention because Gov. Terry McAuliffe, a Democrat, tried to used his executive authority to restore voting rights to 206,000 convicted felons who had served their sentences. Critics claimed he did so to help the chances of Democrats in this year's races, notably those of Hillary Clinton and her running mate Sen. Tim Kaine, a Virginian.

Now, we have the aliens from outer space report. It does make seem to make a valid point that merely checking boxes and scribbling addenda is sloppy.

But even if all 1,046 cases the groups claim are valid, they do not make their point, given that more than 2 million Virginians tend to vote in elections. That's hardly massive voting fraud.

Peter Galuszka is a regular contributor to All Opinions Are Local.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NATIONALIST POPULISM often looks like a rising, even inexorable force in Europe, particularly in the formerly communist nations on the eastern edge of the European Union. Right-wing governments that base their appeal in part on Islamophobic attacks on **immigrants**, and liberal values more generally, are entrenched in Poland, Hungary and Slovakia. So it was striking, and heartening, to see a popular backlash in two of those countries this week that dealt the populists stinging rebuffs.

The first came in a referendum last Sunday in Hungary, where Prime Minister Viktor Orban appealed to voters to reject a European Union plan for distributing the refugees that have poured into Europe from the Middle East and Africa. The government spent tens of millions of dollars on a blatantly racist campaign describing all refugees as potential terrorists. Though the E.U. allocated only 1,294 refugees to Hungary, a country of about 10 million, Mr. Orban insisted they could destroy the country's "Christian" identity.

Opposition parties urged voters to skip the vote, or cast invalid ballots, to prevent the referendum from reaching the 50 percent turnout needed for legal validity. That is what happened: Only 43 percent of voters went to the polls, and 6 percent of those turned in spoiled voting sheets. The referendum, on which Mr. Orban was reported to have spent more than on any advertising campaign in Hungarian history, flopped. Though the prime minister vowed to press on anyway with new anti-migrant laws or a constitutional amendment, the anti-**immigrant** statement he hoped to send to the E.U. instead became a vote of no confidence in his toxic xenophobia.

Something similar happened in Poland, where legislators of the ruling right-wing Law and Justice Party were pushing a measure that would have turned what is already one of the West's most restrictive abortion laws into a near-absolute ban. The bill, which won initial approval last month, would have allowed abortions only when the life of the mother was directly threatened; doctors and women who carried out abortions in other circumstances would have faced prison terms of up to five years.

On Monday, tens of thousands of women and men dressed in black turned out in Polish cities to protest the measure. Central Warsaw was paralyzed. Three days later, the ruling party abruptly reversed itself, voting down the measure and withdrawing another that would have severely restricted access to in vitro fertilization. It was the first significant political retreat by Law and Justice, which has refused to give up an attempt to take control of the country's Constitutional Tribunal and curtail judicial checks on its power despite mass domestic protests and sharp criticism from the European Union.

Mr. Orban and his Polish counterpart, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, are far from vanquished; they still hold strong parliamentary majorities and use state-run television networks to bombard citizens with propaganda. Mr. Orban has endorsed Donald Trump for the U.S. presidency; if the American populist wins, his counterparts in Europe will get a big boost. However, this week's results showed that, even where the populists are now strongest, their extremist ideas are generating powerful resistance. In Europe as in the United States, liberalism still has its defenders.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Here is a beautiful specimen of young American childhood," Andrew Jackson declared as he examined a dirty-faced baby handed to him at a campaign stop in the early 1800s. It would have been the beginning of the most sacred of campaign traditions, baby kissing, except Jackson foisted the boy on a nearby politician with a directive, "Kiss him," and scooted away.

We know, of course, why moments with children are such a part of campaigning: It's humanizing for the candidate. But we generally don't know about the lives these babies and children go on to lead, or how they ended up in the political spotlight in the first place. Here are four stories of the anointed few.

Fleure Fraser

Fleure Fraser was only 3 on June 29, 1999, but she remembers the most important parts of that day. She recalls practicing for the community center dance recital. She remembers the girls' parents had worked together to make their pink outfits sparkly, and when it was finally time to perform at the Del Mar Fair, she gave it everything she had.

But when asked about what happened after she got off stage and was whisked away by strangers, Fraser draws a blank. She doesn't remember being planted in front of presidential candidate George W. Bush as he ate a Cinnabon, or being kissed on the lips by him.

Bush's appearance at the fair north of San Diego was part of a three-day, seven-city tour through California to go where Republican presidential nominees often ran into trouble: in pursuit of the Latino vote. The Republican Party had come to be seen as the anti-**immigrant**, anti-affirmative-action party, but the demographic was the fastest-growing minority, and Bush had made inroads with Latinos in Texas in the past. He went to a tech training for minorities and spoke about education to voters at the fair's Plaza de Mexico in Spanish. "If you can't read, you can't realize the American dream," he told onlookers.

That day, political strategist and image guru Mark McKinnon was shooting footage to soften Bush's image as the candidate roved the fairgrounds. An aide pointed Fleure out to Bush, who knelt to kiss her. A short while later, he petted a sheep.

These days, Fraser, 20, is in her last semester at Cuyamaca College in El Cajon, Calif. She is preparing to apply to nursing school to work toward becoming a midwife.

Fraser has been brought up with a robust media diet including CNN, MSNBC and Fox News. Discussions about the politics of the day are frequent in the Fraser household, but she is having trouble mustering much excitement about her first opportunity to vote in a presidential election.

Her initial excitement about Hillary Clinton's candidacy waned after seeing Clinton take so many selfies with celebrities. And she feels that there has been a lack of respect for opposing candidates and supporters.

But disappointments with this election aside, Fraser knows she will be there on Election Day to cast her lukewarm ballot.

Kate and Lindsay Handy

"BUSH," the stickers on the twins' hats declared. The candidate laughed uproariously as he wrangled the girls for a photo op, grabbing hold of one awkwardly by the leg. The twins' mother, Kathleen Anderson, had prepared them for this moment: chic matching dresses in navy with red accents — subtle but patriotic. And matching stockings, matching shoes and, since it was a wintry day in Provo, Utah, matching headwear.

Anderson had checked her 7-year-old son out of school, driven an hour from Salt Lake City and waited patiently for George W. Bush on March 9, 2000. When she arrived, she noticed half a dozen campaign workers pointing at her 7-month-old daughters, Kate and Lindsay. So it was no surprise that after the candidate delivered his stump speech, he made a beeline to Anderson and asked to take a photo with her daughters. A swarm of photographers surrounded them, and the clatter of camera shutters filled the air.

Bush had particular cause to smile: Sen. John McCain, Bush's rival and the most formidable roadblock on the path to the Republican presidential nomination, had conceded earlier that day.

Now in their last year of high school, Kate and Lindsay, 17, are busy with classes, varsity cheerleading and figuring out the next chapters of their lives. Lindsay is leaning toward getting a degree in interior design, while Kate is trying to decide whether to become a teacher, cheerleading coach or lawyer.

Most of their political knowledge comes from Anderson, who was appointed director of communications for Donald Trump's Utah campaign operation in August. She remembers a middle school discussion about Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter being the "first time I came alive in school." The girls, on the other hand, are just starting to become politically aware. They say they will become more tuned in once they are of voting age.

"I don't want to be the mother who tells my kids how to think and what to say," Anderson said.

Luke Ervin

Luke Francis Ervin was a serious-minded baby. When he was told to eat, he ate. When he was told to sleep, he slept.

This is the same intensity that Luke brought to a chance encounter with presidential candidate Bill Clinton on July 21, 1992. He had a habit of making strong eye contact with the people around him, and Clinton was no exception. In this sea of constituents, handlers and photographers, Luke appears to be the only one really looking closely to see who this man is.

His aunt, Mary Rodgers, had brought the 5-month-old along as she dropped her daughter off at volleyball camp. That morning Rodgers didn't know that the Clinton team had set up at Seneca High School, in Louisville. Luke made his national debut in a primary-colored onesie covered in jaunty baseball players — the backup in case of vomit.

After the photo was snapped, Clinton delivered a peck on the infant's bald head and returned him to Rodgers. Luke's aunt was already leaning toward voting for Clinton, but the intense spark between the candidate and her nephew solidified her conviction.

Twelve days before, Clinton had chosen Sen. Al Gore as his running mate. Six days after that, the Democratic National Convention officially nominated them to the ticket. Then, for nearly a week, the pair and their spouses toured the American heartland. The Louisville stop was on the docket for the next-to-last day.

Ervin, of course, has no memory of these events. But he decided to take a close look at Clinton once again in 2013. When his history professor at Centre College in Danville, Ky., assigned a research paper on a topic of his choosing, Ervin decided to look into why Clinton's approval ratings ascended in the wake of the Monica Lewinsky scandal. ("It turns out that Clinton was holding and kissing people other than just babies such as myself at campaign events," he wrote in the introduction.) He ended up presenting it at the 2014 Kentucky Political Science Association annual meeting.

Today, Ervin, 24, is in his final year of law school at the University of Louisville, following in his father's footsteps. He plans to vote for Hillary Clinton but isn't sure what to expect from Bill should he become the first first gentleman. "Hopefully he ... will be very supportive of Hillary and doesn't cause any distractions," he said.

Nick and John Poulos

It was Nick and John Poulos's first Palm Sunday on April 3, 1988, and for the occasion their mother had chosen slick velvet ensembles and tiny tuxedo shirts. It was also the day the 3-month-old twins would unexpectedly meet presidential hopeful and darling of the Greek community Michael Dukakis at the church where the family worshiped in Wauwatosa, Wis.

Despite being just two days away from the Democratic primary in Wisconsin, the priest's wife, Toula Trifon, remembers Dukakis barely uttered a word about politics. Instead, the Massachusetts governor floated around, mingling with parishioners young and old. During the post-service luncheon, Trifon tied an apron around him and stuck a serving spatula in his hand (he was put in charge of the baked cod and onions).

Dukakis was still sporting the apron when he was photographed by the Associated Press at Sts. Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church, arms overflowing with the twins. Orbiting them in the picture were those who would watch them grow up over the years and become adults, now 28 . Nick is a manager at his father's auto business; John, a senior financial adviser at Dell. Father Theodore, in shadow at Nick's left, would later baptize them as infants and marry John and his wife, Nina, in 2015.

At the time, Dukakis was in a battle with Jesse Jackson to be the front-runner for the Democratic nomination. He hadn't yet been dragged down by a Republican ad showing Dukakis in a battle tank wearing an ill-fitting helmet, grinning and pointing. And he hadn't been pilloried for a controversial furlough program or for his clinical response to a debate question on the use of the death penalty if his wife were raped and killed.

All that would smother Dukakis's message about the power of the American dream and how his father, a Greek **immigrant**, had attained it.

The Poulos boys' father, Chris, came from similar beginnings. Chris Poulos arrived in the United States from his native Greece with just $52 — and a little note in his wallet that explained, because he didn't know English, who he was and that he was headed to Milwaukee to join his sister. Once he set foot in Wisconsin, Poulos put down roots and worked hard. He met his wife, Mary, with whom he raised four children and built the family business, Chris' Auto Service.

John fears that the opportunities that made his father's accomplishments possible no longer exist because of the direction of the economy and the problems he hears his friends are having finding jobs. And he worries those opportunities still won't be there for his son, Christos, nearly a year old.

Both brothers are dissatisfied with the tenor of this presidential campaign. "I feel like in these types of settings thus far, you get a lot of questions asked and hope to get answers," John said. "A lot of what I hear is just rhetoric."

May-Ying Lam is a photo editor for The Washington Post. Do you have your own story or photo from an encounter with a presidential candidate as a child? If so, please email it to wpmagazine@washpost.com.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Philip Bump reports that Donald Trump has a new theory: Border patrol agents have been told to allow illegal **immigrants** to pour into the country so they can vote in the presidential election.

In fairness, Trump didn't come up with this all by himself. In a conversation today between Trump and representatives of border patrol agents, a union official suggested something like this. The official appeared to say that agents are being told not to spend time deporting those who are found to have criminal records, in order to spend more time fast-tracking people's applications for citizenship so they can vote this fall. After hearing this, Trump gestured at the reporters present and said:

"You're not going to write it. That's huge. But they're letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote."

It seems Trump misconstrued one statement (that border agents are being told to set aside those with criminal records, in order to process other would-be voters faster) and turned it into another (border patrol agents are being told to let illegal **immigrants** pour into the country so they can vote). Regardless, McClatchy reports that the union is not providing evidence of its theories, and Trump's suggestion makes little sense, since illegal **immigrants** can't vote; only citizens can.

But in a way the details of this little dust-up don't matter as much as the broader argument Trump has been hinting at, which can be summed up this way: There is something suspect about the number of Latinos who are voting in the presidential election.

For instance, it's worth linking today's Trumpism with the tweet heard 'round the world about Alicia Machado:

Did Crooked Hillary help disgusting (check out sex tape and past) Alicia M become a U.S. citizen so she could use her in the debate?

What Trump really meant by that tweet is that there's something suspect about Alicia Machado's effort to secure citizenship for herself. It is being engineered by Democrats for their own ends, and Machado is merely a tool in that nefarious plot. But Democrats aren't the main reason Machado is becoming a citizen. Donald Trump is. Machado had explicitly said in the past that she is becoming a citizen in order to vote against Donald Trump.

Last month, Trump offered up another variation on this whole argument. He said this:

"I think this will be the last election that the Republicans have a chance of winning because you're going to have people flowing across the border, you're going to have illegal **immigrants** coming in and they're going to be legalized and they're going to be able to vote and once that all happens you can forget it."

It's true that Democrats and Hillary Clinton favor a path to citizenship, at least for the 11 million undocumented **immigrants** currently in this country. (As for Trump's suggestion that untold hordes will come in later and become citizens, and thus voters, the **immigration** reform measures that Democrats have supported would also throw enormous additional resources at securing the border.) It's also true that many of those people currently here would, if they became citizens, likely vote Democratic.

But as many Republican strategists will tell you, the answer to this problem is for the GOP to embrace **immigration** reform in order to get right with Latinos and then try to appeal to them and get them to vote Republican.

Trump is doing the opposite of this, obviously, by doing everything he possibly can to alienate this growing demographic. Indeed, the result of Trump's efforts may be that more Latinos vote in this election than otherwise would have. As the Post reported recently, activists around the country believe that Trump's candidacy may be sparking a surge in applications for citizenship among Latinos, precisely so that they can vote against Trump. Which means there are very likely a lot of Alicia Machados out there.

We don't know if Latinos will end up voting in this election at higher rates than in 2012. That's still one of the outstanding unknowns. But other preliminary evidence, such as surging Google searches about voter registration in Latino areas, suggests it might happen.

This isn't all that mysterious. If more Latinos do end up voting this fall, it won't be due to dark and dastardly conspiracy theories. It will be due to one Donald J. Trump.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This post has been updated

NEW YORK — Donald Trump claimed Friday that the United States is allowing illegal **immigrants** to enter "so they can go and vote" in the election.

But undocumented **immigrants** are not allowed to vote in U.S. elections. Only U.S. citizens can vote. To apply for citizenship, an individual must be a legal resident for at least three to five years and meet other requirements, according to the Department of Homeland Security.

The Republican presidential nominee's remark, which he made without presenting extensive evidence, came during a roundtable discussion on border security held on the 25th floor of Trump Tower.

Art Del Cueto, the national vice president of the National Border Patrol Council, the union that represents Border Patrol agents, told Trump that agents were given instructions not to deport illegal **immigrants** with criminal records. The Obama administration has focused on targeting illegal **immigrants** who have committed felonies for deportation.

"I spoke to several agents in my sector who are in charge of processing," said Del Cueto. "And the problem that we're seeing reflected through us as a voice is that some of these individuals that we're apprehended with criminal records, they're not, they're checking their records, they see that they have criminal records, but they're setting them aside because at this point they are saying **immigration** is so tied up with trying to get the people who are on the waiting list to hurry up and get them their **immigration** status corrected."

"Why?" asked Trump.

"So they can go ahead and vote before the election," Del Cueto responded.

Trump replied: "Big statement, fellas." He motioned to the small group of reporters who were covering the event. After some crosstalk, he continued: "You're not going to write it. That's huge. But they're letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote."

Added Del Cueto: "They want to hurry up and fast-track them so they can go ahead and vote in the election."

Trump chimed in again, saying, "And these are the professionals. You hear a thing like that, and it's a disgrace. Well, it will be a lot different if I get elected."

The National Border Patrol Council supports Trump. The group's spokesman, Shawn Moran, did not immediately respond to an email and voice mail seeking further clarity on whether Del Cueto's comments reflect the official position of the organization.

In a written statement posted on the National Border Patrol Council's web site under the heading, "Clarification to Statements Made During Trump Press Conference," the group said it "has an internal email from the United States Citizen and **Immigration** Service (USCIS) showing that extra overtime is being provided to employees to process as many applications for citizenship as possible prior to November 8."

It added: "The NBPC also has text messages from upper level managers telling us that criminal prosecution cases are being put on hold in order for judges to adjudicate these applications. Historically, we have seen criminal background checks curtailed in situations like this, thus allowing some criminals to gain United States citizenship."

In a statement, Department of Homeland Security spokeswoman Marsha Catron said: "As Secretary Johnson has stated repeatedly, our borders are not open to illegal migration. We must and we will enforce the law in accordance with our enforcement priorities. Our actions reflect that commitment."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which has been a sharp critic of Donald Trump's economic policies, plans to "turn up the heat" to overhaul the country's **immigration** laws if he is elected president, a top official said Friday.

Rob Engstrom, senior vice president and national political director for the business lobby, said in an interview for C-SPAN's "Newsmakers" that the Chamber remains optimistic that bipartisan agreement can be forged on key **immigration** policy issues, despite Trump's inflammatory anti-**immigrant** rhetoric.

"I would argue on a piecemeal basis there is opportunity in the next Congress, in the next two years, to be able to get substantive things done on **immigration**reform," said Engstrom in an interview set to air Sunday. "In my private conversations with members of both political parties, on the Senate side and also on the House side, there is agreement on some tenets."

If Trump is elected to the White House, "we're going to continue to turn up the heat," he added. "We are going to continue to be focused. There are bipartisan majorities in the Senate and in the House that believe that that ought to be done. And we're going to start where we agree, then we're going to ensure that **immigration** reform is completed."

The group's plans underscore how the deep split among conservatives over Trump's candidacy would have major policy reverberations if he is elected.

The Chamber, which is typically closely aligned with the Republican presidential nominee, would be at odds with a President Trump over not just **immigration**reform, but free trade.

Both Trump and Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton are currently opposed to the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), a 12-nation Pacific Rim trade pact negotiated by the Obama administration. Clinton generally favors free trade and originally backed TPP, but now says she wants to see more protections in the deal for American workers. Trump has gone further, making protectionist language a centerpiece of his bid and arguing that international trade deals hurt American workers.

Thomas J. Donohue, the Chamber's chief executive, has said the real estate mogul has "very little idea about what trade really is." And the Chamber has warned that Trump's policies would lead to a weaker economy.

Nevertheless, Engstrom said he is optimistic that the next president will ultimately support trade agreements.

"The Chamber will not walk away from our vigorous belief in the facts, and the facts are that trade equals jobs in this country," he said. "Mr. Trump is fundamentally wrong. Secretary Clinton is fundamentally wrong."

"We believe we will have a constructive discussion once the dust settles in this election," he added.

But in the meantime, anti-trade rhetoric has spilled over into congressional races. And some of the Chamber's staunchest allies have come out against TPP, including Sen. Rob Portman of Ohio and Sen. Patrick J. Toomey of Pennsylvania — two incumbents getting major financial backing from the group.

"Look, the definition of being pro-business means different things in different places," Engstrom said. "We respect the local economies and we know that there have been [impacts] in the local economies in both of those states."

"I think what Sen. Toomey and Sen. Portman are saying is we have to find out what's in it before we pass it, and I think that's the U.S. Chamber's position, and I think it's a fundamentally responsible position," he added.

So far, the business lobby has spent $25 million on 2016 races, largely on efforts supporting GOP Senate candidates. In the final stretch of the campaign, the Chamber plans to continue those campaigns and make new investments in House races.

Engstrom indicated that the Republican candidates likely to see a boost from the group include Rep. Bob Dold of Illinois, Rep. Martha McSally of Arizona, Rep. Mike Coffman of Colorado, Rep. Barbara Comstock of Virginia and Rep. Carlos Curbelo of Florida.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Before this presidential campaign began, Republicans were concerned about whether they'd be able to appeal to minority voters and expand their base of support beyond the older whites who formed the foundation of their constituency. It wouldn't be easy, they knew, but there were ways they could make progress, at least making some improvements here and there to the performance of their recent presidential nominees.

Then Donald Trump happened. And now the question isn't whether Republicans can do better with non-whites, but just how much worse they're going to do. There's reason to believe that the answer is that they're going to do much, much worse. In fact, they may well have dug themselves into a hole so deep it will take years if not decades for them to climb out.

Let's look at some things we've learned or have happened just in the past few days:

\* The public opinion firm Latino Decisions has released their new prediction model , which forecasts that Hillary Clinton will beat Donald Trump among Latinos by a margin of 82-15. This follows on another national poll of Latinos showing Clinton winning by 83-11. This would be a significant change from 2012, when Barack Obama beat Mitt Romney among Latinos by 71-27. Many analyses of voting and demographic trends had predicted that if Republicans couldn't garner 40 percent of the Latino vote it would be almost impossible for them to win the White House.

\* A new study of Asian-Americans, the fastest-growing minority group in the country, shows Clinton leading Trump by 70-20 among registered voters. Only 16 percent of Asian-Americans now call themselves Republicans.

\* Reports are coming in from states like North Carolina and Wisconsin showing that Republican officials are desperately trying to resist court orders to undo voter suppression efforts. In places like Texas , officials have reacted to such court rulings by trying to make it harder for minorities to register to vote in the first place.

\* In Florida, governor Rick Scott has refused to extend the period when voters can register beyond the deadline of next Tuesday, despite the chaos that Hurricane Matthew is likely to bring over the next few days, Many interpret this as a decision meant to ensure that as few Latinos as possible, including recent arrivals from Puerto Rico, are able to register in time for the election.

\* After being consumed with the Alicia Machado story for days, media outlets serving Latinos (both English- and Spanish-language) have been giving enormous attention to Mike Pence's "that Mexican thing" comment from the vice-presidential debate, which has become a viral meme.

\* The Republican ticket still can't seem to decide whether or not it wants to ban Muslims from entering the United States.

\* This morning, Trump charged that the Obama administration is allowing undocumented **immigrants** to "pour into this country so they can go and vote."

\* Trump continues to instruct his nearly all-white audiences to go out and monitor polls in "certain areas" for mythological voter fraud, because "we can't lose an election because of you know what I'm talking about." Everyone knows what he's talking about.

It's important to understand that the endless string of offenses to minority groups are not a series of isolated and discrete cases. When the Republican nominee says he wants to ban Muslims, Asian-Americans see that and understand that it has something to do with them, too. When he describes contemporary African-American life as though all he knows about it comes from watching "Death Wish" in 1974, Latinos hear it as an indirect message about them. When he talks about how we need to keep out **immigrants**, Jewish voters see their own history being replayed.

On that last point, I can tell you that as a liberal political commentator, I've always gotten plenty of hateful emails and tweets, but only this year have I gotten anti-Semitic hatred directed my way. Judging from what other writers and commentators have said publicly, my experience is a common one.

This is what Donald Trump has unleashed — and he did it with purpose and intent. From the first day of his campaign when he talked about Mexicans being rapists and criminals, he has told his supporters to vent their ugliest impulses, to put their resentments and their rage on display for all to see. Acting as though everyone is worthy of equal respect is nothing more than "political correctness," he told them, so let your flag fly, even if it has the stars and bars or something worse on it.

What happens when this election is over? Is this beast that Trump has loosed on the land going to slink back from whence it came? Or are the Republicans who run for president in four years going to have to cater to it, accommodate it, step gingerly around it? What would happen to a Republican with presidential ambitions who genuinely condemned the anti-Muslim rants, the "Trump That Bitch" t-shirts, the "Build that wall!" chants? He'd probably wind up like Jeb Bush.

The rest of the party hopes this is something they can finesse, that once 2016 is over memories will begin to fade and Republicans can start with a clean slate. But they'll be doing that while still supporting so many of the policies Trump is advocating, and pushing their own. Is there a single prominent Republican who has opposed the party's nationwide effort to suppress the votes of minorities? If so, I haven't noticed any. So do supposedly reasonable Republicans think that they can try to make it as hard as possible for minorities to register and vote, justified on laughably phony fears of "voter fraud," then turn around and tell minorities, "By the way, if you happen to make it past the obstacles we've put in front of you, we'd like you consider the GOP when you get to the polls"?

I suspect they're hoping that minority voters will look at the vote suppression effort the same way Republicans themselves do: It's not personal, it's just business. If you weren't voting for Democrats, we wouldn't be trying so hard to stop you from voting.

It's hard to know how we'll think about this election in four or eight or twenty years. But among minorities, p eople will remember the vile comments, the shocking policy proposals, the hate and fear Republicans whipped up and sought to exploit. Donald Trump and his party are building ties of solidarity that cross ethnic, racial, and religious lines — all united against the GOP. Someday they may find a way to convince non-white voters that the Republican Party doesn't despise them. But it's going to take an awfully long time.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**During the first debate with her Democratic challenger Thursday, Rep. Barbara Comstock (R-Va.) called herself an independent advocate for Northern Virginia in the Republican-controlled House, and never once uttered the name Donald Trump.

But Democrat LuAnn Bennett could not stop talking about Trump, hoping the GOP presidential candidate will sink down-ballot Republicans like Comstock and turn the 10th Congressional District seat blue for the first time in a generation.

Bennett, 63, worked Trump into her answers on the economy, climate change and **immigration** — a strategy that sometimes elicited chuckles from the crowd at the debate, which was hosted by the Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce.

Comstock, 57, who has neither endorsed nor repudiated Trump, prioritized transportation funding, defense spending and tax cuts, and she seized on former president Bill Clinton's recent critique of the Affordable Care Act as "the craziest thing in the world" before he walked it back.

The 10th District includes all of Loudoun County as well as Manassas and Manassas Park and parts of Fairfax and Prince William counties. In recent years, the district has seen an influx of professionals — many of them women and minorities — who polls show are cool to Trump's candidacy. Both parties are pouring millions of advertising dollars into the district, which they consider among the most competitive this year.

In seeking a second term, Comstock has focused on constituent services and issues that she says are important to Northern Virginia, while Bennett has tried to paint the congresswoman as out of step with the district's moderate voters on national concerns.

On **immigration**, Comstock said she favors policies for which consensus already exists, such as visas for highly skilled workers, as opposed to wading into the more contentious effort to pass comprehensive reform.

"Some people want to have an issue instead of a solution. Let's get what we can, come together and compromise on today," she said.

In response, Bennett asked why the visa issue is unsettled if there is agreement and said that neither Comstock nor Trump can solve the problem.

"Donald Trump wants to build a wall and then convince you someone else is going to pay for it," she said.

Bennett again linked Comstock to Trump on the environment, saying Republicans will not acknowledge that climate change is real.

Comstock said that the "Earth is warming" but that the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan, the subject of federal litigation, would hurt the economy, especially local data centers that rely on plentiful, cheap energy.

On transportation — a key issue in the congested Washington suburbs — Bennett noted that as a state delegate Comstock voted against then-Gov. Robert F. McDonnell's tax-laden 2013 transportation bill, which provided funding to expand Metro's Silver line.

"It was a vote taken because of ideological extremism," Bennett said. "She had signed Grover Norquist's no-tax pledge, and, because of that, it forced her to take a bad vote."

Comstock countered that she has gone to bat for the region even when it put her at odds with her caucus, and she took credit for restoring $75 million in ­Metro funding.

"When my own Republican Party tried to take it out, I worked with my Democratic colleagues to do that," she said.

Later in the debate, Comstock noted that she broke with House Republicans to prevent sequestration cuts from taking effect. The across-the-board federal budget cuts have been particularly harmful to Virginia's ­military-dependent economy, data show.

And she said she joined Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.), the ­vice-presidential nominee, and Gov. Terry McAuliffe (D) in fighting attempts to tinker with ­decades-old rules that limit flights at Reagan National Airport while benefiting Dulles ­International Airport.

On health care, Comstock said she agreed with Clinton's criticism of Obamacare and said the landmark law should be repealed and replaced.

Bennett said the Affordable Care Act, although imperfect, made health care "more affordable" — drawing laughter from the crowd — and said Virginia should expand Medicaid, an action that the GOP-controlled General Assembly has blocked.

Comstock responded: "Affordable clearly it is not. That's ­exactly what Bill Clinton was talking about."

The congresswoman also targeted one of the main themes of Bennett's campaign — pay equity for women — saying her rival pays female employees of her real estate development firm and campaign less than men.

"I have women running my office and campaign," Comstock said. "I pay women on average more than men. LuAnn does not."

Asked after the debate about Comstock's claim, a Bennett spokesman said the 10th Congressional District has the highest pay disparity in the state.

"This is nothing more than an attempt by Barbara Comstock to paper over how she repeatedly voted against equal pay laws and believes that those of us fighting for equal pay are part of a 'left wing agenda,' " spokesman Robert Howard said in a statement.

Comstock twice voted "no" on procedural votes that would have allowed consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would have made it illegal for employers to retaliate against a worker who discloses their pay as part of an inquiry.

Elizabeth H. Mitchell, a former college administrator, said she supports Bennett — and Hillary Clinton for president — and ­rejected Comstock's argument that a region that is otherwise represented by Democrats needs an advocate from the party in power.

"I don't think saying, 'The House isn't going to turn over, therefore vote with the majority' is a reason to vote for a candidate," she said.

Scott K. York, a consultant and former chairman of the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, said he expects voters who can't support Trump will still vote for Comstock based on her record.

"If they feel that Congresswoman Comstock — as I believe she has — has done a wonderful job, they're going to pull the lever for her," he said.

The next debate is Oct. 19 in Fairfax County.

jenna.portnoy@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There's a long-standing theory that Democratic politicians seek a path to citizenship for **immigrants** in the country illegally because a lot of those new citizens will vote Democratic. In September, Donald Trump embraced the idea, telling an interviewer that, if he lost, "this will be the last election that the Republicans have a chance of winning" because **immigrants** will flow across the border, become citizens and then vote Democratic forever.

In a discussion with some border patrol agents Friday, Trump implied that some people might be skipping that middle step.

The video above chronicles the conversation between Trump and Art Del Cueto, president of National Border Patrol Council Local 2544.

"I spoke to several agents in my sector who are in charge of processing," said Del Cueto. "And the problem that we're seeing reflected through us as a voice is that some of these individuals that we're apprehended with criminal records, they're not, they're checking their records, they see that they have criminal records, but they're setting them aside because at this point they are saying **immigration** is so tied up with trying to get the people who are on the waiting list to hurry up and get them their **immigration** status corrected."

That's not exactly what Del Cueto said. Del Cueto seemed to be saying that **immigration** resources were being spent on fast-tracking citizenship applications instead of addressing people with criminal records who've entered the country illegally. (It's not entirely clear, but Del Cueto replied to Trump's summary: "They want to hurry up and fast-track them so they can go ahead and vote in the election.")

Update: A representative of the union told McClatchy that Del Cueto had inadvertently combined two issues when speaking with Trump.

Whether that's true is one thing. There have been a number of reports that support the idea that people on the cusp of gaining citizenship are hoping to have the process resolved so that they can vote. Our Ed O'Keefe reported in May that the 2016 election had spurred "a surge" in the number of people seeking citizenship applications and new citizens registering to vote. In March, Bloomberg reported that the Mexican government was aiding efforts to help permanent legal residents transition into American citizens. (They insisted, though, that the idea was not to influence the results of the election.)

But that's different from what Trump heard Del Cueto say — a summary for which there's no non-anecdotal evidence. It's illegal for noncitizens to vote in federal elections, which is not by itself prohibitive (any more than murder being illegal means no one is murdered). There's no evidence, though, that **immigrants** (a) come to the country illegally to vote, (b) register to vote illegally and (c) cast votes in federal elections on any substantive scale.

A report from Trump supporter Laura Ingraham's website Lifezette this week stated that the Public Interest Legal Foundation, a group that focuses on purported voter fraud, said that it had identified noncitizens registered to vote in Pennsylvania and Virginia, some 1,100 from 2005 to 2015, a portion of whom cast votes. The problem, the group figured, was motor-voter laws, in which people who get driver's licenses are registered to vote automatically — even if they leave blank the box asking whether they are citizens. Incidentally, in 2012, 9.6 million people voted in those two states, meaning that even if all of those 1,100 people had voted (which they didn't), it would have been 1 percent of 1 percent of all votes cast. (A reminder: There's essentially no in-person voter fraud in American politics.)

I note this story to point out that bureaucratic glitches that result in voter registrations for people who shouldn't be allowed to vote is very different from what Trump is describing. "They're letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote," Trump said — a claim for which there's no evidence. Are "they" — some murky part of the government cabal working to stymie Trump — also giving out driver's licenses and hoping that bureaucracy will overlook that the new drivers shouldn't be allowed to vote? Or is there some other nefarious process at play that hasn't yet been uncovered?

**Immigrants** in the country illegally are less likely to be politically engaged, for perhaps obvious reasons. A 2012 Pew Research survey found that Hispanic **immigrants** here illegally are less likely to identify as or lean toward the Democratic Party than are Hispanic citizens and Hispanic registered voters. But notice that more than a quarter of those in the country illegally don't identify with either party. (Only 9 percent of registered Hispanic voters say the same.)

Trump's goal, incessantly, is to argue that the system is rigged against him and his candidacy and that illegal **immigration** is a massive problem undermining the United States. His interpretation of Del Cueto's remarks fits neatly into both of those lines of thinking, which is probably part of the reason it was the interpretation Trump made. The good news for Trump is that the states that are home to the most undocumented **immigrants** are California and Texas. If they're moving in to vote, he can be confident at least that they won't shift the electoral map that much.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Twelve business people — Republicans, Democrats and independents — from privately held and publicly traded companies have joined together to write a letter denouncing Donald Trump from a business perspective. Right Turn received a copy of the letter in advance of its release.

They write:

Trump's harmful rhetoric regarding **immigrants**, women, racial and religious minorities, the disabled and American veterans is not only unacceptable, it creates an atmosphere of vulgarity that poisons the climate, as does his general approach to business and many of his economic ideas. And how do you lose nearly a billion dollars in a single year?

Without saying whether they will vote for Hillary Clinton, they provide some interesting stats on Trump's business record:

Never before has a major party nominee been so philosophically committed to the culture of bankruptcy and frivolous litigation. After his six business bankruptcies, almost all major banks understandably refuse to lend to Trump or his businesses. With his economic policies estimated to cost the Treasury $10 trillion over the next decade and his flirtations with renegotiating the national debt — a potentially disastrous blow to investment in the U.S. — it's as if he is already preparing for his next bankruptcy, only this time on behalf of our government. We cannot allow that to happen.

Ironically, the letter coincides with Trump's declaration that he'd cut off trade with China if it suspended visas for its people to come to Trump's Las Vegas resort. In essence the 12 signatories say Trump's record is illusory and he would be horrible for actual business people:

"Who the hell cares if there's a trade war?" Trump said. Well, we do. As president, Trump could unilaterally impose tariffs without Congressional approval. He has proposed a 45 percent tariff on Chinese imports, which would immediately hit the pocketbooks of all American families. Further, the inevitable retaliation would devastate any U.S. company selling abroad, 97% of which are small businesses. The resulting trade war would cost millions of American jobs and send the economy into a recession. . . . .

The letter is signed by José Andrés, chef and founder of ThinkFoodGroup (who is involved in litigation against Trump); Bill Cummings, founder of Cummings Properties; Sara Sutton Fell, founder and chief executive of Flexjobs; Mike B. Fernandez, founder and chairman of MBF Healthcare Partners; Carlos Gutierrez, former U.S. Secretary of Commerce under President George W. Bush and former chairman and chief executive of the Kellogg Company; Joseph Kopser, co-founder of RideScout; Monica C. Lozano, former chairman and chief executive of U.S. Hispanic Media, Inc.; Jack McGregor, former chief executive of Aquarion and founder of the NHL's Pittsburgh Penguins; Mark Pincus, founder and chief executive of Zynga; Reshma Saujani, chief executive of Girls Who Code; Whitney Tilson, founder and managing partner of Kase Capital Management; and Jimmy Wales, founder of Wikipedia.

Andrés in an email to Right Turn explained, "To be a businessman in America you need everyone around you to be successful for you yourself to be a success.  Donald Trump only thinks about himself, which does not create a good business environment."

The signers' game plan is to build a grassroots movement of other business people who can sign onto the letter via the group's website.

Monica Lozano explained to Right Turn via email why she is doing this. "One of the great economic success stories in America has been the rapid growth of Hispanic entrepreneurs tripling in number in the last 25 years and outpacing all other groups," she says. "As an Hispanic entrepreneur myself, I know just how important it is to have someone in the White House who understands and invests in innovative programs that accelerate the economic activity of Hispanic business." She adds: "We have not heard Donald Trump say anything that demonstrates his understanding of the undisputable role that Latinos play in securing American prosperity and competitiveness. On the contrary, his relentless attacks on **immigrants** and ethnic groups make him an unacceptable choice for president."

The combination of Trump business record (increasingly seen as glitzy but not successful and not run according to legal and business norms) and his policies (protectionism, anti-**immigrant**, fiscally reckless) make him an unacceptable choice for many business owners who honor their commitments, pay suppliers, treat employees with respect and function in the global economy. Ironically, going from a nominee in 2012 who arguably put too much emphasis on business creators (you didn't build that), the GOP is now offering someone whose economic record, personal temperament and agenda are scarier than Hillary Clinton's.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Dave Shiflett once was responsible for developing the manifesto of a Donald Trump presidency. Hired in 1999 to ghostwrite "The America We Deserve," Shiflett spent days with the real estate magnate, channeling his voice and temperament into the pages of a manuscript.

The draft alarmed Trump's aides. They demanded Shiflett come to Trump Tower for a meeting, where he said they told him to "turn the temperature down a few notches" by making the businessman sound less strident and more "inclusive." The result was a relatively restrained and wonky book, with chapters on Social Security and foreign policy.

Trump ultimately withdrew his prospective 2000 candidacy and promptly returned to the unfiltered person whose inflammatory statements have defined his image ever since — endearing him this year to many Republican presidential primary voters but emerging in the general election campaign as a focal point for critics, including Democrat Hillary Clinton, who say he is temperamentally unfit for the White House.

On Sunday, when he faces off for the second time in a debate against Clinton, a major question will be which version of Trump shows up: the unfiltered provocateur Americans have come to know, or a carefully managed candidate whose words were once delivered to the electorate with a ghostwriter's gloss.

Trump has declared that he has a "winning temperament." He argued in the first debate that "my strongest asset, maybe by far, is my temperament."

Surveys, though, suggest it is one of his biggest political weaknesses. A Fox News poll taken after the first debate, for instance, found that just 37 percent of likely voters believe Trump has the right temperament to be president, compared to 67 percent for Clinton.

Moreover, Trump's behavior, including his recent Twitter tirades against a former Miss Universe, has stoked concerns among those who have worked closely in the past with presidents from both parties and are having trouble envisioning Trump as a commander in chief with access to the nuclear codes.

"What you need is a good temperament . . . not character alone, but a sense of balance, perspective and judgment, and that has a lot to do with history, a perspective of where the world is," said David Gergen, who has been a counselor to presidents Nixon, Ford, Reagan and Clinton.

Trump has long embraced many of his personal attributes that worry his critics, according to a review of his writings and statements.

He has acknowledged that he has fired those who disagree with him and has argued that shallowness is a virtue because it helps him make quick decisions.

"The day I realized it can be smart to be shallow was, for me, a deep experience," he wrote in "Think Like a Billionaire," his 2004 book.

Trump also wrote that it is crucial to be curious, writing in the same book that "you have to be alive to your surroundings and hungry to understand your immediate world."

Trump said in an interview with The Washington Post earlier this year that he has never read a biography of a president and has little patience for detailed reports or briefings. He said he makes decisions "with very little knowledge other than the knowledge I [already] had, plus the words 'common sense,' because I have a lot of common sense and I have a lot of business ability."

While a president has to deal with countless issues, relying on advisers and the ability to absorb and distill vast quantities of information, often from competing interests, Trump has prided himself on being a "one-man army."

"You're not only the commander in chief, you're the soldier as well. You must plan and execute your plan alone," he wrote in "Think Like a Billionaire."

Trump has cited Ronald Reagan as his political role model. He noted in "Think Like a Billionaire" that rivals often underestimated Reagan, who suffered "years of insults about his lack of intelligence and political experience."

Trump has faced similar criticism.

Ken Duberstein, Reagan's former chief of staff, said that a president has "to be willing to surround themselves with smart people and be willing to listen to them. That doesn't mean they always have to agree, but they have to listen to them. Reagan said, 'That's why God gave us one mouth and two ears.' "

Duberstein, who has not said which candidate he will support in this election, said Reagan understood the necessity of compromise. "Part of governing is you have to say no to some of your strongest supporters and yes to some of your adversaries. That is how you build coalitions."

Different types of individuals can adapt to the presidency, Duberstein said. Trump increased his fame through a reality show, not unlike how Reagan rose as a B-film actor, television host and pitchman.

"People used to criticize Reagan, saying, 'How can an actor be president?' " Duberstein said. "His answer was, 'How can you be president and not be an actor?' "

Clues to Trump's approach to the presidency can be found in his many books. As he explored a run for the presidency on the Reform Party ticket in 2000, Trump suggested that as president he would attack North Korea to destroy its nuclear weapon capability. "Am I the only one who thinks it might make more sense to disarm the North Korean nuclear threat before it shows up in downtown Seattle or Los Angeles?" Trump wrote.

Yet Trump's changeability on the issues makes him hard to predict. He favored abortion rights before he opposed them. In 2012, Trump said Mitt Romney's plan for illegal **immigrants** to "self-deport" was "crazy" and "maniacal," and he complained it cost Romney the Hispanic vote. Today, Trump wants forced deportation of illegal **immigrants**.

In recent weeks, Clinton and her allies have chided Trump for being easily drawn into feuds in a way that suggests a lack of fitness for the presidency — a job that requires an even keel and the ability to endure public criticism.

William Cohen, a Republican who served as President Clinton's secretary of defense, said a commander in chief must choose his words carefully. "There has to be a filter between his thoughts and words, and one hopes his thoughts are deeply anchored," said Cohen, who has endorsed Hillary Clinton. What I see is [Trump] just shoots whatever is in his mind."

Leon Panetta, a Democrat who served as President Clinton's chief of staff and President Obama's secretary of defense and CIA director, said a president must be able to "remain calm and to have control of your emotions." Panetta said he is concerned that Trump would be "so easily provoked that he thinks more about himself and the consequences to his name and image."

Similar concerns have been cited by other former national security officials, Democrats and Republicans alike, in their decision to oppose Trump's candidacy. In August, a group of officials that included Michael Chertoff, who led the Whitewater investigation into Clinton dealings and became President George W. Bush's secretary of homeland security, wrote a letter saying that Trump "lacks the temperament to be president . . . lacks self-control and acts impetuously." Chertoff has endorsed Clinton.

Trump has waved off the attacks, referring to such critics as "political hacks." His campaign last month countered with a letter signed by 88 retired military generals and admirals endorsing the Republican nominee and criticizing Clinton, pointing to Trump's "commitment to rebuild our military, to secure our borders, to defeat our Islamic supremacist adversaries and restore law and order."

Shiflett, the ghost writer, recalled that when he went to talk to Trump to gather material for "The America We Deserve," the businessman was surrounded by beautiful women and by three men in pinstripe suits, who expressed agreement with whatever Trump said. Shiflett began to refer to them as the "Amen Charlies."

As president, however, Trump would need to solicit disagreement and consider whether he is wrong, something that he has often disdained.

Shiflett said he won't vote for Trump, having observed how the real estate mogul — without a ghost writer or reality television show script — has talked like he is in "a frat house." But he said another aspect of Trump's character might help him modulate his behavior.

"My whole view of Trump is Trump wants to be successful," Shiflett said. "He doesn't want to be a loser."

michael.kranish@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump and his allies signaled Thursday that he is ready to move past the controversies that have dominated the 10 days since the first presidential debate and that he will try to stay focused on policy, not attacks, at the second debate on Sunday.

The Republican presidential nominee appeared more controlled on the campaign trail on Wednesday and Thursday than he was last week, sticking with scripted speeches, mostly avoiding interviews and sending tweets that appeared to have been closely edited, if not entirely composed, by his staff. He denounced interruptions during debates, announced plans to campaign with House Speaker Paul D. Ryan in Wisconsin on Saturday and said he would avoid mentioning Bill Clinton's affairs during Sunday's town hall with Hillary Clinton in St. Louis.

In the moments that Trump went off-script, stumbles returned. At a rally in Reno, Nev., on Wednesday night, Trump bragged about being able to properly pronounce the state's name and proceeded to mispronounce it. In an interview with a local television station, he seemed unfamiliar with a pivotal state issue — the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain — and said that if China and the United States became engaged in a trade war that hurt Trump's hotel in Las Vegas and other tourism businesses, he would "cut off relationships with China."

Clinton's campaign manager, Robby Mook, told reporters Thursday that he expects Trump to be "much better prepared" on Sunday and not use "the kind of personal and harsh attacks that he has been threatening."

"We expect a more focused, more prepared Trump at this debate," Mook said. "What we're enthusiastic about is that this will be a town hall, that the candidates will be taking questions from voters. . . . And so the real question for us is: Will Donald Trump come with any specific plans? Will he have a command of the issues such that he can really address people's questions and really explain to them how he will in fact make any difference."

Trump was off the campaign trail for most of Thursday, but he returned to stoke existing feuds and spark new ones at what was billed by his campaign as a town hall event in New Hampshire on Thursday evening. The event was staged before a friendly audience.

He attacked Clinton, alleging with no evidence that when she says she is preparing for debates she is actually "resting." He went after Sen. Mark Kirk (R-Ill.), who does not support him. He knocked journalists John Harwood and John King, as well as the media in general and even the Commission on Presidential Debates.

Trump also denied that he was using the event to prepare for Sunday night's debate in St. Louis, which will operate under a similar format.

"This isn't practice. This has nothing to do with Sunday," Trump said. Without any substantiation, he said that what Clinton does is "not debate prep – she's resting."

Later, he said: "She wants to build up her energy for Sunday night."

Trump's first debate performance Sept. 26 was widely viewed as a damaging flop, and even many of his supporters have said they hope he is better prepared for the St. Louis town hall. His running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, provided a stark contrast at the vice-presidential debate Tuesday night, where many declared him the clear winner.

"I watched — he won. He won on the issues," Trump said of Pence at a campaign stop in Las Vegas on Wednesday, an apparent hint on where his own focus might be Sunday. "He won on — somebody said he won on style. The style doesn't matter. The issues, the policy matters."

Trump also told the New York Post's Page Six that he does not plan to bring up Bill Clinton's sexual history during the debate, something he had threatened to do if Hillary Clinton continues to bring up the disparaging comments he has made about women over the years.

"I want to win this election on my policies for the future, not Bill Clinton's past," Trump said in an email to the gossip column. "Jobs, trade, ending illegal **immigration**, veteran care and strengthening our military is what I really want to be talking about."

In another move typical for an ordinary campaign but not for his, Trump issued a somber statement Thursday urging those in the path of Hurricane Matthew to follow local evacuation orders because "nothing is more important than the safety of your family." He left it to the Republican National Committee to attack Hillary Clinton's campaign for running commercials on the Weather Channel during the storm's buildup.

Meanwhile, Trump's oldest daughter, Ivanka, campaigned for her father in southwest Ohio on Thursday, touring a manufacturing plant in the steel-mill town of Middletown and meeting with local female business owners.

Trump avoided national television interviews this week, allowing Pence to appear instead on Fox News on Wednesday night and several morning talk shows on Thursday. Pence didn't stir up any controversy, as Trump is known to do, and he insisted Trump has abandoned several of his most controversial positions.

During an interview Thursday on CNN's "New Day," for example, anchor Chris Cuomo asked Pence about two Trump positions that Pence had previously condemned: A temporary ban on Muslims entering the United States and Trump's assertion that an Indiana-born judge whose parents were from Mexico couldn't fairly rule in a federal fraud case involving Trump University.

"You condemned those comments," Cuomo said. "Why do you not condemn them now?"

"Well," Pence said, "because it's not Donald Trump's position now."

On MSNBC's "Morning Joe" the same morning, host Joe Scarborough asked Pence point-blank if the campaign still wants a "ban on all Muslims," and Pence replied: "Of course not."

Pence is one of numerous Trump surrogates to repeatedly say Trump no longer wants a religion-based ban and would instead focus on halting **immigration**from unidentified countries compromised by terrorism, many of which have large Muslim populations.

But Trump has yet to formally drop his call for a temporary ban on allowing most foreign Muslims into the United States, and his campaign website still contains a "statement on preventing Muslim **immigration**" that calls for "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on."

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

Anne Gearan and Sean Sullivan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If you haven't heard this before, you may need to spend some time thinking about your media diet.

There's a mass exodus underway from Puerto Rico to the U.S. mainland, spurred by Puerto Rico's massive and complex debt crisis. And many of these former island dwellers have relocated to a section of Florida known as the Interstate 4, or I-4, corridor. That's the east-west highway that runs from Tampa to just south of Daytona Beach and straight through several densely populated counties that sit in between. A federal oversight board  took control of the island's finances Sept. 30, part of a turnaround plan that has been met with some concern about a loss of on-island control of key financial decisions.

In truth, a range of challenges on the island have dispatched millions of Puerto Ricans to the U.S. mainland for decades, but as early as the tail end of the 2000s, the epicenter of that relocation activity shifted from traditional places such as New York and New Jersey to the I-4 corridor in Florida. There are so many Puerto Ricans in Florida now that the state's Democratic-leaning Puerto Rican population was credited with delivering narrow but critical victories in that state to Barack Obama in 2008 and 2012. In addition to the growth in Central Florida's Puerto Rican population, more recent Cuban **immigrants** and Cuban Americans who have never lived on the island are proving a more politically progressive group than those before them.

All of this, of course, matters right now because Florida remains a much-sought after swing state where the 29 electoral college votes up for grabs makes every presidential candidate and campaign eager to put resources and effort into winning votes in the state. And, it appears that this demographic change is poised to deliver a possible state victory for Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton in 2016. Or, at least, that's what a new Center for American Progress Action Fund-Latino Decisions poll out this week indicates.

Researchers working for the public opinion analysis firm Latino Decisions and the left-leaning Center for American Progress polled a total of 504 registered Latino voters in Florida and found that 74 percent support Clinton while 17 percent back Trump. What's more, the same voters gave Clinton a 68 percent favorable rating while Trump earned a 78 percent unfavorable rating.

The poll was conducted between Sept. 17 and  26, just before the first general election presidential debate. And, to be very clear about its potential limitations, the Center for American Progress Action Fund's board includes a number of Clinton allies. Latino Decisions is an independent polling firm where the staff maintains a firewall between its work and either of the campaigns. However, two of the firm's founders have been hired to work separately as consultants to the Clinton campaign.

That said, polls that delve into the views of Latino voters, and in particular, subsets of Latino voters, remain relatively rare and therefore valuable. In this case, the picture painted of the political situation in Florida indicates that one fast-growing group of natural-born U.S. citizen voters has not found a lot to like in Trump's **immigration** policy ideas and other proposals.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LULANG FOLK VILLAGE, China — The original Tibetan village here was bulldozed five years ago. What has replaced it is Lulang Folk Village, a postcard-ready replica, a Disney-esque version of an age-old settlement in the high ­forest.

Grand, ornate buildings in ­Tibetan style, built by Chinese real estate developers but still vacant, are here, and an empty primary school, and a brand-new luxury hotel offering rooms for $150 to $1,000 a night. Soon Chinese restaurant owners will move in, and Chinese tour groups will follow.

"Lulang is paradise on earth, located on the roof of the world," said community volunteer He Yilin. This is Tibet sanitized for tourists from the rest of China, complete with Mandarin-speaking guides, Chinese food and a whitewashed view of Chinese rule.

While foreign tourists still face restrictions on travel to Tibet, ­domestic tourists are arriving in extraordinary numbers. The government is investing heavily and eagerly promoting tourism as a pillar of the economy.

"Tourism is the new engine for development in Tibet," Penpa Tashi, vice chairman of the Tibet Autonomous Region, told reporters shortly before the glitzy opening ceremony of the Third China Tibet Tourism and Culture Expo in the capital city, Lhasa, this September.

The aim, he said, is to create the tourism infrastructure and services that will turn Tibet into a "world-class tourism destination."

Yet critics say domestic tourism is being used in another way, as part of a grand economic and strategic plan to bind Tibet ever more tightly into China's embrace — in the process trivializing its culture, marginalizing its people and polluting its pristine environment.

"It is very similar to how the United States treated its developing West 100 years ago," said P. Christiaan Klieger, a cultural anthropologist, historian and author. "They are commodifying the native people and bringing them out as an ethnic display for the consumption of people back east."

Elliot Sperling, an Indiana University professor, says China has a narrow, materialist view of development as the solution to all ­Tibet's problems, and warned that tourism risks turning parts of ­Tibet into a "Lama Disneyland" where locals are outnumbered by Han Chinese.

Chinese troops moved into ­Tibet in 1951, two years after the Communist Party rose to power in Beijing. Many Tibetans, who say their land was largely independent from China, still fiercely resent that takeover and complain of ­religious, cultural and linguistic repression, as well as economic and social discrimination. Others, including Tibet's spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, have fled into exile abroad.

These days, large parts of Lhasa feel increasingly like any modern Chinese city, with hundreds of old buildings knocked down to make way for shopping malls and apartment houses for **immigrants**, drawn from China's ethnic Han majority.

Now Tibetans have to adjust to a new flood of arrivals, after China opened a train route across the high-altitude Tibetan plateau, from Xining to Lhasa, in 2006.

Chinese tourism statistics on ­Tibet are opaque and confusing, but one count suggests that around 8 million tourists will come this year. That's a roughly 12-fold rise since the first train arrived. Officials predict a further rise, of 50 percent, by 2020.

That will dwarf the permanent population of just over 3 million people, and attract even more **immigrants** from elsewhere in China to build infrastructure and support the tourism industry, experts say.

The government has already started to build another major train route, from the major western city of Chengdu to Lhasa, an ambitious project traversing 1,000 miles across some of the world's most mountainous terrain.

Multinational companies are arriving fast, too: Lhasa already boasts an imposing Intercontinental Hotel, as well as a Sheraton, a St. Regis and a Shangri-La. Officials predict 10 more luxury hotels there by 2020.

Foreign visitors are less welcome: They have to obtain special permits and visit on organized tours, and currently make up just over 1  percent of arrivals.

Penpa Tashi said the central government had ordered that ­Tibet should be "open to the world," and promised that restrictions on foreign visitors would be eased as soon as the region had upgraded its tourist infrastructure.

What he didn't say: Backpackers have been blamed by China for supporting the cause of Tibetan nationalism, and for informing the world about Tibetan uprisings in the late 1980s. Foreign journalists are completely barred, except on rare government tours.

The real reason for the restrictions, says the Tibetan government-in-exile in the Indian town of Dharamsala, is "to hide the actual reality in Tibet."

By contrast, domestic visitors are a much safer bet.

Some are inspired by a sense of patriotic duty, others by a renewed interest in Buddhism or increasingly by a growing fascination with an "exotic" people living in a timeless "Shangri-La."

"I am not Buddhist, but we have Buddha in our heart," said Zhu Chunhua, a young Chinese woman from the eastern province of Jiangsu, photographing a friend after turning prayer wheels outside a small temple in Lhasa. "The local people are very simple and pure."

Already, Tibetan Buddhism's holiest site, the Jokhang Temple in Lhasa, is bursting at the seams with Han tourists, who flock through its darkened shrine in droves before emerging onto the roof and into the light in a flurry of selfies. In the process, some of the temple's magic seems to dissipate.

Some are respectful of what they are seeing, but Tibetans on social media complain of cameras thrust in pilgrims' faces and of sacred prayer flags trampled underfoot.

On a recent visit, one tour guide committed a grave breach of religious etiquette by walking the wrong way around a statue of Buddha.

At the landmark Potala Palace, a tourist stood beside a sign banning photographs, taking a photo, while a Tibetan tour guide expressed exasperation at how little Han tourists knew or understood.

"Lhasa has been turned from a holy place of pilgrimage into a tourist site," said Tibetan writer Woeser, who last visited the city three years ago. Most tourist shops in the Tibetan old town are owned by Han Chinese, she said, and many supposedly Tibetan artifacts are manufactured in other parts of China.

So is Tibetan culture being swamped?

Wang Songping, deputy director of the Tibet Tourism Development Commission, says tourism has both positive and negative effects everywhere in the world. But the influx of money will encourage people to protect "their intangible cultural heritage," he argues, and help transform the economy in places like Lulang "from cutting down trees to watching trees."

Tourism accounts for a fifth of the local economy and provides 320,000 jobs in Tibet, Wang said, with some 97,000 herders and farmers now involved in the industry. Hundreds of residents have been given government grants to convert their houses for tourist homestays.

Some Tibetans do benefit from tourism, and there is a growing number of small tour agencies offering "responsible," eco-friendly travel for foreigners and better-educated domestic tourists.

But mostly, critics say, Tibetans are neither consulted nor empowered as their land is transformed. The top jobs and most of the profits are being cornered by companies and people from elsewhere in China — fueling the kind of inequality and resentment that contributed to riots in Tibet in 2008.

One young man, who looked over his shoulder to check he was not being watched before speaking to a small group of reporters in Lhasa, said tourism was good for the economy — but then complained that Han Chinese visitors did not always respect sacred mountains and holy sites. "Many tourists move rocks and run anywhere inside temples," he said. "It's not good."

Lulang Folk Village sits at 12,000 feet above sea level in what officials have designated the "Switzerland of the East," a region of forested mountains in southeastern Tibet near the Indian border.

It has been built by some of China's biggest real estate companies, with help from the southern provincial government of Guangdong, ostensibly as part of efforts to spread the nation's wealth to its poorer hinterlands.

Yet Han Chinese construction workers have done most of the building. Local Tibetans, one worker claimed, simply do not have the skills.

Tibetans who lost their homes in the original village of Zhaxigang will be given new accommodation here, officials said, but their opportunities to make money may be limited. Restaurants in a nearby site are overwhelmingly run by Han Chinese.

"Some shops will be run by people from inland, but some will be run by local people," said Tu Hang, a Foreign Ministry official from Nyingchi prefecture, told reporters on a guided tour, adding, with unconscious condescension about Tibetans: "They will have shops to sell small things like biscuits and sweet tea."

But those modest opportunities may be scant consolation for many Tibetans, who worry that their land is drowning in the influx from the east.

There are two problems with the Han Chinese, one Tibetan said. "The first one is they're always brainwashing us. Always," he said. "And the second problem is they just keep coming here, more and more."

simon.denyer@washpost.com

Congcong Zhang, Gu Jinglu and Jin Xin contributed to this report.

Read more

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Fox News argues that it is a legitimate news organization and that Sean Hannity, among other nighttime hosts, is "entertainment." (If so, he should not get the "Fox News" logo nor the accessories of a newsman, but let's leave that for another day.) The unhinged non-news Hannity, who is widely seen as an adjunct to Donald Trump 's campaign -- even going so far as appearing in a campaign ad for the GOP presidential nominee -- now has attacked an actual news host, Megyn Kelly. He accuses her of being in Hillary Clinton 's camp. This is as obnoxious as it is false. The question, however, is now teed up for the Fox News execs: Is it a real news network that cares about the integrity of its news personnel or a caricature of right-wing media -- in the thrall of know-nothingism, conspiracy-mongering and plain dishonesty?

Hannity's behavior is so inappropriate that one has to wonder whether he is trying to get booted -- or justify an upcoming post-election change. Nevertheless, the responsibility is Fox's. If it cares about the reputations of quality news figures (e.g. Bret Baier, Chris Wallace, James Rosen) it will dump Hannity or relegate him to 21st Century Fox 's entertainment division. Fox cannot be both a serious outlet and tolerate Hannity's attack on the integrity of its news people. The latter should be letting their bosses know in no uncertain terms: It is time to choose between the Fox News brand and the Hannity brand. The two are incompatible.

In some ways, the Fox News dilemma is a microcosm of the GOP's dilemma. Does it want to be a serious center-right party dedicated to good governance and building an electoral majority, or does it want to be the party of Donald Trump -- ignorant, divisive, mean-spirited and racist?

Mitch Daniels , for one, would like to know. Daniels, the former Indiana governor and now president of Purdue University, says in an interview with the Washington Examiner:

I don't know if the current nominee represents an aberration or a long-term shift in what the party stands for and what the term means. . . . What I found important about [the GOP] was that it was the party that stood first of all for freedom and the assumption of human dignity that goes with it, that we are not mere victims, that it demeans the dignity of people to render them dependent on the state, tell them that they need the protection of their benevolent betters to get by in life. I still believe that there must be room in America for at least one party that starts from those premises. Whether that is still the one we've known as the Republican Party I can't tell you.

Daniels, the quintessential grown-up whose record in the executive branch and as governor earned respect from both sides of the aisle, in essence is posing to the GOP the same question that has been presented to Fox News: Do you want to be taken seriously or not?

We've increasingly felt that the GOP is -- to borrow a phrase -- irredeemable. Beyond Trump, his enablers, the spineless Reince Priebus and the horde of anti-**immigrant** talk-show hosts, there are the GOP regular voters and nearly all elected officials. They've all embraced Trump, allowing themselves to be intellectually corrupted and morally debased. How would such a party ever regain its integrity and shed the stain of Trump? In essence, either the #NeverTrump or the Trumpkins (along with their enablers) control the GOP. If it is the latter, the former must decamp to set up a party that would, in Daniels's words, stand "first of all for freedom and the assumption of human dignity that goes with it, that we are not mere victims, that it demeans the dignity of people to render them dependent on the state, tell them that they need the protection of their benevolent betters to get by in life."

We know the model for that new party -- the party of Daniels, Sen. Ben Sasse (R-Neb.), Evan McMullin, Sens. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), Ohio Gov. John Kasich and Maryland Gov. Larry Hogan. ("Hogan's 71 percent approval rating — up five points since this spring and 10 points from a year ago — is a record for the first-term Republican, who continues to enjoy wide backing among the white Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents who were key to his surprise 2014 victory.") It's a party that believes in limited government but does not hate government. It believes in free trade, **immigration**reform (not mass deportation), fiscal sobriety and responsible international leadership. It jealously guards constitutional protections -- the First and the 14th Amendments alike -- and rejects government by executive edict. It is not focused on rolling back gay marriage nor on dismantling every post-New Deal program and agency. It is forward-looking and cognizant that the dual issues of poverty and middle-class wage stagnation demand more than tax reform, which in any case must take a different form than cutting top marginal rates. It puts as much emphasis on the character of its elected officials as it does on their policy to-do list.

Robert E. Rubin (no relation) sets out an agenda that contains many items a center-right party would find enticing: infrastructure spending, funding of basic and applied research, "breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty through early family intervention, transitional public employment to provide jobs and workforce readiness, and other policy interventions could significantly reduce social costs and increase long-run productivity," **immigration** reform, entitlement reform, "a sensible balance of costs and benefits to regulation," and education reform. Arguments can be had about what level of government should undertake what tasks, what form **immigration** reform and anti-poverty programs should take and hundreds of other details. The mind-set, however, must be serious, forward-looking and inclusive. America must flourish in the 21st century, not stick its fingers in its ears and hum.

Can the GOP be that party? Maybe a radical makeover -- akin to dumping Hannity and defending Fox's serious news people -- will be possible. We're increasingly doubtful, however. Sometimes it is easier to start from scratch.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Indiana Gov. Mike Pence (R) has been repeatedly asked to clarify something that his running mate simply will not: Does Donald Trump still want to ban Muslims from entering the United States?

"Of course not," Pence said on MSNBC's "Morning Joe" on Thursday, then clarified that the campaign instead wants to suspend **immigration** from "areas of the world, territories and specifically countries that have been so compromised by terrorism that we can't know for certain who those people are."

Pence is one of numerous Trump surrogates to repeatedly say that the Republican presidential nominee does not want a religion-based ban and will instead focus on countries with high rates of terrorism against the United States, most of which happen to have high Muslim populations. In an interview on CNN on Thursday, Pence said that a Muslim ban is "not Donald Trump's position now."

But there's one key person who has yet to say Trump no longer wants a Muslim ban: Donald Trump.

Trump has said that he purposely stopped using the word "Muslim" in describing the ban, and he has said that all of his proposals are simply suggestions open to negotiation. But he has yet to formally abandon the controversial position that he first took in early December.

And his campaign website still contains a "statement on preventing Muslim **immigration**" that says: "Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on."

The topic did not directly come up during the first presidential debate last week.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**DONALD TRUMP has telegraphed his intentions, if not always consistently, to radically shift **immigration** policy and, in so doing, subvert America's vitality and international standing as a beacon of diversity and tolerance. While he cannot unilaterally undertake every change he proposes, there is plenty he can do, on his own, to overhaul America's approach to **immigrants**. His program would undercut the nation's economic prospects, its values and the vibrancy of its neighborhoods and communities.

A President Trump could slash the number of refugees allowed to enter the country, including from Syria, downgrading President Obama's goal of admitting 110,000 in the fiscal year that started Saturday. Federal law gives presidents the power to bar any "class of aliens" they deem "detrimental to the interests of the United States," so Mr. Trump could as promised ban **immigrants** from Muslim-majority countries. The effect would be to undercut Washington's standing with allies as well as America's relations with its own Muslim citizens — a blow to America's capacity to fight terrorism.

In the same category of feasible but self-defeating policies, Mr. Trump could revoke work permits and the protection from deportation granted by Mr. Obama to nearly 1.5 million young undocumented **immigrants** brought to the United States as children by their parents. Just as Mr. Obama has used executive orders to shield those "Dreamers," Mr. Trump could remove the shield and thereby expel from the country a generation of promising, American-educated young **immigrants**, most of whom have little or no memory of their birth countries.

As president, Mr. Trump could also unilaterally broaden the categories of undocumented **immigrants** targeted for accelerated deportation; they would include, as he has pledged, visa overstayers. Together, they amount to more than 5 million people.

True, it would be staggeringly expensive to find, detain, process and remove so many migrants in those categories. Yet considering the pride of place his campaign has given to accelerated deportations, it is likely Mr. Trump could exert his will to a significant extent.

A study by the American Action Forum, a conservative group, estimates that deporting all illegal **immigrants**, as Mr. Trump has threatened, would require more than 90,000 federal deportation agents; there are fewer than 5,000. The nation's 34,000 detention beds would have to increase tenfold, and more than 30,000 additional federal lawyers would be needed to process the throngs that would jam **immigration** courts.

The price of carrying out such a mass expulsion (along with the wall Mr. Trump would build) would not be limited to the estimated budgetary expense ($400 billion to $600 billion), nor even the blow to the economy of depleting the labor force by more than 10 million workers. The most lasting and damaging cost would be to America's prestige globally and to its founding principles. A nation that expels millions of long-standing residents with deep roots in their communities is not a leader; it is a fearful, mean and meek place, heartless and spiritually crabbed. This is not the America envisioned by the Founding Fathers; it is certainly not a home of the brave.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The first time Melissa de la Cruz tackled **immigration** in her writing, it was her autobiography "Fresh Off the Boat," which hit YA shelves in 2005.

"It was a very small book," said de la Cruz, who is best known for her young adult fantasy and romance novels. "There was not as much hype or interest. But now 11 years later, I'm publishing [a new book] and it's got trumpets and a huge market."

De la Cruz's new novel, "Something in Between" published this week, and it parallels her autobiography very closely. In the book, 17-year-old Jasmine de los Santos, a Filipino **immigrant**, has just won a prestigious scholarship to any university of her choice. But then Jasmine finds out that she is undocumented. The novel follows her as she tries to juggle her quest for citizenship with her pursuit of higher education and her first romance.

Like Jasmine, de la Cruz was also born in the Philippines, and she moved to the United States when she was 13 years old. De la Cruz's experience wasn't quite so harrowing as her protagonist's, but it did take her 20 years to finally receive her green card after much bureaucratic red tape. It took even longer for her, born in the Philippines, to become an American citizen at the age of 40.

She said that even though there were editors and readers looking for stories about the **immigrant** experience in America back in 2005, the interest — and need — is much greater now.

"It's kind of fun to see the culture come around to that and have this experience again in a different way," de la Cruz said.

In a phone interview, de la Cruz talked about what it's like to tackle real life topics, why young-adult is her favorite genre and why it's important to be optimistic.

This interview has been condensed and edited.

This book is a really different direction from many of your previous books. I did write a lot of really fun, almost chick-lit books, and I really enjoyed writing them and maybe I got a little burned out. Then I wrote a lot of fantasy because I'm a big sci-fi nerd, so I gave up writing contemporary fiction to focus on the fantasy for a while. Going back to contemporary felt like coming home. It's a little more serious, not kind of fluffy and candy, which is what I like to write and eat.

I've been in YA almost 20 years now and as I've become older and also as I've become a mom, I did want to write books that had a little bit more to say about teenagers rather than just pure entertainment. I didn't want it to feel like an after-school special. I don't think you need to lecture to teenagers.

What is it about YA that really attracted you to the genre? A lot of what makes a good YA writer is just empathy. . . . It's not even writing for kids, it's writing for the kid in you.

When I found [the YA genre] I thought, "This is what I do. This is what I write." I love it because it's about a time in your life when anything is possible. It's all about idealism and opportunity and you're so excited and everything is brand new. This is a really fun place to be, instead of this adult jadedness and cynicism. When you grow up you realize what the world is really cracked up to be and it's a little disappointing, but when you're a kid it's so exciting. Everything is so discoverable. I think it keeps me young.

This book is so relentlessly optimistic, despite its difficult subject matter. How and why did you write it that way? That optimism is mine. It comes from my point of view in life and my personality so it has my optimism, idealism and cheerfulness. When I got my own green card, it came from having worked hard and gone to Columbia. I just think there is luck in the world, and you never where it's going to come from. It's such a seemingly hopeless and depressing situation that I wanted to write a book that was positive.

Who is your audience — teens who have similar experiences or readers who may not know that this is happening? It's definitely for both, and definitely for kids in the suburbs who have a nice life who don't know what life is like if you're undocumented.

everdeen.mason@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**During the Veep debate, Mike Pence grew so frustrated with Tim Kaine's repeated efforts to remind the audience about Donald Trump's insults towards Mexican **immigrants** that he finally said: "Senator, you've whipped out that Mexican thing again."

This has since sparked a viral meme. As Buzzfeed reports, Latino newscasts are all over it, and the Hillary Clinton campaign, worried about the possibility of lagging enthusiasm among Latino voters, is doing everything it can to stoke the fires, particularly on social media, where it's already cutting a wide swath on its own:

The moment came and went quickly, but blossomed on social media, where Latinos responded by highlighting the sacrifices their families have made in the country, leading both #ThatMexicanThing and #ThatMexicanThingAgain to trend on Twitter….the attention from young people and Hispanics on social media is a good sign for a campaign that need them when it comes to young Latinos.

New polling suggests that this "Mexican thing" isn't going away for the Republican Party anytime soon.

Scott Clement and Jim Tankersley report today that newly-released polling from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs sheds fresh light on the true nature of Donald Trump's **immigration** appeals among Republican voters. The key finding is that Republican voters are disproportionately concerned about what they view as the negative impact of **immigration** on the United States -- and disproportionately want something done to control it. These negative feelings about **immigration** are even more pronounced among Trump supporters -- even as they are not shared by a majority of the broader public, the poll found.

Crucially, the Chicago Council's polling from previous years show that these concerns among Republicans predate Trump, suggesting that he identified and spoke to already existing anxieties. As Clement and Tankersley put it, these anxieties "appear unlikely to dissipate," even if Trump loses. (Click through the link for more information and charts.)

It should be noted that polling has been mixed on Republicans and **immigration**, with some showing that Republicans actually support a path to citizenship. But other polls have shown that Republican voters support mass deportations, which has been one of the central pillars of Trump's agenda for the last year, notwithstanding the fact that many news organizations have suggested that he's "softening" on this goal. If the new polling above is right, such instincts and anxieties may outlast Trump's candidacy and continue to bedevil Republican leaders who have long wanted to move beyond this issue in hopes of recasting the party as more welcoming to Latino **immigrants**. That could complicate efforts to embrace reform after Trump, at a moment when Republican leaders might be particularly eager to expunge the stench of Trumpism from their party.

And so, in a sense, it's fitting that Pence's "that Mexican thing" moment has gone viral, because it captures a great deal about Campaign 2016. On the one hand, for many Latinos, it seemed to neatly capture the hostility towards Mexican and undocumented **immigrants** that has long provided the Trump campaign with its driving energy. Remember, the quote that Kaine kept throwing in Pence's face -- in which Trump called Mexican **immigrants** "rapists" -- was delivered during Trump's presidential announcement speech. On the other, given that Pence blurted out "that Mexican thing" after finally growing frustrated with having to explain away that hostile quote, it also seemed to capture the annoyance many establishment Republicans (many of whom favor **immigration** reform and getting right with Latinos) seem to feel with having their party hijacked by the xenophobic Trump.

Establishment Republicans, of course, failed to follow through with their own desire to realize **immigration** reform, because they feared the GOP base on this issue. Republican voters have now stuck the party with Trump. But the sentiments Trump successfully exploited to win the nomination could well outlast him, making it harder for the GOP to embrace **immigration** reform and get right with Latinos in coming years, too. Which means Republicans may end up being frustrated by "that Mexican thing" for some time to come.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One of the big policy questions for the Republican Party, in the heat of this presidential election, is what it will do if Donald Trump loses come November. Will it retrench to its traditional positions and focus, stressing free markets, low taxes and social conservatism? Or will it continue along Trump's more populist path, critiquing globalization and, in particular, **immigration**, at increasingly high volume?

Newly-released polling from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs suggests the populism is here to stay. Concerns about **immigration**, refugees and globalization predate Trump in the GOP - and thus appear unlikely to dissipate whether he wins or loses.

It is a cycle of nativism and economic pessimism that has been building for years among Republicans, particularly those who form the core of Trump's support. As the Council puts it, "Those Americans who feel more threatened by **immigration**, favor deportation, and feel unfavorably toward **immigrants** believe that the next generation will be economically worse off than adults today. Unease with **immigration** and pessimism about the next generation's economic prospects reinforce each other and have proven to be key factors in support for Donald Trump."

Republican disillusionment with globalization and trade has been building for a decade. In 2006, more Republicans than Democrats said globalization had been good for America. Soon after, that flipped: Democrats today are substantially more likely to view globalization positively than Republicans do, 74 to 59 percent, and half-again as likely to do so as core Trump voters are (49 percent).

**Immigration** concerns are even more pronounced. A large majority of Republicans saw **immigrants** and refugees entering the U.S. as a "critical threat" even before Trump's candidacy (the 2015 survey was conducted almost entirely prior to Trump's campaign launch). What's notable is that concern about **immigrants**and refugees was similarly high across party lines in the late 1990s and after the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, but concern dropped off substantially among both groups since then. Republicans have continued to be concerned.

Perceptions of **immigrants** and refugees as a "critical threat" peaks at 80 percent among Core Trump supporters, those who wanted him to become president more than all Republican or Democratic candidates.

Or consider the breakdown over time of Americans who think controlling and reducing illegal **immigration** is a very important foreign policy goal. Just like the "threat" question, Trump did not need to convince Republicans to be prioritize blocking illegal **immigration** - they already thought it was a major issue. And also similar to above, Republican concerns have been steady since rising after the 2001 terrorist attacks, while Democrats and independents have become less likely to say the issue is important over time. Also similar to the threat question, Trump's core supporters are significantly more likely to prioritize controlling illegal **immigration** than Republicans overall, 83 vs. 68 percent.

International trade is one issue where Trump's campaign appears to have influenced public opinion in a significant way. The share of Republicans who said international trade is a "good thing" for the U.S. economy dropped from 60 percent in 2006 to 51 percent in 2016, though this was met by a slightly larger increase in the share of Democrats saying trade is a "good thing."

Polling from the Pew Research Center has found an even more dramatic shift on this issue among Republican-leaning voters, with the share saying trade is a good thing plummeting from 51 percent in early 2015 to 32 percent this August. Both Pew and Chicago Council surveys have shown that before Trump, far fewer thought trade was beneficial to American workers.

Altogether, the findings suggest it will be difficult for GOP leaders to ignore **immigration** and trade concerns among their base, no matter when Trump leaves the scene. Restricting the flow of people and goods across borders isn't a traditional pillar of free-market ideology, but it's becoming one in America's most traditionally market-driven party.

The 2016 Chicago Council survey was conducted online June 10-17 among a sample of 2,061 adults from the GfK Knowledge Panel. The panel of survey participants was recruited through probability-based sampling methods including Random Digit Dialing and Address Based Sampling. The margin of sampling error for overall results is plus or minus 2.4 percentage points; the error margin for individual questions and 2.6 and 3.9 percentage points, and is larger among subgroups such as Democrats and Republicans. Additional details about the survey can be found here.

Results from the 2016 Chicago Council Survey will be discussed Thursday at 10 A.M. as part of an event co-sponsored by The Washington Post and the Wilson Center.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Here's another thing from last night's debate that deserves more attention amid all the talk about Mike Pence's calm, reassuring demeanor. When Tim Kaine reminded the audience that Donald Trump has promised to ship millions of undocumented **immigrants** out of the country in cattle cars, Pence sadly denied it, and softly suggested that Trump would never, ever do anything so horrible as to follow through on his vow to create a "deportation force."

But Pence also went right ahead and doubled down on Trump's plans for mass deportations, and for good measure, on the whole wretched, dishonest, demagogic story that Trump has been telling about **immigration** for the last year -- indeed, the very same story that launched Trump's whole candidacy.

The key part came when Kaine drew a contrast between the Democratic ticket's plan -- comprehensive **immigration** reform, including a path to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented **immigrants** in this country -- and Trump's plan. "Donald Trump believes in deportation nation," Kaine said, repeatedly reminding the national audience that Trump has proposed to create a "deportation force." Kaine added that "they want to go house to house, school to school, business to business" in rounding up and "kicking out" undocumented **immigrants**.

Pence repeatedly replied this was "nonsense." But here's how he described what the GOP ticket would actually do:

"Donald Trump's laid out a plan to end illegal **immigration** once and for all in this country. We've been talking it to death for 20 years. Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to continue the policies of open borders, amnesty, catch and release, sanctuary cities, all the things that are driving -- that are driving wages down in this country, Senator, and also too often with criminal aliens in the country, it's bringing heartbreak.

What's on display here is the same scam job that Trump's campaign used to hoodwink reporters into claiming he was "softening" on mass deportations, in the run-up to his big clarifying speech in Arizona. Trump had repeatedly hinted he was backing away from his "plan" to proactively, immediately round up every single undocumented **immigrant** and ship them out of the country without any delay. But then, in the Arizona speech, Trump confirmed that very little had actually changed.

While Trump had stopped using the words "deportation force," his plan still contained several core elements. First, it offered no path to legalization for those 11 million people without leaving the country and coming back, which in practice means this path to legalization doesn't meaningfully exist for many of them. Second, all 11 million would remain targets for removal for the indefinite future. While this is not quite the same as vowing instant mass deportations, Trump's position on the underlying core dispute -- should the millions of otherwise law-abiding undocumented **immigrants** who have been here for many years, and are already contributing to American life, be given a way to get right with the law, or should they remain forever in the shadows as perpetual targets for suspicion, enforcement and removal -- hadn't changed.

Pence confirmed all this last night. Though he sadly denied that Trump would create a "deportation force," he did reiterate that Trump's plan is the one he presented in Arizona, with all of the key pillars I mentioned above. In fact, in this context, it's particularly noteworthy that Pence rebuffed the "mass deportations" charge by saying: "We have a deportation force. It's called **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement." This is correct, but it actually undermines his own suggestion that we should find Trump's plan more reassuring than "mass deportations." That's because Trump's plan explicitly seeks to expand ICE's enforcement efforts. As Benjy Sarlin has explained, by proposing this ICE expansion, Trump actually offered a "recommitment" to mass deportations. This, combined with other elements in Trump's plan, would mean that as many as 6.5 million would be targeted for rapid removal. Pence effectively confirmed all this while trying to sound soothing about it.

Pence also revived another clever rhetorical trick Trump has used to make his mass deportation plan seem more "humane," as Trump likes to put it. Pence reiterated that Trump would target the criminals for removal first, and repeated Trump's suggestion that "we'll deal with those that remain" after the border is secured. But this ruse is designed to sugar-coat the goal of mass removals, and make it sound less cruel to the ears of suburban swing voters, by implying that maybe something can be worked out later for all of those undocumented **immigrants** who have integrated themselves. But, since Trump has ruled out any meaningful path to legalization -- which Pence confirmed last night -- that goal simply isn't in Trump's vision, no matter how hard people wish for it to be there.

Finally, Pence repeated the lie that under Obama, there have been "open borders," in effect underscoring Trump's long-running suggestion that dark hordes are besieging the southern border. Trump's first general election ad dramatized this with grainy footage of shadowy figures sprawled atop a train crossing the border. In reality, experts say the border is being managed, and the latest figures show that the undocumented population in the U.S. leveled off years ago.

There was one moment when Pence's polish deserted him. It came when Kaine once again reminded the audience of Trump's demagoguery towards Mexicans. Pence replied, tiredly, "Senator, you've whipped out that Mexican thing again." But as annoying as it must have been for Pence to be confronted with Trump's demagoguery, Pence did not tell a story that was meaningfully different from it. He told the same ugly and dishonest **immigration** tale that Trump has told ever since he announced. As Dara Lind puts it, Pence spoke to the same anxieties about **immigration** that have animated Trumpism for the last year, only he did it a little more quietly than Trump himself does. Or maybe he did it in a comforting Indiana drawl.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In an essay for the Economist, President Obama writes, "It's true that a certain anxiety over the forces of globalization, **immigration**, technology, even change itself, has taken hold in America."

You can't blame him for writing this. Congressional resistance threatens to scupper Obama's Trans-Pacific Partnership, much to the confused delight of China. Obama's assertions feed into an overall spate of commentary that either celebrates or bemoans the rise of economic populism in the United States — but certainly presumes that it's happening.

The hard-working staff here at Spoiler Alerts would like to question the president's premise, however. Indeed, one of my running themes this election cycle has been that Donald Trump's brand of economic populism is not all that popular. And today we have a big honking new Chicago Council on Global Affairs survey to demonstrate why this is the case.

The bad news first: The Chicago Council survey undeniably demonstrates that there is a constituency for this kind of economic message, and that constituency is concentrated in the Republican Party. As my Washington Post colleagues Scott Clement and Jim Tankersley note:

One of the big policy questions for the Republican Party, in the heat of this presidential election, is what it will do if Donald Trump loses come November. Will it retrench to its traditional positions and focus, stressing free markets, low taxes and social conservatism? Or will it continue along Trump's more populist path, critiquing globalization and, in particular, **immigration**, at increasingly high volume?

This is true. Indeed, the Chicago Council report highlights that economic populism is the area where GOP elites are most out of step with the base of the party:

On two core areas — globalization and jobs — Trump has been able to take advantage of an opinion gap between the Republican public and Republican leadership. The 2016 Chicago Council Survey reveals that 85 percent of core Trump supporters and 78 percent of Republicans say protecting American jobs is a very important foreign policy goal. In contrast, the 2014 survey of foreign policy opinion leaders found that only 37 percent of Republican opinion leaders think protecting American jobs is a very important foreign policy goal.

If the thenation consisted only of Republicans, the dominant narrative about rising economic populism would be accurate.

The United States is more diverse than that, however, and a glance at the aggregate data shows some more powerful countervailing trends. Consider this chart about American attitudes toward **immigration**, for example:

Over the past two years, the chart shows that the issue of illegal **immigration** has strongly resonated with Republicans, but not with the rest of the nation. Democrats and independents are less concerned about illegal **immigration** as a threat now than they were two years ago — which, by the way, is consistent with actual facts about illegal **immigration**.

The trend lines on the illegal **immigration** question are emblematic of the overall findings of the report. Republicans, particularly Trump supporters, have mostly shifted in a more economically populist direction. The rest of the country, however, has shifted in the opposite direction. This might just be a function of raw partisanship, although the movement of independents suggests not. Consider the following data points culled from the report:

\* "Just three in 10 among the overall US public (28 percent) say that illegal **immigrants** should be forced to leave the United States and leave their jobs — half the percentage of core Trump supporters who feel this way."

\* "Overall, the number of Americans who prefer there be a pathway to citizenship [58 percent] has increased since 2013, when 50 percent were in favor either immediately (25 percent) or after a waiting period and paying a fine (25 percent). This result is in line with the findings of other polls, which have found that a majority of Americans favor a pathway to citizenship and have since at least 2014."

\* "The gap between Republicans and Democrats on support for globalization has grown from four percentage points in 2006 to 15 percentage points in 2016."

\* "Core Trump supporters have different views than other Americans on trade and globalization. But some of core Trump supporters' demographic groupings — namely predominately white, less-educated and older Americans — are shrinking in America."

There are also the areas where public opinion polling flatly contradicts the notion that the country has embraced Trump's zero-sum worldview:

\* "With a negative outlook on international trade, it is somewhat surprising that half of core Trump supporters support the TPP (49 percent support, 46 percent oppose). Nonetheless, this puts them at lower levels of support than the overall U.S. public (60 percent), Republicans (58 percent) and Democrats (70 percent), and on par with independents (52 percent). Surprisingly, despite [Sen. Bernie] Sanders's vocal opposition to the TPP, 56 percent of his core supporters favor the agreement, as do 74 percent of [Hillary] Clinton's core supporters."

\* "Americans overall — and across party lines — have grown more positive toward Mexican **immigrants** since a 2013 Chicago Council survey. In 2013, 55 percent reported favorable views of Mexican **immigrants** living in the United States — a sentiment that rose to 60 percent in 2016."

\* "Among the overall public, 89 percent say that maintaining existing alliances is very or somewhat effective at achieving U.S. foreign policy goals. That view has bipartisan support: Democrats (94 percent), Republicans (88 percent) and independents (86 percent) all view maintaining existing alliances as very or somewhat effective, as do 84 percent of core Trump supporters."

My point here is the same point I've been making this entire election cycle. President Obama has described the wave of populism the way it is normally described: as an inexorable rising tide. The data suggests otherwise, however: For every American who is attracted to Trump's message, there are more Americans who are repelled by it. Whether because of political polarization or common sense, this trend is worth stressing again: Economic populism simply isn't terribly popular.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The progress our economy has made since the financial crisis is real. So, too, is the sense that our country is adrift. Faith in institutions is eroding. Income inequality, job insecurity and sluggish wage growth — even with 2015's improved performance — are fraying our social fabric. Technological development and, to a lesser extent, globalization contribute to productivity and growth but also put pressure on wages and jobs. The poverty rate is unconscionably high. Many feel that the American promise of hard work leading to a better life is out of reach.

The United States, however, still holds the world's best long-run hand. The question is how we play our cards. We need a policy regime that effectively promotes growth, widespread income gains and greater economic security in the context of an economy undergoing transformation. These three objectives are interdependent and mutually reinforcing and, taken together, constitute one overarching goal: inclusive growth, which could, in turn, restore a sense of common purpose, confidence in our future and much-needed social cohesion.

An inclusive growth agenda would address three broad categories of challenges: first, public investment; second, structural reform and innovation; and, finally, our intermediate and longer-term fiscal outlook.

Public investment should begin with overdue action on infrastructure, including addressing deferred maintenance estimated at more than a trillion dollars. Repairing and expanding bridges, railways, airports and ports would create jobs immediately, tighten labor markets to improve wages and increase the productivity and capacity of our economy for years to come. Economic success also requires increased funding for basic and applied research, broadened access to high-speed Internet and other targeted investments in our future.

Next, we need structural reform in many critical areas, often in conjunction with public investment. Twenty percent of our children live in poverty — that's a moral disgrace and highly counterproductive economically. Breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty through early family intervention, transitional public employment to provide jobs and workforce readiness, and other policy interventions could significantly reduce social costs and increase long-run productivity.

Likewise, our nation's criminal-justice policies fail us morally and harm us economically. Alternatives to incarceration for many nonviolent crimes, shorter sentences, better rehabilitation in prison and vastly improved re-entry programs could produce great direct cost savings, including from reduced recidivism, and substantial productivity gains from better equipping released prisoners for the workforce.

Reform should also include **immigration** measures that provide a fair path to citizenship and recognize the immense contribution of both high- and low-skilled **immigrants**. We also need to level the playing field for workers to opt for collective bargaining; apply a sensible balance of costs and benefits to regulation; address climate change; improve K-12 education; and develop innovative measures to address ongoing wage and job pressure from transformative technological development. Those measures might include public employment, free or low-cost lifelong learning, effective retraining and a substantially expanded earned-income tax credit.

Finally, to achieve inclusive growth, we must address our unsound and economically harmful intermediate and longer-term projected fiscal conditions. Our current trajectory is likely to increasingly undermine business confidence, both by creating uncertainty about future policy and by exacerbating concerns about Washington's ability to govern. And it diminishes our resilience in the face of another economic or geopolitical crisis; reduces our capacity to fund public investment and national security; crowds out private investment when it recovers; and, at some future point, could trigger financial market or economic destabilization. To a certain extent, some of these risks are already materializing.

A constructive fiscal regime would pair immediate public investment to boost current demand and future productivity with measures to effectively address our longer-term trajectory. That would require increased revenue, which should be raised progressively, and putting our social insurance and federal health-care programs on sustainable financial footing. We should also rigorously scrutinize both the defense and nondefense sides of the budget to improve programmatic efficiency and relevance. The longer we wait to address these challenges, the greater the effects and the harsher the measures that will be required.

But the fundamental challenge, upon which all else depends, is reestablishing a willingness among members of Congress to engage in principled compromise across policy and political divides, to make difficult decisions and to focus on facts and analysis, while recognizing that politics will always be involved. If they do this, we can achieve broadly shared economic success. If they do not, we languish.

For too long, we have been caught in a vicious cycle: Failure to achieve inclusive growth has undermined the public trust and Congress's commitment to governing that, in turn, is necessary to achieve inclusive growth. If we act on the policies that promote inclusive growth, we could restore support for governance and initiate a virtuous cycle, spurring further constructive policy. All of us can contribute to this positive outcome, even when we have very different policy views, by using all means available, from emails and social media to campaign contributions, to insist that our elected officials engage in making our system work.

Inclusive growth offers an economic vision that reflects and reinforces our country's broad values. The policies exist to achieve it. Now it's up to us to make it happen.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A friend of mine whose family emigrated from Argentina to the United States when he was a kid recently told me he could never have built his small business back home because he wasn't born to the right class. No one in the United States cares about his background, he said. They cared about what he could do.

My friend isn't rich, but he is comfortable, with a full-time job and a robust furniture resale business. It's a tale worth telling as Forbes Magazine on Tuesday released its annual list of the 400 richest Americans, a record 42 of whom are **immigrants** from 21 countries.

The 42 have a combined net worth of $250 billion, Forbes reports, and include New York City grocery mogul John Catsimatidis ($3.3 billion, Greece), Tesla founder Elon Musk ($11.6 billion, South Africa) and WhatsApp co-founder Jan Koum ($8.8 billion, Ukraine).

"There is no other country on the planet where you or your parents can show up and with a lot of hard work create huge wealth within one generation," said businessman Raul Fernandez, who was born in Washington to **immigrant** parents from Cuba and from Ecuador.

Six of the 42 richest **immigrants** on the Forbes list are from Israel, five are from India, and four each are from Hungary and Taiwan. Moscow native and Google co-founder Sergey Brin, whose parents brought him to the United States when he was six, leads the **immigrant** list with an estimated net worth of $37.5 billion.

Brin's "mathematician parents faced anti-Semitism in their homeland," Forbes staffer Jennifer Wang writes. "They were reportedly forced to sit in separate rooms during university entrance exams, and were limited in their choice of careers."

All but two of the Forbes 42 are self-made, and a third are richer than real estate baron Donald Trump, who has made **immigration** a central theme of his candidacy.  The Donald fell 35 spots to number 156. The billionaire still clocks in with a fortune of $3.7 billion, down $800 million from 2015.

Twenty-six people fell off the list, including Elizabeth Holmes, whose wealth has been lowered by Forbes to zero after the troubles of her medical testing company, Theranos. Another dropout is hedge fund manager Bill Ackman, who was burned by his investment in Valeant pharmaceutical.

According to a report on **immigration** and entrepreneurship by the Kauffman Foundation, "there is a little debate about the economic contributions of **immigrant** entrepreneurs." The Kauffman report said "**immigrants** are  twice as likely to become entrepreneurs as native-born Americans."

"The risk-taking that defines an **immigrant**'s experience in starting anew in a country often continues to benefit **immigrant** entrepreneurs as they channel a healthy appetite for risk in a way that leads to new business ideas," according to the report.

"It's a unique and truly American ecosystem that sets the stage for hungry, scrappy **immigrants** and entrepreneurs to create great companies and enormous wealth," Fernandez said.

Microsoft founder Bill Gates again leads the 400 -- his 23rd consecutive year -- with an estimated net worth of $81 billion. Although he still owns 13 percent of Microsoft, Gates has diversified his fortune into a wide range of investments, from Deere & Co. to Canadian National Railway.

The rocket-like rise of Amazon.com stock propelled founder and CEO (and Washington Post owner) Jeff Bezos past famed investor Warren Buffett (former Washington Post part owner) to take the No. 2 spot on the Forbes list. Bezos's net worth is estimated at $67 billion. Buffett is now in third.

America's wealthiest are doing well, thank you. The era of low interest rates has boosted the stock market and the booming technology industry along with it. Facebook founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg is worth $55.5 billion, surpassing Oracle founder Larry Ellison, who fell to No. 5 at $49.3 billion.

The youngest member of the Forbes 400 is Snapchat founder Evan Spiegel, who is 26 years old and already worth $2.1 billion. (Messaging app Snapchat renamed itself Snap Inc. in late September.) The oldest is David Rockefeller Sr., age 101, the only living grandchild of Standard Oil founder John D. Rockefeller.

They have a combined net worth of $2.4 trillion and an average net worth of $6 billion. Those are the highest for both categories since Forbes started tracking America's richest people starting in 1982. The entrance fee this year is a net worth of $1.7 billion, which is the same as 2015.

The best way to join this elite crowd is to inherit your money or start a company. There aren't many Buffetts out there who can stock-pick their way to billionaire status.

Some businesses launched by **immigrants** are small. Some are quite large, like Brin's Google. But others aren't: The National Foundation for American Policy, a nonpartisan research group, says that 44 of the 87 American tech companies valued at $1 billion or more were founded by **immigrants**, many of whom now rank among the richest people in America.

Fernandez isn't on the Forbes list, but he has done just fine. He built his fortune in technology, sold his company and is now an investor. He is vice chairman of Monumental Sports & Entertainment, the holding company that owns D.C.'s Verizon Center, home to the NBA Wizards and NHL Capitals.

"It's the America dream, not the Russian or Chinese dream," he said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Now that the GOP is the Party of Trump, could Democrats become the party of . . . Reagan?

That's a stretch. But Democrats are making a bid for the title.

At Tuesday night's vice-presidential debate, the 40th president was name-checked twice — both times by the Democrat, Tim Kaine.

"Our plan is like Ronald Reagan's plan from 1986," Kaine said on **immigration**.

The Republican, Mike Pence, countered that "Ronald Reagan said a nation without borders is not a nation."

Kaine later said Reagan believed nuclear proliferation could mean "some fool or maniac could trigger a catastrophic event" and said Trump is exactly the type "Reagan warned us about."

Pence responded that "Reagan also said nuclear war should never be fought, because it can never be won."

Reagan did say that, but this only highlights his difference with Trump. Former GOP congressman Joe Scarborough, now an MSNBC host, reported in August that unnamed sources told him Trump had thrice asked his national security experts about nuclear weapons: "Why can't we use them?"

Both Trump and Pence, like most Republicans, routinely claim inspiration from Reagan. Pence even affects the Gipper's nod and tilt of the head, and on Tuesday he drew groans in the media filing center when he recycled one of Reagan's best lines — "There you go again" — when he scolded Kaine on Social Security.

Last month at the Reagan Library, Pence gave a full speech likening Trump to Reagan, saying they share "honesty and bluntness," and "toughness."

But the Reaganization of Trump suffered a serious blow on Monday when Reagan's son, the conservative commentator Michael Reagan, revoked his earlier endorsement of Trump in a series of tweets after Trump suggested in a speech, without basis, that Hillary Clinton was unfaithful to her husband.

"No way do I or would my father support this garbage," he wrote, saying Nancy Reagan would have voted for Clinton and that she was "appalled" before her death when people likened Trump to her husband. "Not the Party of Reagan," he tweeted, and, "If this is what the Republican Party wants leave us Reagans out."

The resounding rejection of Trump by one who has some authority to speak for the late president brought to mind the scene in "Annie Hall" when a loudmouth in a movie line pontificates about media theorist Marshall McLuhan — until the Woody Allen character brings over McLuhan himself, who says, "You know nothing of my work."

Ronald Reagan famously said that "I did not leave the Democratic Party — the Democratic Party left me." Though it's impossible to know how Reagan's views might have evolved, Republicans such as former GOP chairman Michael Steele speculate that Reagan couldn't win a Republican primary today. His record on **immigration**, taxes, the debt, gun control and abortion would disqualify him.

The most obvious difference may be style: Reagan was sunny and gentlemanly; Trump is gloomy and crude.

Trump talks of the American military as a "disaster," in "shambles," with generals reduced to "rubble." Reagan blamed civilian leaders but hailed the generals and their troops as "guardians of freedom, protectors of our heritage . . . keepers of the peace."

Trump calls the Iraq War a "disaster" and a "huge mistake" with "absolutely nothing" to show for thousands of American lives lost. He suggested some U.S. troops stole cash in Iraq. Reagan, by contrast, hailed those who fought in another failed war, the "noble cause" of Vietnam, and said we shouldn't "dishonor the memory of 50,000 young Americans who died in that cause."

On **immigration**, Trump talks of building a wall, banning Muslims and Syrian refugees from entering the country and deporting all 11 million illegal **immigrants**. Reagan supported amnesty for illegal **immigrants** who put down roots in America, and he memorably called America home "for all the pilgrims from all the lost places who are hurtling through the darkness."

Reagan proudly updated Gen. George Patton's phrase that wars are "won by men" to "men and women." Trump, who declared that Patton is "spinning in his grave" because of the situation in the Middle East, derided the "geniuses" who "put men and women together" in the armed forces.

And Reagan, of course, spoke with great moral force about the "evil empire" of the Soviet Union and the "barbarism born of a society which wantonly disregards individual rights . . . and seeks constantly to expand and dominate other nations."

Now, a Russian dictator, Vladimir Putin, is returning to these Soviet-era abuses, and Trump praises him as a strong leader he can work with, while disputing charges that Putin has killed journalists and meddled in the U.S. election.

Does Trump's abandonment of Republican internationalism and moral leadership give Democrats the Reagan mantle? Not necessarily. But as long as it's Trump's GOP, the mantle is for rent.

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Virginia Sen. Tim Kaine and Indiana Gov. Mike Pence met face-to-face for the first time Tuesday night, as the running mates took part in the only vice-presidential debate of the 2016 election.

The debate came amid Kaine and Hillary Clinton's newfound momentum in the race and as the Trump-Pence campaign continues to find itself on its heels -- due to a poor Trump debate performance last week and basically everything that has happened since.

We've posted the complete transcript below, along with our annotations of the key moments, fact checks and other commentary. To see an annotation, click on the highlighted text. To make your own annotations, make sure you have a Genius account.

QUIJANO: Good evening. From Longwood University in Farmville, Virginia, and welcome to the first, and only, vice presidential debate of 2016, sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates.

QUIJANO: I'm Elaine Quijano, anchor at CBSN, and correspondent for CBS News. It's an honor to moderate this debate between Senator Tim Kaine and Governor Mike Pence. Both are longtime public servants who are also proud fathers of sons serving in the U.S. Marines.

The campaigns have agreed to the rules of this 90-minute debate. There will be nine different segments covering domestic and foreign policy issues. Each segment will begin with a question to both candidates who will each have two minutes to answer. Then I'll ask follow-up questions to facilitate a discussion between the candidates. By coin toss, it's been determined that Senator Kaine will be first to answer the opening question.

QUIJANO: We have an enthusiastic audience tonight. They've agreed to only express that enthusiasm once at the end of the debate and right now as we welcome Governor Mike Pence and Senator Tim Kaine.

(APPLAUSE)

Gentlemen, welcome. It truly is a privilege to be with both of you tonight.

QUIJANO: I'd like to start with the topic of presidential leadership. Twenty-eight years ago tomorrow night, Lloyd Bentsen said the vice presidential debate was not about the qualifications for the vice presidency, but about how if tragedy should occur, the vice president has to step in without any margin for error, without time for preparation, to take over the responsibility for the biggest job in the world.

What about your qualities, your skills, and your temperament equip you to step into that role at a moment's notice? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Elaine, thank you for being here tonight, and, Governor Pence, welcome. It is so great to be back at Longwood University in Farmville, Virginia.

This is a very special place. Sixty-five years ago, a young, courageous woman, Barbara Johns, led a walkout of her high school, Moton High School. She made history by protesting school segregation. She believed our nation was stronger together. And that walkout led to the Brown v. Board of Education decision that moved us down the path toward equality.

I am so proud to be running with another strong, history-making woman, Hillary Clinton, to be president of the United States. I'm proud because her vision of stronger together, building an economy that works for all, not just those at the top, being safe in the world not only with a strong military, but also strong alliances to battle terrorism and climate change, and also to build a community of respect, just like Barbara Johns tried to do 65 years ago. That's why I'm so proud to be her running mate.

Hillary told me why she asked me to be her running mate. She said the test of a Clinton administration will not be the signing of a bill or the passage of a bill. It'll be whether we can make somebody's life better, whether we can make a classroom better learning environment for schoolkids or teachers, whether we can make a safer -- it's going to be about results.

And she said to me, you've been a missionary and a civil rights lawyer. You've been a city councilman and mayor. You've been a lieutenant governor and governor and now a U.S. senator. I think you will help me figure out how to govern this nation so that we always keep in mind that the success of the administration is the difference we make in people's lives.

And that's what I bring to the ticket, that experience having served at all levels of government. But my primary role is to be Hillary Clinton's right-hand person and strong supporter as she puts together the most historic administration possible. And I relish that role. I'm so proud of her.

KAINE: I'll just say this: We trust Hillary Clinton, my wife and I, and we trust her with the most important thing in our life. We have a son deployed overseas in the Marine Corps right now. We trust Hillary Clinton as president and commander-in-chief, but the thought of Donald Trump as commander-in-chief scares us to death.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: Well, first off, thank you, Elaine, and thank you to -- thank you to Norwood University for their wonderful hospitality and the Commission on Presidential Debates. It's deeply humbling for me to be here, to be surrounded by my -- my wonderful family.

And, Senator Kaine, it's an honor to be here with you, as well. And I just -- I also want to say -- I want to say thanks to everyone that's looking in tonight, who understands what an enormously important time this is in the life of our nation.

For the last seven-and-a-half years, we've seen America's place in the world weakened. We've seen an economy stifled by more taxes, more regulation, a war on coal, and a failing health care reform come to be known as Obamacare, and the American people know that we need to make a change. And so I want to thank all of you for being -- being with us tonight.

PENCE: I also want to thank Donald Trump for making that call and inviting us to be a part of this ticket. I have to tell you, I'm a -- I'm a small-town boy from a place not too different from Farmville. I grew up with a cornfield in my backyard. My grandfather had **immigrated** to this country when he was about my son's age. My mom and dad built a -- everything that matters in a small town in Southern Indiana. They built a family and -- and a good name and a business. And they raised a family. And I dreamed some day of representing my home town in Washington, D.C., but I -- honestly, Elaine, I never imagined -- never imagined I'd have the opportunity to be governor of the state that I love, let alone be sitting at a table like this in this kind of a position.

So to answer your question, I would say I -- I would hope that if -- if the responsibility ever fell to me in this role, that I would meet it with the way that I'm going to meet the responsibility should I be elected vice president of the United States. And that's to bring a lifetime of experience, a lifetime growing up in a small town, a lifetime where I've served in the Congress of the United States, where -- where I've led a state that works in the great state of Indiana, and whatever other responsibilities might follow from this, I -- I would hope and, frankly, I would pray to be able to meet that moment with that -- that lifetime of experience.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, on the campaign trail, you praised Secretary Clinton's character, including her commitment to public service, yet 60 percent of voters don't think she's trustworthy. Why do so many people distrust her? Is it because they have questions about her e-mails and the Clinton Foundation?

KAINE: Elaine, let me tell you why I trust Hillary Clinton. Here's what people should look at as they look at a public servant. Do they have a passion in their life that showed up before they were in public life? And have they held onto that passion throughout their life, regardless of whether they were in office or not, succeeding or failing?

Hillary Clinton has that passion. From a time as a kid in a Methodist youth group in the suburbs of Chicago, she has been focused on serving others with a special focus on empowering families and kids. As a civil rights lawyer in the South, with the Children's Defense Fund, first lady of Arkansas and this country, senator, secretary of state, it's always been about putting others first. And that's a sharp contrast with Donald Trump.

Donald Trump always puts himself first. He built a business career, in the words of one of his own campaign staffers, "off the backs of the little guy." And as a candidate, he started his campaign with a speech where he called Mexicans rapists and criminals, and he has pursued the discredited and really outrageous lie that President Obama wasn't born in the United States.

It is so painful to suggest that we go back to think about these days where an African-American could not be a citizen of the United States. And I can't imagine how Governor Pence can defend the insult- driven selfish "me first" style of Donald Trump.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, let me ask you, you have said Donald Trump is, quote, "thoughtful, compassionate, and steady." Yet 67 percent of voters feel he is a risky choice, and 65 percent feel he does not have the right kind of temperament to be president. Why do so many Americans think Mr. Trump is simply too erratic?

PENCE: Well, let me -- let me say first and foremost that, Senator, you and Hillary Clinton would know a lot about an insult- driven campaign. It really is remarkable. At a time when literally, in the wake of Hillary Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, where she was the architect of the Obama administration's foreign policy, we see entire portions of the world, particularly the wider Middle East, literally spinning out of control. I mean, the situation we're watching hour by hour in Syria today is the result of the failed foreign policy and the weak foreign policy that Hillary Clinton helped lead in this administration and create. The newly emboldened -- the aggression of Russia, whether it was in Ukraine or now they're heavy-handed approach...

KAINE: You guys love Russia. You both have said...

PENCE: ... their heavy-handed approach.

KAINE: You both have said -- you both have said Vladimir Putin is a better leader than the president.

PENCE: Well...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Well, we're going to get to Russia in just a moment. But I do want to get back to the question at...

PENCE: But in the midst -- Elaine, thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Senator, I'll...

KAINE: These guys have praised Vladimir Putin as a great leader. How can that...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Yes, and we will get to that, Senator. We do have that coming up here. But in the meantime, the questions...

PENCE: Well, Senator, I must have hit a...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: I must have hit a nerve here.

QUIJANO: Why the disconnect?

PENCE: Because at a time of great challenge in the life of this nation, where we've weakened America's place in the world, stifled America's economy, the campaign of Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine has been an avalanche of insults.

Look, to get to your question about trustworthiness, Donald Trump has built a business through hard times and through good times. He's brought an extraordinary business acumen. He's employed tens of thousands of people in this country.

KAINE: And paid few taxes and lost a billion a year.

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: And why the disconnect with your running mate?

PENCE: But there's a -- there's a reason why people question the trustworthiness of Hillary Clinton. And that's because they're paying attention. I mean, the reality is, when she was secretary of state, Senator, come on. She had a Clinton Foundation accepting contributions from foreign governments.

KAINE: You are Donald Trump's apprentice. Let me talk about this...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Senator, I think I'm still on my time.

KAINE: Well, I think -- isn't this a discussion?

QUIJANO: This is our open discussion.

KAINE: Yeah, let's talk about the state of...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Well, let me interrupt -- let me interrupt you and finish my sentence, if I can.

KAINE: Finish your sentence.

PENCE: The Clinton Foundation accepted foreign contributions from foreign governments and foreign donors while she was secretary of state.

KAINE: OK, now I can weigh in. Now...

PENCE: She had a private server...

KAINE: Now, I get to weigh in. Now, let me just say this...

PENCE: ... that was discovered...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: ... Senator, you have an opportunity to respond.

PENCE: ... keep that pay to play process out of the reach of the public.

KAINE: Governor Pence -- Governor Pence doesn't think the world's going so well and he, you know, is going to say it's everybody's fault.

PENCE: Do you?

KAINE: Let me tell you this. When Hillary Clinton became secretary of state, Governor Pence, did you know that Osama bin Laden was alive?

PENCE: Yes.

KAINE: Do you know that we had 175,000 troops deployed in the battlefield in Iraq and Afghanistan? Do you know that Iran was racing toward a nuclear weapon and Russia was expanding its stockpile?

Under Secretary Clinton's leadership, she was part of the national team, public safety team that went after and revived the dormant hunt against bin Laden and wiped him off the face of the Earth. She worked to deal with the Russians to reduce their chemical weapons stockpile. She worked a tough negotiation with nations around the world to eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program without firing a shot.

PENCE: Eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program?

KAINE: Absolutely, without firing a shot. And instead of 175,000 American troops deployed overseas, we now have 15,000.

PENCE: Right and...

KAINE: These are very, very good things.

PENCE: And Iraq has been overrun by ISIS, because Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate...

KAINE: Well, if you want to put more American troops in Iraq, you can propose that.

PENCE: Hillary Clinton -- Hillary Clinton -- Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate a status of forces agreement...

KAINE: No, that is incorrect. That's incorrect.

PENCE: And so we removed -- we removed all of our...

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, we'll get to...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: ... troops from Iraq, and ISIS was able to be conjured up in that vacuum.

KAINE: But I'd like to correct...

PENCE: ... and overrun vast areas of Iraq.

KAINE: Governor, President Bush said we would leave Iraq at the end of 2011. And, Elaine, Iraq didn't want our troops to stay, and they wouldn't give us the protection for our troops. And guess what? If a nation where our troops are serving does not want us to stay, we're not going to stay without their protection.

PENCE: It was a failure of the secretary of state...

QUIJANO: We need to move on to the next topic, gentlemen.

KAINE: If Governor Pence wants to put more troops back in Iraq, that's...

QUIJANO: There are a lot of people wondering in this country about the economy. Let's turn to the issue of the economy.

KAINE: OK.

QUIJANO: According to the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, neither of your economic plans will reduce the growing $19 trillion gross national debt. In fact, your plans would add even more to it.

Both of you were governors who balanced state budgets. Are you concerned that adding more to the debt could be disastrous for the country. Governor Pence?

PENCE: I think the fact that -- that under this past administration was of which Hillary Clinton was a part, we've almost doubled the national debt is atrocious. I mean, I'm very proud of the fact that -- I come from a state that works. The state of Indiana has balanced budgets. We cut taxes, we've made record investments in education and in infrastructure, and I still finish my term with $2 billion in the bank.

That's a little bit different than when Senator Kaine was governor here in Virginia. He actually -- he actually tried to raise taxes by about $4 billion. He left his state about $2 billion in the hole. In the state of Indiana, we've cut unemployment in half; unemployment doubled when he was governor.

PENCE: But I think he's a very fitting running mate for Hillary Clinton, because in the wake of a season where American families are struggling in this economy under the weight of higher taxes and Obamacare and the war on coal and the stifling avalanche of regulation coming out of this administration, Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want more of the same. It really is remarkable that they actually are advocating a trillion dollars in tax increases, which I get that. You tried to raise taxes here in Virginia and were unsuccessful.

But a trillion dollars in tax increases, more regulation, more of the same war on coal, and more of Obamacare that now even former President Bill Clinton calls Obamacare a crazy plan. But Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to build on Obamacare. They want to expand it into a single-payer program. And for all the world, Hillary Clinton just thinks Obamacare is a good start.

Look, Donald Trump and I have a plan to get this economy moving again just the way that it worked in the 1980s, just the way it worked in the 1960s, and that is by lowering taxes across the board for working families, small businesses and family farms, ending the war on coal that is hurting jobs and hurting this economy even here in Virginia, repealing Obamacare lock, stock, and barrel, and repealing all of the executive orders that Barack Obama has signed that are stifling economic growth in this economy.

We can get America moving again. Put on top of that the kind of trade deals that'll put the American worker first, and you've got a prescription for real growth. And when you get the economy growing, Elaine, that's when you can deal with the national debt. When we get back to 3.5 percent to 4 percent growth with Donald Trump's plan will do, then we're going to have the resources to meet our nation's needs at home and abroad, and we're going to have the ability to bring down the national debt.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Elaine, on the economy, there's a fundamental choice for the American electorate. Do you want a "you're hired" president in Hillary Clinton or do you want a "you're fired" president in Donald Trump? I think that's not such a hard choice.

Hillary and I have a plan that's on the table that's a "you're hired" plan. Five components. First thing we do is we invest in manufacturing, infrastructure, and research in the clean energy jobs of tomorrow. Second thing is we invest in our workforce, from pre-K education to great teachers to debt-free college and tuition-free college for families that make less than $125,000 a year.

Third, we promote fairness by raising the minimum wage, so you can't work full-time and be under the poverty level, and by paying women equal pay for equal work.

Fourth, we promote small business growth, just as we've done in Virginia, to make it easier to start and grow small businesses. Hillary and I each grew up in small-business families. My dad, who ran an iron working and welding shop, is here tonight.

And, fifth, we have a tax plan that targets tax relief to middle- class individuals and small businesses and asks those at the very top who've benefited as we've come out of recession to pay more.

KAINE: The Trump plan is a different plan. It's a "you're fired" plan. And there's two key elements to it. First, Donald Trump said wages are too high. And both Donald Trump and Mike Pence think we ought to eliminate the federal minimum wage.

Mike Pence, when he was in Congress, voted against raising the minimum wage above $5.15. And he has been a one-man bulwark against minimum wage increases in Indiana.

The second component of the plan is massive tax breaks for the very top, trillions of dollars of tax breaks for people just like Donald Trump. The problem with this, Elaine, is that's exactly what we did 10 years ago and it put the economy into the deepest recession -- the deepest recession since the 1930s.

Independent analysts say the Clinton plan would grow the economy by 10.5 million jobs. The Trump plan would cost 3.5 million jobs. And Donald Trump -- why would he do this? Because his tax plan basically helps him. And if he ever met his promise and he gave his tax returns to the American public like he said he would, we would see just how much his economic plan is really a Trump-first plan.

QUIJANO: On that point, Governor Pence, recently the New York Times released part of Mr. Trump's 1995 tax return and reported that he could have avoided paying federal income taxes for years. Yesterday, Mr. Trump said he brilliantly used the laws to pay as little tax as legally possible. Does that seem fair to you?

PENCE: Well, first, let me say, I appreciated the "you're hired," "you're fired" thing, Senator. You use that a whole lot. And I think your running mate used a lot of pre-done lines.

Look, what -- what you all just heard out there is more taxes, $2 trillion in more spending, more deficits, more debt, more government. And if you think that's all working, then you look at the other side of the table. I mean, the truth of the matter is, the policies of this administration, which Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine want to continue, have run this economy into a ditch. We're in the...

KAINE: Fifteen million new jobs?

PENCE: ... slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression.

KAINE: Fifteen million new jobs?

QUIJANO: Governor... (CROSSTALK)

PENCE: There are millions more people living in poverty today than the day that Barack Obama with Hillary Clinton at his side...

KAINE: And the poverty level and the median income...

PENCE: ... stepped into the Oval Office.

KAINE: ... improved dramatically between 2014 and 2015.

PENCE: You -- honestly, Senator, you can roll out the numbers and the sunny side, but I got to tell you, people in Scranton know different. People in Fort Wayne, Indiana, know different. I mean, this economy is struggling. The answer to this economy is not more taxes.

KAINE: But it's not the giveaway tax relief to the folks at the top.

PENCE: It's not more spending...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: I am interested to hear whether he'll defend his running mate's not releasing taxes and not paying taxes.

PENCE: Absolutely I will.

QUIJANO: Governor, with all due respect, the question was about whether it seems fair to you that Mr. Trump said he brilliantly used the laws to pay as little tax as legally possible.

PENCE: Well, this is probably the difference between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine. And, I mean, Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine -- God bless you for it, career public servants, that's great -- Donald Trump is a businessman, not a career politician. He actually built a business.

Those tax returns that were -- that came out publicly this week show that he faced some pretty tough times 20 years ago. But like virtually every other business, including the New York Times not too long ago, he used what's called net operating loss. We have a tax code, Senator, that actually is designed to encourage entrepreneurship in this country.

KAINE: But why won't he release his tax returns?

PENCE: Well, we're answering the question about -- about a business thing, is he...

KAINE: I do want to come back to that, but...

PENCE: His tax returns -- his tax returns showed he went through a very difficult time, but he used the tax code just the way it's supposed to be used. And he did it brilliantly. KAINE: How do you know that? You haven't seen his tax returns.

PENCE: He created a runway -- because he's created a business that's worth billions of dollars today.

KAINE: How do you know that?

PENCE: And with regard to paying taxes, this whole riff about not paying taxes and people saying he didn't pay taxes for years, Donald Trump has created tens of thousands of jobs. And he's paid payroll taxes, sales taxes, property taxes...

KAINE: Elaine, let me talk about something.

QUIJANO: Senator, I'm going to give you about 30 seconds to respond, and I have question on Social Security for you.

KAINE: OK.

PENCE: The only issue on taxes -- Hillary Clinton is going to raise taxes, and Donald Trump and I are going to cut them.

KAINE: Donald Trump started this campaign in 2014 and he said, "If I run for president, I will absolutely release my taxes." He's broken his first...

PENCE: And he will.

KAINE: He's broken his first promise. Second, he stood on the stage...

PENCE: He hasn't broken his promise. He said he's...

KAINE: He stood on the stage last week and when Hillary said, you haven't been paying taxes, he said, "That makes me smart." So it's smart not to pay for our military? It's smart not to pay for veterans? It's smart not to pay for teachers? And I guess all of us who do pay for those things, I guess we're stupid. And the last thing I'll say is this...

PENCE: Senator, do you take all the deductions that you're entitled to?

KAINE: The last thing -- the last thing I want to ask Governor Pence is...

PENCE: I do.

KAINE: Governor Pence had to give Donald Trump his tax returns to show he was qualified to be vice president. Donald Trump must give the American public his tax returns to show that he's qualified to be president. And he's breaking his promise.

PENCE: Elaine, I have to respond to this.

QUIJANO: You get very little time, 20 seconds.

PENCE: I'll be -- I'll be very respectful.

QUIJANO: Governor?

PENCE: Look, Donald Trump has filed over 100 pages of financial disclosure, which is what the law requires.

KAINE: But he said he would release his tax returns.

QUIJANO: All right, Gentlemen...

PENCE: The American people can review that. And he's going -- Senator, he's going to release his tax returns when the audit is over...

QUIJANO: ... I need to ask you about Social Security...

KAINE: Richard Nixon released tax returns when he was under audit.

PENCE: They're going to raise your taxes. We're going to cut your taxes.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen...

KAINE: If you can't meet Nixon's standard...

QUIJANO: The people at home cannot understand either one of you when you speak over each other. I would please ask you to wait until it is that the other is finished.

KAINE: All right. We're having fun up here.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, on the issue of Social Security, in 18 years, when the Social Security Trust Funds run out of money, you'll be 76. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget estimates your benefits could be cut by as much as $7,500 per year. What would your administration do to prevent this cut?

KAINE: First, we're going to protect Social Security, which is one of the greatest programs that the American government has ever done. It happened at a time when you would work your whole life, your whole life, raising your kids, working, being a Little League coach or a Sunday school teacher, and then you would retire into poverty. And Social Security has enabled people to retire with dignity and overwhelmingly not be in poverty.

We have to keep it solvent. And we will keep it solvent. And we'll look for strategies like adjusting the payroll tax cap upward in order to do that.

Here's what Hillary and I will not do. And I want to make this very plain. We will never, ever engage in a risky scheme to privatize Social Security. Donald Trump wrote a book and he said Social Security is a Ponzi scheme and privatization would be good for all of us.

And when Congressman Pence was in Congress, he was the chief cheerleader for the privatization of Social Security. Even after President Bush stopped pushing for it, Congressman Pence kept pushing for it. We're going to stand up against efforts to privatize Social Security. And we'll look for ways to keep it solvent going forward, focusing primarily on the payroll tax cap.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, I'll give you an opportunity to respond.

PENCE: Well, thanks, Elaine. There they go again. OK...

KAINE: Go read -- go read the book.

PENCE: All Donald Trump -- all Donald Trump and I have said about Social Security is we're going to meet our obligations to our seniors. That's it.

KAINE: Go read the book.

PENCE: We've said we're going to meet the obligations of Medicare. That's what this campaign is really about, Senator. And I get, this is -- this is the old scare tactic that they roll out...

KAINE: But -- but you have a voting record, Governor.

PENCE: And I get all of that. I just, look...

KAINE: I...

PENCE: There's a question that you asked a little bit earlier that I want to go back to.

KAINE: I can't believe that you won't defend your own voting record.

PENCE: I have to go back to.

QUIJANO: We...

PENCE: Well, look, I -- you're running with Hillary Clinton, who wants to raise taxes by $1 trillion, increase spending by $2 trillion, and you say you're going to keep the promises of Social Security. Donald Trump and I are going to cut taxes. We're going to -- we're going to -- we're going to...

KAINE: You're not going to cut taxes. You're going to raise taxes on the middle class.

PENCE: ... reform government programs so we can meet the obligations of Social Security and Medicare.

QUIJANO: All right. PENCE: Stay on the path that your party has us on, we're going to be in a -- in a mountain range of debt. And we're going to face hard choices and...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Gentleman, I want to move on now.

KAINE: You did ask this question about debt, and the debt explosion on the Trump plan is much, much bigger than anything on the Clinton side.

QUIJANO: All right. Let me move on now...

PENCE: Three hundred and five (ph) economists said your plan is bad for the economy.

QUIJANO: ... to the issue of law enforcement and race relations. Law enforcement and race relations. After the Dallas police shooting, Police Chief David Brown said, quote, "We're asking cops to do too much in this country. Every societal failure we put it off on the cops to solve. Not enough mental health funding, not enough drug addiction funding, schools fail, let's give it to the cops."

Do we ask too much of police officers in this country? And how would you specifically address the chief's concerns? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Elaine, I think that's a very fair comment. I think we put a lot on police shoulders. And this is something I got a lot of scar tissue and experience on.

I was a city councilman and mayor in Richmond. And when I came in, we had one of the highest homicide rates in the United States. We fought very, very hard over the course of my time in local office with our police department, and we reduced our homicide rate nearly in half.

And then when I was governor of Virginia, we worked hard, too. And we did something we had really wanted to do. For the first time ever, we cracked the top 10, 10 safest states, because we worked together.

Here's what I learned as a mayor and a governor. The way you make communities safer and the way you make police safer is through community policing. You build the bonds between the community and the police force, build bonds of understanding, and then when people feel comfortable in their communities, that gap between the police and the communities they serve narrows. And when that gap narrows, it's safer for the communities and it's safer for the police.

That model still works across our country, but there are some other models that don't work, an overly aggressive, more militarized model. Donald Trump recently said we need to do more stop-and-frisk around the country. That would be a big mistake because it polarizes the relationship between the police and the community.

So here's what we'll do. We'll focus on community policing. We will focus on -- and Hillary Clinton has rolled out a really comprehensive mental health reform package that she worked on with law enforcement professionals, and we will also fight the scourge of gun violence in the United States.

I'm a gun-owner. I'm a strong Second Amendment supporter. But I've got a lot of scar tissue, because when I was governor of Virginia, there was a horrible shooting at Virginia Tech, and we learned that through that painful situation that gaps in the background record check system should have been closed and it could have prevented that crime, and so we're going to work to do things like close background record checks. And if we do, we won't have the tragedies that we did.

One of those killed at Virginia Tech was a guy named Liviu Librescu. He was a 70-plus-year-old Romanian Holocaust survivor. He had survived the Holocaust. Then he survived the Soviet Union takeover of his country. But then he was a visiting professor at Virginia Tech, and he couldn't survive the scourge of gun violence.

We can support the Second Amendment and do things like background record checks and make us safer, and that will make police safer, too.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: You know, my uncle was a cop, a career cop, on the beat in downtown Chicago. He was my hero when I was growing up. And we'd go up to visit my dad's family in Chicago. My three brothers and I would marvel at my uncle when he would come out in his uniform, sidearm at his side.

Police officers are the best of us. And the men and women, white, African-American, Asian, Latino, Hispanic, they put their lives on the line every single day. And let my say, at the risk of agreeing with you, community policing is a great idea. It's worked in the Hoosier state. And we fully support that.

Donald Trump and I are going to make sure that law enforcement have the resources and the tools to be able to really restore law and order to the cities and communities in this nation. It's probably -- probably why the 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police endorsed Donald Trump as the next president of the United States of America, because they see his commitment to them. They see his commitment to law and order.

But they also -- they also hear the bad mouthing, the bad mouthing that comes from people that seize upon tragedy in the wake of police action shootings as -- as a reason to -- to use a broad brush to accuse law enforcement of -- of implicit bias or institutional racism. And that really has got to stop.

I mean, when an African-American police officer in Charlotte named Brentley Vinson, an all-star football player who went to Liberty University here in the state, came home, followed his dad into law enforcement, joined the force in Charlotte, joined the force in Charlotte in 2014, was involved in a police action shooting that claimed the life of Keith -- Keith Lamont Scott, it was a tragedy. I mean, I -- we -- we mourn with those who mourn. We -- we grieve with those who grieve. And we're saddened at the loss of life.

But Hillary Clinton actually referred to that moment as an example of implicit bias in the police force, where -- where she used -- when she was asked in the debate a week ago whether there was implicit bias in law enforcement, her only answer was that there's implicit bias in everyone in the United States. I just think...

KAINE: Can I -- can I explain...

PENCE: ... I just think what we ought to do is we ought to stop seizing on these moments of tragedy. We ought to assure the public that we'll have a full and complete and transparent investigation whenever there's a loss of life because of police action. But, Senator, please, you know, enough of this seeking every opportunity to demean law enforcement broadly by making the accusation of implicit bias every time tragedy occurs.

KAINE: Elaine -- Elaine, people shouldn't be afraid to bring up issues of bias in law enforcement. And if you're afraid to have...

PENCE: I'm not afraid to bring that up.

KAINE: And if -- if you're afraid to have the discussion, you'll never solve it. And so here's -- here's an example, heartbreaking. We would agree this was a heartbreaking example.

The guy, Philando Castile, who was killed in St. Paul, he was a worker, a valued worker in a local school. And he was killed for no apparent reason in an incident that will be discussed and will be investigated.

But when folks went and explored this situation, what they found is that Philando Castile, who was a -- they called him Mr. Rogers with Dreadlocks in the school that he worked. The kids loved him. But he had been stopped by police 40 or 50 times before that fatal incident. And if you look at sentencing in this country, African-Americans and Latinos get sentenced for the same crimes at very different rates.

PENCE: We need criminal justice reform.

KAINE: Well, we do.

PENCE: Indiana has passed criminal justice reform.

KAINE: But I just want to say, those who say that we should not...

PENCE: But that's not what you're talking about.

KAINE: ... we should not be able to bring up and talk about bias in the system, we'll never solve the problem...

QUIJANO: Governor Pence...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor Pence...

PENCE: Senator, when African-American police officers involved in a police action shooting involving an African-American, why would Hillary Clinton accuse that African-American police officer of implicit bias?

KAINE: Well, I guess I can't believe you are defending the position that there is no bias and it's a topic we don't even...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, I have a question on that point.

PENCE: I did not make that statement. I...

QUIJANO: Your fellow Republican, Governor Pence, Senator Tim Scott, who is African-American, recently spoke on the Senate floor. He said he was stopped seven times by law enforcement in one year.

KAINE: A U.S. senator.

QUIJANO: He said, "I have felt the anger, the frustration, the sadness, and the humiliation that comes with feeling like you're being targeted for nothing more than being just yourself." What would you say to Senator Scott about his experiences?

PENCE: Well, I have the deepest respect for Senator Scott, and he's a close friend. And what I would say is that we -- we need to adopt criminal justice reform nationally. I -- I signed criminal justice reform in the state of Indiana, Senator, and we're very proud of it.

I worked when I was Congress on a second chance act. We have got to do a better job recognizing and correcting the errors in the system that do reflect on institutional bias in criminal justice. But what -- what -- what Donald Trump and I are saying is let's not have the reflex of assuming the worst of men and women in law enforcement. We truly do believe that law enforcement is not a force for racism or division in our country...

KAINE: Elaine, can I...

QUIJANO: So what would you say to Senator Scott, Governor?

PENCE: Law enforcement in this country is a force for good. They are the -- they truly are people that put their lives on the line every single day. But I would -- I would suggest to you, what we need to do is assert a stronger leadership at the national level to support law enforcement. You just heard Senator Kaine reject stop-and-frisk. Well, I would suggest to you that the families that live in our inner cities that are besieged by crime...

KAINE: Elaine, let me -- let me...

QUIJANO: Governor, the question is about Senator Scott. What would -- what would you tell Senator Scott?

KAINE: Elaine, if I could -- if I could jump in. I've heard Senator Scott make that eloquent plea. And look, criminal justice is about respecting the law and being respected by the law. So there is a fundamental respect issue here.

And I just want to talk about the tone that's set from the top. Donald Trump during his campaign has called Mexicans rapists and criminals. He's called women slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting. I don't like saying that in front of my wife and my mother. He attacked an Indiana-born federal judge and said he was unqualified to hear a federal lawsuit because his parents were Mexican. He went after John McCain, a POW, and said he wasn't hero because he'd been captured. He said African-Americans are living in Hell. And he perpetrated this outrageous and bigoted lie that President Obama is not a U.S. citizen.

If you want to have a society where people are respected and respect laws, you can't have somebody at the top who demeans every group that he talks about. And I just -- again, I cannot believe that Governor Pence will defend the insult-driven campaign that Donald Trump has run.

QUIJANO: All right. I want to turn to our next segment now, **immigration**. Your running mates have both said that undocumented **immigrants** who have committed violent crimes should be deported. What would you tell the millions of undocumented **immigrants** who have not committed violent crimes? Governor Pence?

PENCE: Donald Trump's laid out a plan to end illegal **immigration** once and for all in this country. We've been talking it to death for 20 years. Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to continue the policies of open borders, amnesty, catch and release, sanctuary cities, all the things that are driving -- that are driving wages down in this country, Senator, and also too often with criminal aliens in the country, it's bringing heartbreak.

But I -- Donald Trump has a plan that he laid out in Arizona, that will deal systemically with illegal **immigration**, beginning with border security, internal enforcement. It's probably why for the first time in the history of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement their union actually endorsed Donald Trump as the next president of the United States, because they know they need help to enforce the laws of this country.

And Donald Trump has laid out a priority to remove criminal aliens, remove people that have overstayed their visas. And -- and once we have accomplished all of that, which will -- which will strengthen our economy, strengthen the rule of law in the country and make our communities safer once the criminal aliens are out, then we'll deal with those that remain.

But I have to tell you, I just -- I was listening to the avalanche of insults coming out of Senator Kaine a minute ago. KAINE: These were Donald's -- hold on a second, Governor.

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: It's my time, Senator.

QUIJANO: It is, in fact, the governor's time.

KAINE: I apologize. It's your two minutes. I apologize.

PENCE: Thanks. I forgive you. He says ours is an insult-driven campaign. Did you all just hear that? Ours is an insult-driven campaign?

I mean, to be honest with you, if Donald Trump had said all of the things that you've said he said in the way you said he said them, he still wouldn't have a fraction of the insults that Hillary Clinton leveled when she said that half of our supporters were a basket of deplorables. It's -- she said they were irredeemable, they were not American.

I mean, it's extraordinary. And then she labeled one after another "ism" on millions of Americans who believe that we can have a stronger America at home and abroad, who believe we can get this economy moving again, who believe that we can end illegal **immigration** once and for all. So, Senator, this -- this insult-driven campaign, I mean...

QUIJANO: Governor...

PENCE: That's small potatoes compared to Hillary Clinton...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

PENCE: .... calling half of Donald Trump's supporters a basket of deplorables.

KAINE: Hillary Clinton said something on the campaign trail, and the very next day, she said, you know what, I shouldn't have said that.

PENCE: She said she shouldn't have said half.

QUIJANO: Governor, this is Senator Kaine's two minutes, please.

KAINE: Yeah, that's right, so now we're even.

PENCE: Yeah.

(LAUGHTER)

KAINE: Look for Donald trump apologizing to John McCain for saying he wasn't a hero...

PENCE: Oh...

KAINE: ... to Donald Trump apologizing for calling women slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting.

PENCE: She apologized for saying "half."

QUIJANO: Governor. It is his two minutes, please.

KAINE: Did Donald Trump apologize for taking after somebody in a Twitter war and making fun of her weight? Did he apologize for saying African-Americans are living in Hell? Did he apologize for saying President Obama was not even a citizen of the United States? You will look in vain to see Donald Trump ever taking responsibility for anybody and apologizing.

**Immigration**. There's two plans on the table. Hillary and I believe in comprehensive **immigration** reform. Donald Trump believes in deportation nation. You've got to pick your choice. Hillary and I want a bipartisan reform that will put keeping families together as the top goal, second, that will help focus enforcement efforts on those who are violent, third, that will do more border control, and, fourth, that will provide a path to citizenship for those who work hard, pay taxes, play by the rules, and take criminal background record checks.

That's our proposal. Donald Trump proposes to deport 16 million people, 11 million who are here without documents. And both Donald Trump and Mike Pence want to get rid of birthright citizenship. So if you're born here, but your parents don't have documents, they want to eliminate that. That's another 4.5 million people.

These guys -- and Donald Trump have said it -- deportation force. They want to go house to house, school to school, business to business, and kick out 16 million people. And I cannot believe...

PENCE: That's nonsense. That's nonsense.

KAINE: I cannot believe that Governor Pence would sit here and defend his running mate's claim that we should create a deportation force to -- so that they'll all be gone.

PENCE: Senator, we have a deportation force. It's called **Immigrations** and Customs Enforcement. And the union for **Immigrations** and Customs Enforcement for the first time in their history endorsed Donald Trump to be the next president of the United States of America.

KAINE: So you like the 16 million deportations?

PENCE: Senator, that's -- that's nonsense. Look, what you just heard is they have a plan for open borders, amnesty. That's...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: Our plan is like Ronald Reagan's plan from 1986.

PENCE: They call it comprehensive **immigration** reform -- they call it comprehensive **immigration** reform on Capitol Hill. We all know the routine. It's amnesty. And you heard one of the last things he mentioned was border security.

PENCE: That's how Washington always plays it.

KAINE: No, I...

PENCE: They always say we're going to do this, we're going to do that, we'll eventually get the border...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: ... border security three years ago, and Governor Pence was against it.

QUIJANO: Governor, Mr. Trump has said...

PENCE: Ronald Reagan said a nation without borders is not a nation. Donald Trump is committed to restoring the borders of this nation and securing our nation, enforcing our laws.

QUIJANO: So, Governor, how would these millions of undocumented **immigrants** leave? Would they be forcibly removed?

PENCE: Well, I think Donald Trump laid out a series of priorities that doesn't ends with border security. It begins with border security. And after we secure the border, not only build a wall, but beneath the ground and in the air, we do internal enforcement.

But he said the focus has to be on criminal aliens. We just -- we just had a conversation about law enforcement. We just had a conversation about the -- the violence that's besetting our cities. The reality is that there's heartbreak and tragedy that has struck American families because people that came into this country illegally are now involved in criminal enterprise and activity. And we don't have the resources or the will to deport them systemically.

Donald Trump has said we're going to move those people out, people who've overstayed their visas. We're going to enforce the law of this country. We're going to strengthen **Immigrations** and Customs Enforcements with more resources and more personnel to be able to do that. And then Donald Trump has made it clear, once we've done all of those things, that we're going to reform the **immigration** system that we have...

KAINE: I just have to correct Governor Pence....

PENCE: ... where people can come into this country.

KAINE: I have to...

PENCE: That's the order that you should do it. Border security, removing criminal aliens, upholding with law, and then -- but then, Senator, I'll work you when you go back to the Senate, I promise you, we'll work you to reform the **immigration** system.

KAINE: I look forward to working together in whatever capacities we serve in. But I just want to make it very, very clear that he's trying to fuzz up what Donald Trump has said. When Donald Trump spoke in Phoenix, he looked the audience in the eye and he said, no, we're building a wall, and we're deporting everybody. He said, quote, "They will all be gone." "They will all be gone." And this is one of these ones where you can just go to the tape on it and see what Donald Trump has said. And to add...

PENCE: He's talking about criminal aliens.

KAINE: And to add to it, and to add to it, and to add to it, we are a nation of **immigrants**. Mike Pence and I both are descended from **immigrant** families. Some things, you know, maybe weren't said so great about the Irish when they came, but we've done well by absorbing **immigrants**, and it's made our nation stronger.

When Donald Trump says Mexicans are rapists and criminals, Mexican **immigrants**, when Donald Trump says about your judge, a Hoosier judge, he said that Judge Curiel was unqualified to hear a case because his parents were Mexican, I can't imagine how you could defend that.

QUIJANO: Gentleman, I'd like to shift now to the threat of terrorism. Do you think the world today is a safer or more dangerous place than it was eight years ago? Has the terrorist threat increased or decreased? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: The terrorist threat has decreased in some ways, because bin Laden is dead. The terrorist threat has decreased in some ways because an Iranian nuclear weapons program has been stopped. The terrorist threat to United States troops has been decreased in some ways because there's not 175,000 in a dangerous part of the world. There's only 15,000.

But there are other parts of the world that are challenging. Let me tell you this: To beat terrorism, there's only one candidate who can do it, and it's Hillary Clinton. Remember, Hillary Clinton was the senator from New York on 9/11. She was there at the World Trade Center when they were still searching for victims and survivors. That's seared onto her, the need to beat terrorism.

And she's got a plan to do it. She was part of the national security team that wiped out bin Laden. Here's her plan to defeat ISIL. First, we've got to keep taking out their leaders on the battlefield. She was part of the team that got bin Laden, and she'll lead the team that will get Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the head of ISIS.

Second, we've got to disrupt financing networks, third, disrupt their ability to recruit on the Internet, in their safe havens. But, fourth, we also have to work with allies to share and surge intelligence. That's the Hillary Clinton plan; she's got the experience to do it.

Donald Trump. Donald Trump can't start a Twitter war with Miss Universe without shooting himself in the foot. Donald Trump doesn't have a plan. He said, "I have a secret plan," and then he said, "Um, I know more than all the generals about ISIL." And then he said, "I'm going to call the generals to help me figure out a plan." And finally he said, "I'm going to fire all the generals." He doesn't have a plan.

But he does have dangerous ideas. Here's four. He trash talks the military. The military is a disaster, John McCain's no hero, the generals need all to be fired, and I know more than them. He wants to tear up alliances. NATO is obsolete, and we'll only work together with Israel if they pay "big league."

Third, he loves dictators. He's got kind of a personal Mount Rushmore, Vladimir Putin, Kim Jong-un, Moammar Gadhafi...

PENCE: Oh, please. Come on.

KAINE: ... and Saddam Hussein. And last and most dangerously, Donald Trump believes -- Donald Trump believes that the world will be safer if more nations have nuclear weapons. He's said Saudi Arabia should get them, Japan should get them, Korea should get them. And when he was confronted with this, and told, wait a minute, terrorists could get those, proliferation could lead to nuclear war, here's what Donald Trump said, and I quote: "Go ahead, folks, enjoy yourselves."

I'd love to hear Governor Pence tell me what's so enjoyable or comical about nuclear war.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: Did you work on that one a long time? Because that had a lot of really creative lines in it.

KAINE: Well, I'm going to see if you can defend any of it.

PENCE: Well, look, I can defend -- I -- I -- I can -- I can make very clear to the American people, after traveling millions of miles as our secretary of state, after being the architect of the foreign policy of this administration, America is less safe today than it was the day that Barack Obama became president of the United States. It's absolutely inarguable.

We've weakened America's place in the world. It's been a combination of factors, but mostly it's been a lack of leadership. I mean, I will give you -- and I was in Washington, D.C., on 9/11. I saw the clouds of smoke rise from the Pentagon.

KAINE: I was in Virginia where the Pentagon's...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: I know you were. We all lived through that day as a nation. It was heartbreaking. And I want to give this president credit for bringing Osama bin Laden to justice.

But the truth is, Osama bin Laden led Al Qaida. Our primary threat today is ISIS. And because Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate a status of forces agreement that would have allowed some American combat troops to remain in Iraq and secure the hard fought gains the American soldier had won by 2009, ISIS was able to be literally conjured up out of the desert, and it's overrun vast areas that the American soldier had won in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

My heart breaks for the likes of Lance Cpl. Scott Zubowski. He fell in Fallujah in 2005. He fought hard through some of the most difficult days in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and he paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend our freedom and secure that nation. And that nation was secured in 2009.

But because Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama failed to provide a status of forces agreement and leave sufficient troops in there, we are back at war. The president just ordered more troops on the ground. We are back at war in Iraq. And Scott Zubowski, whose mom would always come to Memorial Day events in Newcastle, Indiana, to see me, and I'd give her a hug and tell her we're never going to forget her son and we never will, Scott Zubowski and the sacrifices the American soldier made were squandered in Iraq because this administration created a vacuum in which ISIS was able to grow.

And a reference to the Iranian deal, the Iranian deal that Hillary Clinton initiated, $150 billion to the radical mullahs in Iran.

KAINE: Stopping a nuclear weapons program without firing a shot?

PENCE: You didn't stop the nuclear weapons program.

KAINE: Yes, we did.

PENCE: You essentially...

KAINE: Even the Israeli military says it stopped.

PENCE: ... guaranteed that Iran will someday become a nuclear power, because there's no limitations once the period of time of the treaty comes off.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, Mr. Trump has proposed extreme vetting of **immigrants** from parts of the world that export terrorism. But that does not address many of the recent terrorist attacks in the United States, such as the Orlando nightclub massacre and the recent bombings in New York and New Jersey. Those were homegrown, committed by U.S. citizens and legal residents. What specific tools would you use to prevent those kinds of attacks?

PENCE: Well, I think it's -- I think it's a great question, Elaine, but it really does begin with us reforming our **immigration** system and putting the interests, particularly the safety and security of the American people, first.

I mean, Donald Trump has called for extreme vetting for people coming into this country so that we don't bring people into the United States who are hostile to our Bill of Rights freedoms, who are hostile to the American way life.

But also, Donald Trump and I are committed to suspending the Syrian refugee program and programs and **immigration** from areas of the world that have been compromised by terrorism. Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to increase the Syrian refugee program by 500...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: Elaine, I want to...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor, the question was about homegrown.

PENCE: Yeah, and so -- but first, you know, let's make sure we're putting the safety and security of the American people first instead of Hillary Clinton expanding the Syrian refugee program...

KAINE: Or instead of you violating the Constitution by blocking people based on their national origin rather than whether they're dangerous.

PENCE: That's not -- that's absolutely false.

KAINE: That's what the Seventh Circuit decided just -- here's the difference, Elaine.

PENCE: The Seventh Circuit...

KAINE: We have different views on -- on refugee issues and on **immigration**. Hillary and I want to do enforcement based on, are people dangerous? These guys say all Mexicans are bad.

PENCE: That's absolutely false.

KAINE: And with respect to refugees, we want to keep people out if they're dangerous. Donald Trump said keep them out if they're Muslim. Mike Pence...

PENCE: Absolutely...

KAINE: ... put a program in place to keep them out if they're from Syria. And yesterday an appellate court with three Republican judges struck down the Pence plan...

PENCE: Right. Right.

KAINE: ... and said it was discriminatory...

PENCE: And those judges -- those judges said...

KAINE: We should focus upon danger, not upon discrimination.

QUIJANO: Governor?

PENCE: Elaine, to your point, those judges said it was because there wasn't any evidence yet that -- that ISIS had infiltrated the United States. Well, Germany just arrested three Syrian refugees that were connected to ISIS.

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: But they told you there's a right way and a wrong way to do it.

PENCE: But, look, if you're going to be critical of me on that, that's fair game. I will tell you, after two Syrian refugees were involved in the attack in Paris that is called Paris' 9/11, as governor of the state of Indiana, I have no higher priority than the safety and security of the people of my state.

KAINE: But, Governor Pence...

PENCE: So you bet I suspended that program.

KAINE: But, Governor Pence, I just...

PENCE: And I stand by that decision. And if I'm vice president of the United States or Donald Trump is president, we're going to put the safety and security of the American people first.

KAINE: Sure. Can we just be clear -- Hillary and I will do **immigration** enforcement and we'll vet refugees based on whether they're dangerous or not. We won't do it based on discriminating against you from the country you come from or the religion that you practice.

PENCE: But the problem with that...

KAINE: That is completely antithetical to the Jeffersonian values of...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Elaine, the director of the FBI, our homeland security, said we can't know for certain who these people are coming from Syria.

KAINE: Yes, we can, and when we don't let them know, we don't let them in.

PENCE: So -- the FBI...

KAINE: When we don't know who they are, we don't let them in.

PENCE: The FBI and homeland security said we can't know for certain. You've got to err on the side of the safety and security of the American people, Senator. I understand the...

KAINE: By trashing all Syrians or trashing all Muslims?

PENCE: ... the U.N. wants us to expand the Syrian refugee program...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, let me ask you this. Secretary Clinton...

PENCE: We're going to put the safety and security of the American people first.

QUIJANO: ... has talked about an intelligence surge.

KAINE: Yes.

QUIJANO: What exactly would an intelligence surge look like? And how would that help identify terrorists with no operational connection to a foreign terrorist organization?

KAINE: Intelligence surge is two-thirds, Elaine. It's two things. It's, first, dramatically expanding our intelligence capacities by hiring great professionals, but also we've got some of the best intel and cyber employees in the world right here in the United States working for many of our private sector companies.

So it involves increasing our own workforce, but striking great partnerships with some of our cyber and intel experts in the private sector so that we can, consistent with constitutional principles, gather more intelligence.

But the second piece of this is really, really important. It also means creating stronger alliances, because you gather intelligence and then you share your intelligence back and forth with allies. And that's how you find out who may be trying to recruit, who may be trying to come to one country or the next. Alliances are critical.

That's why Donald Trump's claim that he wants to -- that NATO is obsolete and that we need to get rid of NATO is so dangerous.

PENCE: That's not his plan. KAINE: Well, he said NATO is obsolete. And, look, if you put aside -- push aside your alliances, who you're going to share intelligence with? Hillary Clinton is the secretary of state who knows how to build alliances. She built the sanctions regime around the word that stopped the Iranian nuclear weapons program. And that's what an intelligence surge means. Better skill and capacity, but also better alliances.

QUIJANO: All right. I'd like to turn now to the tragedy in Syria. Two hundred fifty thousand...

PENCE: Can I speak about the cybersecurity surge at all?

QUIJANO: You can -- you can have 30 seconds, Governor, quickly, please.

PENCE: First, Donald Trump just spoke about this issue this week. We have got to bring together the best resources of this country to understand that cyber warfare is the new warfare of the asymmetrical enemies that we face in this country. And I look forward if I'm privileged to be in this role of working with you in the Senate to make sure that we resource that effort.

KAINE: We will work together in whatever roles we inhabit.

PENCE: We have an intelligence, sir (ph). But I will also tell you that it's important in this moment to remember that Hillary Clinton had a private server in her home that had classified information on it...

QUIJANO: And I don't -- 30 seconds is on up.

PENCE: ... about drone strikes, e-mails from the president of the United States of America were on there.

QUIJANO: Right.

PENCE: Her private server was subject to being hacked by foreign...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: I'd like to ask you about Syria, Governor.

PENCE: We could put cybersecurity first if we just make sure the next secretary of state doesn't have a private server.

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: And all investigation concluded that not one reasonable prosecutor would take any additional step. You don't get to decide the rights and wrongs of this. We have a justice system that does that. And a Republican FBI director did an investigation and concluded that...

(CROSSTALK) QUIJANO: All right, we are moving on now. Two hundred fifty thousand people...

PENCE: If your son or my son handled classified information the way Hillary Clinton did...

QUIJANO: ... one hundred thousand of them children -- Governor...

PENCE: ... they'd be court martialed.

KAINE: That is absolutely false and you know that.

PENCE: Absolutely true.

KAINE: And you know that, Governor.

QUIJANO: Governor...

PENCE: It's absolutely true.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, please.

KAINE: Because the FBI did an investigation.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen.

KAINE: And they concluded that there was no reasonable prosecutor who would take it further. Sorry.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, Governor Pence, please.

KAINE: Syria.

QUIJANO: I want to turn now to Syria. Two hundred fifty thousand people, 100,000 of them children, are under siege in Aleppo, Syria. Bunker buster bombs, cluster munitions, and incendiary weapons are being dropped on them by Russian and Syrian militaries. Does the U.S. have a responsibility to protect civilians and prevent mass casualties on this scale, Governor Pence?

PENCE: The United States of America needs to begin to exercise strong leadership to protect the vulnerable citizens and over 100,000 children in Aleppo. Hillary Clinton's top priority when she became secretary of state was the Russian reset, the Russians reset. After the Russian reset, the Russians invaded Ukraine and took over Crimea.

And the small and bullying leader of Russia is now dictating terms to the United States to the point where all the United States of America -- the greatest nation on Earth -- just withdraws from talks about a cease-fire while Vladimir Putin puts a missile defense system in Syria while he marshals the forces and begins -- look, we have got to begin to lean into this with strong, broad-shouldered American leadership.

It begins by rebuilding our military. And the Russians and the Chinese have been making enormous investments in the military. We have the smallest Navy since 1916. We have the lowest number of troops since the end of the Second World War. We've got to work with Congress, and Donald Trump will, to rebuild our military and project American strength in the world.

But about Aleppo and about Syria, I truly do believe that what America ought to do right now is immediately establish safe zones, so that families and vulnerable families with children can move out of those areas, work with our Arab partners, real time, right now, to make that happen.

And secondly, I just have to tell you that the provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength. And if Russia chooses to be involved and continue, I should say, to be involved in this barbaric attack on civilians in Aleppo, the United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike military targets of the Assad regime to prevent them from this humanitarian crisis that is taking place in Aleppo.

There's a broad range of other things that we ought to do, as well. We ought to deploy a missile defense shield to the Czech Republic and Poland which Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama pulled back on out of not wanting to offend the Russians back in 2009.

QUIJANO: Governor, your two minutes are up.

PENCE: We've just got to have American strength on the world stage. When Donald Trump becomes president of the United States, the Russians and other countries in the world will know they're dealing with a strong American president. QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Hillary and I also agree that the establishment of humanitarian zones in northern Syria with the provision of international human aid, consistent with the U.N. Security Council resolution that was passed in February 2014, would be a very, very good idea.

And Hillary also has the ability to stand up to Russia in a way that this ticket does not. Donald Trump, again and again, has praised Vladimir Putin. And it's clear that he has business dealings with Russian oligarchs who are very connected to Putin.

The Trump campaign management team had to be fired a month or so ago because of those shadowy connections with pro-Putin forces. Governor Pence made the odd claim, he said inarguably Vladimir Putin is a better leader than President Obama. Vladimir Putin has run his economy into the ground. He persecutes LGBT folks and journalists. If you don't know the difference between dictatorship and leadership, then you got to go back to a fifth-grade civics class.

I'll tell you what offends me...

PENCE: Well, that offended me.

KAINE: Governor Pence just said -- Governor Pence just said that Donald Trump will rebuild the military. No, he won't. Donald Trump is avoiding paying taxes. The New York Times story -- and we need to get this -- but the New York Times suggested that he probably didn't pay taxes for about 18 years starting in 1995. Those years included the years of 9/11.

So get this. On 9/11, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's hometown was attacked by the worst terrorist attack in the history of the United States. Young men and women -- young men and women signed up to serve in the military to fight terrorism. Hillary Clinton went to Washington to get funds to rebuild her city and protect first responders, but Donald Trump was fighting a very different fight. It was a fight to avoid paying taxes so that he wouldn't support the fight against terror.

QUIJANO: The question was about Aleppo, Senator.

KAINE: He wouldn't support troops. He wouldn't -- he wouldn't support -- this is important, Elaine. When a guy running for president will not support the troops, not support veterans, not support teachers, that's really important.

QUIJANO: Right.

KAINE: And I said about Aleppo, we do agree the notion is we have to create a humanitarian zone in northern Syria. It's very important.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence, you had mentioned no-fly zone. Where would you propose setting up a safe zone specifically? How would you keep it safe?

PENCE: Well, first and foremost, Donald Trump supports our troops. Donald Trump supports our veterans.

KAINE: He won't pay taxes.

PENCE: Donald Trump has paid all the taxes that he's -- do you not take deductions? How does that work?

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, this is about Syria. I'd like to...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: Honestly, Senator. Honestly, Senator.

KAINE: It is about our troops. It is about our troops.

PENCE: I understand why you want to change -- I understand why you want to change the subject.

KAINE: How can you support the troops if you won't pay taxes?

PENCE: I understand why you want to change the subject. And let me be very clear on this Russian thing. The larger question here...

KAINE: Do you think Donald Trump is smart to not pay taxes?

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, we're going to have time to get to Russia here.

PENCE: What we're dealing with is the -- you know, there's an old proverb that says the Russian bear never dies, it just hibernates. And the truth of the matter is, the weak and feckless foreign policy of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama has awakened an aggression in Russia that first appeared a few years ago with their move in Georgia, now their move into Crimea, now their move into the wider Middle East.

And all the while, all we do is fold our arms and say we're not having talks anymore. To answer your question, we just need American strength. We need to -- we need to marshal the resources of our allies in the region, and in the immediate, we need to act and act now to get people out of harm's way.

QUIJANO: And exactly how would those safe zones work? How would they remain safe?

PENCE: The -- the safe zones would have to be -- as the senator said, there's already a framework for this that's been recognized by the international community. The United States of America needs to be prepared to work with our allies in the region to create a route for safe passage and then to protect people in those areas, including with a no-fly zone.

But, look, this is very tough stuff. I served on the Foreign Affairs Committee for a decade. I traveled in and out of that region for 10 years. I saw what the American soldier won in Operation Iraqi Freedom. And to see the weak and feckless leadership that Hillary Clinton was the architect of and the foreign policy of the Obama administration...

KAINE: Well, let me -- let me come back...

PENCE: ... is deeply troubling to me. That will all change the day Donald Trump becomes president of the United States.

KAINE: ... and talk about -- let me talk about the things that Governor Pence doesn't want to acknowledge, Elaine. He doesn't want to acknowledge that we stopped the Iranian nuclear weapons program. He doesn't want to acknowledge...

PENCE: We didn't.

KAINE: ... that Hillary was part of a team that got bin Laden. He doesn't want to acknowledge...

PENCE: I just did. KAINE: ... that it's a good thing, not a bad thing, that it's a good thing -- not a bad thing -- that we're down from 175,000 troops deployed overseas to 15,000.

But let me tell you what will really make the Middle East dangerous. Donald Trump's idea that more nations should get nuclear weapons, Saudi Arabia, Japan, South Korea. Ronald Reagan said something really interesting about nuclear proliferation back in the 1980s. He said the problem with nuclear proliferation is that some fool or maniac could trigger a catastrophic event. And I think that's who Governor Pence's running mate is, exactly who Governor Reagan warned us about.

PENCE: And come on. Senator. Senator, that was even beneath you and Hillary Clinton. And that -- that's pretty low.

KAINE: But do you -- do you think -- do you think we should have -- more nuclear weapons in the world will make us safer?

PENCE: Senator, the...

KAINE: That's what Donald Trump thinks.

PENCE: Ronald Reagan also said nuclear war should never be fought because it can never be won. And the United States of America needs to make investments in modernizing our nuclear force for both deterrence...

KAINE: But can you defend Donald Trump's claim that more nations should get nuclear weapons?

PENCE: ... and assurance to our allies. But let me go back to this Iran thing. I mean, he keeps saying that they prevented -- that Hillary Clinton started the deal with the Iranians prevented Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: That's what the Israeli joint chiefs of staff is saying right now.

PENCE: Well, that's not what -- that's not what Israel thinks.

KAINE: Gadi Eizenkot, you can go check it.

PENCE: You wouldn't necessarily know that.

KAINE: Go to the tape.

PENCE: I know you boycotted Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech when he came before the Congress.

KAINE: No, I visited him in his office. I visited him in his office.

PENCE: You boycotted the speech. The point is, what this Iran -- so-called Iran deal did was essentially guarantee -- I mean, when I was in Congress, I fought hard on a bipartisan basis with Republican and Democrat members to move forward the toughest sanctions, it -- literally in the history of the United States, against Iran.

KAINE: And then Hillary used them to get a deal.

PENCE: We were bringing them to heel, but the goal was always that we would only lift the sanctions if Iran permanently renounced their nuclear ambitions.

KAINE: Elaine, let me just mention one thing.

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: They have not -- Elaine, let me finish a sentence. They have not renounced their nuclear ambitions. And when the deal's period runs out, there's no limitation on them obtaining weapons. That...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: And very quickly, Senator.

KAINE: Elaine...

PENCE: ... and the fact that they got $1.7 billion in a ransom payment...

QUIJANO: We need to talk about Russia. Very quickly, though, Senator, please.

PENCE: ... is astonishing to the American people.

KAINE: Six times tonight, I have said to Governor Pence I can't imagine how you can defend your running mate's position on one issue after the next. And in all six cases, he's refused to defend his running mate.

PENCE: Well, let's -- no, no, don't put words in my mouth.

QUIJANO: All right.

PENCE: He's going...

(CROSSTALK)

KAINE: And yet he is asking everybody to vote for somebody that he cannot defend. And I just think that should be underlined.

PENCE: No, I'm -- look...

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: All right, gentlemen, let's talk about Russia. This is a topic that has come up.

PENCE: I'm very, very happy to defend Donald Trump. If he wants to take these one at a time, I'll take them one at a time.

QUIJANO: I will give you an opportunity to do that.

KAINE: More nations should get nuclear weapons. Try to defend that.

PENCE: Don't put words in my mouth. Well, he never said that, Senator.

KAINE: He absolutely said it. Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Japan.

PENCE: Most of the stuffy you've said, he's never said.

QUIJANO: Gentlemen, Russia. Russian President Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine, annexed Crimea, and has provided crucial military support to the Assad regime. What steps, if any, would your administration take to counter these actions? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: You've got to be tough on Russia. So let's start with not praising Vladimir Putin as a great leader. Donald Trump and Mike Pence have said he's a great leader. And Donald Trump has business...

PENCE: No, we haven't.

KAINE: ... has business dealings -- has business dealings with Russia that he refuses to disclose. Hillary Clinton has gone toe-to- toe with Russia. She went toe-to-toe with Russia as secretary of state to do the New START Agreement to reduce Russia's nuclear stockpile. She's had the experience doing it.

She went toe-to-toe with Russia and lodged protests when they went into Georgia. And we've done the same thing about Ukraine, but more than launching protests, we've put punishing economic sanctions on Russia that we need to continue.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, didn't know that Russia had invaded the Crimea.

PENCE: Oh, that's nonsense.

KAINE: He was on a TV show a couple months back, and he said, "I'll guarantee you this, Russia's not going into the Ukraine." And he had to be reminded that they had gone into the Crimea two years before.

PENCE: He knew that.

KAINE: Hillary Clinton has gone toe-to-toe with Russia to work out a deal on New START. She got them engaged on a meaningful way to cap Iran's nuclear weapons program. And yet she stood up to them on issues such as Syria and their invasion of Georgia. You've got to have the ability to do that, and Hillary does.

On the other hand, in Donald Trump, you have somebody who praises Vladimir Putin all the time. America should really wonder about a President Trump, who had a campaign manager with ties to Putin, pro- Putin elements in the Ukraine, who had to be fired for that reason. They should wonder -- when Donald Trump is sitting down with Vladimir Putin, is it going to be America's bottom line or is it going to be Donald Trump's bottom line that he's going to be worried about with all of his business dealings?

Now, this could be solved if Donald Trump would be willing to release his tax returns, as he told the American public that he would do. And I know he's laughing at this, but every president...

PENCE: But what's it got to do with Russia?

KAINE: Every president since Richard Nixon has done it, and Donald Trump has said I'm doing business with Russia. The only way the American public will see whether he has a conflict of interest...

PENCE: No, he hasn't said that.

KAINE: He has, actually.

QUIJANO: Senator, your time is up. Governor?

PENCE: Well, thanks. I'm just trying to keep up with the insult-driven campaign on the other side of the table.

KAINE: You know, I'm just saying facts about your running mate.

PENCE: Yeah.

KAINE: And I know you can't defend.

QUIJANO: Senator, please. This is the governor's two minutes.

PENCE: I'm happy to defend him, Senator. Don't put words in my mouth that I'm not defending him.

KAINE: You're not.

PENCE: I'm happy to defend him. Most of what you said is completely false, and the American people know that.

KAINE: I'll run through the list of things where you won't defend...

PENCE: This isn't the old days where you can just say stuff and people believe it.

QUIJANO: Senator, please. This is Governor Pence's two minutes.

PENCE: Look, this is the alternative universe of Washington, D.C., versus reality. Hillary Clinton said her number-one priority was a reset with Russia. That reset resulted in the invasion of Ukraine, after they'd infiltrated with what are called little green men, Russian soldiers that were dressing up like Ukrainian dissidents, and then they moved all the way into Crimea, took over the Crimean Peninsula. Donald Trump knew that happened. He basically was saying it's not going to happen again. The truth of the matter is that what you have in the rise of aggressive Russia, which has had -- increased its influence in Iran, that's now -- now because of this deal is on a pathway in the future to obtain a nuclear -- the leading state sponsor of terror in the world in Iran now has a closer working relationship with Russia because of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama's foreign policy and $150 billion and sanctions all being lifted.

And then, of course, Syria, I mean, it really is extraordinary that -- Syria is imploding. You just asked a very thoughtful question about the disaster in Aleppo. ISIS is headquartered in Raqqa. It is -- ISIS from Raqqa has overrun vast areas that at great sacrifice the American soldier won in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and yet Senator Kaine still sits here, loyal soldier -- I get all that -- in saying that the foreign policy of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama somehow made the world more secure. I mean, it really is astonishing that on the day...

KAINE: We even wiped out the leader of Al Qaida.

PENCE: ... on the day that Iran released four American hostages...

KAINE: We stopped Iran from getting nuclear weapons.

QUIJANO: Governor...

PENCE: ... we delivered $400 million in cash as a ransom payment for Americans held by the radical mullahs in Tehran.

(CROSSTALK)

QUIJANO: Governor, yesterday, Mr. Trump said...

KAINE: And we stopped a nuclear weapons program without a shot.

QUIJANO: ... quote, "Putin has no respect for Hillary Clinton and no respect for Obama." Why do you think he'll respect a Trump- Pence administration?

PENCE: Strength. Plain and simple.

KAINE: Business dealings.

PENCE: Donald Trump -- that's nonsense. Donald Trump is a strong leader...

KAINE: Donald Trump's son says that the Trump organization...

PENCE: ... who is going to lead with American strength.

QUIJANO: Please, Senator, I'll give you a chance to respond.

PENCE: We're going to rebuild our military. And let me -- let me -- this whole Putin thing. Look, America is stronger than Russia. Our economy is 16 times larger than the Russian economy. America's political system is superior to the crony, corrupt capitalist system in Russia in every way.

When Donald Trump and I observe that, as I've said in Syria, in Iran, in Ukraine, that the small and bullying leader of Russia has been stronger on the world stage than this administration, that's stating painful facts. That's not an endorsement of Vladimir Putin. That's an indictment of the weak and feckless leadership...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

PENCE: ... of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama.

KAINE: Well, this is one where we can just kind of go to the tape on it. But Governor Pence said, inarguably, Vladimir Putin is a better leader than President Obama.

PENCE: That is absolutely inaccurate.

KAINE: And -- and -- and I just think a guy who praises...

PENCE: He said he's stronger -- he's been stronger on the world stage.

KAINE: No, he said leader. And if -- and I'll just say this, Governor.

PENCE: You just said better.

KAINE: If you mistake leadership for dictatorship, and you can't tell the difference, a country that's running its economy into the ground...

PENCE: Yeah, here we go. This is the grade school thing again?

KAINE: ... persecuting journalists...

PENCE: Right, this is grade school.

KAINE: ... if you can't tell the difference, you shouldn't be commander-in-chief.

PENCE: Yeah. KAINE: And with Donald Trump -- Donald Trump's sons say that they have all these business dealings with Russia. Those could be disclosed with tax returns, but they refuse to do them. Americans need to worry about whether Donald Trump will be watching out for America's bottom line or his own bottom line.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, what went wrong with the Russia reset?

KAINE: Vladimir Putin. Vladimir Putin is a dictator.

QUIJANO: And what would do you differently?

KAINE: Vladimir Putin is a dictator. He's not a leader. Anybody who thinks otherwise doesn't know Russian history and they don't know Vladimir Putin. Hillary Clinton knows exactly who this guy is. John McCain said, I look in his eyes and I see KGB. And Hillary kind of has that same feeling.

PENCE: Right.

KAINE: So how do deal with him? You've got to -- we do have to deal with Russia in a lot of different ways. There are areas where we can cooperate. So it was Hillary Clinton who worked with Russia on the New START Treaty to reduce their nuclear weapons stockpile. It was Hillary Clinton that worked with Russia to get them engaged in a community of nations to stop the Iranian nuclear weapons without firing a shot.

She's not going around praising Vladimir Putin as a great guy. But she knows how to sit down at a table and negotiate tough deals. This is a very challenging part of the world, and we ought to have a commander-in-chief who is prepared and done it, rather than somebody who goes around praising Vladimir Putin as a great leader.

QUIJANO: All right, I'd like to ask now about North Korea, Iran and the threat of nuclear weapons. North Korea recently conducted its fifth and most powerful nuclear test.

PENCE: Right.

QUIJANO: What specific steps would you take to prevent North Korea from developing a nuclear-armed missile capable of reaching the United States? Governor Pence?

PENCE: Well, first, we need to -- we need to make a commitment to rebuild our military, including modernizing our nuclear forces. And we also need -- we also need an effective American diplomacy that will marshal the resources of nations in the Asian Pacific Rim to put pressure on North Korea, on Kim Jong-un, to abandon his nuclear ambitions. It has to remain the policy of the United States of America the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, plain and simple.

And when Donald Trump is president of the United States, we're -- we're not going to have the -- the kind of posture in the world that has Russia invading Crimea and Ukraine, that has the Chinese building new islands in the South China Sea, that has literally the world, including North Korea, flouting American power. We're going to -- we're going to go back to the days of peace through strength.

But I have to tell you that -- that all this talk about tax returns -- and I get it, you know, you want to keep bringing that up. It must have -- must have...

KAINE: Until he...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: ... done well in some focus group. But here -- Hillary Clinton and her husband set up a private foundation called the Clinton Foundation. While she was secretary of state, the Clinton Foundation accepted tens of millions of dollars from foreign governments and foreign donors.

Now, you all need to know out there, this is basic stuff. Foreign donors, and certainly foreign governments, cannot participate in the American political process. They cannot make financial contributions. But the Clintons figured out a way to create a foundation where foreign governments and foreign donors could donate millions of dollars. And then we found, thanks to the good work of the Associated Press, that more than half her private meetings when she was secretary of state were given to major donors of the Clinton Foundation. When you talk about all these -- all these baseless rumors about Russia and the rest, Hillary Clinton -- you asked the trustworthy question at the very beginning -- the reason...

QUIJANO: Governor, your two minutes are up.

PENCE: ... the reason the American people don't trust Hillary Clinton is because they are looking at the pay to play politics that she operated with the Clinton Foundation through a private server...

QUIJANO: Governor, please.

PENCE: ... while she's secretary of state.

QUIJANO: Your two minutes are up, Governor.

PENCE: And they're saying enough is enough.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine?

KAINE: I'm going to talk about the foundation, and then I'll talk about North Korea. So, on the foundation. I am glad to talk about the foundation. The Clinton Foundation is one of the highest- rated charities in the world. It provides AIDS drugs to about 11.5 million people. It helps Americans deal with opioid overdoses. It gets higher rankings for its charity than the American Red Cross does. The Clinton foundation does an awful lot of good work.

Hillary Clinton as secretary of state took no action to benefit the foundation. The State Department did an investigation, and they concluded that everything Hillary Clinton did as secretary of state was completely in the interest of the United States. So the foundation does good work. And Hillary Clinton as secretary of state acted in the interests of the United States.

But let's compare this now with the Trump organization and the Trump Foundation. The Trump organization is an octopus-like organization with tentacles all over the world whose conflict of interests could only be known if Donald Trump would release his tax returns. He's refused to do it.

His sons have said that the organization has a lot of business dealings in Russia. And remember, the Trump organization is not a non-profit. It's putting money into Donald Trump's pockets and into the pockets of his children, whereas the Clinton Foundation is a non- profit and no Clinton family member draws any salary.

PENCE: The Trump Foundation is non-profit.

KAINE: In addition, Donald Trump has a foundation. The foundation was just fined for illegally contributing foundation dollars to a political campaign of a Florida attorney general. They made an illegal contribution, and then they tried to hide it by disguising it to somebody else. And the person they donated to was somebody whose office was charged with investigating Trump University.

This is the difference between a foundation that does good work and a secretary of state who acted in accordance with American interest and somebody who is conflicted and doing work around the world and won't share with the American public what he's doing and what those conflicts are.

QUIJANO: Governor, I will give you 30 seconds to respond, because I know you want to, but, again, I would remind you both this was about North Korea.

(LAUGHTER)

PENCE: Well, Thank you. Thank you. The Trump Foundation is a private family foundation. They give virtually every cent in the Trump Foundation to charitable causes.

KAINE: Political contributions?

PENCE: Less than ten cents on the dollar in the Clinton Foundation has gone to charitable causes.

KAINE: A $20,000 portrait of Donald Trump? PENCE: Less than 10 cents on the dollar of the Clinton Foundation has gone to charitable causes.

KAINE: Ninety percent.

PENCE: It has been a platform for the Clintons to travel the world, to have staff. But honestly, Senator, we would know a lot more about it if Hillary Clinton would just turn over the 33,000 e-mails...

QUIJANO: All right, let's turn back to North Korea...

PENCE: ... that she refused to turn over in her private server...

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine...

PENCE: ... and we'd have a much better picture of what the Clinton Foundation was about.

QUIJANO: Senator Kaine, if you had intelligence that North Korea was about to launch a missile, a nuclear-armed missile capable of reaching the United States, would you take preemptive action?

KAINE: If we -- look, a president should take action to defend the United States against imminent threat. You have to. A president has to do that. Now exactly what action, you would have to determine what your intelligence was, how certain you were of that intelligence, but you would have to take action.

You asked the question about how do we deal with a North Korea. I'm on the Foreign Relations Committee. We just did an extensive sanctions package against North Korea. And interestingly enough, Elaine, the U.N. followed and did this -- virtually the same package. Often China will use their veto in the Security Council to veto a package like that. They're starting to get worried about North Korea, too. So they actually supported the sanctions package, even though many of the sanctions are against Chinese firms, Chinese financial institutions.

So we're working together with China, and we need to. China's another one of those relationships where it's competitive, it's also challenging, and in times like North Korea, we have to be able to cooperate. Hillary understands that very well. She went once famously to China and stood up at a human rights meeting and looked them in the eye and said, "Women's rights are human rights." They didn't want her to say that, but she did.

But she's also worked on a lot of diplomatic and important diplomatic deals with China. And that's what it's going to take.

The thing I would worry a little bit about is that Donald Trump owes about $650 million to banks, including the Bank of China. I'm not sure he could stand up so tough to the people who have loaned him money.

QUIJANO: All right. I'd like to turn to our next segment now. And in this, I'd like to focus on social issues. You have both been open about the role that faith has played in your lives. Can you discuss in detail a time when you struggled to balance your personal faith and a public policy position? Senator Kaine?

KAINE: Yeah, that's an easy one for me, Elaine. It's an easy one. I'm really fortunate. I grew up in a wonderful household with great Irish Catholic parents. My mom and dad are sitting right here. I was educated by Jesuits at Rockhurst High School in Kansas City. My 40th reunion is in 10 days.

And I worked with Jesuit missionaries in Honduras, now nearly 35 years ago, and they were the heroes of my life. I try to practice my religion in a very devout way and follow the teachings of my church in my own personal life. But I don't believe in this nation, a First Amendment nation, where we don't raise any religion over the other, and we allow people to worship as they please, that the doctrines of any one religion should be mandated for everyone.

For me, the hardest struggle in my faith life was the Catholic Church is against the death penalty and so am I. But I was governor of a state, and the state law said that there was a death penalty for crimes if the jury determined them to be heinous. And so I had to grapple with that.

When I was running for governor, I was attacked pretty strongly because of my position on the death penalty. But I looked the voters of Virginia in the eye and said, look, this is my religion. I'm not going to change my religious practice to get one vote, but I know how to take an oath and uphold the law. And if you elect me, I will uphold the law.

And I was elected, and I did. It was very, very difficult to allow executions to go forward, but in circumstances where I didn't feel like there was a case for clemency, I told Virginia voters I would uphold the law, and I did.

That was a real struggle. But I think it is really, really important that those of us who have deep faith lives don't feel that we could just substitute our own views for everybody else in society, regardless of their views.

QUIJANO: Governor Pence?

PENCE: Well, it's a wonderful question. And my Christian faith is at the very heart of who I am. I was also raised in a wonderful family of faith. It was a church on Sunday morning and grace before dinner.

PENCE: But my Christian faith became real for me when I made a personal decision for Christ when I was a freshman in college. And I've tried to live that out however imperfectly every day of my life since. And with my wife at my side, we've followed a calling into public service, where we've -- we've tried to -- we've tried to keep faith with the values that we cherish.

And with regard to when I struggle, I appreciate, and -- and -- and -- I have a great deal of respect for Senator Kaine's sincere faith. I truly do.

KAINE: That's shared.

PENCE: But for me, I would tell you that for me the sanctity of life proceeds out of the belief that -- that ancient principle that -- where God says before you were formed in the womb, I knew you, and so for my first time in public life, I sought to stand with great compassion for the sanctity of life.

The state of Indiana has also sought to make sure that we expand alternatives in health care counseling for women, non-abortion alternatives. I'm also very pleased at the fact we're well on our way in Indiana to becoming the most pro-adoption state in America. I think if you're going to be pro-life, you should -- you should be pro- adoption.

But what I can't understand is with Hillary Clinton and now Senator Kaine at her side is to support a practice like partial-birth abortion. I mean, to hold to the view -- and I know Senator Kaine, you hold pro-life views personally -- but the very idea that a child that is almost born into the world could still have their life taken from them is just anathema to me.

And I cannot -- I can't conscience about -- about a party that supports that. Or that -- I know you've historically opposed taxpayer funding of abortion. But Hillary Clinton wants to -- wants to repeal the longstanding provision in the law where we said we wouldn't use taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

So for me, my faith informs my life. I try and spend a little time on my knees every day. But it all for me begins with cherishing the dignity, the worth, the value of every human life.

KAINE: Elaine, this is a fundamental question, a fundamental question. Hillary and I are both people out of religious backgrounds, from Methodist church experience, which was really formative for her as a public servant.

But we really feel like you should live fully and with enthusiasm the commands of your faith. But it is not the role of the public servant to mandate that for everybody else.

So let's talk about abortion and choice. Let's talk about them. We support Roe v. Wade. We support the constitutional right of American women to consult their own conscience, their own supportive partner, their own minister, but then make their own decision about pregnancy. That's something we trust American women to do that.

And we don't think that women should be punished, as Donald Trump said they should, for making the decision to have an abortion.

Governor Pence wants to repeal Roe v. Wade. He said he wants to put it on the ash heap of history. And we have some young people in the audience who weren't even born when Roe was decided. This is pretty important. Before Roe v. Wade, states could pass criminal laws to do just that, to punish women if they made the choice to terminate a pregnancy.

I think you should live your moral values. But the last thing, the very last thing that government should do is have laws that would punish women who make reproductive choices. And that is the fundamental difference between a Clinton-Kaine ticket and a Trump- Pence ticket that wants to punish women who make that choice.

PENCE: No, it's really not. Donald Trump and I would never support legislation that punished women who made the heartbreaking choice to end a pregnancy.

KAINE: Then why did Donald Trump say that?

PENCE: We just never would.

KAINE: Why did he say that?

PENCE: Well, look, it's -- look, he's not a polished politician like you and Hillary Clinton. And so...

KAINE: Well, I would admit that's not a polished...

(CROSSTALK)

PENCE: You know, things don't always come out exactly the way he means them.

KAINE: Well, can I say...

PENCE: But I'm telling you what the policy of our administration would be.

KAINE: Great line from the -- great line from the gospel of Matthew. From the fullness of the heart, the mouth speaks.

PENCE: Yeah. KAINE: When Donald Trump says women should be punished or Mexicans are rapists and criminals...

PENCE: I'm telling you...

KAINE: ... or John McCain is not a hero, he is showing you who he is.

PENCE: Senator, you've whipped out that Mexican thing again. He -- look...

KAINE: Can you defend it?

PENCE: There are criminal aliens in this country, Tim, who have come into this country illegally who are perpetrating violence and taking American lives.

KAINE: You want to -- you want to use a big broad brush against Mexicans on that?

PENCE: He also said and many of them are good people. You keep leaving that out of your quote. And if you want me to go there, I'll go there.

But here's -- there is a choice, and it is a choice on life. I couldn't be more proud to be standing with Donald Trump, who's standing for the right to life. It's a principle that -- Senator Kaine -- and I'm very gentle about this, because I really do respect you -- it's a principle that you embrace.

And I have appreciated the fact that you've supported the Hyde amendment, which bans the use of taxpayer funding for abortion, in the past, but that's not Hillary Clinton's view. People need to understand, we can come together as a nation. We can create a culture of life. More and more young people today are embracing life because we know we are -- we're better for it. We can -- like Mother Teresa said at that famous national prayer breakfast...

KAINE: This is important --

PENCE: ... bring the -- let's welcome the children into our world. There are so many families around the country who can't have children. We could improve adoption...

KAINE: But, Governor...

PENCE: ... so that families that can't have children can adopt more readily those children from crisis pregnancies.

KAINE: Governor, why don't you trust women to make this choice for themselves? We can encourage people to support life. Of course we can. But why don't you trust women? Why doesn't Donald Trump trust women to make this choice for themselves?

That's what we ought to be doing in public life. Living our lives of faith or motivation with enthusiasm and excitement, convincing other, dialoguing with each other about important moral issues of the day...

PENCE: Because there are...

KAINE: ... but on fundamental issues of morality, we should let women make their own decisions.

PENCE: Because there is -- a society can be judged by how it deals with its most vulnerable, the aged, the infirm, the disabled, and the unborn. I believe it with all my heart. And I couldn't be more proud to be standing with a pro-life candidate in Donald Trump.

QUIJANO: I do have one final question for you both tonight. It has been a divisive campaign. Senator Kaine, if your ticket wins, what specifically are you going to do to unify the country and reassure the people who voted against you?

KAINE: That's a really important one. That may be the $64,000 question, because it has been a divisive campaign. And again, Hillary is running a campaign about stronger together, and Donald Trump -- and this is -- this is not directed at this man, except to the extent that he can't defend Donald Trump -- Donald Trump has run a campaign that's been about one insult after the next.

But we do have to bring the country together. So here's what we'll do. Hillary Clinton was first lady, then senator for eight years and secretary of state. And I served in the Senate. And I'm really amazed, Elaine, as I talk to Republican senators, how well they regard and respect Hillary Clinton.

She was on the Armed Services Committee. She was on other committees. She worked across the aisle when she was first lady to get the CHIP program passed so that 8 million low-income kids have health insurance in this country, including 150,000 in Indiana.

She worked across the aisle after 9/11 to get health benefits for the first responders who bravely went into the towers and into the Pentagon. She worked to get benefits for -- TRICARE benefits for National Guard members, including Hoosiers and Virginians in the National Guard.

She has a track record of working across the aisle to make things happen. And, you know, Elaine, I have the same track record. I was a governor of Virginia with two Republican houses. And in the Senate, I have good working relationships across the aisle.

Because I think it's fine to be a Democrat or Republican or independent, but after Election Day, the goal is work together. And Hillary Clinton has a track record of accomplishment across the aisle that will enable her to do just that when we work with the new Congress in January.

QUIJANO: Governor, how will you unify the country if you win?

PENCE: Well, thank you, Elaine, and thanks for a great discussion...

KAINE: Absolutely.

PENCE: ... tonight. Thank you, Senator.

This is a very challenging time in the life of our nation. Weakened America's place in the world after the leadership of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama on the world stage has been followed by an economy that is truly struggling, stifled by an avalanche of more taxes, more regulation, Obamacare, the war on coal, and the kind of trade deals that have put American workers in the back seat. I think the best way that we can bring people together is through change in Washington, D.C.

You know, I served in Washington, D.C., for 12 years in the Congress of the United States. And I served with many Republicans and Democrats, men and women of goodwill. The potential is there to really change the direction of this country, but it's going to take leadership to do it.

The American people want to see our nation standing tall on the world stage again. They want to see us supporting our military, rebuilding our military, commanding the respect of the world, and they want to see the American economy off to the races again. They want to see an American comeback.

And Donald Trump's entire career has been about building. It's been about -- it's going through hardship just like a businessperson does and finding a way through smarts and ingenuity and resilience to fight forward and -- when Donald Trump becomes president of the United States, we're going to have a stronger America.

When you hear him say he wants to make America great again, when we do that, I truly do believe the American people are going to be standing taller. They're going to see that real change can happen after decades of just talking about it. And when that happens, the American people are going to stand tall, stand together, and we'll have the kind of unity that's been missing for way too long.

QUIJANO: All right, gentlemen, thank you so much.

This concludes the vice presidential debate. My thanks to the candidates, the commission, and to you for watching. Please tune in this Sunday for the second presidential debate at Washington University in St. Louis and the final debate on October 19th at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

From Farmville, Virginia, I'm Elaine Quijano of CBS News. Good night.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Sen. Tim Kaine (Virg.), the Democratic vice presidential nominee, and Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, the Republican nominee, held a debate on Oct. 4 at Longwood University in Farmville, Virg. The following is a list of 25 suspicious or interesting claims. As is our practice, we do not award Pinocchios when we do a roundup of facts in debates.

"She worked a deal with the Russians to reduce their chemical weapons stockpile" --Tim Kaine

Kaine surely meant to say nuclear weapons, but it came out as chemical weapons. (Later in the debate, he said, "she went toe-to-toe with Russia as secretary of state to do the New START Agreement to reduce Russia's nuclear stockpile.")

Even so, Kaine overstates the impact of the 2011 New START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty ) agreement, which Clinton helped negotiate as Secretary of State.

New START placed tighter limits on deployed strategic weapons, but Russia was actually already meeting the treaty's limits, for the most part, when treaty implementation began. Indeed, Russia has increased deployed nuclear weapons from 1,537 in February 2011 to 1,796 in September 2016. Also, the treaty does not restrict either country from stockpiling weapons, nor does it require them to destroy any existing weapons.

Russia's total nuclear warhead arsenal has been on a steady decline, from 40,000, since 1986. During Obama's presidency, Russia's nuclear warhead total has hovered around 4,500 since 2012.

"She worked a tough negotiation with nations around the world to eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program without firing a shot."

Kaine leans way over on his skis here. The Iranian nuclear agreement was actually negotiated by Clinton's successor, John Kerry, though Clinton helped tee up the negotiations by increasing sanctions on the Islamic Republic. The deal, which has been sharply criticized by Republicans, did increase the amount of time that Iran would need to build a nuclear weapon by reducing its centrifuges for uranium enrichment and its stockpile of enriched uranium. But the deal expires in 15 years, and Iran's nuclear infrastructure remains in place.

While Iran has insisted it has no interest in building nuclear weapons, the deal does not eliminate the risk that it will obtain nuclear bombs.

Clinton and Kaine are "actually advocating $1 trillion in tax increases."

Indeed, Clinton's economic plan would raise an estimated $1.46 trillion in tax revenues over the next decade, according to an analysis by economist Mark Zandi. But the tax hike "falls almost exclusively on the most highly paid," the analysis says.

This figure does not take into account the impact of her other proposals on the economy. For example, his report also said that if Clinton were able to fully implement her economic plans, the economy would add an additional 3.2 million jobs during the first four years of her presidency. Combined with anticipated job creation under current law, that adds up to 10.4 million jobs. But the report also said that Clinton would face significant roadblocks to getting her economic plan through Congress, resulting in far fewer job gains.

"Donald Trump during his campaign has called Mexicans rapists and criminals. He's called women slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting. I don't like saying that in front of my wife and my mother. He attacked an Indiana-born federal judge and said he was unqualified to hear a federal lawsuit because his parents were Mexican. He went after John McCain, a POW, and said he wasn't hero because he'd been captured. He said African-Americans are living in jell. And he perpetrated this outrageous and bigoted lie that President Obama is not a U.S. citizen. … And we don't think that women should be punished, as Donald Trump said they should, for making the decision to have an abortion." --Kaine

Trump has, indeed said all those things.

During his presidential campaign announcement speech, Trump said: "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people." We awarded Trump's claim connecting illegal **immigrants** from Mexico and crime Four Pinocchios. (During the debate, Pence correctly noted that Kaine was leaving out a part where Trump said: "And some, I assume, are good people.")

In 2007, Trump called Rosie O'Donnell "a slob," "a pig" and a "degenerate" in a single speech. He has called Arianna Huffington "a dog," and said New York times columnist Gail Collins had "the face of a dog."

Trump did say that the Indiana-born U.S. District Court Judge Gonzalo Curiel had an "inherent conflict of interest" because of his Mexican heritage and Trump's plan to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border. Trump has said McCain was "not a war hero," and that McCain is "a war hero because he was captured. I like people that weren't captured."  Trump has, indeed, said: "We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African-Americans, Hispanics, are living in hell, because it's so dangerous."  And Trump was one of the most high-profile "birthers" who questioned whether Obama was a U.S. citizen.

Earlier in the campaign, Trump said women who receive illegal abortion should be subject to "some sort of punishment." But he reversed that statement several hours later, after widespread criticism from those on both sides of the abortion rights issue. He amended his statement to say that the doctors, not women, should be punished.

"Richard Nixon released tax returns when he was under audit."

This is correct. A key difference here is that Nixon did not release his taxes while he was a presidential candidate; he did so in 1973, a year after he was re-elected.

Presidential candidates have no legal obligation to release their returns, but there has long been a tradition to do so for the sake of transparency. Trump has cited a pending Internal Revenue Service audit, even though the first president to release his taxes, Nixon, did so in the middle of an audit. Moreover, Trump has not released his tax returns from before 2009, which are no longer under audit, according to his attorney.

"The state of Indiana has balanced budget … we've made record investments in education and infrastructure."

Pence is correct on raw numbers regarding education spending, but is incorrect when the figures are adjusted for inflation.

Fiscal 2017 state spending on higher education and K-12 education is the largest in the state's history. But adjusted for inflation, the 2017 appropriations are not quite as high as they were in 2010 and 2011, said Lawrence DeBoer, Purdue University economist and expert on Indiana state budget. By 2017, Indiana state spending on education will be almost back to 2011 levels, DeBoer said.

On infrastructure, Pence began improving the state's roads only after an emergency repair of the Interstate 65 bridge led to a month-long traffic problem and caused a political liability, the Minneapolis Star Tribune reported. Political ads attacked Pence for saving money in the state's reserves at the expense of underfunding the state's infrastructure.

Pence then proposed a plan to improve roads "that relied on borrowing, drawing down state reserves and accounting gimmicks to reach an advertised $1 billion sticker price," the Star Tribune reported. "In the end, he got just a fraction of that after Indiana's Republican-controlled Legislature balked. And much of the money set aside for local governments came from local taxes held in state reserves that were already supposed to be returned."

Clinton and Kaine "have a plan for open borders."

Pence exaggerates Clinton's stance on border security and **immigration** enforcement.

Clinton has said she would expand Obama's executive actions on **immigration**, and has advocated comprehensive **immigration** reform including a pathway to citizenship. But she also has supported enhanced border security. And her **immigration** proposal includes "humane, targeted and effective" enforcement and focusing **immigration** resources on detaining and deporting those "who pose a threat to public safety."

"Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to increase the Syrian refugee program by 550 percent."

This is correct. Clinton has said she supports President Obama's decision to accept 10,000 Syrian refugees in fiscal year 2016 -- and that she would support an increase up to 65,000. That is a 550 percent increase from 10,000. But Clinton has not yet disclosed her plan for the new fiscal year or beyond.

Maybe the GOP ticket did not precisely use the word "great" or "better" but Kaine pretty much hits the target here.

Pence told CNN just a few weeks ago: "I think it's inarguable that Vladimir Putin has been a stronger leader in his country than Barack Obama has been." Pence made these remarks just after Trump asserted that Putin has "been a leader far more than our president has been a leader."

"The second component of the [Trump] plan is massive tax breaks for the very top, trillions of dollars of tax breaks for people just like Donald Trump. The problem with this, Elaine, is that's exactly what we did 10 years ago and it put the economy into the deepest recession -- the deepest recession since the 1930s." --Kaine

Kaine repeats a line that recently earned Hillary Clinton Three Pinocchios. But no credible analyst would cite the Bush tax cuts as playing a key role in spurring the economic crash.

Kaine puts it even more starkly than Clinton. The Clinton campaign tried to suggest income inequality, exacerbated by tax cuts, led to the stagnation of the middle class and spurred excess borrowing and leverage — key components of the crash along with lax regulation. But that's a real stretch, given that a housing bubble was the key trigger. The causes of the Great Recession are complex and debatable, but there's no debate that it is wrong to put the Bush tax cuts at the top of the list.

"When Donald Trump spoke in Phoenix, he looked the audience in the eye and said … quote, 'They will all be gone. They will all be gone.'" --Kaine

This isn't a direct quote about deporting all undocumented **immigrants**, but Trump did say that all "criminal illegal **immigrants**" (likely referring to undocumented **immigrants** convicted of a crime) "are going to be gone. It will be over."

Among other claims Trump made at the Aug. 31 Phoenix rally about removing those here illegally:

"Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation."

But Trump also laid out his deportation priorities during the speech. Among his priorities were at least 5 million and as many as 6.5 million undocumented **immigrants** who would be subject to swift removal. That is about half of the 11 million undocumented people estimated to be living in the United States.

"More than half of the private meetings when she [Clinton] was secretary of state were given to major donors of the Clinton Foundation."

Pence misconstrued an Associated Press report here, similar to the way Donald Trump did earlier in the campaign.

The AP analyzed State Department records and looked specifically at Clinton's meetings on the phone or in person with 154 people who were not federal employees or foreign government representatives. This narrowed down the denominator to a small subcategory of people Clinton met with as secretary of state, since the majority of her diplomatic work would involve representatives of foreign governments.

The AP found that 85 of those 154 people, or "more than half" of 154, had donated to the Clinton Foundation or "pledged commitments to its international programs." The 85 donors collectively contributed as much as $156 million, the AP reported. There were representatives from at least 16 foreign governments, who donated as much as $170 million to the charity, but those representatives were not included in the 154 number, the AP reported.

The AP focused on 85 out of 154 people who met with Clinton but were not foreign government representatives or federal employees. It is based on partial records released by the State Department so far and does not reflect the full scope of people with whom Clinton met as secretary of state.

"15 million new jobs? 15 million new jobs?"

This is wrong. Counting from January 2009, there have been nearly 11 million private-sector jobs created in the United States, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. If you count all jobs, including government jobs, the figure is 10.5 million.

So how does Kaine come up with 15 million? He's counting from the low point for jobs in Obama's presidency — February 2010. When you start the clock from then, the tally is 15 million private-sector jobs and 14.8 million overall jobs.

The last time we checked, February 2010 was 6 1/2 years ago. So with this claim, Kaine is trying to wipe off a year of Obama's presidency.

Moreover, as a general matter, regular readers know that we tend to discount job-creation records by a president, as so much of the record is due to economic forces beyond a president's control.

"Independent analysts say the Clinton plan would grow the economy by 10.5 million jobs. The Trump plan would cost 3.5 million jobs."

Mark Zandi, a respected economist at Moody's Analytics, did issue a report saying that if Trump's economic plans were fully implemented, 3.5 million jobs would disappear, incomes would stagnate, debt would explode, and stock prices would plummet. (This compares to an anticipated increase of 6 million jobs under current Obama administration policies.) Zandi, in another report, also said that if Clinton were able to fully implement her economic plans, the economy would add an additional 3.2 million jobs during the first four years of her presidency. Combined with anticipated job creation under current law, that adds up to 10.4 million jobs.

But both reports were highly skeptical that either candidate would be able to get their plans through Congress, including Trump even if Congress was controlled by Republicans--because so many of his positions are such a departure from Republican principles. Even so the report said the U.S. economy would likely suffer under a Trump presidency. (The report was issued in June and Moody's has not issued an updated report that would reflect additional policies announced by trump, including a revised tax plan, but the report said Trump's trade policies would be especially damaging.)

"A reference to the Iranian deal, the Iranian deal that Hillary Clinton initiated, $150 billion to the radical mullahs in Iran."

Pence makes it sound like this is U.S. taxpayer money — and he uses a too-high estimate. Because of international sanctions over its nuclear program, Iran had billions of dollars in assets that were frozen in foreign banks around the globe. With sanctions lifted, in theory those funds would be unlocked.

But the Treasury Department has estimated that once Iran fulfills other obligations, it would have about $55 billion left. (Much of the other money was obligated to illiquid projects in China.) For its part, the Central Bank of Iran said the number was actually $32 billion, not $55 billion.

"That's why Donald Trump's claim that he wants to -- that NATO is obsolete and that we need to get rid of NATO is so dangerous."

Trump has called the North Atlantic Treaty Organization obsolete but he has not said he wants to get rid of it. Asked specifically by The Washington Post in March if he wanted to pull out of NATO, he said: I don't want to pull it out. NATO was set up at a different time. NATO was set up when we were a richer country. We're not a rich country anymore. … I think NATO as a concept is good, but it is not as good as it was when it first evolved." He has argued that "distribution of costs" has to be changed, but as we have noted, Trump frequently overstates the burden on the United States.

"We will never, ever engage in a risky scheme to privatize Social Security. Donald Trump wrote a book and he said Social Security is a Ponzi scheme and privatization would be good for all of us." --Kaine

Kaine is referring to Trump's 2000 book, "The America We Deserve," where he made such a comparison about Social Security and said he wanted to privatize the program: "The workers of America have been forced to invest a sixth of our wages into a huge Ponzi scheme. The pyramids are made of papier-mache."

Trump added in the book: "Privatization would be good for all of us. As it stands today, 13.6 percent of women on Social Security live in poverty."

But that book was published 16 years ago. On the campaign trail, Trump has said he wants to "keep Social Security intact … I'm not going to cut it."  His specific plans for the program, however, are vague. His campaign has said "the key to preserving Social Security and other programs that benefit AARP members is to have an economy that is robust and growing."

For more on Social Security and allegations it is a Ponzi scheme, see The Fact Checker's guide to critical questions about the program.

"We have the smallest Navy since 1916"

This is a zombie claim that just won't go away. We have awarded it Three Pinocchios, and fact checkers repeatedly debunked this in the 2012 presidential elections.

Indeed, the number of ships (272) as of Oct. 4, 2016 is the lowest count since 1916 (245 ships). But a lot has changed in 100 years, including the need and capacity of ships. After all, it's a now a matter of modern nuclear-powered fleet carriers, versus gunboats and small warships of 100 years ago. The push for ships under the Reagan era (to build the Navy up to 600-ship levels) no longer exists, and ships from that era are now retiring.

This talking point is a poor way to depict the country's naval fleet needs. Gunboats of 1915 and aircraft carriers of 2015 are not the same. And military budget, fleet needs and historical circumstances are much different in 2015 than they were in 1916.

"We ought to deploy a missile defense shield to the Czech Republic and Poland which Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama pulled back on out of not wanting to offend the Russians back in 2009."

Pence reprises a GOP talking point from the 2012 campaign, but it's not correct. Obama substituted a different system, but it was on the recommendation of then-Defense Secretary Robert Gates, a Republican. Gates, in fact, had recommended the original plan to George W. Bush and then decided the new system implemented by Obama was more effective, less costly and timelier than the Bush plan.

Gates, in his 2013 memoir, noted that while the Obama administration had stumbled in failing to lay the diplomatic groundwork for the shift, looking "like a bunch of bumbling fools," the Bush plan was already running into trouble in both Prague and Warsaw and likely would have been rejected by parliaments in both countries. "The Polish and Czech governments were relieved," he wrote.

"I sincerely believed the new program was better — more in accord with the political realities in Europe and more effective against the emerging Iranian threat," Gates added. "While there certainly were some in the State Department and the White House who believed the third site in Europe was incompatible with the Russian 'reset,' we in Defense did not. Making the Russians happy wasn't exactly on my to-do list."

In fact, Gates says, the Russians quickly concluded that the Obama plan was even worse from their perspective, as it eventually might have capabilities that could be used against Russian intercontinental missiles.

"How ironic that U.S. critics of the new approach had portrayed it as a big concession to the Russians," Gates added sardonically. "It would have been nice to hear a critic in Washington — just once in my career — say, Well I got that wrong."

"Donald Trump said wages are too high. And both Donald Trump and Mike Pence think we ought to eliminate the federal minimum wage. Mike Pence, when he was in Congress, voted against raising the minimum wage above $5.15."

Trump has walked back the particular claim that Kaine cites, that "wages are too high." Of course, Trump has flip-flopped on the minimum wage at least five times since August 2015 and has consistently contradicted his own statements, making it hard to track exactly where he stands on the issue at a given time. Trump's stance on this matter, as of August 2016, was that he supports "raising it to $10 at the federal level, but believes states should set the minimum wage as appropriate for their state."

During a November 2015 Republican primary debate, Trump was asked whether he was "sympathetic to the protesters' cause since a $15 wage works out to about $31,000 a year." His full answer, with the part Kaine is quoting in bold:

"I can't be, Neil. And the reason I can't be is that we are a country that is being beaten on every front economically, militarily. There is nothing that we do now to win. We don't win anymore. Our taxes are too high. I've come up with a tax plan that many, many people like very much. It's going to be a tremendous plan. I think it'll make our country and our economy very dynamic. But, taxes too high, wages too high, we're not going to be able to compete against the world. I hate to say it, but we have to leave it the way it is. People have to go out, they have to work really hard and have to get into that upper stratum. But we cannot do this if we are going to compete with the rest of the world. We just can't do it."

Days later, Trump clarified he was referring to whether he would increase the minimum wage. He would not raise it, because then it would be "too high," he said.

Kaine correctly notes that Pence, as a congressman, voted in 2007 against raising the minimum wage above $5.15.

"More and more young people today are embracing life."

Pence made this claim in the context of abortion and choosing whether to be for or against abortion rights. But polling does not support this. In fact, it shows young adults' views on abortion rights are about the same as their elders -- unlike issues like marijuana and gay marriage, where young people are more liberal.

Among adults aged 18 to 29, 58 percent said abortion should be legal in all or more cases, and 39 said it should be illegal in all or most cases, according to a 2014 Pew Research Center poll. That was similar to those aged 30 to 49 (59 percent supported abortion, 38 percent opposed) and those aged 50 to 64 (56 percent supported, 37 percent opposed).

"But what I can't understand is with Hillary Clinton and now Senator Kaine at her side is to support a practice like partial-birth abortion." --Pence

"Partial-birth abortion" is usually used to refer to later-term abortions using a specific fetus-extraction method.

Clinton has said she supports a ban on late-term abortions, including partial-birth abortions, as long as the health and the life of the mother is protected. As senator, Clinton opposed the Partial-Birth Abortion Act of 2003, which did not include a health exception.

Earlier this year, Clinton again said she is "on record in favor of a late pregnancy regulation that would have exceptions for the life and health of the mother."

Kaine: "More nations should get nuclear weapons. Try to defend that." Pence: "Don't put words in my mouth. Well, he never said that, Senator." Kaine: "He absolutely said it. Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Japan."

Trump has, indeed, said that countries like South Korea, Japan and Saudi Arabia should have nuclear weapons because nuclear proliferation is inevitable. Trump has said that countries like Japan and South Korea would be "better off" if they were armed with nuclear weapons, in order to defend themselves from North Korea. And Trumps said he considers nuclear weapons a last resort, though he would not "rule anything out" regarding their use.

For example, during a March CNN town hall, Trump was asked: "So if you said, Japan, yes, it's fine, you get nuclear weapons, South Korea, you as well, and Saudi Arabia says we want them, too?"

Trump answered: "Can I be honest with you? It's going to happen, anyway. It's going to happen anyway. It's only a question of time. They're going to start having them or we have to get rid of them entirely. But you have so many countries already, China, Pakistan, you have so many countries, Russia, you have so many countries right now that have them."

"She [Clinton] went toe-to-toe with Russia and lodged protests when they went into Georgia."

This is an odd, inaccurate comment. The Russia-Georgia war took place in 2008, when Clinton was still a U.S. senator. Bush's Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, lodged the protests. Whatever diplomatic pressure the Bush team had put on Russia over Georgia was abandoned when President Obama was elected and the administration decided to pursue the ill-fated "reset."

Pence: "Less than 10 cents on the dollar of the Clinton Foundation has gone to charitable causes."

Kaine gets this right, as Pence repeated a false claim that is popular on the right. The Clinton Foundation does not dole out grants, like a typical foundation, but instead directs the donations it raises directly for specified charitable activities. So simply only looking at the grants does not tell the whole story about the Foundation's activities.

The American Institute of Philanthropy's "Charity Watch" gives the Clinton Foundation an "A" rating for its efficiency (the top rating is A+). It says the Foundation spends 88 percent of its expenses on programs and 12 percent on overhead. It also says the Clinton Foundation spends just $2 to raise $100.

(About our rating scale)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Explaining Donald Trump's appeal sits at the heart of understanding not only this election but, more broadly, the electorate that has produced this most unlikely of presidential candidates.

The easy answer — and the one favored by many Democrats — is racism. Racial animus, they argue, is the thread that ties all of Trump's support together. I don't buy that. Sure, there is an element of racially coded language employed by Trump and, without doubt, there are avowed racists who support him. But, is everyone who supports Trump a racist? I find that very hard to believe.

Friday morning on "Morning Joe," Chris Matthews gave the best explanation of what's behind Trump's appeal that I've heard in this entire election. I transcribed it — although you can watch it here, too. (It starts at about the five-minute mark of the clip.)

Here's the key bit:

A lot of this support for Trump, with all his flaws which he displays regularly, is about the country — patriotic feelings people have, they feel like the country has been let down. Our elite leaders on issues like **immigration**, they don't regulate any **immigration** it seems. They don't regulate trade to our advantage, to the working man or working woman's advantage. They take us into stupid wars. Their kids don't fight but our kids do.

Yes to, literally, all of that.

The most important thing about Trump that Matthews gets is that the Republican nominee's appeal is fundamentally an emotional one. It's heart, not head. Spending time wondering why all of the fact-checking in the world doesn't change peoples' minds about Trump misses that point entirely. It's about a gut feeling that things are screwed up, and this guy is the only person who gets it. No fact-check changes how people feel.

The other key element to Matthews's analysis of Trump is the revulsion with elites. The ever-widening economic and cultural disconnect between coastal elites, which includes the leaders of both political parties, and the average person sits at the very heart of Trump's appeal. It's a classic "us" vs. "them" message. THEY think you're stupid. THEY think they're better than you. THEY think they can tell you what to think and how to act.

This tweet from Trump, which he typed out Friday morning, speaks to that very sentiment — in the context of his inability to win the endorsements of even conservative editorial boards.

The distance between the financial circumstances and policy views of elites and the average person has never been wider. On trade. On **immigration**. On what the proper role should be for the United States in the world community. On almost everything.

So, every time a newspaper endorses against Trump or a celebrity says how dumb he is or a member of the Republican foreign policy establishment condemns him, it cements many people's belief that what Trump has been saying all along is right. If the elites think Trump is stupid or out of touch (or both), then those same elites think the same things about the average Joe. About you.

The resentment and anger those feelings fuel is why, at some level, it doesn't matter what Trump says or does. It's beside the point for many of these people. The point is that he is the channeling of all of their distaste for the state of the country — and the elites who they believe have created it.

Those emotions are why Trump is still within shouting distance of Hillary Clinton despite running one of the least strategic campaigns in modern memory. And it's why he still has a chance to win despite everything that he has done wrong over these past many months.

Chris Matthews gets that in a way few other people — and especially pundits — do.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BRUSSELS — Western and Afghan officials gathered Wednesday for a feel-good conclave to pledge billions of dollars in development aid to the struggling country. The feel-bad topics may have been stuffed into a late-night news release the night before.

Announced with little fanfare, Europe just got Afghanistan to agree to accept an unlimited number of deportations of Afghan citizens. Volumes are expected to be so high that as part of the deal, "both sides will explore the possibility to build a dedicated terminal for return in Kabul airport."

E.U. nations may want to deport up to 80,000 Afghan citizens whose applications for asylum have been rejected, according to internal documents that were leaked earlier this year. Under the deal, Europe would need to cap the number of deportees to 50 per flight for the next six months, but there is no limit on the number of flights.

The agreement shows the great lengths to which European leaders will go to reduce the numbers of migrants in their countries. Surging anti-**immigrant**sentiment helped British advocates for a divorce from the European Union win a referendum in June, and anti-migrant politicians are capturing posts across Europe.

The deportations to Afghanistan may be especially surprising, since the country is plagued by war and violence. E.U. countries have long deported Afghan citizens who were determined to have **immigrated** for economic reasons, if they are able to go back to less violent parts of the country. Critics say the criteria used to make these judgments are inconsistent and that E.U. citizens put people at risk when they are deported.

The deportation deal was not formally linked to the E.U. pledges of development aid to Afghanistan, but the connection was unmistakable, and E.U. leaders discussed it at the donors conference. At the conference, E.U. leaders agreed to give $1.5 billion a year in aid through 2020. Overall, Western governments offered more than $15 billion in aid.

"We do expect sending countries to take back irregular economic migrants, in line with international standards and obligations," European Council President Donald Tusk said Wednesday. "That is why I want to thank the Afghan government for its courage in agreeing to a way forward to manage migration fairly in cooperation with the European Union. We will support this agreement with money and job-creation programs to reintegrate returning migrants to the benefit of their local communities."

Read more:

Donors pledge billions to Afghanistan but seek push for peace

Taliban opens offensives in Afghanistan ahead of government appeal to donors

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

Mike Pence put on a reasonably strong debate performance last night -- stronger, in key ways, than that of Tim Kaine. But in so doing, Pence inadvertently revealed the fundamental weakness of his running mate's whole candidacy. This weakness is surmountable, and Donald Trump could still win. But right now, it looks more likely that Trump won't surmount it -- and once you get past the noise and spin enveloping last night's festivities, what you see is that fundamental weakness sitting right there in plain sight once again.

During the debate, by my count, Tim Kaine reminded the national audience of Trump's attacks on Mexican **immigrants** no less than five times. He revived Trump's attacks on a Mexican-American judge twice. He criticized Trump's misogynistic quotes twice and quoted Trump's suggestion that women should be punished for abortions once. He blasted Trump's birtherism three times, in one case flatly describing it as bigoted. And he aired Trump's plans for mass deportations five times. All of that, of course, was designed to remind everyone of Trump's sexism, bigotry, racist campaign, and cruel, pathologically abusive streak. Kaine also revived Trump's displays of ignorance about international affairs and his quotes about nuclear weapons and Vladimir Putin to press the case that Trump is dangerously unhinged and unfit for the presidency.

It's been widely observed that Pence either refused to defend many of Trump's statements or simply pretended he hadn't said them. This is being widely analyzed by Clinton supporters as proof that you can't defend the indefensible and by neutral observers as a sign that Pence didn't help Trump as much as he might have done.

But I think this gets at something else that's important: it shows, in a roundabout way, how and why Trump may be currently on track to losing the election.

Top Democratic strategists have concluded that at this point, there are very few undecided voters left, based on both public polls and on private polling that attempts to push undecided voters to make a choice. This is the prism through which they are viewing last night's performance. As Jefrey Pollock, a pollster for the pro-Clinton Super PAC Priorities USA, emailed me this morning:

"I would bet that there were very few truly undecided voters watching the VP debate last night, partially because there aren't many real undecided voters left. If you push those who say they are undecided to say who they might consider, many are not considering either major candidate. Therefore, the pool of undecides that are actually gettable by either Clinton or Trump is tiny."

Meanwhile, a senior Clinton adviser confirmed to the Washington Examiner that for Kaine, a key debate objective was to remind the national audience once again of Trump's stream of insults directed towards women, Mexicans, and President Obama.

Right now, as Politico reported recently, the Clinton campaign is mostly focused on what the composition of the electorate will look like on election day, which essentially entails re-energizing the Obama coalition (Latinos, African Americans, young voters, unmarried women), converting registered or unregistered voters into likely or certain voters, and winning over those drifting to minor parties. These voters were the real target of Kaine's frequent airing out of Trump's bigoted quotes, along with college educated whites, especially women, who (Dems hope) will remain alienated by Trump's temperament, which Kaine also highlighted last night.

The story that the latest polling has been telling is that those voters are on track to giving Clinton a winning coalition. As Nate Cohn explains, Clinton's lead right now is partly due to a surge in enthusiasm among core Dem voters, as well as her strength among well educated white voters, which is enabling her to move ahead in more diverse states like Florida, Virginia, Colorado, and North Carolina. Meanwhile, Trump continues to remain a real threat in Rust Belt states, because he's maintaining very durable support among working class whites. But as Cohn notes, if the current state of affairs holds, there just won't be "much room for him to fight back with additional gains among white working-class voters."

Even Pence's undeniably solid performance last night confirmed the basic outlines of this state of affairs. Pence was much more in command of policy, had a smoother, more likeable delivery, and prosecuted a stronger case against Clinton than Trump did at his debate. But even there, the intended audience for Pence's arguments -- the attacks on Clinton's emails and the Clinton Foundation; the tale that as Secretary of State, Clinton left the Middle East in flames -- was mostly GOP base voters. While such attacks might keep alive doubts about Clinton in the minds of college educated whites and suburban women, what did Pence say that might get them to reconsider their potentially irreversible alienation at the hands of Trump's ignorance, bigotry, chauvinism and unstable temperament? He barely even tried. In essence, what Pence could not successfully do last night is persuade college educated whites and suburban women that Trump is not a racist, is not sexist, and is not dangerously insane.

All of which is to say that both sides pumped their respective bases, but only one side continued making the very same case to educated whites, particularly women, that has already proven persuasive (as the polls indicate) to them. It is possible that Trump's strength among working class whites can still enable him to win, provided something happens that enables him to pull off wins in multiple diverse states. But it's hard to see how Pence did anything to alter the losing hand Trump now seems to hold.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* POLL SHOWS PENCE WON, BUT WITH BIG CAVEAT: A CNN instant poll of debate watchers found that they thought by 48-42 that Pence did the better job last night, and Pence was seen as the more likeable candidate by 53-37.

But the poll also found that watchers thought by 48-41 that Kaine had a better understanding of the issues, and crucially, they said by 58-35 that Kaine did the better job of defending his running mate.

\* KAINE WAS HAPPY TO DEFEND CLINTON: Dan Balz makes a key point about Pence's overall performance:

At times he simply sought to deny that Trump had said or done things Kaine brought up, whether in calling for the deportation of the roughly 11 million undocumented **immigrants** or praising Putin as a stronger leader than Obama. Kaine was far more ready, even eager, to take on criticism of Clinton, jumping at the chance to compare the Clinton Foundation with Trump's charity.

Whether Kaine did that effectively, of course, is another matter, but at least he was willing to try. Pence wasn't.

\* PENCE WHITEWASHES AWAY THE LAST YEAR OF TRUMP: The Huffington Post has a good overview of all the ways in which Pence last night tried to pretend Trump has not said what he has said.  There was the denial that Trump didn't know the Crimea had been invaded; that Trump said Putin is a better leader than Obama; that more countries should get nuclear weapons; and that Trump said we should have a "deportation force."

Moral of the story: it's a lot easier to pretend Trump never said these things than to defend them.

\* YES, TRUMP SAID ALL THE THINGS HE SAID: The Post fact checking team finds fault with some of Kaine's statements, but concludes that Kaine got it right when he recounted Trump's history of insults:

In 2007, Trump called Rosie O'Donnell "a slob," "a pig" and a "degenerate" in a single speech. He has called Arianna Huffington "a dog"….Trump did say that the Indiana-born U.S. District Court Judge Gonzalo Curiel had an "inherent conflict of interest" because of his Mexican heritage….Trump has, indeed, said: "We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African-Americans, Hispanics, are living in hell, because it's so dangerous." And Trump was one of the most high-profile "birthers" who questioned whether Obama was a U.S. citizen.

Glad we have that cleared up!

\* KAINE WAS TALKING TO MINORITIES AND WOMEN: The New York Times observes this about Kaine's debate performance:

Mr. Kaine aimed his political message squarely at minorities by regularly mentioning Mr. Trump's attacks on Hispanics and illegal **immigrants**, and at women by noting Mr. Trump's recent insults against a former Miss Universe who had gained weight soon after winning the pageant. Mr. Kaine argued that Mr. Trump was incapable of expressing regret or admitting he was wrong, which he described as dubious traits for a president.

Kaine was tasked with putting Trump's disgusting insults of women and Mexicans (and Trump's birtherism) out there before the nation once again, and with reminding everyone of Trump's unhinged temperament.

\* BATTLEGROUND MAP LEADS TOWARDS CLINTON: NPR updates its race ratings based on the latest polls, and finds Clinton's leads in Virginia, Colorado, and New Hampshire would put her over 270:

She would win the presidency at this point without any of the tossups, states that could go to either Clinton or Trump. That means Clinton could win without Florida, North Carolina, Nevada and Arizona (the tossups). It also means she would win without places that are now leaning toward Trump and were former tossups — Ohio, Iowa and two electoral votes between Nebraska and Maine which, unlike other states, split their electoral votes partially by congressional district.

As long as Clinton holds Virginia, Colorado, and Pennsylvana, one more state (such as New Hampshire or Nevada) is enough, barring a surprise Trump win in a blue-leaning state like Wisconsin.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — The British government has come under fierce criticism for a proposal that could force companies to publish what proportion of their workforce is foreign.

The measure, unveiled Tuesday by Home Secretary Amber Rudd, is part of efforts to slash **immigration** and encourage companies to employ locals.

Political opponents and business figures slammed the proposal, saying it has nasty undertones and is anti-business.

Sadiq Khan, the mayor of London, said the proposal sends a "deeply worrying message."

Nicola Sturgeon, the first minister of Scotland, tweeted a picture of Wednesday's newspapers and said, "Depressing doesn't even begin to cover it."

We seem to have woken up with a UKIP government. Depressing doesn't even begin to cover it. pic.twitter.com/O8DYc6smdE

Adam Marshall, acting director general of the British Chambers of Commerce, told the BBC that it would be disappointing for businesses if having a global workforce was seen as "a badge of shame."

The concerted pushback follows a speech by Rudd at the annual Conservative Party conference, where she told the party faithful that Britain's June 23 vote to leave the European Union was driven "in large part" by high levels of **immigration**.

The government wants net migration — the number of people arriving minus the number of people leaving — reduced to the "tens of thousands." Last year, it was nearly 330,000, with about half coming from the E.U.

Prime Minister Theresa May recently said that Britain will start the process of leaving the E.U. no later than the end of March. But the process could take up to two years or more, and while Britain is still a member of the bloc, there is little it can do about controlling **immigration** from the E.U.

Rudd said that Britain still wants to "attract the brightest and the best" but that it also wants to curb net migration "in the long term, by reducing the numbers that come from Europe" and "in the mid-term, by reforming the student and work route of entry."

The other proposals she outlined Tuesday include **immigration** checks for taxi drivers and tightening restrictions for international students. She also said that landlords who knowingly rent out property to illegal **immigrants** could go to prison.

One of Britain's top scientists said the proposals were "deplorable."

Astronomer Martin Rees told the BBC's "Newsnight" program: "I thought Amber Rudd's speech was deplorable, and it will lead to difficulties. People won't feel welcome and won't want to take jobs here." He added, "U.K. science has greatly strengthened in the past 20 years. It will be very sad if this is jeopardized by limiting **immigration**."

Rudd seemed to soften her position on Wednesday. When asked whether her proposals to force companies to publish the number of foreign workers they employ amounted to "naming and shaming," she told the BBC that it was just an idea under consideration.

"It's not something we are definitely going to do. It's one of the tools we are going to use as a review to see if we can use it as a way of nudging people to do better behavior," she said.

But Rudd said the government wanted to encourage businesses to hire more local staff and insisted that people need to be able to talk about **immigration**without being labeled a racist or xenophobe.

"We mustn't ignore the fact that people want to talk about **immigration**," she said. "And if we do talk about **immigration**, don't call me a racist."

Read more:

New British visa restrictions could get workers from non-European nations deported

What does Brexit mean? With divorce talks looming, Britain still doesn't have a clue.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One of the trickiest tasks facing Republican vice-presidential candidate Mike Pence in his 90 minutes of fame this 2016 campaign was to simply try to defend running mate Donald Trump on, well, name a controversy. On a lot.

The Indiana governor decided to ignore that challenge completely. Instead, Pence spent much of the surprisingly contentious vice-presidential debate Tuesday night defending a Trump that does not exist.

Pence repeatedly championed policies Trump has eschewed. Or he chose not to defend Trump at all. It underscored the two politicians' already notable policy differences on everything from President Obama's birthplace, to a Muslim **immigration** ban, to the Iraq War, to much more.

Here are a few of the entries Pence added to that list in Tuesday's debate:

Insults

What Pence said at the debate: "At a time of great challenge in the life of this nation, where we've weakened America's place in the world, stifled America's economy, the campaign of [Democrats] Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine has been an avalanche of insults."

How it differs from Trump's position: About the time Pence was saying this, Trump was literally tweeting out insults.

"@Jnelson52722: @realDonaldTrump @Susiesentinel Kaine looks like an evil crook out of the Batman movies"

Russian President Vladimir Putin

What Pence said: "The small and bullying leader of Russia is not dictating terms to the United States. We have got to be able to lean into this with strong, broad-shouldered American leadership."

How it differs from Trump: Trump has basically done the opposite of call Putin "bullying" or "small." He has repeatedly flattered the Russian president and refused to denounce him despite near-universal agreement among U.S. leaders and foreign-policy experts that Putin disregards human rights.

As recently as September's commander in chief forum, Trump defended Putin, saying he expects to have a "very, very good relationship with Putin."

Trump went on: "Well, he does have an 82 percent approval rating, according to the different pollsters, who, by the way, some of them are based right here."

Our investigative team found Trump's warm relationship with Putin and financial ties to Russia go back decades.

Syria

What Pence said: That the United States should consider striking a key Russian military ally, Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad.

"The provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength," Pence said. "The United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike military targets of the Assad regime."

How this differs from Trump:  Trump has not said much about how he would battle the Islamic State, which controls portions of the war-ravaged Syria, only to say he has a "secret" plan. But we do know that far from striking a key ally of Russia in that region of the world, Trump has said the United States could work with Russia. Here's what he said at September's commander in chief forum:

"The beautiful part of getting along: Russia wants to defeat ISIS as badly as we do. If we had a relationship with Russia, wouldn't it be wonderful if we could work on it together and knock the hell out of ISIS? Wouldn't that be a wonderful thing?"

Mexican **immigrants**

What Pence said: "Senator, you whipped out that Mexican thing again," Pence said in response to Kaine mentioning, yet again, that Trump had referred to undocumented **immigrants** as "rapists" and that they were "bringing crime," during his campaign launch.

When Kaine asked whether Pence could defend it, Pence said this of Trump: "He also said, 'And many of them are good people,' and you keep leaving that out of your quote."

How it differs from Trump: Trump actually said, "Some, I assume, are good people." The full quote is below:

"When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people."

The broader point here is that Pence tried to play down one of Trump's most controversial statements of the presidential campaign — one that cost him a deal with Macy's. This was one of the few times during the debate that Pence tried to directly defend something Trump said, and he factually missed the mark. And he made an awkward comment to boot about "that Mexican thing."

Mike Pence is really winning this debate with Donald Trump.

Where they agree: Trump's taxes

Trump has not denied a New York Times report detailing a $916 million loss in income in 1995 that would have allowed Trump to avoid paying federal income taxes for the next 18 years. Instead, he has called the notion that he knew how to avoid paying taxes "smart."

On Tuesday, Pence also did not deny news that Trump may have gone nearly two decades without paying federal income taxes. He, too, praised the notion:

"His tax returns showed he went through a very difficult time," Pence said, "but he used the tax code the way it was meant to be used, and he used it brilliantly."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If there is one idea that many people took away from Tuesday night's debate, it was that Republican vice-presidential nominee Mike Pence was not there to defend the Donald Trump who has spent the past 14 months mounting a presidential campaign and named Pence his running mate.

Pence flat-out denied things that Trump has said, on tape and on the record in print. He described an **immigration** policy around which Trump's campaign has been largely framed in the most neutral, scarcely accurate manner possible. And he described Trump's nearly $1 billion in business losses on his 1995 tax returns as nothing more than an example of a wisely used deduction. But there was at least one thing that Pence did not try to evade and was prepared to defend.

During one of many moments of cross talk and disagreement with Sen. Tim Kaine (Va.), the Democratic Party's vice-presidential nominee, Pence said that comments Trump made in a June 2015 speech announcing his plans to run for the White House have been misunderstood or deliberately truncated in all the reporting about that speech since.

Take a look at this exchange, pulled from a transcript of Tuesday night's debate:

KAINE: When Donald Trump says women should be punished or Mexicans are rapists and criminals ...

Now, it is true that Trump's infamous declaration that Mexican undocumented **immigrants** are "rapists" and "criminals" was followed by an aside that included the words, "some of them are good people, I assume." But this has indeed been reported, widely. What Pence (and anyone else sold on the idea that Trump's comments have simply been misunderstood or taken out of contest) seems unable to grasp is that the act of declaring an entire group prone to illegal activity is about as close to a textbook example of bigotry and xenophobia as possible.

In making those comments in a presidential announcement speech — the kind of address which is typically carefully written, delivered and staged and almost always framed around the ways in which an individual candidate would advance the country and keep it connected to its core ideals — Trump set himself and his campaign apart. And his aside about the possibility that some are "good people" does not negate the remainder of what he said.

Trump has run a campaign based on the idea that he will say things, propose things and do things that others will not because he does not allow himself to be held to social conventions regarding open displays of bigotry or policies which codify the idea that certain groups are fundamentally suspect. Trump has tried to make a virtue of what he calls "politically incorrect" speech.

On Tuesday, Pence took on the unwise task of trying to pretend that those goals have not been a part of the Trump campaign all along. It was a very strange issue on which to make a stand.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. — Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton weren't on the stage at the vice-presidential debate here Tuesday night, but it didn't really matter. They were still front and center.

Stripped of the overpowering personalities of Trump and Clinton, the debate between Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.) and Indiana Gov. Mike Pence (R) offered the possibility of a more civil and sober conversation about issues that divide the two national party tickets. At times it was just that, whether on the economy, **immigration**, the chaos in the Middle East or abortion.

But for much of the evening, it was a boisterous proxy war by a pair of running mates whose goal was to take down the other's presidential nominee. They squabbled, they disagreed, they interrupted one another, they rolled out canned lines, and they feigned indignation.

It was bad enough almost from the start that, barely a third of the way through the 90-minute debate, moderator Elaine Quijano of CBS News admonished the candidates to back off. "The people at home cannot understand either one of you when you speak over each other," she said.

Overall it was an unsatisfying, disjointed debate, as the two candidates brushed past specific questions to open up other arguments at will. It probably changed few minds and no doubt brought some encouragement to the bases of the two parties. In that way it was a typical vice-presidential debate.

Both Kaine and Pence understood their objectives. Kaine's was to hurl Trump and everything he has said in Pence's face and force him to respond. He began by using an opening question about preparedness to be president, pivoting to a series of attacks on Trump.

Pence's role was to do what Trump could not do consistently during the first presidential debate, which was to prosecute a case against Clinton — highlighting both her policy vulnerabilities as secretary of state and questions about her private email server and the Clinton Foundation. He was more effective by far than Trump, but he struggled to fully defend everything Trump has said and done.

Kaine accused Trump of running an "insult-driven, selfish, me-first" campaign. Pence took umbrage at that. "You and Hillary Clinton would know a lot about an insult-driven campaign," he said, and then launched into a catalogue of complaints about Clinton, President Obama and the state of the world under the two of them.

With that, the evening on the campus of Longwood University seesawed back and forth; occasionally there was serious policy discussion, but then it was quickly back to barbs and insults. Kaine was by far the more aggressive debater, overly so in the opening as he appeared almost too eager to make the entire evening about Trump.

Pence appeared taken aback by the assault, though he surely understood that it would be coming. More disciplined than Trump, and with a baritone voice that evoked a sense of seriousness, he battled back.

Were it not for the landmines Trump had left for Pence to tiptoe through, it might have been a different debate. Pence pressed at every opportunity to raise questions about Clinton, questions that Trump failed to raise at the first debate.

But Kaine kept returning to Trump, daring Pence to defend his decision not to release his taxes; to praise Russian President Vladimir Putin; or to explain Trump's comments about women, Mexicans and others.

Throughout the campaign, Pence has walked a line between being loyal to the man who put him on the ticket and protecting his own political future. That was the case again Tuesday night, though it's likely he did more to help himself than to absolve Trump of the charges Kaine kept leveling.

At times he simply sought to deny that Trump had said or done things Kaine brought up, whether in calling for the deportation of the roughly 11 million undocumented **immigrants** or praising Putin as a stronger leader than Obama.

Kaine was far more ready, even eager, to take on criticism of Clinton, jumping at the chance to compare the Clinton Foundation with Trump's charity. Whether his style sat well with undecided voters, those few who are still making up their minds, is another question.

In Pence and Kaine, the public got a glimpse of two politicians — though of different parties and ideologies — who bear more resemblance to one another than any comparison of Trump and Clinton. Both are lawyers, and both have served in Congress and in governor's mansions.

Both have low-key personalities, and neither is known for slashing, negative politics, though the traditional role of a vice-presidential candidate is to carry the attack against the other party's presidential nominee. They were little known nationally when chosen as running mates to the two least-popular major-party nominees in the history of polling.

Pence had the more difficult task Tuesday night, forced to take the stage after Trump suffered through one of the worst weeks of his candidacy — a week that began with the Hoftstra debate, where polls declared Clinton the winner, and that spiraled downward from there.

The damage to Trump was mostly self-inflicted, starting the morning after the debate with insults of a former Miss Universe and followed by an early-morning tweet storm that extended the controversy. Then came a New York Times exclusive that revealed that Trump had claimed $916 million in losses on his tax returns during the 1990s and, that same night, a rambling, off-script performance at a rally.

Trump's week was his worst since immediately after the Democratic convention, when he got into a verbal exchange with a Gold Star family; that, combined with Clinton's convention bounce, put the Republican ticket behind in the polls by the end of August. The effect of the past several days was that Trump appeared to arrest the gains he had been making in the polls before the first debate, if not begin to reverse them.

Four years ago, Vice President Biden had to follow a weak performance by President Obama, who lost his opening debate against Mitt Romney. Biden's challenge, however, was not as difficult as Pence's. Biden needed only to reenergize a Democratic base demoralized by Obama's performance.

He did that with a display of aggressiveness — some critics judged it over the top — that contrasted with Obama's laconic posture against Romney in Denver. Biden did not have to answer for or defend controversial behavior on the part of the president.

Still, it was left to Obama to produce the real rebound in the second of the three presidential debates, just as it will be Trump's challenge to deliver a more consistent and focused performance against Clinton when the two meet at Washington University in St. Louis on Sunday night for a town hall debate.

Vice-presidential debates rarely matter. They can produce memorable video clips, as several have over the years, but they don't move the polls. Pence played his prescribed role Tuesday night, delivering what Trump hoped for. But so did Kaine, as he kept Trump's vulnerabilities front and center.

Given the damage Trump did to himself over the past seven days, that will put much greater pressure on the Republican nominee Sunday to show that he learned from his mistakes in the first debate and to show the voters a more disciplined candidate.

dan.balz@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. — Indiana Gov. Mike Pence sought to stabilize the Republican ticket by accusing his Democratic opponents of the same kind of insults and raw partisanship that have been a hallmark of Donald Trump's candidacy as he faced off against Sen. Tim Kaine here Tuesday night in a combative and at times grating vice-presidential debate.

With Trump reeling from self-inflicted controversies at a critical juncture in the campaign, Pence projected a steadier temperament than Trump and largely ducked Kaine's demands to answer for the GOP nominee's incendiary actions and statements.

But Pence made numerous statements that conflicted with positions taken by Trump. He suggested that Trump would not immediately deport all undocumented **immigrants**, that he believes military action is warranted to help the besieged Syrian city of Aleppo and that Russia is a dangerous country that the United States must deal with aggressively.

Pence on several instances denied statements that Trump had made in the past, including his assertion that NATO is "obsolete" and his suggestion that Putin is a "stronger" leader than President Obama. Pence repeatedly accused Kaine and Clinton of running "an insult-driven campaign."

Kaine's retort: "I'm just saying facts about your running mate."

The first and only debate between the vice-presidential nominees, a 90-minute forum on the campus of Longwood University in historic Farmville, showcased the two tickets' vastly divergent plans, from illegal **immigration** to foreign policy.

Pence injected a number of traditional conservative priorities — abortion, taxes and entitlements — to help reassure Republicans who have misgivings about Trump's populist agenda, which they see as out of step with GOP orthodoxy.

Kaine and Pence sparred vigorously over Trump's avowed affinity for Russian President Vladi­mir Putin. Pence called Putin "a small, bullying leader," but Kaine repeatedly reminded viewers that Trump has praised the Russian's leadership style.

"If you mistake leadership for dictatorship," Kaine said, "you can't be commander in chief."

Kaine sought to put Pence on the defensive by bringing up Trump's attacks on Mexican **immigrants**, dismissive comments about prisoners of war and years of falsely questioning President Obama's birthplace.

"If you want to have a society where people are respected or respect laws, you can't have a person at the top who demeans every group he talks about," Kaine said.

Kaine repeatedly mentioned Trump's comments in his 2015 campaign announcement speech that some Mexicans were "rapists" and "criminals."

"Senator, you whipped out that Mexican thing again," Pence said.

Kaine countered, "Can you defend it?"

"I couldn't be more proud to be standing with Donald Trump," Pence said.

Unlike Trump's response to Clinton's aggression on the debate stage last week, Pence refused to be baited into a point-by-point discussion of Trump's controversies. Rather, Pence drove a pointed contrast between the economic policies and worldviews of Trump and Hillary Clinton, arguing that she and Kaine "want more of the same."

Responding to Kaine's comments about the improving economy, Pence said: "Honestly, Senator, you can roll out the numbers and the sunny side, but I've got to tell you: People in Scranton know different. People in Fort Wayne know different. People are struggling."

Pence also excoriated Clinton's record at the State Department, and he blamed her "weak" and "failed" foreign policy for the humanitarian crisis unfolding in Syria.

"In the wake of Hillary Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, where she was the architect of the Obama administration's foreign policy, we see entire portions of the world, particularly the wider Middle East, literally spinning out of control," Pence said.

The two men, who sat around a table with moderator Elaine Quijano of CBS News, displayed different strategies and mannerisms. Kaine was aggressive, interrupting and hurling rehearsed insults at Pence, while the Indiana governor was calmer, spoke in homespun language and counterpunched with an edge of disdain for Kaine's tactics.

A number of times, Kaine delivered the kind of catchy one-liners commonly delivered at debates. "Do you want a 'You're hired' president in Hillary Clinton or do you want a 'You're fired' president in Donald Trump?"

Pence replied: "I appreciated the 'You're hired,' 'you're fired,' thing, senator. You use that a whole lot. And I think your running mate used a lot of pre-done lines."

Tuesday's debate came at a critical juncture in the presidential race. With five weeks until Election Day, Trump has been reeling from his rocky performance during the first presidential debate last week in Hempstead, N.Y. In the days that followed, he took a combative posture and at times displayed erratic behavior.

Trump continued a bitter feud with former Miss Universe Alicia Machado for a full week, lashing out at her for gaining weight as a beauty pageant winner two decades ago and urging his supporters to view her "sex tape," although it was not evident that one existed.

Trump also attacked Clinton in strikingly personal terms at campaign rallies, including imitating her unsteadiness at a public appearance during a bout with pneumonia, and he suggested without evidence that she had been disloyal to her husband, former president Bill Clinton.

Trump has slipped in polls nationally and in nearly every battleground state. In Pennsylvania, a vote-rich state in which Trump is competing aggressively, Clinton has widened her lead against Trump to 10 percentage points, according to a Monmouth University survey released Tuesday.

On stage in Farmville, the No. 2s showed different styles than the candidates at the top of their tickets. Both talked movingly about their personal faith, something Clinton and Trump rarely do, for example.

Tuesday's forum was marred by so many interruptions that Quijano interjected: "Gentlemen, the people at home cannot understand either one of you when you talk over each other." Kaine's impulse to interrupt and rattle Pence was so strong that he interrupted Quijano just as she was trying to force Pence to answer a difficult question about police bias.

Kaine and Pence clashed over criminal justice policies in light of the recent spate of police shootings of black men. Waxing about his uncle, who was a career cop in Chicago, Pence called for unity behind law enforcement and accused Clinton and Kaine of politicizing shootings.

"We ought to stop seizing on these moments of tragedy," he said. "Enough of this seeking every opportunity to demean law enforcement broadly by making the accusation of implicit violence every time a tragedy occurs."

Kaine responded by saying, "If you're afraid to have the discussion, you'll never solve it." He added, "I can't believe that you are defending the position that there's no bias."

Pence took the debate stage here under intense pressure to shift the campaign's narrative in a way that benefits Trump. Last week, Trump missed several opportunities to put Clinton on the defensive.

Pence tried to correct his running mate's errors. He fired barbs at Kaine over Clinton's use of a private email server as secretary of state and her comment at a fundraiser last month describing half of Trump's supporters as "a basket of deplorables."

"If Donald Trump had said all of the things that you've said he said in the way you said he said them, he still wouldn't have a fraction of the insults that Hillary Clinton leveled when she said that half of our supporters were 'a basket of deplorables,' " Pence said. "She said they were irredeemable, they were not American. I mean, it's extraordinary."

Pence was asked about a New York Times report, which relied on leaked pages from Trump's 1995 tax returns, which showed that Trump had claimed a $916 million loss — and might have been able to avoid federal income taxes for up to 18 years. Pence did not make any claim that Trump had paid federal income taxes.

"His tax returns showed he went through a very difficult time, but he used the tax code the way it was meant to be used, and he used it brilliantly," Pence said.

Kaine challenged Pence repeatedly to say why Trump had not released his tax returns, as other nominees have for 40 years. Pence repeated what Trump has said — that he would release the tax returns, but only when an Internal Revenue Service audit is over. The IRS has said that there is no legal prohibition on releasing taxes while they are under audit.

The vice-presidential candidates also clashed over entitlement spending, something the presidential candidates have not often discussed. Kaine argued that Pence and Trump would hurt the middle class by privatizing Social Security, calling Pence the "chief cheerleader" for such a plan during his time in the House.

"There they go again," Pence responded curtly, echoing a line made famous by former president Ronald Reagan.

The Libertarian Party's vice-presidential nominee, former Massachusetts governor Bill Weld, did not participate in Tuesday's debate because he and running mate Gary Johnson, a former New Mexico governor, did not meet a minimum national polling threshold. Weld offered his commentary throughout the debate via Twitter.

Clinton was expected to watch the debate from her home in Chappaqua, N.Y., aides said, while Trump had planned to watch and tweet about it from Las Vegas, where he is staying during a Western campaign swing.

philip.rucker@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If Tuesday night's vice-presidential debate was about Mike Pence helping Donald Trump right the ship in the 2016 presidential race, it was an abject failure.

But if it was about making Mike Pence look good — possibly for a future presidential run? — it was a success.

By largely parrying Tim Kaine's many attacks on Trump and avoiding direct, in-depth defenses of Trump's most controversial policies and provocative statements, Pence did plenty of good for himself, if not his running mate.

Since he became Trump's vice-presidential pick, there has been a real tension between Pence's own, more traditionally conservative positions and Trump's decidedly unorthodox Republican campaign. (More on those differences here.) This has made the usual role of a vice presidential nominee vouching for his ticket mate very difficult.

And Pence didn't bother too much with all that on Tuesday night. Basically every time Kaine interrupted him — and Kaine did so mercilessly — and brought up a specific comment from Trump's campaign, Pence avoided litigating it in-depth, instead opting for the kind of generalities and deflections that would make any debate coach proud.

Through it all, Pence appeared cool, composed and unflappable — a studied debater and one the GOP establishment surely wishes was at the top of the ticket.

Kaine, by contrast, was often grating with his interruptions and staid with his one-liners and talking points, some of them groan-worthy ("You are Donald Trump's apprentice," "Do you want a 'you're hired' president in Hillary Clinton or do you want a 'you're fired' president in Donald Trump?," etc.). He was taking one for the team, essentially, playing the role of attack dog and making himself look less attractive in order to help the ticket. People don't really vote on VP picks, after all.

Pence took a different approach. It's possible that was the plan all along. Perhaps the Trump campaign decided that it wouldn't be helpful to really get into the details of what Trump has said. Perhaps they wanted Pence to just run the clock out and avoid making this debate about "X thing Trump said" or "Y thing Trump did" and whether Pence could truly defend it.

But the sum total of it was that Pence didn't really seem like he was standing up for his running mate. Kaine pushed him over and over again to defend Trump on everything from Vladimir Putin — whom Kaine mentioned more than 20 times — to Trump's taxes. Pence assured that he was defending Trump and would continue to do so, but it was never terribly forceful or direct. It was almost as if Pence was a GOP Senate candidate trying to say nice things about Trump to avoid inflaming Trump's myriad supporters but not wanting to be too closely tied to him.

There was, however, one moment toward the end of the debate in which Pence did venture into this territory. It didn't go well.

After Kaine repeatedly accused Trump of having attacked Mexicans as rapists and criminals, Pence began to quibble with that idea and noted that Trump was referring only to the illegal **immigrants** that Trump alleges were sent by Mexico, not all Mexicans or even Mexicans more generally.

Here's the exchange:

KAINE: When Donald Trump says women should be punished, or Mexicans are rapists and criminals ...

Pence then quickly pivoted to talking about abortion, perhaps realizing that re-litigating Trump's controversial comments that undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico are "rapists" and "criminals" — but that "some, I assume, are good people" — wasn't terribly fruitful.

But that exchange was the exception to the rule in this debate. Pence didn't put up much of a true defense of Donald Trump at all — at least not in the way Trump appears to need at this point.

And perhaps that was the game plan going in. It's not all that clear exactly how much Mike Pence helped Donald Trump on Tuesday. VP debates generally aren't much of a factor in the final presidential results. But it's crystal clear that he definitely helped himself.

I must retract my prior tweet from months ago about Pence being disqualified in 2020 by saying yes to Trump. He's really redeemed himself.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. — Since joining the Democratic ticket, Tim Kaine has proved to be a workmanlike campaigner, ably touting Hillary Clinton's agenda and throwing punches at Republican Donald Trump without damaging his own nice-guy reputation.

At the vice-presidential debate here Tuesday, however, Kaine turned in a performance that threatened to undermine the image of authenticity that has been one of his greatest strengths.

The senator from Virginia came across as over-rehearsed, often interrupting his Republican opponent, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, with points Kaine had already made several times earlier in the debate. At times, Kaine simply seemed to be trying too hard.

At one point in the 90-minute encounter at Longwood University, Kaine accused Trump of being someone who "loves dictators" and then unloaded one of many canned lines of the evening, accusing Trump of having "a kind of personal Mount Rushmore: Vladimir Putin, Kim Jong Un, Moammar Gaddafi and Saddam Hussein."

Pence, who maintained the calmer demeanor through much of the debate, was able to easily parry, asking Kaine: "Did you work on that one a long time?"

Some other Kaine lines fell flat as well. "You are Donald Trump's 'Apprentice,' " Kaine said to Pence early in the debate, referencing the hit NBC show in which contestants sought to earn a position working alongside Trump in his business enterprises.

In other ways, Kaine accomplished what the Clinton team was looking for.

He highlighted key differences between the two tickets on issues including **immigration**, and he recounted many of the controversies that have done damage to Trump in recent weeks, including his public spat over the weight gain of a Latina beauty queen and his assertion that avoiding income taxes makes him smart.

"I guess all of us who do pay for those things, I guess we're stupid," Kaine said, ticking off the government services funded by taxes, including the military.

Often at the pressing of Kaine, Pence also made numerous statements that conflicted with positions of Trump. Pence, for example, suggested that Trump would not immediately deport all undocumented **immigrants** and that Russia is a dangerous country that must be dealt with aggressively by the United States.

Kaine's sometimes awkward performance Tuesday night brought back memories of the last time millions of Americans watched him on television — his speech at the Democratic National Convention. On that night, Kaine unleashed a cringe-worthy impersonation of Trump, repeating the phrase, "Buh-leave me" to mock the GOP nominee.

But those prime-time moments stand in stark contrast to the impression he has made on much smaller audiences as he travels among presidential battleground states on Clinton's behalf. The difference suggests that Kaine, who draws on skills honed over a long political career starting on the Richmond City Council, is still more comfortable in more intimate settings.

On the campaign trail, Kaine has proved versatile, demonstrating an ability to relate with a variety of audiences.

Speaking to African American groups, Kaine has recalled his days as a civil rights lawyer and discussed his membership in a predominantly black Catholic parish in Richmond.

When addressing Latino audiences, Kaine frequently breaks into Spanish that he picked up while taking a break from law school to work with Jesuit missionaries in Honduras.

And the Clinton campaign has also sent him into largely working-class pockets of battleground states, in the hope that his appeal to fellow white men will allow him to vouch for Clinton in a demographic with which she has struggled.

Kaine has a long political résumé that includes stints as Richmond's mayor, Virginia's governor and chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

But the role that has in some respects best prepared him for his current venture was the four years he served as his state's lieutenant governor — another job where his profile was overshadowed by a more prominent political partner, in that case venture-capitalist-turned-governor Mark R. Warner.

During Tuesday night's debate, Kaine also repeatedly vouched for his running mate, who he referred to most often simply as "Hillary."

"My primary role is to be Hillary Clinton's right-hand person and strong supporter as she puts together the most historic administration possible," Kaine said at the debate's outset. "And I relish that role. I'm so proud of her."

Clinton has said she chose Kaine for the ticket because of his ability to help her govern. In addition to his focus on domestic issues as governor, Kaine has gained foreign policy experience through his seats on the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations committees.

On the campaign trail, Kaine comes across as more authentic than Clinton, to whom many voters, including those who support her, say seems very distant.

Audience members at Kaine rallies have held signs referring to him as "America's Dad." His joint appearances with his wife, Anne Holton — who has referred to the vice-presidential candidate as "my hubby" in front of audiences — has bolstered that image.

Holton, until recently Virginia's education secretary, is spending plenty of time on the road promoting the Democratic ticket on their own. But when the couple travel together, Kaine has told audiences it feels like they are on vacation together.

The couple have three children, all young adults now, including one whom Kaine confessed last month to an audience in Iowa had voted for Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, Clinton's rival in the Democratic primaries. It was a line that might not have been good for Clinton but reinforced that notion that Kaine is honest.

Kaine was tagged by some with the "boring" label at the time of his selection in July. But there have been moments on the campaign trail where he's come across as nothing of the sort.

Three weeks into his service, he whipped out a harmonica during a visit to an Asheville, N.C., brewpub and joined a male-female guitar-and-vocal duo for a rousing rendition of "Wagon Wheel" followed by "My Home's Across the Blue Ridge Mountains." After finishing, Kaine bellied up to the bar and ordered a locally brewed White Zombie beer.

Kaine has also showed a sense of humor about the often-scripted nature of campaign events. At an event in Daytona Beach, Fla., after chatting with teachers and students in a culinary school kitchen, Kaine directed the attention of reporters trailing him to some blue arrows taped on the floor, showing him where to exit.

"They make it easy for me," he said.

john.wagner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One could understand the lack of excitement leading up to the vice-presidential debate between Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.) and Indiana Gov. Mike Pence (R). In the eight days since the presidential debate, which Donald Trump lost decisively, he has been on a tear. He attacked moderator Lester Holt, insisted he won (because online polls his supporters can manipulate said so), blamed the microphone, attacked former Miss Universe Alicia Machado, sent out series of infamous 3 a.m.

tweets (inviting followers to look for a non-existent sex tape), accused Hillary Clinton of cheating on her husband, was found to have lost $916 million in 1995 as the real estate market was booming (allowing him to avoid paying income tax for as many as 18 years), was told by the New York state attorney general to stop soliciting fund for his foundation since it lacked the needed certification (which would have required exacting audited), said "strong" vets "who can handle it" do not get PTSD, was alleged to have engaged in widespread sexual harassment on "The Apprentice" and was found to have "rented New York office space from 1998 to 2003 to an Iranian bank that U.S. authorities have linked to terrorist groups and Iran's nuclear program." Unsurprisingly, Trump's state and national poll numbers are sinking fast.

With all that, a face-off between two relatively bland VP contenders did not suggest high drama would be in store. It was surprisingly feisty, but ultimately unsatisfying given a weak moderator who did not stop constant interruptions or force candidates off their talking points.

Kaine started over-caffeinated, interrupting Pence frequently, and continued in that vein through much of the debate. Soon the candidates were talking over one another as the moderator lost control. Pence was measured and calm, but ran into trouble when he too obviously avoided an obvious question about Trump avoiding payment of taxes and refusing to disclose his returns. Kaine zeroed in on Trump's broken promise to reveal his taxes. His best line early on reminded voters: "Pence had to give Donald Trump his tax returns to show that he was qualified . . . Trump must give the American public his tax returns." And he successfully skewered Pence and Trump for wanting to privatize Social Security. His frenetic demeanor, however, detracted from his arguments.

Pence sounded serious in defending law enforcement, accusing the Democrats of painting police with a broad brush. He was caught off guard however when asked about conservative African American Sen. Tim Scott (R-S.C.) who has been repeatedly stopped for no apparent reason.

Kaine gained some ground in the second half of the debate, reminding Pence of Trump's obnoxious slurs and insults (Pence attempted to deny the comments were made, which smacked of Trump's habit of flat-out lying). When Kaine repeated the list Pence let it go. Kaine's riff on comparing **immigration** plans -- comprehensive **immigration** reform vs. deportation -- was effective. Kaine likewise dinged Trump who "can't start a Twitter war with Miss Universe without shooting himself in the foot." He reeled off a list of Trump's missteps -- including Trump's idolization of Vladimir Putin ("Trump has a kind of Mt. Rushmore of dictators") and favoring nuclear proliferation. He socked Trump for shadowy connections to Putin and comparing him favorably to Putin. His methodical attack on Trump's foundation for conflicts of interest and violation of law elicited a bland defense that its overhead was low (!).

Pence highlighted the Republicans' agony: If Pence or any other mild-mannered Republican headed the ticket, Republicans could easily win this election. Pence lacks pizzazz and was stuck defending Trump's comments and inane deportation policy. Shaking his head and looking incredulous did not negate Kaine's recitation of Trump's own words. At one point he accused Kaine of "whipping out" Trump's remark again about Mexicans. When Kaine asked him to defend it, Pence demurred. Indeed, what may be most noteworthy are the Trump comments and positions he did not bother to defend.

But he did show how a prepared, reasonable Republican with experience in government could chop down the Obama-Clinton record. He ably attacked Clinton's support for partial birth abortion and dissected the flaws in the Iran deal. His performance is unlikely to make any difference in this race, but he certainly helped himself with the GOP base and made himself a credible candidate in the future. (At one point Pence defended creating safe zones in Syria, something at odds with Trump's hands-off stance toward Bashar al-Assad. He simply refused to answer Kaine's question as to whether he favored more nukes in the world. He also took a noticeably harder line on Russia than did Trump. ) He was perhaps most effective in reminding the audience that it was Clinton's reset policy that presaged Putin's invasion of Ukraine, and in explaining the inherent conflict in the Clinton Foundation accepting foreign government's money while she was secretary of state.

Kaine tried to play the attack dog but came away looking like a yippy terrier. He threw out enough zingers that Pence declined to defend to highlight that Pence's biggest problem is not Kaine but Trump. Kaine was far more effective in explaining the role of faith in his life and the need to enforce the death penalty as governor even though it conflicted with his Catholic faith.

Ironically, Kaine made Clinton look better -- stronger, calmer -- by comparison to her VP pick. Pence made Trump look worse by comparison to his VP selection. Trump is more ignorant, erratic, boorish and unethical than Pence -- by a mile. Pence very likely could have beaten Clinton -- if Trump were not on the ticket.

As a debate, there was far too much interruption, off-track answers and stock responses with no follow-ups. Moderators in the next presidential debate will need to take a firmer hand.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**.@mike\_pence: "@realDonaldTrump and I are committed to suspending the Syrian refugee program." #VPDebate

This post has been updated with Pence's comments about Syrian refugees during Tuesday's vice presidential debate.

Before he was Donald Trump's vice-presidential pick, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence (R) took a politically popular, if legally questionable, stand: There would be no Syrian refugees resettled in his state, not after the attacks in Paris last fall carried out in part by Islamist terrorists who masqueraded as Syrian migrants.

On the day before the vice-presidential debate, his biggest moment as Trump's running mate, Pence's stand on Syrian refugees received a likely fatal blow: A federal appeals court ruled Monday that Pence has no legal authority to stop the resettlement of these refugees in Indiana.

In fact, the three-judge panel — all Republican appointees — said Pence's directive preventing money from going toward resettling Syrian refugees amounted to "discrimination" and was based on "nightmare speculation."

In Tuesday's vice presidential debate, Pence defended the program, but didn't directly address the court ruling:

.@mike\_pence: "@realDonaldTrump and I are committed to suspending the Syrian refugee program." #VPDebate

Pence says America needs to "exercise strong leadership" to protect Syrian civilians. Doesn't explain what that means in any detail.

In the past, Pence has said that preventing Syrians from resettling in the state is a safety issue, given that screening from war-torn countries is difficult. But the court definitely did not see it that way. Here's a key passage from its ruling (which you can read in full here):

He argues that his policy of excluding Syrian refugees is based not on nationality and thus is not discriminatory, but is based solely on the threat he thinks they pose to the safety of residents of Indiana. But that's the equivalent of his saying (not that he does say) that he wants to forbid black people to settle in Indiana not because they're black but because he's afraid of them, and since race is therefore not his motive he isn't discriminating. But that of course would be racial discrimination, just as his targeting Syrian refugees is discrimination on the basis of nationality.

The court went on to say:

The governor of Indiana believes, though without evidence, that some of these persons were sent to Syria by ISIS to engage in terrorism and now wish to infiltrate the United States in order to commit terrorist acts here. No evidence of this belief has been presented, however; it is nightmare speculation.

In short, the legality of Pence's decision to block Syrian refugees from Indiana wasn't a close call for the judicial branch: It's not legal.

In an added dose of embarrassment for Pence, one of the judges who ruled against him Monday is on Trump's Supreme Court shortlist. Judge Diane Sykes is someone the GOP presidential nominee has said might be a conservative "just like Justice Scalia," the late justice whose seat remains unfilled. Sykes made Trump's list of 11 possible choices he made public in May (it has since nearly doubled).

Pence's Syrian refugee saga started last spring, when he joined about 30 other governors, almost all of them Republican, in trying to keep out of their states the estimated 10,000 Syrian refugees President Obama wanted to resettle.

Refugee resettlement and legal experts immediately questioned the viability of the governors' stance: Federal law says the president, not governors, has the power to decide which refugees come into the country and how many.

And while many of those governors' promises to keep Syrian refugees out — in some cases, "even 5-year-old orphans" — fizzled, Pence's directive stayed in the spotlight. The American Civil Liberties Union and a private refugee resettlement group in the state, Exodus Refugee **Immigration**, sued Pence. Pence's team was forced to try to defend his directive, and the lawsuit made Indiana a test case in the debate over Syrian refugees.

The intrigue over his legal showdown heightened when Trump picked Pence as his running mate in July. Trump has called for a temporary ban on Muslims and/or people from countries with a history of terrorism. A few days after accepting Trump's offer, Pence used his decision to block Syrian refugees on CBS's "60 Minutes" as a talking point for the campaign's get-tough-on-terrorism message.

"We have no higher priority than the safety and security of the people of this country," he told CBS's Lesley Stahl.

But in August, The Washington Post's Katie Zezima traveled to Indianapolis and found that despite Pence's ban, 140 Syrian refugees had since resettled in the state, with more on the way.

"You can't pick and choose who comes to your state," Cole Varga, executive director of Exodus Refugee **Immigration**, told Zezima.

Apparently the courts agree.

Monday's circuit court ruling affirmed a lower court's ruling. If Pence wanted to appeal the decision, he'd have to appeal to the Supreme Court. Precedent suggests that the court would be unlikely to pick this case up, given that there has been no disagreement among the lower courts.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The two vice-presidential candidates got into a bitter exchange about an excerpt from the speech that launched Donald Trump's presidential campaign, in which Trump said that undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico were "rapists" and "bringing crime."

"He's not a polished politician, like you and Hillary Clinton," said Gov. Mike Pence (Ind.), Trump's running mate, in the only vice-presidential debate of the season.

"He is showing you who is he is," said Sen. Tim Kaine (Va.) a few moments later, saying that Trump's comments about Mexicans showed his true character.

"Senator, you whipped out that Mexican thing again," Pence said. It was, indeed, one of several times that Kaine had brought up that remark – a calculated effort, playing to Hispanic voters.

"Can you defend it?" Kaine interrupted.

"Look, there are criminal aliens in this country," Pence said, essentially repeating Trump's argument that crime brought by **immigrants** justified a strong, blunt statement about **immigrants** as a whole.

Kaine pressed him further, interrupting as he had all Tuesday night.

"He also said, 'And many of them are good people,' and you keep leaving that out of your quote," Pence said.

This had been the full quote from Trump: "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people."

The year's only vice-presidential debate was an unexpectedly contentious affair, in which Kaine tried — too aggressively at times — to make Pence defend the unorthodox views of his running mate. Pence seemed far more confident, but he was often reduced to accusing Kaine of lying about what Trump had said.

Before that exchange about Trump and Mexicans, the two running mates had traded attacks about the charitable foundations run by Clinton and Trump.

Pence accused Clinton and her husband, former president Bill Clinton, of designing their Clinton Foundation as a way to skirt laws against foreign governments making political contributions.

"While she was secretary of state, the Clinton foundation accepted tens of millions of dollars from foreign governments, and foreign donors," he said. "The Clintons figured out a way" around the laws, Pence said, while accusing Clinton of showing favoritism toward foundation donors while she was secretary of state.

Kaine sought to defend the Clinton Foundation by saying that it had done valuable charitable work around the world — and that Clinton herself had been cleared of any wrongdoing by a State Department inquiry.

Kaine, in turn, attacked Trump's charity — the Donald J. Trump Foundation — for giving a prohibited political gift in 2013, when it sent $25,000 to a campaign committee supporting Florida Attorney General Pam Bondi (R). The Trump Foundation then filed paperwork with the IRS that omitted any mention of that gift, and in its place listed a nonexistent gift to a different group with a similar name.

"The foundation was just fined for illegally contributing foundation dollars to a political campaign," Kaine said. "They tried to hide it by disguising it as somebody else."

Earlier Pence attacked Russian president Vladimir Putin as a "small and bullying leader" — a sharp break from Trump's own attitude toward Putin, which has been warm and conciliatory.

"The small and bullying leader of Russia is not dictating terms to the United States," Pence said. "We have got to be able to lean into this with strong, broad-shouldered American leadership."

Pence went on to call for U.S. military strikes against a key Russian military ally, the regime of Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad, if Assad's regime threatened to move against a besieged rebel enclave around Aleppo, Syria.

"The provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength," Pence said. "The United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike military targets of the Assad regime."

Kaine raised the issue of Trump's praise for Putin.

"If you don't know the difference between dictatorship and leadership, then you've got to go back to a 5th-grade civics class," Kaine said.

After its first hour, the debate between Kaine and Pence was defined by frequent interruptions by Kaine, and — from Pence — a calm, confident disdain, and a constant struggle to reconcile his positions with those of Trump himself. Earlier in the evening, Pence seemed to back away from a key piece of Trump's policy agenda during the Republican primaries, a plan to deport undocumented **immigrants** en masse.

"In all six cases, he's refused to defend his running mate…and yet, he's asking everybody to vote for somebody that he cannot defend," Kaine said at one point.

On **immigration**, Pence, instead, said that Trump would focus first on ending illegal **immigration** and deporting "criminal aliens."

"Once we have accomplished all of that…Then we'll deal with those that remain," Pence said, while giving no more details. Trump said repeatedly during the GOP primary that he wanted to immediately deport 11 million **immigrants** already in the United States.

Kaine tried to tie Pence to Trump's past statements, saying that "Donald Trump believes in deportation nation. You've got to pick your choice."

"That's nonsense," Kaine said. "It's nonsense."

Moderator Elaine Quijano pressed Pence to say if he would follow through on Trump's previous mass-deportation plan. Pence did not answer directly. Instead, he said he would seek to work with Democrats to work on an undisclosed answer: "Senator, I'll work with you when you go back to the Senate," he said to Kaine.

While Pence seemed to pivot on Trump's **immigration** priorities, he stuck with Trump's stance on taxes. Pence did not challenge the notion that his running mate had not paid federal income taxes — saying that Trump had used the tax code "brilliantly."

Pence was asked about a New York Times report, which relied on leaked pages from Trump's 1995 tax returns, which showed that Trump had claimed a $916 million loss — and might have been able to avoid federal income taxes for up to 18 years. Pence did not make any claim that Trump had paid federal income taxes.

"His tax returns showed he went through a very difficult time, but he used the tax code the way it was meant to be used, and he used it brilliantly," Pence said. "Donald Trump has created tens of thousands of jobs, and he's paid payroll taxes, property taxes…."

Kaine of Virginia challenged Pence to say why Trump had not released his tax returns, as other nominees have for 40 years. Pence repeated what Trump has said — that he would release the tax returns, but only when an IRS audit is over. The IRS has said that there is no legal prohibition on releasing taxes while they are under audit.

The two candidates spent the debate's first half-hour using sharply different strategies: Kaine was aggressive, interrupting and hurling pre-rehearsed insults at Pence. Pence was calmer, counter-punching with an edge of disdain for Kaine's tactics.

"People at home cannot understand either one of you when you speak over each other," moderator Quijano said at one point, frustrated that the two men would not let one another talk.

Earlier, Kaine opened the debate by saying he was "scared" of the prospect that the GOP nominee would become president, while his son is serving in the Marine Corps.

"We trust Hillary Clinton as president and commander-in-chief," Kaine said, speaking of himself and his wife. "The thought of Donald Trump as commander-in-chief scares us to death."

Kaine began the debate, held in Farmville, Va., on the attack. He turned two of the first answers from questions about himself or Clinton into attacks on Trump.

"I can't imagine how Gov. Pence can defend the insult-driven, selfish, me-first style of Donald Trump," Kaine said.

The debate, which pitted two nominees with vanilla reputations, turned quickly bitter, with both Kaine and Pence interrupting each other.

"Senator, you and Hillary Clinton would know a lot about an insult-driven campaign. It really is remarkable," Pence said.

After being interrupted by Kaine again, Pence responded in a flat tone that belied the bitter tone of the debate. "I musta hit a nerve here,"he said.

"You are Donald Trump's apprentice," Kaine said at one point, implying that the famously genial Pence had taken on Trump's aggressive persona.

It seemed clear that Kaine had come armed with pre-planned zingers that mocked Trump, with varying degrees of zing.

"Do you want a 'You're hired' president under Hillary Clinton, or do you want a 'You're fired' president, under Donald Trump," Kaine said.

Pence mocked that: "You used that a lot, and I think your running mate used a lot of pre-planned lines."

The debate began a few minutes after 9 p.m. at Longwood University. The debate came at a moment when the Democratic ticket, led by Clinton, seems to be pulling away and at a troubling time for Trump.

He is reeling from a tumultuous performance in his first debate with Clinton last week, his attacks on a Latina beauty queen, his hostile 3 a.m. outbursts on social media and new revelations about his taxes.

Trump spent Tuesday morning in Denver, where he met privately with energy company executives. He then traveled to Arizona for an afternoon rally in Prescott Valley. Trump sent his "best wishes" to Pence ahead of the debate and said the evening contest will be "a contrast" between "our campaign of big ideas and solutions" and the "small and petty Clinton campaign that is totally stuck in the past."

Trump was watching the debate while out west and was live tweeting his reactions.

Historically, voters have tuned into vice-presidential debates to see whether the candidates — Sarah Palin, Dan Quayle and John Edwards, to name a few — appear prepared for the presidency should the need arise.

But Pence and Kaine seem to have met the governing threshold already with their seasoned tenures in elected federal and state offices. On the Republican ticket, for instance, Pence is more qualified for the presidency by traditional standards than Trump.

Clinton said at a press conference in Harrisburg, Pa., on Tuesday that she had not spoken to Kaine that day but the two have emailed and plan to talk when the debate is over.

"I know how intense it is to prepare for a debate," Clinton said. "I don't want to interrupt his rhythm by calling."

Clinton said Kaine is "ready to go toe to toe with Mike Pence on all the issues that matter to Americans" and that Pence "has a huge burden defending his own record and the record of Donald Trump."

The debate's setting in Farmville — which was chosen long before Clinton and Trump picked their running mates — gives the former Virginia governor a home-field advantage. Farmville was the epicenter of Virginia's civil rights struggle, a point of resonance for Kaine, a former civil rights lawyer and the son-in-law of former governor Linwood Holton, who helped integrate Richmond's schools in the 1970s. The state's emergence from its segregationist past as a diverse economic powerhouse may give Kaine a dramatic backdrop against which to criticize Trump's nationalist agenda and racially charged statements.

Tuesday will be the first face-to-face meeting for Kaine and Pence. When Kaine served as Virginia's governor, Pence was working on Capitol Hill as a congressman. They switched places in 2013, with Pence becoming Indiana's governor and Kaine joining the Senate.

"We talked by phone once, but I never met him," Kaine said in a recent interview. "He called and said, 'Hey, welcome aboard.' He had been on the ticket a week before me."

Both No. 2's have their future careers to consider during their turn Tuesday before what could be a national television audience of tens of millions. Pence, 57, has an eye on a possible 2020 presidential run, should Trump lose, while Kaine, 58, also has national ambitions four or eight years from now.

robert.costa@washpost.com
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Philip Rucker, Abby Phillip, Sean Sullivan and John Wagner contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. — For months now, CNN has engaged in a pathetic search for the perfect person to speak on behalf of Donald Trump during its quite-frequent panel discussions on the 2016 presidential race.

It hired Jeffrey Lord, a political director in the Reagan White House. Only Lord has a knack of making wacko references to slavery and FDR. It hired Kayleigh McEnany, a Harvard Law School graduate and pundit. Only McEnany has trouble acknowledging that the sky is blue. It hired Corey Lewandowski, a former Trump campaign manager who was fired from his post. Only Lewandowski is incapable of — and perhaps contractually prohibited from — ever straying from official talking points. It routinely invites national campaign spokeswoman Katrina Pierson to defend Trump positions. Only Pierson once said, "He hasn't changed his position on **immigration**, he's changed the words that he is saying."

Mike Pence laps all of these folks. He's the governor of Indiana, and tonight at the vice-presidential debate here at Longwood University he showed why he's just the guy to suit up and blab away on the 2016 presidential race with an ever-expanding group of news professionals at CNN. Moderated by Elaine Quijano of CBSN and CBS News, the debate was about 15 white papers more substantive than last week's presidential debate last week at Hofstra University. That's what happens when you subtract the Donald Trump factor.

In any case, Pence makes for an attractive CNN hire. He can defend and advocate for Trump's positions on foreign policy, social issues, **immigration** and the economy. Further, he possesses expert deflection skills, as he saved himself from having to directly defend Trump's laundry list of offensive and outrageous comments about Muslims, Mexicans, John McCain and many, many other topics. Check out how he responded to Tim Kaine's contention that the Trump-Pence ticket is engaging in the politics of insult: "Senator, you and Hillary Clinton would know a lot about an insult-driven campaign. It really is remarkable. At a time when, literally, in the wake of Hillary Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, where she was the architect of the Obama administration's foreign policy, we see entire portions of the world, particularly the wider Middle East, literally spinning out of control."

The debate's format lent itself to interruptions, eruptions and Quijano's repeated attempts to get both fellows to shut up; there's no telling whether Quijano's practice sessions — featuring CBS News veterans Bob Schieffer and Bill Plante as the vice presidential stand-ins, according to CBS News sources — seasoned her for the ferocity of these two rhetorical gladiators. What we do know is that Pence tonight honed his expertise in dealing with crosstalk, a central element of cable news.

The guy's unflappable, too, as possible future colleague CNN political analyst Gloria Borger noted in the post-debate chatter: "It's easier to get under Donald Trump's skin than it is to get under Mike Pence's skin," she said.

So what's stopping CNN from making this move? Well, Pence is the sitting Indiana governor and the Republican vice-presidential nominee, you might say. But why would that matter? After all, CNN hired Lewandowski despite his confidentiality strictures, his prolonged severance payments from the Trump campaign, and strong evidence that Lewandowski has returned to the nerve center of the Trump campaign. So why not?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The head of the Catholic diocese in Raleigh, N.C., has been tapped by Pope Francis to lead the Diocese of Arlington, a center of theologically and politically conservative Catholicism that spans 21 counties in Northern Virginia.

Bishop Michael Burbidge, 59, is replacing Bishop Paul Loverde, who is retiring after 17 years in the role. During his tenure, Lo­ver­de's challenge was to keep the many conservatives among his 600,000-member flock satisfied while not alienating more-liberal parishioners.

The diocese — which counted Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia a member until his death earlier this year — required Catholic schoolteachers to sign "fidelity oaths" submitting to church teachings as part of a larger churchwide push to revive orthodoxy, a move that sharply divided Catholics. It was also the second to the last in the nation to accept altar girls.

Burbidge, who was born and raised in the Philadelphia area, is a cautious conservative with a Pope Francis-like pastoral touch and a desire to bridge divides, according to some observers of the Catholic Church.

Earlier this year, he published a statement distancing himself from the North Carolina Catholic conference's support of the state law restricting transgender people from using restrooms of their preferred gender. Instead, Burbidge urged "another remedy."

"The bottom line was no one should feel unwelcome," said Rocco Palmo, a Philadelphia-based writer who blogs on the inner workings of the Catholic Church. "That was very striking. That was not the governor's line. Burbidge's conservatism is cautious by nature."

Burbidge's move reflects the growing influence of Cardinal Donald Wuerl of the Archdiocese of Washington, who has emerged as a leading force in reshaping the hierarchy of the U.S. church to better align with Francis's call for bishops to dispense mercy and not to "take refuge in rigidity" or launch "vain crusades."

In Raleigh, Burbidge had a reputation as a pastoral administrator who enjoyed spending time with church members and traveling to events such as Catholic school opening Masses and antiabortion prayer vigils. The Diocese of Raleigh stretches over 32,000 square miles, from the center of the state to the Outer Banks. The Diocese of Arlington, while populous, is only a fifth that size.

The Rev. Michael Clay, associate dean for seminary and ministerial studies at Catholic University, served as a priest in the Diocese of Raleigh under Burbidge. Clay said he expects the extroverted Burbidge to be highly engaged with people.

"He has boundless energy," he said. "He's not the kind of person who would be sitting behind a desk."

When he arrived in Raleigh, Burbidge did not know how to speak Spanish, but he worked with a tutor every week to learn the language and now can celebrate Mass in Spanish, Clay said.

Burbidge spent much time with North Carolina's prominent Hispanic community, which is heavily Catholic. The Arlington diocese also has a growing Hispanic population, and Catholic Charities there is the largest nongovernmental provider of services for **immigrants** and refugees.

Before his appointment in Raleigh, Burbidge served as the rector of Philadelphia's St. Charles Borromeo Seminary and was named an auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese by Pope John Paul II in 2002.

Burbidge was popular during his time in Philadelphia, Palmo said — so much so that he would sometimes go incognito to the Jersey Shore with his family, wearing a hat and sunglasses so he could have time away.

Burbidge said he plans to continue some of the priorities of his predecessor, focusing on evangelization, charitable outreach, service and bridging political, cultural and other divides.

"What unites us are not the political issues," he said. "You could one day be in a parish that's more traditional. The next day, you're in a parish that's more vibrant in its praise or worship. The church has room for all of that."

A sports fan, Burbidge wakes up at 5 a.m. most days and spend the first part of his day exercising on either the elliptical, rowing machine or bike in his garage. He is a lifelong Eagles fan whose father had season tickets.

"I'll be rooting for the Nationals, but I can't give up my allegiance to the Eagles yet," he said. "This is dangerous territory to say this, isn't it?"

Loverde said he will retire in Annandale and continue to help Burbidge in the diocese.

Part of Loverde's legacy was managing to engage more liberal Catholics without alienating conservative ones, said Brian Doyle, chairman of the theology/religious studies department at Marymount University, which is in the Arlington diocese. And Doyle is hopeful that Burbidge, who has mostly avoided high-profile involvement in the culture wars, can do something similar.

"Someone who's been in Philly and Raleigh is going to have a good handle on a mixture of Southern heritage and cosmopolitan character," Doyle said.

He notes that the long-term impact of Pope Francis's tenure will hinge on who he appoints and elevates within the church hierarchy.

"My hope is Burbidge will be able to walk the line between pastoring all the people in his diocese," Doyle said. "Bishops like to make names for themselves. He does not seem to be one of them, and I think Francis likes that."

sarah.bailey@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The co-author of Donald Trump's best-selling "The Art of the Deal" -- who has become one of Trump's most outspoken critics during this presidential campaign — said Tuesday that he would give away the $55,000 in royalties he's made off the book over the past six months.

Tony Schwartz said that he'd given the money to the National **Immigration** Law Center, which helps low-income **immigrants** and advocates for policies that would allow more undocumented **immigrants** to remain in the United States legally. Schwartz said the law center would work together with four other civil rights groups, including MPower Change — which advocates for Muslim Americans.

In recent weeks, Schwartz has said that he regrets his role in building Trump's persona as a wise and clever business executive. A recent story in the New Yorker quoted Schwartz as saying, "I feel a deep sense of remorse that I contributed to presenting Trump in a way that brought him wider attention and made him more appealing than he is." In particular, Schwartz has said he fears Trump would be mercurial and easily distracted as president and that he believes Trump has demonized Hispanic **immigrants** and Muslims for political gain.

In an interview with The Washington Post this week, Schwartz said that his royalty checks for "The Art of the Deal" had increased since Trump began his presidential run. But, he said, the royalties "suddenly became, for me, blood money."

"I didn't want to be anywhere near it," Schwartz said. "It just feels wrong."

Earlier, Schwartz had donated the $25,000 he'd received in royalties for the second half of 2015. That money had gone to the National **Immigration** Law Center, Human Rights Watch, the Center for Victims of Torture, the National **Immigration** Forum, and the Tahirih Justice Center, which helps **immigrant**women and children.

Schwartz said that, with Tuesday's $55,000 donation (actually $54,632.16, after he paid his agent), he wanted to help groups that he believed Trump had attacked.

Trump himself promised, back in the 1980s, that he would donate his own proceeds from "The Art of the Deal" to charity. For a time, it appears, he did — funneling hundreds of thousands of dollars into his Donald J. Trump Foundation, which then gave the money away to charities.

But now, tax records show no donations at all from Trump to the Trump Foundation since 2008. The Post has searched for evidence that Trump might be giving gifts directly from his own pocket, but has found little evidence of that in recent years: Between 2008 and this May, The Post's search turned up just one gift, worth less than $10,000.

Schwartz said that he and Trump split the book's royalties evenly: If he made $55,000 in the past six months, Trump did, too. The Post asked Trump's campaign whether Trump had donated this money to charity, in keeping with that promise from the 1980s. The Trump campaign did not immediately respond.

This post has been corrected. Schwartz initially said the law center would share his donation with four other civil rights groups.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Perhaps because so much of what we see in presidential campaigns is so trivial and absurd, we find ourselves asking again and again whether one or another event or development will "matter." The question inevitably comes up when looking forward to tonight's debate between Tim Kaine and Mike Pence, particularly since vice-presidential debates ordinarily don't matter all that much.

But even though this campaign features an unusually vivid pair of personalities at the top of the tickets, tonight's debate could matter a great deal, in two important ways.

The first way a debate can matter is if it has a meaningful impact on who eventually wins. The reality, however, is that running mates almost never have a measurable effect on the ultimate outcome of the race, and in those rare cases when they do, it's both small and negative. The right VP candidate can't gain the ticket many votes, but the wrong one can cost it a few. The two cases political scientists have identified where a running mate made a difference were Dan Quayle and Sarah Palin, each of whom lowered their ticket's vote totals somewhat — though not enough to change the outcome.

While the 2016 race certainly doesn't hinge on tonight's debate (unless something truly spectacular happens), it does come at a critical moment. After the first debate went so poorly for Donald Trump, and was then followed by a truly epic week of bumbles and damaging revelations (so much so that some are now calling it the worst week any candidate in political history has experienced), Hillary Clinton moved back into a relatively solid national lead of about six points, after Trump had nearly pulled even with her in some polls. That means that what Trump needs now is something to change the race.

While we don't know what kind of questions moderator Elaine Quijano will ask or what kind of criticisms Kaine will lob, there's a strong chance that Pence will have to spend a good deal of time defending his boss. As Philip Rucker and Robert Costa put it last night, "Trump's incendiary statements and erratic behavior, especially over the past week, have formed a hurricane at the center of the Republican campaign. Pence could be forced again and again to account for Trump's actions."

If that ends up being the case, it will be bad for Republicans almost no matter what. While it's theoretically possible that Pence could devise a defense of Trump for attacking a former Miss America for gaining weight or saying that not paying taxes "makes me smart" that is so eloquent and persuasive that it changes all Americans' minds on those topics, that isn't particularly likely. What's more likely is that he simply repeats the Trump campaign's weak defenses on those controversies, and tens of millions of Americans are reminded again of the noxious bilge that keeps pouring out of Trump's mouth. The very fact of having that discussion before a huge audience will reinforce everything the Clinton campaign is saying about Trump being an erratic, impulsive con artist who shouldn't be allowed within a mile of the White House.

So the VP debate will matter if it merely keeps the race moving on its current current trend, because there are only a few opportunities the Trump campaign will have in these last five weeks to change the trajectory of the race. The second way it will matter is if the debate allows for a meaningful, substantive discussion of what separates the two parties.

Sounds crazy, I know. But though it's easy to forget in a presidential campaign that is so dominated by personality, we're facing a choice between two radically different paths for the country. Since Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton won't be there, this debate could be an opportunity to explore those two paths, so that the public can get a deeper understanding of where we're going to go from here.

The unfortunate fact is that most Americans don't actually have a firm handle on the differences between Democrats and Republicans, even in our polarized age. And right now those differences are as stark as they have ever been. Republicans have been moving to the right for some time, and Democrats have been moving left in recent years as well (though not as quickly). Paul Ryan and Mitch McConnell stand ready to deliver to President Trump's desk an absolute tsunami of conservative legislation that would unwind not just the Obama years but in some ways the last few decades of American political and social progress, while Hillary Clinton — who used to be associated with her party's centrist wing — is running on the most liberal Democratic platform in decades.

So on one side you have a party that wants to outlaw abortion, cut taxes for the wealthy, scale back the social safety net, do nothing about climate change and promote the use of the dirtiest fossil fuels, resume the use of torture, loosen gun laws, repeal the Affordable Care Act, increase military spending, and reduce regulations on Wall Street, and keep undocumented **immigrants** subject to deportation. On the other side you have a party that wants to strengthen abortion rights, increase taxes for the wealthy, enhance the social safety net, take aggressive measures to combat climate change, pass universal background checks and other gun safety measures, increase the minimum wage, create greater worker protections, regulate Wall Street more closely, and provide a path to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants**. Among other things.

Without Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump on the stage, the vice presidential debate could be the best opportunity Americans have to watch those two agendas being debated and discussed for an hour and a half.

We could also get from Kaine and Pence some sense of how the administration each wants to help create would actually function. What effect would Trump's disinterest in policy have on his administration? How would Pence move into that vacuum, and what would his priorities be? What would Clinton and Kaine do if they're faced with a Republican Congress that has no interest in passing any bills they advocate? How does each view the limits on presidential power, which is bound to be a key determinant of how the executive and legislative branches interact in the coming years?

We might get insight into all those questions. Or we might just worry about whether anybody committed any "gaffes." But even if they don't, we shouldn't rush to say that the debate didn't matter.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This item has been updated.

One of the nation's largest Latino civic groups claims that it has helped register more than 100,000 new voters, a key milestone announced as voter registration deadlines are nearing in several states.

Voto Latino, a nonpartisan, mostly online-based voter registration group, says it helped compile 101,720 new voter registrations between November 2015 and last weekend, topping registration rates from previous presidential election years. In the past few weeks, the group says it has been assisting more than 5,000 people register per day, exceeding a 3,000-per day goal.

Voto Latino's figures are impossible to independently verify — and don't necessarily mean that the group has helped register more than 100,000 new Hispanic voters. Tracking a voter's ethnicity won't be possible until voter files can be reviewed after November's election. There is also no national way to track how many voters are registering ahead of November's elections, but several nonpartisan civic groups that focus on registering Latino voters, including National Council of La Raza and Mi Familia Vota, have reported in recent days modest increases in signups compared to four years ago.

Voto Latino uses its website and a network of hundreds of partners across the country — including independent bloggers, Hollywood actors, the Spotify music-streaming service and popular Spanish-language rock bands — to encourage Hispanics to vote, primarily by using its VoterPal app.

The group's top four states for registrations were Texas (20,483 new voters), California (13,394), Florida (10,565) and North Carolina (6,297). Just 2 percent of the Tar Heel State's registered voters are Hispanic, roughly 135,000 out of more than 6.4 million as of February, according to the nonpartisan Pew Research Center.

While small, the North Carolina numbers are notable, because it trumped states with larger Latino populations, including Arizona, Colorado and Nevada, where Latino political activism is more pronounced. The uptick in North Carolina is partly because of an increased rate of Internet searches for voter registration information, the group said. Democrats have focused this year on registering small, but growing percentages of Latinos in several states, including North Carolina, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Iowa and Wisconsin, believing that they could make the difference in close races, especially in the presidential race.

But increased registration rates don't guarantee turnout: Historically, Hispanics show up to vote in lower numbers than other groups.

The reported uptick comes as these civic groups are scrambling to register historic numbers of Latinos in what promises to be one of the most consequential election for Hispanics in modern American history. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, with his incendiary comments about illegal **immigrants**from Mexico, has sparked widespread furor, concern and awareness among Latinos ever since launching his campaign last year — emotions that Latino leaders know must be met with evidence of increased participation to prove that Trump's theories and pronouncements were soundly rejected by the nation's largest minority group.

Voto Latino claims it has reached the 100,000 threshold faster than any other national organization working on registering Latinos — a claim that appears to be true. And it comes at a time when several groups are suffering from significant funding shortfalls. Large philanthropic organizations and progressive groups that have historically funded voter registration or "get out the vote" projects backed off this year or gave considerably less than in the past. This has especially affected Mi Familia Vota and the National Council of La Raza.

Maria Teresa Kumar, Voto Latino president and chief executive, said her group has raised $1.5 million for registration programs this year, below what the group has raised for previous cycles.

"We're trying to do more with less, but it's incredibly challenging," she said, noting that the group's focus on registering new voters through the Internet helps keep overall costs low.

Kumar said in a separate statement that she believes registrations spiked in the past few weeks not because of Trump but based on the group's understanding of Latino voting behaviors developed over its several years of tracking registration patterns.

"This is not simply a reaction to any candidate — but, in fact, Voto Latino has been able to predict when the interest would uptick and when to turn on different social strategies based on our research," she said in her statement.

Across the country, activists, lawmakers and political consultants have said that Hispanics are flooding into citizenship workshops and congressional offices and jamming hotlines on how to become U.S. citizens or register to vote. Many said they are primarily motivated by the rise of Trump, who has proposed deporting 11 million undocumented **immigrants** and building a wall on the U.S.-Mexico border.

This year, amid the funding shortfall and the unique nature of Trump's anti-**immigrant** message, all sorts of groups are trying new, creative ways to reach potential voters. Kumar's group has partnered with the Mexican rock band Mana, among other artists, while the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is encouraging taco truck owners to provide voter registration forms to customers. The group did so after a Trump supporter warned on national television that a failure to stop Latinos and their "dominant culture" would mean "you're going to have taco trucks on every corner."

Earlier this year, California officials reported that the number of Hispanics registering to vote had doubled in the first three months of this year compared with the same period in 2012. In Texas, naturalization ceremonies in the Houston area swelled earlier this year to about 2,200 per month, compared with 1,200 before, according to an analysis by the Houston Chronicle.

A recent Pew analysis compared the number of citizenship applications filed during the first nine months of fiscal 2016 (October 2015-June 2016) with the same period in fiscal 2015 and found a 26 percent spike in citizenship applications. The 718,430 citizenship applications filed by legal permanent residents this fiscal year is an 8 percent jump over the same period in 2012, Pew said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

In response to revelations that Donald Trump may have rolled over massive business losses to avoid paying federal taxes for nearly two decades, his campaign is pushing back with an argument that is not only deeply ludicrous, but also deeply revealing about both Trump's own priorities and his campaign strategy in the final stretch of the race.

The New York Times reported over the weekend that Trump declared a $916 million loss in 1995, which could have then allowed him to exploit an arcane provision in the tax code to cancel out taxable income for as long as 18 years. Though it hasn't been confirmed that he took advantage of the provision that way, Trump, who boasted during the debate that not paying federal taxes "makes me smart," did not deny that he had done this. Instead, he and his campaign made two other separate but interrelated arguments.

The first is that Trump's exploitation of this provision, well, "makes me smart." Trump's initial statement declared that he is a "highly-skilled businessman" who has a responsibility "to pay no more tax than legally required." Similar arguments tumbled forth from Trump surrogates Rudy Giuliani on ABC's This Week and Chris Christie on Fox News Sunday, who both extolled Trump's awesome fiscal wizardry. But as Ruth Marcus notes, if Trump's tax manipulation proves Trump's brilliance, why the continued refusal to release his returns, which is tantamount to concealing evidence of that brilliance from the public?

The second, and more significant, argument from Trump's campaign is that his firsthand inside knowledge of how to game the tax code in his favor uniquely qualifies him to reform it -- and prevent people like him from gaming it in the future. "I know our complex tax laws better than anyone who has ever run for president and am the only one who can fix them," Trump tweeted. Christie added that Trump is well equipped to "change the tax laws" that are "favoring people that they shouldn't favor," which he would do "against his own personal interests."

But there's a small problem with this whole argument. It's undermined by Trump's own tax plan. Thanks to that plan, we already know what Trump's actual priorities are for "fixing" the tax code.

First of all, as Allan Sloan points out, Trump's tax plan would not close the very same loophole that may have allowed him to avoid paying taxes for many years. (It would eliminate a loophole for hedge funders, but Sloan notes it's unlikely Trump would benefit from that.) What's more, Trump's tax plan would deliver far and away its largest windfalls to the highest earners, including those in the top 0.1 percent.

Here's another key point: Trump's plan would also repeal the estate tax, which would allow a tiny minority of the very wealthiest individuals and families to shield assets from taxation. A recent Third Way analysis concluded that Trump's family would be among the families to benefit, to the tune of $7 billion. Why would anyone believe Trump would fix the tax code to prevent such assets from being shielded in the future?

Trump, of course, argues that these tax cuts would unleash spectacular growth that would shower everyone with riches. But the point is that, even allowing for this argument, it is still true that the immediate priorities in his tax plan are to dramatically reduce the tax burden on people like himself. There is simply no reason to believe, as Christie puts it, that Trump would "fix" the tax laws to prevent them from "favoring people that they shouldn't favor…against his own personal interests."

Making this even more absurd, we've already seen this same trick from Trump in the past. During the GOP primaries, he repeatedly hinted that he'd require the wealthy to pay more, in order to burnish his "populism." His actual plan ended up doing the opposite. Again, even if Trump sincerely believes his plan would ultimately benefit everyone, it is a matter of simple fact that it more dramatically favors people like him in the short term. His public position is that this is good policy. If you also want to believe that this is good policy, go ahead, but it simply does not entail "fixing" the tax code to expose people like himself to a higher tax burden. In fact, when Allan Sloan asked Trump aides for evidence that he or his family would lose out from his own tax plan, they declined to respond.

In response to these revelations, you hear it argued that voters won't care about them, because they sympathize with the goal of lowering one's personal tax burden. But this is to elide the deeper political meaning of these revelations. Hillary Clinton's campaign is arguing that Trump's business conduct, writ large, shows that he doesn't really care about anyone but himself. I'd say it's likely that swing voters see these revelations as more evidence of this.

It's true that during the GOP primaries, Trump openly boasted of paying little in taxes, arguing that the government would waste it anyway, and that this probably only helped him. Trump is once again betting that an argument that worked in the primaries will also work with the broader general election audience. But it's not surprising that such an argument worked on anti-tax, anti-government GOP voters, and it is unlikely that it will work with swing voters. Even if some of them do accept that any given individual should do everything possible to lower his or her tax burden, the added element here is that Trump won't release his returns, which could make it easier for Dems to sow further doubts about just how far Trump went in doing that. On top of that, majorities of Americans favor raising taxes on the wealthy -- which is to say, they want the opposite of Trump's plan.

Why would swing voters believe that Trump's creative efforts to reduce his own tax burden somehow show that he'd "fix" the tax code in a way they favor, or in a way that will later increase the tax burden people like himself? Hint: They won't.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

 \*WHY TRUMP MIGHT LOSE FLORIDA: The Wall Street Journal reports that some Republicans are worried by new polling that shows Clinton slightly ahead of Trump nationally among older voters, long a reliable GOP-leaning constituency. Note this:

In Florida, the nation's largest presidential battleground, one of every five residents is a senior citizen, the highest ratio in the country. A Mason-Dixon poll last week showed Mr. Trump ahead of Mrs. Clinton by six percentage points among voters 65 and older. Mr. Romney won them by 17 percentage points four years ago, and lost the state.

And of course, if Trump loses Florida, he loses the election.

\* WHY TRUMP MIGHT LOSE FLORIDA, CONTINUED: The New York Times looks at how Florida Latinos (once dominated by Cubans who are now being supplanted by new **immigrants** from Latin America) are edging into the Democratic column:

Ten years ago, Republicans had a registration edge among the state's Latinos — 37 percent were Republicans, 33 percent were Democrats and 28 percent independents, according to official figures. This year, the party lags among Latinos, with 26 percent registered as Republicans, 37 percent as Democrats and 35 percent as independents. And the independents increasingly lean Democratic, particularly among new **immigrants** and Puerto Ricans.

Don't look now, but FiveThirtyEight now has Clinton slightly favored in the state, and she leads by a hair in the polling averages.

 \* CLINTON LEADS IN VIRGINIA: A new Wason Center for Public Policy poll finds Clinton leading Trump among likely voters in Virginia by 42-35. Note this:

Millennial voters moved away from the Libertarian ticket and other third-party candidates and into Clinton's camp. Among voters ages 18-34 Clinton has increased her support from 34 percent to 42 percent.

With the Clinton campaign working hard to consolidate millennials behind her, this sort of movement is worth keeping an eye out for in other polls.

\* CLINTON LEADS IN A NEW NATIONAL POLL: A new Morning Consult poll finds Clinton leading among likely voters nationally by 42-36 in the four-way, and by 46-39 in the head-to-head match-up. The polling averages put Clinton up nationally by anywhere from 2.5 points to 4.7 points.

\* TRUMP'S CRAZY TWEETS REVEAL STAKES IN THIS ELECTION: E.J. Dionne looks at Trump's latest crazy tweetstorm (particularly his "sex tape" tweet about Alicia Machado) and concludes:

If this Trump episode does not lead to a flood of defections among Republican politicians supporting him, they will be on record as putting party loyalty (or fear of Trump's followers in GOP primaries) over the need to protect the nation from a truly unhinged leader. And this should be the end of the pretense, which sometimes drives the media, that whatever might be wrong with Trump, there are things equally wrong with Clinton.

Nothing will ever put an end to that pretense, except, perhaps, for the election.

\* DON'T LET REPUBLICANS OFF HOOK FOR TRUMP: Paul Krugman looks at the moral cowardice and/or corruption on display in Mitch McConnell's and Paul Ryan's continued support for Trump:

They know what kind of man they're dealing with — but they are spending this election pretending that we're having a serious discussion about policy, that a vote for Mr. Trump is simply a vote for lower marginal tax rates. And they should not be allowed to flush the fact of their Trump support down the memory hole when the election is behind us. This goes in particular for Mr. Ryan, who has received extraordinarily favorable press treatment….Every time he's held up as an example of seriousness, remember that when it mattered, he backed Donald Trump.

Yeah, good luck with that, Professor. All will promptly be forgotten.

\* QUOTE OF THE WEEKEND: Yesterday on This Week, after repeatedly calling Trump a "genius" for possibly using business losses of $916 million to pay no taxes for many years, Rudy Giuliani added:

"Don't you think a man who has this kind of economic genius is a lot better for the United States than a woman, and the only thing she's ever produced is a lot of work for the FBI checking out her e-mails."

Now, I think Rudy probably garbled this unintentionally, but man, what a raging buffoon this guy has become.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Supreme Court will not reconsider President Obama's plan to shield undocumented **immigrants** from deportation and denied the Washington Redskins' bid to get its trademark case on this term's docket.

With oral arguments postponed for a day because of the Rosh Hashanah Jewish holiday, the first Monday in October that marks the beginning of the new Supreme Court term became a day of rejection. The court issued a thick stack of cases that had accumulated over the summer that the justices decided not to hear.

Among the other losers: the NCAA, which had asked the court to review an appeals court ruling about its policies involving the amateur status of college football and basketball players. The issue remains alive in other court proceedings.

The administration's request was a long-shot bid to salvage what had been the biggest legal defeat of Obama's presidency. In June, a deadlocked court failed to revive his stalled plan to shield millions of undocumented **immigrants** from deportation and give them the right to work legally in the United States.

The justices' votes at the time were not announced, but the court's liberals and conservatives were split at oral argument last spring. The tie meant that a lower court's decision that Obama probably exceeded his powers in issuing the executive action kept the plan from being implemented.

The court's action affected about 4 million illegal **immigrants** estimated to be covered by Obama's plan, which would have deferred deportation for those who have been in the country since 2010, have not committed any serious crimes and have family ties to U.S. citizens or others lawfully in the country.

The Supreme Court rarely grants motions for rehearing. But the administration's lawyers made the request in hopes that by now the vacancy created by the death of Justice Antonin Scalia would be filled. Instead, Senate Republicans have blocked consideration of Obama's nominee to the court, appeals court judge Merrick Garland. They say the next president should fill the election-year opening.

The fate of the program now awaits the election. Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton has said she will revive and expand the program; Republican nominee Donald Trump has said he would end it for good.

Washington Redskins

The football team's request was something of a Hail Mary pass, as well. The club's decades-old registration of its iconic nickname was canceled by the U.S. Patent and Trade Office, which said it violated the ban on disparaging trademarks.

But the team has appealed that and a lower court's agreement to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit. The Supreme Court does not usually take up cases before proceedings in the lower court are completed.

The issue, though, will be covered in the court's term. The justices last week said it would consider the similar case of an Asian American rock band called the Slants, who were denied trademark registration.

A majority of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit said the law — which calls for the rejection of trademarks that "may disparage . . . persons, living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt, or disrepute" — violates the First Amendment's free-speech guarantee.

NCAA

The justices decided not to review an appeals court decision that gave both the NCAA and the former college athletes something to be unhappy about.

U.S. District Judge Claudia Wilken said the NCAA could not prevent universities from offering money to athletes beyond scholarships to cover the "full cost of attendance." She also said they should be able to provide them with $5,000 a year that they would receive after leaving college.

A divided panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit agreed on the full cost of attendance, but upheld the organization's ban on paying athletes. It said the NCAA's amateurism rules carried some benefits.

After the trial court ruled, the organization decided to let colleges pay the full cost of attendance.

The suit was filed by former UCLA basketball player Ed O'Bannon on behalf of himself and other former athletes.

Wisconsin probe

The court also declined to revive an investigation into alleged campaign finance improprieties in Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's 2012 battle against recall.

The justices decided not to review a Wisconsin Supreme Court decision that shut down the John Doe probe into whether Walker (R) illegally coordinated with outside conservative groups.

Walker defeated the recall effort and won reelection in 2014.

The questions in the case concerned whether Walker's campaign coordinated with the Wisconsin Club for Growth and other conservative groups on advertising during the 2012 recall without reporting the groups' contributions.

An investigation was conducted under the state's John Doe law that allowed secret probes into public misconduct by public officials. The judge halted the investigation, and conservative justices on the Wisconsin Supreme Court agreed. One of the challenges was whether those justices, who also received contributions from Club for Growth, should have recused themselves.

robert.barnes@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With Breanne Deppisch

THE BIG IDEA:

COLUMBUS, Ohio—Being a field organizer for Hillary Clinton at The Ohio State University means being rejected a lot.

Tyler Hoisington, 24, is one of four full-time, paid staffers focused on registering new voters on the campus of this battleground state's flagship university, which has 65,000 students. Over more than two hours yesterday, he knocked on every door on both sides of four city blocks, including a few multi-level apartment buildings. Despite his best efforts, he could not get a single person to either register to vote or sign a card committing to support the Democratic nominee for president.

It was a stark illustration of apathy and ambivalence five weeks before Election Day. Millennial voters, who were so instrumental in Barack Obama's victories, are lukewarm at best about Clinton, even four months after she vanquished Bernie Sanders.

Obama held his first rally of the 2012 reelection campaign here on the campus of OSU, drawing a crowd of 10,000 – mostly students. That thrill is gone.

Two African American females were smoking cigarettes on their front porch when Hoisington asked if they were registered. "I keep that kind of thing to myself," one said coldly, turning away to continue her conversation.

Two guys down the street answered and said they are excited to vote – for Libertarian Gary Johnson.

An African American upperclassman came to his front door bleary-eyed and shirtless. He said he was not registered. Hoisington encouraged him to sign up, explaining that it would take just one minute to fill out the form on his clipboard. "Nah, man, I'll pass," he said. The organizer pressed: "Are you sure? It's really important." The potential voter paused for a moment, as if about to relent. "Yeah, man," he said. "I'm sure."

"That doesn't happen too often," Hoisington said after the door closed. "Most people just lie and say they're already registered."

The onetime high school wrestler, who has grown out his hair, stepped over broken bottles and maneuvered around beer pong tables outside grungy off-campus row houses. Four fraternity brothers walked by on the street. One carried a 12 pack of beer. Another held a can of Natural Light. Hoisington introduced himself. "I'm all in for Donald Trump, man," one of the young men said before belching. The organizer shrugged it off and kept walking.

And so it went. This is the unglamorous drudgery of field work, but it is also the way to win. The fight to re-activate the Obama coalition is playing out not just in rallies and with television ads but in door-to-door conversations like these.

Clinton's campaign has more than 300 paid staffers in this state alone, fanned across 57 offices, vastly more than Trump's campaign, which will not even reveal its number.

 "Striking out," Hoisington said, as he slogged from one street to the next. "This is the slowest start I've had."

-- Hillary herself returns to Ohio today for the first time since Labor Day. She will deliver a speech on the economy in Toledo and then lead a voter registration drive in Akron. The goal of her visit is to draw attention to the state's Oct. 11 voter registration deadline (that's next Tuesday). Then early voting begins the next day. Bill, who was here last week, comes back to the state tomorrow for a two-day bus tour.

Obama carried this state twice, partly by expanding the electorate. The Clinton campaign has tried innovative approaches to build on his success, such as registering people at PokemonGo gathering points.

Almost everyone on the ground agrees that Trump is slightly ahead and would probably carry Ohio if the election was today. Because the state is older, whiter and less educated than the national average, Clinton has focused on trying to shore up Pennsylvania, lock down Virginia and put North Carolina on the map. Ohio is lower on the priority list than in typical years, but it is still very much a toss-up.

The battle lines in the Buckeye State are clear. The Clinton campaign is trying to peel off center-right, college-educated suburban women who are uneasy with the GOP nominee while the Trump campaign works to win over as many blue-collar, non-college-educated, lower-propensity voters in places like Youngstown and Toledo as possible.

Minorities and millennials are the X-factors. African Americans made up about 10 percent of the vote when John Kerry lost Ohio in 2004 and closer to 15 percent when Obama won. To help with both, the Clinton campaign is rolling out the endorsement of Cleveland Cavaliers basketball star LeBron James today to coincide with her visit to Akron. "Only one person running truly understands the struggles of an Akron child born into poverty," James writes in the Akron Beacon Journal.

-- Polls show just how heavy Clinton's lift is with young voters. Our latest Washington Post/ABC News poll shows that voters under 30 prefer Clinton by 2 points nationally, compared with a 30-point preference for Obama four years ago. This tracks with every other survey: Gallup found that only one in three adults under 30 approve of the Democratic nominee. In Quinnipiac's last poll, 31 percent of likely voters from ages 18 to 34 supported Clinton – compared to 29 percent for Johnson.

In Ohio specifically, the latest CBS-YouGov poll has Clinton winning 51 percent of voters under 30, down 6 points from the summer. Obama won 63 percent of Ohio voters under 30, according to 2012 exit polling.

There is also a yawning enthusiasm gap in The Post/ABC poll. Only 41 percent of 18- to 29-year-olds say they are certain to vote, compared to 75 percent of those 30 or older:

A recent analysis by the liberal group Project New America found that in several battleground states—including Ohio, Florida and North Carolina—Sanders holdouts likely constitute a constituency larger than the margins that decided the 2012 presidential race, Bloomberg reported last week.

-- Hoisington, the organizer whom I tagged along with yesterday, supported Sanders during the primaries. He is also an introvert, and he credits working for Clinton with helping him come out of his shell. He graduated from the University of Redlands in California two years ago and was working at a Half Priced Books back home in Dallas when a friend told him about the job opportunities on the Clinton campaign. He applied about two weeks ago, and Hillary for America flew him up to Ohio the very next day.

As he walked down Summit Street, not far from campus, Hoisington said that he still runs into a lot of Sanders diehards. Are they persuadable? "Not all the time," he sighed. "So the angle I try to take is, 'I know you might not like Hillary or Trump, but the two really aren't comparable.' But in their eyes they are. In their eyes, they're equally evil. Which is nuts to me."

"I definitely have been able to change a few people's minds, but a lot revert to just Gary Johnson," he added. "So I say, do you not believe in climate change? And a lot of people say, well, can you prove climate change? It's really frustrating."

He worries that what's playing out in Ohio is similar to what allowed Brexit in the U.K., when a lot of people voted to leave the European Union not understanding the implications.

There are no signs out for Clinton or Trump in the neighborhood he canvased yesterday, but there were a few "Sushi for President" signs. They're a gag from a local Japanese restaurant trying to drum up business.

Hoisington arrives for work at 9:30 a.m. on weekdays, and he's lucky to be done before 10 p.m. or 11 p.m. most nights. From 5 p.m. to 9 p.m., he phone banks. The local organizers set a daily goal every morning for how many new voter registrations they can get that day. Some days teachers invite them to come speak to their classes for the first five minutes, so they set the goal a little higher. If they have not met their goal after phone banking, the organizers go to areas where students hang out and try to get a few more.

When he asks students who they're supporting, most refuse to tell him. "The Trump people don't want to say because they're embarrassed," he guessed. "The Hillary people a lot of times are bashful. Maybe because the Trump people are so loud?"

-- The polling and the anecdotal reports like these have set off alarm bells at headquarters in Brooklyn, and the campaign has dramatically stepped up outreach to young voters in recent weeks. This is why the former secretary of state played along with actor Zach Galifianakis for an episode of the goofy "Between Two Ferns" web series. "No one will work harder to make your life better," Clinton told students at Temple University in Pennsylvania two weeks ago.

Sanders campaigned with Clinton in New Hampshire last week, and he'll make solo appearances for her this week in Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin – where he's more popular than her and can help drive early turnout. Elizabeth Warren is also hitting the trial hard in the final weeks to limit defections to third-party candidates.

The Trump campaign tried to make hay this weekend of a hacked audio recording that was taken during a February fundraiser (and probably leaked by the Russians), in which Clinton says that many millennials backing Sanders are "children of the Great Recession" who are "living in their parents' basement." "If you're feeling like you're consigned to being a barista, or some other job that doesn't pay a lot, and doesn't have some other ladder of opportunity attached to it, then the idea that maybe, just maybe, you could be part of a political revolution is pretty appealing," Clinton told a concerned donor. "So I think we should all be really understanding of that." (Dave Weigel explains how Republicans are intentionally taking this out of context.)

The Vermont senator defended Clinton Sunday during appearances on ABC and CNN. "Secretary Clinton and I do disagree on issues. But what she was saying there is absolutely correct," he told George Stephanopoulos. "And that is you've got millions of young people, many of whom took out loans in order to go to college, hoping to go out and get decent-paying, good jobs and you know what? They are unable to do that. And, yes, they do want a political revolution."

-- At the last house on the last street Hoisington was assigned to walk, across from a Shell station, a guy answered and told him he's registered but undecided. "It's really up in the air," the student told him. The organizer was excited to engage. But the student inside didn't want to talk politics. He wanted to get back inside to watch the Cleveland Browns play the Washington Redskins. As he closed the door, Hoisington tried to convey one point. "Just watch the debates," he said. "Please watch the debates!"

WHILE YOU WERE SLEEPING:

-- Colombia voted to reject a peace deal with FARC rebels by a razor-thin margin of 50.24 to 49.75 percent, throwing years-long negotiations into chaos and threatening to prolong the country's half-century war. Sunday's outcome also amounts to a huge setback for the U.S. and Obama administration, which had backed Colombian President Juan Manuel Santos and pledged to boost U.S. aid to the country by nearly 50 percent, to $450 million a year. The fate of that funding proposal is also now up in the air. (Nick Miroff)

-- Five thieves in ski masks robbed Kim Kardashian at gunpoint in Paris, tying her up in the bathroom of her luxury residence before making off with millions of dollars' worth of jewelry.From Reuters: The attackers struck around 3 a.m. after threatening the night guard with a handgun. The men then held a gun up to Kardashian's temple before tying her up, a police source confirmed. The robbers stole $5.6-$6.7 million worth of jewels and a ring worth about 4 million euros. The source said the attackers fled on bicycles, and police later found the night guard in the staircase with his hands and feet bound. As news of the event spread, husband Kanye West abruptly left his New Yorkperformance mid-song. "I'm sorry I have a family emergency, I have to stop the show," he told the audience. (Emily Yahr)

-- The Nobel Prize in Medicine was awarded to Japanese scientist Yoshinori Ohsumi for his work on a fundamental process for autophagy, or "cell recycling." According to the Stockholm-based prize committee, his work involves a series of experiments using baker's yeast that helped expand our understanding of how cells adapt to starvation and respond to infection. (Ariana Eunjung Cha)

-- First in the 202 – New Ann Kirkpatrick ad ties John McCain to Trump: With Trump heading to Arizona tomorrow and polls showing the presidential race somewhat close, the Democratic nominee for Senate has a new spot linking the GOP incumbent with his party's presidential nominee. It opens with the Miss Piggy comment and then features a clip of McCain saying he supports Trump during a TV interview. "He's said it more than 60 times," a narrator says. "There was a time when John McCain put country ahead of party. But 33 years in Washington have changed John McCain." (Watch here.)

-- The Clinton campaign is going on the radio in Miami today with an ad highlighting Newsweek's report that Trump violated the Cuba trade embargo. "This is a serious insult to our community," the narrator says, accusing the GOP nominee of enriching the Castro brothers. (Listen here.)

GET SMART FAST:​​

\* An incoming state representative from Ferguson, Mo., who is set to begin her first term in January, has publicly accused a soon-to-be colleague of rape.  The two would soon be the only black lawyers in the Missouri legislature and they had set up a meeting to discuss how they might work together, Cora Faith Walker told the St. Louis Dispatch. She says they had two glasses of wine, and she woke up the next morning in a bed at the same apartment, with no memory of what happened. The alleged perpetrator has not been arrested or charged. (Amy B Wang)

\* The GOP nominee for Oregon governor told incumbent Democrat Kate Brown that educated women are "less susceptible to abuse" following Brown 's revelation during a debate that she had been a victim of domestic violence. "A woman that has great education and training and a great job is not susceptible to this kind of abuse by men, women or anyone," said Bud Pierce, a practicing oncologist. (Amber Phillips)

\* The New Jersey transit agency was under scrutiny for "dozens" of safety violations before last week's deadly train crash in Hoboken.  The violations, uncovered by a federal audit in June, were described as "operational," meaning they dealt with train operations rather than with physical problems such as infrastructure. The train's black box recorder picked up no information and the conductor says he has no recollection of the crash.(Ashley Halsey III)

\* The LAPD's fatal shooting of a black teenager sparked angry protests this weekend, coming on the heels of recent police shootings in Charlotte, Tulsa, and El Cajon. Los Angeles authorities said the 18-year-old was shot after a car chase, but they have not disclosed whether he was carrying a weapon or other critical details. (Kristine Guerra)

\* Congress continues to expand its probe into EpiPen maker Mylan, investigating whether the generic drug manufacturer (in addition to price gouging) also knowingly and improperly underpaid state Medicaid programs. ( Catherine Ho)

\* India ratified the Paris climate deal this weekend,  joining other major emitters such as the United States, China and Brazil in officially signing on to the agreement.  Their vote comes days ahead of a possible European Parliament referendum, which would put the deal past the 55 percent threshold required for it to take effect. ( Chris Mooney and Brady Dennis )

\* British Prime Minister Theresa May announced that her country will begin the process of withdrawing from the E.U. by the end of March,  outlining a two-year plan for a clean Brexit, slated for completion in spring 2019. (Griff Witte)

\* Dozens were killed in Ethiopia after security forces fired tear gas and warning shots into a crowd of political protesters, provoking a stampede.  Early reports suggest up to 100 people were crushed by the fleeing crowds. ( Paul Schemm )

\* One of the planes displayed during North Korea's first air show this summer was manufactured in New Zealand using U.S. parts, prompting an investigation by New Zealand's foreign ministry.  The discovery underscores the difficulties of implementing sanctions when North Korea's long border with China remains so porous. ( Anna Fifield )

\* An 11-year-old student was recommended for a mental health screening after he drew a picture of a lynching alongside a "Black Lives Matter" quote for a school assignment. His intention was to show that "racism is not dead," but an alarmed teacher misread the broader message and attempted to send him to a crisis center instead. ( Donna St. George )

\* A Long Island community is reeling after four high school students were found dead. Police suspect the notorious Salvadoran gang, MS-13, is behind the killings. (Amy B Wang)

\* Siberian officials are considering killing off 300,000 reindeer by Christmas – an ill-timed holiday deadline that was proposed in the aftermath of a fatal anthrax outbreak this summer. (Amy B Wang)

\* A hunt for a pair of missing Van Gogh paintings came to an end after 14 years, capping off a sprawling investigation that has left nearly as many people behind bars. Officials say the two paintings – which mark important biographical times in the artist's life -- were found in the safe of a drug kingpin. (Cleve R. Wootson Jr.)

DONALD'S GOT 99 PROBLEMS, AND HIS TAX RETURNS ARE ONE:

-- A bombshell New York Times report that Trump lost $916 million in 1995 – and could have used the losses to avoid paying federal income taxes for nearly two decades – dominated the news cycle on Sunday.

-- The Trump campaign does not challenge any of the facts in the story or the authenticity of the tax return anonymously mailed to a reporter, though lawyers for the real estate developer unsurprisingly threatened to sue. "An attorney for Trump issued a statement that indirectly confirmed the story, reading, in part, "Mr. Trump is a highly-skilled businessman who has a fiduciary responsibility to his business, his family and his employees to pay no more tax than legally required. Mr. Trump knows the tax code far better than anyone who has ever run for president and he is the only one that knows how to fix it." (Paul Farhi)

-- "As to Trump's claim that because he understands the rigged tax system he alone can fix it — none of Trump's suggested fixes would affect his ability to avoid paying taxes," Ruth Marcus writes in a fantastic column.  "There are sound policy reasons to let businesses deduct operating losses, and to carry over those losses into other years … But the real estate business, with its highly leveraged investments, huge interest deductions, opportunities for depreciation and tendency to realize most income as capital gains, can particularly benefit from — or manipulate, depending on your perspective — these provisions. Trump in charge of the tax code would not be a case of Nixon goes to China. It would be a case of Trump, as always, doing what's best for Trump."

--Tax experts weighed in on the revelations, telling Lisa Rein and Kelsey Snell that it's impossible to know whether Trump used the huge loss to shield himself from paying taxes over the next 18 years. One point of contention is whether either the courts -- through bankruptcy settlements -- or Trump's creditors participated in any "debt forgiveness," meaning that Trump would have been required to count the difference as income and pay taxes on it.

-- The revelations give Clinton a fresh opportunity to hit Trump for what her campaign has characterized as his poor business practices. And the allegations offended many voters in Ohio, David Weigel and Jenna Johnson report from Toledo: "It's disgusting," said 65-year-old business owner Steve Crouse. "As a businessman, he's got that right to do that. It's the way the laws were set up. But it's not right. I would feel guilty if I didn't pay anything. It's flat-out cheating the government. You're using all the roads, the fire department, the police, so you should pay for that."

"And the tax returns gave Clinton an argument that would not have worked against Romney: that Trump's swagger covered up a record of business failure. In the 24 hours since the tax leak, the $916 million loss has proven the toughest aspect for Republicans to spin. 'He ain't that good,' said Alex Pickett, 52, while waiting for a bus that would take him to a downtown church. 'Can't be that good if he lost that much money.'"

-- The Fix's Chris Cillizza writes that all the bad stories add up to Trump's single worst week of his campaign: "Trump has, during the course of this campaign, repeatedly demonstrated an inability to cut his losses. Instead, he quadruples down on those losses. Trump did that again — and again — over the past six days. And the result was one of the worst weeks of not only his campaign but of any presidential candidate I can remember."

-- Donald's surrogates, including two former U.S. attorneys, lauded their man for dodging taxes on the shows:

\* Rudy Giuliani called Trump a "genius":  "The reality is, this is part of our tax code. The man's a genius. He knows how to operate the tax code to the benefit of the people he's serving," Giuliani said on CNN. He went on to insist Trump would not be to blame, saying instead that "the law is responsible for it." "If you have a set of laws, you live by those laws," he said. "And the reality is, you are ignoring completely the fiduciary obligation he has to all the people around him to run his business at the lowest possible expense."

\* Chris Christie said the report is actually "a very, very good story" for his boss: "What it shows is what an absolute mess the federal tax code is, and that's why [Trump] is the person best positioned to fix it," the New Jersey governor said on Fox News Sunday. "There's no one who's showed more genius in their way to move around the tax code."

\* Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid, meanwhile, eviscerated Trump,  calling him a "billion-dollar loser" who won't release his taxes "because they'll expose him as a spoiled, rich brat who lost the millions he inherited from his father."

-- New York Times columnist Frank Bruni slams Trump's "pathetic fraternity": "The Trump campaign has shown me many things that I never thought I'd see and others that I'd never seen so clearly, including the readiness of power-hungry men to trade dignity for relevance and swap pride for a place at the table, even if the table is a despicable one. Christie made that deal with shocking alacrity, apparently on the theory that by getting to the table first, he could snag the best seat. Rudy Giuliani made that deal, too, and Trump has been his ticket to a renewed and terrifying omnipresence. In this wretched race there's a leitmotif of cockamamie cameos from men who are stars no more. It's amazing how alike some of the manservants clinging to Trump are: His campaign is like some Canyon Ranch for bullies needing revitalization. 'Sensible' isn't an adjective you associate with either man these days. Both sacrificed it to their orange overlord."

-- The New York Times' Nicholas Confessore documents nine times that Trump has taken to Twitter to denounce people who avoid paying their taxes and to talk about the "significant pain" that paying taxes has caused him:

\* "Half of Americans Don't Pay Income Tax": Trump adopted this popular – and potentially very ironic -- argument during the 2012 presidential campaign.

\* "Higher Taxes ASAP ": In 2015, Trump criticized tax loopholes available to hedge funds and private equity firms, attacking them for "paying practically nothing."

\* "Not as I do": "In April 2012, after Mr. Obama released his tax returns, Mr. Trump attacked the president for calling for tax hikes yet paying what Mr. Trump suggested was a paltry tax rate of 20.5 percent. 'Do as I say not as I do,' he taunted. (In retrospect, Mr. Trump may have been referring to himself.)"

-- Vox's Ezra Klein notes that whatever is in Trump's tax returns must be worse than what the Times reported: "All the Times has is three pages of Trump's records from 1995," he said. "Everything else is informed speculation … Think about how dangerous that was for the paper. Trump could have released his tax returns and proven them wrong. Trump could have shown their speculation to be mere speculation, and used it as a cudgel to discredit their reporting on his campaign. But the Times bet correctly. Trump still isn't releasing his returns. The Trump campaign has decided it prefers the picture the Times is painting — a picture where Trump didn't pay taxes for 18 years — to the picture Trump's real records would paint."

-- "Some tax experts are stuck not by the fact that Trump is claiming net operating losses, but by the sheer size of them," says Politico's Brian Faler. "A $916 million loss in one year is really, really big, and is sure to raise questions about Trump's business acumen. Of course, savvy business tax planners want to report big losses to the IRS, in order to cut their tax bills. It's impossible to know, though, how Trump came up with the $916 million figure … 'A claim of a $916 million [net operating loss] would catch the attention of even the least ambitious IRS agent,' said [Tax Foundation economist Alan Cole]. 'Presumably it was then audited and confirmed. So there's a good chance that he really lost a whole lot of money.' Remember: Businesses pay taxes only when they make money, so it would be ironic if Trump — who often brags of his business prowess — ended up paying very little taxes because he doesn't actually make very much money."

-- Clinton did not mention the issue during an appearance in North Carolina yesterday, but she's not being shy about bashing The Donald on Twitter, his favorite medium:

-- CAN HE REBOUND? Trump today plans to contrast how he and the Clintons amassed their fortunes. From Philip Rucker: "In Colorado, Trump plans to argue that he built a global real estate empire and employed thousands of people, while the Clintons got rich delivering paid speeches to financial institutions and other corporate interests. ... 'We're going to shine the spotlight very brightly on how the Clintons made their money,' adviser Jason Miller said. 'They were so broke when they left the White House that they couldn't pay either of their mortgages … yet they're [now] worth a couple hundred million dollars.'"

The next big opportunity to change the trajectory of the race will be next Sunday's debate, a town-hall style event at Washington University in St. Louis. Trump spent Sunday at his Bedminster, N.J. golf club huddling with Giuliani, Christie and a handful of other advisers and family members in order to prepare for the second showdown. He has also blocked off time in his schedule this week for preparation sessions. Christie -- who has held countless town-hall forums of his own -- is playing a major role in prep. "It was question and answer, question and answer," Giuliani told Robert Costa. "Chris had a lot of advice and was very helpful. He's one tough debater."

-- "Trump's organization did business with Iranian bank later linked to terrorism," by the Center for Public Integrity's Sasha Chavkin, Michael Hudson, and Dave Levinthal: "Trump's real estate organization rented New York office space from 1998 to 2003 to an Iranian bank that U.S. authorities have linked to terrorist groups and Iran's nuclear program. Trump inherited Bank Melli, one of Iran's largest state-controlled banks, as a tenant when he purchased the General Motors Building on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, … The Trump Organization kept the bank on as a tenant for four more years after the U.S. Treasury Departmentdesignated Bank Melli in 1999 as being controlled by the Iranian government. U.S. officials later alleged that Bank Melli had been used to obtain sensitive materials for Iran's nuclear program. U.S. authorities also alleged that the bank had been used between 2002 and 2006 to funnel money to a unit of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard that has sponsored terrorist attacks — a period that overlapped with the time the bank rented office space from Trump."

-- Creepy --> "Inside Trump's Surveillance Operations," by Buzzfeed's Aram Roston: "The suburban house on Water Mark Place in Sterling, Virginia, doesn't look like a [Trump] residence: no classical columns, no gold accents. But sources say it has one feature, common to many Trump properties … an extensive and closely-monitored surveillance system." Trump's adjacent golf club also has an extensive web of surveillance cameras that is "far beyond" what is routine for a golf club, former employees said. Two said the cameras were monitored "intently, almost invasively," and workers reportedly occasionally get called by security in New York if they were in an unexpected place. "The elaborate surveillance arrangement is consistent with a pattern … In his bedroom at his Mar-a-Lago estate, Trump (reportedly) had a switchboard that allowed him to eavesdrop on any landline there." One major surveillance equipment contractor described 360-degree "low profile cameras that look like smoke detectors," saying the "first phase" of its contract involved installing over 100 cameras, and it continued later with even more video surveillance.

-- " Trump Is Handing a Windfall to Mexican **Immigrant** Families ," by Bloomberg's Isabella Cota: "Mention the name Trump to Gerardo Lozano, and it doesn't take long for him to explode. Lozano, 58, short and wiry with thick glasses, is an undocumented Mexican **immigrant**. For 15 years, he's worked in the U.S., doing roofing, landscaping, whatever comes his way. But what Lozano doesn't know about Trump's candidacy is that, strangely enough, it has benefited him greatly. The value of those paychecks he earns, when converted into pesos and wired back home to his family in Mexico, is soaring. That's because Trump's harsh discourse toward Mexicans … has rattled markets and pushed the peso down against the dollar month after month. It all adds up to a mini-windfall for the Lozanos and countless other Mexican families spread out across both sides of the Rio Grande, and it is one of the great ironies of the 2016 presidential campaign. [Trump], the man whose improbable political rise was built largely on his pledge to crack down on illegal **immigrants**, is inadvertently assisting many of them."

-- " How Trump's 'Apprentice' moved from capitalism to sexism ," by the Associated Press's Garance Burke: "In his years as a reality TV boss on 'The Apprentice,' he repeatedly demeaned women with sexist language, according to show insiders … rated female contestants by the size of their breasts and talked about which ones he'd like to have sex with. [One] former crew member … recalled that Trump asked male contestants whether they would sleep with a particular female contestant, then expressed his own interest. 'We were in the boardroom one time figuring out who to blame for the task, and he just stopped in the middle and pointed to someone and said, 'You'd f… her, wouldn't you? I'd f… her. C'mon, wouldn't you?' 'Everyone is trying to make him stop talking, and the woman is shrinking in her seat.'" Twelve former contestants or crew spoke on the record about what Trump's so-called inappropriate behavior. Another nine discussed concerns regarding Trump's treatment of females, but said they did not want to be identified because of non-disclosure agreements, or concerns about wrecking their careers."

THE DAILY HILLARY:

-- Clinton visited a Charlotte church on Sunday, pledging to fight for "end-to-end reform" of the criminal justice system after the fatal shooting of Keith Scott sparked days of violent unrest. From John Wagner: "Our entire country should take a moment to really look at what's going on here and across America," Clinton said. "Imagine it through our children's eyes. It makes my heart ache when kids ... are going through this and trying to make sense of the absolutely senseless.'" Clinton delivered the last several minutes of her remarks with her arm around a 9-year-old girl she had invited to the pulpit, who had recently addressed the Charlotte City Council about police violence and the experience of seeing African American parents being prematurely buried. Clinton listed several reform initiatives she has pushed in her candidacy, including training police to "de-escalate" potentially violent situations, and enacting additional gun-control measures. Those who say problems can be solved "simply by more law and order" are overlooking systemic racism that still exists in the country, she said, making an unnamed reference to Trump.

-- The San Diego Union-Tribune became the latest conservative newspaper to throw its support behind a Democratic candidate for the first time, repudiating the Republican nominee and urging readers to vote for Clinton instead. "Upon inauguration on Jan. 20, he would be in charge of the executive branch of a global superpower and possess enormous authority, operating with no coherent worldview besides 'I alone can fix it,'" the editorial board wrote. "Imagine that. Imagine President Trump." (Cleve R. Wootson Jr.)

-- George W. Bush's daughter Barbara Bush became the latest in her family to signal support for Clinton, attending a fundraising event for the Democratic nominee in Paris on Saturday night. She also posed for a picture with Huma Abedin, who hosted the event alongside Vogue editor-in-chief Anna Wintour. (CNN)

-- Wall Street Journal, "Among Seniors, Clinton Grows More Appealing," by Michael C. Bender: "Ruth Mary Baudhuin watched Lawrence Welk as a young girl, listened to fellow Philadelphian Chubby Checker on the radio and eventually grew into her parents' Republicanism … But the 68-year-old retiree, like many older voters, no longer recognizes her party. So she's backing [Clinton], ending her streak of supporting every Republican presidential nominee since Gerald Ford. Mrs. Baudhuin's change of heart isn't an anomaly when it comes to America's oldest—and most reliable—voters. Among voters 65 and older, the most recent round of major media polls show Mr. Trump running between 11 and 18 percentage points behind [Romney in 2012] … No Democratic presidential candidate has won older voters since Al Gore in 2000, exit polls show. Mrs. Clinton has her own demographic dilemma, as her campaign works feverishly to energize the nation's youngest voters …. Yet the biggest partisan shift this year may be America's older citizens, who are choosing between a pair of candidates from their own peer group for the first time in 168 years."

-- New York Times, "How Hillary Clinton Grappled With Bill Clinton's Infidelity, and His Accusers," by Megan Twohey: "Confronting a spouse's unfaithfulness is painful under any circumstance. For [Hillary], it happened repeatedly and in the most public of ways, unfolding at the dawn of the 24/7 news cycle, and later in impeachment proceedings that convulsed the nation. Outwardly, she remained stoic and defiant, defending her husband as a progression of women and well-funded conservative operatives accused Mr. Clinton of behavior unbecoming the leader of the free world. But privately, she embraced the Clinton campaign's aggressive strategy of counterattack … What is clear is that Mrs. Clinton was in a difficult spot. She was aware that her husband had cheated earlier in their marriage, but by her telling, she also believed him when he denied the accusations levied by Ms. Flowers and others."

Quote du jour: "Mickey Kantor, the chairman of Bill Clinton's 1992 campaign, said that Mrs. Clinton wanted to separate fact from fiction and to size up the women making the claims. And that determination to fight back inspired others in the campaign to do the same. 'She's the firefighter running to the fire, not away from it,' Mr. Kantor said."

-- " Tim Kaine's Long, Conflicted History With The Death Penalty ," by Buzzfeed's Chris Geidner: "In 2005, Tim Kaine faced a tight race for governor. He was running against Jerry Kilgore, [who] was hitting him hard on the death penalty. 'The thing that redeems that is the presence of God in every person,' Kaine had said, discussing the death penalty and his Catholicism. But less than three months later, Kaine would be faced with the convergence of two threads in his life — his work as a capital defense lawyer and his promise to enforce the death penalty. Over the course of the past three decades, Kaine's experience with the death penalty is far more complex and nuanced than that of any other major party candidate for the presidency or vice presidency in the modern era …. Kaine has represented multiple people on death row, seeking to highlight what he has described as a 'shockingly unequal' system, and he also has governed one of the few states that has continued to carry out executions regularly over the past decade."

POLLING ROUNDUP:

-- A Washington Post/ABC News poll found nearly three times as many respondents declared Clinton the winner of last week's debate as Trump, with 53 percent saying they believe Clinton took home the victory on Monday. Twenty-nine percent said the same of Trump; 47 percent also said Trump got the facts wrong in the debate, while 24 percent said the same of Clinton. More than 3 in 10 believe Trump "lied on purpose."

The debate appears to have only slightly impacted their standing with voters: Trump's unfavorable ratings climbed from 59 to 64 percent, while his favorability numbers declined by just a single point, 35 to 34 percent. Meanwhile, Clinton's favorability ratings increased from 41 to 45 percent.

-- In New Mexico, an Albuquerque Journal survey shows Clinton up 4 points (35-31) with former Gov. Gary Johnson getting 24 percent.

-- " Florida's Changing Latino Population Veers From G.O.P. ," by Julia Preston and Lizette Alvarez in the NYT: "For decades, being Latino in Florida almost always meant being Republican. Miami was the undisputed capital of Cuban exiles who had fled the Communist government — they were most of the state's Latinos — and by the 1980s a large majority had registered with the Republican Party. But a glimpse at the state voter rolls these days, where the names Samuel Del Valle, Maria Flores and Oswaldo Muñoz all appear as Democrats or independents, makes clear how much has changed in one of the nation's most important swing states."

WHO IS TO BLAME?

-- " Jeff Zucker's singular role in promoting Trump's rise ," by Margaret Sullivan: "Looking for someone specific to hold responsible for the improbable rise of [Trump]? Although there are many options, you could do worse than to take a hard look at Jeff Zucker, president of CNN Worldwide. It was Zucker, after all, who as the new head of NBC Entertainment gave Trump his start in reality TV with 'The Apprentice' and then milked the real estate developer's uncanny knack for success for all it was worth. … Make no mistake: There would be no Trump-the-politician without Trump-the-TV-star. One begot the other. [And] ten years later, it was Zucker, now the head of CNN, who gave Trump astonishing amounts of free exposure in the Republican presidential primary … He has called himself a 'ratings machine,' and in the world of TV, ratings equal profit. Twice, Zucker made Trump a winner. And twice, Trump made Zucker a winner. But what about the rest of us?"

-- Paul Ryan is preparing to launch a frantic cross-country tour over the final five-week stretch before Election Day aimed at saving the GOP's congressional majority, Paul Kane reports. "The Wisconsin Republican will hit 17 states and 42 cities from several corners of the nation … while raising money and stumping for more than a dozen House and Senate candidates … Unlike most of the speaker's previous political travel — which focused on closed-door fundraisers — Ryan's appearances will include many public events with Republicans who are facing difficult reelection prospects. The whirlwind trek comes as Ryan, 46 … has defied even his own prediction that he would not be the same type of voracious fundraiser as his predecessor, [John Boehner]. "Ryan's political prowess has come in part from being his party's 2012 vice presidential nominee, introducing him to a vast array of wealthy conservative donors … In addition, he's benefited from many of those big donors abstaining from financially supporting Trump this year and instead focusing on protecting the House as well as the Senate majority."

-- Obama chose five moments from the last eight years of his presidency that he believes will have an outsized historical impact. Here are two, as explained during an interview with New York Magazine's Jonathan Chait:

\* On the BP oil spill: "The BP oil spill was the first event that taught me about a particular news cycle where there's a real problem that can and will be solved but that garners, for whatever reason, 24/7 attention. And there's this sense of doom that gets ramped up … We started having gallows humor about the pelican, that it seemed like they had one pelican that they showed over and over again, covered in oil. It just was draining — or maybe the better analogy is 'leaking' — political capital every single day."

\* On working with Republicans : "When I came into office, my working assumption was that because we were in crisis, and the crisis had begun on the Republicans' watch, that there would be a window in which they would feel obliged to cooperate on a common effort to dig us out of this massive hole. Probably the moment in which I realized that the Republican leadership intended to take a different tack was actually as we were shaping the stimulus bill … It established the dynamic … for a much sharper party-line approach … that I think is going to have consequences for years to come."

WAPO HIGHLIGHTS:

-- " Drinks, junkets and jobs: How the insurance industry courts state commissioners ," by Michael J. Mishak: "When the Arkansas insurance commissioner weighed the merits of a hospital's billing complaint against United Healthcare, her interactions … extended far beyond her department's hearing room. During months of deliberations, Commissioner Julie Benafield Bowman met repeatedly with United Healthcare lawyers and lobbyists over lunch and drinks ... [before ultimately deciding] in United Healthcare's favor — a 2008 ruling that stood to save the company millions of dollars. Nearly two years later … Benafield had moved on: She was working for United Healthcare, having joined at least three of her predecessors representing insurers in Arkansas." It's a common career move: An investigation found that half of the 109 state insurance commissioners who left their posts in the past decade went on to work for the industry they used to regulate. "Consumer advocates and some commissioners say the tight bond between regulators and the insurance industry — reinforced by campaign contributions, lavish dinners and the prospect of future employment — diminishes consumers' voices as insurers press rate increases, shape regulations and scuttle investigations."

--"With Flint victory, African American lawmakers increase their clout in Congress," by Karoun Demirjian and Mike DeBonis: "The Congressional Black Caucus has emerged as the driving force behind several dramatic standoffs in Washington this year – most recently spurring successful efforts to secure funding for the water crisis in Flint, Mich. as part of a budget deal that sent lawmakers home for the elections ... Black lawmakers trace the current upswing in influence to a bitter debate over allowing Confederate flags on federal grounds forced Republicans to yank a spending bill off the House floor. New York Democrat Hakeem Jeffries called that episode, and the 25-hour sit-in over gun control, 'probably the two most dramatic moments that we've had in the House since the government shutdown' in 2013."

-- " How do you stop migrants? In Hungary, with 'border hunters ,'" by Anthony Faiola: "During a recruiting fair at a police proving ground here, a gaggle of teenagers ogled a display of machine guns, batons and riot gear. A glossy flier held out the promise of rugged patrols in 4x4s … night-vision goggles and migrant-sniffing dogs. Because that's how Hungary's new 'border hunters' roll. This nation that once sat behind the Iron Curtain is offering a rare glimpse into a world where the build-a-wall mentality to keep migrants out rules the land. They may as well hang a sign at the border, critics say: Welcome to Hungary — the migrant's dystopia. Trump may want a wall, but Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban – a vocal fan of Trump's **immigration** plan -- has built one. Now, the nation is launching a massive recruitment drive for 3,000 'border hunters.' … Yet in a country where the Gestapo once hunted Jews and Cold War-era secret police ferreted out dissidents, some here say that the government is in danger of instilling a different kind of fear."

SOCIAL MEDIA SPEED READ:

In case you missed it, Trump was on a Twitter rampage the last few days:

Here's what he wrote after the New York Times reported Trump could have avoided taxes for years:

He also targeted Clinton for her leaked criticism of Bernie Sanders's "revolution" (though the leaked comments were from February):

Twitter user "Southpaw" wondered if Marla Maples was connected to the NYT leak:

The rumor was circulating all weekend:

Rudy Giuliani was confronted about his own marital infidelities when he criticized the Clintons. And his response was that everybody does it!

Voices on the right were not impressed:

The editor of The Weekly Standard:

The founder of RedState, who now writes for the Resurgent:

Ted Cruz's former Senate chief of staff:

A prominent Iowa radio host:

Hillary added King James to her list of supporters, hoping he'll hold some sway in Ohio:

Trump's new D.C. hotel was spray-painted with Black Lives Matter slogans:

Louisiana Senate candidate and noted anti-Semite David Duke criticized Lester Holt's moderation of the debate while noting that his wife is Jewish:

Spotted at a Clinton event in Paris -- Barbara Bush:

Chloe Grace Moretz campaigned for Clinton in Michigan:

Trump and Clinton wished Jewish followers a happy new year:

Cory Booker found himself at a special intersection in Florida:

John Thune's dad met his 20th great-grandchild:

Here's a question you've probably never thought about:

Finally, remember all those baby giant pandas on display in China last week? Check out the one that fell off the stage!

DAYBOOK:

On the campaign trail: Trump campaigns in Pueblo and Loveland, Colo. Clinton campaigns in Toledo and Akron. Pence is in Ashland, Va.

At the White House: Obama participates in a discussion with Leonardo DiCaprio and Dr. Katharine Hayhoe. Biden campaigns for Clinton in Florida.

On Capitol Hill: The Senate meets in pro forma session. The House is out.

NEWS YOU CAN USE IF YOU LIVE IN D.C.:

-- "The day should more or less define perfection," the Capital Weather Gang forecasts (yay!). "We have considerable sunshine, which is much appreciated after four and half days of cloudy skies.  Temperatures are exquisite as highs reach the mid-to-upper 70s."

-- The Redskins beat the Browns   31-20.

-- The Nationals beat the Miami Marlins 10-7. (Here's more on the finalized playoff matchups.)

-- " Company run by David Trone broke campaign contribution limits, state prosecutors say ," by Bill Turque: "A company run by David Trone, the Potomac wine magnate who was a candidate for Congress in Maryland's 8th District this year, made more than $250,000 in illegal contributions to political candidates between 2011 and 2014, state prosecutors say. Before he mounted the most expensive self-funded congressional campaign in history — spending more than $13 million in his Democratic primary loss … he was best known as a major-party fundraiser, hosting [Obama, Clinton] and a long list of other political figures at his home. The Maryland State Prosecutor's Office announced Friday that it had issued 12 citations to Retail Service and Systems Inc., charging that the company or its subsidiaries violated what was then the $4,000 limit on giving to a single candidate. According to an affidavit from the prosecutor's office, the improper contributions were made by Trone's companies to the 2014 gubernatorial campaign of then-Lt. Gov. Anthony G. Brown, his running mate Ken Ulman, and the 2014 reelection campaign of State Comptroller Peter Franchot."

VIDEOS OF THE DAY:

"Saturday Night Live" is back.

Here's the cold open with Alec Baldwin as Trump:

And a Clinton vs. Trump-themed spoof of Family Feud, with appearances by Lin-Manuel Miranda and Vladimir Putin:

Watch as Trump went off-script at a Pennsylvania rally:

Here he imitates Clinton stumbling ill on 9/11:

A video of Trump's two-hour deposition in his lawsuit against celebrity chef Jose Andres came out Friday. Our video team pulled out the five most interesting minutes:

Seth Meyers took a closer look at Trump's blunders and other election developments:

Nathan Lane recapped the debate:

Clinton's team is circulating this clip of Trump and Alicia Machado (click to watch):

Trump released a new ad attacking Clinton (which we saw on TV in Ohio):

Ivanka Trump cut a commercial trying to humanize and soften her dad:

Joe Biden gave Jimmy Fallon his take on the debate:

Biden also spoke about his aviators while eating ice cream:

Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter were caught on a kiss cam at an Atlanta Braves game:

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On July 1, 2015, Kathryn Steinle was shot and killed in San Francisco by Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez, an undocumented **immigrant** who had been convicted of seven felonies and deported seven times. Lopez-Sanchez had most recently been arrested for an outstanding drug warrant and served time briefly in a San Francisco jail before the U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) asked that the city release him into its custody for deportation. Because San Francisco is a designated "sanctuary city," it declined to prosecute Lopez-Sanchez's drug charge, and he was released rather than deported.

The shooting of Steinle ignited a firestorm over San Francisco's sanctuary policy. Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump has made opposition to sanctuary policies a major theme of his campaign. A bill titled the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act, and nicknamed the Donald Trump Act by Democrats, passed the House on July 23, 2015, and would have blocked sanctuary cities from receiving federal law enforcement funding in response to the shooting.

Since then, public scrutiny of sanctuary cities has grown. For example, Louisiana Attorney General Jeff Landry stated that sanctuary cities "allow illegals to commit crimes, then roam free in our communities," citing Los Angeles's spike in crime in 2015 as evidence.

But is really true? Despite popular accounts, decades of research actually shows that **immigrants** — whether legal or illegal — tend to have lower crime rates.

Now, our new research shows that designating a city as a sanctuary has no statistically significant effect on crime.

We examined all the sanctuary cities listed by the National **Immigration** Law Center (NILC). All sanctuary cities included in the study passed sanctuary laws during or after 2002. We define a sanctuary as a city that expressly forbids city officials or police departments from inquiring about **immigration** status.

For each city, we drew on city-level crime data compiled by the FBI by year, as well as a host of demographic and political features that may affect crime levels and/or sanctuary status, such as racial and partisan composition, the unemployment rate, average income levels, the poverty rate, education levels and the percent of the city that is foreign-born.

First, we assessed changes in crime rates at the city level immediately following the passage of a sanctuary policy. Figure 1 reports the results for changes to violent crime in the year immediately following a change in laws for sanctuary cities that have available crime data in the year after the city became sanctuary.

Some cities — such as San Francisco and St. Louis -- did see increases in crime immediately following passage. Other cities, such as San Jose, saw no change in crime. Still others -- such as Baltimore and Washington -- saw a reduction in crime. Taken together, the average change in crime is not statistically significant. The same results hold for property crime and rape crime.

The graph below presents our results for violent crime. It compares violent crime rates among sanctuary and non-sanctuary cities from when no cities in our data set were classified as sanctuaries to after all cities had passed their sanctuary policies.

That is, a sanctuary policy itself has no statistically meaningful effect on crime.

These results make sense if sanctuary city policies have countervailing effects. Given lower crime rates among **immigrants**, crime rates in sanctuary cities should drop, if those cities do attract new **immigrants**.

At the same time, sanctuary policies are typically designed to increase trust between **immigrant** communities and law enforcement. Thus, crime reporting -- but not crime itself -- might actually increase in these locations if undocumented **immigrants** are more likely to work with police and local authorities.

Taken together, these explanations may explain what we observe in these data: a sanctuary city designation does not produce a significantly higher crime rate.

Loren Collingwood is an assistant professor of political science at University of California at Riverside whose research interests include American politics, political behavior, and race and ethnic politics.

Benjamin Gonzalez-O'Brien is an assistant professor of political science at Highline College whose research interests include American politics, **immigration**policy, racial and ethnic politics and American political development.

Stephen El-Khatib is a graduate student at University of California at Riverside whose research interests include political conflict, **immigration**, and race and ethnic politics.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK -- On the campaign trail Sunday, Hillary Clinton took a pass on speaking about the discovery that Donald Trump may not have paid federal income taxes for as many as 18 years.

But the Democratic presidential nominee more than compensated for her silence with a series of pointed messages posted on Twitter after she was done for the day.

"Three pages of Trump's tax returns confirm he's a business failure who's gotten rich at your expense," Clinton said in one tweet on her official campaign account. "Imagine what he's hiding in the rest."

She was referring to a New York Times report that Trump, a real estate magnate, may have canceled out years of income taxes by declaring a $916 million loss on his 1995 return that the paper obtained. Trump has declined to voluntarily release his tax returns, breaking with years of precedent for White House hopefuls.

Clinton's tweet included a video highlighting the newspaper report and subsequent television coverage that was less than flattering for Trump.

Clinton demonstrated little interest in speaking about issue on camera Sunday.

As she was getting ready to fly out of White Plains, N.Y., to a church in Charlotte, she ignored a shouted question on the tarmac about Trump's tax returns.

With the traveling reporters in tow all day, Clinton also declined to make herself available for questions -- something she has been doing a few days a week recently.

Trump's boosters have argued that the Times article was actually good for him, because it suggested a prowess at managing his finances and didn't allege anything illegal. On ABC News's "This Week," former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani called Trump's actions "absolute genius."

On her Twitter account, Clinton offered quite a different interpretation.

"Donald Trump built numerous squandered businesses on the backs of taxpayers — and he hasn't even paid his fair share," she said in one tweet.

Another one tried to knock Trump on two fronts: his taxes and his hard-line views on **immigration**.

"According to @NYTimes , Trump may contribute less to our military and college students than the undocumented **immigrants** he wants to deport," it said. Another of posts on Twitter said the same thing but in Spanish.

According to @NYTimes, Trump may contribute less to our military and college students than the undocumented **immigrants** he wants to deport.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — British Prime Minister Theresa May said Sunday that her country would begin the process of withdrawing from the European Union by the end of March and suggested that she would seek a clean break that makes limits on **immigration** a priority.

The announcement eased the anxieties of Brexit backers, who had feared that May might delay the start of Britain's withdrawal by a year or more and that she would seek only modest changes in her country's relationship with the 27 remaining members of the bloc.

It disheartened Europhiles who had hoped that the country's exit might somehow be avoided altogether.

May's comments — first to the BBC in a Sunday morning interview and later in the opening speech of the Conservative Party's annual conference — were the most specific she has given to date on her plans for Britain's post-E.U. future.

The country voted in June to leave the bloc, 52 percent to 48. Previously she had said only that the country would not trigger Article 50, the never-before-used mechanism for an E.U. exit, this year.

The early 2017 timetable is roughly in line with what European leaders who have met with May have said they expected.

But some British advocates for sticking with the E.U. had suggested that the process should be put on hold until after France and Germany — the two most important European voices in the negotiations to come — have held national elections slated for next year.

May on Sunday firmly rejected those calls, a decision that was praised by E.U. leaders, who are pressing Britain to get on with its departure. European Council President Donald Tusk tweeted that May's words had brought "welcome clarity."

Even after Britain triggers Article 50, it will remain an E.U. member for some time. The rules call for a two-year negotiation on the withdrawal terms, although that time limit could be extended if all sides agree.

If Britain does leave two years after triggering Article 50, a departure in spring 2019 could allow May to claim victory on her oft-repeated pledge that "Brexit means Brexit" with a year to go before scheduled national elections.

May again refrained Sunday from saying exactly what she will ask for in her negotiations with Europe, insisting that she won't give "a running commentary" on British bargaining.

She also rejected the idea that Britain must choose between "hard Brexit" and "soft Brexit," saying it's a "false dichotomy" to suggest that Britain must decide between "some form of continued E.U. membership and . . . a conscious decision to reject trade with Europe."

But European leaders have said that is exactly the choice Britain faces, with one after the next arguing that Britain will not be allowed to retain the trade benefits of E.U. membership without accepting the rights of E.U. citizens to move freely across national borders.

May left no doubt Sunday that she will not accept that free-movement principle, saying that voters had made clear that they want reduced **immigration**. She was far less resolute in defending Britain's single-market membership, and she specifically ruled out a Norwegian-style arrangement that grants trade benefits in exchange for acceptance of the free movement of workers.

"The process we are about to begin is not about negotiating all of our sovereignty away again," she said. "It is not going to be about any of those matters over which the country has just voted to regain control. It is not, therefore, a negotiation to establish a relationship anything like the one we have had for the last 40 years or more."

Leading Brexit advocates cheered May's announcements. Former Conservative Party leader Iain Duncan Smith, a longtime Brexit proponent, told Sky News that he hoped her stand would signal that Britain was moving "quickly to the exit door and out."

But those who had backed "remain" in the referendum took the prime minister's words as further indication that Brexit is unavoidable and that it will bring a shock to the British economy.

Anna Soubry, a former Conservative minister, said triggering Article 50 by next spring is too soon. The timeline "really concerns me, troubles me hugely, because we won't have had the French elections, we won't have had the German elections, and, I'm sorry, it is going to take a lot of time and effort to disentangle ourselves and get the right deal," she told Britain's ITV .

May herself backed the "remain" campaign in the referendum. But after Prime Minister David Cameron resigned, she quickly pivoted and ran to succeed him on a platform of implementing the voters' will.

griff.witte@washpost.com

Britain's 850,000 Polish citizens face backlash after Brexit vote

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Supreme Court's new term begins Monday with the focus not on the court's docket but on the court itself and a future that will be defined by the presidential election.

For the first time in decades, there will be only eight justices, not nine, to begin the new term. Also absent are the kind of big-ticket cases — involving **immigration** reform, affirmative action, abortion, same-sex marriage and the Affordable Care Act — that in recent years have catapulted the Supreme Court to the fore of American civic life.

Instead, the short-handed court has assembled a docket of more-modest cases — albeit ones that touch on contemporary controversies such as the role of race in criminal justice and politics, free speech and perhaps the treatment of transgender students.

Of far greater consequence is the fate of the court's ideological balance. And on that question, the court finds itself like the rest of the country: waiting to see what happens on Nov. 8.

It has been nearly a half-century since a presidential election promised such an immediate impact on the court. Senate Republicans have refused to take up President Obama's choice of Judge Merrick Garland for the seat of the late Justice Antonin Scalia, arguing that a newly elected president should fill that vacancy.

As of Sunday, Garland has been waiting 200 days for the Senate to act on his nomination. Obama tapped Garland a month after Scalia's death in February. But Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) has been adamant that the Senate will not even hold a hearing on Garland, the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The next president's impact on the court could go well beyond that one choice and be felt for decades. Three of the current justices are now older than other members who recently retired from the court, suggesting more departures to fill.

A victory by Donald Trump would continue the modern tradition of courts dominated by Republican-appointed members. But Hillary Clinton's success could upend the status quo at the Marble Palace, producing nominees who would cement abortion rights, affirmative action and gay rights, and challenge hard-won conservative victories on gun rights, strict voting laws and campaign finance.

Any discussion of the Supreme Court these days, Stanford law professor Pamela S. Karlan said at a recent preview session at William & Mary Law School, can be summed up in two words: "It depends."

If the procedural precedent for Republican resistance is thin, the political imperative is clear.

"I really don't think there can be any doubt that if Chief Judge Garland is in fact the next justice on the Supreme Court, it is going to lead to a sea change in the direction of the court on many of the most consequential issues of the law," said Kannon Shanmugam, a Washington lawyer and former Scalia clerk who regularly represents clients before the court.

Garland's fate depends not only on whether Clinton is elected but also which party comes to control the Senate. A Republican-majority Senate might finally welcome Garland, perhaps even in a lame-duck session before the end of the year. Republican senators in the past praised Garland as the most moderate nominee a Democratic president might offer.

But a Senate controlled by Democrats might want a more liberal nominee or a younger one, who would probably get to serve longer on the court than the 63-year-old Garland. That would present Clinton with a tough choice as she puts together a Cabinet and a legislative agenda.

"The political capital that a President Clinton would have to exert to nominate someone else, unless she has a filibuster-proof Senate, might not be worth it," Karlan said.

Trump has promised that his nominee would come from a list of 21 possibilities — all but one are judges — that has drawn respect from the conservative legal establishment. But Democrats probably would not make it easy for him to fill an opening that occurred during a Democratic president's term.

"Whatever the outcome of this, the damage to the court has been done," said David Strauss, a law professor at the University of Chicago. "Because it's hard to imagine the Democrats in the foreseeable future, should they be in the position Republicans are now, unilaterally disarming."

The current divide on the court has actually led to more liberal outcomes than conservative ones. The four justices on the left need only draw one vote from the right in order to prevail, and Justice Anthony M. Kennedy has sided with them on several.

"A lot of the big things are actually ones on which the court already has a so-called liberal majority — abortion and affirmative action, now that Justice Kennedy has voted that way, are two recent examples," said Neal Katyal, who was acting solicitor general under Obama.

But it is clear that the court itself recognizes it is split. Three cases accepted before Scalia died — disputes involving class actions, a government "taking" of private land and subsidies for a religious organization — have not yet been scheduled for oral argument, while others granted months later will be argued this week.

The court found itself deadlocked four times last term — including over the propriety of Obama's ambitious order to shield some longtime undocumented **immigrants** from deportation. Other times, it reached agreement by avoiding fundamental questions.

The justices mostly have been silent about how the vacancy has affected their work. But Justice Sonia Sotomayor recently told a group of lawyers and judges in Colorado that it eventually will keep the court from doing its job.

"There are a few cases where you can see that we ruled very, very, very narrowly, and it doesn't take a genius to figure out why," Sotomayor said. But she added the court's job is to take on the most vexing questions, ones that have divided lower courts.

"If we do rule narrowly on every case we take," Sotomayor said, "the resolution of those important issues will continue to elude us and elude you."

The court will begin oral arguments on Tuesday, instead of the traditional first Monday in October, because of a Jewish holiday. Race in the justice system will be a prominent topic.

In one case, the court will consider Duane Buck's assertion that his right to a fair hearing in Texas was compromised during the death penalty phase of his conviction for two murders in 1995. His lawyers put on the stand a state expert who said black men are more likely to present a risk of future violence.

In another case, Miguel Angel Peña Rodriguez wants to show that the jury in his trial on sexual assault charges was improperly swayed by the prejudicial statements of one of the jurors. The former law enforcement officer was outed by fellow jurors who said he argued for convicting Peña Rodriguez because he was Mexican and "Mexican men take whatever they want."

The Colorado Supreme Court said rules protecting the secrecy of jury deliberations prohibited a judge from considering the man's remarks.

And the court will again confront the role of race in politics. For the third straight term, the justices will consider whether state legislators improperly relied on race when drawing electoral districts. The current cases come from Virginia and North Carolina.

Later this month, the court will decide whether to accept the case involving Gavin Grimm, a transgender boy, who is barred from using the boys' bathroom at Gloucester High School in Virginia. Lower courts have deferred to the Obama administration's directive that schools must allow students to use the bathroom that corresponds with their gender identity.

But Gloucester County received a stay from complying with the ruling, which the Supreme Court granted until it decided whether to hear the case.

If accepted, said American Civil Liberties Union legal director Steven Shapiro, it would "immediately become the highest profile case" on the court's docket.

robert.barnes@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Eric Zhou grew up in China's Fujian province watching his father, an accomplished chef, whip up banquets of intricate Chinese dishes. But when Zhou moved to the United States and started working in a Chinese restaurant, he saw that his native cuisine was mostly considered cheap in this country, confined to greasy takeout counters and $7.95 lunch buffets.

So Zhou edged his way into a much more lucrative industry: Japanese food. Years later, he owns four Japanese and Asian fusion restaurants in the Washington area. With Chinese food, he says, "the price in America is too low. Japanese restaurants don't have this problem. To us, it's more suitable. It's a better life."

Zhou, 44, has joined thousands of other Chinese **immigrants** in the United States in seeking a leg up the economic ladder through Japanese food. From Ames, Iowa, to Lancaster, Pa., Chinese Americans have opened many of the sushi joints that dot suburban malls and city blocks across the country. It's the result of what experts describe as a striking convergence between U.S. ethnic-food preferences and the economic pressures facing a new wave of Chinese **immigrants**, whose population in the United States has tripled in the past 25 years.

Which cuisines sell well and which do not may seem a combination of chance and cultural tastes. But the outsize role of Chinese Americans in the Japanese food business, according to academics who have studied it, sheds light on deeper forces. The influx of low-wage Chinese **immigrants** — China recently eclipsed Mexico as the largest source of **immigrants** to the United States — has created fierce competition to provide cheap food. At the same time, Japan's wealth and economic success helped its cuisine gain a reputation as trendy and refined. So for many entrepreneurial Chinese **immigrants** looking to get ahead, Japanese food has often become the better opportunity.

"Chinese entrepreneurs have figured out that this is a way to make a slightly better living and get out of the . . . world of $10, $5 food at the bottom end of the market," says Krishnendu Ray, who leads New York University's food studies program.

Ray has collected data from Zagat, the restaurant guide, to underscore the point. In 1985, the average cost of a Chinese dinner for one in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco was $24.20 when adjusted for inflation, compared with $31.88 for a Japanese dinner, a difference of just $7.68. By 2013, a Chinese dinner only cost a little more — $32.78 — while a Japanese dinner had nearly doubled, to $62.73, a difference of nearly $30.

"Japanese food has more prestige and seems to, if you just look at a menu, have greater economic opportunity attached to it, because people are conditioned to pay more for rice and protein when it's presented as sushi than rice and protein when it's presented as a stir fry," said Sasha Issenberg, author of "The Sushi Economy."

Some — but not all — of the difference in the price of Japanese and Chinese offerings has to do with food itself. Ray argues that Chinese food has earned a reputation for being cheap in large part because of the historic poverty of the country and its **immigrants**. "Foods we associate with poor **immigrants** tend to be cheap, and we are generally not willing to pay a higher price for it," he says.

He argues that the cuisine's reputation could change as China's economy grows and its people become wealthier. Already, more upscale Chinese restaurants are popping up to cater to a new wave of wealthy Chinese migrating to the United States. But others are skeptical that most Americans will ever pay top dollar for Chinese food.

Kin Lee, the owner of Love Sushi in Gaithersburg, Md., was 11 when he came to the country from Guangzhou, a massive city in southern China. His father owned a Chinese restaurant. His wife, however, had worked in Japanese restaurants and advised him that it was a better business.

"I can tell you it is easier to do than a Chinese restaurant," he says, "and the profit margins are better."

Patterns in **immigration**

Since China loosened its restrictions on emigration in the 1970s, the total number of Chinese **immigrants** in the United States has gone from just 384,400 in 1980 to 2 million in 2013, according to the Migration Policy Institute. Some Chinese have arrived legally, aided by American laws designed to help them escape religious persecution, democracy crackdowns or forced abortions. Others paid tens of thousands of dollars to be smuggled into the country.

Like many migrant groups, they clustered in specific industries, where language skills were less important, and where there were well-established networks of job opportunities. According to the best estimates, there are more than 40,000 Chinese restaurants in the country, more than the number of U.S. post offices. On the East Coast, many Chinese **immigrants** arrive in New York, and from there ride the network of long-distance buses from Chinatown to kitchens all over the country. Like Zhou, many are from Fujian province, where entire villages emptied out in the 1990s as people sought opportunity in the United States.

David Wank, a professor of sociology at Japan's Sophia University who has studied Chinese ownership of Japanese restaurants, says that Japanese, Vietnamese and Korean **immigrants** began opening Japanese restaurants outside of major cities in the 1980s to take advantage of Americans' growing appetite for the food. But it was the Fujianese who greatly expanded the reach of inexpensive Japanese restaurants, he says, first opening sushi restaurants in New York in the 1990s, then pushing up and down the East Coast.

It is impossible to say how many of the roughly 25,000 Japanese restaurants in the United States are owned by people of Chinese origin. The Japanese Ministry of Agriculture estimated in the past that only about a tenth of Japanese restaurants in the States were run by people of Japanese descent. A survey of 33 Japanese restaurants in the Washington area revealed that 12 were owned by Chinese Americans and 12 by Korean Americans. Only six were Japanese owned.

Wank says Chinese **immigrants** abandoned Chinese food restaurants because of fierce competition. Many Chinese **immigrants** were poor and willing to work punishing hours to send money home to their relatives or give their children a better life in the United States. That led to a crowded industry and low wages.

By contrast, Japanese food offered a much clearer economic opportunity. As Japan's economy roared in the second half of the 20th century, its food became associated with a new class of business travelers. The cuisine's healthful reputation, its embrace by Hollywood stars and the invention of Americanized classics such as the California roll helped the food's popularity to grow. Americans expected to pay high prices for Japanese food. But incomes in Japan were already so high that it didn't make economic sense for a Japanese chef to emigrate to work anywhere but in the priciest U.S. restaurants, often in major cities.

That created an opening for Chinese Americans.

"Often, the margins look better on sushi than they do on Chinese food," Issenberg says. "If I could be selling egg rolls for $3 each or cucumber rolls for $5 each, why am I not in that business?"

Kazuhiro Okochi, a chef and owner at KAZ Sushi Bistro in Washington, D.C., who trained as a chef in Japan, said that he's seen many non-Japanese chefs cook good Japanese food, and that Japanese cuisine actually borrows a lot from other culinary traditions, including China's. But he worries that the quality and the reputation of some Japanese restaurants in the U.S. might be suffering because new restaurant owners are trying to compete on price and expand quickly.

"Japanese food and, particularly sushi, has grown so fast in the past few decades, and a lot of people just try to copy and open the restaurants, without getting much [training]," Okochi says.

Big dreams

Zhou loves Fujianese food; he talks fondly of the big pot of soup that his wife keeps bubbling on the back burner at home nearly all hours of the day. But he's happy to have specialized in Japanese cooking.

"I wanted to earn money," he says, "so I studied the industry that had the higher salary."

Zhou (pronounced like "Joe") is the owner of Masa Hibachi Steakhouse & Sushi, a spacious Japanese restaurant in Silver Spring, Md., that features flat iron teppanyaki griddles on which chefs cook and perform tricks for customers. At 5:30 p.m. on a Wednesday in August, a birthday party of young women shrieked with delight as their chef — also from Fujian — flipped vegetables, squirted sake into their mouths and sent flames shooting across the grill.

Zhou now owns four restaurants in the Washington suburbs that serve a mix of hibachi, sushi and Asian fusion. He owns a house in Bowie and pays for family vacations and piano lessons for his two middle-school-age children. But he is still striving to improve his business and dreams of building a network of eight to 10 hibachi and sushi restaurants.

"In terms of family, I think I've achieved the American Dream," he says. "Professionally, I'm still working towards it."

For the past few decades, the Japanese restaurant business has offered people like Zhou the clearest path to success. Yet, if China's economy continues to grow, that could gradually set its emigrants and its cuisine in the United States on a new path.

Ray believes that as China gets wealthier, its cuisine may move up-market, just as Japanese food did. He thinks Americans may soon discover what a remarkable cuisine China possesses — and has possessed throughout recorded history.

"If you go to any of the major Chinese cultures 1,000 years ago, they have a foodie culture like Brooklyn and Manhattan has today," Ray says. "I think my son's generation, when he grows up, is going to look at Chinese culture with totally different eyes."

But for now, Zhou and other Chinese American entrepreneurs are still following local tastes. "If Americans really wanted to eat the authentic food, it would exist," Zhou says.

He recalls a Chinese-style dish, a duck breast, that he added to the menu at his restaurant after it opened. Zhou thought it was delicious, but it sold poorly.

"When you open a restaurant, you need to follow local appetites, then you can earn money," he says. "You can't just say, 'Oh, I like this.' The customers have to think that."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EL CAJON, Calif. — In a turnabout, police here Friday decided to release two videos, taken by a taco-stand employee and a customer, showing the minutes leading to the fatal shooting by police of an unarmed black man.

Police on Tuesday night had released a still photo taken from a video showing the police killing hours earlier of Alfred Olango, 38, an **immigrant** from Uganda. But backed by the district attorney, the police chief had refused until Friday to release the full video.

The fuller release was made to try to avoid a repeat of the violence that erupted at the Thursday night protest march on a downtown street in this suburb east of San Diego. Five men were arrested after the rally of 50 to 75 turned violent, with car windows broken, bottles thrown at police and a rider pulled from his motorcycle.

Police used "pepper balls" and flash-bang grenades to disperse the crowd after the protest was declared an unlawful assembly. Four of the men arrested were charged with failure to disperse and one other for assault.

Friday night, a crowd of more than 100 protesters gathered at the same intersection where Thursday's melee broke out. By nearly 9 p.m., there had not been a repeat of that violence but El Cajon police were prepared. The police department took to social media to warn  motorists to stay away from the intersection because of the growing crowd and "the possibility of police activity."

Meanwhile, with several marches planned for Saturday, some businesses are planning to close early.

The videos released Friday included one taken by a taco-stand employee that is 1 minute and 37 seconds in duration. A second one by a customer is only a few seconds. Both were given voluntarily to police, officials said.

Both videos show two El Cajon officers closing in on Olango and one officer firing his gun. The video taken by the taco-stand customer has audio of a woman screaming.

The two officers were not wearing body cameras. They were responding to calls from Olango's sister and other witnesses that Olango was acting erratically.

The longer of the videos shows Olango starting to walk away from one of the officers, then turning, walking several steps and assuming what police have called a "shooter's stance."

A protester watching the video on television said, "they trapped him like an animal."

The decision to release the videos was made collectively by the city's mayor, police chief, county sheriff, the district attorney, the area's county supervisor and the chiefs of the police departments in San Diego, Chula Vista and Escondido, officials said.

The investigation into the shooting is continuing, El Cajon Police Chief Jeff Davis told reporters at a news conference. Also at the news conference was Andre Branch, president of the San Diego branch of the NAACP.

"Full disclosure to the public builds trust and shows respect," Branch said.

San Diego County District Attorney Bonnie Dumanis said the videos are only part of the investigation. Dumanis agreed with the police decision to release the videos early, in a deviation from the standard policy of waiting until the full investigation is complete.

"I think it's the right thing to do to ensure public safety," she said of the decision to release the videos. She said any decision on whether or not to file charges is a "long way" away.

Protesters were not allowed at the news conference.

Asked why he released the still photo Tuesday night, Davis said, "We felt that the aggression of some of the protesters made it necessary to release some information."

The photo purported to show Olango in a "shooter's stance" and pointing a metallic, cylindrical object at one of the officers. The object proved to be a vaping device.

Davis declined to say whether the two officers had yet been interviewed by the homicide squad. He also declined to say whether Olango's family had been interviewed. In response to a question, Davis said one caller had told the police dispatcher that Olango did not appear to have a gun.

Local ministers have repeatedly called for protests to remain peaceful. The call was echoed by Olango's mother at a tearful news conference Thursday afternoon, and by Mayor Bill Wells. A prayer vigil outside El Cajon Police Department headquarters was set for Friday.

A rally demanding release of the video and the shift of the investigation to the Justice Department is set for Saturday afternoon. Protesters say the still photo provides only a limited view of the shooting and may be an effort by officials to cover up misconduct by police.

Olango, 38, arrived in the United States as a refugee with his family in 1991, according to a statement released by U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement.

An **immigration** judge ordered him deported in 2002 after he was convicted of transporting and selling drugs. An **immigration** judge renewed that order in 2009, when Olango left prison after serving a sentence for being a felon in possession of a firearm.

In both instances, Uganda refused to issue travel documents that would have permitted Olango to return to his homeland, according to a statement issued by ICE. Olango and his family had fled Uganda for fear of becoming victims of political violence, according to court documents.

The **immigration** system was required to release Olango from custody in compliance with a U.S. Supreme Court ruling that **immigrants** ordered deported cannot be held in custody indefinitely if their native country refuses to allow them to return, officials said.

After being released from federal custody, Olango was ordered to appear regularly before officials of the customs agency. He followed that requirement for several years but stopped reporting in February 2015 and "had not been encountered by the agency since," according to the statement.

On Tuesday afternoon, the two El Cajon officers confronted Olango in a strip-mall parking lot after police received a call from his sister saying that he was acting erratically. According to police, Olango refused their commands and reached into his pocket for a metallic-looking object and then assumed a "shooting stance," aiming the device at an officer.

That officer fired his service weapon, fatally striking Olango. The other officer fired a stun gun.

His sister watched in horror as her brother was shot.

"I told the police — please don't shoot him, he's sick, he's mentally sick," she told reporters later. "I didn't call the officers to come and kill my brother in front of me."

Olango, who worked as a cook at a Hooters restaurant, had several run-ins with local police, including allegations of drunken driving and domestic violence.

Olango's tangled **immigration** and criminal background has added a level of complexity to the potential political fallout from his shooting. Olango's supporters say his **immigration** status has no bearing on the shooting and is an attempt by officials to distract the public from the overriding issue of police conduct toward black residents.

At the news conference Thursday, Olango's mother, Pamela Benge, said she feels the pain of other mothers who have had sons killed recently by police.

"We need justice," she said. "This kind of thing needs to stop."

She said her son was a "good, loving young man" who adored soccer, his family and particularly his daughter.

She denied that he was mentally ill. He had become distraught over the recent death of a friend, she said.

"His mind was not communicating," Benge said. "A mental breakdown is not easy to control."

The Rev. Shane Harris, president of the National Action Network, said Thursday that the killing was "representative of what we've seen around the country."

Olango "was attacked and not given the opportunity to live," he said. "Alfred was not mentally ill nor was he unstable."

The incident followed controversial police shootings in several locations in the United States. That increased the anger of protesters in El Cajon, a blue-collar suburb with a large **immigrant** population.

Olango's family has contacted a San Diego lawyer, Dan Gilleon, who once sued one of the officers involved over a sexual-harassment allegation filed by a female colleague; the city settled the case, and the officer, a 21-year veteran, was demoted. Gilleon says the officer should not be on the police force.

The shooting fit a pattern found during a study by Dumanis's office in 2014 of several hundred police shootings in San Diego County between 1993 and 2012. The study found that in 45 percent of cases, the shooting occurred "immediately" after the officer arrived and that in most cases, two officers were on the scene when the shooting occurred.

Olango's shooting happened within a minute of the officer arriving, police said.

The shooting also highlights a concern by police throughout the country: how to deal with people with mental-health issues. (The nature of Olango's mental health has not been officially clarified.)

The El Cajon police, according to Wells, the mayor, have officers with specific training in dealing with the mentally ill, but those officers were at another call when the two officers confronted Olango. He said 30 percent of police time in El Cajon involves dealing with people with mental-health issues.

"We have to do better with the mentally ill," Dumanis said Thursday.

Mental-health issues are a factor in about a quarter of fatal police shootings, according to a Washington Post database tracking such incidents nationwide. Olango was at least the 716th person fatally shot by police this year. In 2016, 172 of those who have died had mental-health issues.

Experts say such shootings highlight the issue of how often police are called to respond to people in mental or emotional crisis — and whether police training adequately prepares them to handle those calls.

In most cases last year in which people with reported mental illness were fatally shot by police, police were responding because relatives or bystanders were worried about the person behaving erratically; last year, this included dozens of explicitly suicidal people.

This post has been updated.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lørdag uddelte @DanskernesParti såkaldt asylspray i #Haderslev. Det var der stærke reaktioner på. #dkpol https://t.co/SBaOcf0a4V[https://t.co/SBaOcf0a4V] pic.twitter.com/Reymk4ecCQ

A provocative stunt by a far-right Danish political party this week has stirred a growing international backlash.

Members of the Party of the Danes in the port town of Haderslev distributed dozens of aerosol spray cans to passersby. They were labeled "anti-migrant spray," aimed at equipping local Danes against the threat of assault from **immigrants** and asylum seekers.

The purse-size can came with a label that translates as "Refugee Spray," both "legal" and "effective." The move immediately drew critics.

Izza Leghtas, a senior advocate for Europe at Refugees International, described the gag to CNN as "an appalling act of hostility and xenophobia towards asylum-seekers and refugees." She went on: "People who have fled to Europe to escape from war and violence should find the protection they need, and be treated with respect like any other human being. Yet too often, they find closed doors and prejudice. This is the latest, extreme example of that."

The Party of the Danes defended its stunt in Haderslev. "I cannot see how it is racist," party leader Daniel Carlsen told CNN. "Pepper spray is illegal here so we wanted to figure out a way for Danish people, in particular women, to protect themselves. It's obviously not the ideal situation."

While the party is relatively fringe and linked with neo-Nazism, its fellow travelers include more prominent, legitimate organizations, such as the Danish People's Party. From obscurity in the 1990s, the xenophobic DPP has risen to command a significant chunk of seats in Denmark's Parliament, winning some 21 percent of the vote in elections last year. Denmark's coalition government has been accused of taking a hard line on migrants, and was widely criticized for a plan to seize the assets and valuables of incoming refugees.

Like the attitudes of far-right populists elsewhere, security fears in Denmark about an influx of migrants are often built on a more abhorrent reservoir of racial hostility. This summer members of the Party of the Danes circulated a meme online ahead of the European soccer semifinal between France and Iceland. The image showed France's many non-white players juxtaposed against the Icelanders, hailing a clash between Africa and Europe.

This picture by Danish neo-nazis @DanskernesParti has tried to use Iceland's success for racist purposes. F\*\*k them! pic.twitter.com/Zmb3YzIyj3

The solidarity, as you can see in the tweet above, did not impress Icelanders.

This is not the first time xenophobic groups have distributed sprays to combat **immigrants**. In January, Geert Wilders, the Dutch far-right leader, walked around a fish market in Rotterdam, handing women spray cans that promised to be "Islamic testosterone bombs." The stunt followed right-wing furor in parts of Europe after migrants and asylum seekers were implicated in a series of sexual assaults in major cities.

Charlotte Bech, a resident of Haderslev, wrote a blog for the Agence France-Presse website decrying the divisive politics that have overtaken her town and describing her own experience when handed one of these anti-migrant sprays.

Fixed it... https://t.co/v4kVuAZM4r[https://t.co/v4kVuAZM4r] pic.twitter.com/I34gcrR4Ue

"I asked him what it was and he responded, very seriously, that it was an anti-migrant spray," she wrote. "I was shocked. I felt a deep sense of injustice. I have gotten to know several refugees who are living in my town and some of them have become friends. I can't stand people judging them in that way."

She added a note of optimism: "But it is important to point out that a lot of Danes have taken to social media to denounce these sprays. Two people even filmed themselves handing out aerosol sprays meant to promote compassion towards migrants."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EL CAJON, Calif. — In a turnabout, police here Friday decided to release the full video taken by a taco-stand employee showing the minutes leading to the fatal shooting by police of an unarmed black man.

Police on Tuesday night had released a still photo taken from the video showing the police killing hours earlier of Alfred Olango, 38, an **immigrant** from Uganda. But backed by the district attorney, the police chief had refused until Friday to release the full video.

The fuller release was made to try to avoid a repeat of the violence that erupted at the Thursday night protest march on a downtown street in this suburb east of San Diego. Two men were arrested after the rally of 50 to 75 turned violent, with car windows broken, bottles thrown at police and a rider pulled from his motorcycle.

Police used "pepper balls" and flash-bang grenades to disperse the crowd after the protest was declared an unlawful assembly.

A protest march is set for Saturday, and an additional protest was expected Friday night.

Police had responded Tuesday to a call from Olango's sister that he was mentally ill and acting erratically.

The two officers at the scene — one who shot Olango with his service weapon, one who used a stun gun to try to disable Olango — were not wearing body cameras.

Olango arrived in the United States as a refugee with his family in 1991, according to a statement released by U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement.

An **immigration** judge ordered him deported in 2002 after he was convicted of transporting and selling drugs. That order was renewed in 2009, when Olango left prison after serving a sentence for being a felon in possession of a firearm.

In both instances, Uganda refused to issue travel documents that would have permitted Olango to return to his homeland, according to a statement issued by ICE. Olango and his family had fled Uganda for fear of becoming victims of political violence, according to court documents.

The **immigration** system was required to release Olango from custody in compliance with a U.S. Supreme Court ruling that **immigrants** ordered deported cannot be held in custody indefinitely if their native country refuses to allow them to return, officials said.

After being released from federal custody, Olango was ordered to appear regularly before officials of ICE. He followed that requirement for several years but stopped reporting in February 2015 and "had not been encountered by the agency since," according to the statement.

On Tuesday afternoon, when the two El Cajon officers confronted Olango in a strip-mall parking lot, police said, Olango refused their commands and reached into his pocket for a metallic-looking object and then assumed a "shooting stance," aiming the device at an officer. The object turned out to be an electronic smoking device.

That officer fired his service weapon, fatally striking Olango. The other officer fired a stun gun.

national@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One day in October 1961, a young astronomer named Frank Drake scribbled a string of symbols on a blackboard at a radio observatory in Green Bank, W. Va. Drake's specialty was detecting and interpreting the natural radio waves that emanate from clouds of interstellar gas and from the cores of so-called active galaxies, among other cosmic locations. But he also was intrigued by the idea that **alien** civilizations might be broadcasting artificial radio signals into space, and that we might be able to detect them with the huge dish antennas he and his colleagues used for more conventional research.

The existence of aliens was mostly a fringe idea at the time. Science still hadn't recovered from claims by astronomer Percival Lowell in the early 20th century that he could see canals on Mars, built by enterprising Martians — claims that later proved embarrassingly wrong. It also didn't help that the flying-saucer craze, which had begun after World War II, was still in full swing.

Before the 20th century, however, the notion that life existed beyond Earth wasn't nearly so controversial. The idea, which dates as far back as the ancient Greeks, was championed by, among others, the astronomer William Herschel, the philosopher John Locke and the polymath Benjamin Franklin.

And in the 1960s — largely as a result of the bold vision laid out by Drake and a small group of colleagues, including a young Carl Sagan — the idea once again began entering the scientific mainstream. Just how firmly reestablished it has now become is richly evident in "All These Worlds Are Yours: The Scientific Search for **Alien** Life," by Jon Willis. In it, Willis, a cosmologist at the University of Victoria, in Canada, lays out the current state of astrobiology — the broad, interdisciplinary field of science that has drawn some of the most talented astronomers in the world.

The rigorous scientific enterprise Willis describes made talking about aliens respectable again, but that didn't keep UFO believers from dropping their own convictions about visitations, abductions and other fringe ideas as Ben Mezrich's "The 37th Parallel: The Secret Truth Behind America's UFO Highway" makes clear. It's a breathless, gripping — and credulous — tour through the wacky world of E.T. enthusiasts.

In his much more mainstream book, Willis explains that Frank Drake was afraid right from the start that he'd be lumped in with the saucer people. He needn't have worried: His approach to this risky topic was rigorously scientific. Drake guessed that **alien** civilizations probably existed (although he didn't believe they were visiting), but he didn't know if enough of them were sprinkled around the Milky Way to make the search for their radio broadcasts worthwhile. If the aliens were few and far between, he might have to look for a thousand years before he stumbled on one. If they were a dime a dozen, by contrast, one of their broadcasts could pop up in his radio receiver at pretty much any time.

So Drake, preparing for a small conference he'd convened to discuss the matter, stepped up to a blackboard and wrote down what is now known as the Drake Equation to help astronomers figure out whether there was any point to the enterprise. The equation takes the number of sun-like stars in the galaxy and whittles that down by asking how many of those stars have planets, how many of those planets are Earth-like, how many Earthlike planets give rise to life, how many life-bearing planets evolve intelligent life, and so on.

The catch: The only number Drake and the others had a clue about was the frequency of sun-like stars in the Milky Way. The rest was pure guesswork. So the scientists made their best guesses, multiplied all the factors and calculated that there were probably a million detectable civilizations in the galaxy. That meant it was clearly worth listening. Drake, along with a handful of others pursuing the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, have been listening ever since. They haven't had any luck.

But astronomers and planetary scientists have had plenty of luck in filling some of the other numbers in the Drake Equation. In 1961, for example, nobody knew whether any star beyond the sun had planets. Now, largely because of the Kepler space mission, we know of thousands, and it's almost certain that the Milky Way is home to many hundreds of billions. Tens of billions of these are probably Earthlike. We also know that some Earthlike planets orbit stars that aren't like the sun at all, which greatly expands the possibilities. And we know that a world doesn't necessarily have to be like Earth to be habitable. Several of the moons in our solar system have oceans of water hidden beneath their frozen surfaces, and where there's liquid water, there's at least the possibility of life.

In "All These Worlds Are Yours," Willis covers all the bases, from the origin of chemical elements to the formation of planets to the origin of life on Earth to the current search for life in the solar system — and onward to the search for signs of life in exoplanet atmospheres, which is just now gathering steam.

The book's great strength is Willis's meticulously detailed explanations of the science. As you read, you'll truly understand what we know about life in the universe, and what we're likely to find out in coming decades. The one exception is his overly bold answer to the question of whether there actually is **alien** life, at least in microbial form, in other worlds. "Well, yes, there is," he declares early on. "Probably lots of it."

In fact, he knows no such thing. Although Willis devotes an entire chapter to the several unproved theories about how life might have emerged on the young Earth, nobody really knows what happened. That means we don't know if life is virtually certain to arise under the right conditions, or whether it's a quadrillion-to-one shot. If it's the latter, we might truly be alone in the cosmos and, despite the fond hopes of most astrobiologists, Willis's certainty is a step too far.

The book's greatest weakness, unfortunately, is the same as its strength. Willis explains things in such exhaustive detail that only the most devoted of space geeks will be willing to slog through his mostly dry prose. He does make occasional attempts at reader-friendliness, but this usually comes across like a professor awkwardly trying to jolly the students along as they mostly roll their eyes. "Please tell me," he writes, imagining his readers' thoughts, "this isn't one of those 'life in the universe' books that just drones on about the solar system and leaves out all the neat stuff I am interested in. No, it isn't. But thank you for your patience in sticking with me so far." It does require patience, and many readers might have already given up by now.

Dry prose isn't even remotely a problem with "The 37th Parallel." Mezrich has written no fewer than eight New York Times bestsellers (his first, "Bringing Down the House," was on the list for more than a year), and several have been made into movies. He writes vividly and grippingly about the adventures of Chuck Zukowski, a longtime amateur UFO investigator whose relentless investigations of Area 51, cattle mutilations, the Roswell affair and other mainstays of X-Files subculture have turned him into a True Believer.

It all makes a terrific story, but while Mezrich's writing is light-years ahead of Willis's, his grip on science falls just as far behind. He seems to swallow without question the classic UFOlogical reasoning that if science doesn't have a ready explanation for your experience, it's perfectly reasonable to blame it on aliens. He accepts so many nonsensical claims that it would be impossible to list them all. One of my favorites is that the now-defunct "National Institute for Discovery Science," a UFO investigation unit founded by aerospace entrepreneur Robert Bigelow, was made up of "the top researchers in the fields of biology, geology, astrophysics, and chemistry." Impressive if true. But Mezrich names just one of these researchers, a biochemist who wasn't at the top of anything, or even close. There's a reason you've never heard of this institute — and it isn't because there's a government conspiracy to suppress it.

The publicity blurb for "The 37th Parallel" says that Mezrich did extensive research for this book, and that it turned him from a skeptic into a believer. Because nearly all of his sources were believers, too, however, it probably would be more accurate to say he drank the Kool-Aid. But it will make a heck of a movie.

I won't go to see it, though. The real science of astrobiology is exciting enough, and a long list of new telescopes and new planetary probes, already in the pipeline, guarantees that it will only get better over the next decade or two. Humans have been wondering whether we're alone in the universe for thousands of years, at least. We could know the answer very soon.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The guard searched the line of undocumented **immigrants**, placing each in shackles in the basement of a Homeland Security building in Northern Virginia. Then he came to a young woman in a blouse and blue pants that July day, and he paused.

"I know you," the guard told her, she remembered later. Months earlier, Wendy Uruchi Contreras had come to the same facility under much different circumstances — as an **immigration** rights activist.

That day, she had helped a Mexican woman bring her husband his belongings before he was deported. Uruchi and the guard had struck up a conversation, quickly realizing they lived near each other in Fredericksburg. Now she was on the other side of the plexiglass divide.

"What are you doing here?" the guard asked.

"I'm not a U.S. citizen," Uruchi answered. "And I got a DUI."

"I can't believe it," he said.

Uruchi's sudden fall — from **immigrant** advocate to undocumentedinmate — has stunned many who knew her. At Casa, the **immigrants** rights organization where Uruchi worked, colleagues were caught by surprise. Two weeks before pleading guilty to drunken driving, she had led a demonstration outside the Supreme Court urging the justices to support undocumented **immigrants**, but she never hinted she was one of them. She had spent threeyears helping others fight deportation. Now she faces that very fate.

Her arrest has exposed her husband's undocumented status and upended her children's lives. Any day now, Uruchi, 33, could be sent back to Spain. Under Obama administration guidelines, her DUI conviction makes her a priority for deportation. And under the visa waiver program she used to enter the country 14 years ago, she forfeited her right to legal appeal. Her only chance is a plea to **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officials for a stay of deportation, citing her otherwise clean record, community service and two American-born kids.

"These stays are not commonly granted," said Kim Propeack, communications director for Casa, which is helping Uruchi. "And they are not granted without a fight."

Uruchi's case comes at a time of intense national debate over **immigration**, including what to do about mixed-status families like hers — parents who are in the country illegally but have children who are U.S. citizens. President Obama's efforts at **immigration** reform,which could have opened a pathway to legal status for Uruchi and her husband, have been repeatedly blocked by Congress and the courts. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, meanwhile, has pledged to deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants** if elected, regardless of whether they have children born here.

Uruchi's situation isn't likely to generate much public sympathy. A recent CNN-ORC poll found that 83 percent of Americans favor deporting undocumented **immigrants** who have been convicted of a crime while living in the United States.

Uruchi knows she put everything at risk by getting into her car after drinking. "Driving that night," she acknowledged, "was the worst decision of my life."

In the Homeland Security complex many **immigrants** refer to as "Prosperity" after the avenue on which it sits in Fairfax, the guard waved a hand-held metal detector up and down Uruchi's body. Then the man she had once befriended put her in shackles and loaded her into a van bound for jail.

‘Pray for me’

Earlier this month, Uruchi's husband, Giovani Jimenez, stood in the doorway of their small house and tried to corral his children toward the car. It was a Sunday morning, and they were late to visit Wendy in jail in Williamsburg, 100 miles away.

"You're not taking anything?" Jimenez asked Alex, a quiet, gangly 13-year-old. Alex slunk inside and emerged with a thick library copy of "Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince."

Lucia, a bubbly 7-year-old, clutched a stuffed panda in a pink dress and an iPad. She sat next to Alex in the back of the family's beige 1991 Honda Accord, its mismatched hood and Ron Jon Surf Shop window sticker vestiges of a previous owner.

Jimenez held a manila folder. Inside were printouts of the kids' grades, which had plummeted since Uruchi's May 28 arrest. Alex, an eighth-grader, was suddenly getting D's in English and algebra. He had begun to talk back to his father. Lucia, in second grade, was also struggling in math. She could only fall asleep while holding on to her father's wrist. She woke up most nights crying for her mother.

Jimenez, 37, was coping as well as he could. Along with the lawyer's fees and court fines, mortgage and car payments, there was the cost of a tank of gas for every Sunday visit, 15 cents per minute for every call from jail, $30 to print and mail photos of the kids' pool visits and birthday parties because the jail didn't allow Jimenez to email or hand them to Uruchi.

On Sunday night, after spending all day driving his children to see their mother, he would climb behind the wheel of a delivery truck and drive to New Jersey and Pennsylvania, hopefully returning home in time to welcome his kids from school on Monday.

His wife's arrest had been like a bomb landing in their precariously built lives. Jimenez had come to the United States in early 2001 from Bolivia. He met Uruchi online. She, too, was born in Bolivia but was raised in Madrid. She told him about her abusive stepfather in Spain. He told her to come to America. When they met at Dulles International Airport in October 2002, they had never even seen a photo of each other.

As a Spanish citizen, Uruchi entered the country under the United States' visa waiver program, which allows visitors from 38 countries to stay for up to 90 days without a visa.

She and Jimenez got married, had kids and settled in Virginia. He worked as a trucker; she cleaned hotel rooms. When her back began to hurt, she took food safety courses and managed the hotel's kitchen.

In 2013, Uruchi began to get involved in activism. Deportations had reached an all-time high of more than 409,000 the previous year. But Uruchi's adolescence in Spain, where she saw women say and do what they wanted, had left the 4-foot-11 **immigrant** unafraid of speaking out. After meeting Casa employees at an event at the Salvadoran Embassy in D.C., she began attending the group's events. Soon, she was organizing them. In 2014, she was hired full time as a Virginia community organizer.

"She was banging off the walls with excitement," said Propeack, her Casa co-worker. Propeack recalled Uruchi organizing a Jan. 14 event in Richmond. It was the middle of winter, but Uruchi persuaded several dozen people to show up to the state capitol to lobby for **immigrants**' rights. "Wendy got all these undocumented moms to come," Propeack recalled.

Uruchi also helped undocumented **immigrants** fight deportation. Liliana Mendez, a 26-year-old Salvadoran woman from Falls Church, was about to be deported after a traffic accident when she came to Casa for help. Uruchi organized a news conference with a congressman. Within days, Mendez's deportation was stayed, and her ankle monitor was removed. "Wendy helped me so much," Mendez said.

Uruchi's activism took a toll on her marriage, however. She would often come home at 9 or 10 at night, only to spend more time on the phone guiding **immigrants** through health care sign-ups or school applications. The couple was considering a divorce when Uruchi was arrested.

She had attended a Casa event in Woodbridge, then gone to a restaurant with a colleague for dinner. They drank margaritas and discussed Uruchi's marital problems. As Uruchi drove them back to Fredericksburg, a Stafford County sheriff's deputy pulled her over.

Uruchi was on the phone with Jimenez when she saw the flashing lights behind her. She knew an undocumented **immigrant** could be deported over something as small as a fender-bender.

"Pray for me," she told her husband and hung up.

Her blood alcohol level was twice the legal limit for driving of 0.08.

On July 8, Uruchi and her husband went to Stafford County court. Their DUI attorney had negotiated a deal with the prosecutor: just one day in jail if she pleaded guilty to the misdemeanor. Only then did they tell the attorney Uruchi was undocumented. They say he told them not to worry: Stafford wouldn't alert federal officials.

Jimenezsaid he begged his wife not to take the deal, telling her it would be better to challenge the Breathalyzer results in court. But Uruchi pleaded guilty.She wanted it to be over, she said. "I screwed up, and I needed to face it."

She prayed she would be released after a day. Instead, she was sent from Stafford to "Prosperity," where ICE officials asked about her husband. He, too, was undocumented, she admitted.

"They have all my information: Wendy gave it to them," Jimenez said. "They might come for me now."

After two days of questioning, ICE officials told Uruchi she would be deported. The Obama administration began more aggressively deporting illegal **immigrants** with DUI convictions after a string of deadly, high-profile incidents. One of the most notorious occurred in 2010 in Prince William County, when Carlos A. Martinelly Montano drunkenly hit another car head on, killing Sister Denise Mosier and injuring two other nuns. Montano, an illegal **immigrant** from Bolivia, had been arrested for drunken driving on two earlier occasions but released.

Corey A Stewart (R-At Large), chairman of Prince William's Board of County Supervisors, the head of Trump's Virginia campaign and a longtime critic of illegal **immigration**, said there was "no question" Uruchi should be deported.

"Otherwise, eventually, people tend to graduate in the severity of their crimes," he said, citing the 2010 case. Uruchi "shows how entitled illegal **immigrants**feel: Here is somebody who is so brazen that they're here illegally, and they are out there as a crusader trying to keep people from being deported."

Almost 24,000 undocumented **immigrants** from Virginia and the District have been deported over the past 10 years, ICE figures show.

Had Uruchi not pleaded guilty, she might have been able to admit to a lesser charge and avoid ICE altogether. Had she entered the country illegally, rather than on a visa waiver, she would have been entitled to a hearing in front of an **immigration** judge. And had she been an American citizen, her DUI would have cost her $300 and her license for a year.Instead, she is now filing an application for a stay of deportation.

"It's the one shot we have left," said her lawyer, Enid Gonzalez.

"She is a woman who [has been] fighting to stop deportation and now is in danger of getting deported herself," wrote Pamela Benavides-Barahona, 12, who said in a letter of support that Uruchi drove her to school events when her mother could not. "She never gives up and we should not give up on her."

‘I’ll be home soon’

"Hello," Jimenez said in English to the woman behind the desk at the Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail in Williamsburg. "I'm here to see Wendy Uruchi."

"I thought I recognized you," the woman said.

As his father signed in, Alex paced back and forth in the lobby. Eventually, the woman at the desk directed them to visitation room 111.

On either side of a large plexiglass window sat a metal stool. The door opened. Lucia gasped.

"Mama," she said, jumping onto the table, putting her small hand to the window and wiggling her fingers. Dressed in a dark blue jumpsuit, Uruchi put her own hand to the glass, revealing broken nails.

"Como estás?" she asked Alex.

"Soy bien," he said into a metal speaker, botching his Spanish. While his younger sister is fluent, Alex has lost much of the language, leading his parents to worry how he will adapt if Uruchi is deported and the family has to follow her to Spain.

"You look chubby," Uruchi told her daughter with a smile. Lucia, dressed in a sparkly new school outfit, now wore size 10, Jimenez said.

Had they been brushing their teeth, taking their vitamins, doing their homework, Uruchi asked. Had they been to the pool?

"It's closed," Jimenez said.

"I guess it's not summer any longer," she replied.

She asked them what books they had been reading, scolding Lucia when Jimenez reported she had been playing games on the iPad instead. From time to time, Uruchi would say something to Alex in Spanish that he didn't understand.

"I feel like there is a fly stuck inside my head," he said after one misunderstanding.

"You're my son," Uruchi told him. "You are strong, Alex. This won't last. I won't be here forever. One of these days, I'll come home."

"Are you going to be in here for all of second grade?" Lucia asked. "And third grade?"

"No, mi amor," Uruchi said. "I'll be home soon."

She told Alex she was sorry she had missed his birthday, three days earlier.

"When I get out, we'll celebrate it," she said.

"No, it's better if we don't," he replied.

A female jailer opened the door behind Uruchi, signaling the end of the visit.

"Keep your head up, Alex," Uruchi told her son as he walked out of the small room.

Lucia ran back to the plexiglass. Mother and daughter kissed the window at the same time. Then Uruchi was led away.

michael.miller@washpost.com

Emily Guskin and Jennifer Jenkins contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ON SATURDAY evening, in Durham, N.C., the artist Eaten Fish received the 2016 Courage in Cartooning Award, in a ceremony at the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists convention.

Eaten Fish, the pen name of a man otherwise known publicly only by the first name Ali, could not be at the AAEC Political Satire Fest to pick up his award. That is because he remains held in an Australian detention center in Papua New Guinea, where he has been for about three years.

From there, Ali, an Iranian refugee, draws cartoons that depict his hardships in the center. From there, Eaten Fish documents his story as a budding symbol of Australia's larger **immigration** issues, as the nation keeps more than 2,000 people in its detention centers — the vast majority of them refugees. And from there, Eaten Fish tells The Washington Post's Comic Riffs that he appreciates the new award from the Cartoonists Rights Network International (CRNI).

Once-jailed political cartoonist Nikahang Kowsar, now an executive with the Washington-area-based CRNI, picked up the award on Eaten Fish's behalf, and Australia-based advocate Janet Galbraith appeared by video.

Ahead of the award, Comic Riffs conducted an email interview with Eaten Fish through Kowsar, who is also from Iran. Here is that exchange:

MICHAEL CAVNA: What do you want Post readers — and the world — to most know about your plight there?

ALI: Hi, my name's Ali; people know me as Eaten Fish. I'm living in [an] Australian detention center on Manus Island in Papua New Guinea — but actually, it's a prison. I fled my country to Australia to find safety, but as you know about the other reports, most horrible things [have] happened to me in this place. I asked for asylum in Australia and they forcibly sent me to Manus. … I've been told this place is a refugee processing center and [that] it's legal, but you know that Papua New Guinea's high-court decision made this place illegal. So I've been locked up in PNG for three years.

I've been assaulted and abused. And not having the medical care I need. It's very painful and awful being trapped somewhere and not having control of your plight. [Having] suffered, I didn't deserve this horrible life.

[Editor's note: Australia's **immigration** and border-protection department has said in a statement that it "strongly denies the claims made by Cartoonist Rights Network International that transferees are subject to 'beatings, deprivation of food and, even worse, degrading treatment by the guards.' " The statement goes on to say: "The Department takes allegations of inappropriate conduct very seriously. Any allegations of inappropriate behaviour by service provider or departmental staff at regional processing centres are immediately reported to the Department for investigation. The Department currently has no evidence that any of these allegations are true."]

MC: According to some reports, your situation is extremely difficult in terms of physical pain, psychological challenges as well as issues of safety and brutality. Could you talk about what your truest difficulties and hardships are there?

ALI: My story is a long story to tell. I've got very sick in here. Having OCD, [it's] getting very hard — and [I've had] painful panic attacks for more than a year. [I'm] having stress and nightmares every single night. [I'm] not feeling safe and … I need freedom in a safe place.

[Editor's Note: The Australia border and **immigration** department said in its media statement: "Transferees receive appropriate medical care, broadly comparable with health services available within the Australian community."]

MC: Are you hopeful that your situation might improve soon? And does outside-world attention at all buoy your hope?

ALI: What kind of hope? I don't think … there is any hope for me. I'm trapped in a political game and it will never get finished. I have no control of my life. Policy does not care about my life. I'll die in here.

[Editor's note: "The Australian Government is working with the Government of Papua New Guinea to close the regional processing centre, settle refugees in PNG and assist those found not to be refugees to return to their country of origin," a Department of **Immigration** and Border Protection spokesperson told The Post on Tuesday.]

MC: Why did you leave Iran, and would you fear returning, or at least have great concern about a return?

ALI: I don't feel safe in here, and also it's not safe enough for me to answer this question. I cannot return to my country. I would be dead or imprisoned.

MC: So about your art: When did you first begin cartooning in general, and how long into your detention did you decide you wanted to create cartoons about your plight? And have you been punished for your cartoons?

ALI: I started drawing and cartooning since when I was a child. As you can see, my cartoons are my diaries, and I've been doing drawing all the time I [have been] here. I draw about whatever happens to me, mostly. I do not know if you call it some kind of punishment, but I've suffered mentally [as a result of] cartooning and publishing them. Even I tried to kill myself once.

MC: What does it mean to have fellow cartoonists and writers, including in Australia, rally and draw to your cause?

ALI: Oh, that means a lot to me. I see light and too much kindness in those cartoons. Australian people and artists are so kind for supporting me with the campaigns. I really thank them.

Also, my deep appreciation to my [artist] friends Sally Stokes, Janet Galbraith and the First Dog on the Moon who never stopped helping me and I would be dead now without their help.

MC: What does receiving the Courage in Cartooning Award mean to you?

ALI: Getting a cartooning courage award feels awesome, but I feel sad because I've suffered badly and an award does not fix my hurt body. At least I wish I could touch the courage award by my hands.

MC: Is there anything you want to say directly to readers?

ALI: Yeah, I'd really like to say this: I see many people looking for scientific and theoretical movies and stories like the movie called "The Maze Runner." But if people do a bit [of] research about this detention center, they'll find out the "Maze Runner" story in real life somewhere in the world called Australian detention/processing center in Papua New Guinea, where if you try to protect yourself from abuses, you'll hear [that] it's against the rules and you'll be named a violent criminal and will be hit by Papua New Guinea royal police exactly like grievers in that movie.

Note: Cartoonists around the world are drawing in solidarity with Eaten Fish. Here are a few examples:

In solidarity with #EatenFish a refugee cartoonist languishing in Australia's detention center @CRNetInt @comicriffs @TurnbullMalcolm pic.twitter.com/DO03Grj95K

Cartoonists 4 #EatenFish@PeterDutton\_MP @TurnbullMalcolm #AusPol pic.twitter.com/k8ScjmQzge

@firstdogonmoon#EatenFish "support"-drawing pic.twitter.com/XJ3YclOPnS

.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CALAIS, France — So far, Donald Trump's plan to build a wall along the Mexican border is all talk. Last week, France and Britain actually began building one along theirs.

Construction started here on a roughly mile-long concrete barrier intended to separate a sprawling migrant camp from the tunnels that offer passage to Britain, the latest attempt in what has become a global effort to throw physical barriers in the way of historic streams of human ­migration.

From a razor-wire-topped border fence in Hungary to the sealed border of Macedonia and Greece to Trump's proposed wall , polarized societies across the world are finding that they can unite around keeping others at bay.

The "Great Wall of Calais," as the project is informally known, is considerably shorter than Trump's proposed partition of the United States and Mexico, but its message is much the same: Keep out. The concrete wall, which will rise to 13 feet, extends a fence near the sprawling Calais migrant camp known as the "Jungle," where more than 7,000 migrants have been stranded as they seek to enter Britain by all means possible. The concrete will be specially formulated to make it difficult to scale.

The camp here has become one of the most visible symbols of Europe's migration crisis: a squalid no man's land nestled between London and Paris, two of Europe's wealthiest cities. The victorious British campaign to leave the ­European Union was partly fueled by concerns over **immigration**, while candidates for France's presidential election next year are already competing over being tough on migrant flows. Opponents of French President ­François Hollande have tried to turn the camp into a symbol of his weakness.

"It's something scary, this resignation, this lack of authority," former French president Nicolas Sarkozy said while visiting Calais last week. Sarkozy's campaign to recapture the presidency has pulled anti-**immigrant** rhetoric from the surging far-right National Front party, which has vowed to reestablish controls at France's borders.

So far, the only sign of the wall is an anonymous, unmarked construction site at the edge of the highway, far from the center of this small, working-class city. Late last week, a small squadron of construction workers laid small foundation slabs into ditches cleared alongside the highway as cars and trucks sped by.

The aim is to keep migrants from stowing away on ferries and trucks. The barrier follows portions of the highway leading into the port, which passes directly in front of the encampment's entrance. Britain has contributed most of the money for the project, which will cost about $2.5 million, according to leaked reports in the British media. The British Home Office refused to confirm the price tag. In total, London has pledged $22 million to France for assistance with border security.

British Prime Minister Theresa May has taken Britain's exit referendum as a mandate to toughen **immigration** policies, working hand-in-hand with French authorities to try to discourage migrants from pooling in Calais. Both nations have taken an increasingly hard-line approach. The moves come as many European countries have pursued national policies to discourage migration, while campaigning against German-led efforts to share asylum seekers among the 28 nations of the E.U.

The wall will "prevent illegals trying to get to the U.K.," British Home Secretary Amber Rudd told the House of Commons in September , defending the initiative against critics who called it a waste of money.

In France, the wall's construction comes at a tense political moment, as the country prepares for the 2017 presidential election. The rise of Marine Le Pen — the outspoken leader of the far-right National Front Party — has pulled the political mainstream toward her agenda, which is firmly opposed to France becoming a haven for migrants and refugees.

In the aftermath of three devastating terrorist attacks in the past two years, contenders in the forthcoming presidential election are increasingly engaged in a debate focused on **immigration** and Islam rather than economics or domestic policy. The camp in Calais has become a flash point.

"The attacks have considerably changed the climate in France," said Bruno Cautrès, a political analyst at the Center for Political Research at Paris's Sciences Po. "The desire for many is to have a president who can bring security back."

Local authorities in Calais ­oppose Paris's decision to construct the wall, preferring instead only the dismantling of the Jungle camp, whose existence has placed considerable strain on the town of 126,000.

"The beginning of the solution begins with the demolition of the Jungle," said Faustine Maliar, the chief of staff for the mayor of Calais, a Sarkozy ally. "The ­moment the Jungle is destroyed, there is no need for a wall," she said.

Hollande, who is seeking reelection next year, has vowed to demolish the camp by the end of the year.

"From now on our objectives are clear," Hollande told reporters in Calais on Monday. "To ­guarantee the security of the people of Calais, maintain public order and ensure that conditions for the migrants and refugees are dignified."

Migrants who wish to claim asylum in France will be shipped to other shelters across the country, Hollande said. But because the vast majority of Calais' migrants want to travel onward to Britain, the plan's chance for success is unclear. Previous attempts to squeeze the size of the camp have failed.

From a practical perspective, the short, easily defendable French wall — combined with the formidable obstacle of the 22-mile-wide English Channel — may be more successful at preventing passage than any Trump-built wall on the long U.S.-Mexico land border, said Alexander Betts, the director of the Refugee Studies Center at the University of Oxford. But the political symbolism is more important than any practical purpose, he said.

"The wall is an idea that public audiences can understand as a tool of exclusion," he said.

 With both governments agreeing that they want to deter migrants from coming to Calais, "they can agree on strong deterrence. So if building a wall solves that, or building an asylum center in Paris solves that, then that's fine, even if it's not in the best interests of the refugees and migrants in Calais," he said.

 If the wall is intended to deliver a message of deterrence, so far it does not seem to have accomplished its mission. Few migrants in the camp appear to have heard about its construction — but they were much more worried that they would soon be pushed out of their temporary home.

"The wall is not important," said Tariq Shinwari, a 26-year-old business administration graduate from Afghanistan who said he had lived in the Jungle for six months. "People in here do not care about the wall — they care about the demolition. We have minors in here. If they demolish the camp, where will they go?"

james.mcauley@washpost.com

michael.birnbaum@washpost.com

Birnbaum reported from Brussels.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Sept. 20 front-page article "Suspect's family life shadowed by financial troubles, violence" characterized the suspected New York City and New Jersey bomber as living the "typical life of an **immigrant** son." One hopes this is not now the norm.

Millions upon millions of **immigrants** entered the United States in the mid- to late 1800s and helped shape this country into what made it great. My father — and scores of others in this country — represent the true definition of the typical **immigrant**'s son. This particular **immigrant**'s son was one of the very first volunteers for the U.S. Navy Seabees (an honored unit that exists today). He married shortly after Pearl Harbor, spent a brief time with his new bride and entered the military service of the United States one month to the day after they wed.

He spent more than a year and a half in North Africa during World War II, immediately after the Torch Landings of 1942. Upon return to the United States a few days after D-Day, he spent a year on a Rhode Island naval base and from there was mobilized to Guam in preparation for the invasion of Japan. However, two days after my father crossed the International Date Line in the Pacific Ocean on the attack transport USS Sitka, the United States dropped an atomic bomb on Nagasaki, averting the planned invasion.

After three years and 13 days of service, my father returned to his bride on Nov. 6, 1945. He spent the rest of his life disabled from his service to our country, and never once did I hear him complain about his injuries. He worked seven days a week for 40 years in the restaurant he built, creating a future for his children. He died 20 days into the new millennium of complications from his service injuries, as the veins in his legs finally failed to function.

He, and millions of others, are typical **immigrants**' sons. Please do not insult me, my father or the rest of this country by suggesting that the suspected bomber is anywhere near the caliber of my dad.

Frank Calcagno Jr., Herndon

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
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Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Only 19 percent of Americans trust the federal government to do what's right most of the time, according to the Pew Research Center. And it's hard to blame them, given that our Congress has just extended a 25-year-old visas-for-investment **immigration** scheme that has accomplished essentially nothing except to foster corruption, risk national security — and subsidize real estate developers.

The EB-5 program reserves up to 10,000 permanent residency slots each year for foreign nationals who invest in the United States. Congress enacted it in 1990 on the superficially plausible theory that trading green cards for capital would boost the economy, as a similar plan in Canada had reportedly done.

Before 2008, however, EB-5 produced more than 1,000 investor **immigrants** per year only once, due to competition from Canada, bureaucratic hassles and a lack of business opportunities fitting the program's minimum requirements — $1 million invested and 10 jobs created. When admissions did go above 1,000, in 1997, the program was temporarily suspended amid concerns that fraud caused the spike.

Subsequent Congresses, and administrations of both parties, responded — by relaxing standards. Now visa seekers may invest passively in existing U.S. firms rather than start their own. They get credit for "indirect" job creation. They may put up as little as $500,000 if they do so in needy "targeted employment areas" — gerrymandered to include hot urban real estate markets. The government empowered an army of politically connected promoters, known as "regional centers," to guide investors through the U.S. market for a fee.

EB-5 applications have surged; in fiscal 2015, 9,764 investors and their family members got visas. Much of their money flowed into developments such as Hudson Yards, a $25 billion office, retail, residential and park project in Manhattan that has so far attracted $600 million via EB-5. The program enables developers to raise "mezzanine" financing (the portion not accounted for by a mortgage or the developer's own equity) at the equivalent of a 10 percent discount, according to Gary Friedland of the NYU Stern School of Business. EB-5 investors are in it for the visa, not the rate of return.

Most projects could have proceeded without the subsidy, Friedland argues, but if not, so what? There'd be less market distortion.

Some 85 percent of EB-5 investors in fiscal 2015 were from China, which is problematic, given the risk of money laundering: It's hard to establish the ultimate source of investible funds emanating from that notoriously nontransparent economy. A 2015 Government Accountability Office report found that the Department of Homeland Security lacked the capacity to vet EB-5 applicants from China and elsewhere. DHS has detected people with possible intelligence connections to Iran attempting to access EB-5.

Alert Trump Tower: Inadequately vetted foreigners and their U.S.-based enablers are exploiting our porous **immigration** rules!

Then again, Donald Trump's son-in-law and adviser, Jared Kushner, may be an expert on EB-5 already: His company is building a luxury, Trump-branded apartment building in Jersey City with $50 million raised in large part from Chinese EB-5 applicants.

In Vermont, meanwhile, the Securities and Exchange Commission has recently accused developers of bilking EB-5 investors out of hundreds of millions supposedly destined for a ski resort and other projects. A similar scandal erupted in Chicago in 2013.

EB-5 expansion spawned an EB-5 lobby, spreading campaign donations and boosterish information around Capitol Hill — such as a study commissioned by the "regional centers" showing that EB-5 investors contributed $3.58 billion to U.S. output and created more than 41,000 jobs in fiscal 2013.

Even if not hyped, these figures amount to less than 0.1 percent of gross domestic product and 1.9 percent of all jobs created that year. More to the point, they do not account for growth and jobs that might have occurred if all the American resources being poured into EB-5-stimulated projects had been deployed elsewhere.

"EB-5 costs taxpayers nothing!" the lobby cries. True — it amounts to a valuable gift to the private sector, in the form of influence over the government's heretofore exclusive authority to admit **immigrants**.

For the government, EB-5 isn't an unseemly business — selling visas — as critics sometimes protest. It's a stupid business — giving them away and letting someone else sell them.

For the past year, Sens. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) tried to reform the EB-5 program or kill it, using as leverage the impending Sept. 30 expiration of the overall federal spending law to which EB-5's key legal authorities had been attached.

But the lobby and its Capitol Hill allies successfully resisted, and the legal authorities were extended as part of the must-pass spending measure that passed Wednesday and expires on Dec. 9. EB-5 could well survive via similar maneuvering for years.

This might not happen in a country that legislated according to regular procedure, and on merits — a country like, say, Canada, which in 2014 terminated the investor visa program upon which Congress patterned EB-5.

It "provide[d] limited economic benefit," an official statement noted, demonstrating that Canada's government possesses yet another quality ours lacks: an ability to admit its mistakes.

lanec@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

This morning, at a disconcertingly early hour, Donald Trump tweeted:

Did Crooked Hillary help disgusting (check out sex tape and past) Alicia M become a U.S. citizen so she could use her in the debate?

As Brian Stelter points out, this guarantees more news cycles will be spent on Trump's battle with Machado. If so, it won't be the first time. After Clinton brought Machado to the nation's attention by declaring at the debate that Trump had previously humiliated this ex-Miss Universe for gaining weight, Trump helpfully went on national television and justified this by saying her weight gain had been "massive" and that she had not exactly been "Mother Teresa." Trump simply can't stop himself from taking the bait, and that continues this morning.

The "sex tape" angle here is sucking up all the attention. (Apparently, sex sells.) That appears to be a reference to reports about a steamy love scene that Machado filmed in 2005, though without further clarification, it's hard to know for sure. As for her "past," the Daily Beast recently ran through some of the more lurid allegations from during her days as a Venezuelan celebrity right here.

But all that is less interesting and revealing -- no, really -- than is Trump's suggestion that Clinton helped Machado become a U.S. citizen so she could become a prop for Clinton at the debate.

It turns out that Trump is right in one sense. But it isn't quite how he thinks.

Machado did in fact become a U.S. citizen in order to increase her influence over this presidential contest. She did so apparently to vote against Donald Trump, because she sees this as an an enormously consequential election.

We know this because Inside Edition did a segment on Machado back in August that reported: "This former Miss Universe says she's becoming a citizen just in time to cast her vote -- against Trump." The Inside Edition report continued:

She told Inside Edition: "Today is a very important day for me; I am now a U.S. citizen. I am so proud and so inspired to be a U.S. citizen."

What Trump's tweet really says is that Machado's effort to secure the vote for herself is suspect, because Clinton may have helped smooth that process, to Clinton's own benefit. This is a version of the longtime charge that Democrats only want to create a path to citizenship for Latino **immigrants** in order to pad the voter rolls in their favor, and surely this will thrill Trumpist voters who are very upset about the ways the country is rigged in favor of various minority groups.

But the merits of that argument aside, it is politically awful for Trump -- given his need to expand his appeal -- to be questioning this effort at political integration by a former Latina beauty queen who is publicly urging more Latinos to participate in the election and is publicly declaring her pride at becoming a U.S. citizen who can now exercise her right to vote.

The Clinton campaign has not yet commented. But it's unclear how Clinton might have done this, if she had wanted to. **Immigration** attorney David Leopold tells me it's conceivable but highly unlikely that the Clinton campaign encouraged Machado to become a citizen, but even so, that there's no way any telephone calls, even if they had been made, would succeed in speeding the process. And in any case, Leopold notes, this process could take anywhere from five months to a year, so Clinton would have had to get involved many months ago. "It's clear Trump has no idea how the citizenship process works," Leopold says.

The ultimate irony of the whole tale is that the person who may have done the most to drive Machado to become a U.S. citizen and secure the vote for herself is one Donald J. Trump. And if the preliminary evidence proves to be right, Trump is driving many other Latinos to vote in this election for the first time, too.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Update: As Libby Nelson points out, the whole Machado "sex tape" meme has already been debunked.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* CLINTON LEADS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE: A new WBUR poll finds that Clinton leads Trump among likely voters in New Hampshire by 42-35 in the four-way, and by 47-38 in the head-to-head. Voters there by a wide margin think Clinton won the debate, and now 62 percent say Trump is unfit to be president, while they say by 49-46 that Clinton is fit for it.

If Colorado, Pennsylvania, and Virginia hold for Clinton, she can win by adding just New Hampshire, provided Trump doesn't pull off any surprise wins in blue-leaning states.

\* CLINTON LEADS IN MICHIGAN: A new Detroit News poll finds that Clinton leads among likely voters in Michigan by 42-35, and leads by seven points in the head-to-head. This is interesting:

Trump's bright spot is Macomb County, where he holds a 20-point lead. He has built a base of blue-collar support as he rails against international trade deals that he blames for the decline in manufacturing jobs in Michigan since Clinton's husband was president.

Macomb County is the home of the original Reagan Democrat. If Clinton continues to lead in Michigan despite this, it makes it less likely that he picks off a blue Rust Belt state.

\* CLINTON LEADS IN FLORIDA: Politico reports on a new Mason-Dixon poll that finds Clinton leading in Florida by 46-42. That's only a two point shift in direction, but keep in mind, Florida is an absolute must-win for Trump.

The HuffPollster and Real Clear Politics polling averages both have Clinton slightly up in the state.

\* EVEN A SMALL DEBATE BOUNCE WOULD BOOST CLINTON: Nate Silver calculates that the post-debate polling so far suggests Clinton now has a three-to-five point national lead, which would mean:

With a 3-to-5-point lead nationally for Clinton, we'd expect to see the following in the swing states: A 4-to-8-point lead in Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Colorado, Virginia, Wisconsin and Michigan, which have been slightly bluer than the national average this cycle…Somewhere between a tie and a 4-point Clinton lead in Florida and North Carolina, which have been slightly redder than the national average….A roughly tied race in Ohio and Iowa, which have been significantly redder than the national average.

If so, that would be a pretty solid position in the electoral college. But such a bounce could fade, and as Silver notes, we need more polling before we can really know where things are.

\* TRUMP FOUNDATION DRAWS STILL MORE SCRUTINY: David Fahrenthold keeps the scoops coming:

Donald Trump's charitable foundation — which has been sustained for years by donors outside the Trump family — has never obtained the certification that New York requires before charities can solicit money from the public, according to the state attorney general's office….If New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman (D) finds that Trump's foundation raised money in violation of the law, he could order the charity to stop raising money immediately.

Some are suggesting that Trump's crazy tweetstorm this morning is meant to distract from this. But let's stop assuming that every crazy thing Trump does is a fiendishly clever distraction plot.

\* USA TODAY URGES VOTE AGAINST TRUMP: USA Today's editorial board has never taken sides in a presidential race. But today, it publishes a scathing editorial urging readers not to vote for Trump, for these reasons:

This year, one of the candidates…is, by unanimous consensus of the Editorial Board, unfit for the presidency….He is erratic….He is ill-equipped to be commander in chief….He traffics in prejudice….His business career is checkered…He speaks recklessly…He has coarsened the national dialogue….He's a serial liar.

The USA Today edit board is divided over whether it should endorse Clinton. But this once again underscores the lopsided nature of their relative qualifications and fitness for the presidency.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the first debate between presidential contenders Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, Trump repeatedly relied on troublesome and false facts that have been debunked throughout the campaign. Clinton stretched the truth on occasion, such as when she tried to wiggle out of her 2012 praise of the Trans Pacific Partnership as a "gold standard." But her misstatements paled in comparison to the list of Trump's exaggerations and falsehoods.

Trump once again asserted that the 2008 Clinton campaign was responsible for spreading the myth that President Obama was born in Kenya, when that is false. He claimed that "thousands" of American jobs will leave the country when Ford shifts small-car manufacturing to Mexico, but no one here will lose their jobs. He also falsely claimed that he was against the Iraq War, when all available evidence demonstrates that he supported it until the rest of the country began to turn against it in 2004. He also once again falsely said he started his business with a "small loan" from his father.

Here's a roundup of 23 of the most noteworthy claims that were made. As is our practice, we do not award Pinocchios when we do a roundup of facts in debates.

"So Ford is leaving. You see that, their small car division leaving. Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They're all leaving. And we can't allow it to happen anymore." —Trump

Ford is moving its small car production to Mexico, but the expansion will not affect U.S. workers.

The company has said that while production of Ford Focus models will shift to Mexico, its plant in Michigan will build other, larger vehicles. Ford and many other automakers are finding Mexico more attractive for several reasons.

"The cost of labor is indeed greater in the United States, which makes producing labor-intensive small cars in Mexico more profitable. The United States also has advantages, though — inexpensive electricity, experienced technicians and access to sophisticated materials and equipment — often means building larger and more expensive cars is cheaper in this country," our colleague Max Ehrenfreund wrote.

"The only years that anybody's ever seen were a couple of years when he had to turn them over to state authorities when he was trying to get a casino license, and they showed he didn't pay any federal income tax." —Clinton

Clinton exaggerates here. We know of three years in the 1970s when he did pay federal income taxes. But there were at least five years in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s when Trump did not pay any, or nearly any, income taxes.

"Under my plan I will be reducing taxes tremendously." —Trump

Trump's tax plan would raise federal income taxes on more than half of America's single parents and one-fifth of families with children, according to an analysis by Lily Batchelder, a New York University expert on tax policy who formerly worked for Obama's National Economic Council.

While the Trump campaign called it "pure fiction," the right-leaning Tax Foundation has said the group was able to replicate her findings. Kyle Pomerleau, director of federal projects at the Tax Foundation, posted on Twitter that Batchelder's results "seem reasonable to me."

.@lilybatch We were able to replicate many of the numbers in the report. The results seem reasonable to me.

"Independent experts have looked at what I've proposed, what Donald has proposed. And basically they've said this. … [Under Trump's tax plan] we would lose 3.5 million jobs and maybe have another recession. My plans — and they've said 'okay, we can do this,' and I intend to get it done — we will have 10 million more jobs because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy."

Mark Zandi, a well-respected economist, did issue a report saying that if Trump's economic plans were fully implemented, 3.5 million jobs would disappear, incomes would stagnate, debt would explode and stock prices would plummet. But the report also said it was highly unlikely that Trump would get many of his plans approved by Congress, even if it is controlled by Republicans, because so many of his positions are so a departure from Republican principles. Even so, the report said the U.S. economy would likely suffer under a Trump presidency.

His report also said that if Clinton were able to fully implement her economic plans, the economy would add an additional 3.2 million jobs during the first four years of her presidency. Combined with anticipated job creation under current law, that adds up to 10.4 million jobs. But the report also said that Clinton would face significant roadblocks to getting her economic plan through Congress, resulting in far fewer job gains.

"I don't mind releasing. I'm under a routine audit, and it'll be released." —Trump

Trump cites an Internal Revenue Service audit as his justification for not releasing his federal income tax returns, but the audit does not prohibit from releasing the returns. Richard Nixon, who started the tradition of presidents and presidential candidates releasing their returns, did so in the middle of an audit.

Moreover, Trump has not released his tax returns from before 2009, which are no longer under audit, according to his attorney.

Presidential candidates have no legal obligation to release their returns, but there has long been a tradition to do so for the sake of transparency. Hillary Clinton has released three decades' worth of tax returns.

While Trump has not released the returns, his long history of litigation has given the public a sense of what is in his returns. Tax information made public so far show Trump did not pay any, or nearly any, income taxes at least five times in the past 40 years.

"As far as tax return, you don't learn that much" from tax returns. —Trump

Trump is being misleading. Tax experts say that tax returns provide insight about a person's finances in several key areas.

First, the tax return reveals a person's annual income. A person's net worth is not disclosed, but voters would gain an understanding of a person's cash flow. Second, voters would understand the sources of a person's income, such as how much comes from certain businesses, speeches, dividends, capital gains and so forth.

Third, a tax return would disclose how much a person gives to charity. Mitt Romney gave almost $2.3 million to charity in 2011, while Bill and Hillary Clinton gave $3 million to charity in 2014. We know these figures because of information in their tax returns.

Trump claims he has given $102 million to charity in the past five years, but a Washington Post investigation found not a cent in actual cash — mostly just free rounds of golf, given away by his courses for charity auctions and raffles. Trump's tax return would clear up exactly how much he has really given to charity — indeed, whether he has given anything at all.

Fourth, a tax return would reveal how aggressive Trump has been on his taxes. There is no black-and-white approach to taxes; there are many gray areas subject to interpretation, especially regarding deductions. Trump frequently suggests that he knows how to game the system, so voters would learn whether he takes the same approach to his taxes.

Finally, the tax returns would disclose what percentage of Trump's income actually goes to taxes.

TRUMP: "You called it the gold standard of trade deals. You said it's the finest deal you've ever seen."

Trump is right. Clinton is subtly adjusting her words here when confronted with a question about her consistency on policy positions.

But the fact is she never used the word "hoped." Instead, she was more declarative, using the phrase "gold standard" when she was Secretary of State.

"This TPP sets the gold standard in trade agreements to open free, transparent, fair trade, the kind of environment that has the rule of law and a level playing field," she said in Australia in 2012. "And when negotiated, this agreement will cover 40 percent of the world's total trade and build in strong protections for workers and the environment."

"You've taken business bankruptcies six times." —Hillary Clinton

Clinton is correct.

Trump's companies have filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection, which means a company can remain in business while wiping away many of its debts. The bankruptcy court ultimately approves a corporate budget and a plan to repay remaining debts; often shareholders lose much of their equity.

Trump's Taj Mahal opened in April 1990 in Atlantic City, but six months later, "defaulted on interest payments to bondholders as his finances went into a tailspin," The Washington Post's Robert O'Harrow found. In July 1991, Trump's Taj Mahal filed for bankruptcy. He could not keep up with debts on two other Atlantic City casinos, and those two properties declared bankruptcy in 1992. A fourth property, the Plaza Hotel in New York, declared bankruptcy in 1992 after amassing debt.

PolitiFact uncovered two more bankruptcies filed after 1992, totaling six. Trump Hotels and Casinos Resorts filed for bankruptcy again in 2004, after accruing about $1.8 billion in debt. Trump Entertainment Resorts also declared bankruptcy in 2009, after being hit hard during the 2008 recession.

Why the discrepancy? Perhaps this will give us an idea: Trump told Washington Post reporters that he counted the first three bankruptcies as just one.

"In Chicago, they've had thousands of shootings. … Stop and frisk worked very well … it brought the crime way down [in New York City]." —Trump

Trump cherry-picks the increase in violence in Chicago, but this is not indicative of overall crime rates, which have been declining for years. Moreover, while Trump says stop-and-frisk policies should be enacted in Chicago as it was implemented in New York City, those policies have not been correlated with crime.

While violent crime overall has been declining for about two decades, there was a sharp increase in the violent crime rate in 2015. Homicides have continued to spike in major cities this year, though the rates remain far below their peak in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Law enforcement officials, including the FBI, have voiced concerns about the uptick in crime in 2015.

Criminal justice experts warn against comparing crime trends from short periods of time, such as month over month or year over year. An annual trend can show a trajectory of where the trend might be headed, but still does not give a full picture. Many criminal justice experts say crime trends are determined over at least five years, preferably 10 or 20 years, of data.

Trump praises stop-and-frisk policies under former New York City mayor Rudolph Giuliani. But it's debatable whether the stop-and-frisk policies had such a direct impact on crime, as Trump suggests. Crime is affected by many factors, and New York's decline in crime mirrored the decline in many other major cities at the time. Moreover, crime was declining for four years before Giuliani took office, and it continued to decline for 14 years after he left.

We awarded Three Pinocchios to Trump's claim attributing stop-and-frisk policies to the decline in crime.

Trump also claimed that "murders are up" in New York. That is incorrect. Homicides in New York are down so far this year from the same point last year, according to the New York Police Department. But homicides did see an uptick in New York City in 2015, similar to trends in numerous other cities.

"If you're too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun." —Clinton

Democrats, including Clinton, frequently point out that people on the terrorist watch list can purchase a gun. But the proposal that Democrats have made in Congress wouldn't ban such purchases automatically. We have awarded Two Pinocchios to this claim for lack of context.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) has introduced legislation to give authority to the attorney general to decide whether or not a suspected terrorist could buy a gun. Anyone who was subjected to a federal terrorism investigation within five years of the attempted gun purchase would be flagged in the background-check system, and the Justice Department would be able to review those cases.

The government uses a "reasonable suspicion" standard to nominate and include someone in the Terrorist Watchlist, which includes the "no-fly list." Belonging to a terrorist organization, or being listed on one of the watch lists, does not automatically stop someone from buying a gun. There has to be another factor that disqualifies the person from buying a gun under federal or state law, such as a felony conviction or illegal **immigration** status.

"He actually advocated for the actions we took in Libya and urged that Gaddafi be taken out, after actually doing some business with him one time." —Clinton

Clinton is right that Trump emphatically urged the United States to remove Libyan dictator Moammar Gaddafi  from power.

Here's Trump, in February 2011, urging an intervention on his video blog. "I can't believe what our country is doing," Trump said. "Qaddafi in Libya is killing thousands of people, nobody knows how bad it is, and we're sitting around we have soldiers all have the Middle East, and we're not bringing them in to stop this horrible carnage and that's what it is: It's a carnage."

Trump added: "Now we should go in, we should stop this guy, which would be very easy and very quick. We could do it surgically, stop him from doing it, and save these lives. This is absolutely nuts. We don't want to get involved and you're gonna end up with something like you've never seen before. …We have go in to save these lives; these people are being slaughtered like animals. It's horrible what's going on; it has to be stopped. We should do on a humanitarian basis, immediately go into Libya, knock this guy out very quickly, very surgically, very effectively, and save the lives."

"I did not support the war in Iraq." —Trump

This is just totally false.

We have found no evidence of his early opposition to the invasion. Trump expressed lukewarm support the first time he was asked about it on Sept. 11, 2002, and was not clearly against it until he was quoted in the August 2004 Esquire cover story titled "Donald Trump: How I'd Run the Country (Better)."

But by the middle of 2004, many Americans had turned against the war, making Trump's position not particularly unique. In light of Trump's repeated false claim, Esquire has added an editor's note to its August 2004 story, saying, "The Iraq War began in March 2003, more than a year before this story ran, thus nullifying Trump's timeline."

We have awarded this claim Four Pinocchios, compiled a timeline of all of Trump's comments prior to the invasion in March 2003, and even a video documenting how this is a bogus claim.

Trump said he had "numerous conversations with Sean Hannity" prior to the invasion, expressing his opposition to the war. These appear to be private conversations. Hannity told Erik Wemple Blog that Trump "would watch the show and call after and we argued a lot about" the war. We should note that Hannity is one of Trump's biggest boosters and has never asserted that Trump made these private claims to him until recently, even though this has been a constant source of controversy during Trump's campaign. Hannity has also not offered any evidence to back up his claim that he and Trump had such conversations at the time.

[Update: During the debate, Trump also cited his January 2003 Fox News interview with Neil Cavuto as proof of his early opposition. The day after the debate, Fox News cited this clip, declaring it "backs up Trump on Iraq War opposition." As our timeline shows, Trump was not clearly against the war in this interview, either.

On Feb. 18, 2016, Cavuto replayed the clip and said it wasn't clear Trump was against the war then. While Trump now says he opposed the Iraq war, Cavuto said: "When I interviewed him back in January 2003, couple of months before we formally got involved in Iraq, he could've left you with a different impression."

Cavuto said that in the January 2003 interview, Trump was "not bashing the president back then, nor is he fully endorsing Iraq. But he is saying some clear decision is required." Meghan McCain, appearing in the segment, said in response: "He speaks now though, like he was protesting with Code Pink in the street, like he was adamantly against the war in Iraq. Like he was this huge person in the media stage, protesting against President Bush and going into Iraq."]

Clinton: "You know, I made a mistake using a private email."

Regarding Clinton's statement, the key issue with the email controversy was that Clinton had a private server — not just a private email — and she never used her designated State Department email account, which would have kept records of emails subject to requests under the Freedom of Information Act.

The accuracy of Trump's claim depends on whether he is referring to her decision to use a private server, or if he is suggesting that Clinton purposefully intended to mishandle classified information. On the former point, yes, Clinton chose on purpose to use a private email server. On the latter, the FBI would disagree.

FBI Director James B. Comey has said Clinton was "extremely careless" in handling classified information through her private server. Our colleagues Matt Zapotosky and Rosalind Helderman noted: "But Comey also has said that investigators found particularly lacking any intent on Clinton or her staff's part to mishandle classified information, and that would undermine any possible criminal case against them."

Click here for our round-up of 14 fact-checks about the Clinton email controversy.

"In addition, I was just endorsed by ICE. They've never endorsed anybody before on **immigration**. I was just endorsed by ICE." —Trump

How can a federal agency, the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, endorse a candidate? Trump is actually referring to the National **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement Council, which is the union representing ICE officers. In a statement released by the campaign, National ICE Council President Chris Crane said it was the union's first-ever endorsement.

"We have a trade deficit with all of the countries that we do business with, of almost $800 billion a year." —Trump

Trump is basically right. The trade deficit in 2015 was $762 billion, according to the Census Bureau.

"You even at one time suggested that you would try to negotiate down the national debt of the United States." —Clinton

Clinton is correct. Trump in May caused a stir when he suggested the United States should borrow more and renegotiate new terms later. "I would borrow, knowing that if the economy crashed, you could make a deal," Trump said on CNBC. The comments caused angst in the financial markets, as the U.S. Treasurysecurities are considered the world's safest investment precisely because the United States is at low risk of default. Renegotiating the terms would be seen as a form of default.

Trump later walked away from his comments, claiming he had been misquoted.

"Sidney Blumenthal works for the campaign and very close friend of Secretary Clinton. And her campaign manager, Patti Doyle, went to — during the campaign, her campaign against President Obama, fought very hard. … Patti Solis Doyle was on Wolf Blitzer saying that this happened. Blumenthal sent McClatchy, highly respected reporter at McClatchy, to Kenya to find out about it. They were pressing it very hard. She failed to get the birth certificate." —Trump

To support the debunked notion that Clinton's campaign originated "birther" rumors during the 2008 presidential campaign, Trump pointed to these two examples. But they don't add up to much of anything.

James Asher, former D.C. bureau chief of McClatchy, has said that longtime Clinton ally Sidney Blumenthal "strongly urged" him to "investigate the exact place of President Obama's birth, which he suggested was in Kenya." McClatchy assigned a reporter to go to Kenya, and the reporter found the allegation was false, Asher said. (We reached out to Asher several times but did not receive a response.)

Blumenthal, declining to elaborate further, said in a statement to The Fact Checker: "This is false. Period. Donald Trump cannot distract from the fact that he is the one who embraced and promoted the birther lie, and bears the responsibility for it."

Solis Doyle did say in a recent CNN interview that in December 2007, a volunteer coordinator in Iowa forwarded an email perpetuating the birther conspiracy. Clinton "made the decision immediately to let that person go," Solis Doyle said in the interview.

As in the instance with the Iowa volunteer coordinator, the campaign denounced isolated instances of Clinton's staffers questioning whether Obama was Muslim. We found that there's no evidence that she or her campaign were "pressing it very hard" — though some of her supporters did perpetuate the claims in the bitter 2008 primary campaign against Obama.

"As multiple, independent fact checkers have affirmed in the years since, neither the 2008 campaign nor the candidate ever questioned the President's citizenship or birth certificate. Period," said Clinton campaign spokesman Josh Schwerin.

"The 28 countries of NATO, many of them aren't paying their fair share. Number two — and that bothers me, because we should be asking — we're defending them, and they should at least be paying us what they're supposed to be paying by treaty and contract. I read on the front page of the Wall Street Journal that NATO is opening up a major terror division. And I think that's great. And I think we should get — because we pay approximately 73 percent of the cost of NATO. It's a lot of money to protect other people. But I'm all for NATO. But I said they have to focus on terror, also. And they're going to do that. And that was — believe me — I'm sure I'm not going to get credit for it — but that was largely because of what I was saying and my criticism of NATO." —Trump

Trumps mixes up a lot of things here.

The United States pays about 22 percent of the common-fund budget for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But the volume of the U.S. defense expenditures effectively represents 73 percent of the defense spending of the Alliance as a whole. But that does not mean that the United States pays 73 percent of the costs of running NATO.

The figure reflects the fact that United States, as a world power, projects its might across the globe. Experts say it is all but impossible to calculate how much of overall U.S. defense spending is devoted exclusively for NATO, but there is little dispute that most members are not meeting their commitment to have defense expenditures should amount to 2 percent of each country's gross domestic product.

As for Trump patting himself on the back for spurring NATO to focus on terror, he's kidding himself. The plan was in the works long before Trump starting saying NATO was obsolete.

"Violent crime is one-half of what it was in 1991. Property crime is down 40 percent. We just don't want to see it creep back up. We've had 25 years of very good cooperation." —Clinton

This data checks out, according to research by the Brennan Center for Justice. Nationally, the violent crime rate has fallen by 51 percent since 1991, and property crime has fallen by 43 percent.

"President Obama and Secretary Clinton created a vacuum the way they got out of Iraq, because they got out — what, they shouldn't have been in, but once they got in, the way they got out was a disaster. And ISIS was formed. … But they wouldn't have even been formed if they left some troops behind, like 10,000 or maybe something more than that. And then you wouldn't have had them." —Trump

As Clinton noted in her response, the terms of departure from Iraq were originally set by the George W. Bush administration. The Bush administration signed a Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Iraq in 2008 that established a deadline for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Iraq by Dec. 31, 2011. But it was widely expected troops would remain after a negotiated extension.

Clinton, as Secretary of State, had pushed for some troops to remain in Iraq but the administration was not able to reach an agreement and so U.S. troops left Iraq. Former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, in his memoir, pinned the blame on Obama: "To my frustration, the White House coordinated the negotiations but never really led them. Officials there seemed content to endorse an agreement if State and Defense could reach one, but without the President's active advocacy, [Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri] al-Maliki was allowed to slip away."

Obama, meanwhile, was pleased to be able to run for reelection in 2012 on a claim that no more U.S. troops were left in Iraq.

To a large extent, the Islamic State of today is simply an outgrowth of al-Qaeda of Iraq, which emerged after the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

At best, one could argue that actions that Obama failed to take (over Clinton's opposition) helped contribute to the growth of ISIS, also known as the Islamic State. Islamic State certainly has become an important player in the Middle East, taking advantage of the civil war in Syria and the disarray in the Iraqi government to claim vast areas of both countries. In the past couple of years, the group's activities have gathered attention in the United States; it was only in 2014 that President Obama dismissed Islamic State as a "JV team."

Clinton was Secretary of State when Obama made decisions that could be seen as contributing to the rise of the Islamic States, but ironically she was one of the loudest forces for keeping a residual force in Iraq and for intervening in Syria, such as arming the rebels. Both steps advocated by Clinton might have thwarted the emergence of the terror group. Moreover, Clinton was not Secretary of State when Obama all but ignored the Islamic State as it moved back into Iraq in late 2013.

But — and here's the irony — Trump criticizes Obama for a policy position he had advocated be taken even sooner than 2011. "I would announce that we have been victorious in Iraq and all the troops are coming home and let those people have their civil war," Trump told CNBC in 2006. "I just said, announce victory, get them home…. Let's say, 'Victory, Tremendous.' Have a big thing in the streets. Then get out real fast before you get shot. Let's get home."

"We have gangs roaming the street. And in many cases, they're illegally here, illegal **immigrants**. And they have guns. And they shoot people. And we have to be very strong. And we have to be very vigilant." —Trump

Indeed, there are victims of homicide by undocumented **immigrants**, including by those in gangs. But there are two important data points to remember when Trump talks about this.

First, the vast majority of unauthorized **immigrants** do not fit Trump's description of aggravated felons, whose crimes include murder. U.S. Sentencing Commission data shows homicides are a small percentage of the crimes committed by noncitizens, whether they are in the United States illegally or not.

Second, illegal **immigration** flows across the Southern border in fiscal 2015 were at the lowest levels since 1972, except for in 2011. The apprehensions in fiscal 2016 so far have exceeded fiscal 2015, but still indicate an overall decline.

"I said it to you once, had we taken the oil — and we should have taken the oil — ISIS would not have been able to form either, because the oil was their primary source of income. And now they have the oil all over the place, including the oil — a lot of the oil in Libya, which was another one of her disasters." —Trump

ISIS does not control oil in Libya. Trump has been called out before on this point, but he keeps saying this false claim.

As for keeping the oil in Iraq, This is nonsensical. The Bush administration invested a lot of diplomatic effort in assuring Middle Eastern allies that the United States was not invading because of Iraq's oil fields. Moreover, oil revenue was crucial to ensuring a functioning Iraqi state — which is why insurgents often targeted the oil sector in Iraq.

In any event, seizing the oil of a sovereign nation after invading it would be considered a "grave breach" of the Geneva Conventions, one of the cornerstones of international law, as well as other international agreements. Maybe Trump's staff should arrange a tutorial on international law.

Our colleague Steven Mufson looked deeply at whether, international law aside, such a proposal was even feasible. One expert said it was "beyond goofy."

"You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys. " —Clinton

Clinton is referring to this statement by Kellyanne Conway, back when she was supporting Trump rival Ted Cruz, the Texas senator.  Conway, who now defends Trump with fervor, told CNN on March 8: "For Trump, the debates are fought with peril. The Trump victims. The reason the messaging has gotten better is they are starting to talk about victims of Trump University, victims of Trump in Atlantic City. Before it was conservative apostasies, and now it is, you built your business on the backs of the little guy."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Forty-six days ago, Donald Trump reached beyond America's borders for a bogeywoman to compare Hillary Clinton to: German Chancellor Angela Merkel.

"In short, Hillary Clinton wants to be America's Angela Merkel, and you know what a disaster this massive **immigration** has been to Germany and the people of Germany," Trump said. "Crime has risen to levels that no one thought they would ever, ever see. It is a catastrophe."

It wasn't his first attack on either. Clinton may be the main target in Trump's stump speeches, but Merkel has been an occasional guest star for months.

But in an interview airing Thursday night, Trump pulled one of the biggest about-faces of his campaign. He said Merkel -- the woman he accused of causing crime in Germany to rise to unbelievable levels and creating a "catastrophe" for her country -- was a world leader he admired.

Asked by New England Cable News about a world leader he wanted to "emulate", here's what Trump said: "Well, I think Merkel is a really great world leader, but I was very disappointed ... with the whole thing on **immigration**. I think it's a big problem. I was always a Merkel person. But I think she made a very tragic mistake a year and a half ago."

It's almost like Trump was asked about a world leader he really liked, and Merkel was the first to come to mind — and then he immediately thought better of it.

Of course, he wouldn't be the first to struggle with this question over the last day-plus; Libertarian nominee Gary Johnson couldn't name a single world leader he respected during an interview with MSNBC's Chris Matthews on Wednesday evening.

But it's worth noting Thursday's response was technically an about-face on an about-face, since Trump has praised Merkel before — early in his campaign, he said she was "probably the greatest leader in the world today."

By February, though, after the backlash in Germany over its welcoming of Syrian refugees had grown, Trump arrived at a different conclusion. "Everyone thought she was a really great leader, and now she's turned out to be this catastrophic leader," he told Trump-friendly Breitbart. "And she'll be out if they don't have a revolution."

He also tweeted this in December, after Time magazine picked Merkel as its person of the year:

I told you @TIME Magazine would never pick me as person of the year despite being the big favorite They picked person who is ruining Germany

That "catastrophic leader" "who is ruining Germany" and whom Trump continued to bash just a month and a half ago is now the person he labels a "really great world leader." He even used that same construction -- "really great leader" -- in February, before arguing that Merkel is the opposite.

To state the obvious: Those are statements that are impossible to reconcile with one another. They make no sense, when placed next to one another. Even as Trump qualified his answer in Thursday's interview by noting that Merkel's **immigration** policies were bad, it makes no sense for him to say she's still a "really great world leader."

Trump's campaign will probably say on Friday, when it is asked about it, that he thinks she's a great leader who made a bad decision. But he said she was a "catastrophic leader." That quote and his comment Thursday are diametrically opposed, and they suggest a man who has either drastically changed his position or was saying something he didn't believe — either before or now — with no obvious reason for his position to change.

Even for Trump, whose has demonstrated little fluency in or commitment to policy — both foreign and domestic — this is a rather remarkable flip-flop.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump gave a surprising response Thursday when asked to name a world leader he respects. He named Germany's Angela Merkel, whom he has regularly criticized on the campaign trail over her refugee policies.

"Well, I think Merkel is a really great world leader, but I was very disappointed ... with the whole thing on **immigration**. I think it's a big problem," Trump told New England Cable News. "I was always a Merkel person. But I think she made a very tragic mistake a year and a half ago."

Trump was asked to name "a world leader who you admire, respect, would like to emulate."

The question came as Libertarian presidential candidate Gary Johnson faced ridicule for drawing a blank when asked to name his favorite world leader during a prime time forum on MSNBC. Johnson called it an "Aleppo moment," referencing another embarrassing moment earlier this month when he was asked about the humanitarian crisis in the Syrian city and he responded by asking, "What is Aleppo?"

Trump's response came as a surprise to political observers and campaign reporters. He has regularly blasted Merkel on the campaign trail, assailing her for allowing Syrian refugees into her country and accusing her policies of expanding crime in the country. Trump fumed in December when Merkel was picked as Time magazine's person of the year, tweeting that they chose someone who was "ruining Germany."

I told you @TIME Magazine would never pick me as person of the year despite being the big favorite They picked person who is ruining Germany

Last month, during a speech on fighting terrorism, Trump drew an unflattering comparison between the German chancellor and his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton.

"Hillary Clinton wants to be America's Angela Merkel. It's true. And you know what a disaster this massive **immigration** has been to Germany and the people of Germany," Trump said during the speech in Ohio. "Crime has risen to levels they thought they would never, ever see. It is a catastrophe."

Clinton herself said that Merkel is her favorite world leader Thursday, during a question-and-answer session with reporters on her campaign plane.

"I like a lot of the world leaders. One of my favorites is Angela Merkel, because I think she's been an extraordinary strong leader during difficult times in Europe," she said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Some weeks ago, in one of my periodic postings about Donald Trump's lack of fitness to be president of the United States, I dropped a casual remark to the effect that I assumed that none of my readers were misguided enough to take him seriously, or to serve as a volunteer in his campaign. Several commenters took me to task for the remark; "what kind of bubble do you live in?" one asked.

It's a fair question, and fair criticism. It did make me reflect a bit on the "bubble." It is true that, for the first time in my life, spanning more than a dozen presidential elections, a major-party candidate does not have support from a single friend of mine -- or even from a close acquaintance. Maybe it's just because I spend most of my time either in the District or Vermont, and finding Trump supporters in either of those jurisdictions is a very difficult task. I suspect, though, that it reflects something more insidious, and that we are really, finally, collapsing into separate camps, each with its own favored newspapers, and websites, and TV news channels, and so on, and across whose boundaries nothing passes.

So in the spirit of constructive engagement, let me ask a couple of questions, regarding things that I really do not understand in connection with Trump's candidacy. I understand many people's hostility to Hillary Clinton, though I don't share it to a great degree, and I understand the desire for "change" in Washington, and the notion that the ruling elites have failed miserably to address many of our problems. And I understand that people can have different, and more Trump-friendly, views than mine on all sorts of policy questions, on everything from **immigration** to gun rights to international trade and the rest.

I get all that. But here's what I don't get.  Trump is unstable -- what the Arizona Republic newspaper, in endorsing a Democratic nominee for the first time in its 126-year history, called his "inability to control himself or be controlled by others," and his "reckless … lack of propriety" -- and unstable people should not be put in command of our armed forces and our nuclear codes.  The U.S. commander in chief has awesome, and virtually unconstrained, power to commit U.S. forces to battle and to dictate to the generals -- generals sworn to obey his orders -- how those battles should be fought, up to and including the use of nuclear weapons.

For me, the election conversation really starts, and ends, here, before you get to **immigration** policy, or climate change, or SCOTUS appointments, or international trade, or law and order, or any of the other issues the next president will have to deal with, and I don't understand how Trump supporters get past this point.

So my question is: Which part of that formulation do you disagree with? That he's dangerously unstable? Or that it matters, as a dispositive criterion for choosing a president? Trump has a secret plan to deal with the Islamic State; you trust that he will act reasonably and prudently in pursuit of that plan because …?

I don't mean these as rhetorical questions, and I'm not trying to be snarky or sarcastic.  I genuinely cannot imagine an argument in support of putting that kind of power -- the power to kill, and to get American soldiers killed -- into this guy's hands.

And please, if you do care to respond, I ask that you NOT tell me about how terrible you think Hillary Clinton is. I get that; many of you think she's an abomination. Many of you may even think that she's dangerously unstable and shouldn't be entrusted with the commander in chief's power. Fine; put that all aside. My question isn't "Whom do you like more, Trump or Clinton?," nor is it "Why aren't you supporting Hillary Clinton?" (or Gary Johnson, for that matter). It's a much simpler question, and it's just about Donald Trump. For purposes of this question, it doesn't matter who he's running against; the failings of other candidates don't affect his standing on the one test that matters most of all. If you're a supporter, I assume that you've satisfied yourself that he will exercise the rather awesome and terrifying powers of the U.S. commander in chief in a reasonable manner, and I'm curious as to how you've done that.

And I have a second question: What makes you think that you're not being scammed?  This guy's the master of the scam -- it has been his M.O. for years.  Short of tattooing "CON MAN" on his forehead, how much more obvious could it be? Trump University! The Trump "Charitable" Foundation!! The Trump Institute!!! Every one of them is a con job. You can bet that in a quiet moment, talking with friends, he has a word to describe all the folks who shelled out their hard-earned money for his worthless junk: "suckers." One born every minute, or so I've heard.

So even if you like all his policies, what makes you think he will follow through with anything he promises? Why would you believe that? Don't you think that you're going to wake up one morning during a Trump presidency and smack your forehead with your palm and say, "Damn! He conned us!"? If not, why not?

It's a lousy feeling, the feeling that you've been taken in by a scam, as I can testify from personal experience. I fell for a scam once, more than 40 years ago; the experience seared itself in my memory, and I can recall it vividly to this day. I picked up a guy hitchhiking on Interstate 95; he was going back, he said, to his Army base after a weekend leave. Really good guy; we hit it off, had a really nice, earnest conversation about things, over the course of three or four hours.  I ended up lending him 50 bucks -- a fair bit of money back in those days, at least for a grad student on a stipend that I think was around $1,800 a year. I think I may have even been the one who suggested the loan, which would enable him, by taking a bus back to base rather than hitchhiking, to be sure to arrive back in time. He promised, of course, to send me a check the moment he got back to his barracks -- and he gave me his address in case there was any problem at all. Like a dope, I believed it, at least until I sent him a gentle reminder at the address he gave me -- and it was returned to sender as undeliverable. At which point I had my palm-smack-to-forehead moment. Schmuck! You believed him!! Although I suppose in retrospect, 50 bucks was a small price to pay for the lesson in the need for healthy skepticism.

The thing that makes Trump's con job so obvious, to me, is not just his history of scamming people, appalling though that is. It's that even if he were being sincere in all the things he's promising, he's not going to deliver because he's not going to be able to deliver, and he's not going to be able to deliver because he hasn't the faintest idea, and has completely surrounded himself with people who themselves haven't the faintest idea, how to get anything done using the levers of the federal government.

It's not a trivial problem. That's the thing about the Constitution: Presidents (unlike, say, chief executives of privately held corporations) can't just snap their fingers and get things done (except, terrifyingly in this case, in their role as commander in chief; see Question 1). All of Trump's promises -- to "overhaul the Tax Code," to"unleash America's $50 trillion in untapped shale, oil, and natural gas reserves," to "deliver safe neighborhoods … all across this country [and] to make our communities safe again from crime and lawlessness,"  the whole lot of them -- will require navigating a very complex world of law-making and law-applying, comprising 435 representatives, 100 senators, countless interest groups clamoring for their preferments, enormous federal agencies with complicated agendas of their own. We can all wish, perhaps, that it weren't so; but it is so.

And while it is true that this affects all presidential candidates, all of whom make sweeping promises to do this or that, and then, when they get into office, are unable to just snap their fingers to get them done, there is a difference here: We have never, in the history of this country, had a major-party presidential candidate who knew less about how governments at any level function and actually get things done than Donald Trump. This ain't Ronald Reagan, folks, who had spent eight years figuring government out as governor of California. It is fantasy to think that Trump is going to somehow miraculously figure it out. Trump will be very lucky if Congress and all those interests and bureaucrats don't play him like a violin -- implementing his agenda? Hard to imagine.

A cautionary tale: Trump is not the first snake-oil salesman or con man to seek high elected office. A few weeks ago, I read the first of the four volumes of Robert Caro's sensational biography of LBJ, entitled "The Path to Power," covering Lyndon Johnson's boyhood and early political career (up to around 1940) in Texas. Caro's book is peopled with all sorts of amazing characters I had never heard of or knew next to nothing about (John Nance Garner; Johnson's father, Sam Ealy Johnson; Sam Rayburn; Herman Brown, a founder of the Brown & Root engineering and construction company; political operative Alvin Wirtz), a dozen or so of whom get full-blown mini-biographies inside of the overall narrative of LBJ's life.

One of these characters was Wilbert Lee "Pappy" O'Daniel. O'Daniel was a salesman for the Burrus Mills Flour Co. who started, in the late 1920s, hosting a Burrus-sponsored half-hour radio show, featuring "hillbilly music" (by a group called the Light Crust Doughboys, which for a time included Bob Wills, later to become one of the legendary founders of Texas "swing"), songs that O'Daniel wrote and some religious homilies. He was, apparently, terrific at it -- H.L. Mencken's American Mercury magazine called his on-air persona "Will Rogers and Dale Carnegie and Bing Crosby all rolled into one" -- and the O'Daniel show became a statewide sensation. In 1935, he took some of the money he had made and started his own flour business -- Hillbilly Flour (whose slogan, "Pass the Biscuits, Pappy!," strikes me as a little more upbeat than "You're fired") -- and began broadcasting as Pappy O'Daniel and the Hillbilly Boys.

He was Texas's first real statewide media star. In 1938, he ran for governor.  The story is that Carr Collins -- an insurance magnate, radio station owner and seller of Crazy Crystals, minerals that allegedly acted as a laxative when drenched in water -- suggested to O'Daniel that running for governor would be a great way to market his flour. Pappy introduced the idea to his radio audience by reading a letter, supposedly from a blind listener, urging the broadcaster to enter the gubernatorial race. O'Daniel told his listeners that he'd run, but only if they wanted him to, and that they should send in a postcard giving their view on the question. On his next show, he announced the results: "Yes" carried the day, 54,499 to 4.

So Pappy and the Hillbilly Boys hit the road. His "platform" consisted largely of the Ten Commandments, and one central promise: a $30-per-month pension for every Texan older than 65.  His campaign rallies -- which drew, to the amazement of political observers, enormous and frenzied crowds -- featured a few words from the candidate, often including one of his homespun poems, a pitch for his Hillbilly Flour and a whole lot of free barbecue and music by the Hillbilly Boys. Nobody -- certainly not any of the other 11 (!) candidates --  took him seriously for two seconds, until he beat them into the ground, garnering over 50 percent of the vote in the 12-man field.

Way to go, Pappy! Rich guy becomes media celebrity and parlays that into a position as chief executive.

Sound familiar? [Back in February, Jesse Walker, over at Reason, had a terrific piece on the Pappy/Trump parallels.]

But here's the thing: Pappy never got anyone a pension. He was -- surprise! -- completely incapable of manipulating the levers of power at his disposal to get anything of substance done as governor. Other promises he had made from time to time on the campaign trail -- to eliminate the poll tax and capital punishment -- fell by the wayside as well. [You can read more about O'Daniel here at the Texas State Historical Association, and at Wikipedia here.]

It's sad, really; a lot of people, played for suckers. A universal pension of even $30 per month would have alleviated a great deal of misery in Texas, and the state almost certainly had enough money to pay for it. The immense East Texas Oil Field -- 5 billion barrels of oil, more oil than the geologists' estimates of total global petroleum reserves at the time -- started pumping out oil in 1930 and 1931, and by the time of Pappy's triumphant entrance into Austin, there was lots and lots of money pouring into Texas.

But Pappy had no idea how to pull it off and failed to get much of anything done, because it turns out getting governments to get things done is a complicated business, requiring some cajoling, some threats, some compromise, the assembling of coalitions and all the rest. [And just to complete the tale, the senior citizens of Texas did, of course, eventually get those government pensions. It's called Social Security, which began its payouts in 1940, and it took someone -- many people, actually -- who actually understood how governments work to make it happen.]

So that's Question 2: Assuming you can get past the commander-in-chief problem, what makes you think that the outcome of Trump's presidency would be any different from the outcome of Pappy O'Daniel's governorship?

I'm looking forward to reading your responses.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I've been involved in policy for three decades, since AOL played a pivotal role in getting the nation online in the early days of the Internet. Initially, my focus was on commercializing the Internet, expanding access and putting appropriate rules of the road in place. In the past decade, my focus shifted to encouraging pro-growth policies that foster innovation, generate jobs, help start-ups and create opportunity. I was proud to work with a Democratic president and a Republican House to help get the Jumpstart Our Business Startups (JOBS) Act passed four years ago, and I have spent countless hours meeting with members of both parties on **immigration** reform, patent reform and pro-start-up economic ideas.

Despite my active engagement on policy, however, I've tried to steer clear of politics. I've avoided endorsing candidates or making big contributions to campaigns. I've wanted to be nonpartisan, able to work with people on both sides of the aisle. Indeed, I've been troubled by the hyper-partisanship that has defined our politics of late, and by the resulting gridlock that has set in. The United States faces many challenges, but in my view our greatest threat may not be external forces but rather our inability to work together to move our country forward.

So my inclination is to continue to stay out of politics and continue to quietly build working relationships with both Republicans and Democrats. I'd prefer to be positioned as a builder of bridges and consensus.

But I've decided to make an exception this election. I have concluded that I cannot sit on the sidelines this year. At this pivotal time, the choice is too important.

I've decided to back Hillary Clinton for president for four reasons.

First, I think she'd be better for our economy, especially with respect to innovative technology and start-ups. Donald Trump knows business, but his campaign has been backward-looking on the economy and oddly absent of ideas to spur creation of the jobs of the future. Clinton understands what we need to help start businesses and will invest in education, advanced manufacturing and basic research. She's not promising a return to a bygone era — she's focused on making our economy strong for our children and their children. These forward-leaning policies are essential to ensure continued U.S. economic leadership.

Second, Clinton is right on **immigration**. To win in the global economy, our country must win the global battle for talent. **Immigrants** don't take U.S. jobs; they create them. More than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by **immigrants** or their children: Think how many fewer jobs we'd have in the United States if these entrepreneurs and their parents had been kept out by a wall. Trump's harsh policies will cost us jobs, and his even harsher rhetoric will chase away **immigrant** families whose children could grow up to be the next Steve Jobs (whose father was a Syrian refugee) or Sergey Brin (an **immigrant** himself).

Third, while Trump has been largely silent on technology issues facing the new economy, Clinton has put forward an agenda that has won considerable acclaim among technology leaders. She wants to appoint a chief innovation adviser, expand science, technology, engineering and math, or STEM, education and more. And she shares my view that it's not enough to support a booming Silicon Valley — we need policies that promote the "rise of the rest": a spread of start-ups to all parts of our country. We need to level the playing field so anybody, anywhere, has a shot at the American dream.

Fourth, I agree with Clinton on the need to control the deficit. Despite his populist rhetoric, Trump wants to give huge tax breaks to people like me, the very folks who have benefited greatly from the innovation economy, while many others have been left behind. In the process he would blow up our deficit and make the economy more unequal. I agree we need to simplify the tax code, but if we are going to give tax relief, let's make sure it is in incentives for start-ups to grow and create jobs.

I think I get why Trump has been such a potent political force this year. I am well aware that millions of people are angry about their prospects and fearful that the forces of globalization and digitization have left them behind. I also recognize many are frustrated by politics and feel we need an outsider to shake things up. But I don't think Trump is the answer, for those people or for the country.

I don't agree with everything Clinton has said and done. I take issue with some aspects of her platform, and I worry about her inclination to all too often view the government as the solution to problems. If she becomes president, I'm sure there will be plenty of times I will disagree with her. But for 2016, I believe Hillary Clinton represents the best choice for the United States — and our best hope to remain the most innovative and entrepreneurial nation in the world.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I take issue with Robert J. Samuelson's statement in his Sept. 26 op-ed, "The wrong **immigration** debate," that "we need an **immigration** system that gives priority to skilled over unskilled workers."

My maternal and paternal grandparents were unskilled and uneducated **immigrants** to the United States from Poland and Ireland, respectively. They came in the wave of **immigration** in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Many of their children fought for the United States and led productive lives as public servants or in business. The same is true in my generation and that of my children and grandchildren.

Thus, literally hundreds of productive citizens (and, from Mr. Samuelson's standpoint, consumers) resulted from the ability of my grandparents to **immigrate** to the United States. There were more than 20 million others during that same period. Do the math. Clearly their contribution and that of their offspring to society far exceeded any drain on society.

Let us not forget, particularly during this time of **immigration** debate and anti-**immigrant** fervor, that all of us are **immigrants** or descended from them.

William E. Kennedy, New Market

Robert J. Samuelson concluded his generally positive op-ed with the words "But the underlying realities will not retreat no matter how much we wish they would. If we cannot maneuver **immigration** to our advantage, it will almost certainly work to our disadvantage." He was writing solely in terms of our economy. There are other considerations.

In 1960, when I was in college, the population of the United States was 180 million; teachers could afford to live near the schools where they taught; police officers and firefighters could likewise afford to live near where they worked; and almost no one outside Los Angeles was required to endure frustrating commutes on packed roads. Now the opposite is true because of population growth driven largely by legal **immigration**. And it's going to get worse, much worse. The Census Bureau projects our 2060 population to be 417 million — 237 million more than when I was in college.

There is a terrible quality-of-life cost with such population growth. When do we stop?

Edwin Stennett, Montgomery Village

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Gary Johnson, the Libertarian nominee for president, had been raring for Wednesday night's "town hall" on MSNBC. He had been cut from the first televised debate after missing the polling threshold, and he had not been invited when the network hosted a "commander-in-chief forum" with Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump.

"This was their consolation prize," Johnson told The Washington Post this week when asked about the MSNBC special. "It was put to us that, look, you weren't in this initial program. Here's what we'd like to offer in lieu of being with the two major-party candidates. And I said, 'An hour of prime time Chris Matthews? I'll take it.' "

But the hour didn't go as planned. Johnson, who had been pilloried for blanking on the relevance of the Syrian city of Aleppo in another MSNBC interview, whiffed his way through an even easier foreign policy question.

"Who's your favorite foreign leader?" Matthews asked.

"Who's my favorite?" Johnson replied.

"Anywhere in the continents," Matthews said. "Any country. Name one foreign leader that you look up to."

William Weld, Johnson's running mate, chimed in with an assist: "I'm with Shimon Peres."

"I'm talking about living, okay?" Matthews said. "You gotta do this. Any continent. Canada, Mexico?"

"I guess I'm having an Aleppo moment," Johnson said.

"In the whole world!" Matthews said. "Anybody in the world."

"I know, I know," Johnson said.

"Pick any leader," Matthews said.

"The former president of Mexico," Johnson said.

"Which one?" Matthews said.

"I'm having a brain freeze," Johnson said.

Weld, who had left the governor's office in Massachusetts in an unsuccessful attempt to become ambassador to Mexico, began naming the country's former presidents. "Fox? Zedillo? Calderon?"

"Fox," Johnson said with a combination of jubilation and relief. "He was terrific."

Johnson's inability to remember the full name of Vicente Fox was a genuine surprise. Johnson governed New Mexico, which shares a small border with Mexico, from 1995 to 2003. Fox, a former Coca-Cola executive, won Mexico's 2000 presidential election with an unusual amount of fanfare, as his center-right National Action Party (PAN) broke generations of one-party rule by the center-left Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI).

And in recent months, Fox had become a vigorous opponent of Donald Trump. He gave several interviews promising that Mexico would not "pay for that wall" if Trump won the presidency. He was filmed bashing a Trump-shaped piñata. He tweeted mockery at Trump when he managed to wind up on a Trump campaign fundraising email list.

Johnson had appeared to notice. Over the summer, as he rose in the polls, Johnson added Texas-based **immigration** reform advocate Juan Hernandez as an adviser on Latino issues. This past weekend, at the annual Texas Tribune Festival in Austin, Hernandez organized interviews between Johnson and several Spanish-language TV stations. The Washington Post was in the room as Hernandez talked Johnson through a Mexican television spot, where he offered to meet with Mexico's President Enrico Peña Nieto to discuss **immigration** and trade. "As Vicente Fox says, 'Hoy, hoy, hoy!' " Johnson said.

And on Monday, minutes before the debate began, Johnson told a room full of journalists that he would have lit up the stage had he been permitted to share it. Arit John, a reporter for Bloomberg Politics, asked if the "Aleppo moment" had suggested he would fluster when the debate turned to policy. Pacing behind a desk, his yellow tie partly undone, Johnson said he was furious at American foreign policy and had had enough of gotcha questions.

"Hillary Clinton crosses the I's and crosses the T's on all of the names and everything associated with this," Johnson said. "But as a result of that, we have the foreign policy we have right now, which I have to tell you, I think is horrible. Horrible! And that's how I would answer it tonight. I would be mad. I would be angry. I would angry that they would be calling out names of geographic locations, names of foreign leaders, when the underlying policy has thousands of people dying."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As a shrinking Midwestern city of about 388,000, Cleveland is not the sort of place that outside of presidential-election years gets a lot of national media attention.

But this year, Cleveland has hosted the Republican National convention and more than one massive Donald Trump rally. With the help of federal dollars that can come with holding certain major events, the city's police department has become the proud owner of unspecified surveillance and crowd-control devices, which have both civil liberties activists and some citizens concerned.

The reason: Long before Trump and the Republican Party brought heightened attention on Cleveland, a grand jury in December declined to indict a Cleveland police officer who fatally shot a 12-year-old black child in a city park in response to a 911 call about a man with a gun. The caller did tell the dispatcher that the person was possibly a child playing with a toy, but that information apparently was not relayed to the officers.

Ari Melber, a journalist and lawyer, in a Washington Post op-ed described Tim McGinty's handling of the Tamir Rice case as "upside down," with the prosecutor using the grand jury as more of a "sounding board for an exoneration of the potential defendants, rather than as a review of possible charges against them." Later, the city sued the boy's family for unpaid medical expenses before dropping the claim.

In May 2015, a judge acquitted another Cleveland police officer facing criminal charges in the shooting deaths of two unarmed black adults. The officer was one of 13 who fired a total of 137 bullets into a fleeing car but the only one who mounted the vehicle's hood and fired 15 shots at the unarmed occupants after the car had come to a stop and the other officers had ceased shooting. Also in May 2015, the city's police department agreed to federal oversight and restrictions on the ways in which police routinely use force, including a ban on using force or weapons because someone talked back, pistol-whipping and firing warning shots.

Now, with all of that in the not-so-distant past, the Cleveland Police Patrolmen's Association has set a membership vote Friday on whether to endorse Trump for president.

The union's roughly 1,000 members are expected to do so, on the grounds that Trump is the "pro-police" candidate. Steve Loomis, who is the union's president and is white, is a vocal Trump supporter and has advocated for both the endorsement and the full membership vote after also attending a Trump rally in full police uniform. Lynn Hampton, president of the Black Shield Police Association, a black officer subgroup within the union, has described the union endorsement vote as one that seems set to divide the union ranks along racial lines and inflame community distrust in a city where the relationship between police and residents of color is already, at best, fraught. The move may be regarded as intentionally antagonistic.

Some officers involved in the meetings where the larger union's leadership decided to put the issue to a membership vote also thought it wise to stay out of national political matters and focus on local races.

From the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

Many officers predict that members of the Cleveland Police Patrolmen's Association will vote to endorse Republican candidate Donald Trump, whose hardline stances on policing and **immigration** have sparked outrage and fear within black and Hispanic communities.

Cleveland, to be clear, is just over 53 percent black, 37 percent white and, in 2010, 10 percent Latino. The city is also dominated by Democrats, while the surrounding state is more of a political mix and regarded as a key ingredient in any Republican victory. No Republican has ever won the White House without carrying Ohio.

Trump has made a particular show of similar endorsements from the Fraternal Order of Police, a national police organization, and the union that represents **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers and U.S. Border Patrol agents. Their support is evidence, he has said, that he is the candidate with the ideas that law enforcement officers think are necessary to maintain public safety and secure the country's borders.

The @GLFOP has made an endorsement for President of the United States. pic.twitter.com/L5ydPsNauI

What Trump has not said is that black officers in several cities have repudiated the Fraternal Order of Police's decision to endorse Trump. According to the organization, the Fraternal Order is the world's largest police union, with more than 330,000 members. But within its ranks, the decision to endorse Trump has created divisions that run largely along racial and ethnic lines. Fraternal Order President Chuck Canterbury has become a fixture on cable news programs covering the spate of shooting deaths and use-of-force incidents involving a disproportionate share of black men. Canterbury often advances the idea that any effort to question, closely examine or challenge the conduct of police amounts to an anti-police stance and has described the Black Lives Matter movement as a hate group.

Despite that, the logic of police endorsements for Trump and Trump's decision to publicize them is not exactly clear. Friday's union vote in Cleveland poses a political (or, at least, a perception) problem for Cleveland's police and, oddly, may provide limited benefit to Trump. Voters already in Trump's camp — an overwhelmingly white group — tend to support his "law and order" stance and his plans to codify and implement profiling tactics if elected. It's voters whose support eludes Trump — women of all races, men of color and young white Americans — who are far more divided on these practices and ideas.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Many libertarian-inclined conservatives unable to stomach either Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton thought former New Mexico governor Gary Johnson would be a respectable alternative. He is turning out not to be.

The Post reports on the Libertarian ticket's appearance on MSNBC:

Johnson, who had been pilloried for blanking on the relevance of the Syrian city of Aleppo in another MSNBC interview, whiffed his way through an even easier foreign policy question.

Needless to say, the joke about his position on legalized marijuana started flying after that. Johnson come across not just as an isolationist but also as a joke. So what's a #NeverEitherOneofThem conservative to do?

Well, Evan McMullin is up to 2 percent (better than nothing) and ahead of Green Party Jill Stein in the latest PPP poll. While Johnson gets flakier, McMullin is gaining gravitas. After Trump's horrible performance at Monday's debate, McMullin wrote: "He is surrounded by employees of Vladimir Putin, and is openly infatuated with the Russian strongman. His new cabal of advisers would be familiar in the third world; every strongman has a propagandist like Trump's new campaign CEO, Steve Bannon — a man who happily profits from pushing racial discord, ethnic strife, and overt anti-Semitism."

Unlike Clinton and Trump he has the nerve to stand up for free trade:

McMullin's stance on trade is in line with traditional conservative ways of thinking: It is largely good for America. He believes retreating from the global trade stage would be unwise and argues that manufacturing job loss is not a result of trade but instead technology, meaning retraining workers for new jobs in new industries is the better way.

Likewise, while they are whistling through the fiscal graveyard, McMullin supports a premium support plan (i.e. defined-benefit plan) for Medicare, and on Social Security favors "gradually paring back benefits for the wealthiest seniors over the next 20 to 30 years while at the same time gradually raising the retirement age." Whether you think these are precisely the right remedies, he at least has a coherent approach to a problem the other two continue to ignore.

On **immigration**, he rejects Trump anti-growth exclusionary approach. (He "would offer a path to legalization for undocumented **immigrants** already in the United States -- something most agree would be good for those already living here and contributing to the American economy.")

Unlike Johnson, he knows something about foreign policy having served overseas in the CIA. He would not be a lap dog for Vladimir Putin. He's the only candidate specifically advocating "changing the conditions on the battlefield" in Syria to get rid of Bashar al-Assad. He points out that we already have "boots on the ground" in Iraq and posits that support for local troops can be augmented by U.S. Special Operations forces. On the policing issue that has spawned Black Lives Matter, he argues that we need leadership favoring "reconciliation."

At this point he seems like a much sounder alternative for conservatives than Johnson. The concern about "throwing your vote away" should not trouble the vast majority of Americans outside of swing states. If they cannot bear to vote for Clinton, a regular GOP voter at least can take his support away from Trump in closely contested states.

Moreover, for Republicans who've given up on the race, and frankly on the party, McMullin points the way to a new sort of center-right party -- more appealing to younger voters (he's barely 40 years old), confident, measured on foreign policy, pro-growth on economic issues and inclusive in tone. It's not the know-nothing message of Trump nor the rigidly right-wing message of Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) (anti-**immigration**, anti-gay marriage, hostile toward government).

McMullin is not going to win in 2016, but with the disintegration of Johnson and the reminder of Trump's abject unfitness, despondent Republicans can at least signal that McMullin's agenda is the direction in which the party should head.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Steve Case, who endorsed Hillary Clinton, and Jeff Immelt, chief executive of GE, this week highlight the divide between pseudo-economists on the right and market reality. The fixation on cutting top marginal tax rates, which has driven supply-side senior citizens into Trump's camp, and the fantasy of cutting off trade and **immigration** bear no resemblance to the needs of employers and the 21st-century workforce.

Case explained in his endorsement:

Donald Trump knows business, but his campaign has been backward-looking on the economy and oddly absent of ideas to spur creation of the jobs of the future. Clinton understands what we need to help start businesses and will invest in education, advanced manufacturing and basic research. She's not promising a return to a bygone era — she's focused on making our economy strong for our children and their children. These forward-leaning policies are essential to ensure continued U.S. economic leadership.

Immelt, in the second of two appearances in Washington on Wednesday (we earlier did a rundown on the first), sounded a similar note: "You know, one of the things everybody in this town, everybody in this room, has to worry about is we've got to boost U.S. productivity again. We've got to be thinking about 2 or 3 percent productivity. This is a tool that's going to help us get there." He also recommends that both business and government need to get their act together in creating high-paying jobs.

In other words, we need investment in human capital as well as investment in the physical infrastructure and the scientific foundation on which a 21st-century economy depends. The economic discussion on the GOP side, with the exception of regulatory reform, virtually never touches on these topics. Why? It wasn't much of an issue in the 1980s, where too many fiscal conservatives remain frozen.

This is why Clinton -- who at least stresses investment in the right things -- has a more effective agenda than does Trump, who would like to pretend globalization and mechanization can be reversed or ignored. Case and Immelt aren't advocating a "big-business agenda" -- they are stressing an approach that builds up smaller businesses, which in many cases are the suppliers for the Fortune 500 companies. ("Clinton has put forward an agenda that has won considerable acclaim among technology leaders," Case says. "She wants to appoint a chief innovation adviser, expand science, technology, engineering and math, or STEM, education and more. And she shares my view that it's not enough to support a booming Silicon Valley — we need policies that promote the 'rise of the rest': a spread of start-ups to all parts of our country. We need to level the playing field so anybody, anywhere, has a shot at the American dream.")

Moreover, real employers and their employees appreciate the importance of trade. Immelt notes that "if you're a GE factory worker who's exporting $20 billion, you have a lot to lose in terms of these trade deals or how you think about trade contextually. . . . [ A deal like TPP] strengthens our company to be able to fight and win — or, our country to be able to fight and win around the world, speaking the same language that every other country around the world speaks." This is obviously much more crucial to the 21st century than lowering the individual top marginal tax rate, yet right-wing ideologues put their eggs in the latter basket at the expense of the former when they back a protectionist such as Trump.

And yes, **immigration** is part of the disconnect as well. GE doesn't suffer if **immigration** dries up because it has undergone a massive localization effort so 70 percent of its operations are outside the country. But for everyone else, skilled **immigrants** are essential to maximizing our productivity, which is the key to higher-paying jobs.

Case argues, "To win in the global economy, our country must win the global battle for talent. **Immigrants** don't take U.S. jobs; they create them. More than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by **immigrants** or their children: Think how many fewer jobs we'd have in the United States if these entrepreneurs and their parents had been kept out by a wall." He adds, "Trump's harsh policies will cost us jobs, and his even harsher rhetoric will chase away **immigrant** families whose children could grow up to be the next Steve Jobs (whose father was a Syrian refugee) or Sergey Brin (an **immigrant** himself)."

Neither of these people, nor the chief executives of the top 100 companies (none of whom back Trump), like the choke-hold of regulations, or tax increases, that one  normally associates with Democratic administrations. Taken as a whole, however, two Republican leaners (Case and Immelt) find more positive items than negative in Clinton's agenda because their concern is 21st century-realities, not a 30-year-old agenda. From their perspective, Trump's approach -- expanding debt, cutting off trade and **immigration**, and ignoring a technology and training agenda -- does much more harm than good. Clinton's negatives from their vantage point (overspending, overregulation) may be mitigated by a GOP Congress.

Immelt raises the intriguing argument that employees who understand the modern economy (because they work in it) need to make sure their voice is heard:

Multiply our million constituents with another million constituents from another company. That's the — that's the voice that is not heard today. And I've never watched a political campaign talking about manufacturing jobs in the U.S. from people that have no idea what they do. Wouldn't know a factory person if they saw them — 20 of them in front of them and have no idea how to create the jobs.

Indeed they understand the problem much more clearly than 1980s supply-siders. Rather than asking those who have essentially failed in the 21st-century economy (50-year-old, high-school-educated unemployed men), we should be asking the people who are succeeding what they need.

The right-wing set, in their ideological ivory tower, would do well to come down to the factory floor and talk to real employers and employees. Because they and their party are so divorced from reality, we've come to the point where Democrats have a more effective and relevant economic agenda than the Republicans. That's got to change if Republicans want to win back the White House one day.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Looking on the bright side, perhaps this election can teach conservatives to look on the dark side. They need a talent for pessimism, recognizing the signs that whatever remains of American exceptionalism does not immunize this nation from decay, to which all regimes are susceptible.

The world's oldest political party is an exhausted volcano, the intellectual staleness of its recycled candidate unchallenged because a generation of younger Democratic leaders barely exists. The Republican Party's candidate evidently disdains his credulous supporters who continue to swallow his mendacities. About 90 percent of presidential votes will be cast for Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump, refuting the theory that this is a center-right country. At the risk of taking Trump's words more seriously than he does, on some matters he is to Clinton's left regarding big government powered by an unbridled presidency.

His trade policy is liberalism's "industrial policy" repackaged for faux conservatives comfortable with presidents dictating what Americans can import and purchase at what prices, and where U.S. corporations can operate. Trump "wouldn't approve" Ford manufacturing cars in Mexico. He would create a federal police force to deport 450,000 illegal **immigrants** a month, including 6.4 percent of America's workforce in two years. Yet the 25 million jobs he promises to create would require more than doubling the current rate of legal **immigration** to fill them, according to economist Mark Zandi. Of the Supreme Court's 2005 Kelo decision diluting property rights by vastly expanding government's powers of eminent domain, Trump says, "I happen to agree with it 100 percent." Even Bernie Sanders rejects Kelo.

When Trump says "people are not making it on Social Security," he implies that people should be able to "make it" on Social Security for a third or more of their lives, and that he, like Clinton, is for enriching this entitlement's benefits. He will "save" the system by eliminating — wait for it — "waste, fraud and abuse." Trump is as parsimonious with specifics regarding health care ("Plans you don't even know about will be devised because we're going to come up with plans — health-care plans — that will be so good") as regarding foreign policy ("I would get China, and I would say, 'Get in [North Korea], and straighten it out.' ").

"Charismatic authority," wrote Max Weber in 1915, seven years before Mussolini's march on Rome, causes the governed to submit "because of their belief in the extraordinary quality of the specific person . . . . Charismatic rule thus rests upon the belief in magical powers, revelations and hero worship." A demagogue's success requires a receptive demos, and Trump's ascendancy reflects progressivism's success in changing America's social norms and national character by de-stigmatizing dependency.

Under his presidency, Trump says, government will have all the answers: "I am your voice. . . . I alone can fix it." The pronoun has unlimited antecedents: "I will give you everything. I will give you what you've been looking for for 50 years. I'm the only one."

Urban without a trace of urbanity, Trump has surrounded himself with star-struck acolytes (Mike Pence marvels at Trump's anatomical — "broad-shouldered" — foreign policy) and hysterics (Rudy Giuliani: "There is no next election! This is it!"). When Ferdinand VII regained Spain's throne in 1813, he vowed to end "the disastrous mania of thinking." Trump is America's Ferdinand.

The American project was to construct a constitutional regime whose institutional architecture would guarantee the limited government implied by the Founders' philosophy: Government is instituted to "secure" (the Declaration of Independence) preexisting natural rights. Today, however, neither the executive nor legislative branches takes this seriously, the judiciary has forsworn enforcing it, and neither political party represents it because no substantial constituency supports it.

The ease with which Trump has erased Republican conservatism matches the speed with which Republican leaders have normalized him. For the formerly conservative party, the Founders' principles, although platitudes in the party's catechism, have become, as former senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan said, "a kind of civic religion, avowed but not constraining."

The beginning of conservative wisdom is recognition that there is an end to everything: Nothing lasts. If Trump wins, the GOP ends as a vehicle for conservatism. And a political idea without a political party is an orphan in an indifferent world.

Pessimism need not breed fatalism or passivity. It can define an agenda of regeneration, but only by being clear-eyed about the extent of degeneration, which a charlatan's successful selling of his fabulousness exemplifies. Conservatism's recovery from his piratical capture of the conservative party will require facing unflattering facts about a country that currently is indifferent to its founding.

georgewill@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**You could say that Ryan Fu's feelings about his heritage are complicated. The openly gay son of Chinese **immigrants**, the New York fashion stylist can't even cross paths with an Asian deliveryman without shooting him a look of disdainful superiority. Because that happens during the first scene of the romantic comedy "Front Cover," it's clear that the character's notions about cultural identity are going to play a big part in what's to come.

It doesn't take long. Ryan (a charming Jake Choi) gets an assignment to style an up-and-coming Chinese actor, Ning (James Chen), who's visiting from Beijing while preparing for a big magazine spread. At first, the two don't get along. Ning jokes to his entourage that Ryan is ABC — short for "American-borrowed Chinese." ("Like the pandas," the actor helpfully explains to his unamused stylist.)

Things get worse before they get, predictably, better: The pair's tenuous alliance very nearly falls apart after Ning tells Ryan that they can work together only if Ryan doesn't show his "homo side" so openly.

Doth he protest too much? You bet.

Meanwhile, the guys end up learning a thing or two from each other. Ning becomes more open-minded, and Ryan finds a new appreciation for his roots. The movie, which tends to lack surprise and subtlety, only really finds its groove once Ryan's parents (Elizabeth Sung and Ming Lee) show up, demonstrating both how shabbily their son treats them — he's constantly embarrassed by their **immigrant** ways — and how devoted they are to him. His mother still harbors feelings of guilt over trying to toughen up her son during childhood, when he was constantly bullied.

That subplot, not to mention Sung's moving performance, makes the movie more complex. Otherwise, "Front Cover" is weighed down by heavy-handed dialogue and a melodramatic score. The second feature from writer-director Ray Yeung ("Cut Sleeve Boys"), the film's examination of the first-generation American experience feels fresh. The delivery, however, is hardly original.

stephanie.merry@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A man suspected of killing two people and kidnapping another during a two-day crime rampage through Texas had been deported to Mexico three times since 1996 and was living in the U.S. illegally, authorities said Wednesday.

Juan Navarro Rios, 40, was arrested Tuesday night after he barricaded himself in an apartment complex in an Austin suburb and set fire to part of the building, according to police, who said they grabbed him as he tried to flee down a staircase. He is suspected of shooting and killing two motorists in the Dallas area, and kidnapping a landscape worker in Austin.

**Immigration** officials said Rios was a Mexican national who had been deported in 1996, 2009 and 2014 for a range of criminal offenses, according to the Associated Press. Police initially identified him as Silvestre Franco-Luviano, but a Dallas County sheriff's spokesperson later said he used at least eight aliases and that his real name was Juan Navarro Rios.

"This is an example of the worst of the worst that we go after on a daily basis," Hector Gomez, supervisory deputy marshal of the Lone Star Fugitive Task Force, told the Dallas Morning News.

Crimes committed by people who enter the United States illegally, in particular repeat deportees, has become a major political cause among many conservatives and others arguing for tougher border controls and more aggressive action to deport those with criminal records. The anger reached a peak last year when an undocumented **immigrant**, a repeat felon who has been deported five times to Mexico, was charged with shooting Kate Steinle while she was walking on a busy pier in San Francisco with her father. The accused man, who claimed his gun fired by accident, is awaiting trial. Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump has championed the issue, accusing the Obama administration of fostering "deadly, non-enforcement policies that allow thousands of criminal aliens to freely roam our streets."

.@LeslieRangelTV on how the arrest of Silvestre Franco-Luviano unfolded, now on KXAN at 10: https://t.co/ynd8Afccd7[https://t.co/ynd8Afccd7] pic.twitter.com/XYirF2MgoE

Authorities said they began searching for Navarro Rios on Sunday night, after he allegedly opened fire on cars in Dallas, killing 33-year-old Ruben Junior Moreno.

Later that night, police in Cedar Hill, Tex., a Dallas suburb, responded to reports that someone had fired on cars, injuring one person. Police said Navarro Rios then drove to a Texaco gas station in town, where he fatally shot Welton Betts, 44, and stole his car, forcing the man's wife out of the vehicle at gunpoint.

Police said Navarro Rios's next stop was Georgetown, Tex., 30 miles east of Austin, where on Monday morning he kidnapped a man doing landscape work outside a Bealls department store, according to KXAN. Authorities found the victim unharmed later in the morning at a gas station a mile away, police said.

According to the Morning News, police received a tip that Navarro Rios was hiding out at his sister's apartment in Georgetown. On Tuesday, as police evacuated the apartment complex and deployed SWAT teams to the area, Navarro Rios set fire to his sister's unit and broke through the wall to the unit next door, the Morning News reported. Police arrested him as he fled the burning building.

"The flash bombs went off, you heard them hit the door really hard, you knew they were going in and the screen comes flying out as if he was going to jump out of the third floor, so he had nowhere to go and at that point he had to know that that was it," one witness told KXAN.

Navarro Rios is being held on a murder charge in Dallas County jail on a $250,000 bond, records show. Attorney information for Navarro Rios wasn't immediately available Thursday.

Exclusive Video of murder suspect Silvestre Franco-Luciano being taken into custody pic.twitter.com/KUg3eRXCHa

It's not clear when Navarro Rios first arrived in the United States, but he was first deported to Mexico in 1996 for what **immigration** officials said was a felony conviction, according to the AP. Officials wouldn't say what the conviction was, but court records show that he was convicted of assault and hindering prosecution around that time, the AP reported.

In 2009, Navarro Rios tried to reenter the country through southeastern Texas and was immediately deported for falsely claiming he was a U.S. citizen, U.S.**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officials said.

A short time later, he returned again and was convicted twice of vehicle burglary, once in 2010 and once in 2011, according to court records. He also has convictions in Texas for felony possession of a controlled substance and driving without a license, records show. Authorities located him in an Austin jail in 2011 and charged him with reentry after deportation, the Austin American-Statesman reported. He was deported for the third time in March 2014, after serving an eight-month sentence, officials said.

In his most recent deportation, Navarro Rios likely would have been marked "Priority 1″ by ICE, a category reserved for repeat offenders, people convicted of violent crimes, and others deemed to pose a threat to national security.

**Immigration** rights advocates have criticized the Obama administration for deporting people in record numbers, while praising the White House for using executive orders to keep families and children of undocumented **immigrants** in the country.

Texas Lt. Gov. Dan Patrick said Wednesday that Navarro Rios's arrest showed that the border was too porous.

"This is an indictment against the federal government's failure to police the border and another reason that Texas must continue to focus on border security," Patrick told the American-Statesman.

The brother of Ruben Junior Moreno, the first victim, said his brother had spent the evening watching a Dallas Cowboys game before he was fatally shot in the driver's seat of his Hummer on the shoulder of the highway. Carlos Moreno described his brother as funny and outgoing, saying he'd "give you the shirt off his back."

"For my brother's life to end in his own truck, it's not right, just to be sitting there for hours until they found him," Moreno told the Morning News. "It hurts, it really hurts."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Arizona Republic ed board has never endorsed a Democrat for president. Until now: https://t.co/EGdmxQYV6m[https://t.co/EGdmxQYV6m] via @azcopinions pic.twitter.com/ZP7Vyd608q

In 1890, when the Arizona Republic first started printing from Phoenix, before it published photographs or crossword puzzles or won a Pulitzer Prize, the newspaper was called the Arizona Republican.

It later changed its name, but not the political slant of its editorial page.

For 126 years, the Republic has endorsed candidates for president of the United States. For 126 years, they have always been Republicans.

That changed Tuesday.

In a historic first, the newspaper's editorial board announced online their unequivocal endorsement of Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton — and eviscerated her opponent, Republican nominee Donald Trump, along the way.

The state's largest newspaper acknowledged its own bold and uncharacteristic move in the editorial:

Since The Arizona Republic began publication in 1890, we have never endorsed a Democrat over a Republican for president. Never. This reflects a deep philosophical appreciation for conservative ideals and Republican principles.

The Republic is not the first newspaper with a traditionally conservative editorial slant to deviate from historical norms and endorse the Democratic candidate this election. Earlier this month, the Dallas Morning News threw its support behind Clinton, the first Democratic presidential candidate it had endorsed since before World War II. The Cincinnati Enquirer, which has supported Republicans for president for nearly a century, endorsed Clinton, as did the Houston Chronicle.

Several have even decided to endorse long-shot Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson, who did not qualify for the general-election debates, instead.

Trump, as of this writing, has received no endorsements from major publications since the primary season.

Like most of those nontraditional endorsements for Clinton, the Republic acknowledged she has made "serious missteps." The newspaper critiqued her use of private email servers while serving as secretary of state and wrote that although there was no evidence of wrongdoing, Clinton should have created a firewall between herself and her foundation to prevent the concern that donors were trying to buy access.

"Yet despite her flaws," the newspaper wrote, "Clinton is the superior choice."

The editorial continues:

She does not casually say things that embolden our adversaries and frighten our allies. Her approach to governance is mature, confident and rational.

The editorial praises Clinton's diplomatic work with foreign countries friendly and not, and it cites her long record of public service — as a senator, secretary of state and first lady — as evidence of her commitment to furthering the nation's collective ideals. They touted her temperament, an area in which, just 24 hours before, at the first 2016 presidential debate, Trump proclaimed he was far superior. The Republic disagreed.

They wrote:

Trump mocked a reporter's physical handicap. Picked a fight with a Gold Star family. Insulted POWs. Suggested a Latino judge can't be fair because of his heritage. Proposed banning Muslim **immigration**.

Trump, the editorial claims, "hangs scapegoats like piñatas and invites people to take a swing." The endorsement criticizes his insults toward women as "not just good-old-boy gaffes," but "evidence of deep character flaws." It condemns his views on **immigration**, an issue the state of Arizona takes particularly seriously because of its proximity to Mexico.

The editorial board probably anticipated a backlash from its conservative readership when it penned the endorsement, making a point to acknowledge the dread many Republicans might feel in this election. Many GOP voters understand Trump's flaws, they wrote, but "shudder" at the thought of another president Clinton — especially when it comes to nominating justices to the Supreme Court.

"We get that," the board wrote. "But we ask them to see Trump for what he is — and what he is not. Trump's conversion to conservatism is recent and unconvincing."

When the Republic published its endorsement online Tuesday night, it posted the article to Facebook. Within hours, the comment thread was flooded with angry responses, threats to cancel subscriptions and confessions of perceived betrayal from the traditionally conservative editorial board. It had been shared nearly 2,000 times and commented on almost 1,000 times.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Eric Zhou grew up in China's Fujian province watching his father, an accomplished chef, whip up banquets of intricate Chinese dishes. But when Zhou moved to the United States and started working in a Chinese restaurant, he saw that his native cuisine was mostly considered cheap in this country, confined to greasy take-out counters and $7.95 lunch buffets.

So Zhou edged his way into a much more lucrative industry: Japanese food. Years later, he owns four Japanese and Asian fusion restaurants in the Washington area. With Chinese food, he says, "the price in America is too low. Japanese restaurants don't have this problem. To us, it's more suitable. It's a better life."

Zhou, 44, has joined thousands of other Chinese **immigrants** in the United States in seeking a leg up the economic ladder through Japanese food. From Ames, Iowa, to Lancaster, Pa., Chinese Americans have opened many of the sushi joints that dot suburban malls and city blocks across the country. It's the result of what experts describe as a striking convergence between U.S. ethnic-food preferences and the economic pressures facing a new wave of Chinese **immigrants**, whose population in the United States has tripled in the past 25 years.

Which cuisines sell well and which do not may seem a combination of chance and cultural tastes. But the outsize role of Chinese Americans in the Japanese food business, according to academics who have studied it, sheds light on deeper forces. The influx of low-wage Chinese **immigrants** — the country has recently eclipsed Mexico as the largest source of **immigrants** to the United States — has created fierce competition to provide cheap food. At the same time, Japan's wealth and economic success helped its cuisine gain a reputation as trendy and refined. So for many entrepreneurial Chinese **immigrants** looking to get ahead, Japanese food has often become the better opportunity.

"Chinese entrepreneurs have figured out that this is a way to make a slightly better living and get out of the . . . world of $10, $5 food at the bottom end of the market," says Krishnendu Ray, who leads New York University's food studies program.

Ray has collected data from Zagat, the restaurant guide, to underscore the point. In 1985, the average cost of a Chinese dinner for one in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco was $24.20 when adjusted for inflation, compared to $31.88 for a Japanese dinner, a difference of just $7.68. By 2013, a Chinese dinner only cost a little more — $32.78 — while a Japanese dinner had nearly doubled, to $62.73, a difference of nearly $30.

"Japanese food has more prestige and seems to, if you just look at a menu, have greater economic opportunity attached to it, because people are conditioned to pay more for rice and protein when it's presented as sushi than rice and protein when it's presented as a stir fry," said Sasha Issenberg, author of "The Sushi Economy."

Some of the difference in the price of Japanese and Chinese has to do with food itself — but not all. Ray argues Chinese food has earned a reputation for being cheap in large part because of the historic poverty of the country and its **immigrants**. "Foods we associate with poor **immigrants** tend to be cheap, and we are generally not willing to pay a higher price for it," he says.

He argues the cuisine's reputation could change as China's economy surges ahead and its people grow wealthier. Already, more upscale Chinese restaurants are popping up to cater to a new wave of wealthy Chinese **immigrating** to the United States. But others are skeptical Americans will ever pay top dollar for Chinese food.

Kin Lee, the owner of Love Sushi in Gaithersburg, Md., came to the country when he was 11 from Guangzhou, a massive city in southern China. His father owned a Chinese restaurant. His wife, however, had worked in Japanese restaurants, and advised him it was a better business.

"I can tell you it is easier to do than a Chinese restaurant," he says, "and the profit margins are better."

SUBHED

Since China loosened its restrictions on emigration in the 1970s, the total number of Chinese **immigrants** in the United States has gone from just 384,400 in 1980 to 2 million in 2013, according to the Migration Policy Institute. Some Chinese have arrived legally, aided by American laws designed to help them escape religious persecution, democracy crackdowns or forced abortions. Others paid tens of thousands of dollars to be smuggled over the border.

Like many migrant groups, they clustered in specific industries, where language skills were less important, and where there were well-established networks of job opportunities. According to the best estimates, there are more than 40,000 Chinese restaurants in the country, more than the number of U.S. Post offices. On the East Coast, many Chinese **immigrants** arrive in New York, and from there ride the network of long-distance buses that runs from Chinatown to kitchens all over the country. Like Zhou, many are from Fujian province, where entire villages emptied out in the 1990s as people sought opportunity in America.

David Wank, a professor of sociology at Japan's Sophia University who has studied Chinese ownership of Japanese restaurants, says that Japanese, Vietnamese and Korean **immigrants** began opening Japanese restaurants outside of major cities in the 1980s to take advantage of Americans' growing appetite for the food. But it was the Fujianese who greatly expanded the reach of inexpensive Japanese restaurants, he says, first opening sushi restaurants in New York in the 1990s, then pushing across the East Coast.

It's impossible to say how many of the roughly 25,000 Japanese restaurants in the United States are owned by people of Chinese origin. The Japanese Ministry of Agriculture estimated in the past that only about a tenth of Japanese restaurants in the states were run by people of Japanese descent. A survey of 33 Japanese restaurants in the Washington area revealed that 12 were owned by Chinese Americans and 12 by Korean Americans. Only six were Japanese owned.

Wank says Chinese **immigrants** abandoned Chinese food restaurants because of fierce competition. Many Chinese **immigrants** were poor and willing to work punishing hours to send money home to their relatives or give their children a better life in the United States. That led to a crowded industry and low wages.

By contrast, Japanese food offered a much clearer economic opportunity. As Japan's economy roared in the second half of the 20th century, its food became associated with a new class of business travelers. The cuisine's healthful reputation, its embrace by Hollywood stars and the invention of Americanized classics like the California roll helped its popularity to grow. Americans expected to pay high prices for Japanese food. But incomes in Japan were already so high that it didn't make economic sense for a Japanese chef to emigrate to work anywhere but the priciest U.S. restaurants, often in major cities.

That created an opening for Chinese Americans.

"Often the margins look better on sushi than they do on Chinese food," Issenberg says. "If I could be selling egg rolls for $3 each or cucumber rolls for $5 each, why am I not in that business?"

SUBHED

Zhou loves Fujianese food; he talks fondly of the big pot of soup that his wife keeps bubbling on the back burner at home nearly all hours of the day. But he's happy to have specialized in Japanese cooking.

"I wanted to earn money," he says, "so I studied the industry that had the higher salary."

Zhou (pronounced like "Joe") is the owner of Masa Hibachi Steakhouse and Sushi, an spacious Japanese restaurant in Silver Spring that features flat iron teppanyaki griddles where chefs cook and perform tricks for customers. At 5:30 p.m. on a Wednesday evening in August, a birthday party of young women shrieked with delight as their chef — also from Fujian — flipped vegetables, squirted sake into their mouths and sent flames shooting across the grill.

Zhou now owns four restaurants in the Washington suburbs that serve a mix of hibachi, sushi and Asian fusion. He owns a house in Bowie and pays for family vacations and piano lessons for his two middle-school-age kids. But he is still striving to improve his business and dreams of building a network of eight to 10 hibachi and sushi restaurants.

"In terms of family, I think I've achieved the American dream," he says. "Professionally, I'm still working towards it."

For the past few decades, the Japanese restaurant business has offered people like Zhou the clearest path to success. Yet if China's economy continues to grow, that could gradually set its emigrants and its cuisine in America on a new path.

"If you go to any of the major Chinese cultures 1,000 years ago, they have a foodie culture like Brooklyn and Manhattan has today," Ray says. "I think my son's generation, when he grows up, is going to look at Chinese culture with totally different eyes."

But for now, Zhou and other Chinese American entrepreneurs are still following local tastes. "If Americans really wanted to eat the authentic food, it would exist," Zhou says.

He recalls a Chinese-style dish, a duck breast, that he added to the menu at his restaurant after it opened. Zhou thought was delicious, but it sold poorly.

"When you open a restaurant, you need to follow local appetites, then you can earn money," he says. "You can't just say, 'Oh, I like this.' The customers have to think that."

You might also like:
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Local politicians who are skeptical of **immigration** often worry that newcomers will place a financial burden on city and state governments. These governments are responsible for major expenses related to **immigrant** families, especially education, and since **immigrants** tend to own less property and make less money, they also often pay less in taxes.

Figuring out just what **immigrants** mean for local governments' finances is a challenge, though. The fiscal consequences vary widely from place to place, depending on the region's economy, how taxes are collected, **immigrants**' earnings and the number of children they have in school.

On average, state governments spend about $3,300 more on each household headed by **immigrants** than those households pay in taxes a year, according to a comprehensive new report published last week by the nonpartisan National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine.

However, the report, which published last week, found that these families can yield benefits over the long term, as their children grow up, find well-paying jobs,and begin paying more taxes to their local governments.

"The main thing that is affecting the spending level, especially at the state and local level, is the number of school-age kids," said Kim Rueben, one of the authors of the report and an economist at the Urban Institute. "These things are being looked at as costs, but in some ways, they're our investment into the future."

The cost of households headed by first-generation **immigrants** varies widely by state, however. In Minnesota, they cost the government about $10,000 on average, but in neighboring North Dakota, the state actually receives an average of nearly $5,000 more in taxes from first-generation households than it spends on them.

Meanwhile, households headed by the second generation -- the children of **immigrants** -- pay an average of $3,000 more in taxes to the governments of their states than those governments spend on them.

In Mississippi, the figure is $8,000, according to the report. By contrast, the state of Utah spends about $1,150 on the average second-generation household beyond what that household pays in taxes.

"There is really surprising and consistent intergenerational progress within almost all **immigrant** groups in the United States," said Michael Fix, the president of the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, who was not involved in writing the report. "We see substantial progress from the first to the second generation."

The figures are based on Census data from 2011 through 2013. During that period, there were far more first-generation households than second-generation households, and recent **immigrants** and their families were a net cost for state governments.

The children in those first-generation households present substantial costs for state governments as they attend school, as do the children of parents born in the United States.

"Obviously, for all of us, kids are a substantial cost and are contributing nothing to society," said David Kallick, who directs **immigration** research at the nonpartisan Fiscal Policy Institute in New York. "And yet obviously, we invest in them -- partly because we love them and care about their future, but also because we think in the long run as a society, it's going to be good for us all."

When they come of age, they will begin working and paying taxes. Often, researchers have found, second-generation **immigrants** are more successful economically than both their parents or other Americans whose families have been in the country much longer.

"They're very motivated to realize their parents dreams for them," Kallick said. "They're very motivated to do well, and they do do well, both in school and in the labor market."

That makes them especially valuable to state governments. Compared to the $3,000 in fiscal surplus generated by the average second-generation **immigrant**household, households headed by third and subsequent generations yield just $2,400 on average, according to the report.

The report's authors did not calculate whether the costs to states of **immigration** exceed the benefits over the long term, because of the unknown variables: the children's educational attainment, how much they earn, whether they move to other states, and how states tax their citizens in the future.

Taking a very broad view, all **immigrants** would impose fiscal costs over the long term. Federal and state governments combined spend more on the average American than the average American pays in taxes each year, and almost all Americans are descended from prior **immigrants**. Unless policies on taxation and public expenditures change, the descendants of today's **immigrants** can be expected to contribute to the national debt, just like the rest of the country.

"It's not just the **immigrants** who are running up the tab," Fix said. "It's everybody who's running up the tab."

All the same, countries with expanding populations generally have sounder finances than those with declining populations -- even if the government is running a deficit at the moment. An increasing labor force has more capacity to earn money and pay taxes, giving a government more flexibility to respond to a financial crisis. A growing population can more easily pay off the debts incurred by the smaller generations of the past.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WINCHESTER, Va. — At a drug-awareness rally in the rural swath of her Northern Virginia district, Rep. Barbara Comstock clasped hands with a recovering heroin addict as if they were old friends.

She suggested treatment options to teary moms and cooed over pictures of a caseworker's kids. As the park cleared out, she stayed to chat with a doctor treating three-pound babies born hooked on opioids.

"It's nice to see her out in the community," said James Thall, 41, a recovering addict. "Just talking to her, she seems like she really cares."

If Comstock (R) can overcome the anchor of the Donald Trump candidacy in her swing district, this is how she'll do it. With a focus bordering on obsession, the freshman congresswoman puts a premium on constituent services and has ingratiated herself with every rotary club, fire company and charity that will have her.

But it could still be close.

Comstock faces a vigorous challenge from LuAnn Bennett, a first-time candidate but longtime Democratic donor who is trying her hardest to yoke Comstock to Trump. The nonpartisan Cook Political Report has changed its prediction of the race from "likely Republican" to "lean Republican," signaling a more competitive race.

Although drawn five years ago to favor a Republican, Virginia's 10th Congressional District includes all of Loudoun County, the richest county in the United States and a suburban commuter haven that occasionally tilts blue thanks to an influx of educated professionals, many of them minorities and women.

Loudoun voters made history last November when they elected Phyllis Randall, a Democrat, to become the first African American woman to chair a Virginia county's board of supervisors.

These voters are cool to Trump's comments that Hillary Clinton "doesn't have that strength and stamina" to be president, his calls to deport illegal **immigrants**and plans to build a wall at the U.S. border with Mexico. Although Trump carried the state in the GOP presidential primary, he was beaten badly by Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) in Comstock's district.

Comstock has not endorsed Trump and still sports a Rubio bumper sticker on her car. Cautious to the point of inspiring opponents to dub her "No Comment Comstock," she has steered clear of anything Trump, hoping voters stick by her even if they can't vote for the top of her ticket.

Will she endorse him before the election?

"If I change my mind, I'll let you know," she said in an interview.

Is she going to vote for him?

"I'm watching."

Bennett says Comstock's attempt to distance herself from Trump belies their shared agenda.

Both Comstock and Trump want to overturn Roe v. Wade, oppose measures that would close the wage gap between men and women and hold extreme views on **immigration**, Bennett says.

Democrats have also linked the congresswoman to Trump through his campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, and her deputy, David N. Bossie, who have worked with Comstock in GOP politics over the years.

A Georgetown-educated lawyer, Comstock, 57, was working for her predecessor, longtime congressman Frank Wolf, in the 1990s when a constituent complaint grew into Travelgate, a probe into what Republicans said was a plot devised by Hillary Clinton to replace seven staffers in the White House travel office with Clinton friends.

From there, Comstock built a reputation as an uber-prepared chief counsel on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee and opposition researcher for the Republican National Committee. She won election to Congress in 2014 with 57 percent of the vote.

Comstock said she is committed to issues important to her constituents, including national security, Metro funding and the opioid crisis.

"Voters here are independent, and they look at people based on who they are," she said. "People have seen me in their community, at their local events, at their local schools, at their businesses where I visit every week. I've worked very meticulously with them on a whole host of issues that are priorities."

She argues that it's important to have a Republican representative in the GOP-controlled House, noting that as a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee she helped push to get $5.4 billion in formula funds for Virginia's highways inserted into a five-year transportation law.

Bennett, 62, has emphasized her background as a real estate executive and single mom. She owns the Bennett Group, a real estate development and management firm she started in the 1980s with her first husband, Richard, who died of leukemia. She is divorced from James P. Moran, the former Democratic congressman from a neighboring district.

A prolific political donor, she gave about $113,500 to Democratic candidates and causes in the past decade, according to the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics.

Bennett has shown some shakiness on the campaign trail and made a few missteps in an otherwise strong campaign, political observers say.

"She has a lot of mettle," said state Sen. Barbara A. Favola (D-Arlington), referring to the way Bennett built a business and raised her children as a widow. "A very savvy businesswoman. It took some doing when she was going along. It was harder to get loans from banks. She didn't have a lot of experience and here she is, the CEO of this company."

"She's a salt-of-the-earth, no-nonsense, get-the-job-done person centered on family values," Favola said.

Bennett said she will champion women's issues in Congress, focusing on equal pay, paid family leave and health care.

But she failed to win the Virginia AFL-CIO endorsement and, with it, labor's voter-turnout engine. It marked the first time in a decade that the union declined to endorse a Democrat running in the 10th District.

She has also lagged in the money race, raising $1.2 million to Comstock's $3.2 million, as of June 30.

A relative unknown, Bennett has outspent Comstock on television advertising so far, running spots to introduce herself to voters.

Both candidates are counting on a boost from national groups. Republicans have reserved about $5 million to help Comstock compared with about $2.6 million for Bennett from Democrats.

On a recent campaign stop, Bennett waded through swarms of people at a festival at the Eden Center, a Vietnamese strip mall. It was an unlikely venue — the Falls Church center is outside the district, and many of the people approached by Bennett lived in Maryland or elsewhere in Virginia.

In search of a connection, Bennett dropped Clinton's name. "I really support Hillary Clinton's small-business plan that aims to make starting a small business easier," she said.

Later, at the Haymarket Day Festival in Prince William County, Bennett greeted voters among the funnel-cake and corn-dog booths. She skipped the popular parade earlier in the day, missing a chance to show voters how she compares with Comstock, who was there.

Still, she got some support. Chalet Jean-Baptiste of Gainesville, 36, an English professor at Northern Virginia Community College, recognized Bennett and hugged her.

"I'm hoping you beat Barbara Comstock," she said. "We've got to."

Jean-Baptiste said she suspects Comstock is a closet Trump supporter because she won't say for whom she plans to vote. "If you can't answer that question, then I don't believe you," she said.

Bennett is counting on voters such as Jean-Baptiste and points out that Comstock and Trump align on several issues.

Comstock twice blocked consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would have made it illegal for employers to retaliate against a worker who discloses their pay or the pay of others in an inquiry.

She voted repeatedly with her caucus to defund Planned Parenthood and supported a bill that would ban abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy; it was later blocked by the Senate.

Comstock said she voted to avoid a government shutdown in the interest of national security — and to keep an investigation running into covert videos of Planned Parenthood employees. No wrongdoing was uncovered.

Meanwhile, Comstock has painted Bennett as an interloper unfamiliar with the needs of the district who would blindly support Clinton.

In a district flush with federal workers, Comstock earned a 60 percent rating from the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, easily surpassing other Republican members of Congress.

Comstock says Bennett would cut military budgets, citing an endorsement the Democrat received from the Council for a Livable World, which said Bennett "believes that U.S. Pentagon spending is too high."

Bennett said all agencies can more efficiently spend taxpayer dollars and accused her rival of selectively highlighting her positions.

Comstock and Republicans also question Bennett's residency. They claim she lived in her Ritz-Carlton apartment in Washington, near her office, rather than her Delaplane, Va., farm 55 miles away, before she jumped into the race, to avoid the District's higher tax rate.

"Since she hasn't lived in this district for most of the past decade, she's really not familiar with the issues or the priorities of the district," Comstock said.

Bennett said she has lived in Virginia for 35 years and spent only "a night or two" in Washington, preferring to commute to Virginia.

"I listened to a lot of books on tape," she said, adding, "The residency issue for Barbara is like Donald Trump's birther issue. It's a red herring. It's a distraction."

It may not matter.

Comstock is popular in the conservative western parts of the district, where her message of faith and family resonates, but also among the wealthy business crowd.

Nearing the end of a long day, she ducked into a McDonald's and changed into a black suit to attend a gala at a therapeutic equestrian center in Loudoun. At the end of an unpaved road, the party was in full swing in a stable dotted with crystal chandeliers and white lights.

It was after 10 p.m. when she finally left.

At a police appreciation dinner earlier that night in Clarke County, she worked the room, telling the gathering she is trying to secure federal funds to combat heroin coming from Baltimore.

On her way out, a woman emerged from the kitchen to seek help for volunteer firefighters who experience respiratory issues on the job.

"Okay, well, let's figure out whether it's county, state, federal," Comstock said. "We'd be happy to look into it."

Correction: An earlier version of this story misstated the rating that Rep. Barbara Comstock received from the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association. She received a rating of 60 percent, not 66 percent.

jenna.portnoy@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The man who would be in charge of guarding a wall with Mexico if Donald Trump is elected president isn't so sure the strategy would keep undocumented **immigrants** out.

Instead, Mark Morgan —  the first outsider to lead the 21,ooo uniformed agents who make up the U.S. Border Patrol — has had another priority in the three months he's been on the job: changing the agency's culture.

The law enforcement force on the front lines of U.S. border security has faced allegations of an overly confrontational approach that's resulted in multiple fatal shootings, long unaddressed internal corruption and a lack of accountability in investigating misconduct.

Morgan has never arrested an illegal **immigrant**. But Customs and Border Protection Commissioner R. Gil Kerlikowske turned to him -- overlooking others who came up through the ranks -- to change course in what is, even by law enforcement standards, an insular culture.

"It was a culture of not getting out and talking about issues, not being transparent about the process that drove the perception there was a culture problem," Morgan, a career FBI official and former Los Angeles police officer, said in his first interview since his appointment in June.

Besides meeting with line agents at almost half of the 20 outposts that cover 6,000 miles along the Southwest and Canadian borders, Morgan, 51, has spent his first weeks in the job ensuring that new use-of-force policies in the training academy curriculum are encouraging recruits to turn to other strategies to defuse encounters that could get violent.

He's devising strategies to help agents develop better intelligence on the drug cartels and smugglers behind so many illegal crossings. He's coordinating multiple law enforcement authorities so that if agents do fire their weapons, there is a system to review whether the action was appropriate.

"The border patrol comes into contact with a lot more people than the FBI," he said in his Washington office, dressed in the green Border Patrol uniform and black boots, his graying hair in a crew cut.

"The piece we need to get better at when a shooting happens is, what happens now?" he said. "I don't think we were very good at all about making decisions like whether the use of force was within our guidelines."

When it comes to enhancing border security, the wall the Republican nominee for president has proposed to keep out illegal **immigrants** does not top Morgan's list, however hotly debated it has been. As a civil servant and not a political appointee, Morgan will be in the job whether Trump or Hillary Clinton is elected.

"A simplistic answer to an immensely complex problem," is how Kerlikowske describes the wall. He notes that the government "spends a tremendous amount of money repairing what we have now" on the Southwest border — 600 miles of very intermittent fencing — from damage from erosion, flooding and holes when migrants break through.

"Does infrastructure play a role? Of course," Morgan said. "It's one element of a multifaceted approach. It isn't the answer."

He quipped, "I try not to be in the business of sound bites."

Morgan is, however, in the business of educating himself about the agents who patrol the border solo in scorching desert heat and frigid winters. He commutes an hour each way along Interstate 95 from his home in Stafford County, Va., where he spends most weekends poring over research and policy on training tactics, high-tech sensors and other border security strategies.

In his (limited) spare time, he remodels and putters, two hobbies he says he's "pretty good at." His reading list skews heavily toward books on leadership. He says they've taught him that "you don't need to have a title to be a leader who makes an impact."

Morgan's varied FBI resume includes leading a Hispanic gang task force in Los Angeles and senior roles in Baghdad, New Haven, Conn., and El Paso. He was in charge of agency-wide training when Kerlikowske tapped him for the Border Patrol post, passing over several inside candidates.

Morgan was not entirely new to border security. Two years ago, Kerlikowske brought him in to run the internal affairs office at the larger Customs and Border Protection agency after removing the longtime official in the job. That official was criticized for failing to investigate multiple allegations that Border Patrol agents had used excessive force on migrants.

An review in March by the Homeland Security Advisory Panel, an oversight board, criticized the system of discipline for abusive or corrupt Border Patrol agents as "deeply flawed."

Morgan is credited with bringing more accountability to these cases.

His appointment was criticized by the powerful Border Patrol union, which said an outsider could never gain agents' trust. Today union spokesman Shawn Moran says agents "understand they're going to give the new chief a feeling-out period."

Moran said the public has "a lot of misconceptions that the Border Patrol is a trigger-happy organization rife with corruption."

Kerlikowske said the problems stem from a "huge amount of growth" in the force since the terror attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, along with increasingly aggressive drug cartels and smuggling operations. "Now it's not uncommon to see people carrying guns," he said.

Asked to describe the state of border security at a time when Trump supporters decry a massive lack of it, Morgan said, "Everybody has a different perspective on that." Some will say, of course, that the border is not secure unless you catch everyone who tries to cross illegally.

He acknowledges that it's very hard to know how large this group is.

"How do you measure something you're preventing?" he asks. "We're constantly trying to improve the way we measure this."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The U.S. dollar is usually seen as a symbol of America's strength and economic dominance. But the mighty greenback may not be all it's thought to be.

In a new book, "The Curse of Cash," Harvard economist Kenneth Rogoff argues that paper currency, especially large-denomination bills, may be undermining America's success by facilitating crime, corruption, tax evasion and illegal **immigration**. As Rogoff explains, the cash economy has also limited what economic planners around the globe could do to revive their countries after the recession.

I recently spoke with Rogoff about some of the surprising advantages that phasing out large bills could bring. The interview has been edited for length and clarity.

Many places have already phased out very large notes — the 500 euros note, Canada's $1,000 bill, the 10,000 Singapore dollar note, and Sweden's 1,000-krona note. Could America's $100 bill, the $50 and the $20 be next?

This idea of getting rid of cash sounds radical. But you point out that the history of money has included an incredible amount of evolution, right?

I'm for less cash, not no cash. But probably we're not going to have any paper currency in 50 or 75 years, 100 at most. It will all be electronic, maybe in ways we can't even imagine at the moment. We're clearly in a transitional state. Debit cards have exploded, smartphone variants are coming.

So it's happening. A lot of my kids' friends don't even carry cash around. My son worked at Starbucks a summer ago, and I went in, and I use cash. I'm old, basically. I paid in cash, and my son said, 'Dad, you're the only person who has paid me in cash today.' He might have been joking a little, but not much.

So yes, we live in a history of change, and change will surely come again.

What do you see as the ideal form of money?

My plan is to keep $10 bills and less around forever. There are needs still for physical cash: for privacy, to use after a disaster like Hurricane Sandy, for low-income people. The kind of transactions that take place in poor communities, or sending your kid to the store, that's not going to change.

But most other transactions should be electronic. I think smartphones will take over as the way of doing transactions. In Sweden, if I want to buy your television set at midnight, I just pay you on my smartphone, and the transaction clears immediately. That technology is here in the Nordic countries. In the U.S., it's very inferior by comparison.

In your book, you describe a stunning amount of cash in circulation around the world, especially U.S. dollars. How much is out there, and why?

The U.S. had $4,200 in paper currency in circulation, outside of banks, at the end of 2015 for every man, woman and child. Just shy of 80 percent of that is in $100 bills, which amounts to $3,400 in $100 bills for every American man, woman and child. Certainly some of that is abroad. Let's say at least half of it is in the U.S., which means the average American should be holding 15 or 20 $100 bills.

However, the surveys the Fed has done find maybe 5 percent of people holding a $100 bill. These bills are not in cash registers, they are not in businesses, they are not in wallets. The truth is, we don't know exactly where they are. But we know that when there are crime busts, drug busts, tax-evasion cases, political corruption cases, they find piles of cash. Cash is used very intensively in crime.

How much would eliminating large bills cut back on crime? There would still be crime, but I think a number like 5 or 10 percent is not a wild-eyed number. The benefits of that are very hard to put a number on, but it might be very significant, if you look at the human cost.

You also say eliminating cash could go a long way to solving illegal **immigration**, since most businesses that hire illegal **immigrants** are paying them off the books in cash. Eliminating cash could be a much easier and more effective solution than building a big wall.

First, let me say that I favor expanded legal **immigration** and a fairly broad amnesty program for undocumented illegals who are here already. Certainly, employers pay illegal **immigrants** in cash, and they pay them off the books. Now, they're not giving them $100 bills. So if you really want to target this, you'd need to use more restrictions further down the road, for example on very large cash deposits. But in the long run, I do think it's reasonable for countries to be able to control their borders, and in a world where cash was used less, it would be easier to do.

Your book gets into some interesting ethical arguments about how much control the government should have over private activity. There are some strong objections to eliminating cash, since it allows for anonymous transactions. Eliminating cash would give the government much greater oversight over how people are spending their money — which is partly the point of the proposal, of course.

Of course, that point is important. The question is: What size transactions do we want to make super easy to be anonymous, and what size don't we? If we just had $10 bills, it's really not very hard to pay $1,000 or $2,000. But do we want to allow people to buy a $50,000 car, an $8 million house, a $1 million apartment with cash, as they do today? That's very seldom because they didn't trust banks. There's almost invariably some element of crime, tax evasion or something else going on in these cases.

So, we're trying to strike a balance. If we get rid of the big bills, it makes it harder for someone to run a human-trafficking or drug-trafficking operation. For most people, you can do your everyday anonymous transactions pretty easily. If they had occasion for something on a really large scale, it could be done. You could use gold coins, you could use uncut diamonds. But it would make it much harder for criminal operations, and that's the conversation I'm looking to provoke.

Given the political objections to government scrutiny, do you see this as something that is politically possible?

I'm writing about an idea, and if it doesn't come into play for 10 or 20 years, so be it. I wrote my first paper on this subject 20 years ago now. Today, there's a lot of interest at the technocratic level, from justice departments and finance ministries, who are under pressure to raise taxes without raising tax rates. Central banks are also very interested as a long-term way to move effectively to negative interest rates, which is a whole can of worms conceptually to explain.

Right. So I'm going to ask you to explain that can of worms. You say that eliminating cash also has an important collateral benefit — it's the simplest and more elegant approach for central banks to set negative interest rates , where depositors essentially pay banks for the privilege of holding their money, rather than vice versa.

You say that the " the zero lower bound ," which prevents banks from setting negative interest rates, is something the policy world is hugely uneasy about. How should the average American understand this issue?

In the middle of the financial crisis, there was a freeze-up in lending, investing and consuming. Central banks wanted to cut interest rates to try to propel money out into the system, to try to get people to spend more money, to reflate the economy.

But central banks quickly moved interest rates to zero, and they couldn't move farther. There were a few obstacles, but the big one is they were worried about people hoarding large amounts of cash, because cash pays zero as things stand right now, which is more than people would receive with negative interest rates. We're not talking about just ordinary people — they were worried about pension funds and insurance companies building vaults and filling them with cash. And if everyone pulled their money out of the banking system and Treasury bills, they can't create negative rates. On top of that, if money is being pulled out of the system, it is not being lent to businesses.

I want to be super clear: Negative interest rates alone will not solve everything. You need to do many other policies. But the fact that monetary policy has been paralyzed because of the zero lower bound has hurt, and it will hurt in the next recession. The European Central Bank, the Nordic central banks, the Bank of Japan, they have tiptoed into negative rate territory, but they haven't been able to do much, because they're worried about the run into cash.

If you look at what's happened in Europe and Japan, Japan has done quantitative easing on a scale that's already triple what the U.S. has done. Europe is on track to buy up 20 percent of all corporate bonds within the time frame of their new quantitative-easing policy, and it's not working very effectively. I think negative interest rates would be vastly more effective. Central bankers can't come out and say that, but I think they all wish they had that tool. Not so they could use it today, but if something really bad happens.

Let's say the U.S. were to phase out most cash over a 10-to-15-year period and we had the ability to implement negative interest rates. How do you think this transition would affect the global economy?

It would be the healthiest and most transformative change in monetary policy since the end of fixed exchange rates. It would be on par with the end of the gold standard. And the change is coming, whether or not they actually phase out larger bills. There are other ways to do it. You can basically tax currency, by charging people when they turn currency in at the bank, which is an idea that I trace back to Kublai Khan.

I think implementing negative interest rates would probably benefit the U.S. disproportionately. We would probably get accused of competitive devaluation, because if you can go to a negative interest-rate policy, it's going to depreciate the exchange rate. That said, if you wait a year or two after the policy, the negative interest rate will be gone, the U.S. economy will have strengthened, and the dollar might be higher than where it started. It's certainly going to be controversial, but it might not be as bad as what we have now. Now no one really knows what central banks are going to do, because they're flailing away at the zero bound trying to find something that works, and it creates an enormous amount of uncertainty.

So negative interest rates are going to come. Central bankers need them in the current environment. In 10 to 15 years, certainly in 20 years, if it's needed, they'll have figured out how to do it. And when they finally find a way, I think it will be regarded as leading to a better and healthier financial system.

You might also like:

Why amazing video games could be causing a big problem for America

The sneaky math that made the lottery more alluring — and harder to win

How the world's wealthy hide millions offshore — from their spouses

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Sept. 23 news article "Migrant flow into U.S. again soaring" was correct. Numbers appear to be rising again this year, compared with last year's. I'm a social worker at a school that serves Langley Park, where there is a high concentration of Central American **immigrant** youths.

Our students were willing to take the dangerous journey because it was perceived as worth the risk over staying in their more dangerous communities back home. Survival is a basic human instinct. As long as the youths in these countries are intimidated by gang violence, extortion, narco-trafficking and corruption, they will continue to choose the dangerous journey north over the dangerous journey to school in their home towns. The vast majority of these youths are indeed refugees, fleeing violence to save their lives.

Beth Hood, Silver Spring

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As Donald Trump flailed and sniffled his way through the presidential debate on Monday night, one could not help but imagine: What if the Republicans had nominated any of the "normal," reasonable Republicans, such as Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), former Florida governor Jeb Bush or Ohio Gov. John Kasich?

Most of the debate Monday night would not have occurred. All of these men possess government experience, and none can be accused of hiding their tax returns or playing fast and loose with their charitable foundation or charitable giving. None evaded military service; Graham served as a lawyer in the Air Force in both active duty and reserves. (Graham, a former JAG officer, could have had fun with Hillary Clinton's email debacle and its implications for national security.)

None has a record of stiffing small-business people or exaggerating his wealth. Three have had one wife only; Graham was never married but helped raised his sister when their parents died. None backed the birther nonsense. None of them can be accused of ever (let alone, routinely) making misogynistic or xenophobic remarks. None is a bully who would have constantly interrupted, made faces and hinted that he intended to bring up Clinton husband's past affairs.

Republicans, are you feeling the buyer's remorse, yet? You should be. Any candidate, and these are no exception, has faults, but consider the lines of attack they -- but not Trump -- could have pursued:

Both of the governors have robust records on achieving school reform and have demonstrated fiscal sobriety. The two senators have introduced a raft of legislation from secondary school reform to anti-terrorism measures. They could therefore criticize Clinton's domestic agenda as costly, old-style big government. They could have zinged her on the shortcomings of Obamacare (rising premiums, loss of choice of carriers and doctors) and taken her to task for neglecting entitlement reform.

All could have gone after her for Russian reset. The conservative John Hay Initiative, for example, as part of a series of primers on issues for 2016, has a user-friendly information sheet with all sorts of relevant facts and insightful questions that could have been marshaled against Clinton on Russia:

Although designed to pursue "win-win" approaches to global problems, the reset policy triggered a series of U.S. concessions to Russia.

Trump would offer even more concessions to Russian President Vladimir Putin, of course.

None of the four Republicans favor a weirdly isolationist/pro-nuclear weapons proliferation/anti-NATO bent. Instead they could have made the case that the Obama administration led from behind, blundered in Syria, neglected allies and cut bad deals with Iran and Cuba. All four Republicans care about human rights and could have taken the Obama-Clinton administration to task for neglecting the concerns of persecuted minorities and failing to exert quiet pressure on Egypt, Saudi Arabia and others. (And for good measure, they could have chided Clinton over her foundation taking money from human rights scofflaws.)

Since Bush, Kasich, Rubio and Graham never drank the anti-trade Kool-Aid, they would have been in a position to blast her flip-flop on the Trans-Pacific Partnership and avoid the falsehoods and exaggerations Trump routinely spouts. They could have pointed out virtually nothing in her agenda addresses the critical issue: How do we boost productivity?

They all support comprehensive **immigration** reform (Graham and Rubio were part of the Gang of 8) and could ask what Clinton ever did to promote **immigration** reform. All are in favor of reforming legal **immigration** to enhance the entry of highly skilled people needed for our economy. There, too, they could have quizzed Clinton: Why didn't the administration pursue legal **immigration** reform?

Since all four have at least a solid understanding of the Constitution and worry about the executive branch's abuse of power and overreach, they could have pointed to the slew of court decisions (on water regulations, **immigration**, etc.) that slapped down Obama administration attempts to rule by executive fiat.  They could have appealed to voters who  are concerned about abusive power, skeptical of giant bureaucracy and worried about undemocratic tendencies that cut out the people's representatives.

In short, the GOP could have nominated an ethically sound, experienced, and reasonable center-right candidate who could have given Clinton fits. All had very plausible lines of attack (whether you agree with them or not) that Clinton would have had to wrestle with. All could have exploited her ethical weaknesses far better than Trump -- by far the most egregious liar of the two -- ever could. Instead, the GOP nominated the most unstable, ignorant, bigoted and ethically deficient candidate ever to have gotten a major-party nomination -- arguably the only Republican in the field who could not have shown Clinton up on the stage Monday night. Great going, Republicans.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump went head-to-head for the first time Monday night in a debate at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y. The debate was moderated by Lester Holt of NBC News and came as polls both nationally and in swing states are increasingly tight.

The complete transcript of the debate is posted below. The Fix team has annotated it with context, analysis and other thoughts, using Genius.

To see an annotation, click or tap the highlighted words. If you would like to leave your own annotations, make sure you have a Genius account. Post staff annotations will appear by default; others are in a menu that you can see in the upper right when you click or tap on an annotation.

LESTER HOLT: Good evening from Hofstra University in Hempstead, New York. I'm Lester Holt, anchor of "NBC Nightly News." I want to welcome you to the first presidential debate.

The participants tonight are Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. This debate is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization. The commission drafted tonight's format, and the rules have been agreed to by the campaigns.

The 90-minute debate is divided into six segments, each 15 minutes long. We'll explore three topic areas tonight: Achieving prosperity; America's direction; and securing America. At the start of each segment, I will ask the same lead-off question to both candidates, and they will each have up to two minutes to respond. From that point until the end of the segment, we'll have an open discussion.

The questions are mine and have not been shared with the commission or the campaigns. The audience here in the room has agreed to remain silent so that we can focus on what the candidates are saying.

I will invite you to applaud, however, at this moment, as we welcome the candidates: Democratic nominee for president of the United States, Hillary Clinton, and Republican nominee for president of the United States, Donald J. Trump.

(APPLAUSE)

CLINTON: How are you, Donald?

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Good luck to you.

(APPLAUSE)

Well, I don't expect us to cover all the issues of this campaign tonight, but I remind everyone, there are two more presidential debates scheduled. We are going to focus on many of the issues that voters tell us are most important, and we're going to press for specifics. I am honored to have this role, but this evening belongs to the candidates and, just as important, to the American people.

Candidates, we look forward to hearing you articulate your policies and your positions, as well as your visions and your values. So, let's begin.

We're calling this opening segment "Achieving Prosperity." And central to that is jobs. There are two economic realities in America today. There's been a record six straight years of job growth, and new census numbers show incomes have increased at a record rate after years of stagnation. However, income inequality remains significant, and nearly half of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck.

Beginning with you, Secretary Clinton, why are you a better choice than your opponent to create the kinds of jobs that will put more money into the pockets of American works?

CLINTON: Well, thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us.

The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together. Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. That means we need new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes.

I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future. That means jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business, because most of the new jobs will come from small business. We also have to make the economy fairer. That starts with raising the national minimum wage and also guarantee, finally, equal pay for women's work.

CLINTON: I also want to see more companies do profit-sharing. If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top.

And I want us to do more to support people who are struggling to balance family and work. I've heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you're under. So let's have paid family leave, earned sick days. Let's be sure we have affordable child care and debt-free college.

How are we going to do it? We're going to do it by having the wealthy pay their fair share and close the corporate loopholes.

Finally, we tonight are on the stage together, Donald Trump and I. Donald, it's good to be with you. We're going to have a debate where we are talking about the important issues facing our country. You have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency, who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. I hope that I will be able to earn your vote on November 8th.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

Mr. Trump, the same question to you. It's about putting money -- more money into the pockets of American workers. You have up to two minutes.

TRUMP: Thank you, Lester. Our jobs are fleeing the country. They're going to Mexico. They're going to many other countries. You look at what China is doing to our country in terms of making our product. They're devaluing their currency, and there's nobody in our government to fight them. And we have a very good fight. And we have a winning fight. Because they're using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China, and many other countries are doing the same thing.

So we're losing our good jobs, so many of them. When you look at what's happening in Mexico, a friend of mine who builds plants said it's the eighth wonder of the world. They're building some of the biggest plants anywhere in the world, some of the most sophisticated, some of the best plants. With the United States, as he said, not so much.

So Ford is leaving. You see that, their small car division leaving. Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They're all leaving. And we can't allow it to happen anymore. As far as child care is concerned and so many other things, I think Hillary and I agree on that. We probably disagree a little bit as to numbers and amounts and what we're going to do, but perhaps we'll be talking about that later.

But we have to stop our jobs from being stolen from us. We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States and, with it, firing all of their people. All you have to do is take a look at Carrier air conditioning in Indianapolis. They left -- fired 1,400 people. They're going to Mexico. So many hundreds and hundreds of companies are doing this.

TRUMP: We cannot let it happen. Under my plan, I'll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That's going to be a job creator like we haven't seen since Ronald Reagan. It's going to be a beautiful thing to watch.

Companies will come. They will build. They will expand. New companies will start. And I look very, very much forward to doing it. We have to renegotiate our trade deals, and we have to stop these countries from stealing our companies and our jobs.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, would you like to respond?

CLINTON: Well, I think that trade is an important issue. Of course, we are 5 percent of the world's population; we have to trade with the other 95 percent. And we need to have smart, fair trade deals.

We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. And the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again. In fact, it would be the most extreme version, the biggest tax cuts for the top percent of the people in this country than we've ever had.

I call it trumped-up trickle-down, because that's exactly what it would be. That is not how we grow the economy.

We just have a different view about what's best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will actually produce jobs and rising incomes.

I think we come at it from somewhat different perspectives. I understand that. You know, Donald was very fortunate in his life, and that's all to his benefit. He started his business with $14 million, borrowed from his father, and he really believes that the more you help wealthy people, the better off we'll be and that everything will work out from there.

I don't buy that. I have a different experience. My father was a small-businessman. He worked really hard. He printed drapery fabrics on long tables, where he pulled out those fabrics and he went down with a silkscreen and dumped the paint in and took the squeegee and kept going.

And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we will be off and the better we'll grow. That's the kind of economy I want us to see again.

HOLT: Let me follow up with Mr. Trump, if you can. You've talked about creating 25 million jobs, and you've promised to bring back millions of jobs for Americans. How are you going to bring back the industries that have left this country for cheaper labor overseas? How, specifically, are you going to tell American manufacturers that you have to come back?

TRUMP: Well, for one thing -- and before we start on that -- my father gave me a very small loan in 1975, and I built it into a company that's worth many, many billions of dollars, with some of the greatest assets in the world, and I say that only because that's the kind of thinking that our country needs.

Our country's in deep trouble. We don't know what we're doing when it comes to devaluations and all of these countries all over the world, especially China. They're the best, the best ever at it. What they're doing to us is a very, very sad thing.

So we have to do that. We have to renegotiate our trade deals. And, Lester, they're taking our jobs, they're giving incentives, they're doing things that, frankly, we don't do.

Let me give you the example of Mexico. They have a VAT tax. We're on a different system. When we sell into Mexico, there's a tax. When they sell in -- automatic, 16 percent, approximately. When they sell into us, there's no tax. It's a defective agreement. It's been defective for a long time, many years, but the politicians haven't done anything about it.

Now, in all fairness to Secretary Clinton -- yes, is that OK? Good. I want you to be very happy. It's very important to me.

But in all fairness to Secretary Clinton, when she started talking about this, it was really very recently. She's been doing this for 30 years. And why hasn't she made the agreements better? The NAFTA agreement is defective. Just because of the tax and many other reasons, but just because of the fact...

HOLT: Let me interrupt just a moment, but...

TRUMP: Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years, not right now, because of the fact that we've created a movement. They should have been doing this for years. What's happened to our jobs and our country and our economy generally is -- look, we owe $20 trillion. We cannot do it any longer, Lester. HOLT: Back to the question, though. How do you bring back -- specifically bring back jobs, American manufacturers? How do you make them bring the jobs back?

TRUMP: Well, the first thing you do is don't let the jobs leave. The companies are leaving. I could name, I mean, there are thousands of them. They're leaving, and they're leaving in bigger numbers than ever.

And what you do is you say, fine, you want to go to Mexico or some other country, good luck. We wish you a lot of luck. But if you think you're going to make your air conditioners or your cars or your cookies or whatever you make and bring them into our country without a tax, you're wrong.

And once you say you're going to have to tax them coming in, and our politicians never do this, because they have special interests and the special interests want those companies to leave, because in many cases, they own the companies. So what I'm saying is, we can stop them from leaving. We have to stop them from leaving. And that's a big, big factor.

HOLT: Let me let Secretary Clinton get in here.

CLINTON: Well, let's stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago. We had the worst financial crisis, the Great Recession, the worst since the 1930s. That was in large part because of tax policies that slashed taxes on the wealthy, failed to invest in the middle class, took their eyes off of Wall Street, and created a perfect storm.

In fact, Donald was one of the people who rooted for the housing crisis. He said, back in 2006, "Gee, I hope it does collapse, because then I can go in and buy some and make some money." Well, it did collapse.

TRUMP: That's called business, by the way.

CLINTON: Nine million people -- nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And $13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out.

Now, we have come back from that abyss. And it has not been easy. So we're now on the precipice of having a potentially much better economy, but the last thing we need to do is to go back to the policies that failed us in the first place.

Independent experts have looked at what I've proposed and looked at what Donald's proposed, and basically they've said this, that if his tax plan, which would blow up the debt by over $5 trillion and would in some instances disadvantage middle-class families compared to the wealthy, were to go into effect, we would lose 3.5 million jobs and maybe have another recession.

They've looked at my plans and they've said, OK, if we can do this, and I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs, because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy. Take clean energy. Some country is going to be the clean- energy superpower of the 21st century. Donald thinks that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. I think it's real.

TRUMP: I did not. I did not. I do not say that.

CLINTON: I think science is real.

TRUMP: I do not say that.

CLINTON: And I think it's important that we grip this and deal with it, both at home and abroad. And here's what we can do. We can deploy a half a billion more solar panels. We can have enough clean energy to power every home. We can build a new modern electric grid. That's a lot of jobs; that's a lot of new economic activity.

So I've tried to be very specific about what we can and should do, and I am determined that we're going to get the economy really moving again, building on the progress we've made over the last eight years, but never going back to what got us in trouble in the first place.

HOLT: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: She talks about solar panels. We invested in a solar company, our country. That was a disaster. They lost plenty of money on that one.

Now, look, I'm a great believer in all forms of energy, but we're putting a lot of people out of work. Our energy policies are a disaster. Our country is losing so much in terms of energy, in terms of paying off our debt. You can't do what you're looking to do with $20 trillion in debt.

The Obama administration, from the time they've come in, is over 230 years' worth of debt, and he's topped it. He's doubled it in a course of almost eight years, seven-and-a-half years, to be semi- exact.

So I will tell you this. We have to do a much better job at keeping our jobs. And we have to do a much better job at giving companies incentives to build new companies or to expand, because they're not doing it.

And all you have to do is look at Michigan and look at Ohio and look at all of these places where so many of their jobs and their companies are just leaving, they're gone.

And, Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions.

CLINTON: Well, actually...

TRUMP: I will bring -- excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You can't bring back jobs.

CLINTON: Well, actually, I have thought about this quite a bit.

TRUMP: Yeah, for 30 years.

CLINTON: And I have -- well, not quite that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again...

TRUMP: Well, he approved NAFTA...

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: ... million new jobs, a balanced budget...

TRUMP: He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever approved in this country.

CLINTON: Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we're actually going to look at the facts.

When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test. Will they create jobs in America? Will they raise incomes in America? And are they good for our national security? Some of them I voted for. The biggest one, a multinational one known as CAFTA, I voted against. And because I hold the same standards as I look at all of these trade deals.

But let's not assume that trade is the only challenge we have in the economy. I think it is a part of it, and I've said what I'm going to do. I'm going to have a special prosecutor. We're going to enforce the trade deals we have, and we're going to hold people accountable.

When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs.

HOLT: Very quickly...

TRUMP: But you haven't done it in 30 years or 26 years or any number you want to...

CLINTON: Well, I've been a senator, Donald...

TRUMP: You haven't done it. You haven't done it.

CLINTON: And I have been a secretary of state...

TRUMP: Excuse me.

CLINTON: And I have done a lot...

TRUMP: Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened to the manufacturing industry.

CLINTON: Well, that's your opinion. That is your opinion.

TRUMP: You go to New England, you go to Ohio, Pennsylvania, you go anywhere you want, Secretary Clinton, and you will see devastation where manufacture is down 30, 40, sometimes 50 percent. NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country.

And now you want to approve Trans-Pacific Partnership. You were totally in favor of it. Then you heard what I was saying, how bad it is, and you said, I can't win that debate. But you know that if you did win, you would approve that, and that will be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing will ever top NAFTA.

CLINTON: Well, that is just not accurate. I was against it once it was finally negotiated and the terms were laid out. I wrote about that in...

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard.

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard of trade deals. You said it's the finest deal you've ever seen.

CLINTON: No.

TRUMP: And then you heard what I said about it, and all of a sudden you were against it.

CLINTON: Well, Donald, I know you live in your own reality, but that is not the facts. The facts are -- I did say I hoped it would be a good deal, but when it was negotiated...

TRUMP: Not.

CLINTON: ... which I was not responsible for, I concluded it wasn't. I wrote about that in my book...

TRUMP: So is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: ... before you even announced.

TRUMP: Is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: Look, there are differences...

TRUMP: Secretary, is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: There are...

TRUMP: Because he's pushing it.

CLINTON: There are different views about what's good for our country, our economy, and our leadership in the world. And I think it's important to look at what we need to do to get the economy going again. That's why I said new jobs with rising incomes, investments, not in more tax cuts that would add $5 trillion to the debt.

TRUMP: But you have no plan.

CLINTON: But in -- oh, but I do.

TRUMP: Secretary, you have no plan.

CLINTON: In fact, I have written a book about it. It's called "Stronger Together." You can pick it up tomorrow at a bookstore...

TRUMP: That's about all you've...

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Folks, we're going to...

CLINTON: ... or at an airport near you.

HOLT: We're going to move to...

CLINTON: But it's because I see this -- we need to have strong growth, fair growth, sustained growth. We also have to look at how we help families balance the responsibilities at home and the responsibilities at business.

So we have a very robust set of plans. And people have looked at both of our plans, have concluded that mine would create 10 million jobs and yours would lose us 3.5 million jobs, and explode the debt which would have a recession.

TRUMP: You are going to approve one of the biggest tax cuts in history. You are going to approve one of the biggest tax increases in history. You are going to drive business out. Your regulations are a disaster, and you're going to increase regulations all over the place.

And by the way, my tax cut is the biggest since Ronald Reagan. I'm very proud of it. It will create tremendous numbers of new jobs. But regulations, you are going to regulate these businesses out of existence.

When I go around -- Lester, I tell you this, I've been all over. And when I go around, despite the tax cut, the thing -- the things that business as in people like the most is the fact that I'm cutting regulation. You have regulations on top of regulations, and new companies cannot form and old companies are going out of business. And you want to increase the regulations and make them even worse.

I'm going to cut regulations. I'm going to cut taxes big league, and you're going to raise taxes big league, end of story.

HOLT: Let me get you to pause right there, because we're going to move into -- we're going to move into the next segment. We're going to talk taxes...

CLINTON: That can't -- that can't be left to stand.

HOLT: Please just take 30 seconds and then we're going to go on.

CLINTON: I kind of assumed that there would be a lot of these charges and claims, and so...

TRUMP: Facts.

CLINTON: So we have taken the home page of my website, HillaryClinton.com, and we've turned it into a fact-checker. So if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please go and take a look. Because what I have proposed...

TRUMP: And take a look at mine, also, and you'll see.

CLINTON: ... would not add a penny to the debt, and your plans would add $5 trillion to the debt. What I have proposed would cut regulations and streamline them for small businesses. What I have proposed would be paid for by raising taxes on the wealthy, because they have made all the gains in the economy. And I think it's time that the wealthy and corporations paid their fair share to support this country.

HOLT: Well, you just opened the next segment.

TRUMP: Well, could I just finish -- I think I...

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: I'm going to give you a chance right here...

TRUMP: I think I should -- you go to her website, and you take a look at her website.

HOLT: ... with a new 15-minute segment...

TRUMP: She's going to raise taxes $1.3 trillion.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, I'm going to...

TRUMP: And look at her website. You know what? It's no difference than this. She's telling us how to fight ISIS. Just go to her website. She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website. I don't think General Douglas MacArthur would like that too much.

HOLT: The next segment, we're continuing...

CLINTON: Well, at least I have a plan to fight ISIS.

HOLT: ... achieving prosperity...

TRUMP: No, no, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do.

CLINTON: No, we're not. No, we're not.

TRUMP: See, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do. No wonder you've been fighting -- no wonder you've been fighting ISIS your entire adult life.

CLINTON: That's a -- that's -- go to the -- please, fact checkers, get to work.

HOLT: OK, you are unpacking a lot here. And we're still on the issue of achieving prosperity. And I want to talk about taxes. The fundamental difference between the two of you concerns the wealthy.

Secretary Clinton, you're calling for a tax increase on the wealthiest Americans. I'd like you to further defend that. And, Mr. Trump, you're calling for tax cuts for the wealthy. I'd like you to defend that. And this next two-minute answer goes to you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Well, I'm really calling for major jobs, because the wealthy are going create tremendous jobs. They're going to expand their companies. They're going to do a tremendous job.

I'm getting rid of the carried interest provision. And if you really look, it's not a tax -- it's really not a great thing for the wealthy. It's a great thing for the middle class. It's a great thing for companies to expand.

And when these people are going to put billions and billions of dollars into companies, and when they're going to bring $2.5 trillion back from overseas, where they can't bring the money back, because politicians like Secretary Clinton won't allow them to bring the money back, because the taxes are so onerous, and the bureaucratic red tape, so what -- is so bad.

So what they're doing is they're leaving our country, and they're, believe it or not, leaving because taxes are too high and because some of them have lots of money outside of our country. And instead of bringing it back and putting the money to work, because they can't work out a deal to -- and everybody agrees it should be brought back.

Instead of that, they're leaving our country to get their money, because they can't bring their money back into our country, because of bureaucratic red tape, because they can't get together. Because we have -- we have a president that can't sit them around a table and get them to approve something.

And here's the thing. Republicans and Democrats agree that this should be done, $2.5 trillion. I happen to think it's double that. It's probably $5 trillion that we can't bring into our country, Lester. And with a little leadership, you'd get it in here very quickly, and it could be put to use on the inner cities and lots of other things, and it would be beautiful.

But we have no leadership. And honestly, that starts with Secretary Clinton.

HOLT: All right. You have two minutes of the same question to defend tax increases on the wealthiest Americans, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: I have a feeling that by, the end of this evening, I'm going to be blamed for everything that's ever happened.

TRUMP: Why not?

CLINTON: Why not? Yeah, why not?

(LAUGHTER)

You know, just join the debate by saying more crazy things. Now, let me say this, it is absolutely the case...

TRUMP: There's nothing crazy about not letting our companies bring their money back into their country.

HOLT: This is -- this is Secretary Clinton's two minutes, please.

TRUMP: Yes.

CLINTON: Yeah, well, let's start the clock again, Lester. We've looked at your tax proposals. I don't see changes in the corporate tax rates or the kinds of proposals you're referring to that would cause the repatriation, bringing back of money that's stranded overseas. I happen to support that.

TRUMP: Then you didn't read it.

CLINTON: I happen to -- I happen to support that in a way that will actually work to our benefit. But when I look at what you have proposed, you have what is called now the Trump loophole, because it would so advantage you and the business you do. You've proposed an approach that has a...

TRUMP: Who gave it that name? The first I've -- who gave it that name?

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, this is Secretary Clinton's two minutes.

CLINTON: ... $4 billion tax benefit for your family. And when you look at what you are proposing...

TRUMP: How much? How much for my family? CLINTON: ... it is...

TRUMP: Lester, how much?

CLINTON: ... as I said, trumped-up trickle-down. Trickle-down did not work. It got us into the mess we were in, in 2008 and 2009. Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn't worked.

And a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that. And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class.

CLINTON: I don't think top-down works in America. I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their -- their debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based, inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, we're...

TRUMP: Typical politician. All talk, no action. Sounds good, doesn't work. Never going to happen. Our country is suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs and in terms of what's going on.

Now, look, we have the worst revival of an economy since the Great Depression. And believe me: We're in a bubble right now. And the only thing that looks good is the stock market, but if you raise interest rates even a little bit, that's going to come crashing down.

We are in a big, fat, ugly bubble. And we better be awfully careful. And we have a Fed that's doing political things. This Janet Yellen of the Fed. The Fed is doing political -- by keeping the interest rates at this level. And believe me: The day Obama goes off, and he leaves, and goes out to the golf course for the rest of his life to play golf, when they raise interest rates, you're going to see some very bad things happen, because the Fed is not doing their job. The Fed is being more political than Secretary Clinton.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, we're talking about the burden that Americans have to pay, yet you have not released your tax returns. And the reason nominees have released their returns for decades is so that voters will know if their potential president owes money to -- who he owes it to and any business conflicts. Don't Americans have a right to know if there are any conflicts of interest?

TRUMP: I don't mind releasing -- I'm under a routine audit. And it'll be released. And -- as soon as the audit's finished, it will be released.

But you will learn more about Donald Trump by going down to the federal elections, where I filed a 104-page essentially financial statement of sorts, the forms that they have. It shows income -- in fact, the income -- I just looked today -- the income is filed at $694 million for this past year, $694 million. If you would have told me I was going to make that 15 or 20 years ago, I would have been very surprised.

But that's the kind of thinking that our country needs. When we have a country that's doing so badly, that's being ripped off by every single country in the world, it's the kind of thinking that our country needs, because everybody -- Lester, we have a trade deficit with all of the countries that we do business with, of almost $800 billion a year. You know what that is? That means, who's negotiating these trade deals?

We have people that are political hacks negotiating our trade deals.

HOLT: The IRS says an audit...

TRUMP: Excuse me.

HOLT: ... of your taxes -- you're perfectly free to release your taxes during an audit. And so the question, does the public's right to know outweigh your personal...

TRUMP: Well, I told you, I will release them as soon as the audit. Look, I've been under audit almost for 15 years. I know a lot of wealthy people that have never been audited. I said, do you get audited? I get audited almost every year.

And in a way, I should be complaining. I'm not even complaining. I don't mind it. It's almost become a way of life. I get audited by the IRS. But other people don't.

I will say this. We have a situation in this country that has to be taken care of. I will release my tax returns -- against my lawyer's wishes -- when she releases her 33,000 e-mails that have been deleted. As soon as she releases them, I will release.

(APPLAUSE)

I will release my tax returns. And that's against -- my lawyers, they say, "Don't do it." I will tell you this. No -- in fact, watching shows, they're reading the papers. Almost every lawyer says, you don't release your returns until the audit's complete. When the audit's complete, I'll do it. But I would go against them if she releases her e-mails.

HOLT: So it's negotiable?

TRUMP: It's not negotiable, no. Let her release the e-mails. Why did she delete 33,000...

HOLT: Well, I'll let her answer that. But let me just admonish the audience one more time. There was an agreement. We did ask you to be silent, so it would be helpful for us. Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think you've seen another example of bait-and- switch here. For 40 years, everyone running for president has released their tax returns. You can go and see nearly, I think, 39, 40 years of our tax returns, but everyone has done it. We know the IRS has made clear there is no prohibition on releasing it when you're under audit.

So you've got to ask yourself, why won't he release his tax returns? And I think there may be a couple of reasons. First, maybe he's not as rich as he says he is. Second, maybe he's not as charitable as he claims to be.

CLINTON: Third, we don't know all of his business dealings, but we have been told through investigative reporting that he owes about $650 million to Wall Street and foreign banks. Or maybe he doesn't want the American people, all of you watching tonight, to know that he's paid nothing in federal taxes, because the only years that anybody's ever seen were a couple of years when he had to turn them over to state authorities when he was trying to get a casino license, and they showed he didn't pay any federal income tax.

TRUMP: That makes me smart.

CLINTON: So if he's paid zero, that means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I think probably he's not all that enthusiastic about having the rest of our country see what the real reasons are, because it must be something really important, even terrible, that he's trying to hide.

And the financial disclosure statements, they don't give you the tax rate. They don't give you all the details that tax returns would. And it just seems to me that this is something that the American people deserve to see. And I have no reason to believe that he's ever going to release his tax returns, because there's something he's hiding.

And we'll guess. We'll keep guessing at what it might be that he's hiding. But I think the question is, were he ever to get near the White House, what would be those conflicts? Who does he owe money to? Well, he owes you the answers to that, and he should provide them.

HOLT: He also -- he also raised the issue of your e-mails. Do you want to respond to that?

CLINTON: I do. You know, I made a mistake using a private e- mail. TRUMP: That's for sure.

CLINTON: And if I had to do it over again, I would, obviously, do it differently. But I'm not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake, and I take responsibility for that.

HOLT: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: That was more than a mistake. That was done purposely. OK? That was not a mistake. That was done purposely. When you have your staff taking the Fifth Amendment, taking the Fifth so they're not prosecuted, when you have the man that set up the illegal server taking the Fifth, I think it's disgraceful. And believe me, this country thinks it's -- really thinks it's disgraceful, also.

As far as my tax returns, you don't learn that much from tax returns. That I can tell you. You learn a lot from financial disclosure. And you should go down and take a look at that.

The other thing, I'm extremely underleveraged. The report that said $650 -- which, by the way, a lot of friends of mine that know my business say, boy, that's really not a lot of money. It's not a lot of money relative to what I had.

The buildings that were in question, they said in the same report, which was -- actually, it wasn't even a bad story, to be honest with you, but the buildings are worth $3.9 billion. And the $650 isn't even on that. But it's not $650. It's much less than that.

But I could give you a list of banks, I would -- if that would help you, I would give you a list of banks. These are very fine institutions, very fine banks. I could do that very quickly.

I am very underleveraged. I have a great company. I have a tremendous income. And the reason I say that is not in a braggadocios way. It's because it's about time that this country had somebody running it that has an idea about money.

When we have $20 trillion in debt, and our country's a mess, you know, it's one thing to have $20 trillion in debt and our roads are good and our bridges are good and everything's in great shape, our airports. Our airports are like from a third world country.

You land at LaGuardia, you land at Kennedy, you land at LAX, you land at Newark, and you come in from Dubai and Qatar and you see these incredible -- you come in from China, you see these incredible airports, and you land -- we've become a third world country.

So the worst of all things has happened. We owe $20 trillion, and we're a mess. We haven't even started. And we've spent $6 trillion in the Middle East, according to a report that I just saw. Whether it's 6 or 5, but it looks like it's 6, $6 trillion in the Middle East, we could have rebuilt our country twice.

And it's really a shame. And it's politicians like Secretary Clinton that have caused this problem. Our country has tremendous problems. We're a debtor nation. We're a serious debtor nation. And we have a country that needs new roads, new tunnels, new bridges, new airports, new schools, new hospitals. And we don't have the money, because it's been squandered on so many of your ideas.

HOLT: We'll let you respond and we'll move on to the next segment.

CLINTON: And maybe because you haven't paid any federal income tax for a lot of years. (APPLAUSE)

And the other thing I think is important...

TRUMP: It would be squandered, too, believe me.

CLINTON: ... is if your -- if your main claim to be president of the United States is your business, then I think we should talk about that. You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys.

And, indeed, I have met a lot of the people who were stiffed by you and your businesses, Donald. I've met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, drapery installers, like my dad was, who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do.

We have an architect in the audience who designed one of your clubhouses at one of your golf courses. It's a beautiful facility. It immediately was put to use. And you wouldn't pay what the man needed to be paid, what he was charging you to do...

TRUMP: Maybe he didn't do a good job and I was unsatisfied with his work...

CLINTON: Well, to...

TRUMP: Which our country should do, too.

CLINTON: Do the thousands of people that you have stiffed over the course of your business not deserve some kind of apology from someone who has taken their labor, taken the goods that they produced, and then refused to pay them?

I can only say that I'm certainly relieved that my late father never did business with you. He provided a good middle-class life for us, but the people he worked for, he expected the bargain to be kept on both sides.

And when we talk about your business, you've taken business bankruptcy six times. There are a lot of great businesspeople that have never taken bankruptcy once. You call yourself the King of Debt. You talk about leverage. You even at one time suggested that you would try to negotiate down the national debt of the United States.

TRUMP: Wrong. Wrong.

CLINTON: Well, sometimes there's not a direct transfer of skills from business to government, but sometimes what happened in business would be really bad for government.

HOLT: Let's let Mr. Trump...

CLINTON: And we need to be very clear about that.

TRUMP: So, yeah, I think -- I do think it's time. Look, it's all words, it's all sound bites. I built an unbelievable company. Some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, real estate assets anywhere in the world, beyond the United States, in Europe, lots of different places. It's an unbelievable company.

But on occasion, four times, we used certain laws that are there. And when Secretary Clinton talks about people that didn't get paid, first of all, they did get paid a lot, but taken advantage of the laws of the nation.

Now, if you want to change the laws, you've been there a long time, change the laws. But I take advantage of the laws of the nation because I'm running a company. My obligation right now is to do well for myself, my family, my employees, for my companies. And that's what I do.

But what she doesn't say is that tens of thousands of people that are unbelievably happy and that love me. I'll give you an example. We're just opening up on Pennsylvania Avenue right next to the White House, so if I don't get there one way, I'm going to get to Pennsylvania Avenue another.

But we're opening the Old Post Office. Under budget, ahead of schedule, saved tremendous money. I'm a year ahead of schedule. And that's what this country should be doing.

We build roads and they cost two and three and four times what they're supposed to cost. We buy products for our military and they come in at costs that are so far above what they were supposed to be, because we don't have people that know what they're doing.

When we look at the budget, the budget is bad to a large extent because we have people that have no idea as to what to do and how to buy. The Trump International is way under budget and way ahead of schedule. And we should be able to do that for our country.

HOLT: Well, we're well behind schedule, so I want to move to our next segment. We move into our next segment talking about America's direction. And let's start by talking about race.

The share of Americans who say race relations are bad in this country is the highest it's been in decades, much of it amplified by shootings of African-Americans by police, as we've seen recently in Charlotte and Tulsa. Race has been a big issue in this campaign, and one of you is going to have to bridge a very wide and bitter gap.

So how do you heal the divide? Secretary Clinton, you get two minutes on this.

CLINTON: Well, you're right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country. Unfortunately, race still determines too much, often determines where people live, determines what kind of education in their public schools they can get, and, yes, it determines how they're treated in the criminal justice system. We've just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte.

And we've got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police. We have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training, the best techniques, that they're well prepared to use force only when necessary. Everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law.

CLINTON: Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods. So I have, ever since the first day of my campaign, called for criminal justice reform. I've laid out a platform that I think would begin to remedy some of the problems we have in the criminal justice system.

But we also have to recognize, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing, there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform. So we have to bring communities together in order to begin working on that as a mutual goal. And we've got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African- American men, more than the next nine causes put together. So we have to do two things, as I said. We have to restore trust. We have to work with the police. We have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them. And we have to tackle the plague of gun violence, which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we're seeing today.

HOLT: All right, Mr. Trump, you have two minutes. How do you heal the divide?

TRUMP: Well, first of all, Secretary Clinton doesn't want to use a couple of words, and that's law and order. And we need law and order. If we don't have it, we're not going to have a country.

And when I look at what's going on in Charlotte, a city I love, a city where I have investments, when I look at what's going on throughout various parts of our country, whether it's -- I mean, I can just keep naming them all day long -- we need law and order in our country.

I just got today the, as you know, the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police, we just -- just came in. We have endorsements from, I think, almost every police group, very -- I mean, a large percentage of them in the United States.

We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African- Americans, Hispanics are living in he'll because it's so dangerous. You walk down the street, you get shot.

In Chicago, they've had thousands of shootings, thousands since January 1st. Thousands of shootings. And I'm saying, where is this? Is this a war-torn country? What are we doing? And we have to stop the violence. We have to bring back law and order. In a place like Chicago, where thousands of people have been killed, thousands over the last number of years, in fact, almost 4,000 have been killed since Barack Obama became president, over -- almost 4,000 people in Chicago have been killed. We have to bring back law and order.

Now, whether or not in a place like Chicago you do stop and frisk, which worked very well, Mayor Giuliani is here, worked very well in New York. It brought the crime rate way down. But you take the gun away from criminals that shouldn't be having it.

We have gangs roaming the street. And in many cases, they're illegally here, illegal **immigrants**. And they have guns. And they shoot people. And we have to be very strong. And we have to be very vigilant.

We have to be -- we have to know what we're doing. Right now, our police, in many cases, are afraid to do anything. We have to protect our inner cities, because African-American communities are being decimated by crime, decimated.

HOLT: Your two -- your two minutes expired, but I do want to follow up. Stop-and-frisk was ruled unconstitutional in New York, because it largely singled out black and Hispanic young men.

TRUMP: No, you're wrong. It went before a judge, who was a very against-police judge. It was taken away from her. And our mayor, our new mayor, refused to go forward with the case. They would have won an appeal. If you look at it, throughout the country, there are many places where it's allowed.

HOLT: The argument is that it's a form of racial profiling.

TRUMP: No, the argument is that we have to take the guns away from these people that have them and they are bad people that shouldn't have them.

These are felons. These are people that are bad people that shouldn't be -- when you have 3,000 shootings in Chicago from January 1st, when you have 4,000 people killed in Chicago by guns, from the beginning of the presidency of Barack Obama, his hometown, you have to have stop-and-frisk.

You need more police. You need a better community, you know, relation. You don't have good community relations in Chicago. It's terrible. I have property there. It's terrible what's going on in Chicago.

But when you look -- and Chicago's not the only -- you go to Ferguson, you go to so many different places. You need better relationships. I agree with Secretary Clinton on this.

TRUMP: You need better relationships between the communities and the police, because in some cases, it's not good.

But you look at Dallas, where the relationships were really studied, the relationships were really a beautiful thing, and then five police officers were killed one night very violently. So there's some bad things going on. Some really bad things.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton...

TRUMP: But we need -- Lester, we need law and order. And we need law and order in the inner cities, because the people that are most affected by what's happening are African-American and Hispanic people. And it's very unfair to them what our politicians are allowing to happen.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I've heard -- I've heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it's really unfortunate that he paints such a dire negative picture of black communities in our country.

TRUMP: Ugh.

CLINTON: You know, the vibrancy of the black church, the black businesses that employ so many people, the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids. There's a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up.

But we do always have to make sure we keep people safe. There are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective. Stop-and-frisk was found to be unconstitutional and, in part, because it was ineffective. It did not do what it needed to do.

Now, I believe in community policing. And, in fact, violent crime is one-half of what it was in 1991. Property crime is down 40 percent. We just don't want to see it creep back up. We've had 25 years of very good cooperation.

But there were some problems, some unintended consequences. Too many young African-American and Latino men ended up in jail for nonviolent offenses. And it's just a fact that if you're a young African-American man and you do the same thing as a young white man, you are more likely to be arrested, charged, convicted, and incarcerated. So we've got to address the systemic racism in our criminal justice system. We cannot just say law and order. We have to say -- we have to come forward with a plan that is going to divert people from the criminal justice system, deal with mandatory minimum sentences, which have put too many people away for too long for doing too little.

We need to have more second chance programs. I'm glad that we're ending private prisons in the federal system; I want to see them ended in the state system. You shouldn't have a profit motivation to fill prison cells with young Americans. So there are some positive ways we can work on this.

And I believe strongly that commonsense gun safety measures would assist us. Right now -- and this is something Donald has supported, along with the gun lobby -- right now, we've got too many military- style weapons on the streets. In a lot of places, our police are outgunned. We need comprehensive background checks, and we need to keep guns out of the hands of those who will do harm.

And we finally need to pass a prohibition on anyone who's on the terrorist watch list from being able to buy a gun in our country. If you're too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. So there are things we can do, and we ought to do it in a bipartisan way.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, last week, you said we've got to do everything possible to improve policing, to go right at implicit bias. Do you believe that police are implicitly biased against black people?

CLINTON: Lester, I think implicit bias is a problem for everyone, not just police. I think, unfortunately, too many of us in our great country jump to conclusions about each other. And therefore, I think we need all of us to be asking hard questions about, you know, why am I feeling this way?

But when it comes to policing, since it can have literally fatal consequences, I have said, in my first budget, we would put money into that budget to help us deal with implicit bias by retraining a lot of our police officers.

I've met with a group of very distinguished, experienced police chiefs a few weeks ago. They admit it's an issue. They've got a lot of concerns. Mental health is one of the biggest concerns, because now police are having to handle a lot of really difficult mental health problems on the street.

CLINTON: They want support, they want more training, they want more assistance. And I think the federal government could be in a position where we would offer and provide that.

HOLT: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: I'd like to respond to that.

HOLT: Please.

TRUMP: First of all, I agree, and a lot of people even within my own party want to give certain rights to people on watch lists and no- fly lists. I agree with you. When a person is on a watch list or a no-fly list, and I have the endorsement of the NRA, which I'm very proud of. These are very, very good people, and they're protecting the Second Amendment.

But I think we have to look very strongly at no-fly lists and watch lists. And when people are on there, even if they shouldn't be on there, we'll help them, we'll help them legally, we'll help them get off. But I tend to agree with that quite strongly.

I do want to bring up the fact that you were the one that brought up the words super-predator about young black youth. And that's a term that I think was a -- it's -- it's been horribly met, as you know. I think you've apologized for it. But I think it was a terrible thing to say.

And when it comes to stop-and-frisk, you know, you're talking about takes guns away. Well, I'm talking about taking guns away from gangs and people that use them. And I don't think -- I really don't think you disagree with me on this, if you want to know the truth.

I think maybe there's a political reason why you can't say it, but I really don't believe -- in New York City, stop-and-frisk, we had 2,200 murders, and stop-and-frisk brought it down to 500 murders. Five hundred murders is a lot of murders. It's hard to believe, 500 is like supposed to be good?

But we went from 2,200 to 500. And it was continued on by Mayor Bloomberg. And it was terminated by current mayor. But stop-and- frisk had a tremendous impact on the safety of New York City. Tremendous beyond belief. So when you say it has no impact, it really did. It had a very, very big impact.

CLINTON: Well, it's also fair to say, if we're going to talk about mayors, that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders. So there is...

TRUMP: No, you're wrong. You're wrong.

CLINTON: No, I'm not.

TRUMP: Murders are up. All right. You check it.

CLINTON: New York -- New York has done an excellent job. And I give credit -- I give credit across the board going back two mayors, two police chiefs, because it has worked. And other communities need to come together to do what will work, as well.

Look, one murder is too many. But it is important that we learn about what has been effective. And not go to things that sound good that really did not have the kind of impact that we would want. Who disagrees with keeping neighborhoods safe?

But let's also add, no one should disagree about respecting the rights of young men who live in those neighborhoods. And so we need to do a better job of working, again, with the communities, faith communities, business communities, as well as the police to try to deal with this problem.

HOLT: This conversation is about race. And so, Mr. Trump, I have to ask you for five...

TRUMP: I'd like to just respond, if I might.

HOLT: Please -- 20 seconds.

TRUMP: I'd just like to respond.

HOLT: Please respond, then I've got a quick follow-up for you.

TRUMP: I will. Look, the African-American community has been let down by our politicians. They talk good around election time, like right now, and after the election, they said, see ya later, I'll see you in four years.

The African-American community -- because -- look, the community within the inner cities has been so badly treated. They've been abused and used in order to get votes by Democrat politicians, because that's what it is. They've controlled these communities for up to 100 years.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, let me...

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: Well, I -- I do think...

TRUMP: And I will tell you, you look at the inner cities -- and I just left Detroit, and I just left Philadelphia, and I just -- you know, you've seen me, I've been all over the place. You decided to stay home, and that's OK. But I will tell you, I've been all over. And I've met some of the greatest people I'll ever meet within these communities. And they are very, very upset with what their politicians have told them and what their politicians have done.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, I...

CLINTON: I think -- I think -- I think Donald just criticized me for preparing for this debate. And, yes, I did. And you know what else I prepared for? I prepared to be president. And I think that's a good thing.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, for five years, you perpetuated a false claim that the nation's first black president was not a natural-born citizen. You questioned his legitimacy. In the last couple of weeks, you acknowledged what most Americans have accepted for years: The president was born in the United States. Can you tell us what took you so long?

TRUMP: I'll tell you very -- well, just very simple to say. Sidney Blumenthal works for the campaign and close -- very close friend of Secretary Clinton. And her campaign manager, Patti Doyle, went to -- during the campaign, her campaign against President Obama, fought very hard. And you can go look it up, and you can check it out.

TRUMP: And if you look at CNN this past week, Patti Solis Doyle was on Wolf Blitzer saying that this happened. Blumenthal sent McClatchy, highly respected reporter at McClatchy, to Kenya to find out about it. They were pressing it very hard. She failed to get the birth certificate.

When I got involved, I didn't fail. I got him to give the birth certificate. So I'm satisfied with it. And I'll tell you why I'm satisfied with it.

HOLT: That was...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Because I want to get on to defeating ISIS, because I want to get on to creating jobs, because I want to get on to having a strong border, because I want to get on to things that are very important to me and that are very important to the country.

HOLT: I will let you respond. It's important. But I just want to get the answer here. The birth certificate was produced in 2011. You've continued to tell the story and question the president's legitimacy in 2012, '13, '14, '15...

TRUMP: Yeah.

HOLT: .... as recently as January. So the question is, what changed your mind?

TRUMP: Well, nobody was pressing it, nobody was caring much about it. I figured you'd ask the question tonight, of course. But nobody was caring much about it. But I was the one that got him to produce the birth certificate. And I think I did a good job.

Secretary Clinton also fought it. I mean, you know -- now, everybody in mainstream is going to say, oh, that's not true. Look, it's true. Sidney Blumenthal sent a reporter -- you just have to take a look at CNN, the last week, the interview with your former campaign manager. And she was involved. But just like she can't bring back jobs, she can't produce.

HOLT: I'm sorry. I'm just going to follow up -- and I will let you respond to that, because there's a lot there. But we're talking about racial healing in this segment. What do you say to Americans, people of color who...

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: Well, it was very -- I say nothing. I say nothing, because I was able to get him to produce it. He should have produced it a long time before. I say nothing.

But let me just tell you. When you talk about healing, I think that I've developed very, very good relationships over the last little while with the African-American community. I think you can see that.

And I feel that they really wanted me to come to that conclusion. And I think I did a great job and a great service not only for the country, but even for the president, in getting him to produce his birth certificate.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, just listen to what you heard.

(LAUGHTER)

And clearly, as Donald just admitted, he knew he was going to stand on this debate stage, and Lester Holt was going to be asking us questions, so he tried to put the whole racist birther lie to bed.

But it can't be dismissed that easily. He has really started his political activity based on this racist lie that our first black president was not an American citizen. There was absolutely no evidence for it, but he persisted, he persisted year after year, because some of his supporters, people that he was trying to bring into his fold, apparently believed it or wanted to believe it.

But, remember, Donald started his career back in 1973 being sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination because he would not rent apartments in one of his developments to African-Americans, and he made sure that the people who worked for him understood that was the policy. He actually was sued twice by the Justice Department.

So he has a long record of engaging in racist behavior. And the birther lie was a very hurtful one. You know, Barack Obama is a man of great dignity. And I could tell how much it bothered him and annoyed him that this was being touted and used against him.

But I like to remember what Michelle Obama said in her amazing speech at our Democratic National Convention: When they go low, we go high. And Barack Obama went high, despite Donald Trump's best efforts to bring him down.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you can respond and we're going to move on to the next segment.

TRUMP: I would love to respond. First of all, I got to watch in preparing for this some of your debates against Barack Obama. You treated him with terrible disrespect. And I watched the way you talk now about how lovely everything is and how wonderful you are. It doesn't work that way. You were after him, you were trying to -- you even sent out or your campaign sent out pictures of him in a certain garb, very famous pictures. I don't think you can deny that.

But just last week, your campaign manager said it was true. So when you tried to act holier than thou, it really doesn't work. It really doesn't.

Now, as far as the lawsuit, yes, when I was very young, I went into my father's company, had a real estate company in Brooklyn and Queens, and we, along with many, many other companies throughout the country -- it was a federal lawsuit -- were sued. We settled the suit with zero -- with no admission of guilt. It was very easy to do.

TRUMP: I notice you bring that up a lot. And, you know, I also notice the very nasty commercials that you do on me in so many different ways, which I don't do on you. Maybe I'm trying to save the money.

But, frankly, I look -- I look at that, and I say, isn't that amazing? Because I settled that lawsuit with no admission of guilt, but that was a lawsuit brought against many real estate firms, and it's just one of those things.

I'll go one step further. In Palm Beach, Florida, tough community, a brilliant community, a wealthy community, probably the wealthiest community there is in the world, I opened a club, and really got great credit for it. No discrimination against African- Americans, against Muslims, against anybody. And it's a tremendously successful club. And I'm so glad I did it. And I have been given great credit for what I did. And I'm very, very proud of it. And that's the way I feel. That is the true way I feel.

HOLT: Our next segment is called "Securing America." We want to start with a 21st century war happening every day in this country. Our institutions are under cyber attack, and our secrets are being stolen. So my question is, who's behind it? And how do we fight it?

Secretary Clinton, this answer goes to you.

CLINTON: Well, I think cyber security, cyber warfare will be one of the biggest challenges facing the next president, because clearly we're facing at this point two different kinds of adversaries. There are the independent hacking groups that do it mostly for commercial reasons to try to steal information that they can use to make money.

But increasingly, we are seeing cyber attacks coming from states, organs of states. The most recent and troubling of these has been Russia. There's no doubt now that Russia has used cyber attacks against all kinds of organizations in our country, and I am deeply concerned about this. I know Donald's very praiseworthy of Vladimir Putin, but Putin is playing a really...

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: ... tough, long game here. And one of the things he's done is to let loose cyber attackers to hack into government files, to hack into personal files, hack into the Democratic National Committee. And we recently have learned that, you know, that this is one of their preferred methods of trying to wreak havoc and collect information. We need to make it very clear -- whether it's Russia, China, Iran or anybody else -- the United States has much greater capacity. And we are not going to sit idly by and permit state actors to go after our information, our private-sector information or our public-sector information.

And we're going to have to make it clear that we don't want to use the kinds of tools that we have. We don't want to engage in a different kind of warfare. But we will defend the citizens of this country.

And the Russians need to understand that. I think they've been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go, how much would we do. And that's why I was so -- I was so shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is just unacceptable. It's one of the reasons why 50 national security officials who served in Republican information -- in administrations...

HOLT: Your two minutes have expired.

CLINTON: ... have said that Donald is unfit to be the commander- in-chief. It's comments like that that really worry people who understand the threats that we face.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes and the same question. Who's behind it? And how do we fight it?

TRUMP: I do want to say that I was just endorsed -- and more are coming next week -- it will be over 200 admirals, many of them here -- admirals and generals endorsed me to lead this country. That just happened, and many more are coming. And I'm very proud of it.

In addition, I was just endorsed by ICE. They've never endorsed anybody before on **immigration**. I was just endorsed by ICE. I was just recently endorsed -- 16,500 Border Patrol agents.

So when Secretary Clinton talks about this, I mean, I'll take the admirals and I'll take the generals any day over the political hacks that I see that have led our country so brilliantly over the last 10 years with their knowledge. OK? Because look at the mess that we're in. Look at the mess that we're in.

As far as the cyber, I agree to parts of what Secretary Clinton said. We should be better than anybody else, and perhaps we're not. I don't think anybody knows it was Russia that broke into the DNC. She's saying Russia, Russia, Russia, but I don't -- maybe it was. I mean, it could be Russia, but it could also be China. It could also be lots of other people. It also could be somebody sitting on their bed that weighs 400 pounds, OK?

TRUMP: You don't know who broke in to DNC.

But what did we learn with DNC? We learned that Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of by your people, by Debbie Wasserman Schultz. Look what happened to her. But Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of. That's what we learned.

Now, whether that was Russia, whether that was China, whether it was another country, we don't know, because the truth is, under President Obama we've lost control of things that we used to have control over.

We came in with the Internet, we came up with the Internet, and I think Secretary Clinton and myself would agree very much, when you look at what ISIS is doing with the Internet, they're beating us at our own game. ISIS.

So we have to get very, very tough on cyber and cyber warfare. It is -- it is a huge problem. I have a son. He's 10 years old. He has computers. He is so good with these computers, it's unbelievable. The security aspect of cyber is very, very tough. And maybe it's hardly doable.

But I will say, we are not doing the job we should be doing. But that's true throughout our whole governmental society. We have so many things that we have to do better, Lester, and certainly cyber is one of them.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think there are a number of issues that we should be addressing. I have put forth a plan to defeat ISIS. It does involve going after them online. I think we need to do much more with our tech companies to prevent ISIS and their operatives from being able to use the Internet to radicalize, even direct people in our country and Europe and elsewhere.

But we also have to intensify our air strikes against ISIS and eventually support our Arab and Kurdish partners to be able to actually take out ISIS in Raqqa, end their claim of being a Caliphate.

We're making progress. Our military is assisting in Iraq. And we're hoping that within the year we'll be able to push ISIS out of Iraq and then, you know, really squeeze them in Syria.

But we have to be cognizant of the fact that they've had foreign fighters coming to volunteer for them, foreign money, foreign weapons, so we have to make this the top priority.

And I would also do everything possible to take out their leadership. I was involved in a number of efforts to take out Al Qaida leadership when I was secretary of state, including, of course, taking out bin Laden. And I think we need to go after Baghdadi, as well, make that one of our organizing principles. Because we've got to defeat ISIS, and we've got to do everything we can to disrupt their propaganda efforts online.

HOLT: You mention ISIS, and we think of ISIS certainly as over there, but there are American citizens who have been inspired to commit acts of terror on American soil, the latest incident, of course, the bombings we just saw in New York and New Jersey, the knife attack at a mall in Minnesota, in the last year, deadly attacks in San Bernardino and Orlando. I'll ask this to both of you. Tell us specifically how you would prevent homegrown attacks by American citizens, Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: Well, first I have to say one thing, very important. Secretary Clinton is talking about taking out ISIS. "We will take out ISIS." Well, President Obama and Secretary Clinton created a vacuum the way they got out of Iraq, because they got out -- what, they shouldn't have been in, but once they got in, the way they got out was a disaster. And ISIS was formed.

So she talks about taking them out. She's been doing it a long time. She's been trying to take them out for a long time. But they wouldn't have even been formed if they left some troops behind, like 10,000 or maybe something more than that. And then you wouldn't have had them.

Or, as I've been saying for a long time, and I think you'll agree, because I said it to you once, had we taken the oil -- and we should have taken the oil -- ISIS would not have been able to form either, because the oil was their primary source of income. And now they have the oil all over the place, including the oil -- a lot of the oil in Libya, which was another one of her disasters.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I hope the fact-checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: That is absolutely proved over and over again.

TRUMP: Wrong. Wrong.

CLINTON: He actually advocated for the actions we took in Libya and urged that Gadhafi be taken out, after actually doing some business with him one time.

CLINTON: But the larger point -- and he says this constantly -- is George W. Bush made the agreement about when American troops would leave Iraq, not Barack Obama.

And the only way that American troops could have stayed in Iraq is to get an agreement from the then-Iraqi government that would have protected our troops, and the Iraqi government would not give that.

But let's talk about the question you asked, Lester. The question you asked is, what do we do here in the United States? That's the most important part of this. How do we prevent attacks? How do we protect our people?

And I think we've got to have an intelligence surge, where we are looking for every scrap of information. I was so proud of law enforcement in New York, in Minnesota, in New Jersey. You know, they responded so quickly, so professionally to the attacks that occurred by Rahami. And they brought him down. And we may find out more information because he is still alive, which may prove to be an intelligence benefit.

So we've got to do everything we can to vacuum up intelligence from Europe, from the Middle East. That means we've got to work more closely with our allies, and that's something that Donald has been very dismissive of.

We're working with NATO, the longest military alliance in the history of the world, to really turn our attention to terrorism. We're working with our friends in the Middle East, many of which, as you know, are Muslim majority nations. Donald has consistently insulted Muslims abroad, Muslims at home, when we need to be cooperating with Muslim nations and with the American Muslim community.

They're on the front lines. They can provide information to us that we might not get anywhere else. They need to have close working cooperation with law enforcement in these communities, not be alienated and pushed away as some of Donald's rhetoric, unfortunately, has led to.

HOLT: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: Well, I have to respond.

HOLT: Please respond.

TRUMP: The secretary said very strongly about working with -- we've been working with them for many years, and we have the greatest mess anyone's ever seen. You look at the Middle East, it's a total mess. Under your direction, to a large extent.

But you look at the Middle East, you started the Iran deal, that's another beauty where you have a country that was ready to fall, I mean, they were doing so badly. They were choking on the sanctions. And now they're going to be actually probably a major power at some point pretty soon, the way they're going.

But when you look at NATO, I was asked on a major show, what do you think of NATO? And you have to understand, I'm a businessperson. I did really well. But I have common sense. And I said, well, I'll tell you. I haven't given lots of thought to NATO. But two things.

Number one, the 28 countries of NATO, many of them aren't paying their fair share. Number two -- and that bothers me, because we should be asking -- we're defending them, and they should at least be paying us what they're supposed to be paying by treaty and contract.

And, number two, I said, and very strongly, NATO could be obsolete, because -- and I was very strong on this, and it was actually covered very accurately in the New York Times, which is unusual for the New York Times, to be honest -- but I said, they do not focus on terror. And I was very strong. And I said it numerous times.

And about four months ago, I read on the front page of the Wall Street Journal that NATO is opening up a major terror division. And I think that's great. And I think we should get -- because we pay approximately 73 percent of the cost of NATO. It's a lot of money to protect other people. But I'm all for NATO. But I said they have to focus on terror, also.

And they're going to do that. And that was -- believe me -- I'm sure I'm not going to get credit for it -- but that was largely because of what I was saying and my criticism of NATO.

I think we have to get NATO to go into the Middle East with us, in addition to surrounding nations, and we have to knock the hell out of ISIS, and we have to do it fast, when ISIS formed in this vacuum created by Barack Obama and Secretary Clinton. And believe me, you were the ones that took out the troops. Not only that, you named the day. They couldn't believe it. They sat back probably and said, I can't believe it. They said...

CLINTON: Lester, we've covered...

TRUMP: No, wait a minute.

CLINTON: We've covered this ground.

TRUMP: When they formed, when they formed, this is something that never should have happened. It should have never happened. Now, you're talking about taking out ISIS. But you were there, and you were secretary of state when it was a little infant. Now it's in over 30 countries. And you're going to stop them? I don't think so.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, a lot of these are judgment questions. You had supported the war in Iraq before the invasion. What makes your...

TRUMP: I did not support the war in Iraq.

HOLT: In 2002...

TRUMP: That is a mainstream media nonsense put out by her, because she -- frankly, I think the best person in her campaign is mainstream media.

HOLT: My question is, since you supported it...

TRUMP: Just -- would you like to hear...

HOLT: ... why is your -- why is your judgment...

TRUMP: Wait a minute. I was against the war in Iraq. Just so you put it out.

HOLT: The record shows otherwise, but why -- why was...

TRUMP: The record does not show that.

HOLT: Why was -- is your judgment any...

TRUMP: The record shows that I'm right. When I did an interview with Howard Stern, very lightly, first time anyone's asked me that, I said, very lightly, I don't know, maybe, who knows? Essentially. I then did an interview with Neil Cavuto. We talked about the economy is more important. I then spoke to Sean Hannity, which everybody refuses to call Sean Hannity. I had numerous conversations with Sean Hannity at Fox. And Sean Hannity said -- and he called me the other day -- and I spoke to him about it -- he said you were totally against the war, because he was for the war.

HOLT: Why is your judgment better than...

TRUMP: And when he -- excuse me. And that was before the war started. Sean Hannity said very strongly to me and other people -- he's willing to say it, but nobody wants to call him. I was against the war. He said, you used to have fights with me, because Sean was in favor of the war.

And I understand that side, also, not very much, because we should have never been there. But nobody called Sean Hannity. And then they did an article in a major magazine, shortly after the war started. I think in '04. But they did an article which had me totally against the war in Iraq.

And one of your compatriots said, you know, whether it was before or right after, Trump was definitely -- because if you read this article, there's no doubt. But if somebody -- and I'll ask the press -- if somebody would call up Sean Hannity, this was before the war started. He and I used to have arguments about the war. I said, it's a terrible and a stupid thing. It's going to destabilize the Middle East. And that's exactly what it's done. It's been a disaster.

HOLT: My reference was to what you had said in 2002, and my question was...

TRUMP: No, no. You didn't hear what I said.

HOLT: Why is your judgment -- why is your judgment any different than Mrs. Clinton's judgment?

TRUMP: Well, I have much better judgment than she does. There's no question about that. I also have a much better temperament than she has, you know?

(LAUGHTER)

I have a much better -- she spent -- let me tell you -- she spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an advertising -- you know, they get Madison Avenue into a room, they put names -- oh, temperament, let's go after -- I think my strongest asset, maybe by far, is my temperament. I have a winning temperament. I know how to win. She does not have a...

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

TRUMP: Wait. The AFL-CIO the other day, behind the blue screen, I don't know who you were talking to, Secretary Clinton, but you were totally out of control. I said, there's a person with a temperament that's got a problem.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Whew, OK.

(LAUGHTER)

Let's talk about two important issues that were briefly mentioned by Donald, first, NATO. You know, NATO as a military alliance has something called Article 5, and basically it says this: An attack on one is an attack on all. And you know the only time it's ever been invoked? After 9/11, when the 28 nations of NATO said that they would go to Afghanistan with us to fight terrorism, something that they still are doing by our side.

With respect to Iran, when I became secretary of state, Iran was weeks away from having enough nuclear material to form a bomb. They had mastered the nuclear fuel cycle under the Bush administration. They had built covert facilities. They had stocked them with centrifuges that were whirling away.

And we had sanctioned them. I voted for every sanction against Iran when I was in the Senate, but it wasn't enough. So I spent a year-and-a-half putting together a coalition that included Russia and China to impose the toughest sanctions on Iran.

And we did drive them to the negotiating table. And my successor, John Kerry, and President Obama got a deal that put a lid on Iran's nuclear program without firing a single shot. That's diplomacy. That's coalition-building. That's working with other nations.

The other day, I saw Donald saying that there were some Iranian sailors on a ship in the waters off of Iran, and they were taunting American sailors who were on a nearby ship. He said, you know, if they taunted our sailors, I'd blow them out of the water and start another war. That's not good judgment.

TRUMP: That would not start a war.

CLINTON: That is not the right temperament to be commander-in- chief, to be taunted. And the worst part...

TRUMP: No, they were taunting us.

CLINTON: ... of what we heard Donald say has been about nuclear weapons. He has said repeatedly that he didn't care if other nations got nuclear weapons, Japan, South Korea, even Saudi Arabia. It has been the policy of the United States, Democrats and Republicans, to do everything we could to reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons. He even said, well, you know, if there were nuclear war in East Asia, well, you know, that's fine...

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... have a good time, folks.

TRUMP: It's lies.

CLINTON: And, in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling. That is the number-one threat we face in the world. And it becomes particularly threatening if terrorists ever get their hands on any nuclear material. So a man who can be provoked by a tweet should not have his fingers anywhere near the nuclear codes, as far as I think anyone with any sense about this should be concerned.

TRUMP: That line's getting a little bit old, I must say. I would like to...

CLINTON: It's a good one, though. It well describes the problem.

(LAUGHTER)

TRUMP: It's not an accurate one at all. It's not an accurate one. So I just want to give a lot of things -- and just to respond. I agree with her on one thing. The single greatest problem the world has is nuclear armament, nuclear weapons, not global warming, like you think and your -- your president thinks.

Nuclear is the single greatest threat. Just to go down the list, we defend Japan, we defend Germany, we defend South Korea, we defend Saudi Arabia, we defend countries. They do not pay us. But they should be paying us, because we are providing tremendous service and we're losing a fortune. That's why we're losing -- we're losing -- we lose on everything. I say, who makes these -- we lose on everything. All I said, that it's very possible that if they don't pay a fair share, because this isn't 40 years ago where we could do what we're doing. We can't defend Japan, a behemoth, selling us cars by the million...

HOLT: We need to move on.

TRUMP: Well, wait, but it's very important. All I said was, they may have to defend themselves or they have to help us out. We're a country that owes $20 trillion. They have to help us out.

HOLT: Our last...

TRUMP: As far as the nuclear is concerned, I agree. It is the single greatest threat that this country has.

HOLT: Which leads to my next question, as we enter our last segment here (inaudible) the subject of securing America. On nuclear weapons, President Obama reportedly considered changing the nation's longstanding policy on first use. Do you support the current policy? Mr. Trump, you have two minutes on that.

TRUMP: Well, I have to say that, you know, for what Secretary Clinton was saying about nuclear with Russia, she's very cavalier in the way she talks about various countries. But Russia has been expanding their -- they have a much newer capability than we do. We have not been updating from the new standpoint.

I looked the other night. I was seeing B-52s, they're old enough that your father, your grandfather could be flying them. We are not -- we are not keeping up with other countries. I would like everybody to end it, just get rid of it. But I would certainly not do first strike.

I think that once the nuclear alternative happens, it's over. At the same time, we have to be prepared. I can't take anything off the table. Because you look at some of these countries, you look at North Korea, we're doing nothing there. China should solve that problem for us. China should go into North Korea. China is totally powerful as it relates to North Korea.

And by the way, another one powerful is the worst deal I think I've ever seen negotiated that you started is the Iran deal. Iran is one of their biggest trading partners. Iran has power over North Korea.

And when they made that horrible deal with Iran, they should have included the fact that they do something with respect to North Korea. And they should have done something with respect to Yemen and all these other places.

And when asked to Secretary Kerry, why didn't you do that? Why didn't you add other things into the deal? One of the great giveaways of all time, of all time, including $400 million in cash. Nobody's ever seen that before. That turned out to be wrong. It was actually $1.7 billion in cash, obviously, I guess for the hostages. It certainly looks that way.

So you say to yourself, why didn't they make the right deal? This is one of the worst deals ever made by any country in history. The deal with Iran will lead to nuclear problems. All they have to do is sit back 10 years, and they don't have to do much.

HOLT: Your two minutes is expired.

TRUMP: And they're going to end up getting nuclear. I met with Bibi Netanyahu the other day. Believe me, he's not a happy camper.

HOLT: All right. Mrs. Clinton, Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, let me -- let me start by saying, words matter. Words matter when you run for president. And they really matter when you are president. And I want to reassure our allies in Japan and South Korea and elsewhere that we have mutual defense treaties and we will honor them.

It is essential that America's word be good. And so I know that this campaign has caused some questioning and worries on the part of many leaders across the globe. I've talked with a number of them. But I want to -- on behalf of myself, and I think on behalf of a majority of the American people, say that, you know, our word is good.

It's also important that we look at the entire global situation. There's no doubt that we have other problems with Iran. But personally, I'd rather deal with the other problems having put that lid on their nuclear program than still to be facing that.

And Donald never tells you what he would do. Would he have started a war? Would he have bombed Iran? If he's going to criticize a deal that has been very successful in giving us access to Iranian facilities that we never had before, then he should tell us what his alternative would be. But it's like his plan to defeat ISIS. He says it's a secret plan, but the only secret is that he has no plan.

So we need to be more precise in how we talk about these issues. People around the word follow our presidential campaigns so closely, trying to get hints about what we will do. Can they rely on us? Are we going to lead the world with strength and in accordance with our values? That's what I intend to do. I intend to be a leader of our country that people can count on, both here at home and around the world, to make decisions that will further peace and prosperity, but also stand up to bullies, whether they're abroad or at home.

We cannot let those who would try to destabilize the world to interfere with American interests and security...

HOLT: Your two minutes is...

CLINTON: ... to be given any opportunities at all.

HOLT: ... is expired.

TRUMP: Lester, one thing I'd like to say.

HOLT: Very quickly. Twenty seconds.

TRUMP: I will go very quickly. But I will tell you that Hillary will tell you to go to her website and read all about how to defeat ISIS, which she could have defeated by never having it, you know, get going in the first place. Right now, it's getting tougher and tougher to defeat them, because they're in more and more places, more and more states, more and more nations.

HOLT: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: And it's a big problem. And as far as Japan is concerned, I want to help all of our allies, but we are losing billions and billions of dollars. We cannot be the policemen of the world. We cannot protect countries all over the world...

HOLT: We have just...

TRUMP: ... where they're not paying us what we need.

HOLT: We have just a few final questions...

TRUMP: And she doesn't say that, because she's got no business ability. We need heart. We need a lot of things. But you have to have some basic ability. And sadly, she doesn't have that. All of the things that she's talking about could have been taken care of during the last 10 years, let's say, while she had great power. But they weren't taken care of. And if she ever wins this race, they won't be taken care of.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, this year Secretary Clinton became the first woman nominated for president by a major party. Earlier this month, you said she doesn't have, quote, "a presidential look." She's standing here right now. What did you mean by that?

TRUMP: She doesn't have the look. She doesn't have the stamina. I said she doesn't have the stamina. And I don't believe she does have the stamina. To be president of this country, you need tremendous stamina.

HOLT: The quote was, "I just don't think she has the presidential look."

TRUMP: You have -- wait a minute. Wait a minute, Lester. You asked me a question. Did you ask me a question?

You have to be able to negotiate our trade deals. You have to be able to negotiate, that's right, with Japan, with Saudi Arabia. I mean, can you imagine, we're defending Saudi Arabia? And with all of the money they have, we're defending them, and they're not paying? All you have to do is speak to them. Wait. You have so many different things you have to be able to do, and I don't believe that Hillary has the stamina.

HOLT: Let's let her respond. CLINTON: Well, as soon as he travels to 112 countries and negotiates a peace deal, a cease-fire, a release of dissidents, an opening of new opportunities in nations around the world, or even spends 11 hours testifying in front of a congressional committee, he can talk to me about stamina.

(APPLAUSE)

TRUMP: The world -- let me tell you. Let me tell you. Hillary has experience, but it's bad experience. We have made so many bad deals during the last -- so she's got experience, that I agree.

(APPLAUSE)

But it's bad, bad experience. Whether it's the Iran deal that you're so in love with, where we gave them $150 billion back, whether it's the Iran deal, whether it's anything you can -- name -- you almost can't name a good deal. I agree. She's got experience, but it's bad experience. And this country can't afford to have another four years of that kind of experience.

HOLT: We are at -- we are at the final question.

(APPLAUSE)

CLINTON: Well, one thing. One thing, Lester.

HOLT: Very quickly, because we're at the final question now.

CLINTON: You know, he tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs, and someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said...

TRUMP: I never said that.

CLINTON: .... women don't deserve equal pay unless they do as good a job as men.

TRUMP: I didn't say that.

CLINTON: And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest. He loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them. And he called this woman "Miss Piggy." Then he called her "Miss Housekeeping," because she was Latina. Donald, she has a name.

TRUMP: Where did you find this? Where did you find this?

CLINTON: Her name is Alicia Machado.

TRUMP: Where did you find this?

CLINTON: And she has become a U.S. citizen, and you can bet...

TRUMP: Oh, really? CLINTON: ... she's going to vote this November.

TRUMP: OK, good. Let me just tell you...

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, could we just take 10 seconds and then we ask the final question...

TRUMP: You know, Hillary is hitting me with tremendous commercials. Some of it's said in entertainment. Some of it's said -- somebody who's been very vicious to me, Rosie O'Donnell, I said very tough things to her, and I think everybody would agree that she deserves it and nobody feels sorry for her.

But you want to know the truth? I was going to say something...

HOLT: Please very quickly.

TRUMP: ... extremely rough to Hillary, to her family, and I said to myself, "I can't do it. I just can't do it. It's inappropriate. It's not nice." But she spent hundreds of millions of dollars on negative ads on me, many of which are absolutely untrue. They're untrue. And they're misrepresentations.

And I will tell you this, Lester: It's not nice. And I don't deserve that.

But it's certainly not a nice thing that she's done. It's hundreds of millions of ads. And the only gratifying thing is, I saw the polls come in today, and with all of that money...

HOLT: We have to move on to the final question.

TRUMP: ... $200 million is spent, and I'm either winning or tied, and I've spent practically nothing.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: One of you will not win this election. So my final question to you tonight, are you willing to accept the outcome as the will of the voters? Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I support our democracy. And sometimes you win, sometimes you lose. But I certainly will support the outcome of this election.

And I know Donald's trying very hard to plant doubts about it, but I hope the people out there understand: This election's really up to you. It's not about us so much as it is about you and your families and the kind of country and future you want. So I sure hope you will get out and vote as though your future depended on it, because I think it does.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, very quickly, same question. Will you accept the outcome as the will of the voters? TRUMP: I want to make America great again. We are a nation that is seriously troubled. We're losing our jobs. People are pouring into our country.

The other day, we were deporting 800 people. And perhaps they passed the wrong button, they pressed the wrong button, or perhaps worse than that, it was corruption, but these people that we were going to deport for good reason ended up becoming citizens. Ended up becoming citizens. And it was 800. And now it turns out it might be 1,800, and they don't even know.

HOLT: Will you accept the outcome of the election?

TRUMP: Look, here's the story. I want to make America great again. I'm going to be able to do it. I don't believe Hillary will. The answer is, if she wins, I will absolutely support her.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: All right. Well, that is going to do it for us. That concludes our debate for this evening, a spirit one. We covered a lot of ground, not everything as I suspected we would.

The next presidential debates are scheduled for October 9th at Washington University in St. Louis and October 19th at the University of Nevada Las Vegas. The conversation will continue.

A reminder. The vice presidential debate is scheduled for October 4th at Longwood University in Farmville, Virginia. My thanks to Hillary Clinton and to Donald Trump and to Hofstra University for hosting us tonight. Good night, everyone.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Look, we told you it wasn't going to be aliens.

On Monday, after teasing about an announcement concerning "surprising activity" on Jupiter's moon Europa, NASA revealed new evidence for water geysers shooting from the ice-covered satellite.

Surprising? Well, not really. This isn't the first time scientists have spotted what looks like geyser activity on the icy moon, which is thought to contain a subsurface ocean with more liquid water than all the seas on Earth combined. In 2012, the Hubble space telescope spotted water vapor above Europa's surface. Scientists determined the most likely culprit to be a plume of water vapor spurting out of Europa's south pole. The plume would have been big, shooting out 20 times as high as Mount Everest.

But just because these new results — also relying on Hubble data and set to be published in the Astrophysical Journal — don't have us gasping in shock doesn't mean they aren't significant and cool. This is the first time plumes have been spotted again since that one-off in 2012.

Plumes would be exciting because they'd probably be signs of geological activity under the ocean surface, which would mean a source of energy for potential life-forms under the **alien** sea. Scientists are fairly certain that Europa is covered in a global, salty ocean full of genuine liquid H2O kept warm by the powerful tidal forces of Jupiter. There's a rocky core deep beneath that precious liquid, and if hydrothermal vents or volcanoes are heating up the ocean floor and spurring on chemical interactions between rock and water, microbes could make a cozy home there. At least in theory, anyway. On Earth, life is found pretty much wherever there is water and energy. Until we probe potentially habitable places like Europa, we can't be sure how often that basic equation works on other worlds.

Those tell-tale plumes would also make the hunt for microbial life easier by giving us a way to sample the ocean without drilling into miles of ice. The Cassini spacecraft recently made a pit stop near Enceladus, a moon of Saturn known to shoot geysers out of its subsurface ocean with far more regularity, for the sole purpose of diving through its plumes.

"Europa's ocean is considered one of the most promising places that could potentially harbor life in the solar system," Geoff Yoder, acting associate administrator for NASA's Science Mission Directorate, said in a statement. "These plumes, if they do indeed exist, may provide another way to sample Europa's subsurface."

Scientists detected the plumes by borrowing a trick from exoplanet hunters: When an exoplanet passes in front of its host star, the light that passes through its atmosphere changes based on the molecules it encounters. So by looking at a star with a planet crossing in front of it, scientists can read the chemical makeup of its atmosphere — a crucial step in determining a world's habitability.

Led by William Sparks of the Space Telescope Science Institute in Baltimore, researchers retooled this method to look at an **alien** world much closer to home.

"The atmosphere of an extrasolar planet blocks some of the starlight that is behind it," Sparks said in a statement. "If there is a thin atmosphere around Europa, it has the potential to block some of the light of Jupiter, and we could see it as a silhouette. And so we were looking for absorption features around the limb of Europa as it transited the smooth face of Jupiter."

In searching for signs of Europa's atmosphere, they saw water vapor venting from its surface. The team watched Europa transit in front of Jupiter 10 times over the course of 15 months and saw what might have been plumes on three occasions.

At Monday's news conference, the researchers stressed that these results push the limits of the Hubble's capabilities — they can't be too certain of what they're seeing.

"We do not claim to have proven the existence of plumes but rather to have contributed evidence that such activity may be present," Sparks said.

But no other known natural phenomenon could explain the water vapor they've seen, he added.

Experts not involved with the study agreed that the results, while far from definitive, could prove to be significant if true.

"When you push the envelope with any astronomical facility and you're really at the limit, there's always the possibility that it might be, something else, a background atmosphere for example," Cornell University's Jonathan Lunine, who wasn't involved in the new study, told The Washington Post. "But it looks pretty confined, not spatially uniform, so that argues for it being a plume."

If Europa really is displaying its plumage, Lunine explained, the big question remaining is whether the jets of water come from the ocean itself or the icy crust that contains it.

"You can have a plume coming from warm ice," he said. A plume coming from the icy crust might carry the same molecules as the ocean far below, but it might not. So scientists hope to sample water propelled up from the deepest depths, where life might flourish in warm volcanic vents. In that case, the plumes would carry the molecular signatures of life.

"If it's coming from the ocean, it means that we're sampling material that might be part of a habitable environment," Lunine said.

NASA already has a mission to Europa in the works, scheduled to launch in 2022 and arrive a few years after that. That probe won't land or even orbit the icy moon — Jupiter's radiation makes the area too dangerous for a robot — but it will orbit Jupiter and make a few close passes of the watery world. If Europa does indeed shoot geysers into space, the spacecraft could use those plumes to sniff out the chemical composition of an ocean without needing to get too close.

But unless follow-up observations from home find more definitive geyser evidence, a probe hoping to dive through the spray might not know where to go looking for watery eruptions. Unlike Enceladus — where certain geological features make it obvious where the frequent plumes will occur — Europa has a complex surface with many potential hot spots.

"Whereas on Enceladus the geology makes it a little bit obvious where the activity has been, on Europa there's activity everywhere that could lead to plumes or could muddy the interpretation," Georgia Tech's Britney Schmidt said at Monday's news conference.

If any areas of the moon show particular promise in ground-based observations or during the upcoming flyby, a future mission could land on the surface and drill into the ice. But don't hold your breath for that subsurface dive. Scientists think Europa has about 60 miles of ice in its crust, compared to the half mile or so that we have to drill through to study subglacial lakes on Earth. It's going to take a lot of work to create a spacecraft that can survive Europa's radiation levels, land on an icy surface, operate at temperatures of minus-180 degrees Fahrenheit and tunnel down through the massive layer of solid ice before it even starts collecting data.

In the meantime, scientists are hopeful that the powerful James Webb Telescope, launching in 2018, will paint a better picture of Europa's possible plumes, pushing past the limits of Hubble's line of sight.

This post was originally published on September 26. It has been updated.

Read More:

More about Europa

Water bears' latest superpower: Proteins that protect them from radiation

Scientists finally figured out the source of this bizarre, glowing space 'blob

How scientists read an ancient and fragile biblical scroll without unrolling it

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AUSTIN — The "Texas campaign launch" for Evan McMullin, an independent presidential candidate who is not on the ballot — he must be written in — was held in the vintage room of a wine bar near the city's convention center. Badge-holders from the Texas Tribune Festival had trekked downtown, joining some intrigued local activists noshing on brie, crackers and falafel. As McMullin searched for parking, the omnipresent McMullin strategist Rick Wilson held court and took compliments from people who'd seen him on cable.

"Thank you for giving us a choice."

"Thank you for giving us something to vote for."

When McMullin arrived, the crowd of a few dozen people swarmed his way. After a few minutes of small talk, the candidate headed to the front of the room, where a TV cameraman had found good lighting. He was running for president because no one else wanted to pick up the banner of pragmatic conservatism, he said. Donald Trump, McMullin added confidently, had hijacked a Republican Party that had wanted and deserved better.

"The majority in opposition to Donald Trump stayed fragmented, and he gained momentum," McMullin said. "I was sitting in Congress then, and I watched members of Congress first say he was a joke. I watched with them as he gained steam. And I watched one by one as they caved — and I advised them not to do it. I said he posed a threat to our Constitution and our civil liberties. And they said, well, this is politics, and you've got to make compromises."

McMullin, the last-ditch candidate of the #NeverTrump movement, entered the race when it looked like those Republicans would be humiliated. After the Democratic National Convention, Trump trailed in every poll by margins that suggested a Hillary Clinton landslide. "Trump is weak," McMullin said in one of his first interviews. "Trump is a weak candidate and he is losing badly to one of the most unfit Democratic candidates to appear before the American people in quite some time."

Trump, who has rarely ignored the bait dangling in front of him, ignored McMullin — and stopped losing. New polls of Pennsylvania, where Democrats have counted on appalled suburban Republicans to back Clinton, show Trump capturing close to 90 percent of his adopted party's vote. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), who had been booed out of the Republican National Convention, used the Tribune festival to explain that he "was never #NeverTrump" and had decided to vote for him.

"I'm disappointed but not surprised," said Ben Howe, a writer for RedState who became a regular cable news guest for rejecting Trump. "I also think Reince [Priebus] wielding RNC support like a weapon to smash any dissent among those running for reelection in the next few years probably helped. It was a message to everyone that they are taking names."

It was the primary all over again, asymmetry growing between the accepted voices of conservatism and the Republican electorate. Most dramatically, Clinton's effort to showcase Republican endorsements, including newspapers that had never endorsed Democrats and the quiet support of George H.W. Bush, had made little impact on conservative voters. Each one fit snugly with the Trump campaign's narrative, of an unbought tycoon being opposed by the "establishment." Each angered the Democratic left, elements of which have proven more resistant to Clinton than a senator who was personally humiliated in the primaries was resistant to Trump.

The #NeverTrump movement did not count on this. On Sept. 10, during a McMullin meet-and-greet at publicist Juleanna Glover's D.C. mansion, Weekly Standard editor Bill Kristol (who had urged McMullin to run) confessed his surprise that the election was close. "I'm surprised she's not doing better," he said of Clinton. But #NeverTrump was confident that voters would reject Trump and look for decency.

"I'm amazed at how many former Bernie Sanders supporters come up to me and say, look, we know we don't agree with you on every issue, but we're going to be voting for you," said McMullin to two rooms full of reporters and political commentators. "I get emotional when I see our supporters confronting the bigotry, the misogyny, the intolerance of Trump."

At the Austin meet-and-greet two weeks later, with Clinton still ahead but even more narrowly, Kristol wondered how many protest voters could stay that way.

"I think if Hillary opens a big lead, it's better for Evan," Kristol said. "They can say, 'I'm voting my conscience but I'm not electing Trump.' Evan gets three or 4 or 5 percent in that scenario. If it's close, some of that goes away."

Trump's polling surge has been clarifying, separating anti-Trump voices into two camps. The first camp, exemplified by Cruz, opposed Trump not just as a populist interloper but as a surefire election loser. His recovery presented the chance of stopping Hillary Clinton and filling the empty Supreme Court seat that Republicans have put a wall around until after the election. The second camp, exemplified by McMullin, opposed Trump on moral grounds.

If it's close, the rationale of #NeverTrump — and all anti-Trump voters — will be challenged. In August, it looked as if Trump's political style could be discredited by a rout, the way that Barry Goldwater's defeat discredited opposition to the Civil Rights Act or that George McGovern's defeat discredited the New Left. McMullin was set to play a role in that, building a "new conservative movement" on the Trump rubble.

In a friendly interview with the Weekly Standard, McMullin strategist Joel Searby said that the tighter polls actually gave McMullin "a real chance to make a significant difference." But while McMullin gets attention from conservative media, he's running third among third-party candidates. Gary Johnson, the Libertarian whose social liberalism and unapologetic goofiness sent the #NeverTrump forces scrambling for an alternative, appears on every state ballot and draws real crowds. Just two hours after McMullin's Austin event ended, Johnson packed hundreds of voters into a rally at a Sixth Street concert venue. Another hundred voters waited in a line around the block, missing the speech but grabbing signs that they pasted around the city's most famous stretch.

Still, McMullin's conservatism is far better represented in media and politics than Johnson's libertarianism. That was proved Sunday, when McMullin closed out the festival with an hour-long public Q&A, then headed to a stately, vacant part of the local student union for an hour-long media roundtable. A supporter grabbed him first, asking whether he'd talked to the Koch brothers about coming off the fence to support him.

"We need to engage with them more," McMullin said. "There's just a difference between saying that you'll refuse to support Trump, and that you'll spend money against him."

When he sat down, McMullin was quizzed as if the election was a three-way or four-way contest — like he had as much a chance of anyone as being elected president. He criticized Hillary Clinton's State Department for the halfhearted adventurism that led to the Benghazi attacks, analyzed the root causes of terrorism, and pitched a long-term strategy for preventing Ebola-style outbreaks in Africa. "How about we realize the several million dollars, or dozens of millions of dollars, to improve the health systems there?"

John Davidson, a writer for the Federalist, prodded McMullin on the ways he could restore sanity to the political debate. "For a lot of people, **immigration**'s kind of a watchword for something else, and that is anxiety about the decline of their community," Davidson said. "This is particularly the white working class in the Rust Belt and Appalachia. What is your message to voters — and apparently, there are a lot more than we thought in this part of the country — who blame **immigration** for the loss of manufacturing jobs? They see **immigration** as an ongoing threat."

It was the sort of question Trump has repeatedly answered with table-banging promises to "build a wall" and browbeat manufacturers into sticking with the United States. McMullin did not bang his table.

"Their frustration is justified," McMullin said. "A lot of Americans have suffered under stagnant wages for decades. I think the Republican Party has ignored these people. Well, the Republican Party has become the party of big corporations. It's crony capitalism."

"So what would you do?" asked Davidson.

"Well, look at Germany," McMullin said. "They have these apprenticeship programs. I lose my job making coats in a factory in Mississippi, and that job isn't coming back. So maybe a high-tech firm — it makes LEDs, or whatever — is hiring, but I don't have the skills. So the government offers tax incentives if they hire me and train me."

It was not a Trumpian answer. It was closer to what Democrats, once dominant in Appalachia, now promise to do — to voters who could not care less. And in much of Appalachia, he would not appear on the ballot.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a 90-minute debate, you can cover only a fraction of what voters think is important. That means there were acres of unplowed issues Lester Holt did not touch upon in the first of three debate outings. Next week is the vice presidential debate, but looking ahead to the final two presidential debates (if Donald Trump shows up, which he might not do after his thrashing on Monday), there is plenty to discuss:

For Donald Trump:

Will you grant a path to citizenship for any illegal **immigrants** already here, and if so, which ones? Would you require them all to go home first? How will you deport the remaining ones?

The Pew Research Center poll recently reported: "**Immigration**, which in the 1980s and 1990s was the principal driver of Hispanic population growth, began to slow in the mid-2000s. And, in the case of Mexico, **immigration** has now reversed back toward Mexico since 2009." In fact, Asian Americans now surpass Hispanics in their average annual rate of (3.4 percent from 2007 to 2014). So why do you talk almost exclusively about Hispanics coming over the border with Mexico? Do you think Asian countries send "murderers and rapists" to the United States?

Pew separately reports, "During the first 10 months of fiscal year 2016, 46,635 Cubans have entered the U.S. via ports of entry -- already surpassing full fiscal year 2015's total of 43,159, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection data obtained through a public records request." Are you willing to end the special status afforded to Cuban refugees who come into the United States?

Explain how you will eliminate the debt without resorting to growth figures that would be historically unprecedented. Please be specific about how you cut taxes, leave entitlements alone and eliminate the debt.

Did you use donations to your foundation for non-charitable purposes? Where is evidence that you have given substantial amounts of charity in the last eight to 10 years? Please list the groups that received money from you.

If you rip up the Iran deal, what do you do next? What if Iran accelerates development of a nuclear weapon?

What is your position on the South China Sea?

Explain how "extreme vetting" would work and why terrorists wouldn't just lie. How would you identify people who don't "love" this country? What about people who think gay marriage is sinful? People who think "we don't win anymore"?

Is it bad thing or a good thing that Iranian-backed militias are fighting the Islamic State in Iraq?

How should we treat Turkey in the wake of the failed coup attempt? Would you turn over exiled cleric Fethullah Gulen, whom Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan blames for the coup?

Will you apologize to Judge Gonzalo Curiel or the Gold Star parents of Humayun Khan? Have you ever apologized to anyone in public?

For Hillary Clinton:

What did you do wrong in connection with Benghazi? In what way was our Libya policy flawed?

In retrospect, should the United States have negotiated a stay-behind force in Iraq of 10,000 to 15,000 troops, as the military requested? Is former defense secretary Leon Panetta right that the White House did not push for a deal?

What did the president do wrong in connection with the 2009 Green Revolution in Iran?

Why did the Clinton Foundation continue to take foreign and corporate donations after you became secretary of state? Did you ever think this would create the appearance of a conflict of interest? Why now are you contemplating changes to the foundation to avoid conflicts if you are elected president?

Whom did you mean to identify as "deplorable" among Trump supporters? Is someone who supports an unrepentant birther "deplorable"?

How can you contemplate expanding Social Security when we have a debt of more than $19 trillion? Was the 2011 Budget Control Act that gave us the sequester a mistake?

What would you say to the public that is dismayed by 15 years of war in which there has been no definitive victory?

What is the case for admitting Syrian refugees to the United States?

Why did you back away from support for charter schools?

Name some areas on which you and House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) could work together. Do you think a GOP House or Senate would ever accept a tax hike? If not, how do you pay for your spending items?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For all the differences between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during Monday night's debate (the groan! the shoulder shimmy!), perhaps the most stark was the willingness to get specific.

In the immediate post-debate analysis, observers concluded that Clinton had played the policy wonk, more comfortable discussing the specifics of her proposals than articulating broader rhetorical themes. "When it gets to policy, it can't just be three things," New York Times columnist David Brooks said on PBS. "It has to be 16 things, and [she] gets into laundry list mode."

Trump brought no laundry list. He repeated the central theme of his campaign — "I want to make America great again" — but demonstrated little command of facts and policies. Trump hadn't "given lots of thought to NATO" before running for president, struggled to take a clear position on whether the United States should modify its policy governing the use of nuclear weapons, and mocked Clinton for posting her proposal for defeating the Islamic State on her website. "I don't think General Douglas MacArthur would like that too much," he said.

As Perry Bacon Jr. of NBC News observed, Trump "has released far fewer detailed policy proposals [than Clinton] and speaks more in generalities about his vision for governing."

Clinton and Trump were playing to type. In our new book, "Asymmetric Politics: Ideological Republicans and Group Interest Democrats," we show that Democratic candidates run by appealing to group identities, emphasizing policy specifics and promoting a pragmatic approach to governing. Republicans, on the other hand, rely on broad ideological themes and vow to stick to their principles rather than compromising with the opposition.

These differences grow from two very different approaches to politics.

Democrats emphasize policies for groups; Republicans emphasize principles

The groups that make up the Democratic coalition view the party as standing up for their particular political interests. They pressure Democratic candidates to commit themselves to specific issue positions that will further these interests. They prefer pragmatic governance that delivers concrete progress on this policy agenda.

And Democratic politicians respond. They sell themselves to voters with detailed policy proposals and by explicitly invoking the social groups they are vying to represent, as Hillary Clinton did during the 2016 primaries. She even characterized her primary opponent Sen. Bernie Sanders as a "single-issue candidate" because of his focus on regulating Wall Street and changing the campaign finance system. And it worked: Clinton's strong support from key Democratic groups — particularly women and racial minorities — helped her hold off Sanders's challenge.

The group focus of the Democrats was on display at the party's convention this summer. Speakers represented African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, gays and lesbians, transgender people, Muslims, millennial-generation voters, and people with disabilities.

Republican candidates, in contrast, rarely make appeals to specific groups a centerpiece of their campaigns. Instead, they emphasize broad, symbolic themes, with an eye toward mobilizing voters based on ideological predispositions.

Consider the figure below. It shows the frequency with which Republican and Democratic candidates in primary debates from 1999 through 2012 mentioned particular themes. Republicans are more likely than Democrats to use the language of ideology, principle and American imagery (such as the flag, national virtues or threats to the American way of life) in primary debates. Democrats cite specific demographic and interest groups.

In general election debates, these differences become more muted, in part because both candidates are appealing to the same set of voters. But, as the figure below shows, Democrats remain more likely to invoke group identities and mention policy specifics, as Clinton did Monday. Republicans remain somewhat more likely to cite ideological principles and values.

How Trump is — and is not — a typical Republican

Which brings us back to Trump.

While the New York businessman has diverged from the typical Republican playbook — spending little time warning against big government or extolling the virtues of individual liberty, for instance — he has in many ways adopted the standard GOP approach. His campaign is built around a broad theme of American nationalism applied to **immigration**, foreign policy, international trade agreements, terrorism and culture.

Trump won the Republican presidential primaries by running to the ideological right of his opponents on his signature topic of **immigration**. He was the Republican candidates' most outspoken critic of President Obama, who many conservatives believe isn't patriotic enough and is too soft on terrorism.

Trump's aggressive affect, his hyperbolic rhetoric ("We don't have a country anymore!"), and his disdain for incremental change — all on display during the debate last night — contrast sharply with Clinton's more pragmatic and policy-oriented style.

But while many commentators see these differences as merely reflecting Clinton and Trump's distinct personalities, experiences and philosophies, it's more accurate to view the two candidates as personifying a more enduring difference between the parties they were chosen to lead.

Matt Grossmann  is director of the   Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  and associate professor of political science at Michigan State University. Find him on Twitter @mattgrossmann.

David A. Hopkins  is assistant professor of political science at Boston College and blogs about U.S. politics at  Honest Graft .

Together they are the authors of " Asymmetric Politics : Ideological Republicans and Group Interest Democrats," recently published by Oxford University Press.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The conversation — or argument — we've been having on **immigration** has been remarkably skewed. It's been all about the estimated 11 million illegal **immigrants**, otherwise known as the "undocumented." Actually, what counts far more are the estimated 31 million **immigrants** who are here legally and the roughly 1 million who gain legal entry every year.

Of course, the question of undocumented **immigrants** is important. As a society, it's intolerable to have so many people living in a legal twilight zone, often despite years of responsible and law-abiding behavior (two-thirds of illegal **immigrants** have been in the United States for 10 years or more, reports the Pew Research Center). Still, one powerful reason for settling this issue — to legalize most of those already here and to suppress new illegal flows, even with a wall — is to move on to larger subjects.

We need an **immigration** system that gives priority to skilled over unskilled workers, rather than today's policy that favors family preferences for green cards. This sort of system would promote assimilation (because skilled workers have an easier time integrating into the workforce and society), increase economic growth (because skilled workers have higher "value added" than unskilled labor) and reduce poverty (because many unskilled **immigrants** have incomes below the government's poverty line).

Although we can't easily quantify these benefits, they would promote the greater good for an aging society with a sputtering economy. Anyone who doubts **immigration**'s pervasive influence should examine a massive report issued last week by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. It's titled "The Economic and Fiscal Consequences of **Immigration**." Here are some highlights.

● **Immigration** is no longer a side issue. From 1995 to 2014, the number of **immigrants** increased from 24.5 million (9 percent of the population) to 42.3 million (13 percent). When the children of **immigrants** are added to the total, nearly 1 in 4 Americans is of **immigrant** stock. **Immigrants** are increasingly shifting from traditional "gateway" states (California, New York, Florida) into nontraditional states (North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee and Nevada).

● The number of illegal **immigrants** has stabilized at about 11 million since 2009. The number of Mexicans illegally in the United States declined from 6.4 million in 2009 to 5.8 million in 2014. Others have taken their place. All these figures represent "net changes" — illegal **immigrants** entering the United States minus those leaving. Although these flows now roughly balance, they're still huge, averaging about 300,000 to 400,000 annually.

● Poor **immigrants** — heavily from Latin America — have increased U.S. poverty. In 2011, the poverty rate (the share of the people below the government's poverty line) was 35 percent for Mexican **immigrants** and their children and 22 percent for El Salvadoran **immigrants**; by contrast, the poverty rate was 11.1 percent for Korean **immigrants** and their children and 6.2 percent for Indian **immigrants**. The poverty rate for all native-born Americans was 13.5 percent.

● **Immigrants** and their children impose costs on government, mainly for local schooling, which the Supreme Court has decreed must be provided for all **immigrant** children. By contrast, Congress has barred even legal **immigrants** from receiving some federal benefits. In 2013, the study estimated, **immigrants**' costs to government exceeded their taxes by $388 billion, slightly more than 2 percent of gross domestic product.

What justifies **immigration** if it generates more in government costs than in taxes? The answer is that the benefits of **immigration** can — and, in this case, do — go beyond taxes. By one estimate, **immigrants** (including their entrepreneurial activity) have increased the size of the U.S. economy by 11 percent or about $2 trillion. With baby boomers retiring, all the projected growth in the U.S. labor force from 2020 to 2030 stems from **immigrants** and their children, the study reported.

The gains from **immigration** would be magnified if we emphasize high-skilled workers. Productivity would be higher, poverty lower. Interestingly, this also would help low-skilled Americans, both natives and recent **immigrants**. They wouldn't have to compete against new low-skilled **immigrants**, who would vie for their jobs and depress wages.

Whether we have the political competence and courage to face these issues candidly is an open question. The study deliberately steered away from policy prescriptions; it was mainly a fact-finding exercise, reflecting (presumably) the subject's controversial nature.

The presidential campaign offers little ground for optimism. Donald Trump has used **immigration** as a wedge issue and shows little understanding of the underlying substance. Hillary Clinton seems intent on placating her Hispanic supporters, many of whom surely support family preferences for **immigrating**legally to the United States.

But the underlying realities will not retreat no matter how much we wish they would. If we cannot maneuver **immigration** to our advantage, it will almost certainly work to our disadvantage.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The presidential debate tonight is Donald Trump's best, and maybe last, chance to change the trajectory of the race in his favor. Despite a ludicrous amount of hubbub over Hillary Clinton's pneumonia and "diving" poll numbers the last couple of weeks did not change the fundamentals of the race: Clinton, already with an advantage in the electoral college, enjoys a low single-digit lead nationally and a comfortable position in critical states like New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and Michigan. She can win without Ohio or Florida. Her overwhelming advantage among minority voters and her ability to pick up white college-educated voters disgusted with Donald Trump suggest she is in a somewhat stronger position than was President Obama at a similar point in the race.

The pre-debate jostling did not augur well for Trump. Learning that businessman and surrogate Mark Cuban would be attending and sitting in the first row of the debate, Trump lashed out, threatening on Twitter to invite Gennifer Flowers, with whom Bill Clinton had an affair decades ago. It was a crude, un-presidential move, only serving to remind voters of Trump's temperament and make Clinton seem sympathetic. Trump had to quickly retreat. He sent his surrogates VP nominee Gov. Mike Pence and campaign chief Kellyanne Conway to clean up the mess, explaining on Sunday that Flowers was not asked and  wouldn't be at the debate. Yes, Clinton baited him all right; Trump got mad, made an idle threat and slunk away.  As Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta on Meet the Press put it: "[Y]ou saw his reaction, which is to do his favorite sport, which is to dive in the sewer and go for a swim."

Plainly this was a gaffe, not brilliant strategy on his part. The Post reported: "Donald Trump's threat to seat Gennifer Flowers, who had an extramarital affair with Bill Clinton, in the front row at Monday night's presidential debate focuses new attention to Trump's own history of infidelity and could further weaken his support among female voters." If he plunges into the sewer during the debate Trump almost surely will seal his own fate.

It would be a mistake, however, for Clinton to simply try to bait Trump or to play "not to lose" tonight. Her biggest problem lies in the perception that she is a creature of the status quo, too conventional to bring about change most voters want. Her most difficult question won't be about the emails. (She should apologize, point out Trump never does and then move on.) It will be: What will you change?

She might be inclined to rattle off a list of her policy ideas. A hundred million (or whatever) sets of eyeballs would glaze over before she got through explaining her debt-free college plan. Instead, she would do well to stick to two big ideas.

First, she has to present herself as the healer, the person who gets along well enough with both sides to be the conciliator in chief. That's the tagline for her campaign -- Stronger Together.  Whether it is police shootings and ensuing riots or getting a budget through Congress or resolving the **immigration** issue, she will need to be what Trump (and to many voters, Obama) is not: The only candidate to help change the mood in the country and the tone in Washington, D.C. Given her good relationships with Republicans like Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and experience in the Senate she has a good argument that she is better able to ease gridlock and find common ground. Rather than deny her Wall Street ties she should tout her relationships there but also point to her deep ties to labor and to minority communities. She can appeal to the public's sense that they are tired of being angry and frustrated at how little gets done inside the Beltway. That attitudinal change -- whether in Charlotte, N.C., or the Capitol -- has to take place so that we can begin to address a whole range of problems.

Second, there is a good argument to be made that we need more than expansion of GDP and job creation to get out of our economic rut. The underlying problem is a mismatch between worker skills and the demands of the 21st-century economy. Clinton has to figure out how to tie her myriad mind-numbing policies together in a single overarching goal of investing in human capital. It is no longer true that a rising tide lifts all boats. Whether they are urban minorities or poor rural whites they lack the skill set and the support structure to get a paddle, let alone a boat. And for the middle-class worker whose wages have stagnated, more is going to be needed than corporate tax reform.

The Wall Street Journal reported:

One of the labor market's biggest mysteries just got deeper: The number of job openings available at the end of July climbed to a new record of 5.9 million. Yet the number of people actually being hired into one of those jobs was 5.2 million for the second month in a row. . . . The number of job openings for professional and business services and for health and education services have reached substantial new highs in recent years. The number of job openings in manufacturing and construction, by contrast, remain below their levels of a decade ago. This lends some support to the idea that openings are going unfilled because workers don't have the right skills.

For manufacturing jobs we see a dramatic example of the gap between worker skills and employer needs. ("Factory work has evolved over the past 15 years or so as companies have invested in advanced machinery requiring new skill sets. Many workers who were laid off in recent decades — as technology, globalization and recession wiped out lower-skilled jobs — don't have the skills to do today's jobs. The mismatch poses a problem for the economy, often limiting the ability of businesses to increase production which weighs down on growth.")

Increasing both labor participation and labor know-how are key to worker productivity (through job training, apprenticeships, technical training schools) and to upward mobility (giving those at the bottom the tools and boost to get on the up escalator). Trump operates like a left-winger in a zero-sum world where if you get rich, I get poor. (His anti-growth **immigration** and trade plans are precisely the wrong idea, and quite likely would set us skidding back to recession if he ever got them passed.)

Clinton needs to flip that and explain that by investing in education, enlisting an army of mentors for at-risk youth and encouraging work (e.g., expanding the earned-income tax credit) we help others but also contribute to our own prosperity and well-being. Not all of this can be done by the federal government (although she'll want more to be done by the feds than Republicans do), but we do need a president who will cajole state and local government, private-sector chief executives and charitable groups to attend to the deficit in human capital.

If Clinton is smart she will argue that Trump isn't the status quo candidate, but worse -- the back-to-the-future candidate trying to run from modern realities. "There is no turning back," writes Alan S. Blinder. "Our choice is clear: We can get out front by using the latest technologies to our advantage (the American way since the 1790s), or we can hunker down shouting 'America First' while other nations grab the lead. Slogans like 'Back to the 1950s' and 'Make America Great Again' are defeatist—and we haven't even lost. They are also recipes for failure going forward."

"We're all in this together" is a nice sentiment, but Clinton will need to convince viewers that the only way we succeed in the 21st century -- as it is and not as we remember our childhood -- is by traversing the gap between battling political and social factions and by investing in current and future workers. As Blinder says, "The wrong way to deal with globalization is the Trump way: close the borders, renege on trade agreements, erect tariff barriers and try to get back to the 1950s—a time when U.S. manufacturing dominated a world still recovering from World War II, when foreign competition could be ignored and when information traveled at a fraction of today's speeds. Wrong way again, Donald." If she can communicate that to debate watchers she will, we think, come across as more knowledgeable and empathetic (hard not to) than her opponent, but also as someone not content with the status quo.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Sunday evening, Donald Trump summarized his case for the presidency in the format of a series of cable channel chyrons.

Five people killed in Washington State by a Middle Eastern **immigrant**. Many people died this weekend in Ohio from drug overdoses. N.C. riots!

Quite pointedly, Trump noted that the suspect in the shooting at a mall in Washington state over the weekend had **immigrated** from Turkey. Trump didn't say "Turkey" or "from Turkey," opting instead to use more characters to link Arcan Cetin broadly to the Middle East. The rhetorical point: **Immigrants** from the Middle East are dangerous.

What struck me when I saw that tweet is the reaction that Trump offered when I spoke with him on the day of the Umpqua Community College shooting in Oregon in October. At that point, Trump told me that the incident sounded "like another mental health problem." That was before much was known about the shooter, but he reiterated the argument that weekend on NBC's "Meet the Press."

"Guns, no guns, doesn't matter," Trump told host Chuck Todd. "You have people that are mentally ill, and they're going to come through the cracks, and they're going to do things that people will not even believe are possible."

On ABC's "This Week," Trump told host George Stephanopoulos that "no matter how you cut it, you have people who are mentally ill, and they have problems, and they're going to slip through the cracks. No matter how you do it, no matter how you try — and if you go back 2,000 years, and if you go forward 2 million years — you're going to have problems."

A month later, he used the same argument after Robert Louis Dear allegedly shot and killed three people at a Planned Parenthood in Colorado.

"I think he's a sick person," Trump said, "and I think he was probably a person ready to go. We don't even know the purpose. I mean, he hasn't come out, to the best of my knowledge, with a statement as to why it happened to be at that location." When it was pointed out that Dear had mentioned "baby parts" during the shooting spree, Trump said that "there is a tremendous group of people that think it's terrible, all of the videos that they've seen with some of these people from Planned Parenthood talking about it like you're selling parts to a car ... there are a lot of people that are very unhappy about that."

In July, Micah Johnson shot and killed 12 police officers in Dallas. The next day, Trump posted a statement on Facebook. It began: "Last night's horrific execution-style shootings of 12 Dallas law enforcement officers — five of whom were killed and seven wounded -- is an attack on our country. It is a coordinated, premeditated assault on the men and women who keep us safe."

The evening of the shootings in Oregon, Trump also tweeted about the attack. He didn't mention the background of the shooter, or loop him into overall crime statistics.

Over the course of an hour the day after the shooting at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Trump tweeted twice, extending the sympathies contained in the tweet above just a bit.

Had the shooter in Washington this weekend not been an **immigrant**, it's safe to assume that he probably wouldn't have been included in Trump's tweet.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Health care, foreign policy and Social Security are on people's minds ahead of tonight's Great Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, according to Microsoft's Bing search engine, which is the Seattle software giant's answer to Google.

Other nuggets that Bing shared with The Post: Both men and women search for Trump more often that they search for Clinton. Clinton's health and whether she had a "body double" were hot topics.  People wanted to know about Trump's encounter with a "nervous mess" of a pastor and whether he was, get this, on the ballot in Minnesota. Go figure. Melania Trump's **immigration** status and Facebook co-founder Dustin Moskovitz's $20 million pledge to beat Trump also took center stage.

John Johnson, an MIT Ph.D. who crunches data for a living, cautioned that examining searches may not tell you who is voting and why, or whether they are actually going to vote for a candidate.

"Although the data can't tell the whole story, it does imply the media narratives may not reflect what voters really care about," Johnson said. "That said, it is just interesting which headlines people are searching the most. You don't see major policy stories among the top, but the more sensational stories about Clinton body doubles and Trump's reaction to a pastor.

People are boning up on the candidates ahead of their first debate. On Sunday, New Hampshire was the only state where Clinton was searched more than Trump, according to Bing. By Sunday night, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa, Arkansas, Kentucky, West Virginia and New Hampshire are all searching Clinton more than Trump.

Trump had been the top searched topic of all 50 states for more than a week, and then a day before the debate Clinton searches pulled ahead of Trump searches in several states.

On the policy front, picking up after Social Security, gun control was fourth-most searched topic on people's minds, drug policy was fifth and **immigration**reform -- remember the Great Wall? -- came in sixth.

This isn't a poll, but it is telling for a couple of reasons. We are talking about billions of anonymous search queries between Aug. 22 and Sept. 22 that were classified into policy issues.

Bing's product manager, Shahar Ronen, said in an email that "search queries provide more honest insights into what really interests people. Social media users may be preoccupied with projecting a certain public image of themselves, whereas searchers are looking for information in private."

In other words, Bing's searches may be unmasking the fact that there are lots of people who are seriously considering Trump or Clinton, but won't admit it to their friends.

Another thing: Bing Predicts, which calls everything from NFL games to "Dancing with the Stars," said that if the vote were held today, Clinton has a 68.9 percent chance to win in November, and would capture 308 electoral votes to Trump's 230. But that has been tightening. Last week, Clinton's chances were pushing 80 percent.

Rounding out the rest of the most-searched policy issues are the environment, LGBT rights, education, tax reform and, coming in at number 11, abortion.

Bing also separated the search topics to find out the specific subjects pertaining to the candidates that people were examining. Here they are:

1. Donald Trump almost missed getting on the ballot in Minnesota

2. Teresa Barnwell, Hillary Clinton's 'body double,' debunks rumors

3. Donald Trump: Pastor who stopped me talking was 'nervous mess'

4. Facebook co-founder pledging $20 million to defeat Trump

5. Melania Trump releases letter from lawyer on **immigration** status

6. Pneumonia bug that struck Clinton also seriously sickened her staff

7. Don King uses racial epithet while introducing Donald Trump

8. Clinton cancels California trip as she recovers from health episode

9. Hacker 'Guccifer 2.0′ releases more DNC docs in new leak

10. Skittles issues terse response to Donald Trump Jr. refugee tweet

11. George H.W. Bush 'voting for Hillary'

12. Hillary Clinton returns to campaign trail after illness

13. Gary Johnson wants to eliminate the Department of Homeland Security

14. Local Democrats want Donald Trump, Mike Pence off Minn. ballot

15. Fact checking Wednesday's 'commander-in-chief' forum

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Monday, NASA is set to reveal evidence of "surprising activity" on Jupiter's moon Europa. The space agency teased the event last week, much to the chagrin of science journalists everywhere who are planning to cover the news, whatever it is. NASA has a bad habit of starting rumors about big discoveries, always leading to much online buzz and speculation, but the press conferences never turn out to be about aliens:

Monday, we'll announce new findings from Jupiter's moon Europa. Spoiler alert: NOT aliens: https://t.co/89qj23DM6Y[https://t.co/89qj23DM6Y] pic.twitter.com/d7cSuBBXZz

(I mean, really: If NASA officials were sitting on findings that huge, they would either keep that secret on lock while they confirmed all their data or shout it from the rooftops immediately. You don't tease about aliens.)

We'll have the new Europa news up on Speaking of Science ASAP after Monday's press conference, which is set to start at 2 p.m. Eastern. But in the meantime, we'll follow up that bitter "sorry, no aliens" shot with a delicious chaser: Here are all the fascinating things we already know about Europa that make it one of our favorite moons, and some ideas about what today's findings might reveal.

We already know that Europa has an ocean, which is as cool as it sounds.

Including Earth, there are at least five likely ocean worlds in the solar system. Only Earth and Titan are known to hold liquid on the surface. But Europa is a very respectable subsurface ocean world. Below its icy crust, an ocean covers the entire moon, kept liquid by friction from Jupiter's massive gravitational pull. It may hold more water than all of Earth's oceans combined.

That's why some scientists hold out hope for finding **alien** life on Europa: It's not like we expect to find life everywhere we find water, but it's an excellent place to start.

We know it could maybe, possibly support life.

While scientists have yet to find any direct evidence of microbial life in Europa's watery depths — let alone signs of an intrepid space squid civilization — there are indications that the moon's ocean might be able to support some kind of Earth-like life.

Unlike Titan's fancy-pants surface ocean (which is made of super-cold liquid methane), Europa's underground sea is thought to contain actual water — liquid H2O. And some studies suggest that the ocean might be able to produce the right kinds of minerals to support life as we know it, even if the moon doesn't have any volcanic activity (more on that in a minute).

We know that strange microbial life can thrive in the frigid subglacial lakes of our own planet's polar regions, so there's reason to hope that some kind of microbes might have evolved on Europa as well. We can assume that NASA's assurance that Monday's news doesn't involve **alien** life extends to the microbial level, because astrobiologists don't discriminate against single-celled beasties. But it's possible that scientists have found evidence for some of the geological activities or molecules associated with life in deep, dark thermal ocean vents.

We hope there are some mysterious plumes at play.

In 2012, the Hubble spotted water vapor above Europa's surface. Scientists determined the most likely culprit to be a plume of water vapor spurting out of Europa's south pole. The plume would have been big, shooting out 20 times as high as Mt. Everest. But no plumes have been spotted since.

That was a big disappointment, because the volcanic activity that could produce giant geyser plumes would also help support life in the ocean depths by creating warmth and powering certain chemical reactions. Plus plumes make it easier to study ocean chemistry. The moon Enceladus — an icy ocean world orbiting Saturn — releases smaller geyser plumes with aplomb. NASA's Cassini orbiter was recently able to go diving through those frequent plumes to analyze the moon's chemistry, looking for signs of habitability.

But for now, Europa's own plume activity remains unconfirmed. Was the water vapor produced by some other phenomenon we haven't thought of yet? Was it indeed a plume, but just a one-off spurt caused by an unseen impact? Or does Europa experience plumes that are more episodic than Enceladus's, perhaps dictated by the incredibly strong gravitational forces of its host planet Jupiter?

So even if Monday's news isn't a first — even if the big reveal is that scientists spotted a water plume again — geyser activity on Europa could still be a pretty exciting prospect.

We're going to visit very soon.

NASA has set a 2022 launch date for a mission to Europa, so we'll be visiting the moon relatively soon even if Monday's announcement turns out to be a dud.

Europa is bathed in too much radiation from Jupiter's seething magnetic field for a spacecraft to orbit the icy moon. Instead, the mission will orbit Jupiter and occasionally swing around Europa for a quick flyby. The spacecraft will take pictures and use remote probing instruments to try to determine Europa's habitability.

If any areas of the moon show particular promise, a future mission could land on the surface and drill into the ice. But don't hold your breath for that subsurface dive. Scientists think Europa has about 60 miles of ice in its crust, compared to the half mile or so that we have to drill through to study subglacial lakes on Earth. It's going to take a lot of work to create a spacecraft that can survive Europa's radiation levels, land on an icy surface, operate at temperatures of -180 degrees Fahrenheit and tunnel down into 60 miles of solid ice before it even starts collecting data.

But if scientists have found something truly exciting in the new Hubble images being discussed on Monday, perhaps the agency will be motivated to attempt a landing there sometime soon.

Read More:

Looking for aliens on ocean worlds: 'You'd be in denial to believe there isn't life out there'

Water bears' latest superpower: Proteins that protect them from radiation

How scientists read an ancient and fragile biblical scroll without unrolling it

Study: Maybe we can't find aliens because they've all died already

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The coyote looked over the motley huddle of migrants assembled on the banks of the Rio Grande. It was nighttime, and the group was about to attempt a crossing on flimsy rafts.

" If any of you are Christians," he announced, "now's the time to pray."

Perhaps the comment was intended as sardonic, but to Mariela, an evangelical Christian among the group, it was an invitation. A 29-year-old Honduran, the survivor of a brutal rape at the hands of a drug trafficker and years of abuse by a vicious husband, Mariela had made the harrowing journey northward with her two sons, ages 4 and 7. She asked the group to join hands in a prayer circle. As she prayed, she looked up and noticed a gorgeous moon overhead. A week later, on the other side of the border, exhausted, traumatized, but alive, Mariela told me about the moon. When she saw it, she knew that God was protecting her and her boys.

Last month, I heard dozens of stories of women like Mariela, stories of unspeakable violence and perilous escape. I was volunteering with a pro bono legal team that assists women who have fled Central America and are requesting asylum in the United States. The women — all of them mothers with children — are in a family detention facility in south Texas. They are fleeing conditions of violence that have pushed homicide rates in Central America to the highest in the world. Gangs and drug traffickers have turned neighborhoods into war zones. Homes are another theater of brutality: Violence against women is rampant and goes unpunished by complacent authorities. But what I also learned is that many of the refugee mothers are devout evangelicals. Donald Trump's proposal to vet **immigrants** based on religion and values has animated many supporters, including the Christian right. But in Trump's America, on which side of the wall do these refugee mothers belong?

The prevalence of evangelicals such as Mariela among Central American refugees reflects the explosion of evangelical Protestantism in historically Catholic Latin America in recent decades. The three countries currently hemorrhaging refugees — El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras — are also home to the highest proportions of Protestants in the region. According to a 2014 Pew Research Center study, 41 percent of Hondurans, 41 percent of Guatemalans, and 36 percent of Salvadorans identify as Protestant. Theirs is not a casual faith. Between two-thirds and three-quarters of Protestants in these countries say religion is "very important in their lives," that they pray daily and attend church weekly. Most identify as evangelicals or Pentecostals. In contrast, about a quarter of the population of the United States identifies as evangelical Protestant.

It is not surprising, then, that many of the Central Americans at the detention center were devout evangelicals. When I asked a Guatemalan mother who had walked the entire length of Mexico with her 9-year-old daughter how she had known where to go, she smiled at my naiveté. God had guided her, she told me. A Honduran mother who witnessed two men shot to death while shopping with her toddler could express only gratitude that God had blinded the perpetrators to their presence in the store (witnessing gang crimes is frequently a death sentence). After the rape, Mariela recounted, she had found God, and her evangelical brothers and sisters had helped her overcome depression. Recently, however, the drug trafficker had resurfaced and threatened to kill her. And so Mariela found herself on the banks of the river, in a prayer circle with her two sons, under a brilliant moon.

Trump has suggested that **immigrants** be subjected to ideological tests to determine whether they "share our values." It is a supreme irony of the refugee crisis that as deeply religious evangelicals, many Central American asylum seekers probably share values that are closer to those of Trump's evangelical supporters than are those of Trump himself.

The anti-**immigrant** right has cast politics as a battle between us and them, Americans and foreigners, the righteous and the criminal. Family detention provides a glimpse of who is actually crossing the border. Rather than the "rapists and murderers" of Trump's now infamous characterization, they are frequently the desperate victims of such crimes. They are fiercely protective mothers, devout evangelicals, as well as employees and petty entrepreneurs, neighbors, civic organizers and many other things. The tragic folly of the wall lies not in the fact that it won't work but in the extent to which it will, keeping out people whom most Americans would probably welcome into their churches, schools, workplaces and communities.

When I asked Mariela if she was nervous about her upcoming interview with an asylum official, she shook her head. God knows I wouldn't be here if I didn't need to be, and I put myself in his hands. When I told her that in the United States some religious conservatives want to keep out refugees like her, she was unperturbed. I will pray for them, she said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(Here is the latest edition of the Institute for Justice's weekly Short Circuit newsletter, written by John Ross.)

If David Adier had hung an American flag outside his hair salon, he'd be in the clear. But since he instead put up a flag promoting his business, Hoboken, N.J. officials have taken him to court, seeking to collect $40,000 for violating the city's sign code. Which is entirely unconstitutional, says Erica Smith of the Institute for Justice, in light of the Supreme Court's decision in Reed v. Town of Gilbert last year. Read more here.

Last week, Robert Everett Johnson joined us on the podcast to talk Chevron deference and a pair of Second Amendment cases. Click here to listen.

\* In 2013, a West, Texas fertilizer storage facility exploded, killing 15 and leveling part of town. The facility had been exempt from OSHA's hazardous-chemical regulations because it was classified as a retail operation. OSHA: Well, no more. We're rewriting the exemption. D.C. Circuit: Not without giving notice to the public and allowing for comments.

\* In 2006, the Second Circuit ruled that New York state corrections officials' practice of adding post-release conditions to convicts' sentences without a judge's say-so was unconstitutional. Policymakers ignored the decision for nearly two years. Second Circuit: And three of them can be held personally liable for that.

\* Second Circuit: To comply with Chinese export controls, Chinese manufacturers of Vitamin C supplements must violate U.S. prohibition on price fixing. At least that's what the Chinese gov't says, and we defer to them. So no need for the manufacturers to pay the $147 million awarded to their U.S. customers.

\* Prior to the start of public meetings, Rowan County, N.C. legislators invite attendees to stand and bow their heads for, on the vast majority of occasions, a Christian prayer. Which does not violate the Establishment Clause, says two-thirds of a Fourth Circuit panel.

\* Nonprofit posts files online that allow people to print gun components using 3D printers. State Dep't: Foreigners can access the files, so the nonprofit is "exporting" weapons, which is illegal without our permission. Nonprofit: May we have permission? State Dep't: No. Fifth Circuit (over a dissent): No need to allow the nonprofit to post the files while their constitutional claims go to trial. (In the meantime, they are still available on third-party sites, including The Pirate Bay.)

\* On wiretap, FBI agent overhears gang leader order murder. Police find the target in Avondale, La. within an hour. Yikes! He has contraband on him. Suppress the evidence? District court: Yes. Fifth Circuit: No.

\* Convicted murderer orders copy of victim's death certificate -- for use in appeal, he says. Pontiac, Ill. corrections officers confiscate it. Seventh Circuit: Officials presented no evidence he instead wanted it as a trophy, and it's clearly established that officials cannot withhold inmates' mail without a solid reason, so no qualified immunity.

\* Man accosts three hijab-wearing women on the street. He departs, but not before a bystander calls police. Police find man; put him in joint lock, handcuffs, and squad car; and then book him for disorderly conduct. Wait a tick! Minnesota law requires officers to have personally witnessed a misdemeanor if they're going to arrest (sans warrant). City: The officers didn't arrest him; the bystander did, by virtue of filling out a citizen's arrest form that police provided. Eighth Circuit: Qualified immunity.

\* Dakota County, Minn. officials charge prisoners $25 per day, pursue former inmate seeking to have his $3,504.77 debt discharged in bankruptcy court. Eighth Circuit: The debt is not so much a penalty for wrongdoing as it is a fee meant to allow the county to recoup some of its costs. So the former inmate need not pay.

\* **Immigrant** advocates file class action in district court arguing **immigration** judges' inability to appoint counsel for children facing deportation is a due-process violation. Ninth Circuit: It might be, but the class action is a no-go. Individuals must wait until they've lost in **immigration** court and then appeal directly to us. Judge McKeown, concurring in her own majority opinion: The lack of representation is a crisis, and the other branches can and should fix it.

\* If the primary purpose of San Clemente, Calif. border-patrol checkpoint is to enforce **immigration** laws, then officers do not need individualized suspicion to detain motorists. But if, as plaintiff argues, its primary purpose is to enforce drug (and other non-**immigration**) laws, the checkpoint violates the Fourth Amendment, and the meth found in his vehicle should be suppressed. Ninth Circuit: The district court erred in not permitting discovery on this point.

\* Tustin, Calif. police order man to lie down. He declines, continues to walk away. Police order him to remove a hand from his pocket. As he complies, an officer shoots him twice, killing him. He was unarmed. Ninth Circuit: No qualified immunity.

\* Permanent resident from Moldova declines police order to stop his vehicle. Which is a crime of violence, says the gov't, so we're deporting him once he's finished his five-year sentence. Tenth Circuit: The definition of "crime of violence" is unconstitutionally vague.

\* And in en banc news, the Ninth Circuit will reconsider its denial of qualified immunity to San Diego officers who unleashed a police dog into a dark office after work hours where it bit a sleeping worker who had unknowingly triggered an alarm.

Missouri requires African-style hair braiders to spend thousands of dollars and 1,500 hours learning cosmetology techniques that are entirely irrelevant to braiding. This week, a federal district court upheld the law, even though the state provided no evidence that it safeguards the public in any way. Indeed, the court held that the government did not need such evidence to win; mere speculation that the law advances some salutary purpose renders it constitutional under the rational-basis test. To the Eighth Circuit! Learn more here.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — German state-funded broadcaster Deutsche Welle has filed a lawsuit against the Turkish Ministry of Youth and Sports in a development that could have wider implications for relations between the two countries.

DW announced Monday that it had taken the decision after a videotaped interview it conducted with Turkish Sports Minister Akif Cagatay Kilic on Sept. 5 was allegedly confiscated by Turkish authorities the same day. Turkey first denied those allegations. But DW stuck to its claims and gave the ministry repeated deadlines to hand over the material before it took legal steps Monday.

According to DW, its host discussed issues, such as the recent coup attempt, "press freedom and the status of women." Turkish officials insisted that the footage should not be aired, before confiscating the tapes, the German channel said. Although it is funded by the German government, the channel perceives itself as being focused on fostering press freedom and mainly operates abroad.

"We advocate unrestricted press freedom. Turkey is closely connected to Europe. Along with that comes respect for democratic fundamental principles," the DW board's chairman, Karl Jüsten, was quoted as saying Monday. "It is deeply troubling that Deutsche Welle has been forced to file suit in court for the return of the video interview with the Turkish minister."

DW host Michel Friedman who conducted the interview is known in Germany as a provocative on-air journalist, but the channel says it had discussed the topics of the interview with the ministry in advance.

The German government has backed the efforts undertaken by its international broadcaster to get back its footage. "Press freedom is a great and nonnegotiable value for us," said government spokesman Steffen Seibert.

Relations among Turkey and European countries, including Germany, are increasingly strained. Turkey complains that Europe has not made a significant effort to condemn the July coup attempt, and has protested being tasked with absorbing Syrian refugees without being granted the concessions it had hoped for from the European Union. A deal struck earlier this year required Turkey to take back refugees who had risked the journey to Europe and fled through Turkey to countries, such as Greece. In return, the European Union originally agreed to Turkey's demand to grant its citizens visa-free travel in Europe. That promise is yet to be fulfilled.

Germany is a particular case, nonetheless: About 3 million Turkish **immigrants** live in the country. Half hold Turkish citizenship and are allowed to vote in Turkish elections. Turkish citizens living in Germany voted overwhelmingly for President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's Justice and Development (AKP) party in elections last year.

The importance of Erdogan's AKP to Turkish **immigrants** living in Germany has worried politicians in Europe's economic powerhouse. German authorities have noticed a rise in violent clashes between Turkish AKP supporters living in Germany and Kurdish **immigrants** or members of the Gulen movement — tensions that have mainly spilled over from Turkey, officials said. Erdogan has publicly accused the Gulen movement (named after self-exiled, U.S.-based cleric Fethullah Gulen) of organizing the July coup attempt and has arrested thousands of its alleged members in Turkey.

Turkish citizens started arriving in Germany as "guest workers" at the beginning of the 1960s. Originally invited with the goal of filling job vacancies, many of them never returned to their country of origin.

Tensions became particularly apparent in June, when the German Parliament recognized the Armenian "genocide" — a decision that resulted in Turkey's withdrawing its ambassador to Germany. Other nations have also described the massacre of 1 million to 1.5 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire in 1915 as a genocide, but none of them are home to such a significant Turkish minority as Germany.

Back then, the resolution was seen as a threat to the refugee deal the European Union had struck with Turkey earlier this year.

The escalating dispute about DW's interview could add more difficulties to ongoing negotiations between Turkey and Europe, the channel suggested on its website Monday.

Read more:

Home to 3 million Turkish **immigrants**, Germany fears rising tensions

Turkey's ruling party has huge popularity in Germany

Turkey protests Germany's recognition of Armenian 'genocide'

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It's hard to know where Monday night's first presidential debate will go in terms of substance. But if the candidates do argue about the economy, viewers would benefit from some background on what presidents can and cannot really accomplish when it comes to the economy. Realistic benchmarking of our expectations in this space should serve as an inoculation against bogus claims.

The most bogus claims are those that the president can just snap her or his fingers and raise the economy's growth rate, as though we're growing at only 2 percent because it never occurred to President Obama to insist that we grow at 3 percent. Or 6 percent. Or whatever.

Republican nominee Donald Trump, for example, argues that his tax plan, which largely consists of about $5 trillion in tax cuts heavily tilted toward the wealthy, along with a big dose of deregulation, could raise the growth rate from 2 to 3.5 or 4 percent.

The least bogus claims — the ones you should really listen for — are twofold. First, what can the candidate do to help steer more opportunities to those who've been left behind by structural economic changes that tilt against them or embedded problems such as racism and poverty? Which one is more likely to help promote a more inclusive economy? Second, which is more likely to help offset the next recession with robust counter-cyclical policies, an area where a president can make a real difference?

Why can't presidents double the growth rate, as Trump has said he would do?

There are three main ingredients for faster overall growth: productivity, labor supply and demand (consumers and investors buying more goods and services). Labor supply, which has slowed considerably in recent years, is determined by demographic factors and **immigration**. The former are baked in the cake, and in fact, most economists will tell you that two of the three-percentage-point drop in the labor force participation rate since 2007 is the result of retiring boomers.

That said, there's more a president could do to pull more potential workers back into the job market, which would lift growth a bit. For example, create more demand for workers by investing in infrastructure, something both candidates talk about, although Trump's fiscal plan is problematic in that regard, as I'll show below. Such investment also has been shown to nudge productivity growth a bit at the margins.

Sticking with labor supply, one area in which Trump's plans point strongly in the opposite direction of faster growth is his deportation of millions of undocumented **immigrants**. Economist Mark Zandi predicts that if Trump were able to follow through on the plank in his platform, it would generate a recession.

What about tax policy? We've long heard conservatives argue that cutting taxes for wealthy taxpayers and corporations would unleash torrents of growth, and Trump's tax plan is solidly in that camp, with large cuts for rich estates and a much lower corporate rate with a new, big invitation for tax avoidance by high-earning individuals. We are likely to hear this argument at the first debate, and all I can say is it represents a serious failure of our political economy discourse that we're still even arguing about trickle-down economics.

Based on its historical record, listeners should wholly discount linking high-end tax cuts to faster growth. What they will do is exacerbate after-tax inequality and raise the budget deficit. The latter is a problem I'll get to in a moment.

Similarly, you'll hear claims from Trump that he also gets to 4 percent growth by cutting "regulations." Again, there's no evidence to support such a broad claim. That's not at all to say every regulation is worthwhile. Instead, the point is that the implicit assumption in the anti-reg rap is that regulations are all costs, no benefits, and that is clearly wrong. As a simple example, consider Trump's intention to deregulate financial markets by getting rid of the Dodd-Frank reforms. Yet financial market excesses helped to bring us the Great Recession which was … um … kinda bad for growth.

Summing up, outside of some public investment (including human capital, such as early childhood interventions), it has never been clear what presidents can do to boost productivity growth, especially in the near term, which is one reason everyone claims their favorite policy is the magic elixir. Boosting labor supply is mostly a matter of welcoming **immigration** policies, a challenge, to say the least, for the Trump platform. Offsetting weak demand is, at least in downturns, a matter of countercyclical policies such as the Recovery Act, and Republicans have grown largely hostile to such interventions.

But although presidents cannot do much to sharply alter the growth trajectory, they can do a great deal to determine the extent to which the prosperity we generate is more broadly shared. Minimum wages, unions, labor standards such as overtime rules, anti-discrimination policies (a "regulation"), gender pay equity, housing support, pro-work wage subsidies for poor workers, help with the major expenses faced by working families, including housing, child care, paid leave and paying for college — these are the public policies that form the connective tissue between growth and more broadly shared prosperity. Their erosion is implicated in the rise of inequality, stagnant pay and limited opportunities for the large majority on the wrong side of the wealth divide.

There's compelling new evidence in support of this claim. President Obama's economics team just released a report on the impact of tax changes, the Affordable Care Act, refundable tax credits for low-income working families on inequality since 2009: "In total, these policies will increase the share of after-tax income received by the bottom quintile in 2017 … 18 percent; increase the share received by the second quintile by … 6 percent; and reduce the share received by the top 1 percent by … 7 percent."

Obviously, they're looking at their own record and liking what they see, but it is an empirically rigorous report based on commonly used data (also, team Obama gets serious extra credit as it generated these results amid an extremely hostile Congress). So if the candidates get into a growth debate based on tax cuts and deregulation, go refill your popcorn. If they're arguing about how to reconnect people and growth, listen carefully.

This is also where the deficit problem comes back in. Contrary to Clinton's plans, Trumpian, or, for that matter, House Republican, fiscal plans will significantly worsen the deficit and debt. In mainstream growth economics, budget deficits crowd out private borrowing, push up interest rates, and slow growth. While such dynamics could occur, recent movements in interest rates have been largely uncorrelated with public debt (the Federal Reserve is very much in the mix, holding down rates for years now).

Instead, the concern should be that large budget deficits will lead to calls for spending cuts, and such calls will not target defense, and may not even target the big, popular social insurance programs. They will target the very kinds of work supports, infrastructure investments, health-care subsidies and opportunity-agenda items that helped drive Obama's income-equalizing record. (To be clear, protecting the social insurance programs is equally important in terms of economic security.)

In other words, do not believe candidates who say they can massively cut taxes, generate much faster growth, and spend more on infrastructure and helping those who've been left behind.

Finally, I'm leaving out a huge piece of all of this: the role played by Congress. Presidents' impact on growth is particularly limited if Congress won't cooperate, so that's obviously worth listening for, too. Do either of these candidates sound like they can possibly reintroduce the concept of compromise?

As I said up top, there's a strong chance that this sort of substance will be banished from the hall during the debate. But if at least parts of the forum turn to economic policy, these are the points for which I'll be listening. I'll let you know what I hear.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Action in Community Through Service food pantry needs volunteers to stock shelves, prepare food bags and make grocery store pickups either on a regular schedule (flexible) or on an on-call basis. To complete an online application, visit actspwc.org.

ACTS Helpline needs volunteers to answer a suicide-prevention hotline. 703-221-1144.

American Association for the Advancement of Science needs scientists, engineers, mathematicians and physicians to assist K-12 STEM teachers. Victor Crawford, 703-732-9004. vicris51@verizon.net.

American Cancer Society's Road to Recovery needs drivers to take patients to appointments. 804-527-3719. leah.seldinsommer@cancer.org.

Beacon for Adult Literacy trains people to help adults with literacy and English-speaking skills. 703-368-7491. beaconliteracy.org.

BEAT Cancer Coalition needs drivers 55 and older to take patients to appointments. Retired and senior volunteer program. 703-369-5292.

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Washington-Manassas needs volunteers. bgcgw.org/prince-william.

Catholic Charities Hogar **Immigrant** Services needs teachers for its English as a second language and citizenship classes. Training provided. 571-208-1572. volunteer.hogar@ccda.net.

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children's Intervention Services, needs Spanish-speaking volunteers to visit children who have been abused and neglected. Ben Gimeno, 703-330-8145, bgimeno@casacis.org.

ESL and **Immigrant** Ministries trains volunteers to teach English to adults. 703-841-0292. office@eslim.org, eslim.org.

Friends of Feral Cats of PWC needs volunteers and donations of cat food. Call Nancy, 571-719-0657.

Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind needs volunteers to raise and train puppies. 866-282-8046. guidedog.org.

Habitat for Humanity needs help with projects, ReStore and providing lunch to volunteers. 703-369-6708. volunteer@ habitatpwc.org.

Historic Dumfries needs docents for the Weems-Botts Museum to help with events and research projects, gather and transcribe local oral histories, and work on other projects. 703-221-2218.

Keep Prince William Beautiful needs help with its storm-drain program and educational outreach. 571-285-3772. kpwb.org.

Literacy Volunteers of Prince William needs adults to help adult students improve their literacy skills. Training provided. 703-670-5702. lvapw.org.

Mutt Love Rescue needs foster homes for rescued dogs. 703-577-0106. adopt@muttloverescue.org, muttloverescue.org.

Northern Virginia Family Service seeks foster parents. 571-748-2500.

Occoquan needs volunteers for events throughout the year, including the annual arts and crafts shows. Donna Brown, 703-491-2168. dbrown@occoquanva.gov.

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Monday-Friday. 703-792-4583.

Prince William Area Free Clinic needs volunteer doctors, pharmacists, physician assistants, nurses, translators and administrative assistants for the Unified Health Center in Woodbridge. 703-496-9403. pwafc.org .

Prince William Cooperative Extension Program needs facilitators for the Parent Education Program's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting groups. Training provided. Janice Brody, 703-792-4678. jbrody@pwcgov.org.

Prince William County Historic Preservation Division needs tour guides and assistance with special events, educational programs and gardening. 703-792-4754. historicpreservation@pwcgov.org .

Prince William County Office of Elections needs student volunteers to participate in its electoral page program. pwcvotes.com.

Prince William Health District seeks volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community health experience necessary. Training provided. Contact Valda Wisdom Brown, valda.wisdombrown@vdh.virginia.gov.

Prince William Trails and Streams Coalition needs volunteers to help build and maintain trails in the county. 703-791-6158. pwtsc.org.

Project Mend-a-House needs help for home-safety repairs. 703-792-7663. lizw@pmahweb.org.

Reset seeks volunteers to lead elementary and preschool students in science and math learning. John Meagher, 703-250-0236. reset@resetonline.org , resetonline.org .

Serve needs drivers for its food-recovery program at its food distribution center, as well as a bilingual (Spanish and English) food-assistance client-intake specialist. Navara Cannon, 571-748-2536, ncannon@nvfs.org.

St. Paul United Methodist Church needs bus drivers on Thursdays to take people to and from a community dinner. Drivers must have a class C license with a P endorsement. 703-494-2445.

Wildlife Rescue League needs hotline volunteers, wildlife transporters and rehabilitators. Training provided. 703-391-8625. volcoord@wildliferescueleague.org.

— Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Sept. 19 editorial "Today's nativism, and yesterday's" mischaracterized my position on refugees as intolerant. Before serving in Congress, I was an **immigration** lawyer and I have a long history of helping people from more than 70 countries lawfully **immigrate** to the United States. The United States has a generous legal **immigration** system and has been a safe haven for people fleeing persecution. We must remain compassionate, but we must also use common sense in this age of terror.

President Obama continues to unilaterally increase the number of refugees resettled here and ignores warnings from his own national security officials by planning to bring in even more Syrian refugees over the next year. The Islamic State has vowed to infiltrate Western countries through the refugee system. We should not take that threat lightly.

It's time for Congress to take up legislation that makes responsible reforms to the refugee program that maintain our nation's generosity while protecting national security. The editorial board's careless disregard of opposing points of view and lack of concern for our national security was intolerant.

Rep. Bob Goodlatte, Roanoke, Va.

The writer, a Republican, is chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HIGH POINT, N.C. — Donald Trump's week began in the wake of explosions in New Jersey and New York. It ended in the aftermath of shootings and riots. For a candidate whose strategy relies on painting a dystopian view of the nation — often based on inaccurate and questionable claims — the tragedies yielded a trove of political opportunities.

Shortly after the first bomb went off — Trump boasted that he had been ahead of newscasters in calling it a "bomb" — he seized upon the terrorism act as justification for some of the most disputed things he has said since announcing his presidential bid.

Terrorism wouldn't have happened if others had opposed the Iraq War as he did, Trump said, even though he had said at the time in a radio interview he supported the war. The problem increased because Hillary Clinton has "been silent about Islamic terrorism for many years," Trump claimed falsely. Trump called for profiling people, but insisted he "never" suggested targeting Muslims, even though he held an event specifically to propose a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States" and has called for "surveillance of certain mosques."

Trump's campaign is hardly the first to spin things its way, and Clinton has made her share of questionable claims, but Trump has nevertheless revealed himself to be a candidate who at times seems uniquely undeterred by facts.

An examination by The Washington Post of one week of Trump's speeches, tweets and interviews shows a candidate who not only continues to rely heavily on thinly sourced or entirely unsubstantiated claims but also uses them to paint a strikingly bleak portrait of an impoverished America, overrun by illegal **immigrants**, criminals and terrorists — all designed to set up his theme that he is specially suited to "make America great again."

African American communities, he said, are in the worst shape they have "ever, ever, ever" been — notwithstanding the days of slavery and Jim Crow. The U.S. military is "the gang that couldn't shoot straight." Terrorists are winning, and the United States is losing, he said, because "all of these young people in our country and other countries are looking up to" the Islamic State, also known as ISIS.

Trump is expected to employ this approach, in both style and substance, at the first debate between the two major-party candidates on Monday night. Expecting that the moderator, Lester Holt of NBC News, will serve as a real-time fact-checker during the debate, Trump has repeatedly said that Holt should not do so. (Trump initially criticized Holt, saying: "Lester is a Democrat. It's a phony system." But after reports surfaced that Holt has registered Republican, Trump said he thought the moderator would be fair.)

Trump's tactics, and his disregard for the truth in numerous cases, drove his primary opponents to fits earlier this year and last. An exasperated Jeb Bush said Trump was creating an "alternative universe."

But if there was any thought that Trump's Sept. 16 abandonment of his years-long effort to question whether President Obama was born in the United States would lead him to back away from other false or questionable claims, that idea was dismissed in the week that followed. Nor was Trump intimidated by the increasing practice of media outlets to bluntly call out statements as "lies" and "false" in headlines and news stories, not just in fact-checking columns.

To the contrary, Trump doubled down during the past week on some of his most controversial and debunked statements and made surprising new ones. It is a strategy Trump has long employed. In his 1987 book, "The Art of the Deal," he wrote that "I call it truthful hyperbole. It's an innocent form of exaggeration — and a very effective form of promotion." When the media questioned his claims, the former reality TV star called them "dishonest" and "disgraceful," and said the reporters were "wacky" or "crazy" or "neurotic."

After criticizing Clinton for not holding news conferences, Trump held none himself. (His campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, said on CNN that "he gives press availability every day by doing these rallies," although that does not involve actually taking questions from reporters.)

In an effort to track Trump's words, The Post attended his events, reviewed transcripts and sought to compile every word uttered by him in a seven-day period beginning Sept. 18 and ending Saturday. During that time, Trump appeared at nine events in Florida, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia. He gave seven television interviews, all but one on Fox News channels. He tweeted more than 40 times, posted on Instagram and Facebook, and sent out daily news releases, many with the subject line "Crooked Hillary" (even as running mate Gov. Mike Pence criticized Democrats for "name calling").

Monday

After remaining relatively quiet Sunday — other than a pretaped interview that ran on Fox's "Media Buzz" program in which he called journalists "disgraceful" and "unbelievably dishonest" — Trump woke Monday and promptly dialed into the "Fox & Friends" show at 7:02 a.m. for an interview that lasted nearly a half-hour, uninterrupted by commercials. The bombings in New York City and New Jersey, and a knife attack in Minnesota, gave Trump issues that seemed to play directly into his campaign's theme that the nation is under attack because of a failure to screen **immigrants**.

"If somebody looks like he's got a massive bomb on his back, we won't go up to that person," Trump said. "If he looks like he comes from that part of the world, we're not allowed to profile. Give me a break."

In fact, there is nothing to stop police from questioning a person suspected of carrying a massive bomb, and the United States does allow certain types of profiling of airline passengers and **immigrants**.

Trump then spoke at a large rally in Fort Myers, Fla., at which he delivered some disputed claims. He said Clinton had "allowed thousands of criminal aliens to be released into our communities," and favors a 550 percent increase in Syrian **immigrants**, even though "law enforcement said there's no way" to vet them. He said it is a "plain fact" that the United States "makes no real attempt to determine the views of the people entering."

After the rally, Trump went on Fox News's "The O'Reilly Factor," where he issued his call for profiling people to detect potential terrorists. Host Bill O'Reilly was skeptical about spotting lone attackers inspired by propaganda. Trump responded by saying that officials didn't go after the alleged New York bomber because "they don't want to get sued," a claim for which there is no evidence. Trump then denied he was targeting Muslims: "You go in to profile people that maybe look suspicious. I didn't say they were Muslims."

Tuesday

Trump arrived at a midday rally at High Point University in North Carolina, where supporters packed a basketball gymnasium. Asked in interviews whether they were concerned about the veracity of Trump's statements, supporters variously said the comments were misinterpreted by the media or were nothing compared with Clinton's falsehoods.

"I don't think he means some of the things that come out of his mouth in the most derogative way," said Pam Guy, of Thomasville, N.C. "I think he says things sarcastically at times. If you listen, and you hear him clarify things later, the puzzle pieces start to come together and make sense." Guy, who said she has only been to two political rallies in her life — both of them for Trump — said her main concern is, "I need someone to come in and just explode the system."

The question of whether Trump's statements are true was a "non-factor" to John Clinard, of High Point. "I am definitely voting for the lesser of two evils. I'm not 100 percent for Trump, but I'm 200 percent against Hillary. I don't know what's true and what's not. I just try to listen and make my own opinion."

Observing it all was Brandon W. Lenoir, a High Point University professor of political communications and campaign veteran who said he was not surprised that Trump's supporters are undeterred by fact checks.

"When new information comes in, if it is consistent with your world view or your opinion of that particular candidate, you let it in; if it is inconsistent, you block it out," Lenoir said. "So what happens is, people who have already pledged their allegiance to Trump, when they hear this information, they basically discount it and say, 'Oh, that's just the other side trying to break him down.' "

Trump's next stop was Kenansville, N.C., population 850, where he made one of his most outlandish comments.

"Our African American communities are absolutely in the worst shape that they've ever been in before, ever, ever, ever," Trump said. Not only did the comment ignore the history of slavery and Jim Crow, but Trump delivered it in an area where blacks were once captives of slave plantations; indeed, the town of Kenansville was named after the family of a slave owner. Trump's statement was promptly called out on social media by reporters traveling with him, but the campaign made no effort to explain or defend it; indeed, no campaign official was made available to the press corps all day except for a travel coordinator.

Wednesday

The event in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, was billed as a Trump town hall to discuss issues facing African Americans. The audience was mostly white, and the forum was run by Fox News Channel's Sean Hannity, a conservative commentator who is one of Trump's most vocal supporters. Earlier in the week, he had appeared as a "TV personality" who backed the Republican nominee in a campaign video called "Heartland 4 Trump." The network told Hannity not to appear in any more such ads but allowed him to continue his role as on-air booster and let him proceed as host of the town hall — which came across much like another campaign video.

As Hannity introduced Trump, he said: "The Obama years have been disastrous for the country, especially for African Americans. But believe it or not, Democrats still feel entitled to their vote." Then, after Hannity said, "the left is stoking racial tensions," a video was shown of protesters chanting, "Black Lives Matter!"

Trump was then shown saying: "Vote for Donald Trump. I will fix it."

"And Donald Trump is the only candidate promising to bring about real change," Hannity said, according to the network's transcript.

The hour-long Hannity program marked the fourth time in four days that Trump appeared on Fox News.

A rare non-Fox interview, with an Ohio television reporter, was brief but revealing.

Asked why he had acknowledged that Obama was born in the United States, Trump said he just wanted to get on with his campaign, saying nothing about being convinced by the evidence.

Then Trump was asked about a Post report that he had used $258,000 from his charitable foundation to settle lawsuits related to his for-profit companies. Trump evaded the question, saying: "The foundation is really rare. It gives money to vets. It's really been doing a good job." Trump concluded by saying his campaign had put the story "to sleep just by putting out our last report." That appeared to be a reference to a statement by campaign spokesman Jason Miller, who attacked the story as inaccurate without providing any specifics, and said it was the result of "a biased reporter who is clearly intent on distracting attention away from the corrupt Clinton Foundation." The campaign, meanwhile, put out news releases attacking the Clinton Foundation.

As it turned out, the Hannity town hall did not air Wednesday night as planned because the network coverage shifted to riots on the streets of Charlotte, where protests occurred following the police shooting of a black man, Keith Lamont Scott. Trump seized upon the riots as more evidence of his view of a shattered nation. "We need unity & leadership," he tweeted.

Thursday

As violence continued in Charlotte, Trump again called in to "Fox & Friends," his fifth appearance of the week on the network, which ran an image of the candidate superimposed over video of clashes between rioters and police. "It's very sad," Trump said, lamenting a "lack of spirit between the black and the white."

Trump's solution was "you have to have law and order. . . . There has to be a unity message." And he repeated his call to allow police to "stop-and-frisk" suspects.

Trump later said in a Pittsburgh speech that there has been a 17 percent rise in violent crime in the largest 50 cities in the United States, and sharp spikes in homicides in Washington and Baltimore, to make the case that violence is a "national crisis." Violent crime rose 1.7 percent nationally in 2015, according to preliminary FBI data.

Trump also seemed to connect drugs to urban crime in Charlotte during the speech in Pittsburgh, which many took to suggest that protesters in Charlotte were taking drugs.

"And if you're not aware, drugs are a very, very big factor in what you're watching on television at night," he said.

That led reporters to question Trump about why he was tying drugs to the protests. Trump denied it. "That was never said, you know that," Trump responded, adding, "Drugs are a big problem all over the country."

The unrest, Trump said, was partly Clinton's fault. "Those peddling the narrative of cops as a racist force in our society — and this is a narrative that is supported with a nod by my opponent, you see what she's saying, and it's not good — share directly in the responsibility for the unrest that is afflicting our country and hurting those who have really the very least," Trump said.

Friday

It was supposed to be an easy appearance for Eric Trump on the Fox News show "Outnumbered." With his father taking the day off the campaign trail to prepare for Monday's debate, Eric Trump was playing surrogate when he was asked a seemingly easy question about how his father could appeal to millennials.

Eric Trump said his father, in contrast with Clinton's political career, "has been an entrepreneurial guy. . . . He's become the epitome of the American Dream. He's gone from just about nothing into a man who just — "

"Nothing?" one of the hosts interjected. "He got a million bucks, Eric!"

The host had correctly referred to a gift from Donald Trump's father to give him a head start in business, among a number of gifts and loans that Fred Trump provided to his son. Donald Trump, nonetheless, went more than $1 billion in debt and put his businesses through six corporate bankruptcies, barely surviving financially before he reemerged as the star of "The Apprentice."

As for millennials, Eric Trump said they are largely uninformed except on issues that directly affect them, such as student debt. "I don't think millennials relate to policy very well because they haven't lived their lives long enough to understand so many of the issues," said Trump, who, at 32, is himself a millennial.

Saturday

Trump spent part of his Saturday morning on Twitter, urging people to come to rally later in the day in Virginia, and handing out accolades and insults. He tweeted a link to a Post story that quoted a professor predicting he would become president, said it was a "wonderful surprise" that archrival Sen. Ted Cruz endorsed him Friday and mocked "dopey Mark Cuban," the Dallas Mavericks owner who has become a leading critic of Trump and who plans to sit in the front row of Monday's debate. "Perhaps I will put Gennifer Flowers right alongside of him," Trump tweeted, referring to a woman who said she once had an affair with Bill Clinton. (It was a rare case of making a correction; Trump deleted an initial tweet that spelled her name as "Jennifer.")

Just before appearing at an evening rally in Roanoke, Trump's campaign sought to switch the focus to Clinton's veracity. "Hillary Clinton cannot stop telling lies," the campaign said in a press release. She "even lies about lying." Trump, introduced as a "truth teller," then delivered his most measured speech of the week, mostly sticking to his teleprompter, but still taking sharp digs at his opponent.

Speaking in coal country, Trump said that "Hillary Clinton says she wants to put the miners out of work," which is close to what she said in March, albeit in the context of speaking about helping miners transition to new jobs. He also sought to portray himself as a better advocate for women and children than Clinton, who has spent much of her life promoting their welfare. Trump said Clinton has "provided no relief" to families in need of child care. In fact, both candidates have put forward plans to help working mothers.

Trump's success so far, even as he makes questionable claims about the state of the nation, is "very different" from most presidential campaigns, according to Lenoir, the High Point University professor.

"People are just upset with the way things are, and they are willing to go with that person who goes against the grain, and Trump represents that on the Republican side," Lenoir said. "If any other candidate said half of the things Donald Trump has said, they would be out of the race. But this is a unique election cycle, so we will have to see how it all plays out."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I thought she was beautiful, although I never understood why she plucked her eyebrows off and penciled them on every morning an inch higher. She had been captain of her high school basketball team in Japan, and she ran circles around us kids on a dirt court in our small town in Upstate New York. I can still see this Japanese woman dribbling madly about, yelling "Kyash! Kyash!" That's how she said Kath, or Kathy.¶ She married my American GI father barely knowing him. She moved from Tokyo to a small poultry farm just outside Elmira, N.Y., and from there she delivered eggs all over the county and into Pennsylvania. My sister describes her as having a "core of steel." She raised us as determinedly as any mother could, and yet, looking back, I barely knew her.

Some people think the film I co-directed, "Fall Seven Times, Get Up Eight: The Japanese War Brides," is a paean to loving Japanese mothers. When one interviewer suggested as much to me and fellow director Karen Kasmauski, we exchanged a look that said, "Shall we tell him the truth?" The film, titled after a Japanese proverb, is about strong women, for sure. Warm and loving mothers? No.

So who are these women and what do we, their children, know about them?

They are sisters and daughters of the ferocious enemy that attacked Pearl Harbor in the "day of infamy," an enemy that surrendered four years later after waves of firebombing of Japanese cities and the dropping of atomic bombs. They married men who occupied their country and came to the United States. And then? They disappeared into America. There were tens of thousands of them, yet they vanished from public awareness — Japanese women who were barely a blip in **immigration** history, who married into families of North Dakota farmers, Wisconsin loggers, Rhode Island general store owners.

They either tried, or were pressured, to give up their Japanese identities to become more fully American. A first step was often adopting the American nicknames given them when their Japanese names were deemed too hard to pronounce or remember. Chikako became Peggy; Kiyoko became Barbara. Not too much thought went into those choices, names sometimes imposed in an instant by a U.S. officer organizing his pool of typists. My mother, Hiroko Furukawa, became Susie.

How did it feel to be renamed for someone in the man's past, a distant relative or former girlfriend? My mother said she didn't mind, and others said it made their lives easier to have an American name.

The brides, as many as 45,000, landed in the home towns of their husbands, places where Japanese people had been visible only on World War II propaganda posters. Was their skin really yellow? One war bride in South Carolina was asked to pull up her sleeve since no yellow was visible on her hands and wrists.

My mother, once a daughter of privilege, came to her in-laws' chicken farm. She has lived in the same two square miles of countryside ever since. It has been 64 years.

I read and reread the transcripts from interviews I had recorded with my mother when I was pregnant with my own daughter more than 20 years ago, when I realized I didn't have even a timeline of her life. Six hours of tapes and they didn't tell me what I now wanted to know. So I went back to her recently to try to understand what she could possibly have been thinking when she made the choice to marry an American soldier she barely knew. "I wasn't thinking. I just had to get out," was one of her succinct responses.

I didn't know other women like her, although I had two journalist friends who were also daughters of Japanese war brides. When they proposed making a film about our mothers, I readily agreed because I had always wanted to tell her story. And she's such an excellent raconteur that, sitting beside her in the film as her interviewer, I'm almost an unnecessary prop.

In making the film with Kasmauski and Lucy Craft, I began to understand that my mother's struggles as an **immigrant** woman who was alone in this country were mirrored in the lives of tens of thousands of other Japanese women of her generation who came as wives of Americans. As a journalist, I felt compelled to talk to some of them before it was too late. As a daughter, I wanted to know my mother's place in U.S. history and perhaps my own. I received a grant from my alma mater, Vassar College, to travel the United States and interview Japanese war brides and their families, to capture their voices in audio stories and scan their old photographs, to create an oral history archive. Over the course of a year I recorded some 60 conversations.

Sometimes the women, now in their 80s and 90s, were reluctant to be interviewed and were coaxed into being recorded by their families, especially their children, who wanted to hear the stories themselves. But once they started to talk, these women remembered some of the most startling details of their early lives — the small lies they told their mothers, the sudden glimpses of temper in the men they would marry, the sweetness or bullheadedness of American men trying to communicate with future Japanese fathers-in-law. They showed me albums with wonderful treasures — photos of striking young couples, of themselves in glamour poses perhaps influenced by the Hollywood films that were so popular in Japan, of beach outings with their soldier boyfriends.

These are the stories they and their families tell.

The bombs fell, the emperor surrendered, and hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops landed on the Japanese homeland by troopship and transport plane, to prevent starvation and social collapse while they remade the defeated nation.

Only families of wealth and elevated social status were able to insulate their daughters from the world of American soldiers. Those who had survived needed work, and the Americans provided it. They set up typing schools and English classes, hired secretaries, clerks, maids, babysitters. Nightclubs and cabarets sprang up for the occupiers, and Japanese women found work there, too.

My mother, the daughter of an Imperial Japanese Army officer, had a pampered childhood in Korea when it was ruled by the Japanese, with maids and dance lessons. An aide came every morning to polish her father's boots and chauffeur him to camp. But her father died of an illness, and the family came back to Japan during the war, reduced in circumstances.

After high school, she looked for a job. There was no money for her to go to college; it would be saved for her brother. The U.S. military operated a PX — or Army post exchange, a retail outlet for soldiers — in the Ginza area of Tokyo. She went for an interview and was hired as a sales clerk in the jewelry department, helping servicemen pick out gifts for their girlfriends.

Sometime in 1950, she was going home on a streetcar when a GI started talking to her. She told him she worked at the PX. He started showing up there to talk to her and ask her out. She turned him down, but he kept asking. Japanese men, the war brides recount, rarely pressed their luck after being rebuffed. American men? Extremely persistent.

These ardent Americans also brought presents the Japanese could not afford or had never seen before — chocolate, dresses from Sears Roebuck or Montgomery Ward and even Spam, a culinary oddity. And they seemed handsome. Tall, well-fed, wearing crisp uniforms. Japan had lost so many of its young men in the war, and the ones who came back were physically and mentally debilitated.

American chivalry, the notion of "ladies first," also enchanted Japanese women. War brides almost universally say "he was such a gentleman" to describe their American suitors.

There was, of course, bad behavior. A woman remembers seeing GIs in a train station with watches up and down their arms, taken from Japanese men. Others I spoke to witnessed physical abuse of Japanese civilians.

My mother liked Bill, the soldier from Upstate New York who spoke to her on the streetcar. Liked him well enough, that is; she wasn't head over heels. He was quiet and well-behaved compared with some of the American soldiers she had seen; he did not drink. She does not speak of romance, only of her desperation to get out of what she viewed as her hopeless situation in Japan. He was her opportunity.

I met a family whose story begins with a similar chance meeting in postwar Japan, and in their case led to rural Wisconsin. In a small ranch-style house with a large fenced garden, a deer blind and, across the road, an expanse of cornfields, Nancy Roberts, 84, recalls the day she met Don. Her name was Hiroko Yamamoto then.

Her girlfriend dragged her through a Kyoto department store where they worked to look at the Marine who she said resembled Montgomery Clift, the actor in their favorite movie, "From Here to Eternity." Hiroko was a sophisticated city girl and thought he was cute, in a country bumpkin kind of way. She brazenly spoke to him, and he invited her out for a meal. He began to call her Nancy, because she reminded him of the cartoon character in Nancy and Sluggo, with her button nose and black curly hair. She had no idea who that was.

It was 1953. Hiroko was 21, enjoying a life of movies, parties, going around with groups of other young people determined to have fun and not think about the future. There was a kind of recklessness about these young women who had seen their families and nation ruined by war.

"We didn't care about yesterday or tomorrow because we found out that everything we believed in wasn't true and we just lived for today — fun, fun, fun!" That's how Hiroko once described herself to her eldest daughter, Charmaine Roberts.

The Yamamoto family was respectable, and for a daughter to date a GI was a big blemish on its reputation. Some families disowned daughters, striking their names from family registries, the all-important record of ancestry.

Hiroko's father died when he was struck by a truck while riding a bicycle, and she hid her Montgomery Clift look-alike boyfriend, a Marine and cook for the officers club, from her mother for quite a while.

As for my family, my Japanese grandmother opposed my mother's relationship with Bill, and neighbors gossiped pointedly. My mother didn't care. Neither did she care when my grandmother warned her with an old proverb: "He's like the bones of an unknown horse." My grandmother was saying: Before you marry a man, you must know his family, his circumstances, his values. The soldiers were an unknown quantity in a society where lineage is all-important.

The U.S. government was not in favor of these liaisons, either. The men faced tremendous legal hurdles to bringing home Japanese wives. The **Immigration**Act of 1924, which limited **immigrants** through a quota system by nationality, also excluded any person who was not eligible for citizenship, and that meant Asians. Several temporary laws in the late 1940s allowed servicemen to marry their Japanese girlfriends and bring them home if they could complete the paperwork in time. The system was designed to make marriage difficult to accomplish, and easy for the young man to change his mind.

Passage of the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952 removed the legal obstacles, although the paperwork was still considerable. Commanding officers continued to discourage the relationships, not just out of bigotry but also because they anticipated the unions might be deemed illegal in the men's home states. In 1952, interracial marriages were still banned, at least on the books, in more than half the nation. The Supreme Court declared those laws unconstitutional in the 1967 decision Loving v. Virginia.

With their can-do American persistence, some men lobbied their congressmen for help. In 1947, Angelo Amato had just turned 20 and was determined to bring Kimiko Yamaguchi — "the most beautiful girl I had ever seen" — home to East Boston. That's how the young John F. Kennedy, his congressman, came to sponsor H.R. 8558, "A Bill for the relief of Kimiko Yamaguchi, May 18, 1950." Their son, Joseph Amato, treasures the sheaf of letters from Kennedy regarding the bill.

On Christmas Eve 1950, his father brought his fiancee home to a triple-decker in his Italian American neighborhood, where she has lived ever since.

It seems incomprehensible to me, as a mother, to let a daughter go so far away with a foreign man, knowing communication would be difficult and coming home almost impossible. But I also know that some families were large, and poor, and to send a daughter off with what they thought was a rich American was a tough but practical decision. America meant a brighter future.

The young women were ill-prepared for their lives in the United States. As one family liked to joke, their mother went from life in Tokyo with a maid to life in Florida with an outhouse. And women who married black GIs entered an America segregated to a degree they did not imagine.

"My husband told me about it. He mentioned to me before I left Japan," said Chizuko Watkins, 88, of Los Altos Hills, Calif. "He told me when you go to the States, you see something, funny things like that." But she didn't think much about it until she traveled by train to meet her husband in Atlanta, where she unknowingly checked into a "white" hotel and her husband, Clifford, couldn't join her, or even meet her there.

And what about the men? What did they expect? Probably wives who would be more submissive than American women, but also, paradoxically, wives who would run American-style households, cook American meals, raise American kids and impart American values to those children. The Red Cross in Japan ran popular "brides schools," where Japanese women were taught how to make beds, bake cakes, wear makeup and walk in high heels. Toyo Swartz, 92, of Vallejo, Calif., showed me glossy photographs of herself in those classes and recalled being taught how to make meatloaf. Such photographs were taken to show Americans that the Japanese women were going to fit right in.

In many cases the men were unprepared as well. After all, my mother knew she was going to a farm. My father probably never suspected he was bringing home an opinionated, strong-willed woman who could never be content as a chicken farmer's wife.

My mother remembers vividly her second day at the chicken farm. She was pregnant with me. Helen, her mother-in-law, took her into the hatchery to see the baby chicks. They were a blanket of yellow fuzz in large drawer-like trays under heating lights. A potbellied stove nearby kept the entire room warm. What happened next made my mother sick. Her mother-in-law reached into that peeping sea of yellow and pulled out a chick that was deformed in some way, a runt perhaps or exhibiting some other sign of poor health. And she opened the door of the stove and tossed the chick into the flames. It made a popping sound. She repeated this several times while my mother struggled to stay upright.

At this moment my mother realized that life on the farm was going to be like nothing she had experienced or expected. It's painful for me to hear her describe her shock at farm life — the dirtiness of the house, the crude, rough way of living. Her constant fights with my father over what she wanted — a life apart from the farm, for him to continue his education on the GI Bill. Her frustration with his lack of ambition.

The more my father wanted to settle for what he had — a house trailer and low-level farm work — the more my mother fought for what she wanted. And for years, that was the pattern. She says it made their marriage worse, and she blames herself as much as him: She wasn't the right wife for him. Not because she was Japanese, but because they were poorly suited for each other. In temperament. In outlook. After more than 30 years together, they got divorced.

He remarried and died more than 15 years ago. I wish I had asked him why he chose my mother, what made him think he should marry her and bring her home to the farm, whether he believed in the obedient Asian wife stereotype. I do know that as the years went by, he resented her ambition, her desire to expand the grocery store, build a new home, push her children to apply to the best colleges possible. And because of their personalities, she got her way.

Never once did she consider going back to Japan. No war bride I've interviewed felt she could go back to Japan. When they left, they recalled, they were warned: Don't come home crying. And certainly don't come home crying with children.

Some descended into bitterness and depression. Most simply moved forward as best they could — raising kids, finding solace in friendships or faith; reinventing themselves to fit their changed reality.

There were many exceptions, of course. Great love stories, solid partnerships, loving families; men who cared about their wives' Japanese roots. More than 12 years after his wife, Kiyoko, died, 82-year-old Joe Sexton of Philadelphia still sends a large box of gifts every Christmas to her relatives in Hokkaido, Japan's northernmost island, and calls them annually, using an interpreter. He treasures his favorite ramen broth that they send to him in return packages, and he shares the bounty with his children.

Women married to career military men more easily found other Japanese war bride families to form friendships. But they also endured husbands absent for long stretches — including duty in Vietnam in the 1960s and '70s. During that period, the Japanese wives left behind near the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Aberdeen, Md., formed a social group that continues to this day.

About a dozen of the women meet every month, often at the Golden Corral for the all-you-can-eat brunch, loading their plates with fried chicken, macaroni and potatoes. They trade Japanese books and magazines, teach each other how to make new origami ornaments, go to cheer the Japanese youth baseball team that comes to compete in the Cal Ripken World Series.

In the United States, work — any work — felt like a form of liberation and was often a necessity. The skills many of them brought from Japan were as seamstresses and barbers. Keiko Ingerson's Keiko's Family Hair Care in Lewiston, Maine, was an institution for many years. Most of her customers did not know of her hardships, her need to work to support her three children after her husband left. Yoko Breckenridge's abusive father made her learn barbering so he wouldn't have to pay for a shave. She married Roger to escape him, and she became a successful barber when she landed in Redwood Falls, Minn.

My mother worked at the family farm, processing eggs and delivering them. Then she and my father, Bill, ran a small grocery store after it was clear the farm was too small to survive.

When my parents divorced, my father offered my mother the choice of keeping either their house or the country store — assuming she'd take the home. It only went to show how much he still misjudged her. My mother took Tolbert's Store and made an unlikely success of it — also demonstrating a kind of feminism by employing only women, from Ellie, who worked the deli, to "Betty, my butcher."

In fact, Betty Maramack became my mother's closest friend and business confidante — teaching her how to control inventory and also persuading her to get her first flu shot. Betty advised my mother when to sell the store — a sale that made enough money to usher her into comfortable retired life.

The Japanese war brides were determined to raise what they imagined were all-American children. And they did. Their children are American, and they have little connection to Japan. Most do not have Japanese names.

I don't think of myself as Asian American. In my Upstate New York upbringing, there weren't other Asians, certainly not other Japanese Americans, with whom I might have felt some affinity. But I was surprised to find that even children of Japanese war brides on the West Coast — with its deeply embedded Asian communities — did not think of themselves as especially Japanese American.

I think that's partly because the Japanese war brides so rigorously suppressed their former identities to become American. Their departures on the arms of American men were viewed with sadness, by the women and their families alike, because they were probably leaving forever. And there was an underlying tinge of shame that they had turned away from Japan or that Japan could not provide for them.

The women don't view their families today as a branch on their Japanese family tree; they started from scratch. "I came here alone, and today I have 28 family members," one woman told me with quiet pride.

My mother didn't speak Japanese to us. Very few war brides used Japanese at home. Their husbands didn't want them to, fearing it would become a shared language that excluded them. And the women viewed it as counterproductive to their efforts to become real Americans and to have their children be seen the same as other kids.

Some of their children who later learned Japanese or who were able to spend time in Japan found it gave them unexpected insights into their mothers.

Rodney Yoder, of Boston, was a Harvard student spending a year at Doshisha University in Kyoto when his mother, Itsuko, came to visit. Decades later, sitting in his Back Bay apartment, he choked up at the recollection. "I could understand my mom for the first time. I could hear her speak, I could hear her sense of humor. My home-stay family told me how bright and cheerful my mother is. So in a way it was like getting to know her for the first time."

The women often stayed away from Japan — perhaps taking only one or two trips "home'' during 60 years. Sometimes it was because of the expense. But also, Japan had changed, become unrecognizably rich, and they themselves had become strangers there.

My mother enjoyed more regular visits to Japan — sometimes as a member of the local delegation in the "Sister City" exchanges between nearby Corning, N.Y., and the city of Kakegawa. Japan may have changed, but the food she loved was the same. Her mother, brother and sister always welcomed her. Her nieces took time off from work to go around with her. She was lucky.

But she never told her mother that she was divorced; she couldn't bring herself to undermine the picture of her American life that she had painted over the years, of a good marriage and wonderful family. She also didn't want to concede that her mother had perhaps been right more than six decades ago with her warning about the bones of an unknown horse.

She herself knew she did not make a mistake. She has said over and over that it was the right decision to leave Japan. She bounced back from a hard landing, made a life and is satisfied with how it turned out.

America has been perfect for her in that sense, because she was entrepreneurial and the harder she worked, the more she could get ahead. That brought her immense satisfaction.

And she raised four children, not with warmth or expressions of love, but with a fierce determination.

The language my mother used when we were growing up was always about hard work and studying, getting ahead. Like Japanese mothers in general, she was obsessed with education. She paid for tutors. She read my history chapters when I was in junior high so that she could ask me questions before a test.

She wanted us to succeed because that would mean she succeeded. That was extremely important to her. She said she didn't want people to say, "Look what happens when a Japanese comes to this country."

Her mothering didn't include saying to her children, "I love you." To this day she doesn't say it, although she now returns goodbye hugs, if stiffly.

I am the oldest child, the custodian of her story. I tell my mother's story, and those of other Japanese women like her, to give them recognition for what they endured and what they achieved. For their extraordinary resilience.

I have learned Japanese and taught it to my daughter. I also hug my daughter every time I see her, and I always tell her I love her.

kathryn.tolbert@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**After a week in which the Trump campaign made seemingly contradictory public statements referencing racism in policing, profiling, racial unrest and the systemic bias faced by black Americans, Rep. Marsha Blackburn, a Trump surrogate, began this week calling for great care in discussing police shootings and discrimination.

"Everyone should be very careful," Blackburn (R-Tenn.) said Sunday on CNN's "State of the Union." "It is imperative that everyone supports the thin blue line. It is what separates us ... from anarchy."

On Sunday, she also joined Trump in describing New York police's former "stop-and frisk" policy as an effective crime-prevention tool that should be implemented broadly.

When CNN host Jake Tapper attempted to bring the conversation back to race and policing, Blackburn challenged the idea that institutional racism exists. According to the show transcript:

TAPPER: … talk about the institutional racism.

Eventually, CNN political commentator and former Obama administration official Van Jones interjected, leading to a noteworthy exchange among Blackburn, Jones and another commentator, Angela Rye. Again, from the show's transcript:

JONES: First of all — I'm going to say something. I'm from a law enforcement family. ... What African-Americans want is effective and fair policing. And that's all.

A federal court banned stop-and-frisk in New York in 2013 because the judge behind the order described the tactic as an unconstitutional "policy of indirect racial profiling" where vast majorities of those stopped were both people of color and people who had done nothing wrong. Among the most common reasons police cited for stopping individuals: "furtive movements," and "suspicious bulges," in their pants or other clothing.

In 2011, when stop-and-frisk activity reached an all-time high in New York, police stopped 685,724 people, according to data analyzed by the American Civil Liberties Union. A full 53 percent were black, 34 percent were Latino and 9 percent were white. More than half were ages 14 to 24, and 88 percent were neither arrested nor received any sort of citation.

Then-Mayor Michael Bloomberg and Police Chief Ray Kelly claimed that stop-and-frisk had reduced crime in New York and other communities. Bloomberg argued that ending the policy would lead to an increase in homicides and fought the federal court order. Those who challenged the program in court said it did far more to poison police-community relationships than prevent crime and violated the rights of people of color. New York's current mayor, Bill de Blasio, ended stop-and-frisk permanently.

Bloomberg has since voiced strong opposition to the Trump campaign. Blackburn has said she would have been honored if asked to join the Trump ticket.

Blackburn, who represents a Tennessee district that includes heavily Republican suburbs, small towns and rural communities, is a longtime advocate for hard-line **immigration** policies, including local police involvement in **immigration** enforcement — a practice that **immigrant** advocates insist leads to racial and ethnic profiling. National law enforcement organizations also have described local police involvement in **immigration** enforcement as counterproductive, breeding distrust between police and **immigrants** who have witnessed crimes.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**We've hit the home stretch of the election. The time has come to get serious, really serious, about understanding what's at stake with Donald Trump's proposal to deport 5 million to 11 million undocumented **immigrants** and his promise that 2 million will be deported in "a matter of months" if he is elected.

In May, former homeland security secretary Michael Chertoff told the New York Times: "I can't even begin to picture how we would deport 11 million people in a few years where we don't have a police state, where the police can't break down your door at will and take you away without a warrant." He also said, "Unless you suspend the Constitution and instruct the police to behave as if we live in North Korea, it ain't happening."

Trump's specific policy involves adding 5,000 Border Patrol agents, tripling the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement deportation agents, creating a special deportation force that he has described as a military unit and deporting not merely people who have been convicted of crimes but also **immigrants** on visa overstays and undocumented **immigrants** who have been arrested, even if not convicted. He has proposed expedited procedures that would, to ensure speed, presumably require setting aside the due process protections meant to safeguard rights and minimize error.

One of the last times the world saw such a major effort at mass deportations in a developed country was in the 1990s in the former Yugoslavia. That experience is instructive.

In 1989, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and four decades of peaceful ethnic and religious relations in Yugoslavia, post-communist politicians of all three communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Croat, Muslim and Serb) came to power on a surge of ethno-nationalist rhetoric. Starting in 1992, they promulgated official policies such as the "Six Strategic Objectives for the Bosnian Serb People" that included the forcible removal of other groups from towns and villages, using new "crisis staffs" made up of police and civilian paramilitaries.

The process spun out of control and, in many communities, neighbors turned against neighbors, driving them out of their homes and seizing their assets. It started with a small number of activists, fewer than a few thousand people who were extreme nationalists and members of fringe parties. But as the propaganda and fear spread, the wider citizenry participated in the campaign of persecution. With the cover of official policy, civilians took it upon themselves to hasten the expulsion of members of other ethnic or religious groups. The fratricidal conflict claimed 100,000 lives. The majority of fatalities were civilians murdered in the context of mass deportations.

The Bosnian deportations grew into a systematic policy termed "ethnic cleansing." The U.N. Security Council declared forcible removal based on ethnicity a crime against humanity in 1994. And eventually there was also accountability for political leaders who enacted deportation policies and incited their followers to hatred and violence. In March 2016, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia found former Bosnian Serb president Radovan Karadzic guilty of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. The tribunal ruled that his speeches and official propaganda made a significant contribution to an overarching joint criminal enterprise to create an ethnically homogenous state of Bosnian Serbs.

The United States, of course, has its own history of mass deportations. There is the 19th-century Trail of Tears, when the U.S. government forcibly relocated members of Southeastern Native American tribes to land west of the Mississippi River. And in the 1930s and 1940s, under the pressure of the Great Depression, about 2 million Mexicans and Mexican Americans were deported; many lost their property. This was also the backdrop to the famous Zoot Suit Riots in Los Angeles in 1943, when U.S. sailors and Marines attacked Latino youths. The violence spread to San Diego and Oakland, and developed into broader racial violence that summer in Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, New York and Evansville, Ind. In the 1950s, the deportation of millions was attempted again with Operation Wetback; again people lost their property. Some died in the desert heat of Mexicali.

The notion that governments have learned how to conduct mass deportations in "humane and efficient" ways is ludicrous. The summary removal of millions of members of a minority ethnic or religious group from a territory has been accompanied, in nearly every historical instance, by assault, murder, crimes against humanity and, occasionally, genocide. It has involved armed roadblocks to check papers, the smashing down of doors in the night to drag people out of their homes. It has also involved unrestrained popular violence against a target population.

We might like to think that we're above all that sort of thing, that with the right kind of training a special deportation force and beefed-up ICE units would carry out an orderly removal. But we do have in our midst the elements that have historically made mass deportations so dangerous: heated rhetoric that slurs whole minority groups ("they're not sending their best . . . they're rapists"); an activist minority of white nationalists; an armed minority of militiamen; and the ongoing militarization of our police forces.

Then there is the other deeper, more profound truth of the matter. Mass deportation policies give neighbors who are citizens the chance to take advantage of neighbors who are not. If due process is not going to be protected for undocumented **immigrants**, why would their property be protected? Or perhaps someone has a score to settle? These are the basic sorts of temptations that have, historically, led ordinary people to participate in programs that became uglier than ever expected.

Currently, we are seeing net outflows of **immigrants** across the Mexican border, as has been the case since 2009. In other words, we do not have an **immigration** crisis. But even if we did, history has shown that crisis rhetoric, coupled with a racially tinged aspiration to mass deportations, has repeatedly led to episodes that harm some severely, perhaps even mortally, and is likely to bring shame on us all.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HARLOW, England — He went down with a single punch.

Arkadiusz Jóźwik — shy, devoted to his mother and an **immigrant** to Britain from his native Poland — was out with friends late last month enjoying pizza and drinks when they were set upon by a group of teens, some reportedly shouting anti-Polish slurs.

The punch knocked Jóźwik to the ground, the back of his head slapping the concrete of the rundown pedestrian plaza in this hardscrabble London suburb. The 40-year-old was taken off of life support days later.

Now Jóźwik's violent death is reverberating throughout Britain, and across Europe, as the latest evidence of a post-Brexit surge in suspected hate crimes directed at **immigrants**.

When anti-**immigrant** assaults first started rising after the June 23 vote to leave the European Union, authorities expressed hope that the spike would prove temporary.

But nearly three months later, the rate of such crimes remains sharply higher than it was last year, generating fears that the xenophobic passions unleashed by the Brexit vote have created a new normal of fear and intimidation for the country's approximately 8.5 million foreign-born residents.

It may get worse: Those who backed Brexit, expecting the vote to leave the European Union would yield mass deportations and a ban on new **immigrant**arrivals, are bound to be disappointed by the years-long bureaucratic slog that lies ahead, which could lead to even more violence as frustration sets in.

Eric Hind, a Polish-born friend of Jóźwik's, said the day after the vote that he received messages on Facebook: "What time is the next bus back to Poland?" His mother and his sister were told by their factory manager that "now you Poles need to pack up your bags and go back home."

The vote mandated no such thing. But the threat of violence may force them out just the same.

"People are scared and horrified. I'm scared and horrified," Hind said "My wife wants to move back to Poland. I keep saying, 'Let's not panic.' Arek's death was one case. But it could have been me."

Such is the depth of concern that the Polish national police sent two officers to Harlow last week to patrol the town, which was largely built in the 1950s as a concrete-clad socialist utopia for London residents who were bombed out during the Blitz.

In more recent decades, Harlow has struggled with closed factories and wide income disparities, even as **immigrants** have moved in to launch businesses and get a foothold in their new land.

"A lot of people here feel like they've been left behind. Britain's moving on at a huge pace, but their situation is getting worse and worse," said Owen Jones, senior organizer for the anti-extremism group Hope Not Hate. "Then they see **immigrants** driving around in nicer cars and living better lives than they do. It creates even more resentment."

In the pedestrian plaza where Jóźwik died — its storefronts dominated by liquor shops, betting parlors and faded pubs — officers with "Policja" stamped on their blue uniforms are walking the beat alongside those bearing the more familiar bulbous black caps of a British bobby.

The Polish officers have no formal police powers in Britain. But their highly unusual assignment was intended to help "engage with members of the Polish community who do not speak English as their first language," according to the local Essex police force.

The arrival of the officers followed days after a visit to London by Polish Foreign Minister Witold Waszczykowski, who cited Jóźwik's death and other attacks in arguing that the Brexit vote had spawned an eruption of violence against **immigrants** who "deserve to be respected and secured."

Last week, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker used his annual state-of-the-E.U. address to speak out about Jóźwik's killing and the rising British nativism it has come to represent.

"We Europeans can never accept Polish workers being harassed, beaten up or even murdered on the streets of Essex," Juncker said.

British leaders, too, have strongly condemned the rise in hate crimes. Prime Minister Theresa May has addressed the issue from the floor of the House of Commons and phoned her Polish counterpart to express her "deep regret" at crimes such as the attack on Jóźwik.

Here in Harlow, his death has spawned a reckoning over the town's problems with anti-**immigrant** prejudice.

"This isn't a town where everyone has pitchforks and is outright racist," said Emma Toal, deputy leader of the Harlow Council. "There's a big portion of the community that is shocked by this and doesn't want any Polish person to have to fear violence."

But Toal acknowledged there were some in Harlow who are hostile toward **immigrants**, and who had been deceived by pro-Brexit politicians into thinking that a vote to leave would force foreigners to head home.

"People thought they were voting to take back control, and that many **immigrants** wouldn't be allowed to stay," she said.

Those with such views may be a minority in Harlow. But they aren't difficult to find.

The tree-shaded spot where Jóźwik was attacked is now strewn with flowers, candles, Polish soccer jerseys and messages of peace. "Down with racism!" reads a hand-lettered sign in black ink.

A man with a buzz cut walking past the site, his pit bull tugging at the end of a short leash, explained to a young child one recent day that the tribute was "a memorial for something that happened to scum."

Others here vehemently deny that the town has a problem with prejudice, and say Jóźwik was killed not because he was a foreigner but because he was unlucky — chosen randomly by teens looking for trouble.

"It had nothing to do with racism, but it's become politicized," said Sue Keningale, a local resident who puffed on an electronic cigarette as she waited outside a laundromat. "Yeah, it was a Polish guy who died. But what would have happened if it was an English guy?"

Keningale said the real problem in Harlow is that young people have nothing to do, and police do little to disrupt violent behavior. "There's been trouble here before with the kids. It's not a new thing," she said.

Hind said he doesn't believe the attack was random. He said he had spoken with another friend who survived the assault by the teens who told him that "the whole atmosphere changed when they said they were Polish."

"It was a hate crime," Hind said of the killing of the burly factory worker. "It's because of where he came from."

Police have confirmed they are investigating that possibility.

Hind, an information technology manager who organized a peace vigil in his friend's honor, said he worries that for all their rhetoric, authorities aren't taking the rise in hate crimes seriously. He described the presence of the Polish officers as "a joke," and said it would do nothing substantive to address **immigrants**' concerns for their safety.

That makes him nervous, even as he resists his wife's pleas to move the family away from the hostility they feel in Harlow and back to their homeland.

"I'm not going to let this destroy everything I've worked for," Hind said. "I came here to achieve something."

griff.witte@washpost.com

Karla Adam contributed to this report from London.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AURORA, Colo.

Here on the High Plains, where the deer and the antelope once played, Denver's suburbs roam toward the Rockies' front range and the nature of today's polyglot politics is written in the local congressman's campaign schedule. One day last week, Republican Mike Coffman went from a Hispanic charter school in a strip mall, to another strip mall for lunch at an Ethiopian restaurant with leaders of the Ethio­pian American community, then to a meeting with the editor of the largest of two Korean-language newspapers serving more than 3,000 Korean Americans in the metropolitan area.

Coffman was elected to Congress in 2008 with 61 percent of the vote, replacing Tom Tancredo, a firebrand who that year ineffectually ran for president as a scourge of illegal **immigrants**. Coffman's thinking was somewhat congruent with Tancredo's. Then, however, the political market — a.k.a. democracy — began to work, with an assist from Democrats, who inadvertently made Coffman a better politician and person.

After he was reelected with 66 percent of the vote in 2010, his district was gerrymandered to make it more Democratic — 20 percent Hispanic, with a generous salting of other minorities. He won in 2012 with just 48 percent of the vote. In 2014, national Democrats recruited a formidable opponent, a Yale Universitygraduate who had taught, in Spanish, in Central American schools. So, Coffman learned Spanish well enough to do an entire debate in the language, and today banters in Spanish with the children at Roca Fuerte Academy.

The pastor who founded it in 2008 says this charter school is anathema to, and underfunded by, the local school district, which is obedient to the teachers union, which dislikes charters that are not obedient to it. The district's schools have just a 61 percent graduation rate. Roca Fuerte Academy does better.

Some of the academy's pupils in their school uniforms are antecedents of the pronoun in Donald Trump's four-word **immigration** policy: "They have to go." They were brought here by illegal **immigrants**. Trump wants to send them "home" to countries they do not remember. Coffman has co-authored legislation that would provide legal status and a path to lawful permanent resident status to those who came before age 16, have lived here five consecutive years, and who have been accepted to a college or vocational school or have demonstrated an intent to enlist in the military, or have a valid work authorization.

At the Nile restaurant, Coffman's cowboy boots go beneath a table groaning under the weight of trays laden with Ethiopian food that is eaten without utensils, scooped up with bits torn from rolls of bread as thin and flexible as fabric. Coffman sits next to an Ethio­pian Orthodox bishop who is wearing a cassock and a glittering pectoral cross. As guests arrive, several kiss a crucifix he holds. He speaks scant English but draws 1,500 to Sunday services. Many of those around the table have been in the United States for at least a decade and are citizens and small-business entrepreneurs. Ethiopians are Colorado's second-largest **immigrant** community and are grateful for Coffman's attempts to pressure Ethiopia's authoritarian government to stop using violence against protesters. Coffman attends the annual "Taste of Ethiopia" festival here in America's Mountain West and "Ethiopians for Coffman" might matter in November. As might the Korean American community, which continues to honor those Americans who, like Coffman's father, fought in the Korean War.

Coffman, 61, enlisted in the Army before receiving his high school diploma, which he earned while serving. After leaving the Army and graduating from the University of Colorado, he went to Marine Corps officer training. When he left the Corps he became a state legislator until called back into uniform in 1991 for the Gulf War. In 2005, he resigned as state treasurer to serve a tour of duty with the Marines in Iraq. There he helped organize elections in a place where diversity is rather more problematic than in Colorado's 6th Congressional District.

His opponent this year, who dislikes charter schools and school choice, does not speak fluent Spanish and, unlike almost all candidates challenging incumbents, does not seem to want many debates — she even declined the Denver Post's. Coffman thinks she does not want anything to distract from her theme, which is: Trump is a Republican and so is Coffman.

In early August, however, Coffman acted preemptively with a television ad that began: "People ask me, 'What do you think about Trump?' Honestly, I don't care for him much." Spoken like a Marine who does 10 sets of 50 push-ups daily.

georgewill@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lutz Bachmann has frequently been criticized for not sticking to his own principles.

He's a convicted criminal. But one of his main messages as leader of Germany's anti-**immigration** movement Pegida — the Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamization of the West — is to deport criminal foreigners as part of a "zero-tolerance policy." Bachmann's criminal record includes theft, physical assault, drug dealing and burglary — something he rarely discussed publicly.

Now, the face of Germany's anti-**immigration** movement has become a migrant himself. Saying that he has faced "persecution" in Germany, Bachmann now spends most of his time in Tenerife in the Canary Islands off the West African coast.

Bachmann had previously described refugees as "junk," "animals" and "filth" on Facebook, and once photographed himself with an Adolf Hitler mustache, publicly ridiculing refugees fleeing repression and war. Such rhetoric turned Bachmann into one of the leaders of Germany's right-wing political scene.

Although he avoided describing himself as a "migrant," Bachmann explained in a Facebook video that he had lived and worked on the Spanish island for several months. He cited several alleged break-in attempts at his house in the eastern German city of Dresden as one of the reasons he and his wife left.

Bachmann is hardly the only anti-**immigration** advocate who has recently embraced the idea of migration. Germany's ZDF television recently reported that a growing number of Germans opposed to German Chancellor Angela Merkel's pro-refugee policies had moved to Hungary, where Prime Minister Viktor Orbán built a border fence last year.

Hungary-based real estate agent Ottmar Heyde said 80 percent of his customers now said they wanted to move to the country to escape Merkel's migrant-friendly government. "They say that they are fed up and that it gets worse and worse in Germany," Heyde told ZDF.

In Dresden, the anti-**immigration** movement Pegida continues to attract hundreds of people to its weekly protest marches. The right-wing Alternative für Deutschland party — which operates independently from Pegida — is now considered one of the three most popular parties in the country, and has made gains in recent regional state elections.

German authorities, however, have recently cracked down on radical parts of the right-wing movement. Earlier this year, Bachmann was found guilty for "inciting the people" — a criminal offense that dates back to fears that populists and neo-Nazis could regain power following World War II.

Shortly afterward, he moved to Tenerife.

Read more:

The former head of Germany's anti-Islam Pegida movement says 'sorry' to Muslims

Germany confronts its growing right-wing movement in court

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Should we build a Latino Smithsonian museum? Some Hispanic politicians think so. Piggybacking on the attention garnered by the opening this weekend of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, they have renewed a push for the creation of a National Museum of the American Latino.

It's an idea that sounds good — until you think about it for about three seconds.

This is not just because museums are for dead things ("The Louvre is a morgue; you go there to identify your friends," the French artist Jean Cocteau famously complained), but because it would breathe life into concepts from which we need to move away.

The Latino museum is being championed by Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), who doesn't even bother to hide the "me-tooism." Just a couple of weeks before the opening of the African American Museum, Becerra introduced a bill calling for the Latino museum to be placed in the Arts and Industries Building on the Mall. Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) moved parallel legislation in the Senate.

"It provides inspiration, and it really does give you locomotion to try to move this forward," Becerra told The Post. "So many [of the African American Museum's supporters] have come to me and said, 'You're next.' It pumps you up."

And that's just it. Of all the reasons this is a bad idea, we can start with the fact that the experiences of African Americans cannot be compared to those of any other group — especially **immigrants** and their descendants.

That would include the vast majority of the 56 million people the Census Bureau instructs to identify themselves as "Hispanic" — who can't all be descended from the estimated 100,000 people who chose to remain in the Southwest at the conclusion of the Mexican War in 1848.

The notion that they constitute an ethno-racial pentagon along with African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans and non-Latino whites is a dubious social construct of very recent pedigree. That a museum would help perpetuate this division — literally cement it — is a second reason to oppose it.

Dividing the country along these cleavages — an official policy that began only in the late 1970s and quickly migrated to the academy, the labor market and the culture — has contributed to a degree of social fragmentation that is only now becoming apparent.

What started as a perhaps well-meaning concept stands behind much of today's palpable societal angst. Even liberals are starting to worry about what national fracturing is doing to social solidarity.

The multicultural dispensation that resulted depends on indoctrinating members of four of the groups into believing that they are historical victims of the fifth. This is on its face a nonsensical proposition for those who willingly came here, and for their descendants, and has led to misallocations of priorities and funds.

Many non-Latino whites are disadvantaged socially, as this year's runaway bestseller "Hillbilly Elegy" by J.D. Vance makes abundantly clear. As a very good review in last week's New Yorker explained, poor whites also face economic and cultural barriers to upward mobility.

At the same time, many members of the designated minorities also are very socially advantaged and do not need set-asides to get a government contract or be accepted into Harvard University.

Which is the third important reason the Smithsonian should not open a Latino national museum: Such an institution could only perpetuate the notion of victimhood.

This is a corrosive idea because it tells individuals, especially the young, that they lack agency, that their problems were created by others. We don't have to imagine what politicians would do with this — we see it every day.

There are small museums here and there for German Americans, Italian Americans and Jewish Americans, which is fine. There could be a repository for the definitive story of Cuban Americans, most of whom are here as a result of the traumatic dislocation caused by the Cuban Revolution; for Mexican Americans, whose incredible cultural imprint in the Southwest is at least as important as that of Vance's Scots-Irish in Appalachia; for Puerto Ricans, etc.

But, please, no Smithsonian museum for an ethnicity created by 1970s federal bureaucrats. Defenders of **immigration** make the case that today's **immigrants**will assimilate as members of previous surges did — which is what undoubtedly will happen, but only if they are treated as those earlier arrivals were.

That is, as **immigrants** on their way to being Americans, not as members of a permanent national minority.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PITTSBURGH — Donald Trump has amplified his focus this week on a strident nationalist and law-and-order message, emphasizing rhetoric that has fueled his popularity among white working-class voters but which also threatens to antagonize the centrists likely to decide the November election.

In speeches and interviews in recent days, Trump has called for "American hands" to remake the country rather than those of foreigners. He has portrayed Syrian refugees as a cultural threat, not just a security risk. He has also embraced controversial "stop-and-frisk" policing — a tactic championed by some conservatives but opposed in minority communities as a form of racial profiling — and suggested on Thursday that drugs were a major factor in anti-police protests.

Trump's hard-edged message is at odds with more traditional nominees who tend to use the final weeks of the race to shore up support among voters in the middle of the political spectrum. It also comes at the same time that Trump has been attempting to reach out to minority communities with visits to black churches and charter schools, making for some awkward interactions and scenes.

With less than seven weeks until Election Day, polls show Trump is steadily chipping away at Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton's once-wide lead. But the electoral math still favors Clinton, putting pressure on Trump to improve his standing in diverse battleground states such as Pennsylvania, which Democrats have claimed in the last six presidential elections.

Trump's supporters say his "America first" message applies to minorities, **immigrants** and moderate voters as much as it does to conservative whites.

"It is many of those voters who need the jobs. It's many of those voters who want to walk the streets in Chicago and feel safe," said Rep. Chris Collins (R-N.Y.), a Trump backer.

He acknowledged, however, that it's a provocative pitch. "There's some controversy in it, but you can't be afraid of controversy when you're putting America first," Collins said.

At a Wednesday rally in Toledo, Ohio, Trump expanded on his usual security-focused objections to letting in refugees fleeing the Syrian civil war, saying that the migrants — most of whom are Muslims — should be blocked for cultural reasons as well.

"This isn't only a matter of terrorism, but also a matter of quality of life," said Trump, who has proposed an unspecified vetting procedure to screen out **immigrants** whose views are incompatible with American values. "We want to make sure we're only admitting those into our country who support our values and love — and I mean love — our people."

Trump received loud cheers from the predominantly white crowd.

During the same rally, Trump proclaimed that under a Trump presidency, "American hands will rebuild our nation. Not the hands of people from other nations."

Trump has held up sweeping trade deals as a job-killers in Rust Belt states and parts of the South that once thrived with manufacturing jobs but have experienced severe economic decline.

"We can't continue to be the suckers that allow thousands of companies, millions of jobs to be lost by moving their manufacturing plants and factories to other countries. We can't do it," he said in Kenansville, N.C., on Tuesday.

While he has spoken to concerns of many white blue-collar voters this week, Trump has also made a concerted effort to show that he is reaching out to minority communities, promising to devote himself to rebuilding inner cities and saying his economic stewardship would elevate black neighborhoods. The message is aimed in part at reassuring white suburban voters concerned about his history of racially incendiary rhetoric, particularly regarding Mexicans and Muslims.

But the attempts have hit speed bumps. A town hall in Ohio this week hosted by Sean Hannity of Fox News was supposed to be focused on issues facing the black community, but the audience was largely white. Trump continues to speak to mostly white audiences on the campaign trail.

During a Wednesday campaign event at the New Spirit Revival Center in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, several high-profile Trump surrogates — including famed boxing promoter Don King — sought to combat the impression among many voters that Trump is racist.

However, as King introduced Trump, he inadvertently said the n-word while discussing black assimilation, drawing immediate outrage on social media and from black rights groups.

"If you're a dancing and sliding and gliding n-----, — I mean negro!" King said, catching himself abruptly. "You're a dancing and sliding and gliding negro. So dare not alienate because you cannot assimilate. You know, you're going to be a negro till you die."

Trump also faced a swift backlash Tuesday after he declared that blacks are "in the worst shape they've ever been" during the event in Kenansville — a town named after a man whose family owned a slave plantation.

Such botched outreach attempts have fueled accusations from critics that Trump lacks the historical and cultural awareness of the struggles minority voters have faced.

Trump's championing of "stop-and-frisk," a controversial policy in which police officers are empowered to stop, question and search individuals they deem suspicious, has also alarmed many African American leaders.

"The policy of 'Stop & Frisk' (aka Detain & Dehumanize) is simply profiling for communities of color," tweeted NAACP President Cornell William Brooks on Thursday.

During the Hannity event, Trump said "stop-and-frisk" worked "incredibly well" in New York. But a 2014 New York Civil Liberties Union report found that as the number of stops increased dramatically from 2002 to 2011 during Michael Bloomberg's tenure as mayor, the number of guns recovered, shooting victims and murders only "changed modestly."

In an interview on "Fox and Friends" on Thursday morning, Trump said that he was "really referring to Chicago with stop-and-frisk," drawing questions about how widespread he believes the policy should be in practice.

Here in Pittsburgh later Thursday, Trump condemned violent protesters and called for national unity in the wake of the unrest in Charlotte following a deadly police shooting. But he did not directly confront concerns about systemic discriminatory policing nationwide.

"We honor and recognize the right for all Americans to peacefully assemble, protest and demonstrate, said Trump at the start of a speech on energy policy. "But there is no right to engage in violent disruption or to threaten the public safety and peace of others."

He added that such disruption disproportionately hurts African Americans "who live in these communities where the crime is so rampant" and said that drugs are a "very, very big factor in what you're watching on television at night."

jose.delreal@washpost.com

sean.sullivan@washpost.com

Sullivan reported from Washington.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Would you invest more than $345,000 in a company partly owned by a foreign-born **immigrant** who's temporarily resident in the U.S. because he might be allowed to stay? Would that same entrepreneur take that risk? That's what the president's hoping.

Mike Galarza is one of those people. The Mexican-born **immigrant** has been living in the U.S. since 2009 when he came over as an intern through a J1 visa. Originally, he hoped to build a company in Mexico with "the best U.S. business strategies and practices, " he told me. Instead, he was so inspired by the U.S. business culture that he saw another opportunity: finding a better way to help businesses manage payments and expenses. So he stayed in the U.S. and built Entryless, a fast-growing tech company that automates payables and receivables processing for small and mid-sized businesses.

But there's a problem: his status is still temporary. He has to apply for a new visa every single year. He's done this four times already, visiting the U.S. Embassy in Mexico each time to renew and each time there's a chance that his petition can be declined. "It's a huge risk for my company," he says.

On Aug. 26, the Obama administration proposed new visa rules for foreign born entrepreneurs like Galarza in the hopes of getting them to stay in the U.S. and not take the technical skills they learned here back to their home countries.

The president's "start-up visa" targets those **immigrant** entrepreneurs who own at least 15 percent of their company and have an "active and central role" in the company's operations. If so they can apply for "parole" to stay in this country for two years which can then be extended another three years if certain conditions are met. To do so, the entrepreneur's company must have raised at least $345,000 from qualified U.S. investors or received $100,000 in grants from select government agencies. Other "reliable and compelling evidence" of the venture's ability to grow and add jobs may also meet the criteria.

The rule is open for comments for the next 45 days. The president hopes to see it in action before he leaves office next January 20th. More than 3,000 entrepreneurs are expected to apply each year.

At first, the proposal kind of seems like a no-brainer, doesn't it? We all know this country's **immigration** laws are chaotic. Large companies are often accused of rigging the current H1B visa system to their own advantage--and to the detriment of smaller tech companies who desperately need more talent. We're aware that many foreign-born nationals get their education here and then take this knowledge back home to start-up their own companies which then compete with companies in the United States.

**Immigration** reform has been a hot button this election year mainly over the debate to allow people into this country who may be a drain on resources. But no one argues that allowing foreign-born entrepreneurs to stay because these are the people that this country has been built on--individuals that are likely to grow their companies, provide more work, create wealth and contribute to our economy.

Critics say the proposal favors those who can pay to stay. They contend that this is just a political gesture for votes and these start-up entrepreneurs don't contribute a great deal to the country's overall economic output. And they may be right. But that's not the real flaw. There's an even bigger flaw to the president's proposal. And it's fatal.

The White House is calling the proposal the **Immigration** Entrepreneur Rule. The key word here is: "rule." The proposal is interpreting a section of the **Immigration** and Naturalization Act allowing **immigrants** to stay in the U.S. if, on a case-by-case basis, there's "urgent humanitarian reasons" or "significant public benefit." Do entrepreneurs who can potentially provide jobs and economic value fall under the definition of "significant public benefit?" The White House is hoping so.

But hope is not law. And this is a rule interpretation, not a law. Smart entrepreneurs, wherever they're from, always evaluate the risks. And they know what's going to happen. There is no congressional approval. There is no bi-partisan **immigration** reform ready to be passed. Hillary Clinton will support it but Donald Trump will not and both will have genuine reasons why. There will be debates in Washington. There will be opposing views. Someone will inevitably contest the rule and sue, with the appeals process throwing everything in limbo until the decision reaches (hopefully) the Supreme Court.

"It shows the intention and efforts of the current administration to act on the well needed **immigration** overhaul," says Galarza. "Yet they are short measures leaving too many doors open."

So imagine you're thinking of making the leap, starting up a business in the U.S., putting your life savings into the venture, moving your family here and enduring all the bureaucracy that even American-born entrepreneurs must suffer-- and then multiply that because you're not American born. Or imagine you're an American investor being asked to sink your money into this venture, great as it may be. And you're doing so under the "hope" that the president's "rule" will still apply a year or two from now.

And then consider all the things that may otherwise happen to throw this into jeopardy. Will foreign entrepreneurs be willing to take this risk? Unfortunately, I don't think so.

Gene Marks is a columnist who owns the Marks Group,  a Bala Cynwyd  Pa.  consulting firm that helps clients with customer relationship management. Follow Gene Marks and On Small Business on Twitter.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

There is a conventional wisdom hardening which holds that Hillary Clinton's most urgent task at the first debate is to bait Donald Trump into acting like the ignorant, dangerous, hateful, bigoted, temperamentally unhinged character he has periodically displayed to the nation for the last year. The corollary to this is that if Trump acts relatively controlled and projects minimal seriousness, he might "defy expectations" and emerge the winner.

I don't buy it. While this is certainly a factor worth considering, I'm going to suggest that Clinton can win this debate -- in the minds of voters, if not in the minds of pundits -- even if Trump does pull off that magic transformation for ninety minutes on Monday night.

No question, Team Clinton probably would like to see Trump come unglued before an audience that could be as large as 100 million people. The New York Times reports that Team Clinton is trying to determine "how to knock Mr. Trump off balance," in the belief that "she needs the huge television audience to see him as temperamentally unfit for the presidency, and that she has the power to unhinge him."

And no question, Team Trump believes that avoiding that outcome is key to his hopes of prevailing. The Associated Press reports that Trump's advisers are counseling him to avoid letting Clinton rile him up, noting, remarkably, that "some Trump aides are more concerned about Trump's disposition on the debate stage than his command of the issues."

But Clinton does not necessarily have to bait Trump into acting angry, hateful, or crazy to prevail. Clinton can win if she displays more knowledge and competence than Trump, and if she shows that she takes the debates more seriously than Trump does -- while simultaneously taking steps herself to remind the audience of Trump's erratic judgment and temperament and track record of bigotry, hate speech and all-around abusiveness.

Indeed, this is likely the real game plan. As I reported yesterday, Clinton is preparing to face one of two Trumps: Unhinged Trump, or Serious, Sedate Trump. When I asked a top Clinton adviser if she will try to bait the former to make an appearance, he declined to answer, but said she would be prepared to face either. It's obvious that Clinton is prepping a strategy that will hopefully be effective against either Trump. Job One for Clinton is to project as much steadiness, sobriety of purpose, and mastery of complex issues as possible, on the theory that voters will reward the candidate who actually takes the debates seriously as a proving ground for the excruciating pressures and brutally tough choices required of a president. Meanwhile, whichever Trump makes an appearance, Clinton will almost certainly take steps herself to remind the massive, engaged debate audience of Trump's birtherism, his bigotry, his chauvinism, his cruelty, his overly bellicose temperament, his xenophobic nationalism, his proposals for mass deportations and a ban on Muslims, etc.

In a sense, the idea that Clinton "needs" to "bait" Unhinged Trump into making an appearance is its own form of artificial expectations gaming. If Trump avoids this "trap," that then allows commentators to claim that he "defied expectations" and was surprisingly sober, serious, and perhaps even presidential. But these "expectations" are arbitrary, and they are set by the commentators themselves. Trump should not be accorded credit for being less ignorant, unhinged, hateful, and dishonest than usual.

Indeed, allow me to suggest one possible way all this might go. Serious, Sedate Trump appears on Monday night, and manages to remain present throughout. Commentators gush about how he "defied expectations." Meanwhile, Clinton gets a message out to the voters that she is nonetheless far more prepared for the presidency than Trump is, while simultaneously reminding them herself in some detail about the Unhinged Trump they already know so well. Commentators don't register that happening, or at least give it short shrift amid their zeal to declare that Trump cleared the bar that they themselves set at floor-level for him. But the voters do register it.

I'm not necessarily predicting a uniformly winning performance from Clinton. She'll struggle under tough questioning about her emails, the Clinton Foundation, and so forth. No doubt many Dems are also hoping Clinton takes major steps to make herself more likeable, and it's anyone's guess whether she'll succeed at that. I'm simply suggesting that, whatever the commentariat concludes about the outcome, the public's ultimate verdict on it will not hinge on whether Trump manages to "defy expectations" by avoiding efforts to bait him into being unhinged, or by meeting an arbitrary pundit-generated minimal standard of knowledge and seriousness.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* CLINTON TEAM ROLLS OUT BRUTAL NEW AD: This ad is running in multiple swing states:

Clinton will try to remind the debate audience about all of these Trumpian statements, whichever Trump shows up.

\* CLINTON LEADS IN ANOTHER NATIONAL POLL: A new McClatchy-Marist poll finds Clinton leading Trump by 48-41 among likely voters nationally, and by 45-39 in the four-way match-up:

She is winning because voters trust her more than Trump to handle **immigration**, fight terrorism and manage the nation's economy, and think she has the experience to do the job. The weakness she's been unable to shake is the public's view of her honesty and trustworthiness.

Clinton is trusted on terror by 52-41 even though this poll was partly taken amid the New York bombing and its aftermath. The national averages have Clinton up by anywhere from 2.6 points to four points.

\* NATIONAL POLLS LOOK GOOD FOR CLINTON RIGHT NOW: A new Associated Press poll finds Clinton leads Trump in the four-way match-by 45-39. That's the third national poll this week showing Clinton up six, after the above McClatchy poll and the NBC/WSJ poll released on Wednesday.

Still, the state polls are showing a far more mixed picture. Keep an eye on the averages of national and state polls.

\* CLINTON LEADS IN ENOUGH STATES TO WIN, BUT… Nate Silver has an interesting look at the map that concludes Clinton now leads in enough states to win the presidency, but this isn't as solid a position as you might think:

That both understates and overstates how precarious Clinton's position is. Clinton's polling has been somewhere between middling and awful in most of the other swing states lately, and they all at least lean toward Trump at the moment…. On the other hand, Clinton's leads in the states she needs to win appear to be pretty solid. As of late Thursday afternoon, she's ahead in our forecast by 3.1 percentage points in New Hampshire, and by slightly more than that in Colorado (3.3 points), Pennsylvania (3.4 points) and Michigan (also 3.4 points).

If Pennsylvania, Colorado, and Virginia hold, Clinton needs one more (NH, NV, FL, or NC). But that bars a surprise loss in another blue-leaning state, and the margin for error is very small.

\* TRUMP'S POLICIES WOULD HIT MINORITIES HARDEST: The New York Times looks at Trump's call for more aggressive anti-terror, **immigration**, and policing tactics across the country and concludes:

An examination of Mr. Trump's recommendations for policing, terrorism and **immigration** enforcement reveals a series of policies that civil rights activists and national security veterans fear could have the effect of treating minorities with suspicion and singling them out for heavier government scrutiny….experts in national security and law enforcement…warn that Mr. Trump's agenda could undermine public safety by generating a backlash in communities that the police and intelligence officials rely upon for cooperation.

Why, it's almost as if Trump isn't actually reaching out to minority groups.

\* AND MEDIA SHOULD HOLD TRUMP ACCOUNTABLE FOR DEBATE LIES:Paul Krugman spells it out:

I am not calling on the news media to take a side; I'm just calling on it to report what is actually happening, without regard for party. In fact, any reporting that doesn't accurately reflect the huge honesty gap between the candidates amounts to misleading readers, giving them a distorted picture that favors the biggest liar….don't grade on a curve. If Mr. Trump lies only three times as much as Mrs. Clinton, the main story should still be that he lied a lot more than she did, not that he wasn't quite as bad as expected.

Yup. Trump should not be rewarded for meeting a minimal standard of self control -- he shouldn't be given credit for being somewhat less dishonest, unhinged, and abusive as usual.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"We're allowing these people to come into our country and destroy our country, and make it unsafe for people. We don't want to do any profiling. If somebody looks like he's got a massive bomb on his back, we won't go up to that person … because if he looks like he comes from that part of the world, we're not allowed to profile. Give me a break."

-- Donald Trump, interview on "Fox and Friends, Sept. 19, 2016

After the explosions in New York, Donald Trump complained about restrictive policies that he said do not allow "profiling" of potential terrorists on ethnic grounds. Under profiling, law enforcement officers target people based on their race or ethnicity or other factors on the grounds that certain minority groups are more likely to commit crimes.

Oddly, as our colleagues at PolitiFact found, Trump has also falsely claimed that he never said he wanted to profile Muslims, just "people that maybe look suspicious." Trump also approvingly cites Israeli policies, which appears to allow for the profiling of Arabs, but Israel, a much smaller country, has a serious problem with Palestinian terrorism. (Update: Israel's methods are actually more sophisticated than ethnic profiling but relies instead on behavior patterns, according to an article in the Times of Israel titled "Israel doesn't do ethnic profiling the way Trump thinks it does.")

So he's being inconsistent, as he's either for profiling of Muslims (the Israeli model) or not.

But Trump also gets the rules wrong. Profiling to prevent terrorism is permitted, with some restrictions, under policies first set by President George W. Bush and affirmed by President Obama.

The Facts

First of all, if someone is carrying what looks like "a massive bomb" on their back, police are going to ask questions. There is no need for profiling in the first place. There is a clear basis for approaching a person who appears to be carrying a bomb, no matter what the ethnicity, religion or race.

If there is just a person with a backpack, and no credible information suggesting such a threat was unfolding in a particular area, it would be more difficult to make the case that a person must be stopped because they appear to be from a particular ethnic group. But presumably that's not what Trump is talking about. (As usual, his campaign did not respond to a query for an explanation of his remarks.)

As the Congressional Research Service noted in a 2012 report, the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, prohibiting unreasonable search and seizure, and the 14th Amendment, allowing for equal protection under the law, have led to court rulings that have limited the use of profiling against racial and ethnic groups. However, exceptions have developed.

In 2001, shortly after taking office and before the Sept. 11 attacks, Bush ordered a review by the Justice Department on how to end racial profiling. In 2003, Bush issued a ban on the practice by federal agencies — with the exception of using profiling to combat terrorism and to screen airline passengers and people at border crossings and **immigration** checkpoints.

In 2014, Obama issued his own policy, broadening the definition of racial profiling to include such characteristics as sexual orientation and gender identity. But he kept the carve-out to combat terrorist threats, screen airline passengers and people at border crossings and **immigration** checkpoints.

So a listed characteristic cannot be used by a police officer as a factor to pull over a car. But there are three factors that can allow the use of generalized stereotypes:

\* The information must be relevant to the locality or time frame of the criminal activity, threat to national or homeland security, violation of federal **immigration**law or authorized intelligence activity.

\* The information must be trustworthy.

\* The information concerning identifying listed characteristics must be tied to a particular criminal incident, a particular criminal scheme, a particular criminal organization, a threat to national or homeland security, a violation of federal **immigration** law or an authorized intelligence activity.

The Justice Department guidance gives specific examples, such as tracking members of an ethnic insurgent group present in the United States after receiving reliable information that the group plans an attack.

The Pinocchio Test

As usual, Trump's actual policy position is a bit of fog. He denies he wants to profile Muslims, while at the same time says the model for the United States should be Israel. (Wink, wink.)

But Trump also wrongly claims that that the United States does not allow profiling. In fact, profiling is permitted to screen airline passengers and **immigrants** — and law enforcement can use it to combat terrorist threats. From the context of his remarks, those are the situations that he is describing when he says profiling is not permitted. We wavered between Three Pinocchio and Four Pinocchios, but ultimately tipped to Four, given the inability of his staff to explain what he has in mind.

Four Pinocchios

(About our rating scale)

Send us facts to check by filling out this form

Check out our guide to all Trump and Clinton fact checks

Sign up for The Fact Checker weekly newsletter

https://www.sharethefacts.co/share/a7a4ce34-af35-4a26-aed4-6648d49d9995[https://www.sharethefacts.co/share/a7a4ce34-af35-4a26-aed4-6648d49d9995]

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In advance of the upcoming presidential debates, we gave Post readers a chance to play moderator. We received more than 3,200 submissions, almost all thoughtful and sincere. They touched on matters from personal character to potable water, from what the candidates see as the biggest mistake in the nation's history to their understanding of patriotism.

There was no starker gap than that between questions directed only at Donald Trump and those directed only at Hillary Clinton. About 60 percent of questions were asked of both candidates. But of the remainder, only about 100 were solely for Clinton, while more than 1,000 were solely for Trump. There were also several questions about the exclusion of third-party candidates, particularly Libertarian nominee Gary Johnson.

A quarter of questions to Trump concerned his refusal to release his tax returns — readers especially wanted documentation proving that he is under audit. Other popular topics for Trump included how he would deal with conflicts of interest, why he for so long fueled birtherism and "when was America last great?" — a response to his campaign slogan. Topics for Clinton were varied, although her "deplorables" comment and her email controversy made several appearances.

On issues of substance, foreign policy led the way with 365 questions. Topics included dealing with Russia, stopping genocide and the future of the Middle East. Questions about nuclear weapons were a particularly prominent topic, with 79 questions — almost as many as the 87 submissions on terrorism (a number not included in the foreign policy count). Most concerned Iran and North Korea's nuclear programs and the United States' policy on using nuclear weapons.

Other popular policy areas included the environment (climate change in particular), **immigration** (about that wall) and health care (especially what the candidates would do about the Affordable Care Act). Of course, the responses should not be taken as a scientifically representative survey. Social Security was the third-most popular topic; almost all of those submissions came after the AARP's advocacy arm featured The Post's form on its Facebook page. Conversely, we received surprisingly few questions on gun control, abortion and same-sex marriage.

Post readers also submitted a number of considered, probing queries seeking to learn more about Clinton and Trump: how they make decisions, how they educate themselves and how they would work across the aisle. Below, we have included our favorites — and we offer our thanks to all who participated.

—  James Downie

Military and foreign policy

Had you become president on Sept. 12, 2001, what would you have done differently than the Bush administration, and how do you think the world would look different today?

Victor Rortvedt, Washington

Many presidents leave behind a foreign-policy doctrine when they leave office (Monroe Doctrine, Truman Doctrine, etc.). What would the Trump or Clinton Doctrine look like?

Jay McCann, Landover

Do you see any geographic or legal limits to the war on terrorism?

Eleanor May, Atlanta

Mr. Trump, one of your goals if elected is to increase the size and strength of the military. To get the desired increase in manpower, would you reinstate the draft, and, if so, would both men and women be conscripted?

Chris Self, West Caldwell, N.J.

Ms. Clinton, have the real or perceived failures of the Russia reset humbled or chastened you enough that you will be wary in your dealings with Vladimir Putin if you are elected president?

Wesley Dearen, Midland, Tex.

Mr. Trump, you say that instead of allowing refugees from nations such as Syria to **immigrate** to the United States, you will build "safe zones" for them in their home countries. Please be specific about how you plan to build these safe zones in foreign countries, which the United States does not control and where open warfare is taking place. How will the zones be kept safe, and by whom?

Derek Wood, Los Angeles

Domestic issues

In the past 50 years, which economic policy, initiative or law that was enacted by or credited to the opposing political party do you believe has had the most positive effect on America, and why?

Victor Rortvedt, Washington

Given that most education policy is already set at the state level, such as whether to adopt Common Core, what do you see as the primary role of the Education Department?

Alex Valencic, Savoy, Ill.

The Republican Party platform claims that Environmental Protection Agency regulations cost consumers financially, while not mentioning human health and financial costs associated with pollution, such as asthma and lead poisoning, let alone the potential long-term cost savings of increased energy efficiency. Do you believe an individual's freedom to make a decision that is financially negative and collectively harmful is more important than the general public's freedom from the effects of those decisions?

Robert Pierce, Washington

Much of rural America lacks access to affordable high-speed Internet for home or business. What will you do as president to help expand access to affordable high-speed Internet for everyone in America?

Marty Newell, Caroga Lake, N.Y.

Cities such as New York and San Francisco have many of the best opportunities for finding high-paying jobs. Those same cities also have skyrocketing housing prices. Keeping in mind that many of the laws that determine housing prices, such as zoning laws or rent control, are enacted at the local level, what will you do to help make housing in these cities more affordable?

Mark Doss, New York

There is a growing question about how ethical and effective interventions such as solitary confinement are in the U.S. prison system. Do you think solitary confinement is acceptable?

Stephanie Barwitz, Denver

Mr. Trump, do you support a federal gun law that would require background checks on private gun purchases made at gun shows? Also, do you support a federal law that would require all gun owners to store guns in lockable safes?

Paige Marshall, La Porte, Ind.

What specific actions should be taken to assure that science, technology, engineering and mathematics education will maintain U.S. preeminence in research and development?

John Webber, Melbourne Beach, Fla.

President Obama has created more national monuments than any other president. Environmentalists love for federal land to be protected from development. States, especially in the West where most of the federal land is, often oppose removing land from development opportunities. How do you foresee using your power to create national monuments?

Thomas Straka, Pendleton, S.C.

What is the best punishment for people who knowingly employ undocumented **immigrants**?

Nikko Schaff, Ithaca, N.Y.

To Ms. Clinton: If you legalize the illegal **immigrants**, what will you do for those who applied for legal **immigration** to the United States? We waited 10 years before we were admitted a long time ago; others still waiting may have been waiting even longer. Shouldn't they get preference?

To Mr. Trump: Most illegal **immigrants** now come from overseas, not Mexico or Central America. Instead of building a wall, should we not concentrate on more effective ways to stop illegal entry and also adopt a national ID card?

Louis Simons, Midlothian, Va.

Name one Supreme Court decision that you agree with and one that you disagree with, and tell us why.

Diane Keafer, Pickerington, Ohio

General

What is the biggest mistake this country has made in its 240 year history, and why?

Lori Pelletier, Middletown, Conn.

Is the birther movement racist, as Colin Powell asserted, and does Mr. Trump owe President Obama an apology for his leadership role in the movement?

Joyce Bloom, Amherst, Va.

Mr. Trump, you stated that you sent a team of "experts" to Hawaii in 2011 to investigate the legitimacy of Barack Obama's birth. Given your assessment of their findings as "incredible," you certainly recollect what they were. What were they? Why haven't you ever shared with the public what these findings are? And why keep the identities of these experts a secret?

Robert Swift, Westminster, Vt.

Through your husband, Ms. Clinton, and through your father, Mr. Trump, you accessed the power and influence that have gotten you to this position. Please counter the view that such accidents of birth and alliance may have distanced you from the plight of America's common man by discussing an experience with the less powerful majority in this country that has informed your perspective on the job you seek.

Barbara Sherrod, New York

What is the biggest mistake you've made in your career, and what did you do to rectify it once you realized the mistake had been made?

David Sutton, Marlton, N.J.

What is your definition of patriotism?

John P. Epstein, Holyoke, Mass.

If you were required to give up your personal and family wealth as a condition of becoming president, would you do it?

David Prensky, Arlington

Given the secularism debate currently engulfing Europe, where do you stand on America's idea of separation of church and state? Some Americans in recent years have asserted that we are a Christian nation. Are we?

Jim Stevens, Honolulu

Where do you stand on congressional term limits and the modification of congressional benefits to put them in line with benefits for other public servants, such as the Secret Service, police officers and firefighters?

Christy Page, Bloomington, Ind.

Mr. Trump, what steps did you personally take at the Trump Organization to rectify the racial discrimination alleged by the Justice Department during the 1970s? After paying to settle the lawsuit, did you reevaluate any of your personal beliefs about African Americans?

Scott Lewis, Nashville

Mr. Trump, would you hire a chief executive for one of your companies who had no business experience? And, if not, why should the American people hire you as their president without any political experience?

Joe Penna, Dallas, Oregon

List five American novels you would recommend that every American read, and why.

John Metzger, Shingle Springs, Calif.

Mr. Trump, you have told us you are the ultimate dealmaker. When you are making deals, do you just base your decisions on the representations made by the other party alone? If they say the business is sound and successful, is that enough for you, or do you have your attorneys and accountants examine all their financial records? If you do the latter, shouldn't the American people be able to do the same, by seeing your tax returns?

Chuck Guerriero, Charlotte

The two of you used to be friends. What happened?

Tony Costa, New York

Politics

Why is releasing tax information relevant or irrelevant to the process of evaluating political candidates?

Jennifer Vizzo, Irving, Tex.

Mr. Trump, while vetting Mike Pence, did your campaign ask to see his tax returns? Since you claim there is little that can be learned from a person's tax returns, and often cite that as one reason not to release your own tax returns, why did your campaign find it necessary to review Mr. Pence's tax returns before selecting him as your vice-presidential nominee?

Mark Crosby, Redondo Beach, Calif.

Please name an issue on which you are willing to break with your party. On what issue would you advocate your personal solution knowing that it would hurt your approval rating?

Jon Gottfried, Washington

The stalemate in Congress will likely be one of the biggest challenges our new president faces in getting things done. What is one policy initiative you're confident you can work through both the House and Senate in 2017, and how will you do it?

Daniel Groce, Smyrna, Ga.

Obviously, the president cannot inform the public of every detail of the office. However, both of you have been accused of lacking transparency. What steps will you take to improve public disclosure, both in government and in your own affairs?

Collin Carroll, New York

You are two of the most divisive candidates in modern history. You are two of the most disliked candidates in modern history. However, come January, one of you will be inaugurated as the next president of the United States. What will be your strategy to win the hearts and minds of the voters who did not vote for you?

Carrie Smith, Oxford, Miss.

Spin out what's behind each of your campaign slogans. Ms. Clinton, why is our country so divided now, and how will you be able to coax its citizens together on the major issues of the day? Mr. Trump, why do you think America is not great now, exactly when was it great before and what specifically made it great then vs. now?

Ellen Lambeth, Vienna

On election night, if you are defeated, will you call your opponent, acknowledge them and support them as the president-elect? What will you do to heal the polarization caused by the campaign?

Ray Strano, East Norriton, Pa.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Presidential candidates rarely come to the debates with fresh facts. Instead, they rely on claims that have been scattered in their stump speeches for many months — claims that The Fact Checker has already put to the Pinocchio Test. So here's a quick guide to old favorites viewers will likely hear during the presidential debates that start on Sept. 26.

The list is longer for Trump because, frankly, he has been exceptionally fact-challenged in this campaign. His average Pinocchio rating is 3.4, which is extraordinary; the highest average rating in the 2012 campaign was Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.), who earned 3.08. Clinton has an average Pinocchio rating of 2.2, which is slightly higher than President Obama and slightly lower than Mitt Romney in 2012.

Debate moderators, please clip and save.

Donald Trump

"I was totally against the war in Iraq."

False, false, false. We have carefully documented how Trump supported the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

"Clinton caused all these problems with her stupid policies. Look at what she did with Libya."

Trump conveniently forgets that he also supported intervention in Libya, specifically advocating the aim of removing leader Moammar Gaddafi.

"The rise of ISIS is the direct result of policy decisions made by Obama and Clinton."

This is false. The terrorist group emerged as a direct result of the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

"Obama took everybody out of Iraq. And really, ISIS was formed."

Trump apparently has forgotten that he also called for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops.

"92 million Americans are not part of the economy, a silent nation of jobless Americans."

This is a phony statistic. Trump is counting retirees, students, stay-at-home parents and the disabled — people who say they are not seeking jobs.

"Since President Obama came into office, another 2 million Hispanics have joined the ranks of those in poverty."

From the start, this was a cherry-picked, false factoid. But Trump keeps saying it even though new census data now shows that nearly 1 million Hispanics have been lifted out of poverty under Obama.

"Fifty-eight percent of African American youth is unemployed."

Another false fact. Trump basically triples the official rate by counting students and people in training programs as "unemployed" even though they are not seeking jobs.

"Our veterans, in many cases, are being treated worse than illegal **immigrants**."

Ridiculous on every level. Yet Trump keeps saying it, despite his campaign's inability to provide any credible evidence.

"Since 2013 alone, the Obama administration has allowed 300,000 criminal aliens to return back into United States communities."

Some fuzzy math is at work here. The official estimate of "criminal aliens" released is about ¼ of Trump's number, which lumps together people not considered criminal aliens.

"Your crime numbers are so crazy, they're going through the roof" because of illegal **immigration**.

Totally false. There is no evidence this is the case.

"Illegal **immigration** costs our country more than $113 billion a year."

This is a figure from a group that wants to dramatically reduce legal **immigration**. Caveat emptor.

"Hillary Clinton plans to admit 620,000 Syrian refugees."

There is no such plan. This is a made-up figure.

"People are pouring in, pouring in, and they're doing tremendous damage if you look at the crime, if you look at the economy."

This is doubly wrong. Illegal **immigration** flows are at their lowest level in two decades. And there is no documented correlation between illegal **immigration**and crime.

"Over 300,000 veterans died waiting for care."

Trump often repeats a misreported figure in the media, based on a government report about inadequate records-keeping. No one really knows the figure, but it's not this high.

"Hillary Clinton started talks to give $400 million, in cash, to Iran."

Clinton had nothing to do with this transaction, part of a settlement of long-standing claims dating from the 1979 Iran Revolution. (Critics have charged the payment was tied to the release of hostages.)

"NAFTA was signed by Bill Clinton."

Nope, the North American Free Trade Agreement was negotiated and signed by President George H.W. Bush, a Republican, though Bill Clinton was an avid supporter and got congressional approval.

"You know who started the birther movement? Hillary Clinton."

Another ridiculous claim — and ironic, given that Trump is the most famous birther of all.

"NATO is unfair, economically, to the United States. We pay a disproportionate share."

Trump is mixing apples and oranges here. The United States projects military might across the globe, so defense budgets cannot be easily compared with the European countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"Obama went on an apology tour."

Trump resurrects a GOP golden-oldie from the 2012 campaign. There was no apology tour.

"I think it's very sad when Obama lands in Saudi Arabia, and he lands in Cuba, and there aren't high officials to even greet him. This is the first time in the history of Air Force One."

It appears to be news to Trump, but the airport ceremony is an unimportant part of the trip. Presidents are frequently not greeted by their counterparts when they arrive in an overseas airport.

"I built a business after my father gave me a small loan of a million dollars."

This is a fable. Trump benefited from millions of dollars in loans from his father, as well as his father's connections in New York real state and local government. His father also saved him from almost certain financial ruin in 1990.

"Trump University got an A rating from the Better Business Bureau."

Actually, the BBB rated Trump University a D-minus, its second lowest grade.

"Vladimir Putin said I'm a genius."

No. The Russian president only said Trump was a "colorful" figure.

[We simulated a Clinton-Trump debate, now you get to ask the questions]

Hillary Clinton

On emails, "everything I did was permitted."

Nope, it was not permitted. She also did not comply with the requirement to turn over business-related emails before she left government service.

"Classified material has a header which says 'top secret,' 'secret,' 'confidential.' None of the emails sent or received by me had such a header."

Clinton often relies on legalistic wording when talking about the email controversy. The reality is that there do not need to be any markings for an email to contain classified information.

"We now have 15 million new jobs that have been created in the last 7 1/2 years."

This is wrong. Clinton only counts back 6½ years to get this number. The real number for Obama's presidency is 10.5 million jobs.

"The average CEO makes about 300 times what the average worker makes."

Clinton sometimes bungles this talking point. This version would be especially wrong. The "300" figure comes from the pay ratio of top corporate chief executives to workers at their companies; it is not a comparison of all CEOs and all workers.

"Hedge fund managers pay a lower tax rate than truck drivers or nurses."

This a hyper-technical factoid. Clinton is talking about the tax paid on every additional dollar of earnings, known as the marginal tax rate. She's barely right on nurses, wrong on truck drivers. But the effective tax rate — a more important number — is higher for hedge fund managers.

"I worked with Democrats and Republicans to create the Children's Health Insurance Program."

Clinton overstates her backstage role in the creation of CHIP. She didn't work directly with Republicans.

George W. Bush's "plan was to give the Social Security Trust Fund to Wall Street."

Democrats love to bring up the long-dead GOP plan for Social Security, falsely deriding it as "privatization." But it was really only a modest, voluntary program.

"I will not let the Department of Veterans Affairs be privatized."

Neither will Trump, though Clinton likes to pretend he does.

"We have to pass a law prohibiting people on the terrorist watch list from being able to buy a gun in the United States of America."

The proposed legislation actually wouldn't ban such purchases automatically.

"The economy does better when you have a Democrat in the White House."

Clinton is citing an actual study. But the study said this was mostly due to "good luck," not policy choices by Democratic presidents.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A regular feature of the presidential campaign: "A group of 75 retired career Foreign Service officers, including ambassadors and senior State Department officials under Republican and Democratic presidents over nearly a half-century, has signed an open letter calling Donald Trump 'entirely unqualified to serve as President and Commander-in-Chief.' "

Trump's usual song-and-dance routine is trying to intimidate the press. "Trump tells Lester Holt: Don't fact-check debates." Obviously, Trump is afraid he will. A lot.

It's common for Newt Gingrich to make stuff up these days. "In spite of what widespread criticism of the media during this election season might lead some to believe, reporters and journalists are still doing their jobs. New York Times correspondent Jonathan Martin wanted to make sure Newt Gingrich knew that when the former presidential hopeful called out the media for not paying attention to violence in Chicago."

Trump routinely reveals his reckless disinterest in actual evidence. "Attempting to strike a unifying, presidential tone while commenting Thursday about urban unrest in Charlotte, Donald Trump veered temporarily off-script and attributed the violence — without offering any evidence — to drugs."

Donald Trump Jr.'s continued gaffes are nearly as bad as his father's. "I think we've been under audit for five years. Who knows if that's politically motivated or not, but our tax counsel, going through a 12,000-page tax return, has said they wouldn't advise us to do it. It could create all sorts of other problems. I'm going to listen to them on that." All sorts of other problems.

Standard alt-right claptrap: "An Ohio volunteer county chair on Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's campaign has stepped down after saying in an interview that there was no racism in the U.S. before President Barack Obama was elected and blaming him for crime and violence in cities." No mystery there as to why she joined the Trump campaign.

Hey, this sounds familiar: "**Immigration** has an overall positive impact on economic growth in the United States and has small-to-no effects on wages and employment for native-born workers, according to a new report. . . . Republican nominee Donald Trump often warns of **immigrants** taking jobs. But this report did not find that **immigrants** reduce employment among native-born workers."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Obama administration's efforts to stem the flow of Central American migrants illegally crossing into the United States have largely failed two years after a border crisis prompted President Obama to order an emergency response.

The number of families and unaccompanied minors arriving in 2016 is on pace to exceed the total in 2014, when U.S. Border Patrol stations were overwhelmed along the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. They are coming primarily from Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador, an area sometimes called the Northern Triangle.

Vice President Biden is expected to tout progress on strengthening border security and deepening economic ties when he meets Friday with the leaders of the Northern Triangle nations at the Inter-American Development Bank in Washington.

But human rights advocates said the continued influx from the region has demonstrated that the administration's deterrence policy has misdiagnosed the root causes and failed to adequately address the humanitarian needs.

Overall, 122,132 families and children, mostly from Central America, have been apprehended at the U.S. border with Mexico with a month remaining in fiscal 2016. That compares with a total of 132,259 in fiscal 2014, according to statistics from U.S. Customs and Border Protection. The renewed surge this year comes after a significant drop in 2015.

"Clearly, at this point, the deterrence strategy has failed," said Kevin Appleby, director of international migration policy at the Center for Migration Studies. "There needs to be a paradigm shift here, with more of a focus on protection and less on the enforcement side. They need to treat this as a real refu­gee crisis. They've been in self-denial for a year or two on this issue."

Unlike the situation in Syria, where millions have been displaced by a devastating civil war, the Obama administration has been reluctant to label the Central American exodus a refu­gee crisis. Under international legal standards, refugees are defined as those who flee government persecution. U.S. officials said the Central American migrants are primarily escaping economic hardship in societies with rampant violence and crime perpetrated by drug cartels and organized gangs.

In the aftermath of the 2014 border crisis, Obama initiated a government-wide response that included additional temporary shelter space and $750 million in economic development aid for the migrants' home countries. Most of those funds, however, have not been delivered to the region.

Under mounting pressure from advocates, the administration announced plans this summer to expand a State Department program launched in 2014 that allows Central Americans to apply for refugee status in the United States from within their home countries.

The administration also won a commitment from Costa Rica to accept 200 gravely endangered Central American minors while U.S. officials examine their cases.

So far, only a few thousand children have won refugee status under the new programs.

"We are committed to protecting Central Americans at risk and expanding resettlement opportunities in the region," White House spokesman Peter Boogaard said in a statement. "The steps taken over the past year are another example of the creative solutions being taken across the federal government to make progress on this issue, consistent with existing statutory law, which limits who is admissible and eligible for humanitarian relief. While these efforts will not solve this challenge alone, they are a further example of the United States' continued commitment."

But the administration's central focus has been on deterring Central Americans from attempting what Obama called a dangerous journey north under the guidance of human smugglers. The administration ramped up the number of **immigration** judges to adjudicate asylum requests and made clear, in advertisements in the Northern Triangle countries, that migrants who lose in court can be returned to their home countries.

Obama and Biden also pressured Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto to tighten his country's borders with its southern neighbors and intercept migrants attempting the journey to the United States. In January, as the numbers of Central American migrants surged again, the Department of Homeland Securityconducted raids to round up several dozen of those who had outstanding deportation orders.

"The federal government has really tried to push the story in Central America that it's just criminal gangs and general violence, but the evidence on the ground, if you look at news reports, is that gangs have gained a huge political dimension," said Bryan S. Johnson, a New York-based **immigration** lawyer who has represented hundreds of Central Americans in court.

At a special U.N. refu­gee summit this week, Obama announced plans for the United States and 18 other countries to increase the number of refugees they will accept next year from across the world. The president specifically thanked Mexico for "absorbing a great number of refugees from Central America."

But advocates emphasized that Mexico has deported many and granted refu­gee status to relatively few. In 2015, for example, Mexico granted refu­gee status to 1,013 migrants from the Northern Triangle, including 57 children, while deporting 175,000.

Appleby said the Obama administration's strategy of enlisting Mexico to block the Central Americans "is part of the things we're seeing around the world — externalizing the border. Extend the border, but don't extend the protections."

david.nakamura@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For years, Boise, Idaho, has welcomed large numbers of refugees from strife-torn countries, in the past year accepting twice as many Syrians as New York City and Los Angeles combined. And so Jodi Larson-Farrow of Boise's Agency for New Americans holds a cultural orientation for about 30 new arrivals about every two weeks, and she asks them what comes to mind when they think of the police.

"Fear," was a frequent response, Larson-Farrow said. "Rapist." "Power." "No trust." "Corruption." "Intimidation." "Run from them."

Then she introduces them to a police officer, Dustin Robinson, assigned full time to the Boise refu­gee communities, which include numerous Somali, Congolese and Burmese natives. And Robinson resumes a task now becoming commonplace in police departments across the United States, reaching out directly to burgeoning refu­gee populations to establish trust — and reduce fear — before crime or terrorism can take root.

"Terrorism is the white elephant in the room," said Lt. Sasha Larkin of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, speaking Wednesday in Washington at a national gathering of police and **immigrant** community leaders brought together to share ideas about integrating refugees into American cities. In many cases, Larkin said, refugees "are isolated, so radicalization is the easy path."

Police are also concerned about refugees' reluctance to report crime, because of their mistrust of police, and the possibility of gangs evolving out of refu­gee communities where young people seek a sense of belonging. Police leaders talked about mentoring refu­gee teenagers, hiring them as interns and simply spending time in their neighborhoods to understand their hopes as well as their fears.

With the United States admitting more than 70,000 refugees a year, including more than 10,000 this year from Syria, American police are not only responding to the needs of brand-new residents but also addressing the fears of long-term residents. "We need to learn to dispel some of the bad news" about refugees, said Assistant Chief Scott Hoffman of Missoula, Mont., which has been receiving **immigrants** from Russia and Vietnam since the 1980s. "If there's fear among the community, we're not doing our job. We need to help them understand that they are vetted, they go through a process. We're there as an educator."

The word "outreach" was tossed around a lot at the seminar, organized by the Police Executive Research Forum and the Carnegie Corp., as police commanders shared their most-effective strategies for building relationships with refu­gees who may have spent years in dehumanizing camps and suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

"Trust is a main issue," said Christopher Coen, head of Friends of Refugees, a nonpartisan watchdog group that monitors refu­gee admissions. Police need to "explain the system, let them know they're wanted here." He said the recent stabbings by a Somali man in St. Cloud, Minn., may have been motivated by harassment. "That's how these young men get disaffected," Coen said. "They have a hostile relationship with the authorities."

So police forces are trying to be proactive. In San Diego, a unit of specially trained patrol officers is assigned to one small area with large groups of Laotian, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Chinese and Thai refugees, and a Multi-Cultural Community Relations storefront is staffed by nine bilingual "police service officers" 12 hours a day during the week. Within a 3.4-square-mile area, 102 languages are spoken, acting lieutenant Paul Yang said.

There are citizens groups for each nationality, Yang said, and they all meet regularly with San Diego Police Chief Shelley Zimmerman. Abraham To, chairman of an Indochinese community advisory board, said Zimmerman attends community meetings and festivals each week, often speaking a few words of greeting in Hmong or Vietnamese to break the ice. Her interest in refugees has filtered down to better service from the officers on the street, To said.

Officers in Portland, Ore., and Las Vegas have launched programs for refu­gee women, who are often deferential and unwilling to call police. Officer Natasha Haunsperger of the Portland police said she tells women: "You didn't survive 10 years of atrocities to have your sons or daughters come here to join ISIS. Right now, we are in this together."

The Las Vegas department's "Female Engagement Team" does things such as show women what happens, or doesn't, when they call 911. "We need to create the environment that they're comfortable to tell us things they truly need," said Sgt. Ivan Chatman.

In Boise, "having someone they trust is huge as the trust is built," said Robinson, the full-time refu­gee liaison officer. "We get a lot of information" about potential crime and terrorism threats, he said.

Police acknowledged that things are not perfect. In San Diego, refu­gee support groups pointed to officer-involved shootings, sometimes involving refugees with mental health issues and a lack of available translators. Wendy Gelernter, an advocate for the San Diego Burmese community, noted that the American Civil Liberties Union has requested an investigation into San Diego police shootings. "The police will tell you that they are overwhelmed with the number of languages, cultures and mental health problems presented by refugees, and no one can dispute the difficulties they face," Gelernter said. "But the SDPD has also shown no interest in improving police training, inviting community input or changing the culture that produces such unnecessarily rapid, violent responses."

Yang said San Diego police are increasing their mental health training for street officers and trying to use more interpreters, though the number of languages they face is daunting.

Local attitudes toward the new arrivals remain a concern for police. "Over the last year, the climate in refu­gee resettlement has changed," Boise's Larson-Farrow said. "I've had Syrian clients ask, 'Am I safe here?' " she said, because of a rock thrown at a Muslim woman or a finger pointed like a gun. "I've never been asked that before. And that has broken my heart."

tom.jackman@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Will Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi be the next David Cameron? Renzi has called for a referendum, to be held in November or December, on constitutional reform aimed at reducing political gridlock. Originally Renzi said that he would resign if it failed . But with polls indicating an uncertain outcome, Renzi has tried to distance himself from that statement. Renzi was in New York this week for the opening of the U.N. General Assembly, and he sat down to talk with The Post's . Edited excerpts:

Q: You have a problem with refugees streaming into your country?

A: Ninety percent of refugees arriving in Italy come from Libya. The question is: What is going to happen in Libya? The situation there is moving in the right direction but we need stability to give to Libya a future.

Is there a possibility of a Libyan government strong enough to control the refugee outflow?

The number-one priority in Libya is to block the frontier of the sea. But the second point [for Italy] is to return **immigrants** who have arrived without permission to their countries of origin. I am speaking of economic refugees, obviously. The refugees who escaped from war have the right to be welcomed in Europe.

Isn't the flow of refugees a problem particularly for Italy because Austria is putting up fences and Switzerland is, too?

Yes, but the numbers are not dramatic. Last year, 155,000 refugees [came to Italy]. It is also important for Europe to invest a lot of money in Africa.

Are your friends in Europe willing to do this?

In theory, they agree with me. The problem is the lack of strategy after Brexit. If we consider Brexit only as a bureaucratic problem, I think we have lost the message that comes from the British people, which is, "Hey! We want a different Europe, not focused on the bureaucrats but on ideals, on dreams and on the hopes of the next generation."

Don't you think the cause of Brexit was the United Kingdom's fear of mass **immigration**?

The problem is not the **immigrants**. The problem is the lack of reaction of Europe. The [European Union] is without vision. We need a strategy for the next year and the next decade. I think we have to change the narrative.

What should the new narrative be?

The changed narrative means Europe becoming a place of dynamism, energy, a place where it is possible to experiment and create hope, not only to discuss austerity. Today we have the Europe of austerity. We need the Europe of hope.

Italy has serious economic problems today. Your banking system has problems — there are a lot of nonperforming loans. Italy has not enjoyed much growth for 20 years, right? So you blame this all on austerity?

For many years Italy wasn't able to criticize Europe because a European could say, "Please achieve the result of your reforms, and then you can speak." With my government, we achieved the results of the reforms — labor reforms, constitutional reforms, and now we have the referendum.

So you have done enough reforms?

We achieved the results of reforms, and now we can speak about Europe.

Your growth rate is 1 percent, correct?

One percent growth. I am not happy with 1 percent growth but last year it was 0.8 percent growth. Three years ago, it was minus 1.9 percent. We changed direction, but the velocity is not the velocity of my dreams.

What about the upcoming referendum? You said originally you were going to resign if it didn't pass and now you seem to have backed away from that position?

Six months ago I delivered a message of responsibility. Italian politicians decided to focus on me rather than the referendum.

But you spoke about yourself.

At first I spoke about myself. Now I have stopped this discussion. This referendum is not about my career or my resignation. It is about the power of the regions, the number of politicians and reducing the red tape of bureaucracy in Italy.

But originally you did say that you would quit if it didn't pass.

Yes, I made a mistake because I shifted the discussion to my life and my career. . . . No country in the Western community has changed its government as often as Italy has — 63 governments in 70 years. Instability is a problem in my country. So this referendum could finally give stability to the country.

What do you think Brexit means for the future of Europe?

It is worse for the U.K. than it is for the E.U. The problem will be very serious for the U.K. If we don't change Europe, the risk to the unity of the E.U. will be greater than it is now.

Because more countries will withdraw?

Maybe, because this was the first referendum and the first opens every possibility. I think if [the E.U.] shows a very strong reaction in terms of new energy, we can block the exodus of other countries.

Should Italy take the place of Great Britain in the E.U. today? Should the core players be France, Germany and Italy?

The problem is whether or not Germany will accept this. I have a great respect for Angela Merkel and François Hollande, but we cannot lose momentum. Carpe diem.

You want to copy President Obama and have a stimulus program in Italy?

Obama is a model for me for a lot of reasons — for the quality of his political discussions and for his political vision. He achieved concrete results in terms of creating new jobs.

And you want to do the same thing for your country?

Not only for my country — for my continent. Because the European Union decided on a different strategy — it focused on austerity, which was a crucial mistake for Europe.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Donald Trump began his "outreach" to African-Americans, there was a near-unanimous conclusion among journalists and commentators about what Trump was really up to. He couldn't possibly believe that he'd get support from the most reliably Democratic constituency, so he could only be doing what some Republicans, most notably George W. Bush, had done before him: by making a show of reaching out, he was trying to send a signal to white moderates that he was the kind of reasonable, inclusive candidate they could feel comfortable voting for.

But everyone was wrong. Trump wasn't trying to appeal to white moderates. He was appealing to the same white conservatives who have driven his presidential bid from the very beginning.

Trump's "outreach" has been full of contempt and insults, demonstrating to his core supporters that the campaign of white nationalism that he has been running since last June, when he debuted his candidacy by calling Mexican **immigrants** rapists and criminals, has not changed a bit.

You couldn't get a much better symbol for Trump's outreach than the town-hall-style interview he has conducted, which will air on Fox News tonight. Billed as a forum on issues of concern to African-Americans, it took place in front of a mostly white audience and was moderated by noted civil rights activist Sean Hannity, who asked hard-hitting questions like, "What does it mean to you to see people of all races and all religions and all backgrounds going to bat for you in this election the way they are?" When one audience member asked him what he would do about "violence in the black community," Trump responded, "I would do stop and frisk. I think you have to. We did it in New York, it worked incredibly well."

Later in the event, a questioner asked Trump about the epidemic of opiate addiction. Oddly enough, Trump did not suggest using stop-and-frisk in communities affected by this crisis. Somehow, the idea of having the police harass and search huge numbers of random white people as a way of finding those possessing opiates doesn't strike him as an appropriate response to the problem; instead, he said that the way to solve it is to build a wall on the Mexican border.

We should note that stop-and-frisk has not only been ruled unconstitutional, it had virtually nothing to do with the dramatic drop in New York's crime rate over the last couple of decades, which began long before stop-and-frisk was instituted and continued after it was abandoned (Philip Bump has details here ). But perhaps most importantly, stop-and-frisk has an enormous symbolic and practical impact on the minority voters Trump claims to be reaching out to. It tells them that they're always a suspect, and at any moment police will detain them, search them, and publicly humiliate them, not for anything they've done, but because of who they are.

To put it mildly, when Trump suggests stop-and-frisk as a way to address crime, he isn't thinking that Eric and Donny Jr. will be slammed up against a wall and patted down when they're walking down a Manhattan street. Now look at what he said about the issue this morning on Fox & Friends:

"They are proactive and if they see a person possibly with a gun, or they think may have a gun, they will see the person and they will look and they will take the gun away. They will stop, they will frisk, and they will take the gun away and they won't have anything to shoot with."

This morning I checked the NRA's web site and social media feeds to see if they were expressing outrage at this gun-grabbing assault on Second Amendment rights, and you'll never guess what I found: nothing. Somehow when the idea of a black person with a gun comes up, the calculation is very different. Don't think for a moment that's lost on black people.

You can add this to the shockingly offensive rhetoric Trump uses whenever he talks about African-Americans and the places where they live. Instead of arguing that African-American are disproportionately affected by broader problems like poverty, crime, and low-performing schools — let alone acknowledging that systemic racism may have played some part in creating that condition — he paints their lives as a miserable hell from which only he can save them. And even after he has been criticized for the tone of these remarks, he hasn't changed. Just on Tuesday, he said , "our African-American communities are absolutely in the worst shape they've ever been in before. Ever, ever, ever," adding, "You take a look at the inner cities, you get no education, you get no jobs, you get shot walking down the street. They're worse, I mean honestly, places like Afghanistan are safer than some of our inner cities."

The fact that these ideas are factually wrong is only part of the point. They also play into the worst stereotypes of African-Americans living in almost animalistic conditions. That's not the voice of someone trying to demonstrate empathy.

And at the same time, Trump continues to sow fear of **immigrants**, particularly refugees. He says that refugees are not people fleeing terrible situations but a "Trojan horse" coming to destroy us all. "This is cancer from within," he said earlier this week, explaining why we need to racially profile Muslims. "This is something that's going to be so tough. They stay together. They're plotting." Again, Trump's idea is that we should subject innocent non-white people to widespread police harassment because of something someone who shares their race or ethnicity might have done in the past, a policy white people will never have to worry about. And as he said on Wednesday about banning refugees, "this isn't only a matter of terrorism, but also a matter of quality of life."

Today, Trump gave a speech in Pennsylvania where he read off a teleprompter a statement about the events in Charlotte, where protesters angry at the shooting of yet another black man by police were met by officers in riot gear launching tear gas and stun grenades. While the prepared statements are never the truest expression of Trump's beliefs — for that, you have to wait until he's speaking extemporaneously, usually the next day — it said nothing about what the protesters' grievances were, simply characterizing the events in Charlotte as a kind of mindless chaos that needs to be put down:

"Many Americans are watching the unrest in Charlotte unfolding right before their eyes on the TV screens. Others are witnessing the chaos and the violence firsthand. Our country looks bad to the world, especially when we are supposed to be the world's leader. How can we lead when we can't even control our own cities? We honor and recognize the right of all Americans to peacefully assemble, protest, and demonstrate. But there is no right to engage in violent disruption or to threaten the public safety and peace of others. Every single American in our country is entitled to live in a safe community. The violence against our citizens and our law enforcement must be brought to a very rapid end."

The idea that America's cities are cesspools of crime and chaos is right out of Richard Nixon's playbook — at time when crime is actually at historic lows. So don't think for a moment that Trump is going after moderates who might be concerned about his good will toward people of all races. He's still talking to the people who already support him.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS — Two of Nevada's Democratic congressional candidates sat at a Mexican restaurant here recently listening as small-business owners vented over chips and salsa about high taxes, business regulations and health-care costs.

Unlike most such conversations in U.S. politics, this one was conducted in "Spanglish."

The meeting was hosted by Catherine Cortez Masto, a Mexican American who would be the first female Hispanic ever elected to the U.S. Senate, and House candidate Ruben Kihuen, a Mexican **immigrant** who would be the state's first Latino congressman. In a year when political parties and interest groups are spending millions of dollars to mobilize Latino voters — and when the words of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump are being used as a galvanizing force — they are a rare sight.

If Latinos show up to vote this fall, most of them probably won't find one of their own on the ballot. Hispanics comprise roughly 17 percent of the U.S. population, but just 2 percent of the country's political officeholders, according to one measure.

In Nevada, Cortez Masto and Kihuen are each locked in close contests and they know they will need the votes of Hispanics, which is why they find ways to emphasize their backgrounds — and to attack Trump.

When Trump calls Mexican **immigrants** rapists and criminals, "he's talking about my family. It's very offensive," Cortez Masto said in an interview.

Trump is "racist, homophobic and doesn't support our community — not only with his words, but also with his actions," Kihuen told the business owners in Spanish.

Javier Becerra, who owns a graphic-design company, stood up during the meeting and implored the business owners to help Cortez Masto and Kihuen: "We have the biggest politicians, Hispanics, right there," he said pointing at them. "This is a historical moment. It's not time to go to sleep and dream. It's time to wake up and work."

There are Latino elected officials in at least 46 states, including Alaska and Hawaii, according to the nonpartisan National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO). That tally includes more than 30 Hispanic members of Congress — different accounts vary depending on how individual members classify themselves. At least 13 new Hispanic candidates are running for House or Senate seats this year, according to Democrats and Republicans, a group that would comprise the largest incoming class of Latino lawmakers ever if they all win. (Ten were elected in 2012.)

Among them are Rep. Loretta Sanchez (D-Calif.), who is also running for an open U.S. Senate seat and would also become the first Latina U.S. senator. But she trails California Attorney General Kamala Harris in the race to succeed retiring Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.).

In New York City, Democrat Adriano Espaillat is poised to become the first Dominican American elected to Congress as he seeks to win the Harlem seat held for decades by retiring Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.). In Florida, Democrat Darren Soto is expected to win an Orlando-area seat, making him the first Puerto Rican elected to Congress from a state increasingly dominated by former island residents.

Nationwide, Latinos represented 3 percent of all political candidates and 2 percent of all officeholders from the county level on up in 2014, according to a study by the Reflective Democracy Campaign, a project of the nonpartisan Women Donors' Network seeking to elect more women and minorities to office.

"It's actually pretty remarkable, because people of color are underrepresented in general both on the ballot and in elected office. But Latinos are the most underrepresented group," said Brenda Carter, who directed the study.

But Arturo Vargas, executive director of NALEO, said that Latinos are increasingly running in areas not traditionally dominated by Latinos, including Republican Reps. Raúl R. Labrador (Idaho) and Jamie Herrera Beutler (Wash.).

"These are not Hispanic elected officials being elected by Latinos. They're being elected in their own right by members of their political parties, and they're presenting themselves as the best candidates," Vargas said. "Which to me is a great thing because if we are going to only depend upon [congressional redistricting] to elect Latinos to office, we're never going to approach parity."

In Nevada, Hispanics comprise nearly 30 percent of the state's voting population and 18 percent of the state's eligible voters — a sizable chunk in a competitive presidential battleground state. Both parties understand that Hispanic candidates can be the key to victory. After all, the state's Republican governor, Brian Sandoval, is one of two of the nation's Hispanic governors.

"What we have going on in Nevada did not happen overnight," said Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.), who has mentored Cortez Masto and Kihuen for years and is friendly with Sandoval.

Reid understands the power of the Latino vote here perhaps better than any other national political figure. He barely won reelection in 2010 thanks to a last-minute surge of Hispanic support, especially among Las Vegas's culinary and hospitality workers.

"We proved in 2010 that around the country, the strength of Hispanics is in the way that people vote," Reid said. "It's gotten better, not worse, and it's been compounded because of that worthless fraud running for president."

The "fraud," in Reid's view, is Trump. Cortez Masto and Kihuen agree, but for them Trump's attacks are deeply personal.

Cortez Masto, 52, is trailing Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R-Nev.) in a closely watched race to succeed Reid. Both candidates have faced more than $10 million in attack ads aired against them, including more than $7 million in ads against the Democrat paid by entities controlled by the industrialist Koch brothers, Reid's longtime foes.

Her father moved from Mexico at a young age and parked cars at a Las Vegas casino for a living; her mother was Italian. Cortez Masto's father occasionally spoke to her in Spanish, she said, but her parents insisted that she would speak English predominantly, especially outside the home.

"Very rarely did they speak it because at that time they felt it was all about assimilation," she said.

Cortez Masto does not speak Spanish when campaigning among Hispanics — she is somewhat unassuming on the stump — but her aides distribute blue and orange Spanish-language campaign signs that say, "Una de las Nuestras," or "One of Us."

Kihuen, meanwhile, campaigns flawlessly in both languages — and is far more outgoing. Political forecasters give him the edge in a contest against first-term incumbent Rep. Cresent Hardy (R-Nev.) to represent the state's 4th Congressional District. The 36-year-old, who pronounces his last name "key-when," moved from Mexico in 1988. His parents first settled the family in California, then Nevada.

"Their first job was picking strawberries in the fields of California," Kihuen said. "We didn't know where we were going to live, we had no connections, no friends, no family. Thirty years later, their son is a state senator running for Congress. That's the essence of the American Dream."

With less than two months to go, Cortez Masto and Kihuen can probably count on strong Hispanic support, but there's evidence that she especially may be struggling to connect. A recent Univision News poll released last week found that nearly 4 in 10 Hispanic voters do not know enough about Cortez Masto to register an opinion — even though she leads Heck among Hispanics by a wide margin.

The history of her candidacy "should resonate more. I'm not sure why it's not resonating as much," said Gil Lopez, 29, a recent law school graduate at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas who is supporting Cortez Masto. "Maybe because the whole election cycle, there's not that much excitement about Trump versus Clinton. But that's something we've got to really change."

That will mean tracking down voters such as Sylvia Navarro, a Mexican American housekeeper, who lives in Las Vegas's Winchester neighborhood. Standing at a street-corner food stand with her three teenage sons eating spiced mango and vanilla-flavored slushies, she said she had heard very little about Cortez Masto. Navarro was surprised to learn that she might have the opportunity to elect the nation's first Latina senator.

"Really?" she said. "Maybe I haven't been paying attention, but I haven't seen anything about that yet."

ed.okeefe@washpost.com

Dalton Bennett contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Kellyanne Conway, Donald Trump's campaign manager, sat down for an interview with CNN's Erin Burnett on Tuesday to talk about the state of the campaign. It got a little weird. Using Genius, I annotated it. You can too! Sign up for Genius and annotate alongside me! To see an annotation, click or tap the highlighted part of the transcript.

ERIN BURNETT, CNN ANCHOR:  And out front now, Donald Trump's campaign manager Kellyanne Conway.

Kellyanne, thank you so much for being with me.  I want to give you a chance to react to this news that Jamie just was breaking, former President George H.W. Bush says he will vote for Hillary Clinton.

That, of course, is not just not voting for Donald Trump, it is voting for Hillary Clinton.  What is your response to that?

KELLYANNE CONWAY, TRUMP CAMPAIGN MANAGER:  Well, I respect the 92-year-old former president very much and his decision.  And I think that Americans are very grateful to the Bush family for their public service.  That is his right.

It is ironic that he would vote for the wife of the man who knocked him out of the race, Bill Clinton defeated George Herbert Walker Bush, Bush 41, Erin, in 1992, for his reelection.

But look, this was a bruising primary, and Jeb Bush really failed all expectations that he would be the "electable," the predominant person on the stage.  I mean, he lasted through South Carolina.  Got out of the race before March 1st.

So I know there are a lot of hurt feelings there.  That is his right.  I think what's most disturbing about this report to me, Erin, is that someone divulged a private conversation.  It doesn't seem it was meant for public consumption and that is always very bothersome to me.

BURNETT:  Originally saying it to, obviously a member of the Kennedy family at a private gathering.  As you point out, he has, of course, since come out and said it and is -- you know, said to Jamie.  But, yes, fair point, it was originally meant to be private.

I want to ask you, Kellyanne, about the another story that is breaking tonight.  This is The Washington Post report, reporting that Trump may have violated laws against self-dealing through his foundation.

And I don't know if you've had a chance to read it.  But they lay out several donations that he made to charities in order to settle lawsuits.  One of them involved Mar-a-Lago.  It was a $100,000 donation to a veterans charity, and to settle fines that Mar-a-Lago owed Palm Beach over some sort of a dispute about a flagpole.

Of course, it is illegal to use a charity's money to benefit yourself or your businesses.  Are you concerned at all that Trump may have broken the law?

CONWAY:  No.  And I would point out in the second paragraph of that story that you mention, Erin, it says "may have," and later on in the story it says the IRSmay want to look into it.  But of course they haven't.

And let's just go back.  I think this is classic Donald Trump.  He wanted to raise the American flag as high as he possibly could over Mar-a-Lago.  I think a lot of Americans at this point would applaud that.

And, of course, the county said he couldn't do it.  It had to be smaller.  So they started assessing a $1,250-a-day fine.  So the way that they "settled it" was for Mr. Trump to donate $100,000 to a veterans group.  I don't want that to be lost here.

And so the money went to veterans.  You know, the Trump Foundation started out with Mr. Trump's money.  He was its sole owner for a very long time.  And I want to point out to you that the Trump Foundation has no permanent, no paid staff, no overhead, no one from the Trump family takes a penny as a salary or as benefits.

Contrast that to, as we know, the slush fund otherwise known as the Clinton Foundation.  As we speak they have their international donor fly in so that they can pick up all kinds of foreign cash to coincide with the U.N. General Assembly.

So I think there is absolutely no comparison between these two foundations, especially when you think about Hillary Clinton being a public servant, secretary of state, while the Clinton Foundation was doing a lot of its cash collecting.

I know when they left the white house they were quote, "dead broke."  But, boy, are they worth a quarter of a billion dollars now.  And it is no coincidence that it went along with the Clinton Foundation and her time in the State Department.

BURNETT:  So let me ask you a couple of questions that you raise there, because you mention The Post saying "may have," and you are right, it does say "may have." It goes on though to quote a lawyer, Jeffrey Tenenbaum, who advises 700 non-profits annually on taxes, and his quote was "I've never encountered anything so brazen." Saying "it's as blatant an example of self-dealing as I have seen in a while."

Again, referring to that Mar-a-Lago example.  There was another one with a golf course as well to settle a dispute.  A donation was given from the foundation to charity.

Can you categorically say there was no self-dealing?  Or at this point are you not sure?

CONWAY:  Well, I've been talking to the people who are responsible for the Trump Foundation today, trying to get some facts and some figures.  And so I know this is all developing.  We need to gather information.

But let me tell you something.  It is very important for people to understand what happened in these cases.  Donations went to veterans groups.  Donations went to another person's foundation, in another instance.  The idea that the money went for -- when people hear self-dealing, Erin, you know what they think of immediately, that it's going or plane rides and fancy hotels and expensive meals and certainly salaries and overhead.

Again, that sounds to me like the Clinton Foundation where a report this weekend said about 6 percent of their money got to charities.  A lot of it was wasted in overhead.  That is not the case here.

(CROSSTALK)

CONWAY:  ... Clinton Foundation.

BURNETT:  Kellyanne, to the point, though, it was the Trump Foundation and if this was settling a lawsuit that enabled Donald Trump's business to benefit, whether it be Mar-a-Lago or a golf course, that would possibly then be self-dealing.

CONWAY:  I'm sorry, how did his golf course benefit from him redirecting moneys that mistakenly came to the Trump foundation?  He redirected them to someone else's private foundation based on a hole-in-one contest.

They were misdirected to his foundation, I'm told, by his accountants and attorneys.  They went to the right foundation after that.  How in the world did his business benefit from that?  How did Mar-a-Lago benefit from him giving $100,000 to veterans.  The veterans benefit.  And I think that is great.  I applaud him for doing that.

(CROSSTALK)

BURNETT:  Well, the business, of course, benefitted by the lawsuit going away, being settled, right?  That would be how the business benefitted.

CONWAY:  Well, there are man lawsuits every day against people.  That's -- I think that is a bridge too far.  I think you are making things up based on facts as they are not reported in this story which also uses a lot of conditional phrasing, I would like to point out.

But look, foundations exist to help charities, to help those in need.  And Mr. Trump has been incredibly generous throughout his career.  I'm up in his office here in Trump Tower routinely when he is writing -- he is signing checks privately to help people that isn't even part of the foundation.

I mean, can you imagine?  I know you can imagine, Erin.  You can only imagine how many people have asked Mr. Trump for his time and his resources and his connections and his money privately.  And he does that.

He doesn't have cameras in there.  It doesn't go through foundations.  And by the way, everybody should also note that foundation disbursements, as you know under federal law, are all a matter of public record.  That is how this Washington Post reporter who seems a little obsessed with Donald Trump these days, that's how he got this information in the first place.

BURNETT:  So, but you mention private...

CONWAY:  So it's all a matter of public record.

BURNETT:  Yes, it is a matter of public record when it comes to the foundation, and you mention that he writes private checks.  Obviously part of the issue here, for some people, is that Trump has not donated to his own foundation since 2009.  He did up to that point and then he no longer did.

So...

CONWAY:  For decades.  For decades.  For decades, Erin.

BURNETT:  But since 2009 -- OK.

CONWAY:  This foundation started in 1987.  Let's be fair here.  If we're going to throw words and figures around, let's be fair to Mr. Trump.  The foundation, as I understand it, started in about 1987.  For a very long time Donald Trump was the only donor to the foundation.

I mean, people think that there is no history before 2009.  Let's be fair to him.  And you say that some people think this is an issue.  I don't see it in a CNN poll anywhere.  I see jobs, economy, terrorism, health care, **immigration**.

I mean, good lord, just down the street from us right here we had this terrorist -- this radical Islamic terrorist whose ex-wife says he hates gay, he hates America, tried to kill people.  Thank God he didn't.

But he certainly scared a whole heck of a lot of us, and he certainly injured many people who have our prayers and condolences -- our prayers here at the Trump campaign.

So I do want to talk about the issues that Americans are talking about but this isn't on the list.

BURNETT:  I would say, Kellyanne, one thing though, of course, when you talk about those private checks and private donations, everybody would know what they were, there would be no issues if he just put out his personal taxes, because that's where all of that would show up.

So that's the only thing I would say on that, is all that would be out there for everybody and quiet perhaps some of this, which I will say I do believe is a real issue, to have full financial transparency.  And I said that with Mitt Romney as well.

CONWAY:  Well, one thing -- I can tell you one -- well, one thing that you wouldn't see in his tax returns, Erin, is $16.5 million for some advisory position at Laureate University that Bill Clinton gets.  You wouldn't see $21.5 million for 92 speeches that Hillary Clinton gave.  She gives speeches for free now, nobody seems to want to listen to them.

She doesn't get these rally crowds that Donald Trump gets anywhere.  So I think if we're going to use foundations as an issue, we actually -- that would be great if actually people want to do some fair, even-handed reporting about the foundations at work here.

Because the Clintons are very involved in their foundation.  Seem to have financially benefitted.  Seem to have used through the foundation to help, not to have necessarily the victims of the earthquake in Haiti get all the money they were expecting, but certainly to help their friends and allies and colleagues get special favors and be granted access, yes, at the State Department.  That has been made very clear through some emails.  But also around the world.

BURNETT:  So, Kellyanne, I want to get you on the record about another news story out there today.  Of course, the tweet from Donald Trump Jr.  He tweeted a graphic yesterday that likened Syrian refugees to Skittles.

The tweet was "this image says it all, let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first.  Trump 2016." And then the graphic said: "If I had a bowl of Skittles and had told you just three would kill you, would you take a handful?  That is our Syrian refuge problem."

Now obviously he got a lot of criticism for that.  Mars Candy, who owns Skittles, actually put a statement out saying "Skittles are candy, refugees are people, we don't feel it's an appropriate analogy."

Look, Kellyanne, I know that you and the campaign have an issue with the lack of vetting that's possible with a lot of Syrian refugees, with the increase in Syrian refugees, but do you believe that this analogy specifically was appropriate?

CONWAY:  Well, the analogy was not -- I don't think it is as you just characterized it.  But what I do think, what we do know is that many Americans are very concerned with the lack of vetting that is going on.

We see what's happening all across Europe, Erin.  The lack of vetting there and just sort of sure, just come on over, that has been a disaster.  I mean, many women have been raped and you know that there has been -- look at Germany.  Look at the problems in France.

And, of course, you know, it's really a shame to those refuges who want to come here through the regular channels and who are law-abiding peaceful people, which, of course, is most of them.  It's a shame that people are resisting vetting programs that would actually just keep out those who want to do us harm.

The idea that Hillary Clinton's plan wants to increase Syrian refuges by 550 percent is very concerning to many Americans.  They know what has happened.  They know there's home-grown terrorism here.

They know people are coming into our country like in San Bernardino.  And they know that they are being radicalized.  They come here on fiancee visas.  They killed 14 innocent coworkers whose biggest crime was giving them a baby or a bridal shower at work, and going to a Christmas party?

So people aren't blind.  They know -- they want to have a country where people who are coming in are known to our authorities, those who are in charge of this.  And we have to start giving our local law enforcement and our federal authorities the tools they need.

Many of them tell us, tell Mr. Trump and our campaign all the time they feel very hamstrung.  They feel like they can't do their job.  So careful vetting of countries that are, again, where there aren't -- there is not vetting going on now, where we don't have strict vetting processes at all, and which have a history of terror or exploiting terror I think is incredibly important.

It matches up with what many people are saying.  As Mr. Trump has said just this week twice on the campaign trail because he actually does rallies with people, not fundraisers with donors only, he has said **immigration** security is national security.

That is actually a phrase that resonates with many Americans.

BURNETT:  So, Kellyanne, I want to ask you about something with Donald Trump.  You know, he was very, very critical of Hillary Clinton not taking reporter questions.  As were we at CNN.  That has a changed in recent days.  And Trump himself has actually not held a formal press conference in 55 days.  The last formal one was on July 27th.

Will he do it again?  Will he start having press conferences?  Hillary Clinton -- I mean, just to be fair, at this point, is now doing this almost every day.

CONWAY:  Well, when Hillary Clinton is in front of the press, she has got the press asking her these -- they might as well just ask her, lovely blouse, where did you get it today, Mrs. Clinton?

I mean, some of these questions are not journalism.  Some of them are just -- it's great to see you, do you think this is will hurt Donald Trump because he -- I mean, did you see this question from a Bloomberg reporter yesterday?

And so, you know, she also gets words like bombing scrubbed from any -- you know, I watched CNN all weekend and what are they saying?  Donald Trump called it a bomb before it was a bomb.  It was a bomb.

And very few people were mentioning from a journalistic point of view that Hillary Clinton had also said the bombings or the bombing.

(CROSSTALK)

BURNETT:  But, again, the question, Kellyanne, is, is he going to take questions?

CONWAY:  CNN added it to...

(CROSSTALK)

BURNETT:  Is he going to take questions?

CONWAY:  Well, sure, he'll take questions.  But, Erin, we're very -- listen, Erin, I have to respectfully disagree because Mr. Trump is out there, we have the press pool with us every day.  He is in public places at rallies with voters.  Not at fundraisers where the cameras are not allowed like which does constantly.

And the press is right there to cover everything.  And you know what, they really do.  A lot of the people who travel with us don't give us a the positive tweet, don't give us positive stories.  Are they not there yesterday in Fort Myers where I was with Mr. Trump?

There were 10,000 people inside and we had 31,000 RSVPs for a place that only held 8,500 people.  I mean, it is just incredible.  We don't get these stories from the whole press pool.  So, sure, maybe he'll take a question here and there, but you know what, he gives press availability every day by doing these rallies in these swing states where he is every single day and they are there with him.

We don't get fair questions.  Just last night CNN added in the word "racial" that he never mentioned with profiling.  Your network added in "racial" to make it look like he had said racial profiling where he never had.

BURNETT:  So, Kellyanne, I want to interrupt you there.

CONWAY:  I'm answering your questions right now.

BURNETT:  I want to interrupt you there because that was a "lower third," as we call them, on our screen.  It actually happened during this hour, and I want to make it clear the word "racial" should not have been put in quotes.

CONWAY:  Thank you.

BURNETT:  But I want to ask you something about this though.  Because a lot of other people were happy to describe it as racial profiling without putting quotation marks around it because Donald Trump continually does speak about profiling related to Muslims.

So if it isn't racial, what specific profiling is he talking about?

CONWAY:  Well, how about a profiling where just, hypothetically speaking, a man who then has pressure cooker bombs in New Jersey and New York's father tells the FBI or tells authorities, my son is a terrorist, and then they drop it.

They don't investigate it.  He's not on a watch list.

BURNETT:  Well, he did recant, he did recant, just to be clear.

CONWAY:  OK.  The father recanted.  Did they look in this man's journals when he was caught yesterday sleeping in a bar in the middle of the morning, and the authorities caught him.  We just are so impressed with law enforcement.

We, in this campaign, can't show enough love and respect and gratitude towards our law enforcement.  And you saw it on display again yesterday.  You saw it on display again yesterday, law enforcement in Linden, New Jersey, capturing this criminal.

And what was in his journals?  They found anti-American, pro-ISIS stuff in his journals I read in the paper today.  He had been to Afghanistan.  His wife -- or his ex-wife said he hates gays.  He hates America.

He is a terrorist.  His father said he was a terrorist.  I mean, if the FBI is -- if our authorities are going look the other way, then at least we have a presidential candidate who is telling the Americans who say, I'm so tired of looking the other way.

We don't have a vetting process.  We don't have borders.  We have people just so worried about political correctness that this -- look what this did the other night.  People were injured.

BURNETT:  OK.  So but this issue of profiling and whether it is racial, ethnic, religious, all of them, coming under the same umbrella.

CONWAY:  He didn't say that.

BURNETT:  But let me ask you, because it's not just what you would probably call the mainstream media that is saying this and having these questions.  OK, it has come up on FOX News several times where they have interpreted this and asked these questions in similar ways.

Trump many times has indicated that he supports profiling based on ethnicity.  Let me just play so you can hear it, Kellyanne.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BILL O'REILLY, HOST, "THE O'REILLY FACTOR":  You know, another thing you said that was very controversial is that you want to profile.  You want to profile Arab or Muslim men.  How would that work?

DONALD TRUMP (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE:  Well, we have no choice.  Look, Israel does it.  And Israel does it very successfully.

In San Bernardino they saw bombs laying around the apartment.  People saw it.  And they wanted to be -- they called it racial profiling.  We didn't want to call in because of racial profiling.  In other words a lawyer got to them and said, you got a problem here.  You knew this was -- say racial profiling.

But look, whether it's racial profiling or politically correct, we better get smart.  We are letting tens of thousands of people into our country.  We don't know what the hell we're doing.

I want surveillance of certain mosques, OK?  If that's OK.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

BURNETT:  So, Kellyanne, if it isn't religious, if it isn't ethnic, if it isn't racial, what is it?

CONWAY:  It's based on what he just said, which is, look at San Bernardino.  Let's use an actual real-world example instead of hypotheticals here.  In the real world San Bernardino happened.  There are 14 families who will always feel grief because people looked the other way.

You saw all the reports afterwards, CNN went right out there.  And you had people saying, yes, I thought it was kind of weird, or I saw bomb-making devices or whatever they had said at the time.

It wasn't like if they were just hanging around my house or your house, Erin, and saying, or, frankly, all the peaceful people of many different ethnic backgrounds, in saying, gee, I didn't see bomb-making materials.

I mean, the idea that people feel that they have got a reason to be suspicious and don't feel comfortable to say that.  I mean, I talked to Mayor Giuliani about this.  We used to have police officers were able to patrol certain places of worship based on reasonable suspicion.  And that has just all gone away.

And so, again, we -- I just want to say that we in this country -- Mr. Trump's message is that we in this country, if we're going to have a country, it would be nice too know who is here and why they're here.

And in the case of this guy Ahmad Khan Rahami in Linden, New Jersey, he had been to Afghanistan and his wife said he came back hating America, hating gay, being so angry.  His father called him a terrorist.

I mean, if this doesn't raise suspicion among law enforcement, what in the world will?  How many more people have to die or be afraid or be injured in Chelsea, New York, Erin, for us to wake up?

BURNETT:  All right.  Kellyanne, thank you very much.  I appreciate your time tonight.

CONWAY:  Thanks.

BURNETT:  The campaign manager, as we said, Kellyanne Conway, for Donald Trump.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Picture this: Carrie, Charlotte, Miranda and Samantha chatting and dining in a swanky New York bistro. They're discussing careers, relationships and sex — recurring motifs that made "Sex and the City" so iconic.

Now, let's take these lovely women and put them in bustling Ghana. Their skin is brown, and their Prada ensembles are replaced with trademarks of African fashion. Their names become Nana, Sade, Makena, Zainab and Ngozi.

Goodbye, Manhattan. Hello, Accra. This is "An African City."

A popular Web series that earned 1 million views within weeks of its debut, "An African City" details the lives of five young, highly educated African millennial women navigating their way to success, entrepreneurship and romance in modern Accra. The first episode hit the Web in 2014; the series's second season is now available online, and scripts are currently being written for a third season, the show's creator and writer, Nicole Amarteifio, says.

But will "An African City" maintain its appreciation for the African diaspora? Will it tell an accurate story of what it's like to be a young, millennial Ghanaian woman in a developing nation? Amarteifio addresses these questions and more.

Why did you create "An African City"? What was the driving force behind it?

I wanted to change people's perceptions of the continent of Africa. … I was born in Accra, Ghana, and raised in New York, and it seemed like everything on television about the continent was negative. I had amazing Ghanaian and Nigerian women in my life. The visibility of these women weren't being highlighted in Western media, and I wanted them to be.

Besides "Sex and the City," where else did you get inspiration?

Shows like "Real Housewives" are my guilty pleasure! But they also encourage me to do this work. I want the characters of "An African City" to show an alternate visual of female friendships. No fighting. No throwing. No punching. Instead, a sisterhood reinforcing a loving togetherness. Additionally, sitcoms like "Being Mary Jane" inspire me to try and incorporate real-world issues to the show.

Speaking of real-world issues, in the episode "Sexual Real Estate," Nana Yaa is hesitant when a real estate agent tells her a condo she likes may not always have electricity, even though the price is comparable to that of a Western luxury property. Is this accurate in Accra?

That can be life in Accra! You buy or rent a luxury property, yet the sustainable availability of water or electricity is not a guarantee. The costs of some of these properties are only affordable to foreigners or expats, pushing out the average Ghanaian. It's a problem.

How did you come up with the characters?

Well, the story line is inspired by "Sex and the City." I started to wonder what Carrie Bradshaw would look like if she were Ghanaian. How would she act? What would the story line be? And that's how the characters were born. The first actress to walk into the audition was MaameYaa Boafo, who plays Nana Yaa, the lead character. She immediately embodied what Nana Yaa is: stunning, intelligent, Ghanaian American. She was it. And it was the same story with the other leading ladies. They were "it" right away.

Is "An African City" popular in other parts of Africa? The world?

Oh, yes! Outside of Ghana, our top viewership is from Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya and Senegal. Online, most of our viewership comes from the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and France. We assume that viewership is from the African diaspora — first- or second-generation African **immigrants**. We have also received emails and tweets from South Korea, Australia, India and Pakistan!

Why did you want the women in "An African City" to have been educated in elite Western universities and colleges?

In the United States, the most educated **immigrant** group is African. Fact. So, for me, the five lead characters being educated in Ivy League schools should not be such a surprise. And if it is, one should ask him or herself why. "An African City" is here to disrupt the stereotypes — highlight another reality, another truth.

How will "An African City" change Western viewers' perceptions of Ghana being poor? Will the show bring an accurate picture of how young Ghanaians live?

I believe the world has taught many African Americans to not be proud of their roots, yet when African Americans watch the show, they tell me how proud they are. Some have even visited or moved to Ghana because of the show. When I hear that, I think to myself: Mission accomplished.

What's one thing you can tell Westerners about young, single professional women in Ghana?

I think the story of the single woman is the same everywhere. It's tough and comes with a lot of heartbreak, disturbing surprises, and battles of self-love and respect. And that's the whole purpose of the show. It's a universal story about being a single woman, African or not.

READ MORE:

Why this single mother of 3 moved her family to the UAE

What has changed for single Americans in the past decade

'Bridget Jones's Baby' is delightful, but where's her backup plan?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget is out with an updated analysis of the two major parties' fiscal policies. Both "would increase the debt relative to current law," but Donald "Trump would increase it by an order of magnitude more." Specifically, CFRB reports, Hillary "Clinton's plans would increase the debt by $200 billion over a decade above current law levels (compared with our prior estimate of $250 billion), and Trump's plans would increase the debt by $5.3 trillion (compared with our prior estimate of $11.5 trillion). As a result, debt would rise to above 86 percent of gross domestic product under Clinton and 105 percent under Trump." A spokesman explained to me, "He's adding more than 25 times (26.5) to current law debt than Clinton. Debt levels in 2026 will be over 20% higher [under Trump's plan]."

Since the initial report, Clinton has proposed an additional $250 billion in spending over 10 years, $250 billion in revenue decreases and $500 billion in revenue "offsets." Interestingly, if you go searching for the offsets -- tax hikes -- on her website, you won't find them. The campaign provided the figures directly to CRFB. She is actually losing less revenue than was determined in CRFB's initial report ($200 billion vs. $250 billion) thanks to a whole lot of taxes -- which have no chance of making it through Congress if Republicans retain a majority in at least one house. Trump went from intolerable revenue losses of $11.5 trillion -- trillion -- to a still intolerable loss of $5.3 trillion.

If they keep this up, one or both might get to a fiscally sane proposal. Neither addresses the existing debt, in large part because neither is willing to look at entitlements, which are the main drivers of the debt, nor to propose mammoth tax hikes on middle-class Americans.

Trump likes to say he is going to achieve unprecedented growth to pay for all of this. How many times have we heard politicians say that? But if he really wanted to pump up growth, he would reform and increase legal **immigration**. In other words, he'd go back to the Gang of Eight. You may recall that the Congressional Budget Office found that the bill would in the first 10 years have reduced "the federal deficit by $175 billion," according to Politico. "Capitol Hill's nonpartisan budget scorekeeper said the Gang of Eight bill would slash the deficit by $197 billion in the first decade, but implementing the bill would cost about $22 billion." In the second 10-year period, the deficit would decrease by an additional $700 billion, the CBO said. You see, if Trump really wanted to stoke growth, he'd turn to **immigration** reform. ("Taking account of all economic effects (including those reflected in the cost estimate), the bill would increase real (inflation adjusted) GDP relative to the amount CBO projects under current law by 3.3 percent in 2023 and by 5.4 percent in 2033, according to CBO's central estimates.")

Another way to make the candidates' numbers work -- or work better -- would be completing major trade deals. "Economic modeling estimates that the benefits to the U.S. from the [Trans-Pacific Partnership] will be $5 billion in 2015, rising to $14 billion in 2025. . . .  U.S. small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) also stand to gain from trade liberalization. In fact, almost 98 percent of all exporters and 97 percent of all importers are SMEs, representing almost 40 percent of U.S. goods exports and 31.5 percent of goods imports. In addition, 94 percent of SMEs are exporters and importers. Therefore, trade agreements that liberalize trade barriers, like the TPP, should disproportionately benefit SMEs. In contrast with large businesses, SMEs generally benefit the most from government efforts to reduce trade barriers overseas as their capacity to overcome these barriers by establishing subsidiaries in other countries is much more limited." Think of trade deals as both growth generators and inequality reducers.

To a large extent we want to do the opposite of what one or both of the candidates want. Tax reform that promotes growth should not lose revenue. **Immigration** reform, trade deals and regulatory reform can contribute to growth as well and generate more revenue, thereby bringing down the debt. In the long term, the key to reducing the debt and stagnant wages is the same -- increase worker productivity. Alternatively, we can do what the candidates want -- jack up the debt, destroy U.S. overseas markets and pass up the chance to attract skilled, productive workers.

Other than both of these candidates losing (both Gary Johnson and Evan McMullin favor legal **immigration** and free trade, by the way) the biggest hope is a pro-growth economic agenda from the GOP House. If there is still a GOP House. And if the back-benchers who shut down the government in 2013 don't dump House Speaker Paul D. Ryan.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's **immigration** policy originally was intended as protection for the working man and woman from the scourge of illegal **immigration**. Then it became about not letting Muslims -- subsequently changed to not letting people from countries where there is Islamic terrorism (Would France and Israel be included?) -- get into the United States without "extreme vetting." It soon became apparent he wanted to squelch legal **immigration** as well. And yesterday he let slip out that this is not about jobs at all.

He declared on Wednesday, "Think of that. Not only the danger of it all, this isn't only a matter of terrorism, but also a matter of quality of life. We want to make sure we're only admitting those into our country who support our values and love — and I mean love — our people."

Hmm. Would that include people like himself who think "America doesn't win anymore" and is a nation whose generals have been reduced to "rubble"? What about people who think African Americans' lives are a "disaster"? What about devout, peaceful Muslims who don't think their wives should work -- as Trump himself has said?

It is hard to imagine what he is talking about if not a scheme to keep out people he deems "undesirable" because of religion, ethnicity or other classification. This goes beyond job protection (even that is a ruse, as we have explained) or, as he confessed, terrorism. This is a play to angry whites who think the country is changing because there are more and more people who don't think or look like them. Guess what? It is -- and the United States has been in constant flux since it started because neither race nor class nor political outlook makes one an American.

It's not complicated.  In the 18th century, they put it this way: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." In the 21st century we talk about the promise that anyone, regardless of where he or she came from or who his parents are, can pursue his or her God-given talents as far as they can go. It may drive Trump and his alt-white followers nuts, but that means a nationalized Muslim American from Pakistan and the child born in this country whose parents came from Mexico illegally are every bit as American as the angry white men who think "their" country has been lost. Hint: It was never the province of one gender, race or religion so they need to adjust to reality.

Trump was not content to leave it at that. He also at one point Wednesday declared, "American hands will rebuild our nation. Not the hands of people from other nations." Let's count the ways this is idiotic:

\* Other than Native Americans, this country has always been built by people who came from other countries or whose ancestors came from other countries to America.

\* Trump's 1st and 3rd wives were not born here.

\* Trump's mother wasn't born here.

\* The men and women who build his buildings and work at his properties include many people not born here. In fact, it turns out some of them were here illegally. As for the legal **immigrants**, he complains he cannot get summer labor at Mar-a-Lago so he imports foreigners.

The "hands of people from other nations" comment is in one sense the most revealing thing he has said to date. He wants to keep out foreigners not because they are "taking" jobs or coming to kill us but because they are foreign. Period. That's in essence what he is all about -- making those who feel they've lost the top perch in American society (white Christian, working-class males primarily) feel superior and protected from "outsiders." It's naked xenophobia, or just plain old racism if you want to be blunt. That is what -- from birtherism to his indecipherable **immigration** plan -- his campaign is all about. And Hillary Clinton was right: The whole thing is deplorable.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"American hands will rebuild our nation," Donald Trump said during a campaign stop in Toledo on Wednesday. "Not the hands of people from other nations."

Nine thoughts on that.

1. America was created by non-Americans and, over time, built by an awful lot of hands from other nations, both literally and figuratively. Railroads, customs, highways, inventions: **Immigrants** have had a hand in the creation of nearly every part of our country. Not all of those **immigrants** came here willingly.

2. Over the course of American history, 407 **immigrants** have served in Congress, building the nation by creating and passing laws. That's about 3 percent of those who have ever served in the House or the Senate.

3. Just because hands are from other nations doesn't mean they're not American. In 2014, the Census Bureau estimated that there were about 41 million people in America who were born in another country, 18.8 million of whom are naturalized citizens. In 2015, there were 26.3 million citizen and non-citizen **immigrants**in the labor force, the large majority of whom are here legally. At the same time, the unemployment rate is near-post-recession lows.

4. Trump has built his business empire with the hands of people from other nations. Trump Tower was built largely thanks to the labor of Polish **immigrants**, some of whom were in the country illegally.

5. Trump's just-opened hotel in Washington was rebuilt with the help of dozens of construction workers from Central America, some of whom also **immigrated**illegally.

6. Trump has consistently hired foreign guest workers at his Mar-a-Lago resort in Florida. CNN reported that in the past 15 years, he has hired 1,256 foreign workers to do jobs in the United States.

7. Trump's clothing line and other products are manufactured by non-Americans in other countries. In an interview with a North Carolina TV station this week, he defended that practice.

The reason I do manufacture things overseas — you know, I have to do this, there is no choice — because they've devalued their currency so much that our companies are out of business for the most part. You look at so many of the products that we used to make proudly and they're out of business — put out of business by China and Mexico and other countries.... So people that buy a lot, like Trump and other people, we have no choice. In many cases, they don't even sell the product in this country any more. A product we used to use and make proudly, we don't even make it here.

This has been fact-checked in the past: Trump's clothes could be made in the United States, and many of the countries where his products are made are not ones where the currency is manipulated.

8. Trump is the son of an **immigrant**, and four of his five children are the children of **immigrants**. Melania and Ivana Trump have helped to build America, too.

9. Trump's grandfather, Frederick Trump, **immigrated** to the United States and moved to Seattle, where he opened a restaurant and, later, a hotel. When he died in 1918, his wife, Elizabeth, also a German **immigrant**, helped Donald's father, Fred, launch his real estate empire.

That her hands were non-American doesn't seem to have been much of a concern.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Dale Koontz, a Hillary Clinton supporter in Arlington, Va., knew without asking that certain family members disagreed with her about the election. Her mother and grandmother were posting articles on Facebook supporting Donald Trump and excoriating Clinton. "I actually had one or two friends text me about it because they were concerned — 'Is your mom voting for Trump?' "

Koontz, 23, a staff assistant at a public-affairs firm, called her mother in North Carolina, and the discussion became heated. "She's like, 'Well, you're not going to vote for [Clinton], right?' — and it came out that I was. . . . It's really difficult, because I've always been very, very close to both my mom and my grandma, rarely disagreeing with them. I've always looked up to my mom and respected her opinions."

But it got to a point where Koontz was afraid to open her emails "because I was scared it would be another article," she said.

Welcome to Election 2016. Americans are backed into their political corners, rarely encountering people in the flesh who do not think like them, except, for many, in one conspicuous place: their families.

Sometimes the dissenting relatives went to college and then moved far away from their home states, landing in different political waters. Sometimes it's a case of generations divided. There also can be more political disagreement in white families, because they are more apt to include Trump and Clinton supporters.

Yet bridge building even between family members is rare during what is arguably the most contentious presidential campaign in recent memory. Instead, dissenting relatives frequently avoid talking politics in person to keep the family peace.

In such a divisive campaign, with its heavy themes of racial and ethnic bigotry and the candidates' perceived character flaws, a family member's political disagreement can easily begin to sound like a personal attack, said Andrew Christensen, a UCLA psychology professor.

For example, said Christensen, who researches conflicts within couples, "if the family member is supporting Trump and that implies that maybe they're not so smart, or that they're racist . . . then it becomes more fraught because they're not just explaining why they support Trump but defending themselves."

"And it's the same for someone who supports Hillary, who might be seen as elitist or a victim of political correctness," he said.

Koontz said she objects to Trump's inflammatory rhetoric and his views on **immigration** and race. Her mother and grandmother think Clinton represents corrupt politics as usual.

"I talked to my mom about that, about how she can be okay with the things that he says," she said. "The issues that I care about are clearly less important to her, and they have issues that they're maybe more worried about that I'm not."

Social media makes relatives' dissenting views more apparent than they might have been in the past.

Patricia Greene, 81, of Powdersville, S.C., plans to vote for Trump but does not talk about it with her son, a Clinton supporter. On the other hand, she said, "he's very vocal on Facebook. . . . Sometimes I'll look at his page, and there will be 15 entries about the sorry, rotten Republicans and things like that. I want to see a picture of maybe a garden he's planted or maybe his grandchildren."

When they get together, the family avoids political discussions. "I don't think either side talks about their leanings, whether they're conservative or liberal," Greene said. "Probably we might would if there weren't so many differences in the family."

For his part, her son, Raymond Myers, 65, a lawyer in Nashville, said he believes Trump is a "con man" who is "part of the Republican Party's proto-Nazi arm."

"I post exactly those things on Facebook, and my sister has literally posted things like that the Clintons are having people murdered," he said.

The differences run deep. Myers deplores Trump's statements about **immigrants** and minorities, and said he believes they reflect poorly on those who would vote for him. "I think a large percentage of Trump supporters are out-and-out racist."

Including his mother and sister? "Let's say that I certainly have a concern about racism affecting who supports Trump and who supports Hillary," he said. "In my Facebook posts, I say that Trump supporters are racist, so in that regard, yes."

In turn, his sister posts items calling Clinton supporters racist. But when they meet face to face, they avoid the topic.

"It might be a cop-out, but I will say that nobody's perfect," Myers said. "I love my sister and mother — there are many good things about them, and I love those good things. So, I just compartmentalize those things."

Turning liberal

Melanie D'Evelyn, 33, an education-policy consultant in Ann Arbor, Mich., grew up in a conservative family in Colorado — her uncle is a state co-chair for the Trump campaign. But she "went to the dark side in college, in their view, " she said. Now, she is in the uncomfortable position of having to reconcile her love for her relatives with political positions she abhors.

"I don't think the stakes have ever been higher for a presidential election, and I have a feeling that my family members feel similarly," she said. "My father-in-law is a Trump supporter. That conversation has been pretty traumatic for me, because he is by far one of the kindest, gentlest people I know."

Her husband, James Arnott, is used to disagreeing with his father on politics. "But it is more difficult when I see someone like Trump," said Arnott, 29, a researcher at the University of Michigan. "I almost feel like he's getting snookered or something, so that makes me feel bad. It also makes me feel bad that the moral values that Trump represents are so different from what he represents and what they raised me to represent."

Arnott said he is troubled by Trump's comments about **immigrants** and race, his elevation of wealth as a worthy goal, and his "complete and utter disregard to truth." So, how does he reconcile someone he loves supporting him?

"I don't think that supporting Trump makes my dad a bad person," he said. "It's a very noisy landscape out there, and it's very difficult to get clear messages. I think he's hearing different things from what I'm hearing, and he's kind of building this architecture of ideas around what he's hearing."

Still, when Arnott's mother-in-law pointed out a smugness in his reasoning, it made him reconsider whether it is productive to talk about it with family members who disagree.

"I've always felt like dialogue is really important," he said. "But in this instance I feel like being respectful of something that's totally repugnant — what do you do in that situation, especially when you have family mixed up in that? I think taking a chill pill is probably the way to go."

His father, Rocky Arnott, 70, a building construction specialist in Grand Junction, Colo., said he is mystified by his children's liberal turn, which he said happened when they went away to college.

"I don't try to change their minds; I'm not very good at that," he said. "Let's see in the next few weeks if some people in my family will come around. . . . If they change their minds, I guess it will be because Trump changes."

In the meantime, they use humor to take the edge off: D'Evelyn teases her mother about being responsible for a Trump presidency, and her mother jokes about getting together this Thanksgiving, when the world as her daughter knows it will have ended.

But a degree of strain persists.

"I find it perplexing, because we have so many shared values in the rest of the way that we live our lives," D'Evelyn said. "It's so confusing for me that something I care so much about, that we could be so diametrically opposed."

For groups who feel targeted by Trump's proposals, that sense of bafflement can be particularly pronounced. Christian Garcia, a Mexican American teacher and business owner in San Diego, said he believes that a Trump presidency would be a disaster. Garcia, 29, cites the candidate's plans to deport 11 million people and build a border wall, rhetoric that he says "demonizes Latinos."

So it galls him that his brother Alfredo plans to vote for him.

Alfredo Garcia, 42, sees Trump's antipathy toward political correctness as a refreshing antidote to "the sissification of America." He admits to ribbing his brother about Trump's rise in the polls. "He says, 'Man, you can't be serious — I'm going to disown you.' "

The two spar three or four times a week, with the younger brother trying to change the older one's mind.

"I'm obviously frustrated," Christian Garcia said. "It usually ends with me saying he's an idiot, and then we get past it."

So what happens in a few weeks, when one side of the family is celebrating and the other side is reeling in horror?

If Clinton wins, Koontz plans to play it cool in front of her mother and grandmother. "They're going to be upset, and I'm not going to be able to act happy or excited around them. And the same if Trump wins, I'll be upset. So I think there may be some tension afterward, but we'll all be glad that it's over with."

tara.bahrampour@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A Hungarian pamphlet showing migrant "no-go zones" across Europe - being distributed ahead of the country's referendum on refugee quotas pic.twitter.com/liiDm2sj1r

Hungary's right-wing government is intensifying its anti-migrant rhetoric ahead of an Oct. 2 referendum on whether to accept a quota of refugees mandated by the European Union . The government, including hard-line Prime Minister Viktor Orban , is vehemently opposed to the proposal and has been outspoken about the supposed threat posed by Muslim arrivals in Europe.

In a new pamphlet distributed to millions of Hungarian voters, the government warned that **immigrant** communities had turned major cities across Europe into "no-go zones," a line once used on the other side of the Atlantic by Donald Trump and by others fearful of Islam. Trump was widely mocked for his comments last year; the London police, in an arch statement, offered to give him a personal briefing.

Boris Johnson, who was London's mayor at the time and is now Britain's foreign secretary, scolded Trump.

"As a city where more than 300 languages are spoken, London has a proud history of tolerance and diversity and to suggest there are areas where police officers cannot go because of radicalization is simply ridiculous," Johnson said in December.

Nevertheless, the Hungarian government, which conflates the specter of militant Islamists with a larger debate over multiculturalism, seems undeterred.

"The so-called 'no-go' zones are areas of cities that the authorities are unable to keep under their control," the pamphlet states. "Here the recipient society's written or unwritten norms do not apply. In those European cities, where **immigrants** live in great numbers, several hundred 'no-go' zones exist."

The talking point is not new, even for the Hungarians. In March, the government launched a website where it first mentioned the supposed existence of 900 "no-go areas" across the continent, including towns and neighborhoods within major capitals, among them London and Berlin. The project was headlined by a banner that said, "Refugees are not welcome here."

The Hungarian position has irked others in Europe; earlier this month, the foreign minister of Luxembourg suggested that Hungary be thrown out of the European Union for the measures it has taken to thwart refugees.

Grilled by a bemused and increasingly irritated Evan Davis, the BBC "Newsnight" presenter, Hungarian Foreign Minister Peter Szijjarto defended his government's position on Tuesday night.

"We based this information on open, official reports given by the police of the respective countries and from the news," he said. "There are no-go zones in Europe, and we don't want no-go zones in Hungary."

The Huffington Post transcribed part of the testy exchange that followed:

The Newsnight interviewer pressed: "You still believe there are no-go areas in London where you can't go because the migrants have taken over?

As WorldViews has tracked over the past year, Hungary is hardly alone in its controversial — and, some would say, bigoted — stance. In Central and Eastern Europe, a host of right-wing, populist governments have grandstanded on the refugee influx, scaremongering about the supposed end of their societies and way of life even though Muslim arrivals would number a minuscule proportion of the population.

"If we let the Muslims into the continent to compete with us, they will outnumber us," Orban said last year. "It's mathematics."

More on WorldViews

Hungary's Orban invokes Ottoman invasion to justify keeping refugees out

Everyone hates the elites. Even the elites.

Hungarians are making these creepy scarecrows to keep migrants out

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TOLEDO — Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump on Wednesday said his proposed ban on Syrian refugees is not just about terrorism, but also "a matter of quality of life."

Trump blasted his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, for supporting the admission of refugees fleeing the bloody civil war in Syria during a campaign event here. He has strongly advocated for ceasing all **immigration** from "dangerous countries," and in particular countries with "radical Islamic terrorism."

"Think of that. Not only the danger of it all, this isn't only a matter of terrorism, but also a matter of quality of life. We want to make sure we're only admitting those into our country who support our values and love — and I mean love — our people," Trump said.

The GOP nominee spent much of Wednesday in Ohio speaking about his outreach to minority communities, promising to devote himself to rebuilding American inner cities and saying that his economic stewardship would elevate black communities economically. Several high-profile Trump surrogates, including famed boxing promoter Don King, sought to combat the impression many minority voters have — that Trump is racist — during a campaign event at the New Spirit Revival Center in Cleveland Heights on Wednesday afternoon.

Ben Carson and Omarosa Manigault — members of Trump's diversity outreach network — were in attendance as well.

But Trump remains deeply unpopular with minority voters. He has been accused by advocacy groups of scapegoating **immigrants** and Muslims to appeal to white working-class voters. Last year, he proposed a temporary ban that would prevent all Muslims from entering the country; he now describes that ban in geographic terms, calling for a restriction on those from "dangerous regions."

Trump sounded similar nationalist themes during his speech in Toledo on Wednesday.

"American hands will rebuild our nation. Not the hands of people from other nations," he said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Before she cracked open her new book, "This is Me: A Story of Who We Are & Where We Came From" in the Youth Readers Center of the Library of Congress, Jamie Lee Curtis had to clarify a few things.

"How come you're here if you were in the movies?" asked one curious child, seated on the floor. Another girl had recognized Curtis as "Shelly," the funeral parlor makeup artist in "My Girl." And, Curtis told the kids, they might also know her as Aunt Viv from "Beverly Hills Chihuahua."

"I get to pretend to be other people all the time and it's great," Curtis said. But she explained she was there to reprise a lesser-known role: children's book author. "Everyone here can be a writer. As long as you know your letters, and have an imagination in your head, you can be a writer."

Curtis's 11th book, "This is Me," released this week by Workman Publishing, is aimed at sensitizing children to the anxieties, fears and excitement of being an **immigrant**. It aims to inspire them to think about what they would take with them if they had to leave their homes forever and had just a small suitcase for their most treasured belongings. The book was illustrated by Laura Cornell, whom Curtis has partnered with on several books.

Carla D. Hayden, who was sworn in last week as the 14th Librarian of Congress, introduced Curtis and spoke glowingly of the book, saying it is important for children's literature to reflect the diversity of young readers. Hayden, who is the first woman and the first African American to serve in the role, recalled her favorite book when she was a child, "Bright April," about a young African American girl.

"Just seeing myself reflected in a book was so important," Hayden told Curtis.

"This is Me" opens with a teacher telling the story of her great-grandmother's travels to the United States, flashing back to when the great-grandmother was a little girl, forced to fit only her most beloved possessions into a small suitcase. The little girl looks pained in the illustration. Her cat, too, looks distraught.

"Tomorrow we leave for a place far away," her parents tell the little girl. "So fill up this case with the things you LOVE best. Sadly you'll have to leave all of the rest."

Then, the teacher in the book asks the students what they would take for such a journey. For a character named Roberto, it's "abuelo's beret, my ukelele, my St. Christopher medal to look out for me." For another character named Ali, it's "Legos, a camera to film what I leave. If this really happened, it would be hard to believe."

The closing page of the book features a pop-up suitcase that opens so that readers can stash their own items.

Curtis turned to the audience of young readers -- nearly 40 first- and second-graders from Moten Elementary -- and asked what they would bring. Their answers: Ninja Turtles, stuffed bears, a Star Wars robot figurine. One girl was particularly ambitious: "I would take Justin Bieber!"

"I don't think he would fit in the suitcase," Curtis said skeptically, as adults in the audience chuckled.

The book was released in the midst of an election cycle that has featured hotly debated **immigration** policies, with some **immigrants** saying they feel demonized by the heated rhetoric. Curtis said she conceived of the idea long ago and that her book has no political bent.

But Hayden said adults often look to children's literature to help them talk about difficult topics like **immigration**.

"This is the perfect book for children at this point," Hayden said. "Now we have a book to help children understand it."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The 2016 presidential election is revealing a number of splits in the electorate. Men prefer Donald Trump; women prefer Hillary Clinton. Nonwhite voters prefer Clinton; white voters prefer Trump. But the biggest rift, polling regularly suggests, is between white working-class voters — particularly men — and everyone else. They love Trump. Everyone else is much more skeptical.

CNN and the Kaiser Family Foundation surveyed Americans with an eye toward figuring out why that split is so dramatic. We can illustrate it simply, by pulling out the responses when people were asked whether they'd consider voting for one candidate or the other. A majority of white working-class Americans said they would consider voting for Trump but wouldn't consider voting for Clinton. A majority of whites with college educations and working-class black and Hispanic respondents said they would not consider voting for Trump, but would for Clinton. (The figures below include only registered voters.)

It's important to recognize what that graph indicates. There are members of each group who might consider either candidate and members who would consider neither. But this suggests that the contest isn't generally presenting Americans with two candidates they might consider backing. It's presenting them with one candidate they could vote for and one they wouldn't ever think about backing. That's not really much of a choice.

We can pick out three areas that appear to be driving support for Trump. Asked who they blamed for the stagnant economic conditions facing the working class, more than 60 percent of working-class whites said the government bore all or most of the blame. A quarter of working-class blacks put all of the blame at the feet of the government, but a majority felt the government bore some or no blame. A majority of college-educated whites and a plurality of working-class Hispanics agreed.

A majority of all four groups, though, said that Wall Street bore some, but not all or most, of that blame.

That frustration with government clearly drives some of Trump's support. It's hard to separate these results from existing support for Trump, but this pattern has been shown in other polls as well. Eighty-four percent of working-class whites said that Washington doesn't represent their views well. Seven-in-10 feel that international trade agreements signed by past presidents have cost America jobs.

Part of the frustration that working-class black Americans feel about government stems from a feeling that the government isn't doing enough to improve economic conditions. Asked how they felt about what the government was doing to help racial and ethnic minorities, 7 in 10 black working-class respondents said the government was not doing enough. A plurality of whites said that the government was doing too much in this regard. Only 8 percent of working-class blacks agreed.

Asked about the role of **immigrants** in American society, a plurality of working-class whites felt that **immigrants** are a burden because they take jobs or government services. A majority of every other group said **immigrants** strengthen the country through talent and hard work. Nearly three-quarters of Hispanics made that argument.

Trump's campaign has focused on how the rigged government and broken **immigration** system is acting as a roadblock for everyday Americans — an appellation that largely refers to those working-class white voters who support him so enthusiastically. Trump's rhetoric often intentionally pits that group against others, casting aspersions on Muslims and Hispanic **immigrants** and having offering a response to the concerns of black voters that often seems to be directed elsewhere. The question is which group will cast a plurality of votes this November: the working-class whites who like Trump — or everyone else.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This image says it all. Let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first. #trump2016 pic.twitter.com/9fHwog7ssN

Donald Trump Jr., in an interview with the Deseret News and KSL in Utah, defends his controversial tweet this week likening a bowl of possibly poisoned Skittles to the Syrian refugee crisis.

But in doing so, Trump makes the same mistakes he made in the initial tweet. And in the end, it still doesn't make sense.

First, the comments, via the Deseret News (emphasis added):

Trump Jr. said the picture he tweeted earlier this week was about his concern as a father of five about what could happen "if we're not vetting people and we're arbitrarily letting them into a country."

Now, to the three problems:

1) Trump says refugees are "arbitrarily" being let into the United States

While this was suggested by his tweet, Trump is now flat-out saying it. But it's just not true. The refugee vetting process is a lengthy one that can take one to two years. And people who can't be adequately vetted are turned away.

You can argue that the current refugee screening process isn't sufficient. You can argue that refugees from Syria can't be adequately vetted even with the most stringent form of "extreme vetting" possible. But Trump is basically pretending that this process doesn't exist. He's saying the Skittles are being indiscriminately grabbed from the bowl by the handful and that refugees are "arbitrarily" let in, as if the refugee process is a willy-nilly handing out of a plane ticket to Nebraska.

It's not.

2) He says he wasn't referring to a specific ratio

Since Trump tweeted this, our own Philip Bump and others have pointed to data suggesting the odds of a specific American being killed by a refugee in a terrorist attack is roughly 1 in 3.64 billion.

In other words, for every 10.92 billion years that Americans live — one Skittle, if you will — refugees will kill an American in a terror attack in three.

Trump insists he wasn't being specific about his ratio, but the small bowl pictured and the fact that he specifically said three of them were poisoned suggest he was certainly inflating the risk, whether intentionally or not. If the bowl included, in Trump's metaphor, 10 billion Skittles, after all, you can bet most anyone would gladly grab a handful or two without giving it a second thought. (I sure would. Skittles are delicious.)

3) He says he wants the risk to be zero

Of course, in the interview, Trump also suggests even one poisoned Skittle in a vat of 10 billion wouldn't be acceptable to him, because of the risk it would pose to one American life. That's also a problematic position, though, given that calculated risks are inherent in every decision made by the American **immigration**system.

His father, for instance, says he could be okay with admitting a Muslim **immigrant** from Scotland. But what if, in Trump's metaphor, the risk there is one poisoned Skittle out of 1 million? Is that still a risk worth taking? Trump seems to say no.

By that logic, the only solution is a large-scale walling off the entire United States and all of its ports, because every person coming in represents some kind of risk and could wind up killing one person.

It's a very difficult proposition to try to decide how much risk is warranted through the refugee and **immigration** process, but it's a calculation that is part of the process and must be balanced against the humanitarian benefit in the case of refugees and the economic benefit in the case of **immigrants**. No level of screening is going to be completely foolproof. And there is always a risk, in Trump's metaphor, of a poisoned Skittle no matter which bowl you grab them from — whether Syrian refugees, Scottish Muslim **immigrants** or American-born extremists driven by racism.

Which makes the Skittles metaphor entirely too simple for such a complex humanitarian issue, even as revised.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update: According to former Maryland lieutenant governor Kathleen Kennedy Townsend (D), former president George H.W. Bush told her he will vote for Hillary Clinton in November. Bush's office is neither confirming nor denying this, saying he is a private citizen. But Townsend told Politico that stands by her assertion, which she first made in a Facebook post.

With that news, we are adding Bush to the below list while noting the lack of complete clarity.

The list of Republicans supporting Hillary Clinton is growing quickly — with multiple new additions every day and more than a dozen on Wednesday morning alone.

For weeks, we have been keeping track of all of the GOP elected officials, administration officials, business leaders and donors who have crossed over to back Clinton over Donald Trump.

Below is that list as it stands:

\* George H.W. Bush (?) -- Kathleen Kennedy Townsend said in a Facebook post that Bush told her this in-person. The president's office isn't confirming it, but she stands by it. "That's what he said," she told Politico

\* Rep. Richard Hanna (N.Y.), a moderate Republican who is retiring this year, told Syracuse.com that he will support Clinton and that Trump is unfit to lead. He cited Trump's criticism of Khizr Khan. "I think Trump is a national embarrassment," Hanna said. "Is he really the guy you want to have the nuclear codes?"

\* Henry Paulson, treasury secretary

\* Carlos Gutierrez, commerce secretary

\* Louis Sullivan, health and human services secretary -- "I am a Republican, but I am voting for Hillary. I'm not that fired up about Hillary, but I detest Donald Trump so much."

\* Rosario Marin, U.S. treasurer -- "I will stand up for my community against the menace of a tyrannical presidency that does not value the countless contributions of **immigrants**."

\* John Negroponte, director of national intelligence and deputy secretary of state under Bush, five-time ambassador and Reagan deputy national security adviser

\* Richard Armitage, deputy secretary of state and adviser to Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush — Trump "doesn't appear to be a Republican, he doesn't appear to want to learn about issues. So I'm going to vote for Mrs. Clinton."

\* Brent Scowcroft, chairman of the President's Intelligence Advisory Board and adviser to three previous Republican presidents — "The presidency requires the judgment and knowledge to make tough calls under pressure. ... [Clinton] has the wisdom and experience to lead our country at this critical time."

\* James Clad, deputy assistant secretary of defense -- "There is no choice: In razor sharp contrast to her opponent, Secretary Clinton is ready, steady and prepared. With a proven preference for bipartisanship, she must win this election."

\* Richard Painter, chief White House ethics lawyer -- "I'm a Republican, but I believe that Hillary Clinton is the only qualified major party candidate in the race and she should become president.

\* William Reilly, Environmental Protection Agency adminstrator

\* Alan Steinberg, regional EPA administrator

\* Robert Blackwill, former deputy national security adviser and ambassador to India

\* Scott Evertz, former director of the Office of National AIDS Policy

\* Lezlee Westine, former White House director of public liaison and deputy assistant to the president — "Our nation faces a unique set of challenges that require steady and experienced leadership. That is why today I am personally supporting Hillary Clinton."

\* Shirin Tahir-Kheli, special assistant to the president and ambassador and senior adviser for women's empowerment under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice

\* Ashley J. Tellis, special assistant to the president and senior director for strategic planning and Southwest Asia

\* David A. Gross, State Department coordinator for international communications and information policy

\* James Kunder, assistant administrator for Asia and the Near East at USAID

\* Matthew Waxman, senior official in the State Department and Defense Department

\* Kori Schake, National Security Council and State Department aide

\* Frank Lavin, former Reagan political director and ambassador to Singapore — "It might not be entirely clear that Hillary Clinton deserves to win the presidency, but it is thunderingly clear that Donald Trump deserves to lose. From this premise, I will do something that I have not done in 40 years of voting: I will vote for the Democratic nominee for president."

\* Doug Elmets, former Reagan spokesman — "I could live with four years of Hillary Clinton before I could ever live with one day of Donald Trump as president." Elmets spoke at the Democratic National Convention, along with other Republicans now backing Clinton.

\* Jim Cicconi, former Reagan and George H.W. Bush aide — "Hillary Clinton is experienced, qualified and will make a fine president. The alternative, I fear, would set our nation on a very dark path."

\* Fred T. Goldberg Jr., former assistant U.S. treasury secretary and IRS commissioner under George H.W. Bush

\* Charles Fried, former U.S. solicitor general under Reagan and current Harvard Law professor — "Though long a registered Republican, this will be the third consecutive presidential election in which my party forces the choice between party and, in John McCain's words, putting America first. ... It is to [Mitt] Romney's credit that this year, like John Paulson and George Will, he is standing up against the brutal, substantively incoherent, and authoritarian tendencies of Donald Trump."

\* Pete Teeley, press secretary to then-Vice President George H.W. Bush, former U.S. ambassador to Canada and U.S. representative to UNICEF

\* Richard Howill, former deputy assistant secretary of state and ambassador to Ecuador under Reagan

\* William Ruckelshaus, former Environmental Protection Agency head, deputy attorney general and acting FBI director

\* Carla Hills, U.S. trade representative under George H.W. Bush

\* Robert Kagan, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, former Reagan State Department aide and adviser to the presidential campaigns of John McCain and Mitt Romney

\* Max Boot, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and adviser to GOP presidential candidates — "I'm literally losing sleep over Donald Trump. She would be vastly preferable to Trump."

\* Peter Mansoor, retired Army colonel and former aide to former CIA director David Petraeus — "It will be the first Democratic presidential candidate I've voted for in my adult life."

\* Meg Whitman, former Hewlett-Packard chief executive and California gubernatorial nominee — "Donald Trump's demagoguery has undermined the fabric of our national character. America needs the kind of stable and aspirational leadership Secretary Clinton can provide."

\* Marc Andreessen, venture capitalist — "[Silicon] Valley wouldn't be here, we wouldn't be doing any of this if we didn't have the amazing flow of **immigrants**that we've had in the last 80 years. And the idea of choking that off just makes me sick to my stomach."

\* Harry Sloan, head of Global Eagle Acquisition — "He is unprepared and temperamentally unfit to be our president. Most of my Republican friends feel the same way. As a businessman, a father and a conservative, it is clear to me that Hillary Clinton is the right choice in this election."

\* Dan Akerson, former chairman and chief executive of General Motors — "Serving as the leader of the free world requires effective leadership, sound judgment, a steady hand and, most importantly, the temperament to deal with crises large and small. Donald Trump lacks each of these characteristics."

\* Chuck Robbins, chief executive of Cisco

\* Hamid Moghadam, chairman and chief executive of Prologis — "Our country is about tolerance and inclusion and that's why, as a lifelong Republican supporter, I endorse Hillary Clinton for president in this election."

\* William Oberndorf, donor of $3 million to GOP candidates since 2012 — "If it is Trump vs. Clinton, and there is no viable third-party candidate, I will be voting for Hillary Clinton."

\* Mike Fernandez, $4 million to GOP candidates in recent years — "If I have a choice — and you can put it in bold — if I have a choice between Trump and Hillary Clinton, I'm choosing Hillary. She's the lesser of two evils."

\* Chris Shays, former congressman from Connecticut — "I have friends who are up for office and they say, you know, if you don't support Donald Trump, you're hurting us because then we have to answer the question. And now I'm going one step further. So I am hurting them. But, you know, there's a time when you put your country first."

\* Connie Morella, former congresswoman from Maryland

\* David Durenberger, former senator from Minnesota

\* William Milliken, who served as governor of Michigan from 1969 to 1983 — "Because I feel so strongly about our nation's future, I will be joining the growing list of former and present government officials in casting my vote for Hillary Clinton for president in 2016."

\* Larry Pressler, former three-term Republican senator from South Dakota who lost an independent campaign for his old seat in 2014 — "I can't believe I'm endorsing Hillary Clinton for president, but I am. If someone had told me 10 years ago I would do this, I wouldn't have believed them."

\* Arne Carlson, a former two-term Republican governor of Minnesota who supported President Obama

\* Robert Smith, former judge on New York's highest court, the Court of Appeals — "This year, I'm going to vote for a Democrat for president  —  the first time I've done it in 36 years  —  and I think the decision is easy. Hillary Clinton is the only responsible choice, and I don't understand why so few of my fellow conservatives see it that way."

\* David Nierenberg, finance chairman to Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign

\* Mark Salter, former top adviser to John McCain — "Whatever Hillary Clinton's faults, she's not ignorant or hateful or a nut. She acts like an adult and understands the responsibilities of an American president. That might not be a ringing endorsement. But in 2016, the year of Trump's s campaign, it's more than enough."

\* Sally Bradshaw, former top Jeb Bush adviser, told CNN that she had left the Republican Party to become an independent because of Trump's presence at the top of the ticket — and that if the race were close in her home state of Florida this fall, she would be voting for Clinton. "As much as I don't want another four years of [President Barack] Obama's policies, I can't look my children in the eye and tell them I voted for Donald Trump."

\* Maria Comella, former spokeswoman for two of Trump's top backers, Chris Christie and Rudy Giuliani — "Instead of speaking out against instances of bigotry, racism and inflammatory rhetoric whether it's been against women, **immigrants** or Muslims, we made a calculus that it was better to say nothing at all in the interest of politics and winning elections."

\* Kurt Bardella, former top aide to Rep. Darrel Issa (R-Calif.) and ex-spokesman for Breitbart News -- "A big reason why I decided that Hillary Clinton is the candidate who I'm voting for -- the first Democrat I'm voting for in my life -- is because this is a time where what's going on is much bigger than partisanship, bigger than Republican or Democrat, or single issues that traditionally these campaigns are about."

\* Mike Treiser, former Mitt Romney aide — "In the face of bigotry, hatred, violence, and small-mindedness, this time, I'm with her."

\* Craig Snyder, former chief of staff to then-Republican Sen. Arlen Specter (Pa.) and an ex-colleague of former top Trump adviser Roger Stone and current top Trump adviser Paul Manafort.

Correction: This post initially described Smith as a state Supreme Court justice. He served as a judge on the New York state Court of Appeals, which is the state's highest court.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

Don Trump Jr. is getting the media treatment today, with multiple major news orgs publishing profiles pointing out that his now-internationally-infamous Skittles tweet is part of a larger pattern, in which Don Jr. has flirted extensively with white nationalism, in true chip-off-the-old-block fashion. In these stories, the Trump campaign continues to stand by its defense of the tweet -- in which Don Jr. likened Syrian refugees to a bowl of Skittles -- arguing essentially that he was speaking hard truths.

An interesting new poll published today by CNN may help explain why the Trump campaign is not repudiating the Skittles tweet, but rather embracing it -- and, more broadly, doubling down on his hardline message on Muslim **immigration** in general.

In the Skittles tweet, Don Jr. posted an image that said: "If I had a bowl of Skittles and I told you just three would kill you. Would you take a handful? That's our Syrian refugee problem." Philip Bump had an extensive rundown of why this is so misleading and reprehensible, noting that there is an extensive vetting process in place and that the actual odds of getting killed by a refugee are not even remotely disproportionate, relative to the overall population. But there are political reasons for the Trump campaign to stand by it and his broader hardline message.

The new CNN poll finds that white working class voters are more likely to believe **immigrants** from Muslim countries increase the risk of terrorist attacks in the U.S. Those voters believe this by 63-32. By contrast, college educated white voters do not believe this, by 52-42.

Meanwhile, in defense of white working class voters, the poll also finds that they believe that Muslim **immigrants** are "basically good, honest people," by 63-25. In other words, working class whites -- who are key to Trump's candidacy -- might be perfectly comfortable with a more anodyne interpretation of Don Jr.'s tweet, i.e., one that holds that most Muslim **immigrants** are not a threat, but a few just might be. (This does not get into whether they would agree with Trump's proposed solutions to this, but some polls have shown that working class whites support a temporary ban on Muslims).

Now, it's true that the CNN poll, which was also conducted with the Kaiser Family Foundation, also finds that 51 percent of Americans overall also believe Muslim **immigration** boosts the risks of terror attacks here. And that includes 50 percent of working class Latinos, too. It is an unfortunate possibility that majorities of Americans might not agree with those of us who find the Skittles tweet reprehensible, or might at least agree with a sugar-coated (as it were) interpretation of it. So the Trump campaign, perhaps with some justification, may see no serious political risk in standing by it.

But the Trump campaign's posture goes well beyond just sticking by the Skittles imagery. As Maggie Haberman points out, Trump is hurtling into the debates with as great an emphasis as ever on his xenophobic nationalism. And this overall doubling-down may only further deepen the cultural schism that Trumpism is driving between non-college and college educated whites, who don't see Muslim **immigration** as a threat (per CNN's new poll above) and don't support Trump's proposed ban on Muslims, either. Yet expanding his appeal among those voters is essential for him to win, and that would probably require him to persuade many of them that he's not the xenophobic bigot who has been shouting at them from their TV screens for the last year.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* DON TRUMP JR.'S 'DEPLORABLE' PATTERN: Amid controversy over the eldest Trump son comparing Syrian refugees to Skittles, Jason Horowitz takes a look at Don Jr.'s overall pattern of rhetoric and concludes:

If his sister Ivanka Trump has become known for her polish and message discipline, he has distinguished himself by wading frequently into the shadowy waters of white supremacy, anti-Semitism, incendiary language and conspiracy theories….The Trump campaign declined to make Donald Jr. available for comment, instead releasing a statement that echoed his derision of political correctness and applauded him for speaking "the truth."

He's politically incorrect, wink wink, nudge nudge. Get it?

\* CLINTON PIVOTS TO MORE POSITIVE MESSAGE: The Post's Philip Rucker reports that Clinton is set to give a big speech on the economy today, as part of a broader effort to better convey her agenda to the public:

Clinton's objective is twofold: To lift her sagging approval ratings as well as build trust in her agenda and earn a mandate that could help her, should she be elected, govern in a divided Washington….Polling indicates that many of Clinton's economic policies…have widespread support….But Clinton is a flawed messenger because of deep character doubts.

As I've noted, the Clinton campaign is acknowledging that allowing Trump to destroy himself through maximum media exposure isn't enough; a more concerted affirmative case for her is also needed.

\* CLINTON LEADING AMONG TOP EARNERS: A new Bloomberg/Purple Slice poll finds that Clinton is leading Trump by 46-42 among likely voters with annual household incomes over $100,000, a demographic that historically backs the Republican. But:

Higher-income voters do pick Trump over Clinton as the candidate they think would be best for their own investments, 45 percent to 36 percent. Among those who say Trump would be better for their holdings, 17 percent aren't supporting him.

Before Trump seizes on this poll to say Clinton is the candidate for the rich, note that this probably reflects the fact that college educated voters, including whites, are backing her.

\* EXPERTS APPALLED BY TRUMP'S 'SELF-DEALING': The New York Times has now picked up the Post's story about the Trump Foundation's use of other people's money to settle fines related to his private businesses. Trump's charity also donated to the Florida attorney general at around the time she was considering complaints about Trump University, and one expert tells the Times:

"I don't recall ever seeing a pattern of self-dealing that encompasses so many different kinds of self-dealing."

Well, Trump is the best at everything, so really, no surprise here, either.

\* DEMS ADVISE 'ROPE A DOPE' DEBATE STRATEGY FOR CLINTON: Politico reports that Democratic Senators are giving lots of advice to Clinton as she preps for next Monday's debate showdown:

The best strategy for Clinton, lawmakers advised, is to let Trump do most of the talking….clinton will have to parry when Trump comes directly at her, but a more restrained rope-a-dope strategy is preferable to an aggressive posture right out of the gate, Democratic senators said. Trump showed in the Republican debates that he's best as a counter-puncher, leveling spontaneous one-liners at his attackers that left them reeling.

Clinton will really have to bait Trump into some truly crazy moments, since many in the press corps will be eager to say that he's "defying expectations" by not being his usual unhinged self.

\* AND THE TRUMPISM OF THE DAY, BLACKS-REALLY-LOVE-HIM EDITION: Trump is under fire for saying African American communities are in their worst shape "ever," but the fuller comment is also worth noting:

"We're going to rebuild our inner cities because our African American communities are absolutely in the worst shape they've ever been in before. Ever, ever, ever….I say to the African American communities and I think it's resonating, because you see what's happening with my poll numbers with African Americans. They're going, like, high."

Maybe Trump means high single digits? Either way, it's pretty obvious African Americans aren't the real target for this "outreach."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There is no segment of the GOP coalition that has fared worse in 2016 than evangelical conservatives. They not only failed to lift any of their favorites (e.g. Sen. Ted Cruz, Mike Huckabee) to the nomination, but they also wound up embracing someone who quite obviously cares very little about their issues -- and, in fact, has been an enthusiastic, pro-choice Democrat.

Donald Trump is not just any run-of-the-mill, mostly secular politician feigning (poorly) religious literacy. He is inimical to virtually all the values that social conservatives claim to believe in -- including the Golden Rule and "turn the other cheek." His **immigration** stance is an affront to many Christians. But don't take my word for it. Here are Ralph Reed and Russell Moore (who still, heroically, opposes Trump) in 2014 writing in support of comprehensive **immigration**reform:

Those who desire citizenship should take their place behind those who have begun that process. There should be no special pathway for those who entered the country illegally. Criminals need to be deported.

Oh, Reed is founder of the Faith & Freedom Coalition. He now lines up evangelical support for Trump.

It makes sense then for Trump to delegate the job of attending Iowa's Faith & Freedom Coalition gathering on Sept. 24 to Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, despite his retreat -- much criticized by social conservatives -- on Indiana's religious liberty bill. (We wonder whether he will endorse the kind of legislation he could stand by in his red state.) Pence is still married to his only wife, does not have a history of philandering (and never pretended to be a PR man to brag about it), has been pro-life his entire career and seems sincere in his faith. Trump, of course, is none of those things. Dispatching Pence rather than choosing to attend himself is also indicative of the low regard with which Trump views this segment of the base.

Erick Erickson, a devout Christian and #NeverTrump leader, wrote on Tuesday:

I see it happening even now. This past Friday I debated the merits of Trump and sat next to a Christian who argued that because God chose sinners, we should choose Trump. She argued that a bunch of other Presidents were terrible, immoral people so we should be okay with Trump. She argued that God chose Abraham, Samson, and David, so we should choose Trump.

Invoking Gertrude Himmelfarb for the admonition that we should not define deviancy downward, he argues, "Seeing men like Wayne Grudem and others beclown themselves trying to justify support of a man like Trump makes me weep for the shallow faith of a church more wrapped up in its Americanness than its Godliness." Put differently, these Christian leaders have broken the hypocrisy meter. They've bought into the dystopic view of America and adopted Trump's phony nostalgia for an America that never was. They've abandoned core, faith-related issues, leaving open the real possibility that future nominees don't care one bit about their agenda. As such, they have managed to secularize themselves, becoming one more segment of the bitter, angry, thin-skinned Trumpkin base.

Since their claim to relevance was based on their spiritual grounding (it was once called the Moral Majority), it seems that they have written their own political epitaph by throwing their lot in with Trump. These are now voters without values -- and a minority in the GOP without moral stature.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) and Ivanka Trump met in New York on Monday. We do not know what was said, but we certainly hope Ryan offered some advice like this:

1. Her father should stop lying about the origins of birtherism and apologize to the president and the country.

2. Her brother should stay off of Twitter.

3. If she wants to champion a policy, Ivanka Trump better be prepared to defend it without getting snippy. Better yet, stop suggesting policy. The child-care plan is a joke -- a boondoggle for the rich and contrary to the concept of tax reform (i.e. simplification).

4. Donald Trump should stop saying that he was against the Iraq War at the time. It's a lie, as numerous fact-checkers have found, and he'll get embarrassed if he tries saying it at the debate.

5.  Trump should release his tax returns. He should answer all questions about his foundation. Right now he's an ethical train wreck. And while he is at it, Trump should stop saying things like: "It's called OPM. I do it all the time in business. It's called other people's money. There's nothing like doing things with other people's money because it takes the risk -- you get a good chunk out of it and it takes the risk." Cringe.

6. Speaking of the foundation, don't let the campaign put out an empty attack -- with zero facts -- on Washington Post reporter David A. Fahrenthold, who uncovered multiple examples of possible self-dealing. It confirms that the Trump team is worried about it, and worse -- it has no defense.

7. Trump must stop fawning over Russian President Vladimir Putin, dump his pro-Putin advisers and stop freaking out our NATO allies.

8. Trump needs to understand his own tax plan and be able to explain it by debate time.

9. Trump should immediately sever ties to his businesses (see No. 5) -- and not renew them until he is done with politics.

10. Trump should start defending legal **immigration** and making the case that legal **immigrants** make a positive contribution to our economy and society. We need more skilled **immigrants**.

11. Trump should be prepared to dump mass deportation once and for all when asked about it in the debate.

12. Trump should fire Stephen K. Bannon and denounce David Duke and the alt-right.

13. Trump should do interviews with real news people, not Sean Hannity and Bill O'Reilly, in preparation for the debates. He's otherwise in for a rude awakening when someone asks a real question.

14. Trump should stop, immediately and for the rest of the campaign, attacking other Republicans.

15. Trump should come up with a list of things he "regrets" saying. He'll surely be asked about his non-apologies.

16. Trump better be prepared to answer the question: Isn't America great right now? His persistent denigration of the military is unseemly and false.

17. Trump should stop saying that there is no need to reform entitlement programs. It's nonsense and makes him sound like Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) -- an irresponsible crank.

18. Trump should try apologizing to all Gold Star parents.

19. Please, please tell Trump to stay as far away from GOP Senate candidates as possible.

20. Tell Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus to shut his yap. When he says he's going to sanction people who didn't endorse Trump, Priebus sends Republicans running right into Hillary Clinton's arms.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Out of misplaced sympathy for a narrow segment of the electorate and a misguided determination to support the GOP no matter how awful, too many Republicans have adopted the Trumpian argument that trade and **immigration** are our enemies.

William McGurn thankfully recalls Milton Friedman:

For his part, Friedman would ask by what right should an American be prevented from buying a lawful good or service if he found a better price from someone overseas? Where's the morality of keeping a worker from selling the product of his labor to someone who happens to live in another country? And the following was Friedman's response on "Free to Choose" when a union official challenged him on his bid to eliminate all tariffs over five years:

Unfortunately, too many elected Republicans and conservative commentators seem to have forgotten or never learned Friedman's lessons, nor thought through the implications of the arguments they are making.

You hear conservatives justify support for Donald Trump and defend his supporters with baseless assertions: "The downtrodden guys in the Midwest who lost their jobs to trade . . . " Hold it. They didn't lose their jobs to trade. The voices following the Trump line seem unwilling to recognize inconvenient truths. ("U.S.-manufactured exports equaled nearly $1.4 trillion in 2012. U.S.-manufactured goods exports more than quadrupled since 1990. U.S. exports have grown more than twice as fast as U.S. GDP since 2002 and accounted for 14 percent of U.S. GDP in 2012.")

One need only look at the patterns of out-migration (e.g. people moving to other states) to understand that domestic policies and worker attitudes make all the difference. The free market Illinois Policy think tank looked at Michigan and Illinois:

Michigan's migration numbers have improved in large part because of the state's resurgent manufacturing sector. Since the depths of the Great Recession, Michigan has regained 12 manufacturing jobs for every one regained in Illinois. Michigan's bounce-back has netted the state 171,000 manufacturing jobs since the recession bottom, while Illinois has regained fewer than 15,000 manufacturing jobs.

So is China "stealing" only Illinois jobs? That's preposterous. If Illinois wants to revive manufacturing it should follow Michigan's example -- tax reform, worker retraining, fiscal and pension reform and welcoming **immigrants**. Yes, **immigration** promotes growth and employment. Consider for example, Michigan Gov. Rick Snyder (R) who has made a special effort to lure **immigrants** to Michigan, which has been key to the state's manufacturing revival:

A Global Detroit Study by David Egner, the executive director of New Economy Initiative for Southeast Michigan in Detroit, cites the advantages of attracting more well-educated **immigrants**.

The **immigrants** are not "taking" jobs from native born Americans; they are bringing skills and capital -- and purchasing power -- with them, as studies demonstrate:

New Americans in Michigan contribute to the state as both taxpayers and consumers, earning $19.6 billion in income in 2014 and paying out $5.4 billion in overall taxes, says a new report released by the Michigan Office for New Americans, which was established two years ago by Gov. Rick Snyder.

Encouraging Illinois to follow Michigan's example, Michael Lucci writes: "Where the investment dollars go, skilled workers will eventually follow. Until Illinois sets more balanced pro-growth industrial policies, both manufacturing companies and their workers will continue to leave for other states."

In sum, conservatives should stop falling for Trump's sob story. It bears only a passing resemblance to reality. Worse than dishonest, it promotes policies that are at best of no help and at worst counterproductive for those who have not made the leap to the global, highly automated economy.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update: On Tuesday, Pew updated its estimate of the number of unauthorized **immigrants** in the U.S., estimating that the overall total remained slightly above 11 million through 2014. (The chart below has been updated.) That makes up about a quarter of all **immigrants** in the United States. How can they be certain of those numbers? Read on.

At the core of Donald Trump's proposals on **immigration** is that he hopes to crack down on **immigrants** here illegally. But Trump repeatedly claims not to know how many people that is.

"The central issue is not the needs of the 11 million illegal **immigrants** or however many there may be -- and honestly we've been hearing that number for years," he said during his speech on Wednesday. "It's always 11 million. Our government has no idea. It could be 3 million. It could be 30 million. They have no idea what the number is."

It's an important figure in part because Trump's ideas for dealing with those **immigrants** could balloon in cost if the number is three times the 11 million "we've been hearing for years." But Trump misunderstands the figure in a number of key ways. It's not produced by the government, it's not static at 11 million -- and there's basically no way it could be off by 300 percent.

The most common source for the 11 million figure is number-crunching from Pew Research Center. Year-by-year, Pew crafts an estimate of the country's undocumented **immigrant** population, using a variety of statistical tools to ensure that the figure is as accurate as possible. The detailed methodology is available online, but we spoke with Pew senior demographer Jeffrey Passel to walk us through the calculation in simpler terms.

We spoke by phone. A transcript of that discussion (lightly edited, as they say) follows.

THE FIX: How, broadly speaking, does Pew figure out how many people have **immigrated** here illegally?

PASSEL: We start with a fairly simple equation. We start with an estimate of the foreign-born population, and we subtract from the total foreign-born population an estimate of the **immigrants** who are here legally. That difference is our estimate of the unauthorized **immigrant** population.

THE FIX: So the estimate for the foreign-born population comes from Census data?

PASSEL: The estimate of the total foreign-born comes from surveys that the Census Bureau does. The main one we use is the American Community Survey. We make adjustments to that survey for people who are missed in the survey.

THE FIX: How does that adjustment work?

PASSEL: There are a couple of different sources that we use. The Census Bureau itself does evaluations of how complete the census and their surveys are. So we base our estimates in part on the figures that they have for what they call the "undercount."

We also use some information from a couple of other studies that are done that look specifically at Mexican **immigrants** and whether or not they participated in the census. What these studies have found is that U.S.-born Mexicans are much more likely to participate than legal **immigrants**, who are much more likely to participate than unauthorized **immigrants**. So we use the Census Bureau's data as a base for our corrections, but we make adjustments for what we know to be higher undercounts of legal **immigrants** and then yet higher undercounts of unauthorized **immigrants**.

As a check on all of this, we also are able to look at data mainly from Mexico on the number of Mexicans in Mexico. Basically all of the Mexicans -- almost all of the Mexicans in the world are either in Mexico or the United States. So by combining our estimates of the number of Mexican **immigrants** in the U.S. legally and as unauthorized **immigrants**, plus the number of Mexicans in Mexico, we have a check on the total numbers.

THE FIX: The other part of that equation, then, is the number of **immigrants** that are here legally. How do you get that number?

PASSEL: **Immigrants** who are here legally are admitted as lawful permanent residents or as refugees through what is now the Department of Homeland Security. Each year the Department of Homeland Security publishes the number of **immigrants** they've admitted for lawful permanent residence. The other group that's admitted is refugees. Those are counted by the office of Refugee Resettlement in the Health and Human Services department.

So we take the number admitted each year and we add that to the previous year's estimate of lawful permanent residents. We update the estimate from year to year with basic demographic methodology: We take into account the new arrivals; we also make an estimate how many of last year's **immigrants** died in the previous year and how many moved out of the country.

It's a fairly straightforward demographic accounting equation.

THE FIX: During the 2010 Census, there was a very specific focus placed on encouraging people to participate in the census, including a lot of Spanish-language outreach. My assumption, then, is that that was focused on trying to ensure as-accurate-as-possible a count of some of those folks that you were just referring to. Is that correct?

PASSEL: The Census Bureau in every census does outreach to try to get people to participate. In both 2000 and 2010, there were a number of programs designed specifically to get Latinos to participate. It involved advertising, it involved working with community groups and various kinds of outreach.

The messages in the Census Bureau's advertising and outreach varied depending on which groups they were trying to get to participate. The unauthorized **immigrant** population is very heavily Hispanic. The Hispanic population, the Asian populations are very heavily **immigrant**. So the outreach to both the Hispanic population and the Asian population included messages in languages other than English and an emphasis on the confidential nature of the census and how important it is for local communities that people participate.

Based on the coverage studies of the last two censuses, those outreach programs were fairly successful, because the undercount as a percentage of the population was reduced substantially in 2000 and 2010 over what was experienced in 1990 and 1980.

THE FIX: So the natural question that people have is the extent to which this number could be wrong. We've got Donald Trump out there saying, "it could be anywhere between six and 30 million people." Setting that aside, why is it you feel as though a layperson can be confident that you're not off by up to 5 million **immigrants**?

PASSEL: What the Census Bureau is really pretty good at is counting houses. Houses don't move. It's hard for housing units to hide.

In the census and in the surveys, if a housing unit is occupied, the Census Bureau is able to count people in those housing units. They may not get everybody -- it's true that there may be more than one family unit in the household and they only get one. But overall, the studies we have of housing unit coverage and population coverage suggest it's very unlikely that the numbers could be a lot higher than what they are.

We build in a correction for undercount. So we're adjusting the numbers upward, and the adjustments are larger for the groups we know we tend to miss. We know we tend to miss young men more than young women and we know we miss young adults more than older adults. We're already factoring in an upward adjustment.

It's possible that the adjustment could be a bit more than what we're factoring in, but it's very, very unlikely that the numbers are as much as 5 million higher than what we've estimated.

As I said, the other check we have is looking at data on the Mexican population, age-by-age, adding the U.S. numbers to the Mexican numbers.

For instance, just a simple example -- we have a pretty good idea of how many Mexicans were born 25 years ago, and all of the 25-year-old Mexicans are essentially in the United States or in Mexico, so we can put our numbers together with the Mexican numbers and have confidence that the numbers aren't a lot higher than what we think they are.

THE FIX: So is it more likely that you're wrong by being too high rather than by being too low?

PASSEL: No, I think our estimates are pretty accurate.

We're working with sample-based data so the samples could be a little bit wrong but the base from which we adjust our numbers up is pretty -- we're pretty confident in that. It could possibly be a million or maybe a little more higher than where we're estimating. It could be lower by about that much. But it's probably more likely to be a little higher than what we're estimating than a little lower.

All in all we think they're pretty accurate. There are other people making estimates. They often use similar techniques, but there's a pretty wide consensus of numbers around 11 million from people who are looking at data.

What Passel didn't say, of course, is that for people who aren't looking at data, the number could be whatever they want it to be.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Disgraceful. "The White House worked behind the scenes last week to prevent a bipartisan bill to sanction the Assad regime for war crimes and atrocities against civilians from getting a vote in the House of Representatives. The Democratic leadership bowed to White House pressure and withdrew its support for voting on the bill for now."

Trump's idol Vladimir Putin acts in predictably deplorable ways: "U.S. intelligence agencies believe that Russian aircraft conducted the strike that targeted a humanitarian aid convoy in northern Syria on Monday, according to U.S. officials, challenging Russia's assertion that it wasn't behind the attack. [Secretary of State John F.] Kerry initially initially said Syrian forces were "evidently" responsible for the convoy attack, which killed at least 12 people. The U.S. officials said new intelligence indicates that Russian forces, rather than the Syrians, conducted the strike." Someone should ask Trump about this at the next debate.

Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.) understands how egregious this is: "According to the UN Humanitarian Affairs chief Stephen O'Brien, notification of the convoy — which planned to reach 78,000 people in Aleppo — had been provided to the Syrian regime and the Russian Federation. According to witnesses, the convoy was hit by multiple strikes that destroyed aid trucks and then hit rescue workers who arrived to help the injured. If Monday's horrifying, outrageous attack is found to be a deliberate targeting of humanitarians, it would amount to a war crime."

Another odious anti-**immigrant** argument decimated: "The chance of an American being murdered in a terrorist attack caused by a refugee is 1 in 3.64 billion per year while the chance of being murdered in an attack committed by an illegal **immigrant** is an astronomical 1 in 10.9 billion per year. By contrast, the chance of being murdered by a tourist on a B visa, the most common tourist visa, is 1 in 3.9 million per year." Why isn't Trump against common tourist visas? Ah, the Trump hotels. . .

It's appalling that Republicans don't understand America as well as Irish music star Bono: ""Look, America is like the best idea the world ever came up with. But Donald Trump is potentially the worst idea that ever happened to America. Potentially."

His minority "outreach" has been a terrible failure. In North Carolina: "Clinton continues to dominate among black voters, with 98 percent support. The remaining 2 percent said they plan to vote for Trump."

If Trump were capable of apologizing for a contemptible  smear, he wouldn't have started the birther nonsense in the first place. "Donald Trump should apologize for pushing the 'unseemly' birther conspiracy regarding where President Barack Obama was born, South Carolina Sen. Lindsey Graham indicated Tuesday."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This past weekend's bombings in New York and New Jersey and the stabbing of nine people in a Minnesota mall -- now being referred to as terrorist attacks -- have led some observers to suggest that these attacks could help Donald Trump. Washington Post reporter Chris Cillizza wrote on Monday that "chaos, uncertainty and anxiety will work in Trump's favor," and Trump adviser Alex Castellanos said that "Trump is strength in an uncertain world."

But is this really true? The 2015 attacks in Paris and San Bernardino didn't really move polls about a then-hypothetical Trump-Clinton matchup.

Moreover, in a result reported here for the first time, the 2016 Chicago Council Survey found no difference in support for either of the current major-party presidential candidates just after the Orlando shootings in June.

This survey, fielded between June 10-27, provides an unusual real-time experiment. That is because the survey was already in the field when the Orlando attack — considered the nation's worst terrorist attack since 9/11—took place on June 12. Altogether, 804 respondents completed the survey before the attack and 1,257 after the attack.

After the attack, there was little increase in the belief that international terrorism is a critical threat to U.S. security. This perception had increased substantially before the attack -- from an all-time low of 63 percent in 2014 to 75 percent in this June survey.  There were only slight differences among those interviewed just before (73 percent) and after the Orlando shootings (77 percent).

However, there were increases in the percentage of Americans who felt less safe from terrorism and were concerned about being the target of both a terrorist attack and of gun violence.

Similarly, there were increases in the percentage who said that Islamic fundamentalism was a critical threat (from 52 percent before the attack to 64 percent after) and the percentage who supported sending troops to fight violent Islamic extremist groups (37 percent before vs. 45 percent after).

However, there were no differences in perceptions of **immigrants** as a threat, views of Middle Eastern or Mexican **immigrants**, or attitudes toward limiting the flow of migrants or refugees, as well as Syrian refugees in particular. There were also no differences in support for military action in Syria specifically, as well as beliefs about the effectiveness of various anti-terrorism tactics, like airstrikes, drone strikes and torture. In short, there is very mixed evidence that the public became more hawkish in the immediate aftermath of the attack.

Given these mixed results, it's not surprising that neither Donald Trump nor Hillary Clinton gained much after the Orlando attack. About half of voters surveyed said they would vote for Hillary Clinton both before (52 percent) and after (51 percent) the attack in Orlando. Four in 10 said they would vote for Donald Trump before and after the attack.

In fact, it's hardly clear that we should even expect Trump to benefit. Political scientists Jennifer Merolla and Elizabeth Zechmeister have shown that Republicans are generally advantaged on the issue of terrorism, but they also found that candidates with national security experience are also advantaged, which could help Clinton.

We now have had a tragic series of terrorist attacks during this presidential campaign. But despite an often-expressed view that these attacks help Trump in the general election, precious little evidence supports that view.

Dina Smeltz is a senior fellow in public opinion and foreign policy at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs .

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**President Obama convened a special summit of world leaders in New York on Tuesday to address the dramatic increase in refugees across the globe, which he called "one of the most urgent tests of our time." History, he added, "will judge us harshly if we do not rise to this moment."

Among the nations the president thanked for its efforts was Mexico, which, Obama noted, "is absorbing a great number of refugees from Central America."

Yet human rights advocates have sharply criticized the Obama administration for its policy of deterrence when it comes to refugees from Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras.

Despite clear warning signs, the administration was caught flat-footed in 2014 when tens of thousands of women and children from those nations surged across the U.S. border with Mexico, overwhelming Border Patrol stations in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. Human rights advocates said the Central Americans were fleeing escalating violence and persecution perpetrated by drug cartels and organized crime in their home countries.

The administration responded to the mounting humanitarian crisis, and political embarrassment, with a multipronged strategy aimed at stemming the flow by making clear that the undocumented **immigrants** were not welcome in the United States and would be sent home if they did not win political asylum protections from an **immigration** judge.

In addition, Congress, with White House support, approved $750 million in development aid for the region, and the administration broadcast advertisements imploring would-be migrants to stay put. Obama and Vice President Biden pressured Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto to tighten his country's borders with its neighbors and intercept those who made the journey north under the guidance of human smugglers.

The White House explained the policy by noting the dangers of the journey for women and children, some of whom were raped and abused along the way.

But advocates charge that the policy has not worked. The number of unaccompanied children who crossed the Mexican border illegally in 2014 was 68,000; the figure fell to 40,000 in 2015 but has swelled again to 54,000 this year, according to government statistics.

"The reasons for that are quite simple: The root causes of migration have continued unabated — violence in the region, narco-trafficking," Wendy Young, president of Kids in Need of Defense, said Tuesday during a conference in New York sponsored by the Center for Migration Studies.

The vast majority of Central American migrants who have arrived since 2014 are still in the United States, many in temporary shelters or family detention centers, awaiting their court hearings. The administration's policy remains that those who do not win asylum protections are eligible for deportation; in January, the Department of Homeland Security initiated raids in several cities to apprehend dozens of Central Americans with outstanding deportation orders.

Under mounting pressure from advocates, however, the administration announced plans this summer to expand a State Department program launched in 2014 that allows Central Americans to apply for refugee status in the United States from within their home countries. The administration also won a commitment from Costa Rica to accept 200 Central American minors who are in grave danger while their cases are examined by U.S. officials.

So far, only a few thousand children have won refugee status under the new programs.

"If you look at displacement around the world, there are more and more situations where nongovernment actors are the sources of violence," Young said. "It may not fit the classic perception of what a refugee is, but it's the same kind of abuse and the same levels of abuse we need to be aware of and offer safe haven to."

At his summit, Obama said nations have pledged to accept 360,000 refugees this year, twice as many as last year, and the private sector has promised $650 million in financial aid. But the cause is far bigger: A record 65 million people have been forcibly displaced from their homes, including 21 million who have left their home countries, according to the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Three million of them are awaiting asylum decisions, the study found.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The total population of undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States has remained largely unchanged since 2009, although it has risen in Virginia and a few other states, according to an analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data released Tuesday.

The report, by Pew Research, said an estimated 11.1 million **immigrants** were living in the country illegally in 2014, compared with 11.3 million in 2009.

"The recent relative stability in the estimated size of the U.S. unauthorized **immigrant** population is a contrast to previous periods," Pew said. The number rose through the 1990s and early 2000s, peaking at 12.2 million in 2007.

Virginia had an estimated 300,000 undocumented **immigrants** in 2014, an increase of 20 percent, while Maryland had 250,000 undocumented **immigrants**and the District had 25,000.

Other states where the number rose included Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Washington state.

Only Louisiana's increase could be traced to a rise in the number of undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico.

Nationwide, the number of undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico declined about 8 percent in 2014, to 5.85 million. "The decrease in the Mexican unauthorized **immigrant** population since 2009 indicates that departures have exceeded arrivals," the report said.

The population of undocumented **immigrants** from sub-Saharan Africa jumped 35 percent to 275,000, while the number from Asia jumped 10 percent to 1.45 million, and the total from Central America rose 6.8 percent to 1.7 million.

Mexicans still made up the majority of the undocumented **immigrants** in the United States in 2014.

Virginia and Maryland were among the top one-third of states for the largest populations of unauthorized **immigrants**, ranking 10th and 12th, respectively, the report said.

The District, Maryland and Virginia each ranked among the top one-third in the nation for highest percentage of undocumented **immigrants** within their populations.

Maryland tied for sixth place, with 4.2 percent; the District tied for ninth, with 3.9 percent, and Virginia tied for 13th, with 3.5 percent, which matched the national average.

Individuals from El Salvador made up the largest percentage of undocumented **immigrants** in the District, Maryland and Virginia, with rates of 37 percent, 28 percent and 25 percent in those jurisdictions, respectively.

Mexico was the second-largest country of birth for undocumented **immigrants** in Maryland and Virginia, representing 11 percent and 14 percent in those states, respectively. In the District, Guatemala was the second-largest, with 7 percent.

Pew said the undocumented-**immigrant** population continues to become more settled, with such individuals living in the United States for a median of 13.6 years in 2014 compared to a median of eight years in 2005.

Also, new arrivals make up a smaller share of the undocumented population. Fourteen percent of undocumented **immigrants** had lived in the United States for less than five years in 2014, compared to 31 percent in 2005.

josh.hicks@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A cottage industry of apologists for Donald Trump and his supporters has sprung up to excuse, justify, infantilize and pity his core group of white, non-college-educated males who lash out at **immigrants** and globalism more generally. Victims ignored by elites! The Emmy winners mock them! There are more than a few problems with this.

First, conservatives used to stand up for "creative destruction," the rise and fall of businesses and entire industries, which is an intrinsic part of a dynamic free market. If you're not a hard-core Libertarian, the average conservative has considered the solution to this problem to be a safety net and tax, education and other policies that allow workers to rebound; it has never been to halt the marketplace or shift to a government-planned economy. The latter has been tried and has failed, as conservatives are quick to point out when ridiculing Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) or other anti-capitalist wags. It also exempts these voters from responsibility for their lives. The coal town is depopulated? Yes, that's sad, but why are they not moving -- as **immigrants** do -- to where the jobs are?

Second, the ills about which Trump and his apologists complain have little to do with the plight of many of their supporters (whose average salary is $72,000, much higher than that of the average Sanders or Hillary Clinton supporter). The things Trump demonizes -- free trade and **immigration** -- did not cause the decline of low-skilled manufacturing (automation did that); they have, however, contributed to the resurgence of high-skill manufacturing in the United States to such an extent that we have record numbers of unfilled manufacturing jobs. If Trump were railing about the lack of job training programs, that would be one thing, but he is not, of course. Constructive measures that do not involve attacks on others are of no concern to him. He's simply casting about for targets for white, lower-class rage.

Third, Trump's defenders seem to demand that we treat members of his base delicately for fear of ruffling their feathers and damaging their self-esteem. When you play the "Hollywood makes fun of us" card, you get perilously close to political correctness and emotional feebleness, not things Trump and his ilk are supposed to promote. Even worse, complaining that other people don't wish them "Merry Christmas" -- and then transforming that into a war against Christianity -- is victimology rarely seen outside the "safe spaces" on college campuses.

Fourth, the pity party for lower-class white males excludes virtually everyone else. Are we expected to turn the economy inside out for the latter, even to the extent that it harms those who have prepared themselves for a competitive workplace -- or who simply want to enjoy moderately priced consumer goods not priced out of their grasp by tariffs? Why concern ourselves with the delicate sensibilities of the "Merry Christmas"-deprived and not with Mexican **immigrants**("murderers"), women (Trump thinks it's a mistake to let wives work outside the home), African Americans (whose lives he insists are a "disaster"), the disabled, etc.?

In elevating one specific group -- older white males -- Trump fails the test of a leader in a diverse, complex society in which we want to maximize benefits for the largest number of people. He seems not to grasp the demands of living in a prosperous 21st-century society --technical prowess, flexibility, cooperation and respect for others.

It also happens to be dumb politics, as Gerald Seib points out:

Suburban women "have in the past voted consistently Republican, and this year they are leaning heavily toward Hillary Clinton" says GOP pollster Whit Ayres, who works with Sen. Marco Rubio. Says one Trump adviser flatly: "Suburban women will decide this election."

There is no virtue in pandering to Trumpkins at the expense of every other group and the country's general prosperity. In making these white males (and only them) into victims and encouraging them to blame outsiders or menacing forces beyond their control, Trump does what Republicans used to accuse liberals of doing -- pitting one group against another in a zero-sum conception of the economy. It is doing the Trumpkins no favors and it is heightening dissension in a country that needs to rediscover common values and shared endeavors and undertake some systemic reforms in government, education and criminal justice.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump likes to use terrorist attacks to congratulate himself. He also cites Israel as a model for "profiling" -- not understanding what it is that Israeli security profiles for. (Hint: It's not race.)

Varda Spiegel writes in the Times of Israel:

Every Israeli I know was appalled by the cavalier announcement that the bomb had gone off and his subsequent attempt to take credit for calling it first. It prompted ridicule on the part of his opponents in the Hebrew media and an awkward silence on the part of their colleagues who support him.

If you pop off when information is incomplete, she explains:

\* You may be wrong.

\* You may drive throngs of panicking and/or curious spectators to or from the scene, who may in turn interfere with investigations, law enforcement, and emergency and security services.

\* Evil forces may take advantage of such premature revelations to make good on their intention to kill and maim.

\* You may instill terror in people, particularly children, who are ill-prepared to deal with it and at physical or emotional risk of responding badly.

\* You may tip off folks that their loved ones are in harm's way or worse — setting off unnecessary or unmanaged grief. No one needs to hear on television from Donald J. Trump that a bomb went off in front of their daughter's or son's apartment or their father's or mother's workplace — especially if the ensuing dread is warranted. Letting people know that the worst has happened is better left to physicians and mental health professionals.

\* You may thwart the media's attempts to provide the public with vital information by attracting attention-starved halfwits who jockey for position in front of the cameras as such grizzly events unfold. We have our share of these idiots too. But imagine Israelis' horror at watching a would-be leader of the Western world invite the likes of them to the after-party.

Trump consistently mistakes bluster for strength. He is not only reckless in his pronouncements and his policy suggestions (e.g. banning Muslims), but he also proves himself to be wrong -- a lot.

In this case, according to news reports, it was the father, the head of the Muslim **immigrant** family, who tried to warn authorities about his son. It is not the only time a parent has heroically tried to head off a child's plot. It's the patriotic, decent **immigrants** we need to cooperate with law enforcement and national security officials; Trump would make them the enemy, painting all Muslims with the same brush.

Since Trump so admires the Israelis, he might consider a critical part of their anti-terrorism efforts. As one report explains, "There is little question that Israeli intelligence agencies have for decades relied on Palestinian informants to gather information on Arab communities in Israel and the Occupied Territories. These individuals provide the Israeli intelligence establishment with human intelligence or plant technical surveillance equipment as instructed by their handlers."

Arab recruits also play a vital role in Israel security operations. But don't bother Trump with reality. He's too busy bellowing nonsense and providing fodder to Islamist recruiters that the West is irredeemably hostile toward Muslims.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A rep for @Skittles gives me their response to @DonaldJTrumpJr pic.twitter.com/OmkJQkIqug

UPDATE: This post has been updated to include the most recent U.S. State Department data on the number of Syrian refugees admitted to the United States.

Sometimes it's not what is said but who says it that really speaks volumes.

Donald Trump Jr., eldest son, lifelong pupil and employee of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump Sr., shares many of his father's beliefs and habits. One of them is making the time to pontificate via Twitter.

Among the many ideas Trump Jr. has expressed in the past 24 hours — and there are a lot of ideas on this dude's Twitter feed — was this:

This image says it all. Let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first. #trump2016 pic.twitter.com/9fHwog7ssN

Actually, it's the younger Trump's metaphor that says it all. Or, that's what Denise Young, vice president of corporate affairs at Wrigley Americas, the Chicago-based company that produces and sells Skittles, apparently thought. Trump's decision to compare the more than 4.8 million human beings that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) says have been set adrift by conflict in Syria to a bowl of candy with assorted flavors was not welcome.

The comparison between candy and people — 39.3 percent of whom are children 11 or younger — just didn't sit right with Young. It seemed to strike Young as absurdly insensitive ... or maybe just absurd. The vast majority of the 4.8 million people scattered by the Syrian conflict are living in what are often tent cities and do not have the legal right to work in the countries to which they have fled. About 1.12 million have sought refuge and asylum in Europe. Exactly 13,828 Syrians have been admitted to the United States between Jan. 1, 2014, and Sept. 20, 2016.

MarketWatch, the economic news outlet, called Young's response simply "the best reply" to the younger Trump's refugee commentary. (See text of Wrigley's response at the top of this post. Seth Abramovitch is a journalist with the Hollywood Reporter.)

And really, there's a limit to what can and needs to be said here about why Wrigley responded the way they did.

We know that the men involved in the Paris terrorist attacks were Europeans of Middle Eastern heritage; some were born on the continent and as such, radicalized in Europe, according to the BBC. And as The Washington Post has reported, we know that one of the men had a passport — believed to be fake — indicating that he may have entered Europe as a refugee. However, nothing more has been determined. The matter remains under investigation.

We also know that the vast majority of bank robbers, rapists and other criminals are men. Few would consider it reasonable to treat all men as if they are suspects in these crimes when they occur until some unspecified process allows us to figure out who they are and what they have done and with whom they associate. But that's precisely how Donald Trump has suggested that a Trump administration would deal with refugee resettlement requests.

The Department of Homeland Security has acknowledged that refugee screening is a challenging task but has not suggested that a total shutdown is the solution. Instead, officials have said repeatedly that they will continue to adjust the process to render it more rigorous in an effort to prevent terrorist attacks.

Those are the facts. However, the younger Trump's Twitter feed reads like a running summary of the essence of his father's political philosophy.

There are various references to the threats posed by refugees and other **immigrants**, overt claims that refugees in Germany have spurred a rape crisis and several examples of what seems like a near obsession with German Chancellor Angela Merkel and his read on Merkel's recent comments acknowledging that admitting so many Syrian refugees came with a political cost for her party and created domestic tensions that bolstered the political cause of the far right. The younger Trump characterized Merkel's comments as Merkel having admitted to wrongly allowing in refugees.

Not quite, Donald Jr. Not quite. This is what Merkel actually said, according to the Guardian:

In an unusually self-critical but also combative speech, the German chancellor said on Monday afternoon she was fighting to make sure there would be no repetition of last year's chaotic scenes on Germany's borders, when "for some time, we didn't have enough control". "No one wants a repeat of last year's situation, including me," Merkel said.

But the younger Trump's leap from Merkel's more nuanced comments to the conclusion that refugees are the source of so many, if not all, of Germany's problems offers a veritable illustration of the political philosophy that the elder Trump and some large portion of his supporters embrace.

To Trump and his supporters, America's problems are rooted in **immigration**, particularly illegal **immigration** and politically correct efforts to aid the millions of people made stateless by the Syrian war. As such, the Trump doctrine holds that most, if not all of America's problems can and will be excised by deporting millions, embracing the type of domestic "profiling" for which Israel has long been rebuked by international human rights agencies, a temporary halt to refugee admissions and withdrawal from various trade deals and defense pacts.

Trump's philosophy is what he calls America first. In effect it is America only.

But when corporations, which are not known for declining free publicity, must point out that a comparison born of that philosophy is callous, that really says quite a lot.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Department of Homeland Security's inspector general on Monday released a report detailing at least 858 **immigrants** from countries that pose national security threats or their neighbors who have mistakenly been granted citizenship. They were naturalized despite being ordered to be removed from the country, because the government couldn't match their identities to their removal orders.

The report lands at a potential inflection point in the presidential election. Donald Trump has long carved out a strong position against admitting Syrian refugees and called for "extreme vetting" of other **immigrants** — calls he ramped up still further after this weekend's terrorist attacks in Minnesota, and New York and New Jersey, both of which appear to have been perpetrated by Muslim **immigrants** (one from Somalia and one from Afghanistan).

Trump's campaign is already promoting the report. It's unlikely to stop anytime soon.

Outrage. Just another day at DHS: 858 criminal aliens from 'special interest countries' wrongly granted citizenship https://t.co/bZVkJ0hlCG[https://t.co/bZVkJ0hlCG]

The report, it should be noted, doesn't say the **immigrants** were all criminals. But there's plenty for the Trump campaign to work with here.

From the Associated Press's report:

The report does not identify any of the **immigrants** by name, but Inspector General John Roth's auditors said they were all from "special interest countries" — those that present a national security concern for the United States — or neighboring countries with high rates of **immigration** fraud. The report did not identify those countries.

Here are a couple other key points from the report itself:

\* "[U.S. Citizenship and **Immigration** Services] granted U.S. citizenship to at least 858 individuals ordered deported or removed under another identity when, during the naturalization process, their digital fingerprint records were not available. The digital records were not available because although USCIS procedures require checking applicants' fingerprints against both the Department of Homeland Security's and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) digital fingerprint repositories, neither contains all old fingerprint records."

\* "Later, [**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement] identified missing fingerprint records for about 315,000 aliens who had final deportation orders or who were criminals or fugitives, but it has not yet reviewed about 148,000 aliens' files to try to retrieve and digitize the old fingerprint cards."

\* "Under the [**Immigration** and Nationality Act], a Federal court may revoke naturalization (denaturalize) through a civil or criminal proceeding if the citizenship was obtained through fraud or misrepresentation. However, few of these individuals have been investigated and subsequently denaturalized. As it identified these 1,029 individuals [a number that was reduced to 858 after finding duplicates], OPS referred the cases to ICE for investigation. As of March 2015, ICE had closed 90 investigations of these individuals and had 32 open investigations. The Offices of the United States Attorneys (USAO) accepted 2 cases for criminal prosecution, which could lead to denaturalization; the USAO declined 26 cases."

Trump has been making the case that the bureaucracy is simply too dense and faulty to adequately vet both Syrian refugees and potential **immigrants** from countries with a history of terrorism. He has called for a ban on Syrian refugees and "extreme vetting" of all **immigrants** from specific countries where terrorism is a concern — though he hasn't delineated which countries would be included or just how much of his previous blanket ban on all Muslim **immigrants** remains intact.

And this report completely plays into his hands on that second count. The Department of Homeland Security is disclosing that it not only mistakenly allowed certain **immigrants** due for deportation to stay and become citizens; it allowed **immigrants** from countries that pose threats to remain.

Expect to hear plenty more about this one in the days ahead.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK — With record numbers of people fleeing trouble in their homelands, the Obama administration is struggling to confront what Secretary of State John F. Kerry on Monday described as a "global humanitarian crisis, in some places a catastrophe."

The scale of that emergency has intensified dramatically over the past decade, with an estimated 65.3 million people forcibly displaced by war, sectarian conflict and persecution in 2015, up from 37.5 million in 2005, according to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

On Tuesday, President Obama will convene a special summit here on the sidelines of the U.N. General Assembly aimed at rallying global support for the victims of the worst refugee crisis since World War II.

Obama is expected to announce new commitments from world leaders and business executives to help relocate and provide economic aid to refugees — including a vow to welcome 110,000 into the United States next year, a 30 percent increase from 2016.

But critics said the summit also highlights Obama's failings on the issue, including his refusal to use U.S. military power to carve out safe areas for those fleeing the Syrian government's barrel bombs and artillery attacks.

The war between President Bashar al-Assad's regime and an array of rebel forces, including the Islamic State, has produced an exodus of 4.8 million Syrians, many of whom have massed in Turkey and spread into Europe.

"The bitter truth is this summit was called because we have been largely failing — failing the long-suffering people of Syria in not ending the war in its infancy," Zeid Ra'ad al-Hussein, the United Nations' human rights chief, said Monday as world leaders gathered in New York.

Images of injured and dead children have highlighted the humanitarian disaster in Syria, but rising strains of nationalism in Europe and the United States have blunted appeals from human rights advocates for the admittance of a greater number of refugees.

The Obama administration announced in August that it had met its goal of welcoming 10,000 Syrians this year, a number that officials said is expected to rise in 2017. Yet Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has cited terrorism fears in his call for a temporary ban on Muslim refugees from Syria and elsewhere.

Over the past year, Obama has tried with increasing urgency to counter Trump, lambasting his proposals as contrary to American values and counterproductive to fighting terror.

This year, the United States had accepted 28,957 Muslim refugees through early August, the highest number since data on religious affiliation became available in 2002, according to an analysis from the Pew Research Center.

But the bombing attacks that injured 29 in New York and New Jersey over the weekend underscored Obama's challenge in calming public anxiety. The initial police investigation focused on a 28-year-old Afghan **immigrant**, and the president urged the public not to "succumb to that fear."

Terrorists, Obama said in a brief public statement, "want to inspire fear in all of us, and disrupt the way we live, to undermine our values."

Human rights advocates praised the president's summit, calling it a small first step in a process that will require sustained, long-term engagement from the United States and other nations.

Of the world's estimated 65 million refugees, 41 million have fled their homes but remained in their own nations, and 21 million have fled their countries, the U.N. report found. An additional 3 million are awaiting decisions on asylum.

Obama's efforts are "still just a tiny drop in the bucket," said Margaret Huang, interim executive director of Amnesty International. "The United States does accept more refugees than any other country in the world, and there are reasons for this administration to be proud of its record. . . . But it's not enough."

The U.N. summit will seek to address a crisis that goes well beyond Syria and the broader Middle East. Most refugees today are trapped in camps in relatively poor nations such as Thailand, Jordan, Kenya and Pakistan. Burma and Congo have sent the most refugees to the United States this year, followed by Syria and Iraq.

In all, eight countries host more than half the world's refugees, and 75 percent of the U.N. budget for migrants and refugees comes from 10 nations, according to the world body.

"We need to give them basic succor," said Michel Gabaudan, president of Refugees International, an aid group based in Washington. "And the money has not matched the rise in need."

Nor has the political will. In Germany, Chancellor Angela Merkel's decision to accept tens of thousands of Syrians last year prompted massive protests. On Sunday, her ruling coalition suffered major losses in the Berlin state election to the far-right opposition party that campaigned on an anti-**immigrant** platform.

In Hungary, public polling has shown that voters are likely to reject a refu­gee quota mandated by the European Union in a national referendum early next month.

"People around the world are frightened by things they see happen, acts by extremists, but it's very important to understand refugees are not the perpetrators of this kind of violence," said Chris Boian, spokesman for the U.N. refugee agency. "They're fleeing that same violence."

In the United States, a bipartisan coalition in the House, including 47 Democrats, approved a bill in November that would require stringent new screening procedures for Syrian and Iraqi refugees. That same month, Obama toured a Malaysian refu­gee center during a trip to Asia, kneeling on the floor to chat with schoolchildren.

"The notion that somehow we would be fearful of them, that our politics would somehow leave us to turn our sights away from their plight, is not representative of the best of who we are," Obama said then.

The House legislation, opposed by the White House, was defeated in the Senate.

Yet human rights advocates have criticized the administration for not doing more to resettle the tens of thousands of children fleeing violence in Central America who have illegally crossed into the United States from Mexico in recent years.

The Obama administration has said those migrants are subject to deportation if they fail to qualify for political asylum. Under pressure from advocates, the administration expanded a refu­gee program for the Central American minors in July, but only a few thousand have been granted refu­gee status.

"It's a massive failure on the Obama administration's part to not deal with this issue," Huang said.

david.nakamura@washpost.com

greg.jaffe@washpost.com

Nakamura reported from Washington. Carol Morello in New York contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ESTERO, Fla. — Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump on Monday asserted that his proposed ideological tests for **immigrants** would prevent future terrorist attacks in the United States, while also accusing his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, of facilitating the spread of terrorist attacks in the United States through her "weakness."

"These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system, which fails to properly vet or screen the individuals or families coming into our country," Trump said during a campaign event in Estero, Fla. "Attack after attack, from 9/11 to San Bernardino, we have seen how failures to screen who is entering our United States puts all of our citizens, everyone in this room, in danger."

Trump said that ideological tests to assess an **immigrant**'s "world view," which he has proposed before, are an important component of such vetting.

The primary suspect in Saturday's New York City and New Jersey bombings, Ahmad Khan Rahami, is a naturalized U.S. citizen born in Afghanistan, according to the FBI. The Republican nominee lamented that Rahami is likely to receive modern medical treatment and access to a lawyer.

"Now we will give him amazing hospitalization. He will be taken care of by some of the best doctors in the world. He will be given a fully modern and updated hospital room, and he'll probably even have room service, knowing the way our country is," Trump said. "And on top of all of that, he will be represented by an outstanding lawyer. His case will go through the various court systems for years. And in the end, people will forget and his punishment will not be what it once would have been. What a sad situation."

Trump last year proposed a temporary ban on Muslims entering the United States. He has since described the ban in geographic terms, saying Monday that he would restrict **immigration** from "dangerous countries" while focusing on the threat of radical Islam.

"We cannot let this evil continue. Nor can we let the hateful ideology of radical Islam … be allowed to reside or spread within our country. Just can't do it," Trump said in Estero. "We will not defeat it with closed eyes or silent voices. Anyone who cannot name our enemy is not fit to lead this country."

Trump said that Clinton "caused the problem," blaming her **immigration** positions in part. He incorrectly stated that Clinton supports "open borders."

"She very much caused the problem, when you think about it. Her weakness, her ineffectiveness, caused the problem. And now she wants to be president? I don't think so," he said. "Hillary Clinton is a weak and ineffective person. And I will tell you, if you choose Donald Trump, these problems are going to go away."

Trump said that Clinton "refuses to say the words 'radical Islam,'" and is thus unwilling to confront terrorist threats directly.

"In fact, Hillary Clinton talks tougher about my supporters than she does about Islamic terrorists. She calls the patriotic Americans who support our campaign, many of them cops and soldiers, deplorable and irredeemable — and she means it," he told thousands of supporters gathered in Estero. "Has she ever talked that way about radical Islam? No."

Trump also said the authorities should use "whatever lawful methods are available to obtain information" from the suspected New York and New Jersey bomber. He called on Congress to pass measures ensuring foreign enemy combatants are "treated as such." Trump has in the past voiced support for bringing back waterboarding as an interrogation tactic.

Sean Sullivan in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In this tumultuous campaign season, Graham Ambrose, a junior majoring in history at Yale University, writes about a group of voters from whom we haven't heard much: students at some of the most competitive universities in the country who endorse Donald Trump for president. — Susan Svrluga

At Cornell University, junior Irvin McCullough estimates sizable campus support for Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump. But he says they're largely invisible at the Ivy League school: "They're still in the closet."

At Yale University, 21-year-old Karl Notturno jokes about being one of the few students on campus openly supporting the Republican presidential nominee. "People sometimes say to me, 'Oh, you must be the smartest Trump supporter out there.' " He tells them, "No, there are a lot of Trump supporters who are a lot smarter than me. The reason you haven't heard of them is because they're a lot smarter than me."

National polls show strongest support for Trump among Americans who didn't graduate from college. But on the nation's elite college campuses, from the Ivy League to small liberal arts colleges to top public universities, Trump supporters do exist, even in places known for their liberal politics.

Some supporters are loud, championing the 70-year-old real estate mogul with an ardor characteristic of the presidential aspirant himself. But many keep a low profile, even among close friends. They say what links them is a refusal to accept "politically correct" codes of campus speech, anger toward voices of authority and, above all else, a deep, visceral disdain for the Democratic presidential nominee, Hillary Clinton.

On campus, students supporting Trump face a perception problem: how to overcome the enduring public image of Trump voters as uneducated, poor, white and, more baldly, unintelligent. Corey Hong, a sophomore at Washington University in St. Louis, said he believes well-educated Trump supporters are keeping quiet because they don't want to be perceived as less intelligent than their more liberal peers.

"There are definitely uneducated Trump supporters out there, and unfortunately they tend to be the most vocal about their support," Hong said.

Some students said there's so much hostility toward Trump on campus that it can be difficult to even mention the candidate. Alexander Spanopoulos, a Vanderbilt University senior, said his peers have accused him of being a bigot, a threat to freedom, a white supremacist, a member of Hitler Youth and an embarrassment to the academic community.

"The most interesting statements hurled against me have been that I should leave the country as soon as possible and that I am not on the list to survive the revolution," said Spanopoulos, who was born in Greece and raised in Memphis. He sees such statements as an attack on the First Amendment. "Labeling differing opinions as hate speech is thinly-veiled censorship perpetrated by those who are unwilling to engage in difficult conversations," he said. " … Conservative beliefs are openly mocked by both students and faculty."

When the Cornell Daily Sun reached out to Olivia Corn, the 19-year-old from Riverdale, N.Y., who serves as chairwoman of the Cornell Republicans, she was eager to speak out on behalf of campus Trump supporters. But she felt betrayed by reaction to the story online.

"There were many horrible comments attacking me personally," she said. "I lost many friends over my political views simply because they can't understand my reasoning for why I believe what I believe, and that to me is incredibly disheartening."

Sarah Muller, a junior at Northwestern University who supports Clinton, countered: "It's hardly fair to say that campus Trump supporters are a victims of campus culture. It's no secret that they hold a minority opinion at Northwestern, but college is a place where people's opinions are supposed to be challenged all the time. Trump supporters aren't being mindlessly written off as bigots; they are being asked hard questions about their beliefs and values."

Trump, Muller said, "has shamelessly established himself as a symbol of racism, xenophobia and sexism. Supporting Trump is an endorsement of those beliefs, so there's definitely a stigma to it. Trump is one of the most polarizing figures American politics has seen in decades, so throwing your support behind him carries with it a stigma."

On a number of campuses, when Trump supporters have promoted his campaign in chalk, some students responded with fear. A coalition of student groups at Emory University in Atlanta, for example, wrote an open letter after finding pro-Trump chalkings, calling it an attack on marginalized and minority communities on campus that had created an environment in which students no longer felt safe or welcome.

At some campuses, there were anti-Mexican, anti-Islamic or anti-**immigrant** messages written alongside Trump's name; at others, it was simply his name and slogan.

At Washington University, Hong said the school is so liberal that it's almost to the point of being militant. "I would argue that while universities make it a priority to make minorities, LGBT or basically anybody else feel safe and accepted, conservatives who make their political stances known are often perceived as less intelligent, and usually are treated as such," he said.

That, students said, has pushed Trump supporters underground. McCullough, the Cornell junior, said he was invited to a secret gathering with other closeted Trump supporters and was shocked to see some of the people who turned out for it: "There was a kind of a 'You're a Trump supporter too? Really!'-type moment," he said.

Some critics say that Trump uses his blunt speech as a cover for offensive or imprudent policy, such as limiting Muslim **immigration**. But for those who say they're tired of being told how to think and speak, Trump heralds a welcome change.

"Donald Trump's lack of political experience is refreshing to Americans," said Josh Parks, a student at the University of Chicago. "A businessman like Donald Trump comes along, never having held public office and unafraid of offending the politically correct elites, and the content and tone with which he speaks resonates with the everyday Americans … it is refreshing to see an individual running for the high office that speaks in an off-the-cuff manner because we are drowning in overly-polished political correctness."

Many of Trump's supporters at elite universities also welcome his slogan. " 'Make America Great Again' means once again believing that there is something special about this country, its values, and its culture and that those things are worth fighting for," said Notturno, 21, who grew up in Washington, D.C.

"It's an ideological return for which we strive," Spanopoulos said. "'Make America Great Again' means the death of the nanny state, the return to the height of military power, the re-empowerment of our citizenry through returned freedoms and lowered taxes, honesty and transparency in media and government, and, most importantly, shifting power away from the bloated federal government and back to the states, per the 10th Amendment."

For others, it is simpler: a powerful enmity for Trump's opponent. Of the more than two dozen students across the country who avowed support for Trump, each cited a profound contempt for Clinton as a primary reason.

"I don't trust Hillary Clinton," Hong said.

"I am repulsed by her to the point that I am drawn to Donald Trump," said Luke Kelly, a junior at Harvard University.

At elite universities, where Clinton enjoys strong support, Trump backers can appear more mythical than real. One recent headline from the student newspaper at the University of California at Berkeley illuminated the scarcity: "Seeking: One Trump Supporter."

"During the spring semester, I could count on both hands the number of vocal Trump supporters among my classmates," said Spanopolous.

For his part, Parks enjoys his role at the University of Chicago. During his second week of college, he walked into the student lounge of his dorm wearing a red "Make America Great Again" hat.

"A now good friend of mine stopped me, thinking that I was wearing the hat ironically," he said, "and with a very concerned look on her face said, 'You do know that the money you spent on that hat goes directly to advancing the Trump campaign?'"

Parks told her, "That's exactly why I ordered two."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals or families coming into our country." — Donald Trump, campaign rally speech, Sept. 19, 2016

Fox News host Ainsley Earhardt: "Why do they care so much if you use the word 'bombing' or not? I mean, we're talking about a terrorist attack and there are bigger issues here. Why is that?" […]

Trump: "Well, that's not really the reason. The reason is because my poll numbers now are so good that they are so worried. … I mean, it's common sense, but they will do anything. Think of it, Hillary Clinton wants to allow hundreds of thousands of these same people that are, you know, they have such hatred and sickness in their heart. It's sickness, and it's hatred, and she wants to allow hundreds of thousands more to come in." — Exchange on "Fox and Friends," Sept. 19, 2016

In response to Saturday's bombings in Manhattan and Seaside Park, N.J., Trump touted his plan to stem **immigration**, with a focus on Muslims, and criticized Hillary Clinton's proposal to accept Syrian refugees.

On Monday, the New York Police Department identified Ahmad Khan Rahami in connection to the bombings. Rahami was apprehended Monday after a shootout with police.

Trump blamed the bombings on the "extremely open **immigration** system" in the United States and criticized Clinton's proposal to accept at least 65,000 more refugees from war-torn Syria. (In the Fox interview, Trump incorrectly says Clinton wants to admit "hundreds of thousands" of Syrian refugees.) But what does the refugee resettlement process have to do with Rahami?

The Facts

There's always the possibility of inaccurate or incomplete reports in a fluid breaking news situation, such as these bombings. So we will go by what law enforcement has released, which Trump should be going by as well, unless he somehow has direct knowledge of Rahami and his **immigration** background.

Here's what we know so far.

Rahami, 28, was born in Afghanistan, came to the United States with his family when he was young and was naturalized, according to the FBI. He lived in New Jersey with his family, above the family's restaurant, First American Chicken in Elizabeth, N.J. Members of the Rahami family have owned and operated the restaurant since 2002, according to The Washington Post's review of court records.

Rep. Peter T. King (R-N.Y.), member of the House Homeland Security Committee, told The Post that Rahami's "trips to Afghanistan changed him," adding that the 28-year-old had also visited Pakistan at some point. Neighbors told the New York Times that Rahami showed signs of radicalization after he visited Afghanistan. But as of Monday night, law enforcement had not yet confirmed whether Rahami was influenced by international terror organizations or had any links to them.

"I do not have information yet to show what the path of radicalization was," said William Sweeney, FBI special agent in New York, at a news conference on Monday afternoon. Law enforcement said there was no indication Rahami was part of a larger network.

As of Monday night, NBC News and the Daily Beast cited anonymous U.S. officials to say that Rahami arrived in the United States in 1995 as the son of an Afghan asylum seeker. But no law enforcement agency had confirmed this detail. The Department of Homeland Security did not provide any information to The Fact Checker about Rahami's **immigration** history.

Such information is not always accurate. For example, the Tsarnaev brothers in the Boston Marathon bombings were identified as refugees in initial news reports. But later, it was revealed that the brothers ended up in the United States as minors because their father applied for asylum.

Also on Saturday, 22-year-old Dahir Adan was fatally shot by an off-duty police officer after stabbing nine people in a Minnesota mall. A news agency linked to the Islamic State claimed he was a "soldier" of the militant group, but law enforcement found no evidence of direct or indirect communications and said Adan appeared to be a lone attacker. Adan moved to the United States from Kenya at age 2 and grew up in Minnesota.

The problem with Trump linking the bombings to an "extremely open **immigration** system" or Clinton's plan to admit Syrian refugees is that we don't know all the details of Rahami's **immigration** history yet. Trump misleads the public by saying that Syrian refugees waiting to gain entry into the United States are people who have "such hatred and sickness in their heart" and by comparing them to Rahami. (The Trump campaign did not respond to our request for clarification.)

Even if the family's status as asylum seekers were confirmed, there is a difference between refugees and those given asylum. Refugees are screened outside of the United States and are referred for resettlement mainly by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Asylum seekers apply for asylum once they are in the United States or at the border. Asylum status is available to people who meet the definition of a refugee; successful asylum seekers obtain refugee status, though the screening protocol is different.

Resettled refugees have not been a major terrorist threat to the U.S. homeland (we took a deep-dive into this issue last year). On occasion, refugees have posed terrorism threats and have been linked to international terrorist groups: There have been at least 10 occasions since 2009 when refugees were arrested on terrorism-related charges in the United States, but that's a tiny percentage of the refugees admitted in that period.

By contrast, homegrown terrorism, especially among lone attackers who are not a part of a larger network, is a growing concern, especially American citizens who are radicalized online.

The Pinocchio Test

Based on the information we have so far, the suspect in the bombings was an American who became radicalized. He came to the United States at a young age with his family and became a naturalized U.S. citizen. It's unconfirmed yet how Rahami entered the United States — whether he gained refugee status or asylum-seeker status or received some type of visa. This points to radicalization of those living legally in the United States, which is a different matter than what Trump talked about in response to the bombings on Monday.

Instead, Trump blamed the bombings on the "extremely open **immigration** system" and to the "hatred and sickness" of refugees (including from Syria). But this is quite misleading. Rahami's potential for radicalization while legally living in the U.S. and legally traveling to his home country is not something that would be caught through a vetting system upon entry. Only a minuscule number of refugees are ever linked to terrorism. Moreover, Trump exaggerates the number of Syrian refugees Clinton has said she would accept.

In Trump's view, refugees (Syrian or otherwise), homegrown terrorism, asylum seekers and naturalized citizens of Afghan descent may all fit into one bucket. But that's not how it works, and it's overly misleading to make such sweeping claims with such little, credible information at hand.

Three Pinocchios

(About our rating scale)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton tells us she is recovering from a mild case of pneumonia, but less than half of American voters believe her belated explanation of why she appeared to faint leaving a 9/11 commemoration. If she wants to understand why, she can find the answer in a children's poem.

In his 1907 classic, "Matilda Who told Lies, and was Burned to Death," Hilaire Belloc tells the story of a young girl who "told such Dreadful Lies, It made one Gasp and Stretch one's Eyes." One day Matilda calls in a false alarm to London's fire brigade, and as punishment is left home alone while her aunt goes to the theater:

That Night a Fire did break out--

You should have heard Matilda Shout!

You should have heard her Scream and Bawl,

And throw the window up and call

To People passing in the Street . . . but all in vain!

For every time She shouted "Fire!"

They only answered "Little Liar!"

And therefore when her Aunt returned,

Matilda, and the House, were Burned.

Today, it is the American people who have been burned, time and again, by Hillary Clinton's dreadful lies. Let's review just a few examples of her serial dishonesty:

She lied repeatedly about her emails. She lied when she said she had "turned over everything I was obligated to turn over" (FBI Director James Comey said the FBI "discovered several thousand work-related e-mails that were not among the group of 30,000 e-mails returned by Secretary Clinton to state in 2014"). She lied when she said there was "no classified material" in her private emails . . . that there was nothing "classified at the time" . . . and that there was nothing "marked classified" in her private emails — all of which the FBI director said were untrue. And, to top it all off, she lied about her lies — declaring on national television that "Director Comey said my answers were truthful, and what I've said is consistent with what I have told the American people" — a claim The Post's Fact Checker gave "Four Pinocchios."

Clinton lied to the American people about Benghazi. At 10:08 p.m. the night of the attack, she issued a statement that blamed the attack on "inflammatory material posted on the Internet" with no mention of terrorism or al-Qaeda. But an hour later, at 11:12 p.m. she emailed her daughter, Chelsea: "Two of our officers were killed in Benghazi by an Al Queda-like [sic] group." The next day in a phone call with the Egyptian prime minister, Clinton said: "We know the attack in Libya had nothing to do with the film. It was a planned attack, not a protest." Yet two days later, as she welcomed the caskets of the fallen in Dover, Del., she blamed that attack on "an awful Internet video that we had nothing to do with."

She lied about a trip she made to Bosnia, claiming that she and her team arrived "under sniper fire," skipped the arrival ceremony and "just ran with our heads down to get into the vehicles to get to our base." In fact, a video shows her being greeted on the tarmac by Bosnian officials and an 8-year-old Muslim girl, Emina Bicakcic, who read a poem in English and told Clinton, "There is peace now."

She lied about her family history. In 2015, she said she could relate to illegal **immigrants** because "all my grandparents" **immigrated** to the United States. When BuzzFeed's Andrew Kaczynski pointed out that three of Clinton's four grandparents were born in the United States, a Clinton spokesman said "her grandparents always spoke about the **immigrant** experience and, as a result she has always thought of them as **immigrants**."

And her dishonesty stretches back decades. As the late, great William Safire pointed out in a 1996 New York Times column, she delivered a "blizzard of lies" as first lady — about Whitewater, the firing of White House travel aides, her representation of a criminal enterprise known as the Madison S&L and how she made a 10,000 percent profit in 1979 commodity trading simply by studying the Wall Street Journal. Even back then, Safire concluded, Clinton was "a congenital liar."

Today, the American people agree. A recent NBC News poll found that just 11 percent of Americans say Clinton is honest and trustworthy. To put that in perspective, 14 percent of American voters believe in Bigfoot. In other words, more Americans believe that a large, hairy, hominoid creature inhabits the forest of North America than believe that Hillary Clinton tells the truth.

So if Clinton wonders why so many believe she is lying about her health, it is because she has lied so many times, about so many things, that most Americans no longer believe a word she says — even if she's telling the truth.

When she opens her mouth, people look at her like Belloc's Matilda and say, "Little Liar."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK — Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton warned Monday that anti-Muslim rhetoric by opponent Donald Trump is "giving aid and comfort" to the Islamic State as both candidates sought to position themselves as better qualified to combat terrorism in the aftermath of a spate of violence over the weekend.

"We know that a lot of the rhetoric that we've heard from Donald Trump has been seized on by terrorists, including ISIS, because they are looking to make this a war against Islam," Clinton said, using an acronym for the Islamic State. She insisted that the United States is up to the challenge of combating terrorism on its shores and that only she has a detailed plan to meet that challenge.

Trump said current anti-terrorism efforts are insufficient at home and abroad. He blamed President Obama and Clinton, who served as Obama's first secretary of state, and he suggested that profiling is necessary to counter the threat.

"We have to lead for a change. Because we're not knocking them," Trump told Fox News Channel. "We're hitting them once in a while. We're hitting them in certain places. We're being very gentle about it. We're going to have to be very tough."

A week before Clinton and Trump are scheduled to face off in their first televised debate, bombings in New York and New Jersey and a mass stabbing in Minnesota have refocused the presidential race on concerns about domestic terrorism and national security. With the nation rattled Monday in the wake of the three attacks, both candidates made the case for why they are better prepared than the other to step into the Oval Office.

The two candidates' responses aptly reflected what each sees as a winning argument — for Clinton, an appeal to steady leadership and presidential bearing, and for Trump, a get-tough message.

At an airport news conference with her campaign plane as a backdrop, Clinton stood somberly at a lectern and repeatedly sought to encourage Americans to go about their lives, to not be deterred by fears of terrorism and to rest assured that the United States is well- positioned to address the threat at home and abroad.

In his interview, Trump said the United States is too tentative in its efforts against terrorism overseas. The better approach would be to "knock the hell out of them" and possibly introduce profiling as a counterterrorism tactic, he added.

"Our local police, they know who a lot of these people are," Trump said in the Fox interview. "They are afraid to do anything about it, because they don't want to be accused of profiling. And they don't want to be accused of all sorts of things."

He concluded: "Do we have a choice? Look what's going on. Do we really have a choice? We're trying to be so politically correct in our country."

In a second interview with Fox News that aired Monday night, Trump said "we have to profile," but skirted specifics about what his proposal would look like in practice.

"I'm saying you're going to profile people that maybe look suspicious. I didn't say they were Muslims or not," said Trump, whose campaign website still includes the ban on Muslims entering the country that he proposed last year.

It's not the first time Trump has suggested that profiling could be an effective tactic.

At a campaign rally in Estero, Fla., Monday afternoon, Trump took sharp and repeated aim at Clinton, accusing her of embracing plans on **immigration** and refugees that are too lax. He blamed the attacks over the weekend in part on **immigration** laws he cast as too weak and linked them to radical Islam.

Authorities have not confirmed any connection between the suspects and terrorist groups, although a news agency linked to the Islamic State claimed that the Minnesota attacker was "a soldier of the Islamic State."

"There have been Islamic terrorist attacks in Minnesota and New York City and in New Jersey," Trump said. "These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals or families coming into our country."

Trump also said the authorities should use "whatever lawful methods are available to obtain information" from the suspect. He called on Congress to pass measures ensuring foreign enemy combatants are "treated as such." He has in the past voiced support for bringing back waterboarding as an interrogation tactic.

Trump later added that Clinton "talks tougher about my supporters than she does about Islamic terrorists," citing her controversial statement earlier this month that half of his backers come from a "basket of deplorables." Clinton has said she regrets classifying "half" of Trump's supporters that way.

The Republican nominee also lamented that the suspected New York and New Jersey bomber — a U.S. citizen — is likely to receive modern medical treatment and access to a lawyer.

"Now we will give him amazing hospitalization. He will be taken care of by some of the best doctors in the world. He will be given a fully modern and updated hospital room, and he'll probably even have room service, knowing the way our country is," Trump said. "And on top of all of that, he will be represented by an outstanding lawyer. His case will go through the various court systems for years. And in the end, people will forget and his punishment will not be what it once would have been. What a sad situation."

Later Monday, Clinton met with Egyptian President Abdel Fatah al-Sissi in New York for talks that were likely to include discussion of terrorism and prospects for peace in the Middle East. Trump also met with him, "focusing on political, military and economic cooperation between the two countries," according to his campaign. Sissi, a former military chief who seized power in the 2013 toppling of Mohamed Morsi, Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood-backed president, is in the United States for the annual U.N. General Assembly.

In addition, Clinton planned to use the gathering of world leaders to hold a session with Ukraine's leader Monday. Ukraine and Russia are at odds, and skirmishing nearly daily, over Russia's annexation of Crimea two years ago. Clinton's meeting with Petro Poroshenko, which Ukrainian officials said was at the country's invitation, is a finger in the eye of Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin, the autocratic leader for whom Clinton has accused Trump of having a dangerous affinity. (During an episode of NBC's "The Tonight Show" that aired Monday, Clinton referred to their relationship as "the most famous bro-mance going.") Ukraine said it also invited Trump to meet Poroshenko in New York.

Clinton, who also served as a U.S. senator from New York, quickly pointed to her experience, in a direct contrast to that of Trump, the New York businessman who has never held elective office. Clinton sought to reassure Americans that law enforcement and other authorities are up to the task — a clear message to voters worried about how the next administration will confront security challenges.

Her comments came while a manhunt was underway for Ahmad Khan Rahami, 28, a naturalized U.S. citizen born in Afghanistan who is a suspect in connection with bombings Saturday in Manhattan and in Seaside Park, N.J. He was taken into custody several hours after his name was made public.

"This threat is real, but so is our resolve. Americans will not cower. We will prevail," Clinton said. "We will defend our country, and we will defeat the evil, twisted ideology of the terrorists."

Republicans have recently had an edge in voter trust when it comes to dealing with terrorism. But recent Washington Post-ABC News polls find that Clinton holds a three-point edge over Trump among registered voters on handling terrorism and a 24-point lead on handling an international crisis.

"I am the only candidate in this race who has been part of the hard decisions to take terrorists off the battlefield," Clinton said.

She added that she had laid out "a comprehensive plan to meet the evolving nature of this threat and take the fight to ISIS everywhere they threaten us, including online."

Trump, she insisted, has no real plan.

Trump offered a vague strategy for combating the Islamic State and other terrorists overseas.

"Maybe we're going to be seeing a big change over the last couple of days," Trump warned. "I think this is something that maybe will get, you know, will happen perhaps more and more over the country."

Clinton spoke at a hastily called news conference as she was headed to Philadelphia for a speech aimed at young voters, many of whom are cool toward her candidacy and are helping to buoy the third-party runs of libertarian Gary Johnson and Green Party candidate Jill Stein. Her schedule also included an afternoon fundraiser in Philadelphia that guests paid a minimum of $10,000 to attend.

The events of the past few days are "a sobering reminder that we need steady leadership in a dangerous world," she said at the start of her Philadelphia speech.

The emphasis on steadiness and calm, as well as experience, has been Clinton's main national-security argument in a year in which voters have sought outsider candidates and a message of change. She is constrained somewhat by the imperatives to defend Obama's foreign policy as his designated successor and not alarm liberal Democrats still suspicious of her reputation as a hawk.

In touting her credentials, Clinton pointed to the endorsements she has received from Republican national-security leaders who have voiced grave concerns about the prospect of Trump as commander in chief.

On Saturday night, as initial reports about an explosion in Manhattan were still coming in and before authorities had announced the details, Trump told supporters at a rally that a "bomb" had gone off in New York. On Monday, he bragged about his choice of words.

"What I said is exactly correct," Trump said. "I should be a newscaster, because I called it before the news."

"I must tell you that just before I got off the plane, a bomb went off in New York and nobody knows exactly what's going on," Trump said shortly after he left his plane at a rally in Colorado Springs on Saturday night.

Law enforcement officials said they are investigating whether Rahami could have been influenced by international militant groups or the ongoing conflict in his homeland.
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Sullivan reported from Washington. Wagner reported from White Plains, N.Y. Emily Guskin in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Politics was everywhere at the Emmys last night, whether host Jimmy Kimmel was blaming Mark Burnett, the prodigious British reality television producer behind "The Apprentice," for Donald Trump's presidential campaign; "Saturday Night Live" star Kate McKinnon was thanking Hillary Clinton, whom she plays on the show, as she collected her trophy for Best Supporting Actress in a Comedy Series; or "Transparent" creator Jill Soloway was condemning Donald Trump as "the most dangerous monster to ever approach our lifetime." And beyond those obvious remarks, the winners' list and the speeches they gave felt a bit like an extended cover of the convention Clinton used to try to sell herself to America.

Clinton may be struggling to cement a durable lead against Trump in the polls. But when it comes to television, at least, Americans and Emmy voters are embracing artists who look like the coalition Clinton is trying to build, and stories that echo the story about herself that she has tried to tell.

Sarah Paulson and Sterling K. Brown won Emmys for doing on film what Clinton is hoping to do in politics: busting through leaden narratives about likability and incompetence. As Marcia Clark and Christopher Darden, the two prosecutors who failed to win a murder conviction for O.J. Simpson, in "American Crime Story: The People v. O.J. Simpson," Paulson and Brown took historical figures who had been reviled -- Clark as a bad mother, Darden as an Uncle Tom, both of them as incompetents -- and separated them from their images, painting them as richly sympathetic and deeply human.

In two of the three directing categories where only one woman was nominated, both took home the prizes, Soloway in the comedy category for "Transparent" and Susanne Bier in the limited series, movie or dramatic special category for her work on "The Night Manager." (Lesli Linka Glatter, nominated for "Homeland," lost to Miguel Sapochnik, who staged a bloody, grand spectacle in "Game of Thrones," in the drama category, while Beth McCarthy-Miller and Beyoncé Knowles Carter, both nominated in the variety special category, lost to Thomas Kail and Alex Rudzinski, who won for their work on "Grease: Live.")

Soloway and Bier's wins felt triumphant, but they also came shortly after new data that suggest that women and people of color are making relatively little progress winning television directing jobs. In culture, as in politics, the prominent exceptions often prove the rule. Soloway and Bier may win Emmys, and Clinton may bust through the glass ceiling that has long stood between women and the presidency in November, but in both fields, not enough women are getting the experience and opportunities that may position them to repeat these victories.

The roster of winners in many other categories was equally affirming for an industry where, as Kimmel cracked in his opening monologues, "the only thing we value more than diversity is congratulating ourselves on how much we value diversity." As with the Clinton coalition, variety itself, rather than any single big idea, sometimes felt like the uniting theme in the winners' list.

Aziz Ansari and Alan Yang won for comedy writing for an episode of "Master of None," Ansari's sweet, insightful Netflix series, where their characters reconnect with their fathers and learn more about about their experiences as **immigrants**. In his acceptance speech, Yang made a smart appeal to an earlier generation of **immigrants**, noting "there's 17 million Asian-Americans in this country, and there's 17 million Italian Americans. They have 'The Godfather,' 'Goodfellas,' 'Rocky,' 'The Sopranos.' We got Long Duk Dong, so we've got a long way to go."

"Mr. Robot" star Rami Malek, who won the award for lead actor in a drama series, reflected both on his family's **immigrant** experiences and on the responsibility he felt to portray his characters' mental illness thoughtfully.

And Jeffrey Tambor, whose performance in "Transparent" as a transgender woman coming out late in life has gone from groundbreaking to question-raising with all the same speed at which contemporary transgender politics seem to be evolving, won his second Emmy for the part. In accepting the award, he was careful to note that "I would be happy if I were the last cisgender male to play a transgender female," nodding to the fierce debates about work for transgender performers and whether it's acceptable for male actors to play transgender women that have accompanied movies like "Dallas Buyers Club" and Matt Bomer's upcoming "Anything."

White men weren't missing from the winners' lists, of course. Liberal stalwart John Oliver took home the statuette for variety talk series.

And "Game of Thrones" took home a predictable haul, though in the wrong categories. David Benioff and D.B. Weiss won the drama writing award for "Battle of the Bastards," one of the last-interestingly written episodes in a season that also included the melancholy "The Door," the affecting "The Broken Man" and "The Winds of Winter," which did an excellent job tying up the series' complicated threads. Sapochnik's victory for staging of the carnage in that episode felt moderately more justified, though again, it shut out "The Door." But for all that I love writing about "Game of Thrones," it felt like a bit of a bummer that this uneven season of the show locked out "The Americans" for best drama. In awards shows, as in politics, hawkishness sometimes overshadows quieter domestic concerns.

None of this is to say that the Emmy results should be taken as some sort of reassuring flash poll, much less absolution for Hollywood's years of monochrome incuriosity. We still have 49 days to go until Election Day. Hollywood is not a representative sample of America. And for all that the Emmys occasionally felt like a restaging of the Democratic National Convention, at the polling place, the messenger matters as much as the message.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton has a problem with millennials, and she tried to address that today with a big speech in Philadelphia that spelled out her differences with Donald Trump over college debt, the minimum wage, equal pay, climate change, and so forth. But one notable bit came when she appealed to millennials voters by invoking Trump's bigotry and campaign of hate, and argued that for this reason, this election really is far more important than previous ones.

It drew sustained cheers and applause from her audience:

Sahil Kapur posted a transcript of the key part:

"This time is different. We're facing a candidate with a long history of racial discrimination in his businesses. Who re-tweets white supremacists. Who led the birther movement to delegitimize our first black president, and is still lying about it today. He refuses to apologize to President Obama, his family, and the American people. We have to stand up to this hate. We cannot let it go on."

I'm flagging this section because it suggests another reason why the Clinton campaign is working so hard to turn the fight over her "deplorables" comments into a national debate over Trump's racism. Young voters are particularly prone to believing Trump is bigoted, is personally a racist, or is running a racist campaign.

A recent Post poll found that 60 percent of Americans think Trump is "biased against women and minorities," and according to the crosstabs, 66 percent of respondents aged 18-39 agree with this -- 52 percent strongly. A recent Quinnipiac poll found that 73 percent of respondents aged 18-34 think the way Trump talks "appeals to bigotry." And a recent poll commissioned by NextGen Climate found that 73 percent of respondents aged 18-34 in 13 battleground states agree that "Trump is racist." That poll also found that large majorities of these voters find Trump's bigotry towards Muslim Americans (the claim that thousands celebrated 9/11) and Mexican **immigrants** ("they're rapists") offensive.

The Clinton campaign is obviously aware of these perceptions of Trump among young voters. As Ron Brownstein recently noted, her campaign is fully engaging the battle over her criticism of Trump's bigoted and racist supporters to signal to groups in the Democratic coalition that she is aligned with the forces that welcome culturally and demographically evolving America, while Trump is aligned with forces that are resistant to it:

Clinton's dismissal of the "deplorables" may help Trump energize his voters by deriding her as an elitist who "mocks and demeans" them (as he said Monday). But the exchange also portrayed Clinton to her coalition as the defender of a diverse, inclusive America against an opponent they consider uniquely hostile to it.

Young voters are an obvious target for this message. And by the way, it's worth recalling that some Never Trump Republicans and conservatives agree with the idea that Democrats might be able to make big gains -- and even perhaps lasting ones -- with these voters by highlighting Trump's bigotry and angry ethno-nationalism. As Obama delivered his convention speech, in which he sought to position the Democrats as the party that is comfortable with the diversifying America of the future, some conservative operatives expressed alarm at how this would contrast with Trump's rage-and-hate convention in the minds of a generation of young voters:

Will a Trump apologist explain to me why an 18 yo watching the conventions would want to be a Republican? We're giving away a generation

It's hard to say how far this will go in fixing Clinton's problem with young voters. If there's one thing we do know at this point, it's that these young voters already see Trump as a bigot, but that this isn't enough to get them to support Clinton in the numbers she needs. She will presumably do more in coming days to connect her critique of Trump's racist and xenophobic campaign to the policy debate, by talking about her own policy proposals on issues such as **immigration**, environmental racism, and criminal justice reform. Meanwhile, some Democratic strategists point out that Clinton is struggling with these voters in part because of how they perceive her -- that is, as untrustworthy and unprincipled. She'll have to do more to address that, too.

But if one of the problems here is that younger voters don't grasp the stakes of this election, reminding them that is is in part a referendum on whether the country will reject Trump's racism, white nationalism, and years-long campaign to delegitimize the first African American president might help drive those stakes home.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In May, The Washington Post reported that activists, legislative staffers and political consultants were saying much the same thing: "How to become a citizen" workshops held in cities around the country were full, and phone lines in congressional offices were alight with legal permanent residents trying to start the application process in time to vote against Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump -- and his plans to deport 11 million undocumented individuals and make legal **immigrants** subject to greater scrutiny and monitoring in the United States.

Or, that's what the callers were saying and, therefore, what activists, nonprofit staff, members of Congress and citizenship hotline organizers told The Washington Post and Boston Globe.

New data released by the U.S. Citizenship and **Immigration** service and analyzed by the Pew Research Center indicates, that's only partly true.

People may be worried. They may be seeking information about how to become a U.S. citizen. When Pew compared the number of applications filed during the first nine months of fiscal year 2016 (October 2015-June 2016), to the same period in fiscal year 2015, they found a 26 percent spike in citizenship applications.

So some of those people seeking information are, without question, following up and submitting applications on a timeline that may make them citizens eligible to vote in the presidential election. The 718,430 citizenship applications filed by legal permanent residents this fiscal year also is an eight percent jump over the number of people who applied to become citizens in 2012, the last presidential election.

But it's the Trump effect that's less than certain. There have been bigger jumps in citizenship applications in the not so distant past.

In 2008, the country saw citizenship applications drop more than 60 percent. The reason: There had been a massive surge in applications -- an 89 percent increase --  in 2007 from people trying to avoid a planned increase in citizenship application fees. In July 2007, citizenship application fees jumped from $330 to $595. And, at least some of what is happening with citizenship applications this year may also be related to a price change. In October, the price will move from $595 to $640 per application (low-income **immigrants** can request a reduced price of $320).

Pew's analysis matters in this sense, too. When a legal permanent resident applies to become a U.S. citizen and things go smoothly, the  process typically takes six to seven months. So applications filed before the end of May likely have the best shot at being processed in time for the individuals involved to become citizens, register and vote in the presidential election. Yet even this is only part of the process. In addition to the considerable cost of applying for citizenship, there are mandatory multiyear wait times for legal permanent residents before they can apply.

A 2013 Department of Homeland Security estimate put the number of legal permanent residents eligible to become U.S. citizens at 8.8 million people. There are an estimated 4.6 million people inside and outside of the United States waiting right now to become legal permanent residents.

Now matter how motivated a potential citizen may be, the process itself isn't quick or simple enough to rush through.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump announced yet more changes to his economic agenda last week, including his first definitive comments on how he would approach federal spending.

Trump endorsed a set of budgetary goals known as the "penny plan." Congress would reduce discretionary spending by 1 percent each year excluding defense, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

Trump's campaign, however, did not provide any details about how he would achieve these reductions. He did not identify specific programs that would receive less funding, or discuss by how much their budgets would be reduced. The campaign's statement on federal spending consisted of 91 words in a fact sheet, leaving little room for the nuts and bolts.

Figuring out how to meet Trump's goals would be no small task. The 1 percent reductions would quickly add up.

Ordinarily, federal outlays increase each year. As the population grows and the economy expands, the federal government can be expected to spend more each year on public services, such as law enforcement, education, housing assistance, medical research and transportation.

Trump, by contrast, would reduce spending annually. As a result, more and more spending would have to be eliminated to keep the budget within Trump's limits each year, and the effects on agencies and public programs would accumulate.

For example, spending outside of defense and entitlements will total $602 billion this year, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Reducing spending by 1 percent would entail limiting those outlays to $596 billion in 2017. Yet the office also projects that spending in this category will increase to $615 billion next year. For Trump to meet his goal of a 1 percent cut from the previous year, he would in fact have to reduce next year's budget by 3 percent.

After a decade, Trump would be reducing spending in this category by 23 percent annually, relative to current projections of future federal costs.

Trump had signaled his endorsement of the penny plan before. The plan, he said recently, "is something that, as simple as it is, I've always sort of liked."

Yet in Trump's other statements on federal spending, he has laid out ambitious goals for his administration if elected — goals that could be difficult to achieve while reducing the discretionary budget by 1 percent each year.

Trump has pledged to build a wall along the border with Mexico and to triple the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officers focused on deportation. Homeland-security expenses are included in this category of the budget are not considered defense outlays.

Estimates of the cost of the wall range from $15 billion to $25 billion. In 2013, the Congressional Budget Office estimated the cost of hiring 5,000 additional officers at $5.4 billion over five years. A document from Trump's campaign suggests he would increasing staffing by at least twice that much.

Those figures do not include other expenses related to Trump's **immigration**-enforcement priorities, such as requiring all American businesses to electronically verify that their employees can work legally in the United States.

Trump has also said that he wants to spend substantially more money on transportation and infrastructure. Trump's Democratic opponent Hillary Clinton has proposed spending at least $275 billion over five years, and last month, Trump told Fox Business Network he would spend "at least double" that amount, or about $110 billion each year.

Another question about Trump's plan is whether it would force the government to borrow more money each year. Trump has proposed radical reductions in federal spending, but he has proposed even greater reductions in taxes. If the government spends more than the taxes it takes in, it must borrow to make up the difference.

Trump's advisers have suggested that his proposal on taxes would reduce revenue by about $300 billion a year. The reduction in spending, according to the campaign, would be just $100 billion a year — adding some $200 billion to the annual shortfall. Trump's advisers argue that reduced taxes would close the gap by stimulating the economy, allowing businesses and households to pay more in taxes.

More from Wonkblog:

We broke down Trump's supporters. We needed more baskets.

Things are getting a lot better for the working poor

By 2025, 99.6% of Paul Ryan's tax cuts would go to the richest 1% of Americans

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Many Trump surrogates on Sunday were caught lying about this. "[Gov.] Chris Christie hammered for saying it's 'not true' Trump kept up birther issue."

It is high time these flacks got pinned down. "Chuck Todd put Donald Trump campaign manger Kellyanne Conway on the hot seat this morning over Trump's birtherism. He started off by asking, 'How and when did Donald Trump conclude that the president was born in the United States?'"

Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.) nailed it: "I have a boy who's a Marine infantry officer. He's one of the 2 million young men and women who serve in the United States military. And he's deployed now for the second time.  I would trust Nat — I would — I would trust Hillary Clinton with Nat's life, with my son's life."

President Obama landed a few punches himself. "I mean, [ISIS], North Korea, poverty, climate change — none of those things weighed on my mind like the validity of my birth certificate."

Once snared in Trump's orbit intellectual corruption and moral debasement are inevitable: "Pence Stands Behind Trump's Claim of 'Birther' Roots."

This captured the essence of the GOP's demise: Threaten anyone who shows decency. "Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus on Sunday threatened Ohio Gov. John Kasich and other Republicans who refuse to support presidential nominee Donald Trump, saying the party may take steps to ensure it's not 'that easy for them' to seek the White House again."

Demagogues frequently have tagged **immigrants** as the cause of their problems. "Fear and loathing of **immigrants** isn't a new phenomenon. Today, much of that animus is directed toward Mexico, and Donald Trump has made it the cornerstone of his presidential bid. But it's worth looking back to the decades after the Civil War, when hostility toward the foreign-born focused especially on the Chinese."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lagging support among Hispanic voters for Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton and congressional candidates in crucial races has stoked deep concern that the party and the presidential campaign are doing too little to galvanize a key constituency.

While Clinton holds a significant lead over Republican rival Donald Trump in every poll of Hispanic voters, less clear is whether these voters will turn out in numbers that Democrats are counting on to win. Clinton trails President Obama's 2012 performance in several ­Latino-rich states, including Florida, Nevada, Colorado and Arizona. In those same states, on which Democrats' prospects of retaking the Senate hinge, some down-ballot Democrats remain unknown to many Hispanic voters.

That reality has prompted a flurry of criticism of Clinton's and the party's Hispanic strategies. Despite a uniquely favorable environment with Trump's repeated attacks on undocumented **immigrants**, Democrats are increasingly worried that the opportunity is slipping away to meet a long-standing party goal of marshaling the nation's growing Hispanic population into a permanent electoral force. The concerns are compounded by Trump's recent surge in several battleground states.

"We're not seeing the Democratic Party take advantage of this moment in time, really looking to leverage more engagement in a more strategic way with our community," said Janet Murguia, president of the National Council of La Raza.

One top criticism is that Clinton waited until this month to launch a sustained campaign of traditional, Spanish-language ads in key markets. Previously, the campaign's Hispanic strategy centered on reaching millennial voters through new media such as Facebook and YouTube. Its television outreach was produced primarily in English and aimed at bilingual households. According to critics, Clinton missed a chance to deploy a broader effort to target the Hispanic electorate such as the one that Obama pioneered four years ago.

"This approach may end up being vindicated on Election Day," said Fernand Amandi, a veteran strategist who led Obama's research, messaging and paid media operation for the Hispanic vote in 2012. "I just find it to be more risky than replicating what we know worked, which is the sustained approach that the Obama campaign put in place."

Clinton aides and her allies insist that they are facing a very different opponent than Obama's, along with new challenges posed by a Hispanic electorate that grows younger and less reliant on traditional modes of communication with each passing cycle.

The dispute goes to the heart of a debate among Hispanic operatives about how much emphasis should be placed on newer ways of reaching younger Hispanics, who like millennials overall are more resistant to backing Clinton than older Latinos.

"A lot of it has evolved to include outreach that isn't obvious to people who are used to doing it old school," said veteran Democratic strategist Maria Cardona. "The Clinton campaign and the DNC are very strategically focused on Latino millennials."

Much of the upset is also focused on down-ballot House and Senate races. Even Clinton has said any hope that Democrats can retake majorities rests on Hispanic turnout. Yet neither the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee nor the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee employ Hispanic outreach coordinators, according to Albert Morales, who held that job until March for the Democratic National Committee.

"The DSCC has never really had a robust or a Hispanic engagement effort that I ever coordinated with, and that's saying a lot being at the DNC under three different chairmen," Morales said. "I couldn't name one. If you were to ask me, name a Hispanic staffer who's been at the DSCC, I couldn't name it. That's pretty sad."

As a result, critics say, the party is failing to capi­tal­ize on anger at Trump in a way that would help down-ballot candidates.

For instance: According to recent polls, just 40 percent of Hispanic voters say they believe that Trump will make good on his campaign pledge to deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. That means that a key argument of the Democrats' case against him isn't sinking in.

"What really scares me is the non-motivation down-ballot of targeting Latinos for Senate and congressional races," said Chuck Rocha, a Democratic political consultant who worked on the presidential campaign of Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont.

In Florida, Republican Sen. Marco Rubio has a seven-point edge among Latinos against Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy, according to a poll released by Univision News last week. Rubio's Cuban American heritage may be Murphy's biggest hurdle, but Murphy is also widely unknown among Hispanics: 6 in 10 said they didn't know enough about him to register an opinion, the poll said.

Arizona tells a similar story. Democratic Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick, who is hoping to unseat incumbent Republican Sen. John McCain, is unknown by 4 in 10 Hispanics, even though she leads 50 percent to 35 percent among them, according to the same Univision survey.

In Nevada, where former Democratic attorney general Catherine Cortez Masto hopes to become the first Latina elected to the Senate, she's leading Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R) among Hispanics 58 percent to 24 percent — but 38 percent of Hispanics don't know enough about her to register an opinion.

"You can never do too much, there's more to be done, yes," said Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.). "I think there's more to do around the country, but it's just expensive."

DSCC spokeswoman Lauren Passalacqua said the committee is rolling out a more focused strategy in the closing weeks in key states. She also noted that Cortez Masto and Kirkpatrick are already airing Spanish TV ads.

According to the DCCC, which coordinates House races for Democrats, Spanish-language television and radio ads are on the air in a House race in Texas and another in Florida, with more likely to go up soon. The committee's biggest effort this cycle has been to hire local, Spanish-speaking organizers earlier than ever to register and turn out voters in key districts.

"This is a new approach that we believe will work," said Rep. Ben Ray Luján (D-N.M.), the first Latino chairman of the committee.

Also of concern to Rocha and others is the lack of messaging on bread-and-butter topics beyond **immigration** such as the economy, education and health care — issues that are important to most voters, including Hispanics.

In contrast, Obama's first Spanish-language ads in 2012 were focused on health care and education, including Head Start and Pell Grants, which provide aid to poor students who attend college.

"Being part of the Bernie team for so long and seeing how the message of free college and raising the minimum wage resonated, I just don't see that out there now that I'm working on these races where there's a lot of Latinos," Rocha said.

Obama also targeted the intricacies of the Latino community, according to Freddy Balsera, a Miami-based political consultant who crafted much of Obama's Spanish-language advertising campaign in 2008.

"When we were talking to a Latino voter in Colorado, we were discussing issues that mattered to them there. We did the same thing in Florida and took it a step further by talking to South Florida Hispanics with an announcer who was more Cuban-sounding. It was a more Puerto Rican-sounding voice in Orlando," Balsera said. "We really, really localized the message and understood there's not a pan-Hispanic community. And as such, there's no universal pan-Hispanic messages."

Veterans of Obama's 2012 race said the campaign determined in early 2011 that they needed an aggressive strategy to turn out minority voters — especially Hispanics — in anticipation of a drop-off in support among white voters. It involved early, heavy advertising on Spanish-language television, including one voiced in Spanish by Obama and others by Cristina Saralegui, who has been described as the "Spanish Oprah." Those efforts were paired with targeted grass-roots outreach and an aggressive field program.

Clinton aides said they began putting Latino organizers on the ground in May, both in Hispanic-rich battlegrounds and in other states with smaller but potentially pivotal Latino populations, including Wisconsin, Iowa, Georgia, Ohio and Nebraska.

The effort includes programs targeting various groups within the Hispanic community, including undocumented **immigrant** children, or dreamers, and their families, small-business owners, and a program targeted at Latino faith leaders.

Soon, the campaign plans to bus Puerto Rican supporters from New York into Pennsylvania, where they will canvass in towns and neighborhoods, including Bethlehem, Lancaster and North Philadelphia, that are full of Puerto Rican transplants. Also under consideration is flying Puerto Ricans from the island to knock on doors in Florida.

But in the general election, the campaign's investment in the kind of targeted advertising that was pioneered in 2012 has been smaller and has come later. And the question of language has been a key spark in the debate.

Until recently, much of Clinton's television advertising to Hispanic voters has been in English, a concerted decision aimed at reaching bilingual households.

"All of these tactics complement each other. One part of course is Spanish-language ads. But the other part targets English-dominant Hispanics," said Lorella Praeli, Clinton's director of Latino Outreach. "We're also very comfortable spending time in the Spanglish space — that's the way that we communicate."

A new Spanish-language radio ad released this week and airing in Florida, Nevada and Ohio, is voiced by Clinton's running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.). In Spanish, Kaine touts his work as a Jesuit missionary in Honduras — part of the senator's backstory that Clinton campaign aides believe will resonate with Hispanics, who are predominantly Catholic and who generally revere Pope Francis, the first Jesuit pontiff.

That kind of Spanish delivery can matter, said Federico de Jesus, who served as Obama's Hispanic communications director during the 2008 campaign, noting that they received positive feedback in 2008 when Obama's Spanish ads included him approving the ad in Spanish: "Soy Barack Obama y yo apruebo este mensaje."

This year, Clinton's Spanish ads only have her saying, "Soy Hillary Clinton and I approve this message."

"It's fine that she did only part of it, but it's different," de Jesus said.

Amandi, the veteran strategist of Obama's 2012 campaign, questioned the wisdom of waiting to engage in Spanish until the end.

"The question I would ask is what message does that send to the Spanish-dominant Hispanic voters?" Amandi asked. "That they're not as important as the English-language Hispanic voters by waiting this late in the cycle to engage with them?"
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON — "Brexit means Brexit."

So said Prime Minister Theresa May  over and over and over this summer as she vaulted herself out of the hurricane-strength political wreckage of Britain's vote to leave the European Union and into the nation's top job.

But two months after May took the keys to 10 Downing Street as her predecessor sped away without glancing back, Britain is none the wiser as to what "Brexit means Brexit" actually means.

Instead of a unified position ahead of what are sure to be lengthy, contentious and ultra-high-stakes divorce talks with its 27 erstwhile partners in the European Union , the British government has instead treated the public to a near-daily display of mixed signals and evasive maneuvering.

Will Britain seek a clean break with the European Union , forswearing membership in the world's largest common market so it can also slam the door on European **immigrants**? Will it seek an exit-in-name-only, formally leaving the bloc but carving out enough opt-ins that the departure is felt only gently? Or will it seek a bespoke deal that blazes a new path, tempting others in Europe to do the same?

In recent weeks, there have been nearly as many answers to those questions as there are ministers in May's cabinet.

The government's three leading Brexit advocates — the "Brexiteers" — have suggested they want a speedy and complete departure from the clutches of the bureaucracy in Brussels, in line with the will of the 52 percent of Brits who voted for an exit in the country's June 23 referendum.

Boris Johnson, the country's bombastic foreign secretary, has even gone so far as to record a video supporting an advocacy group that seeks to press May — Johnson's boss — to fully liberate Britain from its Brussels shackles.

Meanwhile, David Davis, the country's newly minted minister for Brexit, has said a continued presence in the bloc is improbable if Europe insists, as it has, that membership comes with the free movement of workers.

But May, who reluctantly backed the "remain" side in the June vote, has found ways to remind her countrymen that leaving will not be easy and that there is a clear downside to departure.

On Sunday, a close May ally and fellow "remain" supporter, Home Secretary Amber Rudd, told the BBC that Brits hoping to vacation on the golden sands of the French coast or in the refined air of the Italian Alps could be forced to apply for a visa and pay a fee once the country is out of the European Union . For years, travel to the continent has been as simple as hopping on a Eurostar train or booking a flight on a budget airline. But new barriers, Rudd said, could be the price Britain pays if it wants a clean break.

"I don't think it's particularly desirable," Rudd said, "but we don't rule it out."

May herself has sworn off any direct indications of what Britain wants from Europe, saying that to give "a running commentary" on the country's negotiating strategy would put it at a disadvantage.

Asked at Prime Minister's Questions on Wednesday how the government would safeguard its financial-services industry — which has much to lose from continental rivals if it's not protected in the talks — May delivered what has become her standard non-answer when pressed about any of the details of Brexit.

"This government will be working to ensure the right deal for the United Kingdom," she said, prompting groans and jeers from Parliament's green benches.

It's unclear how long she will be able to get away with such vague responses to questions that cut to the core of what could ultimately be Britain's biggest transformation in decades.

May is under pressure from her European counterparts to quickly trigger Article 50, the never-before-used mechanism for a country to leave the European Union.

But May has stalled, saying it will not happen until at least the start of the new year. Once Article 50 has been invoked, Britain will have two years to negotiate the terms of its departure. Many experts regard that as an unrealistically rapid timeline for such a complex untangling and say it is one that could put Britain at a disadvantage because it has more to lose than Europe does if no deal materializes in time.

With her government divided over what to ask for, May is thought to be seeking clues from her fellow European leaders about what Britain can realistically expect to get. The strategy, according to Eurasia Group analyst Mujtaba Rahman, is to "turn the Article 50 process on its head: first get a sense of the final framework, and only then trigger official notification and proceed with exit negotiations."

But European leaders have resisted this dessert-before-vegetables approach, with several top continental officials telling Britain that there will be no pre-negotiations before the main event. That, Rahman wrote in a recent briefing note, will make May's goal over the coming months "very difficult to achieve."

If there is a silver lining for Britain in its thus-far-incoherent approach to Brexit, it's that Europe itself has been divided over how to approach the talks. European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker insisted Wednesday that Britain will not be allowed "a la carte" access to the bloc without accepting the free movement of people across national borders, which is a core E.U. principle.

But others have advocated taking a softer line: using Brexit as an opportunity to address concerns about the European Union that extend far beyond British shores. Limiting mass migration and cutting down on Brussels bureaucracy, for instance, are goals shared by countries outside Britain.

"Brexit was not just a British issue," said Stephen Booth, co-director of the London-based pro-business think tank Open Europe. "There are a lot of people in Europe who are unhappy with the status quo."

But Booth said that anyone expecting a quick answer to the question of what Britain will look like outside the bloc is bound to be disappointed.

Two of the simplest solutions — either a clean break from the bloc or a Norway-style deal that allows Britain to maintain access but end its membership — will not work for Britain, he said.

The former, he said, will impose World Trade Organization -level tariffs on Britain's trade with Europe, forcing businesses to reckon with "costs that they're not sure they can cope with." The latter does nothing to address voter concerns over **immigration**, a key driver of Brexit.

"We're not looking at the Norway option. It's going to be something else," Booth said. "But what that is exactly is very much up for grabs."

What's left, Booth said, is a "shades-of-gray" deal that gives Britain more market access in some areas than in others, along with some sort of limit on **immigration**. But that will take years of painstaking negotiation, followed by a long period in which Britain seeks to find its way in its new outside-the-E.U. world.

"The U.K. has to reshape its future," Booth said. "It's not as though everything will be completed on the day we leave the E.U."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE OBAMA administration's goal of accepting 110,000 refugees in the fiscal year starting Oct. 1 — a nearly 30 percent increase from the current level and a nearly 60 percent jump from the three previous years — is an amply justified response to the world's worst refu­gee crisis since World War II, and it prompted predictable snarls from congressional Republicans. Sen. Jeff Sessions of Alabama said the president's new target ignores "the common sense concerns of the American people," and Rep. Bob Goodlatte of Virginia, the House Judiciary Committee chairman, said the influx of refugees, including from Syria, disregards "how it will impact local communities."

The Sessions-Goodlatte impulse fits a xenophobic historical pattern of U.S. antipathy toward foreigners — especially those fleeing war and persecution — that clashes with the cherished image of an open-hearted nation greeting the poor, huddled masses.

One can well imagine with what warmth, or lack of it, Mr. Sessions and Mr. Goodlatte might have welcomed previous waves of unwashed and desperate refugees from, say, Hungary in 1958; Indochina in 1979; Cuba in 1980; or, for that matter, the European Jews who urgently sought refuge here in the late 1930s. Today, of course, they might celebrate those **immigrants** and their successful assimilation, yet when those refugees were knocking on this nation's door, large majorities of Americans opposed their admission.

Survey data gathered last year by the Pew Research Center provide a picture of Americans' past hostility. In 1958, soon after the Soviet Union squashed a liberation movement in Hungary, 55 percent of Americans disapproved of a plan to admit 65,000 Hungarian refugees. In 1979, 62 percent of Americans disliked an initiative to absorb 14,000 refugees per month, double the existing number, from Indochina following the end of America's military engagement there. And in 1980, more than 70 percent of Americans opposed the Mariel boatlift, when the Castro dictatorship in Havana allowed tens of thousands of Cubans to set off for Florida.

In each case, refugees resettled in the United States in large numbers, defying predictions that their admission would trigger social upheaval and economic disaster, much as previous **immigrants** from Ireland, Italy and Eastern Europe overcame the antagonism of those who had preceded them to U.S. shores.

The long history of fear and hatred directed toward refugees in the abstract — tempered by the warm-hearted embrace with which many have been greeted in real life by their new American neighbors, churches and communities — is often swept under the historical rug because it is so blatantly disgraceful. Politicians like Mr. Sessions and Mr. Goodlatte would no doubt decry America's failure to rescue more Jews from Europe immediately before Hitler unleashed the Holocaust. Yet in 1938, on the eve of World War II, two-thirds of Americans opposed the admission of refugees, including children, from Germany and Austria.

The current hostility of many Americans toward admitting Syrian Muslim refugees is based on ostensible concerns about terrorists mingling among the migrants. Yet it fits the pattern of historical nativism, justified by different arguments at different times. To his credit, Mr. Obama grasps the prejudice at the root of the opposition, and has the courage to disregard it.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For the first 67 days of Donald Trump's campaign, his campaign website listed no actual policy positions. He'd loosely articulated some at his announcement: More winning, fewer **immigrants**. But the campaign mostly dealt in abstractions and broad themes.

"A lot of voters are saying that they really want to see your policies now," a reporter said to Trump in the middle of August.

"Well, I think the press is more eager to see it than the voters, to be honest," Trump replied. He added that he didn't particularly like stating firm policy positions because it limited his ability to negotiate. "But I know the press wants it," he said. "I don't think the people care. I think they trust me. I think they know I'm going to make good deals for them."

Regardless, he pledged to introduce his first policy proposal shortly afterward -- and he did: His policy on **immigration** was added to his website in late August.

In mid-September, another addition: Second Amendment rights. Trump was of course then battling for the Republican nomination, so it's not surprising that the two positions he'd taken by the 100th day of his campaign focused on things of concern to his party.

By the time voting began, he'd only delineated five policy positions: the two above, tax reform, veterans administration reforms and U.S.-China trade reform. Those were all introduced by Veteran's Day.

In March, in the heat of the primary contest, the site added healthcare reform. In April, pay for the wall -- a separate part of his **immigration** policy that was broken out in part thanks to skepticism that his proposal to make Mexico pay for a wall on America's southern border was feasible.

For more than four months, that was it for policy proposals. In early August, after falling behind Hillary Clinton substantially in the polls, Trump replaced tax reform with economic vision -- a swap that occurred in part because he overhauled his original tax proposals. But just recently, tax reform was returned to the mix. (You can compare the before and after, if you'd like.)

The ninth addition was made last week, when child care reforms that will make America great again was added, apparently at the impetus of Trump's daughter Ivanka. By this point in 2012, Mitt Romney's site listed three major issue areas and 25 specific policy positions.

Hillary Clinton's website didn't list any issues when her campaign launched in April 2015, either. By June, she listed "four fights," broad policy focus areas. By September, the site listed 22 issue areas. As of writing, the list is at 39.

During a rally in Colorado Springs on Saturday night, Trump offered some insight into why his strategy for combating terrorism isn't articulated on his website.

"I will give you good results," he told the audience according to CBS' Sopan Deb. "Don't worry how I get there, OK? Please."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump listened skeptically as his labor consultant bragged in early 1981 about connections to New York's underworld.

Daniel Sullivan, who dealt with labor problems at Trump's construction sites, was a 42-year-old giant of a man with great charm and a criminal record. He told Trump he was tight not only with leaders of unions, some of them fronts for the mob, but also with the FBI.

Trump was dubious.

"He was . . . a big storyteller," Trump recently told The Washington Post. "He portrayed himself to be the closest person on earth to the FBI."

It turned out Sullivan was telling the truth. One day in April 1981, he walked into Trump's Manhattan office with two men in suits. They were FBI agents, and they wanted to talk to Trump about organized crime.

Trump welcomed them in.

That meeting came at a pivotal time early in Trump's career, when he was trying to establish himself as a Manhattan developer and Atlantic City casino operator.

Trump soon deepened his interactions with Sullivan, who turned out to be an FBI informant, and cultivated a friendship with one of the FBI agents, a young investigator named Walt Stowe, who was one of Sullivan's handlers at the agency.

Over the next few years, Trump, Sullivan and Stowe forged a triangle of mutually beneficial interests as Trump sought to grow a casino and real estate empire.

The story of the entrepreneur, the informant and the FBI offers new insights into the man who would be president.

"It tells people he's a tough, tough, tough businessman," said Stowe, long retired from the FBI, who recently sat for two days of interviews with a Washington Post reporter at his vacation home in Utah. "New York was so totally corrupt and so controlled by the mob in the '80s that in order to be a successful businessman, you had to have some way to work that world."

During his run for the White House, Trump has maintained that he always operated aboveboard as a real estate developer and casino operator, at a time when corruption and organized crime were rampant in New York and Atlantic City. But the details of Trump's relationships with Sullivan and Stowe show that he worked with men with underworld connections to further and protect his business interests. In doing so, Trump risked his reputation and his dream of becoming a tycoon.

He entered into a land deal with Sullivan and an organized crime figure who was later targeted for a hit. He agreed to finance Sullivan's purchase of a company under FBI investigation for racketeering. And he collaborated on a plan with Stowe and other FBI agents to allow an undercover operation at his first casino.

In speaking in court and to journalists over the years, Trump has minimized his relationship with Sullivan, who died of a heart attack in 1993, saying he briefly used him as an unpaid consultant and playing down his role.

Trump did not respond to detailed questions from The Post about his interactions with Sullivan.

In an earlier interview with The Post, Trump said he continued working with Sullivan only after Stowe and another agent vouched for him as "100 percent clean."

"You know, that solves a lot of problems for me," Trump told The Post. "I mean, it's hard to say, 'Gee whiz, you shouldn't have been working with him.' "

But FBI reports at the time along with recent statements by Stowe contradict that assertion.

A report from Sept. 22, 1981, said that agents "have repeatedly told TRUMP that they were not references for [Sullivan] and cannot speak for source's business dealings."

Though Sullivan once described Trump as "an old friend," the two had a falling-out in the mid-1980s. Sullivan later testified in a civil case that Trump used illegal **immigrants** as laborers in Manhattan. Trump denied Sullivan's claims.

Trump has spoken little about his interactions with the FBI or his friendship with Stowe. Trump told The Post that Stowe was a "high-quality guy" but "not a pal."

Stowe said he remains fond of Trump and never saw him do anything illegal. He said he considered both Trump and Sullivan to be "professional friends."

For this account, The Post examined thousands of pages of legal documents from the National Archives, casino regulatory reports obtained through open-records laws, news articles and books, along with previously undisclosed FBI records obtained and shared by journalist William Bastone, co-founder of the Smoking Gun website.

The Post also conducted interviews with lawyers, former federal investigators, gaming regulators and others who knew Trump, Sullivan and Stowe.

The paths of Sullivan and Trump crossed in 1979, when Sullivan worked as the chief labor negotiator on the construction site of the Grand Hyatt Hotel in Midtown Manhattan. The hotel project was a partnership between Trump and the Hyatt Corporation.

Trump, then 33, was a brash, wealthy scion of a family real estate empire based in New York's outer boroughs. He was intent on making a name for himself as a developer in Manhattan.

One of the challenges facing him was the mob's stranglehold on the city's construction unions. This was Sullivan's purview. A longtime union member and activist, Sullivan represented three different contractors at the Hyatt. He was responsible for striking deals between management and the unions — including their masters in organized crime.

Sullivan always stood out. At 6 feet 5 inches tall and closing in on 300 pounds, he was by turns loud, outspoken and boastful. Friends and associates recall Sullivan as the embodiment of a gregarious Irishman. He portrayed himself as a labor crusader and testified in court he had been a member of dozens of different union locals and had once advised Congress on labor legislation.

But Sullivan had a shady side. He was arrested on weapons and assault charges and served time for larceny, court records show. Behind the police record were ominous rumors, some fueled by Sullivan himself. He told stories about his early career as a truck driver and union activist, working on the docks of New York. One day, after a milk delivery man declined to follow union rules, an irate Sullivan decided to send a message. He drove the man's truck into the river.

Sullivan earned dark renown as the last person to see a labor lawyer named Abraham Bauman before he disappeared off the streets of New York in 1966. Sullivan declined to cooperate with police in the sweeping investigation that followed, according to a 1967 account in the New York Times. Later, he openly discussed his ties to Teamsters president Jimmy Hoffa, who disappeared in 1975. He told friends he knew where Hoffa was buried.

One day in late 1979 or early 1980, while working on Trump's Hyatt project, Sullivan visited Theodore Maritas, president of the District Council of Carpenters, a union that represented some 25,000 laborers in the New York region.

At the time, Maritas and the owners of drywall companies across in the region were under investigation by the FBI for racketeering, including bid-rigging and extortion.

As part of the investigation, the FBI had placed bugs in Maritas's office. One of the agents reviewing the transcripts was a young undercover specialist named Walt Stowe. He wondered about the identity of the man with the big personality on the other end of the wire. Stowe and his partner soon made the ID, Stowe told The Post.

When they checked the FBI's internal records, they found that Sullivan had been a bureau informant in the 1960s and early 1970s. The records said he was intimately familiar with LCN, better known as La Cosa Nostra, or Our Thing. It was the name some Italian mobsters used for themselves.

Stowe and his partner decided to drive to Sullivan's home early one morning.

They knocked on the door.

"Can we talk to you?" Stowe asked, according to the account he gave to The Post.

Sullivan opened the door wide.

"Come on in, guys," Sullivan said. "Whatever you want to know."

Stowe began meeting with Sullivan at all hours in obscure bars and diners in Manhattan. Sullivan proved himself to be a fountain of information about unions, the mob and, before long, Donald Trump. In confidential internal FBI reports, Stowe and his partner referred to Sullivan by a code number, NY18904.

Stowe, 31, was a tough guy himself, a former rugby player with a bushy mustache, a law degree from William & Mary and big ambitions. He had arrived in New York in 1975 and began working as an undercover agent. It was an era notable for mob investigations and corruption stings. Sources and informants were crucial to such cases — and to an agent's career.

In February 1980, Sullivan told Stowe about a pending property deal in the middle of a proposed casino site near the boardwalk in Atlantic City.

Sullivan knew the property owner through a trash-hauling business Sullivan owned. He told the FBI that the financially beleaguered owner of the property, which was $800,000 in arrears, wanted Sullivan's help to stave off foreclosure.

Sullivan said he had given the owner $325,000 for a share of the property, and he told Stowe he planned to buy it outright in partnership with two others. One was Kenneth Shapiro, a man later publicly identified by authorities as a financier and agent in Atlantic City for a Philadelphia mobster named Nicodemo "Little Nicky" Scarfo.

Trump also happened to be interested in the property for the location for his first casino. In April, Trump's attorney contacted Shapiro and soon entered into lease negotiations with him, Sullivan and their partner, even though they did not yet have title to the property.

On June 26, the three partners closed on the property, paying about $2.7 million. Just days later, Trump signed off on a 98-year lease with the partners that could cost him tens of millions. The transaction was one of several Trump had to make to cobble together parcels of land for the casino.

The deal put Trump in contact with a mob associate, who would later play a central role in a mob scheme to secretly influence Atlantic City's mayor. It also put him close to an FBI informant whose shady past would imperil Trump's casino plans.

After the lease was signed, Sullivan celebrated it as a business triumph. With typical bluster, he told the Bucks County Courier Times, which published an article about the transaction, that Trump was "an old friend from New York."

"It's nice being friends with a billionaire," Sullivan told the Pennsylvania newspaper.

Trump's relationship with Sullivan seemed odd to some observers.

"I have always wondered, why did Trump get involved with Sullivan in the first place?" Susan Singer, one of Sullivan's attorneys at the time, recently told The Post. "It was just a puzzle to me, given the rumors about Dan's underworld connections."

Trump and Sullivan quickly became better acquainted. As the land deal progressed, Trump recommended Sullivan to business associates who needed to negotiate with hotel workers.

"I was always satisfied with Dan," Trump would later say in the late 1980s under oath in a civil lawsuit. "I was always satisfied with his services as a consultant."

In June 1980, Trump confided in Sullivan about a problem he was having at a construction site on Manhattan's East Side. Trump was tearing down the iconic Bonwit Teller building to make way for Trump Tower, his most ambitious project up to then.

Trump told Sullivan that his demolition subcontractor was relying on illegal Polish workers and that the workers were unhappy about their nonunion wages and hours, according to testimony Sullivan gave later in the lawsuit. Trump worried that the building was not coming down quickly enough, according to Sullivan, and said he faced heavy real estate taxes if the demolition was not finished soon.

Several days later, Trump called Sullivan at his home and asked him to come to New York immediately to help tamp down growing trouble at the Bonwit Teller site, court and FBI documents show. The Polish **immigrant** workers were now threatening to harm the Trump organization's construction manager.

Sullivan rushed to Trump's office and began looking into the problem. Scores of Polish men were getting paid only $4 per hour, far below union wages, and they were working seven days a week in 12-hour shifts, sometimes longer, court documents show.

The Polish **immigrants** were required to use jackhammers and wheelbarrows to take down the building by hand, in "almost a Stone Age fashion," as Sullivan described it.

Sullivan testified during the lawsuit that he could not have been more direct with Trump about the implications of using illegal **immigrants** and flouting the union contract. Sullivan testified that he had told Trump, "Don't exploit them like that. . . . Don't try to f--- these poor souls over."

Trump has disputed Sullivan's account and said under oath that he did not know that any illegal Polish **immigrants** were used for the demolition work. He said a subordinate and a demolition subcontractor mismanaged the project and testified he did not even visit the worksite. "I was no different than anybody walking up and down the sidewalk," Trump said.

Trump portrayed Sullivan as a rogue who got involved in the demolition without his permission. "He would do things that I wouldn't even know about, that, frankly, were not authorized by me or anybody else," Trump testified in the civil lawsuit, which was brought by union workers against the subcontractor, Trump and others.

Trump thought Sullivan "looked like a little bit of shady character" and wondered whether he should keep working with him, Trump recently said in his interview with The Post. But Sullivan began telling Trump he had friends at the FBI. Trump was incredulous but intrigued, he said.

"I just want to tell you I'd like to bring FBI agents up just to give me a reference," Sullivan said, according to Trump.

One day early in April 1981, Sullivan arrived at Trump's office, accompanied by FBI agents Stowe and Damon Taylor, a supervisor of organized crime investigations.

"They were legitimately FBI agents," Trump told The Post. "And I say, 'Well, what do you think of him?'

"They say, 'Mr. Trump, he's 100 percent. He's working with the FBI. He's a tremendous guy, et cetera, et cetera.' "

But Trump knew that Sullivan operated in a murky world. At the time, Trump told the FBI agents that he understood Sullivan was "in a very rough business" and "knows people," some of whom "may be unsavory," the report said.

Trump told the visiting agents about his casino plans and his concerns about Atlantic City, according to an internal FBI report posted on the Smoking Gun website. Stowe and his colleague told Trump he "should carefully think over his decision to build in Atlantic City, and carefully prepare not only methods of securing employees' honesty, but also corporate integrity," their internal report said.

Trump said he wanted to "cooperate with the FBI" if his casino plans came to fruition. Before long, Trump met with them again and said he was moving forward.

"TRUMP stated in order to show that he was willing to fully cooperate with the FBI, he suggested that they use undercover Agents within the casino," an FBI report said.

It is clear that the agents and Trump were courting each other.

Trump invited Stowe to play golf at a private club in Westchester and took him to lunch at the famed 21 Club in a chauffeur-driven limousine, Stowe said. Trump broached the possibility of hiring Stowe.

"Here I am, like I said, I'm 31 years old or so, and I can see people looking all around to see who is this guy having lunch with Donald," Stowe said. "It's not like we became really good friends, but whenever I saw him, he was pleasant."

Stowe welcomed the attention, but it was not primarily a friendship he was seeking at that time. Having a contact like Trump was a valuable asset for a rising star at the FBI. Trump was "a guy who knew people," Stowe said.

On May 1, 1981, Trump applied for his first casino license. Gaming authorities began scrutinizing his background, in part to look for any links to organized crime figures.

Around that time, Trump took a step that would complicate the gaming review. He agreed to finance Sullivan's purchase of Circle Industries, a drywall manufacturer that employed Sullivan.

Sullivan told Stowe and another agent about the Circle acquisition plans, according to a report they wrote on May 7, 1981. It said that Sullivan, Trump and a third man, then president of Circle, "will be equal, one-third partners," with "Sullivan overseeing labor relations and Trump financing the enterprise."

Circle Industries was among a group of some 20 drywall makers that secretly referred to themselves as "the club." The companies held significant power in New York's construction industry because of the importance of their product in so many projects.

Trump's decision to invest in that industry came at an extraordinary time.

The industry was under FBI investigation, and in two years, Circle was among the firms implicated in a racketeering scheme involving the carpenters' union and the Genovese crime family. One of those indicted was union president, Theodore Maritas, who disappeared and was presumed murdered. As it happened, Trump's attorney, Roy Cohn, also represented Genovese leaders.

On Sept. 21, 1981, the FBI got a strange call from Trump. He said he had traveled to Trenton the previous week to meet with Mickey Brown, the director of New Jersey's Division of Gaming Enforcement. Trump was worried about the status of his application for a casino license. Brown told Trump that everything was on track except for "one problem" that might draw out the investigation — his ties to Sullivan, according to an FBI report.

Brown said that Sullivan had not been candid with investigators about his background and his business activities.

To defend himself and "nip things in the bud," Trump said he told Brown that Sullivan had introduced him to two FBI agents and was close to the agency.

"TRUMP stated that he talked with BROWN about nothing of a substantive nature, particularly involving any proposed undercover activity," the report states.

In a call with Sullivan that same day, Stowe and Taylor learned that Sullivan had been asked by gaming investigators specifically about his association with the FBI. "Source declined to answer this question," the report said.

Trump's meeting with Brown put into peril the undercover operation to ferret out organize crime proposed at Trump's planned casino, documents and interviews show.

By late September, the FBI proposal was in a "thoroughly finished state," but, Stowe said, it apparently never came to fruition.

Three weeks later, investigators with the Division of Gaming Enforcement spelled out their findings about Trump in a 97-page report. It provided an overview of Trump's biography, his business activity and financial circumstances.

The report devoted more than 10 pages to Sullivan, underscoring his arrest record and recounting questionable episodes from his past, including the disappearances of Bauman, the labor lawyer, and Hoffa, the Teamsters leader.

Under pressure from regulators, Trump "advised the Division that he would not have any future personal, social or business dealings with Sullivan other than in the context of their Atlantic City lessor-lessee relationship."

Trump would eventually pay $8 million to cancel the lease and buy the property outright from Sullivan and his partners. He also backed out of his investment in the drywall company, Circle Industries.

Sullivan felt betrayed and thought that gaming enforcement officials had mischaracterized his past. Sullivan privately threatened to sue both Trump and the Division of Gaming Enforcement and even make his FBI role public, FBI reports show.

This troubled Stowe. Sullivan was advised "that his life might well be endangered by revealing his relationship with the FBI to LCN figures and other members of the criminal element."

Despite what he told gaming officials, Trump stayed in touch with Sullivan. In early 1982, he tentatively offered Sullivan a job as his organization's chief labor negotiator, with a $75,000 salary, according to a civil lawsuit Sullivan filed against New Jersey authorities in 1983.

Trump also used Sullivan as a labor consultant in an aborted effort to buy the New York Daily News, according to the lawsuit and Stowe's account.

The continuing relationship with Sullivan and his land partner, Shapiro, now put Trump uncomfortably close to a mob plot to rig the 1982 mayoral election in Atlantic City and take control of city hall.

Candidate Michael Matthews had made a deal with Scarfo, the Philadelphia crime boss, and corrupt union officials associated with him, to provide favors in exchange for secret financial support, $125,000. Matthews was directed to communicate through Shapiro, Scarfo's financial agent in Atlantic City, who raised an additional $65,000 in cash and checks, court records show.

Throughout this time, Trump was pushing forward with his casino and meeting with Sullivan, Shapiro and Matthews on issues related to its construction and parking. Trump also discussed the election with them, according to investigative journalist Wayne Barrett in his 1992 book "Trump: The Deals and the Downfall."

"According to Shapiro and Sullivan, Trump then suggested that Shapiro put up the $10,000 and indicated that he would eventually pay him back," Barrett wrote. "Shapiro made the contribution, according to the two, but was never reimbursed."

Trump has denied those claims.

Under New Jersey's Casino Control Act, casino operators and those seeking licenses are prohibited from giving political donations to candidates.

The scheme between Matthews and Scarfo exploded into public after Matthews was caught on tape accepting payments from an undercover FBI agent. A federal grand jury investigating the case wanted Shapiro to testify. But he balked because he was worried about being killed, Stowe told The Post. He was right to worry.

"When Scarfo feared that Shapiro was going to cooperate with the federal government, he plotted his murder," a New Jersey State Commission on Investigation report said.

At Sullivan's urging, Stowe called Shapiro and persuaded him to testify.

"I said, 'Kenny, look. If you're subpoenaed and you don't testify, they're going to put you in jail,' " Stowe told The Post.

Shapiro became a key witness, and Matthews was indicted on charges of extortion, bribery and conspiracy. Matthews pleaded guilty to accepting a $10,000 bribe and was sentenced to 15 years.

Trump was questioned by FBI agents about whether he made campaign contributions through Shapiro, according to Barrett's book. Trump denied it and was not implicated in any wrongdoing.

In the coming years, the paths of Trump, Sullivan and Stowe continued crossing. But the unusual triangle they had formed would never be the same.

Trump and Stowe stayed in touch, even after Stowe moved on to other assignments. Trump invited Stowe to a New Jersey Generals football game and called Stowe now and then to chat or announce his latest endeavor, such as the purchase of a yacht. He attended Stowe's bachelor party, at a favorite FBI haunt on Manhattan's East Side. Later, Trump and his wife, Ivana, hosted Stowe and others at a Michael Jackson concert, introducing them to celebrities.

Sullivan, for his part, ran into legal troubles. Federal prosecutors in Philadelphia claimed he had evaded taxes for several years. He was convicted, and on Aug. 1, 1985, Sullivan was sentenced to two years in prison for tax evasion.

Sullivan filed lawsuits against the New Jersey Division of Gaming Enforcement, officials in the state attorney generals office, Donald Trump and others. In a tangle of claims — some relating to the division's report about him and Trump's decision to back out of the Circle Industries deal — Sullivan said he lost millions of dollars in potential income. The suits were eventually dismissed or settled.

In the late 1980s, Sullivan and Trump found themselves at odds one more time.

At issue was a lawsuit related to the demolition of the Bonwit Teller building. Workers from Local 95 of the Housewreckers Union alleged that Trump and his subcontractor, in conjunction with union leadership, had failed to submit payments to the union's pension and welfare funds for each worker — union members and Polish laborers alike.

In a deposition on April 12, 1988, Trump said he did not oversee the demolition. He repeatedly said he could not recall the details. "The only thing I did was sign checks when they were sent to me," he said under oath.

Trump said he could not recall asking Sullivan for help in June 1980. "I know that Mr. Sullivan was somebody that would constantly try and ingratiate himself. I know that I didn't pay him anything for this," Trump said. "But I think there was some kind of involvement in this."

Sullivan was a witness and gave damning testimony.

He said Trump had reached out to him in anticipation of the 1990 trial.

"Donald called me up and asked me to help him settle his case, so I told him that he should settle this case by paying these people what they should have gotten in 1980, and I was quite direct about it. And I told him, 'Donald, your mother's an **immigrant**, your wife's an **immigrant**, mine is, about 60 percent of the American public is.' "

Sullivan went on.

"And I said, 'Donald, if you don't pay these people, you are going to piss everybody in the world off.' You cannot allow the public to have an attitude that you don't give a s--- about this."

In 1991, a federal judge in Manhattan ruled that Trump and others conspired with Local 95's president to withhold $325,000 from the union funds. Both sides appealed, and the case ended with a sealed settlement in 1999.

In October 1993, Sullivan, 54, died of a heart attack. In an obituary, one of his Bucks County political pals was quoted describing "the source of Sullivan's strength."

"Excitement makes him tick; a challenge makes him tick; being in the thick of things makes him tick," the man told the Bucks County Courier Times.

Stowe, now retired, became a gaming executive after rising through the ranks of the FBI. He said Daniel Sullivan remains an enigma to him.

"Donald would say to me, 'What do you think about Dan?' "

"And I'm like, 'I don't know.' "

But Stowe said he understood why Trump turned to Sullivan in the first place.

"So, if you're going to be dealing with very tough, somewhat corrupt mob-dog guys on the labor side, you're going to want a junkyard dog on your side. Now, I never sat in negotiations with Dan, but he was a physically imposing guy. I don't think he was afraid of anybody."

robert.oharrow@washpost.com

Alice Crites contributed to this report.
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Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HOUSTON — Donald Trump repeatedly criticized Hillary Clinton's record on **immigration** in a speech Saturday, accusing her of "effectively proposing to abolish the borders," even as Clinton has vowed to protect them.

"Hillary Clinton is the person — and I mean the first person — to ever run for the presidency of a country effectively proposing to abolish the borders around the country that she is supposed to be representing," said Trump.

Clinton's plan, however, calls for the government to "uphold the rule of law" and to "protect our borders." She backs a pathway to citizenship for illegal **immigrants**, while Trump does not.

The Republican presidential nominee made his remarks at a luncheon hosted by the Remembrance Project, a nonprofit organization that says it "advocates for families whose loved ones were killed by illegal aliens." Many people at the event wore shirts or passed out cards paying tribute to their lost relatives.

Trump said his debates with his Democratic rival will be "a very interesting period of time."

The Republican brought several people who have lost family members to illegal **immigrants** to speak on stage, including Laura Wilkerson.

"If we are all deplorables, we are doing something right," said Wilkerson, referencing Clinton's recent remark that half of Trump supporters are a "basket of deplorables." Clinton later said she regretted labeling "half" his backers in that way.

Trump delivered an **immigration** speech in Arizona last month in which he strongly suggested he would try to deport as many people as possible. He vowed to crack down especially hard on illegal **immigrants** who have committed crimes aside from being in the country without proper documentation. A Washington Post analysis found that Trump's plan would immediately target 5 million to 6.5 million or more undocumented **immigrants** for swift removal.

"Our nation should not accept one lost American life because our country failed to enforce its laws," Trump said here Saturday.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In several races that could play a big role in which party gains control of the Senate in November, Senate Democrats are counting on the Hispanic vote to help them win. But a sizable number of Hispanic voters don't seem to know who these Senate Democratic candidates are.

Consider this from a recent poll by Univision News on Hispanic voters:

\* In Florida, nearly 6 in 10 Hispanic voters did not recognize Rep. Patrick Murphy (D), who is challenging Sen. Marco Rubio (R) for the seat. (Rubio has a seven-point edge over Murphy, 46 to 39, among Latino voters.)

\* In Arizona, 4 in 10 did not recognize Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D), who is challenging Sen. John McCain (R). (Kirkpatrick leads McCain by 15 points. But as my colleagues Ed O'Keefe and Scott Clement point out, that's a much smaller edge than Hillary Clinton's 50-point lead over Donald Trump in the state.)

\* In Nevada, nearly 4 in 10 Hispanic voters (38 percent) did not recognize Catherine Cortez Masto, who is Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid's (D) handpicked successor for the seat. (Although more than 4 in 10, 41 percent, also did not recognize the Republican candidate, Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R).)

So in at least three states where the Hispanic vote is expected to be higher than the national average — and a critical puzzle piece for Senate Democrats to take back control of the chamber — Senate Democrats have yet to lock down their vote. That's a fairly big hill for Senate Democrats to climb with a little more than seven weeks to go.

Getting Hispanic voters, who make up some of the most transient, least-engaged part of the electorate, revved up about politics — let alone Senate races — is no easy task. Neither side has yet to figure out the formula.

In 2012, a majority of Latino voters didn't cast ballots in the presidential election. A 2013 Pew Research analysis found Hispanics made up 17.2 percent of the nation's population during that election, but just 8.4 percent of all voters. "Much of this difference is driven by the relative youth of the nation's Hispanic population and the high number of non-citizen adults among its population," the study authors wrote.

Senate Democrats need to net four seats in November (or five if Trump wins and Mike Pence is the Senate tiebreaker) to take back control of the chamber. They have a chance in about five to seven races. And in at least four of those, they're counting on the Hispanic vote to help them get over the line.

That was Senate Democrats' strategy before Trump, and it most certainly is the strategy after Trump, who on the first day of his presidential campaign called Mexican **immigrants** rapists and criminals: About 8 in 10 Hispanics have an unfavorable view of the Republican nominee.

Democrats say it's too soon to make any determination about how they're doing with the Hispanic vote. Most voters, regardless of ethnicity, are just now starting to tune into politics, and recent history suggests Hispanic voters tend to make their decision about whom to vote for fairly late in the game.

Democrats are confident they're putting in the legwork to reach these voters. In the past few weeks, Cortez Masto has launched three Spanish-language ads, and a Reid-aligned super PAC has launched a fourth. In Arizona, Kirkpatrick just launched her second Spanish-language ad and is hammering McCain for portraying his **immigration** record differently in Spanish than he does in English.

But as these poll numbers seem to indicate, not liking Trump isn't the same as being excited about the alternatives to Trump. That same Univision poll showed Clinton leading Trump among Hispanics in four battleground states, but by less than you might think — in several states, her lead is smaller than President Obama's was in 2012.

Put all this together, and it suggests that even in the Year of Trump, Senate Democrats have work to do to lock up the Hispanic vote.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Before they thwarted a gunman on a Paris-bound train, collected France's highest honor and shook President Obama's hand, the three friends from Northern California bonded in the principal's office.

They were troublemakers. Spencer Stone and Alek Skarlatos grew up next door to each other, roughhousing with pellet guns in their northeast Sacramento neighborhood. They both struggled at the public elementary school, so their mothers — who also happened to be best friends — sent them to a private Christian one. That's where they met Anthony Sadler, another new kid, who had an athletic scholarship and a tendency to curse loudly on the basketball court.

They felt like outsiders in a place where everyone, a strangely obedient bunch, had known one another since kindergarten. So they stuck together.

"The 15:17 to Paris" details the trio's journey from unremarkable childhoods to chance heroism to international fame and the complicated aftermath. Journalist Jeffrey E. Stern weaves together the friends' stories with intimate detail, giving readers a more nuanced portrait than what emerged in the global news coverage (which initially and incorrectly labeled them U.S. Marines).

After high school graduation, they took different paths: Stone sold smoothies for a living until he decided to join the Air Force, Skarlatos opted for the Oregon National Guard, and Sadler went to college. They reunited last summer on a loosely planned, credit-card-funded Euro­trip, which was supposed to start in Italy and end with a clubbing spree in Spain. The adventure climaxed instead with a bloody fight for their lives at 185 miles per hour.

On Aug. 21, 2015, Ayoub el-Khazzani boarded Train 9364 in Brussels. He carried an AK-47, a Luger pistol, a box cutter and 270 rounds of ammunition. He slipped into a bathroom, removed his shirt, slid his backpack around his chest — making it easier to reload — and slung the assault rifle over one shoulder. He waited until the train, hauling more than 500 passengers, crossed the Belgian border into France. Then he stepped into the aisle.

Khazzani, Stern reports, first tussled with a Frenchman on his way to the toilet. The terrorist broke free, continuing down his narrow path of would-be destruction, shooting another man through the neck. (The victim would later recover.)

Enter Stone, who snapped awake from a nap and spotted the gun-wielding shirtless man. He charged the attacker, who pointed the assault rifle in his direction. The weapon miraculously did not fire, because of an uncharacteristic jam. Stone tackled Khazzani, who slashed him repeatedly with the box cutter. Skarlatos and Sadler rushed to their friend's defense.

"Metal tearing into flesh, but it doesn't hurt," Stern writes from Stone's perspective. "He feels no pain, he feels it as muted percussion waves coming off the terrorist's body. Thumps. Spencer sees he's not being hit, the terrorist is being hit — Alek is driving the rifle into the gunman, furiously."

These up-close moments, flashbacks throughout the chronological memoir, make for a compelling ride, especially once we get to know the protagonists.

Stern dives into the minds of our three heroes, all in their early 20s, and the chain of events that put them in position to stop what could have become one of the West's deadliest terrorist attacks. (Not exactly spoilers: Khazzani ends up hog-tied. No passengers die. French President Francois Hollande gives each American the Legion of Honor.)

Stone, Skarlatos and Sadler are revealed to be, well, regular guys. They get lost. They choose a McDonald's meal over more exotic fare. They don't have fancy résumés, and their imperfections make them relatable.

The book risks losing readers, however, when Stern mixes their personal tales with modern history lessons. He notes, for example, that the 1984 Schengen Agreement largely ended Europe's internal border checks, making early-adopter countries such as France and Belgium more appealing to **immigrants** such as Khazzani.

References to the European Union's **immigration** landscape and various Muslim populations pop up throughout the book, with a focus that could come off as relevant context or off-putting politics, depending on who's reading. ("If ISIS wanted a place away from the Middle East . . . they could hardly do better," Stern writes. France, with its large Muslim minority, "presented itself as an obvious new theater of war." )

Geopolitics aside, it's a relief when the narrative shifts back to the protagonists, who despite their newfound celebrity had trouble readjusting on American soil. They felt a nagging responsibility to stop evil and, simultaneously, a powerlessness against it. Less than two months after they foiled Khazzani's plan, a gunman killed nine people at the Oregon community college Skarlatos had attended. They also experienced symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder, including sensitivity to loud noises and outsize, adrenaline-cranked responses to mild threats.

"In the months after it was over, there was this feeling. That they had disrupted something large, used up all their good luck in those few moments, and had none left to spare," Stern writes from Sadler's perspective. "The feeling Anthony had was their luck, their parents' prayers, might, therefore, be extinguished."

Weeks after the fateful ride, Stone recalled the weight of it all hitting him after a little girl asked: Are you a superhero? "Then she said she wanted to hug me. But she was afraid to, because I still have the cast, and the stitches. . . . And it just all came out. I just bawled, man."

It's a reminder that celebrated feats of heroism can bring personal anguish. Stone drove off in a free car. Skarlatos boogied through "Dancing With the Stars." Sadler met one of his favorite singers. Beneath the glamour, though, the friends quietly tried to make sense of what happened on the train and what it would mean for their lives beyond it.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CANTON, Ohio — Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump said in an interview here that he remains unwilling to say that President Obama was born in the United States, that he is more bullish than ever on his chances to win and that he is not exploring the launch of a new media company in case he loses the race.

Trump also made a far-from-subtle push — in the interview and in a letter from his doctor released Thursday — to be seen as vigorous and healthy, as his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, returned to the campaign trail after being treated for mild pneumonia.

In the interview, conducted late Wednesday aboard his private plane as it idled on the tarmac here, Trump suggested he is not eager to change his pitch or his positions even as he works to reach out to minority voters, many of whom are deeply offended by his long-refuted suggestion that Obama is not a U.S. citizen. Trump refused to say whether he believes Obama was born in Hawaii.

"I'll answer that question at the right time," Trump said. "I just don't want to answer it yet."

When asked whether his campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, was accurate when she said recently that he now believes Obama was born in this country, Trump responded: "It's okay. She's allowed to speak what she thinks. I want to focus on jobs. I want to focus on other things."

He added: "I don't talk about it anymore. The reason I don't is because then everyone is going to be talking about it as opposed to jobs, the military, the vets, security."

Late Thursday, campaign spokesman Jason Miller said in a statement that Trump no longer doubted Obama's birth in Hawaii and had done "a great service to the President and the country" by prompting Obama to release his long-form birth certificate in 2011. But Miller also repeated the widely debunked claim that Clinton and her campaign had questioned Obama's birthplace in 2008, which is false.

Miller is among three Trump associates who have recently claimed a change of heart, but the candidate has yet to say so himself. Trump has repeatedly raised questions about Obama's heritage over the past five years.

In the interview, Trump defended his wife's **immigration** history; attacked targets including CNN host Anderson Cooper and Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.); and said he had been "respectful" since Clinton fell ill but "that doesn't mean that I'm going to stay there."

Sitting in his plush, cream-and-gold cabin as his top aides looked on, Trump began by repeatedly recounting his poll numbers, which have ticked up nationally and in some key states.

Trump said a possible turning point in the race came last week when Clinton said that "half" of his supporters belonged in a "basket of deplorables" — a remark she has since said she regrets.

"It's the single biggest mistake in this political cycle, a massive comment, bigger than 47 percent," Trump said, a reference to Mitt Romney's controversial 2012 statement at a fundraiser about voters who receive government benefits or pay little in taxes. "When I first heard it, I couldn't believe that she said it."

Clinton and her campaign argue that some Trump backers are racist and misogynistic and have sought to link him to the "alt-right" movement of self-avowed white nationalists, many of whom have rallied around his candidacy.

"The alt-right. You know they came up with the term 'alt-right,' " Trump said, blaming Clinton and her allies, although the term has been used within the movement for years. "I think the term itself is ridiculous. The alt-right. When did it come into existence? It was just made up."

Trump was a leading and vocal proponent of the debunked conspiracy theory that the nation's first black president was born overseas and thus not eligible for the White House. Obama released his Hawaiian birth certificate in 2011, but Trump has never disavowed his earlier claims.

The Republican nominee said he still believes he can win significant support from black voters. "I've come up with African American voters like a rocket ship," he said.

When told again that the birther issue could still hang over his candidacy and its appeal to that voting bloc in particular, Trump glared and said, "I think it hangs over the reporters."

There have been rumors and scattered media reports for months that Trump has been considering founding a media company with his friend Roger Ailes, former Fox News chairman, should he lose the presidency. But Trump said he has never had a conversation about launching a venture with Ailes or other prominent right-wing media figures.

"No, never did," he said. "I want to win the presidency, and I want to make America great again. It's very simple. I have no interest in a media company. False rumor."

Trump characterized Ailes, who resigned from Fox News after a series of sexual-harassment allegations, as a trusted friend more than a formal adviser. "He's certainly been very successful at what he does and on occasion, we'll talk," Trump said. "I love the benefit of his experience and knowledge. He's had an amazing experience. But there is no role."

Trump said Ailes has told him "some interesting things about past debates" during conversations they've had over several weekends at Trump's golf club in Bedminster, N.J.

"Debate skills are either something you either have or don't have. You have to prep. You have to have knowledge," he said. "But when people say you have to be nice or not nice, well, I won't really know until it begins. Because if she treats me with respect, I'll treat her with respect. If she doesn't, I'll reciprocate. If she's respectful of me, I'll be that way with her."

Trump said he was unconcerned that moderators may decide to fact-check during the forums.

"I don't care. My facts are good. My facts are good. I don't get enough credit for having my facts right," Trump said. "They'll say I'm wrong even when I'm right."

Trump took an unprompted shot at Cooper, who is one of the moderators selected by the nonpartisan Commission on Presidential Debates. Trump said he would take part in the debate moderated by Cooper but remains unhappy with his selection.

"I don't think Anderson Cooper should be a moderator, because Anderson Cooper works for CNN and over the last couple of days, I've seen how Anderson Cooper behaves," Trump said. "He'll be very biased, very biased. I don't think he should be a moderator. I'll participate, but I don't think he should be a moderator. CNN is the Clinton News Network and Anderson Cooper, I don't think he can be fair."

On Wednesday, Trump's wife, Melania, released a letter from her attorney, who attested with "100% certainty" that she had **immigrated** legally from Slovenia, following several news stories scrutinizing how she entered and worked in the United States before gaining citizenship.

With the letter, Trump said, there is no longer a need for his wife to hold a news conference on the topic, as the campaign once promised. He also reiterated his refusal to release his tax returns, as Clinton and all other presidential candidates have done for decades, citing an Internal Revenue Service audit that he says is ongoing.

Briefly discussing foreign affairs, Trump bristled at the idea that he had "embraced" Russian President Vladimir Putin with positive comments about him, including his contention last week that Putin was superior to Obama in leadership skills.

"By the way, that's a totally false narrative. I haven't embraced them. You know that," he said. When told that he has been more warm to Putin than many other Republicans, Trump said: "No. No."

"I simply said that Putin is a stronger leader than Obama," he said.

Trump on Thursday released a letter from his longtime doctor, Harold N. Bornstein at Lenox Hill Hospital in New York, that summarized the candidate's latest physical and discussed it on "The Dr. Oz Show." It said he takes a statin drug to lower his cholesterol and has a body mass index in the overweight range but is in "excellent" condition.

Trump defended Bornstein — who has come under scrutiny after acknowledging that he rushed writing a previous hyperbolic statement on Trump's health — as "very, very professional."

"He's never been exposed to the public like this, so he was having a little bit of a hard time," Trump said.

Trump said Bornstein's letter will be the final document that he will release on his health before the election. He does not plan to share a trove of medical files as other presidential candidates, such as Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), have done during previous campaigns.

"There is nothing else to release," Trump said.

He took a swipe at Clinton, whose campaign on Wednesday released a two-page letter from her doctor that said she had been treated for "mild" bacterial pneumonia but is in overall good health and "fit to serve as president."

"She didn't give this. She didn't give all of these EKGs," Trump said, referring to an electrocardiogram test result included in the letter. "I took EKGs. She said her cholesterol is okay, I say what my cholesterol is. I give the good, the bad and the other cholesterols. I give all three cholesterols."

When asked directly whether he has ever had a major illness or a heart attack, Trump said he has not. "No," he said. "I've never had a scare."

Trump shrugged off a question about whether he could use more exercise.

"I guess. But that's exercise," he said of his raucous rally speeches. "When you're up there soaking wet, the room is 90 degrees because there are so many people. . . . It's warm. It's like that in a lot of rooms."

Told that Reid had said that Trump is "not slim and trim," Trump grimaced and waved his hand dismissively.

"Harry Reid? I think he should go back and start working out again with his rubber work-out pieces," an apparent reference to the exercise band that snapped last year and caused Reid to fall and break a number of ribs and some facial bones.

Since Clinton fell ill Sunday at a memorial service marking the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Trump has been mixed in his responses. He has sounded taunting in some of his recent remarks, such as when he wondered aloud at his rally Wednesday whether Clinton "would be able to stand up here for an hour and do this."

"I don't think so," Trump told the cheering crowd.

"I asked a question," Trump said in the interview soon after. "Everyone screamed 'No!' I want to be respectful. I'm a respectful person. That doesn't mean that I'm going to stay there. But right now, she's in bed recuperating and I want to be respectful."

Trump also said that he resisted weighing in on Clinton's illness Sunday on Twitter because "I thought it would be inappropriate to tweet when I saw her in serious danger."

But was he tempted?

"No," Trump said quickly. "No. I was not tempted. Not even a little bit."

robert.costa@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Our culture's obsession with weight, from diet fads to the thigh gap, takes a particular toll after childbirth.

According to medical books, a 25- to 35-pound gain during pregnancy is considered healthy. A woman becomes roughly 12 pounds lighter immediately after childbirth. The rest is supposed to just melt away.

But instead of fitting a statistical bell curve, many new mothers feel like outliers.

Too much gain, the fear-mongering "What to Expect When You're Expecting" book, the belly that refuses to "shrink back" after six weeks like it does for Victoria's Secret models, physical ailments, the work-life routines that leave no time for fitness — the weight shaming list goes on.

In a recent BabyCenter survey, 61 percent of new mothers hoped to be back to their pre-pregnancy weight within a year of giving birth, but the majority reported carrying extra pounds after that. And among moms of children up to 4 years old, 87 percent said their stomachs have yet to return to their pre-pregnancy state.

Publicly, there is a vindication of the postpartum body. Stretch marks are known as a mother's tiger stripes. The rolls are her armor. No reasonable person expects her gravestone to read "Sally was a lovely human being, but a little top-heavy." Everyone realizes it's ridiculous to hide poolside, instead of donning that bathing suit and splashing in the water with the kids.

However, the private acceptance of the new reflection in the mirror is harder to control. Having birthed two kids in two years, I can relate.

Growing up in Russia, I never had a choice of clothes. We didn't go on department store jaunts with our mothers and toss items of interest into an overflowing shopping cart. Instead, people wore a lot of hand-me-downs and DIY things: knitted or crocheted sweaters and ensembles made of repurposed wool that once was grandpa's holiday vest. As I grew, my favorite gray dress grew along with me: First it lost the sleeves, then it magically morphed into a shirt, thanks to my grandmother and her sewing machine with a foot pedal. My grandmother once showed me her gold tooth stashed away in a jewelry box, promising that one day, she'd melt it into a ring for my wedding.

This lack of choice followed me to the United States as an **immigrant** teenager. Neon-colored sweatshirts and sweatpants on sale at Target were my uniform, along with clashing secondhand items, such as T-shirts with meaningless inscriptions like "Bermuda or Bust." I got used to dodging questions about whether I really did run a marathon in Texas before I was born, or work at the Gilroy Garlic Festival. " 'Cause it says so on your shirt, you know." Yeah, I knew.

"Do you want my old clothes?" said a girl in my English as a Second Language class. Her cartoonish outfits were accessorized with pink bows, ruffles and Hello Kitty. I politely declined. "Are you sure?" She looked my **immigrant** uniform up and down with pity. I was sure.

For more than a decade that followed, I didn't pay much attention to trends and developed my own, somewhat haphazard, fashion sense (even if it meant green hair for a while).

But years later, after moving to Washington, D.C., to pursue a new career, it became apparent that my style had to change.

What at first appeared to be an uptight workweek environment — women clicking around in fitted, tucked-in clothing, hardly a loose thread or a pair of pants in sight — became an opportunity for self-reinvention. In my new home, style — whether conservative or glam — was a professional expectation, not an option.

So I spent all my free time during those first few weeks observing and researching fashion, while gaining a sense of what would and wouldn't suit me. I made lists and then constructed the first deliberate wardrobe of my life.

Soon there were the flats, the heels and the accessories — the sensible and the fun. The coordinating tops and bottoms lounged on the real wooden "adult" hangers. Even on a bad day, I knew I could break out something fabulous — and looking put together was a much-needed pick me up. For the first time, I didn't own items just because they were on the clearance rack (although it helps), or were given to me, or because a random piece at a store resembled something a French girl sipping an espresso at a Parisian café would wear (yet matched nothing I owned and looked sort of dumpster chic instead).

Clothing captures a personal aesthetic, social belonging and professional pride. That's why losing control over your wardrobe and its meaning, particularly for new mothers, can feel as heavy as the extra pounds.

Recently, I've been contemplating my closet. It's disorganized and self-conscious. It works for the new suburban home and the new work schedule, for stroller walks and for taking care of two small kids. For now.

But the shelves and back hangers are still lined with the dusty items from my recent past.

"Hey, I'm the dress you wore when you met the president! You'd have to buy another one of me and stitch us together to fit you nowadays!"

"We're the heels you used to wear to the Pentagon. Feet a little swollen now? Boo hoo, not like you need heels to buy potatoes at Safeway."

"Remember me? I'm the silk blouse your baby daddy liked when you dated. Um, careful of the seams."

Shut up, clothes. Just shut up.

Every couple of months, I'd try on my pre-baby identity, hoping to reconnect to it. This invariably ended badly, no matter the workout routine or diet. The old clothes, the old identity, didn't fit. And the pity party began.

A single child-free person living in a big city can skip meals, eat frozen pizza and regard cocktails and networking events as dinner. It's easy to be slim when there's time for daily workouts. But women whose bodies have recently birthed and nursed little humans do not look like this — and it's not just the weight that changes. They can't. And why should they?

Finally, I decided to regain control and to get rid of anything that would not reasonably ever fit again.

It was empowering. Some larger-sized items survived the purge. Perhaps one day they'll fit again. But I stashed them away in those vacuum-seal bags to keep them out of sight for a while.

Power to those women who slipped into their skinny jeans a few weeks after childbirth. For the rest of us, distress over the change in the way we saw ourselves and appeared to the world for many years is perhaps a natural step to transformation and self-acceptance. With some time, effort and loving kindness, we can discover the new beauty, inside and out, that motherhood has given us.

Masha Rumer is a communications professional and a mom. She blogs at The Flying Yenta.

Check out On Parenting on Facebook for more essays, advice and news.

You might also be interested in:

Five suggestions for baby-proofing your job interview

Five things that will help build a strong relationship with a nanny

Refuse to vaccinate? You may be told to seek care elsewhere

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If you are the status quo candidate in a change election in which the national mood is sour and two-thirds of the electorate think the country is on the wrong track, what do you do? Attack. Relentlessly. Paint your opponent as extremist, volatile, clueless, unfit, dangerous. Indeed, Hillary Clinton's latest national ad, featuring major Republican politicians echoing that indictment of Donald Trump, ends thus: "Unfit. Dangerous. Even for Republicans."

That was the theme of Clinton's famous "alt-right" speech and of much of her $100 million worth of ads.

Problem is, it's not working.

Over the past month, Trump's new team, led by Kellyanne Conway, has worked single-mindedly to blunt that line of attack, on the theory that if he can just cross the threshold of acceptability, he wins. In an act of brazen rebranding, they set out to endow him with stature and empathy.

Stature was acquired in Mexico, whose president inexplicably gave Trump the opportunity to stand on the world stage with a national leader and more than hold his own. It's the same stature booster Sen. Barack Obama pulled off when he stood with the French president at a news conference in Paris in 2008.

That was part one: Trump the statesman. Part two: the kinder gentler Trump.

Nervy. Can you really repackage the boasting, bullying, bombastic, insulting, insensitive Trump into a mellow and caring version? With two months to go? In a digital age in which every past outrage is preserved on imperishable video?

Turns out, yes. How? Deflect and deny — and pretend it never happened. Where are they now — the birtherism, the deportation force, the scorn for teleprompters, the mocking of candidates who take outside money? Down the memory hole.

Orwell was wrong. You don't need repression. You need only the sensory overload of an age of numbingly ephemeral social media. In this surreal election season, there is no past.

Clinton ads keep showing actual Trump sound bites meant to shock. Yet her numbers are dropping, his rising.

How? Trump never goes on the defensive. He merely creates new Trumps. Hence:

1. The African American blitz. It's a new pose and the novelty shows. Trump is not very familiar with the language. He occasionally slips, for example, into referring to " the blacks." And his argument that African Americans inhabit a living hell and therefore have nothing to lose by voting for him hovers somewhere between condescension and insult.

But, as every living commentator has noted, the foray into African American precincts was not aimed at winning black votes but at countering Trump's general image as the bigoted candidate of white people.

Result? A curious dynamic in which Clinton keeps upping the accusatory ante just as Trump keeps softening his tone — until she finds herself way over the top, landing in a basket of deplorables, a phrase that will haunt her until Election Day. (Politics 101: Never attack the voter.)

2. The **immigration** wobble. A week of nonstop word salad about illegal **immigration** left everyone confused about what Trump really believes. Genius. The only message to emerge from the rhetorical fog is that he is done talking about deportation and/or legalization. The very discussion is off the table until years down the road.

Case closed. Toxic issue detoxified.

Again, that's not going to win him the Hispanic vote. But that wasn't the point. The point was to soften his image in the Philadelphia suburbs, pundit shorthand for the white college-educated women that Republicans have to win (and with whom Trump trails Romney 2012 by 10 points). Which brings us to:

3. The blockbuster child-care proposal. Unveiled Tuesday, it is liberalism at its best, Big Government at its biggest: tax deductions, tax rebates (i.e., cash) and a federal mandate of six weeks of paid maternity leave. The biggest entitlement since, well, Obamacare.

But wait. Didn't Trump's acolytes assure us that he spoke for those betrayed by the sold-out, elitist GOP establishment that for years refused to stand up to Obama's overweening mandates, Big Government profligacy and budget-busting entitlements?

No matter. That was yesterday. There is no past. Nor a future — at least for Ivankacare. It would never get through the GOP House.

Nor is it meant to. It is meant to signal what George H.W. Bush once memorably read off a cue card. "Message: I care."

And where do you think Trump gave this dish-the-Whigs cradle-to-college entitlement speech? Why, the Philadelphia suburbs!

Can't get more transparent than that. Or shameless. Or brilliant.

And it's working.

letters@charleskrauthammer.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With Breanne Deppisch

THE BIG IDEA: The June massacre at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando was an inflection point that has shifted the politics of gun control. Democrats from Hillary Clinton on down are playing offense on the question of whether suspected terrorists should be able to buy weapons. Thursday brought two illustrations of how:

-- In Florida, after three months of getting hammered by his challenger, Marco Rubio introduced legislation to prevent suspected terrorists from purchasing firearms.

Last December, seeking the Republican presidential nomination, Rubio said: "None of the major shootings that have occurred in this country over the last few months or years that have outraged us would gun laws have prevented."

In a press release yesterday, the senator said: "After the Orlando terrorist attack, I met with Fred and Maria Wright, who shared with me the story of their son Jerry and the unimaginable pain they carry after losing him that night. The Wrights made a simple request: that we improve our laws so it is more difficult for evil people to get ahold of guns. I told them I would continue working toward consensus on common-sense measures that would help ensure criminals, terrorists and others seeking to take innocent lives are not able to acquire firearms."

The bill is a slightly modified version of what Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas) introduced a few months ago as a watered-down alternative to a toothy Democratic proposal. The main idea was to give political cover to vulnerable incumbents, so they can tell voters they support action even as reforms are blocked.

Rubio's move reflects the potency of the terror watch list question in private polling, especially in Florida. As Sen. Chris Murphy (D-Connecticut) responded:

-- Meanwhile, in Missouri, Democratic Senate candidate Jason Kander went on TV with one of the most memorable ads of the election. Wearing a blindfold, he assembles an AR-15 rifle while talking about his experience fighting in Afghanistan. Then he says he'd like to see his opponent, Republican Sen. Roy Blunt, do the same. Watch here:

The ad comes in response to attacks being run by the National Rifle Association like this one:

One of things that makes the Kander ad so notable is that he does more than just show off his prowess with a gun. "I also believe in background checks so that terrorists can't get their hands on one of these," he declares at the end, holding up the weapon.

"Kander could have easily skipped the ending, but he wisely used the ad to make the case for gun safety," said Peter Ambler, the executive director at Americans for Responsible Solutions, the group created by Gabby Giffords and Mark Kelly.

He sees the commercial as illustrative of a broader political shift. "It's not 1994 anymore," Ambler said in an interview. "There's a generation of Democrats who saw this as a third rail. Those days are behind us, and today's developments in Missouri and Florida are a case study for why."

The spot, filmed in a Kansas City warehouse, was produced by Mark Putnam, who is best known for his work helping Democrats survive in red states.

Other groups pushing for stricter gun laws celebrated the ad, as well. Michael Bloomberg-backed Everytown for Gun Safety said "Kander blew up the gun lobby's agenda" in 30 seconds "and with a blindfold on!" Erika Soto Lamb explained that her group also loves the ad because it shows that the idea voters must choose between gun rights or gun safety is a false dichotomy. "The ad is yet another prime example of how 2016 is shaping up to be the year of gun safety," she said, "dismantling the myth of the gun lobby's electoral power."

The NRA's Jennifer Baker argues that the ad actually underscores the potency of the issue, and that Kander felt compelled to run a response to their attacks because he recognizes his "F" rating is costing him support. She noted that there are nine issues pages on his campaign web site but nothing about guns. He did not respond to their candidate questionnaire, she said, but in the state legislature he voted against a bill to expand the castle doctrine. "It's telling that Kander remained silent on the Second Amendment until forced to address the issue by the National Rifle Association," said Baker. "This latest advertisement will not fool Second Amendment supporters. Law-abiding gun owners across Missouri and America deserve a candidate who can stand behind their voting record, not one who uses a firearm as a distraction from the truth."

-- Blunt advisers acknowledge that the ad is "clever," but they are also surprised that he's actually running it in each of the Show-Me State's television markets (except St. Louis). Speaking anonymously to be candid, they argue that Kander has made a strategic blunder: Democrats have been hammering the incumbent over the fact that his wife and children are registered lobbyists, using that to create a narrative that Blunt is a creature of Washington. Republicans say they will happily make the race all about guns instead, which could juice base turnout and might embolden the NRA to invest more.

The senator has been running neck-and-neck in the polls with Donald Trump, which has worried the national party (because it suggests Blunt would lose if the bottom fell out from underneath the GOP presidential nominee). Signs of weakness have emboldened outside Democratic groups to pour money in, which in turn prompted GOP groups to respond with their own show of force.

-- In purple and blue states, where the battle for the Senate is mostly playing out, the gun issue works more clearly to the advantage of Democrats in 2016:

In Pennsylvania: Vulnerable Republican Sen. Pat Toomey has run commercials touting how he partnered with Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin after Sandy Hook to strengthen background checks.

In New Hampshire: ARS, the Giffords group, slammed Republican Sen. Kelly Ayotte for opposing Toomey's background check bill. A narrator asked, "Why is Sen. Ayotte playing politics with our safety?"

Tellingly, the Ayotte team already had a response ad in the can that it could get on the air immediately. It includes local cops insisting that "she's voted for background checks" and "to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists."

-- The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee has also identified several districts where challengers can effectively run on this. Two examples:

In Florida-7: Stephanie Murphy, who is challenging Rep. John Mica in suburban Orlando, was the first candidate endorsed by the Pride Fund to End Gun Violence, a group created by LGBT activists after the nearby Pulse nightclub shooting.

In New York-1: Anna Throne-Holst is up with an ad that features elementary-aged children participating in an active-shooter drill at their school. She then attacks Rep. Lee Zeldin for voting against background checks. "Lee Zeldin even voted to let people on the FBI's terrorist watch list buy guns," the Democrat says to camera. "As a mother, nothing is more important than keeping our kids safe." Watch:

WHILE YOU WERE SLEEPING:

-- Donald Trump told The Post's Robert Costa in an interview that he remains unwilling to say that President Obama was born in the United States. "I'll answer that question at the right time," Trump said. "I just don't want to answer it yet." When asked whether his campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, was accurate when she said recently that he now believes Obama was born in this country, Trump responded: "It's okay. She's allowed to speak what she thinks. I want to focus on jobs. I want to focus on other things." He added: "I don't talk about it anymore. The reason I don't is because then everyone is going to be talking about it as opposed to jobs, the military, the vets, security."

-- Not long after the story posted, at 10:17 p.m., the Trump campaign sent a press release with a quote from senior communications adviser Jason Miller saying that the GOP nominee is no longer a birther. Miller claimed Trump did "a great service to the President and the country" by prompting Obama to release his long-form birth certificate in 2011. He also repeated the widely debunked claim that Clinton and her campaign had questioned Obama's birthplace in 2008, which is false.

Another falsehood from Miller's statement: that Trump stopped making birther claims in 2011. As Buzzfeed's Andrew Kaczynski notes, he's on the record stoking conspiracy theories well into 2014: "The president should come clean," Trump said in an exchange that year with Irish TV. "He should have come clean over the years. If you remember the very famous story where I offered him $5 million if he showed some basic records and he never took me up on it. And that would be for charity. So charities would have benefited and it would have been a great thing." When the host noted that Obama had, in fact, produced the long form birth certificate, Trump continued to stoke speculation: "Well, a lot of people don't agree with you and a lot of people feel it wasn't a proper certificate," Trump said.

-- Clinton, highlighting The Post's interview, blasted Trump for refusing to directly answer whether Obama was born in the U.S. and decried his campaign of "bigotry and hate" during a speech at the Congressional Hispanic Caucus gala. "He was asked one more time: 'Where was President Obama born?' And he still wouldn't say Hawaii. He still wouldn't say America," Clinton said. "This man wants to be our next president? When will he stop this ugliness, this bigotry?" (Abby Phillip)

-- President Obama, at the same gala, urged Latino members of Congress to push back harder against Trump's "bluster and falsehoods and promises of higher walls."  "I know there are a lot of people who have this notion of what the real America looks like; somehow, it only includes a few of us," Obama said. "Who's to determine that in this nation of **immigrants** ... that you have a greater claim than anybody here? So you can't let that brand of politics win." (David Nakamura)

-- HRC and POTUS visited backstage for about 15 minutes before her speech.

GET SMART FAST:​​

\* A suicide bomber detonated a blast in a mosque in Pakistan's tribal area near the Afghan border, killing at least 16 and wounding nearly two dozen others.  No group has yet claimed responsibility, but the tribal area is a base for the Taliban. The attack comes just after the final day of Eid al-Adha. ( Pamela Constable )

\* The Consumer Product Safety Commission issued a recall for Samsung's Galaxy Note 7, ripping the high-end smartphone off the shelves after many burst into flames. The recall allows airlines to make the use of the phone illegal on flights. (Hayley Tsukayama)

\* Almost one in 10 U.S. railroad workers involved in accidents this year tested positive for drugs afterward.  That's triple the level of a decade ago. (Ashley Halsey III)

\* Brain cancer has replaced leukemia as the leading cause of cancer deaths among children and adolescents. The shift comes as surgeons struggle to treat the delicate structure of the brain and to develop treatment options for molecularly-different tumors. (Laurie McGinley)

\* A new Brazilian study finds babies born with microcephaly are 55 times more likely to be infected with Zika than babies without the severe birth defect – providing the strongest evidence yet that Zika virus infection in pregnant women causes microcephaly in their babies. (Lena H. Sun)

\* Columbus police fatally shot a 13-year-old who was carrying a BB gun.  ( Mark Berman )

\* The family of Sandra Bland, a 28-year-old black woman found dead in a jail cell after a routine traffic stop last year, reached a $1.9 million settlement in a wrongful death lawsuit. (Mark Berman)

\* Democrats and Republicans on the House Intelligence Committee urged Obama not to pardon Edward Snowden for "the largest and most damaging leak of classified information in American history."  The bipartisan letter comes in response to a push by human rights groups. An  Oliver Stone movie , which opens in theatres today, also casts Snowden as a hero. ( Ellen Nakashima )

\* The Senate passed a bill that would make available more than $100 million in federal funds to help update the city of Flint's water infrastructure. The deal still must pass muster with the House. (Mike DeBonis)

\* It's unclear whether there will be enough votes in either chamber to override Obama's veto of a bill that would let 9/11 victims' families sue Saudi Arabia. ( Karoun Demirjian )

\* House Republicans moved a bill to prevent Obama from releasing any more detainees from Guantanamo Bay. The doomed legislation represents a final showdown in an eight-year struggle over shuttering the detention facility. ( Karoun Demirjian )

\* The Navy's Blue Angels stunt team will stop performing the aerial move that killed a pilot this summer, putting in place a number of new dive recovery rules and airspeed limitations. (Dan Lamothe)

\* Turkey announced it will construct 150 new prisons over the next five years, after tens of thousands were arrested in the aftermath of a failed coup attempt. The crackdown has placed an incredible strain on the country's penal system, with detainees forced to sleep in shifts and makeshift prison facilities. ( Ishaan Tharoor )

\* The State Department has paid or approved 90 claims for a total of $11 million in reparations from France to former World War II prisoners who were carried to Nazi death camps in French trains — the first French reparations paid to Holocaust survivors living in the United States. (Katherine Shaver)

\* John Boehner joined the board of Reynolds American, the second-largest tobacco company in the U.S.  The former Speaker will serve on the board's corporate governance, nominating and sustainability committee. Does he get free smokes as part of the deal? ( Catherine Ho )

THE DAILY DONALD:

-- Other highlights from Bob Costa's interview with Trump: He said he is "more bullish than ever" about winning in November. He defended his wife's **immigration** history and said he had been "respectful" since Clinton fell ill -- but "that doesn't mean that I'm going to stay there."

\* ON THE DEBATES: "If she treats me with respect, I'll treat her with respect. If she doesn't, I'll reciprocate."

\* ON ANDERSON COOPER: "I don't think Anderson Cooper should be a moderator, because Anderson Cooper works for CNN …. He'll be very biased, very biased. CNN is the Clinton News Network and Anderson Cooper, I don't think he can be fair."

\* ON VLADIMIR PUTIN: "That's a totally false narrative. I haven't embraced them."

\* ON HIS MEDICAL RECORDS: Trump said the letter from his physician, examined on the "Dr. Oz Show," will be the final document he plans to release on his health before the election. "There is nothing else to release," he said.

The Trump Effect --> " African Americans worry Trump has awoken a resentment that won't go away ," by Robert Samuels in Jackson, Miss.: "With his vow to 'make America great again,' a slogan that feels to many blacks like a not-so-subtle reference to days that were anything but great for them, many here fear that Trump has emboldened a resentment among whites that will endure regardless of the outcome of the general election."

\* "My family has worked so hard to reconcile the races," said Priscilla Sterling, 48, a distant cousin of Emmett Till, who was abducted, brutalized and murdered in 1955 at the age of 14 after he had allegedly whistled at a white woman. The white men who killed him were acquitted by an all-white jury. "In Mississippi, it's been hard. But Trump is making it harder . . . by getting people excited about making America like it was in the past. Does he know about the past?"

\* Bobby McGowan, an African American county board supervisor, said that a few weeks ago he was driving a charter bus through a rural area outside Jackson when some young white men threw rocks at him. 'These were things that used to happen in the old days,' he said."

-- Trump suggested "something was up" with the pastor who scolded him for campaigningduring a church visit in Flint, Michigan. "Everyone plays their games, it doesn't bother me," he said on Fox News, saying the pastor was "shaking" when she approached him. "She was so nervous, she was like a nervous mess. I figured something was up." (NPR)

-- Trump unveiled a scaled-back tax proposal in New York. The plan dramatically reduces the size of his previously-touted tax cuts for high earners and the middle class, though it includes even more benefits for the country's lowest earners. It also scraps a business tax provision that could have delivered large windfalls to the companies in Trump's business empire – which Clinton has slammed as the 'Trump Loophole.' The Tax Foundation said the updated tax plan, after accounting for increased economic growth, would cost the government $2.6 trillion in lost tax revenue over a decade, down from $10 trillion for his initial plan." (Sean Sullivan and Jim Tankersley)

-- Paul Ryan suggested that Trump release his tax returns, but he stopped short of calling on his nominee to do so immediately. Pressed at his weekly news conference, the Speaker noted that he released his own tax returns when he was the vice-presidential nominee in 2012 and then said he would "defer" to Trump as to what would be "the appropriate time to release." "I know he's under an audit, and he's got an opinion about when to release those," Ryan said. (Mike DeBonis)

-- Ivanka Trump criticized Cosmo after the magazine published a transcript of its interview with her, in which (among other things) she said that her father's new maternity leave policy would only apply to married women. (Read the transcript.)

THE DAILY HILLARY:

-- Clinton returned to the campaign trail after three days of recovering from pneumonia, delivering a speech on how she would try to make life better for children and families. "I have to say, it's great to be back on the campaign trail," she said in Greensboro, N.C. after coming on stage to James Brown's "I Got You (I Feel Good)."

She presented her time off the trail as a positive, saying that it gave her time to reflect on the core issues that brought her into public service in the first place, remarking that  many families aren't able to take paid time off in the event of sickness. "Life events like these are catastrophic for some families, but mere bumps in the road for others," she said. "I have met so many people living on a razor's edge — one illness away from losing their job; one paycheck away from losing their home." (Abby Phillip and Anne Gearan)

-- Speaking to reporters, Clinton said "a number of people" knew she had pneumonia, including members of her senior staff. But she refused to say whether Tim Kaine was kept in the loop. "We communicated, but I'm not going to go into our personal conversations," she said. Translation: her own running-mate was kept in the dark about her getting sick. (Abby Phillip)

-- Clinton hinted pretty strongly that she will choose someone other than Merrick Garland for the Supreme Court if elected. In a radio interview, she said she would "look broadly and widely for people who represent the diversity of our country" should she have the opportunity to fill Antonin Scalia's seat. "The comments are Clinton's most specific yet on how she would handle the 7-month-old vacancy," Bloomberg notes. "Her remarks offer hope to progressives who say the Supreme Court nomination should go to a younger, more liberal jurist and possibly to a racial minority or woman." But Clinton also said she would not ask Obama to withdraw Garland's nomination after Nov. 8, allowing for a possible lame-duck confirmation:  "I think we should stick with one president at a time. I'm going to let this president serve out his term with distinction and make the decisions that he thinks are right for the country."

-- Hillary was asked during the same interview about Colin Powell telling his friends that she spoils anything she touches with "hubris." "I have a great deal of respect for Colin Powell, and I have a lot of sympathy for anyone whose emails become public," she replied. "I'm not going to start discussing someone else's private emails. I've already spent a lot of time talking about my own, as you know."

-- The Clinton campaign is ramping up efforts to dissuade millennials from supporting third-party candidates. From stories by Bloomberg and the NYT:

\* Priorities USA will launch a multi-million dollar digital campaign with the message that "a vote for a third-party candidate is a vote for Trump."

\* On Saturday, Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren will campaign for her in Ohio.

\* On Monday, Hillary will deliver a speech aimed at millennial voters in Philadelphia.

-- 10 days until the first debate:  "I don't think we're going to be going in there seeking to provoke him," Clinton s pokesman Brian Fallon told MSNBC. " She's going to go in and do what she always does … And the contrast there will speak for itself. ...  We have to prepare essentially for two different Donald Trumps because we don't know which one is going to show up."

DEEP DIVE on Hillary's hawkishness -->  " Clinton regrets her Iraq vote. But opting for intervention was a pattern," by Michael Kranish: "For years, Clinton has blamed Bush for misleading her into voting for the [Iraq War] resolution. But an examination by The Washington Post found that her decision was based as much on advice from her husband's advisers as from Bush administration officials. There were also significant gaps in her fact-gathering, most notably her apparent failure to read a classified analysis that other senators cited in voting against the resolution. The path to Clinton's decision was paved by her evolving sense of presidential power, forged during years in which she played a bigger role than widely realized in pushing her husband to intervene militarily in the Balkans, Iraq and Kosovo … [It's a path on which she continued] when she advocated intervention in Libya as secretary of state."

-- Harry Reid, a boxer in his youth, just released a punchy 400-word statement responding to Trump mocking his appearance: "Donald Trump can make fun of the injury that crushed the side of my face and took the sight in my right eye all he wants - I've dealt with tougher opponents than him. I may not be able to see out of my right eye, but with my good eye, I can see that Trump is a man who inherited his money and spent his entire life pretending like he earned it. In Searchlight, we learned a thing or two about hard work that Trump may not have learned at his boarding school. … We know how to spot a con artist in Las Vegas. And Donald Trump is a con-artist."

NEW POLLING:

-- A Fox News poll shows the race has tightened  by 7 points since the beginning of August: Hillary is up 3 points (46-43) among registered voters. She was up 10 in the beginning of August and six at the end of the month.

-- Trump has cut deeply into Clinton's lead in MICHGIAN. She's up just 3 points (38-35) in a Detroit Free Press/WXYZ-TV poll.

-- A Monmouth University poll of IOWA shows Trump has opened an 8-point lead on Clinton (45-37). Chuck Grassley bests Democratic challenger Patty Judge by 17 points.

-- A University of Mary Washington survey of VIRGINIA has Clinton up by just 3 points (40-37). In a head-to-head matchup, her lead grows to 5 points. (This is an outlier...)

-- A CBS/NYT national poll shows voters remain highly concerned about the prospect of either becoming president: 51 percent believe Clinton is a risky choice for the country, while 67 percent said the same of Trump.

\* 67 percent of registered voters describe the current race as more negative than previous years – a 30 point increase from 2012.

\* Both Clinton and Trump are seen as "untrustworthy" by more than 60 percent.

\* And majorities believe neither shares their values, with 57 percent saying so of Clinton, and 62 percent saying the same for Trump.

-- Clinton's recent pneumonia diagnosis has left many uncertain about the state of her health. Only 39 percent say they believe Clinton is in good enough physical condition to effectively serve as commander in chief for the next four years in a new HuffPost/YouGov survey. A nearly equal 38 percent said they do not believe she is in good enough condition, while 23 percent remain unsure.

WHAT THE PUNDITS ARE SAYING ABOUT THE TIGHTENING RACE:

-- "At its core, Clinton has an enthusiasm problem while Trump has a structural problem," Cook Political Report's Amy Walter writes. "Trump has not expanded his base, he performs as well with men and non-college whites as a 'traditional' Republican, but remains behind with women and college voters. Clinton, however, has not motivated hers - especially the young and drop-off voters who gave Obama his wins in 2008 and 2012. Hers is theoretically an easier hurdle to overcome, but still requires her to give those voters a reason to show up and to keep attention on his flaws and not hers. … Clinton has made the race a referendum on Trump. But, with Trump giving her less fodder, and she (and hackers) providing much of her own, that message becomes less compelling."

-- "Terrified Democrats are Clinton's secret weapon" – and the possibility of a Trump victory is just the thing Hillary needs to turn out left-leaning voters,"  Politico's Glenn Thrush  argues. "The wow in recent national polls is not Trump's rise, but the fact that more Trump voters are psyched about their candidate than Democrats are jazzed about their less-than-exciting nominee," he says. "But fear is as powerful an emotion as love in politics (it's why negative ads work and the decision by Jeb Bush's super PAC to dump tens of millions into positive ads was so bad) — and Democrats are panicking, in a way that could be good news for their underperforming nominee."

Quote du jour: "I ran into a top adviser to Clinton at a social event earlier this week, and asked him how things were going. 'How the hell do you think it's going? We're probably going to win, but there's a 30- to 40 percent chance we are going to elect a f---ing madman for the White House.' Then the guy headed for the bar."

-- "Nervy" is how Charles Krauthammer describes Trump's last-minute softening. "Can you really repackage the boasting, bullying, bombastic, insulting, insensitive Trump into a mellow and caring version? With two months to go? In a digital age in which every past outrage is preserved on imperishable video? Turns out, yes. How? Deflect and deny — and pretend it never happened. Where are they now — the birtherism, the deportation force, the scorn for teleprompters, the mocking of candidates who take outside money? Down the memory hole. Orwell was wrong. You don't need repression. You need only the sensory overload of an age of numbingly ephemeral social media. In this surreal election season, there is no past."

-- Eugene Robinson tells Democrats they are in a good spot and they should get past the "freakout stage": "If she wins Florida, it's over. Same if she wins Ohio. And she could even lose both and still get to 270. Angst doesn't help. Energizing the Democratic Party's reliable voters, especially in crucial states, can make all the difference."

-- Many Washington elites are TOTALLY PANICKED that their emails will be hacked and leaked next. The Russians have created a climate of fear that can be somewhat crippling and has made electronic communication harder. A lot of people are texting more and emailing less. More from the New York Times's Michael D. Shear and Nicholas Fandos: "The soul searching is happening with a special urgency in Washington, where email accounts burst with strategies, delicate political proposals, gossipy whispers and banal details of girlfriends, husbands, bank accounts and shopping lists. A panicked network anchor went home and deleted his entire personal Gmail account. A Democratic senator began rethinking the virtues of a flip phone. And a former national security official gave silent thanks that he is now living on the West Coast.  A television news anchor said … staff at her network had jokingly agreed at a morning news meeting to issue blanket apologies to one another if their emails were ever made public."

Said one former national security spokesman: "There but for the grace of God go all of us."

-- " Russian hacking a question of revenge and respect ," by Andrew Roth and Dana Priest: "The recent spate of embarrassing emails and other records stolen by Russian hackers is [Putin's] splashy response to years of what he sees as U.S. efforts to weaken and embarrass him on the world stage and with his own people, according to experts [in Moscow and the U.S.] … Putin is seeking revenge and respect, and trying to reassert Russia's lost superpower status at a time of waning economic clout and an upcoming Russian election … After years of keeping its hacking activities secret, Russia picked this particularly unsettling moment in U.S. politics to make its exploits public. It all plays into Putin's narrative that his democratic critics are simply U.S. agents and that American democracy is as politically corrupt as any other form of government. The antics have also forced world attention back to Putin, giving him the aura of a superpower leader."

-- Ranking House Intelligence Committee Democrat Adam Schiff suggested Obama should sanction Russia for hacking U.S. political organizations, saying the president ought "to look at a series of escalating responses" if Putin's government continues to breach campaign committees.

Lawmakers from both parties are increasingly frustrated with Obama for not doing more to retaliate:  "I can't imagine something so fundamental to our country as the integrity of the electoral process," said Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman Bob Corker. (Karoun Demirjian notes that it's an awkward moment for the administration to start wading into the realm of sanctions talk because of the new cease-fire deal.)

A NEW COLD WAR KEEPS HEATING UP:

-- " Amid fears of Trump, Europe tries to make its security less dependent on the U.S .," by Michael Birnbaum in Brussels: "European leaders are contemplating broad new efforts to pool their defense capabilities amid growing concerns that the continent needs to better protect itself from threats ranging from Russia to the Islamic State. The leaders of the remaining 27 nations in the European Union are gathering Friday in Slovakia to discuss their visions for a Europe without Britain, including a Franco-German proposal to create a centralized European military headquarters in Brussels … The discussions are part of a broader effort to make Europe more capable of providing for its own security, independently from the U.S., after a tough push from both President Obama and [Trump] … A Europe that is more independent militarily would also be more capable of pursuing a foreign policy path more distinct from the United States, potentially widening cracks in Western unity."

-- Polish investigators are re-investigating the 2010 plane crash that killed President Lech Kaczynski and 95 others in Russia, after a government commission asserted that flight recordings were manipulated in possible attempts to mask the cause of the tragedy. Polish Defense Minister Antoni Macierewicz said there was "irrefutable proof of falsifications, manipulations and obfuscation of the truth." (Andrew Roth)

-- The tick tock: The Pentagon dragged its heels before signing off on John Kerry's deal with the Russians to get a cease-fire agreement in Syria. Karen DeYoung and Missy Ryan  report on the tense final hours before the announcement was made: "Hours after reaching an agreement on Syria last Friday with Secretary of State John F. Kerry and clearing the final deal with Moscow, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov wandered the halls of their meeting venue in Geneva, waiting for Kerry to get the okay from Washington. In a secure room upstairs, a frustrated Kerry was on hold. Already deep into a conference call with President Obama's top national security team, he was waiting for the Defense Department to locate its legal counsel to sign off on one of the many provisions of the accord that Defense Secretary Ashton B. Carter was questioning. 'I hope before Washington gets some sleep, we can get some news,' Lavrov said as he offered pizza and vodka to reporters awaiting an announcement. Clearly on a propaganda roll, he observed that the wheels of government appeared to turn more efficiently in his country than in the United States."

WAPO HIGHLIGHTS:

Chilling --> " Clashes between Germans and refugees spark new tensions. This is what ISIS envisioned," by Rick Noack: "The city of Bautzen in eastern Germany has been at the center of tensions between refugees and anti-**immigration** protesters in recent months. In February, Germans applauded as a refugee accommodation burned down, allegedly after an arson attack. … There have been attacks on refugee residences nearly every day since then." But frustration among migrants and newcomers with their increasingly unwelcoming host nation has raised worries among counter-terrorism experts and officials, who draw connections between the growing frustration and the ability of groups such as the Islamic State to cause havoc: "In a handbook released last year, the Islamic State imagined a scenario that has resembled some of the recent violence. 'When Muslims and Mosques will be attacked by neo-Nazis in protests, Muslims will do counter-protests alongside with antifascist groups,' the propaganda book's authors speculated. 'This is how the future Jihad in Europe will begin.'"

SOCIAL MEDIA SPEED READ:

Social media seized on Donald Trump Jr.'s admission that his dad is not releasing tax returns because he does not want to be scrutinized, not because of an audit:

His joke about gas chambers also raised eyebrows:

A couple of reactions:

See anything wrong with this picture?

Trump went after Colin Powell:

A little context:

Ivanka defended her dad's child care proposal:

Trump said he's "working harder also" so he doesn't feel sorry for wage-earners:

The New Hampshire sky:

Outgoing police chief Cathy Lanier turned in her weapon:

GOOD READS FROM ELSEWHERE:

-- Time, " The New Politics of Late Night ," by Richard Zoglin: "In his 16 years as host of Comedy Central's nightly satirical newscast, [Jon] Stewart brought political savvy, journalistic rigor and bite to the old pastime of topical satire on late-night TV. His retirement … along with Stephen Colbert's departure from The Colbert Report … came as a blow to a generation of viewers who relied on the two shows for insightful news analysis as much as for entertainment. But the shake-up, abetted by the craziest presidential campaign in modern memory, has had an unexpected and largely unappreciated payoff. It has triggered an extreme makeover for political satire, which is now more ubiquitous, more pointed, more passionate and often more partisan than ever before. … [Now] in a wild election with a ripe orange target, comics are ditching balance and taking sides."

-- Bloomberg, " Milo Yiannopoulos is the pretty, monstrous face of the alt-right," by Joel Stein: "For his shopping trip to Gieves & Hawkes, [Milo] Yiannopoulos calls for an Uber. The driver is a man, possibly because Uber's algorithm has learned that Yiannopoulos rejects female drivers. Women, he says, have been scientifically proven to be worse at spatial relations, as have Asians. Yiannopoulos is the 31-year-old British tech editor and star writer for Breitbart News, where he's the loudest defender of the new, Trump-led ultraconservatism, standing athwart history, shouting to stop **immigrants**, feminists, political correctness, and any non-Western culture. Their followers' politics are almost exactly the same: They're angry about globalization—culturally even more than economically. They're angry about political correctness guilting them about insensitivity to women, minorities, gays, transgender people, the disabled, the sick—the everyone-but-them. In this Kafkaesque troll war for America's soul, Yiannopoulos believes that all offense is performed rather than truly felt": "I have never been offended," he says. "I don't know what it means. It's not that I disagree with it. I don't understand it."

DAYBOOK:

On the campaign trail: Trump is in Washington, D.C. and Miami, Fla. Clinton is in Washington, D.C.

At the White House: Obama meets on trade with business, government and national security leaders, and later participates in an ambassador credentialing ceremony. Vice President Biden speaks at a DSCC event in Denver, Rice University in Houston and DSCC event in Austin.

On Capitol Hill: The Senate and House are out.

NEWS YOU CAN USE IF YOU LIVE IN D.C.:

-- Yet another day of sunny, un-muggy bliss! Here's the good news from today's Capital Weather Gang forecast: "With dew points at or below 60 degrees promoting fairly comfortable humidity levels, we should be able to enjoy warm upper 70s to low 80s without much humidity-induced sweating. A light 5 to 10 mph easterly breeze brings slowly increasing moisture into the air, and some clouds with it — at times— too. It could be close on the cloud-cover percentage for Nice Day Stamp purists, but it's a very pleasant day either way."

-- The Virginia Supreme Court declined a GOP request to hold Terry McAuliffe in contempt, clearing the way for the Democratic governor to individually grant clemency to some 200,000 nonviolent felons. (Laura Vozzella)

-- Maryland Gov. Larry Hogan announced he is undergoing what might be his final chemotherapy maintenance treatment for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, after which, he said, he will "hopefully be done forever." Hogan has been in remission for nearly a year. (Ovetta Wiggins)

-- D.C. and Maryland have the highest median income in the country, according to this week's Census Bureau report, with each hovering around $75,628. (The national median is $56,500.) (Perry Stein)

VIDEOS OF THE DAY:

Trump appeared on "The Tonight Show," weighing in on the "grueling" process of campaigning, defending Matt Lauer's widely-panned moderation of an NBCCommander-in-Chief forum ("I thought [he] did a wonderful job!") and, most shockingly – letting host Jimmy Fallon mess with his hair. At first, the Republican nominee hesitated. "I'll be gentle," Fallon reassured, proceeding to send his golden locks "flying in every direction." And though Trump appeared to smile through the process, he quickly moved to tame his mane – and, the AP reported, he also refused to let press take photos of him after the taping. The Hollywood Reporter has write-up.

Here is the 1-minute hair clip:

Trump does a mock job interview:

And he explained why he likes fast food:

Bill Clinton appeared on "The Daily Show" for the first time since Trevor Noah took over from Jon Stewart: Here's a 10-minute clip:

"Jonah" from Veep noted that a congressional candidate's new real-life ad in Minnesota looks just like the ad created for his fake campaign on the show:

Bill Hader spoofed James Carville in "The War Room" in this episode of Documentary Now!:

Lewis Black thinks Trump is making it hard for comedians:

Seth Meyers took a closer look at the Trump foundation:

This pro-Trump super PAC Rebuilding America Now has shifted from running negative ads about Clinton to positives about the Donald because his image is so underwater:

At his rally last night, Trump said he was glad that the traveling press was held up in traffic and not there to see him talk:

Obama spoke at the annual Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute gala:

The secret behind the success of Starbucks's pumpkin spice latte is less in the flavor and more in the type of marketing the company uses:

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**After two years under Trump's policies, U.S. economic growth would slow to about 0.3 percent annually, the worst pace since the recession ended, according to British research firm Oxford Economics.

If the Republican presidential nominee was able to fully implement his plans to impose tariffs on goods from China and Mexico and force large numbers of undocumented **immigrants** to leave the United States, the U.S. economy would begin to stall by 2019, the research firm determined. Economic expansion would also slow globally as weakness in China and the United States spread to their trading partners.

Globally, the rate of expansion would decline to about 2.2 percent annually, compared to a forecast of 2.9 percent if Trump's policies were not implemented. Without the policies, the U.S. economy would be $430 billion larger after five years, according to the research.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/09/15/donald-trump-puts-more-details-to-his-tax-plan/?tid=pm\_business\_pop\_b"]Wonkblog[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/09/15/donald-trump-puts-more-details-to-his-tax-plan/?tid=pm\_business\_pop\_b"]Wonkblog] Donald Trump reveals more details of his tax plan[/interstitial\_link]

More likely, according to the firm, Congress would force Trump to compromise on his agenda, in which case the effect on the economy would be contained. The U.S. rate would decline to under 2 percent a year, and there would be only a minimal effect worldwide.

"The economic and market impact is most likely to be relatively muted. But, should Mr. Trump prove more successful in achieving adoption of his policies, the consequences could be far-reaching," the report authors wrote.

Broadly speaking, economists have been critical of Trump's proposals, which depart from the standard approach that Republican politicians have taken in the past.

Typically, GOP candidates have argued that the best policies for the economy are ones that make goods and labor cheaper -- usually by reducing taxes and eliminating restrictions on business, especially international trade. Yet Trump's policies would do the opposite. Tariffs would make imported goods more expensive and could also increase costs for U.S. exporters if foreign countries retaliate. Deporting large numbers of **immigrants** would increase the cost of hiring workers for U.S. firms.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/08/15/what-donald-trump-gets-totally-right-about-the-economy/"]What[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/08/15/what-donald-trump-gets-totally-right-about-the-economy/"]What] Donald Trump gets totally right about the economy[/interstitial\_link]

Besides tariffs and deportations, Trump's other major economic proposal is a massive reduction in taxes. Reducing taxes can stimulate the economy but also forces the government to either borrow more or spend less. If Congress reduces spending while reducing taxes, the benefits will be limited, the researchers note. Much of the economy relies on public spending through programs that put money in private citizens' pockets, such as Social Security and military contracting.

While grim, the forecast is in fact optimistic compared with another that Moody's issued earlier this year. That forecast -- authored by economist Mark Zandi, who has advised politicians in both parties -- predicted that Trump's policies could in fact create a recession in the United States. In other words, economic expansion would not just decelerate as Oxford Economics forecast, but would actually begin to reverse.

One major difference between the two forecasts appears to be divergent predictions about how the Federal Reserve would respond to Trump's economic policies.

Imposing tariffs and reducing the number of available workers would increase businesses' costs and force them to raise prices for goods and services. Zandi and his colleagues at Moody's predicted that the U.S. central banks would respond to the inevitable inflation by increasing interest rates. Steeper rates would make it more difficult for businesses and households to borrow money, giving them less to spend on goods and services and putting a check on the increase in prices.

By contrast, Oxford Economics predicted that the Federal Reserve would take a long view, looking past an immediate increase in prices to the negative economics effects of Trump's policies over the long term. To keep the economy moving, the Federal Reserve would maintain interest rates close to zero, Oxford forecast, helping to mitigate the ramifications of Trump's policies.

More from Wonkblog:

Donald Trump appears to abandon plan that would give his companies a big tax break

A massive new study debunks a widespread theory for Donald Trump's success

Hispanics are doing really well. And so is Donald Trump.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**President Obama on Thursday called on Latino members of Congress to "push back against bluster and falsehoods and promises of higher walls" in a personal appeal aimed at shoring up a key voting bloc to help defeat Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump.

In his annual address to the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Obama also defended his **immigration** record and said comprehensive reform of border-control laws remains possible if the nation elects Hillary Clinton as president and more Democrats to Congress.

Obama didn't mention Trump or Clinton by name but alluded to them throughout his remarks. He denounced Trump's vision of a country that was not tolerant of undocumented **immigrants** and suggested that the November election amounted to a referendum on the nation's identity.

"I know there are a lot of people who have this notion of what the real America looks like; somehow, it only includes a few of us," Obama said. "Who's to determine that in this nation of **immigrants** ... that you have a greater claim than anybody here? So you can't let that brand of politics win."

Obama has stepped up his attacks on Trump, including at a rally on behalf of Clinton in Philadelphia this week. He has sought to draw a sharp contrast with Trump's stance on **immigration**, including his pledge to build a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico to keep out undocumented **immigrants**.

One of Obama's biggest legislative losses was his failure to get comprehensive **immigration** restructuring through Congress. A bill featuring a path to citizenship for many of the nation's 11 million **immigrants** in the country illegally was approved by a bipartisan coalition in the Senate in 2013, but House Republicans did not allow it to come to a vote, effectively killing the legislation in 2014.

The president said he was proud of the executive actions he took that have deferred the deportations of undocumented **immigrants** who arrived as children and allowed them to obtain work permits. More than 740,000 people have benefited from that program. However, Obama's move to expand the program to cover up to 4 million parents of U.S. citizens has been blocked in federal court.

"We need a comprehensive solution," Obama said. "We  need an approach that upholds our tradition as a nation of **immigrants** and a nation of laws. It's possible to do that. It's possible to insist on a lawful and orderly system while still seeing **immigrants** as students and hard-working parents and not as criminals, and not as rapists, but as families who came here for the same reasons all **immigrants** came here — to work hard and to learn and to build a better life."

Obama is trying to mobilize the coalition of Latinos and other minority groups that supported him in record numbers to support Clinton and give her an advantage over Trump. More than 70 percent of Latinos and Asian Americans, two of the fastest-growing voting blocs, supported Obama in 2012 in his reelection victory over Republican Mitt Romney.

The president lamented the tone of the debate on the campaign trail and said that "talk around these issues has cut deeper than in years past — a little more personal, a little meaner, a little uglier. Folks are betting that if they can drive us far enough apart and put down enough of us — over where we come from, what we look like, what religion we practice — it will pay off at the polls. It's a bet they're going to lose."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Michael Higgs wanted to pump some fight into the 50 or so Donald Trump supporters who packed the second floor of an office rowhouse in Rockville, the Republican Party's outpost in deep-blue Montgomery County.

"We have a lot of angry people on the left. A lot of anger out there these days," said Higgs, chairman of the county GOP. That makes it tempting, he said, to avoid talking politics with friends or neighbors, or even planting a yard sign.

Don't be cowed, he urged.

"It's more important than ever for people to see that they're not alone, especially here in this liberal stronghold of the People's Republic of Montgomery County," said Higgs, a genial telecommunications attorney whose work in Larry Hogan's 2014 gubernatorial campaign helped him land him a post as deputy director of the state Department of Assessments and Taxation.

"Never forget, there's 124,000 registered Republicans in this county. So anytime you think you're the only guy in your neighborhood, you're not."

It's actually 121,474 on the rolls of the registered, according to the latest Board of Elections data,surrounded by 376,934 Democrats (not to mention 142,004 independents) who have thrived over the last quarter century as the GOP shifted rightward and the county grew more diverse.

No Republican presidential candidate has carried Montgomery since Ronald Reagan, who eked out 50.1 percent in 1984. Rep. Connie Morella (R-Md.) was gerrymandered out of office by Democratic state lawmakers in 2002, and the last Republican on the County Council, Howard Denis, was unseated four years later.

On this recent evening, though, in this room, an enthusiastic cross-section of the Trump coalition came together — largely white, north of 40, and voicing a mix of disillusion, anxiety and anger over the direction of the country.

They took different paths to supporting Trump, but most converge around illegal **immigration** and border security, the belief that Democrat Hillary Clinton must be stopped, and that their candidate is the prescriptive for a political establishment rotten with insiderism and corruption across both parties.

The meeting drew from right-wing movements that have found a harbor in Trump's candidacy. There was John O'Malley, 62, a 9/11 "truther" who believes the attacks were the work of rogue elements inside the U.S. government. He said he is drawn to Trump because the New York billionaire has indicated a willingness to reopen the investigation into the events of that day.

O'Malley, a retired Pentagon and Food and Drug Administration research analyst who ran for the Montgomery County Council in 2014, was also there to represent Maryland 20/20 Watch, a tea party offshoot. He distributed applications for election judge posts in Baltimore City, saying there could be massive voter fraud at the polls.

Seated off to the side was Brad Botwin, by day a senior official in the Commerce Department's Office of Technology Evaluation. On his own time, he is founder and director of Help Save Maryland, listed as a "nativist-extremist" group by the Southern Poverty Law Center for its history of hostility to illegal **immigrants**. He has said the listing is baseless.

In a July blog post, Botwin assailed Montgomery police chief Tom Manger for lax enforcement of **immigration** laws that he said has led to a surge of gang-related violence in "the unnaturally diverse communities of Montgomery Village and Gaithersburg." His site carries commentary calling Casa de Maryland, the **immigrant** advocacy group, "Maryland's Number 1 Illegal Entity," and sells stickers with a bright red slash across the Casa logo.

Botwin enlisted volunteers to staff campaign booths at county events this fall. "We don't take any crap from anybody, right?" he told a couple of interested high school students. "We're Trump people."

Higgs, whose nomination to Maryland's Public Service Commission stalled last year after Democratic lawmakers objected to some old tweets ("newsflash Illegal **alien immigrants** now to be referred to as #UndocumentedDemocrats"), said that while the party has no formal relationship with Help Save Maryland, the organization is a welcome presence.

"Brad has a great group, those guys do good work," said Higgs. "We have a lot of the same stances on a lot of the issues."

Although Trump won 55 percent of the statewide vote in Maryland's Republican primary, he captured only 39 percent in Montgomery, edging Ohio Gov. John Kasich by 1,700 votes. A few people at the meeting in Rockville the other night reflected some of that ambivalence.

Dwight Patel hopscotched from Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker to Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and then Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) before making his peace with Trump. Even now, he says he would be happier with Indiana Gov. Mike Pence at the top of the ticket.

"Like Donald Rumsfeld said, 'You go to war with the Army you have,' and not the one we wish we had," said Patel, 44, an architect and the county party's second vice chair.

Larry Eisenberg, a tax and pension attorney who lives in Gaithersburg, said he'd long been uneasy about speaking out on politics, repelled by the sense of "moral superiority" he encountered from Democrats. But he came to the meeting with his wife, Jessica Brede, a CPA and tax partner in a wealth advisory firm, as "curious conservatives" who believe it is important that Clinton be defeated. Trump's raw rhetoric is not a concern.

"Gaffes don't matter," said Eisenberg, 58. "I know exactly what he's trying to say. . . . I think it is very important that we have a rational **immigration** system. That's not a racist comment. We have a constitutional right to determine who becomes a citizen, and that includes those who support our constitution and whose primary allegiance is to the United States."

Ruth Melson, a fixture in the 65-year-old Montgomery County Federation of Republican Women, was there also, none too pleased that Hogan, the state's increasingly popular governor, has declared Trump unfit for office and has vowed not to vote for him this fall.

"I think it's terrible. The Republican leader of the state saying he's not supporting his presidential candidate. No excuses for it, " said Melson, a retired Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation official and longtime Trump admirer, who lives in Garrett Park. "New York City would be slums without Donald Trump," she said.

For about 90 minutes, Higgs walked through some of the basics for the fall campaign, including phone banks and the Sept. 26 debate watch party, which he promised would be "Huuuuge." He also put out a call for surrogate speakers, volunteers "who have the gift of gab" but can also "sort of keep it in check."

As the session wound down he addressed the elephant in the room — that barring an astonishing reversal, Maryland's 10 electoral votes will not be a factor in Trump's strategy. A Washington Post-Survey Monkey poll of the state's likely voters shows him trailing Clinton by 30 points.

"Talking candidly here — Maryland may not be on their final vote strategy," Higgs said, meaning that the group should not count on heavy support from the national campaign.

Higgs tried to end on an upbeat note, telling the faithful on Crabbs Branch Way they could still have an impact by making calls and bus trips into bona fide battleground states like Pennsylvania, hooking up with other county organizations and going door-to-door.

"We're going to do everything we can to get Maryland in play," he said, "and move those polls in the right direction."

bill.turque@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**David Rothkopf writes that instrumental in Donald Trump's rise was the "chorus of toxic commentators … the Rush Limbaugh phenomenon and the Black Helicopter guys. They have embraced smear, conspiracy theories, inflammatory language, and gross incivility to drum up ratings and stir up emotions." They've sown not skepticism but hatred and unwarranted distrust of all government. They've indulged in climate-change denial and economic nincompoopery.

For a while, they played the ideological purity game. Anyone who deviated from the Heritage Action script or the NRA scorecard or the anti-gay-marriage hymnal was a "RINO." (The problem with Jeb Bush, you see, was that he was too liberal.) Trump, it must be said, revealed all of these folks to be frauds. The media chorus that hounded impure conservatives now embraces Trump and the worst excesses of the welfare state (subsidized health care for Ivanka Trump?!). They've decided that large swaths of America are made up of victims, driven to madness by elites who refused to say "Merry Christmas" and deprived them of $30-per-hour jobs that required no college education. They have gone from hawking traditional marriage to embracing a thrice-married adulterer.

But it's not just the talk-radio screechers or the Sean Hannitys or the Breitbarts. "Respectable" conservative commentators in print, on TV, online and even in some think tanks parrot nonsense about free trade, blame **immigration** from Mexico (which is, on net, negative) for a raft of economic woes, hold vigils for the end of gay marriage (sometimes extending to the right to discriminate against gays), celebrate lawlessness when convenient (disregard the Supreme Court!) and scream "law and order" when it is about keeping **immigrants** in the shadows. They claim to be offended by crass culture and lack of traditional values, but calling Sandra Fluke a "slut" is just "telling it like it is."

Right-wing media now tell us that electing Hillary Clinton will bring about the end of American civilization. And if Trump does not win, it will not be the fault of water carriers like themselves, but rather, the early-warning detectors who understood perfectly what Trump was up to.

They used to resent racial- and gender-grievance mongering. Now they coddle non-college-educated white males whose lives have been ruined by … what? Free trade that saves them hundreds of dollars a year at Walmart? By the idea that the rich have gamed the system? (It may be objectionable, but crony capitalism did not stymie the job prospects of high school dropouts in Appalachia.)

The conspiracy generators -- Sen. Mitch McConnell sold them out! 9/11 was an inside job! President Obama was born in Kenya! -- assumed that their audience was stupid. They then concocted a brew of urban myth and racial resentment that made their audience even stupider. It used to be that Republicans were the ideas party (Milton Friedman! James Q. Wilson!), while the Democrats were the coalition party (minorities, unions, etc.). Now the Republicans' "big idea" is that whites are persecuted and Christians get no respect. The right-wing media rails about public schools that don't teach history adequately -- and then spews a fractured fairy tale about U.S. history and makes mincemeat of the Constitution when it suits their purposes.

As Rothkopf put it, some of these commentators on the right now are "running the other way, shocked and horrified at the monster they have made, ink-stained Dr. Frankensteins who lack the courage to admit their own responsibility in this gross national failure." And some of the most strident voices have decided to jettison virtually every principle that they insisted RINOs were insufficiently devoted to, and instead vouch for a moral toxic waste dump of a candidate whose America First foreign policy is out of the 1930s and whose domestic policy tries to re-create the '50s.

They are, on the whole, far less informative, honest and fair than the mainstream media (which has its own problems). They sure are less civil. After the election, it will be a good time to name names, to end the Fox News network monopoly on evening conservative news-ish programming, to debunk the false narratives and grotesque sexism and simply to tune out the gibberish. Shining a bright light on charlatans and encouraging more speech have always been the antidote to noxious, false and destructive speech.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The question of whether Donald Trump still supports a ban on Muslim **immigrants** and refugees coming to the United States just got a whole lot murkier.

The Republican presidential nominee has recently sought to emphasize the concept of "extreme vetting" -- apparently as an alternative to his previous blanket proposal to block all foreign Muslims from coming to the United States. But his comments Wednesday night in Canton, Ohio, suggest that even he doesn't think such vetting could work.

"We don't know where these people come from," he said while discussing Syrian refugees. "We don't know if they have love or hate in their heart, and there's no way to tell."

Trump: "We don't know if they have love or hate in their heart and there's no way to tell." So how do you test that? https://t.co/cAuGoBQax1[https://t.co/cAuGoBQax1]

Trump's comment that "there's no way to tell" whether people have hate in their heart is completely at odds with his proposal to exhaustively vet **immigrants**. He said last month that the vetting would include an ideological screening test to determine whether people "share our values and respect our people."

In other words, the test is meant precisely to determine whether people have love or hate in their hearts.

Trump was talking specifically about Syrian refugees, who apparently still would be banned even under his revamped proposal. But he also is talking about a matter of the heart -- not documentation, which Syrian refugees may not have. And if you can't see what's in a Syrian refugee's heart, you also can't see what's in the heart of a Muslim **immigrant** from England. The latter might have more paperwork, but that's not what Trump is talking about here.

It's just the latest example of the candidate seeming to argue with himself about his proposed ban.

While adding the "extreme vetting" proposal, the Trump campaign has offered conflicting signals about just whom the vetting would cover and how much he's backing away from his previous proposal to ban all Muslims from coming to the United States. That proposal, by the way, still appears on the Trump campaign website under the headline: "Donald Trump Statement on Preventing Muslim **Immigration**."

In May, the candidate deflected questions about whether the Muslim ban was still his policy, saying, "We're going to look at a lot of things."

In June, Trump suggested that the ban would not be on Muslims but on countries "where there is a proven history of terrorism."

Later that month, Trump said it "wouldn't bother me" to admit a Muslim **immigrant** from Scotland. A spokeswoman at the time told CNN that his Muslim ban applied only to Muslims from "terror states," but didn't elaborate beyond that.

Trump then delivered his speech on extreme vetting in August.

Trump's comments Wednesday even contradict his own remarks from two weeks ago when Sean Hannity asked him specifically about vetting what's in one's heart and Trump suggested there was a way:

HANNITY: How do you possibly vet what's in their heart?

Through it all, the Trump campaign hasn't clarified whether he is disowning his blanket ban on Muslim **immigration**, whether he is strengthening it, or whether he is scaling it back. He or his top aides and surrogates have indicated all of these things at one point or another. (The New York Times has a good visualization of how the proposal has shifted over time.)

Asked in July whether he was scaling back his proposal, Trump told NBC's Chuck Todd: "I don't think so. I actually don't think it's a rollback. In fact, you could say it's an expansion."

Trump's comments Wednesday night further obscure what his exact proposal on this is. In his Ohio speech, Trump repeated a previous comment that Syrian refugees could represent "the great Trojan horse."

"I don't want to be known in 200 years for having created the Trojan horse with a different name," he said.

Trump still doesn't appear to have decided precisely how he would halt that Trojan horse.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The city of Bautzen in eastern Germany has been at the center of tensions between refugees and anti-**immigration** protesters in recent months. In February, Germans applauded as a refugee accommodation burned down, allegedly after an arson attack.

But on Wednesday evening, those tensions reached a new peak when 20 refugees were involved in violent clashes with 80 German nationals, according to police. The incident occurred nearly exactly one year after the influx of refugees into Germany reached its climax, with thousands arriving in the country every day.

There have been attacks on refugee residences nearly every day since then. But frustration among migrants and newcomers with their increasingly unwelcoming host nation has also caused stirs, and has raised worries among counter-terrorism experts and officials.

[Finding refuge, still seeking peace]

Initial reports alleged that the violence Wednesday was started by refugees, following verbal anti-refugee attacks and provocations by mostly German protesters. Multiple media reports also specified that at least some of the protesters had a right-wing extremist background. Two refugees were injured in the clashes.

About 100 police officers responded and guarded multiple accommodation centers overnight. They also had to intervene when protesters started to attack an ambulance that was on its way to help one of the injured foreigners.

Wednesday's clashes were only the latest signs of rising tensions between refugees and locals in Germany. Eastern Germany has been particularly affected by the increase in attacks — although it is the area with the fewest refugees.

The recent violence has also come as a warning sign to terrorism experts, who draw connections between the growing frustration and the ability of groups such as the Islamic State to cause havoc. In a handbook released last year, the Islamic State imagined a scenario that has resembled some of the recent violence.

"When Muslims and Mosques will be attacked by neo-Nazis in protests, Muslims will do counter-protests alongside with antifascist groups," the propaganda book's authors speculated.

"This is how the future Jihad in Europe will begin," the handbook went on to explain, urging its sympathizers to mix with Muslim protesters to fuel the violence. "If these violent protests and battles happen at a national level — there will be too less police to control the populations in every town and a war will happen between Muslims and their neo-Nazis enemies. People in between will be caught in crossfire and will have to pick sides."

Such predictions have worried German authorities. In April this year, German federal police warned that anti-refugee sentiments could easily escalate: "Apart from physical harm, one has to reckon with murders," authorities concluded. They also argued that neo-Nazis had fueled a "climate of fear," which had targeted journalists, pro-refugee volunteers and politicians, in particular.

Despite this, it remains unlikely that Bautzen could become a role model for right-wing extremists all across Germany in the near future.

Bautzen and its surroundings have for years been considered a bastion for the right-wing extremist party NPD, and anti-refugee sentiments in the city are more prevalent than in most other German towns. In western Germany, that party has rarely had any influence and neo-Nazi protests were frequently stopped by large counter-demonstrations.

German officials have also disputed claims by right-wing commentators that crime levels have increased because of the refugee influx last year. In an unusual move, Germany's Interior Ministry and the Federal Criminal Police Office released crime data for 2015 and the first quarter of 2016 in June. "**Immigrants** are not more criminal than Germans," a ministry spokesman was quoted as saying. Syrians, Iraqis and Afghans committed fewer crimes than refugees from other countries.

Since early 2015, some forms of crime have been on the rise, while others have decreased: There has been an increase in crimes motivated by religion or ethnicity — those numbers include brawls among asylum seekers and terrorism-related offenses. There has been a sharp rise in extremism, and there have been worrying incidents of mass sexual assaults.

Read more:

Finding refuge, still seeking peace

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has ascended to national prominence at a time when Hispanic households are advancing financially much more quickly than white households.

These economic and political trends might be just a coincidence. On the other hand, there is evidence that many of the Republican presidential nominee's white supporters are concerned that their racial group's dominant economic position in American society could be threatened. A recent analysis of polling data by The Washington Post shows that many of Trump's supporters are worried that whites are "losing out" to other racial groups.

The typical Hispanic household's income has jumped 11.8 percent in the past two years, according to Census Bureau data published Tuesday. The change in average income for the typical white household over the same period was just 2.5 percent.

Despite this rapid gain, Hispanic families are still substantially poorer than the general population. The typical Hispanic household took in just over $45,000 last year, compared to nearly $63,000 for the typical white household.

Asians have long been the wealthiest racial group, and their economic advantage has increased recently. Between 2013 and last year, the typical Asian household's income increased 4.8 percent, more rapidly than the national average.

Although white households remain much wealthier, on average, than Hispanic households, it is plausible that the recent decline in white households' relative advantage might be connected with Trump's success. Recent research suggests that many white Americans are less concerned about how much they have as about whether their advantage over other racial and ethnic groups is secure.

For example, psychologists at Stanford recently conducted an experiment in which they told a group of white subjects that white households' incomes were declining relative to other households' incomes. Those subjects were more likely to support the tea party than subjects who were told that other groups' incomes were in decline.

A poll by The Washington Post and ABC News in March found that Trump's supporters are much more likely than Republicans who supported other candidates to believe that white Americans are "losing out to blacks and Hispanics" because of preferences for those groups.

Trump's appeal is not simply a product of economic trends over the past couple of years. For instance, Republicans' attitudes on **immigration** have been hardening for a long time.

In 2000, 38 percent of Republicans described **immigrants** as "a burden" to society, according to the Pew Research Center. That figure has steadily increased, to 57 percent in a Pew poll last year.

Mark Hugo Lopez, the director of Hispanic research at Pew, pointed to a couple of reasons for the improvement in Hispanic households' finances. A recovering economy has finally begun to create more demand for labor, which Hispanic households have supplied. Hispanic adults are somewhat more likely to work than other groups, so they have particularly benefited from recent declines in the unemployment rate.

At the same time, Hispanics are likely to live in places where the economy has recovered more quickly in general, such as Texas and the Western states, Lopez said. Meanwhile, more and more Hispanics who were raised in the United States by **immigrant** parents are now coming of age. As they graduate from college, they are improving the population's overall capacity to earn.

Lopez also noted that in a recent Pew poll, 81 percent of Hispanics expected their personal finances to improve. The figure for the general public was just 61 percent.

"This is all coming together and pointing in the same direction," Lopez said.

More from Wonkblog:

Economic and racial anxiety: Two separate forces driving support for Donald Trump

The most racist places in America, according to Google

College is not the great equalizer for black and Hispanic graduates

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump made what his campaign billed as two major disclosures on Wednesday. First, an attorney provided a timeline of his Slovenia-born wife's **immigration** status. Then, amid questions about his health during a television interview, Trump pulled some medical test results out of his blazer pocket.

Yet despite these high-profile gestures, Trump remains the least transparent major presidential nominee in modern history. He is the first since 1976 to refuse to release his tax returns. He has declined to provide documentation of the "tens of millions" of dollars he claims to have donated to charity. He has yet to release a comprehensive accounting of his health. And, while Wednesday's letter about Melania Trump's **immigration** from her home country offers a few new details, there is no documentation to back up the claims.

At the same time, Trump and his aides are criticizing rival Hillary Clinton as secretive and demanding more information from her about her emails and health. Many Democrats also see Trump's refusal to release basic information as hypocritical since for years, he was one of the loudest voices demanding that President Obama release his birth certificate to prove he was born in Hawaii and qualified to be president. Trump also called on Obama to release his college applications, school transcripts and passport applications.

Trump's campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, played down Trump's need to release health records on MSNBC on Tuesday: "I don't know why we need such extensive medical reporting when we all have a right to privacy."

In the same TV interview, Conway criticized Clinton for not immediately disclosing that she had been diagnosed with mild pneumonia last week, a decision that came to a head on Sunday when she left a 9/11 memorial service after feeling overheated. "Why in the world did Hillary Clinton lie to everyone and conceal such an important fact for two days?" Conway asked.

On Wednesday, Clinton's campaign released a letter from her doctor describing her treatment for "mild, non-contagious bacterial pneumonia" and noting that she received a CT scan confirming the illness and that she is halfway through an antibiotic regimen. In July 2015, Clinton released a two-page letter from her doctor that contained several lab results and more information than what Trump has thus far released.

Clinton also recently made public the past nine years of her tax returns, showing that she and her husband, former president Bill Clinton, had an income of $10.7 million for 2015 and paid about $3.6 million in federal taxes.

Most voters say they want transparency from candidates. In May, a Washington Post-ABC News poll found that 64 percent of registered voters said Trump should release his taxes, while 31 percent said it is okay that he has not done so.

Clinton supporters say Trump is creating the illusion of being transparent by releasing bits of information and saturating the airwaves with interviews. Instead of a full medical history, Trump released a four-paragraph letter from his personal doctor in December that declared he had "no significant medical problems" and would be "the healthiest individual ever elected to the presidency." At the time, Trump was taking aspirin daily and "a low dose of a statin." The campaign said he plans to release more soon.

Trump, 70, would be the oldest president ever elected to a first term. He loves fast food from McDonald's and KFC and, according to media accounts, told the host of "The Dr. Oz Show" that his main exercise is the vigorous hand gesturing he does during his political rallies. Yet for months, Trump has said that Clinton, 68, does not have the "strength" or "stamina" for the presidency and has accused her of being "exhausted" and sleeping too much.

On Monday — the day after Clinton fell ill at the memorial — Trump announced on Fox News that he underwent a physical last week and would release the "very, very specific" results this week. He spoke of his health with great confidence and said he finds the campaign trail "very invigorating."

During a taping of the interview with Dr. Mehmet Oz scheduled to air Thursday, Oz asked Trump why he has not released his medical records.

"Well, I really have no problem in doing it," Trump said, according to a brief clip released by the show Wednesday. "I have it right here. Should I do it? I don't care. Should I do it?"

Trump then pulled out what he called a "report" and a letter from Lenox Hill Hospital in New York, which Oz examined — then the 30-second clip ended.

With the show and the campaign refusing to release any data, members of the audience shared details that they remembered with reporters, though the accounts varied. MSNBC interviewed Daniel Sinasohn, who struggled to remember exactly what Trump said he weighed. "I thought he said 267. My boyfriend said that maybe it was 230," Sinasohn said. " ... I am not 100 percent sure."

Also on Wednesday, Trump's wife, Melania Trump, posted a letter on Twitter from an **immigration** attorney that included new details about her **immigration** to the United States from Slovenia. But it also raised more questions, and no documentation was provided to confirm the claims.

Michael J. Wildes, an attorney who has worked for Donald Trump but was not involved in his wife's **immigration** case, wrote that Melania Trump first entered the United States on Aug. 27, 1996, using a B-1/B-2 visa.

Wildes said that on Oct. 18, 1996, the U.S. Embassy in Slovenia issued her first H-1B work visa and that she got a total of five visas between 1996 and 2001, when she received her green card. Wildes said she got the card — which provides legal permanent residence — under the "extraordinary ability" category but did not outline how.

The federal government defines the "extraordinary ability" designation "for people who are recognized as being at the very top of their field." Experts say the category is used by people with exceptional and renowned talent, including those who win Nobel Prizes. In 2000, Trump was a working model best known for her relationship with Donald Trump, but she was not a top international model.

**Immigration** attorney Bruce Morrison, who wrote the federal law including the "extraordinary ability" provision when he was a Democratic congressman from Connecticut, said it was known as the "Einstein category."

"It wasn't always good enough to be a player in the starting lineup of Major League Baseball; you had to be the most valuable player. The expectation was that you had to be truly extraordinary in your field," Morrison said, adding: "If someone came to me with her ability, I would be dubious that she would get it."

Wildes, the Trump attorney, also used his letter to rebut news stories that Melania Trump had posed for nude photos in New York in 1995, thereby raising questions about whether she was working as a model illegally before getting her visa in 1996. Wildes said Trump was not in the United States at all in 1995.

In late July, the New York Post ran the nude photographs on its cover and reported that they were taken in 1995. Marc Dolisi, former editor of the now-defunct men's magazine Max told The Washington Post in August that the photos were published in the magazine's February 1996 edition and been shot in late 1995. But when contacted again recently, Dolisi said he had made a mistake and that the photos were published in the February 1997 edition.

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

mary.jordan@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LINCOLN, Del. — He is sitting on his mother's back porch on a September day too hot to earn any extra money mowing lawns. He's wondering what he'll do if he loses his slot at a Walmart truck repair shop next month, his surgically repaired back too fragile to do the work at the moment, and he is remembering a time when America felt more safe, more free and more like a family.

"I'm doing worse than my parents' generation," he says, and then he counts the ways that's so: "I can't speak my mind. I can't get ahead. They take every dime I make anymore — in taxes, in insurance, whatever."

Johnny West is 45, a grandfather, and an enthusiastic supporter of Donald Trump, whom he considers a kindred talk-from-the-gut spirit. In many ways, he embodies the anxieties and resentments that differentiate Trump's backers from other Americans.

Feelings of economic decline, political powerlessness and antagonism toward **immigrants** distinguish Trump supporters from Clinton's, according to new polling from The Washington Post and ABC News. For likely Trump voters such as West, those feelings intertwine in complicated ways.

More than a third of Trump supporters in the new poll said that life has gotten worse for them compared to their parents, double the rate of Clinton supporters. Trump supporters are four times more likely than Clinton backers to say the United States is "less great than it has been in the past." They are twice as likely to believe they have no influence whatsoever in Washington.

Almost a third of Trump supporters say that **immigrants** "strongly" weaken American society, four times the rate of Clinton supporters.

But perhaps surprisingly, Trump backers who say they aren't getting ahead in the economy show little evidence of believing **immigrants** — or any other group of Americans — are getting ahead, either. Only 4 percent of Trump supporters say life is getting worse for them, but getting better for other groups of people.

West, who has lived his whole life in this cornfield-crowded section of southern Delaware, says he and his neighbors have been deprived of economic opportunity by a corrupt government and profit-hungry corporations.

"Everybody's getting gotten," he says. "I don't think anybody's getting ahead at my expense. They're just keeping us all down."

When West was growing up here, his father worked in a plastics factory — still works there, in fact — and his mother raised her children at home. One income was enough to afford small luxuries, like dining out and the occasional vacation, he recalls.

At age 18, West started a working life, and a family, of his own. He got married, had a daughter and took a job in the local plastics factory. One day, he fell from the top of a machine that turned pellets into sheets. He could barely move the next morning. Doctors told him he had herniated disks, but he was not a candidate for surgery. With limits on his mobility, he had to leave his job.

West went on to sell cars, mow lawns and work several other jobs. He earned a commercial trucking license and finally, a decade ago, put a self-taught skill with engines to work in a repair shop for Walmart.

He was making good money: $25 an hour, before insurance and taxes.

The bad back finally wore him down. Late last year, his legs felt like a hundred needles were stinging them. Under a special program designed to help employees with spinal problems, Walmart agreed to pay for back surgery. He took six months of disability pay. When it ran out, he was limited in how much weight he could lift, so he could not perform his job at the repair shop. He has not drawn a paycheck since July, though Walmart said it would save a spot in the company for him for 12 weeks if he can find another suitable position. He expects to be formally let go in October.

"I live here with my mom," West, now divorced, says from her porch, motioning toward the back door of a low-slung house. "This ain't mine. If it weren't for her, I'd be done."

West's daughter is now grown, with two kids of her own. He has a son who is an assistant manager for a grocery store. He worries about their opportunities even more than his. He says big businesses don't care about their workers like they used to, and government officials cut deals to enrich those businesses — and themselves.

He believes that all racial and ethnic groups are struggling equally in that system. But he also says, without mentioning specific examples, that **immigrants** in Delaware drive nicer cars than he does, and get free health care for the government, and that angers him.

"I don't have free health care. I don't have anything handed to me," he says. "I'm not bitter about that, but it does anger me. It ain't fair, but you suck it up and move on."

In Trump's approach to governing, including his tax plan, West sees hope for a better economy and more job creation. In the candidate's style, he sees someone he can, at last, relate to in government. "He's a lot like me," West says. "He gets himself in trouble because he speaks right from his heart."

West has been speaking for an hour, and the porch is heating toward boiling. He walks into the yard. He had plans to mow some lawns later in the morning with a young associate, as part of a side business he had started to supplement his income but loomed as his only source of it.

But the forecast calls for temperatures in the 90s, and they decide to do the work the next day, when it should cool down. They drive to drop a mower off with West's son, who needs to cut his own yard.

Along the way they roll down miles of back roads to a highway, past rows of brown corn stalks. Big green harvesters slice through the fields, knocking the husks to the ground.

Emily Guskin contributed.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In his Sept. 13 op-ed, "Build the wall," Robert J. Samuelson came out in favor of building the Trump wall, though it might cost as much as $25 billion. A $20 billion fund for industrial development in Central America could eliminate the stream of illegal-**immigrant** job-seekers, help stabilize those countries and create a mass of Central American consumers of U.S. goods and services. Also, the jobs created "back home" might just persuade a lot of the 11 million illegal **immigrants** already here to "self-deport."

Details such as the need for corruption prevention might seem a bit neo-colonialist, but well-cultivated popular support should overcome objections to that and other necessary controls.

Bob Lindsey, Callao, Va.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NORTH LAS VEGAS — Subbing for a sick wife, former president Bill Clinton delivered a meandering, folksy speech in this presidential battleground state on Wednesday, arguing that Americans should choose "answers, not anger" and elect his spouse.

Over the course of about 40 minutes, the former president spoke dismissively of Hillary Clinton's email scandal, argued that Donald Trump's **immigration**proposals are misguided and suggested that the Republican nominee's call to "make America great again" was racially tinged code for rolling the clock back 50 years.

Clinton also reported that his wife, who was diagnosed Friday with pneumonia, is on the mend, only he referred to her as having the flu.

"She's feeling great, and I think she'll be back out there tomorrow," Clinton said of his wife, who plans to campaign Thursday in North Carolina. "It's a crazy time we live in, you know, when people think there's something unusual about getting the flu. Last time I checked, millions of people were getting it every year."

Speaking in a state that he carried twice but polls suggest is surprisingly tight this year, Clinton framed the election as a choice between a candidate who's served others her entire life and is offering solid policy proposals and one who is appealing to a sense of "road rage" in the country.

The former president said he understands the anger of Americans who haven't had a pay raise since the recession, and he said those frustrations are making people more resistant to **immigration** reform.

"People who are frustrated by the economic circumstances, and they need somebody to blame," he said.

But he ridiculed Trump's proposals to deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants** and build on a wall across the Mexican border.

"The worst thing we could do is spend that kind of money on a wall that would be better spent on bridges, roads and airports," Clinton said.

Speaking of Trump's slogan, "Make America Great Again," he said he was among those who knows what Trump really means — suggesting it's a reference to a time when the racial order in the country was different.

"You have to be a certain age, and it helps to be a white Southern man — I know what that means," he said.

The former president knocked the media for having spent so much time covering his wife's use of a private email server while secretary of state, a practice that he said has yielded nothing disqualifying.

Clinton pointed to a string of former Republican administration officials who have endorsed Hillary Clinton, an indication, he said, that there are no significant concerns about the national security implications of her email.

"So would they have endorsed her, no?" he said answering his own question.

Clinton's visit attracted a throng of television cameras to the College of Southern Nevada but he spoke in a relatively small room at the two-year college, located several miles north of the Las Vegas Strip. Only about 150 chairs were set up in a multipurpose room of the student lounge, leaving a long line of students and others outside the doors.

An aide said Hillary Clinton planned to visit the same college campus but that the campaign had looked at other options for the specific event site.

Hillary Clinton and Trump are locked in intense contest for the Silver State's six electoral votes, with recent polls showing a statistical dead heat and both making regular campaign stops. Clinton was last in the state late last month, delivering a blistering speech in Reno detailing Trump's ties to the alt-right, a movement she said is inspired by racism and other dark forces.

President Obama won here in 2012 over Republican Mitt Romney by nearly 7 percentage points, a margin that has many analysts puzzling over why polls suggest the race is much closer this time.

The state is home to sizable and growing population of Latinos that traditionally has broken heavily in favor of Democrats, and a Republican candidate who has taken a hard line on **immigration** issues.

A poll released earlier this week showed Clinton leading Trump in Nevada among Latinos, 65 percent to 19 percent — a smaller margin than Obama enjoyed over Romney in 2012, according to exit polls.

But 16 percent of Hispanics remained undecided in the Clinton-Trump race, according to the poll for Univision News by Bendixen & Amandi and the Tarrance Group. Democrats here express confidence that once those voters fully tune into the race they will side with Clinton.

Turnout remains a critical question, however, and it is unclear whether this year's election will energize Hispanic Americans here and elsewhere to vote at higher rates than in previous years, when fewer than half cast ballots.

But many Hispanics distrust Clinton, including in Nevada, where 49 percent said she is a liar in the Univision poll.

Nevada, meanwhile, has been slower than many to recover from the Great Recession. The state's unemployment rate remains among the highest in the nation, as does its share of homes with mortgages that are significantly underwater.

Trump has demonstrated an ability to tap into the economic anxiety of voters, particularly those in the working-class and in still-struggling areas of the country.

To this point, Clinton's campaign has invested far more heavily in the state, where Trump has a golden-glass hotel bearing his name in Las Vegas.

Television ads from the Clinton campaign and an allied super PAC aired repeatedly during most commercial breaks during a morning news cast here Wednesday, alternately casting Trump as unfit to be commander in chief and Clinton as someone who's wants to bridge the country's divides. Trump was absent from the airwaves.

Jessica Sanchez, an "American Idol" runner-up, warmed up the crowd for Bill Clinton, performing a song, "Stronger Together," that was written for Hillary Clinton's campaign and shares a title with her campaign slogan.

john.wagner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When the New York Post ran nude photos of Melania Trump on its cover in July, the newspaper inadvertently kicked off questions about how the Republican presidential nominee's wife **immigrated** to the United States. Donald Trump's campaign promised that it would hold a news conference to answer any outstanding questions about how Melania Trump became a citizen.

That news conference didn't happen, but on Wednesday Melania Trump tweeted a letter from an attorney who had reviewed her **immigration** paperwork that she said offered "100% certainty" that she had **immigrated** legally.

pic.twitter.com/GcJKb80k4H

Not quite.

We walked through some of the **immigration** questions earlier this month. Why did Trump say she had to return to her birth country of Slovenia to renew her visa? Who sponsored her green card? Was she working under an employer-sponsored visa? The attorney's letter offers answers to those questions, noting that Trump was here on an H-1B work-related visa that had to be renewed annually and that she self-sponsored her green card.

The questions about the former model's status arose when Politico noted that the photos the New York Post ran were taken in New York in 1995, according to the newspaper, and were published in the January 1996 issue of Max magazine, a now-defunct periodical from France. That's several months before then-Melania Knauss obtained a visa to be in the United States, as her attorney notes.

The attorney's counterargument is a simple one. "Because Mrs. Trump did not enter the United States until August 27, 1996," Michael Wildes wrote, "the allegation that she participated in a photo shoot in 1995 is not only untrue, it is impossible." Wildes confirmed that timeline "through an interview with Mrs. Trump."

The photographer who took those photos, Alé de Basse­ville, confirmed by phone that the New York Post's timing was incorrect. "That was a mistake from the Post," he told The Fix. Asked if the photos were taken in 1996, he said, simply, "yeah." The New York Post had called him while he was at a photo shoot on a French beach, he said, and he told them he didn't remember when the photos were taken.

What's more, the issue of the magazine in which the photos allegedly appeared in January 1996 was a year in review issue, according to a copy available for sale at France's version of eBay, making it more unlikely that Trump would have appeared.

That mystery solved, but some remain.

For example, Trump's attorney explains how she acquired her green card.

"Mrs. Trump did not acquire her green card through marriage," Wildes writes, countering a murky statement from a former Trump Organization attorney that implied the opposite. (Update: A reader notes that the former attorney was none other than Wildes himself, a detail I missed.) "Rather, in 2000, Mrs. Trump self-sponsored herself for a green card as a model of 'extraordinary ability,' and on March 19, 2001, she was admitted to the United States as a permanent resident."

"If she obtained her green card through the 'Extraordinary Ability' category what was the basis of her claim?" asks David Leopold, an **immigration** attorney who once served as president of the American **Immigration** Lawyers Association and who supports Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton. "The law requires a showing of sustained national or international acclaim and that her achievements have been recognized in her field. 'Extraordinary ability' is defined as 'a level of expertise indicating that the individual is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor."

To meet that qualification, Trump would have had to offer "evidence that the **alien** has sustained national or international acclaim and that his or her achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise." That can be something like a Nobel Prize, for example. Otherwise, there's a list of things from which Trump would have needed to demonstrate three examples. The list is not insignificant, requiring membership in organizations based on merit, leadership positions at distinguished organizations or publication "in major trade publications or other major media." Which of those boxes Trump checked isn't clear.

Leopold also noted that Trump's description of having to return to Slovenia each year to renew her visa, something that Wildes said was necessitated by her particular sort of visa, doesn't comport with his experience. As he noted, that's more common for a tourist visa.

"I think the way for the Trump campaign to resolve this is to release her **immigration** file," Leopold said in a phone interview. Donald Trump's emphasis on **immigration** since the first day of his campaign, Leopold argued, suggests that his wife must hit a higher bar of transparency on the subject.

Recent experience with the campaign suggests that a full revelation is unlikely. In the interim, the analysis from Melania Trump's lawyer does at least answer some questions.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**William A. Galston writes:

J.D. Vance, the author of the surprise best-seller "Hillbilly Elegy," writes about running into a hometown acquaintance who said he had quit his job because he was "sick of waking up early." Mr. Vance subsequently saw him complaining on Facebook about the " Obama economy." This man, he comments, is not a victim: His situation is "directly attributable to the choices he's made." But nothing in his environment forces him to look in the mirror and ask tough questions about himself. On the contrary, Mr. Vance insists: "There is a cultural movement in the white working class to blame problems on society or the government, and that movement gains adherents by the day."

Even worse, Donald Trump is saying it's the **immigrants**' fault. It's China's fault. It's "globalism," which means free international markets. It is almost as if these whiners would have preferred a left-wing agenda -- protectionism, nanny statism, unionism -- in order to prevent the "horrors" of creative destruction, affordable food and clothing, and unprecedented gains in the worldwide prosperity and life span.

It is, of course, lazy thinking and moral abdication to hold government responsible for your woes. After years of denying that minorities were entitled to perpetual victim status, they now demand it for white males. If you want families, communities and individuals to have the lead role in building a vibrant and prosperous economy, it is best not to infantilize them.

In addition to a nasty strain of racism and xenophobia (and economic illiteracy that would horrify Milton Friedman and Ronald Reagan), there is the matter of culture, something that used to concern conservatives before evangelicals decided to give Trump a bear hug.

Here Robert P. Jones has it right: The reduction of white Christian protestants to minority status has freaked out a good chunk of white America. Why must everyone say, "Happy holidays!"? Why can't we go back to the 1950s? It's the theme of loss -- which infers entitlement -- that permeates Trump's message. The apocalyptic vision of the end of America and bemoaning that Christianity is under assault bear virtually no relation to actual economic results or to flourishing Christian worship. It is rather a sort of primal scream in recognition that they no longer are demographically or culturally dominant. They aren't mad at government so much as they resent secularism, diversity and new demands (e.g. multi-lingualism, technological sophistication, willingness to move to where jobs are).

Even the search for the hidden white view is an expression of demographic denial. How can whites not be able to determine the president? They are entitled to a certain standard of living regardless of their education and skills. They are entitled to have everyone assume that everyone else is Christian. They are entitled to discriminate against gays. Actually, they are not.

America is defined by ideals, not race or religion. Ironically, these foundational beliefs are understood more thoroughly by **immigrants**, who have risked the security of staying put for the unknowns of a new country. It is the promise of self-realization, the freedom of self-expression and the right to be judged on who you are and not where you came from that define America. Conservatives who understand this look upon the blame-casters in horror as if the latter are pining for the Lost Cause, as the South did 150 years ago. A false memory built on white entitlement is not a sustainable vision for the party of Lincoln. Either they must go or the rest of the GOP must go its own way.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The United States has seen an extraordinary influx of **immigrants** in recent decades. In 1970, the foreign-born were only 4.7 percent of the nation. Now, they make up 13.7 percent of the population.

We've been here once before. As this chart from the Census Bureau shows, the flow of newcomers over the past century resembles the letter U. Between 1840 and 1920, the nation experienced an even larger **immigration** surge. By the early 1900s, nearly 15 percent of U.S. residents had been born in a different country.

Then, as now, not everyone was pleased with the way the nation was changing. A growing nativist movement lobbied — often violently, and often in racist terms — for laws to close the borders. This xenophobic uproar culminated in the Emergency Quota Act of 1921, which capped the number of people that could arrive each year.

By the time the baby boomers were growing up, the **immigrant** presence in the United States was reaching its lowest ebb. But their children — especially today's millennials — were born into a more welcoming climate. In 1965, spurred by the civil rights movement, Congress softened its racist restrictions on **immigration**, causing the foreign-born population to increase again.

The abrupt change in policy created a generational divide. Those who came of age in the 1990s were roughly three times more likely than their parents to encounter peers who were **immigrants** or the children of **immigrants**.

This may help explain why younger generations tend to be much more accepting of **immigrants**. The Public Religion Research Institute, for instance, finds that 68 percent of young adults say that **immigrants** strengthen American society, while only 42 percent of their elders agree.

With the foreign-born population projected to reach record levels in the coming years, **immigration** has again become a front-and-center political issue, just as it was over a century ago. But there are signs that this time is different.

Though Donald Trump has made anti-**immigrant** policies a cornerstone of his campaign, most of his stances don't seem to resonate with younger voters. In fact, a new poll of 18- to 30-year-olds shows that millennials are rapidly becoming even more welcoming toward **immigrants**.

Just in the past three years, there have been startling shifts in how 18- to 30- year-olds feel about the foreign-born, according to a comparison of two identically worded polls from the Black Youth Project at the University of Chicago and the AP-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research.

"It's a really big increase," said Jon Rogowski, an assistant professor of government at Harvard and co-author on the report. "Young adults are becoming substantially more supportive of progressive and comprehensive solutions to the **immigration** problem."

The greatest changes have been among white non-Hispanic millennials, who now overwhelmingly support laws that would help **immigrants** stay in the country.

\* Between 2013 and 2016, their support for a path to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants** increased from 67 percent to 84 percent.

\* About 69 percent of them now say that undocumented citizens should get citizenship if they graduate from college, up from 53 percent in 2013.

\* And 71 percent want an expanded guest worker program, up from 60 percent three years ago.

The data also shows that white non-Hispanic millennials are also starting to view **immigration** itself in more positive ways.

\* 49 percent of them say that **immigrants** "take jobs, housing and health care from people born in the U.S." — down from 59 percent in 2013.

\* Nearly 60 percent of them say that **immigrants** are changing the American way of life for the better, up from 44 percent in 2013.

On most of these issues, white millennials are catching up to black millennials, who were generally more accepting of **immigrants** both in 2013 and 2016. But even among young black adults, support for **immigration** increased on certain questions.

"The data suggests that the next majority coalition will be progressive whites and people of color," Rogowski says.

How is it that millennials seem to be changing their minds so quickly? There are two major explanations.

First, younger generations have grown up with more diversity, so they likely feel more comfortable with **immigrants** in general. This is a version of what psychologists call the contact hypothesis — the idea that people become less prejudiced when they spend more time with other groups.

"Young people in the United States, in many places, are just growing up in fundamentally more diverse localities," says Irene Bloemraad, a sociologist at the University of California at Berkeley. "If you're going to school with people who have **immigrant** parents, if they seem like good kids and they're you're friends, then worries about **immigrants** taking jobs are maybe less salient."

"That doesn't mean it's all sunshine and roses in schools — it's obviously not," she continued. "But it's a different experience for younger people than for people in prior generations."

On the other hand, Bloemraad says, demographic changes are not all that swift; and many children still live in segregated neighborhoods. So the contact hypothesis might not fully explain why young people have shifted their views on **immigration** in the last three years.

Another theory is that the current presidential campaign could have affected how young people answered the survey, which was most recently administered in August. Donald Trump has been widely accused of racism for his comments describing Mexican **immigrants** as "rapists" and his calls to ban Muslims from entering the United States. His inflammatory rhetoric may have caused some millennials to distance themselves from him and his views on **immigration**.

"When politicians are vocal on an issue, it can trigger people to think about their own positions, and maybe reconsider them," said Claudia Sandoval, a political scientist at Loyola Marymount University who studies perceptions of **immigrants**. "I think hearing all of the xenophobia has caused people to question what they themselves thought about **immigrants** in the past."

"This may be one of the positive things that come out of Trump being so critical of **immigrants**," she said.

So far, Donald Trump has made two kinds of arguments against **immigration**. He has described **immigrants** as criminal and economic threats; and he has railed against the undocumented as an offense to law and order, calling for mass deportations and increased border security.

On that latter point, Trump seems to have more support among young adults. Nearly 90 percent of white millennials and three-quarters of black millennials want employers to screen and reject undocumented **immigrants**. Two-thirds of white millennials want more border enforcement; 51 percent still support deporting all **immigrants** "living in this country illegally," down from nearly 60 percent in 2013.

But at the same time, the data suggests that younger generations increasingly believe that **immigrants** are helping the nation, not harming it.

The United States is fast approaching levels of **immigration** that it hasn't seen in over a century. The last time the percentage of foreign-born residents was this high, in the early 1900s, people were making eerily similar objections. They complained that **immigrants** were stealing jobs, refusing to assimilate, and darkening the moral character of the nation.

Donald Trump has accused Mexico of sending "criminals" across the border. Over a century ago, when the nation faced a swell of **immigrants** from southern Europe, a Congressional joint task force concluded that "certain kinds of criminality are inherent in the Italian race."

Preston F. Hall, the secretary of the **Immigration** Restriction League, likened the **immigrants** to barbarians. "They are the defective and delinquent classes of Europe — the individuals who have not been able to keep the pace at home and have fallen into the lower strata of civilization," he wrote in 1912.

Such arguments proved persuasive back then; but as these polls show, young people are much more accepting of diversity these days — and, perhaps, much more skeptical of anything that sounds like bigotry or racism.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This story has been updated.

Melania Trump, the wife of Republican nominee Donald Trump, released a letter from an attorney on Wednesday that includes more details about her **immigration** to the United States from Slovenia in the 1990s but provides no documentation and leaves some key questions unanswered.

"I am pleased to enclose a letter from my **immigration** attorney which states that, with 100% certainty, I correctly went through the legal process when arriving in the USA," Melania Trump said in a statement posted on Twitter on Wednesday morning.

The letter was written by Michael J. Wildes, an **immigration** attorney whose New York-based law firm has done work over the past decade for some of Donald Trump's companies, including Trump Models and the Miss Universe Organization, but has not previously represented Melania Trump.

Wildes writes that news reports that Trump illegally used a tourist visa to work as a model in the United States in 1995 "are not supported by the record, and are therefore completely without merit." He states that Trump was never in the United States in 1995, so it would have been "impossible" for her to have participated in a photo shoot in New York that year, as has been reported. That photo shoot occurred in October 1996 after Trump received a proper work visa, according to Trump.

Wildes lays out this timeline: Trump first entered the United States on Aug. 27, 1996, using a B-1/B-2 visitor visa. On Oct. 18, 1996, Trump received a H-1B visa from the U.S. Embassy in Slovenia to work as a model. Trump received five H1-B visas between October 1996 and 2001, and each visa was good for up to one year. In 2000, Trump self-sponsored herself for a green card based on her "extraordinary ability" as a model. On March 19, 2001, Trump became a lawful permanent resident and a green-card-holder who would be eligible for citizenship in 2006. (The Trumps married in January 2005.)

While the attorney's letter provided new details of Trump's **immigration** history, the Trump campaign released no documents to support the attorney's timeline. Notably, Wildes provided no details about how Trump proved to the U.S. government that she qualified as a model of "extraordinary ability" when she applied for her green card in 2000.

The United States reserves the "extraordinary ability" designation for those who are "among the small percentage of individuals that have risen to the very top of your field" and that applicants "must demonstrate sustained national or international acclaim." Experts say the green card category is used by people with exceptional and renown talent, including those who win Nobel Prizes and Oscars. In 2000, Trump was a working model best known for her relationship with Donald Trump, but she was not a top international model.

The letter indicates that Trump first came to the United States on a visitor's visa in August 1996 before receiving a work visa in October 1996. Any work she performed for money between those dates might have violated the terms of her visitor's visa. Wildes's letter does not indicate how Trump supported herself between those dates.

**Immigration** attorney Bruce Morrison, who wrote the "extraordinary ability" provision of federal law when he was a Democratic congressman from Connecticut, said it was known as the "Einstein category."

"It wasn't always good enough be a player in the starting lineup of major league baseball, you had to be the most valuable player. The expectation was that you had to be truly extraordinary in your field," Morrison said, adding: "If someone came to me with her ability, I would be dubious that she would get it."

Morrison, who supports Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, said the refusal to provide documentation on his wife's **immigration** status was part of a pattern for Trump, who has also declined to release his tax records, charitable giving details and other personal information. "These are the people who harassed the president for this birth certificate," he said.

The reference by Wildes to the disputed date of a photo shoot stems from nude photographs of Melania Trump published in July by the New York Post, which many media outlets reported had been taken in 1995 in New York City. Those reports led **immigration** activists to ask how she could have been working legally for a magazine in 1995 if she got her work visa in 1996.

Marc Dolisi, former editor of the now defunct men's magazine, Max, told the Washington Post in August that the photos were published in the magazine's February 1996 edition. He said it appeared on newsstands in the middle of January 1996 and therefore had been shot sometime in late 1995.

But in recent days when contacted again, Dolisi said he made a mistake and that the photos were published in the February 1997 edition. The Post has not been able to locate a copy of the magazine.

Rosalind S. Helderman contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a presidential race that features two candidates with unusually high negatives, there's a school of thought out there that whoever wins will not come into office in January with a mandate to get much done.

Even if Hillary Clinton wins by a comfortable margin in the Electoral College, the thinking goes, Republicans will be able to write off the result as a repudiation of Donald Trump rather than an embrace of the Democratic candidate's priorities.

Clinton's running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, pushed back against that notion in an interview, expressing optimism about a new administration's ability to promote investments in infrastructure and **immigration** reform, among other initiatives.

"I look at it a little bit differently," said Kaine, a senator from Virginia. "Assuming we win, and assuming that a lot of people say, 'Well, that was just because Donald Trump was a bad candidate,' I think at the point the GOP will be in a position where there will be pressure on their shoulders to show 'we're not the Donald Trump party, we're a party that has responsible ideas and can behave responsibly.'"

"I think that will provide an opportunity to actually do some things right out of the gate," Kaine said. "We'll want to do things for the American public, and the GOP will want to do things for the American public, and I think that there's going to be a real opportunity at the beginning of a Clinton administration to try to do some good things and then fight about who gets credit for them rather than doing the traditional thing of fighting about who gets blame for not enough happening."

Those "good things," Kaine said, include a major investment in the country's long-neglected infrastructure, a proposal Clinton has touted on the campaign trail for months, arguing it will produce a wave of new jobs.

"Mayors and governors of both parties want us to do it," Kaine said. "Organized labor wants us to do it. Financial institutions, knowing that interest rates are low, always say that is the best time to do capital investments."

In the interview last weekend, Kaine also offered an optimistic scenario for action on **immigration** reform, an issue that has paralyzed Congress.

"I think there are some real prospects because I think the election is going to be such a clear mandate," he said, offering a choice between Clinton's plans to develop a path toward citizenship for undocumented citizens and Trump's emphasis on "build the wall" and deportation.

"I think there's going to be a mandate for comprehensive reform, and I think, you know, smart Republican leaders like [House] Speaker [Paul] Ryan will understand that you can't just be on the wrong side of all new Americans and have a great path forward to winning races. So I just think that there's going to be an opportunity to do something meaningful on **immigration** reform for the first time since 1986, early in the administration."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has said hundreds of times — including after meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto a couple weeks back — that Mexico will pay for his proposed border wall.

Not even Trump's supporters believe that will happen.

A new poll from The Washington Post and ABC News shows just 21 percent of Americans think Trump will make good on his long-promised pledge to force Mexico to pay for a wall that is aimed at keeping its own residents out of the United States.

Fully three quarters — 76 percent — say he won't accomplish it.

Even a majority of Republicans think Trump will fail on one of his signature policy initiatives, with 52 percent saying he won't be able to get it done, compared with 42 percent who think he will. Among Americans who say they are voting for Trump in the poll, 48 percent say he'll succeed, and 44 percent say he'll fail.

Hispanics find the idea particularly preposterous. Fully 88 percent of them say Trump won't be able to do it; 10 percent say he'll get it done.

And this poll might actually be somewhat understating just how little Trump's supporters actually buy into the idea. A CNN-Opinion Research showed 25 percent said it was at least "somewhat likely" he would get Mexico to pay for the wall. But it also offered more than just two options, and it turns out just 9 percent thought it "very likely" that he would succeed — including just 18 percent of Republicans and 20 percent of Trump voters.

The proposal has been among the most talked-about Trump proposals of the campaign, in large part because it seems so dubious on its face. But as the media and opponents have largely laughed it off, Trump has doubled down over and over again. It even became a call-and-response at his rallies, with Trump saying, "Who's gong to pay for the wall?" and his supporters responding, "Mexico!"

But last month, Trump indicated he might be softening his **immigration** proposals, then met with Peña Nieto.

Trump said after the meeting that the two men hadn't discussed payment for the wall, which seemed to be a notable omission given how much the GOP nominee has been pressing the issue on the campaign trail. Peña Nieto said soon after that meeting that he did, in fact, tell Trump that Mexico wouldn't pay for the wall. (Trump later disagreed with that account.)

Hours after that meeting, Trump gave a fiery speech calling for massive increases in illegal **immigration** enforcement — and, of course, a wall paid for by Mexico.

"One hundred percent," Trump said. "They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for it. And they're great people and great leaders, but they're going to pay for the wall."

Trump might want to tell that to his supporters — or at least, the ones who don't attend his rallies.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Hillary Clinton said last week that half of Donald Trump's supporters could be put in what she calls "the basket of deplorables," she enraged the political right, and Trump himself.

Clinton has since retracted the word "half" -- but she seems to be standing by the rest of her assertion that a significant number of Trump's supporters are, specifically, racist, sexist, xenophobic and Islamophobic.

So what does the data tell us, for example, about how Trump supporters actually feel about people from other countries, or about Islam? The 2016 PRRI/Brookings Institution **Immigration** Report shows that about 50 percent of Americans say they are bothered when they come into contact with **immigrants** who speak little or no English. That number jumps to 77 percent, more than three-quarters of Trump supporters, who say they're bothered when they meet **immigrants** who speak little or no English.

The PRRI/Brookings **immigration** report also shows that 57 percent of Americans said they believe that Islam is at odds with American values. That number for Trump supporters jumps to more than 8 in 10, or 83 percent

So it's clear there is a bit of a divide on some of these thorny issues between Trump voters and voters overall. But the big question is how many Trump supporters might actually hold the views that might be labeled objectively 'deplorable.' A related question: whether Clinton's comments could actually alienate anyone but those who weren't ever planning to support her to begin with.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was late afternoon on Monday when the Great Falls family of five piled into their minivan and headed for the Virginia countryside and an experience that Mohamed Elsanousi and his wife, Hanane Elabbassi, hoped their children would carry with them forever.

They had gone to a huge Eid al-Adha prayer service at the Dulles Expo Center and then a lavish holiday brunch with friends, and now they were going to roll up their sleeves and reenact a centuries-old religious tradition — sacrificing a sheep in the way that Islam prescribes.

Past the horse farms, cornstalks and the occasional Trump sign they drove, and then, suddenly, there it was: the "Halal Farm" sign, with another one beside it that said "Eid Mubarak" — a blessed holiday — in hand-painted Arabic. Behind the farmhouse, near the gravelly road, there were dozens of cars, the smoke of a few barbecue picnics, a pen full of sheep and goats, and a wooden shed where one family at a time could lead their selected animal. With the help of the farmer and butchers, they would perform the rite that commemorates Ibrahim (also known as Abraham) following God's command to sacrifice his own son, only to have God replace the boy with a ram at the last minute.

As the country's Muslim population grows, so too do the opportunities for Muslims to establish new faith traditions, blending ancient rituals with the latest American ways. The observant now can opt to slaughter their sheep for the holiday on a growing roster of farms; they can purchase organic, grass-fed meat for their feast from a green halal grocer, send money to a charity that will hand out food to the poor in inner-city Baltimore or attend an LGBT holiday barbecue in New York.

For **immigrants**, the trip to the country to slaughter the animal is a means of establishing authenticity to heritage as they assimilate into suburbs and cities, send their kids to public schools and soccer camps, and go through the daily rituals of being American.

Elsanousi and Elabbassi's brood is the embodiment of that hybridization. They're a multi­racial, multilingual family with **immigrant** roots and a deep commitment to the melting pot.

Elsanousi grew up in Sudan; Elabbassi in Morocco. They met as students at Indiana University. He now runs a nonprofit group in the District that promotes interfaith peace-building around the world; she's been the den leader of their 11-year-old son's Cub Scout troop. At home they speak a mix of English and Arabic with their three American-born children; the Arabic, too, is a hybrid of the distinctive Sudanese and Moroccan dialects.

Being part of a religious minority carries challenges; Eid is not a national holiday here, so parents and children often take just one day for a festival that can stretch to several in their homelands. But many say that status also inspires an appreciation of customs that can seem at risk of extinction after **immigration**.

"We took it for granted growing up," Elabbassi said. Rituals here take special effort. "As Muslims in the West, I want them to build childhood memories that help them to identify as Muslim Americans."

‘So many people want camel’

There have long been American farms willing to sell their sheep and space to Muslims to perform the sacrifice on Eid, ranging from large-scale slaughterhouse operations like the one Elsanousi's family visited last year, to Amish farms in western Pennsylvania. Muslims and religious leaders say the number is growing to accommodate a growing Muslim population.

But finding one can still feel daunting. "You have to call a farm, and say you want to do this. It's sort of like, 'You want to do what? But you have to call the Jewish guy,' " said Oz Sultan, who lives in Harlem in New York. If the farm agrees, you still "have to go and catch the animal, subdue the animal," he said.

Or, he joked, "you can hire a thousand artisanal hipsters to do it for you."

Sensing a need, Mian Ajmal Shah, a Pakistani **immigrant** with no previous farming experience, opened his halal farm in Catlett, Va., six years ago, catering to a Muslim clientele that needs sheep and goats for holidays, births, weddings and other celebrations.

Day one of the holiday, Shah and his team helped customers slaughter sheep and goats. On days two and three, he's offering cows as well. And customers are clamoring for more. "So many people want camel," he said. "It's very tender — but we don't have camel."

Technically, it's not necessary for Muslims — or anyone — to travel to a farm to kill a livestock animal. Federal law provides that individuals can slaughter their own animal on their own property, if they so desire. In Muslim-majority countries, courtyards and rooftops are often equipped for such events with drainage holes and faucets.

But with Muslims making up only around 1 percent of the U.S. population, at a time when verbal and physical assaults on Muslims are spiking, and with many Americans squeamish about animal slaughters in general, a farm can seem like the safest option.

Halal, like kosher slaughter, requires that the animal be subdued, but not stunned, before its death. The butcher makes a swift cut through the major artery and vein in the neck, and then the animal is meant to bleed out before being carved, according to both customs. There is a lot of blood, and sometimes the animal kicks involuntarily near the end.

"Uninitiated, it's not something that you would want to have done on your property and have neighbors see it," said Edward Mills, an associate professor of meat science at Penn State University.

That's how Elabbassi felt about her two youngest, Anas, 5, and Jude, 4, when it was finally the family's turn to lead their sheep into the shed. "Come on," she said, leading them away. Nabeel, 11, who his parents said had dissected a squid with his fifth-grade class last year, got to stay behind with his two older cousins to watch.

The parents believe in introducing their kids to the customs slowly, and with consideration of age. "Later, inshallah, she'll cherish these memories," Elabbassi said as Jude stuck a hand through the pen's fence to pet a goat. "I just want her to remember that this is a special day, not an ordinary day."

Options for observance

Charitable giving is a crucial part of Eid observance, but not everyone's practice is the same.

At the farm, where everyone seemed to be sharing, Elsanousi and Elabbassi's family munched on barbecued kebabs and watermelon slices while they waited for Shah's staff to carve up their sheep, and planned to give their own meat — which they later packed into a cooler full of ice for the ride home — to a couple of single mothers they know and to host a dinner party next weekend.

There are also a huge number of people, religious leaders say, who observe the holiday in different ways, and their options are growing too.

"There's a mix for sure," Rizwan Jaka, outreach director of the All Dulles Area Muslim Society Center, said of family Eid practice and celebrations. Some pay a charity overseas to slaughter an animal on their behalf and distribute the meat to the poor. Some purchase meat from a halal butcher, sometimes relying on their mosque to distribute the portion to the needy.

Syed Saboor and his wife in Westchester, N.Y., have removed animal sacrifice from their holiday tradition entirely, although the Saboors have gotten in the habit of throwing a massive annual potluck.

While Eid in Pakistan was always a family affair growing up, in New York, it has become a festival to share with friends — 120 on this year's guest list. The children decorate the house and help prepare traditional Pakistani fare. "It's kind of nice to know that others feel that our open house is a tradition for them, too," Saboor said.

By nightfall on Monday, the first of Eid's three days, Elsanousi and Elabbassi finally were ready to head home. They needed to stop first at another cousin's barbecue in Gainesville, Va., where a relative declared "You're late!" as they walked up to a cluster of picnic tables in the dark.

And then finally it was back onto Interstate 66 and up their quiet driveway. It was a school night, after all, and time for bed.

abigail.hauslohner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's outreach is a dud. Hillary "Clinton is far ahead among Latino voters in Arizona, Colorado, Florida and Nevada, with her biggest lead at 50 percentage points in Arizona and smallest in Florida, where she's ahead by 24 points, according to a new poll for Univision News by Bendixen & Amandi and the Tarrance Group."

Actually it was a total flop, even a boon to Clinton. "A new poll from the Washington Post and ABC News shows Donald Trump's **immigration** proposals are hugely unpopular with the American people — so much so that Trump actually appears to be increasing sympathy for **immigrants** and depressing support for his harsh enforcement techniques."

His boasts about his generosity have blown up in his face as we learn more about his foundation. "Don't fall for Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's smirking dismissal of his illegal campaign contribution to a political action committee supporting Florida's attorney general. His campaign calls it a 'clerical error,' but it was an illegal contribution, and he knows it."

Once again Kellyanne Conway bombs when she tries to explain Trump's chicanery. "'This is badgering': Trump campaign manager comes unglued when CNNasks for proof of charity claims."

Moderators' attempt to eschew fact-checking falls flat. Jon Ralston: "The notion that the moderator should allow falsities or mischaracterizations to go unchallenged means that he or she is superfluous and Pat Sajak may as well read the questions over a loudspeaker. That's not what journalism is. Or at least it shouldn't be. That's not what moderating means. Or at least it shouldn't be."

Trump's foreign policy misses the mark. Former CIA director Michael Hayden: "There are strange echoes between president Obama's campaign in 2008 and Mr. Donald Trump's campaign now with regard to, I will talk to anybody, and with regard to American retrenchment, and there are echoes between the two campaign and specifically with regard to what Mr. Pence said, Gov. Pence said, Donald Trump has yet to express a condition which he would impose on Vladimir Putin for which he demands Putin's actions before he gets a better relationship with the United States. If he says nice about me, I will say nice about him, and that's not a winning hand."

Trump's "free" childcare backfires. Actual conservatives hate it: "How will they pay for it? They'll pay for it by taking money away from the unemployed and give it to new mothers. Not only does this open the GOP up to a new class warfare line of attack, but it establishes precedent within the GOP that government imposed maternity leave is a good thing. It further sets precedent in the GOP that its leaders support 'free' everything. It is worth noting that the policy proposal comes from Ivanka Trump, who is a friend of Chelsea Clinton and a major donor to the Democratic Party as is her husband."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For readers who may be interested, here is my schedule of speaking engagements over the next three months. All of these events are open to the public, unless otherwise noted. If you can attend one or more of these events, please come up and introduce yourself. I am always happy to meet Volokh Conspiracy readers!

September 14, noon to 1 PM, George Mason University, Scalia Law School, Arlington, VA: Debate on executive power over **immigration**, and United States v. Texas (with Prof. Josh Blackman). I outlined my views on this issue here.

Sept. 15, 2:15-3:30 PM, Cato Constitution Day, Cato Institute, Washington, DC: Panel on property rights. I will be speaking on the Supreme Court's recent decision in US Army Corps of Engineers v. Hawkes, and on the future of constitutional property rights more generally.

Sept. 16, 12:10-1:30, Yale Law School, New Haven, CT, Room 120: Debate On Abuses of Executive Power over national security and foreign affairs. With Faiza Patel, Christopher Schroeder, and Nathan Sales Sponsored by the Yale American Constitution Society and the Yale Federalist Society.

Sept. 20, 11:30 AM-12:50 PM, University of Virginia School of Law, Charlottesville, VA: "Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter" (based on the much-expanded new edition of my book, of the same title). Sponsored by the UVA Federalist Society. With commentary by University of Virginia Prof. Daniel Ortiz.

Oct. 13, 12-1 PM (tentative time), University of Colorado Law School, Boulder, Co: ""The Free Market, Conservative Case for Open Borders **Immigration**." I wrote about this issue here." Sponsored by the University of University Federalist Society.

Oct. 21, 9-10:15 AM, 13th Annual Brigham-Kanner Property Rights Conference, The Hague, the Netherlands: Panel on "Eminent Domain and Expropriation as Wealth Redistribution Tools." With James Burling, Prof. James Ely, and Prof. Alexandra Klass.

Oct. 25, 6-7:30 PM, Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, Institute of Politics Forum, Cambridge, MA: "Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter" (based on the much-expanded new edition of my book, of the same title).

Oct. 27, 12-1 PM, DePaul University College of Law, Chicago, IL: "The Free Market, Conservative Case for Open Borders **Immigration**." Sponsored by the DePaul Federalist Society. I wrote about this issue here.

Oct. 27, 5-6:15 PM, John Marshall Law School, Chicago, IL: "Fisher v. Texas and the Future of Affirmative Action." I wrote about the Fisher II decision here. Sponsored by the John Marshall Federalist Society.

Oct. 28, noon-1:15, Northwestern University, Pritzker School of Law, Chicago, IL: "The Grasping Hand: Kelo v. City of New London and the Limits of Eminent Domain." Based on my book of the same title.

November 1, 5:30-7:15 PM, Connecticut Supreme Court Historical Society, Hartford Club, Hartford, CT: "Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter" (based on the much-expanded new edition of my book, of the same title).

November 19, 11 AM-12:30 PM, Federalist Society National Lawyers Convention, Washington, DC: Panel on "Justice Scalia's Property Rights Jurisprudence." With Prof. John Echeverria (U of Vermont), Prof. James Ely (Vanderbilt), and Prof. Roderick Hills (NYU). I wrote about Justice Scalia's property rights jurisprudence here. This event requires paid registration, though it is free to members of the media.

Nov. 22, 3:30-5:30 PM, Georgetown University Law Center, Constitutional Law Colloquium on Recent Books on the Constitution: "The Grasping Hand: Kelo v. City of New London and the Limits of Eminent Domain." Based on my book of the same title. This talk is, I believe, limited to participants in the Georgetown Constitutional Law Colloquium.

UPDATE: In the original version of this post, I accidentally indicated that my October 13 talk was at the University of Denver rather than the University of Colorado, where it actually will be. I apologize for the mistake, which has now been corrected.

UPDATE #2: I have added an additional speaking engagement at the Harvard University Institute of Politics Forum, on Oct. 25.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ASHEVILLE, N.C. — As thousands of Donald Trump's supporters left his rally here this week, they were greeted by protesters who accused them of being, among other things, racist, hateful and uneducated.

"Grow a brain, b----!" one protester shouted at a Trump backer. Another pointed at rallygoers and yelled: "Racist a------s!" A third held a sign that read: "Make racists afraid again."

Then they chanted in unison: "Love trumps hate! Love trumps hate! Love trumps hate!"

"They have these vulgar signs, yet they're screaming about love," said Lisa Jones, 51, a Trump supporter from Hendersonville, N.C. "And we're the ones that are intolerant? We're deplorable and intolerant? Well, we just found out that we're deplorable. We thought that we were just intolerant."

Many rallygoers here in this mountain town Monday evening shrugged off Hillary Clinton's controversial remark that "half" of Trump's supporters belong in a "basket of deplorables" because they are "racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic, you name it." While the Democratic candidate has expressed regret for using the word "half," she has not abandoned her assertion that some of Trump's supporters are truly deplorable.

"It made me feel real little," said John Warren, 72, of Asheville, who wore a camouflage "Make America Great Again" cap. "That she was downplaying us. I mean, we are voters and, you know, we respect her. But not in the position she is running for."

Many Trump supporters say they have been called much worse for their views on same-sex marriage, abortion, transgender rights, Syrian refugees, illegal **immigration** and race relations. Like the Republican nominee, they say they aren't afraid to say politically incorrect things and no amount of name-calling from liberals is going to change that.

"One man's steak is another man's baloney," said a 62-year-old salesman from Tennessee who said he was proud to have sold 14 Confederate flags outside the rally but did not want his name published. "Just like a woman: I mean, I might say she's beautiful. The next guy might say she's ugly. You know what I'm saying?"

A 43-year-old construction project manager dressed up as a "deplorable," putting a laundry basket over his head. Another man carried a sign reading: "Deplorable lives matter." As two young men left the rally, one turned to the other and said, "Okay, Dan, let's go be deplorable."

During the event, former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani joked that Clinton had mentioned "some phobics I've never heard of" and that "maybe the claustrophobics are for Trump." Trump pulled supporters on stage to share their thoughts, concluding: "These are not deplorable people. That I can tell you."

The Trump campaign has focused heavily on the "deplorables" theme as a way to paint Clinton as elitist and out of touch, but it has also stumbled into its own problems with the issue.

Trump's eldest son, Donald Trump Jr., posted a picture labeled "The Deplorables" on Instagram over the weekend that placed his father and several Trump surrogates alongside conspiracy theorist Alex Jones and a cartoon character, Pepe the Frog, associated with the online white nationalist alt-right movement. Trump's running mate, Mike Pence has refused to use the word "deplorable" to describe former Ku Klux Klan leader and Trump supporter David Duke, though he said Tuesday that he and Donald Trump disavow Duke.

The Clinton campaign points to such incidents, as well as polls showing that many Trump supporters harbor prejudiced views of nonwhites, as evidence that many Trump backers are indeed deplorable.

At the Monday night rally, one protester held a sign that read "Deplorable Trump misleads good people."

Some here acknowledged that a small fraction of Trump backers could be seen as having deplorable views, but they added that every movement has a fringe.

"Some of them are, but I am a common-sense, logical person," said Joe Pruden, 26, a plumber from Asheville, whose girlfriend's weight was mocked by a protester.

He continued: "Trump supporters, they're on the defense, and I've been talking to other conservatives and saying, 'Hey, we need to start standing up, man.' We are done being bullied into a corner by these liberal, left-wing, progressive Nazi foot soldiers."

Kathy Campbell, 40, said Trump could avoid some of the criticism by more carefully choosing his words.

"Trump has a way about him that comes off sounding mean and hateful," said Campbell, who lives in North Carolina's Rutherford County and originally supported Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.). "I don't care for his tone sometimes because I think you catch more flies with honey."

Campbell likes that Trump would crack down on illegal **immigration** and the public aid undocumented workers receive. She said her children were on Medicaid for a total of 20 years and, as a single mother, she needed the assistance of food stamps for five years, even though she was working full time.

"The women who are sitting on their asses at home that can work, and they keep having baby after baby after baby just so they can keep getting more and more food stamps? They're abusing the system," Campbell said.

She added: "I'm a deplorable. Whatever. I'm also called narrow-minded. You know what? There is so much talk about tolerance. Where's the tolerance for me as a Christian? Where's the tolerance for me as a Republican? There's none."

This sentiment is common among conservatives here in North Carolina, where Republican lawmakers sparked a national backlash by enacting legislation that weakened anti-discrimination protections for gays and lesbians and that requires transgender people to use public restrooms that correspond to the gender on their birth certificates.

Shannon Niven, a 40-year-old nursing student and mother of two from Transylvania County, said Trump supporters like her are educated and accepting — but tired of having the values of others forced upon their lives. She said the debate over the rights of transgender people, who she believes have a "mental illness," shows how much society has changed in the past decade or two.

"Let a man come into the bathroom with my little girl, and he may not make it out," she said. "North Carolina — we're conservative, we're Christian, but we're also a little crazy, and we will defend ourselves."

The supporters and protesters who showed up to the rally had mostly made up their minds about the election, but each side tried to sway the other anyway. Brenda Lilly, a Clinton backer who teaches in Asheville, chatted with a young couple outside the event and tried to warn them about Trump.

"He is a racist. He's a racist. What makes you think that he's not?" Lilly said, giving a few examples, including Trump's proposed ban on Muslims.

"It's only temporary," the teenage girl, who will not be old enough to vote in November, said as she held a Trump flag over her head.

"Temporary! That's what they said about Jews in Germany," Lilly responded. "Please, read your history. I beg you."

Lilly also debated with Michelle Visconte, 47, who says Trump was right to label illegal **immigrants** as rapists and criminals.

"I dated Hispanic men all of my life, and now I'm just like, I'm done. I'm done," Visconte said. "Because you know what? They're here to bleed us and take advantage of whatever they can get."

"No, they're not," said Lilly, who lived in California for 27 years before recently returning to North Carolina. "Were all of your boyfriends rapists and criminals?"

"Not every one. I had a couple good ones," Visconte said.

"Were they all criminals?" Lilly asked.

"No," Visconte replied. "Wait a minute, wait a minute: Yes, they were criminals if they came over to the United States illegally. That's a criminal."

Conversations like this exasperated Lilly and confirmed what she had suspected.

"Quite frankly, I think 50 percent could be a small percentage," she said of the size of the "basket of deplorables." "These people are nuts. And I don't think they all are. I think there probably are some fine people."

After the rally, arguments between supporters and protesters continued. Two younger demonstrators got into a nasty yelling match with an older man wearing a profane pro-Trump T-shirt; they all took videos of one another saying or doing unkind things. Friends intervened and a police officer begged, "Please, just be nice."

Later, as a young man wearing an "Obama can't ban these guns" tank top flexed his muscles for a photo, a young female protester threw a cup of water on him and ran away. As he pulled the wet shirt off, he yelled, "That f---ing b----!"

As the two sides exchanged nasty words, an older activist took the lead in denouncing the Trump supporters, while a motherly woman leaving the rally urged the young men to go home before a fight broke out. She then turned to the gray-haired protester and asked why he was trying to incite a fight.

"They need to be called out," he said. "They need to be called out for their racism."

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

Sean Sullivan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A reservation at the new Trump International Hotel in the nation's capital will carry lots of baggage this fall — and not just the kind you would need to haul around the $700 (at least) a night it is going to cost to stay at the swish new place.

Emotionally and politically, the hotel that bears Donald Trump's name and opened Monday inside the Old Post Office Pavilion is already sparking fireworks. And protests right in front of the place.

Stay at a Marriott. Book a Hyatt. So what? But consider a reservation at a Trump place — Hotels.com has the D.C. property just down the street from the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue at $761 for Saturday night — and it gets all kinds of complicated. Endorse the Republican presidential nominee's hotel?

"Never. Nope. Not a chance," said Becky Acton, who raised her middle finger at the place as she biked by Sunday night, on the eve of its soft opening. "I would never stay there. No matter what it costs."

What about its bar, where wine is sold by the spoon? Or the daily Champagne sabering, where bottles are opened by sword?

"No interest," she said.

Acton is visiting the District from Columbia, Mo. And she stopped to gape at the Trump hotel as construction workers — many of them Latinos who have been on the receiving end of Trump's slurs against **immigrants** — rushed around in the dark, tile saws screaming when they cut marble outside the front doors in the final, frantic preparations.

She shook her head as she pedaled away.

The Klyder family had a different take.

"It's beautiful, like a castle," said Emily Klyder, 11, as she photobombed her mom's numerous pictures of the hotel Sunday night.

The hotel, for them, is a symbol of what Trump can do for America — bring jobs, glamour and decadent elegance to a mothballed government building.

The family, in town from Gaylord, Mich., said they opted for a cheaper place outside the District on their trip to see the sights.

But once they saw the Trump hotel, they rethought everything, despite the crazy expensive room rates.

"I might spend that, to make a statement," said John Klyder, a hotel owner himself who said he is voting for Trump in the November election.

"He's better than the alternative," said his wife, Christa Klyder.

Of course, they did not know about all of the controversy already surrounding the palatial, Romanesque Revival landmark, with a bell tower that is one of the tallest structures in the capital.

Trump is suing the city over the tax bill for the building, which he does not want to pay. (Now there's a surprise.) He and the two chefs who pulled out of their opening restaurants at the hotel because of Trump's ugly rhetoric on **immigrants** are suing and countersuing one another. And a free-speech advocacy group is suing the District because a valet traffic-pattern exception that the city allowed for the hotel may also give Trump staff members license to curb protesters on Pennsylvania Avenue, which is America's boulevard, according to my colleague Colbert King.

The hotel is full of baggage. Which is the business-as-usual part of the Trump empire that some folks often forget.

But not Pedro Olaniyan. The 62-year-old **immigrant** from Nigeria was somber as he took pictures of the hotel on its final night of construction.

"This man, Trump. He says he wants to make America great again. He says, 'We've got to take our country back.' From whom?" said Olaniyan, who left Nigeria more than 30 years ago. "This country has been great to me. What does he mean?"

Olaniyan's oldest son was a linebacker on UCLA's football team. Full ride.

His daughter is getting her PhD at Temple University.

And his younger son just got a scholarship to the University of Connecticut.

He has worked as a night security guard in downtown Washington for more than 20 years. His longtime co-worker is a Muslim who never fails to say "Merry Christmas" to him.

He does not see the problems with America that Trump sees. And looking at the Trump hotel construction, day after day, with that giant sign — Trump 2016 — has been difficult for him to watch.

"I don't hate [Trump] as a person," Olaniyan said. "I hate what comes out of his mouth."

Would he stay there, even if he got a free night?

"Never," he said.

Same for a homeless woman, who was going from bench to bench Sunday, looking for a place to bed down for the night. She would not consider staying there, either.

"Not in his place," she said.

Other #NeverTrumpeters who passed by said the place looked nicer than they had expected.

"It doesn't look like some of his other places," said one woman, who said she would consider staying at the posh hotel after the election. Then she clarified: "After he loses."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton holds wide leads among Latino voters in four battleground states and enjoys an edge on questions of temperament and who's best equipped to solve the nation's problems. But Donald Trump is not faring as poorly as some might think, amid doubts about Clinton's trustworthiness.

Clinton is far ahead among Latino voters in Arizona, Colorado, Florida and Nevada, with her biggest lead at 50 percentage points in Arizona and smallest in Florida, where she's ahead by 24 points, according to a new poll for Univision News by Bendixen & Amandi and the Tarrance Group.

Clinton's advantages over Trump among Latino voters are similar to President Obama's advantage over Republican Mitt Romney in 2012 in Nevada, Florida and Arizona, while her 45-point lead in Colorado is smaller than Obama's 52-point edge there four years ago.

The results underscore how Latino voters are poised to fuel Clinton's support in key battleground states where they make up a significant and growing share of the electorate. Turnout remains a critical question, and it is unclear whether this year's election will energize Hispanic Americans to vote at higher rates than in previous years, when fewer than half cast ballots.

The poll also measured support for Libertarian presidential candidate Gary Johnson and Green Party candidate Jill Stein. Johnson earned support from 5 or 6 percent of voters in each state, while Stein didn't earn more than 3 percent.

Roughly three-quarters of respondents say they're unlikely to change their minds before Election Day. Clinton is viewed as the most favorable among Latino voters in all four states, while even larger majorities there have negative views of Trump.

In recent weeks, Trump floated the idea of revamping his **immigration** strategy in a bid to revive his standing among Hispanics, who factor **immigration** policy into their support for a potential candidate but do not consider it their top issue of concern. Trump last month announced that he would give a major policy address and then delayed it several times before scheduling the speech on the same day as a trip to Mexico to meet with that country's president, Enrique Peña Nieto. But when he returned to the United States, he doubled down on his long-held **immigration** views, prompting a handful of prominent Hispanic business and religious leaders to cut ties to his campaign.

Trump is seen unfavorably by 81 percent of Hispanic voters in Colorado, 79 percent in Nevada, 78 percent in Arizona and 68 percent in Florida. At least 6 in 10 likely Hispanic voters in each state think Trump will continue making insensitive remarks despite his recently expressing regret for sometimes saying "the wrong thing."

But only 40 percent or fewer of the respondents in each state believe that as president he would deport all undocumented **immigrants** in the United States. In all but Nevada, a larger share of Hispanic voters believe that he would allow at least some undocumented **immigrants** to stay in the country.

The poll results contradict Trump's recent claims that he enjoys broad support among minority voters. On Monday, he told the National Guard Association conference in Baltimore that he is doing "amazingly well with African American and Hispanic workers." Just 5 percent of black voters support Trump, and 91 percent back Clinton, according to an average of August and September Post-ABC polling data.

Clinton, meanwhile, is widely favored in each state on the issue of who would do a better job improving the lives of Hispanics and is seen as being closer to most Hispanics' opinions on major issues. She leads Trump on questions of who is best prepared to handle the economy, terrorism and **immigration** reform; of who has the better temperament to serve as president; and, by a slightly narrower margin, of who is more honest and trustworthy.

But many Hispanics distrust Clinton, with more than 4 in 10 voters in each state saying she is a liar — including 49 percent in Nevada.

Other national polls show that Clinton is viewed unfavorably by a majority of all American voters. Her campaign has acknowledged that she must do more to present a more positive message and explain what she would do as president.

The Democrat earned swift condemnation from Republicans over the weekend for suggesting that half of Trump's supporters fit into a "basket of deplorables." Clinton later expressed regret for the remark, but she blasted Trump again for feuding with the family of a Muslim Army officer killed in Iraq, attacking the judgment of a Hispanic judge hearing two cases against him, and promoting the theory that Obama was not born in the United States.

The Univision poll finds a significant gender gap among Latino voters, with Clinton's support at least 10 points higher among women than men in Nevada, Florida and Colorado. In Florida, Clinton also wins 24 percent of self-identified Republicans, while Trump garners 59 percent.

Among Hispanics in all four states, the top issue remains jobs and the economy. **Immigration** reform ranks second, with education, health care and terrorism generally ranking lower.

With most of the focus squarely on Clinton and Trump, their running mates remain widely unrecognized by most Hispanics. Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.), the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, and his Republican counterpart, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, were unknown by more than 50 percent of Hispanics in Arizona, Colorado and Nevada. In Florida, 59 percent of respondents didn't recognize Kaine; 60 percent didn't recognize Pence.

A separate set of surveys released last week found Clinton with an even larger advantage over Trump among Hispanic voters in key states. The surveys, conducted by **immigration** reform advocate America's Voice and polling firm Latino Decisions, found Clinton leading by 56 percentage points in Nevada, 55 points in Colorado and 35 points in Florida, each wider than the new Univision poll. She held a 52-point edge in Arizona, similar in size to the Univision poll. Latino Decisions is also conducting polling of Hispanics for the Clinton campaign this year.

The Univision News surveys also examined the state's competitive U.S. Senate races — a growing concern for Democrats who believe the party is failing to capitalize on Clinton's commanding leads among Hispanics to the benefit of down-ballot candidates. In Colorado and Nevada, Democrats are hoping to hold on to their seats, while Republican incumbents are defending seats in Arizona and Florida against well-funded Democratic challengers.

In Florida, Republican Sen. Marco Rubio has a seven-point edge among Latinos, 46 percent to 39 percent, against Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy. That's a far better performance among Hispanics for the Cuban American senator than Trump, his onetime presidential rival, who trails 24 points behind Clinton. Rubio earns a 52 percent favorability rating, while 42 percent express an unfavorable view; Murphy earns a 29 percent favorable mark, while 13 percent express an unfavorable opinion. Nearly 6 in 10 Hispanic voters said they didn't know enough about him to register an opinion.

In Arizona, Democratic Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick leads incumbent Republican Sen. John McCain among Hispanics, 50 percent to 35 percent. That's a much smaller edge than Clinton's 50-point margin over Trump and Obama's 49-point win among Arizona Latinos in 2012, making Kirkpatrick's challenge to McCain more difficult in a Republican-leaning state. When asked their overall opinion of the candidates, poll respondents gave McCain a 52 percent favorability rating and Kirkpatrick 36 percent. Four in 10 respondents did not recognize Kirkpatrick.

In Colorado, Sen. Michael F. Bennet (D) holds a comfortable lead over his GOP challenger, retired Air Force Lt. Col. Darryl Glenn, 65 percent to 19 percent, similar to Clinton's margin over Trump in the state.

In Nevada, former Democratic attorney general Catherine Cortez Masto leads Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R) 58 percent to 24 percent, a 34-point edge that is smaller than Clinton's 46-point lead in the state. But 38 percent of Hispanics don't know enough about Cortez Masto to register an opinion; 41 percent don't know enough about Heck.

Those results signal why outside liberal interest groups, including the Senate Majority PAC and Democracy for America, have begun airing several millions of dollars' worth of advertising for Masto in Nevada and Deborah Ross, the Democratic Senate challenger in North Carolina, who is hoping to unseat Sen. Richard Burr (R-N.C.). Similar campaigns are being prepared for other Democratic Senate candidates. In Florida, a group backed by the industrialist Koch brothers is airing Spanish-language advertising in support of Rubio.

The poll of 1,600 Hispanic registered voters — 400 in each state — was conducted Aug. 24 to Sept. 3 by Bendixen & Amandi International and the Tarrance Group. The poll has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus five percentage points in each state.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Last year marked the greatest improvement in the typical American family's finances on record, according to a new annual report from the Census Bureau, especially for the working poor.

The median household income before taxes increased 5.2 percent, the report published Tuesday showed, the largest increase in nearly a half-century of data. Average incomes increased more rapidly for poorer families than rich ones.

"In the last year, we've seen steady job growth," said Michael Strain, an economist at the conservative American Enterprise Institute. "What we're looking at is the recovery delivering, in a way that we've all kind of hoped it would."

The share of overall income enjoyed by the poorest one-fifth of households increased by 3 percent.

The change in the share of income claimed by more affluent groups of households was not statistically significant.

Lawrence Mishel, president of the liberal Economic Policy Institute, also attributed the gains for poorer households to a rapid decline in unemployment, from 5.7 percent at the beginning of last year to 4.9 percent at the beginning of this year.

"Their hourly wages also get a boost from having less competition among workers for jobs," Mishel said. "We may finally start seeing employers having to compete for workers."

Those gains also appeared in the data for specific demographic groups that tend to be worse off.

Incomes for women living alone increased 8.7 percent last year, while the incomes of married couples increased 4.3 percent. The incomes of younger householders increased more than the incomes of older householders. For householders ages 25 to 34, the increase was 5.6 percent, while incomes for those ages 55 to 64 increased just 3.5 percent.

Hispanics and **immigrants** in particular benefited from last year's economy. Median incomes for Hispanics increased 6.1 percent. **Immigrants**' incomes, excluding naturalized citizens skyrocketed 10.5 percent.

Those improvements contributed to an overall increase of 6.4 percent in the Western states, said Giovanni Peri, an economist who studies **immigration** at the University of California at Davis.

Peri attributed the increase in **immigrants**' incomes to robust demand for labor in construction, manufacturing and services. Unemployment in the construction sector decreased from an average of 8.9 percent in 2014 to 7.3 percent last year, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In accommodation and food services, unemployment declined from 8.6 percent to 8 percent.

The connection between **immigrants**' incomes and the labor market "is an important sign of how much they are really contributing to the economy," Peri said. "They are almost all working families, almost all working in jobs for which there is demand."

More from Wonkblog:

The poor are better off when we build more housing for the rich

The real reason Donald Trump is so rich

Income inequality has squeezed the middle class out of the majority

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**House Democrats are unveiling a new set of television ads targeting four Republican House members in tough reelection races, tying Donald J. Trump's controversial statements to the incumbents' own political futures.

It's part of the continuing plan by the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee to try putting enough GOP-held House seats into play for the majority to potentially flip their way in November. The House Democrats' campaign arm plans to focus its resources on districts that are anchored in the suburbs and with large Latino populations.

Party strategists believe those two pockets of voters have particularly negative views of the GOP nominee. His proposals to deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants** and build a wall along the Mexican border, while calling Mexicans "rapists," has driven his disapproval rating very high among Latino voters. Trump's demeanor on the campaign trail has also made his candidacy toxic among well-educated suburban voters.

Few independent analysts, however, have given Democrats much chance at winning the 30 seats needed to take the gavel away from House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.). Part of the reason they think Democrats can't win back the majority is because some Republican incumbents escaped without a serious challenge before the filing deadlines and Trump's unpopularity began to soar in some districts.

The ads are airing against Reps. David Young (R-Iowa), whose Des Moines-based district has the highest level of college-educated voters of the state's four seats; Erik Paulsen (R-Minn.), whose district east of the Twin Cities is one of the nation's most highly educated; Will Hurd (R-Texas), whose sprawling district along the Texas-Mexico border is two-thirds Hispanic; and Carlos Curbelo (R-Fla.), whose south Florida district is almost 70 percent Hispanic.

[Can Democrats ride an anti-Trump wave to retake the House and Senate?]

The ad against Young, part of the DCCC's $1.5 million in reserved ads there, highlights Trump's assertion that "nukes" might be needed for national security policy.

The ad against Paulsen shows Trump mocking a disabled reporter who covered his real estate empire in an image that many pollsters say stuck with voters as being particularly damaging to Trump (it's featured in ads supporting Hillary Clinton).

The DCCC targets Trump's views on **immigration** in a Spanish-language radio ad airing on Miami-area stations hitting Curbelo for supporting GOP leaders that won't move **immigration** legislation beneficial to Latinos.

For Hurd the DCCC is using multiple strategies. An English-language ad, trying to appeal to the heavy military presence in the district, highlights Trump's mockery of the parents of a soldier killed in Iraq for their speech criticizing him. It also slams Trump for disparaging Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) for being captured and held prisoner during the Vietnam War.

"Donald Trump disrespected our veterans, attacking Gold Star military families and mocking prisoners of war," the narrator says, ending with a sign-off line: "Trump and Hurd are just not for us."

A Spanish-language ad airing in San Antonio goes after Trump for his positions on **immigration** and Mexicans.

Three of the four Republicans being targeted won their first congressional election in 2014, during a midterm cycle that was very favorable to GOP candidates and now face the prospect of a very different electorate in their first re-election bid.

Paulsen first won his suburban district in 2008, following a long line of traditionally moderate Republicans who have held the seat since 1961. He won in 2014 with more than 62 percent of the vote, but if Democrats are ever going to win back the majority, they may need to win districts like his.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**DENVER — When Hillary Clinton's campaign and its allies pulled down television ads in Colorado some weeks ago, it was described as a game-set-match moment in the presidential campaign, a seeming acknowledgment that the state had moved from purple to blue in near-record time.

Make no mistake. Donald Trump is a distinct underdog in Colorado. He's hobbled by demographic realities here and by a record of statements that have alienated the very groups of voters who will be pivotal in November.

But Democrats here say it's premature to declare that there has been a permanent shift in the politics of the state. They worry about a lack of enthusiasm for Clinton and warn against complacency born of overconfidence.

Based on late-summer polling, Colorado appeared to be firmly in Clinton's column — paired with Virginia as one of two state whose politics were shifting rapidly because of demographic changes.

The reasons here seemed obvious. Colorado is rich in the very groups that so far have been most resistant to Trump's candidacy.

White, college-educated women are tilting decisively to Clinton this year, in contrast to past elections, and Colorado has among the highest percentage of college graduates of any state in the country. In addition, Hispanics make up more than 14 percent of eligible voters and Democrats see Trump with a huge deficit in that community.

Finally, the state has become one of the nation's most attractive locations for young people, with Denver at or near the top of metropolitan areas favored by millennials — a key part of President Obama's winning coalition in 2008 and 2012. Clinton advisers say their research shows that Colorado has the most millennials of any of the battleground states.

"I think the polls have narrowed," said Dick Wadhams, the former Republican Party chair, arguing that Clinton has flaws as a candidate. "But it's still very tough for Donald Trump to win because of college-educated voters and Hispanics who are reluctant to vote for him."

Two polls in mid-August showed Clinton leading by 10 and 14 points. Since then, the race has tightened. A Washington Post-SurveyMonkey poll taken throughout August showed the race at two points in head-to-head competition at the start of September and a dead heat when Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson and Green Party nominee Jill Stein were included.

Clinton's most recent internal polls showed her with a lead of seven points, according to a Democrat briefed on the results. That was a decline of two points from the previous internal survey. A recent poll by the Republican firm Magellan Strategies showed the race at 5 points in a four-way match.

Trump has spent less time here than Clinton and her surrogates, and his investment in ads and infrastructure trails hers. The Clinton campaign has about two dozen offices around the state and paid staff in the neighborhood of 200 people. Trump now has 10 with two more coming and a paid staff of about 50 people.

Trump is counting heavily on organizational work by the Republican National Committee, but his state director, Patrick Davis, acknowledged that Democrats are well organized. "The Democrats here are a well-oiled machine," he said. "I'll give them that."

Still, Trump's team leaders speak bullishly about the GOP candidate's potential to increase his support. "She has peaked," said Robert Blaha, Trump's state chairman. He said the Republican nominee benefits from growing organic support, with the one big question of whether the campaign can turn voters out.

Even Trump allies, however, say he must prove his steadiness to win over more voters. Steve House, the current Republican chair, said Trump needs to "calm down" and offer reassurance broadly to voters in the state. "He's got to make it okay to vote for him," he said.

Davis said Trump must make a more positive appeal to Hispanic voters. "The **immigrants** in Colorado who have been here for a long time are looking for some certainty and hope that eventually they will be able to become citizens, through some process," Davis said.

Trump's many comments on **immigration** policy have led to confusion as to his exact position about the roughly 11 million undocumented **immigrants** in the country. Davis said that, at the least, Trump has "started a conversation" within the **immigrant** community. Democrats believe it's too late.

Trump is also potentially hobbled by the absence of a competitive Senate race. Democratic Sen. Michael Bennet, who had a tough race six years ago, appears in a strong position. His opponent, Republican Darryl Glenn, won a crowded primary, but his hard-right conservatism and lack of resources have left his campaign sputtering.

Obama won Colorado by five points in 2012 and by nearly 10 points in 2008. Prior to that, Democrats had won just once in the previous seven elections. That was in 1992, when Bill Clinton defeated George H.W. Bush here with help from Ross Perot, who got 23 percent of the vote.

What could turn Colorado into a truly competitive state for Trump over the next eight weeks is the same danger that Clinton faces elsewhere — a lack of enthusiasm among the voters she most needs to win the election. "The Democratic vote is consolidate [behind Clinton]," said a party strategist. "But enthusiasm is not like it was in 2012 and certainly not like 2008.

Start with Hispanics. A Clinton adviser compared Colorado with Nevada, where polls show a much tighter race so far. The Hispanic community there, the adviser said, has been easier to motivate in past elections than Latinos in Colorado. That means the Clinton team must expend more effort in Colorado to assure the sizeable turnout needed to keep her margin over Trump comfortable.

Young voters also pose a potential problem in Colorado, ironically because of a change in voting procedures that Democrats thought would play to their advantage. Colorado uses an all-mail ballot system designed to make it easier for people to vote.

But Democrats here say that could be a problem for young voters, especially those on college campuses, who communicate electronically rather than through traditional mail. As a potentially nervous Democrat put it, how many have stamps? "The mail-in ballot is a curve ball for us," said Emmy Ruiz, Clinton's state director.

Democrats also worry that Trump has the potential to expand his support, in part because his investment to date has been minimal. But that might be as much an effort to tamp down expectations as anything else.

The third-party candidates are a wild card in Colorado. In the Post-SurveyMonkey poll of the state, Johnson and Stein combined for slightly more than 20 percent of the vote. Clinton allies say the third-party candidates are likely to take more votes from Clinton than from Trump.

Priorities USA, the pro-Clinton super PAC, is expected to go back on the air with ads in a few weeks. Clinton advisers declined to forecast when or if they would start a new round of ads in the state. Trump started his ads recently.

State GOP chair House said he's still confident that Trump can make the state a battleground this fall. But he also offered words of caution about the stakes.

"If Hillary wins this time," he said, "then we have to start worrying about the trends."

dan.balz@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**America is getting less white a lot faster than the Republican Party. That trend threatens to be a problem over the long term for the GOP.

When Donald Trump told an interviewer last week that Republicans would never win another election if Hillary Clinton triumphed in November, we took a look at the heart of his claim. Clinton would give blanket citizenship to millions of **immigrants**, Trump asserted, throwing elections to her party thanks to all those new Hispanic voters. But we pointed out that the demographics of the country are already headed that way.

New data from Pew Research makes this point more clearly by looking at past trends.

Since 1992, Pew estimates that the density of nonwhite voters in the Republican Party has doubled from 7 to 14 percent. In the Democratic Party, the increase has been a bit less than double — but it's substantially larger as a percentage of the party. The density of nonwhite voters in the Republican Party in 2016 is still only a little more than half what it was for the Democrats 24 years ago.

But the density of nonwhite voters in the electorate has just about doubled, too. The Democratic Party is getting less white faster than the voting population; the GOP is getting less white a lot more slowly.

The GOP is now about as diverse as the electorate was when Bill Clinton first won the presidency.

What's happened to the GOP, as my colleague Aaron Blake wrote on Tuesday, is that it has increasingly become the domain of older white men without college degrees. (In 1992, 38 percent of Republicans were 50 or older; in 2016, the figure is 58 percent.) The graph at the top of this post suggests that this might be less of a problem for the party, given that the number of older whites in the population will also increase.

The challenge is that younger white voters — the people who will be 65 by 2060 — are more likely to identify as Democrats than older whites.

White millennials (defined by Pew as being born in 1981 or later) identify with or lean toward both parties equally. Among Gen Xers (born 1965 to 1980), the GOP has a 15-point advantage. Among Boomers, it's 20 points. Millennials who aren't white are also more likely to be Democratic by a wide margin but with less of a difference from older nonwhite voters.

There's some variation in party identities over time, but the Democrats are starting from a position of advantage. Research suggests that political beliefs usually form early, with events by the age of 18 being more influential than events later in life. All of which suggests that the tie ballgame with white voters coupled with the wide Democratic advantage among nonwhites as the electorate grows less white is a significant long-term problem for the Republican Party.

Political parties can change (which helps drive some of that movement in the charts above). We remember that the GOP outlined a plan to reach out to Hispanic voters after Mitt Romney's loss in 2012. The only problem was that the existing base wasn't enthusiastic about it, so much so that the current Republican nominee is much more fervently opposed to **immigration** reform than Romney was.

An optimistic way to look at that: Things can change fast. This should offer the GOP some reassurance.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ANN ARBOR, Mich. — Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia made his debut Tuesday in the Democratic presidential ticket's radio advertising campaign, speaking in Spanish.

In a 60-second spot directed at Latino voters, the vice presidential hopeful recalls his experience decades ago working with Jesuit missionaries in Honduras and talks about values learned while there. Kaine's pitch to support the Democratic ticket is airing in Florida, Ohio and Nevada, states where Latino turnout is key, the campaign said.

Kaine frequently breaks into Spanish while on the campaign trail. In 2013, he made history by delivering an entire Senate floor speech on **immigration** reform in Spanish.

Recent polls have showed Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton leading Republican nominee Donald Trump among Latinos by sizable margins. That lead roughly matches the one that President Obama held in defeating Republican Mitt Romney in 2012.  Some Democrats have been surprised that Clinton isn't leading even more, given Trump's strong anti-**immigrant** campaign rhetoric.

Clinton's campaign is in the midst of an aggressive push to boost Latino turnout in November. Kaine is campaigning for the ticket Wednesday in Michigan.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Just because Donald Trump isn't qualified to be president — and just because much of his agenda is hateful and undesirable — doesn't mean that everything he says is automatically wrong. Some of his ideas deserve consideration and enactment. One of these is building a wall across our southern border with Mexico.

It has been ridiculed as a monstrosity and a colossal waste of money. The theory of the wall is that it keeps out low-wage workers and, thereby, raises the wages of U.S. workers, including earlier Hispanic arrivals. They are most vulnerable to additional Hispanic workers, because their skills generally overlap.

Just what a wall would cost is unknown. Guesses vary. Trump has said $8 billion. A detailed report by AllianceBernstein, a research firm, estimated between $15 billion and $25 billion. These sums seem (and are) large, but within a $4 trillion federal budget, they're modest.

The crucial question is: If we had a wall, what would we get for it? The answer: A wall probably represents our best chance of reaching broad agreement on **immigration** policy, a subject that has frustrated Congress and the two most recent presidents.

Let's be clear on one issue: Trump's insistence that Mexico pay for the wall is absurd. No self-respecting Mexican president would accept it. If one did, the wall would become a subject of endless bickering between the two countries as to who actually owned and controlled it. The fact that Trump made this so central to his proposal suggests that he's simply grandstanding.

Still, in the hands of someone serious, a wall could be a catalyst for a comprehensive overhaul of U.S. **immigration** policy. "It's hard to understand opposition [to a wall]," as my colleague Charles Krauthammer recently noted. "It's the most venerable and reliable way to keep people out." He argued correctly that the outlines of a deal have long been apparent. It would:

● Change legal **immigration** criteria to favor employability (a.k.a. skills) over family connections. The emphasis would be on stimulating the nation's economic growth.

● Require most businesses to belong to E-Verify, the government system that allows employers to check on the **immigrant** status of potential workers.

● Create a path to legality — and ultimately to citizenship — for the estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** in the country.

● Embrace policies — including a wall — that would credibly and dramatically reduce illegal **immigration**.

Without a wall, it's doubtful that Republicans would enter meaningful negotiations on **immigration** policy — and without Republican participation, the stalemate would continue. In a recent Pew Research Center poll, 63 percent of Republicans and Republican-leaning voters supported a wall and only 34 percent opposed it. The distrust is deep. Republicans think Democrats don't truly care about stopping illegal **immigration**; they mainly want "amnesty" for existing undocumented **immigrants**. In the same Pew poll, 84 percent of Democrats and those who lean Democrat opposed a wall.

There are two standard objections to a wall — both true but politically irrelevant. The first is that it might have once been justified but isn't now because the inflow of undocumented Mexican **immigrants** is slowing and maybe reversing. Mexico's birthrate — which affects its labor force — has declined, and its economy has improved. It can more easily absorb new workers. A 2015 Pew study found that the number of undocumented Mexicans in the United States had dropped by 140,000 between 2009 and 2014.

But this is a net figure: people entering minus people leaving. There are still hundreds of thousands of Mexicans and Latinos trying to cross the southern border illegally every year. A wall would make this harder and reinforce the natural trend. Some people wouldn't try to enter; of those who did, fewer would make it. Tragedies — dying in the desert, being exploited by "coyotes" — would decline.

The second objection is that the southern border isn't the only way people become illegal **immigrants**. Many arrive legally and overstay their visas. Indeed, according to a study in the Journal on Migration and Human Security, these **immigrants** now outnumber those breaching the southern border. But if E-Verify were widely adopted, these **immigrants** would have a harder time getting work.

If we could buy an **immigration** bargain for $25 billion, or even a bit more, it would be a fabulous deal. That's the opportunity facing the next president. But we won't make it any easier by stigmatizing the one change — a wall — that could be the foundation for compromise.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Seth Shostak, a senior astronomer at the SETI Institute and one of my all-time favorite people in the space world — he's funny, smart, available and always ready to produce a punchy quote on deadline — dropped by The Washington Post on Monday for a Facebook Live chat about the efforts to make contact with **alien** civilizations. (We were supposed to have the conversation remotely a couple of weeks ago, but we couldn't get the phone link between Washington and California to work properly. There might be a lesson in that.)

We talked about the Fermi Paradox: "Where are they?" Enrico Fermi at Los Alamos in 1950 posed the question over lunch, reasoning that aliens should have long ago showed up to visit if, in fact, they are out there. The UFO mythology is unpersuasive, leaving us with this cosmic mystery. Maybe they are just not there. Shostak is among those who thinks that they are surely there and that we just need to keep listening. SETI, named for the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, goes back to 1960, when Frank Drake turned a radio telescope at Green Bank, W.Va., toward two nearby sun-like stars. What we heard then, and have heard ever since, is what Paul Davies calls the "eerie silence." Shostak remains confident we'll succeed eventually in detecting the presence of ETI. Eight years ago, in a speech, he bet a cup of Starbucks coffee for everyone in the room that it would happen within 25 years.

In our conversation, he reiterated that the silence so far reflects only the feebleness of our detection capabilities. We'd have a hard time, for example, picking up television leakage from the nearest star, never mind the ones on the far side of our galaxy or in other galaxies. The only civilizations we can readily detect are ones relatively nearby in the cosmic scheme of things and which are intentionally sending signals our way.

Speaking of those other galaxies: The universe is not really designed for communication. It's too big. The stars are too far apart for large, meat-based creatures to travel around easily. We can't even exchange messages without a significant time delay. You run into the Einstein speed limit. Information can't move faster than the speed of light. If there are aliens on Proxima b, the nearest planet beyond our solar system, we would have an eight-year [I originally wrote "eight-minute," which of course is more like communication with Mars!] time lag between our initial message of "How's it goin'?" and the **alien** response of "Fine."

I'm not complaining about the size of the universe. That would be kind of futile. That's an issue way above my pay grade. As Lawrence Krauss puts it: The universe is what it is.

But golly, it's ridiculously large. Space strikes me as ostentatiously spacious. If you count the galaxies in the observable universe you wind up with Saganesque numbers.

Annoyingly, we can't communicate with civilizations in these other galaxies unless, as Shostak put it, their conception of time is different from ours. It's hard to have a meaningful conversation with a time lag of millions of years.

One wonders if there could be such a thing as a "small, compact, conveniently laid-out universe." Someone please run those inflation numbers through the computer a few more times and see if you can get a mini-cosmos.

Or maybe the bigness of the universe has an anthropic-principle implication. Just thinking out loud here: An intelligent observer should potentially expect to find herself in a universe of grand dimensions, because such a universe has abundant terrain for the evolution of intelligent observers.

And maybe the extreme spaciousness has protective factors. Isolated worlds are safe from contamination and invasive species.

Yeah, for now we're alone in a great big universe — but maybe that's not so bad.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This past weekend was the 50th anniversary of "Star Trek" first hitting the airwaves as a television show. This is the first television show I remember watching in syndication as a child, and I've been devoted to the franchise ever since. As someone who holds strong opinions about the show and about pop culture lists, it seems appropriate to rank the 10 best "Trek" episodes ever aired on television. And just to make things more interesting and controversial, I've chosen from the entire non-animated pool of "Trek" episodes:  "Star Trek" (TOS), "Star Trek: The Next Generation" (TNG), "Star Trek: Deep Space Nine" (DS9), "Star Trek: Voyager" and "Star Trek: Enterprise."

Spoiler alert: Nothing from the last two shows listed made the top 10. And I'll confess at the outset a likely bias toward episodes that focused on interplanetary statecraft, as it were.

In ascending order of greatness:

10. "First Contact" (TNG): The Enterprise D initiates a first-contact mission with the almost-warp-ready Malconians, but it's complicated by the fact Riker has been injured during a covert reconnaissance mission on the planet. This episode does an excellent job of illuminating the politics of a planet undergoing significant social transformations and the reactionary blowback that could be produced by an extraterrestrial visit. Plus, there's an awesome and very funny Bebe Neuwirth cameo.

9. "Journey to Babel" (TOS): This episode manages to weave together the tricky politics of the Federation with the tricky politics of Spock's family. Mark Lenard does a wonderful job as Spock's estranged father, Sarek — and the statecraft parts of the episode hold up surprisingly well.

8. "Measure of a Man" (TNG): The first season of "Star Trek: The Next Generation" was bad, bad, bad. This episode, from the second season, was the first time you got a whiff of the promise of this show and its cast. The show revolves around whether the android Data should be legally viewed as a sentient being or as property of Starfleet. Its centerpiece, in which Captain Picard cross-examines a computer scientist about what it means to be sentient, makes full use of Patrick Stewart's oratorical abilities:

7. "The Doomsday Machine" (TOS): An ancient doomsday device wanders into our galaxy and shreds solar systems. Kirk and his crew must battle the machine — and an Ahab-like Starfleet captain trying to avenge his murdered crew. Nothing fancy, but watching Spock trying to prevent the blinkered captain Deckard from destroying the Enterprise is good fun. Also, a thrilling climax.

6. "Yesterday's Enterprise" (TNG): An Enterprise from a past time travels forward through time and changes the course of history. In this parallel timeline, the Enterprise D is a warship and is run rather differently than the Enterprise we are used to. It works well because the actors and director fully inhabit this world of a very martial Federation in endless war with the Klingons. Also, there's a very amusing opening involving Worf and prune juice.

5. "Chain of Command" (TNG): A two-parter in which Picard is assigned to relinquish command of the Enterprise and lead a covert mission into Cardassian space. He gets captured and is tortured as a result, while the Enterprise finds a way to get him back. Most fans will remember the second part of this episode, with the Cardassian official torturing Picard by borrowing techniques from George Orwell's "1984." Stewart is very good in those scenes — but just as good is Ronny Cox as Captain Jellicoe, the martinet who replaces Picard, butts heads with Riker and unsettles almost all of the bridge crew.

4. "In the Pale Moonlight" (DS9): In some ways, the whole "best episodes" conceit biases this list against DS9. Its Dominion War arc might have produced the richest narrative in the entire "Trek" universe, even if individual episodes don't stand out. This episode, however, in which Captain Sisko provides log entries explaining his efforts to recruit Romulan entry into the Dominion War on the side of the Federation, stands out in highlighting the messiness and moral sacrifices that are often made during great power wars. The ending might also be the least Gene Roddenberry-like plot in the entire "Trek" canon.

3. "Balance of Terror" (TOS): A submarine episode in space. The Romulans are introduced as an antagonist in this episode, and Kirk and his crew must find a way to defeat a new, high-tech ship that breaches the Neutral Zone. Of all the battle episodes in "Trek," this one is the best, but it also has two other things going for it. The episode highlights the ways in which war contributes to prejudice and racial resentments. Most importantly, by also showing the internal deliberations of the Romulan ship, it presents both sides of the conflict. Mark Lenard plays the Romulan commander and evinces a grace note of sadness at the prospect of a successful mission leading to more war.

2. "Darmok" (TNG): The Enterprise D crew tries to establish relations with the Tamarians, but their attempts at communication are unsuccessful with a race that uses language very differently from the Federation. In an effort to bridge the gap, the Tamarian captain beams himself and Picard down to a planet so the two of them can share a common adversary. While many **alien** species in the "Trek" universe don't seem all that **alien**, this was an exception, a truly inspired creation.

1. "Best of Both Worlds" (TNG): The Borg come to town just as Riker struggles with the question of whether he's become too settled in the Enterprise and lacks ambition. This two-parter might have the greatest cliffhanger in television history, but that's only a small part of what makes this the best episode in the "Trek" canon. The Borg are the greatest villain in the "Trek" universe. The capture of Picard and the possible destruction of Earth raise the stakes even further.

To be honest, however, Michael Piller's script is what makes this show stand out. He seamlessly integrated Riker's doubts about his career trajectory with the challenges he faces once the Borg kidnap Picard and exploit his knowledge of the Federation. The dialogue is a cut above standard "Trek" fare. And there's a lovely scene, early in the first part, in which Picard and Guinan discuss what the Borg's victory might mean for history, that provides some interesting interactions between Stewart and Whoopi Goldberg:

I must confess, as the 2016 election approaches, that this scene has come to mind on more than one occasion.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Apple is facing accusations that it copied Chinese innovations in the iPhone 7. Indeed, China's smartphone manufacturers released dual-camera systems and handsets without headphone jacks long before Apple did. And the stickers and animations that Apple is adding to iMessage look like a direct knockoff from China's WeChat. This is quite a twist from the days when Apple accused the Chinese of copying its inventions. The reality is that America's most innovative company is no longer the world's most innovative company. Entrepreneurs all over the world are producing innovations that rival what you see in Silicon Valley.

This is also evidenced in the numbers of billion-dollar technology start-ups, or unicorns, that are sprouting up all over the world. Of the 191 unicorns worldwide, 42 are in China and eight in India, according to CrunchBase. Yes, more than 105 are in the United States, but you would hardly have found any blockbuster technology start-ups in Asia as recently as a decade ago. Today, Chinese Internet companies, such as Alibaba, Baidu and Tencent, are among the most innovative and valuable few in the world.

The world's entrepreneurs used to dream of coming to Silicon Valley because it was the innovation capital of the world and there were few opportunities elsewhere.  This is no longer the case, as I learned during my recent trip to New Delhi. There are start-up incubators sprouting up all over India, and the quality of the start-ups is second only to those in Silicon Valley and China, which are running head to head.

I spoke to about 50 entrepreneurs at local incubators and meetups. Unlike earlier generations, very few had interest in moving to the United States. Most said they believed the greatest opportunities were in India. As technology designer Himanshu Khanna said, "Why should I move to Silicon Valley when I have a market 10 times as large here?" Five years prior, Khanna had asked me to sponsor him for a long-term U.S. visa, which he could not get.

The tide has surely turned.

For decades, the United States invited the world's best and brightest to come and study at its universities and provided them with temporary work visas. But it placed tight limits on the numbers of permanent-resident visas for those who wanted to stay, so the lines grew longer and longer. My research team at Duke, Harvard and NYU documented that there were, as of October 2006, more than a million skilled workers in "**immigration** limbo" in the United States, with only 120,000 green cards being made available every year for their work categories. Ten years later, I estimate the number of skilled workers in limbo is roughly 1.5 million. I explained in my book, "The **Immigrant** Exodus: Why America Is Losing the Global Race to Capture Entrepreneurial Talent," that this would lead to a reverse brain drain. That is exactly what happened.

Hundreds of thousands of highly skilled workers as well as the graduates of top American universities have returned home because of America's flawed **immigration** policies. They are in leadership roles at top research labs and at the unicorns in China and India. America has lost an entire generation of entrepreneurs and innovators and bolstered its global competition.  That is also why the proportion of **immigrant**-founded start-ups in Silicon Valley fell from 52 percent in 2005 to 44 percent in 2012 and is probably even lower today.

It is in this context that the Obama administration announced its last-ditch effort to reverse the tide. On Aug. 26, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) proposed a rule to allow foreign entrepreneurs to enter or remain in the United States and work at qualifying start-ups. This uses the parole authority under which the president, through DHS, can permit certain individuals to temporarily stay in the United States.

But the president's **immigration** authority is very limited, and this is a very short-term and very constrained fix. The start-up entity must have been formed within the three years before an application for entrepreneurial parole; the entrepreneurs must own at least 15 percent of the entity; only three foreigners can be employed by the start-up; and the applicant must prove that the start-up has "substantial potential for rapid growth and job creation" by receiving investments of capital totaling $345,000 or more from established U.S. investors with a history of substantial investment in successful start-up entities or at least $100,000 in grants or awards from local, state, or federal government entities.

This is not a slam dunk for entrepreneurs wanting to come to the United States — and it provides no clear path to permanent residency. Also, to become effective, the rule must undergo a 45-day notice and comment period in the Federal Register. Nevertheless, if it takes effect, it will be better than nothing: it will probably lead to several hundred start-ups moving to the United States and creating tens of thousands of jobs here.

What are needed even more badly are DHS rules that let foreigners on temporary work visas change jobs rather than be subject to abuse by their American employers. Present rules prevent employees from changing jobs while they wait for their green cards, which often take one to two decades to arrive. This disadvantages both the workers on temporary visas and American workers, because it allows employers to artificially depress salaries. The foreign workers also cannot start companies, so those whom we could have created jobs here are getting frustrated and returning to their country of origin.

**Immigration** has become a toxic subject in the United States, thanks to the xenophobia being served up in the election campaigns. Though the use of presidential executive privilege is no substitute for lack of governance on Capitol Hill, we do need to enact rules to improve the dire situation. The country's competitiveness is at stake now more than ever. To quell the social disenchantment that is creating resentment toward **immigrants**, we need economic growth and job creation and we need to welcome those who would bring about both.

Read more from The Washington Post's Innovations section

China shows the path from emerging economy to innovation nation

Why China won't own next-generation manufacturing

Palestinian students in Gaza develop solar-powered car

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A new poll from the Washington Post and ABC News shows Donald Trump's **immigration** proposals are hugely unpopular with the American people — so much so that Trump actually appears to be increasing sympathy for **immigrants** and depressing support for his harsh enforcement techniques.

The poll shows the number of Americans who say that **immigrants** "strengthen American society" has increased from 55 percent in January to 64 percent today.

Similarly, just 15 percent say they support deporting all illegal **immigrants**, and just 34 percent favor a border wall — both numbers lower than just about any poll we've seen.

The 15 percent who favor mass deportation is in contrast to the 79 percent who instead favor a pathway to citizenship with background checks. Previous Post-ABC polls asked a different question — whether people would support or oppose an effort to deport all illegal **immigrants** (with no alternative named). Back in March, 36 percent supported this approach.

Previous Gallup polling showed about 20 percent generally favored deporting all illegal **immigrants**. But that poll offered a third, middle-ground option of allowing illegal **immigrants** to remain in the United States and work for a limited time. That might have depressed support — at least somewhat — for mass deportation.

Like Gallup, the Public Religion Research Institute has long asked a similar three-way question and has only once seen support for a deportation-only approach dropping to 15 percent.

Given the varied questions, it's not clear that support for mass deportation is at a new low, but at the very least, it appears that it hasn't increased at all during Trump's campaign and might even have fallen.

And it wouldn't even be the only **immigration**-related issue that isn't trending Trump's way. Another proposal is Trump's border wall. Last month, the Monkey Cage looked at polling on support for a border wall — which the newest Post-ABC poll showed people opposed 63 to 34 — and found a number of polls showing support for the wall on the decline.

The decline is even more severe when you consider polling earlier this decade showed a majority supported a border wall.

And here's the key point: The Monkey Cage's Michael Tesler noted that the decline was largely among people who didn't like Trump coming around to a position that he strongly opposed. In other words: They appear to have been turned off by his hard-line approach, and joined the other team.

The new Post-ABC poll also suggests this effect might have played a role.

The 64 percent who say **immigrants** strengthen American society — a new high in the 2016 campaign — is spurred by an increase in Democrats (up 14 percent) and independents (up 12 percent) who say they agree with that statement. The increase among Republicans is smaller.

All of which suggests Trump's polarizing approach to illegal **immigration** may be having the opposite of its intended effect. It may not be damaging Trump's campaign in a direct way  — but it does appear to be helping **immigration** reform activists rally supporters.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Our veterans, in many cases, are being treated worse than illegal **immigrants**." -- Donald Trump, speech in Philadelphia, Sept. 7, 2016

"The media and my opponent discuss one thing and only one thing, the needs of people living here illegally. In many cases, by the way, they're treated better than our vets." -- Trump, **immigration** speech in Phoenix, Aug. 31, 2016

"Frankly, illegal **immigrants** get treated better than many of our vets — it's a disgrace what's happening in this country." -- Trump, interview on NBC, July 20, 2015

Trump has been using this talking point for more than a year, and it's never been quite clear exactly what he meant. On its face, this claim doesn't make much sense: People in the country illegally, by definition, are not given the basic rights that people here legally -- veterans or civilians -- have.

Our friends at FactCheck.org and PolitiFact wrote about this claim, and there's no sign Trump will stop saying it. So we decided to take a look at what he means, and whether it holds any water.

The Facts

Trump's campaign explained it this way: "In multiple respects, our politicians and our government prioritize illegal aliens above military service members. In fact, many politicians have given more attention to and pledged more support for illegal aliens than our own veterans."

For example, Hillary Clinton has prioritized a "comprehensive **immigration** reform" plan her first 100 days in office but has not promised a veterans benefits bill, the campaign said. Clinton has "downplayed" the wait-time scandal at the Department of Veterans Affairs, yet "is pledging to fight for illegal **immigrants** and spend taxpayer dollars granting them benefits."

(We fact-checked her claims about the VA scandal here. Clinton has proposed giving illegal **immigrants** health care under the Affordable Care Act. Her plan would require undocumented **immigrants** to be deemed lawfully present before qualifying for Medicare or Social Security, and only after paying income taxes and after they reach requirement age. We explained this in depth here.)

The campaign cited three instances of veterans being treated "worse" than illegal **immigrants**: consequences for criminal convictions, cost to the government, and wait times. We explored each point.

1. "Sanctuary" laws restricting state and local governments from alerting federal authorities about people who may be in the country illegally. The campaign pointed to cases where people were convicted of crimes such as DUI in sanctuary jurisdictions and released without **immigration** consequences. "But members of the military who receive DUIs are subject to punishment from their commanding officers and court martial," the campaign said.

It's unclear why the campaign is comparing undocumented **immigrants** to current service members, or how this comparison makes sense. There is a separate military court system. And sanctuary restrictions exist because **immigration** enforcement is a responsibility of the federal government, not local or state jurisdictions. (For more on sanctuary laws, see here.)

What this argument overlooks is that there are federal, state, local and private efforts to help veterans navigate the criminal justice system -- especially for those with mental illnesses relating to their service. There are many resources to help veterans receive the benefits to which they're entitled, even if they are incarcerated.

There are veterans treatment courts throughout the country. Judges and legal teams help help veterans avoid recidivism or lengthy incarceratio, by offering services for mental health, substance abuse, homelessnes and employment.

2. The cost of illegal **immigration** to federal, state and local governments. The campaign cited costs for housing illegal **immigrants** in prisons in fiscal year 2014 at $1.87 billion. This comes from a study by Jay Bates, a researcher who analyzed state spending on incarceration and the cost of a federal reimbursement program for states and local governments incarcerating inmates of illegal or unknown **immigration** status. The campaign also cited the fiscal 2016 Health and Human Services budgeted amount of $950 million "just to process and care for illegal **alien** minors."

That's $2.8 billion in two separate fiscal years. Let's put it into perspective.

VA is the largest non-military Cabinet agency, with nearly 350,000 employees. In fiscal 2016, discretionary funding for the department totaled $69.7 billion -- and had grown 73 percent since 2009. Funding plans adopted in the House and Senate would increase discretionary spending even more, upwards of $74.9 billion -- which falls below the White House request of $75.1 billion.

It costs states and local governments to educate children of undocumented **immigrants**, but it's unclear exactly how much per year.

In fiscal 2014, the federal government paid $1.2 billion and states paid $1 billion in Medicaid emergency-care costs for undocumented people, said Leighton Ku, director of George Washington University's Center for Health Policy Research. That's about one-half of 1 percent of Medicaid expenditures, he added.

"All in all, data consistently show that **immigrants**, particularly the undocumented, use very little medical care compared to U.S. citizens, and only a small share is paid by government sources, whether federal, state or local," Ku said.

3. Granting unauthorized people entry for humanitarian reasons, or granting refugee status. The campaign pointed to a humanitarian visa granted to foreigners for certain emergencies, and the Obama administration's plan to process 10,000 Syrian refugees before the end of fiscal 2016. Yet veterans continue to experience delays in accessing medical care, the campaign said.

But the humanitarian visa is granted sparingly for foreigners, so they can reenter the country once without changing their visa status. It's discouraged for undocumented **immigrants** already in the country, and experts told us it wouldn't be granted if unauthorized people requested it.

Again, it's unclear how these two compare. One is about granting emergency reentry into the United States for a narrow group of foreigners, and the other is about veterans accessing medical care. There are legitimate delays for veterans waiting for medical care, as uncovered in the 2014 wait-time manipulation scandal at the Phoenix VA that turned out to be a systemic problem. More than two years later, VA continues to report delays in veterans accessing medical care. But these are not apples-to-apples comparisons of wait times.

Unauthorized **immigrants**, who are not granted any deferred-action status that deems them lawfully present in the country, are not eligible to receive Social Security benefits or any other federal means-tested benefits.

The Federation for American **Immigration** Reform, which seeks to limit **immigration**, says undocumented **immigrants** cost U.S. and state governments $113 billion a year in welfare programs. But other reports have shown that there are benefits as well, especially because illegal **immigrants** pay payroll taxes.

Even though the majority of unauthorized people can't collect the benefits, they paid about $12 billion into the cash flow of the Social Security program in 2010, according to the Social Security actuary. (Some undocumented **immigrants** could theoretically collect benefits — illegally — if they've overstayed their visas or falsely obtained a Social Security number.) That means the U.S. government gets far more than it pays out when it comes to unauthorized **immigrants**.

Non-citizens can obtain citizenship after joining the military. And non-citizen veterans who commit crimes can be deported.

When asked last week whether undocumented people who want to serve in the military should be allowed stay in the country legally (a provision of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program), Trump said: "I think that when you serve in the armed forces, that's a very special situation, and I could see myself working that out, absolutely."

The Pinocchio Test

Trump often says veterans "in many cases" are being treated "worse" than illegal **immigrants**. To an extent, whether one group of people is treated "worse" than another is a matter of opinion. But it's clear that the "many cases" that his campaign cites are apples-to-oranges comparisons that don't make much sense. And more broadly, people who are in the United States illegally aren't granted the same rights as people here legally -- both civilians and veterans. This is an absurd comparison, and Trump needs to drop it.

Four Pinocchios
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Substantive policy issues once again took a back seat as the presidential campaign refocused on name-calling over the weekend.

At a fundraiser on Friday night, Hillary Clinton said, "You know, to just be grossly generalistic, you could put half of [Donald] Trump's supporters into what I call the basket of deplorables. Right? The racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamaphobic — you name it. And unfortunately there are people like that." She then went on to call these people "irredeemable."

What is, in fact, deplorable is not only that Clinton said this but that she apparently believes it. There's no question that Trump is running a xenophobic campaign that's pandering to white nationalism and that a portion of his base enthusiastically embraces overtly anti-**immigrant**, anti-Muslim, misogynistic and racist views. But a far wider percentage of Trump's supporters fall into a gray area of more generalized resentment that is partly about identity but also about economic suffering. Clinton and liberals in general should be reaching out to these voters, not offending them.

Many of Trump's working-class white voters are resentful that the American Dream is slipping further from their grasp. They're right to feel this way. On average, their wages have effectively stagnated or declined over the past several decades.

And for the same period of time, conservatives have been systematically trying to convince white working-class voters that they shouldn't blame Republicans who vote against infrastructure jobs and minimum-wage increases while they give major tax breaks to the rich, and they shouldn't blame big corporations that have slashed wages and shipped jobs overseas while turning record profits. No, they should blame **immigrants** and black folks for supposedly stealing "their jobs" or lazing about on welfare benefits that come out of "their pockets." Either unaware of or ignoring the fact that most people on welfare are white and average wages for people of color are still well below average wages for white folks, struggling whites see other long-suffering communities achieve even a wisp of a rhetorical promise of equal opportunity and feel as though they are, therefore, on the losing end.

When the top 10 percent of Americans control 76 percent of the wealth, that leaves just a little sliver left to be divided up among everyone else. And so it's easy to resent the other people who are making claims for more of that sliver — especially if you've been encouraged for decades to fight over the crumbs instead of fighting against the truly powerful and wealthy elite; and especially if that encouragement builds on centuries of racial antagonism.

The Republican strategy to deliberately stoke racial resentment to attract the loyalty of white voters who, like voters of color, are actually directly and overtly harmed by Republican policies — this is irredeemable. But the voters themselves are not. Their hopes and dreams are deeply inspiring and deeply American. And their anger and frustration with economic inequality is absolutely spot on. The problem is the solution they've been sold by the GOP. Ending affirmative action, cutting the minimum wage, slashing food stamps, repealing the Affordable Care Act and deregulating corporations won't put the American Dream back within the reach of millions of struggling Americans. In fact, it will put that dream even further out of reach. The reality is that working people of all races fare far better under Democratic presidents and Democratic policies. Clinton needs to reach out to all voters and tell them this truth — and confront racial resentment without labeling everyone who considers it racist.

I know that we live in a deeply divided, partisan era, and that to some extent Clinton was just acknowledging that. And again, a portion of Trump's base really is explicitly fueled by a racially tinged and xenophobic vitriol to which he has given plain comfort. Clinton is right to call that out — as she did in her speech on Friday as well as in her apology thereafter.

But more broadly, what we need is a candidate — and a president — comfortable in the complexities in between, the space occupied by the vast majority of white Americans who aren't explicit racial supremacists but who do harbor biases that cloud their judgments. Of course we have that in President Obama, arguably one of the most thoughtful leaders on issues of race and racial justice to ever occupy the Oval Office. And yet, because he's black, he can't speak about race without being seen by many whites as biased. If a white president said that if he were black, Trayvon Martin could be his son, he would be hailed as bold and visionary. But when Obama makes this very obvious point, the right attacks him for divisive race baiting. Saying that those who point out racial bias are the racists is like saying that the person who pulls the fire alarm must have started the fire. How are we going to do something about a problem if we don't even talk about it?

White people — including white politicians — have far more leeway to talk about race in America. We need a white president who can be a part of this much-needed conversation in our country  and can help be a bridge to white voters who are feeling alienated and disaffected — rather than pushing those Americans away.

Recently, the brilliant black public intellectual Heather McGhee was on C-SPAN when a white man from North Carolina called in for advice. He talked about how he knows he's prejudiced, but thinks his prejudices are justified and he feels afraid of black people. And then, stunningly, he asked McGhee, "What can I do to change? You know, to be a better American?"

That in and of itself was remarkable and wonderful. But then McGhee offered a model of compassion and leadership that everyone — black, brown and white — should follow. She expressed gratitude to the caller. "Thank you so much for being honest and for opening up this conversation because it is simply one of the most important ones we have to have in this country," McGhee said. She offered the caller an olive branch, pointing out that people of all races actually hold unconscious prejudices. With a warm smile on her face and an unmistakable tone of kindness in her voice, she offered some advice, including expanding his social network to include black families and reading more about the history of race and racism in America.

I don't know if that caller is planning to vote for Trump, but there are many white voters like him who are. We shouldn't tell them they're deplorable. In fact, we shouldn't tell them anything at all. We should listen to their anger and their concerns and try to understand. They've been told that there is no place for them in the pluralistic future of America. That is simply not true. "Stronger Together" shouldn't just be a slogan on a campaign poster. Clinton needs to help all voters feel and understand that they have a place in her vision for America, not leave anyone behind.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TAMPA — Farooq Mitha's friends, seated in a tight circle at a mosque here on a recent evening, told it to him straight.

"This would be the easiest election to take Muslims for granted," said Mohammad Mubarak, a lawyer, as several of the other Muslim American political activists nodded.

The prospect of a Donald Trump presidency may frighten plenty of Muslim voters, the group told Mitha, but Hillary Clinton isn't particularly popular, either. In the Democratic primaries, many Muslim voters backed Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.). Clinton was too hawkish for them — and may still be even if she earns their votes.

And then there are voters such as Oz Sultan, a counterterrorism analyst and commentator in New York who calls himself "a lifelong conservative."

"I don't think Hillary Clinton has the ability to keep our country safe," he said Wednesday from his home in Harlem, after watching Trump speak at a national security forum. Sultan's biggest concern is the Islamic State, and Clinton "has gone on a destabilizing spree," he said, noting the Obama administration's military offensive in Libya.

Registered Muslim American voters are a starkly diverse and growing constituency, and Mitha, 34, who was named Clinton's Muslim outreach director last month, is trying to woo them all.

Back in this Gulf Coast city where he grew up, he expected a tough crowd. He already had held roundtable discussions in Michigan, Ohio and Virginia, and he knew that some Muslims in his home town viewed Clinton as too right-wing or centrist on issues of domestic spying and Middle East policy.

His counter: "I don't think a presidential campaign has ever hired anyone to do Muslim outreach," Mitha told his friends. The campaign has looked at the numbers and embarked on an unprecedented outreach to a voting bloc that has the potential to decide elections in several swing states, where support for Clinton has been ticking downward since the Democratic National Convention.

Take Florida, where Clinton remains locked in a tight race with Trump. In a state where the 2000 presidential election was decided by a 537-vote margin for George W. Bush, there are about 180,000 registered voters who are Muslim, Arab and South Asian, the civic nonprofit group Emerge USA estimates.

Two years ago, Muslims made up just under 1 percent of the U.S. population, according to the Pew Research Center's 2014 Religious Landscape Study. But the population is growing; Emerge USA, which collects data on Muslim voters and has a political action committee to support candidates, puts the number at closer to 2 percent of the population.

Florida, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia "alone add up to almost 1 million Muslim voters," said Khurrum Wahid, a Miami-based lawyer and the organization's founder. "With a decent voter turnout in those states, Muslims will be the swing vote in both the presidential and many close House races."

Most Muslim Americans now lean Democratic, according to the Pew study. In past decades, many were fiscally conservative, profamily and eager to see their cities get tough on crime. Surveys conducted by the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) and the American Muslim Alliance in the aftermath of Bush's 2000 election found that between 72 percent and 80 percent of Muslims polled said that they had voted for him. But after the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, and Bush's rhetoric on religion and the decision to invade Iraq and Afghanistan, the majority began voting Democratic.

At the same time, Muslims are generally less politically active than the larger American population; only 62 percent of those who were U.S. citizens were certain that they were registered to vote, compared with 74 percent of adult U.S. citizens overall, according to Pew.

To reach those voters, the Clinton campaign has appointed two state-level Muslim outreach coordinators to work with Mitha, and the campaign also has dispatched Rep. Keith Ellison (D-Minn.), the first Muslim elected to Congress, and Huma Abedin, Clinton's close adviser and deputy campaign manager, to key swing states across the country.

Ellison estimates that he has met with at least 10 Muslim groups since the July convention. One recent Monday morning, he showed up in a tiny Orlando doctor's office where the campaign was holding its kickoff phone bank for Muslim volunteers and rattled off reasons Muslims should vote for Clinton.

She has fought for children's rights, he said. She stood up for Abedin when the Trump campaign attacked her. And she has gone out of her way to meet with Muslims, Ellison said, stopping in his home district of Minneapolis to meet with Somali American community leaders.

"The Clinton campaign is more inclusive of the Muslim community than any presidential campaign that I've ever seen," he told the group of phone bank volunteers that included doctors, lawyers, college students, Palestinian Americans, Guyanese Americans, Kenyan Americans and others.

Sheer diversity

One of Clinton's challenges is the population's sheer diversity. Nearly a third of all Muslim Americans are black, according to Pew, some of them with deep roots in a distinctly American sect, the Nation of Islam. About 8 in 10 Muslim Americans are **immigrants** or the children of **immigrants**. Muslim Americans come from different ethnic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds; span the economic spectrum; and have policy opinions and priorities that can be just as divergent, community leaders say.

Some, like Sultan, are even likely to vote for Trump, who has called for a ban on Muslim **immigrants** and surveillance of mosques.

"I know, personally, three doctors" who are voting for him, Azhar Subedar, an Islamic scholar, told Mitha in Tampa.

The Trump campaign did not respond to questions about whether it is trying to attract Muslim voters or considers the constituency a potential tipping point in any swing states.

This cycle, get-out-the-vote efforts are surging in Muslim communities. The Clinton campaign, Emerge USA, the Washington-based Arab American Institute, CAIR and a variety of smaller, local organizations, including mosques, have held voter registration drives, candidate forums and phone banks.

The most common arguments for Clinton offered by her Muslim advocates tend to revolve around Trump.

"Obviously, this election has a sense of urgency that we haven't felt before," said Muna Jondy, a Syrian American activist and lawyer from Flint, Mich. "Because it's not just an option between a Republican and a Democrat. It's between a fascist and another person."

"Never before in the history of America has a major party had someone who was screaming bigotry into a megaphone," Ellison told the phone bank volunteers in Orlando. "No Muslim can sit around and let this happen."

The Trump factor "doesn't work with everyone," said James Zogby, the president of the Arab American Institute, who served as a campaign adviser to Sanders.

Support for Sanders among Muslim voters was "huge," said Ellison, who also backed Sanders. A Muslims for Bernie 2016 Facebook page, with 7,523 likes, still exists. A Muslims for Hillary 2016 Facebook group has 820 members. Muslims for Trump has 428.

Sanders's supporters say that, unlike Clinton, the senator from Vermont spoke out about key Muslim voter concerns, such as the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory.

"It was an issue that always existed in our community," said Nuren Haider, 31, who is running for Orange County commissioner in Florida. "But he brought it to the limelight," said Mohammad Shair, a 23-year-old Florida law student who now plans to vote for Green Party candidate Jill Stein.

Ellison tries to remind the dis­enchanted Muslims who supported Sanders that Clinton has done a lot of good. He tells them that she regrets her vote in favor of the Iraq War — and that there are congressional votes he regrets, too.

"I also tell them: 'There's going to be a president, and it's not going to be one of these third-party candidates. It's going to be the Democrat or the Republican. . . . So understand the clear and present danger presented by the alternative,' " he said.

‘We’ve been burned before ’

That binary choice makes some Muslim voters "feel like they have no choice," Amina Spahic, the Tampa Bay regional director for Emerge, told Mitha and the others who gathered at the mosque in Tampa.

Mubarak, the Tampa lawyer, said he regretted his votes for President Obama and what he considers the administration's hawkish drone policy and increased federal surveillance of Muslims. He wants to believe that Clinton would be different. But "the problem is we've been burned before so many times," he said, "and frankly we're tired of it."

To those voters, Clinton's statements on the issues provide little reassurance.

The campaign website's explanation of her stance on combating terrorism starts with the words "radical jihadists" — a term that some Muslim activists say stigmatizes Islam. Her national security page makes prominent reference to "protecting Israel" but no similar reference to Palestinians and Syrians, which some voters say they'd like to see. In a March speech to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, a lobbying group that aligns with the Israeli right and is opposed by many liberal American Jews, she twice referred to "Palestinian terrorists."

Ghazala Salam, a Clinton delegate at the Democratic National Convention in July who chairs the American Muslim Democratic Caucus in Florida, said the former secretary of state is simply the most qualified to do the job. Whether you like all of her policies or not, Salam said, she knows how to deal with the outside world.

Skeptical Muslim voters are "coming around," she said, and what they do next will be critical to the future of Muslim participation in U.S. politics.

Had Muslims been more politically engaged before the 2016 campaign, "we would have not really heard a person like Trump come out and say openly the things he did about Muslims," Salam said. "For it not to happen again, we have to have proactive engagement in every level of government."

abigail.hauslohner@washpost.com

Emily Guskin and Jenna Johnson in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The symbolism was obvious: A rich presidential candidate turns a mothballed government relic into a palatial hotel steps away from the White House. But for Donald Trump, not one for subtlety, even that wasn't enough. It had to be "one of the great hotels of the world."

When Trump International Hotel Washington, D.C. hosted its soft opening Monday, it capped the transformation of a century-old post office building into one of Washington's most expensive and ostentatious new hotels — and a monument to Trump.

But its main draw, the gilded name out front, might also be its biggest obstacle. What began as merely a prominent real estate project has morphed into a political landmark, where polarizing ties to the blustery mogul could influence its business through November and beyond.

Trump and his surrogate, former New York City mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, visited the hotel Monday as workers rushed to cut stone and apply mortar in preparation of the afternoon's soft opening, tweeting a picture thanking "all of the tremendous men & women for their hard work!"

At the same time, two dozen protesters amassed outside the hotel's soaring arches with signs declaring, "**Immigrants** & Muslims are welcome here — Trump hotel is NOT!" Yasmina Mrabet, of the advocacy group Act Now to Stop War and End Racism, said the hotel marked another example of what the "billionaire class represents, which is the reaping of profits at the expense of hardworking people."

Some rough edges were on display when guests were first let in Monday afternoon, including construction crews out back, loose wiring poking through the lobby carpet, and confusion about when certain entrances would open to the public.

Among the first guests allowed in were Blake and Elanie Yturralde, who were in town for business from Boca Raton, Fla., and enjoying complimentary drinks on a lobby couch.

"We like to stay at fine hotels around the world. We've stayed at other Trump properties and they are always really nicely done," Blake Yturralde said. They said they appreciated Trump's attention to detail and planned to vote for him in November. "It's that businessman's sensibility," he added.

Trump has pointed to the project as a symbol of his ability to lead a global superpower. And, indeed, the hotel reflects many of the contradictions at the heart of Trump's campaign: a 1 percenter fortress built alongside a populist campaign by a self-described billionaire, whose blue-collar rallygoers couldn't afford a spoon of wine at his newest high-class masterwork.

While Trump was shouting across middle America that Mexicans were drug-smuggling rapists, Hispanic men were building his luxury hotel for him on one of the national capital's ritziest blocks.

Before Monday's opening, Trump's campaign comments about Mexican **immigrants** drew a rebuke from Mayor Muriel E. Bowser (D), set off angry sidewalk protests and prompted the exodus of celebrity chefs José Andrés and Geoffrey Zakarian, whom the Trumps have since sued.

Should that pattern continue, it could be a problem for the ultimate success of the hotel, one analyst said.

"If he remains high-profile and a thorn in the side of the political elite, and on television the way he has been, I think that's a problem," said David Loeb, managing director at the investment giant Robert W. Baird & Co. "A lot of this is about the Trump brand and what the Trump brand represents, and when you damage that, it's hard to go back."

The $212 million ultraluxury hotel boasts many of Trump's signature extravagances: $1,000-a-night rooms, gold-encrusted bathrooms and Washington's largest suite — called, of course, the Trump Townhouse. A crystal-chandelier bar in the nine-story atrium serves wine by the spoon and offers daily champagne saberings, in which bottles are opened by sword.

The 263-room giant's formal grand opening is scheduled for next month, just days before the election. But its most pivotal moment probably won't come until Inauguration Day, when either a newly elected President Trump parades past the gleaming Pennsylvania Avenue icon — or a President Hillary Clinton strides by the newest showpiece of her vanquished foe's empire. During inauguration weekend, a night in the Trump Townhouse costs $100,000, with a five-night minimum.

"This building is a national treasure," said Ivanka Trump, Trump's daughter and a company executive leading the project. "It is a great honor and privilege to begin an exciting new chapter in its storied history after having transformed it into one of the finest hotels in the country."

Rooms start at an average of $895 a night, a company spokesman said, pricier even than the Four Seasons in Georgetown — some of the highest rates in the city, and critics have charged that the rates could hurt the hotel's chances to attract enough guests and stay afloat.

Those price tags are far loftier than some of the Trumps' early projections. When a Washington Post columnist calculated in 2012 that the hotel would need to charge $750 a night to cover its costs, Ivanka Trump called those numbers "pure speculation and, simply put, wrong." Trump representatives now say the prices are more expensive than first estimated because of higher-than-expected demand.

"There are people in the world who are looking for super luxury — the nicest hotel — of a kind D.C. does not presently have," said Loeb, the analyst.

Completed in 1899, the Old Post Office Pavilion is one of the capital's tallest and most historic buildings, a glimpse of vintage Washington tucked within the drab government boxes of the Federal Triangle.

A failed government push to demolish the underused building in the 1970s stirred outrage and sparked the District's historic preservation movement. But after a series of disastrous redevelopment efforts, fed-up members of Congress pushed authorities to open the site to private developers.

General Services Administration officials awarded Trump's company the 60-year lease in 2012, swayed by his pledge to spend more than $200 million to painstakingly restore the 117-year-old masterpiece — and pay $3 million a year in rent. In doing so, the company beat out Hilton Worldwide and Marriott International, both hospitality giants headquartered in the D.C. suburbs.

The Trumps broke ground in 2014 at a ceremony filled with local Democrats wielding golden shovels, and the project opened two years before the contract's deadline, leading Trump to take a familiar victory lap.

At a March news conference in the hotel's lobby, Trump said, "It's a great thing for the country, it's a great thing for Washington."

Trump has often cited the hotel on the campaign trail as an example of how he'll run the country, with accomplishments ahead of schedule and under budget. In recent weeks, hotel laborers have worked nearly around the clock, cutting stone for the ballroom's sweeping entryway.

But the hotel's development has routinely presented an awkward counterpoint to Trump's fiery campaign rhetoric. Trump's hired architect, Egypt native Hani Hassan, stuck with the project through the **immigration** controversy. The hotel's general manager, France native Mickael Damelincourt, is shepherding his third Trump property.

Damelincourt said he was confident that all 150 rooms made available in the first week would be booked. He said he already has more total business booked in the District than he had in the first six months of Trump's luxury hotel in Chicago, including a dozen weddings.

The controversies might have even helped business, he said: "I don't have to work as hard to let everybody know about the hotel."

The hotel has kept its Romanesque Revival design, including the iconic clock tower housing the Bells of Congress. But the inside appears dramatically new, with a ritzy bar and lounge, a BLT Prime steakhouse and an Ivanka Trump-brand spa. For shopping, the hotel offers a boutique by Italian men's fashion house Brioni, which sells $395 cotton T-shirts and suits starting at $6,000; Trump is a known customer.

The former postmaster general's office in the building was remodeled into a 4,000-square-foot, $15,000-a-night Presidential Suite, with a fireplace and marble "hand-selected from an Italian quarry" — a selling point carried over from Trump Tower. The 6,300-square-foot Trump Townhouse offers a private office and exclusive Pennsylvania Avenue entryway for $20,000 a night.

The hotel has also advertised that its 13,200-square-foot Presidential Ballroom is the "largest luxury ballroom in D.C." — seven hotels offer larger ballrooms in Washington, though the company argues they don't stand on the same level of luxury.

Former GSA officials said the government did its job in awarding the project to the best proposal. But they worry that Trump's political campaign could turn away the deep-pocketed guests, diners and corporate bookers needed to turn a profit.

"As an American I would like to see the building succeed," said Dan Tangherlini, the former GSA administrator who oversaw lease negotiations. "It would be a disappointment if this endeavor fails because of one person's views. However, I do think there will be some impact on the project because of this decision to run for political office."

Robert Peck, the former GSA public buildings commissioner who informed the Trumps of their selection, said he believed the hotel would have no trouble drawing high-end customers due to its "pretty spectacular" location. He will not be among them, though. He said he wouldn't give Trump "a penny from his personal account."

To cover the massive remodeling, the Trump Organization invested $42 million and took out a $170 million loan from Deutsche Bank. Trump's company has also applied for a federal historic-preservation tax credit that would cover about 20 percent of the rehabilitation, or roughly $40 million.

To save money, the Trumps have also pushed for lower taxes at a hotel portrayed as the peak of opulence. District officials agreed last year to trim the property's tax assessment by $7 million, to $91 million. But Trump sued after an appeals board rejected another attempt to lower the bill even further.

In a legal complaint filed in D.C. Superior Court, Trump attorney William Bosch said the District's tax assessments were "unreasonable" and "discriminatory" against Trump's company. Bosch called the lawsuit "a routine and customary practice that thousands of property owners . . . have used to ensure that their tax assessments are fairly established."

The opening is bittersweet for the District's congressional delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton, a Democrat who pushed the government for years to redevelop the property.

"The Trump name we've come to grips with, and I think Ivanka Trump recognizes it's not in their best interest to have politics and business intersect," Norton said. "It doesn't benefit them for this hotel to become a lightning rod."

As for when she'll be able to enjoy the hotel? She laughed and said, "I'll never be able to afford to stay at the Trump hotel."

jonathan.oconnell@washpost.com

drew.harwell@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A high-ranking Canadian official last week slammed the "ludicrous" decision of U.S. border agents to permanently deny entry to a Canadian man who admitted to using marijuana years before he attempted to visit the U.S.

The CBC reported that Matthew Harvey, a Canadian medical marijuana cardholder, was permanently banned from the U.S. in 2014 after telling customs agents that he had smoked marijuana recreationally before obtaining his medical card. Harvey was not carrying any marijuana at the time of his detainment at the border.

"This does seem to be quite a ludicrous situation, because, as you say, not only is the state of Washington, but three or four other jurisdictions in the United States have legalized marijuana," Public Safety Minister Ralph Goodale told CBC News.

The latest federal survey data indicate that a little less than half of American adults have used marijuana at some point in their lifetimes. Marijuana use remains illegal for all purposes under federal law.

Any foreign national who admits to having violated his home country's controlled substances laws at any point in the past can be considered ineligible for admission into the U.S.

"In other words, making an admission to a USCBP [U.S. Customs and Border Protection] officer that you previously violated controlled substance laws in Canada can result in a permanent bar," wrote **immigration** lawyer Henry Chang for the Huffington Post.

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and the Liberal Party have pledged to push for legalization of the recreational use of marijuana in 2017. Ralph Goodale, the public safety minister, told CBC that the current practice of strict prohibition in Canada and the U.S. isn't working.

"In Canada we're moving in an orderly way to a new regime that will include tight restrictions and regulation, and taxation, and at the end of the day will be more effective in keeping marijuana out of the hands of our kids," he said last week.

Matthew Harvey isn't the only Canadian to be denied entry on account of past marijuana use. The CBC spoke with an **immigration** lawyer who said he's represented dozens of Canadians in similar situations.

People entering the U.S. from Canada aren't asked about prior marijuana use as a matter of course. But certain circumstances, often at the discretion of individual border agents, can trigger such questioning. In the case of Matthew Harvey, his career in British Columbia's legal medical marijuana industry may have caused him to be flagged for increased scrutiny.

In another case, an individual was detained for questioning after border patrol agents found a pouch inscribed with the words "weed money" in his car. The pouch contained neither weed nor money.

People who are barred from the U.S. on account of past drug use can still enter the U.S. if they successfully apply for an "advanced permission" permit. The permit costs $585 and must be renewed periodically.

Other types of criminal behavior present no barrier to entry. A DUI conviction, for instance, does not on its own prevent a person from entering the U.S., according to Customs and Border Protection.

If Canada legalizes marijuana in 2017 it would likely present additional complications. The current law prevents entry for people who admit to having used drugs "illegally," but by the letter it does not ban people from crossing the border if they use drugs legally. This could create a situation where an agent denies entry to a person not because they currently use marijuana legally, but because they used it illegally at some point in the past.

"There are certain ironies about the current American position that we will certainly be very vociferous in putting before them," said Public Safety Minister Goodale, "and trying to ensure that Canadians are treated properly and fairly with a lot of common sense, instead of the rather ridiculous situation that's emerged in the last number of days."

Correction: An earlier version of this story misstated how many American adults have used marijuana. That number is less than half.

More from Wonkblog:

Ohio city shares shocking photos of adults who overdosed with a small child in the car

A maker of deadly painkillers is bankrolling the opposition to legal marijuana in Arizona

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**+ What **immigration** policy reforms outside the amnesty fight should receive priority in the next administration?

Ali Noorani is executive director of the National **Immigration** Forum.

Our **immigration** system must serve the interests of all Americans.

And the vast majority of Americans — Republicans as well as Democrats — recognize that our **immigration** system is broken, and support a new process that replaces our outdated laws. One key area is visa programs that are part of our legal **immigration** system. We need to update visa programs in a careful way that helps our economy — not reduce visas significantly, as some politicians and policy makers have proposed.

The last update to the number of permanent worker visas took place in 1990, the year Germany reunified. Our current legal **immigration** system does not meet our economic needs because our inflexible visa system constrains the growth of businesses, therefore undermining the competitiveness of the American worker and the livelihood of our families.

America's dairy industry is a unique example: Farmers regularly report labor shortages and raise concerns about availability of reliable year-round labor. More than half of dairy laborers are **immigrants**, and 79 percent of the U.S. milk supply comes from dairies with **immigrant** labor, according to a 2015 Texas A&M report paid for by the National Milk Producers Federation.

Yet here's the rub: We have no effective visa for the legal entry of such workers. The H-2A visa covers temporary, seasonal agricultural workers, but there is no "milk season"; milking cows is a year-round endeavor. The H-1B visa program covers temporary high-skilled workers, and dairy jobs do not meet the requirements.

People often seek progress on **immigration** reform by calling for a stand-alone E-Verify bill to guarantee a legal workforce. But without visa reforms, this type of enforcement program would gut the dairy industry, lower production of milk and increase dairy prices across the board.

That's just one example. A functioning work visa program would control legal **immigration**, align it with our economic and social needs and minimize the incentive to skip the legal **immigration** process. Frankly, the smartest way to secure our border is to have a 21st-century **immigration** process that advances the social and economic interests of all Americans.

Here are other components of a visa process that works: First, a legal **immigration** process that includes visa numbers in line with labor and workforce needs will make it easier for employers to hire **immigrants** with documentation. Sourcing labor in this way will help create new upstream and downstream jobs in the United States, instead of outsourcing entire industries.

Second, a reformed visa system should allow foreign students educated at U.S. colleges and universities to obtain work visas and contribute their talents here after graduation. We should be stapling green cards, not plane tickets, to diplomas.

Finally, visa reform must keep the family at the core of our **immigration** process. American families with loved ones abroad face a growing wait for a visa allotment process that has not changed in a generation. Employment- and family-based visa reform should go hand in hand.

Congress, with leadership from our next president, can account for our economic needs in a way that benefits American workers and businesses alike. Visa reform may not electrify the electorate, but it is crucial.

Read more:

David A. Martin: Donald Trump wants local police to enforce **immigration** laws. Here's why they don't.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**+ What **immigration** policy reforms outside the amnesty fight should receive priority in the next administration?

David A. Martin is professor emeritus at the University of Virginia School of Law. He served as principal deputy general counsel of the Department of Homeland Security during the first two years of the Obama administration .

Donald Trump has made empowering local police to enforce federal **immigration** law a key part of his campaign. He has said that local agencies know where violators are and that they would be "so happy" to get them out.

But Trump apparently hasn't been paying attention to what local jurisdictions have been doing over the past 10 years. A great many law enforcement agencies — including those covering large **immigrant** populations — have sharply restricted their cooperation with federal enforcement, even for violators arrested for local crimes and in the face of a formal federal request.

The reasons for this local stance reveal much about the counterproductive effects of "enforcement-first" policies. But they also indicate what must be done to achieve stable and sustainable **immigration** enforcement.

There are two strands to this local resistance: First, police leaders in **immigrant**-heavy areas are justifiably concerned that being closely linked to **immigration**enforcement will hamper community policing. They need good relations with the **immigrant** community to sustain communication and cooperation as they focus on their primary mission: public safety. This tension has always existed, but is now more pronounced because of the historically high percentage of unauthorized **immigrants** who have been living in the United States for a long time (60 percent of them have been here more than 10 years).

Second is the changing character of the public debate. The failure to enact a federal legalization program for long-term residents has generated many dramatically sympathetic cases of people facing removal. Anti-deportation activists have used these stories effectively to oppose virtually all deportations — a more extreme stance than localities had heard before.

Seen in this light, the hard-line enforcement camp's success in blocking legalization, through 11 years of serious legislative proposals, has actually eroded public acceptance of **immigration** enforcement — evidenced by the resistance from many states and localities. Finally adopting legalization would counter-intuitively empower and legitimize enforcement by definitively assuring that federal officers focus on more recent arrivals. Effective enforcement against that group is the key to long-term deterrence of future violations, and also far more likely to rebuild sustained public support.

What would a broad legalization program mean for the future role of local law enforcement? Certainly not a return to the street sweeps that Trump envisions. They almost always ensnare both citizens and lawful **immigrants**. Experienced **immigration** officers, not local police, need to be the ones who both determine **immigration** status and apply consistent nationwide enforcement priorities.

Local police will always have an indispensable role, particularly in helping federal officers learn of **immigration** violators involved in crime. But they should concentrate on enforcing their own criminal laws, without regard to **immigration** considerations, under locally implemented (and federally monitored) safeguards against racial profiling.  Through database checks of all arrestees' fingerprints, using a system that's been in place since 2014, federal **immigration**officers will selectively request custody. After legalization, local cooperation should become routine.

Could this more focused connection to **immigration** enforcement still undercut community policing? That tension would still exist, but as many police executives recognize, it would be greatly reduced if Congress assured **immigrants** that the federal government will concentrate enforcement on recent violators.

If elected, Hillary Clinton will certainly press for early legalization. But to have a meaningful and enduring **immigration** legacy, she must also make resolute use of the full enforcement potential of such a move.

Read more:

Ali Noorani: Visa reform could be the smartest way to secure our border

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**\* Katherine Krueger reports that Donald Trump reached truly inspiring levels of chutzpah today :

Donald Trump seized on his opponent's remarks over the weekend decrying the "basket of deplorables" among his supporters, saying Hillary Clinton should apologize after she "viciously demonized" Americans or drop out of the race.

Yes, what kind of monster would insult whole groups of people? How could that person possibly even contemplate serving as president?

\* Halimah Abdullah reports that President Obama could be headed for his first veto override :

President Obama will likely veto controversial legislation empowering the families of 9/11 victims to sue Saudi Arabia if that nation is found legally liable for supporting the deadliest terrorist attack in U.S. history, the White House said on Monday.

After eight years, we finally see some bipartisanship.

\* David Fahrenthold has found five "phantom donations" from the Trump Foundation, where it claimed on its tax forms that it gave money to a charity, but that charity says they never got anything .

\* Brian Beutler argues that the Republican Party is going to need to reckon with their basket of deplorables if they're to make a break with Trumpism once this election is over .

\* German Lopez takes a look at a lot of the polling and determines that, yes, a lot of Republican voters agree with Trump's "deplorable" views, which seems relevant to the question of whether Clinton was, you know, right.

\* And Jonathan Chait says that Clinton was absolutely correct in the sense that most Trump supporters are indeed deplorable .

\* Here's the ad the Trump campaign created out of "basket of deplorables," in which they don't actually deny that their supporters are all the things Clinton said .

\* Sahil Kapur explains one of the mysteries of this election, i.e., how "values voters" have managed to find a way to justify supporting one Donald J. Trump.

\*Joan McCarter notes that Democrats have pretty much united behind the idea of expanding Social Security, which would have been surprising just a few years ago .

\* Steve Benen is right about this: Even if it's true that Trump is far worse on transparency than Clinton is, criticism of her campaign's failure to disclose her pneumonia promptly is still legitimate. -- gs

\* David Drucker reports on what could be a very important factor this fall: Trump has elevated the importance of the **immigration** issue for Latino voters.

\* Heather Digby Parton reminds us that plenty of manly male politicians have had illnesses without everyone shouting that they must be at death's door and incapable of performing the responsibilities of office .

\* Jamelle Bouie says that yes, half of Trump's supporters do belong in the basket of deplorables .

\* At the American Prospect, I asked what we really mean when we say we want a "strong leader."

\* At The Week, I explained how journalists should interview Donald Trump, including the one question he fears most .

\* And finally, this morning I made a joke about Republicans believing Clinton "has been replaced by a shape-shifting **alien** from the planet Gragblorx 9 in preparation for their invasion of Earth."

Then it turned out there are a bunch of people who actually think Clinton employs a body double .

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton maintains a lead over Donald Trump, but lagging interest among some of her supporters poses a potential turnout challenge for Democrats with less than nine weeks before Election Day, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.

Clinton holds a 46 percent to 41 percent edge over Trump among likely voters, followed by Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson at 9 percent and the Green Party's Jill Stein at 2 percent. Clinton's lead swells to 10 percentage points among the wider swath of registered voters, 45 percent to 35 percent, similar to her 45 percent to 37 percent edge last month.

The findings come at a time when the margins between Clinton and Trump have narrowed in some battleground states and when some national polls also have shown a tightening in the competition. Heading toward the first presidential debate on Sept. 26, though, Trump still appears to have the more challenging route to victory.

Both candidates' reputations have been battered by the campaign, with more than 6 in 10 voters saying each candidate is not honest and trustworthy, and with majorities critical of Clinton's ethics as secretary of state as well as Trump's qualifications and his behavior toward women and minorities.

Asked about major campaign issues in the past month, almost 2 in 3 voters disapprove of Trump's explanation of his policy for handling undocumented **immigrants**, while nearly 6 in 10 say Clinton granted special favors to donors of the Clinton Foundation.

Both candidates' coalitions are united more by antipathy toward their opponent than enthusiasm for their own candidacy. Fewer than half of Trump's supporters — 46 percent — say they are "very enthusiastic" about his candidacy, while that number drops to 33 percent for Clinton's supporters. Meanwhile, 8 in 10 Trump supporters feel Clinton would do real damage to the country as president, while 83 percent of Clinton supporters feel the same way about Trump.

Trump's supporters report greater interest in the campaign and voting, which could factor into turnout. More than 6 in 10 registered voters who support Trump say they are following the campaign very closely, and 93 percent say they are absolutely certain to vote. By contrast, 45 percent of Clinton backers are paying close attention to the race, and 80 percent are certain to vote, while one-fifth say they will probably or are less likely to cast a ballot.

Clinton is relying on an extensive ground operation in the competitive states to turn out every vote possible, mindful that some of her supporters are not enthusiastic. Trump has gotten a late start in organizing in the battleground states and appears to be well behind Clinton in this aspect of the campaign. He will rely heavily on efforts by the Republican National Committee to reach his voters.

Seven in 10 voters say they have "definitely" decided which candidate to support, but a sizable 3 in 10 say they are undecided or might change their mind in the last two months. The share of persuadable voters is similar to that in 2008 but higher than Post-ABC polls in 2004 and 2012 conducted at a similar point. Roughly 8 in 10 Trump and Clinton supporters say they are committed to each candidate, while less than half of those who support Johnson or Stein are certain of their choice.

Other national polls have found Clinton's wide advantage after the party conventions shrinking in the past month to low single digits. The Post-ABC poll finds no slippage in Clinton's advantage among registered voters during that period, but her narrower advantage among likely voters, just beyond the poll's 4.5 percentage-point margin of error, could reflect weaker engagement among her supporters.

The Post-ABC poll finds 58 percent of Americans expect Clinton will prevail, though only 18 percent think she will do so easily. Nearly 9 in 10 Clinton supporters think she will win, while just under 7 in 10 Trump backers are similarly confident about him.

The poll finds Trump continues to face significant challenges to expanding his support. Trump's 50 percent to 36 percent lead among white likely voters is smaller than Mitt Romney's 20-point edge in the 2012 exit poll, driven by weaker support among white women and college graduates. Trump and Clinton are actually nearly even among white men with college degrees, a sharp change from recent elections when Republicans carried those voters easily.

Clinton's double-digit lead with white college-educated women would mark Democrats' largest margin since exit polling began covering the topic in 1980.

Clinton's 75 percent to 13 percent lead among the growing share of nonwhite voters is similar to Barack Obama's four years ago. That comes despite efforts by Trump over recent weeks to appeal more directly for support among African Americans, which so far appear to have produced no tangible results.

Trump does benefit from more unified Republican support, with 86 percent of likely GOP voters supporting him, ticking up from 80 percent in early August. Clinton receives 90 percent support among fellow Democrats, similar to 93 percent in August. In this poll, independents split 39 percent to 37 percent between Clinton and Trump. A month ago, they were tilted in Trump's favor.

The poll finds no clear advantage for Trump across a range of issues and personal attributes. Clinton holds a nine-point advantage among registered voters on being closer to them on the issues, a 12-point advantage on "understanding the problems of people like you" and a 26-point edge on having the better personality and temperament to be president.

The two are closer when asked which candidate is more honest and trustworthy — 45 percent choose Clinton, while 43 percent pick Trump.

More than one-third of voters say the economy is the most important issue in their vote, and Clinton holds a narrow 50 percent to 44 percent edge over Trump in trust to handle the economy. Terrorism ranks second on a list of voters' concerns, with Clinton and Trump trusted about evenly on the issue among registered voters (47 percent to 44 percent). Clinton has a slight 49 percent to 44 percent advantage on trust to handle **immigration**, which is ranked by 7 percent as the most important issue in their vote.

Clinton holds a double-digit advantage over Trump on trust to handle taxes and a more than 20-point edge on trust to handle international trade agreements, a signature issue of the GOP nominee's candidacy.

Trump appeared to ease off his previous call to immediately deport all undocumented **immigrants**, although his position is still not entirely clear. His support for building a wall along the southern border and forcing Mexico to pay for it has not changed.

The Post-ABC poll finds broad skepticism of Trump's overall approach, with 78 percent of voters saying they prefer offering undocumented **immigrants** who pass background checks a path to citizenship, which is Clinton's position. Just 16 percent support full deportation. Six in 10 voters oppose building a wall along the country's southern border, and nearly three-quarters say Trump would not be able to get Mexico to fund the barrier. Among Trump's supporters, roughly three-quarters support building a wall, but 62 percent say they prefer a path to citizenship over deportation.

In general, more than 6 in 10 voters say Trump has been inconsistent about the policies he would pursue as president, and 46 percent say this makes them think less of Trump. More than 4 in 10 voters say Clinton has been inconsistent, with 31 percent saying this makes them think less of her.

Beyond their policy differences, both Trump and Clinton continue to face widespread skepticism over questions of ethics and personality.

Just over 7 in 10 voters say Clinton is "too willing to bend the rules," including a striking 55 percent of fellow Democrats. Meanwhile, a 57 percent majority of voters say Trump is biased against women and minorities. Neither sentiment has softened much in recent months.

Voters are also skeptical of how Clinton and Trump would manage conflicts of interest with their ties to nonprofit organizations and business, respectively. Almost 6 in 10 voters say they are very or somewhat concerned about conflicts with Trump's business interests, while a similar portion are concerned about conflicts between Clinton's work as president and the Clinton Foundation.

Concerns about Clinton's use of a private email server have peaked in the two months after the FBI recommended against criminally charging her. Fully 64 percent of voters say they disapprove of her handling of questions about her use of personal email while secretary of state, up slightly from 59 percent in June to the highest level in Post-ABC polling since last year. Half of voters, 50 percent, say they "strongly disapprove" of her handling of questions.

Amid Clinton and Trump's struggles, the Post-ABC poll finds 58 percent of Americans overall approve of President Obama's job performance, the highest since July 2009 and continuing the positive movement since December when he stood at 45 percent. Underscoring the passionate negative views that voters have of the candidate they oppose this year, nearly 8 in 10 Americans who disapprove of Obama say he has done real damage to the country.

The Post-ABC poll was conducted Sept. 5-8 among a random national sample of 1,002 adults reached by cellular and landline phones. Overall results have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points; the error margin is four points among the sample of 842 registered voters, and 4.5 points among the sample of 642 likely voters.

scott.clement@washpost.com

dan.balz@washpost.com

Emily Guskin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the wake of Hillary Clinton becoming faint at a ceremony marking the 15th anniversary of 9/11 and the subsequent acknowledgement that she was diagnosed with pneumonia last Friday, a consensus has emerged from both journalists and her fellow Democrats: This particular health issue may not be a big deal, but she needs to be more transparent. (Republicans, on the other hand, are more likely to believe either that she's hiding a brain tumor or that she has been replaced by a shape-shifting **alien** from the planet Gragblorx 9 in preparation for their invasion of Earth).

You won't get any argument from me when it comes to the assertion that Clinton should be more transparent, both about her health and more generally. There's no doubt that she has a propensity for secrecy, one born of a long dysfunctional relationship with the press that produces a vicious cycle in which they treat every new piece of information about her as shocking and sinister, then in response she tries to keep as much information private as possible, which convinces them that she has something to hide, which makes them even more skeptical of everything she says, which makes her more secretive, and around it goes.

But before we submit to the both-sides-do-it temptation to condemn both Clinton and Trump equally for their unwillingness to be as transparent as possible, we should take a comprehensive look at the transparency issue so we can make an informed judgment about this question. And when you do that, it becomes pretty clear that while Clinton is transparent about some things and secretive about others, Trump has been transparent about almost nothing.

So let's take this one piece at a time to determine what we know and don't know about both party's nominees:

Health: Since Clinton is 68 and Trump is 70 — she'd be the second-oldest president in history after Ronald Reagan, while he'd be the oldest — the public has a particular interest in knowing everything we can about the state of their health. So far, we haven't gotten much. Last July Clinton released a two-page letter from her doctor which falls well short of the complete medical history earlier candidates have released. However, it does go into some specifics about recent medical issues, medications she's taking, and the results of her latest physical. It says: "Her vital signs showed blood pressure 100/65, heart rate 72, respiratory rate 18 and temperature 98.7. The remainder of her physical examination was normal. Laboratory testing revealed a normal EKG and normal laboratory testing, including cholesterol of 195, with an LDL of 118, HDL of 64 and triglycerides of 69."

Trump, on the other hand, has released only a comical four-paragraph letter from his physician Harold Bornstein, a weird character who looks like he just walked out of a Hunter S. Thompson book.  Bornstein's letter, which he says he wrote in five minutes while a car sent by Trump waited to take possession of it, says that Trump's recent lab tests were "astonishingly excellent," gushes that "his physical strength and stamina are extraordinary," and ends by proclaiming that, "If elected Mr. Trump, I can state unequivocally, will be the healthiest individual ever elected to the presidency." Many people read it and assumed it must have been written by Trump himself.

So to date, Clinton has provided slightly more information than Trump about her health, though both of them should go much further.

Finances: This one isn't even close. Trump has filed a financial disclosure as required by the Federal Election Commission, but the information it provides is limited since it lists assets and liabilities only in broad ranges like "over $50 million." However, he has refused to release any tax returns, something that every party nominee in the last three decades has done. Trump's excuse is that he's being audited by the IRS, but the agency has stated that he's perfectly free to release them if he likes, and he's also refusing to release the returns for years that aren't covered by the audit.

Hillary Clinton's finances, on the other hand, are about as transparent as they can be. Between what she has released as a candidate and what Bill Clinton released while president, you can read every one of her tax returns dating back at least to 1990.

This means that while we know about every dollar Clinton has earned, every deduction she's taken, and every dime she's given to charity for most of her adult life, we know none of those things for Trump. And given the intricate web of partnerships and businesses that constitute Trump's business, not to mention the often sketchy ways he has gone about giving and receiving money, the need to understand his potential conflicts of interest seems particularly acute.

But Trump has already said that he won't be releasing any tax returns before the election. Not only that, I'm betting that he'd continue to refuse to do so even if he becomes president. After all, there's no law against it.

Policy: This may not be what you immediately think of when the word "transparency" comes up, but it is highly relevant. You may not like the things Hillary Clinton is proposing to do, but it's hard to argue she hasn't been clear about them. Her web site contains policy statements on 38 different issue areas. If you're not sure where she stands on a particular issue, that's only because you haven't taken the time to find out.

Trump, on the other hand, has been unusually vague for a presidential candidate. We recently learned that while he had a policy shop working to turn his pronouncements into concrete plans, it disbanded after the campaign refused to pay the people doing the work. When asked how he would actually achieve the spectacular results he promises, Trump often falls back on tautologies — he'll create jobs by creating jobs, he'll defeat terrorism by defeating terrorism, and so on. He claims to have a secret plan to defeat ISIS, one so brilliant it is guaranteed to work, but he won't tell us what it is.  Think of how hard we in the press have had to work poring over contradictory statements and vague assurances just to figure out whether Trump actually wants to deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. And that's on his signature issue.

There are other areas in which we could give each of the candidates transparency demerits. Clinton hasn't released the transcripts of speeches she gave as a private citizen, for example, while Trump regularly says things that beg for clarification he refuses to offer (for instance, the names of even one or two of the "hundreds of friends" he claims to have lost on 9/11). Then there's the issue of Clinton's emails, which is obviously complex (though even if you think Clinton set up a private server to shield her correspondence from lawsuits and FOIA requests, she turned the emails over to the State Department when they requested them, so we now know what's in them).

But the conclusion is inescapable: What we have here is one candidate, Hillary Clinton, who has been open about many things but has fallen short of full transparency in some important ways, and a second candidate, Donald Trump, who has been utterly opaque in every way he possibly can. We should keep demanding complete transparency from both of them. But no one can say there's no difference between them.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A right-wing Austrian politician who may yet be the country's president has called for the demolition of Adolf Hitler's first home.

The Nazi leader was born in 1889 in a yellow-brick house on a street in the northern Austrian village of Braunau am Inn. This year, authorities in Vienna pushed through legislation to forcibly expropriate the building from its owner, out of growing fears that it was becoming a place of pilgrimage for neo-Nazis.

Norbert Hofer, a far-right presidential candidate who is slated to contest elections once more after an earlier vote was ruled out for "procedural irregularities," added to the growing chorus urging the site's destruction. It's particularly pointed given that one of the original leaders of his anti-**immigrant**, ultranationalist Freedom Party was a former SS officer and Nazi functionary.

"Well, the only options are turning [the site] into a memorial or tearing it down," Hofer told the Austria Press Agency. "If you ask me, I would be for demolishing it."

The statement is seen as an attempt to build bridges with Austria's tiny Jewish community and soften the image of the far right, which has won considerable popular support by grandstanding over fears of Muslim **immigration**. Hofer has separately called for the publication of an official German translation of the Koran so non-Muslims "can understand this religious community better."

But, according to Agence France-Presse, Hofer, if elected, will scrap the tradition of hosting an annual dinner marking the end of the Muslim holy month of Ramadan at the presidential palace. The position of president in Austria is largely symbolic, but the prospect of a politician from a party espousing such views winning the post sent shock waves across Europe.

Regarding Hitler's home, Hofer is hardly leading the charge. Earlier this year, Austria's Interior Minister Wolfgang Sobotka already signaled his desire to have the house torn down. The government had been renting the building from its owner since 1972, using it as a public center for the disabled. But the owner's recent refusals to renovate the site led the building to be abandoned in 2011.

"The decision is necessary because the Republic would like to prevent this house from becoming a 'cult site' for neo-Nazis in anyway, which it has been repeatedly in the past, when people gathered there to shout slogans," Sobokta explained in July.

In Russia, parliamentarians have also proposed raising money to purchase the site and then blow it up. "If I were to receive financial help, I would buy the house and destroy it demonstratively," proposed Russian Frantz Klintsevich in 2012. The Soviet Union, as WorldViews discussed earlier, suffered greatly under the assault of the Nazi war machine and did perhaps more to defeat Hitler than other Allied powers.

But there are concerns that even destroying the building would still give far-right neo-Nazi sympathizers a public spot to memorialize Hitler. Other suggestions include turning the building into a housing project that would make Hitler's first bedroom into just another apartment in a condominium or transforming the home into a center for education.

Some local historians suggest that Hitler was born not in the current building, but a property nearby that has since been demolished. His family left the yellow-brick home and the village after he turned 3.

Critics say Austria has done less to critically examine its fascist past than neighboring Germany, where everyone grows up now fully aware of the evils of Nazism. Still, the current single monument by the house drives home the point. A simple stone memorial is inscribed with a message that makes no mention of Hitler himself.

"For peace, freedom and democracy," it reads. "Never again Fascism. Millions of dead remind us."

More on WorldViews

What a world without Baby Hitler might look like

Hitler painted this watercolor, and someone may pay $60,000 for it

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If Campaign 2016 needed some shorthand to capture the way many Americans see the competition between the two major-party candidates, Hillary Clinton may have unintentionally supplied it this weekend. For much of the electorate, this could be remembered as a deplorable election.

Candidates are often stamped by seemingly offhand statements. Mitt Romney never escaped his "47 percent" comment in 2012, and President Obama found the same when he said many culturally conservative voters "cling" to their guns and religion. Donald Trump has a laundry list of them. After Friday, Clinton now has hers to regret.

Clinton stumbled as Romney and Obama did, seemingly with her guard down and before the friendliest of audiences, an LGBT fundraiser in New York. If there isn't a page in campaign manuals labeled "Beware of Fundraisers," there should be. It's where mistakes are easily made and not so easily undone.

Unlike Romney and Obama, Clinton spoke at a fundraiser that was open to the media, which should have made her more careful. Although she has said similar things in the past, she clearly went further than before, raising the question of whether this was intentional.

Here's what she said that caused the uproar: "You know, to just be grossly generalistic, you could put half of Trump's supporters into what I call the 'basket of deplorables.' Right? The racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic — you name it. And unfortunately, there are people like that, and he has lifted them up."

She went on to talk about others who support Trump, saying they are worthy of empathy and understanding. She described them as people who feel "that the government has let them down, the economy has let them down, nobody cares about them, nobody worries about what happens to their lives and their futures, and they're desperate for change."

That latter characterization aptly captures an important part of the dynamic of the 2016 campaign, and it is one important reason Trump became the Republican nominee and remains competitive in the general election. But Clinton so muddied the focus on the grievances of many Americans who feel left behind with the first part of what she said that she has landed on the defensive, and understandably so.

The word "deplorable" no doubt captures how many Americans see the overall competition between Clinton and Trump. Last week's 50-state survey by The Washington Post and SurveyMonkey underscored the concerns that voters have about both major-party candidates. Nationally, 55 percent of registered voters say Clinton would threaten the country's well-being, while 61 percent say Trump would threaten the country's well-being. Overall, 95 percent say either Trump or Clinton — or both — would do so.

These attitudes come after a campaign of insults and petty, personal attacks as well as a clash over some of the most fundamental questions facing the country. This is a campaign that could be about big issues but instead often has been fought at the most base level.

On that score, Trump has led the way. He started his campaign by branding illegal **immigrants** from Mexico as rapists and criminals. He has never let up, denigrating people of all kinds. In addition to Mexican **immigrants**, his targets have included women, Muslims, a Vietnam POW named Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), the disabled, a federal judge of Mexican heritage and a Gold Star family. At NBC's commander in chief forum last week, he inexplicably beat up on the generals advising the president.

There has been a truism about this campaign. Trump has taken his opponents down to his level, and they have paid a price for it. Throughout the Republican primaries, he insulted any political rival he deemed a threat, such as "low-energy Jeb" Bush, "Little Marco" Rubio and "Lyin' Ted" Cruz. When they tried to play his game, they ended up scarred.

Bush never could find the formula to fight back effectively and was diminished and eventually destroyed politically by it. Rubio's campaign unraveled when he descended into a round of petty insults that mimicked Trump. He, too, never recovered and has found himself in an awkward embrace with Trump since he got out of the race.

Cruz could not find the right calibration between initial chumminess with Trump (when he believed he could inherit the Trump coalition) and his eventual indignation at what Trump said about his wife and father as he was losing the nomination. Cruz's ultimate refusal to endorse Trump during his speech in July at the Republican convention brought a chorus of boos from the audience and possible long-term problems.

Trump has never recanted his birther campaign against Obama in 2011. In the past week, surrogates have claimed that he now accepts that Obama was born in the United States. He has yet to say so himself. When asked recently, he simply said he doesn't like to talk about the issue anymore.

Trump has the support of white supremacists and the alt-right of the conservative movement. House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) said Trump's attacks on U.S. District Judge Gonzalo Curiel amounted to "the textbook example of a racist comment."

What is also known about some of Trump's supporters is their discomfort with changes, whether cultural or demographic, that are reshaping the country. This is part of what has so divided the country and made this campaign a dialogue about what it means to be an American.

Clinton has sought to make Trump an unacceptable candidate, arguing that his temperament and views should disqualify him in the eyes of a majority of voters. Those attacks have been tough and relentless and unsurprising.

Why Clinton concluded there was something to be gained by shifting her focus from Trump to some of his supporters with her shorthand characterization is inexplicable. Attacking symptoms is one thing, but branding an entire class of voters is another, as Romney and Obama learned.

This was a self-inflicted wound. Her supporters might cheer her, and those at the fundraiser laughed as she made her comment. Ultimately it might have little effect on the polls. But it is a damaging moment that Republicans will use to sow even more distrust about her candidacy.

Trump and his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, seized on Clinton's comment. Trump called it "SO INSULTING" in a tweet. Speaking Saturday at the Values Voter Summit, Pence said, "No one with that low opinion of the American people should ever be elected president."

By Saturday afternoon, Clinton was trying to clean up from Friday. She issued a statement saying she regretted saying that "half" of Trump's supporters were deplorables. But she did not back down on her criticism of Trump and added, "I won't stop calling out bigotry and racist rhetoric in this campaign." She clearly thinks that, ultimately, is a winning position.

At various stages, Campaign 2016 has been waged in ways that have left voters with a sense of despair at their choice. Based on the first week of campaigning in September, it threatens to stay there. Perhaps the debates will take the campaign back up to a different level, but that seems doubtful.

Eventually, one of these two candidates will be elected president. Unifying the country will be exceedingly difficult, to say the least. Clinton has talked about wanting to find common ground with Republicans where possible. She also has been urged repeatedly to find a more positive message, to give people an affirmative reason to vote for her.

In her Saturday statement, Clinton focused again on Americans left out or left behind and said, "I'm determined to bring our country together." But her comments Friday have provided her opponents with fresh ammunition to distrust her desire to work across party lines and could cause them to resist those overtures in the future. If she becomes president, she has made the job of governing all the more difficult.

dan.balz@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**President Obama is asking Americans to remain tolerant of Muslim refugees and other **immigrants**, declaring Monday that the United States welcomes them "with empathy and an open heart."

Obama marked the Eid al-Adha holiday by offering "warmest wishes" to Muslims in a statement from him and the first lady released by the White House. Obama said the holiday should remind Americans "of the millions of refugees across the globe who are spending this sacred holiday separated from their families, unsure of their future, but still hoping for a brighter tomorrow."

The president has sought to create a contrast with Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump, who has proposed banning Muslims from **immigrating** to the United States over fears of terrorism. Trump also has pledged to build a wall along the southern border of the country to keep out undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico. Obama has denounced Trump repeatedly over views that the president has called intolerant and against American values, although he did not mention the New York business mogul by name in the statement.

Obama called Eid al-Adha, the Islamic festival of sacrifice, "a celebration of the ways faith can transcend any differences or boundaries and unite us under the banners of fellowship and love."

Last month, the Obama administration announced it had reached a goal of accepting 10,000 refugees from Syria, where a fierce civil war has displaced millions of people. Human-rights advocates have called on Obama to increase that number.

The president is scheduled to play host to a special summit on the refugee crisis at the United Nations General Assembly meetings in New York City next week. National security adviser Susan E. Rice said in a statement last month that the administration "has committed to work with the international community to significantly increase humanitarian assistance funding, double the global number of refugees afforded opportunities for resettlement or other humanitarian admissions, and help empower refugees in countries of asylum."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Action in Community Through Service food pantry needs volunteers to stock shelves, prepare food bags and make grocery store pickups either on a regular schedule (flexible) or on an on-call basis. To complete an online application, visit actspwc.org.

ACTS Helpline needs volunteers to answer the suicide-prevention hotline. 703-221-1144.

American Association for the Advancement of Science needs scientists, engineers, mathematicians and physicians to assist K-12 STEM teachers. Victor Crawford, 703-732-9004. vicris51@verizon.net.

American Cancer Society's Road to Recovery needs drivers to take patients to appointments. 804-527-3719. leah.seldinsommer@cancer.org.

Beacon for Adult Literacy trains people to help adults with literacy and English-speaking skills. 703-368-7491. beaconliteracy.org.

BEAT Cancer Coalition needs drivers 55 and older to take patients to appointments. Retired and senior volunteer program. 703-369-5292.

Birmingham Green adult-care service needs volunteers who speak Vietnamese. 703-257-6252.

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Washington-Manassas needs volunteers. bgcgw.org/prince-william.

Catholic Charities Hogar **Immigrant** Services needs teachers for its English as a second language and citizenship classes. Training provided. 571-208-1572. volunteer.hogar@ccda.net.

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children's Intervention Services, needs Spanish-speaking volunteers to visit children who have been abused and neglected. Ben Gimeno, 703-330-8145, bgimeno@casacis.org.

ESL and **Immigrant** Ministries trains volunteers to teach English to adults. 703-841-0292. office@eslim.org, eslim.org.

Friends of Feral Cats of PWC needs volunteers and donations of cat food. Call Nancy, 571-719-0657.

Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind needs volunteers to raise and train puppies. 866-282-8046. guidedog.org.

Habitat for Humanity needs help with projects, ReStore and providing lunch to volunteers. 703-369-6708. volunteer@ habitatpwc.org.

Historic Dumfries needs docents for the Weems-Botts Museum to help with events and research projects, gather and transcribe local oral histories, and work on other projects. 703-221-2218.

Keep Prince William Beautiful needs help with its storm-drain program and educational outreach. 571-285-3772. kpwb.org.

Literacy Volunteers of Prince William needs adults to help adult students improve their literacy skills. Training provided. 703-670-5702. lvapw.org.

Mutt Love Rescue needs foster homes for rescued dogs. 703-577-0106. adopt@muttloverescue.org, muttloverescue.org.

Northern Virginia Family Service seeks foster parents. 571-748-2500.

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Monday-Friday. 703-792-4583.

Prince William Area Free Clinic needs volunteer doctors, pharmacists, physician assistants, nurses, translators and administrative assistants for the Unified Health Center in Woodbridge. 703-496-9403. pwafc.org .

Prince William Cooperative Extension Program needs facilitators for the Parent Education Program's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting groups. Training provided. Janice Brody, 703-792-4678. jbrody@pwcgov.org.

Prince William County Historic Preservation Division needs tour guides and assistance with special events, educational programs and gardening. 703-792-4754. historicpreservation@pwcgov.org .

Prince William County Office of Elections needs student volunteers to participate in its electoral page program. pwcvotes.com.

Prince William Health District is seeking volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community-health experience necessary. Training provided. Lesha Spencer-Brown lesha.spencer-brown@vdh.virginia.gov.

Prince William Trails and Streams Coalition needs volunteers to help build and maintain trails in the county. 703-791-6158. pwtsc.org.

Project Mend-a-House needs help for home-safety repairs. 703-792-7663. lizw@pmahweb.org.

RESET seeks volunteers to lead elementary and preschool students in science and math learning. John Meagher, 703-250-0236. reset@resetonline.org , resetonline.org .

SERVE needs drivers for the food-recovery program at the food distribution center, as well as a bilingual (Spanish and English) food-assistance client-intake specialist. Navara Cannon, 571-748-2536, ncannon@nvfs.org.

St. Paul United Methodist Church needs bus drivers Thursdays to take people to and from a community dinner. Drivers must have a class C license with a P endorsement. 703-494-2445.

Occoquan needs volunteers for events throughout the year, including the annual arts and crafts shows. Donna Brown, 703-491-2168. dbrown@occoquanva.gov.

Wildlife Rescue League needs hotline volunteers, wildlife transporters and rehabilitators. Training provided. 703-391-8625. volcoord@wildliferescueleague.org.

— Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The question-and-answer portion of beauty pageants is always good for angering the Internet — and Sunday night's Miss America pageant, which crowned 21-year-old Miss Arkansas Savvy Shields the winner, certainly delivered.

The Top 7 contestants were given a series of surprisingly tough, politically charged questions as the women vied for the crown. As you can see, these were questions (see transcripts below) that would be challenging for anyone, let alone someone who has 20 seconds to formulate an answer on live television — and is trying hard not to alienate any judges or viewers.

While timely political questions are the pageant norm, some were not pleased by this year's theme:

I mean is this a political debate or a pageant??? Maybe I forgot what I was watching because it clearly wasn't a pageant #MissAmerica

Who ever wrote these #MissAmerica questions should be ashamed. Whatever happened to political views being private? Tacky and rude.

Is the new #MissAmerica going to moderate the next presidential debate? Why were those questions so political?

These girls only get 20 seconds to eloquently answer open ended political questions. Most politicians can't do that #MissAmerica

#MissAmerica where you're given 45 seconds to strut in your swimsuit, but less than 20 seconds to answer political questions

Topics ranged from Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton to **immigration**; here are all of the questions and answers:

Question 1: "The **immigration** debate rages on: Building a wall along the Mexico border, establishing sanctuary cities, deporting 11 million undocumented people. Do you believe our country has an **immigration** problem?"

Miss South Carolina Rachel Wyatt: "You know, we certainly do. And I myself am a quarter Japanese. My great-grandfather is an **immigrant**, and I think that America really is a nation built on **immigrants** and so this is an issue that we have to come to a resolution on and be welcoming to others to come into this nation of freedom."

Question 2: "Miss America 1989 Gretchen Carlson just accepted a $20 million settlement from Fox News for her sexual harassment suit against Roger Ailes. Fox paid. Ailes walked. What message does this send?"

Miss Mississippi Laura Lee Lewis: "This sends a message that we have so much further to go with equality in the workforce. Women are just as equal as men in the workforce and I think — it's 2016, guys. We've got to focus on this and have equality in the workforce. And when we start focusing on that, it's going to be great."

Question 3: "49ers quarterback Colin Kaepernick has ignited a national debate by refusing to stand for the national anthem in protest of racial inequality and police brutality. Do you sit with him or stand against him?"

Miss Washington Alicia Cooper: "The first thing I want to say is we need to focus on how important the Black Lives Matter issue is, all lives matter in this situation. I don't necessarily support the fact that he sat out, but I do respect that he took a knee and that people are joining in. Because we need to focus on the resolution to this problem, and we need to come together as a nation to have everyone feel equal in our society."

Question 4: "Journalists are calling out Matt Lauer for aggressively grilling Hillary Clinton while letting Donald Trump slide. Others are declaring a liberal media bias. How would you grade the media on their election coverage?"

Miss Maryland Hannah Brewer: "I think it's been very — I think it's been very equal to both parties. I think both Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton have received a lot of criticism for the way that they're going about this campaign, and I think it's absolutely ridiculous. I think that we need to support both of these people. They are trying to make our country a better place and I support them both."

Question 5: "Donald J. Trump. What do you think of him? You have 20 seconds, go."

Miss New York Camille Sims:  (laughs) "I think that he's a bright reminder of how our country needs to come together. If you don't agree with his message, then it's time to decide where you stand in this debate. As Americans, we need to make sure that we come together, represent what it means to be American — which is celebrating all people from all backgrounds whether you're an **immigrant**, or a Native American, or an African American, or an Asian American.

Question 6: "Hillary Rodham Clinton. What do you think?"

Miss Arkansas Savvy Shields: (laughs) "Sorry, that's kind of funny. If you're trying to be leader of the free world, everything you say and do matters, and all of your actions are held to a higher standard. And unfortunately, the media does love to sensationalize everything, and it's hard to tell what is truth and what is truly scandal. I think going back at what my previous contestant said, both of these contestants have done a great job. Er, both of these candidates have done a great job in competing, but they also need to watch what they're doing, and — (gets cut off for time limit)

Question 7: "This is the 15th anniversary of 9/11. What is one thing the new president should do to protect us?"

Miss Texas Caroline Carothers: "Yes, 15 years ago today we were attacked, and that is very unfortunate. But one thing that our new president needs to realize is that one thing about being strong with this country is learning when and where to be cautious. And I believe that if our new president understands that and learns that, then we will be in a better place and we'll be much safer as a nation."

Read more:

What's a nice lesbian like you doing at Miss America? Erin O'Flaherty's historic quest.

Could D.C. be home to both Miss USA and Miss America?

Miss Arkansas Savvy Shields wins Miss America pageant

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Let's time-hop to around this week four years ago, when the magazine Mother Jones surfaced a video of Mitt Romney disparaging the "47 percent" of Americans who — he claimed — do not pay any (federal) income tax.

There are 47 percent of the people who will vote for the president no matter what. All right, there are 47 percent who are with him, who are dependent upon government, who believe that they are victims, who believe the government has a responsibility to care for them, who believe that they are entitled to health care, to food, to housing, to you-name-it. … These are people who pay no income tax. Forty-seven percent of Americans pay no income tax.

The presidential candidate was grandstanding for a crew of wealthy donors. But even in that context, the remarks sounded awkward. They revealed how Romney and his cadre of campaign consultants had misjudged the GOP coalition of 2012.

The Republican business leaders wanted lower taxes and less restrictive government, as always; but the growing populist wing demanded more tangible solutions for the middle and lower-middle class. Four years ago, these groups were bound together by a fragile line of reasoning that threaded notions of personal responsibility and racially coded condemnations of welfare recipients.

But the truth is that a significant proportion of Republicans receive government benefits of one kind or another. They rely on Social Security or the Earned Income Tax Credit, or food stamps or TANF, or Medicaid. Not only did the gaffe make Romney seem cruel and disconnected, but his remarks insulted the Republicans who are in the 47 percent. It's a complicated relationship. Many regard themselves as hard-working citizens who have been forced against their will into the embraces of the social safety net.

Now, in 2016, polls suggest that Donald Trump's supporters are heavily concentrated among the same "47 percent" that Romney dismissed four years ago.

Arlie Russell Hochschild, a University of California sociologist, has written incisively about the rise of the populist right and their champion. Trump, she argues, "solves a white male problem of pride."

Unlike some other Republicans, Trump doesn't stigmatize government assistance programs. In the division between "makers" and "takers," he legitimizes being a "taker." He accomplishes this, Hochschild says, in part by shifting the scrutiny to other groups, such as **immigrants** and Muslims. For instance, when Trump claimed (incorrectly) that the welfare system helps undocumented **immigrants** more than it benefits "native American" households, the subtext was that his own supporters are among the deserving recipients of government assistance.

In Trump's view of the world, the problem isn't welfare, necessarily. It's that welfare goes to the wrong people.

Hochschild's observations lend some context to the results of a new study from economists Don Fullerton, of the University of Illinois, and Nirupama Rao, of New York University. Fullerton and Rao analyzed data from a long-term research project that has followed the fortunes of over 18,000 Americans since 1968.

They found that there is significant churn among those who don't pay the federal income tax. The so-called "47 percent" are not some permanent underclass of dependents. A large fraction of them quickly get back on their feet again.

"The tax system is providing insurance," Fullerton said. "In good years you're paying income taxes. But if you have a bad year — say you get laid off — you get a break from the government."

Before digging into the data, it's worth recognizing that the real figure is somewhat smaller than 47 percent. Romney took that figure from a Tax Policy Centerestimate for 2009, a year when many Americans were still reeling from the recession. In more typical times, the data suggests that about 39 percent of American households don't pay the income tax in a given year.

Of those households, about 18 percent started paying taxes the very next year. Five years out, about 40 percent of them have begun earning enough to pay the tax. Who are the rest? Some of them are students and retirees (in the data, about half of people over 55 did not pay income tax in a given year). And some, of course, are the chronically poor.

But as this chart from the paper shows, few people escape the income tax for very long. Of those who have ever been part of the 47 percent — or rather, the 39 percent — most of them do end up paying the income tax for most of their lives.

There is nothing necessarily wrong, by the way, with not having to pay income tax. It is exactly why we have a progressive income tax in the first place: to take pressure off people who don't have the means to contribute at the moment. Most people pay other forms of taxes anyway — payroll taxes, sales taxes, gas taxes, and so on.

A much smaller fraction, about 10 percent of Americans, receive assistance from the government in the form of food stamps or TANF or unemployment benefits. But again, most of them quickly cycle off benefits. The drop-off is quite steep. Of the people who receive some form of government transfer in a given year (other than Social Security), about 44 percent of them stop receiving it the next year. Only about 20 percent of them receive benefits for five straight years.

As this chart shows, of all the households in the data that ever receive government transfers, about 30 percent of them take the government money only for a single year.

Although few people are receiving government benefits at any given moment, many more will do so at some point in their lives, the economists say. In the data, about 58 percent of households in their data received benefits at least once in the past, and 68 percent did not pay income tax for at least one year. This is evidence, Fullerton says, that the social safety net is serving its function.

"The point is that these welfare programs don't induce a culture of dependency," he said. "There are short-lived programs."

The statistics that Fullerton and Rao highlight reveal a truth that may seem self-evident not only to Trump supporters, but to middle-class Americans of all stripes. Welfare and public assistance don't only serve the desperately poor. These are relatively broad programs that will touch most lives in this country.

As for the people who don't pay any income tax — they're not "takers"; they're average Americans. The "47 percent" has a vast alumni network. More likely than not, most of us will join that club one day.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**While CNN was waiting for Donald Trump's speech on **immigration** to begin last month, a Trump surrogate explained what he was hoping to hear from the candidate.

"I am not now speaking on behalf of the campaign, I'm speaking as Steve Cortes," Cortes said on the "AC360" program. "I don't want citizenship [for undocumented **immigrants**] and I believe citizenship is off the table. We cannot reward criminality with citizenship. They can never get the right to vote. And by the way, that's a stark contrast from Hillary Clinton, who I think will give all — many, if not all — of these illegals the right to vote because she thinks that she will earn a voting bloc of 10-million-plus Democratic voters."

This sentiment is not uncommon among a segment of conservatives: Democrats are advocating for a path to citizenship for **immigrants** here illegally because they want to secure electoral majorities. It's an argument that Trump himself made on Friday night, in an interview with the Christian Broadcasting Network's David Brody.

TRUMP: I think it's going to be the last election that the Republicans can win. If we don't win this election, you'll never see another Republican and you'll have a whole different church structure. You'll have a whole different Supreme Court structure.

Trump adores hyperbole and deploys it wherever possible. Like Cortes, he implies that Hillary Clinton would finagle citizenship for those **immigrants** with an eye toward building a permanent and growing Democratic majority. Trump offers an image of people crossing the border from Mexico and apparently being handed an American flag, a Clinton lapel pin and a voter registration form.

Clinton does support a path to citizenship, we'll note — as do 57 percent of registered voters, 84 percent of Clinton supporters and even 28 percent of Trump supporters in the July Post-ABC poll. How that path might be created, given with strong Republican control of the House, is not clear. (Even incremental reform was killed in 2013.)

What Trump's argument skips over, though, is that even without creating a path to citizenship for people who **immigrated** illegally, Republican candidates need to do a better job of appealing to a Hispanic citizen population which is projected to be among the fastest growing in the country.

The Census Bureau estimates how the population will grow over the next few decades. The number of Americans overall will increase, and the percentage of the population that is Hispanic will grow more rapidly than the population as a whole. At the same time, the number of people aged 65 and over will also grow — including whites in that age group, a population that currently makes up a lot of the Republican base.

Granting citizenship to everyone currently here because they **immigrated** illegally would add 11 million new citizens. By 2060, though, the Census Bureau estimates that there will be 62.3 million more Hispanics in the country than there were in 2015 regardless. That's the future trend that's a bigger problem for Republicans.

In fact, it's a problem already, as Trump notes. Hispanics vote less regularly than other groups, turning out for presidential elections at about the rate that white voters do for midterms. That's a big reason why they're underrepresented in the electorate.

But in big states with big nonwhite populations, the population is already at an inflection point. New analysis from Brookings and the Center for American Progress shows how the population mix in Texas, California and Florida has changed and is expected to change moving forward. The sections in gray are projections to the future.

This is a blue state, a red state and a swing state — for now. Florida's Hispanic population includes a large population of Cuban-American voters, who have tended to be more heavily Republican (though now they're just about split between the two parties). Texas's heavily Republican white population usually keeps it pretty red. But in our 50-state poll released this week, Texas was closer than at any point in recent memory — thanks in part to Clinton having a 44-point lead with that group.

All of which is to say that Trump's point about the immediate forecast for Republican candidates is true even without granting citizenship to undocumented **immigrants**. The GOP's advantage with older whites seems sturdy now, and that population will continue to grow as well. But, of course, this is also a population that from 1976 to 1992 mostly voted Democratic.

The white vote shifted. The reason that there was an attempt to advance **immigration** reform in 2013 at all was that the Republican Party was trying to similarly shift the direction of the Hispanic vote, which has been drifting away from the GOP in recent cycles. Even if Romney had won a majority of the Hispanic vote, he would have lost the election, but that's because Hispanics were still a relatively small part of the electorate. As they grow as a percentage of those who come out to vote, that gap in support between the right and the left becomes much more significant. **Immigration** reform was seen as a way to do that outreach.

Donald Trump has bet his election this year to some extent on catalyzing white voters' fears about the changing face of America, warning Brody that a vote for Trump is needed to keep the rise of the Hispanic population at bay. It's too late for that in general. Trump may be making the party's situation worse: There are anecdotal indications that Hispanics are mobilizing to oppose Trump specifically in the states mentioned above.

The Republican Party can, and almost certainly will, adjust to improve its standing with this growing segment of the population, as it was hoping to do before this election cycle. It looks like that adjustment has been postponed for a bit.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump and his spinners are outraged -- and some reporters are murmuring their disapproval -- because Hillary Clinton said this at a fundraiser last night:

"You know, to just be grossly generalistic, you could put half of Trump's supporters into what I call the 'basket of deplorables'. Right?" Clinton said to applause and laughter from the crowd of supporters at an LGBT for Hillary fundraiser where Barbra Streisand performed. "The racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamaphobic — you name it."

Let's stipulate at the outset that this kind of generalization is not defensible. Clinton should not have described "half" of Trump's supporters this way. People have all kinds of reasons for supporting their candidate -- party loyalty; reflexive negative partisanship; genuine distaste with the alternatives; meaningful, legitimate support for certain aspects of the candidate's agenda, and not others; and so forth.

A Clinton spokesperson qualified these remarks in a series of tweets, pointing out that Clinton was talking about Trump's rally crowds, and noting that half of them appear to be alt-right types. But even so, Clinton doesn't know what ultimately is motivating "half" of Trump's rally attendees, and she should not claim to.

But if there is one group of people who should take their outrage about Clinton's comments and stuff it in a very dark place, it's Trump and his paid apologists, who unloaded in a series of tweets this morning. Trump's campaign even put out a statement claiming that Clinton "revealed her true contempt for everyday Americans."

Oh, please. Two things can be true at the same time: First, Clinton overgeneralized about what's in the hearts and minds of Trump supporters. Second, her underlying characterization of the general nature of many of Trump's campaign appeals -- and her related observation that they really are successfully playing on the baser instincts of an untold number of Trump's supporters -- are 100 percent accurate.

Every single reporter and commentator closely following this race knows full well that Trump's campaign is fueled, at least to some degree, by tacit or even overt appeals to bigotry or efforts to encourage a sense among many Trump backers that white identity and white America are under siege. We've all seen the polling data and the reporting. Many Republican voters agree with the highest-profile Trump statements and items on the Trump agenda, the ones that are most prominently intertwined with those appeals and messages:

1) Poll after poll after poll has shown that majorities or pluralities of Republican voters support Trump's proposed temporary ban on Muslims from entering the United States. When CNN and NBC News interviewed Trump supporters at a rally in South Carolina, they found a lot of support for the ban.

Is this "Islamophobia," as Clinton suggests? Well, many leading Republicans and conservatives evidently think so. Paul Ryan denounced Trump's Muslim ban as a "religious test" that is an affront to conservatism, and in so doing, he went out of his way to characterize Muslim-Americans as patriots and defenders of American freedom, which conservatives hailed as an act of great moral courage. Never-Trump conservative twitter widely denounced Trump's attacks on the Khan family as naked bigotry.

2) Poll after poll has shown that majorities of Republican voters support mass deportations. Some polling has shown substantial overlap between Trump backers and support for mass deportations. One poll found that a large majority of GOP voters thought Trump was "basically right" in describing Mexican **immigrants** as rapists and drug haulers, while perhaps not agreeing with his exact language. And yes, in all of these cases, Democrats who believe these things are equally "deplorable."

Trump himself has knowingly crafted obviously racist appeals as an entree into the consciousness of GOP primary voters. This is why he fashioned himself the world's most famous birther. The New York Times recently reported that before running, Trump "recognized an opportunity" to exploit "discomfort" over the "first black president," which he "harnessed" for "political gain," using it to spark "his connection with the largely white Republican base." Even GOP leaders have described some of Trump's comments as racism: Ryan denounced his drawn out assault on a Mexican-American judge as the "textbook definition of a racist comment."

Trump's campaign CEO is Stephen Bannon, who has described himself as a creator of "the platform for the alt-right," by which he means Breitbart, which one former Breitbart insider described as a "gathering place for white nationalism." White nationalists themselves believe Trump's elevation of Bannon heralds the displacement of the old GOP worldview with their own, and they hear a lot to like in Trump's message. They feel as if Trump has "lifted them up," as Clinton put it. So, yes, Trump's campaign is functioning as a vehicle for mainstreaming fringe sentiments.

The American people know what Trump is doing. A recent Quinnipiac poll found that American voters say by 59-36 that "the way Trump talks appeals to bigotry."

In the end, this flap inevitably leads us back into the endlessly debated question at the heart of Trumpism. Are Trump's appeals resonating because of many voters' own raw bigotry? Or is their susceptibility to bigoted appeals rooted in legitimate economic and cultural grievances? No question, many Trump supporters may be motivated by nothing more than dissatisfaction with our trade and economic policies, or anger at Washington's dysfunction, or reasonable objections to current terrorism or **immigration** policies. In this context, people are missing the importance of the Clinton remarks that came after the incendiary ones. Clinton also said:

"That other basket of people are people who feel that government has let them down, the economy has let them down, nobody cares about them, nobody worries about what happens to their lives and their futures. They are just desperate for change. Doesn't really even matter where it comes from."

In other words, Clinton is also saying that many Trump supporters are not motivated by bigotry, i.e., that many people supporting Trump have legitimate anxieties. Trump is trying to prey on those anxieties by scapegoating Muslims and undocumented **immigrants**, but this might not be why many support him.

Clinton should not have overgeneralized about the other "half" of Trump's supporters, and she may apologize for it or further clarify it at some point. She shouldn't have called all these voters "deplorables." But the underlying argument here -- that Trump is running a bigoted campaign that tries to prey on legitimate grievances and bigotry alike by scapegoating minority groups -- is inarguable, and the reality it identifies is far worse than Clinton's broad-brush overreach was. If anything, "deplorable" is too mild a word for it.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One of the big questions about the 2016 campaign is this: Will voter groups in the vaunted Obama coalition turn out at levels this fall that rival their turnout in 2012?

Key to this question is the enthusiasm level among Latinos. They are increasingly important to Democrats in national elections, because they are growing as a share of the electorate, even as Republicans appear paralyzed from doing anything to strike a more welcoming posture towards them and have nominated someone who insults Mexican **immigrants** for sport and vows mass deportations and a great wall keeping the hordes out.

Yet some new polling released this week by Latino Decisions offers some mixed news for Democrats on this front.

On the one hand, the poll finds that Hillary Clinton is beating Donald Trump by 70-19 among registered Latino voters nationally. That's better than Barack Obama was faring among Latinos at the same point in 2012, when Latino Decisions polling found him beating Mitt Romney by 65-26. In the end Obama beat Romney by 71-27 among Latinos in the election itself, so while Clinton is roughly at the same number among Latinos right now, Trump is doing worse than Romney fared.

The new numbers on Latinos also look good for Clinton in key battleground states. She's beating Trump among them by 62-27 in Florida; by 70-14 in Nevada; and by 72-17 in Colorado. All this suggests Trump's big speech on **immigration**, in which he doubled down on the xenophobia and chest thumping about mass removals, may have further damaged him among these voters.

Yet Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director of pro-**immigrant** America's Voice, which sponsored the new polling, says there are some causes for concern also lurking in the data -- involving the enthusiasm level among Latinos.

It's true that the poll found that 76 percent of Latinos nationally say it's more important to vote this year than in 2012. That's good news for Clinton. But Tramonte notes that the poll also shows that more middling percentages say they are more enthusiastic about voting this year than in 2012: 51 percent say this nationally, while the number who say this is no higher than 50 percent in any of the battleground states polled.

"When you ask Latino voters if they think it's more important to vote, you get high numbers saying Yes," Tramonte tells me. "The concern is that people may recognize that it's an important election, but if they're not really excited about voting, life can get in the way."

"That's a concern for Hillary Clinton and Democrats, because she needs every vote," Tramonte continues. "She's actually doing better than Obama is, but the next two months are crucial. And it's all about enthusiasm."

Along these lines, Tramonte also argues that the new poll also shows that too few Latinos have been contacted by Democrats: 39 percent say they've been contacted to vote or register, while in all the battlegrounds polled the number is in the high 30s or 40s. "Not enough people have been reached out to," Tramonte says.

This could conceivably matter on the margins, because according to the Real Clear Politics polling averages, the race is a dead heat in Florida and in Nevada, both states with large Latino populations.

All this comes amid concerns among some Democrats that the Clinton campaign had been taking Latino turnout for granted, banking too heavily on Trump as a rallying force, as Abby Phillip reported recently:

Some Democratic strategists fear that Clinton has already missed a unique opportunity and warn that counting on Hispanic voters to turn out just because they hate Trump is not a reliable strategy. Unlike President Obama four years ago, Clinton has run virtually no Spanish-language television ads in the general election, with the exception of a spot that aired during a one-day soccer event.

In fairness, there's time to improve here. The Clinton campaign has stepped up its advertising targeted at Latino voters in Florida and Nevada, and the pro-Clinton Super PAC Priorities USA has followed suit with more of the same. And the Clinton campaign argues that it has been targeting Latinos through digital ads and via Hispanic radio all along.

But it's also worth recalling that the big unknown goes beyond Latino voters: Clinton lost among young voters by huge margins to Bernie Sanders during the primaries, raising questions about whether she can excite those voters, too. So one of the big questions of 2016 -- whether the Obama coalition will turn out in 2012 numbers -- still looms.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

UPDATE: Clinton spokesperson Xochitl Hinojosa emails over this statement in response:

The campaign has ramped up efforts in the general election to engage, energize and mobilize millennial and Latino voters. Earlier this summer, the campaign hired a team at headquarters to lead efforts to engage voters under the age of 35.  This team includes Anne Hubert, Sarah Audelo, Jamira Burley and Kunoor Ojha, who previously worked on the Sanders campaign. Our millennial efforts are integrated in every aspect of our campaign,including policy, communications, and grassroots organizing, and we've hired campus organizers and millennial vote staff throughout the country to register, re-register and educate voters. The campaign has made this a top priority and will continue to do so leading up to November. We are committed to earning the generation's vote, that means doing everything we can to meet them where they are.

 UPDATE II: I originally got a few of the polling numbers wrong. I've corrected them.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A 28-year-old gang member charged in the brutal stabbing death of a Maryland teenager had been deported twice to El Salvador in the past two years, according to U.S. **immigration** officials and Montgomery County prosecutors.

Oscar Delgado-Perez was ordered held without bond during his first court appearance Friday in a killing that detectives suspect was over gang bragging rights.

On June 16, Delgado-Perez and at least two other members of the MS-13 gang stabbed Cristian Villagran-Morales, 18, more than 40 times in a park in Gaithersburg as he begged for his life, according to authorities. Delgado-Perez "directed" the attack, detectives wrote in an affidavit filed in court. Police had been searching for him for more than two months and found him Wednesday at a Red Roof Inn in Rockville.

Parked nearby was a car with Texas license plates, belonging to an associate ready to take him from the area, said Robert Hill, a prosecutor with the Montgomery State's Attorney's Office.

"He was just about to leave that day for Texas to flee the area. He knew that there was a warrant out for his arrest," Hill said.

After officers apprehended Delgado-Perez, he allegedly told them they'd caught a break. "He said to police: 'If I hadn't been drunk this morning, you guys would never have caught me,' " Hill said.

Delgado-Perez, charged with first-degree murder, had been living in the Montgomery Village area and working as a roofer to support his 6-year-old child, according to Stephanie Ferner, a public defender who represented him in court Friday.

She questioned the strength of the case against Delgado-Perez, saying it rests on the word of two co-defendants. "Once they were charged, then they pointed the finger at my client," Ferner said.

At the county jail, according to Friday's court hearing, officials said they'd found no previous adult convictions for him.

In the case that led to the murder charge against Delgado-Perez, a 19-year-old named Vanesa Alvarado allegedly used the promise of sex to entice Villagran-Morales into Malcolm King Park in Gaithersburg.

Once they arrived, MS-13 members came up to Alvarado and Villagran-Morales and asked him whether he wanted to go into the woods to smoke marijuana, police said. He agreed to do so.

"It was a trap," Montgomery State's Attorney John McCarthy said Friday.

How Delgado-Perez repeatedly entered the United States, and why he was deported twice, remain unclear.

On Sept. 16, 2014, an **immigration** judge in Batavia, N.Y., ordered him removed from the country, according to spokesman for the Justice Department's Executive Office for **Immigration** Review. Delgado-Perez was removed to El Salvador the next month, according U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, also known as ICE.

After entering the United States again, he was removed to El Salvador on Feb. 26, 2015, according to ICE. At some point, he returned.

ICE has placed a hold on him at the Montgomery jail, because hecouldface a deportation case, too. If he were convicted in Maryland courts in the murder case, he likely would serve his full sentence before being returned home a third time.

While the challenges of illegal **immigration** are part of the national political debate, they confront local police every day in complicated ways.

The Montgomery County Police Department supports ICE's efforts to deport violent offenders, said Police Chief Tom Manger. But on the streets, Montgomery officers and detectives also must have the trust of **immigrant** communities, he said. That means being able to talk with undocumented residents and not ask about their **immigration** status, he said, so they are willing to report crimes and help solve them.

"We have to strike that right balance," said Manger. "We've got to be able to go into those communities and have trust and cooperation."

Manger said he understands the anger residents feel when they hear about deported individuals who return and commit violent crimes. "Certainly any community is better off without these individuals," he said.

In Montgomery County, the challenges are playing out in the context of a rise in homicides linked to MS-13, the violent gang with ties to Central America.

Last year, assailants with links to MS-13 allegedly stabbed and hurled heavy rocks on a victim as he crawled away from an attack toward a stream, according to court records. In another homicide, the victim was told, "Get on your knees," before being shot in the face, neck and shoulder while in the woods.

In July, police arrested Alvarado and one of the alleged gang members who approached Villagran-Morales at the park: Juan Gutierrez-Vasquez, 16, who was charged as an adult. He told detectives the victim was thought to be a rival gang member, according to court records. But authorities said they found no evidence of that and said the attackers may have made up the claim to gain street credibility.

Gutierrez-Vasquez came to Montgomery County from El Salvador earlier this year, police believe, and joined MS-13 after arriving. "I think he was recruited here," Detective Dimitry Ruvin has said in an earlier interview.

The victim, Villagran-Morales, was born in Guatemala and arrived in Montgomery this year from New Jersey to live with relatives, police said. He had been doing landscaping work. He sent money home to his father in Guatemala, according to friends.

"Even though there is still tremendous pain in all of our hearts, we feel a bit more calm that justice is being served and that the culprits are being caught," Jennifer Torres, a girlfriend of one of Villagran-Morales's cousins, said Friday. "We are still hoping that the other or others will be found."

Police said they continue to look for suspect Jose Coreas Ventura, 20, who also goes by the name Josue Corea, and should be considered armed and dangerous.

Police officials ask that anyone with information about Ventura or the slaying call 301-279-8000. To be eligible for a reward, tipsters should call 1-866-411-TIPS (8477). Callers may remain anonymous.

dan.morse@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If Donald Trump is elected, he's promised to move quickly to suspend Muslim **immigration**, or maybe even stop people from entering the United States "from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism." We'll withdraw from NATO unless all other members pay their fair share, either renegotiate or shred NAFTA and begin "extreme vetting" of **immigrants** to make sure they aren't sneaking in any "hostile attitudes toward our country or its principles." Before you can say "Geneva Conventions," he'll order the waterboarding of suspected terrorists and approve interrogation techniques "a hell of a lot worse than waterboarding," too, including the killing of the families of terrorism suspects. He might (or might not, or might) deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. But "on Day One," he insists, we will definitely "begin working on an impenetrable, physical, tall, powerful, beautiful, southern border wall."

Only, Washington has some pretty high walls in place, too, and electric fences that might shock any newcomer naive enough to believe Trump's line about "criminal aliens": that on "Day One, my first hour in office, those people are gone." In a real sense, this town exists to serve the liberal, constitutional order, and President Trump would face fierce and sustained resistance to his "because I say so" threats to that order — not only from the other party but from his own, and from the nonpartisan civil servants who run the government day to day.

Should he try to make good on his most controversial promises, he'd find, as President Obama has, that the judiciary can block executive action with injunctions that there is no way around. Congress would have to agree to fund his proposals, almost all of which would require more government spending rather than less. And he'd be up against executive-branch workers who, even without staging an open revolt, can slow-walk implementation just about indefinitely.

The most reliable action to block those Trump proposals that so many in both parties find unconstitutional would come from the courts, which would prevent the United States from walking away from international norms and treaty obligations. A flurry of lawsuits would surely answer Trump's opening gambit, and injunctions could jam, say, an executive order on "extreme vetting." Trump could likewise order that we cut our contribution to NATO, but because that, like NAFTA, involves a treaty obligation, this move, too, would be challenged in court.

"There really is no way to stop him from issuing a whole series of unconstitutional and illegal orders and rolling the dice," says Leon Panetta, who served in Congress, as CIA director and defense secretary under Obama, and as President Bill Clinton's White House chief of staff. "But they would be immediately contested in court."

Panetta added: "I can't think of one thing he's recommended that, without some serious compromise on his part, would be enacted. No matter which way he turns, he's going to run into a wall — not one that he's built, but the one that's been in place since the beginning of the republic." The Constitution, in other words.

Obama learned that lesson after issuing his 2014 order that the Department of Homeland Security would not deport some undocumented parents of U.S. citizens or permanent residents, and would expand a program shielding millions of undocumented **immigrants** who came to the United States as children. Texas argued that not deporting some undocumented **immigrants** would raise the cost of issuing driver's licenses. A court in that state blocked Obama's order, and in June, a 4-to-4 split on the Supreme Court allowed the Texas ruling to stand.

If lower courts similarly hindered Trump's proposals, it's theoretically possible that he could eventually get his way by packing the Supreme Court. But even that's not a sure thing. As Robert George, a professor of jurisprudence at Princeton and a Republican critic of both Trump and Hillary Clinton, puts it: "If Trump picks the judges he claims he's going to pick — which, like all Trump's claims, is not a claim I trust — then he'd have problems in the courts with some of his edicts, just as Obama has had. But there is always the possibility that his judges will not be the brilliant, distinguished conservative jurists on the list he got from the Federalist Society but rather his cousin's divorce lawyer in Teaneck, the guy who handled zoning permits for him for one of his golf course developments in South Carolina, and his sister who is already a federal judge."

Congress also has a significant role to play. Because "extreme vetting" would require additional funding to screen **immigrants** for bad thoughts, lawmakers would have to alter the way the entry process works now. They could stop the Trump train by passing a law against screening **immigrants** for bad thoughts — or just by neglecting to fund the extra work Trump would be making for the already understaffed **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agency. Trump has vowed that "we are going to triple the number of ICE deportation officers. . . . We're also going to hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents." But he couldn't do anything of the sort without congressional action. If control of the Senate shifts to Democrats, such a thing is even less likely.

The fact that all Cabinet secretaries and other high-level appointees, including to the federal judiciary, have to be confirmed by the Senate gives the legislative branch considerable leverage, as Obama has also seen. And as for the wall along our southern border, Congress may not see this massive infrastructure project as a priority, since illegal **immigration** is at its lowest ebb in 20 years.

Then there are the civil servants of the executive branch, who — as John F. Kennedy complained in calling the State Department "a bowl of Jello " — can effectively kill policy by failing to implement it. Richard Nixon accused federal bureaucrats of resisting any and all change, because they "have a vested interest in the chaos in which they exist."

Federal workers are in a strong position to resist. One scientist who has spent 35 years at the Environmental Protection Agency (and who asked to speak on the condition of anonymity to discuss political matters) said that after the "hostile takeover" of the agency under Ronald Reagan, career folks initially tried to work with political appointees. But when they concluded that they were really being asked to break laws on water, air and waste, they began complaining to Democrats on Capitol Hill, who held oversight hearings. "And there was a certain amount of setting the political people up,'' the scientist said, by telling House staffers preparing the hearings what questions to ask and then watching Reagan's appointees get "slaughtered."

Although he's seen many direct confrontations over the decades — and stretches when the EPA softball league was more active than the workplace — the civil servant said he had never seen anyone pushed out for pushing back, especially since political appointees can be personally sued in cases of retribution. At any rate, civil-service protections require a whole series of administrative proceedings to remove an intransigent bureaucrat.

And when the political operatives find ways to circumvent the dissenting civil servants? "If they're doing things that are illegal, it's your responsibility to advise them of that, and if they don't listen, then you resign or you spill the beans." During the George W. Bush administration, Sylvia Lowrance and Eric Schaeffer resigned from the EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance to protest the administration's insistence that they downplay their enforcement actions.

Sometimes even the appointees disagree with the White House: In 1996, when Bill Clinton made good on his promise to "end welfare as we know it" without also creating the programs that were supposed to help move poor single moms into well-paying jobs, the president's old friend Peter Edelman , then an assistant secretary at the Department of Health and Human Services, resigned in protest , along with his colleague Mary Jo Bane, who like Edelman had advocated a very different kind of welfare reform. An order from Trump approving waterboarding or other "enhanced interrogation" methods would almost certainly prompt high-profile resignations as well.

The purely practical difficulties President Trump would face in trying to accomplish such amorphous goals as assuring that "those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people" are yet another check on his proposed agenda. He is in such a hurry, and routinely promises to move so quickly, that just watching him would give the rest of us vertigo. ("That wall will go up so fast, your head will spin.") But even if "The Exorcist" was set in Georgetown, this is a city best known for gridlock. And Trump's impatience, more than anything else, is the best reason to doubt that his resolve would outlast official Washington's resistance.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a holding cell below New York City's Chinatown one night last year, I spent four hours curled in a ball, balancing on a narrow wooden bench. I was trying to avoid the freezing cinderblock walls and the cold cement floor, splattered with cigarette butts and rotten food. The NYPD had taken my shoes, in case I tried to hang myself with my laces.

An hour earlier, I was quietly riding the A train home from a folk-music show in Brooklyn. My earbuds were plugged in, my feet propped on the seat in front of me. Sometime around 2:30 in the morning, the train paused at the Canal Street station. A uniformed and armed New York police officer popped her head through the door and beckoned me off the subway car. Within a few minutes, I was handcuffed, ID'd and marched upstairs by two police officers.

That night, I became one more victim of "nuisance laws," regulations that criminalize small misbehaviors that don't hurt anyone. These policies have been enacted by cities across the country. In New York, for example, it's against the law to take up more than one subway seat or even put a foot up. It's illegal to be in most parks after dark, or to drink beer on your stoop. People can get arrested for asking someone else to swipe them into the subway. (Washington's Metro system does not criminalize putting your feet up on the subway or taking up two seats.)

This type of zero-tolerance policing has been adapted around the country. In Texas, minors can be jailed for missing more than 10 days of school in a six-month period. In Arkansas, a woman was imprisoned after a $1.07 check she wrote for bread bounced. In Washington, police can arrest residents for minor offenses like letting your dog off its leash or fishing with the wrong equipment. A two-year-old here was even cited for littering. (Officials later dropped the case.)

On its face, this might not seem like a big deal — everyone wants clean subways and orderly cities. But criminalizing small acts can have major consequences for nonwhite and low-income people, who are disproportionately arrested and convicted for these infractions. A USA Today report, which examined data from across the country, found that "blacks are more likely than others to be arrested in almost every city for almost every type of crime. Nationwide, black people are arrested at higher rates for crimes as serious as murder and assault, and as minor as loitering and marijuana possession." In New York in 2014, 43,000 people were arrested on public transportation; just 3,600 were white, even though whites make up 37 percent of public transit riders. The most recent numbers, from the first six months of 2015, show a similar trend: of the more than 20,000 arrests; fewer than one in 10 people were white.

Those caught misbehaving are often arrested, booked and arraigned in criminal court. They might, as a result, lose their jobs or have to scramble for child care. They might be asked to pay a bail they can't afford. And a criminal record could cost them assets from subsidized housing to student loans.

As Scott Hechinger of Brooklyn Defender Services told the New York Times, an arrest can derail a person struggling to make ends meet. "Most of our clients are people who have crawled their way up from poverty or are in the throes of poverty. Our clients work in service-level positions where if you're gone for a day, you lose your job. People in need of caretaking — the elderly, the young — are left without caretakers. People who live in shelters, where if they miss their curfews, they lose their housing. Folks with **immigration** concerns are quicker to be put on the **immigration** radar."

In other words: A small mistake could ruin your life.

[My white neighbor thought I was breaking into my own apartment. Nineteen cops showed up. ]

Criminalizing small infractions is part of a larger law-and-order effort known as "broken windows" policing. Popularized by two criminologists in 1982, this theory encourages law enforcers to arrest people for low-level offenses including loitering, public drinking and littering. Creating a semblance of order in a neighborhood discourages more serious crimes, the scholars argued.

This method was implemented in New York under Mayor Rudy Guiliani in the 1990s; during that time, the city saw violent crime drop by more than 56 percent and property crime by about 65 percent. Outgoing New York Police Department Commissioner Bill Bratton credits broken windows policing for the declines, saying the method makes neighborhoods cleaner and safer by stopping even the tiniest violation.

But opponents see it differently. They say the practice leads to unwarranted aggression against low-income people and minorities. "The kinds of things that [people of color] get arrested for, these innocuous acts, have been virtually decriminalized among white communities," said Robert Gangi, director of the Police Reform Organizing Project, which tries to raise awareness of racial profiling by New York police. New York's nonwhite residents disproportionately bear the burden of arrest. In 2015, for example, about 153,000 were arrested or given tickets for sneaking into the subway. Ninety-two percent were people of color. According to the New York Times, about 300,000 criminal summonses were issued by officers last year, "many in minority neighborhoods."

This is something Timothy Middleton knows all too well. Middleton, who is black, was arrested on the subway last fall for assault in the third degree — the most minor assault charge — for what he called a "shouting match."

"The police were very derogatory and disrespectful . . . and I spoke up for myself, and they didn't like that too much," he said. Middleton spent a few hours in a cell, received his court date and went home.

That's when he found out that, because he had a charge pending, he'd been automatically suspended from his job without pay. Middleton worked as a peer specialist at a social-service nonprofit, helping people with mental disabilities.

He survived three months of unemployment, borrowing money from friends and waiting for his charge to be resolved. He even went on welfare. When his case was finally resolved (a judge gave him a verbal warning to stay out of trouble for a year), his employer let him know: His job had been filled by someone else. "And it was the perfect job and perfect hours," he said. "I was enjoying what I was doing, helping people. . . . I was just on a roll, you know?"

Others have similar stories. In 2009, Juan Castillo was arrested for putting his foot up on a subway seat so he could inject himself in the thigh with insulin. Castillo, a diabetic, was arrested and jailed for 30 hours, and the police refused to give him access to insulin. He ended up in a hospital. (Castillo later sued the city; he was awarded $150,000.) Flavio Uzcha, an Ecuadorian line cook, was brought in for standing too close to the door in a packed subway car in 2011. When he was arraigned, authorities discovered a 2002 deportation order, and he was forced to leave the United States.

[It's time to stop talking about racism with white people ]

The NYPD has denied allegations of racial profiling and defended its "broken windows" practices, arguing that they make the transit system and city much safer. But in recent months, they've also begun to move away from making arrests for minor offenses. In March, officials announced that officers in Manhattan will no longer arrest people for minor crimes like riding between subway cars or drinking in public. Instead, they will get a criminal summons. In May, the New York City council passed a measure creating a civil process for some common low-level infractions, like littering and excessive noise. "We pledged to reduce unnecessary arrests while protecting the quality of life of all our residents," Mayor Bill de Blasio, said at the time. "This legislation is an important step toward this essential goal."

For my arraignment, I had to report to the New York City Criminal Court in downtown Manhattan, where I spent a few hours sitting in a pew behind a beefy man in handcuffs. Eventually, a judge called me up and gave me a light punishment: probation.

"You didn't have a collateral consequence," Legal Aid Society spokeswoman Pat Bath told me later. She was right. I didn't risk my job, or my family, to appear in court.

The two teenagers I was arrested with were not so lucky. They had been busted for walking between subway cars — a constant sight, but still illegal. One had been arrested three times in the past year, the other two times for putting his foot up on the subway and for panhandling and interfering with "the movement of passengers."

One of them didn't show at court the day I was there, common among teenagers. "So now" — for putting his feet up — "he's a fugitive," Gangi said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I'm something of a logophile, so it was interesting to see two columnists — one on the left, the other on the right — use the word "anodyne" on the Sept. 1 op-ed page: E. J. Dionne Jr., elucidating on Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's "evasively anodyne" **immigration** babble after a quick trip south of his proposed wall (would he be able to slip out of the country so quickly were his wall already erected along the border?) ["Trump's **immigration** circus act"], and George F. Will's "anodyne manifestation" of expanding presidential prerogative [" 'Slush fund' by any other name"].

According to Wordsmith.org, "anodyne" is "from Latin anodynos, from Greek anodynos, from a- (not) + odyne (pain). Ultimately from the Indo-European root ed- (to eat, to bite), which also gave us edible, comestible, obese, etch, fret, postprandial, esurient and edacity." There couldn't be a more apt description for political speech today: mumbo-jumbo aimed at taking away our pain, words lulling us into a haze of meaning anything the listener wants them to.

Perhaps we are all being anesthetized by the anodyne speech of our political class. Still, kudos to these columnists for attempting to wake our minds by expanding the lingua franca.

Robin Payes, Rockville

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hari Kondabolu is a comedian of color who will talk about white people. Or, to be more exact: whiteness. Openly.

If the subject makes the little hairs on your neck stand up, feel free to move along. Kondabolu expects discomfort. He even has a joke called "White People Don't Like Being Called White People."

If you're still here, maybe it's because you've heard of Kondabolu, whose comedy album, "Mainstream American Comic," debuted this summer at the top of the iTunes comedy chart and at No. 2 on the Billboard equivalent.

On it, Kondabolu dives into his favorite subject at length, with jokes such as "All Lives Don't Matter," and another titled "#BobbyJindalIsSoWhite." That's also a hashtag he started about the Indian American former governor of Louisiana that pinged like a virus from his Twitter feed to India and back again.

To most comedians, material touching on race, racism, sexism or a culture of privilege — material about whiteness — is the equivalent of radioactive waste: It's untouchable. But for Kondabolu, it's the sweet spot. In this tumultuous period in American race relations and anti-**immigrant** sentiment, he's the voice of, well, what exactly?

Maybe much-needed levity?

The comic is among the hosts tapped to take over John Oliver's podcast, "The Bugle," and he'll soon make his debut as a documentarian on TruTV with a film about the lasting legacy of Apu, the (some say stereotypical) Indian shopkeeper on "The Simpsons." With his longtime friend and frequent collaborator, W. Kamau Bell, he launched the podcast "Politically Re-Active," bringing in a roster of progressive voices, including feminist author Lindy West and New York Daily News columnist Shaun King.

In many ways, Kondabolu sounds more like Jon Stewart than Aziz Ansari, like Oliver, or Paul Mooney, or a slightly less smug Bill Maher.

"There aren't a lot of political comedians like us, especially of color. Political comedy is a white man's art," says Bell, who met Kondabolu years ago at a show in a high-school auditorium in Santa Rosa, Calif.

"I'd never seen him before, and he was, at that point, dressing like a TA from a liberal-arts college," Bell says. "But he was spitting hot fire."

The game changer

"All lives matter? Really? Really?" Kondabolu asks wryly on "Mainstream American Comic," in a bit poking fun at those who would shout down Black Lives Matter activists.

A pause.

Snickers from the crowd as it dawns on them where this is going.

"The Kardashians?" he prods.

Peals of laughter now.

"All three of them? Really? Realllllly ?"

Ask Kondabolu, 33, how he became woke, and he doesn't miss a beat.

"9/11. That's the game changer," he says. "I'm a different person."

Most Americans have heard the narrative that the terrorist attacks of 2001 united us. But Kondabolu (pronounced cone-da-BOWL-ooh) recalls that "people were turning on brown people. I remember people saying racist things to me. I remember the fear-mongering. All those things shaped me."

Of the fine line between lightheartedness and seriousness that has come to define his sense of humor, he says: "I believe in justice, and my jokes are coming from a place of shooting upwards."

"He's not taking the easiest path," says J.P. Buck, a supervising producer for "Conan" who scouted Kondabolu a decade ago and has watched his star rise.

"If you're going to take a sociopolitical view of things, not everybody is going to love you," Buck says. Kondabolu is "choosing to push the envelope. To make people think."

Speaking from New York before his sold-out performance Saturday at the District's Sixth & I Historic Synagogue, Kondabolu suggests that if you're looking for a place to begin his story, start with his parents, who married in South India in 1981 and moved to New York shortly after. Kondabolu was born in the famed South Asian enclave of Jackson Heights, Queens, and raised in some of the borough's most multiculti neighborhoods.

For his sense of humor, he credits his mother, who helped him "recycle pain into something that's good for you." A doctor in India, she gave up her career to raise her two children (Kondabolu's brother, Ashok, had a turn in the trailblazing but short-lived hip-hop group Das Racist), while his father worked long days in the medical field.

As a teenager, Kondabolu took the train into the city to see comics perform. But his own career blossomed in Seattle, where AmeriCorps dispatched him after college to work with communities on issues surrounding hate crimes and **immigration**. At night, onstage, "I was able to release tension," he says. "I was making people laugh, something I couldn't really do in the same way at work."

But back to inspiration for a moment: He wants to talk about Margaret Cho, a pioneer among Asian American comedians.

"I'd never seen somebody who wasn't black, white or Latino be onstage and take charge like that," Kondabolu says of Cho. "It opened up my mind to the possibility, like, 'Could I do this?' "

Buck has gauged hundreds, if not thousands, of comics. Kondabolu's point of view, he says, "was something I hadn't seen before." Buck steered the comedian to his national television debut, on "Jimmy Kimmel Live," in 2007.

And then, for Kondabolu, some deep-rooted sense of pragmatism kicked in.

He went back to school. Not in Los Angeles, where he could still audition. He enrolled in a master's program in human rights studies at the London School of Economics. It helped him sharpen his voice into something more cutting, more informed.

While he was in London, he was invited to New York to tape a Comedy Central special. When he was done, he hopped a flight and went right back to his studies.

Going mainstream

Deep into Kondabolu's new album, you finally get a clue about where the title came from.

"I don't like being niched as a South Asian comic, man," he says. He seethes over it, really. Kondabolu would prefer it if the world stopped tossing him into the growing pile of funny people of South Asian descent, including Aziz, Mindy Kaling and Kumail Nanjiani. "I'm a mainstream American comic."

If anything, says his friend Bell, Kondabolu "disrupts the narrative" that there's a particular kind of Indian American comedian.

Evidence: Other comedians of similar descent will mine their parents' accents for comic effect — sage-like South Asian parents are practically a pop-cultural trope.

Kondabolu refuses to do the same.

"My parents are **immigrants** with accents," he explains in one joke. "I'm sure they have it hard enough, people questioning their intelligence, making fun of them behind their backs."

Statements like these resonate with his audiences, Bell says. Young Indian Americans and Asian Americans are behind some of the comedian's YouTube-and-podcast-fueled fame, texting links to their friends, ponying up to $10 a ticket to see Kondabolu in the rock clubs where he has frequently performed, packing them out.

"Black people needed Richard Pryor. We needed Chris Rock. We needed Dave Chappelle," Bell says. "When I go to Hari's shows, you can really feel a group of millennial South Asians who are like, 'We need this. This is critical.' "

The Internet, Kondabolu says, has given comedians outside the mainstream a way past club bookers and agents, a way to avoid being beholden to the masses. Owning your particular niche will do.

And Kondabolu's niche — talking about race, and social justice, about whiteness — is what may finally bring his voice to the masses.

"Hari got there early," Bell says. "And when you get there early, you have to be the most strident voice. He's not going to let you, even if you're his fan, be comfortable in the things he says onstage."

Does he ever feel like he'll be a mainstream American comic?

"I'm getting there," says Kondabolu, who adds that he can talk about social issues and make cracks about the male anatomy with equal fluidity.

What he does, he says, is parse "a distinctly American experience, of being an outsider within your country because your parents are **immigrants**.

"The values I have, the search for justice, that's not a niche thing," he says. "These are mainstream issues. I want my work to be framed as part of the larger conversation, because it is. It is."

lavanya.ramanathan

@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Last week, America's Voice, a pro-**immigration** group, released the results of a national survey of more than 3,700 Hispanic voters. By an astounding 70 percent to 19 percent, they favor Hillary Clinton. Donald Trump is viewed unfavorably by 74 percent of Hispanics.

Today, it has put out data on seven battleground states -- Arizona, Colorado, Florida, North Carolina, Nevada, Ohio and Virginia. Clinton's favorable numbers range from 60 percent to 67 percent. Trump unfavorables run from 65 percent to 81 percent. His favorable numbers range between 15 percent and 28 percent.  In the general election, Trump would get between 14 percent and 27 percent of the vote. Clinton gets between 61 percent and 73 percent.

The state results tend not to vary much from one another with one exception: Florida. Trump's favorables are still bad but at his highest (28 percent), as is his vote total (27 percent), while his unfavorables are the lowest of the seven states (65 percent). Those are only about as bad as Mitt Romney's 2012 ballot numbers (he got 27 percent of the Hispanic vote) but not nearly as bad as the results from other states. Likewise, Clinton's worst numbers are from Florida where her split is 60 percent favorable/36 percent unfavorable. She gets 62 percent of the Hispanic vote, higher than only Ohio (61 percent).

The difference in Florida is most likely attributable to Cuban Americans. Although younger generations tilt Democratic like other Hispanics, the older generation (some of whom experienced Castro firsthand) remains staunchly Republican. Ironically, Trump is the rare Republican who seems not at all bothered with normalizing relations with Cuba. In debates during the primaries, he said he was "fine" with the idea and thought it "not a bad thing." The moderators in upcoming debates might want to find out why and whether he has any concern for Cuban dissidents who have been treated worse since President Obama gave away the store with no promise by Cuba of democratization. The **immigration** laws that affect Cuba are generous and **immigrants** are readily granted permanent residence status. They therefore may be personally unaffected by Trump's draconian **immigration** approach to legal and illegal **immigrants**.

Returning to the poll, there is some better news for GOP Senate candidates. They don't win the Hispanic vote but many do get a respectable share of it. Sen. John McCain (Ariz.), a member of the Gang of 8, gets a 46 percent favorable, 45 percent unfavorable rating. In his race against Democrat Ann Kirkpatrick, McCain gets 31 percent of the Hispanic vote. Sen. Marco Rubio (Fla.), whose parents fled Castro, gets a whopping 43 percent of the Hispanic vote, only 4 points less than his Democratic opponent, Rep. Patrick Murphy. In Ohio, Sen. Rob Portman, who voted against the Gang of  8 bill, nevertheless gets 32 percent. GOP candidates in the other states (Nevada, Colorado and North Carolina) who are staunch opponents of the president's executive orders and hard-liners on **immigration** more generally, do less well. Rep. Joe Heck (Nev.) and Sen. Richard Burr (N.C.) score in the low 20's in their support among Hispanics. (They do poorly with Hispanics but not as poorly as Trump, whose campaign has made deportation a central issue.) Right-wing candidate Darryl Glenn (a favorite of Sen. Ted Cruz) is down in Trump territory with 17 percent.

It does not take a math or a political science degree to see that Republicans who favor border security but also a path to citizenship can do well with Hispanics. Those who opposed the Gang of 8 (Portman) but do not take a hard anti-**immigrant** line can also get a reasonable share of the Hispanic vote. If, however, you favor mass deportation and make opposition to **immigration** (illegal and/or legal) the cornerstone of your campaign, Hispanics are going to reject you. Imagine that.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was the early 1960s, and 9-year-old Eliseo Pérez-Stable was at home in Miami with the chickenpox, dreading his return to the third grade.

Nearly a year had passed since his parents in Cuba — fearful of the communists' rise to power — had sent him out of that country with his grandparents, and he still couldn't grasp English. At school, his teacher had resorted to yelling at him in Spanish.

The boy panicked. Scabs were forming over his blisters, but if they didn't heal, he rationalized, perhaps he could stay home. One by one, he began to pick at them. It was a month before he was forced to return to class.

His experiences as a young **immigrant** proved pivotal for Pérez-Stable, who grew up to become a physician and scientist, whose research has documented the impact of language barriers and other issues on the health of Latinos. At 64, he leads the National Institutes of Health's division for funding and guiding minority health research.

"From this stage, I can see the opportunity to shape the field and promote the development of the next generation in minority health and health disparities," he said last week as he marked his first year as director of the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities.

Some of his motivation dates to childhood. At that first school, he never learned English but excelled in math because numbers were their own familiar language. He moved to Pittsburgh once his parents arrived, where he was called racist nicknames, asked if he knew about refrigerators and teased about his favorite baseball player, Roberto Clemente.

"I think my experiences as an **immigrant** child, my efforts at assimilation and the experiences of the external world in the late 1960s shaped my perspective on society," he said.

Yet his homeland continues to shape him. He has returned to Cuba nearly 10 times in the past few decades to recapture his language and "connect to the Latino American reality." His most recent visit was in March.

Pérez-Stable began doing research in the 1980s, when he was a professor of medicine at the University of California at San Francisco. The city's racial and ethnic disparities were clear to him; certainly, there was no empowered Latino community as he had known growing up in Miami and attending college and medical school there.

"You'd walk into UCSF, and the only people of color you would see would be behind the desk or the custodians," he said. "There were very few physicians who were minority."

He studied tobacco use among Latinos and the effectiveness of smoking-cessation policies, the impact of informal translators on Latino health, minority aging and cancer prevention among Latinos.

"At the time, people were saying you quit smoking for your own health," he said. "And what we discovered in working with Latinos ... was that the big motivator was going to be not just for their own health, but also for [their family and] others around them."

His research on interpreters found that communication barriers made it difficult to understand a patient's symptoms and therefore treat their diseases. Errors were made, and ad-hoc interpreters, such as family members or office assistants who happened to speak the language, were being used instead of professional interpreters.

"Documenting empirically that it was better to not do that, I think, was an important step to provide evidence for policy changes," Pérez-Stable said.

Pérez-Stable had been in the Bay Area for 37 years, treating patients and conducting research, when he received a call for applicants to head the National Institutes of Health's lead organization on minority health. The outgoing director, John Ruffin, was retiring after nearly a quarter-century at NIH.

As part of the hiring process, leaders there asked about Pérez-Stable's vision. He wanted to bring the social sciences more under the umbrella of the medical sciences, he told them, to better study health disparities. He envisioned research to show how people's socioeconomic status and everyday lives affect their health. He wanted to know whether being a victim of abuse, for example, or struggling with food insecurity, poverty or family tension, has a biological impact on long-term health.

"Being stressed-out as a baby for whatever reason, or having bad events happen to you as a young child, may trigger changes in biology that may lead to disease when you're 40 or 50," Pérez-Stable explained recently, sitting in his sunlight-flooded office in Bethesda, about 15 minutes from NIH's main campus. A map of Cuba decorates the wall behind his desk.

"We're now beginning to see that that's not just theoretically possible, but it's actually a plausible biological mechanism of what happens with chronic disease," he said. Even if such a mechanism doesn't always matter, "we should always be asking that question."

Pérez-Stable started his new job last September. Created in 2010, his institute is the newest at NIH, and its second-smallest, with a $281 million budget for research, training and public education. Some of the grant money is set aside in a program to target under-resourced institutions. For example, in 2014 the institute funded a $15.5 million grant to Morehouse School of Medicine in Atlanta to expand its capacity to conduct research on minority health and health disparities.

Similarly, in 2016, a $9.5 million grant was awarded to Florida International University to conduct community-based research to reduce high rates of HIV.

Pérez-Stable is planting roots in Washington. In August, he and his wife, Claudia Husni, purchased a home in Columbia Heights, a neighborhood that he describes as having some of the "grit" of the Bay Area.

In his role at NIH, he's intent on providing grants toward causes he has long supported.

"I would like to ... establish a greater depth and credibility and acceptance of the science of minority health and health disparities," he said. "So that people say, yeah, this is important to know what happens in the human behavior, human biology; to understand what the factors of race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status are on how the brain functions, or how childhood experiences affect adult health."

Read more:

The disturbing reason some African American patients may be undertreated for pain

For Latinos, cancer risks can depend on heritage

Risky alone, deadly together

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For years, Germany seemed immune to the forces of populist discontent raging on both sides of the Atlantic, a lone island of calm and stability. That ended on Sunday, when an election in the north-eastern state of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania gave the right-wing party Alternative for Germany (AfD) 20.8 percent of the vote. It sent a nervous shudder throughout the country, shocking allies and neighbors. At home, Chancellor Angela Merkel's friends and foes alike are suddenly sniffing opportunity, one year out from national elections. Is this the twilight of her nearly 12-year reign?

On the face of it, the state many Germans simply refer to as "Meck-Pomm" is an unlikely candidate for a bellwether of change. Abutting the Baltic Sea, it is quietly lovely but impoverished and sparsely populated; a place of sandy soils, lakes, and pines where time seems to flow in big slow loops. It is the home state of President Joachim Gauck as well as Chancellor Merkel—a fact which its famously taciturn inhabitants appear to regard not so much as a source of civic pride but as proof that nothing good happens to those who leave home and get ahead of themselves. It houses two percent of the country's citizens, produces 1.3 percent of GDP, and has an unemployment rate of 9 percent (national average: 6). Its few **immigrants** are mostly Poles or German Russians. Of the million-plus refugees who began arriving a year ago, it has taken in a mere 23,000.

In a speech on Wednesday in Berlin to Germany's federal legislature, Merkel said the AfD "is a challenge to all of us in this house." But she added: "I'm very convinced that if we keep our composure and stand by the truth, then we'll win -- and we'll win back the most important thing we need, the trust of the people."

Still, there are good reasons for the national jitters. Campaigning on a stridently anti-**immigrant** ticket, the three-year-old AfD achieved a spectacular second place behind the incumbent Social Democrats—thereby winning a bet on casting the election as a protest referendum on the chancellor's refugee policy. Worse, this is the first time in postwar history that a populist challenger has overtaken Merkel's center-right Christian Democrats on the right in one of Germany's sixteen states and pushed it into third place. That it is home to the chancellor's own constituency makes for an added sting.

Thomas Schmid, a former left-wing renegade who now writes a thoughtful blog for the conservative daily Die Welt, has suggested that Sunday's upset is due to democracy and civil society being less firmly rooted in formerly communist East Germany. There is some evidence for that, including startlingly high support for Russia's President Vladimir Putin. Yet it's also a somewhat condescending take. East Germans do have legitimate grievances against what they see as an entitled and aloof political establishment. Carpetbaggers from the West who took all the best jobs after unification in 1990 come to mind; and pensions are still lower in the East than in the West, a quarter-century later.

But the AfD is neither a creation of the east, nor is it confined to it. It has fielded candidates in ten of the eleven states that have held elections since its founding in February 2013—five in the West and five in the East. It vaulted over the 5 percent entry threshold in all except one—with double-digit wins in every election held since Merkel welcomed a historic influx of refugees a year ago with the now legendary phrase, wir schaffen das (we can do it). In Mecklenburg, the AfD was able to push voter turnout up by 10 percent and poach voters from all the parties, including the extreme left and right. Even more significantly, it was able to mobilize a large group of non-voters—as it did in the last three regional elections before. No wonder politicians in Berlin are alarmed.

The AfD's often shambolic and disruptive public image makes it easy to underestimate its impact. It magnifies and manipulates voters' fears and grievances, but it is not wasting time by attempting to redress them. By all accounts, its state representatives have spent far more time fighting with each other than on making laws.

At the same time, the AfD has undergone a highly deliberate metamorphosis from a Eurosceptic voice on the right to an increasingly nationalist and xenophobic bloc. It does nothing to disassociate itself from anti-semitic, anti-**immigrant**, racist, or anti-Islamic supporters. It defames fundamental constitutional values and representative democracy. It is reaching out to the conservative mainstream by flaunting its connections to self-proclaimed thinkers of the "New Right." It is actively seeking to ally itself with extreme rightwing movements at home and abroad, from the local Pegida demonstrations to France's Marine le Pen or the Netherlands' Geert Wilders. In nationwide polls, it has consistently been registering 10-14 percent support; not from the dispossessed and disadvantaged, but from middle class men and women raging about social changes they don't like. No mistake, the AfD is in combat mode. Its target, however, is not class warfare—but the culture wars.

For now, the AfD is still a fringe force. But it is dangerous, and needs to be taken seriously, because it is already putting the established parties on the defensive and changing the terms of the national debate. Its national leaders, who regularly claim that their party represents 'true' popular opinion, have made no bones about their ultimate target: "We want to run the country."

Merkel—who has not declared yet whether she will run again in 2017—appears calmly determined to stay the course despite her sinking popularity figures. She can point to the fact that incoming refugee numbers have dwindled to a trickle, and that the country's communities have geared up to better integrating those who will stay. And she can take reassurance from the absence of a serious challenger to her stature.

But if she wants to have the choice of running again, she will have to do better at explaining to Germans and their neighbors why her morally admirable decision to let in the refugees is also good for the country, and for Europe. What is at stake is nothing less than the future of both.

Constanze Stelzenmüller is a contributing columnist for the Washington Post and Robert Bosch Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was late July when voters last heard from the potential first lady of the United States. Melania Trump delivered her speech at the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, and then later stood with her husband, balloons dropping, waving to the crowd in what is starting to feel like a premature farewell to the campaign trail.

Since then, she has not spoken publicly and has largely vanished from view, leaving a trail of questions and voids in her personal biography.

It was only Wednesday night — after a seven-week absence — that Melania Trump appeared at a campaign event, sitting in the audience as her husband addressed a national security forum.

Her long silence followed the fiasco over her convention speech, parts of which turned out to have been plagiarized. Then she took her website down after revelations that there was no record she had obtained a college degree, as her site had claimed. And while the issue of illegal **immigration** is central to her husband's platform, neither Melania Trump nor the Trump campaign has produced documentation to prove how the Slovenian **immigrant** got a visa to work in the United States or how she obtained her green card in 2001. Melania Trump has said she has been "at all times in full compliance" with **immigration** laws; Donald Trump has said his wife is "so documented."

Even as the campaign declines to fill in details of her life story, Melania Trump has deployed an attorney to beat back news reports probing her past. Last week, the former fashion model filed a libel suit against a blogger and a British newspaper for reports, since retracted, suggesting that she once worked as an escort.

Otherwise, the woman who could oversee a White House staff and command a global platform on behalf of the United States has said almost nothing. A news conference at which her husband promised to address **immigration** questions has yet to happen. And there is no sign that Melania Trump will play a significant role in the final stretch of her husband's campaign — a striking departure from tradition in which candidates' spouses serve as key surrogates in the effort to turn out voters.

The Trump campaign did not respond to multiple requests for comment, nor did it respond to specific questions about her past, or her future involvement in the campaign.

In many ways, Melania Trump's approach to campaigning is in keeping with a paradoxical pattern in her life — one in which she has both sought the spotlight and recoiled from its glare. The 46-year-old has been comfortable with public exposure on her own terms, posing nude at times and once even talking on Howard Stern's radio show about her sex life with Donald Trump. And yet, as a model and as a political spouse, she has also remained private to the point of reclusiveness.

Her official Twitter account — once a stream of Manhattan sunrises, Dover sole lunches at the Ralph Lauren Polo Club, and Melania lounging on a piano, a beach or a private jet — has become a series of statements pushing back against what is being written about her.

"Not a lot of people know me," she told The Washington Post in an interview in April. "Only I know my story, and I see people who want to have maybe five, 15 minutes of fame, and they say, 'Oh, I met her for five minutes.' . . . I read a lot of stories, and they are not correct stories."

Several people who have known Melania over the years say she has often been a solitary figure, cultivating few close friendships outside of her immediate family as she moved from the concrete apartment blocks of the former Yugoslavia in the late 1980s to Trump's gold-leafed penthouse in Manhattan in the late 1990s.

She left Slovenia as communism crumbled, joining a wave of young Eastern European women headed for Milan and Paris. It was a startling change for many young women who grew up in small and rural areas, according to people who worked in fashion.

"It was like, 'Wow!' It was a chance to go out with a guy with a Porsche," said Vincenzo Di Sarli, an Italian working in the international fashion business. "Many of them got married with these guys."

Melania, born Melanija Knavs, began calling herself Melania Knauss as she started her modeling career. She kept trying to make a name for herself, albeit with limited success at first, according to people familiar with her career at the time.

Bernarda Jeklin, who ran a Slovenian women's magazine, met Melania when she was 22 and entered the magazine's Face of the Year contest. Jeklin said Melania did not stand out in the crowd of so many promising models.

"She was really quite anonymous," said Jeklin. "She was very, very introverted. She didn't talk to other competitors. She preferred to be in her own world."

Melania placed as a runner-up, which helped her get more work when she returned to Milan. For several years, she modeled for catalogues and walked runways in Paris and other European capitals. During that time, she also met a wealthy Italian businessman, Paolo Zampolli, who said he saw enough potential in Melania to invite her to join a modeling agency he was financing in New York. Zampolli said he arranged Melania's work visa and she said she moved to New York in 1996.

By then, she was 26 and stood out from other recruits, who were typically 18- or 19-year-olds dressed in jeans and T-shirts, according to others who worked at Zampolli's Metropolitan agency. By contrast, Melania showed up at the agency already polished, always dressed exquisitely and expensively and carrying herself with a certain remove.

Michele August, a former booking agent for Metropolitan, said that she was a "very kind, gentle soul" and was "nothing but professional." Still, August said, it was difficult to rebook her because she was "kind of icy looking, not approachable."

"She was sexy, she wasn't high fashion," August said. "You didn't book her for Vogue. She was more commercial lingerie."

The 1990s nightlife of New York models was full of parties and invitations to nightclub openings where booze, cocaine and wealthy men were plentiful. According to August and others who worked at Metropolitan at the time, Melania was ambitious about making a name for herself but largely stayed away from the party scene. Her roommate from those days said that Melania often just stayed home.

"She would come out in her bathrobe and her glasses and slippers and watch 'Friends,' " said Matthew Atanian, a photographer who shared a Union Square apartment with her in Manhattan. "She kept pretty quiet and to herself," he added. He also said she talked by phone to her mother and sister in Slovenia every day.

An exception came in 1998, when she attended a Fashion Week event hosted by Zampolli — and met Donald Trump.

The same year, when she was 28, Melania made another leap into the spotlight by holding her own news conference in Paris. Journalists from Slovenia were flown in for free for the day to meet her, according to two of the journalists who made the trip.

The journalists said they had never heard of Melania Knauss before, but Dusan Nograsek, one of the journalists at that meeting, recalls her describing herself as one of the world's top 50 international models.

"It was very unusual for models to do such a thing," said Nograsek, who, along with others, wrote about Melania. "She was beautiful, likable, nice, natural. She acted as if she'd be standing on the red carpet in no time."

At the same time, Melania's association with Trump was leading to higher-profile assignments, including the January 2000 cover of British GQ, where she famously posed nude on a fur rug in a photo shoot on Trump's plane. She was in the 2000 swimsuit edition of Sports Illustrated, and when she married Trump in 2005, she was photographed wearing a $200,000 gown on the coveted cover of Vogue.

The transition to political wife was clearly not easy.

Earlier this year, Melania Trump had seemed willing to give campaigning a try — and got good reviews. In February, she surprised people when she took the microphone at a primary victory party in South Carolina and told cheering supporters in her accented English that her husband "will be the best president."

She went on MSNBC and CNN and addressed a crowd in Milwaukee after Donald Trump heralded the "exciting" presence of his wife on the campaign trail, saying, "She's never done this before."

At the same time, she seemed reluctant, telling The Post in April, "I am not part of the campaign" and that her 10-year-old son, Barron, was her main priority.

Recently, Melania Trump's absence has become conspicuous enough to spawn such Twitter hashtags as #WhereisMelania and #FreeMelania as people tried to figure out where she was and how she was doing.

On Wednesday night, she finally appeared, sitting in the crowd at the Intrepid Sea, Air & Space Museum in New York as her husband spoke at an NBC forum. Television viewers could only catch glimpses of her as cameras panned across the audience.

mary.jordan@washpost.com

stephanie.mccrummen@washpost.com

Rosalind S. Helderman, Alice Crites and Nejc Trusnovec contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A 28-year-old gang member charged in the brutal stabbing death of a Maryland teenager had been deported twice to El Salvador in the past two years, according to U.S. **immigration** officials.

Oscar Delgado-Perez is expected to make his first appearance in Montgomery County court on Friday afternoon in a killing detectives suspect was over gang bragging rights.

Detectives say that on June 16, Delgado-Perez and at least two other members of the MS-13 gang stabbed Cristian Villagran-Morales, 18, more than 40 times in a park in Gaithersburg. Delgado-Perez "directed" the attack, detectives wrote in an affidavit filed in court. Police had been searching for him for more than two months and found him Wednesday at a Red Roof Inn in Rockville.

Delgado-Perez's exact activities in Maryland or how was able to enter the United States at least three times weren't immediately clear.

But on Oct. 24, 2014, and again on Feb. 26, 2015, he was "removed to El Salvador," said Sarah Rodriguez, a spokesperson for U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, also known as ICE. In general, such removals result from rulings issued by U.S. **immigration** judges, Rodriguez said.

Delgado-Perez is currently locked up in the Montgomery jail, charged with first-degree murder. ICE has placed a hold on him because he probably faces a deportation case, too. If he were convicted in Maryland courts in the murder case, he probably would serve his full sentence before being returned home a third time.

While the challenges of illegal **immigration** are part of the national political debate, they confront local police every day in complicated ways.

The Montgomery County Police Department supports ICE's efforts to deport violent offenders, says Police Chief Tom Manger. But on the streets, Montgomery officers and detectives also must have the trust of **immigrant** communities, he said. That means being able to talk with undocumented residents and not ask about their **immigration** status, he said, so they are willing to report crimes and help solve them.

"We have to strike that right balance," said Manger. "We've got to be able to go into those communities and have trust and cooperation."

Manger said he understands the anger residents feel when they hear about deported individuals who return and commit violent crimes. "Certainly any community is better off without these individuals," he said.

In Montgomery County, the challenges are playing out in the context of a rise in homicides linked to MS-13, the violent gang with ties to Central America.

Last year, assailants with links to MS-13 allegedly stabbed and hurled heavy rocks on a victim as he crawled away from an attack toward a stream, according to court records. In another homicide, the victim was told, "Get on your knees," before being shot in the face, neck and shoulder while in the woods.

In the case that led to the murder charge against Delgado-Perez, a 19-year-old named Vanesa Alvarado allegedly used the promise of sex to entice Villagran-Morales into Malcolm King Park in Gaithersburg.

Once they arrived, MS-13 members came up to Alvarado and Villagran-Morales and asked him whether he wanted to go into the woods to smoke marijuana, police said. He agreed to do so.

In July, police arrested Avarado and one of the alleged gang members who approached Villagran-Morales at the park: Juan Gutierrez-Vasquez, 16, who was charged as an adult.

When Gutierrez-Vasquez was interviewed by detectives, he told them the victim was thought to be a rival gang member, according to court records. But detectives said they found no evidence of that and said the attackers may have made up the claim to gain street credibility.

Gutierrez-Vasquez came to Montgomery County from El Salvador earlier this year, police believe, and joined MS-13 after arriving. "I think he was recruited here," Detective Dimitry Ruvin has said in an earlier interview.

The victim, Villagran-Morales, was born in Guatemala and arrived in Montgomery this year from New Jersey to live with relatives, police said. He had been doing landscaping work. The young man sent money home to his father in Guatemala, according to friends.

Police have said at least three people were involved in the attack.

On Thursday, they said that they continue to look for suspect Jose Coreas Ventura, 20, who also goes by the name Jose Corea, and should be considered armed and dangerous.

Police officials ask that anyone with information about Ventura or the slaying call 301-279-8000. To be eligible for a reward, tipsters should call 1-866-411-TIPS (8477). Callers may remain anonymous.

dan.morse@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Sept. 8, 1966, "Star Trek" premiered with its first episode. Fifty years, six television series, 13 films and countless pages of Spock/Kirk fanfiction later, the franchise has firmly cemented itself as a tour de force in nerd culture. But "Star Trek" did more than just entertain the world's geeks — it also helped inspire a love of science and a hunger for space exploration.

It will surprise no one to learn that I, Rachel Feltman, Captain of the Nerdfleet Geek-erprise, grew up watching a lot of "Star Trek." In honor of #StarTrek50, here are a few moments when these shows and films proved particularly delightful for science lovers.

That time they debated the nature of personhood and artificial humanity

Any fan of "The Next Generation" knows that Data, the crew's resident android, is a person. He has the kind of artificial intelligence that computer scientists in the real world can only dream of. But in the episode "The Measure of a Man," Data's rights as an individual are brought into question. The audience, who knows this artificially intelligent being as just another member of the ship's beloved crew, cringes to hear him called "it," and the passionate Captain Picard (who is maybe Rachel's favorite, okay) presents a mind-bending argument in defense of his friend.

What the heck is life, really? That's a question scientists are asking themselves a lot lately. If we found life on another planet, would we even recognize it? Will artificially intelligent robots be our friends, our slaves or our evil overlords? Could we make "humans" with entirely synthetic genomes one day or perhaps create organisms entirely of our own design?

That time it got us all excited about meeting aliens

Obviously, every foam-faced **alien** creature on "Star Trek" got young humans jazzed about meeting whatever life might lurk out in the cosmos.

But the "First Contact" first contact was pretty special:

With that kind of cinema peppering our formative years, you can't blame us for getting excited every time scientists detect some wannabe-**alien**-signal.

The times it made us really not excited to meet aliens

The **alien** races portrayed on "Star Trek" are many, and some of them don't paint the same rosy portrait of the future as members of Starfleet do. There's Khan, the genetically engineered human with a chip on his shoulder, to remind us that some of our technological advances may lead to tragic folly. We see races of warriors and evil, godlike beings. But the most terrifying glimpse of the future we see on "Star Trek" comes in the form of the Borg.

The scary thing about the Borg is that you can kind of see where they're coming from: This **alien** race constantly seeks "perfection," striving to better itself by integrating biology and technology. That sounds familiar enough! Unfortunately, the Borg also forcefully assimilate any species they think could contribute to the "perfection" of their collective, and they destroy the concept of the individual in pursuit of a more powerful hive mind. Kind of a bummer!

It's easy to miss it behind all of the enthusiastic **alien**-hunting that goes on, but lots of scientists have spent time thinking about how we might avoid making contact with intelligent life.

Literally any time they used a tricorder

Dr. Leonard "Bones" McCoy could complete thorough medical examinations of his patients with no more than a wave of his arm.

Medical devices have gotten smaller, sleeker and more useful, but science hasn't quite tackled the challenge of a real-life tricorder yet. In a recent post about "Star Trek" tech, NASA offers up the recent detection of gravitational waves — ripples in the fabric of space-time — as humanity's coolest sensor technology use to date. Unfortunately, while they may tell us how often black holes form and collide with one another, gravitational waves can't be used to diagnose your personal ailments.

And the tricorder is just one of many Trekkie technological marvels we'd love to get our hands on. One of the first things I ever wrote professionally was about how annoying it is that we don't have holodecks yet. And can you imagine having a replicator to make you any food you desired? Treats from a 3-D printer just can't compare. A recent episode of the sci-fi podcast Flash Forward raised a fascinating question about Trek food prep: If all the meat consumed on the Enterprise is created at the molecular level, then do all of its residents count as vegans?

All those universes

A famous episode of "Star Trek: The Original Series" brought in mustachioed villains from a "mirror universe" — an alternate realm where everything was pretty flipped around. The outfits were scandalous, the facial hair was questionable and the customary greeting was a casual Nazi salute:

In "The Next Generation," we got to see a more nuanced portrayal of alternate universes. That episode dived into the many worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics, which basically boils down to the idea that anything that could ever have happened has happened, spawning infinite parallel universes in the process. There's an entire universe that exists just because I decided not to scratch my nose right now.

The idea that the universe might not unfold linearly is relatively new, and "Star Trek" has never been afraid of tackling some mind-bending chronologies. "The Next Generation" episode "The Inner Light" (which might be Rachel's favorite) features a character living out an entire lifetime during a brief period of unconsciousness in the "real world." The latest reboot of the "Star Trek" franchise brought "Original Series" characters back to the big screen by erasing their previous exploits with a time-travel story line, because the multiverse wasn't complicated enough.

What were your favorite "Trek" moments? Let us know in the comments, or join the part on Twitter with the hashtag #StarTrek50.

Read more:
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The nation's fastest-growing counties for Latinos are not in California, or Colorado, or Florida, or Nevada or Texas. Try North Dakota, Alabama and Georgia.

A new study on the growth of Hispanics across the United States highlights how they're dispersing into areas of the country where they haven't normally lived, causing a handful of rural counties far from major metropolitan areas dominated by Latinos to see huge percentage-point increases in their Hispanic populations.

The study, released Thursday afternoon by the nonpartisan Pew Research Center, found that the Hispanic population more than doubled in the last seven years in three North Dakota counties: Williams, Stark and Ward. These counties were already experiencing explosive general population growth thanks to an oil production boom that kept the state's economic growth in better shape during the Great Recession.

Rounding out the top ten counties for Latino population growth are Russell County, Ala. (just across the river from Columbus, Ga.); Bryan County, Ga. (next to Savannah); Luzerne County, Pa. (just south of Scranton); St. Bernard Parish, La.; Beadle County, S.D.; Duchesne County, Utah; and Burleigh County, N.D.

The report concludes -- as similar studies and government tabulations already have -- that Hispanic growth has slowed since the start of the Great Recession in 2007 due to declining **immigration** rates and birth rates. Despite the slowdown, Hispanics still accounted for 54 percent of the nation's overall population growth between 2000 and 2014, Pew said.

Hispanic population growth beyond states long dominated by Latinos is likely to start reshaping the political contours of rural states in the coming years. Already in an acknowledgment of the changing growth patterns, Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign has hired Latino outreach directors in Georgia, North Carolina and Pennsylvania — a first for a presidential campaign — and until this week spent most of its advertising budget targeting English-proficient Hispanics. Only this week did the campaign start airing Spanish-language ads in Florida and Nevada.

The study has one other important reminder: Most of the Hispanics dispersing across the country don't speak Spanish on a regular basis. According to Pew, 72 percent of the Hispanics moving into these fast-growing counties are "English proficient," meaning they speak only English at home, or might speak another language but speak English very well. That's higher than the national average of 68 percent, Pew said. These counties also have a higher share of U.S.-born Hispanics — not **immigrants** from other countries.

Some other notable findings:

• The five states with the largest Hispanic populations account for 65 percent of all Hispanics in the United States. They are California (15 million); Texas (10.4 million); Florida (4.8 million); New York (3.7 million); and Illinois (2.2 million).

• New Mexico has the largest share of a state population that is Latino, 48 percent. The Land of Enchantment is trailed by California and Texas, with 39 percent each; Arizona (31 percent); and Nevada (28 percent).

• Just about everywhere, U.S.-born Hispanics outnumber Hispanics born elsewhere. But 53 percent of Hispanics in the District of Columbia were foreign-born as of 2014, and half of the Hispanic population in Maryland was also foreign-born.

Related:

Clinton isn't doing better than previous Democrats with Latinos — even against Trump

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — President Enrique Peña Nieto on Wednesday replaced his finance minister, widely seen as the architect of Donald Trump's trip to Mexico, after the U.S. presidential candidate's visit caused a firestorm of protest here.

Peña Nieto offered no explanation for the resignation of Luis Videgaray, one of his closest aides and the protagonist of some of the government's signature economic reforms. But it came a week after the Mexican leader appeared to deferentially greet a politician who has antagonized Mexicans with his harsh criticism of **immigrants** and his vow to build a huge border wall.

Peña Nieto's decision to host Trump has provoked one of his most severe political crises since he took office in 2012, with even his own cabinet deeply divided over the move.

"The political cost [of the visit] was extremely high for Peña Nieto, and he was obliged to find someone to blame," said Alberto Arnaut, a political science professor at the College of Mexico, explaining the minister's departure.

The Trump visit, he said, "was a monumental failure."

Political leaders around the world have expressed concern about a possible victory by Trump, who has threatened to slap new tariffs on key U.S. trading partners, reevaluate current NATO commitments and lessen the protections provided by the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

But Mexico's leadership has been particularly unnerved by the unconventional Republican nominee. Mexico is heavily dependent on the United States for trade and investment; 1 in 10 Mexican citizens lives north of the border, part of a diaspora that sends home billions of dollars in remittances each year.

Videgaray, who had served as the Mexican government's behind-the-scenes liaison to the Trump campaign, and his allies advocated the visit as a chance to defend Mexican interests and calm financial markets worried about how a possible Trump victory in November might harm Mexico's economy, according to Mexicans familiar with the deliberations. But Trump followed his Mexico City trip with a defiant speech in Phoenix vowing to crack down on illegal **immigrants**and build a massive border fence — while forcing Mexico to pay for it.

A recent poll found that 85 percent of Mexicans thought it had been a bad idea to bring the U.S. presidential candidate to their country. Trump's visit prompted opponents in Mexico City to plan a protest march for Sept. 15, the eve of Mexico's independence day, calling on Peña Nieto to step down.

Speaking at a news conference Wednesday in the presidential palace, flanked by Videgaray and other ministers, Peña Nieto praised his close ally for his four years at the helm of the Finance Ministry, saying he had been committed to "further the transformation of Mexico." Videgaray's work has "strengthened public finances and increased tax revenue in an unprecedented way, with less dependence on oil revenue," the president added.

The Mexican leader was losing not just a key minister but also a trusted aide. Videgaray, an MIT-educated economist, had worked with Peña Nieto when he was a governor and later ran his campaign for president. But the Mexican president's approval ratings had been languishing even before the Trump visit, and he has been pilloried relentlessly in recent days.

Peña Nieto appointed José Antonio Meade, Mexico's social development minister and a popular former foreign minister, to take over as finance minister.

At the start of the Peña Nieto administration, Videgaray was perhaps the best-known member of a group of young, hotshot technocrats around him who pledged to reboot Mexico's economy and society and bring a reform-minded agenda to the Institutional Revolutionary Party, which had ruled for much of the past century.

But during Videgaray's tenure as minister, Mexico's economy has been characterized by plodding growth and a weakening peso. A steep drop in world oil prices has hurt the country and dampened enthusiasm for a bold plan to open up the country's crucial oil industry to foreign investment. Videgaray helped craft some of the key economic reforms, including restructuring the tax system with an aim to expand the number of contributors.

His supporters described him as a capable financial mind who kept the economy stable during a turbulent time. "I believe, in general, Videgaray has delivered well," said Gabriel Guerra Castellanos, a consultant and media analyst.

But government deficits and the public debt grew during Videgaray's tenure, and critics saw him as arrogant. Many Mexicans opposed his tax increases.

The driving force behind Videgaray's abrupt departure appeared to be the Trump visit. Many here felt humiliated that Peña Nieto would host the candidate.

The trip also divided Peña Nieto's government. Some cabinet members, such as Foreign Minister Claudia Ruiz Massieu, had argued against inviting the candidate.

The government is expected to present its 2017 budget on Thursday. Peña Nieto said that the government would be "tightening its belt" but that there will "not be new taxes nor increases in existing ones."

"The adjustments will fall on the government, and not on the people," he said.

joshua.partlow@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A pair of Spanish-language television ads began airing Wednesday in support of U.S. Senate candidates in North Carolina and Nevada.

The Tar Heel State has emerged this year as critical to Democratic hopes of electing Hillary Clinton to the White House and retaking control of the U.S. Senate. Currently, Clinton is leading Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump in many polls, while incumbent Sen. Richard Burr (R) is locked in the race of his political life against Democratic state lawmaker Deborah Ross.

In Nevada, Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R) faces former state attorney general Catherine Cortez Masto in the race to succeed Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D). **Immigration** has become a top issue in the race, given the state's growing Hispanic population and Heck's public struggles with the topic.

In North Carolina, Ross is the beneficiary of a new Spanish-language ad campaign that will stretch across television, radio and the Internet and is paid for by Democracy for America, a liberal advocacy group that plans to spend at least $200,000 helping her. Not surprisingly, it focuses on what Trump has said about **immigration** reform and **immigrants**.

Here's the 30-second TV ad:

"When a person like Donald Trump wants to be president and says we are criminals and rapists, we need a fighter of our own," an announcer says. "And for Senate, that person is Deborah Ross. Deborah Ross isn't afraid of Donald Trump. Deborah Ross believes in comprehensive **immigration** reform. And Deborah Ross is for a North Carolina that works for all of us."

The ad was produced for DFA by Solidarity Strategies, led by consultant Chuck Rocha, who was a senior adviser to the presidential campaign of Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.). In the months since Sanders dropped his bid for the Democratic nomination, Rocha and other consultants who focus on wooing Hispanic voters have warned that although Clinton may ultimately enjoy broad support among Latino voters, down-ballot Democrats could suffer if the party and outside groups don't promote candidates properly.

"There's a lot of people concerned about the top of the ticket and the deficiencies of Clinton or Trump, but what really scares me is the non-motivation down-ballot of targeting Latinos for Senate and congressional races," Rocha said in an interview this week.

The ads in North Carolina and Nevada are designed to address those concerns.

In Nevada, the Senate Majority PAC is paying for the spot, which attacks Heck by tying him to Trump's comments on **immigration** and education. Here's the ad:

The message's bottom line: "There is no difference between Joe Heck and Donald Trump," the announcer says.

The announcer in both the ads is a woman. That is because Democrats increasingly believe Latinas will be voting this year in higher numbers than ever before.

A poll released last week by Emerson College put Burr ahead of Ross, 45 to 41, with a 3.4 percentage-point margin of error. Two polls released in late August by Monmouth University and CNN-ORC showed Burr leading by 2 points and 3 points, respectively.

In the Nevada race, Heck and Cortez Masto were tied at 37 percent apiece in a Suffolk University poll taken in mid-August.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS — British authorities confirmed Tuesday that construction will begin this month on a concrete wall in Calais intended to keep migrants and refugees from the city's port, where they frequently attempt to stow away on U.K.-bound trucks and ferries.

"This measure is intended to further protect the Rocade from migrant attempts to disrupt, delay and even attack vehicles approaching the port," the British Home Office said in an emailed statement. The Rocade is an access road leading into the port.

On Monday, French truck drivers and local residents protested against the large migrant camp outside the city, blocking traffic and insisting that migrants and refugees have increasingly resorted to violence to gain passage to Britain, 20 miles across the English Channel.

Tuesday's update from U.K. **Immigration** Minister Robert Goodwill on what local residents immediately began calling on social media the "Great Wall of Calais" came days after the French government pledged, again, to close the "Jungle" encampment outside Calais. Goodwill declined to comment further.

In the camp, 7,000 to 9,000 refugees and migrants — mostly from Afghanistan and Sudan — live in squalid conditions and legal limbo. Nearly equidistant from London and Paris, the Jungle has become an arresting symbol of Europe's migrant crisis, no longer confined to the continent's periphery.

The wall, a crucial part of a $22.65 million Franco-British security package agreed to in early March, is slated to be about 13 feet high and made of smooth concrete, a material that is difficult to scale.

Almost instantly, a pro-**immigrant** segment of the British government voiced concerns, saying the Calais wall could send the same message of exclusion commonly associated with the controversial proposal by Republican U.S. presidential nominee Donald Trump to build a wall between the United States and Mexico.

Alf Dubs, a member of the House of Lords and the lead sponsor of a recent amendment to welcome into Britain more unaccompanied migrant children, called the idea "stupid." Dubs was once a child refugee in Britain, brought there as part of the famous Kindertransports that saved the lives of nearly 10,000 Jewish children in World War II.

"It sends an appalling message after the disaster of the Brexit vote," he said, referring to the United Kingdom's vote to leave the European Union. "It sends an appalling message of us being a small, nasty, inward-looking country."

As part of a 2003 agreement between Britain and France, the British border technically extends to the shores of northern France, which has made Calais a prime destination for migrants and refugees in the past year. Largely because of linguistic, cultural and familial ties, many migrants are still hoping for asylum in Britain.

Meanwhile, the city of Paris announced Tuesday the details of its plan to become the first densely populated European city to create a space within city limits to welcome and house migrants. Anne Hidalgo, the city's Socialist mayor, told reporters that a new facility would open in mid-October in the French capital, initially for 400 and with room to expand to 600.

"We must invent new devices to overcome the current situation, which is a situation of saturation," Hidalgo said.

james.mcauley@washpost.com

Read more

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Recent polls contain a finding that is devastating to Donald Trump's presidential candidacy: He is losing the Catholic vote to Hillary Clinton by an astounding 23 percentage points. However, Trump retains the sort of support from white evangelical Protestants that is typical of recent Republican presidential nominees — around 80 percent.

This contrast doesn't just matter for Trump's candidacy. It reveals a startling political splintering of conservative Catholics and evangelicals, who have tracked side by side for decades.

This alliance of Catholics and evangelicals came about in the 1970s. Before that, Catholics were a solid Democratic Party voting bloc, comprised largely of the **immigrant** underclass. Economic and social status, not moral issues, determined Catholic voting.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/06/27/for-evangelicals-the-question-has-become-which-is-a-worse-sin-abortion-or-racism/"]For[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/06/27/for-evangelicals-the-question-has-become-which-is-a-worse-sin-abortion-or-racism/"]For] evangelicals, the question has become: Which is a worse sin, abortion or racism?[/interstitial\_link]

As the Democratic Party pushed social issues — brought to prominence in George McGovern's presidential campaign in 1972 — and then the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision in 1973 stunned many antiabortion supporters into political action, Republican strategists saw an opportunity to transform U.S. politics by aligning evangelicals and antiabortion Catholics.

This alliance was not easy to achieve given past divisions between evangelicals and Catholics, most prominently in the presidential candidacy of John F. Kennedy in 1960. Kennedy had to pledge to Protestant ministers that if he were elected, he would exercise independent judgment and not take direction from the Vatican. In the 1960s, Southern Baptists often led opposition to state proposals to restrict abortion rights, because Catholic-led organizations, such as the National Right to Life Committee, were promoting such legislation. Evangelicals for years opposed public funding for private education, so that parochial schools would not reap any benefit.

Nonetheless, in the 1970s, social issues drove many Catholics to question their steadfast loyalty to the Democratic Party. By the 1980s, many were voting Republican, due not only to social issues but also to their own improved economic and social status. Evangelical-led organizations, such as the Christian Coalition, in the 1990s made Catholic outreach a priority in their efforts at building support.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/02/29/russell-moore-why-this-election-makes-me-hate-the-word-evangelical/"]Russell[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/02/29/russell-moore-why-this-election-makes-me-hate-the-word-evangelical/"]Russell] Moore: Why this election makes me hate the word 'evangelical'[/interstitial\_link]

Leaders of both faiths cemented their surprising partnership on paper in the 1995 document "Evangelicals and Catholics Together," signed by major figures in both communities who pledged to work together on such issues as abortion and government aid to religious schools.

In the 2000s, President George W. Bush made outreach to conservative Catholics a centerpiece of his strategy to build a broad base of support among the faithful. He weaved familiar Catholic discourse into many of his speeches to showcase his support for much of what traditional Catholics believe. In 2004, the famous "values voters" election, evangelicals and Catholics alone delivered 36 million of Bush's 60 million votes.

Considering that Catholics were for decades solid Democratic Party voters, and that Catholics and evangelicals once stood in opposition in both theology and politics, this transformation was remarkable. Even in the Barack Obama elections, the Republican nominees held their strong support among evangelicals and achieved near parity with Catholic voters. The alliance very marginally weakened, but that's all.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/06/27/failure-is-key-to-christianity-is-donald-trump-too-successful"]Failure[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/06/27/failure-is-key-to-christianity-is-donald-trump-too-successful"]Failure] is key to Christianity. Is Donald Trump too successful?[/interstitial\_link]

This year, the decline in Republican support among Catholics is dramatic. What is going on here?

Throughout the long years of partnership, Catholics have continued to hold less conservative positions than white evangelicals on many issues: **immigration**, the death penalty, health care, social welfare and more.

Trump has pushed a lot of these Catholics over the edge, especially with his strident **immigration** stands. Issues surrounding Trump's personal conduct also have turned away some leading conservative Catholics. The conservative group CatholicVote lambasted Trump's  "character and moral judgment." Dozens of conservative Catholic thought leaders signed a letter that declared Trump "manifestly unfit to be President of the United States" and said that he does not represent Catholic values.

Consider the Catholic beliefs about respecting the inherent dignity of every person. Trump's controversial statements about numerous groups, and his mocking of a man with a disability, stand in sharp contrast to the culture that Catholics strive for. Indeed, many Catholics are disturbed to find that despite all of this, many evangelical leaders and voters can easily accept Trump.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/03/31/c-s-lewis-predicted-donald-trump/"]C.S[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/03/31/c-s-lewis-predicted-donald-trump/"]C.S]. Lewis predicted Donald Trump[/interstitial\_link]

To be sure, some prominent evangelical leaders, such as Russell Moore, the president of the Southern Baptist Convention's Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, and former Moral Majority leader Michael Farris have come out strongly against Trump. Farris even declared a meeting of Trump and evangelical leaders "the end of the Christian Right."

But white evangelical voters are standing firm for Trump. That is a significant contrast with the many normally Republican-voting Catholics opposing Trump.

For four decades, political and religious leaders worked hard to bring together evangelical and Catholic voters on key moral issues. They achieved for some time a truly powerful alliance. The Trump candidacy now threatens to pull these groups back away from each other.

Mark J. Rozell is dean of the Schar School of Policy and Government at George Mason University and author of numerous studies on the intersection of religion and politics.

Want more stories about faith? Follow Acts of Faith on Twitter or sign up for our newsletter.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump said Wednesday that he is open to allowing undocumented **immigrants** to legally stay in the United States if they serve in the military.

"I think that when you serve in the armed forces, that's a special situation, and I could see myself working that out. Absolutely," Trump said during NBC's Commander-in-Chief Forum on Wednesday night when a member of the audience asked him whether he would allow undocumented **immigrants** to gain legal status by serving in the military.

"I think military is a very special thing," Trump said, expanding on his answer. "If they plan on serving, if they get in, I would absolutely, for all of those people. Now, we have to be very careful, we have to vet very carefully, everybody would agree with that, but the answer is it would be a very special circumstance, yes."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump and Mike Pence sat for an interview with ABC News anchor David Muir during a campaign stop in Ohio over the Labor Day weekend. ABC released the full transcript of their interview Tuesday night.  Using Genius, I annotated it. You can too! Sign up for Genius and annotate alongside me! To see an annotation, click or tap the highlighted part of the transcript.

MUIR: Mr. Trump, Governor Pence, thank you for doing this. We sit here in the great battleground state of Ohio. 63 days to go. How badly do you need to win Ohio to win that White House?

TRUMP: Well we're up in Ohio and you see the kind of crowds we're having in Ohio and I think we're going to win it and certainly I think it will be very important to win Ohio. We're going to do very well in Pennsylvania. We're leading in Florida. We're doing well pretty much all over but winning Ohio. First of all, I worked here for a long period of time and I loved this state and I love the people and I think we're going to win Ohio.

MUIR: You've heard what people have said. Republicans do not win the White House without Ohio.

TRUMP: Well I've heard that and certainly we intend to win Ohio. We should win Ohio.

MUIR: Twenty days until the first big debate. Are you ready?

TRUMP: You never know, but I think so.

MUIR: Are you prepping?

TRUMP: Yeah sure. I'm prepping, maybe not in the traditional way. When I had the debates, I had 11 debates with the -- as you know -- in the primaries, and I was very satisfied. Everybody else was very satisfied with the way I did. And I think I'm working the same way I did there.

MUIR: But this will be a lot different. I mean there will be two candidates on that stage. It won't be, you know, the list that was there during the primary.

TRUMP: Well we started off with 17 and in the end we had just a few left so, it's not that much different. But I look forward to the debates. I think it's gonna be very revealing.

MUIR: Any mock debates?

TRUMP: Haven't thought about it much. It could happen. But haven't really given it much thought.

MUIR: I read somewhere that when you were asked about the debate. You were asked about the debates and you said, 'I know how to handle Hillary.'

TRUMP: I don't think I'd ever say that about anybody. I don't know how to handle you. I don't know how to handle anybody. I'm me. I just do what I have to do. And what we're going to be doing -- and you see it from outside when you look at those Ohio crowds we have 60 or 70,000 people right outside the door. That's, nobody's ever had that and what I know how to do is create jobs and that's what I'm going to do.

I'm bringing jobs back to Ohio and Pennsylvania and all of the states and they know my stance on **immigration** and it's the proper stance. But we're going to bring jobs back. We're gonna give jobs back in these states because we are being drained, our country's being drained of its jobs. And we can't have that. I see people today, they want hope, they're desperate, they're desperate. We had 15,000 people working in a factory and now they're down to 500 people. From 15,000 they're down to 500 and the jobs have all left and the companies have gone to Mexico and other places. We're not going to stand for that.

MUIR: We couldn't help but to notice that the Trump Pence plane is at the airport and so is Hillary Clinton's new plane. Does that signal to you that it's game on?

PENCE: Well I think it's been game on with Donald Trump since the very beginning and that's the reason why everyday he's been winning more hearts and minds all across this country with a simple message that we can make America great again. I mean you saw thousands of people out at this county fair today. And they're responding to a strong leader but even beyond that he'd be the first to say this is a movement of people that know that the leadership of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton has weakened America's place in the world, stifled America's economy and Donald Trump has the qualities of leadership and he has the vision to strengthen America at home and abroad.

MUIR: Let me ask you Mr. Trump you just traveled to Mexico and you said shortly after that you and the Mexican president did not discuss who would pay for the wall. And then afterward the president of Mexico said it was discussed and that he said Mexico will not pay for it. Hillary Clinton, who's also here in Ohio, as you know, told us a short time ago that you choked, that the idea of Mexico paying for this wall has been central to your campaign. Did you choke?

TRUMP: So let me just tell you about choking. I don't choke. She chokes. Look at the deals she's made. She's responsible for so many bad things that have happened to our country including the signing by her husband of NAFTA, which has drained our country of its jobs. I've been given A plus, including by you people, but I've been given A pluses for the job I did in Mexico. All that is is a Madison Avenue soundbite. Whether I did phenomenally or not they would have said that. That was a tremendous success for me. You know that virtually everybody including my biggest critics have said that when I went down to Mexico it was a tremendous success. Mike called me and said, 'I've never seen anybody look so presidential.' Many people have said that.

PENCE: It's true.

TRUMP: And the fact is Mexico will pay for the wall, it was discussed that it wouldn't be discussed but they know my stance and I know their stance. And until I'm president I'm not going to press anything very much, but they fully know my stance. My stance is we're going to build a wall and Mexico's going to pay for the wall. It's very simple.

MUIR: Did the Mexican president break his word in talking about it?

TRUMP: They all know the ground rules and the ground rules were there. Rudy Giuliani said it, in fact Rudy was surprised. Rudy Giuliani spoke very eloquently about it. The ground rules. And we had ground rules and that's OK. They know my stance and I know their stance. See who wins in the end. We'll win, 100 percent, they're going to pay for the wall.

We're going to build a wall, they're going to pay for the wall, we're going to keep drugs out, we're going to keep the people that-- we have gangs, we have gang leaders. We have drug kings. We have all of these people flowing into our country, all of those people are going to get out. We're gonna get 'em out. We're gonna stop the flow of drugs into our country.

Our country is being poisoned. Our youth are being destroyed. We have cities over the weekend 20 people are overdosed on drugs. Twenty people from one city and dying. They're dying all over our country and it's coming, mostly, from that section of the world. We're gonna stop it.

PENCE: Other than Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine, Donald Trump's visit to Mexico City was universally praised. You remember that Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine have basically tried to paint a picture of Donald Trump that, just because you're a strong leader at home and you have a strong vision about America's place in the world that you don't have the ability to sit down in a diplomatic setting and build relationships with world leaders. Last Wednesday what the American people saw, and frankly, what the world saw, was a gracious man who will represent America great on a world stage, but also will do it in a way that will command the respect of the world.

MUIR: Governor, you know what the Clinton team will say though. That Mr. Trump is talking often about Mexico paying for that wall and that this campaign returned with Mexico saying, 'we're not paying for it.'

PENCE: You know what you have in Donald Trump is not-

TRUMP: Oh, he didn't say that. He tweeted that long after the meeting was over. He didn't say that.

MUIR: You tweet a lot too though.

TRUMP: I do

MUIR: And we take you at your word.

TRUMP: You have 25 million people with Facebook, why wouldn't I take advantage of something. But the fact is he didn't say that, he tweeted that after I left and then in the speech I made in Arizona -- which was also a really respected speech on **immigration** -- I said, 'And by the way, Mexico will pay for the wall.' I also said they might not even know it yet. But Mexico will pay for the wall, 100 percent and it's easy because they're making so much money. They're taking our jobs. Drugs are pouring across the border. They make a fortune off the United States. Both at the border and with jobs.

And I like them very much, I get along very well with the president. Very, very well. I think we'll have a very good relationship, but Mexico will pay for the wall.

MUIR: You talk about the speech. The central premise of the speech was **immigration** and let me just ask you about what one of your top surrogates, in the last 24 hours, Rudy Giuliani said that Donald Trump would 'find it very difficult to throw a family that's been here in the United States for 15 years with kids who are now American citizens out of this country.' That that's not the America that Donald Trump wants. So will some of these families be allowed to stay?

TRUMP: First of all he's 100 percent right. It's very difficult. It's a very difficult thing to do. Here's what we're going to do. It's very simple. It was put out in the speech and most people understood it but the crowd -- we had 15,000 people and they're going wild and a lot of people I guess didn't hear it or they just were watching the reaction. What we're going to do is we're going to build a tremendously strong and powerful boarder. People are going to come in, but they're going to come in legally. We're going to get rid of all of the bads: the gang members, the drug lords and all of the different people that are here and that shouldn't be here. We're gonna clean things up.

Once we have a secure border -- totally secure -- we're going to take a look at the people that you're talking about. We're going to look at it from where our country is, from where we stand in the world, from how we're doing as a country. We're going to take a very good, strong, hard look at the people that remained.

MUIR: When you take a good, strong hard look, does that mean some of those 11 million undocumented **immigrants** will be allowed to stay?

TRUMP: It could be, but what's going to happen is, if you're going to be a citizen, you're going to leave and you're going to have to come back. We're going to do something -- you know we have thousands and thousands of people waiting on line. It's very, very unfair to put people ahead of the line. We have right now thousands -- they've been waiting ten years, David, to come into the country. It's very unfair to take people and have them circumvent the line. We're going to speed up the line because I want people to come into the country, but they have to do it through a legal process. Tthey have to do it legally

PENCE: David, what you're hearing here is--

MUIR: But people want to know the answer to this question. Those who are here who are undocumented who did not break the law, who are coming--

TRUMP: Well they broke the law in coming into the country.

MUIR: Right.

TRUMP: Is that a correct statement?

MUIR: If they want to be a citizen, they will have to go home?

TRUMP: If they want to be a citizen, they have to go home, get on line. Now, the line will be much more efficient. Like everything with this government, the line is a disaster right now. People are waiting for many many years and people are-- the only people that come into this country are the people that pour in. They just pour in. and many of these people are now member of the gangs and they're now selling drugs all over the country.

A lot of people are on line. It's very unfair to have them waiting for four years, for six years, for ten years and other people just walk into the country. We can't do that, but we're gonna have a very efficient process because we want people to come into the country. They have to go through the system.

PENCE: David, what Donald Trump is calling for is a fundamental reform of our **immigration** system. In that speech in Arizona, he said that if people want to achieve citizenship, they have to go back in line, they have to leave the country but they won't be operating under the same visa caps of the past.

We're gonna be working with the Congress a new commission that our new president will establish to revise and reform our **immigration** laws, but all with the load star on what's in the best interest of the American people now and going forward. That, to me, was the most refreshing part of Donald Trump's message

TRUMP: And at the time, because you're talking about building a wall, securing our border, getting all of the criminals out -- because we have perhaps millions of people who have records, criminals. We're going to end sanctuary cities where they see people are protected. They're swaddled, they're protected. We can't do that anymore. I look at the families who have been destroyed by illegal **immigrants** killing their daughters, their sons, their husband, their wives. We're not gonna have that any more, David. We're not going to have that. So we will see, at the end of the process, where we are as a country and what we'll do.

MUIR: So when those families do ultimately go home, the ones who have no record who are here, once you get the wall and the criminals out of here, as you say. Is it self-deportation?

TRUMP: No.

MUIR: Or will you deport them?

TRUMP: No.

MURI: How does it work?

TRUMP: They will-- If they want to become a citizen, they'll go out and they'll come back in through a process, but they have to get on line,

MUIR: But what is that called? I mean, most people call it--

TRUMP: They don't call it anything

MUIR: Will they have to go--

TRUMP: They don't call it anything, OK? They don't call it anything. They will get on line, they'll go behind people that have been waiting for four, five years. By that time the line, I'm sure, will be much more efficient because we do things efficiently -- right now it's a bureaucratic mess. It's a total mess. You know a lot of people don't come in legally because of the fact that people are just pouring across the border. That's the way they come into the country, right. So they will get on line and they will come in through an efficient process if they want to become a citizen.

MUIR: And if they don't want to become a citizen?

TRUMP: They have to make a determination what happens when the border is secure

MUIR: So you're open to them staying here undocumented?

TRUMP: I'm going to make a decision, or somebody will. Whether it's me or somebody else because, perhaps, depending on the time -- by that time we'll have a secure border, we'll have a wall. We will have stopped the drugs pouring into the country. I mean, you look at states like Ohio you look at states like Pennsylvania or New Hampshire, the biggest thing on their minds is drugs. I say, 'What's your biggest problem?' It's jobs and it's drugs. We're gonna stop the drugs and we're gonna bring jobs back to our states. We're going to bring jobs back to our country.

PENCE: And Donald Trump has laid out a plan to end illegal **immigration** once and for all, which has a direct relationship to the struggling economy that we face. The fact is that, here in Ohio and all over the country, illegal **immigration** now, for more than a generation, has cost Americans jobs, it has suppressed wages and it's had all the other affects that he's talked about so clearly and openly across the country.

I think what the American people are seeing is a leader that knows how to put first things first. Whether it be in a meeting in Mexico City with the president where they focused on first building a relationship, talking about the five things they agreed on: ending illegal **immigration**, human trafficking, ending the flow of illicit drugs and other issues. And also in this area, what people heard from Arizona last week was Donald Trump saying we're going to put border security and internal enforcement and removing criminal aliens and those who have overstayed their visas, we're going to deal with all of that, and for those that remain we'll have that discussion in the future.

TRUMP: David, we have to stop the illegal flow of drugs into our country. Our country is a disaster, our youth is being poisoned, and I'm not talking about small numbers, I'm talking about massive numbers of young people whose lives are going to be destroyed and are destroyed in many cases because they're hooked and they can't get off it. Heroin, in particular, is so hard to get off, they're hooked.

We are going to stop the illegal flow of drugs and, as you know, 16,500 border patrol agents endorsed me. They know better than anybody what's happening. They endorsed me. I said to them, 'How important is the wall?' They said, 'Mr. Trump, it is absolutely imperative, especially for the stopping of the drugs that are pouring in.'

MUIR: I do want to ask one more question on something you said a moment ago about people who are undocumented. You are open to the possibility that ultimately they might simply stay?

TRUMP: We're going to make that determination at the time. Once we have a secure border and we stop the drugs and stop the bad ones and get the bad ones out, those are going to be gone immediately. Day one, first hour, I"m going to give a mandate to everybody, including the local police because they know. You know the local police know every one of the bad ones, it's not like, 'Oh gee, let's figure out who it is.' They know every bad gang member, drug kingpin, they know all of them. As soon as I will be in office for one hour and that order will go out. We're getting them the hell out of the country.

PENCE: But David, let me also say it's very appropriate to have lots of interest in what a President Donald Trump will do on illegal **immigration**. Donald Trump put the issue of illegal **immigration** at the center of the national debate. But what I'd also like to see, and I think millions of Americans would like to see, is more clarity about HIllary Clinton's plan.

Hillary Clinton is presumably for open borders. She intends to impose the unconstitutional executive amnesty that the supreme court rejected. I mean, she actually wants to increase the Syrian refugee program by 550 percent. I think as much attention that's being paid to my running mate and our position on illegal **immigration**, the American people deserve to know that Hillary Clinton will advocate the policies of amnesty that the American people want to reject and it will continue the flow of illegal **immigration** that's costing jobs in this country and too often resulting in tragedy.

MUIR: And when it comes to Syrian refugees you still--

TRUMP: Over.

MUIR: Done, right now?

TRUMP: Done. No more. Done. We have no idea who they are, we have no idea are they ISIS-related, we have absolutely no clue. And you see what happens with just one person. You take a look, all over the world, not just here, not just San Bernadino or Orlando, or any of the other places. You take a look at what one person does, the destruction that one person can do. And it is interesting with Hillary Clinton she wants to let the Syrian refugees, or whoever they are, pour into our country. We don't even know where they're putting them. You know the governors of states don't even know who's coming into their own states.

MUIR: Have you met any of the Syrian refugees who live here now already in communities in California, Idaho?

PENCE: David, that's really not the issue. The issue is that we live in such uncertain times and what Donald Trump has put at the center of the national debate is there simply are countries, and even territories of the world, that are so torn asunder by civil war and so compromised by terrorism that our own homeland security and FBI director said we can't know who these people are. So the only thing that a president of the United States should do is to suspend that program immediately, put the safety and security of the American people first and initiate safe zones in the region for those that are fleeing from those war torn areas.

But secondly, Donald Trump is also calling for an extreme vetting to ensure that people who are coming into this country don't represent a threat to ourselves and our families.

TRUMP: Extreme vetting. Let me tell you, Hillary Clinton doesn't talk about illegal **immigration**. It's a very complex subject and it's a subject that a lot of people don't like to get into, even though everyone knows it's a tremendous, massive problem and basically her definition of illegal **immigrant** is: come on in, folks, welcome to the country. She doesn't get who they are, where they come from, what their record is. If they're killers they're killers. Doesn't make any difference to her. It's open borders, it's take everybody's jobs, and it's a disaster.

And nobody can tell me that's a popular thing, nobody can tell me it's the right thing because it's not the right thing. And you ever notice -- you're talking to us about illegal **immigration**, which is fine with me -- but do you ever notice she never talks about it? She never brings it up. Because basically it's an open border policy where people are going to flow into our country.

MUIR: Let me ask you about something you said recently. You said that you have regretted moments along the way to your candidacy where your words have caused personal pain. And I'm curious, who are you talking about?

TRUMP: Anybody.

MUIR: Can you just give us one example?

TRUMP: No, it's no specifics, just anybody. Look--

MUIR: Your campaign--

TRUMP: I went through, David, I went through 16 people, we had 17. It was a very harsh, very harsh primary. People say the most in history. The most number of people, but it was the harshest in history. I was rough, they were rough on me, but you know a lot of feelings were hurt, some still, even though they signed a pledge. They haven't been able to endorse me because they haven't gotten over what took place. Number one, they lost, and number two, it was a tough primary.

MUIR: So you were primarily talking about the other candidates?

TRUMP: I'm talking about anybody that was offended or hurt. It's OK. Now I have to go into the future, but I said that. And I mean it. I don't want to hurt anybody, I don't want to offend anybody. But if anybody was hurt. But, if you just look at the 16 people that I-- we had a total of 17 and I'm last standing.

And now you see what's happening with Hillary. You see what's going on with her emails. It's a disgrace. It's a disgusting situation where she pretends like she doesn't know. I mean, she had her emails -- 33,000 emails -- acid washed. The most sophisticated person never heard about acid washing. Acid washing is a very expensive process and that's to really get rid of them. Really, and these emails pertain to her wedding or her yoga classes? What's gone on here is very serious, and I'll be honest, I think that the FBI is having a very, very hard time. I don't think they've ever been through a period where so many people are so disappointed in them.

MUIR: Do you think the FBI failed on this?

TRUMP: It's not a question of thinking. You know what-- you cover it every night. What she did is a series of lies, gross negligence, carelessness. I mean, your document said carelessness. This is worse, this is gross negligence. They put a young man in prison, or they're going to put him in prison, because he used the wrong Xerox machine on something. What's going on is horrible.

MUIR: So when the director recommended no criminal charges--

TRUMP: I was shocked. Especially after he read, for a fairly long period of time, just a few of the many things that she did that were illegal.

MUIR: So is that a failure of the FBI?

TRUMP: Well it's certainly not a moment to be proud of, I can tell you that. I can tell you that I have so many people, both legal experts and civilians, regular people that cannot believe-- you see it outside. You see the people outside, how angry.

Now I just heard that we have close to 100,000 people standing outside. They're all for Trump. We're in Ohio. They're all for Trump. And you see the Hillary signs with bars on them. Look what she did is illegal. Now were the laws wrong, maybe they're very tough, but a lot of people's lives were ruined for doing two percent of what she did. Two percent.

You look at General Petraeus. You look at this young person whose mother is absolutely devastated because they're going to put her son in prison and what he did is nothing compared to what she did. It's a horrible thing. It's a horrible, horrible thing. And our country is not very proud right now, I can tell you.

MUIR: Governor Pence, you're making news this week in revealing that you'll release your tax returns.

PENCE: Sure. Will be a pretty quick read.

MUIR: Pretty quick read. I'm curious, do you think the American voter has the right to see the tax returns of Donald Trump before they vote on election day?

PENCE: You know I'm very pleased to provide our tax returns. You're going to find out my family's a middle class family and that there will be pretty clear evidence that we haven't profited from our 16 years in and around public life.

MUIR: Governor, I'm asking about Donald Trump and every presidential candidate going back four years--

PENCE: Look I'm releasing my tax returns. Donald Trump will release his tax returns. I'll give mine to y'all this week and he's going to provide his after a routine audit is done.

But it's important for your viewers to know that both of us have filed what the law requires in the form of financial disclosure statements and I have to tell you, Donald Trump filed over a 100 pages of personal financial information. People have an opportunity to review that. But I do think an awful lot of this is a bit of a distraction. I actually was asked over the weekend on another network, making some comparison between the fact that Hillary Clinton made efforts to delete 17,500 emails and refused to turn those over to the FBI and authorities, with whether or not we had, in fact, yet released our tax returns. I just think that's an absurd comparison, to say the least.

Both of us believe in the the public's right to know. We've both been transparent, as the laws require and will continue to be. But the simple fact is that Hillary Clinton needs to step forward. Donald Trump has had more press conferences in Mexico this year than Hillary Clinton has in the United States. It's time for her to come forward, start answering questions, start coming clean about what was nothing short of a pay-to-play program when major foreign donors were able to give millions of dollars to the Clinton Foundation. And now we know from these emails -- that she refused to turn over, that now have come to light -- that those individuals were given access, and who knows what else, at the state department while she was secretary of state.

MUIR: Let me ask you, Governor, because you said something a moment ago You think the talk about Donald Trump and his taxes, and whether or not he'll release his returns before Election Day, you think that's a distraction?

PENCE: I think-- I have never seen, in my lifetime in and around politics, the level of media attacks on a public figure, the likes of which I've seen on my running mate.

MUIR: I guess I'm asking-- you think people ought to have the right to see--

PENCE: You have a level of dishonesty, you have a level of dishonesty in the Clinton Foundation and Hillary Clinton, while she was secretary of state, the likes of which the American people have never seen. The FBI released their notes from their interview on a Friday afternoon before Labor Day weekend. But fortunately, still the press covered it very thoroughly. And we found out that she actually made classified information available through her private server that could have been hacked and exposed by enemies of this county. That had sensitive information, including information about drone strikes.

The real scandal is that we're finding out more and more every day that Hillary Clinton, while she was secretary of state, and her husband, were operating a foundation that allowed foreign donors to contribute millions of dollars that wouldn't otherwise be able to contribute to American politics. And, you know, this wasn't unknown.

When Indiana Senator Richard Luger was questioning Secretary of State Clinton during her confirmation hearings, he warned her about the potential that foreign individuals would try to take advantage of the Clinton Foundation. I'm told that President Obama and his team actually asked her create a firewall, and now more emails that come out -- David, I just have to tell you, we'll release all the information on our tax records, Donald Trump will release his tax returns when his audit is done -- but I believe this is all a distraction by many in the media who simple don't want to focus on this widening scandal around the Clinton Foundation and this pay-to-play program that happened during Hillary Clinton's years as secretary of state.

MUIR: I do want to let you both know that we pressed her on the Clinton Foundation before we sat down with the two of you.

TRUMP: That's fine. But, by the way, the FBI interviewed her during a major holiday, maybe it was the Fourth of July. Nobody ever heard of a thing like that. Then they released her papers late just prior to Labor Day weekend where people were away and not watching you show as much et cetera, et cetera. You need to say, what's going on?

Now, as far as my taxes are concerned, the only one that cares is the press, I will tell you. And even the press, I tell you, it's not a big deal.

MUIR: You don't think there are voters out there who--

TRUMP: I don't think so. I think people don't care. But for two reasons: Number one, I released the most extensive financial review of anybody in the history of politics. It's either 100 or maybe more pages of names of companies, locations of companies, et cetera, et cetera, and it's a very impressive list and everybody says that. But I released a massive list, far more than you-- you don't learn much in a tax return.

Number two, when this routine audit is done -- and I've been audited, I think, for 15 straight years -- when the audit is done, I'll release them. I don't know when that's gonna be, it could be soon, it could be not. But every lawyer will tell you -- I was watching one of your competitors who happens to be a lawyer and said, well, nobody will release during what's called a routine audit. And that's it. I don't think anybody cares, except some members of the press. I really don't.

MUIR: Tax returns do reveal how much someone has paid in taxes. And how much they've given in charitable giving.

TRUMP: Well that's OK. But i've given a list on things that are given to charity. I have given that list. In fact, I made that list available. I've made a list available.

MUIR: But you won't reveal what you've paid in taxes unless the audit is done?

TRUMP: When the audit is done, it will happen. I mean, I've gone through audits almost my whole adult life.

MUIR: Before we head out into the crowd that's waiting outside. We sit here in Ohio, very popular governor, John Kasich, you've stood on that debate stage against him. I'm curious, Governor Pence, do you believe that Mr. Trump is getting the support that's expected for a Republican nominee from leaders of the Republican party. Is it adequate?

PENCE: Well I think were earning more support each and every day.

MUIR: But what about Governor Kasich here in Ohio?

PENCE: Well we've been in contact with him. I hold Governor Kasich in high regard. Look, these two went through a tough competition together. I respect that, these things sometimes take time. But you know, I was in Utah just the other day with Governor Gary Herbert and Senator Orrin Hatch, I think we're seeing members of Congress, we're seeing governors around the country coming alongside Donald Trump. But what gets me even more excited by a lot is the thousands of people at the county fair today. It's the thousands of people that turn out on very short notice for rallies for Donald Trump or with Donald Trump.

I mean, this is a man who has spoken into the heart of the American people, who know we can do better. Who know that seven and a half years of the kind of leadership that Barack Obama, what Hillary Clinton will continue, has weakened America's place in the world, it's stifled America's economy, and walked away from the constitutional framework our founders enshrined. And the Supreme Court is an enormously important issue.

With all due respect, David, as you've talked about a couple of issues in this interview, what I hear about, when I'm campaigning with Donald Trump or for Donald Trump are the security of the American people, the prosperity of the American people, the Supreme Court of the United States and ensuring that we have the highest standards of integrity in the highest office in the land and on every one of those issues Donald Trump is the clear choice.

MUIR: And you'll make that case on that debate stage?

TRUMP: Well I think so and you know I'm disappointed that people signed a pledge -- and they signed it so I would sign it, just so you remember. The pledges were signed by everybody so that I would sign it because they didn't want me to be out there as a free agent, so to speak. But I'm disappointed-- and most of them came through, Ben Carson, Mike Huckabee, we have so much-- Chris Christie, I have so much support. People don't talk about the support.

MUIR: But as you sit here in Ohio, are you upset with Governor Kasich?

TRUMP: I would say I'm disappointed because we are winning Ohio, we're doing great nationally, as you understand. I mean, we're doing very well, I think we're going to win. I don't think the American people are going to allow four more years of Barack Obama and that's what they'll get with Hillary Clinton except I think it'll be even worse.

MUIR: Thank you, Mr. Trump. Governor Pence. Thank you.

TRUMP: Thank you.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The following story was reported during The Student Journalist Program's five-day Summer Newsroom Workshop in August, 2016.

Stephen Bennett and Megan Geissler felt the same way: With images of violence and warfare dominating coverage of the Middle East, young Americans were getting a limited view of the region.

Their solution? Create a workshop to help local teachers address what they believe is a complex issue.

Bennett and Geissler, who are both outreach coordinators for Middle East-focused programs, envisioned a workshop that would dispel misconceptions. Geissler, who works at the Middle East Policy Council's Teach Mideast program, said the goal was to start a dialogue about different perspectives of the region.

"The reason I felt responsible was to demonstrate that there is much more depth and nuance to the culture," she said

The pair's workshop, which they called "Teaching the Middle East: Through Art, Music, and Culture," was designed for K-12 educators in the D.C. metro area. The program, held on Aug. 10 at George Washington University, featured collegiate scholars whose speeches incorporated music and art from Syria, Lebanon, Egypt and Afghanistan.

From Lebanese pop music videos to Middle Eastern rap, teachers were immersed in the artistry and modern culture of the multi-faceted region. The Lebanese music video, "Ma Sar," in particular married both eastern and western culture; its lead singer, Haifa Wehbe, danced in fitted clothing while elements of traditional Arabic percussion played in the background.

"[Music] shows commonalities in artistic expression. Most people think that there isn't room or space for artistry and creativity [in the Middle East], when in fact there so many rich cultural modes of life taking place there," said Bennett, who works at the George Washington University's Institute for Middle East Studies.

The music resonated with Elisabeth Palmer, an art history teacher at Duke Ellington School of the Arts in Northwest Washington. She said the melodies are an effective way to connect the Middle East with her students in the classroom.

"It's all about pulling interest [with students]. Music, hip hop, and social inequality are great entry points. If I can relate it back to those things, there is a greater understanding," said Palmer.

Mariel Vallano, a teacher at Brightwood Education Campus in Northwest Washington, was intrigued by the emphasis on art. Vallano's students from El Salvador and Ethiopia are in the process of developing English language skills, and she said the workshop's hands-on lesson of Islamic art-inspired geometric figures can help her match her students' learning styles.

"Things like this can really raise their self-esteem," said Vallano.

As presidential candidates in November's upcoming election talk about major issues related to the Middle East, Geissler said she wants to emphasize how essential it is for teachers and students to further their knowledge of the region.

"In talks about the election … **immigration**, terrorism in America, and our security... have such a significant part of our national debate, and yet are not taught in schools," she said. "People don't really understand the differences between the terms Middle East versus Islam versus Arab."

Geissler said she believes this misunderstanding impacts young students across the nation. Middle Eastern **immigration** to the U.S. has risen in recent years, and she said it's important to educate students through teachers.

"These are people who will be the future policy makers," she added. "They are our country. In a globalized society, it's important that young people grow up with a greater understanding of what's going on."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

One of the big questions that will help decide this presidential election is this: Will college educated white voters reject Trumpism? By Trumpism, I mean the crude mix of certain specific policies (such as the mass deportations, the ban on Muslims, the proposed Great Trumpian Wall) and the broader story they appear designed to tell: The narrative that the country is going to hell, and with it, the companion chest-thumping about crushing the dark hordes that allegedly threaten to overrun our country and render it no longer recognizable.

New polling suggests once again that this might be happening. A new CNN poll finds that the public broadly opposes Trump's main **immigration** proposals and priorities, and even more crucially, that there is a dramatic split between non-college whites and college educated whites on them.

The poll finds that a majority of Americans, 51 percent, think our priority should be to develop a plan to legalize undocumented **immigrants** working in the U.S., while only 36 percent say the priority should be to stop **immigrants** from entering illegally, and 11 percent say it should be deporting all undocumented **immigrants** already here.

Among college educated whites, 57 percent say we should prioritize legalization, while 36 percent want to prioritize stopping illegal entry and six percent pick mass deportations. That's a split of 57-42 between mass legalization on the one side, and the combination of Trumpian proposals (stopping more entry plus mass deportations) on the other.

But among non-college whites, those numbers are turned around. Among them, 43 percent want to stop **immigrants** from entering illegally, while 16 percent want mass deportations, and 39 percent want to develop a legalization plan. That's a split of 59-39 of the combination of Trumpian proposals (stopping more entry plus mass deportations) on one side, and mass legalization on the other.

In his big speech on **immigration**, Trump doubled down on the long-term goals of mass removals and building a wall to end further illegal **immigration**, while ruling out any meaningful path to assimilation for the undocumented, ever. CNN's new polling suggests that this approach could further energize non-college whites, at the potential cost of alienating the college educated whites he likely needs to improve among to win.

Meanwhile, here's another data point. As many have observed, Trump appears to be playing on a broad sense among non-college whites in particular that the country has left them behind culturally, economically, and demographically.

The Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index recently attempted to gauge how Americans generally feel about their lives and well-being. It found that 56 percent of Americans rate their well-being well enough to call it "thriving," the highest rating in nine years of this sort of polling.

And here again that same old cultural split shows up. According to data Gallup provided to me, 68 percent of college educated whites rate their well-being as "thriving," while only 49 percent of non-college whites do. Obviously that could partly reflect material circumstances. But the broader point is that Trump may be appealing to non-college whites (beyond the fact that they generally vote Republican) because he's more successfully speaking to their general dissatisfaction than Clinton is, while his American Hellscape rhetoric and proposals may be alienating college educated whites. Indeed, polling just after Trump's Hellscapean convention speech showed that majorities of non-college whites agreed with his depiction of the country, while majorities of college educated whites did not.

I don't claim to know how important any of this will prove. We do know that college educated whites are on track to support the Democrat for the first time in over half a century, and new Post polling confirms once again that Trump is tanking among them. But we don't know how soft these voters' support for Clinton is, or whether it is more motivated by anti-Trump antipathy than pro-Clinton sentiment, or whether it will hold at current levels, or how important the above findings are in explaining it. Still, these new findings may offer a bit of help in understanding why the broader set of policies and narratives that might loosely be called Trumpism is driving such a big split among white voters, one that could in the end help decide the election.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* CLINTON LAUNCHES NEW PUSH FOR LATINOS: The Clinton campaign is rolling out two new TV ads that target Latino voters in Florida and Nevada. One features a Cuban-born Republican who was in the George W. Bush administration. The second ad says this:

"Because he shouts insults, Trump thinks he has real strength," the announcer says before Trump is heard saying that Mexican **immigrants** are "bringing crime, they're rapists."

Comprehensive polling of Latinos shows that Trump may be shredding the GOP brand among them, but some Dems are worried that the Clinton team is taking them for granted.

\* A DEAD HEAT…IN ARIZONA? A new Arizona Republic poll of the state finds Clinton edging Trump among likely voters in the four-way race, 35-34. When undecideds are pushed, Clinton leads by 40-37.

The polling averages still show Trump up by a scant two points there. The tell will be whether Democrats invest any real money in the states.

\* DALLAS MORNING NEWS BACKS FIRST DEM IN OVER 75 YEARS: The Dallas Morning News endorses Clinton for president, noting that this is the first Dem the paper has backed in over 20 elections:

Clinton has made mistakes and displayed bad judgment, but her errors are plainly in a different universe than her opponent's. Trump's values are hostile to conservatism. He plays on fear — exploiting base instincts of xenophobia, racism and misogyny — to bring out the worst in all of us, rather than the best. His serial shifts on fundamental issues reveal an astounding absence of preparedness. And his improvisational insults and midnight tweets exhibit a dangerous lack of judgment and impulse control.

Texas is obviously going to remain Republican, but this opens up the question of what other surprise endorsements in battleground states we may see in the final stretch.

\* TRUMP FACES TOUGH FIGHT IN OHIO: Trip Gabriel reports that Trump and Republicans are lagging behind the Clinton team in building a ground organization in Ohio. The demographics:

He is doing well with white working-class voters in Democratic strongholds like Youngstown, where industrial jobs have vanished, and in rural counties along the Ohio River….But the populations in these counties are relatively small. Mr. Trump's gains there would be outweighed by the significant losses he is expected to face in the suburbs of major cities, especially Columbus, strategists said.

This helps explain why the battle for suburban swing voters has grown so intense.

\* TRUMP'S EFFORT TO REMAKE THE ELECTORATE: NBC News reports that the 2012 electorate was 28 percent minority, 36 percent college educated whites, and 36 percent non-college whites. If that stays the same in 2016, Trump would have to do this:

Minority voters plus college-educated white voters equaled about two-thirds of the 2012 electorate, 64%. Currently most polls show Trump losing badly among minorities and also losing among college-educated whites -- in some cases by double-digits. That seems to leave…two options. Win whites without a college degree by astounding margins or rely more on increasing that group as a part of the electorate.

Since Trump appears disinclined to do what it takes to improve among college whites, it looks like driving up non-college white turnout is his best hope.

 \* REPUBLICANS CAUTIOUSLY OPTIMISTIC ABOUT CONGRESS: Politico reports that Republicans are more optimistic that Trump won't cost them the Senate or House, because he's been acting more disciplined lately:

This late in the presidential contest, there's little congressional Republicans can do other than hope Trump avoids any further campaign debacles over the next two months. Failing that, their only option is to abandon Trump altogether — which for most Republicans is not a viable option….Still, recent national polls suggest that Trump's slightly more disciplined approach to campaigning and focus on Hillary Clinton has helped close the gap — a trend that could likewise buoy House and Senate GOP candidates facing down-ballot headwinds created by Trump's overall unpopularity.

It's kind of funny that Republicans are in the position of hoping their nominee doesn't revert to his typically crazy and depraved self, but that's 2016 for you.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A MONTH ago, Donald Trump and officials in his campaign assured voters they would organize a news conference to clear up questions about the legal means by which his Slovenian-born wife, Melania, entered the country in the mid-1990s and obtained a green card several years before they were married in 2005. Those questions persist, the Trump campaign has refused to answer them, and no such news conference has occurred.

Ms. Trump insists she violated no **immigration** laws; that may prove to be the case. Yet her own sketchy and not-quite-consistent account of her initial **immigration** status, along with the publication of nude modeling photos of her taken in New York the year before she says she entered the country, have combined to stoke doubts that she played entirely by the rules.

If she didn't, some sympathy may be in order. U.S. **immigration** laws are so abstruse, so dysfunctional and so out of step with the demands of the American labor market that — well, it's no accident that 11 million people live in this country without proper documentation, and that many or most of them have been here for 15 years or longer.

Less sympathy would be due Mr. Trump, who, having built his campaign around vilifying illegal **immigrants**, looks like a Grand Wizard of Hypocrisy. And having spent months as the most prominent exponent of the detestable "birther" movement, badgering the president to release his plainly valid and unexceptional birth certificate, the Republican presidential nominee now can't be bothered to come clean on legitimate questions about the terms under which his wife entered the country and remained here.

Mr. Trump's two-facedness on **immigration** doesn't end there. As a developer, he employed and may have exploited undocumented **immigrants** to work on at least one of his most prominent projects, Trump Tower in New York. He has attacked the United States' main visa program for high-skilled workers, calling it a job killer and vowing to end it with "no exceptions," but his own companies have used it liberally to import hundreds of foreign workers, including fashion models.

Of course, Mr. Trump and hypocrisy have long been on intimate terms. Although he has invested overseas in an array of businesses and projects, he thinks nothing of bashing other U.S. companies for launching plants and operations abroad. A champion of "traditional" marriage, he has tried it three times. And then there are his claims about charitable giving, which, upon close examination by The Post, look wildly inflated.

Melania Trump, like many an **immigrant**, may be reluctant to delve too publicly into the details of her earliest days in the United States. Yet it is Mr. Trump's own double standards, on **immigration** and other issues, that invited questions — questions he himself said publicly would be addressed. The country is still waiting.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With Breanne Deppisch

THE BIG IDEA: Donald Trump will spend more money this week in Virginia than anywhere else. Of the $3.5 million in advertising time he's booked, $1.9 million will go into the commonwealth. More specifically, $1.4 million will be spent in the D.C. market.

This is notable because the Clinton campaign is so confident about its prospects that it has aired no ads on broadcast television in the state since Aug. 1. And the main pro-Clinton super PAC has canceled all of its reservations through the election.

Trump himself has Virginia very much on his mind. Speaking to reporters on his plane Monday, he said: "Our jobs have been taken like Grant took Richmond." Yesterday he campaigned in Virginia Beach, targeting his pitch at military families.The visit and the ad buy are part of a post-Labor Day effort to gauge how hard he should compete here in the fall. But the move is also driven, in part, by necessity. Trump will be hard pressed to secure 270 electoral votes without the 13 from Virginia. (He'd need to win a bigger prize like Pennsylvania or Michigan to make up for it.)

Polls have shown Trump is much weaker in Virginia relative to other battlegrounds, and shifting demographics mean that the swing state is not as amenable to his brand of politics as it would have once been. Our 50-state poll published yesterday with Survey Monkey showed Clinton ahead by 8 points. Our statewide poll last month put Clinton ahead by 14 points.

-- The path to victory for Trump in Virginia is very narrow. While Barack Obama in 2008 became the first Democrat to carry the state since Lyndon Johnson in 1964, he won again in 2012 by 4 points.

The consensus among the smartest Republican strategists is that the odds of Trump ultimately carrying Virginia are very low, unless the race breaks decisively his way nationally (which they do not believe will happen).

One of these GOP operatives, a veteran of many Virginia campaigns, explained that Trump struggles the most in states where minorities account for more than 15 percent of the population and where there's a higher-than-average percentage of college graduates. "Those are the two key indicators, and we have both of them," the operative said. "The race is won or lost on the I-95 and I-64 corridors in a dozen or so counties. … The campaign has done nothing to date to appeal to the suburban and exurban women in those places who decide contests in Virginia."

Trump will probably outperform Romney among rural voters, but they account for a smaller and smaller share of the electorate.

Tim Kaine's presence on the ticket also marginally boosts Clinton, especially in suburban Richmond.

Since the start of the year, University of Virginia handicapper Larry Sabato has moved his home state from toss-up to leans Democratic to likely Democratic.

-- It is peculiar that Trump's buy is so heavily concentrated in the very expensive D.C. media market. The area is vote rich, and he's trying to reach suburban voters in Loudoun and Prince William counties, but this is by far his weakest section of the state. His path to victory requires not getting blown out here and then running up the score elsewhere.

Democrats and Republicans who know how to win statewide expressed puzzlement that Trump would spend $1.359 million in D.C., but only $120,195 in Richmond, $119,900 in Norfolk, $86,280 in Roanoke, $55,074 in Charlottesville and $12,415 in Harrisonburg. (He's also spending $134,312 on cable.)

Trump's Virginia campaign chairman, Corey Stewart, is also the chairman of the Prince William Board of Supervisors – and he is presumably the driving force behind this strategy. Stewart plans to run for governor next year in a crowded Republican primary, and he hopes to use a Trump victory as his springboard. If Trump loses badly, his candidacy would lose its animating rationale.

Notably, neither the Clinton campaign nor Priorities USA thought it was a wise investment to buy airtime in the costly D.C. market when they were on the air in Virginia. From June 16 through the end of July, Clinton spent nothing in Washington but $608,685 in Norfolk, $590,525 in Richmond and $331,720 in Roanoke. She spent in the high five figures in the Tri-Cities, Charlottesville and Harrisonburg, as well as a quarter million on cable and another quarter million on satellite.

-- The Clinton team expresses a high degree of confidence that the state will stay in its column and insists that Trump's spending will not change its approach.

When the campaign recently announced $80 million in fall TV reservations, Virginia was noticeably absent. In the past two presidential contests, it would have been hard to imagine the Democratic nominee advertising in Pennsylvania, North Carolina and even the Omaha market in Nebraska while not spending anything in Virginia.

Clinton aides say they will begin advertising again if they feel the polls are actually tightening. They also note that some Virginians see their ads on national cable channels. (And Clinton was up on NBC during the Olympics when Trump was not advertising anywhere.)

Nationally, Clinton is still dramatically outspending Trump on television. She's slated to spend about $15 million this week, about four times more than him. And, even with his buy this week, she will still have spent more in Virginia ($2.2 million) than he has.

Priorities USA said it has no plans to go back on TV in Virginia for the duration of the race. Spokesman Justin Barasky said their resources can be more effectively spent elsewhere. "We're still closely monitoring the state of play in Virginia and a number of other states, but this reflects the fact that this is a tough state for Trump and we want to make sure we beat him in as many places as possible," he emailed. (An ad tracker says the group still has $452,540 in radio time reserved from Oct. 3 to Nov. 8.)

The Republican National Committee said the state is within reach. "The Clinton campaign's decision to stop running ads here shows just how out of touch they are with Virginia," said RNC spokesman Garren Shipley. "Both of Virginia's last two statewide elections were allegedly going to be blowouts according to the polls, but finished extremely close. Neither Terry McAuliffe nor Mark Warner were arrogant enough to go off the air before Election Day. Add in our revamped ground game, and every day Clinton isn't on the air in Virginia is another opportunity for us to put 13 electoral votes in the GOP column."

-- Democrats stress that they are not taking the state for granted. First Lady Michelle Obama will campaign in Northern Virginia next Friday (Sept. 16) at a public event that is being designed to get young people to register to vote ahead of an Oct. 17 deadline. The Clinton surrogate operation is aggressively deploying Kaine's wife Anne Holton, who stepped down as the state's education secretary after HRC tapped her husband. On Monday, she went to Rep. Bobby Scott's Labor Day cookout in Newport News.

And Clinton is surrounded by people who know how to win in Virginia. In addition to her running-mate, one of her closest friends, Terry McAuliffe, is governor. And her campaign manager, Robby Mook, managed McAuliffe's race in 2013.

WHILE YOU WERE SLEEPING:

-- WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange said last night that he plans to release several batches of documents pertaining to the Clinton campaign within the next few weeks and that some could come out in a week. "The first batch is coming reasonably soon," he told Sean Hannity on Fox News. "We're quite confident about it now. We might put out some teasers as early as next week or the week after." He did not give additional specifics.

You can't make this up: In 2010, Hannity said Assange was "waging … war against the U.S." by publishing leaked documents and attacked President Obama for not arresting him. Now that Assange is going after Clinton, Hannity praises him for doing "a lot of good." (Never mind that the U.S. intelligence community believes the pilfered documents he's posting most likely came from the Russians as part of an effort to meddle in our elections.) Hannity then applauded Assange some more and ended last night's interview by saying, "I do hope you get free one day." (Keep in mind that this guy is hiding out in the Ecuadorian embassy to avoid being extradited/prosecuted for alleged sex crimes…)

-- One day after Trump rolled out 88 retired military endorsements, the Clinton campaign just unveiled the endorsements of 95 retired admirals and generals. Only six had previously came out for her. One is Gen. Lloyd "Fig" Newton, a for-star general and the country's first African American Thunderbird pilot.

-- Trump announced that he will order the military to formulate a plan to defeat the Islamic State "in 30 days" if he assumes he presidency, contradicting earlier remarks that he "already" has "a great plan" to defeat the militants. "I am going to convene my top generals and give them a simple instruction: They will have 30 days to submit to the Oval Office a plan for defeating ISIS," Trump said last night in North Carolina. He has previously maintained he already has a plan but does not want to discuss it to avoid tipping his hand to America's enemies. (Politico's Ben Schreckinger)

GET SMART FAST:​​

\* The Syrian government dropped a chlorine bomb on a besieged neighborhood in Aleppo, wounding more than 120 and heightening fears among civilians unable to escape the city. (Liz Sly)

\* Gretchen Carlson received a $20 million settlement from Fox News.  The settlement, which includes a public apology, brings a swift, expensive end to her sexual harassment lawsuit. (Paul Farhi)

\* Longtime host Greta Van Susteren also left Fox, abruptly departing from a network that she says no longer "feels like home."Brit Hume will serve as interim host of "On the Record" through the election. The lawyer by training said she invoked a clause in her contract which allowed her to leave immediately. Fox "has not felt like home to me for a few years," she said on Facebook. (CNN Money)

\* Obama made history by nominating the first ever Muslim to serve on the federal judiciary.  Though it is unlikely Republicans will make any effort to confirm Abid Qureshi to the U.S. District Court, Muslim advocates celebrated the symbolism. (HuffPost)

\* The number of uninsured people in the U.S. reached a historic low, according to a CDC survey, with less than 9 percent of respondents saying they lack healthcare coverage . The 2015 survey put the figure at 9.1 percent, about 1.3 million more people. (Wall Street Journal)

\* ITT Technical Institute is abruptly closing its doors this week after five decades, shuttering campuses across the country just days before classes were scheduled to begin. The move comes as the for-profit school faced a series of new hurdles from the Education Department, including a decision to bar enrollees from using federal financial aid. (Danielle Douglas-Gabriel)

\* Danny Heinrich confessed to abducting and killing 11-year-old Jacob Wetterling in 1989, recounting chilling details of a murder that has haunted Minnesotans and parents everywhere for three decades. Heinrich's admission came as part of a plea negotiation. (Star Tribune)

\* The last Pulse shooting survivor was discharged from the hospital, nearly three months after the Orlando nightclub massacre that left 49 dead and injured scores of others.  Hospital officials declined to provide information about the patient, saying only that he or she remained in critical condition until mid-August. (Orlando Sentinel)

\* New York's Attorney General launched an anti-trust probe into Mylan's EpiPen price gouging, investigating whether the pharmaceutical company engaged in anti-competitive business practices. (Financial Times)

\* Brock Turner registered as a sex offender in Ohio – a distinction that will stay with him for life after he raped an unconscious woman. The disgraced ex-Stanford swimmer was released from prison after just three months. (Amy B Wang)

\* Prosecutors in Bill Cosby's trial said they will push for the inclusion of additional testimony in his criminal case, potentially putting the ex-comedian face-to-face with as many as 13 women who have accused him of sexual assault. (Manuel Roig-Franzia)

FOUR FRESH POLLS:

-- Sneak peek: George Washington University's latest Battleground Poll shows that the race is about even nationally, with 42 percent of likely voters supporting Clinton and 40 percent supporting Trump. In a hypothetical four-way ballot, Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson received double-digit support (10 percent). From a forthcoming release: "The narrow race reflects a conflicted electorate in which voters are weighing many options. Poll respondents were presented with several possibilities for how they may vote in November. Roughly one-quarter of them said that they would likely vote for a third-party candidate or vote for a candidate 'from the other political party than the one that you usually support.' Thirteen percent said they might not vote at all, and 45 percent said they might split their tickets (vote for different parties for president and the rest of the ballot). Meanwhile, 59 percent of the likely voters surveyed said that they would 'reluctantly vote for the candidate of the party you usually support.'"

"The bipartisan GW Battleground Poll, conducted in partnership with The Tarrance Group (Ed Goeas) and Lake Research Partners (Celinda Lake), found that despite this lack of enthusiasm, Trump and Clinton supporters say that their choice is more of a vote for their preferred candidate (60 percent of Clinton voters vs. 54 percent of Trump voters) than against the opponent (37 percent of Clinton supporters and 43 percent of Trump supporters). Slightly more voters held a favorable view of Mrs. Clinton (43 percent) compared with Mr. Trump (38 percent)." (The full results will post here at 9.)

-- Day 2 results from the Washington Post/SurveyMonkey survey of all 50 states --> "In every state, pessimism about Trump, Clinton and the impact of the election," by Dan Balz and Emily Guskin: "The presidential campaign has intensified long-standing political divisions, but there is one area of broad agreement among voters in both red states and blue states — a pervasive pessimism that no matter the outcome, the election will do little to unify the country … Americans also say they fear they are being left behind by the cultural changes that are transforming the country. Asked whether the America of today reflects their values more or less than it did in the past, large majorities of registered voters in every state say the country reflects their values less."

"Nationwide, 55 percent of registered voters say that a Clinton presidency would threaten the nation's well-being, while 61 percent say a Trump presidency would threaten the country's well-being. Only 4 percent nationally say neither would threaten the country's well-being while 21 percent say both candidates represent a threat to the nation's well-being. That number peaks in Utah, where 38 percent cite both candidates as a threat. … Overall, majorities in 40 states say Clinton would be a threat to the country's well-being while majorities in 44 states say the same of Trump."

-- Arizona is within the margin of error, with Trump at 35 and Clinton at 34, according to a new Arizona Republic/Morrison/Cronkite News poll. Third-party candidates captured another 8 percent or so. Another 23 percent are undecided.

-- Trump leads Clinton by 19 points -- 55 percent to 36 percent -- among voters who are currently serving or have previously served in the U.S. military, according to the NBC News/SurveyMonkey Tracking Poll. The poll was conducted online from August 29 through September 4 among 32,226 registered voters, including 3,358 who have previously served or are currently serving in the U.S. military.  hough Trump comfortably earns the support of military-affiliated voters overall, Clinton is perceived more favorably on the use of nuclear weapons. A sizable number of military and veteran voters say they would not be confident in Clinton or Trump's ability to be an effective commander-in-chief."

THE LATINO VOTE TAKES CENTER STAGE:

-- Clinton will launch a new Spanish-language TV ad campaign in Florida and Nevada today.  She has aired just one Spanish language spot in the general election so far, which has prompted some Democrats to voice concern that she is taking the Latino vote for granted. ( Ed O'Keefe )

The Florida spot stars Carlos Gutierrez, a Cuban-born Republican who served as George W. Bush's commerce secretary. He delivers a straight-to-camera appeal, imploring fellow Hispanics to vote for Clinton because Trump is "dangerous."

The Nevada version includes the clip of Trump saying that Mexican **immigrants** are "bringing crime" and "they're rapists."

-- Trump, during his ABC interview that aired last night, denied that Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto said anything about the border wall. Both the Mexican President and a spokesman quickly responded by calling the GOP nominee a liar. They stressed that Trump was told "in no uncertain terms" that Mexico will never fund the wall. (Aaron Blake)

-- A Mexican senator, meanwhile, has introduced legislation that would cancel treaties with the U.S. if Trump wins the presidency. His goal is to empower his government to retaliate and codify in law that the government will never fund any wall. The measure will not pass but underscores how much Mexicans hate The Donald, Ishaan Tharoor notes.

-- Baseball icon David Ortiz called Trump's rhetoric about Latinos "a slap in the face." "I walk around sometimes, and I see Mexican people trying to earn a living in an honest way," the Red Sox star said. "And to hear somebody make those kinds of comments, it hits you. … As Latin people we deserve respect, no matter where you're from." The retiring slugger said he typically refrains from speaking publicly about politics but chose to speak out because Trump's comments "didn't sit well" with him. (Boston Globe)

-- "McCain portrays **immigration** record differently in English and Spanish," by Ed O'Keefe: "There's no doubt that Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) has been a longtime advocate for revamping the nation's **immigration** laws and border security system. But his newly-published Spanish-language campaign website selectively highlights just part of his legislative record — while his English-language site emphasizes other parts. The Spanish language site, for instance, lauds him as a member of the Gang of Eight that sought comprehensive **immigration** reform, and a supporter of a pathway to citizenship for the children of **immigrants** who came to the country illegally — a group known as the 'Dreamers.' The English-language site makes no mention of either and portrays the senator as a champion of tougher border security. McCain's campaign launched his new Spanish-language website on Tuesday, a week after he won a heated Republican primary … McCain's English-language site highlights his stance on 'Homeland Security and **Immigration** Reform,' while the Spanish-language site features McCain's position on 'Inmigracion.'"

-- The LIBRE Initiative, the part of the Koch political network that focuses on Latino outreach, is engaging in express advocacy for the first time, with a $700,000 broadcast buy in Florida to help Marco Rubio. This includes Spanish and English ads, as well as a digital effort and paid field staff in Miami, Central Florida and elsewhere.

-- The U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is launching a "Guac the Vote" campaign, deploying taco trucks to register and mobilize voters. The effort comes after a Trump surrogate warned on MSNBC that the "dominant" Latino culture could lead to "taco trucks on every corner." Democrats in Arizona and Colorado have sent taco trucks to Trump campaign offices or rallies to get media coverage, as well. (Ed O'Keefe)

CONGRESS IS BACK:

-- Senate Democrats last night blocked a $1.1 billion legislative package to fight the Zika virus for the third time in two months, but lawmakers in both parties said they now hope negotiations will begin in earnest to quickly come up with a bipartisan deal to address the crisis,Kelsey Snell reports. "Congress is under intense pressure to pass a funding agreement before the end of September when Centers for Disease Control director Tom Frieden estimates his agency will run out of money to continue its efforts … The vote was 52 to 46 and 60 votes were needed for the legislation to advance. The Zika funding is part of a broader bill funding the Pentagon and veterans programs. Democrats are blocking the legislation over objections to what they charge are politically-motivated provisions added to the bill by Republicans, including language preventing the Zika funds from being used by Planned Parenthood and provisions relaxing use of certain pesticides."

-- "Congressional Republicans want to censure the Obama administration for sending $400 million in 'ransom' to Iran on the same day as American prisoners were released," Karoun Demirjian reports. "The move comes as new details are emerging about just how and when the Obama administration completed the transfer of $1.7 billion to settle claims related to the incomplete sale of military weapons before the Iranian revolution. Treasury officials told lawmakers on Tuesday that, after the U.S. made the $400 million payment, it also paid the remaining $1.3 billion interest in January and February payments. 'What's worse than a $400 million cash ransom to Iran? A $1.7 billion cash ransom to Iran,' House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Ed Royce (R-Calif.) said. ... House GOP leaders are putting a new Iran measure … to prevent such cash payments at the top of their to-do list during the four weeks they are back in session before the November election, with a vote expected in the full House this month."

-- The House passed a measure to honor Gold Star families. The legislation allows relatives of service members killed in combat to contribute to the Library of Congress' Veterans History Project. (Previously, only living veterans have been permitted to contribute.) The measure comes as GOP lawmakers distance themselves from Trump's feuding with the Khan family. ( Elise Viebeck )

-- Coming attraction: Kevin McCarthy says GOP leaders will move to formally punish House Democrats for their gun control protest. The Majority Leader said several rules were broken during the June sit-in, including Democrats sitting on the floor and using their phones, and confirmed leadership plans to bring sanctions against participants. He did not provide specifics but explained that a price must be paid. (BuzzFeed)

THE DAILY DONALD:

-- Trump attempted to distance himself from his "birther" past, but he will not say whether he still believes that Obama was not born in the U.S. He also refuses to apologize or admit error for his leadership role in bringing a fringe movement into the mainstream. From Jenna Johnson: "I don't talk about it because if I talk about that, your whole thing will be about that," Trump told reporters in his campaign plane on Monday. "'So I don't talk about it.'"

-- Ben Carson said on CNN that Trump should apologize for the birtherism.

-- The Dallas Morning News, which has backed every GOP nominee since 1964, endorses Clinton today on the grounds that "Trump is no Republican and certainly no conservative." From the paper's editorial board: "Trump has displayed an authoritarian streak that should horrify limited-government advocates. … His open admiration of Russia's Vladimir Putin is alarming. … Ronald Reagan once said that 'protectionism is destructionism.' Trump, on the other hand, has called the Trans-Pacific Partnership 'a rape of our country.' … His isolationist prescriptions put sound bites over sound policy: Invite the Russians into our elections. Bomb the Middle East into dust. Withdraw from NATO. … We have no interest in a Republican nominee for whom all principles are negotiable, nor in a Republican Party that is willing to trade away principle for pursuit of electoral victory. Donald Trump is not qualified to serve as president and does not deserve your vote." In a follow-up editorial, the board explains that it backs Clinton because she is "the only serious candidate on the ballot."

-- Trump's declaration that HRC does not have "a presidential look" was widely viewed as sexist and drew a rebuke from Clinton's campaign. "Well, I just don't think she has a presidential look. And you need a presidential look. You have to get the job done," he told ABC. "I think if she went to Mexico she would have had a total failure. We had a big success."

-- Trump said he will release his "full medical record," reversing his long-held position that he would do so only if Clinton agreed to as well. "Why not go first?" David Muir asked Trump. "I might do that. I might do that," Trump said. "In fact, now that you ask, I think I will do that." (Trump did not say during the ABC interview when he will release the records.) Clinton did, in fact, release a two-page letter last year "detailing her current health, medical history, medications and family medical history," Jose DelReal reports. "The letter also detailed an incident in 2012 in which Clinton hit her head and suffered a concussion after falling, which was the subject of online conspiracies about lasting effects. Her physician, Lisa Bardack, said that a follow-up in 2013 had "revealed complete resolution of the effects of the concussion." In contrast, Trump's 2015 letter – which said he would be the healthiest individual ever elected to the presidency," was so short and so unusually worded that some originally doubted it was written by a medical doctor.

-- Indiana Gov. Mike Pence will speak at next week's House Republican Conference, trying to drum up support for the ticket among rank-and-file members of Congress. (Elise Viebeck)

-- Down-ballot Republicans continue to play defense over trade because of Trump: Indiana Republican Senate candidate Todd Young now says he is "not prepared to support" TPP because of a lack of protections for pharmaceutical companies. Eli Lilly is headquartered in Indianapolis, Yahoo's Jon Ward notes. Like Pat Toomey in Pennsylvania before him, Young supported giving Obama fast-track trade authority. But he's backed away from the deal under pressure from Evan Bayh.

TAINTED SURROGATE WATCH:

1.  "All Eyes on Chris Christie as Trial in Bridge Scandal Starts [on Thursday]," by the New York Times's Kate Zernike: "The trial in the George Washington Bridge lane-closing scandal … will play out like a documentary on the rise and fall of Mr. Christie's presidential ambitions, a tell-all tale of how he and his aides built his administration and his 2013 re-election campaign with an eye to winning the White House, then scrambled to contain the damage." Though Christie has not been charged in the Bridgegate scandal, he will loom large in the trial. "And while prosecutors have fought back against a defense lawyer's assertion that the case is 'criminalizing normal politics,' their argument in court filings is that the lane closings were precisely that: normal politics. At least, normal Christie politics — aggressively transactional and focused above all on winning. Nearly three years after the mystery of the lane closings captivated New Jersey, the trial will finally answer big questions. Perhaps biggest of all: When and how did Mr. Christie know about the plan, as the prosecution's star witness has said he did? And who else was involved?"

2. " Trump Held Fundraiser For Pam Bondi At Mar-a-Lago After She Dropped Investigation ," from the Huffington Post: "In 2014, Trump opened his Mar-A-Lago resort to host a $3,000-per-person fundraiser for Pam Bondi – the Florida attorney general who recently decided not to investigate Trump University. Though Trump did not cut her a check, use of his Palm Beach club -- and his high-profile contact list –still managed to provide her campaign with a nice financial boost. All this money created the appearance that he was thanking Bondi for halting any further investigation into his failed seminar programs."

THREE TRUMP READS:

-- THE CAMPAIGNER: "Trump Living Large On Donors' Dime," by HuffPost's S.V. Date: "On the night of this spring's Florida primary, the pastor giving the invocation at [Trump's] Mar-a-Lago victory party prayed for Trump to "rise above the GOP establishment." "Turns out the prayer worked. Not only did Trump win … [but two months later, he] signed a deal with the [RNC] giving him access to a top-notch fundraising operation … That same day, Trump's campaign, now set to receive tens of millions of dollars of other people's money, finally sent five- and six-figure checks to Trump's properties for events that had happened months earlier. Meaning that the GOP establishment had not only been defeated, it was now actually paying for that March 15 victory party attended primarily by [Trump's country club members]." In all, just under of $1 million went out the door on May 18. More than $600,000 of that went to Trump-owned businesses, with $423,000 going to Mar-a-Lago alone …"

-- TRUMP, THE BUSINESSMAN: " Is Donald Trump's campaign hurting his hotel chain ?," From the Boston Globe's Christopher Muther: "The grand hotel soon to open in Washington's historic 1899 Old Post Office Pavilion boasts the largest suites in the country, and the biggest ballroom in the city …" But for all the pluses, it's likely some travelers will do their best to avoid it. When it comes to Trump's eponymous hotels, name brand can work both ways: "'I'm quite sure that the campaign will negatively impact the new Trump Hotel, as it has the entire portfolio,'" said Ovation Vacations President Jack Ezon, who says business is down "at least 30 percent" at Trump's other properties. Although he anticipates the hotel will be a 'welcome asset,' Ezon said the building's beauty won't matter. His company, which books luxury package vacations, has seen groups pull out of other Trump hotels as a result of the Republican candidate's tumultuous campaign." Surveys and booking sites show many consumers are avoiding Trump's properties, and booking site Hipmunk reported its reservations for Trump hotels are down nearly 60 percent from 2015.

-- TRUMP, THE …FUTURE OF THE GOP??  " With Koch Brothers U, Conservatives Settle In for Long War ," from the New York Times' Ashley Parker and Maggie Haberman: "The rise of [Trump], with his hostility toward free trade and vow to protect entitlements, is a sharp rebuke to the free-market principles long championed by the billionaire [Koch brothers] … But if the Koch brothers have lost the battle for conservative values in 2016, they are also quietly preparing for a long war. Their secret weapon is the Grassroots Leadership Academy: a training program … intended to groom the next generation of conservative activists to shape the future of the Republican Party. Taking inspiration from icons of the left … the academy offers classes [on persuading voters], community organizing and how to wage a successful public protest. … The goal is not just to equip activists to compete with the left, but also to help rebuild the conservative movement in the wake of a Trump loss — or even a Trump victory."

THE DAILY HILLARY:

-- House Oversight Committee Chairman Jason Chaffetz called for additional hearings over Clinton's use of a private email server, vowing to complete the Republican-led investigation as Congress enters its final working weeks of the year. In an interview with radio host Hugh Hewitt, Chaffetz said that "at least two hearings were coming," with the first, on FOIA compliance, scheduled for Thursday. "How is it the State Department essentially lied to the media, the world, and the public?" Chaffetz said, suggesting multiple federal entities were complicit in concealing information from members of Congress. "We may need to go into a classified setting, because the FBI, State Department, Department of Defense, others, they're holding information back."

"The latest hearings follow months of public and private probes of Clinton's email server," David Weigel notes. "None has found actionable wrongdoing; all have succeeded in creating fresh, negative stories about the Democratic nominee's conduct while at the State Department."

Clinton dismissed Chaffetz's allegations as "outlandish" and verging on conspiratorial: "The FBI resolved all of this," she said, speaking to reporters onboard her campaign plane. "Their report answered all the questions … I believe I have created so many jobs in the sort of conspiracy theory machine factory, because honestly, they never quit. They keep coming back. …  If that's how they want to spend their time instead of looking to address the problems of the American people, that's their choice."

-- Trump  echoed Chaffetz last night. "If she applied for a low-level job at the State Department today, just a low-level job, she couldn't even get a security clearance based on what she's done," he said in the Tar Heel State. "People who have nothing to hide don't smash phones with hammers . . . or destroy evidence to keep it from being publicly archived as required under federal law. Her conduct is disqualifying."

-- Clinton ramped up attacks on Trump for refusing to release his tax returns, saying the Republican nominee clearly has "something to hide" and vowing to press the issue until Election Day. "Clearly his tax returns tell a story that the American people deserve and need to know," Clinton told reporters, ticking off a list of what she characterized as "questionable aspects" about Trump's financial and business history. "If he's going to pursue this campaign, he owes it to the American people to come clean," she said. (John Wagner)

-- Free advice from David Ignatius --> "Clinton should stop pretending she's not elite": "In a year when anti-elitism has been a dominant theme in both parties, donning this establishment mantle might appear to be a mistake for Clinton. But let's be honest: Her strength is that she's the voice of experienced, centrist leadership. She's not a convincing populist: The more she tries to sound like one, the more she risks coming off as a phony in the final two months of the campaign. … Clinton's current strategy, a sort of Bernie Sanders Lite, doesn't seem to be working very well, even against a radically unqualified GOP opponent. … Clinton's weakness is that she symbolizes an elite that many believe has led the country astray. She can't change the elite part; that's her biography. Her challenge is to show voters that she knows how to repair a damaged country…"

-- Clinton has raised nearly double what Trump has from employees of the oil and gas industry this year. This is usually one of the most reliable GOP donor groups, but industry leaders worry that Trump does not understand their business. (Wall Street Journal)

-- Clinton's team is launching an ambitious week-long bid to mobilize women voters, holding more than 150 registration and roundtable events. (Abby Phillip)

-- Clinton met with Charlie Crist backstage after her rally in Tampa. He's the Democratic nominee against Rep. David Jolly (R) and favored to win. To give you a sense of the climate in the district, Jolly released a web video yesterday morning to highlight Crist's ties to Trump from back when he was still a Republican. (  Morning Consult)

-- Trump slammed the Clinton Foundation for its mixed record in Haiti, saying the charitable organization of failed to meet its promises to help the country recover from a 2010 earthquake. This is a potential area of vulnerability for the Clintons. (Jose DelReal)

-- " New book reveals Bill Clinton's rogue diplomacy against the Iraq War ," by Abby Phillip: "It was March 2003, and British Prime Minister Tony Blair had summoned his friend Bill Clinton to Chequers Court, his country home in England, to make an urgent request: Could the former president quietly help corral U.N. Security Council members to back a resolution aimed at slowing or, according to Blair, even stopping the Iraq War? The events that followed show Clinton taking an … unorthodox role in the foreign policy of his successor, George W. Bush, according to a new book, 'Man of the World: The Further Endeavors of Bill Clinton,' written by liberal journalist Joe Conason. Clinton's activism came months after his wife's vote in October 2002 in favor of authorizing Bush to use military force in Iraq — a decision that, according to the book, Bill counseled her to make. And the former president acted without the express approval of the White House."

"In Conason's account, Clinton made last-minute appeals to several world leaders he considered 'friends,' asking them to back Blair's resolution … 'Privately, Clinton arranged a discreet contact with Chilean president [Ricardo] Lagos through a back channel arranged by his former White House chief of staff, Thomas 'Mack' McLarty, who was acquainted with the Chilean interior minister' Conason writes. … The Chileans would get on board only if the Mexicans did. So Clinton phoned Vicente Fox, then president of Mexico, to lobby for his support, the book says."

WAPO HIGHLIGHT:

-- "10 new wars that could be unleashed as a result of the one against ISIS," by Beirut bureau chief Liz Sly: "The borders of the Islamic State's 'caliphate' are shrinking fast. The group's strongholds in Iraq and Syria are collapsing one by one. The U.S.-led war has reached a point where questions are being raised about what comes next. So far, the answer seems likely to be: more war. That's partly because the U.S. strategy for defeating the Islamic State relies on a variety of regional allies and local armed groups who are often bitterly at odds. Though all of them regard the Islamic State as an enemy, most of them regard one another as enemies, too. As they conquer territory from the militants, they are staking out claims to the captured lands in ways that risk bringing them into conflict with others who are also seizing territory. New wars are brewing, for control of the post-Islamic State order." Below is a list of 10 of them, in no particular order. "Any one of them could increase the Islamic State's chances of survival, perpetuating the conditions that enabled the group to thrive — and perhaps entangling the United States in the region for many years to come."

\* U.S.-backed Syrian Kurdish forces and Turkish-backed Arab forces

\* Turkey and the Syrian Kurds

\* Syrian Kurds and the Syrian government

\* The United States and Syria

\* Turkey and Syria

\* Iraqi Kurds and the Iraqi government

\* Iraqi Kurds and Shiite militias

\* Kurds against Kurds

\* Sunni Arabs against Shiites and/or Kurds

\* The remnants of the Islamic State against everyone

SOCIAL MEDIA SPEED READ:

— ZIGNAL VISUAL: Zignal Labs is monitoring tweets from dozens of Clinton and Trump campaign staffers to help illustrate the stories and messages they're pushing. These word clouds from Tuesday show Clinton pushing a story about Trump's foundation in Florida, while the Trump campaign circulated news of a new poll showing a competitive national race:

Trump:

Clinton:

Check out this photo from Obama's Asia trip:

Clinton's press secretary responded forcefully after NBC published a story titled, "Hillary Clinton Struggles to Fight Back Coughing Attack ":

Trump attacked Clinton for sitting down during an event -- while he himself was seated...

Michele Bachmann noted Phyllis Schlafly's last column:

Some reactions to Gretchen Carlson's settlement:

Here's a flashback to what Sean Hannity tweeted after Carlson filed her lawsuit:

The DNC tweeted this four years ago about Mitt Romney:

A South Carolina Republican re-circulated it yesterday and correctly notes:

Lawmakers are back on Capitol Hill:

Finally, a few back-to-school shots:

Independent Journal Review just posted a story with the 18 cutest dogs on Capitol Hill.

John Cornyn's "Ranger" is #11:

Tom Cotton's "Cowboy" is #2:

GOOD READ FROM ELSEWHERE:

-- The Wall Street Journal reports on Politico co-founder Jim VandeHei and Mike Allen's new media outlet: "Late last week, the soon-to-launch company secured about $10 million in financing … NBC News is also backing the venture and will serve as its media partner. … The new company is slated to launch in early 2017 and will focus on areas such as tech, health care and business news, and will also include some political and media coverage … The business model will likely have some similarities to the Politico Pro subscription model … VandeHei said subscription pricing will be premium and can be tailored for customers. He noted that there will be a tier of content available for free. … VandeHei has hired 17 staffers and aims to have between 50 and 60 employees by the time of the launch. The company will be based in Arlington, Va. and will have offices in New York. … Nicholas Johnston, a former managing editor at Bloomberg LP who helped create a fast-filed news service there called First Word, will be editor-in-chief."

DAYBOOK:

On the campaign trail: Tonight is the commander-in-chief forum on NBC at 8 p.m. Both candidates will appear successively. Trump campaigns in Philadelphia. Clinton is spending the day in New York City; Bill Clinton is in Orlando and Miami.

At the White House: Obama is still in Laos. Vice President Biden speaks at the opening session of the 20th Annual CAF Conference in Washington, D.C.

On Capitol Hill: The Senate resumes work at 10 a.m. on the Water Resources Development Act. The House meets at 12 p.m. to work on the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act and five suspension bills.

NEWS YOU CAN USE IF YOU LIVE IN D.C.:

-- Another really hot day ahead – but the Capital Weather Gang forecasters seem to think the end of the oppressive humidity is near: "The main difference from yesterday is noticeably higher humidity, into the moderate range. Otherwise it's a fairly similar forecast, with partly to mostly sunny skies and highs in the low-to-mid 90s. Showers and storms could begin developing late in the afternoon and into the evening."

-- The Nationals beat the Braves 9-7.

-- Ridership on Metro's rail system has plunged dramatically over the last year, sparking new concerns about a budget crunch. Officials blame the aggressive SafeTrack maintenance program. (Faiz Siddiqui and Martine Powers)

-- Metro officials are finalizing plans to partner with Uber and Lyft for transporting the disabled and elderly. Officials say the partnership could reduce costs of its current MetroAccess program by up to $6 million a year. (Luz Lazo)

VIDEOS OF THE DAY:

The new Priorities USA ad attacking Trump juxtaposes his own words with footage from Vietnam and of ISIS militants. "I'm really good at war, I love war, in a certain way," Trump says as bodies of soldiers from Vietnam War are loaded onto a helicopter. "I know more about ISIS than the generals," he boasts. The spot will air in North Carolina, Ohio, Florida, Nevada and Iowa.

North Korea launched a series of missiles and broadcast the event on state television:

Finally, watch the spectacular Northern Lights over Finland:

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At the core of Donald Trump's presidential candidacy is his argument that, as an outsider to Washington, he knows how Washington can be fixed. This is one of those "absence makes the heart grow fonder" vs. "out of sight, out of mind" dualities in which the argument is accepted mostly if one wants to accept it. Maybe Trump can bring a fresh eye to Washington, or maybe he's arguing that it's time for a non-doctor to give that surgery a shot. Your view on the subject is your view.

Where Trump generally has an advantage in arguing for his outsider status is when he talks about his experience in the private sector. In polling, Trump is regularly seen as better able to get the economy humming than Hillary Clinton, with the CNN-ORC poll released this week giving Trump a 15-point advantage on the issue. That's important because jobs and the economy are regularly cited as the most important issue in the minds of voters (as is also the case in that CNN poll).

On Tuesday, The Washington Post released the results of a massive poll conducted in all 50 states, revealing where voters preferred which presidential candidates. We also asked respondents which issue they saw as the most important to them at the moment. And in all 50 states, without exception, the top response was jobs and the economy.

The other options are ranked above by how commonly identified they were. Health care, terrorism and education were the others in the top four, followed by the environment, **immigration** and foreign policy. Let that sear into your brain for a second while we dive a little deeper into the numbers.

Although every state prioritized jobs first, the range of responses both for that issue and the other issues varied. Wyoming and West Virginia were much more worried about jobs and the economy than Washington and Utah. Washington and Utah were more worried about foreign policy than Wyoming, Louisiana and Mississippi. Kentucky and Tennessee were more worried about terrorism than Alaska and Vermont, which sort of makes sense and sort of doesn't. On the maps below, the states with dashed outlines were less likely than most states to rate the issue as important; those with solid boundaries were more likely to.

Notice that **immigration** isn't included there. That's because I want to focus on it for a second.

Did you let the results above sear into your brain? Yes? If so, you may have noticed something fairly amazing: More states ranked the environment as a general priority than **immigration**. Donald Trump's signature issue is really not seen as that much of a priority. And what's more, the hotbeds of concerns are not where you'd think.

We broke out the **immigration** numbers in two ways below. The first is on the same scale as the six maps above; the second is relative to the maximum value just within the **immigration** issue.

The states most worried about **immigration** are North Dakota and Idaho. They are worried about ... Canadian **immigration**, I guess?

If we plot the number of foreign-born Hispanics who are not naturalized vs. the level of concern about **immigration**, there's some correlation: As one increases, so does the other. North Dakota and Idaho are clear outliers here. (The yellow line is the trend excluding North Dakota and Idaho.)

What's at play here? North Dakota is the state that offered the second-highest level of support to Trump in our poll, suggesting that perhaps support for the candidate is driving support for his signature issue. Wyoming was the most supportive state, and it had a relatively high level of concern about **immigration**, too. Idaho was the tenth-most supportive. Barring another explanation, this is probably the best we've got.

But this brings me back to the point I made when Trump reprised his **immigration** positions during that speech in Phoenix last week (and, in fact, the month before that). **Immigration** voters are already mostly onboard with Trump. The growth opportunity lies in jobs and the economy and not in hammering his **immigration** platform once again. Heck, even taking a position on the environment would address more concerns at this point than more **immigration** talk.

In literally every state, voters want to hear the business guy outline a plan for how he'll address the economy. Every state. All 50. He's already done most of the hard work, convincing a majority of people (in that CNN poll) that his business background means he can do a better job with the economy than Clinton. Whether they think an outsider can actually get Washington to do what it's supposed to, Trump has the trust of voters on the issue they care about the most.

He should probably talk about that more.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"When Donald Trump kind of goes after these phantom sanctuary cities and talks about how bad they are, basically what he's going after is police chiefs. And I trust police chiefs, in terms of knowing what should be done to keep their communities safer, and police departments and mayors, a lot more than I trust Donald Trump."

— Democratic vice-presidential nominee Tim Kaine, interview on CNN, Sept. 2, 2016

There has been a lot of focus on "sanctuary cities" in the presidential campaign, especially in relation to illegal **immigration** and crime. Opponents of illegal **immigration**, including Donald Trump, have called for an end to sanctuary policies, arguing that they protect undocumented **immigrants** from criminal prosecution.

When asked about sanctuary cities in a recent interview, Kaine answered that Trump is going after "phantom sanctuary cities" and that police chiefs are making decisions to make their communities safer. Host Chris Cuomo asked Kaine what he meant by "phantom," and Kaine explained his experience as a mayor and governor in Virginia in deciding not to participate in a federal **immigration** enforcement program.

A campaign spokeswoman clarified that the nominee was referring to the fact that local governments are implementing "overarching policies and practices that will make their communities safer" — rather than making policies to shield violent criminals, as opponents of such policies contend.

So we decided to explore this issue further and clear up the facts about sanctuary cities.

The Facts

There's no official definition of "sanctuary," but it generally refers to rules restricting state and local governments from alerting federal authorities about people who may be in the country illegally.

Sanctuary policies came under fresh criticism after the July 2015 death of Kate Steinle, a woman who was shot and killed in San Francisco, allegedly by an undocumented **immigrant** and repeat felon who had been deported five times to Mexico. San Francisco police had released him from custody after drug charges were dropped, despite a request from the Department of Homeland Security to deport him.

**Immigration** enforcement is a federal responsibility. State and local law enforcement officials can decide to what extent they want to cooperate with the federal government on **immigration** enforcement.

According to an analysis of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) records by the Texas Tribune, ICE identified at least 165 cities and counties that had specific policies limiting cooperation on **immigration** enforcement. Researchers on both sides of the **immigration** issue have found more than 300 local jurisdictions that have such policies.

Major cities like San Francisco, Chicago, New York, Baltimore and Boston are sanctuary cities. Interestingly, New York had sanctuary policies even under former mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, now an adviser to Trump's campaign.

ICE can issue an "**immigration** detainer," a request to be notified when a "criminal **alien**" (a noncitizen convicted of a crime) is being released from a state or local law enforcement agency. This is so ICE can take custody of such people when they're released and figure out whether they're subject to deportation.

But some local or state law enforcement agencies decide not to tell ICE when a "criminal **alien**" is released, for several reasons. Some agencies say it leads to mistrust between the community and law enforcement, because victims and potential witnesses might not come forward to report crimes if they are afraid of being reported to federal authorities for their **immigration** status.

Reluctance among local and state agencies grew after a DHS program failed to prioritize deportation of convicted **immigrants**, and state and local governments saw it as a drain on their resources. With many local and state agencies strapped for cash, they declined to cooperate in what is ultimately a federal responsibility.

Between January 2014 and September 2015, local and state law enforcement agencies declined 18,646 ICE **immigration** detainers, the Texas Tribune found. California had the most declined detainers, by far.

Hillary Clinton, the Democratic presidential nominee, has criticized San Francisco for releasing the suspect in Steinle's killing, but she supports sanctuary cities and thinks such policies can help further public safety.

In 2015, Senate Democrats blocked legislation that would have cracked down on sanctuary jurisdictions by pulling their federal funds if they didn't cooperate with the federal government. In his big **immigration** speech last week, Trump proposed blocking federal funds to sanctuary cities.

The Obama administration has taken steps to divert undocumented **immigrants** from sanctuary cities. In February, the Justice Department revealed a new policy that gives ICE — not cities or states — the first rights to an inmate who is flagged for deportation and released from a federal prison.

The Bottom Line

Local and state governments can decide not to participate in federal **immigration** enforcement — which ultimately is a federal responsibility. Many local jurisdictions do cooperate, with the idea that they're multiplying forces to find removable noncitizens.

Kaine rebuts arguments by opponents of sanctuary cities, like Trump, as "phantom" claims that portray such policies as designed to protect undocumented **immigrants** who commit crimes.

This claim by Kaine highlights the core difference in the views of those who support and oppose sanctuary policies. Kaine and Clinton believe that local law enforcement should continue to decide whether to cooperate with federal authorities on enforcing **immigration**, because they are doing what is best for their communities. Law enforcement agencies that support sanctuary policies say they ensure that victims and witnesses of crime feel safe enough to report the crime to police, without the fear of possible deportation.

We will not rate this claim, as "phantom" is more based on Kaine's opinion and therefore not fact-checkable.

No Rating

(About our rating scale)

Send us facts to check by filling out this form.

Sign up for The Fact Checker weekly newsletter.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton relies on a former Bush administration official to attack Donald Trump in Spanish as part of a new ad campaign targeting Hispanic voters in Florida and Nevada.

The Democratic presidential candidate's campaign on Wednesday plans to begin airing new spots in the two battleground states with the largest Hispanic voting populations. During the general election, Clinton has aired just one Spanish-language TV ad during a highly rated soccer match that aired on Univision this summer. Digital ads targeting Hispanics have appeared in both languages and the campaign aired ads targeting Hispanic voters during the primary campaign.

But the lack of Spanish advertising during the general election especially has prompted some Democrats to voice concern that Clinton is taking the Latino vote for granted, warning that millions of dollars need to be spent to remind millions of Hispanic voters to register and cast ballots.

The first ad will air in Miami and stars Carlos Gutierrez, a Cuban-born Republican who served as George W. Bush's commerce secretary for four years. He delivers a straight-to-camera appeal, imploring fellow Hispanics to vote for Clinton because Trump is "dangerous."

"Donald Trump doesn't have the qualities necessary to be president. I know, because I served in the Cabinet of George W. Bush for four years," Gutierrez says in Spanish. "I was born in Cuba, but this country gave me my success. I've been a Republican my entire life, but first I'm an American. Vote for Trump? I can't. It's dangerous and we don't want to go back. Hillary Clinton has the experience and I trust her. For me, country first, and then party."

Gutierrez announced his support for Clinton last month, becoming one of the most prominent Hispanic Republicans to do so. A former Kellogg's chief executive, he is now co-chairman of the advisory firm Albright Stonebridge Group. Gutierrez initially supported the campaign of former Republican Florida governor Jeb Bush and frequently warned fellow Republicans that Trump's anti-**immigrant** message would be detrimental to their party.

The second ad, "Verdadera Fuerza," or "Real Strength," will air in the Orlando, Tampa and West Palm Beach markets in Florida and the Las Vegas and Reno markets in Nevada, according to the campaign.

"Because he shouts insults, Trump thinks he has real strength," the announcer says before Trump is heard saying that Mexican **immigrants** are "bringing crime, they're rapists."

"But Hillary Clinton understands that real strength is revealed in what you do for others," the announcer ads before touting Clinton's early work on behalf of disabled children and as first lady in support of a children's health-care program.

"A life of work — that's where you find real strength," the announcer says before reminding viewers to register to vote.

Clinton maintains a wide lead over Trump among Hispanic voters, but it's not as large as some might expect, which has sparked much of the worry among Democratic activists and political consultants who specialize in targeting Latino voters.

An average of recent Washington Post-ABC News polls shows Clinton leading Trump by 70 percent to 25 percent among Hispanic voters — similar to President Obama's margin over Republican rival Mitt Romney in 2012.

In 2008, Obama's campaign began airing Spanish-language ads in mid-September, meaning that Clinton will beat that timeline, if barely. In 2012, Obama's reelection campaign spent tens of millions of dollars on ads in Spanish beginning in April when he did not have a competitive primary contest.

Overall, Clinton is far outpacing her rivals on the airwaves, with at least $61 million spent by her campaign as of last month. Trump has started airing TV ads in a handful of battleground states, with no signal that he plans to do so in Spanish.

Abby D. Phillip contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Today's special: American lobster in European hot water.

The European Union's Scientific Forum on Invasive **Alien** Species announced Tuesday that there was sufficient scientific evidence to push ahead with a review of Sweden's request to declare the American lobster an invasive species that threatens native lobsters and other marine life.

It could mean a ban on the clawed cousins from across the pond.

Now, before European foodies go off the deep end, the whole spat is based on only a handful of American lobsters found in Swedish waters. And any final decision — not expected before April — will take into account potential fallout on international trade. That includes weighing the risks of possible retaliatory bans against Europe by the United States and Canada, which stand to lose a lobster market valued at up to $200 million by some estimates.

Overall, it is little more than a side dish compared with other transatlantic trade issues, such as last week's E.U. order for Ireland to recover up to $14.5 billion in taxes from tech giant Apple. But out in places like the Gulf of Maine or the coast of Nova Scotia, the lobster showdown is a very big deal.

"Is this really about invasion of a species or invasion of [an] economy?" said Beth Casoni, executive director of the Massachusetts Lobstermen's Association.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/12/15/the-shocking-truth-about-shrimp-today/"]Don't[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/12/15/the-shocking-truth-about-shrimp-today/"]Don't] eat that shrimp![/interstitial\_link]

Casoni and others argue that European lobster fleets are worried about competition from their rivals in North America, where the catch is bigger and the global exporting network is well established. The two lobster species are very similar — with just slight variations in natural shell color and size of the tail — and taste equally delicious.

It's also not entirely clear how the American lobsters, known as Homarus americanus, made it into Swedish waters to mingle with their European mates, called Homarus gammarus. Some of the 32 lobsters found last year still had rubber bands on their claws — which are applied in captivity — raising suspicion that they either escaped from an export shipment or were intentionally set free.

"It's not like there is an army of Homarus americanus marching around in European waters," Casoni said. "It's a very small group that looks like they ended up there because someone put them there."

Sweden, for its part, paints a picture of a clash of crustaceans. It claims that the Homarus americanus could somehow gain a foothold in European seas and spell the end of the Homarus gammarus branch through interbreeding.

"Like a lob-zilla or something," Casoni said.

In Canada, the Fisheries and Oceans department has called the Swedish argument "one-sided" and noted that American lobsters have occasionally turned up in Europe for decades without threatening the local species.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/06/21/how-growing-global-trade-is-carrying-pests-all-over-the-world/?utm\_term=.dcd3dd53e9dc"]How[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/06/21/how-growing-global-trade-is-carrying-pests-all-over-the-world/?utm\_term=.dcd3dd53e9dc"]How] pests get a free ride with global trade[/interstitial\_link]

And Robert S. Steneck, a University of Maine marine scientist, told the Associated Press that winter ocean temperatures along many of the lobster habitats in Europe are too warm for American lobsters to reproduce.

Issues over invasive species around the world are not new. Zebra mussels, native to Eastern Europe, now clog the Great Lakes after being introduced from the ballast water of ships in the late 1980s. America's voracious black bullhead catfish has made its way into European waters in recent decades, possibly in shipments of live carp.

The decision Tuesday by the E.U. Scientific Forum on Invasive **Alien** Species gave no hint on how the debate could progress, saying only that it was "a preliminary opinion on a purely scientific risk assessment."

Yet the North American lobster defenders are taking no chances. The U.S. senators from Maine, Susan Collins (R) and Angus King (I), have led a push to lobby E.U. officials. In March, the senators, along with Reps. Chellie Pingree (D-Maine) and Bruce Poliquin (R-Maine), sent a letter to Secretary of State John F. Kerry appealing for some diplomatic muscle.

"We urge you to engage in immediate efforts to ensure the continuation of safe and responsible import of live Maine lobsters, consistent with the EU's World Trade Organization obligations," they wrote. "Since only a small number of Maine lobsters have been found in foreign waters, we believe regulators should take a more finely tuned approach before calling this an 'invasion.' "

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**David Ortiz continued his farewell tour with a meaty interview with USA Today this week, in which he touched on just about everything you can ask of an athlete at the end of a 20-year career: his place in MLB history, tributes from other players and his plans for retirement.

Among the most meaningful parts of the interview, however, came when the longtime Red Sox player was asked about Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump and his comments on **immigration** and Latinos in general. According to the story, Ortiz, who was born in the Dominican Republic, admitted he doesn't follow politics all that closely and largely refrains from commenting on them publicly, but that Trump's comments "didn't sit well with me."

"When you speak like that about us, it's a slap in the face," Ortiz said of Latinos in general. "I walk around sometimes, and I see Mexican people trying to earn a living in an honest way. And to hear somebody make those kinds of comments, it hits you. I think as Latin people we deserve better. Things have gotten much better in that regard. … As Latin people we deserve respect, no matter where you're from. And especially our Mexican brothers, who come here willing to do all the dirty work.

"Latin people here in the United States are the spark plug of the country's economy. Whoever opposes that is going to lose. And not just Latin people but **immigrants**. I'm talking about people who come from Africa, from Asia, other places. All those people come here with one goal, to realize the American dream, and you have to include them in our group."

Trump has notably hinged much of his presidential campaign on **immigration** reform and border security, notoriously announcing his run by saying Mexican **immigrants** are "bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people."

Ortiz's comments are also notable at a time when athletes are often told to "#sticktosports" in response to any thought, comment or feeling they might have about anything other than their literal job. The last few weeks of the Sports Media Outrage Cycle were fueled by 49ers quarterback Colin Kaepernick's protest of the national anthem to raise awareness of systemic racism and will likely not die down as more athletes are kneeling with him in solidarity. While NBA and WNBA athletes have recently become more outspoken on social-justice issues, athletes in other major American sports have tended to shy from the conversation.

(Then, of course, there's Curt Schilling.)

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**\* It looks like Hillary Clinton is going to keep talking about Donald Trump's shady dealings and his tax returns :

Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton on Tuesday urged Donald Trump to "come clean" about his finances and said she would continue to press the Republican to release his tax returns until Election Day, declaring that "he clearly has something to hide."

Something tells me her staff is spending late nights working on a line about Trump not being as rich as he says for her to zing him with at the first debate.

\* David Weigel reports that Republicans in Congress are working hard on pressing issues that affect the American people :

With just a few working weeks of Congress left, House Oversight Committee Chairman Jason Chaffetz has pledged to hold fresh hearings on Hillary Clinton's use of a private server before leaving the State Department. In an interview with radio host and cable news commentator Hugh Hewitt, Chaffetz said that at least two hearings were coming, with the first, on the Freedom of Information Act, scheduled for this coming Thursday….

And shouldn't we have some more hearings about Benghazi? We still don't know the real story.

\* This is a pretty hard-hitting ad against Trump for his comments on military matters from pro-Clinton PAC Priorities USA . Complete with nuclear explosions.

\* Dara Lind has a good one here: T he media are in denial about Trump's **immigration** plan, and it's just what his campaign wants .

\* Jonathan Bernstein explains why you should pay attention to the polling averages, not individual polls, unless, that is, you actually prefer to be misinformed about the state of the race.

\* Natalie Jackson explains how you can read poll results from now until November without freaking out .

\* Heather Digby Parton traces the press' belief that Clinton is a liar way, way back .

\* Jamil Smith says that Trump's carefully-crafted visit to a safe space inside a black church in Detroit should have inspired universal ridicule .

\* Gabriel Sherman reports that Fox News is going to pay Gretchen Carlson $20 million to settle her sexual harassment lawsuit against Roger Ailes .

\* Katha Pollitt reminds us that Phyllis Schlafly's energetic and successful professional life contradicted everything she fought for as an opponent of women's rights .

\* Catherine Rampell argues that some on both the left and the right are trying to change the way America's cultural "melting pot" works .

\* Ed O'Keefe reports that John McCain's English-language ads portray him as a super-tough advocate of border security, while his Spanish-language ads portray him as a super-compassionate advocate for the interests of undocumented **immigrants** .

\* Daniel Drezner offers a theory about why stories suggesting corruption by Hillary Clinton get more attention than stories suggesting corruption by Donald Trump .

\* And finally a reminder: Donald Trump still — still! — will not admit that Barack Obama was born in the United States .

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CLEVELAND — On a holiday devoted to American workers, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump converged Monday on this Midwestern city built on manufacturing and made starkly different pitches to blue-collar voters about where their allegiances should lie.

In a bid to boost turnout among a traditionally Democratic constituency, Clinton ticked off a list of policy proposals aimed at lifting working-class families and warned that Trump does not have their best interests in mind, citing what she characterized as a long record as a businessman of "stiffing" contractors he employed.

"Just look at Donald Trump's track record when it comes to hard-working men and women," the Democratic presidential nominee told a crowd of about 3,000 people at an annual festival in a park here that has long been a gathering place for African Americans. "There may be people you know who are thinking about voting for him. And you know, friends don't let friends vote for Trump."

Clinton was joined by a trio of national union leaders, all of whom touted her as the best choice for workers, and by her running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia. Kaine called Trump "a guy who's been sitting up in the penthouse and doesn't even under­stand the everyday lives of working folks."

Trump made a lower-key pitch, holding a roundtable discussion with local labor leaders and union members at a suburban American Legion post and mingling with patrons at a city diner before heading to a county fair near Youngstown.

The Republican nominee was joined at both Cleveland-area stops by Tom Coyne, mayor of the suburb of Brook Park and a former Democrat. Trump showcased Coyne as a model of his ability to reach across party lines, including to working-class voters who like his anti-free-trade message and tough anti-**immigration**stands.

"These are the big union folks here," Trump said as he sat with several workers and Coyne at a back table at Goody's Diner.

"I think the mayor is just one example that's happening across this country where voters who traditionally haven't voted Republican or haven't voted in a very long time seem to be coming out to support this messenger and this message," Kellyanne Conway, Trump's campaign manager, told reporters.

Conway added that she is bullish about Trump's prospects for luring union workers to cross over and vote Republican in other industrial states, including Pennsylvania.

At the diner, Trump gestured to reporters to take note when he met a supporter named Maria Hernandez.

"Mexican American supporter [of] Trump. Mexican American. It's so nice," Trump said. Polls show the Hispanic demographic breaking heavily in Clinton's favor.

Monday's events marked the traditional transition to the final leg of the campaign — the "mad dash" to November, as Clinton described it to her traveling press corps.

The importance of Ohio was evident from the runway at the airport here: When Clinton touched down in her newly acquired jet — emblazoned with her "Stronger Together" slogan — Trump's personal plane and the campaign jet used by his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, were already parked on the tarmac.

Besides Clinton and Kaine, other high-profile Democrats fanned out across the Midwest and beyond Monday to reinforce the ticket's message. Those joining the two nominees or campaigning on their own included former president Bill Clinton, Vice President Biden and Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, the runner-up for the Democratic nomination. Sanders was making his first campaign stops for Clinton since the party's convention in July.

At her stop here, Clinton unveiled a new book that compiles policy proposals put forward by her ticket, many of them geared toward helping the middle class. Among them: making college more affordable, raising the minimum wage, an increase in child-care tax credits and requiring equal pay for women for equal work.

Clinton's appearance was marred by a coughing fit just as she took the stage. Her voice never fully recovered, despite several gulps of water and what appeared to be a lozenge.

"Every time I think about Trump I get allergic," Clinton joked.

Conway, Trump's campaign manager, later suggested on Twitter that it was actually the media that had caused Clinton's allergy.

That was a reference to the fact that Clinton was aboard a new plane Monday, flying with reporters in the back for the first time during her campaign.

Previously, reporters followed the candidate around the country in a separate chartered jet.

Before the flight left the airport in the morning in West­chester, N.Y., Clinton ventured back to greet about three dozen members of the media traveling with her. On a flight after the stop in Cleveland, she came back again, making herself available to take questions from the group for the first time in several months.

Over the course of more than 20 minutes — interrupted by more coughing and the landing — Clinton fielded questions on an array of subjects, including a Washington Post report that U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies are probing what they see as a broad covert Russian operation in the United States to sow public distrust in the upcoming presidential election.

"We are facing a very serious concern," she said. "We've never had a foreign adversarial power be already involved in our electoral process."

Upon landing, her motorcade headed to another Labor Day celebration in the Quad Cities area that straddles the Iowa-Illinois border.

In Ohio, throngs of supporters greeted Trump and Pence at the Canfield County fair. Fairgoers waved, shouted "Trump, Trump, Trump" and clamored to shake Trump's hand as the two candidates walked.

En route to the fair, Trump attacked Clinton on **immigration** and took a firm stand against offering undocumented **immigrants** a path to citizenship.

Trump, who has publicly wrestled with the issue in recent weeks, told reporters that Clinton has "no plan" and favored "total amnesty."

"Ask her about **immigration**, because it's a very difficult subject," Trump said. "No matter what you say, there are going to be a group of people that are very unhappy with you."

Asked if he would support giving noncriminal undocumented **immigrants** a path to legal status, Trump said his campaign would revisit the issue in the future.

Meanwhile, Sanders gave three speeches Monday in New Hampshire, where he defeated Clinton in February by the largest margin in the history of that state's primary.

While polling suggests that 90 percent or more of Sanders's supporters back Clinton, Democrats worry that disaffected but anti-Trump voters might go for a third-party candidate instead.

At an AFL-CIO breakfast in Manchester, Sanders thanked New Hampshire voters for proving "radical ideas" like a $15-an-hour minimum wage, universal health care and paid family leave could win votes.

An hour later, at a sloping park in the small town of Warner, Sanders spoke to a crowd of at least 250 people for 30 minutes before mentioning the Democratic ticket. When he promised to "do everything I can" to elect Clinton, a dozen or so supporters of Green Party presidential nominee Jill Stein booed, yelled "Jill" or waved signs with the slogan "Jill, not Hill."

"Trust me, I understand!" said Sanders. "You're talking to the longest serving independent in the history of the Congress. I understand there are people who may not agree with me. And I respect that. But I feel like at this point in history, a candidate like Trump, who is running on ­reactionary economics, tax breaks for the wealthy and cutting programs for the very poor — who rejects the science of climate change — is running on a core of bigotry."

After asking supporters to make sure that Clinton, if elected, enacted the progressive Democratic Party platform, Sanders headed north to Lebanon High School. Flanked by banners that read "Stronger Together" — but made no specific mentions of Clinton's name — Sanders told a more amenable crowd to focus one more time on the issues.

"We have got to be a little bit smarter than the media," said Sanders. "A campaign is not about the candidates. Not about Hillary Clinton. Not about Donald Trump. Not about Bernie Sanders. A campaign is about you and your needs."
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DelReal reported from Washington. Weigel reported from Manchester, Warner and Lebanon, N.H.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There's no doubt that Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) has been a longtime advocate for revamping the nation's **immigration** laws and border security system. But his newly-published Spanish-language campaign website selectively highlights just part of his legislative record -- while his English-language site emphasizes other parts.

The Spanish language site, for instance, lauds him as a member of the Gang of Eight that sought comprehensive **immigration** reform, and a supporter of a pathway to citizenship for the children of **immigrants** who came to the country illegally -- a group known as the "Dreamers." The English-language site makes no mention of either and portrays the senator as a champion of tougher border security.

McCain's campaign launched his new Spanish-language website on Tuesday, a week after he won a heated Republican primary in hopes of scoring a sixth term. "Unidos con McCain," or "United with McCain" is a condensed version of his English-language site, which features far more information on McCain's biography as well as news clippings and special emphasis on military, veterans issues and health-care.

On the issue of **immigration**, there are stark differences between the two sites. McCain's English-language site highlights his stance on "Homeland Security and **Immigration** Reform," while the Spanish-language site features McCain's position on "Inmigracion."

Lorna Romero, a McCain campaign spokeswoman, said the sites were "never intended to be identical."

On both pages, the message begins in a similar fashion, with minor translation adjustments:

In English: "John has led the efforts in Washington to ensure that the U.S. obtains control of its southwest border and to reform our broken **immigration**system. It is the responsibility of the federal government to ensure that the Arizona-Mexico border is secure and that Arizonans have an **immigration** system that works in preventing terrorists and others wishing to do us harm from entering the country — while maintaining a robust **immigration** system that welcomes the best and brightest in the world."

But from there, the two sites deviate considerably.

In English, McCain touts his work to reform the U.S. Border Patrol and to pass laws that "would address the crisis of unaccompanied children coming across Arizona's border with Mexico." But in Spanish, there's no reference to border security or dealing with unaccompanied minors.

Instead, the Spanish site touts McCain as "the central figure who has brought together at the negotiating table Republicans and Democrats to work on **immigration** reform that is humane and sensible to the needs of the **immigrant** community. More recently, McCain led the efforts of the Group of Eight, which resulted in passage in the Senate of an historic **immigration** reform project. John McCain has always said that one of the most important parts of any legislative package of the broken **immigration** system should be to provide a pathway to citizenship for those who were brought as children by their parents, with no say in the matter."

But in English, there's no reference to McCain's work on the Gang of Eight or his support for a pathway to citizenship for "dreamers," the children of undocumented **immigrants**.

Here's a screengrab of McCain's English and Spanish-language sites:

Romero added in an email that McCain has, in both languages, "consistently championed the need for a secure border and **immigration** reform."

She added that the new site "focuses closely on policy issues commonly raised by Spanish-language and bilingual Arizonans, based on the campaign's internal research."

It wasn't immediately clear what that research contained.

Differences in translation between English- and Spanish-language campaign websites are nothing new, but are usually subtle to deal with differences in vernacular. With the growth of the Hispanic electorate nationwide, political consultants in both parties have encouraged political candidates to exhibit a more inclusive tone when discussing **immigration**, an issue of importance to Hispanics, but not usually the top concern. The economy, jobs, health-care and national security often rank ahead of **immigration**, but how a politician discusses the emotionally fraught issue is often seen as a key measure of Latino support.

In the case of McCain, it's not so much differences in translation, but instead of emphasis. The contrasts could spark accusations from Democrats that McCain is trying to be all things to different groups of people on the issue of **immigration**, an especially sensitive topic in Arizona. Democrats are hoping to unseat McCain, a five-term incumbent, who faces a well-funded challenge this year from Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D-Ariz.). She has emphasized McCain's support for Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump -- an historically unpopular figure among Hispanics -- in hopes of driving up her support. McCain has vowed to stand by Trump despite the presidential candidate's previously critical comments about the senator.

McCain has straddled the issue of **immigration** throughout most of his modern political life. After pushing for a comprehensive **immigration** reform bill during the latter years of George W. Bush's administration, he distanced himself from the work during his 2010 reelection campaign and ran ads that called on the federal government to "Complete the dang fence" along the Mexican border.

There are other, more subtle differences between the two websites. A Spanish section called "Empleos y Economia" -- jobs and the economy -- mentions the endorsement of the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, but a similar section on the English site, dubbed "Government Spending, Taxes and the Economy," instead calls out McCain's high ratings from the American Conservative Union, Citizens Against Government Waste and the National Taxpayers Union.

On the English site, the "Defense and National Security" section notes that during McCain's chairmanship of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the panel has heard from "witnesses like Henry Kissinger and America's top military leaders." On the Spanish site, there's no mention of Kissinger.

Paul Kane contributed to this report.

Related:

John McCain is in the fight of his political life in the age of Donald Trump

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Monday Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump offered yet another approach to **immigration** policy that can only be described as intentionally abstruse and still evolving.

During an interview, ABC News's David Muir pressed Trump on what would happen to undocumented **immigrants** under his **immigration** plan -- those who had hope of becoming U.S. citizens and were willing to leave the country to gamble on that process, and those who did not have such hope and were not willing to leave. Under a Trump administration, those in the first category would all have to leave. In the interim, the United States would busy itself with enhanced border security, including Trump's big, beautiful border wall. Those uninterested in citizenship would...well, it's not clear. It's not clear where they would be or whether they would be subject to deportation during the border security build-out period.

This is what Trump said:

Trump: They have to make a determination what happens when the border is secure.

Last week, Trump outlined an **immigration** policy in which all of the nation's estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** would be forced out, including the nearly 1 million young people brought to the United States illegally as children. It was really an overview -- blended with enough strong man savior talk, references to mass deportation and contradictory calls for absolutism and humane action that it was more than a little challenging to follow.

However, one thing was clear. There would be, under a President Trump, no amnesty. There would be deportations all around.

We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. There will be no amnesty. Our message to the world will be this: You cannot obtain legal status, or become a citizen of the United States, by illegally entering our country. This declaration alone will help stop the crisis of illegal crossings and illegal overstays.

It was all very Trump circa June 2015, a 360 degree pivot demonstrating he'd journeyed all the way from Point A to...Point A. It was a simple solution to a complex problem, which Trump would resolve with various shows of force and strength buoyed by an abiding belief that the undocumented are a drain on the nation and its resources, a population that contains many criminals and a group whose fates are not really a U.S. concern. (There has been no mention of late as to what would become of any U.S.-born children of undocumented parents.)

The odd thing is, if Trump is worried about welfare dependency among the undocumented and the employment prospects of those with limited education, amnesty has likely had an effect on both.

"People often talk about amnesty as if it was a failure," said Dorris Meissner, a senior fellow and director of the U.S. **immigration** policy program at the Migration Policy Institute, a research organization. "The strange thing is, in the realm of **immigration** policy the three parts, or pieces of a stool that you often hear people mention, are amnesty, **immigration** enforcement and employer accountability. Amnesty hasn't been the problem; it's just taken much of the blame for what went wrong with some of the other parts of that three-legged stool."

Let's pull that apart.

In 1986, the Reagan administration used much of its political might to wrestle though Congress a law that promised to simultaneously boost employer accountability and border enforcement, as well as create a path to citizenship for much of the nation's undocumented **immigrant** population. This was the three-legged stool, the three-pronged approach that was supposed to wipe the slate clean, Meissner said. It had been discussed and debated since the early 1980s. Finally a deal got done.

What ultimately became law -- thanks to lobbying by both civil liberties and human rights groups and business interests -- was a largely voluntary system of employer accountability requiring a check of easy-to-forge documents, Meissener said. That left much of the lure for illegal **immigrants** in place.

The bill also included a call for increased border enforcement. But Congress did not ramp up border enforcement spending until the mid 1990s. This left the country without much of a punitive or preventative stick to dissuade illegal **immigration** for the better part of a decade.

In the meantime, the amnesty part of the bill went into full effect, creating millions of new, legal, permanent residents, some of whom went on to become citizens. It was the stuff of political compromise, struck in part with a promise that this would be the one and only time that the country would offer an **immigration**amnesty.

All told, about 3 million people applied for legalization. The majority, about 70 percent, were Mexican citizens. However, the individuals who applied hailed from a total of 179 countries. Of the applicants, about 2.68 million saw their applications approved. A 1989 Justice Department report found that one change had a significant impact on these people's lives. Among the report's findings:

\* The nation's legalized **immigrants** remained far more likely than others to work blue collar jobs.

\* Their median annual  income climbed to $15,364 in 1989. That was up from $8,122 in 1987, the year in which most of those eligible actually applied.

\* These workers reported significant decreases in the share who were not paid minimum wage or overtime pay.

\* Those who were legalized were far less likely to rely on public economic assistance than Americans on average. Take a look at the chart below, pulled from that 1989 Justice Department report.

Now, when President Obama created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, known as DACA, in 2012 it did not provide legal status for anyone. But it has granted 728,000 young adults renewable deportation reprieves and permission to work legally in the United States.

When Obama created the program, it came with no new requirements for employers. However, spending on border enforcement and deportation activity were both on an upward trajectory. And, economic and social conditions in Mexico had begun to improve in a sustained way, Meissner said.

Today, Mexico's economy continues to produce jobs and wages at a rate that is allowing more young people to continue their educations, reducing both competition for jobs and the country's birth rate, which is approaching a level similar to that in the United States. All told, stepped-up U.S. border enforcement and deportation activity and improved conditions in Mexico have pushed down the number of detected attempts to enter the United States illegally and allowed the population of illegal **immigrants** in the United States to slide to a 40-year low.

That's the backdrop against which DACA happened. Here's what it did, according to a Migration Policy Institute report on the program and its impact released just this month:

\* More than three-quarters of those who benefited directly from DACA said they had since found new jobs. This is significant because some estimates put the unemployment rate among young undocumented **immigrants** before DACA as high as 66 percent.

\* More than half said they had found a higher-paying job after DACA.

\* DACA recipients on average earned 20 percent more than those who did not benefit from the program (an average of $11.47 an hour compared to $9.43).

\* 90 percent of DACA recipients have bank accounts and 48 percent have credit cards.

There are, no doubt, American voters who will read that and think, well, why should we care? What do indicators of improved economic conditions for those who received an deportation reprieve mean for me?

Well, first, there's the obvious. Those who earn more are less likely to need social assistance. Then, there's the more complicated matter of what all the change described above likely did to the local job markets where many of these young people live.

Jobs don't necessarily become available because someone who once held it leaves or is deported (as Trump implied in his speech). Employers can simply pile responsibilities on a smaller group of workers or leave tasks undone. But, if workers who can do little about pay that falls below the federal minimum wage floor are gone or scarce, then employers have little choice but to pay some workers at least the minimum wage.

There is some evidence that black workers are more likely to lose jobs than white workers when **immigration** -- legal and illegal -- grows. But that may be the only thing known for sure.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's narcissism -- his all-consuming self-involvement and need for obsequious approval -- in comic and serious ways hobbles his quest for victory.

This is the man who when asked about God reverts to a discussion of his own success in real estate. ("Well I say God is the ultimate. You know you look at this? Here we are on the Pacific Ocean. How did I ever own this? I bought it 15 years ago. I made one of the great deals they say ever. I have no more mortgage on it as I will certify and represent to you. And I was able to buy this and make a great deal. That's what I want to do for the country. Make great deals. We have to, we have to bring it back, but God is the ultimate. I mean God created this, and here's the Pacific Ocean right behind us. So nobody, no thing, no there's nothing like God.")

This is a man who bizarrely pretended t0 be PR man John Miller so as to tout his sexual prowess. His reaction to Brexit was to talk about its positive impact on his Scottish golf course.

In a more serious vein, it leaves him entirely without empathy and understanding for others. He cannot possibly imagine that telling African Americans their lives are a "disaster" would offend them. He cannot restrain himself from claiming he was "right" in the wake of the mass shooting in Orlando, Fla. He cannot admit his vast ignorance on numerous subjects so he cannot learn from others (let alone sit down to read a book).

His immense, fragile ego also prompts him compulsively to attack fellow Republicans. He's already attacked -- after sealing the nomination -- Mitt Romney, Sen. Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.), Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Ohio Gov. John Kasich. The latest target was Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) a well-liked, pro-**immigration**reform conservative from a state in which Trump is struggling. "You know, some people, as he said, said it was hardening," he said on Sunday on Face the Nation regarding Trump's Arizona speech. "Some said softening. I say it was just confusing." He proceeded to explain why he could not vote for Trump: "Well, it becomes increasingly difficult to see that he's going to change. So, I don't expect that I will be able to support him in November. I would like to, but he's the Republican nominee. I just don't see how I can."

Rather than ignore Flake, Trump took -- where else? -- to Twitter.

The Republican Party needs strong and committed leaders, not weak people such as @JeffFlake, if it is going to stop illegal **immigration**.

An hour later he felt compelled to tweet again.

The Great State of Arizona, where I just had a massive rally (amazing people), has a very weak and ineffective Senator, Jeff Flake. Sad!

It is sad, but not in the way Trump imagines. Like Captain Queeg obsessing about his disloyal shipmates, Trump cannot refrain from lashing out, even when it is so obviously contrary to his interests.

Trump's core problem has always been Trump -- his intellect, his temperament and his character. No teleprompter or change of campaign staff will change that. The only reason he remains remotely competitive is that his opponent has her own character issues.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Some time ago, the public intellectual Milton Himmelfarb put his finger on what the current presidential campaign is all about. Referring to his fellow Jews, he said that they "earn like Episcopalians, and vote like Puerto Ricans." Never mind the rearview mirror of PC tut-tutness, what Himmelfarb had observed was that not all the people all the time vote their pocketbooks. It's not always the economy, stupid.

Himmelfarb, who died in 2006, lived long enough to see his quip extended to other social, ethnic and cultural groups. In 2004, Thomas Frank did just that with his book, "What's the Matter with Kansas?" It wasn't just that the state had gone deeply conservative, it was that its voters were doing away with programs that benefited them. Ideology was overshadowing economics.

Now Donald Trump proves the same point. We have oodles of polling data to show that Trump's supporters are typically white males who topped out in high school. They are supposedly forlorn, adrift, not living better than their fathers and seeing their sons about to live even worse than they do. Trump, with his anti-**immigrant**, anti-trade and anti-China policy promises to change all that. This check will forever be in the mail.

There is, however, some contrary evidence that money alone is not at the root of the Trump evil. More recent studies suggest that racial and cultural isolation also play a role — maybe a dominant one. For instance, anti-**immigrant** feeling intensifies the farther one gets from the Rio Grande.

In other words, to know Mexicans is to know that they are hard-working and law-abiding, hardly the rapists and criminals of Trump's description. Trump's appeal may not, at bottom, be economic. It might be just plain emotional.

Liberals have a hard time with noneconomic explanations of political behavior. They subscribe to the Officer Krupke Rule of Life, propounded by me and named after the character in "West Side Story" who is mocked by gang members who spout liberal platitudes relieving them of all responsibly for being bad. It's all society's fault. This explains why it surprised liberals that the crime rate did not zoom during the recent deep recession. Most crimes are committed by criminals, not people who have been laid off.

Trump has an economic message, of course, but it's beside the point. He doesn't really have a jobs program, he has a get-even program. His appeal is visceral, emotional, nationalistic. He instinctively knows something about resentment and pride and the place they play when someone enters the voting booth. I don't think he's given these matters a moment's thought. On the contrary, they come naturally to him. He makes his people feel good. He makes them feel proud. He makes them feel as Americans should. It's a feeling I yearn for myself, although not at the cost of voting for Trump.

Hillary Clinton's response to all this is quintessentially Hillary Clinton. Her acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention was — in the harshest put-down of all — one of her best efforts, but it was bloodless, an endless train of programs and ideas, all of them good, but none of them producing a snappy salute. Her message was economic, almost exclusively so: "My primary mission as president will be to create more opportunity and more good jobs with rising wages right here in the United States," she said. Yes, yes, of course. All words. No music. She is the school's principal. Trump is the football coach.

Trump's advantage is that he has enemies — Mexicans, Muslims, the Chinese, criminals, idiotic government regulations, the media and, by inference, a smothering political correctness that inhibits speech, seasoning hate with frustration. Never mind that his enemies are really scapegoats; he enables the angry and frustrated to vent. Their America has changed. It is less white and less Christian and more sexually permissive. It permits same-sex marriage and unisex bathrooms and has taken a blender to all sorts of sexual categories and made them all one. Trump's supporters are bewildered. Uncle Sam does not know which bathroom stall to use.

Clinton represents that changed America. Her enemies are hers alone — the vast right-wing conspiracy, for instance — but not those of wretched white males. She promises them a job, but they have heard that before. What they want is pride, status, a return to when white males owned the culture, understood the culture, were the culture. Trump offers them the past. For that, they'll sacrifice the future anytime.

cohenr@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Our stomachs eventually conquer our worst politics, it seems. Just look at the food courts across America.

Pizza, hamburgers, lo mein — the foods of people America once tried to kick out.

The latest gastronomic absurdity in politics came last week, after Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump gave another grim speech about the impact of **immigrants** on America, and the co-founder of Latinos for Trump, Marco Gutierrez, underscored Trump's hard-line views.

"My culture is a very dominant culture, and it's imposing — and it's causing problems," Gutierrez said on MSNBC. "If you don't do something about it, you're going to have taco trucks on every corner."

They're worried about taco trucks on every corner?

Bah. Look at what all that anti-Italian **immigration** legislation of the 1920s did to stop the folks coming over from Italy.

Today we've got more than 73,000 pizza joints in America. The horror.

This ridiculous routine — hate them, fear them, fight them, accept them — has happened to all of the food-court **immigrants** in our nation's history. (You know, the folks who freaked everyone out when they got here but now dominate every food court in the country — Italians, Chinese, Germans.)

And the food court is a great way to see how absurd our **immigration** stances — from anti-Italian legislation to the taco-truck affair to growing waves of Islamophobia — are.

Let's start with Mexican food, because taco trucks have been all the rage this weekend.

Osiris Hoil has shown how menacing these taco trucks can be.

Born in Yucatan, Mexico, Hoil came to America on a visitor visa and — after working in a restaurant, getting married and working in construction — opened a taco stand in an office-heavy part of Virginia, parked right between a Chipotle and a Baja Fresh in Rosslyn. Talk about every corner.

That was the beginning of District Taco, a local chain that now has multiple restaurants and is about to employ nearly 400 people.

"Remember, I was laid off in 2008, that's how I started this business," Hoil said. "And now we're a big corporation."

When he was starting out with the taco stand, he got up at 4 a.m. and went to bed at 10 p.m. Every day. It was a lot of hard, honest work. Now, as an executive, he gets up at 5 a.m. — but still doesn't make it to bed until 10 every night.

He said Gutierrez's taco-truck comment was so funny, so absurd, he could hardly be angry at it.

"I had to laugh," he said. "A taco truck on every corner? Why not!"

This is what Gutierrez and Trump are afraid of?

The sentiment wasn't so different when waves of Italian **immigrants** were coming to America. The Emergency Quota Act of 1921 and the **Immigration** Act of 1924 were written to minimize the number or **immigrants** — especially Italians — coming.

Before that, 11 Italians were lynched in New Orleans in 1891, and hundreds were arrested, after a police chief was killed and some of the Italians charged in his assassination were acquitted. After that, the Ku Klux Klan began targeting Italians.

As for pizza and pasta jokes, they were everywhere (most too nasty to print).

And now, can you imagine a football season without a pizza party? It's as American as a hot dog.

Oh, wait. That brings us to Germans.

Think America embraced the forefathers of hot dogs and hamburgers?

"Unless the stream of their importation could be turned they will soon so outnumber us that all the advantages we have will not be able to preserve our language, and even our government will become precarious," Benjamin Franklin warned of the waves of Germans coming to Pennsylvania in the 1750s. He called them the "most stupid of their nation."

Well, we forgot about that one quickly.

How about Chinese food?

Sure, General Tso's chicken is an Americanized take on the food of people who helped with the backbreaking labor of building a nation.

But when Congress authorized the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 — which aimed to curb Chinese **immigration**, citizenship, and business and land ownership — did the worst fears that prompted that law come true?

Not really. The threat was called "the Yellow Peril," and a people who were deemed "unassimilable" have become an integral part of the nation.

Any real complaints about the Chinese takeout on every corner?

Our stomachs do our smartest thinking. Our tables are the true indicators of the state of our nation's diversity.

Salsa, after all, has outpaced ketchup in sales in America for years, Hoil reminded me.

"This is still a country of great opportunity," Hoil said while driving between meetings over the weekend. "You can work hard. You can succeed. And that's part of the entrepreneurial dream. A taco truck is what all that hard work is about. How can this be bad?"

petula.dvorak@washpost.com

Twitter: @petulad

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The new poll of voters in all 50 states revealed a variety of interesting dynamics across the country, including wide-ranging support for third-party candidates, the consistent role of Obama's popularity and how Utah may be the most interesting state to watch this election.

Johnson wins substantial support for third-party bid

Third-party candidates Gary Johnson and Jill Stein are positioned to garner significant support across the country in a year in which the major-party candidates have broken records for unpopularity. The Post-SurveyMonkey poll finds the Libertarian Party's Johnson supported by an average of 13 percent across all states, ranging from a low of 4 percent in Mississippi to a high of 25 percent in New Mexico, the state where he served two terms as governor.

Johnson's second-best showing comes in neighboring Utah, where the state's heavily Republican and Mormon electorate has been especially resistant to Trump. Johnson also fares well in several Midwest and Western states, receiving 19 percent support in South Dakota, Idaho and Alaska, 17 percent in Kansas and 16 percent in Colorado, Iowa, North Dakota and Washington.

The Green Party's Stein receives less support than Johnson, averaging 5 percent across all states in the new poll. Her best showing is 10 percent in Vermont, home to runner-up for the Democratic nomination Sen. Bernie Sanders. She also receives 8 percent in Maine and 7 percent across a range heavily Democratic or Republican states, including Oklahoma, Idaho, Oregon and California.

Utah is most uncertain state

An average of 10 percent of registered voters reported "no opinion" when asked whether they would vote for Clinton or Trump, but the share of uncommitted voters is nearly twice as high in Utah at 19 percent, the most of any state. Even when third-party candidates are offered as options, Utah's 11 percent undecided is the most in the nation.

Utah has long been loyal to Republicans, supporting the party's presidential candidates by double digits in presidential contests for nearly half a century. But Trump came in third place in the state's Republican caucuses this March, earning only 14 percent of the vote. He performed particularly poorly in areas of the state with a larger share of Mormons, who account for a majority of the state's population, according to a 2015 Pew Research survey.

Trump is still a favorite to win the state, leading Clinton by 46 percent to 35 percent. His edge shrinks to 34-27 when third-party candidates are mentioned, with Johnson's significant 23 percent only four points below Clinton. Mitt Romney's 73-25 victory in 2012 marked Republicans' largest margin since Ronald Reagan's 1984 run, with Romney probably benefiting from his leadership in the Mormon church. Comparing with the 2008 race, while Clinton's current standing in a two-way contest is nearly identical to Obama's 34 percent support, Trump's support today is well below Sen. John McCain's 62 percent support that year.

Can Clinton ride Obama’s coattails?

Obama's approval rating has been above 50 percent in national polls, an above-average popularity that figures to benefit Clinton this fall. The Post-SurveyMonkey poll underscores the close connection between Obama's image and Clinton's fate this fall.

Across all 50 states, Obama averages 48 percent job approval, and Clinton's support against Trump differs from his rating by an average of only four percentage points. On average, Obama's approval rating is three points higher than Clinton's support, exceeding her support at least narrowly in 48 states. The two exceptions are strongly Republican Wyoming (Obama approval 27 percent, Clinton support 26 percent) and Arkansas, where Clinton served as the state's first lady and garners 41 percent support against Trump, compared with Obama's 36 percent job-approval mark.

Home state favoritism also appears to play a role in the state where Clinton falls short of Obama the most. In Obama's home state of Hawaii, his 70 percent job-approval rating far surpasses Clinton's support by 12 percentage points. The gap is smaller but more consequential in more politically divided Colorado, Florida, Michigan and Iowa, where Clinton's support falls four points short of Obama's approval mark. Coming closer to his support would nearly assure victory in these states, with Obama's job-approval rating ranging from 49 percent in Florida to 53 percent in Iowa.

While Clinton has not united all of Obama's supporters, Trump has even more work to do in galvanizing Obama opponents. His state-level support is six points below Obama's disapproval rating, on average, with sizable underperformance across many states. Obama's disapproval mark exceeds Trump's vote share by 13 points in Vermont and New Hampshire, and by 11 points in Delaware. Among battlegrounds, Trump trails Obama's disapproval mark by eight points in New Hampshire and Pennsylvania, and by seven points in Ohio and Iowa.

**Immigration** a lower-tier issue in all 50 states

Donald Trump's promise to deport undocumented **immigrants** and build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border have put the issue of **immigration** at the center of this year's campaign, but the 50-state poll finds **immigration** is a second- or third-tier issue for voters across the country.

Asked which issue matters to them most, an average of 32 percent across all 50 states picked the economy and jobs, followed by health care and terrorism at 16 percent each, education at 9 percent and the environment at 8 percent. **Immigration** came fifth at 7 percent, exceeding only foreign policy at 4 percent.

The importance of **immigration** peaked in some states near and far from the U.S.-Mexico border, including 13 percent in North Dakota, 12 percent in Idaho, 10 percent in Texas and 9 percent in California. But in each of these states, **immigration** ranked behind the economy, health care and terrorism.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Earlier this year, in one of my periodic forays into trying to memorize poetry, I encountered Emma Lazarus's "The New Colossus," the poem written for the unveiling, and inscribed on the base, of the Statue of Liberty -- "Mother of Exiles." It's worth a read, if you haven't read it in a while (or ever). It's a pretty powerful piece, I think; it always gives me goosebumps (though that may be only because my own grandparents were among the "homeless, tempest-tossed" who sailed into New York Harbor in the early 20th century, and I can't help but think of them floating past the "lamp beside the golden door").

"The New Colossus" by Emma Lazarus

The saddest part of our current political climate, for me, is the realization that so many of my fellow citizens don't share in the vision that I always thought was pretty central -- along with a written constitution, an independent judiciary, the separation of powers and the First Amendment -- to what made this country such a great one. As Donald Trump put it, "We take anybody. Come on in, anybody. Just come on in. Not anymore."

And it does make me wonder -- is there any data out there correlating the number of, say, one's great-grandparents who were born overseas with the likelihood that one is supporting Trump over Clinton? I could be wrong, but it certainly seems to me that people who think of themselves (as I do) as being part of an "**immigrant**" stream couldn't be responding at all well to Trump's heated **immigration** rhetoric, if only because they see themselves and their families in his cross hairs.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HEREImmigration**, a major topic throughout this presidential campaign, has dominated the election-related conversation on Twitter in the past week.

According to the Electome — a project of the Laboratory for Social Machines at the MIT Media Lab that's been analyzing social media data about the election — since the beginning of August, tweets about **immigration** usually make up around 18 percent of the Twitter conversation around core election issues.

But tweets on **immigration** soared to almost 60 percent of the election-related Twitter conversation after Donald Trump's statements about a potential "softening," his visit to Mexico and then his address on the topic Wednesday night in Phoenix.

In the past two weeks, the Republican presidential nominee spurred much of the discussion around his stance on **immigration**. On Aug. 23, at a town hall telecast with Fox News's Sean Hannity, Trump said that "there certainly can be a softening" on **immigration**. The next day, tweets on **immigration** made up 30 percent of the core election issues conversation on Twitter. That number went even higher Wednesday, when Trump met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto and then gave an incendiary speech on **immigration**, hitting 40 percent. The day after his address, it made up 59 percent.

Clinton followers (Twitter users who follow Hillary Clinton and no other presidential candidate) seemed particularly eager to discuss the issue: Since Aug. 23, the **immigration** portion of their conversation leaped 14 percentage points over the August average, while for Trump followers it jumped only 9.5 percentage points.

The conversation around race has also picked up recently; usually tweets on racial issues make up 12 percent of the Twitter conversation about core election issues. Those tweets on core issues were drawn from more than 20 million election-related tweets in August.

But on Aug. 25, the portion of tweets about racial issues grew to 26 percent, coinciding with Clinton's speech tying Trump to the "alt right" — a conservative movement often associated with white nationalism.

It's difficult to disentangle race and **immigration** issues, but as of Friday afternoon, the percentage of tweets about race started down toward their early August levels, even as the portion of tweets on **immigration** continued to grow.

John West is  a writer for the Electome project at the MIT Media Lab.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Ask a Donald Trump supporter why they like him, and there's a good chance they'll respond that Trump "tells it like it is." Not for him all the evasions and double-talk you get from those squirrely Washington politicians; you may not agree with him, but he'll tell you exactly what he thinks.

The truth is that this alleged "telling it like it is" has actually just meant that Trump is willing to say out loud the ugly, bigoted, hateful things many people believe but have been reluctant to utter in polite company. But even when it comes to the central issue on which his presidential campaign is based, Trump can seem almost impossible to pin down, making wildly different statements from one day to the next and shrouding his actual intentions in a fog of confusion.

It's September, just two months from Election Day, and Trump and his campaign can't seem to decide exactly what he wants to do about **immigration**. Or perhaps it's more accurate to say that Trump knows what he's going to do, but then he sends out a wave of surrogates to dissemble and confuse the issue, in the hopes that voters with radically different opinions on this topic will all become convinced that Trump agrees with them. Here's what happened on the Sunday shows:

Several of Donald Trump's top campaign advisers and allies on Sunday struggled to explain the Republican presidential nominee's stance on mass deportation — insisting that he will prioritize undocumented criminals for deportation, but falling short on other details and playing down the scale of his deportation priorities by millions of people.

So Trump and his campaign are trying to convince the public that all of the following are simultaneously true:

\* America is under siege from millions of criminal undocumented **immigrants** who are terrorizing our communities and killing our children.

\* Donald Trump will send a new deportation force to swiftly and ruthlessly toss these barbarians out of our country.

\* Donald Trump isn't going to be sending some kind of deportation force to start breaking down doors and splitting up families; he's too compassionate for that.

\* Donald Trump is softening his position on **immigration**.

\* Donald Trump is hardening his position on **immigration**.

There's no mystery about what's going on here. We have, on one hand, the true Trump, the one who won the Republican nomination by offering a more extreme version of xenophobic bloodlust than any of the more genteel Washington politicians running against him. This is the Trump who talks unscripted at rallies, feeding off the energy of an angry crowd, validating their ugliest impulses and encouraging them to nurture their fears. That Trump is reflected in the actual details of his **immigration** policy, under which there will never be any path to any kind of legal status for undocumented **immigrants** and every last one of them will be deported.

On the other hand, you have the Trump his campaign would like to present to the electorate. They know that the Republican primary voters who gave Trump the nomination are a plurality of a minority, and most Americans disagree with him on this issue, even most Republicans. So they try to portray a different Trump: one who's going to deport only criminals, one who doesn't want to break up families, one who'll get around to addressing the question of the bulk of undocumented **immigrants** at some unspecified later date, and then who knows?

But that's not the true Trump. The true Trump isn't the one sleepily reading a prepared statement someone else has written for him in order to make him sound reasonable. The true Trump is the one whose face reddens, his voice growing gravelly and insistent as he whips his crowds in a frenzy. The true Trump is the one who brings up parents of young people killed by undocumented **immigrants** on to the stage to tell their stories and testify that if Donald Trump had been president their children would still be alive.

To be clear, these individuals' suffering and grief is undeniable; what's ghastly is the way Trump is using them. The fact is that **immigrants** commit fewer crimes than native-born citizens. But isn't it true that if we had no undocumented **immigrants**, then their children would indeed be alive? Yes, but think of it this way: What if Trump kept bringing up on stage Christian parents whose children had been killed by Jews, or white parents killed by blacks, saying that this is the problem we have to solve? In a country of more than 300 million people, he'd have no trouble finding enough examples. Would anyone deny that the spectacle was a vile incitement to hatred? The message of this stunt, repeated over and over again, is simple: **Immigrants** should be hated and feared.

If you want to know what Trump really thinks, that's where to find your answer. Don't listen to the surrogates trying to convince you that, despite everything he's said, Trump has a big heart, he cares deeply about families, he wants to construct a policy that's reasonable and considered and effective. If you think that's the true Trump, you need to pay closer attention.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump made a promise to speak at an African American church in Detroit, Mich. Then he cancelled, and instead agreed to a question and answer session with the pastor, but the script for that session, stuffed with an overabundance of platitudes, got leaked. So Trump gave a speech anyway, took no questions from the audience and left before the service was over (after donning what looked to be a tallit and stiffly moving to the gospel tunes).

As The Post reported, "Trump's approach in recent weeks has been widely criticized for broadly stereotyping minorities and for suggesting that he could instantly solve generations-old problems of poverty and violence. Until Saturday, Trump had turned down repeated invitations to address African American audiences." Riding in his motorcade from behind limousine windows he might have gotten a glimpse or two of the distressed neighborhood around the church. The only visit besides the church was to Dr. Ben Carson's boyhood home.

The speech threw in one canned phrase after another. Coming from Trump they were especially laughable. "Our nation is too divided. We talk past each other, not to each other and those who seek office do not do enough to step into the community and learn what is going on. They don't know. They have no clue. I'm here today to learn." First, he's the most divisive presidential candidate since George Wallace ran in 1968. Second, he has no clue about the African American community (he declared their lives are a "disaster") and had never been to a black church. And third, he didn't stay around to learn or to take questions from the audience.

His buzzwords are empty. "I believe that we need a Civil Rights agenda for our time," he said. "One that ensures the rights to a great education — so important — and the right to live in safety and in peace and to have a really, really great job." But what does that mean and how is he going to accomplish these things? He spoke not a word about African Americans' complaints about policing.

It was a shockingly perfunctory speech, obviously designed to generate a few pictures and no more. Trump is getting virtually no support from African Americans and this pathetic effort will certainly not help matters. "I mean, I think the reality here is most African-Americans have come to know him from his attacks on the first African-American president, with his birtherism, but also his history," said Clinton supporter Neera Tanden on Fox News Sunday. "The New York Times has a long, detailed story last week about Trump Industries and a history of housing discrimination that goes back 30 years." Had Trump really wanted to make a connection he'd have apologized for Trump housing discrimination decades ago and for fanning the birther flames.

It is not likely that voters of any race or ethnicity who won't support him because they believe him to be a bigot are going to be swayed by a single photo-op. Trump's empty gestures are so few and far between and stand in contrast to decades of public rhetoric and behavior. He cannot manage to maintain a pose of tolerance for even a day. (George Will pointed out, "He goes to Mexico and says, people I have described as rapists are now exemplary Americans. And then he goes to Phoenix and he chooses to be introduced by Joe Arpaio, the sheriff of Maricopa County, who's the very face of hostility to **immigrants**.")

White voters can tell themselves whatever fables they want to justify supporting him. If they choose to vote for him, however, they will be condoning decades of misogynistic language, a year of anti-**immigrant** smears and fake facts designed to scare white voters, his birtherism (which he has never renounced) and a man who would do more to stir animosity and division among Americans than anyone ever elected to the presidency. The Republican Trumpkins who pushed him forward, the conservative media that still spin for him, the Republican National Committee who protected him from a convention revolt and the voters who pull the lever for him should not kid themselves: They own his nomination and his racism. It's not clear the GOP will ever remove that stain.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's harsh speech in Arizona last week on **immigration** convinced many in the anti-**immigrant** camp that he was committed to deporting all of those here illegally. No softening! Ann Coulter was in ecstasy. So were the anti-**immigrant** spinners who delight in peddling phony stats.

It, however, was evident Sunday that Trump was trying to have it both ways -- sound like he was reasonable ("softening") and keep on his side both the alt-right and the so-called respectable right-wing, which wants 11 million people thrown out of the country one way or another.

Trump comes to the dead end that all opponents of "amnesty" do because their stance is intellectually dishonest. On the one hand, they say no amnesty, no legalization, and everyone out. On the other, they don't have the nerve to say they are going to kick out grandmothers and little children, college students and hard-working adults who have been here most of their lives. It's one or the other, folks. Trump is trying -- as phony **immigration** hard-line critics of any attainable **immigration** reform do -- to disguise the fundamental contradiction at the heart of his election swindle. He is either going to throw out Granny or he is for some form of legalization; "amnesty," as they like to say.

Martha Raddatz plugged away trying to pin down Trump campaign chief Kellyanne Conway. Around and around they went, with Conway finally settling on this non-answer: "He will rescind all those executive amnesties and try to work with the Congress. And so at least he's trying to solve a problem. And he has said he wants to work with law enforcement and **immigration** officials to actually see what we have left after everything else is done." Raddatz later confessed, "And hard as we try, we can't get that single yes or no answer." It is at least evident to voters that these people are ducking and struggling.

New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie tried to evade a definitive answer: "Donald Trump is going to get rid of very early on, the two to three million criminals that are here illegally in this country. That will be priority number one. And once we get -- remove those two to three million from the country, return them to their countries of origin because of their criminal conduct, then I think what Donald Trump wants to do is take a deep breath, and look at where we are in the country then, and find out -- find a humane way to deal with those who remain." Former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani insisted Trump was only talking about criminal illegal **immigrants**.

Republican vice presidential nominee Mike Pence tied himself in knots trying to avoid answering Chuck Todd's questions:

CHUCK TODD: Why can't you definitively say what's going to happen to these folks? Because he used to definitively say it. He said there would be -- everybody has to leave. Even if -- quickly. Everybody has to leave. And now there's some muddiness to this. I don't know how -- it is just unclear to me. Can you clear this up?

Pence didn't answer that question or say what would become of the "dreamers." Trump's **immigration** plan consists of venomous rhetoric and smoke and mirrors. He wants to rile up his disgruntled white, less-educated audience but not offend college-educated whites and minorities who abhor the notion of forcible deportation and family break-ups. He cannot be both unhinged and reasonable, spitting venom and seeking to assuage those who refuse to demonize **immigrants**. He's trapped, so he and his spinners lie and evade hard questions.

The Clinton campaign sounded frustrated, putting out a statement that warned about wordplay. "What we saw today is Mike Pence and Trump's top campaign officials attempt to mislead voters about their mass deportation policy by using soft words to describe harsh tactics -- one of the oldest tricks in the book," said campaign manager Robby Mook in a written statement. "**Immigrant** families know the meanings of 'humane' and 'fair' and can see straight through their cynical ploys. Trump's message to **immigrant** families is clear: everyone must go."

He need not fear. Most everyone, except his core believers, has figured out his noxious game. Anti-**immigrant** Republicans are getting a good look at how their dream plan (mass deportation) plays out: It's indefensible unless you say it is just one more type of "amnesty." The price of xenophobia is that thoughtful and decent people reject you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump on Sunday evening attacked Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) on social media after the latter said he could not back the GOP presidential nominee in November — prompting an attack from the campaign of Trump's Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton.

The Republican Party needs strong and committed leaders, not weak people such as @JeffFlake, if it is going to stop illegal **immigration**.

The Great State of Arizona, where I just had a massive rally (amazing people), has a very weak and ineffective Senator, Jeff Flake. Sad!

"There's going to be no one left in Washington for Trump to work with who he hasn't insulted," the Clinton team responded via Twitter on Sunday.

Flake — who notably skipped a high-profile **immigration** speech Trump delivered in Phoenix last week — was critical of Trump during an appearance on CNN's "State of the Union" on Sunday morning. Knocking Trump's rhetoric on **immigration**, he warned members of his party that Trump could damage them in future elections.

"I would not vote for Hillary Clinton. And, as of now, I would still not vote for Donald Trump," Flake said. "I just know that I would like to vote for Donald Trump. It's not comfortable to not support your nominee. But, given the positions that he has taken and the tone and tenor of his campaign, I simply can't."

He also said that Republicans should distance themselves from Trump before the election and that Trump's tone has put Arizona in play for the Democratic Party.

"We cannot, for the future of the party, be associated with this kind of message and with this kind of tone and tenor. It's just not good for the party. It really isn't," he said.

Trump and Flake have tangled in the past, in large part because the senator has publicly withheld his endorsement. The ongoing feud between the two has highlighted Trump's struggle to unify the Republican Party behind his candidacy even as he faces a competitive general-election fight against Clinton.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump clarified his position on **immigration** in a speech Wednesday night, after weeks of public confusion about where he stands on the issue that has defined his campaign.

The Republican presidential nominee softened the tone of his campaign-trail promise to deport all 11 million **immigrants** believed to be living in the country illegally. He explained that while all undocumented **immigrants** would be subject to deportation under his plan, removing those who had committed crimes would be his administration's priority if he were elected.

"In a Trump administration, all illegal-**immigration** laws will be enforced. As with any law enforcement activity, we will set priorities," Trump said, adding, "Anyone who entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation."

What this policy would mean in practice — how many **immigrants** would be forced to leave and how quickly — is unclear. A recent analysis by the financial research firm Moody's explores the possible economic consequences depending on how aggressively Trump enforces his plan.

If Trump forced millions of undocumented **immigrants** to leave the country, according to the analysis, many Americans would be put out of work. It's counterintuitive: Trump's supporters argue that forcing undocumented workers out of the country would create more jobs for native workers. Yet Mark Zandi, the chief economist at Moody's Analytics, pointed out that the relationship between undocumented and legal workers can be more complicated.

Zandi, who has advised Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and other politicians in both parties, explains that deporting undocumented **immigrants** would increase costs for employers, because they would have to compete for the workers remaining in the United States, causing wages to rise. Already, the labor force has been shrinking as older workers retire, and the unemployment rate is under 5 percent, which suggests relatively few workers are looking for jobs.

To compensate, businesses would have to increase prices. Some firms would lose customers and could be forced out of business.

"Asking these folks to leave is going to put a hole in the economy that's going to cost jobs," Zandi said. "It's going to cost the jobs of American citizens."

Some opponents of **immigration** argue that, even if foreign labor benefits the economy overall, some workers — especially those with less skill or education — may be harmed financially.

"Most illegal **immigrants** are lower-skilled workers with less education who compete directly against vulnerable American workers," Trump said Wednesday. "They're hurting a lot of our people that cannot get jobs."

Some economists, notably George Borjas of Harvard University, agree with this view, but they constitute a minority. After extensive research, most economists say **immigration** has a minimal effect on wages for this group of workers.

Meanwhile, the increase in prices would leave consumers with less to spend on other products, potentially reducing employment in those industries as well. Undocumented **immigrants** are also consumers, and the businesses they patronize would lose customers as they left the country.

In a scenario in which a Trump administration forced all of the country's undocumented **immigrants** to leave in eight years, Moody's calculated that the unemployment rate would increase to 5.7 percent in the first year of his presidency. By 2021, prices would be 4.1 percent above what they would be otherwise.

A decade from now, gross domestic product would be reduced by 4.6 percent. Average personal income would be about $42,000 year, compared with about $44,000 without the mass exodus.

According to an estimate by The Washington Post, the categories of undocumented **immigrants** Trump identified as priorities for removal include somewhere between 5 million and 6.5 million people. In a scenario considered by Moody's in which 6 million undocumented **immigrants** depart, prices would be 2.8 percent higher after five years, and after a decade, the reduction in GDP would be about 2.9 percent. Personal income would be about $43,000, according to this projection.

Even if only 3.7 million people left the country, the changes in the labor market would still be profound, Moody's calculated. Prices would be 1.4 percent higher in five years and GDP would be 1.7 percent smaller after a decade.

"There is only one core issue in the **immigration** debate, and that issue is the well-being of the American people," Trump said Wednesday, explaining that the goal of **immigration** reform should be to "make life better for American citizens." The analysis from Moody's warns that Trump policies could prove counterproductive.

For Zandi and his colleagues, Arizona is a cautionary example. They studied what happened as the state cracked down on undocumented labor beginning in 2008, when all employers were required to verify the legal statuses of their workers.

The researchers calculated that, as of last year, the state's output was about 0.8 percent less than it would be without the restrictions.

"It's one of the reasons the financial crisis was so hard on Arizona," Zandi said.

In his speech Wednesday, Trump did not explicitly call for requiring employers to vet their employees, saying only that the electronic verification system should "be used to the fullest extent possible under existing law."

"We will work with Congress to strengthen and expand its use across the country," he said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ACTS food pantry needs volunteers to stock shelves, prepare food bags and make grocery store pickups either on a regular schedule (flexible) or on an on-call basis. To complete an online application, visit actspwc.org.

ACTS Helpline needs volunteers to answer the suicide-prevention hotline. 703-221-1144.

American Association for the Advancement of Science needs scientists, engineers, mathematicians and physicians to assist K-12 STEM teachers. Victor Crawford, 703-732-9004. vicris51@verizon.net.

American Cancer Society's Road to Recovery needs drivers to take patients to appointments. 804-527-3719. leah.seldinsommer@cancer.org.

Beacon for Adult Literacy trains people to help adults with literacy and English-speaking skills. 703-368-7491. beaconliteracy.org.

BEAT Cancer Coalition needs drivers 55 and older to take patients to appointments. Retired and Senior Volunteer program. 703-369-5292.

Birmingham Green needs volunteers who speak Vietnamese. 703-257-6252.

Boys & Girls Club of Greater Washington-Manassas needs volunteers. bgcgw.org/prince-william.

Catholic Charities Hogar **Immigrant** Services needs teachers for its English as a Second Language and citizenship classes. Training provided. 571-208-1572. volunteer.hogar@ccda.net, hogarimmigrantservices.org.

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children's Intervention Services, needs Spanish-speaking volunteers to visit children who have been abused and neglected. Ben Gimeno, 703-330-8145, bgimeno@casacis.org.

ESL and **Immigrant** Ministries trains volunteers to teach English to adults. 703-841-0292. office@eslim.org, eslim.org.

Friends of Feral Cats of PWC needs volunteers and donations of cat food. Nancy, 571-719-0657.

Guide Dog Foundation for the Blind needs volunteers to raise and train puppies. 866-282-8046. guidedog.org.

Habitat for Humanity needs help with projects, ReStore and providing lunch to volunteers. 703-369-6708. volunteer@ habitatpwc.org.

Historic Dumfries needs docents for the Weems-Botts Museum to help with events and research projects, gather and transcribe local oral histories, and other projects. 703-221-2218.

Keep Prince William Beautiful needs help with its storm-drain program and educational outreach. 571-285-3772. kpwb.org.

Literacy Volunteers of Prince William needs adults to help adult students improve their literacy skills. Training provided. 703-670-5702. lvapw.org.

Mutt Love Rescue needs foster homes for rescued dogs. 703-577-0106. adopt@muttloverescue.org, muttloverescue.org.

Northern Virginia Family Service is seeking foster parents. 571-748-2500.

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Monday-Friday. 703-792-4583.

Prince William Area Free Clinic needs volunteer doctors, pharmacists, physician assistants, nurses, translators and administrative assistants for the Unified Health Center in Woodbridge. 703-496-9403. pwafc.org .

Prince William Cooperative Extension Program needs facilitators for the Parent Education Program's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting groups. Training provided. Janice Brody, 703-792-4678. jbrody@pwcgov.org.

Prince William County Historic Preservation Division needs tour guides and assistance with special events, educational programs and gardening. 703-792-4754. historicpreservation@pwcgov.org .

Prince William Health District is seeking volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community health experience necessary. Training provided. Lesha Spencer-Brown lesha.spencer-brown@vdh.virginia.gov.

Prince William Trails and Streams Coalition needs volunteers to help build and maintain trails in the county. 703-791-6158. pwtsc.org.

Project Mend-a-House needs help for home-safety repairs. 703-792-7663. lizw@pmahweb.org.

ReSET seeks volunteers to lead elementary and preschool students in science and math learning. John Meagher, 703-250-0236. reset@resetonline.org , resetonline.org .

SERVE needs drivers for the food recovery program at the food distribution center; and a bilingual (Spanish and English) food assistance client intake specialist. Navara Cannon, 571-748-2536, ncannon@nvfs.org.

St. Paul United Methodist Church needs bus drivers Thursdays to take people to and from a community dinner. Drivers must have a class C license with P endorsement. 703-494-2445.

Occoquan needs volunteers for events throughout the year, including the annual Arts and Crafts Shows. Donna Brown, 703-491-2168. dbrown@occoquanva.gov.

Wildlife Rescue League needs hotline volunteers, wildlife transporters and rehabilitators. Training provided. 703-391-8625. volcoord@wildliferescueleague.org.

— Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One of Donald Trump's Twitter targets over the holiday weekend: the GOP senator of a presidential battleground he visited just last week.

The Republican Party needs strong and committed leaders, not weak people such as @JeffFlake, if it is going to stop illegal **immigration**.

The Great State of Arizona, where I just had a massive rally (amazing people), has a very weak and ineffective Senator, Jeff Flake. Sad!

So he's not a fan.

The feeling is mutual. "I've said that I think Republicans do need to distance themselves from Donald Trump," Flake (R-Ariz.) told CNN's Jake Tapper earlier Sunday. Trump's rhetoric had put his traditionally red state in play, said Flake — and potentially delivered it to Hillary Clinton — by alienating voters who would otherwise support the GOP nominee. Voters like himself.

"...As of now, I would still not vote for Donald Trump," the Arizona senator told Tapper, adding that "you can always write somebody in."

"I would like to vote for Donald Trump. It's not comfortable to not support your nominee," he said. "But given the positions that he has taken and the tone and tenor of his campaign, I simply can't."

The bad blood didn't start this weekend, of course; there's history there. Recently, we took a look at Flake's conspicuous — and unapologetic — lack of enthusiasm for his party's standard-bearer, and why he's comfortable keeping his distance.

Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) is quickly becoming the Republican Party's anti-Trump standard bearer, mostly because he can.

His home state politics, the fact that his election is two years away and even his religion make Flake the perfect Senate Republican to call out Donald Trump — and, possibly, get away with it.

Flake, unlike fellow GOP Trump critics Sens. Ben Sasse of Nebraska and Susan Collins of Maine, hasn't officially said he won't vote for Trump this election cycle. But Flake goes out of his way to dis Trump, writes my colleague, Paul Kane.

Here's a snippet from Kane's great new story out of Arizona:

Even when no one asks him about Donald Trump, Sen. Jeff Flake makes sure the audience knows how much he despises the Republican presidential nominee.

This isn't the first time Flake has stood up to Trump and let the media know about it. Earlier in the summer, he introduced himself in a closed-door Capitol Hill meeting with Trump as "the other senator from Arizona — the one who didn't get captured." Then he confirmed the comment publicly.

Flake says the Post's account of his exchange with Trump was reported "verbatim"

Flake's vocal anti-Trump strategy is not without risk. Kane reports that arch-conservatives in Arizona are already threatening to finding a primary challenger to punish Flake. But the senator seems to be betting he can speak his mind on Trump and not hurt his political future. Here's why:

1. He's not up for reelection this year: Despite having pretty much every reason to un-endorse Trump, Flake's partner in the Senate, John McCain (R-Ariz.), has stuck by the nominee. There are a few reasons for that, theorized my colleague Aaron Blake recently, but most pressingly is probably the primary McCain has on Tuesday. His challenger, state Sen. Kelli Ward, is a Trump supporter, and Trump won the state's presidential primary in March by almost 20 points.

Flake doesn't have those problems — at least not yet. He's up for reelection in 2018. Even if Trump ends up winning in November and Arizona voters love their new president, voters have pretty short memories.

2. Arizona's a changing state: Even though it has voted for the Democratic presidential candidate only once in the past 60 years, Arizona has all the signs of a rising swing state, thanks to (a) shifting demographics and (b) Trump.

First, demographics: As in much of the West, Arizona's Hispanic population is booming. Hispanics make up some 26 percent of the state's eligible voting population, way above the U.S. average. And the state's Hispanic voters overwhelmingly voted Democratic — just 26 percent voted for Flake in 2012, while 72 percent voted for his Democratic challenger. Flake's reelection ended up being one of the closest Senate races in the country.

From 2008 to 2012, the Hispanic share of the electorate increased from 12 percent to 17 percent, while the white share of the electorate decreased 78 percent to 72 percent.

When you fold in other Democratic-leaning voters — unmarried women, African Americans and millennials — that's 60 percent of the state's eligible voting population.

The challenge for Democrats, as always, is how to get these people to actually vote, since they tend to show up to the polls in much lower ratios than Arizona's older, whiter population. But the long-term trend is clear: The Hispanic share of the vote in Arizona is growing, while the white share is dropping

Next, Trump: If there was ever a year for Democrats to motivate Arizona Hispanics to become active voters, this might be it. Something like 8 in 10 Hispanics dislike Trump, which could be one reason Trump is leading Clinton in a new CNN/ORC poll in the state by just five points even though Mitt Romney won Arizona in 2012 by 10 points.

Clinton, sensing an opening, is starting to invest in a get-out-the-vote team in Arizona. It's just one of several red states that could be in play in 2016.

Flake seems to be calculating that it's a matter of when, not if, Arizona becomes bluer, and is positioning himself in a way to take advantage of it. (That helps explain why Flake has supported bipartisan **immigration** reform, too.)

3. His religion: Flake is a Mormon. And Mormons, speaking generally, don't tend to be terribly fond of Trump.

The Pew Research Center found Mormons are the most reliable Republican voting bloc in the country. And yet, "many Mormons see frightening parallels between Trump's attacks on Muslims today and their own fraught history," writes Dan Cox with the Public Religion Research Institute.

That was a bigger problem for Trump in Utah, where he got walloped in the state's GOP caucus, losing to Ted Cruz by 55 (!) points. And Utah is now on our list of 2016 battleground states thanks in part to Mormon opposition to Trump.

In Arizona, Mormons make up just 6 percent of the state's population (compared with 60 percent in Utah). Flake is part of that 6 percent. And he's not a Trump fan.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ONE POPULAR view of this unedifying election cycle is that it's an instance of working people — oppressed, underemployed, underpaid — rising up against the Establishment, whatever that might be. Polling shows that supporters of the insurgent leader in this drama, Donald Trump, are not in fact an impoverished peasantry in revolt — their household income is above the national average. Still, those who labor for a living do have reason to worry about the future. That's why they deserve a presidential contest in which the candidates deal seriously with the problems that face them, in this country and elsewhere.

A century after it began its rise to power and comparative prosperity, aided by a burgeoning union movement and a raft of progressive legislation, American labor is in many ways confounded. Unions are diminished, and the social pact by which large corporations provided good wages and benefits in return for loyal and reliable service has been eroded by technological change and international competition on an unprecedented scale. A website called Global Labor Strategies states it thus: "Today's trade unions are a product of a particular historical period when markets and the nation state [were] inextricably bound together. Now globalized capital easily outflanks national labor movements."

A hundred years ago, American workers faced some of these same anxieties. Assembly line production revolutionized manufacturing and brought prosperity to many. (All of those automobiles from Henry Ford's plants now were within reach of the workers.) But it also brought great discontent and disruption among huge numbers of people engaged in the production of goods and services that were becoming obsolete — as well as among craftsmen compelled to abandon well-honed skills for the repetitive work of the factory floor. The changes were accompanied by widespread social conflict, including numerous acts of terrorism. Meanwhile, waves of **immigrants**, who contributed much to the country's industrialization, were seen as a threat by native workers, a situation that finally led to a major reduction in **immigration** in the mid-1920s. Then followed the Depression and a world-altering war and the new economic order that is today undergoing rapid and unpredictable change.

How the United States deals with complex challenges of productivity, technology and globalization is a central question of 2016. No one has all the answers to the problems brought by rapid change, any more than they did in 1916 (though some loudly claim to). It's likely that whatever strategies are discussed for improving the situation of American workers won't be simple, and they're likely to cause as much disruption to existing institutions and arrangements as Mr. Ford's innovations once did. Surely, though, the candidates ought to be talking more about such things as coordinating better with business and industry to produce much-needed skills in the workforce, about reforms in education, about aid to workers displaced by trade, about new arrangements among labor, capital and government.

Right now, both candidates simplistically signal a retreat from free trade, as if that would make the problems with globalization go away. Mr. Trump blames foreigners and **immigrants** for the United States' ills, offers a vision of a fiscal magical kingdom where everyone gets everything they want, and insults, in the most vile terms, any who oppose him. Hillary Clinton offers a far more civilized vision for the country, but one that promises many things to many interests and seems to offer little in the way of new thinking. Workers — all Americans — deserve a more productive debate.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**You would have thought that Labor Day 2016 would bring us a serious conversation about lifting the incomes of American workers and expanding their opportunities for advancement.

After all, we have spent the year talking incessantly about alienated blue-collar voters and a new populism rooted in the disaffection of those hammered by economic change.

But this is not the discussion we are having. Instead, we are enduring an attack-fest between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Their strategies are entirely rational. Voters are understandably skeptical about politicians getting anything done, and both candidates know they have a better chance of encouraging negative votes than securing a positive mandate.

I'm sorry to say the media make things worse by preferring spectacle and confrontation to digging deeply into whether this plan to promote manufacturing or that idea for raising incomes will actually work. Clinton gave a very serious speech about mental-health policy last week, but the coverage flowed to whether Trump was "softening" or "hardening" on **immigration**.

The truth is that Clinton has offered many more serious policy proposals for raising workers' incomes than Trump has. Her website is full of ideas on expanding profit-sharing, a "Make it in America" initiative to promote manufacturing, and plans on family leave, child care, cutting student debt and much more.

One of the banes of this campaign is the media's temptation toward false balance: If a reporter says that Trump is not offering a lot of plans, he or she feels obligated to say either that Clinton is short on specifics, too, or that she may have a lot of plans but is not packaging them very well. But if the media don't want to cover them, all the bright bunting in the world won't matter.

In the meantime, Trump has effectively reduced his campaign to **immigration** and trade (plus "law and order"). He's arguing that the problems faced by U.S. workers will be magically solved if we throw millions of **immigrants** out of the country and if he gets a chance to negotiate much tougher trade deals.

It would be good to have a sane, fact-based debate about how **immigration** and trade affect incomes and job opportunities. But Trump's vicious tone toward **immigrants** and his breathtaking lack of specificity about trade show that he's more interested in exploiting these issues than thinking about them.

In the meantime, voices outside the campaign are trying to interject practical ideas that might help Americans whose incomes are lagging. The Opportunity Nation campaign will release a middle-of-the-road plan at the end of this week. Its main architects, Republican John Bridgeland and Democrat Bruce Reed, draw on ideas that have won support from both parties on expanding early-childhood programs, increasing high school graduation rates, creating much broader opportunities for national service, and finding new ways to connect the 5.5 million Americans ages 16 to 24 who are disengaged from both school and work.

That there is nothing radical in the plan may be a virtue given how hard it will be to get anything through Congress if the voters again produce divided government.

Well worth more attention is the "10-20-30" initiative from Rep. James E. Clyburn (D-S.C.). He would mandate that at least 10 percent of spending on federal programs go to counties where at least 20 percent of the population has lived below the poverty line for 30 years or more. Clinton has endorsed it, and House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) has spoken favorably about it.

When it comes to both politics and our nation's divisions around race, the plan has important virtues. The 488 counties include many that are predominantly white, as well as many that are predominantly African American, Latino or Native American. Clyburn notes that the vast majority of counties that would benefit are represented by Republicans in Congress.

It's also a brute fact that workers' wages have declined or stagnated because the bargaining power of employees has been drastically undercut. A just-released study by the Economic Policy Institute showed that the weekly wages of non-union men without college degrees employed in the private sector would have been 8 percent higher in 2013 if union density had remained at 1979 levels.

And if older union models are out of date in some sectors, we need new ones such as those proposed by Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) to strengthen the rights of Americans who work in the gig economy.

This was supposed to be the election in which the interests of the non-elite finally got a hearing. We still have two months to make it happen.

ejdionne@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Regarding the Sept. 1 front-page article "Trump meets Mexico leader":

With his trip to Mexico, Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, probably unwittingly, came closest to the core reason behind illegal **immigration**. For 100 years, the United States has been a dominant figure in the governance and way of life of Mexico and Central America. The United States has trained police and military, provided endless weapons and military materiel, thrown out democratically elected leadership, supported dictatorships and provided everything necessary to sustain a status quo that provides little in the way of opportunity, justice, fairness or any of the freedoms we like to believe we support.

People are leaving their countries, churches, families and towns, risking life, arrest and all levels of danger all because of the inability of their governments to provide the basic needs everyone craves. These "illegal **immigrants**" are in a life-and-death struggle. Securing our border will not be determined by the size of "the wall," but by what happens when we use our foreign aid and considerable influence to change the horrible inequities of these countries. We have to stop supporting corrupt governments and instead support significant changes to their long-standing ways of operation.

John Creasy, Arnold

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Several of Donald Trump's top campaign advisers and allies on Sunday struggled to explain the GOP presidential nominee's stance on mass deportation — insisting that he will prioritize undocumented criminals for deportation, but falling short on other details and playing down the scale of his deportation priorities by millions of people.

"After the two to three million get put out of the country because they're committing crimes, hurting Americans, selling drugs, doing things that are illegal, once those people are dealt with first — and I think everyone agrees on that issue — then we can deal with the remaining eight million people," New Jersey Gov. Christie Christie said on CBS News' "Face the Nation."

The number Christie cited both undersold the scale of Trump's plan and overstated the estimated number of undocumented **immigrants** who have committed crimes.

Trump laid out his priorities during a high-profile **immigration** policy address on Wednesday in Phoenix, saying he would target for immediate deportation undocumented **immigrants** who had committed crimes and those who overstayed their visas.

Those priorities suggest a dramatic escalation of deportations from current levels: an estimated 690,000 people who have committed crimes, plus an estimated 4.5 million individuals who have overstayed their visas. In all, based on various estimates, Trump's deportation priorities would target 5 million to 6.5 million individuals — or about half of the total 11 million undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States.

Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway, when asked about the plan for undocumented **immigrants** who are not immediate deportation priorities, said the solution will have to be discussed at a later date.

"Once you enforce the law, once you get rid of the criminals, once you triple the number of ICE [**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement] agents, once you secure the Southern border, once you turn off the jobs...and benefits magnet, then we'll see where we are," she said Sunday morning on ABC's "This Week." "And we don't know where we'll be. We don't know who will be left. We don't know where they live, who they are. That's the whole point here, that we've actually never tried this."

Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, Trump's running mate, when asked directly about the other undocumented **immigrants**, provided no additional details during a pre-recorded interview with NBC's "Meet the Press."

"I think Donald Trump's been completely consistent and I think he did answer," Pence said.

Former New York City mayor Rudy Giuliani took it a step further, stating that Trump's plan leaves "a very big opening" for dealing with the fate of the millions of non-prioritized undocumented **immigrants**. He also stressed that he does not believe Trump would want to break up families with undocumented **immigrants**.

That stands in contrast to Trump's assertion that all **immigrants** living in the United States illegally must go back to their home countries.

"[I]f you read that speech carefully, that speech is consistent with what he said in the past, and it leaves a very big opening for what will happen with the people that remain here in the United States after the criminals are removed and after the border is secure," Giuliani said. "Donald Trump, as he expressed in one of his interviews recently, would find it very, very difficult to throw out a family that's been here for 15 years, and they have three children, two of whom are citizens. And that is not the kind of America he wants."

Asked specifically whether Trump will kick out undocumented **immigrants** who were brought to the United States as children, known as "Dreamers," Giuliani said it would depend on the person.

"I would say that would be one of the things that would be pretty clear. There are other options, too. I mean, it's going to depend on the person," Giuliani said. "And maybe some of them have to be thrown out, but not necessarily all of them."

Hillary Clinton's campaign seized on the advisers' television appearances on Sunday morning to accuse Trump of intentionally misleading voters about his **immigration** plan.

"What we saw today is Mike Pence and Trump's top campaign officials attempt to mislead voters about their mass deportation policy by using soft words to describe harsh tactics — one of the oldest tricks in the book," Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook said in a statement.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**First he was a cross-wearing Christian. Then he billed himself as an Italian from New Jersey with slicked-back hair and a fondness for "The Godfather." After that, he tried to pass himself off as a Mexican who drank Corona and cooked carne asada.

But it was Joseph Farrokh's last transformation — into a radical Muslim with plans to join the Islamic State — that has landed him in prison for the next 8 1/2 years. He was among seven young men from Northern Virginia prosecuted on similar charges this year alone, raising concerns about both a potential rise in radicalization and a policing approach that relies heavily on undercover agents or informants posing as radicals.

Another, Mahmoud Elhassan, a student and licensed cabdriver, is accused of pushing Farrokh toward terror. Haris Qamar was a gamer with aspirations in banking when he was accused of helping to make a propaganda video urging attacks on the U.S. Capitol. Mohamed Jalloh had been a Virginia National Guardsman before he allegedly bought a gun in preparation for a Fort Hood-style massacre. Others charged were a police officer, a man who studied justice administration and a pot-smoking drifter.

Together, their cases are a stark example of the challenges law enforcement officials face in uncovering those sympathetic to a terrorist group skilled at reaching out online to attract supporters — some of whom may seem unlikely converts — then sorting out which of those people are actually a danger.

"ISIS has done a good job projecting that they are not just about violence," said John Horgan, an expert in terrorism research at Georgia State University. "They know that they're going to appeal to the young person who's just pissed off and has had a bad deal. But they also want the dreamer, the North American converts who are virtually clueless about Islam but are beguiled by this fantasy that they've bought into."

Several of the young men arrested in Virginia have been described in court as struggling to find work or finish school. Farrokh, who discussed traveling to Syria to fight for the Islamic State, ultimately wrote to a judge that he was attracted to the terrorist group because its propaganda gave him a "sense of belonging."

None of the arrestees in Virginia was caught planning a definitive violent attack, according to court records. But experts say there is no real way to know who will act and who will merely posture as a radical.

Most grew up in Washington's Virginia suburbs, with families and friends who now express despair and bafflement. A least four of the defendants went to Northern Virginia Community College, according to online records. All but one are **immigrants** or the children of **immigrants**.

"Not a day goes by that I don't think about my brother and wonder how everything got to this point, how my sweet, adorable and loving baby brother could have become so lost and confused," Farrokh's sister Jaleh Skeath wrote in a letter to the court.

Friends also were shocked to see the funny, helpful Qamar described as an obsessive Twitter promoter of the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL, who said slaughter made him "giddy." Qamar's parents had confiscated his passport, according to court documents, and hoped that his finding a steady job and a wife would end his infatuation with the Islamic State.

"I was blown away," said Christopher Sutton, who worked at a cafe where Qamar used to play computer games. "He was a good guy; just your average guy that worked at the bank and played PC games in his free time."

The FBI and the Department of Justice say that there is no new focus on or rise in terrorism-related activity in Northern Virginia, merely a dovetailing of several investigations.

"I don't think Northern Virginia is unique. This is happening around the country," said Andrew Ames, spokesman for the FBI's Washington Field Office.

He noted that some investigations, such as the probe into Metro transit officer Nicholas Young, go back years. Young, who worked as a police officer in the D.C.-area transit system for six years, allegedly bought phone cards for use in Islamic State communications. Other cases came together in a matter of months.

Officials do say the area's large Muslim community, the proximity to the nation's capital and an aggressive U.S. attorney's office help explain to the high number of cases. A Syracuse University study recently found that 1 in 5 terrorism prosecutions over the past two decades took place in Northern Virginia. One in 10 Islamic State-related cases originated in the state; close to a third of Islamic State cases this year were brought in Virginia.

"Sometimes we feel like they are trying to justify their employment," Ehsan Islam, president of Manassas's Muslim Association of Virginia said of the numerous FBI operations. "It goes on both sides though. . . . In a way, maybe it is good that they're a little aggressive, [for] prevention."

Rizwan Jaka, chairman of the board at the Muslim ADAMS Center in Dulles, Va., said that while he understands concerns about informants monitoring whole communities of Muslims, "there is no excuse for criminal behavior."

"Everyone is trying to be more preventative, especially after the horrific attack in Orlando," Jaka said. "It's the reality of law enforcement being vigilant and the community being vigilant."

When a suspect partners with someone in a criminal plot, he said, "if it's an informant or an actual extremist, it doesn't matter," he said. "The person arrested thought it was a violent extremist."

At his Dar Al-Noor mosque in Prince William County, Islam said, leaders regularly tell members to "get involved with your kids, know what they're doing, be involved with their Internet activities." **Immigrant** parents, he said, often do not communicate openly with their children or understand what they're doing online.

The mosque is also trying to start more activities, such as soccer and weekly discussion groups, for young people who may have too much time on their hands.

Yusuf Wehelie was a drifter, his attorney says, when authorities say he talked about attacking a military installation. Mohamed Khweis, a graduate in justice administration with a taste for designer shoes, said he followed a girl to Syria before surrendering to Kurdish forces in Iraq.

Of the seven Virginia defendants, only Farrokh has pleaded guilty. The other cases are pending.

Farrokh's parents were initially pleased to see him become religious. Ever since his family's move to California when he was in middle school, he had clashed with his family and acted out. They suspected what he had hidden from them for years — an addiction to prescription opiates.

While they were surprised by his sudden marriage last year to a co-worker he met at a local mall, they were pleased to see him sober and committed to a new job as a nurse's aide. His lectures on Islam, delivered to a Christian mother and a moderate Shiite Muslim father, they took as merely the zeal of a recent convert.

Farrokh, meanwhile, felt he finally belonged. He had found a cause worth believing in and even dying for: the fight against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

Muslim legal advocates say that while FBI tactics probably do not rise to the level of legal entrapment, the use of undercover operatives or informants in six of the seven cases is concerning.

"It does seem problematic that you have seven out of one district," said Abed Ayoub, legal and policy director at the Washington-based American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. In area mosques, he said, "there is a concern that these tactics are focusing in on folks they know may have mental-health issues, may have trouble at home or coming from a certain socioeconomic background, and they take these kids and try to push them to do something."

Advocates also argue that a prosecution-only model alienates those whose help authorities need most. And it leaves no option in situations where the FBI is unable to make a case — as happened with Orlando shooter Omar Mateen, who had been under investigation for 10 months.

"The belief in the Muslim community at large is that they're overwhelmed with spies," said Charles Swift of the Constitutional Law Center for Muslims in America. "What you've accomplished is fear and loathing on both sides."

Although law enforcement authorities have no clear alternative, former officers say they would often interview a suspect before an arrest in hopes of warning him or her away from criminal behavior.

"The FBI doesn't have a lot of tools available . . . that allow [an] intermediate step," said Don Borelli, a former FBI agent who led the Joint Terrorism Task Force in New York. "The FBI is not meant to be a social service organization. But maybe there is some kind of an outlet program that would allow some branch of government to intercede."

In Montgomery County, Md., a nonprofit organization called the World Organization for Resource Development and Education has developed a community-led anti-extremism model.A federal court inMinneapolis is experimenting with a post-prosecution de-radicalization program as an alternative to prison.

Farrokh's attorney, Joseph Flood, petitioned for the de-radicalization expert who consulted in Minneapolis to help prepare an intervention plan for his client.

"There are no services available in the [Bureau of Prisons] designed to de-radicalize even the most willing participants," Flood wrote.

The request was denied.

Farrokh, meanwhile, appears to have turned away from the terrorist group he once planned to join. He listened to the news of the Orlando massacre from jail, on a hand-held radio. In a letter to a federal judge, he said he wondered "what kind of sick person could do such a thing."

"I am disgusted by it," he wrote, "but I am also disgusted by myself."

rachel.weiner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Federal prosecutors in Virginia allege that these seven men have aided the Islamic State. Here are brief descriptions of each case.

Joseph Hassan Farrokh

Woodbridge, Va.

Farrokh, 29, was born in Pennsylvania but moved to California when he was in middle school. Raised by a Christian mother and an Iranian-**immigrant** Muslim father who were often at odds, he struggled to fit in. He followed his father to Northern Virginia in 2012 to try to kick an opiate addiction, and finding Islam helped him do so. In 2015 he met Mahmoud Elhassan, who authorities said encouraged him to become more radical, and he began watching propaganda videos. In January, he attempted to travel to Syria to engage in jihad and was arrested at the Richmond airport.

Farrokh in March pleaded guilty in pleaded guilty to conspiracy to provide material support to the terrorist organization.

Mahmoud Elhassan

Woodbridge, Va.

Elhassan, 26, was born in Sudan and became a legal U.S. resident in 2012. According to his brother, he was a Northern Virginia community college student and a cabdriver. He is accused of planning with Farrokh to join the Islamic State abroad and driving his co-defendant to the airport. Farrokh has said that Elhassan knew the Koran well, spoke Arabic and shared with him outrage over the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

Mohamad Jamal Khweis

Alexandria, Va.

Khweis, 26, was unknown to law enforcement until he was picked up by Kurdish forces in Iraq in March. According to court documents, the son of Palestinian **immigrants** began researching the Islamic State in 2015. He traveled to Turkey in December and found his way to Islamic State territory, he has said. He ended up in Mosul, Iraq, undergoing religious and military training. But he "found it hard" to live there, he told Kurdish television, and soon escaped into Kurdish territory.

Mohamed Bailor Jalloh

Sterling, Va.

Jalloh, 26, a U.S. citizen and native of Sierra Leone, was allegedly inspired to quit the Army National Guard last year after listening to the sermons of deceased radical Muslim cleric Anwar al-Awlaki. In March, he was introduced to an FBI informant, according to court documents, and began discussing a possible domestic terrorist attack. He was arrested in July after buying an assault rifle.

Yusuf Wehelie

Fairfax, Va.

Wehelie, the 25-year-old son of Somali **immigrants**, was detained in Egpyt six years ago with his brother after a trip to Yemen. He was arrested in July on a charge of possessing a weapon as a felon, after allegedly making comments about his desire to join the Islamic State or commit a domestic terrorist attack to undercover agents.

Haris Qamar

Burke, Va.

Qamar, a 25-year-old born in Brooklyn, allegedly tried to join the Islamic State in 2014 but was stopped because his parents took his passport. According to court documents, Qamar came to the attention of the FBI because of his enthusiastic Twitter promotion of the Islamic State. He was befriended by an FBIinformant, who he allegedly told of his desire to kill enemies of the Islamic State here or abroad. At the informant's suggestion, according to authorities, Qamar took footage for a video encouraging attacks on D.C.-area landmarks.

Nicholas Young

Fairfax, Va.

Young, 36, a convert to Islam who grew up in Northern Virginia, has been watched by the FBI for the past seven years after concerns were raised by his co-workers in the D.C. Metro police. Young had been in and out of touch with undercover informants and agents, according to court documents, and was arrested in August after buying gift cards he thought would be used for mobile messages in support of the Islamic State.

rachel.weiner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Georgetown political philosopher Jason Brennan's important new book Against Democracy challenges a basic precept that most people take for granted: the morality of democracy. Dominant conventional wisdom on both right and left holds that all, or nearly all, adults should have a right to vote, and that the electorate has a right to rule. Brennan contends otherwise.

I. Hobbits, Hooligans, and Vulcans.

Brennan begins his analysis by showing that most citizens do a very poor job of considering political issues. He divides citizens into three categories, which he creatively labels hobbits, hooligans, and vulcans. Hobbits have little or no interest in politics, and have very low levels of political knowledge. Hooliganstend to know more than hobbits do. But they are highly biased in their evaluation of information, tending to dismiss opposing arguments out of hand. They also lack any kind of social scientific sophistication. Vulcans, by contrast, combine extensive knowledge and analytical sophistication with open-mindedness. They also don't let emotion and bias cloud their judgment. But very few of us even come close to being Vulcans.

Sadly, the vast majority of voters are some combination of hobbit and hooligan. They often lack even basic political knowledge; and what they do know, they analyze in a highly biased way. Instead of acting as truth-seekers, they function as "political fans" cheering on Team Red or Team Blue. The root of the problem is rational ignorance: because there is so little chance that an individual vote will make a difference, voters have little incentive to either acquire relevant knowledge or keep their biases under control. Voters' ignorance and bias leave them easy pray for unscrupulous politicians, ideologues, and interest groups -- rarely more so than during the current election.

Much of this part of Brennan's book simply builds on the conventional wisdom of public opinion experts across the political spectrum. But most of of us still believe that the voters have a right to rule, no matter how ignorant and biased they might be. As political scientists Christopher Achen and Larry Bartels put it in another important new book on political ignorance, "the ideal of popular sovereignty plays the same role in contemporary democratic ideology that the divine right of kings played in the monarchical era." Much like the kings and emperors of an earlier age, the people are seen as having an inherent right to wield political power, whether or not they do it well. Unlike Achen and Bartels, Brennan is willing to knock our multiheaded king off his pedestal.

In most situations, he points out, we readily assume that people should not be allowed to make important decisions for others unless they have at least a reasonable degree of competence to do so. Brennan calls this idea the "Competence Principle." We don't allow quacks to make medical decisions, for example. This is especially true when the medical decisions in question are extremely important, and the "patients" have no choice but to obey the doctor's orders.

Voting, of course, often literally involves matters of life and death, and the politicians who get elected rule over the entire society, including those who voted against them, or chose to abstain. Ignorant or illogical decisions by voters can easily lead to ill-advised wars, economic recessions, abusive law enforcement, environmental disasters, and other catastrophes that imperil the lives, freedom, and welfare of large numbers of people. If we refuse to tolerate ignorant medical practice or ignorant plumbing, we should take an equally dim view of ignorant voting.

Brennan does not argue that knowledgeable "vulcans" are morally superior to others and have some sort of right to rule. He merely claims that the hobbits and hooligans do not have such a right. Like John Stuart Mill, he contends that voting is not merely an individual choice, but the exercise of "power over others." Such power must be used responsibly, if at all.

II. The Epistocratic Alternative.

Even if democracy is flawed, many would argue -- following Churchill -- that it is the worst form of government, except for all the others. As Brennan recognizes, mounds of evidence show that democracy generally performs better than dictatorship or oligarchy. But he argues that these are not the only possible alternatives to democracy. There is also "epistocracy" -- the "rule of the knowers."

The electorate might make better decisions if it were restricted to make it more knowledgeable and less biased. For most people, ideas like epistocracy sound like advocacy of government by a small elite, which could easily abuse its powers. But Brennan presents a variety of strategies by which the quality of the electorate could be improved, while still keeping it large, and demographically representative. For example, the franchise could be limited to those who can pass a basic test of political knowledge. Those with greater knowledge could instead be given extra votes (as first advocated by John Stuart Mill in the nineteenth century). If the resulting more knowledgeable electorate is unrepresentative (e.g. -- on the basis of race, sex, age, or wealth), the votes of knowledgeable members of these "underrepresented" groups could be given greater weight. Alternatively, we could potentially make the electorate both more knowledgeable and more representative than it is now, by using an "enfranchisement lottery."

Such ideas may seem very radical. In some ways they are. But in many respects they are just modest extensions of the status quo. We already exclude over 20% of our population from the franchise because we think they are ignorant and have poor judgment. We call those people "children," and we feel no guilt over systematically excluding them from political power. It strikes most of us as just simple common sense. The idea of letting some of them vote if they can prove they are more knowledgeable than the average adult is considered radical and dangerous. We don't let legal **immigrants** get the vote unless they can pass a civics test that most native-born Americans would likely fail. Many states also exclude convicted felons and many of the mentally ill from the franchise.

If it is perfectly fine to categorically exclude all 17 year olds from the franchise, why not a 19 year old or a 40 year old, whose understanding of the issues is as bad or worse than that of the average child? If we can exclude ignorant **immigrants**, why not ignorant natives? Under current US law, there is virtually nothing a person under 18 can do to get the vote. By contrast adults (and perhaps even children) denied the franchise under epistocracy could potentially remedy their situation simply by studying for and passing a test.

These and other similar questions posed by Brennan's book should, at the very least, make us uncomfortable. Even if -- like me -- you are skeptical of Brennan's proposals for epistocracy, he makes a strong case that the current electorate's right to rule is not nearly as defensible as we might want to assume. It has in common with the divine right of kings than we like to think.

Ultimately, however, while I agree with most of Brennan's diagnosis of the problem, I am skeptical of his proposed solutions. As he recognizes, there is a substantial likelihood that real-world governments cannot be trusted to implement epistocracy in any kind of unbiased way. Instead of limiting the franchise to to the knowledgeable, they are likely to structure tests, lotteries, or other similar mechanisms, in ways that overrepresent supporters of the party in power and exclude opponents. Such mechanisms also have a variety of other practical flaws.

Even if epistocratic selection mechanisms work better than I expect them to, the resulting more competent electorate might still lack the knowledge needed to effectively monitor more than a small fraction of the activities of the large and enormously complicated modern state. That herculean task may exceed the competence of even Vulcans. Ironically, the main flaw of epistocracy may be that we don't have the knowledge to make it work.

At least for the time being, we are more likely to mitigate the harm caused by political ignorance by limiting and decentralizing the power of government, rather than by trying to transfer it to more knowledgeable hands. But even if full-blown epistocracy is impractical, modest movement in that direction may potentially be feasible. Brennan himself suggests trying out some of his proposed reforms on a small scale, perhaps at the state or local level -- preferable in jurisdictions with low levels of corruption and no history of racial and ethnic discrimination in voting rules. At the very least, Brennan's Competence Principle is a powerful challenge to the conventional wisdom about democracy. And his analysis of epistocratic alternatives to democracy is worth serious consideration -- even if most of these ideas are nowhere near ready for large-scale implementation.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's **immigration** position is, at its heart, fairly simple. People in the country illegally will be subject to deportation if he is elected president, as he said in his speech this week in Arizona. Even those who hadn't crossed the border illegally but who had been admitted on a visa and then didn't leave are "a big problem" in Trump's estimation.

"**Immigration** law doesn't exist for the purpose of keeping criminals out," he said. "It exists to protect all aspects of American life — the work site, the welfare office, the education system and everything else."

That speech came more than three weeks after Trump's campaign promised to answer questions about a more personal component of the **immigration** issue. In early August, Trump pledged that his wife, Melania, a native of Slovenia, would hold a news conference explaining how she managed to navigate the onerous process of getting a green card. He made the pledge after a number of outlets raised questions about the timeline of her entry into the country.

Remember when the New York Post ran a front-page story showing nude photos of Melania Trump? (Yes, you do.) Politico realized that the date of that shoot, 1995, put her in the United States before 1996, the year she has said she arrived on a visa. After that story came out, Melania Trump tweeted a broad defense of her arrival.

pic.twitter.com/U3VTY05mzc

The promised news conference, though, hasn't yet happened.

Curious about the extent to which marrying an American citizen washed away any previous **immigration** problems, I reached out to David Leopold, an **immigration** attorney from Cleveland and former president of the American **Immigration** Lawyers Association. He explained that the popular understanding of how **immigration** is linked to marriage is wrong — but also noted a number of other questions worth asking about Melania Trump's arrival in the United States.

To the marriage question first. The understanding in popular culture that marrying a U.S. citizen automatically grants citizen status is incorrect. "The act of marrying a legal permanent resident of the United States doesn't in and of itself do anything," Leopold said.

There are three main ways in which someone can get a green card: through an employer, through an immediate relative or through the green-card lottery. What's an immediate relative? A son or daughter — or a spouse, for example. Essentially, then, a potential **immigrant** goes from having no immediate relative (and having to hope to win the green-card lottery) to suddenly having one — and for that group, there is no quota on how many green cards can be issued. A green card isn't guaranteed to the new spouse, but it makes them eligible to begin the process.

It isn't guaranteed, in part, because there are restrictions on who can receive a green card. It is not the case, for example, that an **immigrant** who enters the country by illegally crossing the Southern border can simply marry an American citizen and be granted a green card.

"If I marry somebody who is undocumented, the only way at this point she is going to get a green card is if she lawfully entered the United States originally," Leopold said. "If the person entered the country without inspection — I married a woman who crossed the border or entered through fraud or something like that — then she is ineligible to get a green card in the United States." There are exceptions that apply, but this is a critical point: If someone committed fraud or entered the country illegally, they cannot get a green card unless they receive a waiver for doing so.

This is important to the question of Melania Trump.

Here's how she explained getting her citizenship, to Harper's Bazaar:

I came here for my career, and I did so well, I moved here. It never crossed my mind to stay here without papers. That is just the person you are. You follow the rules. You follow the law. Every few months you need to fly back to Europe and stamp your visa. After a few visas, I applied for a green card and got it in 2001. After the green card, I applied for citizenship. And it was a long process.

According to Leopold, the need to have to travel back to her home country wouldn't accompany a visa linked to employment, in his experience.

"The only time I've seen that — and I've been doing this a long time, and I've compared notes with other **immigration** lawyers — that the coming in and going out, to anybody who's been around this stuff, suggests that she was on a visitor visa, which doesn't permit work," he said. If Melania Trump came in on a visitor visa and began working over a short period of time, the government would assume that she entered the country fraudulently. If she told a customs official she was entering the United States as a visitor but was planning to work, that's a material misrepresentation.

To get a work-related **immigrant** visa, Leopold added, Trump's prospective employer would have had to prove that Trump filled a job duty that no American could fill — to show, in other words, that no other model in New York City would have done that shoot. Unless, of course, she had special skills — or a special degree.

You may remember that shortly before questions about Trump's status arose, she suddenly took down her personal website. That change followed revelations that Trump claimed to have a degree that biographers from Slovenia discovered she didn't.

"At the age of eighteen, she signed with a modeling agency in Milan. After obtaining a degree in design and architecture at University in Slovenia, Melania was jetting between photo shoots in Paris and Milan, finally settling in New York in 1996," the site read. The part about the degrees, it seems, was not true, as our fact checkers noted.

We don't know why Melania Trump claimed to have that degree — but having such degrees could bolster an argument for a work visa. If she told an employer she had degrees she didn't to obtain a visa (and the employer wasn't the wiser), Melania Trump is culpable.

Again: It's not clear what visa Trump used to enter the country and how it related to her work experience — but she asserts that she has always been in full compliance with **immigration** laws. If that's not true, it's a problem.

"The bottom line is, if you have procured or attempted to procure an **immigration** through fraud or misrepresentation, you are inadmissible to the United States, and you need to be admissible to the United States to get a green card," Leopold said. Fraud "always is part of your **immigration** portfolio," he added, saying it "sticks to you" — meaning that leaving and reentering properly wouldn't absolve previous missteps. Nor would being married to a citizen.

"If there were material misrepresentations or fraudulent representations regarding her work or her intent to work if she came in on a visitor's visa, that would implicate the validity of her green card," Leopold said. "And that would then affect her citizenship, because when you apply for citizenship, one of the questions they ask you is if have you ever sought to obtain **immigration** benefits from fraud. If you don't 'fess up and answer 'yes' if you've done that, now you have bad moral character and you're ineligible for citizenship." In the worst case, this could lead to denaturalization — loss of citizenship.

How Melania Trump obtained her green card is another question.

In an interview with Univision, a former attorney for the Trump Organization said that Melania Trump obtained her green card in 2001 "based on marriage." But she married Donald Trump in 2005 and has said that she wasn't married previously.

As noted above, marriage is a fast track to green-card status, but it also carries another benefit. Someone who entered the country fraudulently isn't eligible for a green card unless they get a waiver. In this case, that waiver would have to come from a close relative — such as a spouse — arguing that an exception should be granted because the relative would suffer an "extreme hardship" if the application were refused. This is "tough to do," Leopold said, suggesting that it demands proof of legitimate economic or emotional difficulty that would result.

For Leopold (who, we will note, donated to the Hillary Clinton campaign in March), the point isn't that Melania Trump entered the country and obtained citizenship under false pretenses. To some extent, the point is that we don't know her story — which is strange, since it should be fairly simple to explain.

More broadly, though, Leopold sees this as a missed opportunity for Donald Trump as a candidate.

"To me what this shows is this broken **immigration** system — I know that's a cliche already — forces good people to do things they ordinarily wouldn't do. Such as cross a border without authorization, such as misstate the purpose of their trip," he said. "Clearly **immigration** touches his own family very directly. If this is true, then Donald Trump has missed an important opportunity to reach out to **immigrants** and say, 'I understand how difficult and dysfunctional this system is, and I want to stand with you, and I want to fix it.'

"But he's gone the other way."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a presidential year expected to produce record turnout among Hispanic voters, there are few signs that Hillary Clinton is performing any better among Latinos than past Democratic presidential candidates — even with ­**immigrant**-bashing Donald Trump as her GOP opponent.

In Nevada and Florida, the two battleground states with the highest Latino populations, the Democratic nominee remains locked in a close race with Trump. Clinton is polling about the same as Democrats in previous contests among Latinos nationally, apparently gaining no ground from Trump's historic unpopularity.

The close polls in Nevada and Florida have prompted Clinton's allies to begin spending money targeting Hispanic voters in those states. The campaign itself will also begin airing Spanish-language ads in battleground states after Monday.

But some Democratic strategists fear that Clinton has already missed a unique opportunity and warn that counting on Hispanic voters to turn out just because they hate Trump is not a reliable strategy. Unlike President Obama four years ago, Clinton has run virtually no Spanish-language television ads in the general election, with the exception of a spot that aired during a one-day soccer event.

"I'm worried literally to death now that because Donald Trump is so visceral that they'll think that Latinos will turn out because of that alone," said Chuck Rocha, president of Solidarity Strategies, a Latino political-consulting firm that worked with Bernie Sanders in the Democratic primary season. "Hate alone won't motivate somebody to vote. . . . They need something to vote for."

The GOP nominee has staked much of his campaign on cracking down on illegal **immigration**, portraying Mexican **immigrants**, in particular, as "rapists" and criminals who take American jobs. Trump has promised to build a massive wall along the U.S.-Mexico border and deport millions of undocumented **immigrants**, while also suggesting that birthright citizenship should be abolished. As a result, just 18 percent of registered Hispanic voters have a favorable view of Trump in a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.

But there is also evidence that Clinton's standing with Hispanic voters may be weakening. According to the same poll, Clinton's favorability among Hispanics fell in August from 71 percent to 55 percent, a drop outside the sample's 10-point margin of error.

A new Latino Decisions poll released Friday found that 70 percent of registered Latino voters said they would definitely vote for Clinton or were leaning toward doing so, a drop from 76 percent who said the same in April. The survey, conducted for the **immigration** advocacy group America's Voice, also found that support for Trump rose from 11 percent in April to 19 percent in August.

"When you have less than 20 percent in your polling with Hispanics, how much worse could it get?" said Florida-based Republican strategist Al Cardenas, referring to Trump. "It's not so much that Donald Trump is doing better with Latino voters, but she's doing worse. That's tightened up the race in Florida and Nevada."

Clinton campaign officials defend their Latino voter strategy, including the decision not to begin airing general-election ads on Spanish-language television until later this month. The campaign has been aiming digital advertising at Latino voters since early July, and it did heavy Spanish-language advertising during the Democratic primaries.

"If they start doing it now, I think they're on time," said Federico de Jesús, a Democratic strategist who was the Hispanic media director for Obama in 2008. "Obviously, we would have liked them to do it earlier."

"If they wait too much longer until late September, that might be more concerning," he added.

According to Lorella Praeli, Clinton's Latino vote director, the campaign has consistently targeted Latino voters through digital ad campaigns in Spanish, appearances by surrogates on Spanish-language radio and through ­English-language ads targeted at Latino audiences through non-Spanish-language media.

"There are new tactics, new strategies and new platforms," Praeli said. "The way that we absorb information is also evolving, and if you don't adapt to that, then we're missing out on reaching ­Latino voters where they are."

With fewer than 70 days remaining until Election Day, television ads targeted at Hispanic voters in Spanish are beginning to roll in, albeit slowly. A new ­Spanish-language television ad from the voter registration group Mi Familia Vota is aimed at Hispanic voters in Arizona. Pro-Clinton super PAC Priorities USA Action announced a small ad buy this week in Nevada and Florida targeting Latinos in Spanish.

"Florida and Nevada are behaving like battleground states — they're supposed to be close," said Priorities spokesman Justin ­Barasky. "That's a problem for Trump. We have said on the record countless times that we expected the race to be competitive and close, and in a lot of cases, it is."

In 2008, Obama's campaign began airing Spanish-language ads in mid-September, a timeline Clinton could still match this year. But in 2012, the president's reelection campaign spent tens of millions of dollars on ads in Spanish beginning in April, although he did not have a competitive primary campaign.

Obama won Latino voters in 2012 by 71 percent to 27 percent for GOP nominee Mitt Romney — the largest for a Democrat since Bill Clinton won 72 percent of Hispanics in 1996. Latino turnout in 2012 also hit a high of 11.2 million voters.

This year, an average of recent Post-ABC polls shows Hillary Clinton leading Trump by 70 percent to 25 percent among Hispanic voters — similar to Obama's margin over Romney.

"Given how badly Democrats have been burned in recent elections by low turnout from episodic voters like Latinos and millennials, you would have thought the Clinton campaign would have spent more [on ads] than Obama, rather than less," said a Democratic strategist who spoke on the condition of anonymity to speak candidly about the state of the race.

Polls show that Clinton is weakest among Hispanic voters who are English-dominant and U.S.-born, while Spanish-dominant and ­foreign-born Hispanic voters are more likely to support her over Trump. The campaign has been running English-language ads targeted in part at the first group.

One English-language campaign ad called "Brave," featuring Clinton and a young girl, Karla Ortiz, whose parents are undocumented, proved to be highly effective across a range of demographic groups, a campaign aide said. The ad debuted in the primaries against Sen. Bernie Sanders and has continued throughout the general-election campaign.

Still, Democrats say there is no substitute for engaging many Hispanic voters in Spanish and in bilingual ads.

"People want to see that they're being reached out to," de Jesús said. "They want to feel like their vote is in play and they're not being taken for granted, and speaking in their language is important."

abby.phillip@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — Six weeks ago, Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto stood alongside President Obama in the White House and pledged his "absolute will" to cooperate with whichever candidate won the U.S. presidential election.

Even that banal political statement landed with alarm in Mexico. That's because the night before, the man who formally accepted the Republican nomination for U.S. president was Donald Trump, who built his campaign around calling Mexican **immigrants** criminals and vowing to wall off the border and roll back trade ties.

Peña Nieto's comment during the July 22 visit to Washington, however, hinted at the already brewing notion among some factions of the Mexican government that a meeting with Trump might be worth organizing. In the weeks that followed, Mexican cabinet members and advisers to Peña Nieto debated fiercely about whether to invite Trump to Mexico, either before or after the election, according to people here familiar with the discussions.

The result was Trump's surreal appearance Wednesday, calmly talking about his plans for the border wall as he stood alongside Peña Nieto, who hardly spoke a critical word about the American candidate. The event marked a dramatic departure from Mexico's historic caution about getting involved in U.S. presidential politics and has been roundly criticized in this country, where Trump is widely loathed. The meeting has divided the Mexican government and is being portrayed as a sign of ineptitude from Peña Nieto, who already had dismal approval ratings.

"This is probably the single worst public relations disaster of his entire administration," said Jorge Castañeda, who was Mexico's foreign minister from 2000 to 2003. "The substance of [Peña Nieto's] entire message should have been that the wall and the deportations and revisiting NAFTA are all unacceptable positions to Mexico, and all would constitute serious threats to the U.S. relationship with Mexico."

Mexico has long sought to carefully calibrate its relations with its more powerful neighbor and chief trading partner — seeking good ties but insisting on respect for its sovereignty and its citizens' contributions. But Trump's bid for the presidency has utterly flummoxed the Mexican government. Its response has veered from one extreme to the other, with officials first dismissing Trump's candidacy, then abruptly replacing the low-key Mexican ambassador in Washington this past spring and crafting an aggressive public relations strategy to counter Trump's claims and show Mexico's value to Americans. In March, Peña Nieto compared Trump to Hitler.

While it is common for American presidents to visit Mexico soon after being elected, a high-profile meeting between the Mexican president and an American candidate is quite unusual. In 2008, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) visited Mexico while a presidential candidate, along with other senators, and met privately with then-President Felipe Calderón. But that didn't have the state-visit flavor of Trump's appearance.

Andres Rozental, who served as Mexican ambassador to Britain and was a career diplomat for more than 35 years, expressed astonishment that the Mexican government gave Trump a formal greeting at the presidential hangar, flew him by helicopter to the presidential palace and allowed him to appear with Peña Nieto before the world's media.

The planning "was entirely done in secret and outside of the Foreign Ministry's knowledge," he said. "It was certainly done in an extremely amateurish and totally unprofessional way."

Critics said the Mexican president not only took a huge political gamble but appeared to botch the execution of his strategy.

"Peña Nieto meddled in the electoral process of the United States, and as I see it, what was the use?" asked Lorenzo Meyer, a history professor at the College of Mexico. "Mexico is a weak country, and we have to take great care with symbols — it's almost the only thing we have — and he gave to Trump international exposure."

Economic concerns

Over the summer, Finance Minister Luis Videgaray, who had been Peña Nieto's campaign manager in the 2012 election, was a leading advocate for the Trump visit, according to Mexicans familiar with the deliberations, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to be candid. Videgaray, an MIT-educated economist, had been a state-level leader of the Institutional Revolutionary Party, and his political career had advanced along with Peña Nieto's. The president selected Videgaray to be his behind-the-scenes liaison to the Trump campaign.

Videgaray and other aides saw a Trump meeting as a political risk that was worth taking, in case Trump won the election, the sources said. But some senior members of the Mexican government strongly argued against such an invitation — among them, Foreign Minister Claudia Ruiz Massieu.

The Mexico City daily Reforma reported Friday that Videgaray was especially concerned after ratings agencies Moody's and Standard and Poor's had lowered their outlooks on Mexico's sovereign debt to negative in recent months because of the state of the country's public finances. Trump has threatened to slap a 35 percent tariff on many imports from Mexico, potentially making things worse. Videgaray wanted to bring Trump to calm financial-market fears over the potential impact of his victory on the country's economy, the newspaper reported.

"This was the type of political decision that was not popular but was needed," said one person in Mexico who was familiar with the decision-making, describing the advocates' position. "This was going to cost us in the polls, but it was important to meet face to face with the most dangerous candidate on the turf."

Videgaray's spokeswoman, Claudia Algorri Guzman, said that the "idea and the decision" to invite Trump were Peña Nieto's. Any other account is "false," she said.

Peña Nieto wrote in an editorial that ran on the front page of Mexico's El Universal newspaper Thursday that it is his responsibility to meet with both U.S. presidential candidates, but especially Trump, "because there are things that he should hear in person from the President of Mexico, beginning with how Mexicans feel."

"First, I was very clear — in public and in private — in emphasizing that in Mexico we feel offended and hurt by his pronouncements about Mexicans," he wrote.

Peña Nieto's three-page invitation, dated Aug. 25, was delivered to Trump's campaign headquarters in New York by courier on the next day, a Friday. Hillary Clinton received an invitation the same day.

"Dear Mr. Trump," began the note to the Republican candidate. "On November 8th, the American people will choose the next President of the United States of America. I am sure that the electoral process will be one of vibrant debate, contrast of ideas and intense citizen participation, honoring the great democratic tradition of America."

The letter referenced Peña Nieto's recent meeting with "my good friend President Barack Obama," noted the huge volume of trade between the two countries and called for strengthening their partnership.

"Therefore, it would be a great honor to meet with you and have a direct conversation about the common future of our nations," the letter concluded. "For this purpose, I have instructed the Secretary of Foreign Relations to contact your office."

Left out of the loop

Some Mexican officials who opposed the invitation didn't realize that a visit would happen so fast, and on Trump's terms. It occurred on the same day he gave an **immigration** speech in Phoenix.

"Things got out of control," said the Mexican familiar with the decision-making. "This was mishandled, to say the least."

Key parts of the Mexican government were not fully informed about the invitation and Trump's quick acceptance. The U.S. Embassy was alerted to the visit by the Secret Service, which was arranging security for the trip, but by Tuesday afternoon the American diplomats still hadn't received final confirmation of the visit.

On Tuesday, Ruiz Massieu, the foreign minister, was in Milwaukee, unaware that Trump would be landing in Mexico City the next day. In her speech in the United States, she emphasized the importance of trade and the contributions of undocumented workers to Wisconsin's economy, and she appeared to take a jab at Trump.

"The facts speak against the stereotypes," she said. "History against intolerance. Cooperation against xenophobia."

The next afternoon, as Trump stood alongside Peña Nieto, Ruiz Massieu sat with other cabinet members in the front row, a funereal look on her face.

joshua.partlow@washpost.com

Karen DeYoung in Washington and Gabriela Martinez in Mexico City contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At basketball games at his Oregon high school, Justin Ki Hong, an adoptee from South Korea, remembers putting his hand over his heart and singing the national anthem, proud to be a citizen of the United States.

It wasn't until he applied for a job years later that Ki Hong learned he had never been a citizen at all.

The employer asked for proof of citizenship, and Ki Hong's Social Security number and driver's license, which had worked when applying for college financial aid, were suddenly insufficient. He soon learned that his American parents had never filled out the paperwork to naturalize him after bringing him to the United States in 1985.

Now it was too late. Not only that, but Ki Hong is potentially deportable — to a country he doesn't remember.

"I kind of got into a panic," said Ki Hong, 33, of the discovery.

Today, children who are adopted from abroad by U.S. citizens generally receive automatic citizenship, and adoption agencies and embassies are better at informing parents about any follow-up they need to do. The Child Citizenship Act of 2000 awarded citizenship retroactively to what advocates estimated were more than 100,000 international adoptees under 18 who were already in the country when it went into effect in February 2001.

But Ki Hong was not covered by the law because he already was 18 at the time. He is among an estimated tens of thousands of people who were adopted internationally by American parents between the 1950s and 1980s but never naturalized.

For them, life has become a surreal identity crisis. They look and talk like Americans, but they are not technically Americans, though this is the only country they know.

"We're really stateless," Ki Hong said. "I feel like I deserve to be in this country."

In recent years, adoptees in similar circumstances have begun to find each other and are uniting behind the Adoptee Citizenship Act, proposed federal legislation that would grant citizenship to anyone who was adopted by a U.S. citizen regardless of when they turned 18. It would also allow those who have been deported to return to the United States.

"These adoptees grow up in American families, go to American schools and lead American lives," said Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), who sponsored the act. "This constant threat to the life they know is unjust. . . . We need to ensure international adoptees are recognized as the Americans they are." Bills were introduced last year in the Senate and this year in the House and are awaiting votes.

While most adoptees received legal permanent residency when they arrived, those who thought they had become citizens were unaware that they had to renew the permits. Now, many have trouble finding employment, worry about losing their jobs and fear they will be unable to collect Social Security benefits they have paid into. And they live in terror that a wrong move will get them kicked out of the country.

If the legislation passes, "I think it's going to fill a very deep void and hole that I've had about who I am," Ki Hong said.

Widespread adoption of children abroad by U.S. citizens began in South Korea in the 1950s after the Korean War and then spread to other countries. It was initially less regulated than now. "The U.S. federal government and state government did not keep adequate track of numbers," said Kevin Vollmers, a South Korean adoptee who founded the adoptee advocacy organization LGA.

Based on estimates by the Korean government about U.S. adoptees whose status remains unknown, advocates estimate there could be up to 18,000 from South Korea in this situation, along with an undetermined number from countries such as Venezuela, Germany, India, Guatemala, Vietnam and Iran.

Growing up, they were able to obtain Social Security numbers and driver's licenses. Before the 1990s and early 2000s ushered in a stricter era of screening, many even received U.S. passports, served in the U.S. military and voted — unaware that they were not citizens.

"Then when they went to renew [a document], the paperwork they were using up to then are suddenly not enough," said Emily Kessel, advocacy director of the National Korean American Service and Education Consortium.

Often, families did not understand the implications of dropping the ball on the paperwork.

"There wasn't a lot of education to adoptive parents in the earlier time about naturalizing their children or even what papers to keep, said Kessel, whose organization is helping push for bills in the House and Senate.

Some have been able to pursue a typical **immigrant** path.

Joy Alessi, 50, of Houston, learned of her status when she was 25 and attempted to get a passport for a vacation to Mexico. Her legal residency was still valid, so she continued to renew it and got a South Korean passport for travel abroad. But not having U.S. citizenship has limited her.

"Applying for jobs, that was difficult," Alessi said. "I basically carried my adoption papers and relied on people's leniency. . . . I kind of learned not to apply for jobs that had thorough background checks."

Being convicted of a crime, no matter how minor, can raise the stakes exponentially. Around three dozen adoptees — including one who served in the U.S. military — have been deported or are at risk of being deported after criminal convictions; one was later killed in Brazil, his country of birth.

South Korean-born Monte Haines holds little hope for returning to the United States if the act doesn't pass. Adopted by an American family in 1981 when he was around 10, he says his family assumed that adopting him automatically made him a U.S. citizen.

In the 1990s, he enlisted in the U.S. Army and served in Kuwait; then in 2001, he was arrested on a drug charge. While he was in a Texas county jail awaiting trial, **immigration** officials told him he had never been a U.S. citizen.

"I was, like, shocked," said Haines, 44. "I kept on arguing, saying, 'Yes I am; I was adopted.' "

But after serving a prison sentence, he was deported to South Korea, where he did not speak the language. "The first week, I was living on the street underneath a bridge."

He now works for a dollar store in Seoul, unable to return to the United States even on a South Korean passport.

"I'm banned for life — that's what the judge said," he said. "I have my family there, my friends, I went to school, I went to college. What more American can you get?"

Many unnaturalized adoptees try to stay under the radar, telling few people about their situations, avoiding international travel and keeping away from the polls on Election Day.

One woman adopted from Iran in the early 1970s did not learn of her status until 2008, when she applied for a passport. The Social Security Administration had her on record as a citizen, and until learning her status, she used to vote and get called to jury duty.

She met with an array of **immigration** attorneys; one suggested she marry an American to help solve the problem, and another scared her so much about deportation that she balked at applying for legal residency. She learned her father had begun — but never finished — the process of getting her naturalized; he died before she could ask him about it.

"As a child, my mom was always, like, 'Oh, you have citizenship because we're citizens,' " said the woman, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because she feared her employer would think she lied on the job application she filled out before knowing her status.

Now 46 and living in California, she is terrified of losing her job.

"And with all the Trump stuff about **immigration**, I'm even more scared," she said. "The attitude is, like, 'Why didn't you do the paperwork?' People forget, we're these small little kids who came into the country."

tara.bahrampour@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**STRANGERS IN THEIR OWN LAND: Anger and Mourning on the American Right

By Arlie Russell Hochschild

The New Press. 369 pp. $27.95

The white working class is so hot right now.

When we look back on the 2016 presidential contest, we'll recognize a moment when the beliefs and material conditions of low-income white Americans were deemed worthy of popular fascination, cable-news hits and nonstop cultural deconstruction. Are these people prejudiced or just frustrated? Economically victimized or culturally ostracized? Anti-elites or anti-everything? Let hot takes roll down like waters, and condescension like an everlasting stream.

Three new books, works that were set in motion long before Donald Trump declared his love for America's poorly educated, try to go deeper, with varying success. "White Trash," by historian Nancy Isenberg, explains how poor whites have been mistreated and disparaged over some 400 years, the blame for their plight invariably falling elsewhere. "Hillbilly Elegy," by lawyer J.D. Vance, admonishes the poor to shape up and take responsibility for their fate; it's less an elegy than an assault, though one bubble-wrapped in a bootstraps memoir of the author's American Dream, from Appalachian destitution to the Gothic arches of Yale Law School. And now "Strangers in Their Own Land," by sociologist Arlie Russell Hochschild, is the latest and most frustrating of this trilogy.

Hochschild made 10 trips to southwestern Louisiana from 2011 to 2016, extended forays away from her perch at the University of California at Berkeley, to delve into her "keen interest in how life feels to people on the right — that is, in the emotion that underlies politics. To understand their emotions," she writes, "I had to imagine myself in their shoes." She interviewed some 60 people, including 40 professed tea party supporters, visiting their homes, communities and workplaces. It is the same technique Hochschild employed in "The Second Shift" (1989), a well-reviewed look at how couples manage duties at home when both work outside of it. In this case, however, Hochschild arrives with so many preconceived ideas that they undercut the insight she claims to desire.

Hochschild preps for her conservative immersion by reading "Atlas Shrugged," because we know tea party types are into that. "If Ayn Rand appealed to them, I imagined, they'd probably be pretty selfish, tough, cold people, and I prepared for the worst," this acclaimed sociologist writes. "But I was thankful to discover many warm, open people who were deeply charitable to those around them."

When she lands in Louisiana, Hochschild realizes, "I was definitely not in Berkeley, California. . . . No New York Times at the newsstand, almost no organic produce in grocery stores or farmers' markets, no foreign films in movie houses, few small cars, fewer petite sizes in clothing stores, fewer pedestrians speaking foreign languages into cell phones — indeed, fewer pedestrians. There were fewer yellow Labradors and more pit bulls and bulldogs. Forget bicycle lanes, color-coded recycling bins, or solar panels on roofs. In some cafes, virtually everything on the menu was fried."

Dear God, no yellow Labs or solar panels? How do you live?

Through Hochschild's time in Lake Charles, La., and nearby cities and small towns, readers meet people who complicate our oversimplified "whither white America" moment. Especially memorable are Lee Sherman, who repaired pipes carrying lethal chemicals and drained toxic waste illegally into nearby waterways before becoming an environmentalist and, yes, a tea party supporter; and the Areno family, disagreeing over the benefits and risks of local industries, even as they watched turtles go blind and cows die from drinking polluted water. They are the strength of the book, yet Hochschild interrupts their stories to place everything in a formulaic big-picture context, a capitalized and italicized theory of the right. The author, we learn, hopes to scale the Empathy Wall and learn the Deep Story that can resolve the Great Paradox through a Keyhole Issue. These contrivances guide, and ruin, this book.

["White Trash" -- a cultural and political history of an American underclass ]

"An empathy wall," Hochschild lectures, "is an obstacle to deep understanding of another person, one that can make us feel indifferent or even hostile to those who hold different beliefs." The author has traveled to the South to conquer that wall, and she constantly refers to it. "As I was trying to climb this slippery empathy wall, a subversive thought occurred to me," she says at one point. Or when she doesn't quite get another person's thinking, she feels "stuck way over on my side of the empathy wall."

Beyond the wall awaits the deep story. "A deep story is a feels-as-if story — it's the story feelings tell, in the language of symbols," Hochschild writes. "It removes judgment. It removes fact." The deep story she unearths in Louisiana is that tea party supporters — "my Tea Party friends," she always calls them, because only liberals rate pure, modifier-free friendship — see the American Dream as a line that they're patiently waiting in, only to see others cut in front. "Blacks, women, **immigrants**, refugees, brown pelicans — all have cut ahead of you in line," Hochschild writes. "But it's people like you who have made this country great. You feel uneasy. . . . You've heard stories of oppressed blacks, dominated women, weary **immigrants**, closeted gays, desperate refugees, but at some point, you say to yourself, you have to close the borders to human sympathy."

The deep story helps Hochschild unpack the great paradox: that is, why people living in a region with such poor economic, educational and health indicators — and Louisiana struggles in all of them — still support politicians who call for reducing federal help in those arenas. Hochschild peers at the paradox through a keyhole issue: environmental protection. "Everyone I talked to wanted a clean environment," she writes, and she spends much of the book chronicling the harm the oil and gas industry has wrought in the area. We learn of the industrial contamination of the Bayou d'Inde waterway, where the Areno family lived for generations, and of the massive Bayou Corne Sinkhole, which swallowed up 37 acres as earthquakes and ooze emanated from the ground, thanks to the screw-ups of a Houston-based drilling company. So why rally for politicians who want to eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency?

[A hillbilly's plea to the white working class]

Turns out, many people Hochschild spoke to simply don't trust environmental authorities, often with good reason. The Louisiana Department of Natural Resources had known of the risks involved in Bayou Corne but had given out drilling permits anyway, Hochschild writes. She also describes the guidelines state health authorities had provided on how to eat contaminated fish. "Trimming the fat and skin on finfish, and removing the hepatopancreas from crabs, will reduce the amount of contaminants in the fish and shellfish," they advised, featuring handy drawings of how to cut away the yucky parts.

When this is your experience of regulation, the great paradox loses greatness. But Hochschild continues her quest, concluding that tea party supporters grow to hate government because of religious faith, opposition to progressive taxes and the perceived "loss of honor" government imposes. She groups her tea party friends into reductionist categories that sound like they were dreamed up in the faculty lounge: the Team Players, loyal to business; the Worshippers, with their capacity for "meaningful renunciation," forgoing clean lakes in exchange for steady employment; the Cowboys, who equate risky work with progress and scoff at wimpy regulators.

Hochschild's subjects are frustrated by the empowerment of new voices in American identity politics. "For the Tea Party around the country," she writes, "the shifting moral qualifications for the American Dream had turned them into strangers in their own land, afraid, resentful, displaced, and dismissed by the very people who were, they felt, cutting in line."

Then Hochschild attends a Trump rally in New Orleans, and it feels like a revival. "His supporters have been in mourning for a lost way of life. . . . Joined together with others like themselves, they now feel hopeful, joyous, elated," she writes. "As if magically lifted, they are no longer strangers in their own land."

This may well be the mind-set of some Trump supporters; certainly, it is the candidate's pitch. But it's hard to entirely trust Hochschild's conclusions. Early in the book, she notes how federal assistance for strengthening environmental protections, combating global warming and reducing homelessness faces a "closed door" on the right. "If we want government help in achieving any of these goals, I realized, we need to understand those who see government more as problem than solution," she writes. "And so it was that I began my journey to the heart of the American right."

"Strangers in Their Own Land," then, is not an academic's impartial effort to understand conservatives but rather a means to an end — an end toward which the writer regards conservatives as obstacles to overcome.

There's a deep story for you.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ST. PAUL, Minn. -- With just 66 days to go before the polls closed, Evan McMullin made his inaugural campaign stop in one of his most promising states. On Friday afternoon, the #NeverTrump conservative candidate for president stopped by the booth of Minnesota's Independence Party, an outgrowth of Ross Perot's and Jesse Ventura's campaigns that successfully petitioned him onto the ballot.

"He's the alternative," said a party volunteer to passersby.

"What took you so long?" yelled a fairgoer.

"That's a good question," said McMullin, standing below a photo of himself and the message that it was Never Too Late to Do the Right Thing. "I was waiting for someone else to run, and no one did. I believe both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are unfit for the presidency, and it's time for a new generation of leadership in this country."

Less than a month after announcing his first bid for office, one that was not likely to end up on most states' ballots, McMullin drew a steady crowd for an hour that was punctuated with media interviews. This has been a very good year for third-party candidates, who have found a lower barrier to credibility than any of them expected.

That barrier, of course, tumbled when Clinton and Trump won their parties' nominations. The very first political rally I ever covered, in 2000, was for a third party — a Chicago "mega-rally" for the Green Party's Ralph Nader. He won just 2.2 percent of the vote in Illinois that year, and while that safe blue state has been only lightly polled this year, the "anybody else" vote is likely to soar past that.

Why? You can probably guess, but having spent five of the past nine days with third-party candidates, I have some extra answers.

1) People are actually showing up to see third-party candidates. That's not always the case. Nader drew gigantic crowds in 2000, but his fatal success — a split in the progressive vote that many of his supporters came to regret — helped quash third-party momentum. From 2004 through 2012, no third-party candidate was able to wage a campaign in the way we usually see it, with business visits and rallies.

This year is different. The Libertarian Party's Gary Johnson and Bill Weld drew hundreds of people to events in New England last week. On a run through Colorado last weekend, the Green Party's Jill Stein filled indoor and outdoor music venues with hundreds more.

In both cases, this took work. Johnson and Stein basically lived on TV for weeks, making themselves available for cameras in Washington and New York. McMullin did the same, drawing a remarkable amount of coverage for a candidacy that is unlikely to make the ballot in California or Texas. But it did not take much for people to start viewing a third-party event as a decent use of an afternoon.

2) These events are cultural be-ins. People who associate with the fringes of American life have the best time at third-party rallies. Marijuana legalization campaigners get signatures at Johnson rallies; alternative hip-hop artists come by Jill Stein rallies. At her Denver event, an organizer/folk-singer rewrote Phil Ochs's "Love Me, I'm a Liberal" into a riff on the weak progressives who were settling for Hillary Clinton:

I went to Occupy rallies I protested the WTO I love Rachel Maddow and Chris Matthews And I hope gays get married in droves But you're talking about revolution? Well, sister, I surely don't know So love me, love me, love me, I'm a liberal

There is a family feeling to these events, one that keeps people coming back.

3) Third parties are getting better at organizing. Affiliates of the Green Party and the Libertarian Party have used NationBuilder, a cheap organizing software, to build and mobilize lists of supporters. It's something they have in common with Donald Trump's campaign — scoffed at, seen to be a paper tiger that would be devoured by stockier gazelles. But the once-expensive work of telling supporters where to show up and what to do has become dirt cheap. Johnson has boasted of the millions of people watching his speeches on Facebook; Stein's campaign plugged her into the unfathomably popular Harambe meme, which got fresh eyeballs on her campaign, even if some were under raised eyebrows.

4) Many third-party voters don't care about policy. Listening to McMullin, I was struck by how few voters wanted to know about his stances on the issues. Any issues. One asked if he thought WikiLeaks would torpedo the Clinton campaign, leading McMullin to say that he was not a Julian Assange fan. Several complained that pollsters did not ask about him. For a while, his campaign leaflets, which deal (in light detail) with policy, went untouched.

This is not unusual. A lot of the upsurge in third-party support is attitude-based — a loose sense that politics are "broken," and therefore a vote for a nontraditional party will "fix" it. In Colorado, several Stein voters told me that they might vote for Gary Johnson — whose positions on taxes, climate change, and the role of government itself could not be more different — if on Election Day he seemed to be better positioned for a breakout.

5) Hey, neither do the third parties! (Sort of.) Johnson and Weld, the highest-profile candidates in Libertarian history, had to fight for their nominations. The "radical" wing of the Libertarian Party viewed both as interlopers who wanted to turn their party into a Diet Pepsi version of the GOP; both were forced onto second ballots at their conventions.

Since then, neither the Libertarians nor the Greens have had to answer many questions about their respective party platforms. Johnson/Weld have inspired semiregular condemnation from libertarian blogs and magazines for defending the existence of the federal Environmental Protection Agency or suggesting that some gun restrictions might make sense. In Colorado, Stein avoided endorsing a universal health-care initiative backed by the local Greens. The Minnesota Independence Party is campaigning for instant runoff voting, something McMullin did not even address when he stopped by the booth.

6) And they're not even seizing on the most popular issues. The three most-hyped third-party candidates — Johnson, Stein and McMullin — favor some version of **immigration** reform. As Trump has discovered, opposition to increased **immigration** levels is one of the most resonant populist issues there is.

Taco vendors like this at #MNStateFair are entrepreneurs who power the American economy. #TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner pic.twitter.com/OgW9Yxzn4i

Johnson and McMullin have little to say about economic inequality, and Stein talks about it only in the context of her "Green New Deal" promising millions of new jobs. But as Bernie Sanders discovered, class consciousness and the reality of depressed wages were powerful, voter-mobilizing topics.

7) Third-party candidates acknowledge that one of the big two parties is better for their voters than the other. McMullin is the least secretive about this; his campaign, massaged by Republican consultants, is in some states designed to bring out Republicans who might stay home if their options were limited to Clinton, Trump and Johnson. Stein acknowledged it during an interview she gave me in Denver, and at a news conference last month; voters who did not see Greens on the ballot for key races, she said, were probably going to see the most agreement on their issues from Democrats. No third party is offering a full slate for voters in any state. That could start to change this year, especially if strong results get them expanded ballot access. But it is not changing quickly.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With two months to go before the November election, there's one group that already knows it will be a loser: big business.

Indeed, one irony of the 2016 election is that populist antipathy toward corporate America seems to be peaking at precisely the moment when corporate influence on government policy is as low as anyone can remember.

After years of frustration with partisan gridlock and soured relations with both parties, chief executives of America's biggest companies have pretty much given up on Washington, where their opinions and support were once valued.

In Congress, the Republican caucus has been hijacked by tea party zealots who dismiss them as crony capitalists while the Republican presidential nominee demonizes them for shipping jobs overseas. The Obama White House is viewed by business as hostile and unyielding, while the Democratic Party has made "corporate greed" a signature issue.

"The difficult relationship between business and government is the worst I have ever seen it," Jeffrey R. Immelt, the longtime chief executive of General Electric, wrote this spring in his annual letter to shareholders. Asked in July if corporate leaders could help end the political dysfunction, Immelt told an interviewer from LinkedIn that the idea of getting 100 CEOs to come to Washington to push some policy is now just "a laugh line."

"At this point, it is doubtful that either party wants to be involved with big business," said Vin Weber, a former member of the Republican House leadership who now lobbies for corporate clients.

"Honestly, I don't think big business matters much anymore," said William Daley, a banker who served as commerce secretary in the Clinton administration and chief of staff in the Obama White House.

"Corporate America is hunkered down, watching the wing nuts of the right and left fire over their heads," said W.J. "Billy" Tauzin, the Louisiana Democrat turned Republican who left a House chairmanship to become the top pharmaceutical industry lobbyist. "Politics has gotten so damn mean they simply don't get involved any longer."

"They deeply resent the political process and politicians of all stripes," said Sen. Michael F. Bennet, the centrist Democrat from Colorado, of the dwindling number of chief executives who come to see him. "There is a sense of helplessness about having any ability to correct the misbehavior they see in Washington."

For many corporate executives, Washington has simply become an unproductive distraction.

"If Congress is not ready to do something, your time working on it is not going to get you much," said David Cote, chief executive of Honeywell. Cote should know: He was a member of the bipartisan ­Simpson-Bowles budget-balancing commission and later recruited 130 corporate executives to a "Fix the Debt" campaign. Neither moved the political needle.

"Here's the way these guys look at it," said one government official turned executive. "Should I go to Washington and waste my time or go to China and talk to people who can actually do something?"

'A stabilizing force'

Don't feel too sorry for the unempowered chief executive. Their companies still spend more than $3 billion a year on Washington lobbyists and offices. And on issues of narrow interest to individual companies or industries — regulations, tax provisions, line-item appropriations — corporate lobbying efforts are as effective as ever.

Where big business has lost its political mojo is on the broad issues affecting the whole economy — the budget, **immigration**, trade, investments in infrastructure and basic research, tax reform, the environment and health care. It is these issues, which require trade-offs between what is good for the company and what is good for the country, which once demanded attention from executives. In their self-appointed role as stewards of the American economy they would travel to Washington regularly to attend the CEO-only meetings of the Committee on Economic Development or the Business Roundtable and the Business Council, meeting with presidents, Cabinet secretaries and congressional leaders.

"Big business was a stabilizing force, a moderating influence in Washington," said Steve Odland, president of the Committee on Economic Development and a former chief executive of Office Depot and Auto Zone. "They were the adults in the room."

Starting in the 1980s, however, that role of "business statesmen" began to fade. Executives came under increasing pressure to focus ruthlessly on boosting company profits and share prices. Those who didn't risked losing their jobs or seeing their companies swallowed up in hostile takeovers. Those who did were generously rewarded with bonuses and stock options. And while some chief executives were lionized on Wall Street and on magazine covers for restoring the competitiveness of American industry, ordinary Americans began to associate them with plant closings, layoffs and extravagant pay.

In the 1990s, their reputation took another hit after the accounting scandals at Enron and WorldCom. And while it was bankers and Wall Street financiers who brought on the financial crisis and recession in 2008, the rest of corporate America got tarred with the same brush. This June, Gallup's annual survey found that, among all American institutions, only Congress is held in lower esteem than big business.

The relentless pressure from Wall Street also eroded the "enlightened self-interest" that made it possible for executives to put the country's interests first. In his book, "The Fracturing of the Corporate Elite," sociologist Mark Mizruchi of the University of Michigan argues that conflicts within the business community — between globalized companies and domestic ones, energy users and energy consumers, old economy companies and high-tech firms — have made it increasingly difficult for corporate leaders to reach consensus. As a result, big business has been largely missing in action on issues such as health care, climate change and even corporate tax reform.

Instead, executives tend to focus on more parochial company or industry-specific issues. One administration official recalled a recent lunch he had with the head of one of the country's largest corporations. "Every issue he brought up was about his own book of business," the official reported.

Political money has also altered the role of business in Washington. It has become an article of faith in the media and among liberal Democrats that the Supreme Court's decision in the case known as Citizens United unleashed a tidal wave of corporate money into the political system. Not true. The level of political spending by corporations and their political action committees has remained roughly the same. But because of Citizens United, corporate money has been swamped by the enormous sums spent by individual billionaires pushing their personal ideological agendas.

"So a company has a PAC that gives away a couple of million dollars — big deal," Chicago's Daley said. The Las Vegas casino magnate "Sheldon Adelson alone is throwing around 20 times that much."

"We could never play with shareholder money at the level being played by the Koch brothers or Tom Steyer," said one top corporate executive, referring to the hundreds of millions spent in recent years by the libertarian energy moguls and the environmentally conscious hedge-fund manager.

A rightward shift

The story of how big business lost Washington would not be complete without a chapter on the ill-fated decision to abandon a long tradition of bipartisanship and align more closely with the Republican Party.

It began with the Republican takeover of the House in 1994, engineered by Newt Gingrich and Tom DeLay, leaders of the party's conservative wing. In what became known as "the K Street Project," DeLay, the new majority leader, assured business lobbyists that their interests would be protected and their access guaranteed — but only if they demonstrated loyalty to the Republican agenda.

"The breakdown in business bipartisanship begins with DeLay," said Jerry Jasinowski, who back then was president of the National Association of Manufacturers. "I can remember people being called on the carpet just for having meetings with Democrats."

"It was hard to resist it, being brought into the inner circle of government," said Weber, then a close ally of Gingrich and DeLay in the House. "When you are a Washington rep and you can say you are now in the room with the policymakers when they are dealing with the issues you are hired to care about, that's a powerful incentive."

No business group was more enthusiastic in taking up the offer than the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which over the next 20 years increasingly aligned its rhetoric, positions and political contributions with the Republican caucuses in Congress — and, beginning in 2001, with the Bush White House. By 2014, only six Democrats were included among the 268 candidates the Chamber endorsed that election cycle, when the Chamber allocated all but $500,000 of its $35.5 million to Republican candidates. In March of that year, the Chamber's political director told the Lexington (Ky.) Herald-Leader, "The No. 1 priority of the U.S. Chamber's political program is to make Mitch McConnell the majority leader of the U.S. Senate."

For a time it was a winning strategy, dramatically increasing the Chamber's visibility, influence and financial resources. Other business groups, jealous of its success, also drifted into the Republican orbit. And it worked. The period from 1994 to 2006 was, in many respects, a golden era for business lobbying. Taxes were cut, regulation was reduced and companies won new protections from lawsuits filed by consumers, shareholders and employees. Trade was expanded, and corporate megamergers won easy approval. New rulings made it easier for companies to beat back labor unions.

The price for this success, however, was a dramatic increase in partisanship and polarization. The anti-tax, anti-regulation, ­anti-government rhetoric emanating from the Republican majority grew so extreme, and the politicians spouting it so hard line, that soon there was no room for compromise.

When business groups pushed for passage of a modest gasoline tax to pay for a long-delayed highway bill, House Republicans refused to consider it. Business leaders watched in horror as Republicans closed down the government and threatened to allow the government to default on its debt. And when some of the country's biggest companies, including utilities and oil companies, formed a coalition to push for a market-based solution to climate change, Republicans pressured executives and directors to abandon the effort. Several did, and the coalition collapsed.

Instead of corporations pushing and prodding politicians, politicians were pushing and prodding corporations, a kind of reverse lobbying that sometimes gets pretty rough. In 2009, Republicans were furious when Tauzin, as head of the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers Association, struck a deal with the White House to support President Obama's health reform bill in exchange for a promise not to set controls on drug prices. Tauzin recalls getting a letter from Speaker John A. Boehner "telling me that we were selling out." Obamacare passed without a single Republican vote but not before Tauzin had been pressured by some of his members to resign.

The Business Roundtable, representing chief executives of the largest public companies, received similar pressure from the Republican leadership.

"The message was, 'If you help this president achieve the greatest victory of his presidency, don't come running back to us for help,' " one official recalled. "They were very direct, very forceful."

After months of negotiations, a badly divided Roundtable — which had pushed for comprehensive health-care reform for two decades — declined to take a position on the legislation.

In effect, the business lobby had allowed itself to accept ­DeLay's logic that its first priority was to maintain Republican control of Congress. And before long, big business found itself in the uncomfortable position of supporting a Republican caucus that was increasingly hostile to its agenda while helping to defeat moderate, pro-business Democrats who had once been its legislative allies.

"The Republican Party has been free to take us for granted for many years, and the business community took the Republican Party for granted," said Jay Timmons, president of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM). Timmons said it is bad enough that Republicans no longer support business on issues such as trade, **immigration** and infrastructure investment. At the same time, major corporations are scrambling to distance themselves from the Republican agenda on social issues — in particular, opposition to gay rights — which is offensive to many of their customers and employees.

"Frankly, it's a disaster," Timmons said.

"They wound up creating a Frankenstein that they couldn't control," said Mizruchi, the University of Michigan sociologist.

Over the past two years, the Chamber has tried to regain influence over the Republican caucus by opposing a few of the more radical tea party candidates in Republican primaries. Under Timmons, once a top Republican aide on Capitol Hill, NAM has helped moderate Democrats retain their seats. Still, the bitter partisanship is now so hard-wired in Washington's political culture that it will be years before big business can again cobble together the bipartisan centrist coalitions on which it traditionally relied.

"Business chose to ride with the Republicans, and now they have nowhere to go. It's a very precarious position," said Thomas A. Daschle, former Democratic leader in the Senate whom Republicans defeated in 2004 with strong support from business. Among Democrats, Daschle reports, "there is a lot of resentment that's built up — disgust even — with the way so much of business migrated so comfortably to the far right."

No love for Trump

Just as big business has suffered from getting too cozy with the Republican establishment, the Republican establishment has suffered from getting too cozy with big business — at least as measured by the 13 million voters who showed up this year to vote Donald Trump as the party's presidential nominee.

In more than two dozen interviews with corporate executives and business lobbyists over the past month, I found no support for Trump's candidacy. Most of them agreed to speak only if they were not identified.

"If he won, they'd have to shelter in place for four years," joked one Republican consultant with a raft of high-tech clients.

"They are appalled by Trump," a top executive said of his colleagues. "They want to end the dysfunction, not make it worse."

Their fear is that Trump would get the United States into trade wars with Mexico and China and a real war in the Middle East, while initiating mass deportations of illegal **immigrants** that would disrupt labor markets and lead to social unrest.

Among executives, it certainly hasn't gone unnoticed that Trump's kitchen cabinet of economic advisers includes hedge-fund managers and real estate moguls but no prominent corporate executive. They also resent that, for many Americans, Trump is the model of the successful business executive.

Last month, a group of 50 top executives publicly endorsed Hillary Clinton. Although many were longtime Democrats, from finance and high tech, the list also included a few die-hard Republicans such as Hewlett-Packard chief executive Meg Whitman, former General Motors chief Dan Akerson and Jim Cicconi, who served in both the Reagan and Bush White Houses before becoming head of AT&T's Washington office.

Most top corporate executives, however, have remained quiet lest they become targets of Trump's personal attacks, as did Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg when he dared to challenge Trump over **immigration**.

"Just about every Republican I know who is in business is apoplectic about the prospect of Trump as president, but they are also afraid of him," one former chief executive said. "They don't want to put their companies in harm's way."

At the same time, many chief executives have what one called "deep, residual anxiety" about Hillary Clinton. Those anxieties have only deepened since the Democratic presidential nominee joined hands with Sens. Elizabeth Warren (Mass.) and Bernie Sanders (Vt.) — two anti-corporate crusaders — in her effort to consolidate support from the liberal wing of the Democratic Party.

A few business leaders are coming around to the idea that they might be able to strike deals with Clinton, much as they did with her husband in the 1990s.

"I'd say there is a great interest and willingness to reset a more constructive relationship," the head of one industry association said.

But more common was the gloomy outlook of the longtime Washington lobbyist who said of his executive-suite clients, "They don't see anyone on the horizon in either party who can drain this swamp."

Pearlstein is a Post business and economics writer. He is also Robinson Professor of Public Affairs at George Mason University.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has warned us about those Mexican rapists. Apparently the country also has body snatchers.

The Republican presidential nominee **immigrated** briefly to Mexico on Wednesday for a hastily arranged visit with the leader of the country he has made his No. 1 scapegoat. He spent all of an hour with President Enrique Peña Nieto — but when the two men emerged, whoever was occupying Trump's body sounded nothing at all like the bombastic billionaire.

"In the United States, first-, second- and third-generation Mexicans are just beyond reproach — spectacular, spectacular, hard-working people. I have such great respect for them and their strong values of family, faith and community," this Trump look-alike declared in Mexico City.

The impostor gushed about a "common interest in keeping our hemisphere safe, prosperous and free," and waxed poetic about"joint operations between our two countries." He pledged "cooperation" toward shared objectives, a "deep and sincere" bond, and a "close and honest relationship" between the two countries in pursuit of "mutual good." Trump said the countries should be "working beautifully together, and that, I am sure, will happen."

And the North American Free Trade Agreement, which Trump had called a "disaster" and promised to "rip up"? This Trump doppelganger spoke instead about "improving NAFTA" and making sure it's "updated." He voiced a wish for a "strong, prosperous and vibrant Mexico," and he pronounced Peña Nieto "a friend."

A reporter asked: Did they talk about his constant vow to get Mexico to pay for the border wall he wants to build?

"We didn't discuss that," warm-and-fuzzy Trump said.

What had they done with Trump?

Alas, within hours, he was back to his xenophobic self. The bickering began even before he cleared Mexican airspace, as Peña Nieto, contradicting Trump, said he had told Trump at the beginning of the meeting that Mexico would not pay for a wall.

But Trump, having completed his photo op with the Mexican president, discarded the "friend" he had apparently just used as a prop. Trump landed in Phoenix for what was supposed to be a detailed "policy address" on **immigration** but was a familiar, nativist rant. Preceded at the lectern by Joe Arpaio, the Arizona sheriff and anti-**immigration** hard-liner, Trump launched into a lament for the "countless Americans" who are "victims of violence" by illegal **immigrants** who are "dangerous, dangerous, dangerous criminals."

"We will build a great wall along the southern border!" he said to an enormous cheer.

"And Mexico will pay for the wall! One-hundred percent. They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for the wall."

So much for working beautifully together.

This was the Trump we all knew, the Trump who questions the judicial independence of an American-born judge because of his Mexican heritage, who fights with Mexican American journalists, claims that Spanish-language broadcaster Univision "takes its marching orders" from Mexico, and asserts that Mexico is "killing us."

Trump's trip to Mexico was something of a Hail Maria, as polls show Democratic rival Hillary Clinton with a yuuge advantage and Democrats with a better than even chance of taking back the Senate. And from Arizona and Florida on Tuesday came new signs that Trump's rebellion has fizzled.

In Arizona, Kelli Ward, a pro-Trump primary challenger, had been trying to oust Sen. John McCain, whose war heroism Trump famously belittled, with a "defeat the establishment" theme like Trump's. She lost by 13 points. In Florida, Carlos Beruff said that he "supports Donald Trump 100 percent," while his primary opponent, Sen. Marco Rubio, did not. Beruff lost by 54 points. Insurgent Democratic candidates in Florida did no better against their party's establishment.

But Trump's attempt at appearing diplomatic was only a feint. If his core supporters were worried — and if the rest of Americans were reassured — that he was softening his hard-line position, they had to wait only until he spoke in Phoenix on Wednesday night.

In Mexico City, Trump endured without complaint a lecture from the Mexican president, who said that NAFTA has been good for "the U.S. as well as Mexico" and that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce thinks that more than 6 million American jobs rely on trade with Mexico. Peña Nieto said that **immigration** from Mexico to the United States peaked 10 years ago and is now at a net negative. "Mexican nationals in the United States are honest people, working people," he said. "Mexicans deserve everybody's respect."

Trump almost seemed to agree. "Illegal **immigration** is a problem for Mexico as well as for us," he said. "We will work together and we will get those problems solved."

But back on American soil, he returned to his familiar lines: "It's called America First! . . . There will be no amnesty! . . . You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country."

The real Donald Trump was back. Alas.

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The one great service of Donald Trump's extended peregrinations on **immigration** policy is to have demonstrated how, in the end, there's only one place to go.

You can rail for a year about the squishy soft, weak-kneed and stupid politicians who have opened our borders to the wretched refuse of Mexico. You can promise to round them up — the refuse, that is, not the politicians (they're next) — and deport them. And that may win you a plurality of Republican primary votes.

But eventually you have to let it go. For all his incendiary language and clanging contradictions, Trump did exactly that in Phoenix on Wednesday. His "deportation task force" will be hunting . . . criminal aliens. Isn't that the enforcement priority of President Obama, heretofore excoriated as the ultimate **immigration** patsy?

And what happens to the noncriminal illegal **immigrants**? On that, Trump punted. Their "appropriate disposition" will be considered "in several years when we have . . . ended illegal **immigration** for good." Everyone knows what that means: One way or another, they will be allowed to stay.

Trump's retreat points the way to the only serious solution: enforcement plus legalization. The required enforcement measures are well known — from a national E-Verify system that makes it just about impossible to work if you are here illegally, to intensified border patrol and high-tech tracking.

The one provision that, thanks to Trump, gets the most attention is a border wall. It's hard to understand the opposition. It's the most venerable and reliable way to keep people out. The triple fence outside San Diego led to a 90 percent reduction in infiltration. Israel's border fence with the West Bank has produced a similar decline in terror attacks into Israel.

The main objection is symbolic. Walls, we are told, denote prisons. But only if they are built to keep people in, not if they are for keeping outsiders out. City walls, going back to Jericho, are there for protection. Even holier-than-thou Europeans have conceded the point as one country after another — Hungary, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Austria, Greece, Spain, why even Norway — has started building border fences to stem the tide of Middle Eastern refugees.

The other part of the **immigration** bargain is legalization. What do you do with the 11 million already here? In theory, you could do nothing. The problem ultimately solves itself as the generation of the desert — those who crossed the border originally — is eventually replaced by its American-born children who are automatically legal and landed.

But formal legalization is a political necessity. It gets buy-in from Democrats who for whatever reason — self-styled humanitarianism or bare-knuckled partisanship — have no interest in real border enforcement. Legalization is the quid pro quo. If they want to bring the **immigrants** "out of the shadows," they must endorse serious enforcement.

Such a grand bargain could and would command a vast national consensus. The American public will accept today's illegal **immigrants** if it is convinced that this will be the last such cohort.

This was the premise of the 1986 Reagan amnesty. It legalized almost 3 million **immigrants**. Because it never enforced the border, however, three has become 11.

And that's why the Gang of Eight failed. They too got the sequencing wrong. The left insisted on legalization first. The Gang's Republicans ultimately acquiesced because they figured, correctly, this was the best deal they could get in an era of Democratic control.

The problem is that legalization is essentially irreversible and would have gone into effect on Day One. Enforcement was a mere promise.

Hence the emerging Republican consensus, now that Trump has abandoned mass deportation: a heavy and detailed concentration on enforcement, leaving the question of what happens to those already here either unspoken (Trump on Wednesday) or to be treated case by case (Trump last week).

The Trump detour into — and retreat from — mass deportation has proved salutary. Even the blustering tough guy had to dismiss it with "we're not looking to hurt people."

The ultimate national consensus, however, lies one step farther down the road. Why leave legalization for some future discussion? Get it done. Once the river of illegal **immigration** has been demonstrably and securely reduced to a trickle, the country will readily exercise its natural magnanimity and legalize.

So why not agree now? Say it and sign it. To get, you have to give. That's the art of the deal, is it not?

letters@charleskrauthammer.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WOODS HOLE, Mass. — The blue water of Buzzards Bay glittered as boats bobbed on the gently undulating surface and gulls swooped among their sails. The seaside air at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution was thick with the sweet smell of grass and the tang of saltwater. This was late summer on Cape Cod — our ocean world at its most inviting.

But inside a bay-view conference center, 80 scientists were conjuring up very different ocean worlds: the ice-covered moon Europa, whose watery interior is kept liquid by the gravitational pull of Jupiter. Enceladus, whose south pole emits geyser-like sprays of water vapor, gas and ice; as it orbits Saturn, the tiny moon leaves a glowing trail of particles in its wake.

And then there were the dark, seething systems at the bottoms of our own seas, where Earth's crust cracks open, spewing rock, gas and heat — a world as **alien** to humans as any in outer space.

These ocean worlds are forbidding, hostile, sunless and remote — but many scientists say they also hold the key to life. Some 4 billion years ago, one hypothesis goes, the chaotic chemistry at the ocean floor provided the fuel for Earth's first organisms. If life arose elsewhere in our solar system, it probably started under similar circumstances. The only way to know for sure is to go look for it.

That's why all these scientists were sitting indoors on a glorious August day, their faces lit by the glow of a slide projector rather than the morning sun. In a rare union of two very different scientific communities, the Ocean Worlds meeting convened oceanographers and space explorers with the ambitious goal of guiding the search for life beneath **alien** seas.

The man responsible for the conference at Woods Hole is geologist Chris German. Last fall he attended a National Geographic Society planetary sciences meeting to discuss exploration of ocean worlds beyond Earth — and quickly realized he was one of the few scientists there who had actually been to sea.

"There were all these planetary scientists talking about their favorite ocean worlds, Europa or Enceladus or whichever," he recalled. But their conversation wasn't grounded in knowledge of how life underwater actually works. "I realized, maybe it would make sense to have some oceanographers here."

Further piquing his interest, the most recent NASA appropriations bill instructed the space agency to establish an "Ocean Worlds Exploration Program." The mandate meant NASA would be spending more money on the technology needed for finding life in the oceans: remote-controlled robots capable of operating under water and ice, sensors that can detect signatures of life from great distances. Those kinds of tools would also be useful for German's work on Earth.

"There could be a beautiful convergence in breakthroughs in ocean science and space science," German said. "We just have to get them together in the same room."

About half the participants were oceanographers, the other half studied space, with a smattering of engineers and computer scientists attending as well.

"Probably no one in this room will get to see the real fruition of this meeting," German said to kick off the conference. Finding life in a foreign ocean is like building a medieval cathedral, he said. "The grandparents lay the foundation, the grandchildren build the steeple. The people who lay the cornerstones never get to worship inside."

The foundation of ocean-world exploration is understanding deep-sea life on Earth. In 1977, hydrothermal vent systems were discovered by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution's submersible Alvin. Before then, it was assumed that living communities needed sunlight to survive. Yet here were scores of strange creatures — bacterial mats, two-foot-long tube worms, eyeless shrimp — apparently thriving in total darkness.

Colleen Cavanaugh, a graduate student working at Woods Hole at the time, came up with an explanation for the deep ocean's weird life: chemosynthesis. Undersea microbes can harness the energy from chemicals to produce their own food, much as other creatures use photosynthesis to harness the energy of the sun.

There's only one kind of sunlight, but there are lots of kinds of chemicals on the sea floor that chemosynthetic organisms can live off. In the past four decades, scientists using Alvin and remotely operated submersibles have explored scores of other deep ocean systems, each completely different from life as we know it — and from one another. Sulfur-eating organisms live around super-hot, black smokers. Methane-consumers dwell in cold seeps. Scientists estimate that a new species has been found in one of these systems at a rate of about two per month over the past 40 years.

"They are out there in the bazillions in our oceans, and we still have a very rudimentary understanding of what they are doing," said Julie Huber, a scientist at the Marine Biological Laboratory.

Strange creatures have been found in other unlikely places. In 2013, a team led by Montana State University polar microbiologist John Priscu drilled through a half-mile of Antarctic ice to a subglacial lake and uncovered thousands of tiny organisms dwelling in total darkness at subzero temperatures. Like their deep-sea counterparts, the Antarctic microbes made their living off minerals dissolved in the water — and hinted at the potential for life beneath extraterrestrial ice.

"You'd be in denial, I think, to believe there isn't life out there," Priscu said.

In 1977, the same year that Alvin uncovered the first deep-sea life, NASA launched its two Voyager probes on an unprecedented tour of the planets in the outer solar system.

While zipping past Jupiter, Voyager 1 sent back the first detailed images of Europa — and scientists were astonished by what they saw. The moon's surface was fractured into sections that fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. Rather than being pitted by impact craters, like Mars or our moon, its surface was relatively smooth. Europa looked as though it had plate tectonics, like Earth. That meant Europa's solid crust was moving about above a liquid interior, like Earth's.

The Galileo mission in the 1990s confirmed the theory: Europa has the magnetic signature of an interior ocean full of salt water. It's able to stay liquid so far from the sun because of a phenomenon called tidal heating — Jupiter's gravity sloshes it around so much that friction keeps the interior warm.

Just one planet beyond, Saturn's moon Enceladus is practically screaming to be searched for life. In 2005, during close flybys past the moon, NASA's Cassini orbiter snapped photos of huge plumes of water vapor, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, methane and some organic molecules surging hundreds of meters above the planet's atmosphere. Last year, scientists reported that the jets are coming from a vast, watery reservoir in the moon's interior; like Europa, Enceladus has a subsurface global ocean sandwiched between an icy crust and a rocky ocean floor. And just like ours, that rocky sea floor is almost certainly volcanically active — what else could be sending geysers of water surging into the sky?

"We're in the position with Enceladus to go back and sample the moon and start asking whether the ingredients are there to support a habitable environment and to search, even, for life," said Carolyn Porco, a planetary scientist at NASA and the head of the Cassini imaging team. "And the best part is, you don't have you don't have to dig, you don't have to scratch, you don't have to drill, you just have to let the stuff fall on you."

The dwarf planet Ceres, which sits in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter, harbors a huge amount of water ice, and some of it may be liquid. It seems to have formed a towering ice volcano on the planet's surface. Jupiter's giant moon Ganymede is thought to be a club sandwich of oceans layered between rock and ice. Saturn's moon Titan has an ocean as salty as the Dead Sea, and a surface covered in lakes of liquid methane.

"Hearing some of the details ... about these oceans in our solar system is captivating," said Peter Girguis, a deep sea biologist at Harvard. He left the meeting with "all these little kernels of inspiration" for technologies he wants to develop, like sensors that could send back data on their own — something NASAscientists will need if they ever make it beneath the surface of one of these ocean worlds.

If basic research provides the cornerstones for ocean-world exploration, then technology is the walls and roof beams. Much of the talk at the Ocean Worlds meeting was about the robots, real and imagined, that are needed to explore the remote and hostile places.

Woods Hole computer scientist Yogesh Girdhar demonstrated a program he'd written that allows robots to recognize and track objects of interest without being told to.

Bill Stone, an aerospace engineer who has built tools to explore beneath Antarctic ice, screened a video of his latest "cryobot." In a matter of seconds, the torpedo-shaped drill blasted through a thick layer of ice, using super-hot water warmed by a laser to melt its path.

"We would be at the bottom of any ice sheet on Earth in under six hours," Stone said.

At lunch, Geoff Collins, a planetary scientist at Wheaton College who has worked with NASA on Europa research, reached out to shake Stone's hand.

"That was really cool," he said. The rest of the table nodded their agreement.

The closest analog on Earth to drilling through the ice of Europa or Enceladus is Priscu's subglacial lake project, WISSARD, which involved drilling through a half-mile of ice in temperatures of minus-50 degrees Celsius. On Europa, NASA would have to drill through 60 miles of ice at temperatures lower than minus-180 degrees, all their instruments would have to fit into an average spacecraft's payload, and all the research would have to follow planetary protection procedures to ensure that Europa wasn't contaminated with Earthly life.

"This is what we're up against," Priscu said.

He is skeptical that subsurface exploration on Europa could happen in his lifetime. There's still too much work to be done developing the technology for such a mission; he doesn't envy the engineers who have to figure it out.

Here's what the future does hold: In 2022, NASA will launch a spacecraft dubbed the Europa Clipper into a long, looping orbit around Jupiter, allowing the craft to perform multiple flybys of the planet's icy moon. The clipper will carry magnetic sounding instruments to remotely probe the contents of Europa's ocean and thermal imaging tools to look for signs of recent eruptions of warmer water. An array of other gadgets will snap images of the moon and search for plumes of ice and gas like those seen on Enceladus — if they exist, their contents might hint at the chemistry of the oceans from which they erupt. From orbit, the clipper will assess whether the moon might host life and the where best places to search for it might be.

On Earth, oceanographers are doing research that will help the Europa scientists figure out what to look for. On Tuesday, the two conference organizers, German of WHOI and Kevin Hand of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, leave for a two-month mission in the Arctic, where they'll be using a remotely operated sub to explore an underwater volcano hidden beneath several feet of ice.

Hand will be scouring the sea ice — both the surface and the side that abuts the ocean — for chemical traces of the organisms living down below. These biosignatures could point to a way to detect distant living organisms without having to send a submarine out in search of them.

"In my dream of dreams, you could imagine, we find life, we're able trace it up to the ice-water interface, we're able to trace it into the ice, and then we're able to trace it to spectroscopy [light signatures] that we can sense remotely via satellites," Hand said.

"But I don't think we're going to get that," he said.

Thinking back to 1977, when German was a college student and Hand was only 2, "it was a golden age of discovery," German said. Voyager had just launched, Alvin had just made its first visit to the hydrothermal vents on the ocean floor. All the discoveries that would set the course of their careers were in the midst of being made.

The subsequent 40 years of ocean research and space exploration wound up converging on a single, unifying principle: Where there is water, there is almost certainly life. We've found it in the deep ocean, we've found it under the ice. We think we can find it in space.

"It feels like that golden age is coming around again," German said. "The intellectual stars are aligning in a way they haven't for decades."

It's a pretty good time to be building a cathedral.

Read More:

NASA's 1976 mission to Mars did everything that was hoped for—except find Martians.

This Smithsonian scientist's death was a mystery; 150 years later, his skeleton helped solve it.

After a year of pretending to be on Mars, these astronauts are back home.

Dear Science: How do scientists find far-off planets like Proxima b?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**\* The FBI has released yet another report on Hillary Clinton's emails, and it will greatly disappoint conservatives :

The FBI on Friday released a detailed report on its investigation into Hillary Clinton's use of a private email server while she was secretary of state, as well as what appears to be a summary of her interview with agents, providing the most thorough look yet at the probe that has dogged the campaign of the Democratic presidential nominee.

Where's the part about her flying to Benghazi to kill those four Americans before founding ISIS?

\* Nick Gass has an interesting tidbit from the report :

Former Secretary of State Colin Powell warned Hillary Clinton about using a BlackBerry to conduct official business in her first days as President Barack Obama's secretary of state, according to the FBI investigation's report into Clinton's use of a private server to handle classified information in office released Friday.

Don't forget that when the State Department told Powell, along with other secretaries of state, to produce all their work-related emails, Powell said he couldn't because they were all deleted.

\* Abby Phillip has some warning signs for Clinton with Latino voters :

In a presidential year expected to produce record turnout among Hispanic voters, there are few signs that Hillary Clinton is performing any better among Latinos than past Democratic presidential candidates — even with **immigrant**-bashing Donald Trump as her GOP opponent.

It should be said that if Clinton performs just as well as Barack Obama did with Latinos, she'll almost certainly win. But still, she ought to be doing even better.

\* The moderators for the Clinton/Trump debates have been announced: Lester Holt of NBC, Elaine Quijano of CBS, Martha Raddatz of ABC and Anderson Cooper of CNN, and Chris Wallace of Fox News .

Just for the record, TV journalists tend to ask terrible questions, even if they're better looking. How about some print journalists next time?

\* Gabriel Sherman tells the epic tale of how a group of women finally took down Roger Ailes. The details are positively jaw-dropping .

\* Michelle Goldberg asks why it isn't a major scandal that Ailes, who has been revealed to be a sadist and a sexual harasser, is advising Donald Trump .

\* Joshua Holland says that everyone asking whether Trump can ride the working-class white vote to victory is misunderstanding these voters and what motivates them .

\* Michael Tomasky says that if moderate Republicans had a well-funded interest group to promote them, that might bring some sanity back to our politics .

\* David Leopold has a really nice explainer detailing Trump's unkinder, less gentle policies on **immigration** .

\* Elise Foley patiently explains why we should not accept that Trump is "softening" his proposed treatment of undocumented **immigrants** just because he uses that word from time to time, especially since his actual plans would do the opposite.

\* Steve Benen breaks down some polling among African Americans that is truly awful for Trump, including one poll that finds him coming in fourth among that demographic, behind Clinton, Gary Johnson and Jill Stein.

\* Molly Ball has some good reporting that details how reliant the Trump campaign has been on fear for its success .

\* Robert Schlesinger imagines how much of problem Trump's thin skin would be when it comes to handling  foreign policy in particular .

\* At The Week, I explained why it's perfectly fine to vote against the candidate you hate and not for the candidate you like .

\* And Gideon Resnick has the story of the bizarre reality show Trump wanted to make where a group of rich and poor contestants (only he'd know which was which) would compete for the hand of Omarosa Manigault .

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's speech on **immigration** this week -- with its full blown xenophobia, its broad brush portrayal of undocumented **immigrants** as invaders and criminals, and its flat-out nixing of any meaningful path to assimilation -- is the stuff of nightmares for GOP operatives who believe their party's perilous standing with Latinos has left it teetering on the edge of a demographic abyss.

A new poll of over 3,000 Latino voters just released today will not do much to assuage these fears.

The poll, which was commissioned by America's Voice and conducted by Latino Decisions, finds Hillary Clinton leading Donald Trump by 70-19 among Latinos. That's worse than Mitt Romney's 27 percent in 2012.

But buried in the crosstabs are these findings that suggest Trump may also be damaging the GOP's image among them pretty badly:

\* Only 21 percent of Latinos say the Republican Party truly cares about the Latino community. (Forty five percent say the GOP doesn't care too much about them, and 28 percent say it is hostile to them, a total of 73 percent.) By contrast, 56 percent say the Democratic Party truly cares about them.

\* 70 percent of Latinos say that Trump has made the Republican Party "more hostile" to them. By contrast, 58 percent of Latinos say Hillary Clinton has made the Democratic Party "more welcoming" to them.

\* 68 percent of Latinos say Trump's views about **immigrants** and **immigration** make them less likely to vote for Republican candidates this November -- with 58 percent saying those views have made them much less likely to do that. By contrast, 64 percent of Latinos say Clinton's views make them either much more likely (43) or somewhat more likely (21) to vote for Dem candidates.

\* 63 percent of Latinos say Trump's opposition to Obama's executive deportation relief for DREAMers (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) makes them less likely to vote for GOP candidates, with 53 percent saying they are much less likely.

\* Latinos say they'll vote for Democrats on the generic ballot by 60-14.

There is also some evidence that Trump may be galvanizing Latinos to turn out. Seventy six percent of Latinos say it's more important to vote this year than it was in 2012, and of that group, a bare majority say this is because of the need to resist Trump and his views.

GOP consultant Ana Navarro emails that Trump could indeed be hurting the GOP long term:

"Trump's fate has been decided with Latinos. Put a fork in him, he's done. What we have to worry about now is that Trump does not do to the GOP nationally what Pete Wilson did to the GOP in California. He made the party brand less popular than Dengue Fever among Hispanics."

I'm not sure if there's any polling on Dengue Fever, but it probably isn't all that popular. That aside, the comparison to Pete Wilson is interesting. You may recall that one of the only TV ads the Trump campaign has been airing in swing states, which portrays undocumented **immigrants** as dark, invading hordes, very much resembles a notorious ad that Wilson ran in California in the mid-1990s. Some Republicans have wondered aloud whether Trump's rise may portend or encourage a long term fate for the GOP nationally that is similar to the demographic marginalization the GOP suffered in California.

The necessary caveats: This poll was sponsored by an **immigrant** advocacy group (America's Voice), and it includes a mix of telephone and internet polling. However, a recent WaPo poll also found similar travails for Trump among Latinos: 80 percent of them viewed him unfavorably. The new Latino Decision poll puts it slightly lower, at 74 percent. Nonpartisan observer Larry Sabato today vouched for the new poll as "exceptionally well done."

Obviously there is no way to know whether Trump will actually end up doing serious damage to the national party among Latinos over the long term. It's always possible that he'll moderate and improve among them in coming weeks.

But Trump seems to be going in the opposite direction. Indeed, all of the new polling was conducted before Trump gave his **immigration** speech, at a time when the media coverage reflected hints that he might soften his position, and before prominent conservative Latinos backing Trump announced they were pulling their support in response.

So in coming days and weeks it'll be worth tracking the polling among Latinos to see if Trump's -- and the GOP's -- numbers among Latinos continue to get even worse. If that's possible.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

UPDATE: I should add that none of this means Democrats should, or are, taking the Latino vote for granted in this particular election. As Abby Philip reports, some Dem strategists point out that counting on Latinos only to vote against Trump, without giving them a compelling enough reason to vote for Clinton, could prove a mistake. Still, the new numbers have to be worrisome to Republicans who are thinking beyond this election.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Trump's black and Latino voter outreach has always had the fantastical sound of something fit for a vision board.

Polls continue to show that Trump's alternating declarations that he can win the black vote or the Hispanic vote have never had a basis in reality. But on Thursday, things got real.

Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles President Alfonso Aguilar decided he'd had enough. So did Texas Hispanic Republican Federation Chair Artemio "Temo" Muniz and Trump National Hispanic Advisory Council member Jacob Monty.

All three, and an apparently growing list of prominent conservative Latino operatives, announced that they are done with Trump, withdrawing their support or resigning positions inside his campaign. The reason: the uncompromising hard-line **immigration** speech Trump gave Wednesday. It was as if Trump was speaking from a script with stage instructions that included the words "avoid any hints of a softer position, discard all nuance." Instead Trump yelled most of his 10-point **immigration** plan into a microphone and sounded more like he did the day he announced his White House bid than he has in weeks.

And as much of Trump's support from well-known Hispanic politicos began to recede Wednesday, his campaign also clarified the terms of an at-least-partial surrender in its pursuit of black votes. Its weekend plans went from limited contact with an audience of black voters to assured contact with just one. Trump won't speak to a Detroit black congregation, just sit for a televised interview with a black pastor. This would be only mildly unusual if it weren't for the fact that Trump has not shown up and talked to a large group of black voters anywhere. Instead, unlike many other Republicans, he's declined those invitations.

Trump's comments aimed at black and Latino voters have always consisted largely of sweeping statements, photo opportunities and private meetings at Trump Tower. On Wednesday, when Trump gave that **immigration** speech, the clock simply ran out on Trump's ability to pretend that he can trick or somehow cut a slick deal with voters of color. Trump won't be allowed to use a subset of well-known conservative Latino political operatives or a large number of black pastors to give the appearance of broad-based support.

Now, there have also been occasional campaign announcements to make sure that the media is aware of the boldface names in minority politics and, well,  others involved with the Trump campaign. There's Omarosa Manigault, the infamously villainous reality TV star and onetime Clinton administration staffer; Lynne Patton, vice president of the Eric Trump Foundation and the Rev. Marc Burns, an evangelical black pastor affiliated with a mostly white South Carolina church. They and others have all been willing to say publicly they support Trump and will try to convince others to do the same. But never has Trump come out of one of those Trump Tower meetings and said, on this specific thing, I have changed my mind. He's only said the equivalent of: We talked, I listened.

So there are people, many of them Democrats, who will take in Thursday's Trump news cyclone without even a moment of surprise. Trump, these people will almost certainly say, was never serious, never interested in the political concerns of people of color.

Trump simply wanted to make it seem so to white voters who do not appreciate the divisive, often bigotry-enhanced content of his campaign. Getting well-known Latino political operatives and semi-well-known black pastors and others to back him was always about optics, about appearing less offensive to a bigger set of white voters. That's all Trump was really after when he added those lines describing an incredibly dire version of black life in the United States to his stump speech.

It's worth noting that several of those who resigned from Trump's campaign or support operations Thursday described themselves as repulsed by Trump's description of illegal **immigrants** as a source of criminal and economic peril in the United States. But, it his casual mention of the fewer than 1 million young adults who have gained temporary **immigration** reprieves and the legal right to work in the United States under Obama's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Program that really went to far. These young people would have to go. Program over. Nothing more to be said. That, to some of those who stepped away from the Trump campaign, was utterly unacceptable.

Here's why. In reality, those included in the program are mostly young adults still in high school or college. Many are serving in, or have served in, the military. They have lived in the United States for all but a few years of their lives. They do not know their home countries or, in some cases, have anywhere to live if forcibly returned.

Consider what Monty said on CNN on Thursday afternoon:

When he called for the deportation of DACA recipients that is completely unrealistic, cruel and ... not to mention not good for the U.S. economy. ... When I saw that I had to resign because I'm not going to be a prop for his image like the president of Mexico was yesterday. I'm unwilling to be part of his propaganda machine.

Thursday did not mark the first time one of Trump's minorities as props moments fell apart. Trump already endured a November debacle of a get-together with black pastors at Trump Tower. Several of the pastors whose names had been shared with reporters refused to attend after news of the meeting got out. Most of those who did refused to endorse Trump.

But this month, a far smaller group of well-known black Republicans such as Dr. Ben Carson, one time Republican presidential candidate, and black pastors showed up for another meeting. This group of pastors included a number who televangelists and believers in a theology that insists that the faithful are rewarded with riches, health and material blessings on earth. Trump, these pastors said, is their candidate.

Some have large black congregations — they just may not be large enough, or those pastors influential enough, to move Trump's black voter support numbers in most polls above 4 percent. This is where Trump's weekend visit to Detroit was supposed to come in.

News that Trump will not offer a speech to Bishop Wayne T. Jackson's Detroit congregation, nor make himself available for voter questions, did little to shake Jackson's excitement about his planned sit-down with Trump during his own Thursday afternoon CNN interview. Jackson seemed perfectly content, or at least confident, that he can ask a sufficient number of questions to address the concerns of 13 million black Americans.

Trump's plans to "reach out" to black voters through him seem about as likely to work as his efforts to pretend that he had adopted a softer stance on **immigration**. That's especially true if Trump plans to say more about job competition between the people Trump has been known to call "the blacks" --some of whom are **immigrants** -- and the people Trump often calls "the illegals." That has not worked for other candidates in the past. It would require large numbers of black voters to believe that Trump is genuinely concerned about them and committed to respecting their rights.

Here is what that **immigration** speech made clear. Trump remains unwilling or unable to pivot on policy in a way that might help him win a bigger slice of Hispanic votes. Instead, he affirmed some of the very reasons that so many black and Latino voters regard him as suspect or worse.

There isn't a really effective way to campaign and disguise that.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

The New York Times has obtained a "script" that Donald Trump advisers and senior Republicans have created for him to use at the black church he's visiting tomorrow. Everyone had a good chortle about this, but really, it isn't all that different from the sort of standard issue talking points that candidates and surrogates employ regularly.

This script, though, is particularly noteworthy as more than a laugh line: It sheds some light on a deep split, an indecisiveness, that seems to have taken hold of the Trump campaign, at least in terms of its messaging.

Basically, the script advises Trump to stick to standard conservative boilerplate. The Republican agenda is color-blind. The best hope for enhancing opportunity for African Americans is cutting regulations and getting government out of the way to unshackle the power of free markets to "expand options for people who want to be independent of government." The major thing holding African Americans back is the "horrible progressive agenda that has perpetuated a permanent underclass in America."

This confirms something this blog has discussed before: Trump's new team of handlers is trying to morph him into a more conventional Republican on race in particular, by getting him to stick to a broad indictment of liberal Democratic rule as the primary culprit in holding African Americans back. Airbrushed out of the Trump narration are the more patronizing layers he has been heaping on top of this basic storyline -- the exaggerated depiction of African American life as an irredeemable hellscape; the idea that African Americans mindlessly choose the party that's trying to hold them back.

Those Trump moments probably damaged him further among African Americans, and, in part because they created big media controversies that angered them, probably did nothing to help him with college educated whites, who view him unfavorably and believe he is running a racist, divisive campaign.  Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway has explicitly said Trump "deserves credit" for merely taking his case to black communities. This new script suggests that his advisers are merely hoping to get him in and out of them -- thus securing him credit for showing up -- without doing more damage.

But those additional patronizing layers aren't really examples of Trump going "off script." They are Trump's script. They are natural expressions of his whole approach, i.e., the idea that only he is politically incorrect enough to tell the truth about what is happening to America, even if it pisses a lot of people off, and by extension, only he is tough enough to deal with it. The new script isn't simply designed to keep him from going off script. It's a rewrite of his script.

Indeed, in that context, note the contrast between this new script on race and his approach on **immigration**. After what appeared to be weeks of indecision, rather than softening his approach to the issue, he opted for full-blown xenophobia and a re-commitment to the proposal that brought him to the GOP dance -- mass deportations. The Post reports today that this came after an intense disagreement inside the campaign:

Some Trump advisers told him that many voters like his stubborn dedication to issues that other politicians won't touch, and warned that flip-flopping on **immigration** would make him no different from the career politicians he has accused of being "weak" and beholden to donors.

On **immigration**, then, Trump's brain trust decided to go with the magic of the original brand of Trumpism -- the original script. Meanwhile, on race, the brain trust is trying to turn him into a plastic imitation of a conventional Republican -- by giving him a new script.

The whole ball game now comes down to whether Trump can improve among college educated whites, suburban whites, and white women. In the quest to do that, it seems as if the campaign is now struggling with the question of how, or even whether, to dilute that mystical formula that won the nomination for him. Diluting it risks undermining his appeal to his supporters -- what makes Trump Trump, as it were. Yet the formula is toxic to any efforts to expand his appeal.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\* CLINTON ALLIES SEE MANY PATHS TO VICTORY: Politico's Annie Karni reports that Clinton allies see three separate and distinct paths through the electoral college to the White House:

Clinton allies see an East Coast path, for instance, which would guarantee 317 electoral votes by picking up New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina and Florida; a wholly separate Latino strategy that would put her at 295 electoral votes just with victories in Florida, Nevada, Colorado and New Mexico; and a path through the Rust Belt that would focus on Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa and put her at 293 electoral votes without North Carolina, Georgia, Florida or Nevada.

Still, Clinton advisers are worried about overconfidence. The goal of pushing on many paths at once is to force Trump, who has less in resources and organization, to compete in a lot of territory.

\* A 'MEH' JOBS REPORT: The August jobs numbers are in: "Total nonfarm payroll employment increased by 151,000 in August, and the unemployment rate remained at 4.9 percent, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today."

Economic writer Neil Irwin tweets that the real takeaway from today's report is that it should persuade the Fed to hold off on raising interest rates.

\* THE CANDIDATES HAVE STARK DIFFERENCES ON **IMMIGRATION**: Benjy Sarlin and Alex Seitz-Wald take a hard look at their underlying differences:

Trump called for a new "deportation task force" to root out criminals and for tripling the number of **immigration** agents tasked with removing **immigration**violators from the interior….Clinton, by contrast, has pledged to pursue legislation creating a path to citizenship for qualifying **immigrants** in her first 100 days in office. Failing that, she has pledged to "go even further" than President Obama in using executive action to shield undocumented **immigrants** from deportation.

The easiest way to understand the fundamental underlying difference here is that Clinton favors mass assimilation, and Trump favors mass removal, with no meaningful path to assimilation present anywhere in his vision.

\* TRUMP'S FUZZY MATH ON THE UNDOCUMENTED: Trump likes to assert there are two million "criminal aliens" in the United States. But Michelle Lee takes a good look at the claim and finds that it's based on a combination of questionable sourcing and distortions of available data. According to one think tank estimate, it may be less than half of that.

This claim is important to Trump, because it helps exaggerate the degree to which undocumented **immigrants** are a threat, and also because it reinforces his messaging trick about targeting criminals, not the "good ones," for removal.

\* A FEW FACTS ABOUT THE BORDER: NPR has a nice guide to the basics: The number of border agents has more than doubled since 2002. The border patrol budget has exploded to $3.8 billion, and **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement funding has escalated to $5.9 billion. The number of apprehensions at the border -- a measure of how many attempt to cross -- has plummeted steadily since 2000. Removals have increased under Obama.

But Trump tells his audiences regularly we have "open borders," and nothing matters, so please disregard.

\* A KEY DIVIDE BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES: Paul Krugman looks at the profound long term ramifications of lead poisoning children, and adds:

Mrs. Clinton has pledged to "remove lead from everywhere" within five years…everything in her history, especially her decades-long focus on family policy, suggests that she would make a serious effort. On the other side, Mr. Trump — oh, never mind. He rants against government regulations of all kinds….the divide over lead should be seen…as an indicator of the broader stakes. If you believe that science should inform policy and that children should be protected from poison, well, that's a partisan position.

It's also worth adding that Clinton has talked about lead poisoning as a problem embodying systemic racism, which I'm not sure Trump has done or would ever do.

 \* AND CAN REPUBLICANS ESCAPE TRUMP? NBC's First Read crew notes that a new phase of down-ticket Republicans distancing themselves from Trump is set to begin right now, and comments:

After Labor Day, almost every single Democrat in a House and Senate race will be tying their GOP opponent to Trump. So up and down the ticket, hundreds of millions of dollars in Democratic messaging will be "Trump, Trump, Trump, Trump, Trump, Trump."…November is going to go one of two ways. One, this kind of GOP separation from Trump is going to work like we saw in 1996. Or two, the bottom is going to fall out for the Republican Party.

Or somewhere between the two!

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a survey sampling more than  3,700  registered Hispanic voters (with a margin of error that's less than 2 percentage points, due to the huge sample), America's Voice, a pro-**immigration** group, found essentially what media and other pollsters have uncovered: These voters really, really don't like Donald Trump.

Hillary Clinton gets 70 percent of the sampled Hispanic voters. Trump gets 19 percent (less than Mitt Romney, who got 27 percent in 2012). What's more, only 15 percent are certain they will vote for him. Sixty-one percent say they are certain to vote for Clinton. Trump, as you might imagine, is hugely unpopular with Hispanics -- 74 percent have an unfavorable view of him. The poll was taken before the vitriolic speech in Arizona and the exit of a number of advisers from Trump's Hispanic advisory council. It is safe to assume Trump's numbers are now even worse than these.

Even among Hispanic Republicans (like those who repudiated him after the Arizona speech), only 76 percent of them support Trump. Hillary Clinton gets 93 percent of Democratic Hispanics.

Thirty-two percent of the Hispanics polled list jobs and the economy as one of the most important issues, but 38 percent list deportations/**immigration**. This bears out the belief from pro-**immigration**-reform Republicans and most credible pollsters that it's hard to get Hispanics to vote for you if you want to deport their friends and relatives.

Trump is on track to do worse than Romney with Hispanics, African Americans, women, whites and college-educated voters. He's doing much worse among Republicans. When pundits talk about a path to the presidency, they should try to identify states without many Hispanics, African Americans, women and college-educated voters. He'll need enough of those to add up to 270 electoral votes. Oh, you say, "There aren't states like that"? That is precisely what makes discussions about a path to the presidency devoid of meaning.

Battleground states (which America's Voice polled and will release next week) in particular tend to reflect the national trend; Trump is losing in virtually all of them and turning Arizona (with lots of Hispanics) and Georgia (lots of African Americans) into swing states. Unless Trump stops offending some or all of the groups who live in these states (and everywhere else), he's going to lose a lot more battleground states than he will win.

Part of the Trump effect is seen in the states with Senate races. Polls show Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) with an average 8-point lead; Trump is up 2.5 percent (within the margin of error). Georgia is a dead heat at the presidential level; Republican incumbent Sen. Johnny Isakson leads by 8 points. In Florida, Trump is down by 2.7 points; Sen. Marco Rubio is up 5.7 points. In Ohio, Clinton is up nearly 4 points, while Republican incumbent Sen. Rob Portman is 7.5 percent ahead in his race.

You get the picture. Trump is running behind other Republicans in competitive states by a substantial margin. Imagine if the Republicans nominated someone for president who was only as popular, on average, as the GOP incumbent senators. The GOP would in all likelihood be tied or a little ahead of Clinton. Great going there, Republicans.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**IT'S USEFUL that Donald Trump has clarified his plans for Larissa Martinez, who started classes this week as a freshman at Yale University, having graduated in the spring as class valedictorian at her Texas high school. After weeks of waffling, and suggestions that his views on **immigration** might be "softening," Mr. Trump has set the record straight: Ms. Martinez has no future in America.

The recipient of a full scholarship to Yale, Ms. Martinez is hoping for a career as a neurosurgeon. As it happens, she's also a top-notch student, a compelling public speaker and, according to Mr. Trump's policy, a high priority for deportation.

Discarding his dalliance with fairness and compassion, the Republican presidential nominee this week tossed red meat to the xenophobes in his base by reaffirming his intention to launch a crusade of mass deportations that would target, according to an analysis by The Post, at least 6 million people. Among them, he said, would be **immigrants** who have overstayed their visas. That category would sweep up Ms. Martinez, who, at age 13, accompanied her mother and sister to the United States on a tourist visa; they stayed after the visa expired, having fled an abusive home in Mexico.

Of course, there is no place in Mr. Trump's cramped mental universe for someone like Ms. Martinez. To Mr. Trump and the crowds who egg him on, undocumented **immigrants** are criminals, murderers, rapists, carriers of disease and drug smugglers, fit to be rounded up by deportation agents and shipped far, far away.

Just why Mr. Trump would prioritize visa-overstayers for deportation, and not those who entered the country illegally in the first place, is unexplained. Logic is hardly the point of his policy. He asserts that illegal **immigrants** have stolen jobs from Americans and triggered a crime wave. In fact, they have met a labor market demand for low-wage workers and been a catalyst for economic growth.

While there are undoubtedly instances of terrible crimes committed by unauthorized **immigrants** — as there are by authorized **immigrants**, and green card holders, and, it goes without saying, citizens — they are hardly the rule. In fact, young **immigrant** males are incarcerated at roughly half the rate of native-born Americans. Illegal **immigrants**, like legal ones, are generally law-abiding and extremely hard-working.

To the GOP nominee, illegal **immigrants** are a useful instrument with which to whip his supporters into a froth of nativist agitation. He would hire thousands more **immigration** and Border Patrol agents; he would create a "special deportation task force"; he would round up the criminals whose countries refuse to accept them. He would do it all on Day One, in the first hour, the first minute, in the first fleeting seconds of his administration — by fiat, presumably, because he makes no reference to Congress or legality or judicial precedent. It will all be so fast, so beautiful, so efficient. Believe him.

The self-contained imposter who called briefly on Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto on Wednesday was masquerading as Donald Trump. In fact, the real Mr. Trump is the man who has been on television all these months, playing on hatred and fear, threatening people such as Ms. Martinez, who represent American values more truly than Mr. Trump ever could.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"According to federal data, there are at least 2 million, 2 million, think of it, criminal aliens now inside of our country, 2 million people, criminal aliens. … Since 2013 alone, the Obama administration has allowed 300,000 criminal aliens to return back into United States communities. These are individuals encountered or identified by ICE [**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement], but who were not detained or processed for deportation because it wouldn't have been politically correct." -- Donald Trump, **immigration** speech in Phoenix, Aug. 31, 2016

We fact-checked many claims from Trump's 75-minute speech introducing his 10-point **immigration** plan in a roundup, but his claims about the number of "criminal aliens" released by ICE called for a deeper dive.

Trump used these figures to argue his proposal for "zero tolerance for criminal aliens," vowing to remove them from the country. Trump has proposed the mandatory return of all criminal aliens since he released an **immigration** plan on Aug. 20, 2015. "Criminal aliens" refers to noncitizens convicted of a crime.

We were curious: Are his figures correct?

The Facts

This proposal is framed around deporting undocumented **immigrants** who have committed violent crimes. Trump said he would push for two new laws aimed at punishing criminal aliens convicted of illegal reentry and removing "criminal **immigrants** and terrorists," including previously deported unauthorized **immigrants**. He said he would name these laws after victims killed by people in the United States illegally.

Trump cites federal data, saying there are at least 2 million criminal aliens in the country. This number comes from a Department of Homeland Security fiscal 2013 report saying there were 1.9 million "removable criminal aliens."

But this figure refers to a broader population of non-U.S. citizens with criminal convictions. It includes undocumented **immigrants** and people who are lawful permanent residents, or those who have temporary visas. Lawfully present people in the United States who are convicted of serious crimes are subject to removal from the country.

The exact number of illegally present non-citizens within that 1.9 million figure is not clear. Calculations by the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank that doesn't take positions on **immigration** legislation, show about 820,000 (43 percent) of the 1.9 million are unauthorized **immigrants** with criminal convictions.

But Jessica Vaughan, director of policy studies at the Center for **Immigration** Studies, which favors lower **immigration**, said most of that 1.9 million figure are undocumented, but she did not provide any specific data. She said it was based on information she received from a DHS source she could not reveal, which we can't independently verify. The Trump campaign consulted Vaughan on the speech and used her calculations for statistics on criminal aliens.

Trump says 300,000 criminal aliens were released by ICE since 2013, and they were not detained or processed for deportation. This figure lacks a lot of context.

ICE has provided its estimates for released criminal convictions to the House Judiciary Committee. Between fiscal 2013 and fiscal 2015, there were 82,288 criminal aliens that ICE released into non-custodial settings.

Vaughan added an additional 200,000 based on her calculation of the number of people ICE released per prosecutorial discretion guidelines. Most of these encounters were in jails, of people who were arrested and were identified by ICE  as a "criminal threat." Once ICE decides not to pursue deportation, the local law enforcement would release them from jail. They are not technically classified as the same "criminal **alien**" definition by ICE at that point.

Then she added an additional 18,646 "deportable aliens that ICE was seeking" but were ignored by state and local law enforcement. That adds up to just over 300,000.

We ran Vaughan's calculations by ICE, which declined to confirm "a number calculated by an external group."

**Immigrants** can pay bond out of ICE custody. They may be lawful residents who are granted some type of relief under the law, or people granted asylum for fleeing persecution, said Kevin Johnson, dean of the University of California at Davis School of Law. He added: "U.S. authorities may decide not to seek removal of low-level criminal offenders. It is known as prosecutorial discretion. Some minor crimes, for example, might not warrant destroying families."

Trump says ICE didn't deport the 300,000 people out of "political correctness." This is an attack against discretion guidelines and the 2014 ICE deportation reprioritization, which Vaughan said "excuses too many offenders from deportation." ICE says the new priorities focus on removing undocumented **immigrants**who pose the most serious public safety and national security threats.

"The idea behind the 300,000 number is to reflect the number of criminal aliens who were avoiding deportation, or were not held in custody despite the fact that they are considered criminals [or a criminal threat]," Vaughan said.

There are people ICE must release, based on orders from an **immigration** judge. Federal courts and the Supreme Court have requirements dating to 2001 that limit how long ICE can detain people who are ordered to be removed.

Of the 82,288 released criminal aliens reported by ICE, 56 percent (46,422) were released based on discretion. An additional 38 percent (31,314) paid bond. The rest were released under legal requirements or because they couldn't get travel documents to leave the country. So not all are because of Obama administration decisions.

Trump also proposed to "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."

A "detainer" is a term for a request by ICE to a local or state agency to hold a person (usually in jail) until ICE can take over custody. It doesn't necessarily mean the person is present illegally, and detainers don't begin deportation proceedings, according to the American **Immigration** Council.

Under Trump's proposal, a person arrested by police -- regardless of how serious the crime is, without knowing whether they are present illegally -- would be held in jail, and their removal proceeding would begin without due process. Such an approach to enforcement is consistent with Trump's call to bring back two DHS enforcement programs that rely on local governments, which are being phased out because they didn't effectively target violent criminals, and opened up the potential of racial profiling.

"This is going to be a real problem," said Marie Provine, an Arizona State University professor who co-authored a book on local police and **immigration**enforcement, "Policing **Immigrants**." She said Trump's proposal would overwhelm local law enforcement and federal **immigration** courts, without effectively targeting people who committed serious crimes.

The Pinocchio Test

Trump used fuzzy math to back up his proposal to remove criminals who are in the country illegally. The 2 million figure refers to the total number of "removable criminal aliens" as determined by DHS, and refers to convicted non-citizens in the country legally and illegally. While he states it as fact, an independent think tank analyzing **immigration** policy estimated that more than half of the 2 million are convicted criminals who are not U.S. citizens, but lawfully in the country.

Trump's other figure is a complex calculation by the Center for **Immigration** Studies, which advocates for lower **immigration**. In general, figures provided by organizations with a goal to change policy should be viewed with skepticism. The number that directly fits the ICE definition of "criminal aliens" released into the community is 82,228 — about 27 percent of Trump's figure -- that the agency reported to Congress. Of that figure, 56 percent were released based on ICE's discretion, or "being politically correct," as Trump would say. The rest adding up to 300,000 includes a variety of calculations, including those considered a "criminal threat," not necessarily "criminal aliens."

Federal **immigration** enforcement data, especially relating to illegal **immigration**, are not always transparent or reliable. That leads to outside groups recalculating federal data to make their point -- which then gets elevated when a prominent person is willing to cite it in a major speech, such as Trump's **immigration** address in Phoenix. Trump states both figures as simple fact, when both calculations are much more complex than that.

Two Pinocchios
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**According to news reports, Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus really doesn't believe things are going swimmingly with Donald Trump's campaign. The New York Times reports on a meeting between RNC officials and Trump's son Eric in which they laid out a "grim prognosis" and showed that the candidate was "drastically underperforming other Republicans." Apparently professional pollster turned campaign chairman Kellyanne Conway had not broken the news to the Trump camp herself. She prefers to keep bad news away from her boss.

Republicans might be relieved that Priebus and his staff aren't not dumb — they know Trump is losing by a lot. Priebus is simply duplicitous — telling the media one thing and Trump and his family something else in private. (Just as Donald Trump's behind-closed-doors chat with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto conflicted with Trump's version of the meeting and his actual **immigration** approach.) It's not a crime to try to keep a stiff upper lip in public, but Priebus has used Trump's viability as an excuse for not redirecting funds elsewhere. If he's known for some time that Trump is on a sinking ship, he should have been candid with conscientious Republicans who demand that he direct money elsewhere.

Getting back to Trump, however, we can see that for all the bluster and bravado he knows he is failing. That's why he went to Mexico, where he was kept on a short leash, even at the expense of looking painfully ill at ease. (It wasn't short enough, however, to stop him from answering questions and lying about what was said in the meeting with Mexico's president.)

Trump's inability to step outside the reality TV role caused him, as we remarked upon Thursday, to renege on a promise to speak to congregants at a black church in Detroit. Even worse, a detailed script of the questions and answers he was to use with the pastor of the church got leaked. The promised speech isn't happening, and there isn't even going to be an impromptu conversation. Even banalities like "the proof is in the pudding" and saying that pols like him have to have "the courage to go into communities and work with everyone" (precisely what he is accused of not doing) had to be written out. The script is one long string of boring platitudes that Trump apparently couldn't think up on his own, even with a friendly questioner. It reveals no specific understanding of or experience with African American communities.

The Clinton campaign reacted with predictable outrage. "Not surprisingly, Trump's ignorance on issues like the economy, criminal justice reform, the meaning of quality health care or systemic racism, has forced him to resort to scripted conversations and staged engagements with our communities," a spokesperson declared in a written statement. "The problem is, our community can see through this: outreach to African Americans cannot be scripted; leaders ought to be prepared to address the hard truths about race and justice in our country."

Trump's simplistic script raises a number of questions, including whether Trump is so easily distracted that he cannot master even trite phrases, let alone ingest actual policy ideas. Is he so lacking in intellectual capacity that he cannot handle a spontaneous Q&A, let alone a speech with an African American audience? Perhaps if he went more often to speak to minority audiences it would not be such a scary ordeal requiring elaborate preparation to prevent him from falling on his face.

The church script and canceled speech also raise the question of what he could accomplish. In the latest USA Today/Suffolk University poll, he is getting 4 percent of the African American vote, a number that's not likely to rise. If instead he is trying to assuage white women and college-educated whites — with whom he is trailing far beyond Mitt Romney's 2012 numbers — then the speech in Arizona spitting fire about both legal and illegal **immigrants** was an unmitigated disaster, reinforcing his image as a bigot and scary authoritarian. You see, Trump makes problems faster than the RNC and his growing stable of handlers can fix.

And speaking of handlers, he now has deputy campaign manager David Bossie, a boisterous right-wing veteran who won the Citizens United case that gave SuperPACs free rein. (Conway might want to stay off TV and start actually running a campaign.) The irony is rich: Trump hates, he says, SuperPACs. Well if you cannot beat them, join them, right?

To recap: Trump is failing so he has to transform himself into a marionette on the strings of seasoned handlers who do not trust him to wing it. He cannot go on TV interviews outside the Fox cocoon. He and his ego need to be bubble-wrapped and handled with care. He's now the embodiment of a scripted, boring, focus-group friendly pol. It is quite a different portrait of the uber-confident mogul who declares himself to be a winner at everything. But then with Trump, you never get what is advertised.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At the core of Donald Trump's proposals on **immigration** is that he hopes to crack down on **immigrants** here illegally. But Trump repeatedly claims not to know how many people that is.

"The central issue is not the needs of the 11 million illegal **immigrants** or however many there may be -- and honestly we've been hearing that number for years," he said during his speech on Wednesday. "It's always 11 million. Our government has no idea. It could be 3 million. It could be 30 million. They have no idea what the number is."

It's an important figure in part because Trump's ideas for dealing with those **immigrants** could balloon in cost if the number is three times the 11 million "we've been hearing for years." But Trump misunderstands the figure in a number of key ways. It's not produced by the government, it's not static at 11 million -- and there's basically no way it could be off by 300 percent.

The most common source for the 11 million figure is number-crunching from Pew Research Center. Year-by-year, Pew crafts an estimate of the country's undocumented **immigrant** population, using a variety of statistical tools to ensure that the figure is as accurate as possible. The detailed methodology is available online, but we spoke with Pew senior demographer Jeffrey Passel to walk us through the calculation in simpler terms.

We spoke by phone. A transcript of that discussion (lightly edited, as they say) follows.

THE FIX: How, broadly speaking, does Pew figure out how many people have **immigrated** here illegally?

PASSEL: We start with a fairly simple equation. We start with an estimate of the foreign-born population, and we subtract from the total foreign-born population an estimate of the **immigrants** who are here legally. That difference is our estimate of the unauthorized **immigrant** population.

THE FIX: So the estimate for the foreign-born population comes from Census data?

PASSEL: The estimate of the total foreign-born comes from surveys that the Census Bureau does. The main one we use is the American Community Survey. We make adjustments to that survey for people who are missed in the survey.

THE FIX: How does that adjustment work?

PASSEL: There are a couple of different sources that we use. The Census Bureau itself does evaluations of how complete the census and their surveys are. So we base our estimates in part on the figures that they have for what they call the "undercount."

We also use some information from a couple of other studies that are done that look specifically at Mexican **immigrants** and whether or not they participated in the census. What these studies have found is that U.S.-born Mexicans are much more likely to participate than legal **immigrants**, who are much more likely to participate than unauthorized **immigrants**. So we use the Census Bureau's data as a base for our corrections, but we make adjustments for what we know to be higher undercounts of legal **immigrants** and then yet higher undercounts of unauthorized **immigrants**.

As a check on all of this, we also are able to look at data mainly from Mexico on the number of Mexicans in Mexico. Basically all of the Mexicans -- almost all of the Mexicans in the world are either in Mexico or the United States. So by combining our estimates of the number of Mexican **immigrants** in the U.S. legally and as unauthorized **immigrants**, plus the number of Mexicans in Mexico, we have a check on the total numbers.

THE FIX: The other part of that equation, then, is the number of **immigrants** that are here legally. How do you get that number?

PASSEL: **Immigrants** who are here legally are admitted as lawful permanent residents or as refugees through what is now the Department of Homeland Security. Each year the Department of Homeland Security publishes the number of **immigrants** they've admitted for lawful permanent residence. The other group that's admitted is refugees. Those are counted by the office of Refugee Resettlement in the Health and Human Services department.

So we take the number admitted each year and we add that to the previous year's estimate of lawful permanent residents. We update the estimate from year to year with basic demographic methodology: We take into account the new arrivals; we also make an estimate how many of last year's **immigrants** died in the previous year and how many moved out of the country.

It's a fairly straightforward demographic accounting equation.

THE FIX: During the 2010 Census, there was a very specific focus placed on encouraging people to participate in the census, including a lot of Spanish-language outreach. My assumption, then, is that that was focused on trying to ensure as-accurate-as-possible a count of some of those folks that you were just referring to. Is that correct?

PASSEL: The Census Bureau in every census does outreach to try to get people to participate. In both 2000 and 2010, there were a number of programs designed specifically to get Latinos to participate. It involved advertising, it involved working with community groups and various kinds of outreach.

The messages in the Census Bureau's advertising and outreach varied depending on which groups they were trying to get to participate. The unauthorized **immigrant** population is very heavily Hispanic. The Hispanic population, the Asian populations are very heavily **immigrant**. So the outreach to both the Hispanic population and the Asian population included messages in languages other than English and an emphasis on the confidential nature of the census and how important it is for local communities that people participate.

Based on the coverage studies of the last two censuses, those outreach programs were fairly successful, because the undercount as a percentage of the population was reduced substantially in 2000 and 2010 over what was experienced in 1990 and 1980.

THE FIX: So the natural question that people have is the extent to which this number could be wrong. We've got Donald Trump out there saying, "it could be anywhere between six and 30 million people." Setting that aside, why is it you feel as though a layperson can be confident that you're not off by up to 5 million **immigrants**?

PASSEL: What the Census Bureau is really pretty good at is counting houses. Houses don't move. It's hard for housing units to hide.

In the census and in the surveys, if a housing unit is occupied, the Census Bureau is able to count people in those housing units. They may not get everybody -- it's true that there may be more than one family unit in the household and they only get one. But overall, the studies we have of housing unit coverage and population coverage suggest it's very unlikely that the numbers could be a lot higher than what they are.

We build in a correction for undercount. So we're adjusting the numbers upward, and the adjustments are larger for the groups we know we tend to miss. We know we tend to miss young men more than young women and we know we miss young adults more than older adults. We're already factoring in an upward adjustment.

It's possible that the adjustment could be a bit more than what we're factoring in, but it's very, very unlikely that the numbers are as much as 5 million higher than what we've estimated.

As I said, the other check we have is looking at data on the Mexican population, age-by-age, adding the U.S. numbers to the Mexican numbers.

For instance, just a simple example -- we have a pretty good idea of how many Mexicans were born 25 years ago, and all of the 25-year-old Mexicans are essentially in the United States or in Mexico, so we can put our numbers together with the Mexican numbers and have confidence that the numbers aren't a lot higher than what we think they are.

THE FIX: So is it more likely that you're wrong by being too high rather than by being too low?

PASSEL: No, I think our estimates are pretty accurate.

We're working with sample-based data so the samples could be a little bit wrong but the base from which we adjust our numbers up is pretty -- we're pretty confident in that. It could possibly be a million or maybe a little more higher than where we're estimating. It could be lower by about that much. But it's probably more likely to be a little higher than what we're estimating than a little lower.

All in all we think they're pretty accurate. There are other people making estimates. They often use similar techniques, but there's a pretty wide consensus of numbers around 11 million from people who are looking at data.

What Passel didn't say, of course, is that for people who aren't looking at data, the number could be whatever they want it to be.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The morning after Donald Trump once again embraced his hard-line **immigration** posture in a shouted speech, at least four members of his two-week-old Hispanic advisory council said they might not vote for the Republican presidential nominee and warned that his harsh rhetoric would cost him the election.

At meetings Thursday on the 14th floor of Trump Tower in Manhattan, the candidate's top aides held the opposite view. They thought his tough talk on **immigration** — combined with a whirlwind trip to Mexico on Wednesday — had, in the words of one adviser, "won him the election."

"How do you like our poll numbers?" Trump excitedly asked in a brief telephone interview with The Washington Post on Thursday. He rattled off recent surveys that he said show his support has inched up.

For nearly two weeks, Trump has publicly and privately debated how best to describe his **immigration** positions, especially when it comes to the roughly 11 million illegal **immigrants** in the country.

He spent days floating a series of possible changes and gauging the reaction, and even visited Mexico for a few hours Wednesday in a bid to appear more presidential. But later that night, he decided to stick with the far-right positions that were key to his success in the Republican primaries and could help him cement the support of white men — one demographic where he beats Democratic rival Hillary Clinton.

The roller-coaster debate — which continued Thursday after a speech the campaign heralded as definitive — centered on Trump's repeated calls during the primaries to deport all of the undocumented **immigrants** in the country. He suggested that his declaration applied even if they have lived here for decades, are contributing members of society or have children who are U.S. citizens, although he appeared to back away from his call to immediately deport all of the illegal **immigrants** living in the United States with a "deportation force."

But in the end, the debate within the Trump campaign turned out to be about messaging rather than policy.

"He hasn't changed his position on **immigration**," Trump surrogate Katrina Pierson said on CNN last week in remarks that were widely mocked at the time but in hindsight seemed to capture internal thinking. "He's changed the words that he is saying."

The public side of the debate took a turn on Aug. 20, when Trump held a hurriedly organized Saturday meeting with a newly formed National Hispanic Advisory Council at Trump Tower. He asked those around the table to share alternatives to mass deportation, signaling that he was willing to change his mind on the issue.

The council urged Trump to focus on how undocumented **immigrants** contribute to the nation's economy and abandon his plans to quickly deport millions — a view Trump heard from fellow business owners and wealthy Republican donors over the course of the summer. For several days, the candidate seemed to echo these views, saying in interviews with Fox News Channel that he would be willing to work with those who came here illegally and are living prosperous lives.

At a town hall meeting in Texas, Trump even polled audience members to get their input on the fate of the nation's undocumented **immigrants**, using his most flattering language to date.

But some Trump advisers told him that many voters like his stubborn dedication to issues that other politicians won't touch, and warned that flip-flopping on **immigration** would make him no different from the career politicians he has accused of being "weak" and beholden to donors.

These advisers urged Trump to use tough, nativist language in his **immigration** speech in Phoenix on Wednesday to create as sharp a contrast as possible with Clinton. They argued that by showing strength and force of leadership, Trump will attract undecided voters.

"We had a serious adult conversation about where we are. The people that won this debate said, 'Look, this is what got us here, and we can't abandon it,' " one Trump adviser said Thursday, speaking on the condition of anonymity to be candid about the campaign's internal deliberations. "There were many of us who made input, and it was clear that the hold-the-line people, we had more sway with him. I think the political calculation is, you can't abandon the base."

By Thursday of last week, Trump's tone was noticeably different during an interview with CNN, when he said that any **immigrant** who wants to become a legal resident would have to leave the country and apply to return — a process that can take many years.

"You have a lot of people being deported" already, he said on CNN, having praised the policies of President Obama and former president George W. Bush in an earlier interview. "We're going to do that vigorously."

As Trump's campaign was debating whether and when he should give an **immigration** policy speech, the nominee received a three-page invitation from Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto.

The prospect of a preelection Trump visit alarmed several Mexican cabinet members, but Peña Nieto decided to do it. Advocates for the meeting viewed it not as a chance to raise the president's sagging approval ratings, but as a political gamble that was important in the long run in case Trump won.

But Trump surprised them by agreeing to come within days. Not all parts of the Mexican government were fully informed about the plan, and the U.S. Embassy was alerted to the visit by the Secret Service, arranging the logistics of his trip.

Trump arrived Wednesday afternoon — hours before he was to give his **immigration** speech in Phoenix — and met with Peña Nieto for about an hour. Each then gave friendly remarks praising his neighboring nation. Many pundits lauded Trump for seeming willing to work with the leader of a nation that he has insulted so deeply during his campaign.

Hours later, Trump's tone changed significantly as he gave his formal policy speech — broadly painting many undocumented **immigrants** as violent criminals and promising that he would quickly deport millions. At least 5 million **immigrants** would be subject to rapid deportation under Trump's latest proposals, according to a Post analysis.

"That is all him. Those are his decisions," a top campaign aide said, speaking on the condition of anonymity to discuss internal talks. "He got very different viewpoints on **immigration**. But in the end, it was all him. That speech has to be his words, his cadence, his delivery."

Former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani — who traveled with Trump to Mexico and has been a key figure in the candidate's discussions on the issue — said the contrasting speeches showed Trump's range.

"This is what a president has to be able to do," Giuliani said. "If you're meeting with a head of state, you'll act differently than if you were at the Heritage Foundation speaking to scholars or speaking at a rally. That's why Trump seized on the invitation so quickly. He wanted to show that he could operate on several fronts and speak to different audiences, boldly and regardless of the risk."

But the harsh tone of the policy speech stunned Jacob Monty, a member of Trump's Hispanic advisory council and a Houston-based **immigration** lawyer. Monty has helped Trump raise money and wrote a newspaper column in June headlined, "A Latino's case for Donald Trump."

"The speech was just an utter disappointment," he said in an interview Thursday.

Soon afterward, Monty resigned from the advisory group and posted on Facebook that he will not vote for Trump.

"I don't want to be a prop like the Mexican president," Monty said in the interview. "We were out there defending him. And then to be just lied to like that — it doesn't feel good. It's not okay."

Others felt the same way. Ramiro Peña, a Texas pastor, called the advisory council "a scam" in an email to campaign and party leaders, according to Politico. Massey Villarreal, a Houston businessman, deemed the speech "awful" in an interview with NBC Latino. Alfonso Aguilar, a Latino activist, tweeted that he felt "disappointed and misled."

Even as those defections were unfolding Thursday morning, more than a dozen senior Trump campaign staff members met at Trump Tower to map out their strategy for the rest of the race. The mood in the room was charged and optimistic, with attendees praising Trump's speech and trip as a jolt to his bid, according to two people familiar with the discussions who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss a private meeting.

One Trump ally involved in the talks Thursday described Wednesday's drama as the "day that won him the election" because of Trump's reiteration of his conservative views on **immigration**, which many in his orbit consider crucial to wooing economically frustrated working-class voters.

And in another sign that Trump's orbit would continue to hold to its combative ethos, longtime conservative operative David N. Bossie was introduced as the new deputy campaign manager. Bossie, previously president of the Citizens United advocacy group, has been a prominent investigator of Clinton controversies for decades.

"A friend of mine for many years," Trump said, speaking from his office in New York. "Solid. Smart. Loves politics, knows how to win."

Yet even after his big speech, Trump continued to send mixed signals.

"We're going to sit back, we're going to assess the situation, we're going to make a decision at that time," he said on Fox News Channel on Thursday night about undocumented **immigrants** who had not committed other crimes. "I want to see, before we do anything further, I want to see how it shapes up when we have strong, impenetrable borders."
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Joshua Partlow in Mexico City contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**John Rakolta Jr. was skeptical as he headed to a private meeting with Donald Trump in July at Chicago's Trump International Hotel. The Michigan construction executive, a longtime ally of 2012 GOP nominee Mitt Romney and a top fundraiser for Sen. Marco Rubio, was not yet sold on raising funds for Trump.

But the Trump whom Rakolta encountered in a suite on the 27th floor was nothing like the provocateur he expected. "He is extremely soft-spoken," Rakolta said. "None of the stuff that I imagined." The two had a wide-ranging discussion about why auto companies build plants in countries such as Mexico instead of the United States.

Rakolta left with newfound enthusiasm. Trump left with a new talking point.

"I have a friend who builds plants, and he's a great builder of plants, and I was with him the other day — great guy," the candidate told reporters a few weeks later. "And I said, 'How's it going?' He said, 'Unbelievable. . . The plants I'm building in Mexico, I've never seen anything — it's the eighth wonder of the world.' And he's not happy. He's an American guy. He'd rather build them here."

The New York billionaire, who has cast himself as free from the influence of the party's donor class, has spent this summer forging bonds with wealthy GOP financiers — seeking their input on how to run his campaign and recast his policies for the general election, according to more than a dozen people who have participated in the conversations.

Private meetings with top contributors turn into strategy brainstorming sessions. High-priced dinner fundraisers are transformed into impromptu focus groups.

During a July lunch at a Southampton, N.Y., estate, he spent at least an hour asking the 60 heavyweight contributors in attendance to each share their pick of whom he should tap as his running mate. At a photo line with donors in Minneapolis in August, he polled whether he should continue using a teleprompter at public events.

At a mountainside chateau in Aspen last week, he quizzed locals about how the campaign could better compete in Colorado. And in a pistachio orchard outside a supporter's home in Tulare, Calif., this week, he queried farmers about how to create a "permit" system for undocumented workers.

The episodes illustrate how Trump, who has a tiny circle of intimates, is turning to the wealthy business leaders he encounters on the fundraising circuit to serve as an ad hoc kitchen cabinet. He appointed many of his biggest financial backers to his economic advisory council, including Wisconsin billionaire Diane Hendricks, investor Tom Barrack and oil executive Harold Hamm. And there are already signs of how Trump is incorporating ideas from donors into his campaign.

The most dramatic example came in August during a fundraiser in East Hampton, N.Y., when conservative benefactor Rebekah Mercer touted the merits of Breitbart News chief Stephen K. Bannon in a conversation with Trump about his campaign leadership. Days later, Trump sidelined campaign chairman Paul Manafort and effectively replaced him with Bannon.

Several days later, casino billionaire Sheldon Adelson privately urged Trump to show more humility and treat people with more respect, as the New York Timesfirst reported. The next day, the candidate issued a rare apology for causing "personal pain."

In a statement, Trump told The Washington Post that he has "met some really wonderful people while raising money for the RNC. They do also like that I am personally investing many millions in my own campaign. Some of the people I've met I'm sure will be lifelong friends."

When asked about the perception that donors have input on his decision-making, spokeswoman Hope Hicks responded that Trump "is an excellent listener and welcomes the advice of people he respects."

"It is a great leadership quality and reflective of his creative, bold thinking that proved to be so successful throughout his career," she added.

In private, supporters see a side of Trump that sharply contrasts with his persona on stage at his raucous rallies. Solicitous and restrained, he disarms those expecting a bomb-thrower.

"I had heard he was a different person than you see in the media, but you don't know until you experience it," said Janet Beihoffer, a national committeewoman for the Minnesota Republican Party, who was struck by how engaged the candidate was during the photo line in Minneapolis several weeks ago. "I was floored."

Over and over, donors said they were impressed by Trump's attentiveness — he leans in close, moves his chair over, focuses only on what they are saying — as well as his intense efforts to glean new information.

"I had no idea what to expect, and I was very pleasantly surprised by how well he listened to what I had to say," said Andrew Sabin, the owner of a New York-based precious-metals refining business, who met privately with the candidate earlier this summer in the Hamptons to assess whether he wanted to contribute to his campaign. "No arrogance, you know, 'I'm Donald Trump, the king of the world.' He sat back and wanted to know what your opinion was."

The two men discussed **immigration**, among other topics, and Sabin said he made the case that it was impractical to deport the estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States, as the candidate had insisted in the primaries that he would do through a "deportation force."

Several weeks after their meeting, Trump set off a storm of confusion by suggesting that he was still assessing whether all undocumented **immigrants** would be subject to immediate deportation. Sabin was heartened. "I think he liked what he heard," he said.

In a speech Wednesday in Phoenix, however, Trump renewed his hard-line call to deport undocumented **immigrants**, particularly those convicted of crimes and those who have overstayed visas.

Peter Leidel, a Texas-based energy investor, was impressed with how the candidate solicited ideas from a dozen donors at a breakfast fundraiser at Trump Tower in New York in early August.

"To every person who said something, he would ask questions and say, 'Let me get this straight,' " Leidel recalled. "He would jot things down."

When it was Leidel's turn, the investor told Trump that he should do more to highlight Hillary Clinton's "bad judgment" for supporting the war in Iraq and President Obama's health-care overhaul.

Trump scribbled "judgment" in his notebook as Leidel spoke, a word he had used as a cudgel against his Democratic rival in the past.

The very next morning, Trump took up the attack again, tweeting: "Hillary Clinton has bad judgment and is unfit to serve as President."

"I don't know if it was me or not," Leidel said of Trump's tweet. "But I think listening is a very important skill. I think a lot of people pretend they are listening, and they don't even care what you're saying."

Billionaire investor Wilbur Ross, who hosted Trump at his Southampton estate in July, described the candidate as "very relaxed, very low-key, and very, very good at including everybody in the conversation."

"It's a different persona from the one you see at the big rallies," Ross said, "and much more like his persona when he is hosting parties at Mar-a-Lago or at one of his golf courses."

Andy Puzder, chief executive of CKE Restaurants, said Trump's style behind closed doors reminds him of how he himself conducts business meetings. "He says to the guys and gals, 'So what do you think of this?' " Puzder said. "Whatever he is working on, he tries to get input on. That's what I do."

In one case, the restaurant chain executive recalled that Trump walked into a small group of donors gathered at Trump Tower in June and said, "Who do you guys think I should pick for vice president?" Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, his eventual selection, was among those discussed.

While Trump has reportedly little appetite for fundraising, he has kept up a busy pace of pricey events in August, headlining more than 20 receptions and dinner s, including some that cost up to $100,000 a couple, according to a tally of invitations by The Post. (Unlike Clinton, who was on her own fundraising spree in August, Trump does not disclose when he is attending fundraisers, who is hosting them or the minimum donation required.)

Each gathering serves as another sounding board. At an August dinner in Canton, Ohio, he quizzed about 30 donors at a local country club for their thoughts on local business issues.

"He would say, 'How would you solve that? What would you do?' " recalled Doug Sibila, the chief executive of a warehouse and transportation company, who weighed in on what he views as onerous Department of Labor regulations. "As he shared some of his ideas and opinions, you can see they were in process, that he was willing to adapt based on what made sense."

Their biggest regret, many donors said, is that more Americans do not get to see the private Trump.

People view him as "off the cuff, but I think he is actually very thoughtful and measured," Leidel said. "He is not going to make a decision without listening to advisers."

At the breakfast fundraiser at Trump Tower in early August, where he went into details about his approach to issues such as the war in Syria, attendees urged Trump to share more policy specifics in public.

"At the rallies, if I give much more than a one-word sentence, I lose the audience," Trump responded, according to Leidel. "I want to keep their attention."

matea.gold@washpost.com

Sean Sullivan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Of the 2016 election's lightning storm of shocks, few will have more lasting political consequence than the discrediting of the main media organs of movement conservatism.

Fox News — the "fair and balanced" alternative to the liberal media, the voice of traditional values, the never-ceasing hum in the background of American conservatism — has been revealed as the personal fiefdom of a Donald Trump shill and as an institution apparently operating (according to one lawsuit) "like a sex-fueled, Playboy Mansion-like cult, steeped in intimidation, indecency and misogyny." While Fox News is not going away, it will need to be relaunched and rebranded as the network of Bret Baier and Megyn Kelly (both fine journalists), rather than of angry white television personalities who employ perpetual outrage as a business model.

Speaking of which, a similar unveiling has occurred with the right's defining radio personality, Rush Limbaugh. It is difficult to overestimate Limbaugh's influence on two generations of intensely loyal listeners. Steve Forbes has called him "part of the trinity that made modern conservatism," in the company of Ronald Reagan and William F. Buckley.

In this campaign cycle, Limbaugh fully embraced right-wing populism, including defending Trump's hard line on **immigration** and mass deportation — a position Limbaugh once described as "standing up for the American way of life." During the recent six-day period in which Trump moderated his **immigration**stand and essentially embraced Jeb Bush's views, Limbaugh fielded a call from "Rick in Los Angeles," who was angry at Trump for adopting a position he had savaged other Republicans for holding. "This is going to enrage you," Limbaugh replied. "I can choose a path here to try to mollify you. I never took him seriously on this."

It is an admission of astounding cynicism. Trump began his campaign by stereotyping Mexicans as rapists and proposing the forced expulsion of 11 million people — an extreme, inhumane, politically self-destructive policy that Limbaugh urged his listeners to support as a matter of principle. But Limbaugh, it turns out, was in on the joke. He knew it was part of a show, much like his own, in which incitement builds an audience.

Limbaugh is particularly influential but hardly unique. Over the past few decades, conservatives have developed an infrastructure of media institutions that — with notable and principled exceptions — constitutes an ideological bubble. One may listen to Limbaugh at lunch, watch Sean Hannity in the evening and get Twitter alerts from the Drudge Report and Breitbart News all through the day. But these are not just sources of information; they are also businesses, particularly sensitive to the views of their audience. And what gets rewarded with listeners, viewers and clicks? Outrage at the perceived aggressions of liberalism. Anger at the compromises of the Republican "establishment." And the defense of American identity against illegal **immigrants** and Muslims.

These positions can (and should) be debated on their own merits. But this much is undeniable: The market imperatives of conservative media institutions have nothing — absolutely nothing — to do with the health of conservatism, the success of the Republican Party, the election of a Republican president or solving serious national problems through principled compromise. To the contrary, conservative media outlets are incentivized to promote anger and discord, and to beat the hell out of mainstream Republicans. Some resist this incentive structure; most do not.

In this election, we have seen something remarkable. A candidate who reflects the views and values of conservative media was able — with a plurality and a fractured field — to seize the presidential nomination of the Republican Party. But the political universe of conservative talk radio does not constitute anything close to a majority of voters in the general election. In fact, this cartoon version of conservatism tends to alienate key groups of voters, including minorities, Republican women and the college-educated.

Much (not all, but much) of the new conservative establishment feeds outrage as its source of revenue and relevance. It is a model that has been good for Limbaugh and Fox News but bad for the GOP. Republicans are now caught in a complicated electoral dynamic. What their base, incited by conservative media, is demanding, the country is rejecting. A choice and a conflict are becoming unavoidable. Trump's angry nativism — newly restated in Arizona with a few twists — is a talk-radio shtick, correctly viewed by most of the electorate as impractical and cruel. It is less a proposal than an offensive, unhealthy form of ideological entertainment. And this show needs to close.

michaelgerson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If it is not one scam, it's another. "Donald Trump's campaign said it would have at least two dozen field offices in Florida by late August, but to date it only has one, according to the Tampa Bay Times. Trump only has a statewide headquarters, based in Sarasota, while Hillary Clinton has 51 field offices in the key battleground state."

Hillary Clinton never found it hard to wangle money out of people. "Hillary Clinton raised $143 million in August, a total that includes her own campaign's collections as well as money for joint fundraising committees with the national and state parties. Her campaign hailed the monthly fundraising haul Thursday as its best of the campaign cycle. The Democratic nominee has more than $68 million on hand, and its average donation last month was about $50."

Nevada Democratic Sen. Harry Reid's gambit to stop Rep. Alan Grayson (R-Fla.) with handpicked candidate Rep. Patrick Murphy (R-Fla.) hands a winnable seat back to the Rs. "Patrick Murphy used his first day as the Democrats' official Senate candidate in Florida to accuse Republican Sen. Marco Rubio of ignoring a plea for help from the family of a wounded veteran and is now having that line of attack rebuked by both Rubio and Florida's Senior Democratic Sen. Bill Nelson."

The ruse regarding "softening" Trump's anti-**immigrant** rhetoric ended in Phoenix. David Kochel: "It has to be their calculation that they can drive up turnout in white working-class areas of battleground states to dizzying heights. Otherwise this move makes no sense 69 days from the election. The 'softening' of Trump's **immigration** policy died tragically on Wednesday night in Phoenix. Foul play is suspected."

Former commerce secretary Carlos Guiterrez blasts Trump's Mexico swindle. "We got a glimpse of Trump diplomacy. He went to Mexico, sweet-talked [the Mexican president] and misrepresented his policy. He talked about a policy of regional collaberation — keep jobs in the hemisphere — and then he came back and he blasted Mexico. I'm sure every foreign leader is watching this. Looking at how duplicitous it was."

The sequester was a hoax. All it did was scrimp on a tiny slice of spending while the debt got much worse. "The national debt hit $19.5 trillion for the first time ever this week, a little more than seven months after it hit the $19 trillion mark."

At the heart of Trump's anti-**immigrant** fraud is the notion that illegal **immigrants** are flooding into the United States. "After reaching a peak in 2007, the number of Mexican **immigrants** living in the U.S. has dropped off. And between 2009 and 2014, there were more Mexican nationals leaving the U.S. for Mexico than there were Mexican **immigrants** coming into the U.S. Most of that is due to a 1 million-person decrease in the number of unauthorized **immigrants** from Mexico from 2007 to 2014."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton suggests that Donald Trump of Fifth Avenue is at heart a Klansman from Mississippi. Trump says Clinton is a "bigot."

Really?

Both of them have a bit of creepy racial stuff in their pasts: Clinton hailed the late senator Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.), who once bore the risible title "Exalted Cyclops" of the Ku Klux Klan, as her "friend and mentor." Trump was obliged to settle a housing discrimination case and says woefully stupid things about wanting Jews rather than blacks handling his money. But the idea that either candidate is a racist in the way David Duke is a racist is absurd.

Clinton's effort to tie Trump to avowed racists is mostly just a classic political overreach. But the way Trump explains Clinton's bigotry — calling her out for failed urban policy preferences and because she "sees people of color only as votes" — is more than a bit hypocritical. Bigotry is antipathy toward different people or ideas. Trump wants to redefine it as Clinton's indifference to one of her core constituencies, black voters. The problem with applying that line of thinking is that Trump has done basically the same thing. He got this far by pandering to white voters' worst instincts on **immigration**, and when it no longer helped his prospects, he began waffling on what was once his core issue. In his Phoenix speech on Wednesday, Trump returned to form, but he clearly doesn't see it as an immutable commitment.

If taking one's most loyal constituency for granted is bigotry, then when it comes to working-class whites, Trump's a bigot, too.

[Meet Trump's Pennsylvania Supporters]

A bit of context: No Republican presidential nominee has won the black vote since Herbert Hoover — despite the prevailing narrative, African Americans' partisan allegiances changed long before the Democrats' abrupt about-face on civil rights in 1964. From a purely Machiavellian point of view, there's one kind of black voter: reliable Democrat.

And Trump is absolutely correct that 2016 is no different. Clinton and Democrats are taking black voters for granted. Why shouldn't they? Trump is hovering between 1 and 2 percent in recent polls of black voters. While you can imagine a situation where a different GOP nominee could methodically make the case that Democratic policies in communities run by elected Democrats have trapped many black Americans in a cycle of futile government dependence, Trump is not the guy to make that case. His messaging — "What the hell do you have to lose?" — is crude, and his commitment, contrasted with his record, is utterly insincere.

Even more damning, though, is that Trump takes his voters for granted in precisely the same way. On this we have his own word: In interviews earlier this year, both on and, reportedly, off the record, he's taken the "everything's negotiable" stance. He once bragged he could shoot somebody on Fifth Avenue and not dampen the fervor of his most committed cultists, and now on **immigration**, his centerpiece issue, that principle is being tested. Ann Coulter famously said that there was nothing Trump could do to alienate her affections except flip-flop on his ridiculous **immigration** promises, but in recent weeks he's flirted with doing just that.

He was openly discussing a possible breach of faith on the one issue where he had, until now, been consistent, and upon which he built his support. As much as anything else, Trump fought his way to the top of the Republican heap by promising — to blue-collar whites, the slice of the body politic most receptive this approach — to "build a wall," make Mexico pay for it and kick every last illegal **immigrant** out of the country, post haste. Then he spent weeks suggesting these might not all happen, or they'd happen, as Donald Trump Jr. described it, in "baby steps," before doubling down Wednesday night in Phoenix. Earlier that day, he went to Mexico and reported that he didn't bring up what would be his hardest diplomatic task as president, convincing the Mexican government to pay for his wall. Clear illustrations of Trump's willingness, in his words, treat his supporters "only as votes."

Yes, he'll almost certainly get away with it, because Americans, in the main, don't use voting to make heard their views on contentious public policy matters. Most don't even know what those issues are or which politician is on which side of them. In fact, voters routinely report that they support a candidate because he holds a certain position on a certain issue when that candidate actually holds the opposite position. Political allegiance, rather, correlates strongly with cultural affiliations acquired early in life, with issues playing a minor role. That is the finding of several decades' worth of voter research ably documented by Christopher H. Achen and Larry M. Bartels in "Democracy For Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government."

Voters use the ballot to make statements about who they are — or, at least, about what sort of people they perceive themselves to be. It's what has driven all the racism talk in recent weeks. That talk isn't really directed at African Americans or the anxious white working class. It's directed, like most things in our politics, at the relatively affluent white people drinking $4 lattes at Starbucks. The last thing that sort of person wants to be thought of is a racist. To be a racist is the ultimate sin in polite American society, and swing voters will not associate themselves with a candidate if doing so means they will be tarred as racists or racists-by-proxy. Kellyanne Conway, who (at least as of this writing) runs Trump's campaign, knows this.

[Trump sees black America as a dystopian hellhole. So do most white people.]

In the end, Black Lives Matter supporters in Baltimore and Trump-or-die knuckleheads in the former Confederate states may have more in common than they realize. Unlike "independent," relatively affluent, suburban white moderates, their votes already are tallied up in the mental notebooks of those running both major-party campaigns. By Trump's own standard, they're the object of Clinton's — and his — bigotry. They can be ignored and betrayed, as are the millions of loyal black Democrats trapped in failed, Democrat-dominated cities, or the overwhelmingly white corpus of new heroin addicts and the struggling communities around them, needlessly immiserated by backward drug policies and vindictive criminal-justice programs championed for two generations by the Republicans they support.

This election isn't about them. Never has been.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's diatribe on **immigration** Wednesday night dispelled any conceivable doubt: He is a dangerous demagogue who rejects the values of openness and inclusion that made this country great. Rarely has an American politician given such an un-American speech.

Foreigners who come here seeking a better life are the scapegoats he blames for problems real and imagined. Never mind that Trump's mother was an **immigrant**, or that two of his three wives came from overseas. Ronald Reagan saw this country as a shining city on a hill; Trump wants us to cower in fear behind a Berlin-style wall. Reagan invited millions of undocumented **immigrants** to stay and contribute to their adopted land; Trump wants to round them up, all 11 million, and ship them home.

That's what he wants his loyal followers to believe, at least. Like any effective demagogue, Trump is fluent in doublespeak.

At one point, to thunderous applause, he said this: "For those here illegally today, who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and one route only: to return home and apply for reentry like everybody else, under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined."

A few sentences later, though, he appeared to take it back. Only after he has built the Great Wall of Trump on the southern border, which isn't going to happen, and persuaded Congress to approve a whole new **immigration** system, which also isn't going to happen — only then, he said, "will we be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain."

See what he's trying to do? He allows listeners to believe whatever they want about his true intentions. Xenophobes can dream of mobs wielding pitchforks and torches while apologists can assure moderate voters that Trump doesn't really propose a vast pogrom of ethnic cleansing.

I choose to believe the first version — that Trump is saying all 11 million have to go — because the whole point of the speech was to convince his most fervent supporters that he is "hardening," not "softening," his position on **immigration**. Fear and loathing of the "other" is his core appeal.

Trump also told us who would go first: up to 2 million undocumented "criminals," in addition to 4.5 million individuals who are here because they overstayed their visas. Also, any undocumented person stopped by law enforcement for any reason would be detained pending deportation. It is not alarmist to note that actually trying to do all of this would require the creation of a police state.

Of course, that's not what he intends — unless you happen to like the idea of a police state, in which case it's exactly what he intends. Policy positions are just words to Trump, and words are just paving stones on the road to power.

Trump's support base is mostly white and working-class, and he skillfully exploits these voters' fears of demographic change. We must "be honest about the fact that not everyone who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully assimilate," he said. "Sometimes it's just not going to work out. It's our right, as a sovereign nation, to choose **immigrants** that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us." He warned ominously that "**immigration** as a share of national population is set to break all historical records."

Translation: Doesn't it tick you off to hear so many so-called Americans speaking Spanish?

Trump's antipathy toward Hispanic **immigrants**, however, is nothing compared to what he thinks about Muslims. He has changed his proposed Muslim ban into a country-specific ban — that happens to cover only Muslim countries. And he wants screening to include "an ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people."

Ideological certification? Approved by whom, the thought police?

Earlier in the day, Trump tried his best to sound sober and statesmanlike in his meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto. By evening, though, he was back to insisting that Mexico would pay for the border wall, although "they don't know it yet." And on Thursday morning, Trump was again touting a "softening" in his **immigration** views.

But you can't soften bigotry. You can't soften jingoism. You can't soften Trump's naked appeal to anger and resentment. You can't soften the fact that he rejects American exceptionalism, which is based on creed, in favor of tribalism based on ethnic purity.

He can't be George Wallace one day and Thomas Jefferson the next.

eugenerobinson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's ungainly back-and-forth on **immigration** has a parallel in Britain, which is struggling to make sense of its own impetuous resolution to take control of its borders. Indeed, if Britain after the Brexit referendum is anything to go by, a Trump presidency would be dominated by zigzagging: sometimes to dilute past promises, sometimes to double down. In the terrifying event that Trump actually became president, you'd hear supporters grumbling bitterly about treachery — even as critics wondered furiously why impractical campaign pronouncements were so seductive for so long.

More than two months after their vote to leave the European Union, the British are no closer to understanding what they have done. Theresa May, the sensible prime minister, assures the public firmly that "Brexit means Brexit," much as parents tell their children that bedtime means bedtime. But May stoutly refuses to specify what she means by this. On Wednesday she summoned her cabinet for a special off-site meeting, and her spokeswoman declared afterward that Britain wanted the right to curb migration from Europe — but also a "positive outcome" on trade. What if these goals are incompatible? The prime minister does not say.

May's problem is that the Brexit referendum, like the Trump phenomenon, was largely an expression of hostility to **immigrants**. A survey of more than 12,000 voters on the day of the referendum found that the most common reason to support Brexit was an urge to assert sovereignty; second came the desire to control national borders. Although May herself was a quiet Brexit opponent, she understands the public's view on **immigration**. And that makes it almost impossible to envisage a "positive outcome" for trade.

In the European Union, the principle of free movement is nearly as sacrosanct as the Commerce Clause in the United States. This is not necessary or logical: For members of the euro zone, there is an argument that a common currency requires a single labor market; but for E.U. countries outside the euro, you could imagine a union with borders and passports. Yet Norway, which is not in the E.U. but is a member of the E.U. single market, is required to accept unlimited numbers of E.U. migrants as a condition of its trade access. Switzerland, another E.U. outsider that enjoys many of the advantages of single-market membership, wants to control its border but faces similar constraints.

Since the Norwegian and Swiss trade models are incompatible with the Brexit mandate on migration, British politicians have become instant experts on Canada's free-trade deal with the E.U. But this has its own problems. Aside from the fact that its ratification is uncertain, Canada's deal mostly excludes services, which account for a hefty four-fifths of British GDP. A copy-Canada deal would not help Britain's chief exports: financial services, legal advice, architecture and so on.

Faced with no attractive way forward, May is shuffling sideways. She has cannily appointed three leading Brexiteers to cabinet positions dealing with Europe and invited them to propose a solution to their mess. The Brexiteers dislike each other and are generally clueless, so progress has been glacial — the more so because the British civil service has yet to recruit the trade experts and lawyers necessary to make Brexit happen. If the 3.5 million other Europeans in Britain all suddenly applied for permanent residence, it would take the existing **immigration** staff 140 years to deal with the onslaught.

Before the Brexit referendum, Britain's Trump-like fantasists assured voters that it would be easy to negotiate a great trade deal with Europe. Now that reality is dawning, there is delicious speculation that Britain might postpone Brexit — perhaps indefinitely. Before formal negotiations begin, Britain must trigger Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union, and May has always said that this won't happen before January. But the combination of confusion in London and elections next year in France and Germany makes further can-kicking quite plausible. Much as Turkey has been negotiating E.U. accession for years without joining, Britain could proclaim that Brexit means Brexit but not actually leave.

Of course, the prime minister denies this. "There's no second referendum; no attempts to sort of stay in the E.U. by the back door," she reiterated Wednesday. But the embarrassing fact is that more than three-quarters of her cabinet opposed Brexit, and for excellent reasons. More than 40 percent of Britain's exports go to the E.U. The country benefits from collaboration with its neighbors on everything from scientific research to counter-terrorism.

However things turn out for Britain, the lesson for Americans is stark: Refuse to be seduced by campaign pledges that could not possibly be implemented without damaging the nation. Whatever the glib talk of post-truth politics, the truth still matters when it comes to governing.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX — Donald Trump's latest **immigration** proposals would require a dramatic and costly expansion of the U.S. border-control system — targeting millions more people for immediate removal while also making it much harder for millions of others to enter the country legally.

The deportation priorities outlined by the Republican presidential nominee during a policy address here late Wednesday would target at least 5 million and as many as 6.5 million undocumented **immigrants** for swift removal, or about half of the 11 million estimated to be living in the United States. And he left open the possibility that he would seek to deport many more as well.

"Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation," Trump said.

Trump delivered a series of similarly sweeping statements and proposals during the hard-edged speech, following a tortuous two-week period in which he had signaled that he might soften his tone on the issue instead. He not only called for removing all undocumented **immigrants** who had committed crimes, but also said he would prioritize the deportation of those who have overstayed their visas.

To accomplish that goal, he said he would triple the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agents and create a "new special deportation task force" to track the most serious security threats.

"We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. We will break the cycle. There will be no amnesty," he said. "Our message to the world will be this: You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country. Can't do it."

That speech, which followed a quick visit to Mexico earlier Wednesday to meet with President Enrique Peña Nieto, effectively shut down speculation that he would move toward the center on **immigration** issues before Election Day. Many Republican strategists hoped that such a move would help him court moderate voters and regain ground against his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton. His speech also prompted resignations on Thursday by several members of his Hispanic Advisory Council, who said they felt misled by earlier overtures.

There has been widespread confusion about Trump's position in recent weeks, in part because he has repeatedly contradicted himself in public statements about mass deportation. He said in Phoenix that what becomes of the 11 million undocumented **immigrants** "will never be a central issue" even as he vowed that he would begin removing millions on "day one, as soon as I take office." And although he rejected any possible path to legal status — or "amnesty" — during that speech, he suggested Thursday during an interview with conservative radio host Laura Ingraham that he would revisit legalization after his border security policies were enacted.

Despite the confusion, what is clear is that Trump's specific deportation prescriptions would require an expansive effort.

An estimated 690,000 undocumented **immigrants** have committed significant crimes that would make them security priorities — felonies or serious misdemeanors — according to a study by the Migration Policy Institute. That number is closer to 2 million according to some, including Jessica Vaughan of the anti-**immigration** Center for **Immigration** Studies, whom the Trump campaign has consulted on the issue.

If visa overstays are included in the immediate priorities, as Trump said he would order during his speech, the number would grow by about 4.5 million people, according to estimates that place overstays at about 40 percent of the total undocumented population.

In all, the number of people prioritized for removal by ICE would be about 5 million to 6.5 million, according to available data and estimates.

"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," Trump said.

A Washington Post analysis of the possible cost found that Trump's plan could add $51.2 billion to $66.9 billion in **immigration** enforcement costs over the next five years.

Frank Sharry, executive director of America's Voice, an **immigration** reform organization, said that Trump's speech detailed a massive deportation effort that puts him far to the right even of the Republican Party.

"The speech was the most radical platform on **immigration** of any nominee in modern American history," Sharry said. "He's talking about a deportation strategy that is relentless."

Sharry added that the speech is likely to do little to expand Trump's political support among moderates and independents.

"Honestly, he reaffirmed his hard-right stance and left no doubt [that] who he's appealing to are those in his angry white base of support," he said. "I can't imagine a college-educated woman in the [Philadelphia] suburbs seeing that speech and thinking, 'Yeah that was reasonable.' "

Ryan Williams, a GOP strategist who worked for Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign, said the position Trump ultimately adopted on **immigration** this election cycle threatens to set back the Republican Party's effort to improve its standing among Hispanic voters.

"He's proving the type of long-term damage that the RNC warned about after the 2012 election," Williams said.

Trump, Williams predicted, will be "the model case study as someone who went too far and paid for it."

"Unless Republicans change the way they address this issue, the party's going to have incredible difficulties putting together the diverse coalitions needed to win a national race," he said.

Trump also called for a "new **immigration** commission" to recommend several reforms to the current legal **immigration** process. He said that **immigration**levels should be "measured by population share within historical norms" and that **immigrants** should be screened based on their "likelihood of success in U.S. society." Speaking at length about assimilation, Trump also added that an "ideological certification" should be implemented for applicants seeking to live in the United States.

Those positions are deeply unpopular on the left, where critics say that ideological tests and "historical" quotas are subtle forms of ethnic discrimination.

jose.delreal@washpost.com

Aaron Blake and Sean Sullivan in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There are at least two good reasons to read "Beyond the Robot." First, it is an enthralling account of the life and work of Colin Wilson, the often controversial writer who explored the nature of human consciousness in dozens of books, starting with his most famous, "The Outsider," which appeared in 1956 when he was just 24. If you've never encountered this celebration of alienated artists and intellectuals, Tarcher has just reissued it in a 60th anniversary edition.

The other reason to read "Beyond the Robot" is because it will introduce you to Gary Lachman, who writes about philosophical and mystical ideas with exceptional grace, forcefulness and clarity. One of the leading students of the western esoteric tradition, Lachman has published critical studies of Swedenborg, Madame Blavatsky, Aleister Crowley, Rudolf Steiner, P.D. Ouspensky and Jung — and he has done so without being raptly worshipful or casually dismissive. He has also brought out several general surveys of the occult, most recently "The Secret Teachers of the Western World." This begins with magic in antiquity and goes on to consider Gnosticism, Jewish Kabbalah, Renaissance alchemy, the secrets of the Rosicrucians, 19th-century Theosophy, the strange practices of Russian guru George Gurdjieff and New Age speculations about Ley lines, Atlantis and cosmic consciousness.

As Lachman reveals in "Beyond the Robot," he owes his fascination with outside-the-box thinking to Colin Wilson. Back in the 1970s under the name Gary Valentine, he was the bass guitarist in the rock group Blondie when he happened upon a copy of Wilson's "The Occult." A massive, anecdote-rich history, it enticed him to learn more, and he soon started visiting metaphysical societies in New York and Los Angeles. Eventually, Lachman moved to England, gave up his music career and remade himself into a freelance writer and scholar of the occult. To this day, he views himself as a Wilsonian.

But what does that mean?

Colin Wilson was born into a blue-collar family in Leicester, England, left school at 16, and spent his youth drifting around Europe, working at short-term menial jobs in London, sometimes sleeping on Hampstead Heath to save money, and constantly reading and scribbling in his journals. While trying to finish a philosophical shocker about a serial killer — later published as "Ritual in the Dark "— this lonely autodidact found himself wondering about the relationship between rebellion and creativity. He realized that visionary misfits and troublemakers such as William Blake, van Gogh, T.E. Lawrence, Nijinsky and Sri Ramakrishna rejected the meretricious facade of the world around them and tried to break through to some larger, truer reality. When "The Outsider" was published, it was rightly described as an intellectual thriller and became a bestseller.

With the money he earned — never matched by any of his later works — Wilson and his wife bought a house in rural Cornwall, which he gradually filled with 30,000 books. Defining himself as an optimistic existentialist, Wilson then embarked on a lifelong exploration of humankind's ache for spiritual purpose and meaning, an ache that people usually try to assuage through art, sex, drugs, religion or even crime. Men and women deeply yearn, in Lachman's summary, for "an inner expansiveness, a release from trivia and banality, a sensation of more 'life.' " We really should awake each day as if it were Christmas morning, as if the dawn were bringing us — in G.K. Chesterton's phrase — "absurd good news."

Throughout his life Wilson always remained an intellectual magpie. Abraham Maslow's theories about "peak experiences," those meaningful coincidences that Jung dubbed "synchronicities," Robert Graves's fantastic scholarship about the White Goddess — they all enriched Wilson's thinking. He grew particularly excited by the implications of the division between the brain's rational, verbal left lobe and its imaginative, pattern-oriented right. The world we experience, he deduced, is actually highly edited, created by what we choose to perceive. In fact, we sleepwalk through much of our lives, relying on an internalized robot self that automatically attends to our routine tasks and ignores the richness and wonder around us. The more we rely on the robot, the less authentic we feel.

However, some of us — like Proust when he nibbled on a tea-soaked madeleine — discover that we carry whole universes within ourselves and by using what Wilson calls "Faculty X" we can escape the present moment and dwell in the spirit whenever and wherever we choose. But this doesn't mean we should just go with the flow, become lotus eaters. People flourish best, says Wilson, when confronted by obstacles and challenges. Life's setbacks shock us out of our mental laziness and allow us, through disciplined effort, to reshape and strengthen our inner selves. An active will is the key to psychological health.

Over the years Wilson's investigations of fringe science, the paranormal and extreme behavior yielded an astonishing diversity of books: "Encyclopedia of Murder" (co-authored with Patricia Pitman) and "A Criminal History of Mankind," surveys of the supernatural such as "Mysteries" "From Atlantis to the Sphinx" and "Super Consciousness," and even several fictional "thought experiments," including two Lovecraftian science fiction novels, "The Mind Parasites" and "The Philosopher's Stone," as well as "The Space Vampies," later made into the Tobe Hooper movie "Lifeforce. " This self-described "intellectual worker" also taught and gave talks, while tirelessly persevering with his outlier researches right up to his death in 2013 at age 82.

Needless to say, Colin Wilson's immensely readable books and nearly all his ideas were generally dismissed by the literary establishment as the lunatic imaginings of a crank or gullible naif. How could anyone actually treat dowsing, UFOs and **alien** abductions seriously? Yet no matter how wild his ostensible subject, Wilson invariably stressed its connection to crucial humanistic concerns: We need to break free of our mind-forged manacles, cast aside our proclivity for existential despair and strive to live heroic and fulfilling lives. To me, that doesn't sound at all crazy.

mdirda@gmail.com

Michael Dirda reviews books on Thursdays in Style.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The founder and chief executive of one of the largest residential property management companies in the region said Thursdaythat he regrets comments he made to The Washington Post last month regarding **immigrant** tenants.

David Hillman, chairman of Fairfax County-based Southern Management Corp., had told The Post that overcrowding that occurs in many **immigrant**apartments is a matter of cultural preference, rather than financial need. He also said **immigrants** are often paid cash for their work and are not as strapped for money as many people assume.

The remarks were included in a report about the difficulties **immigrants** displaced by a deadly gas explosion at a Silver Spring apartment complex may face in finding a new place to live in the region's expensive marketplace.

After a small protest by the Virginia-based Legal Aid Justice Center outside Southern's company headquarters on Thursday, Hillman told The Post that his remarks "were not intended to disparage or offend any group."

"My printed comments in the Washington Post on August 20th regarding **immigrants** and their housing challenges were part of a much longer and comprehensive conversation with the reporter," Hillman said in statement that was emailed to the newspaper in response to a request for comment. "I regret that anyone has taken offense to them and I certainly apologize for any misunderstanding of the intent."

At the protest, about a dozen demonstrators raised neon-colored signs reading "Solutions not stereotypes" and "Housing is a right," in Spanish and English, and pointed them toward the windows of the towering Southern building on Old Gallows Road.

Multiple households sharing a single apartment "is not a cultural preference," said Edgar ­Aranda-Yanoc, a community organizer. "It is a necessity."

Hillman said he had not been in direct communication with the Legal Aid center.

But Simon Sandoval-Moshenberg, director of the group's **immigrant** advocacy program, said he welcomed Hillman's apology and hopes he will be part of a greater effort to provide quality housing to those on the low end of the income spectrum.

The organization, which helps bring legal cases on behalf of low-income and **immigrant** families, said it was important to draw attention to Hillman's remarks because his views reflect a broader sentiment that they believe is shared by apartment developers in the area.

"When someone in the community expresses racism, we have to respond," Jerrold Foltz, a retired clergyman, said during the protest.

**Immigrants** without legal status or with a status shy of a green card are ineligible for most, if not all, types of housing assistance from the government. Many therefore share space in poorly maintained complexes, which advocates say was the case with the destroyed Flower Branch apartments in Silver Spring.

Angela Reyes, 61, shares a two-bedroom apartment in Falls Church, Va., with four other adults, who together pay nearly $1,800 a month in rent and utilities.

"If I could, I would live alone," said Reyes, who also attended the demonstration. "But I don't have that luxury."

arelis.hernandez@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONGWOOD, Fla. — Republican Bob Cortes was the first Puerto Rican mayor of this Orlando suburb. He became the first Puerto Rican from Seminole County to be elected to the state House.

He doesn't want to be the first Puerto Rican from the county to lose his seat.

But the demographics are changing rapidly here in Central Florida, a mecca of undecided voters stretching from Orlando to Tampa that helps swing state elections and that is rapidly becoming home to more Puerto Ricans, Venezuelans, Colombians and Dominicans.

Cortes said he campaigns as "an elected official who happens to be Hispanic, not a Hispanic elected official," adding that that means "understanding the diversity of the people who live in the district."

Unlike a generation ago, when the state's large Cuban American population was devoted to the GOP, these new Latino voters are less likely to support Republican candidates such as Cortes — and they are increasingly unlikely to register with either political party. "No Party Affiliation" voters — known as "NPAs" in local political vernacular — now account for 26 percent of Florida's electorate, the fastest-growing bloc in the state, according to the latest state voter statistics.

Republican candidates up and down the ballot also have to contend with GOP nominee Donald Trump, who has alienated many Latinos in the state with his talk of **immigrant** criminals, a massive border wall and aggressive deportations.

The combination of factors sets the stage for a remarkably unsettled election for Republicans in Florida, a crucial battleground state that could help determine who wins the White House and Senate. Sen. Marco Rubio — who won the GOP primary on Tuesday — is a top target for Democrats in November, while Trump is trailing Democrat Hillary Clinton in the presidential contest here.

Susan MacManus, a political science professor at the University of South Florida in Tampa, who compiled the data on unaffiliated voters, said the shrinking of the parties means Florida Democrats and Republicans are "fighting for their lives."

The Trump factor

But, she added, "Republicans are a little bit more at risk because of what Trump has already done. That's why his changing commentary to talking about borders instead of deportation is probably too little, too late."

Home to nearly 1.1 million Puerto Ricans, the Sunshine State could surpass New York as the largest home of island transplants by the end of the year. As U.S. citizens, Puerto Ricans are not **immigrants**, but many consider Trump's harsh attacks on **immigrants** an affront to the entire Hispanic diaspora.

"He's a liar. He's a flat-out liar. I don't think that man is capable of running this country. He's a time bomb," said Lisa Diaz, 51, of Kissimmee, another Orlando suburb. She's Puerto Rican and moved to the area in 2006 from New York.

Cortes is well aware of such feelings, which is why he warns that in Florida, "Mr. Trump has his work cut out for himself."

Cortes's district straddles Seminole County, a predominantly Republican area, and Orange County, a Democratic stronghold. He won his House seat in 2014 by defeating a well-known Democratic incumbent, betting that his name recognition would help him win white and Republican voters, while Hispanics would be drawn out to vote for one of their own.

"To be frank, that's exactly what happened," he said. Having studied the numbers closely, he found that out of nearly 14,000 registered Hispanic voters in his district at the time, 5,000 showed up to vote in a non-presidential election — a record total — and most voted for him.

Koch brothers step in

This year, he and other Florida Republicans may also be helped by outside forces waging their own efforts to win over Latinos.

The LIBRE Initiative, backed by the wealthy industrialists David and Charles Koch, is a nonprofit political group designed to woo Latinos to the conservative political cause. Active in 10 states, the group is especially focused on reaching the fast-growing Puerto Rican population in Florida.

In a sign of the urgency conservatives have displayed in trying to win over Puerto Ricans in Florida, LIBRE for the first time sent a team to Puerto Rico in early March to set up a booth at a business expo aimed at people thinking of relocating to Florida.

Cesar Grajales, LIBRE's Florida state director, said Puerto Ricans' high rate of civic engagement means that any candidate or organization with serious designs on winning needs to court them.

"They vote and they vote a lot," he said.

During a recent walk around neighborhoods in Buenaventura Lakes — an Orlando suburb that has been called "Little Puerto Rico" — Grajales and other staffers and volunteers wore blue-and-white T-shirts and carried iPads pre-loaded with local addresses from state voter files.

If someone answered the door, volunteers asked a series of politically loaded questions to gauge a resident's potential support for the Kochs' mostly pro-business concerns. They never bring up Trump; questions about him might be met with a slammed door.

On the Puerto Rican debt crisis, Grajales asked Jorge Reyes in Spanish whether the island's political leaders "deberían ser responsables" — should be held responsible.

"Yo creo que si," Reyes said — I think so.

On Obamacare, Grajales claimed that 15 health insurance companies in Florida planned to raise their rates by at least 17 percent this year. In Spanish, Grajales asked: Should taxpayers be forced to pay for the "mistakes" of Obamacare?

"Claro que no," Reyes said — of course not.

Yet Reyes, 82, a Puerto Rican Democrat, said he planned to vote for Clinton and other Democrats.

"To me, the other guy is nuts," he said, adding later that he thinks Trump is "dividing his own party — the way he talks."

When Grajales and Jeandelize Burgos, a field director, knocked on the door of Guadalupe Rodriguez, 63, he quickly asked in Spanish: "You're not with Trump?"

"No, no," responded Grajales.

"No, we're not with a party," Burgos said in Spanish, laughing nervously.

Rodriguez said later that he's opposed to Trump because he "is against us."

"I don't like to hate nobody, but when somebody looks at you like roaches?" he said later.

Cortes said he's aware of what LIBRE is doing, but hasn't met with the group. Still, he appreciates anyone who talks up conservative ideology to Hispanic voters.

"The moment we start doing that, we'll start getting more voters to join the Republican Party," he said.

Cortes knows that the influx of new **immigrants** across Central Florida could eventually transform his district and make it harder for a Republican like him to keep winning. But the transformation also means greater influence for fellow Hispanics.

"Ten years ago, you'd have a Hispanic candidate around here and he'd come in last. Now, he's winning races," he said. "It's proof that we're going to have even greater influence."

And if Trump loses this year and takes Republicans like Cortes down with him?

"We've got four years to figure out what he did wrong and not do it again," he said.

An earlier version of this story incorrectly identified Cortes as a state senator. He is a member of the Florida House of Representatives.

ed.okeefe@washpost.com

sean.sullivan@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX — Donald Trump's latest deportation priorities could target more than 6 million individuals for immediate removal, according to a Washington Postanalysis. If elected president, he said Wednesday, his administration would also seek to bolster staff devoted to **immigration** enforcement.

After weeks of opaque public statements regarding his stance on mass deportations, Trump spelled out hard-line **immigration** priorities in a fiery speech here in Phoenix. He not only called for removing all undocumented **immigrants** who had committed crimes, but he also said he would prioritize for deportation those who have overstayed their visas.

The GOP presidential nominee also said he would triple the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agents and create a "new special deportation task force" to track the most serious security threats.

Together, those proposals represented his most specific comments on deportation policy — and they pointed to a massive undertaking.

"The police and law enforcement — they know who these people are. They live with these people. They get mocked by these people," he said. "They can't do anything about these people, and they want to. They know who these people are. Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone."

An estimated 690,000 undocumented **immigrants** have committed significant crimes that would make them security priorities — felonies or serious misdemeanors — according to a study by the Migration Policy Institute. That number is closer to 2 million, according to some, including Jessica Vaughan of the Center for **Immigration** Studies, whom the Trump campaign has consulted on the issue.

If visa overstays are also included in the immediate priorities, as Trump said he would order, the number would grow by about 4.5 million individuals, according to estimates that place overstays at about 40 percent of the total undocumented population.

In all, the number of individuals prioritized for removal by ICE agents would range between about 5 million and 6.5 million, according to available data and estimates.

"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," Trump said.

The highly anticipated speech came after Trump struggled to explain how to handle the 11 million undocumented **immigrants** currently living in the country, at times appearing as though he would soften his position on mass deportations and potentially even offering undocumented **immigrants** a pathway to legal status. He had previously called for the immediate removal of all such individuals and pledged to create a "deportation force" to oversee the task.

But as he and his campaign have sought to expand his appeal for the general election, he has found himself caught between appeasing his earlier supporters with more tough **immigration** rhetoric and softening that position to appeal to moderates.

His speech Wednesday was unequivocal: "We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. We will break the cycle. There will be no amnesty," he said. "Our message to the world will be this. You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country. Can't do it."

And his refusal to back legislation that would offer a path to legal status and his proposal to expand the E-Verify program would make it more difficult for such **immigrants** to remain in the country.

"Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation. That is what it means to have law," he said in another instance.

Trump has sought in recent days to change his tone somewhat on **immigration** issues, and in particular with regard to Mexican **immigrants**. During his remarks in Phoenix, he talked positively about his meeting earlier in the day with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto, whom he called "a man I like and respect very much." He also spoke about strengthening ties between the two countries, a sharp departure from his incendiary rhetoric on the campaign trail.

"We also discussed the great contributions of Mexican American citizens to our two countries, my love for the people of Mexico, and the leadership and friendship between Mexico and the United States," he said. "It was a thoughtful and substantive conversation and it will go on for a while. And, in the end we're all going to win. Both countries, we're all going to win."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Americans consistently mention **immigration** as one of the nation's most pressing political concerns, and it has become a signature issue in the presidential campaign. On Wednesday, Donald Trump flew to Mexico to meet with the country's president, and capped off the day by giving a fiery speech in Phoenix on fighting illegal **immigration**.

But while many Americans consider **immigration** one of the biggest issues for the future president, surveys suggest that they also have little understanding of the scale of the problem.

In fact, it's remarkable just how much Americans overestimate **immigration** in their country, as a fascinating 2015 survey by global market research company IPSOS demonstrates. On average, surveyed Americans guessed that one-third of people in their country were **immigrants**. The actual figure? Only 14 percent.

The United States wasn't alone in this tendency to exaggerate. As the chart below from the data blog Metrocosm shows, Japan, Poland, South Korea, Hungary, Italy and Belgium had more outrageous guesses than the United States did about the percentage of their population made up by **immigrants**.

This chart from IPSOS similarly shows that this is a tendency shared around the world — roughly a dozen developed countries surveyed are all above the dashed line in the chart below, indicating that they guessed too high on the percentage of **immigrants** in their country. Again though, the United States is toward the top.

American estimates for the size of the Muslim population in this country, also a focus of political discussion, are even more extreme. In the IPSOS survey, people on average guessed that 15 percent of the U.S. population is Muslim, compared with an actual figure of 1 percent.

Again, the United States is hardly alone in this regard. Hungary, Poland and Japan overestimate the presence of Muslim populations in their countries by far greater amounts. But the United States ranked among the top in the developed countries surveyed.

These surveys asked about **immigration** in general, rather than illegal **immigration**. And it's true that a lot of people are generally inaccurate on data points about their country, from the percentage of wealth owned by the wealthiest 1 percent in the United States (37 percent) to how many Americans are overweight or obese (66 percent).

But with **immigration**, it's revealing that people's mistakes tend to skew so far in one direction: Almost no developed country underestimates its level of **immigration**.

You might also like:

The myth and the reality of Donald Trump's business empire

The strange and wonderful things people searched for during the Republican and Democratic conventions

Why the world's third-richest man is attacking Donald Trump

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**\* Matea Gold has the news on the blockbuster fundraising month Hillary Clinton and the DNC just had :

Hillary Clinton's nonstop schedule of high-dollar fundraisers in August paid off, helping raise $143 million for her campaign and the Democratic Party — her biggest monthly haul yet.

Maybe so, but her investment in hats is lagging way behind.

\* David Fahrenthold reports that Trump's foundation broke a rather important and relevant law, just as many had suspected :

Donald Trump paid the IRS a $2,500 penalty this year, an official at Trump's company said, after it was revealed that Trump's charitable foundation had violated tax laws by giving a political contribution to a campaign group connected to Florida's attorney general.

The really good part is that Bondi solicited the donation while she was investigating Trump . Now substitute the words "Clinton Foundation" for "Trump Foundation" with the same facts, and ask what the response of both the media and Republicans would be.

\* Nicholas Riccardi has details on an aspect of Trump's **immigration** speech most people seem to have missed :

Donald Trump's aggressive rhetoric on illegal **immigration** has obscured a potentially historic policy shift — the Republican presidential nominee is the first major party candidate in modern memory to propose limiting legal **immigration**.

Note: none of this applies to smoking hot Eastern European women under the age of 28, who under Trump's plan will be allowed to enter in unlimited numbers.

\* A new Suffolk University/USA Today poll shows Clinton leading Trump nationally by seven points .

\* Simon Rosenberg takes a big picture look at Trump's deportation strategy, and explains how he would would use fear to get undocumented **immigrants** to "self-deport," as Mitt Romney would say .

\* Lauren Fox and Annie Rees trace the steps Donald Trump and his campaign took to fool a lot of people into thinking he was going to "pivot" on **immigration** .

\* Ana Swanson notes how Americans have beliefs about **immigration** that are wildly at odds with the facts .

\* Adele Stan draws the line connecting the Willie Horton attacks of George H.W. Bush's 1988 campaign and Trump's 2016 campaign .

\* Ian Millhiser draws a map showing how your voting rights may depend on which appeals court circuit you live in .

\* Josh Pacewicz explains how the civil war within the Republican Party has its roots way back in the 1970s .

\* At The Week, I argued that the events of Wednesday show that Trump always reverts to his true self .

\* And Jeremy Fugleberg reports that if you want to volunteer to phone bank for the Trump campaign, you'll have to sign a 2,271-word non-disclosure agreement that among other things forbids you from ever saying anything bad about Donald Trump, his companies, his family members, or his products for as long as you live .

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"We need to believe him [Donald Trump] when he bullies and threatens to throw out every **immigrant** in the country." — Hillary Clinton, interview on CNN with Anderson Cooper, Aug. 24, 2016

A reader called this quote to our attention, saying that it was clearly wrong. Donald Trump has certainly called for deporting an estimated 11 million illegal **immigrants** from the United States — though he may be wavering on that position. But he has not called for removing every **immigrant** in the United States.

This was a live interview, and the Clinton campaign says the former secretary of state misspoke. She apparently meant to say "every undocumented **immigrant**." Now, regular readers know that we don't like to play gotcha here at The Fact Checker, so ordinarily that might be the end of it. But take a look at this tweet issued under Clinton's name on Aug. 25:

The tweet says that "in 2015, Trump launched his own campaign for president by describing Mexican **immigrants** as rapists and criminals." The accompanying video, which starts by saying "Donald Trump built his candidacy on demonizing **immigrants**," has various clips of tough talk from Trump, mainly about illegal **immigrants**. Then the video ends with this warning: "Trump has made his plans for **immigrants** and their families clear."

This made us wonder whether Clinton's supposed slip of the tongue actually was part of an effort by her campaign to try to blur the line between legal **immigrants** and undocumented ones. Let's take a look.

The Facts

Part of the difficulty with fact checking attacks on Trump based on his statements is that he often has made contradictory comments — or made bold attacks that he later tried to clarify.

So, for instance, the Clinton campaign points to Trump's announcement speech on June 16, 2015 as evidence for an attack on all **immigrants**. Trump said:

"The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems. …When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people. But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we're getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the right people."

At the time, this was often interpreted in the media as a reference to all **immigrants**. Not until July 6, three weeks later, did Trump clarify that he was talking only about illegal **immigrants**:

"The United States has become a dumping ground for Mexico and, in fact, for many other parts of the world. On the other hand, many fabulous people come in from Mexico, and our country is better for it. But these people are here legally and are severely hurt by those coming in illegally. I am proud to say that I know many hardworking Mexicans — many of them are working for and with me…and, just like our country, my organization is better for it."

Trump's lack of precision in his language has thus left him open to attacks, especially because he often allows initial impressions to gel before he attempts to clarify what he had supposedly meant to say.

Trump, however, eventually clarified that he was attacking illegal Mexican **immigrants** as rapists and criminals, not all Mexican **immigrants**. (In any case, his statements are false and worthy of Four Pinocchios.) So here the Clinton campaign is deliberately ignoring his clean-up explanation.

The Clinton campaign points to other Trump statements as evidence of a broader attack by the GOP presidential nominee on **immigrants**, not just undocumented **immigrants**. The campaign says this material backs up the line in the video that "Trump has made his plan for **immigrants** and their families clear."

In particular, the campaign cites his proposal for funding a wall on the border with Mexico, his position on birthright citizenship and his proposal to rescind Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). Let's look at each of this in turn.

The Wall. Trump told The Washington Post in April that he would force Mexico to pay for the wall (which could cost as much as $25 billion) by threatening to cut off the flow of billions of dollars in payments that **immigrants** send back to the country. Mexican **immigrants** make up 28 percent of 42 million foreign-born population in the United States, according to the Migration Policy Institute. At the time, Trump said the threat would be withdrawn if Mexico made a $5 billion to $10 billion payment to the United States to help fund the wall.

Birthright citizenship. Trump not only has said that he believes it is wrong for the children of illegal **immigrants** to automatically receive citizenship if they are born in the United States ("anchor babies") but in interviews in August 2015, he also indicated that he would seek to deport children of illegal **immigrants** who are U.S. citizens by virtue of their birth. In his words, he would "test it out in the courts" because he thought he could make a case that "they do not have American citizenship." (He said he might make an exception if a child had parents who are "very bad people.") In theory, that could affect about 4.5 million people born in the United States to parents who were undocumented **immigrants**. But most scholars believe any change in birthright citizenship would require a constitutional amendment.

DACA. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals is an Obama administration policy that allows qualified undocumented **immigrants** who entered the country before their 16th birthday and before June 2007 to receive a renewable two-year work permit and exemption from deportation. More than 650,000 applications have been approved, and presumably these people would be subject to deportation under a Trump presidency. Of course, some might argue that these individuals do not fall under the category of "**immigrants**." But the Clinton campaign says that people approved under DACA now have documents.

The first two items — the threat on remittances and the threat to deport children with birthright citizenship — conceivably might affect some **immigrants** and their families. But not all.

Update, Aug. 31: After this fact check appeared, the Clinton campaign released another tweet, which quoted Trump as saying "They have to go" and then adding: "Trump has been perfectly clear about his intentions for millions of **immigrants**."

"They have to go."

The tweet was accompanied by a video that included clips of Trump speaking about deporting undocumented **immigrants**, ending birthright citizenship and building a wall along the border of Mexico. A campaign official said that the "millions of **immigrants**" referred mostly to undocumented **immigrants**, but he also pointed to Trump's plan to revoke DACA as something that would affect people who currently have legal documents.

The Pinocchio Test

Trump's campaign has been centered on the threat that he claims is posed by illegal **immigrants**. His announcement speech was interpreted as an attack on Mexican **immigrants**, but he eventually clarified that he was talking about undocumented **immigrants**. His plan for a wall on the border, his denial of birthright citizenship and his pledge to rescind DACA are all part of his proposed efforts to thwart illegal **immigration**.

His proposal to make Mexico pay for the wall by halting remittances could certainly affect legal **immigrants** from Mexico, but again he makes this proposal in the context of attacking illegal **immigration**; any possible effect on **immigrants** is a by-product of his plan to eliminate illegal **immigration**.

All too often, Trump's proposals are ill-defined and poorly explained, making it hard to discern his actual intentions. Muddying the waters even more, he has also proposed a temporary ban on Muslims entering the country and forcefully claimed that vetting procedures for refugees are inadequate.

Still, the Clinton campaign is using slippery language to suggest that Trump's attacks on illegal **immigrants** are actually a broader assault on all **immigrants**. If Clinton misspoke, she did so in a way that conveniently mirrored her campaign's video. The video itself stretches the truth, leaving the impression that Trump is broadly attacking even legal **immigrants**. It's quite possible that the Clinton campaign does not want to appear as if it is endorsing illegal **immigration**. But it goes too far in claiming that Trump's "plans for **immigrants**" are clear.

We will accept that Clinton misspoke in the CNN interview. But we are going to keep a close watch on whether her campaign keeps using slippery language that blurs the line between legal **immigrants** and undocumented **immigrants**. In the meantime, this tweet earns Two Pinocchios.

Two Pinocchios

(About our rating scale)
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"Last week, you could tell, there was the real possibility of a pivot. I think there was a big fight within the campaign, and I think the restrictionist forces won."

Those words come from Alfonso Aguilar, a leading Latino conservative. Until yesterday, Aguilar was a prominent surrogate for Trump. But Trump delivered a hardline speech on **immigration** last night, and now top Latino supporters like Aguilar are bolting.

Aguilar, who has been in regular touch with members of the National Hispanic Advisory Committee for Trump, a group formed by the Trump campaign and the Republican National Committee, tells me that he expects as many as a half a dozen members of the Committee to step down or otherwise withdraw their support.

The speech and fallout, said Aguilar, the head of the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, are "a debacle for the Trump campaign."

Latino conservatives thought there was a real chance that Trump might genuinely moderate on the issue, Aguilar said, perhaps by declaring himself open to some form of expedited path to legal status for those undocumented **immigrants** who leave the country and return. But in his speech last night, Trump flatly ruled out any such expedited pathway.

To Latino conservatives, there is no doubt about the true intentions of Trump's speech, even though there are still a few observers here and there who continue to suggest that he somehow softened his approach yesterday. Trump stopped using the words "deportation force," but he nonetheless made it absolutely clear that maximum deportations and stepped up enforcement are his guiding priorities, and also left no doubt that there simply isn't any meaningful path to assimilation in Trump's vision.

"He means, We're gonna start detaining people, left and right," Aguilar said, adding that Trump's vision was akin to "putting ICE on steroids" and creating "a deportation regime with close collaboration with state and local police." Aguilar added, however, that he would not be supporting Hillary Clinton.

Massey Villarreal, a Texas-based businessman who was also a member of the Trump advisory committee, has pulled his support, too. "He will not be supporting Trump, and he will not be supporting Clinton," Villarreal's assistant told me. He told NBC Latino that Trump's speech was "awful."

Still another member of the Trump advisory committee, Jacob Monty, a Texas-based lawyer, longtime Republican, and third-generation Mexican American, told my Post colleagues Aaron Blake and Jenna Johnson that he had attended a meeting with Trump at which he seemed reasonable on **immigration**. But after Trump's speech, he feels that he was misled, and has now decided he's done:

"The speech was just an utter disappointment," Monty said in an interview on Thursday…."We were out there defending him. And then to be just lied to like that — it doesn't feel good. It's not okay."

Politico reports that another member of Trump's advisory council, Ramiro Pena, a pastor, has also pulled out:

"I am so sorry but I believe Mr. Trump lost the election tonight," said Pena, a pastor at Waco's Christ the King Church. "The 'National Hispanic Advisory Council' seems to be simply for optics and I do not have the time or energy for a scam."

In his interview with me, Aguilar suggested that this really is the stuff of nightmares for the Republican National Committee. As you'll recall, the RNC put out that autopsy after the 2012 election, concluding that the party must broaden its appeal by supporting **immigration** reform and taking genuine steps to be more welcoming to Latino **immigrants**. Surrogates such as these are central to these types of outreach efforts, because they embody the case that the conservative agenda holds promise for Latinos.

RNC chair Reince Priebus had gamely defended Trump as his campaign worked through what its **immigration** agenda would look like, promising that Trump would soon outline that agenda's specifics. Earlier this week, however, Priebus appeared not to know for sure what those specifics would look like, though he did promise that Trump's plan would be "humane."

Aguilar told me he had been in touch with the Trump campaign in recent days, and came away believing that there had been an internal struggle over the issue, and that the restrictionists won.

Now, Aguilar said, other Latino conservative leaders, including people the RNC has traditionally relied on to reach Latino voters, would soon be having a "conversation" to "figure out what to do."

"Reince Priebus right now is probably in despair," Aguilar said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's day yesterday was a net-plus for his campaign. I'm still somewhat shocked by the opening he was given by Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto, but good for Trump for seeing the opportunity and acting quickly. While Trump was holding a news conference alongside Nieto and conducting himself in a diplomatic and serious manner, the Hillary Clinton camp was left muttering.

However, the surprise gift of his visit to Mexico was somewhat diminished by Trump's subsequent **immigration** policy speech in Phoenix, where he returned to his bombastic rhetoric of building a wall, making Mexico pay for it, etc. After his more nuanced approach earlier in the day, Trump left himself vulnerable to the charge that he choked at the meeting with Nieto, but in classic bully style, reverted to tough talk when he was back in an environment where no one would challenge him.

It seems as though Trump can't help diminishing the positive moves he makes on the issues he ostensibly cares about. On **immigration**, he makes some valid points that should be part of the policy debate Democrats and Republicans could be having. But he weakens his arguments by exaggerating, making misstatements and using downright deceptive, suspect information. Just look at what Post fact-checkers Michelle Ye Hee Lee and Glenn Kessler had to say about some of the wild inaccuracies in Trump's speech in Phoenix. Even when Trump has facts on his side, the Fact Checker points out that the information he uses is often "misleading and lacks context." It's almost as if Trump would rather not use the truth, even when the truth would do nicely.

Anyway, the day is over -- and the campaign is now in an era where the days matter.

And, oh by the way, according to Gallup, only 8 percent of voters list **immigration** as "the most important problem facing this country today." So even if Trump did score a few stylistic but important points yesterday, that is diminished by the fact that he is still missing the bull's-eye by a mile. In the same Gallup poll, 35 percent of voters say that economic issues are the biggest problem facing the country today. A simple message from Trump about how he will grow our economy is long overdue. There seems to be a new reason for him to "pivot" every week or so, but it never seems to stick. It wouldn't be hard for Trump to simply mimic the very sound economic plan House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) has laid out in the Better Way initiative. It wouldn't be hard for Trump to ask distinguished economists Larry Kudlow and Stephen Moore to write four paragraphs that he could recite over and over on the campaign trail. Plus, it would be a good opportunity for other Republicans on the ballot to follow his lead. Just think -- there could actually be a coordinated GOP message on the issue that is the No. 1 priority for voters. Maybe not. We will see what happens.

Note to readers: People ask me all the time -- as a lifelong believer in the Republican cause and a steadfast promoter of all things Republican -- if I am going to vote for Donald Trump in November. Well, I've never been part of the "#NeverTrump" crowd, but as of right now, I call myself a non-supporter. And as readers know, I'm tormented about reconciling my position on Trump and my commitment to the Republican Party.

But, as a reverent Alabama fan on the dawn of the 2016 football season, here is one way to think about my predicament: Suppose Vladimir Putin engineered the annexation of Tuscaloosa and the disappearance of University of Alabama football Coach Nick Saban and somehow had himself installed as head coach of the awesome Crimson Tide. In today's world, you have to think it's possible -- even if not probable. I certainly suspect Putin wants to control the team. You've gotta think that while Putin might like Crimea, he would love Tuscaloosa -- I'm just sayin'. Anyway, if it happened, I would not suddenly become an Auburn fan. At the end of the day, no matter who's the coach, I will still always support the Tide. It's my team. Maybe Trump (or Putin) is making us all a little crazy. Roll Tide.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As of this writing, Hillary Clinton leads Donald Trump on average nationally by about 6 points. Some Republicans might conclude, Hey, that's not bad, since Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) lost by 7 points!

Sorry, but that won't wash. For starters, the purpose of an election is to win, not lose less badly. Moreover, McCain was running against a fresh face, a history-breaking candidate in then-Senator Barack Obama. McCain ran in the middle of an economic meltdown. For goodness's sake, Trump is running against the most unpopular, least-liked major candidate ever to run for president — except for him. With all of her scandals, flaws and missteps, Clinton is still beating Trump comfortably. If she were up against McCain or Mitt Romney (who lost by "only" 4 points), does anyone imagine she'd be the front-runner?

The New York Times' Upshot takes a crack at exploring the magnitude of the opportunity cost: If the race is a generic Republican against a generic Democrat, the race is virtually even. What's more, as it became evident earlier this year that Trump would be the nominee, the generic polls went from +7 for the Republican to -8. In other words, as Trump became the de facto nominee, the GOP gave up a net 15 points. Another candidate very plausibly could be doing 15 points better than Trump is now, leading by high single digits.

Now it is true that there are no generic candidates; they all come with pluses and minuses. In this case, however, the Trumpkins held up Romney as a horrible candidate, someone who could have beaten Obama. The problem was that Romney was some sort of snob, unapproachable for white working-class people. Well, Romney surely was not perfect, but the much-derided 2012 nominee did better with whites than Trump. He did better with women. He did better in nearly every category. In the latest USA Today/Suffolk poll, for example:

There's a gender gap that also rivals the record. Clinton now leads among women by 54%-38% while the two contenders split men, 44% for Trump and 43% for Clinton. The 11-point difference in Clinton's support between male and female voters precisely mirrors the record gender gap that Bill Clinton scored over Bob Dole two decades ago.

Romney won male voters 52 to 45 percent, and got 59 percent of whites, 7 percent of African Americans and 27 percent of Hispanics. Again, Romney ran 18 points ahead of Trump with whites. If the GOP thought it was finding the "hidden" white vote with Trump, it was sadly mistaken.

There is a close contest, however, when it comes to whether Trump is a racist: "44% of those surveyed say they see him as a racist; 47% say he's not. Among African-Americans, more than eight in 10 say he's a racist, and among Hispanics, more than six in 10 agree. But a 54% majority of whites say he's not." It's hard to win the presidency when 44 percent of the targeted group (whites) thinks you are a racist. And that was before Tuesday night's **immigrant** bashing.

In short, if it persists with an anti-**immigration** hard line, the GOP would do better to go back to Romney; at least he kept it close. And if it ever wants to win, it could go back to George W. Bush, who got 44 percent of Hispanics in 2004.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**During his speech on **immigration** in Phoenix on Wednesday, Donald Trump repeated a recent argument that he clearly hopes will appeal to black voters in the United States. Hillary Clinton, he said, "promises uncontrolled, low-skilled **immigration** that continues to reduce jobs and wages for American workers, and especially for African American and Hispanic workers within our country. Our citizens."

The suggestion to job-seeking black Americans that **immigrants** entering illegally hurt their job prospects is not a new one. Trump himself has stressed it for the past few weeks. Politicians looking to get votes in the black community have been using it for much longer than that. In fact, the same argument was made during the 2008 Democratic primaries, by Hillary Clinton.

Eight years ago, Clinton was facing off against then-Sen. Barack Obama, who had strong support from black voters thanks in part to the chance that he might become the first black president. During a debate in Los Angeles that January, CNN's Jeanne Cummings asked Obama and Clinton a question that came from a voter in Minnesota. "There's been no acknowledgment by any of the presidential candidates of the negative economic impact of **immigration** on the African American community," the question read. "How do you propose to address the high unemployment rates and the declining wages in the African American community that are related to the flood of **immigrant** labor?"

There's been a long history of political tension between the black and Hispanic communities in the United States — particularly in places like Los Angeles — providing an easy point of leverage for politicians. In her response to the question, Clinton accepted and built upon its premise.

I believe that in many parts of our country, because of employers who exploit undocumented workers and drive down wages, there are job losses. And I think we should be honest about that. There are people who have been pushed out of jobs and factories and meat processing plants, and all kinds of settings. And I meet them.

She continued.

[I]f we can tighten our borders, if we can crack down on employers who exploit workers, both those who are undocumented and those who are here as citizens, or legal, if we can do more to help local communities cope with the cost that they often have to contend with, if we do more to help our friends to the south create more jobs for their own people, and if we take what we know to be the realities that we confront — 12 to 14 million people here, what will we do with them?

A few months before the debate, the National Bureau of Economic Research published data looking at the extent to which **immigrants** here illegally actually undercut employment. The core of the finding was that wages for black workers declined 3.6 percent for every 10 percent rise in the **immigrant** population (here illegally and not), while wages for white workers dropped 3.8 percent. In terms of jobs, though, the effects were different. "For white men," the study read, "an **immigration** boost of 10 percent caused their employment rate to fall just 0.7 percentage points; for black men, it fell 2.4 percentage points."

A report compiled by the federal United States Commission on Civil Rights in 2010 reinforced that point. "Illegal **immigration** to the United States in recent decades has tended to depress both wages and employment rates for low-skilled American citizens, a disproportionate number of whom are black men," the report's findings read. "Expert economic opinions concerning the negative effects range from modest to significant."

Clinton's solution to the problem, though, differed starkly from Trump's. "I know that what we have to do is to bring our country together to have a comprehensive **immigration** reform solution," she said to applause. "That is the answer. And it is important that we make clear to Kim and people who are worried about this that that is actually in the best interests of those who are concerned about losing their jobs or already have."

"I hear the voices from the other side of the aisle," she added, echoing arguments she could make just as easily this year. "I hear voices on TV and radio. And they are living in some other universe, talking about deporting people, rounding them up."

Obama was also given an opportunity to address the original question. He took a different tack.

Well, let me first of all say that I have worked on the streets of Chicago as an organizer with people who have been laid off from steel plants, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, and, you know, all of them are feeling economically insecure right now, and they have been for many years. Before the latest round of **immigrants** showed up, you had huge unemployment rates among African American youth.

He continued. "But let's understand more broadly that the economic problems that African Americans are experiencing, whites are experiencing, blacks and Latinos are experiencing in this country are all rooted in the fact that we have had an economy out of balance," Obama said. "We've had tax cuts that went up instead of down. We have had a lack of investment in basic infrastructure in this country. Our education system is chronically underfunded."

"We should not use **immigration** as a tactic to divide," he continued. "Instead, we should pull the country together to get this economy back on track."

Eight years ago, Clinton was to some extent straddling the arguments of Trump and Obama. Now, she's clearly picked a side. For what it's worth, Clinton won the California primary — and the Hispanic vote — easily. She didn't win the nomination.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"This has been an incredible evening," Donald Trump told the crowd in Phoenix as he neared the end of his long-awaited **immigration** speech Wednesday night. "We're going to remember this evening."

He's right. But not for the reason he thinks.

Trump's speech capped a remarkably frenetic — and manic — day on the campaign trail for the Republican candidate.

He had jetted to Mexico earlier Wednesday to meet with that country's president, an appearance that had, generally speaking, won him plaudits for his seriousness and evenness of tone. Talk of the "new" Trump — led by new campaign manager Kellyanne Conway — was everywhere.

But when Trump stepped to the podium in Phoenix — just after 9:30 p.m. Eastern — all of that talk of a tonal shift disappeared. In the single most important speech of his presidential campaign — and with the eyes of the political world on him — Trump delivered an angry affirmation of the message that won him the Republican nomination: We are going to build a wall along our Southern border, and Mexico is going to pay for it. He also repeatedly highlighted the criminal acts done by those in the country illegally and insisted it would never happen if he was elected president.

The 10-point plan Trump outlined for dealing with the country's **immigration** problems was entirely overshadowed by the snarling and sarcastic way in which he delivered the speech. This was Trump in the heat of battle, surrounded on all sides by doubters and haters and losers — lashing out at all of them by basking in the adulation of his core of supporters.

The day and, in particular, Trump's speech serve as a stark reminder that there is no "new" Trump. There is no pivot, no new leaf, no 2.0. Trump, at age 70 and coming off one of the most successful and surprising primary campaigns in political history, is not going to change in any meaningful way. He can change his campaign leadership — as he has now done twice. His surrogates — led by Conway — can insist that the "real" Trump is now starting to come out. But, ultimately, the candidate needs to want to — or be able to — change. And it has been clear to anyone paying attention to this campaign that Trump isn't all that interested in doing things differently.

Sure, Trump is now reading off teleprompters at rallies. (He did so Wednesday night.) And, yes, his visit with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto was surprisingly statesmanlike. But these are moments. And they simply aren't sustained. At root, Trump is an entertainer, a showman. He feeds off crowds and how they react to him. And when he got up in front of that Phoenix crowd Wednesday night, he gave them exactly what they wanted: Chunk after chunk of rhetorical red meat that they cheered lustily for.

The problem, of course, is that there simply aren't enough voters in Trump's base of support to elect him president. (Don't believe me? Look at any swing state or national poll.) His only possible path to victory is to grow the number of people — particularly suburban whites and Hispanics — willing to vote for him. His **immigration** speech will do the opposite. No one outside Trump's base will respond well to a speech that came across — for all of Trump's policy proposals — as an angry rant against the other.

So, yes, we will remember Aug. 31 and Trump's **immigration** speech — just as he promised the crowd. But it will be remembered primarily for killing off any notion that there is a "new" Trump waiting to be unveiled for the stretch run of the 2016 campaign. There just isn't.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**We originally posted this conversation in June and have updated it after Donald Trump's **immigration** speech.

One of the few things that has remained consistent in Donald Trump's shifting message on **immigration** is his plan to build a wall along the border. Trump mentioned it Wednesday night in his tough-talking speech in Arizona, as he has since Day One of his campaign. (No word on whether he persuaded Mexico's president, Enrique Peña Nieto, to pay for it, when the two met in Mexico earlier Wednesday.)

The going wisdom is that this wall — which would cost some $12 billion to $25 billion over five years — is dead on arrival in Congress next year, even if Republicans hold both chambers. It's an expensive and hard-line proposal. A virtual wall wouldn't have much luck either.

But the idea of building a brick-and-mortar wall — or at least some kind of barrier — on the U.S.-Mexico border is hardly new. Over the past few decades, Congress has in fact authorized hundreds of miles of fencing along the border. True, it's not actual brick and mortar. But if Trump gets elected president and Congress stays controlled by Republicans, it's not hard to see how the political will is there for hundreds of miles of fence to turn into Trump's "great, great wall."

I recently caught up with Alex Nowrasteh, an **immigration** policy analyst at the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, to get a better sense of Congress's approach to border barriers, which has shifted over time from redirecting the flow of illegal **immigration** to trying to stop it completely. Here's a timeline of the big flash points:

1990: The first fence goes up

For decades, U.S. Border Patrol had been playing an endless game of cat and mouse on the vast, largely empty U.S.-Mexico border: They would catch **immigrants** crossing illegally, ship them back to the Mexican side of the border, and both sides would repeat.

In 1990, Border Patrol shifted its strategy from catching **immigrants** on the U.S. side to trying to stop them from crossing in the first place. And so the first wall was built.

Actually, it was a fence — a 14-mile-long, about 10-feet-high fence along the San Diego border. There were barriers for vehicles, too, kind of like the guard rails you see along the highway.

"Outside of a port of entry, this was the first physical barrier" along our Mexican border, Nowrasteh said.

1996: Build more fences — but not for the reason you think

In 1996, Congress passed a law that gave the U.S. attorney general and Border Patrol the authority to build even more barriers along the border.

So up went more fences. But they were mostly congregated around higher population areas, such as San Diego and El Paso. That's because Border Patrol's immediate concern was to respond to complaints from U.S. residents about **immigrants** coming onto their private property. Texas's borderland in particular is about 95 percent privately owned.

"Residents were so upset about waking up and finding an illegal **immigrant** sleeping on their yard," Nowrasteh said, "so to solve public complaints, they built a fence around El Paso and funneled these border-crossers elsewhere."

Put another way, this first series of border walls wasn't aimed at keeping all illegal **immigrants** out. It was aimed more at directing the flow of traffic away from population centers.

2005 and 2006: Build, baby, build

Illegal **immigration** from Mexico had been steadily climbing in the '90s, peaking in 2000 at 1.6 million per year, Nowrasteh said. But the 2005 to 2006 period was also big. More than a million people were apprehended on the border pretty much every year starting in 2004, in fact.

It's no coincidence that that was also when a Republican-controlled Congress, with a Republican in the White House, took its first big step toward fencing off the entire border.

In 2005, they passed a law that waived any legal barriers to putting up fences. If Border Patrol wanted to build a barrier that ran into conflict with, say, federal noise control or conservation laws, this new law said the fence took precedence.

The next year, Congress passed a bipartisan law requiring the Department of Homeland Security to build barriers on the border — 850 miles, in fact. Much of it was to be double-fenced, too. In the Senate, 26 Democrats voted for it, including New York's then-junior senator, Hillary Clinton.

At that point, there were only a few dozen miles fenced off, so this new law marked a big shift in how Washington approached securing the border. The message from Congress was clear: Building a physical barrier was an acceptable and even desirable policy solution to illegal **immigration**.

Public opinion at the time was split, with a 2006 CNN poll showing 45 percent in favor of a 700-mile fence. Support rose to 54 percent in a 2010 CNN poll, though, and Republicans in particular began to demand action.

Even those who had been pragmatic when it came to **immigration** reform and giving illegal **immigrants** a way to stay in the United States felt the pressure to toe the line. "Complete the dang fence," Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) memorably said in a 2010 campaign ad, as he was facing a more conservative primary challenger.

2013: Lots of Border Patrol agents, but no fence

Up until this point, we've been talking about actual laws — you know, bills passed by Congress and signed by the president. But to talk about today's relationship with the border, we have to reframe the discussion to plain old bills — proposals that have been tried and mostly failed.

That's because Congress has tried and failed for several years now to pass **immigration** reform. The closest it got was in 2013, when a Democratic-controlled Senate voted to overhaul the U.S. **immigration** system. It didn't call for more fencing, but to appease Republicans who wanted to make sure the border was secure, it planned to send 20,000 more border agents.

Nowrasteh said over the years, in talking about the border, "fence" and "wall" have been used interchangeably in American politics. But Trump's talk of a 30-, 40-, 60-foot wall with a door in it has forced people to make the distinction. And the polls have reflected that. While there has been substantial and even majority support for border fencing, a recent poll showed relatively little support for a massive border wall. Pew asked people earlier this year whether they supported walling off the entire U.S.-Mexico border, and just 34 percent were in favor.

The bill was never brought up in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives anyway.

2016: Trump's not the only one who wants a wall

Fast-forward to the 2016 presidential campaign. Nearly every single Republican presidential candidate talked about how the border needs to be secured before any other **immigration** laws can change. The senators running for president had long, winding debates about who was more adamant on border security.

As such, a majority of them also wanted a wall built.

The guy who said he'd build the biggest, bestest wall of them all, of course, came out on top. And it's not hard to see how, if he's elected president, this could become a real initiative for his administration — even if it's not 55 feet high and built of bricks.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's meeting with his Hispanic advisory council a couple of weeks ago left its members so excited that some even told reporters that Trump was about to significantly soften his approach to illegal **immigration** and maybe even embrace a path to legal status for undocumented **immigrants**.

Those advisers got a reality check Wednesday night, when Trump gave arguably his toughest speech on illegal **immigration** yet — promising a large-scale crackdown and saying that every undocumented **immigrant** is subject to deportation.

Now some of these Trump advisers, along with leading Hispanic Republicans who had been giving Trump a second look over the last two weeks, are renouncing him — and there are signs many more may follow.

Jacob Monty, a Houston-based **immigration** attorney who is a third generation Mexican American and a longtime Republican, has now resigned from Trump's advisory council and withdrawn his support for Trump. In June, as Trump became the presumptive nominee, Monty wrote a column in the Houston Chronicle headlined: "A Latino's case for Donald Trump."

Monty said that he backed Trump — and started to help raise money for him — before he had fully firmed up his **immigration** stances. But Monty believed that a businessman would approach **immigration** from a business standpoint. Monty attended the Aug. 20 meeting at Trump Tower and said he was impressed that Trump talked about what to do with undocumented **immigrants** who have contributed to American society for years or decades.

"He asked all of the right questions. He said all of the right things," Monty said. "He brought it up. … By bringing it up, it told me that he was prepared to talk about it. That was music to my ears, for sure."

Monty also thought Trump's remarks during a visit with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto on Wednesday afternoon struck just the right tone. Monty agreed to go onto cable news shows and defend Trump, believing that the candidate had truly pivoted on this key issue.

Then Trump took the stage in Phoenix. "The speech was just an utter disappointment," Monty said in an interview on Thursday.

He added in a Facebook post: "Tonight he was not a Republican but a populist, modern day Father [Charles] Coughlin who demonized **immigrants**."

"I don't want to be a prop like the Mexican president," Monty said in the interview. "We were out there defending him. And then to be just lied to like that — it doesn't feel good. It's not okay."

Monty wasn't the only member of the advisory council to bolt. According to Politico, Texas pastor Ramiro Peña sent the Trump campaign an email saying the council basically amounted to a "scam."

"I am so sorry but I believe Mr. Trump lost the election tonight," Peña said. "The 'National Hispanic Advisory Council' seems to be simply for optics and I do not have the time or energy for a scam."

Another member, Massey Villarreal, told NBC Latino he was done, too.

"As a compassionate conservative, I am disappointed with the **immigration** speech," Villarreal said. "I'm going to flip, but not flop. I am no longer supporting Trump for president, but cannot with any conscience support Hillary [Clinton]."

One Hispanic data analyst who has worked closely with Republicans, Leslie Sanchez, said she expects half the council to quit.

Hispanic leader who advises Trump camp telling me half of Trump's Hispanic advisory board is ready to resign today (15 of 30)

Other Hispanics who have gone to bat for Trump were disheartened. Alfonso Aguilar, the head of the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles who has alternately been against Trump and then promoted his campaign as a surrogate, said he was finished with the GOP nominee.

"I thought that we could work with him and the campaign to move him to the center on **immigration**, and the initial response was very good," Aguilar said Thursday morning on CNN. "And then we heard yesterday, and I was totally disappointed — not surprised, but disappointed — and slightly misled, because he gave the impression and the campaign gave the impression, till yesterday morning, that he was going to deal with the undocumented in a compassionate way."

Aguilar said Trump's speech was a new low.

"In that speech, he's basically saying: We'll deport you or we self-deport you," he said. "It's even worse than what he initially proposed."

And some Hispanics who had been keeping an open mind about Trump as he appeared to soften his rhetoric in recent weeks recoiled after the speech.

Bettina Inclán, a former director of Hispanic outreach at the Republican National Committee, went from "hopeful" after Trump's Mexico visit to disenchanted after his speech.

I think this was a great move by #Trump, good speech. Strong step in the right direction. Now, how will he follow up? #TrumpInMexico

ughhh.... I was so hopeful after the #TrumpInMexico trip. Please tell me this speech gets a bit better, give me something to work with Trump

Artemio Muniz, the chairman of the Texas Federation of Hispanic Republicans who has been a Trump skeptic but was willing to give him a chance on **immigration**, said Trump is doubling down on a bad strategy.

"I was not sure and I was going to leave my slate blank, but at this point, with what I heard last night, I can't support Trump," Muniz said on CNN. "I can't sell the product that he's trying to give to the Hispanic community."

Certainly, surrogates and advisers bolting from the campaign doesn't tell the whole tale. But the growing exodus suggests that the Hispanics watching Trump's moves on **immigration** the closest now feel betrayed, misled and alienated. And if that extends to Republican-leaning Hispanics writ large, that's very bad for Trump.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump spent about two weeks waffling on his plans for illegal **immigration**, appearing to lean toward moderation on his "mass deportation" proposal.

Then he spoke Wednesday night. The speech was a stemwinder, promising a complete crackdown, ramped up enforcement across the board and assurance that any illegal **immigrant** in the United States will be subject to deportation.

All of that comes, of course, with a price tag. A big one.

Trump laid out policy proposals Wednesday night, and for many of them, we can provide at least a rough estimate of the cost using a variety of sources. There are some programs, though, for which we don't have solid details or estimates.

According to the numbers we do have, Trump's plan would add $51.2 billion and $66.9 billion in **immigration** enforcement costs over the next five years.

To put that in perspective, a 2014 estimate from PolitiFact calculated the United States was spending $16.2 billion on **immigration** enforcement per year. According to these estimates, Trump's plan would increase that annual cost by between 63 percent and 83 percent, and potentially more when you account for programs for which we don't have numbers.

Below, we break it down, proposal by proposal.

1. Southern border wall — $12.6 billion to $25 billion over five years

Trump has put the cost at $8 billion, but our own Glenn Kessler did some digging and found estimates ranging from as low as $15 billion — from Bernstein Research — to more than $25 billion, all told. The National Taxpayers Union, meanwhile, looked at the cost of current border fencing -- which is less expensive than building a wall -- and estimated the cost at $12.6 billion over five years. It's not clear five years would be long enough to finish the wall, but given Trump himself has said building the wall would be done quickly and easily, we'll say the range goes as high as $25 billion over five years.

(Of course, Trump repeated Wednesday night that the wall would be paid for by Mexico — something Mexico's president, whom Trump met with earlier Wednesday, said wasn't going to happen. But then Trump later in his speech assured it would be done "at a reasonable cost.")

2. End "catch-and-release" — $14.4 billion over five years

Trump reiterated that "anybody who illegally crosses our border will be detained" and deported — not released inside the United States. The National Taxpayers Union points to a Congressional Budget Office review of an **immigration** bill in the 113th Congress, which estimated that it would cost $14.4 billion over five years to provide state and local governments with grants to incarcerate illegal **immigrants**.

3. Triple the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) deportation officers — $10.8 billion over five years

The same bill reviewed by the CBO in No. 2 would have added 5,000 deportation officers, 700 support staff, and 60 trial lawyers. It projected this would cost $5.4 billion over five years.

Given the Trump campaign has pointed to estimates that there are about 5,000 ICE officers focused on deportation, you can double the CBO estimate to get a rough estimate of what it would mean to triple the number of deportation officers to about 15,000. The total cost would be about $10.8 billion over five years, according to this estimate.

4. Complete the biometric entry-exit visa tracking system — $6.1 billion to $9.4 billion

This is a program aimed at preventing illegal **immigration** through people overstaying their visas by matching their arrival records to their departure records. The Department of Homeland Security estimated in 2008 that it would cost between $3.1 billion and $6.4 billion to implement the system just at land and sea ports. In 2003, it estimated that implementing the program on land would cost $3 billion. Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) has put the estimate much higher, at $25 billion.

We've combined the more-official DHS estimates to say the full program — land, air and sea — would be between $6.1 billion and $9.4 billion, assuming Trump wants it at all points of entry. (This could be a low estimate because of old estimates and inflation.)

5. Hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents and expand the number of Border Patrol stations "significantly" — $4.3 billion over five years

The CBO calculated in 2013 that adding 3,500 Border Patrol agents would cost $600 million annually, or about $170,000 per agent. Extrapolating from there, we can estimate it would cost about $850 million per year for 5,000 more Border Patrol agents — or $4.3 billion over five years.

Trump didn't put a number on expanding the number of Border Patrol stations, but the CBO estimate included new facilities and other things these agents would need to do their jobs.

6. Restore the Secure Communities program — $1 billion over five years

The Obama administration halted this program, which used data from the Justice Department and DHS to identify foreign-born people arrested by local law enforcement. It led to the removal of an estimated 375,000 people between 2008 and 2014, but was discontinued because of reservations about deportation of non-criminals and how it affected relationships between local law enforcement and foreign-born residents, according to the CBO.

The administration and Congress requested as much as $184 million to fund the program annually, and you have to figure Trump would ramp up his program at a similarly high level — if not higher. So over five years, a conservative estimate would be $1 billion.

7. Have Congress pass Kate's Law — $996 million over five years

This law is named after Kate Steinle, who was killed by an illegal **immigrant** in San Francisco who had previously been deported multiple times. It would require mandatory minimum sentences of five years for any illegal **immigrant** who returns to the United States after being convicted of an aggravated felony or has at least two convictions for illegal reentry, and a minimum sentence of 10 years for anyone who has been deported three times and reenters.

The U.S. Sentencing Commission says this would expand the prison population by 57,000 over five years. The American Civil Liberties Union, which opposes the law, has used that estimate to calculate that it would cost between $3.1 billion and $3.7 billion over the next decade — but with most of that coming in the second half of the decade. The latter estimate pegs it at $996 million over five years. Another group that opposes the law — Families Against Mandatory Minimums — has pegged the cost much higher, at $2 billion annually. Because these are interest groups, and we only have estimates from interest groups on this law, we'll go with the more conservative estimate.

8. Create a nationwide E-Verify system — $635 million over five years

This is an Internet-based program that cross-references information on an employment eligibility form with data from DHS and the Social Security Administrationto make sure a potential employee is eligible. A 2013 CBO report stated that this would cost about $635 million over five years.

9. Restore the 287(g) partnerships — $340 million over five years

Similar to the Secure Communities program, ICE says this program "allows a state and local law enforcement entity to enter into a partnership with ICE, under a joint Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). The state or local entity receives delegated authority for **immigration** enforcement within their jurisdictions." It was halted in 2012.

The program cost $68 million in fiscal 2011, according to the National **Immigration** Forum and a DHS report, so we can project it would cost at least about $340 million over five years under Trump, even if he doesn't ramp it up.

10. Have Congress pass the Davis-Oliver Act — to be determined

This bill is named after two California police officers who were killed by illegal **immigrants**. It would authorize state and local governments to enforce federal **immigration** law and direct money to help in that effort. It would also punish localities that have created "sanctuary cities," where illegal **immigrants** need not fear being arrested for their **immigration** status. There don't appear to be any full cost estimates.

11. New screening tests for all refugees and **immigrants** — to be determined

It's not clear exactly what Trump's "extreme vetting" process would entail, so we can't put a number on it here. But currently the vetting process for refugees is $1.1 billion, so ramping that up significantly would clearly add plenty to the bottom line.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With his emphatic speech Wednesday, Donald Trump made clear that there will be no "pivot" or "softening" from him on **immigration**; indeed, if anything, he is now suggesting even harsher policies than he did during the primaries. One of those ideas in particular offers a window into both Trump's ignorance about **immigrants** and the fears on which he tries so hard to play. Here's part of what he said, taken from two points in the speech:

We also have to be honest about the fact that not everyone who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully assimilate. Sometimes it's just not going to work out. It's our right, as a sovereign nation, to chose **immigrants** that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us. . . .

If you think for a moment about what an "ideological certification" test would involve, you quickly realize how ludicrous the idea is (not to mention the fact that if it was testing respect for American values such as freedom of the press and religion, I'm pretty sure Trump himself would fail). But the idea that the current generation of **immigrants** isn't assimilating like previous ones is both widespread and completely false.

The power of that idea is undeniable, and it may be more responsible than any other factor for Trump winning his party's nomination. The older, conservative white voters who populate the base of the Republican Party are prone to a feeling that the country they knew when they were young has slipped away from them, and it's the fault of **immigrants** in general and Latino **immigrants** in particular. Language becomes a freighted symbol of that change: For some, hearing Spanish being spoken in their daily lives (or having to press 1 for English) can become a stand-in for everything they believe they've lost.

Hearing Trump bring up assimilation, I was reminded of a Republican debate back in September when Trump criticized Jeb Bush because at a town hall meeting someone asked Bush a question in Spanish and he answered in Spanish. "We have a country, where, to assimilate, you have to speak English. And I think that where he was, and the way it came out didn't sound right to me. We have to have assimilation — to have a country, we have to have assimilation," Trump said. "This is a country where we speak English, not Spanish."

After Bush defended himself by essentially saying it was the polite thing to do, Marco Rubio chimed in to explain why he sometimes spoke to audiences in Spanish. It included a story about his grandfather teaching him the wonders of the free market but in his native tongue, gave a shout-out to Ronald Reagan, and closed by saying he'd keep speaking to audiences about conservative principles in whatever language they'd understand. Rubio's comment was eloquent and moving, but you'll remember which of those candidates won the Republican nomination.

Now here's the simple fact: The current generation of **immigrants**, who come primarily from Latin America, are no less likely to assimilate than prior generations were (see here and  here ). Every generation of **immigrants** follows the same basic pattern: Those who **immigrated** as adults are challenged to learn English and stick mostly to their native tongues; those who came as children or who were born here to **immigrant** parents are likely to grow up bilingual; and by the third generation, they speak English almost exclusively and begin to lose their family's ancestral language. That's the way it was in my family and it's probably the way it was in your family, too. Not only that, almost all Latinos themselves believe it's important for **immigrants** to learn English, so they aren't resisting assimilation at all.

And here's an even more important truth: The United States does as good a job of assimilating **immigrants** as any country on Earth, and we always have. Among other things, it's the reason we have had so little home-grown jihadist terrorism: Unlike in many places in Europe, the overwhelming majority of American Muslims don't feel isolated from our society, the kind of alienation that can lead young men to decide to attempt to kill large numbers of people.

Trump won't be storming into any Olive Garden restaurants to shout, "Why won't these Italian **immigrants** assimilate?!?" That's because after a while, the way **immigrants** add to and alter American culture doesn't seem all that unsettling. And the people most responsive to this kind of nativist appeal are already firmly in Trump's camp. In fact, even many of Trump's own supporters aren't as resentful and afraid of **immigrants** as he'd like them to be. According to this recent poll from the Pew Research Center, over two-thirds of Americans, including majorities of Republicans, think undocumented **immigrants** are as honest and hardworking as U.S. citizens, mostly fill jobs Americans don't want, and are no more likely to commit crimes than citizens.

Assimilation is complicated, but it's also inevitable, and its endpoint is usually something even the most die-hard Trumpster can embrace. Consider this viral video of a shirtless Trump supporter seemingly suffering an epic bout of roid rage, screaming at a group of protesters, "Get the f-- out of here! Our country, motherf--er!" and then says, "Go f--ing cook my burrito, b--h!" before adding, "Truuump! I love Trump!" He's plainly torn — he wants Latino **immigrants** to leave, yet he also wants them to stay and prepare some of their delicious food for him.

That ambivalence aside, the fear that **immigrants** won't assimilate is common enough. So as a matter of policy, you can do something that addresses that fear — for instance, many comprehensive **immigration** reform proposals include some kind of "make them learn English" provision, requiring a test of English proficiency before undocumented **immigrants** can reach the end of a long path to citizenship. Even if it's largely unnecessary in practical terms, it reassures ambivalent voters that these **immigrants** will truly become American.

But Trump is suggesting something different. He's not arguing that we need to help **immigrants** assimilate or confirm that they have; he's saying that we can know before someone ever sets foot in the country whether they will or not, and then let in the good ones ready to assimilate — those who can prove they "love us" — and keep out the bad ones who won't. Even many of his own supporters probably understand how absurd that is, and it certainly isn't going to win over the voters who currently aren't sure who to vote for.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE MORNING PLUM:

With his own confidants telling him he is on track to losing, Donald Trump faces a choice. Should he continue to feed his base his customary brew of nativist and xenophobic nationalism, and count on angry non-college whites to push him over the top in a decisive handful of Rust Belt states?

Or should he try to persuade college educated white swing voters that he isn't the peddler of bigotry and hate (these voters actually believe he is biased against minorities or says things designed to play on bigotry) that they have watched screaming at them from their TV screens for the last year?

Trump's **immigration** speech last night strongly suggests that he either continues to bet on the former, or that he believes that a very light cosmetic makeover of his proposals will be enough to win over sufficient numbers of the latter.

You may have read news accounts that told you that Trump has stopped using the words "deportation force." That is narrowly true, but it is largely irrelevant to understanding what actually happened last night. Here are two basic facts about the "new" positions on **immigration** that Trump clarified in his Arizona speech:

1) Trump has now officially ruled out any meaningful path to legalization for the 11 million. Trump flatly stated that for undocumented **immigrants**, there is "one route and one route only" to legal status: "to return home and apply for re-entry like everybody else." Trump did not call for any change in the law that would expedite legal status for those who leave and return, which means in practical terms that this path is foreclosed to many, since it would mean very long wait times that would rupture families and work arrangements. As Julia Preston puts it: "In practice, **immigrants** who depart could face years of uncertain waiting outside the country."

In other words, the 11 million have no meaningful path to legalization -- which Trump labeled "amnesty" numerous times -- and this means they are not just consigned to the shadows indefinitely, but targets for deportation for the foreseeable future.

2) Trump has now confirmed not just that the 11 million are all targets for deportation, but also that deportation efforts will be increased from the status quo. Trump flatly stated that "anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation." Because Trump stopped using the words "deportation force," some journalists are claiming he's "shelving" mass deportations. But to focus on that is to succumb to misdirection. Trump did say he would remove criminals first. But he also said that we will be in a position to consider the "appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain" only after his "beautiful southern border wall" is built, all the criminals are removed, and illegal **immigration** is ended "for good."

Even though none of those conditions is ever likely to be met, some are bizarrely treating this as if it holds out the promise of relief or legal status later. But it cannot mean this, because Trump himself flatly ruled out any meaningful path to legal status, and he also said he would rescind Obama's efforts at executive deportation relief, including for the DREAMers which he repeatedly called "amnesty." There is no logical way to square those priorities with the potential for genuine assimilation later.

What's more, as Benjy Sarlin notes, Trump also outlined proposals that add up to a "far more sweeping enforcement regime" than the status quo, and a "major expansion of enforcement in general." This includes proposals to triple the number of ICE agents, to immediately initiate deportation proceedings for any undocumented **immigrant** arrested for anything, and to redouble the focus on people who overstay visas. An analysis by Jose DelReal concluded that as many as six million would be targeted for short term deportation under Trump's regime. As Sarlin rightly puts it, Trump actually recommitted to mass deportations last night, albeit in a somewhat more limited way than his earlier hallucinations about removing all the 11 million with a clap of those strong, manly hands.

Dem strategist Simon Rosenberg argues that Trump also said he'd do more to enlist local law enforcement in deportation efforts. "Trump stopped using the words 'deportation force,' then proposed something far more Orwellian and expansive," Rosenberg says.

Given all of this, Trump's short term focus on criminals and supposed shift away from mass deportations amount to nothing more than a rhetorical ruse. It's reporter chum. It's designed to soften the goal of mass removal, by creating the impression that maybe possibly something can be worked out for those he calls "the good ones" later. But that option is simply not present Trump's vision, no matter how hard people squint for it. Indeed, all of this taken together puts Trump to the right of Mitt Romney's "self-deportation" stance. Trump would expand deportation efforts, and more generally, he was far more overtly xenophobic about keeping the dark hordes out, and far more lurid and ugly in his broad-brush tarring of illegal **immigrants** as criminals and invaders, than Romney was.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

 \* TRUMP'S SPEECH WAS FILLED WITH LIES AND DISTORTIONS: Michelle Lee and Glenn Kessler serve up a terrific fact-based take-down of many of Trump's major assertions. He inflated the costs to the U.S. of illegal **immigration**, exaggerated undocumented **immigrants**' criminality, told the lie that Clinton's plan would grant them Social Security, and exaggerated the number of Syrian refugees she would admit.

Oh, and Trump also suggested there could be as many as 30 million undocumented **immigrants** here, when serious estimates put it around 11 million, give or take one million.

\* REPUBLICANS PRIVATELY WARN TRUMP HE'S IN TROUBLE: The New York Times reports that close associates of Trump and his family have bluntly told him that "he is in real danger of losing the race":

On Monday, Mr. Trump's son Eric met with senior officials at the Republican National Committee….Without a major shake-up of the electoral map, strategists indicated to the younger Mr. Trump, his father's already narrow path to the 270 electoral votes he needs to win could vanish. Going through the swing states one by one, party officials showed Eric Trump that his father was drastically under-performing other Republicans in the polls.

Surely Trump's outpouring of xenophobia, lies and hate last night will turn this around immediately.

\* CLINTON LEADS IN PENNSYLVANIA: A new Franklin and Marshall poll finds that Clinton leads Trump among likely voters in Pennsylvania by 47-40. While that's a tightening from her 11 point lead in this poll early last month, this new finding is in sync with the polling averages, which show her up just over seven points points in the state.

Also: In the new poll, Democrat Katie McGinty leads GOP Senator Pat Toomey by five points, 43-38, perhaps suggesting that Trump's travails are beginning to be a down-ticket drag.

\* CLINTON EXPANDS MAP INTO ARIZONA: in the wake of Trump's speech in Arizona, the Clinton campaign announced this morning that they will begin airing this ad in the state: It shows children watching a television set as Trump shouts curses, insults, and  and intimations of violence at his rally audiences.

Arizona has long seemed like a ripe state for the Clinton camp to expand into, because of its large Latino population (note that the ad shows him calling Mexican **immigrants** "rapists"). John McCain, who is prepping for a tough re-election campaign, must be thrilled!

\* COULD McCAIN LOSE? Politico looks at that question and concludes that beating McCain is very difficult but not impossible, and turns on whether Dem Ann Kirkpatrick can turn out huge numbers of Latinos or lure moderates alienated by Trump. Note this:

"The biggest vulnerability I hear about John McCain is that he didn't stand up to Trump when Trump insulted him. People are just saying: 'If he doesn't stand up for himself, he won't stand up for us'," Kirkpatrick says. "People just say 'it's time. It's time.'"

It has to be galling to McCain that, because he needs Trump voters, he must continue to say he'll vote for the man even after he questioned the Senator's prisoner-of-war heroism.

\* DEMS HAVE DECENT CHANCE AT SENATE: Sabato's Crystal Ball updates its ratings, and now moves four GOP-held Senate seats to either "leans Democratic" or "likely Democratic." They are: Illinois (held by Mark Kirk); New Hampshire (Kelly Ayotte); Pennsylvania (Pat Toomey); and Wisconsin (Ron Johnson).

Conclusion: "Democrats have a good chance to grab at least a tie (broken by the new vice president) and possibly a majority of as many as several seats." A larger majority is possible because "upsets cannot be ruled out" in Florida, North Carolina, and elsewhere.

\* AND TRUMP JOKES ABOUT DEPORTING HILLARY: Another awesome, thrilling line from Trump's speech:

"Within ICE, I am going to create a new special deportation task force focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants** in America who have evaded justice just like Hillary Clinton has evaded justice, okay? Maybe they'll be able to deport her."

Hey, given that Trump suggested that the "Second Amendment people" might have recourse if Clinton is elected in a crooked election, and given that his convention audiences chanted about "locking her up," maybe this is an improvement.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — Donald Trump, who has made maligning illegal **immigrants** from Mexico a cornerstone of his presidential campaign, met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto on Wednesday — striking a remarkably subdued and cooperative tone as he faced a world leader who forcefully opposes his signature proposals.

Yet just hours later in a major speech on **immigration** in Phoenix, the Republican presidential nominee had returned to the aggressive tenor that has defined much of his campaign. Repeatedly raising his voice to a yell, he said that "anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation," and he vowed to crack down especially hard on illegal **immigrants** who have committed other crimes.

With less than 10 weeks until the election, Trump increasingly has tried to adjust his pitch to appeal more to moderate voters, as polls show he has fallen solidly behind Democratic rival Hillary Clinton nationally and in battleground states. However, the visit here and the speech in Phoenix could provide a jarring contrast for voters and send a confusing message about the kind of president he would be.

Trump said at the joint news conference in Mexico that he and Peña Nieto didn't discuss who would pay for his proposed wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, despite his long-standing vow to compel Mexico to foot the bill. He and Peña Nieto avoided direct confrontation in front of the cameras, airing their differences on **immigration**, border security and trade in cordial tones.

But later, Peña Nieto tweeted: "At the beginning of the conversation with Donald Trump I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall." The Trump campaign did not immediately comment on the apparently conflicting accounts.

Trump spokesman Jason Miller issued an opaque statement Wednesday evening saying the meeting "was not a negotiation. . . . It is unsurprising that they hold two different views on this issue, and we look forward to continuing the conversation." Peña Nieto spokesman Eduardo Sanchez said that the president told Trump, "Mexico won't pay for the wall," but that his comments did not spur a discussion.

The address in Phoenix was considered a chance for Trump to clarify whether he still wants to forcibly deport all of the nation's estimated 11 million illegal **immigrants** after sending mixed signals recently. He left that question unanswered — dismissing it as irrelevant — while also strongly suggesting that he would push to deport as many people as possible.

"The truth is, the central issue is not the needs of the 11 million illegal **immigrants**," Trump said, arguing that "only the out-of-touch media elites think the biggest problems facing American society today is that there are 11 million illegal **immigrants** who don't have legal status."

He said that undocumented **immigrants** seeking legal status would first have to leave and try to return lawfully — a process that can take many years under current procedures. Trump said that he would have "zero tolerance" for illegal **immigrants** who have committed crimes beyond their **immigration** violations.

"We will issue detainers for illegal **immigrants** arrested for any crime whatsoever," he said, going further than other Republicans who have called for felons to be deported. Later, he said he would create a "deportation task force" to deal with "the most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants**" who have "evaded justice."

He also proposed an"ideological certification" test to ensure that **immigrants** share Americans' values, and promised not to issue visas to people coming from parts of the world where "adequate screening cannot occur."

At one point, Trump said: "We're like the big bully that keeps getting beat up."

The hastily arranged meeting in Mexico City was aimed at easing concerns among U.S. voters about his preparedness for the presidency, campaign aides said.

After an hour behind closed doors at Los Pinos, the official presidential residence and office, Trump and Peña Nieto strode out slowly to adjacent lecterns — in front of only the Mexican flag — to address the public about policy differences wider than the Rio Grande is long.

"We had a very substantive, direct and constructive exchange of ideas over quite a period of time," Trump said. "I was straightforward in presenting my views about the impacts of current trade and **immigration** policies on the United States."

At campaign rallies nationwide, Trump has a favorite call-and-response in which he asks his massive crowds who is going to pay for the wall he has promised he would build.

"Mexico!" his supporters shout back. In his Phoenix speech, he renewed his promise to build a wall and make Mexico pay for it.

But according to his account of the meeting with Peña Nieto, Trump passed on a chance to press the issue, apparently keen to play down what has become a very sensitive issue for many Mexicans and Americans.

"We did discuss the wall. We didn't discuss payment of the wall. That'll be for a later date. This was a very preliminary meeting," the candidate said.

Peña Nieto also was tactful during his remarks, offering a polite and careful rebuke to many of Trump's signature stances.

He cast illegal **immigration** and border security as a shared challenge but said that undocumented **immigration** has slowed in recent years. He also praised the merits of free trade; Trump has expressed deep skepticism about sweeping trade deals and has vowed to "rip up" the North American Free Trade Agreement.

"I shared my strong view that NAFTA has been a far greater benefit to Mexico than it has been to the United States and that it must be improved upon to make sure that workers, and so important, in both countries benefit from fair and reciprocal trade," Trump said.

Peña Nieto noted that he also had invited Clinton to visit, and he pledged to respect the electoral process of the United States.

Trump outlined five goals he has for the region: ending illegal **immigration**, creating a secure border, dismantling drug cartels, improving pay for workers and keeping jobs in the hemisphere.

The Republican nominee hit familiar notes about the loss of manufacturing jobs in the United States. But he didn't blame Mexico as directly as in the past, suggesting that keeping jobs in the hemisphere is the goal.

"We must take action to stem this tremendous outflow of jobs from our country," he said. "It's happening every day, it's getting worse and worse and worse, and we have to stop it."

During Peña Nieto's remarks, Trump stood with his hands clasped, and with a slight frown, while an interpreter spoke into his ear. When it was his turn to speak, Trump said it was a "great, great, honor" to be invited to Mexico, a country that he has regularly disparaged as "corrupt" and dangerous during his campaign.

He said he had "tremendous feelings" for Mexican Americans, not only his friends, but his Mexican employees. "I am proud to say how many people I employ," he said. "They are tremendous people."

When Trump began his campaign last summer, he cast illegal **immigrants** from Mexico as "rapists" and criminals and suggested that the Mexican government was sending them. Clinton sought to remind voters Wednesday about his controversial language and warned that he cannot simply paint over it with a quick stopover.

Speaking at the American Legion convention in Cincinnati before Trump's meeting, Clinton said coalition-building and leadership will take more than a "photo-op."

"It certainly takes more than trying to make up for a year of insults and insinuations by dropping in on our neighbors for a few hours and then flying home again. That is not how it works," she said without naming her rival.

After the Mexico City event, Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta said in a statement that Trump had "choked" by not confronting Peña Nieto about his signature issue. Then he amended the statement following the differing accounts of paying for the wall: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

Former Mexican president Felipe Calderón, Peña Nieto's immediate predecessor, said after the news conference that Trump is "a hypocrite" and "a liar." Are Mexicans "rapists," he said, referring to Trump's remarks last year, "or are we a wonderful, marvelous hard-working people," as Trump said at Peña Nieto's side? "I don't believe in him. I think he's lying," Calderón told CNN.

Peña Nieto, who is deeply unpopular here, shocked his country and much of his government by inviting Trump for a personal visit. The invitation, Calderón said, "was a very bad move for Mexico. . . . It was completely unnecessary and inconvenient."

Mexicans learned only late Tuesday that Trump would be visiting — and many were outraged about the invitation. How could a man who has proposed walling off the border, deporting millions, blocking remittances and undercutting Mexican jobs be welcomed in their capital?

Former and aspiring presidents, opposition rivals and regular citizens expressed anger and bafflement at the surprise guest. As one senior Mexican official put it, "This is not a winning proposition having him here."

Using the joint appearance to make the case of Mexico's economic importance to the United States, Peña Nieto rattled off trade and job statistics during the news conference, while mentioning that Trump's commentary had "hurt" his country, and that his people, and millions of Mexicans in the United States are "honest and hard-working people."

"They are good people. They respect family. They respect community life and they respect the law," Peña Nieto said. "Mexicans deserve the respect of everyone."

The U.S. Embassy in Mexico, through the Secret Service, was first informed Saturday of a possible visit by Trump, then was told Saturday night that the trip would not take place. On Sunday, it was informed by security personnel that the trip was back on.

State Department spokesman John Kirby said that the only contact between the Trump campaign and the Obama administration was with the Secret Service regarding security for the trip. The U.S. Embassy in Mexico "was not asked to provide any support or briefings for the visit," Kirby said. "There's no expectation that our ambassador or any embassy personnel are going to be participating in the visit in any way."

It is not unusual for presidential candidates and nominees to travel abroad. The State Department offers only security assistance and, if requested, general briefings on major issues of interest and U.S. policy.

Trump was joined in the meeting by former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani and Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.), who have become fixtures at his campaign rallies.

After shedding, for at least an afternoon, the combative tone that has become his calling card, Trump earned praise from strategists in both parties. Howard Wolfson, a former strategist and communications director for Clinton, tweeted: "If you believe Trump needed to pivot, moderate and look more Presidential, that event was a home run."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**So what is the takeaway from Donald Trump's schizophrenic Wednesday, which featured conciliatory remarks on a visit to Mexico, followed by fiery rhetoric during an **immigration** speech in Arizona? The dazed and confused news media can't agree.

Compare the lead in Thursday's New York Times to the one in the Wall Street Journal.

Times: Donald J. Trump made an audacious attempt on Wednesday to remake his image on the divisive issue of **immigration**, shelving his plan to deport 11 million undocumented people and arguing that a Trump administration and Mexico would secure the border together.

This isn't a slight difference in focus or framing; this is a basic factual point. How could two of the nation's leading newspapers come away with such different understandings of what the Republican presidential nominee proposed?

If you followed Trump's dizzying day, you probably have a clue. In Mexico City, following a meeting with President Enrique Peña Nieto, Trump did not mention deportations at all. In Phoenix, he stressed the importance of booting out criminals, saying he is "going to create a new special deportation task force focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants**." Yet he also said "anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation."

The Times story alone serves as a case study in journalistic whiplash. BuzzFeed's Chris Geidner tweeted a markup showing how the article changed after its initial publication.

NYT made some ~slight~ edits. Definitely looks like they published wrong prewrite: https://t.co/QcPoqjegFS[https://t.co/QcPoqjegFS] pic.twitter.com/EfzeCWUTzM

More broadly, the leads on newspaper front pages all over the country — and especially in cities with large **immigrant** populations — made clear that there is no consensus among news outlets about what defined Trump's whirlwind afternoon and evening. Was it what he said about the wall? Deportation? Was it the tone he took or the reactions he and Peña Nieto received?

Los Angeles Times: Showcasing his flair for the dramatic, Donald Trump flew his unpredictable campaign to Mexico on Wednesday and, in a hastily arranged summit with the country's president, insisted on building a border wall and ending illegal **immigration**.

For the news media, a lack of clarity might be frustrating, but for Trump, it might be exactly what he wants. Voters who hoped to see him hold fast to his earlier promise to deport all undocumented **immigrants** could find what they were looking for in his remarks — and in coverage — as could voters who wanted to see him cut a more statesmanlike figure. The answer to the question of whether Trump hardened his tone or softened it was: yes.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Make no mistake about it: Donald Trump's trip to Mexico was a resounding success.

After weeks of scrutiny over his credentials for higher office, his moral standing — even his sanity — Trump needed to restore some sense of legitimacy and strength to his flailing campaign. What better way to do so than to stand, statesman-like, next to the president of Mexico? Trump played the role to perfection. Subdued and even solemn, he owned the proceedings. Trump chose when and how he wanted to visit Mexico, a country he has insulted and maligned for more than a year. He established the meeting's agenda, laying out a five-point plan for the bilateral relationship in a potential Trump presidency. Trump even chose who got to ask questions during the brief news conference that followed the usual statements, deftly placing himself on equal footing with Peña Nieto. A master of optics, Trump used the setting to his advantage, calling Peña Nieto "a friend" and conveniently shaking his hand for front-page-ready photos. He avoided anything resembling an apology and, albeit in more careful terms than before, stood by the construction of a border barrier.

Some slammed Trump for not demanding Peña Nieto pay for the infamous wall, but such criticism misses the point. Trump's goal in Mexico was not confrontation. In fact, it was the exact opposite: the international debut of "diplomatic Trump," a man who dutifully praises his host, stresses common ground over conflict. Trump's take on a real presidential candidate came in the unlikeliest stage imaginable: Los Pinos, the Mexican president's official residence. Just a few hours later, in Phoenix, Trump would put his new perceived legitimacy to immediate use, giving a ferocious speech on **immigration** policy that repeated all of his insults and boasts, and then taunted "wonderful" Mexican leaders by saying they'd pay for the wall, even if "they don't know it yet."

As for Peña Nieto, Trump's visit should be seen as a new low for an already embattled president.

Whoever had the idea to offer an open invitation to Mexico to both Hillary Clinton and Trump placed Peña Nieto in an impossible bind once Trump accepted. After news broke of Trump's surprising plans to visit Mexico on Wednesday — just before his Phoenix **immigration** speech, no less — Mexican social media quickly condemned the historically unpopular president, questioning his judgment, political acumen and even his dignity. Under such pressure, the options for Peña Nieto to emerge unscathed or even victorious from his meeting with Trump grew scarce.

The Mexican president's controversial generosity, an ill-timed and unnecessary act of diplomatic hospitality, could only be reciprocated with a public apology from Trump, an unlikely outcome if there ever was one. Instead, Peña Nieto was left with something his administration has puzzlingly resisted from the beginning of Trump's political ascendance: He fact-checked Donald Trump, lecturing the Republican candidate on the benefits of the bilateral relationship and the contributions of Mexican Americans in the United States. But Peña Nieto stopped well short of demanding an apology or setting the record straight over who would pay for Trump's wall. His promises to "defend" Mexicans rang empty when he stood silently as Trump quickly noted construction bills would be discussed in future meetings.

Peña Nieto intervened once during the question and answer session — but only to offer a bizarre rationale for Trump's previous outbursts against Mexicans, what Peña Nieto called "misunderstandings." "Mexican people have been hurt by the comments that have been made," said Peña Nieto, who then, bewilderingly, immediately excused Trump: "I am sure that his genuine interest has been to build a relationship that will improve both of our societies." Trump smiled, his bullying having received a presidential seal of approval.

A few hours later, Peña Nieto took to Twitter to clarify his position on the border wall. "In the beginning of my conversation with Donald Trump, I explained that Mexico would not pay for the wall," Peña Nieto wrote.

On his way to Arizona by then, Trump didn't reply. He had already had the last word, back in Mexico.

Read more:

Trump should be running for office in Mexico

I'm Mexican-American, and I was a judge. What Trump did to Curiel was appalling.

A.J. Delgado: Latinos should vote for Trump

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Declaring that "this election is our last chance to stop illegal **immigration**," Donald Trump promised Wednesday night that "there will be no amnesty" if he is elected president.

"You can't just smuggle in, hunker down and wait to be legalized," he said. "Those days are over."

Illegal **immigrants** already here seeking legal status will have "one route and one route only," he said: "to return home and apply for reentry." And of those who might try to live in the shadows, he said, "Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation."

Heading into Wednesday's speech, the big question was whether Trump would continue "softening" on his core issue, making him a hypocrite, or revert back to his typical demagoguery, making him wrong and far outside the mainstream. Most of the speech — which included such points as: Hillary Clinton would bring "total chaos and lawlessness," refugees are a "trojan horse," the U.S. will build an "impenetrable, physical, tall, powerful, beautiful, southern wall," illegal **immigrants** are murdering people left and right — he chose "wrong."

The one softer note came near the end, when Trump said this: "In several years, when we have accomplished all of our enforcement and deportation goals and truly ended illegal **immigration** for good…then and only then will we be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain." In other words he would not deport all 11 million-or-so illegal **immigrants** living in the United States, and doing so is unnecessary to fix the **immigration** system. Trump left himself a smidgen of wiggle room — perhaps even enough to suggest he might offer legal status to some illegal **immigrants** during his administration.

Yet not even an eventual pathway to legal status could rehabilitate everything else he proposed — and render him a mere hypocrite. Though he did not promise to deport 11 million people, he nevertheless pledged to rapidly remove millions of people with deportation forces he would unleash into American communities.

Trump claimed that there are 2 million illegal **immigrant** criminals in the country. "We will begin moving them out. Day one," he said. The police "know who these people are," he insisted, conjuring images of officers rounding up people based on suspicions and prejudices. "My first hour in office, those people are gone," he said. "The crime will be gone." In fact, the most common type of felony conviction on illegal **immigrants**' records concerns violating **immigration**law.

Then, Trump said, he would swell the number of federal deportation agents and remove "illegal **immigrants** who are arrested for any crime whatsoever" — arrested, not convicted. On top of that, he insisted that his program would "identify hundreds of thousands of deportable aliens in local jails that we don't even know about." And, remember, he also promised that all other illegal aliens would be "subject to deportation," as well, even if they would be lower priority. These points suggest Trump plans to deport many more than 2 million people.

His deportation timetable was not crystal clear. But of the 2 million, he said, "They will go fast, believe me." He also said his plan would accomplish more "in a matter of months" than American politicians have in 50 years.

To reinforce his point, Trump referred to Operation Wetback — though not by name. This was an Eisenhower-era deportation program that forcibly and quickly removed several hundred thousand illegal **immigrants**. A Post editorial from last year — Trump has been citing this program for a while — described the operation as "a disgraceful episode that involved inhumane treatment of Mexican migrants, an unknown number of whom died or were sickened by being forcibly relocated and in many cases deposited in sweltering, remote locations with little food or water. One observer depicted 'indescribable scenes of human misery and tragedy.'"

But for Trump, the only problem with the operation was that it didn't remove people a far enough distance from the U.S. border. Even the evidence Trump cites suggests that his **immigration** plan is about as soft as a rock to the head.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It could be one of the most competitive House seats in the nation, a rare chance this cycle for Republicans to go on the offensive and turn a blue district red without the help of redistricting.

But in a five-way primary Tuesday for the Phoenix-and Tucson-area\* congressional district, Republicans nominated a scandal-ridden conservative sheriff -- a man so controversial, even two of his sisters had warned voters not to support him.

House Republican operatives say much of this is old news, and they congratulated Pinal County Sheriff Paul Babeu on his win Tuesday night. He'll face former police officer Tom O'Halleran in a fight to replace Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick, who's challenging Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) in the Senate race. Nonpartisan handicappers at Cook Political Report say Arizona's first district is a toss up.

Babeu's campaign says that Babeu, who's been a local sheriff in 2008, understands issues like **immigration** and environmental issues facing the district. And Republicans in the district have a history of winning over conservative Democratic Mormons in the area, so Babeu's hard-line **immigration** position may actually help him here.

What's more, in 2012, Babeu won his reelection to sheriff by more than 20 points after much of these bad headlines came out.

But it's undeniable that Babeu brings a lot of baggage with him to this competitive congressional race. Like, a lot.

Here's a rundown of his scandals and bad headlines, past and present:

A troubled past with a troubled boarding school

In the late '90s and early 2000s, Babeu was head of business operations at Massachusetts boarding school for troubled children, where the disciplinary practices used there were later described in a state investigation as abusive and inhumane: "Students are routinely denied their basic human rights."

His campaign spokesman Barrett Marson says Babeu had "nothing, zip, zero, zilch" to do with student discipline or student instruction.

In January, ABC 15 in Arizona got ahold of a home video of Babeu praising some of his school's disciplinary measures, like having children farm instead of go to class, or having children sit in a metal chair facing a corner for "weeks" (Babeu's words) at a time.

The school shut down in 2004 amid a state investigation.

Being outed as gay by a Mexican **immigrant**

In 2012, Babeu launched his first run for Congress in Arizona. But he dropped out four months in after an ex-boyfriend who was a Mexican **immigrant** outed the **immigration** hard-liner as being gay.

Babeu's campaign says the sheriff believes his ex-boyfriend was in the country legally on a visa.

Running for Congress in the wrong district

When Babeu launched his campaign this time around, he listed the wrong congressional district on some of his forms and had to hire a D.C. law firm to fix it.

Sending a questionable mailer as sheriff

Then he was criticized for sending out a mailer to about 8,000 residents related to his duties as sheriff. Some Democrats and Republicans thought the mailer, which was paid for by money seized from alleged criminals, looked a lot like a mailer for his congressional campaign, in part because it prominently featured several photos of Babeu.

The sheriff's office said it was not a political mailer.

His sisters endorse his opponent

Babeu's family life has long been complicated. One of his sisters, Lucy Babeu, is a longtime critic of him. In July, she sent out a press release endorsing another candidate in the race, saying: "The decisions my brother Paul has made throughout his life are not the makings of someone who represents the values of our congressional district, our state, or our country."

A few days later, another sister did the same. Veronica Keating said: "Paul thinks only of himself and his political career at the expense of others. He does not care about the people whom elected officials are called to serve. As his siblings, Lucy and I know firsthand how unfit he is to serve. The people of Arizona must know, too."

In a comment to the Phoenix New Times, Babeu's campaign referred to Lucy as a "troubled sister."

\*We originally spelled Tucson wrong. Apologies to all the Arizona readers out there!

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY — U.S. presidential candidate Donald Trump met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto here Wednesday afternoon, marking Trump's first formal international trip as the Republican nominee, to a country where he is broadly despised for his vilification of illegal **immigrants**.

Addressing the media after the meeting alongside Peña Nieto, Trump said the two discussed trade, illegal **immigration**, and border security — issues where their views do not align.

"I was straighforward in presenting my view on the impact of current trade and **immigration** policies on the Untied States," said Trump, who spoke second.

Trump said the two discussed his proposed wall on the U.S.-Mexico border, but, "we didn't discuss who pays for the wall." Trump wants Mexico to pay for it and has made it a central slogan of his rowdy U.S. political rallies. Peña Nieto has said Mexico will not do that.

Peña Nieto offered a polite and careful rebuke to many of Trump's signature stances in his remarks. According to an interpreter, he said illegal **immigration**and border security is a shared challenge, but that undocumented **immigration** has slowed in recent years. He also praised the merits of free trade; Trump has expressed deep skepticism about sweeping trade deals.

"I shared my strong view that NAFTA has been a far greater benefit to Mexico than it has been to the United States," said Trump.

Trump said the meeting was "tremendous" and lasted more than an hour.

The two stood at side-by-side podiums with a Mexican flag in the background. There was no U.S. flag.

Trump and Peña Nieto met at Los Pinos, the official presidential residence and office, ahead of a major **immigration** speech Trump plans to deliver in Phoenix.

American reporters who regularly cover Trump expressed concerns on social media about his decision not to bring his usual traveling press corps with him.

Trump flew by helicopter to Los Pinos for his meeting, according to Mexican media. He did not appear in front of journalists when he arrived at the presidential palace.

Trump was joined by former New York City mayor Rudy Giuliani and Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) during the meeting, according to a person familiar with the gathering, who was granted anonymity to describe the closed-door talks.

Peña Nieto has sharply condemned Trump for repeatedly declaring that Mexico is sending predatory killers and rapists into America, but he is now the target of condemnation at home for extending an invitation to Trump last Friday. Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton also received an invitation but has not arranged a meeting yet.

Speaking at the American Legion convention in Cincinnati ahead of the meeting, Clinton went after Trump, saying coalition building and leadership will take more than a "photo-op."

"It certainly takes more than trying to make up for a year of insults and insinuations by dropping in on our neighbors for a few hours and then flying home again. That is not how it works," she said without naming her rival.

State Department Spokesman John Kirby said that the only contact between the Trump campaign and the Obama administration was with the Secret Service regarding security for the trip. The U.S. Embassy in Mexico "was not asked to provide any support or briefings for the visit," Kirby said. "There's no expectation that our ambassador or any embassy personnel are going to be participating in the visit in any way."

It is not unusual for presidential candidates and nominees to travel abroad. The State Department offers only security assistance and, if requested, general briefings on major issues of interest and U.S. policy.

Former president Vicente Fox, an outspoken Trump critic, said on Mexican television that the visit would be an opportunity for Trump to mock Peña Nieto on his home turf. Fox told Milenio TV that Trump is not welcome and that "he has offended us, he has deceived us, he has discriminated against us."

Trump responded to Fox's criticism by renewing his regular feuding with Fox, engaging directly with him in a bitter war of words on Twitter.

"Former President Vicente Fox, who is railing against my visit to Mexico today, also invited me when he apologized for using the 'f bomb," Trump tweeted Wednesday morning.

Fox responded: "@realDonaldTrump, I invited you to come and apologize to all Mexicans. Stop lying! Mexico is not yours to play with, show some respect."

Discussions of the meeting appear to have been closely held. Several Mexican officials and diplomats contacted Tuesday had no notion that Trump had even been invited, let alone planned to visit the next day.

When The Washington Post first reported on consideration of the trip Tuesday night, Mexico's foreign minister, Claudia Ruiz Massieu, was in Milwaukee for the opening of a new Mexican consulate. Members of her staff said they were unaware of a possible Trump visit.

Trump's trip to Mexico will give U.S. voters their first glimpse of how he carries himself in a high-level meeting with a foreign leader. Trump visited Scotland earlier this year before he was the GOP nominee in a trip characterized as personal, though he did praise Britain's vote to exit the European Union in remarks to reporters.

Trump spent Wednesday morning in California at a home he owns in Beverly Hills and is scheduled to deliver his **immigration** speech in the evening at the Phoenix Convention Center.

The speech will come after Trump has wavered for weeks on whether he will continue to hold his hard-line positions on the central and incendiary issue of his campaign, in particular his call to deport an estimated 11 million **immigrants** who are living in the United States illegally.

In addition to vows of mass deportations, Trump has repeatedly promised to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border and force Mexico to pay for it. Peña Nieto and other Mexican leaders have dismissed the idea as preposterous.

"There is no way that Mexico can pay [for] a wall like that," Peña Nieto said in a July interview on CNN, adding that he did not agree with Trump's frequent characterization of illegal **immigrants** from Mexico as rapists and killers.

Questions about what would become of the estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** if Trump is elected have gone largely unanswered by the candidate and his team in recent days. The campaign has suggested that Wednesday's speech will address those questions and concerns.

"I expect the speech to be a refinement of the goals he's always stated," said Rep. Kevin Cramer (R-N.D.), a Trump supporter. Cramer said that he would like to see Trump lay out a "chronology" of actions that he would try to achieve. The congressman said he is open to a plan that would afford illegal **immigrants** who have not committed crimes some form of legal status.

Trump has offered glimpses of his policy priorities even as he has skirted questions about their implementation. He remains publicly committed to building the border wall, has extolled the need to crack down on those who overstay their visas and has proposed expanding the E-Verify program, used by employers to determine whether an **immigrant** is legally able to work in the country.

The campaign has also said Trump would prioritize the deportation of criminals, a policy that the Obama administration has pursued.

Mark Krikorian, a hard-line opponent of illegal **immigration**, said in an interview that he has been troubled by Trump's recent language because it has echoed viewpoints championed by reform advocates such as former Florida governor Jeb Bush and Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.).

"Anything that seems to suggest the kind of guarantee of an amnesty would, I think, as a policy matter be a bad idea — and as a political matter it would be a bad idea," Krikorian said.

According to a study by the Migration Policy Institute, an estimated 690,000 undocumented **immigrants** have significant criminal histories — felony convictions or serious misdemeanors — that make them top priorities for deportation under current administration policy. The number of people prioritized for deportation would grow to about 5.5 million if visa overstays were included, according to some data, although those estimates are not considered very reliable.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With an extra dollop of venom and a reaffirmation of his harebrained schemes on **immigration**, Donald Trump's speech pleased an odd collection of people. Those rooting for Trump to adhere to his unhinged anti-**immigrant** rhetoric let out a collective war whoop that resonated across social media.

The anti-**immigration** right that opposes all sensible **immigration** reform and had feared that it would be abandoned on hugely unpopular (both in the GOP and in the general electorate) positions, such as widespread deportation and building a wall, were spared the indignity of being kicked to the curb. Instead it got a bear hug from the most xenophobic candidate ever to win a major party's nomination. The groups, pols and media figures who've earned their bread and butter with phony economics, fears of an **immigrant** "flood" (our numbers are historically low) and dreams of fantastical solutions dancing in their heads got the candidate they wanted all along. The schemes they want, however, have been diminished by none other than Trump, who over the past couple of weeks proceeded to make the case against mass deportation before reverting to form. (After listening to Trump deride the expulsion of those who have been here for decades, it is hard to take his original platform seriously.)

Among those cheering the loudest for Trump's reinvigorated xenophobia are the despicable alt-right, white supremacists and other anti-**immigrant** groups who have found in Trump a vehicle to popularize their message, especially their insistence on restricting legal **immigration**. David Duke and anti-**immigrant** groups such as FAIR were delighted to see Trump hold firm on illegal **immigration**, but they were even more delighted to see him launch a bevy of schemes designed to choke off the flow of legal **immigrants**, including refugees. (He proposed, for example, "an ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people." Although **immigration** is below historic levels, he also proposed "to keep **immigration** levels, measured by population share, within historical norms. To select **immigrants** based on their likelihood of success in U.S. society and their ability to be financially self- sufficient." No word was mentioned about foreign models who marry well.) These individuals see themselves in ascendance and as real players in the GOP, which is political poison for everyone with an "R" after his or her name.

Hillary Clinton surely got what she wanted -- Trump's doubling down on a message that is at odds with three-quarters of the electorate and that makes Trump an anathema to minorities and many college-educated voters. His rant sends more Republicans stampeding to the exits and into the camp of reluctant Clinton voters. The pro-Clinton Republican group R4C16.org put out a written statement denouncing Trump: "This afternoon, Donald Trump said Mexican people are 'beyond reproach.' Tonight, he doubled down on the dehumanizing of minorities that has defined his campaign from the start. Trump responded to President [Enrique] Peña Nieto's courtesy and hospitality with anger towards and fear-mongering of decent, hard-working people. Trump is a charlatan, unfit to be our President." Trump's renewed anti-**immigrant** fervor rekindles conscientious conservatives' hopes for a bruising Trump loss but also their fears that the GOP is permanently tainted and irreparably divided. A party in which that speech is cheered is one that legions of Republicans must abandon.

Meanwhile, independent conservative Evan McMullin had a chance to shine as well. He tweeted, "[Trump] showed tonight he's not only divisive—he's dangerous to American freedoms and values. … The only Trump 'softening' today was his silence when Mexico said they wouldn't pay for his wall."

Former New Mexico governor Gary Johnson, the Libertarian nominee, got to show his moxie as well. He put out his own dazzling denunciation. "He goes to Mexico for a photo op with President Peña Nieto, claims to have a great meeting, and then flies to Phoenix to deliver the same incendiary message of nativism and divisiveness that he used to launch his campaign a year ago," he said in a written statement. He added:

All we heard was the same worn out anti-**immigrant** rhetoric that too many politicians have been using for years. He proposes to perpetuate the **immigration**quotas that ignore realities and lie at the root of our broken **immigration** system. He rehashed the unworkable 'self-deportation' idea for those millions of undocumented **immigrants** here already, expecting them to leave their jobs and families and return home to somehow return legally  -- an idea that has been around for years and thankfully dismissed by those who actually understand how absurd it is.  And, ignoring the fact that **immigrants** commit crimes at lower rates than any other group, he turned up the volume on the 'blame **immigrants** first' language that has derailed real **immigration** reform for more than decade.

Not all onlookers were satisfied, to be sure. For pro-**immigration** Republicans, including Sens. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.), who won big this week in their primaries, Trump is a mixed blessing at best. One one hand, they will face newly emboldened anti-**immigration** critics. However, they also have the opportunity to confront the split within the right head-on and demonstrate the superiority of their vision in the November election. Their pro-Trump opponents in the primaries were thumped, suggesting that without Trump, the angry, xenophobic populism has very little sell. If McCain, Rubio and other pro-**immigration** reformers win reelection while Trump gets handed a definitive loss, it may encourage some soul-searching in the GOP, which has managed to chase away large majorities of the fastest-growing segment of the electorate.

Trump's diatribe should not, however, please Republicans who want to win back the White House in the short or medium term. It does not please conservative economists who know all too well that **immigrants** are a boon to the economy and know that the wall is an unworkable and counterproductive boondoggle. It does not please some at-risk, down-ticket Republicans in competitive contests with solid opponents. Trump's words and positions will be used against them, especially if they opposed **immigration** reform, to argue that the entire GOP is inhospitable to minorities. It does not please Americans who are fatigued and depressed by histrionics on the topic and more broadly, by irrational politics.

The speech surely did not please some Hispanic Republicans. "Several major Latino surrogates for Donald Trump are reconsidering their support for him following the Republican nominee's hardline speech on **immigration** Wednesday night," Politico reported. "Jacob Monty, a member of Trump's National Hispanic Advisory Council, has resigned, and Alfonso Aguilar, the president of the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, said in an interview that he is 'inclined' to pull his support." As with Mexico's president, perhaps what Trump told them in private was at odds with what he said publicly.

Finally, Trump's tone, indifference to the facts and ludicrous proposals (e.g. "extreme vetting" to make sure **immigrants** "love our people") lower the political IQ of the country at large and the GOP in particular. In the place of accurate data, he deploys debunked claims ("30 million illegals -- No one knows!"). (The Post's fact checkers report, "A range of experts who study this issue say the margin of error for the 11 million figure may be plus or minus 1 million, but no serious research supports Trumps claim it could be as high as 30 million.") The style of political discourse in which everyone can simply make up a universe that comports with his or her ideological preferences is one in which rational self-government becomes impossible. The solution to these ills and restoration of healthy political discourse rests with the definitive defeat of Trump. A sobering, clear repudiation of his vision is essential if the country is to address its real problems in a constructive, sane fashion.

In place of a diverse and tolerant party, the GOP continues to morph into the nasty caricature that the left has deployed for decades -- a collection of sincere but misguided populists and racist opportunists. The distasteful image that came to life at the Republican National Convention -- one that sent Trump's poll numbers plummeting -- is back in high definition, with the volume turned up. That version of the GOP cannot and should not endure.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**One of the arguments central to Ted Cruz's presidential candidacy was that his conservatism was an asset in a general election, not a liability. Voters concerned about the prospect of pitting someone far to the right against someone in the middle were told that, like Ronald Reagan, Cruz could encourage so many disenchanted conservatives to come to the polls that he could make up for the loss of moderates. This has been a mantra to some on the right: Be yourself, and the voters will follow.

With his unapologetically Trumpian speech in Arizona on Wednesday, it appears that Donald Trump has embraced the same idea. Instead of moderating his positions, Trump will instead rely on the fervor of his existing base to carry him to victory in November, drawing out the conservatives who, Cruz used to argue, had stayed home in 2012 due to skepticism about Mitt Romney.

Will that work?

We can start by pointing out that the idea conservatives stayed home in 2012 is itself questionable. That's a problem because so much of Cruz's argument hinges on that idea. In April 2015, Karl Rove (who was interested in making the case for a moderate nominee) took a stab at rebutting the claim. In short, the number of voters who identified as conservative was up in 2012 over 2008, albeit slightly. The number of conservatives who voted Republican was up a bit more, since Barack Obama peeled away more of that vote eight years ago than when he was up for reelection. It's true that the growth of the conservative electorate was smaller than what might have been anticipated, but the number was up.

FiveThirtyEight considered the idea back in February. The University of Pennsylvania's Dan Hopkins pointed out that those at the ends of the political spectrum already vote more heavily than those in the middle, a pattern that held in 2012. In 2010, the year of the tea party wave, turnout was down across the board but was much higher on the right than the left. The implication? That the conservative turnout stone has been squeezed nearly dry (so to speak).

From the outset, Trump's campaign has argued that it can win by drawing new voters to the polls. Its poll numbers have been in the doldrums recently, prompting an argument that polls simply aren't capturing the population of possible voters that will turn out in November. In part, it has been argued, that's due to Trump backers being reticent to tell pollsters they support the businessman.

We can address that second point first. A look at recent polling shows that there's no real difference in national poll numbers gathered by live interviews or Internet panels, undermining the idea that it's shyness that is tamping down Trump's support.

It is true that pollsters rely on filtering out unlikely voters as they identify whom they want to talk to, since including people who are very unlikely to vote isn't useful, for obvious reasons. But that screen is usually self-identified, meaning that survey respondents are asked how likely they are to vote. If the Trump campaign is correct and there will be an influx of new voters turning out, that should be reflected in the pollster's screening even if those people aren't actually regular voters. In Post-ABC News polling, white men without a college degree — a core of Trump's support — said they were much less likely to turn out than college educated white women, who prefer Hillary Clinton.

There simply may not be enough blue-collar white men to make up the difference for Trump. Our Greg Sargent noted a passage from a New York Times article making that point: A demographer looked at what would happen if Trump's core base of support turned out more heavily.

In fact, even if virtually all of the white, non-college-educated men eligible to vote did so, Mr. Frey found, Mrs. Clinton would still win the popular vote by 1.1 million.

And there's no evidence that those voters are likely to swarm to the polls. Despite Trump's assertions to the contrary, he didn't actually bring out many new voters during the primaries. The uptick in turnout — a majority of which voted for a candidate other than Trump — was a function of voters coming to the polls who don't usually vote in primaries but who do vote in the general, according to analysis from Politico. In other words, the new voters were people that were likely to vote in November anyway.

Hanging over all of this is the fact that Trump's reliance on infrequent voters is itself risky. Getting people who don't usually vote to come to the polls requires having a system in place to remind them to do so and to tell them where to go. That's the ground game, and Trump's ground game is way behind his opponent's. Early voting starts in a few weeks in some states, and in many critical areas, Trump has little to no presence.

So the question then becomes whether Trump's double-down strategy on **immigration** can help expand his base of support beyond the voters who already love him.

In July, Post-ABC News polling found that Trump's hard line on **immigration** was alienating a big chunk of Republican voters. A third of the party's registered voters support a path to citizenship for those here illegally. Of that group, a fifth preferred Hillary Clinton to Donald Trump. That's 7 percent of his own party that opposes both Trump and Trump's **immigration** proposals. The group most likely to support Trump's proposals was those white voters without a college degree, according to a Post-ABC poll from September.

Shortly before Trump spoke, Fox News released a new national poll that showed Clinton maintaining a big lead over Trump. Fox also asked how people felt about the deport-versus-legalization question.

Three-quarters of Americans felt that **immigrants** here illegally should be offered a path to legal status (if not citizenship). That includes two-thirds of Republicans — and two-thirds of Trump's base of white working-class men.

By maintaining his hard line on **immigration**, Trump seems unlikely to sway many new converts to his cause. His speech on Wednesday wasn't much different in tone or content than his speech at the convention. That speech turned off most listeners — save those who already supported him.

So if Trump doesn't have much room to expand his existing demographic base and if his speech didn't do much to expand his support outward, what's the logical conclusion? That Trump's speech won't win him the election.

Or: That tailoring a pitch aimed solely at boosting conservative turnout on Nov. 8 is a bet with awfully long odds.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In Arizona on Wednesday night, Donald Trump proclaimed to his hardcore base what he did not have the nerve to say to Mexico's president. He reverted to red meat and angry rhetoric on **immigration**. In that regard, he is a typical bully -- brave only from a distance.

In Mexico earlier that afternoon Trump had said no discussion occurred about which country will pay for his wall. Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto said for his part "At the beginning of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made clear Mexico will not pay for the wall." A Trump spokesman seemed to confirm Peña Nieto's version when he put out a statement saying it should not be surprising the two disagreed. (Got that?)

Safely back in the U.S., it was Trump as usual. With intros from Rudy Giuliani and Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) who both sported hats reading "Make Mexico Great Again Also" (I kid you not) -- Trump began with praise for the Mexican president, who had effectively called him out as a liar. Insisting we have record levels of **immigration** (we don't), he suggested the **immigrant** system serves the needs of politicians(?). It was downhill from there. Trump insisted we would build a "great" wall along the southern border and get Mexico to pay for it. Of course, he'd first have to ask for it, something he claimed he did not do today.

He continued on, arguing some **immigrants** don't want to assimilate. (Hmm, which **immigrants** could he have in mind?) He claimed many people would still be alive if not for the "open borders" (which we do not have) that Clinton favors (which she does not) and reverted to the stories of Americans killed by illegal **immigrants**.

He did not get more accurate as the speech went on: We could have 30 million **immigrants**, he insisted, and repeated another unfounded claim that illegal **immigrants** cost us $113 billion a year.

On the subject of mass deportation he chose to hang tight.  He said, "We will be fair, just and compassionate to all" -- but most compassionate to American citizens. Later in the speech he said President Eisenhower's deportation plan did not go far enough. (He did not mention that the strategy was called "Operation Wetback".) On "day one" he promised to deport 2 million "criminal aliens" (which would be hard since he says we don't know if there are 3 or 30 million total people). How he did not say. In promising to increase the number of **immigration** officers by 5,000 (far less than the Gang of Eight bill)  he declared of Hillary Clinton, "Maybe they'll be able to deport her." We are back it seems to his banana republic convention style patter.

And yes, mass deportation is still on the table: "Anyone who has entered the U.S. illegally will be subject to deportation." In case it wasn't clear, he insisted, "We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**; there will be no amnesty."

Finally, he reiterated his entirely unworkable "extreme vetting" plan to keep out Muslim extremists, to make sure **immigrants** "love our people" and to end **immigration** from Syria and Iraq. (He lied again in nsisting no paperwork on refugees is done; in fact refugees undergo an exhaustive 18 month-2 year vetting process.)

In short, there was no pivot, no attempt to broaden his base. He remains a prisoner of his own hateful rhetoric and his adoring fans. That it seems is more important even than winning. Despite polling showing the vast majority of Americans, including Republicans, disagree with his extreme stances, he cannot admit error and therefore cannot depart from positions that make him unacceptable to people outside his core base.

Clinton campaign manager John Podesta actually had it right earlier in the day when just after Trump's Mexico visit, he put out a statement that said Trump "choked" on in his first overseas trip. Podesta concluded, "After today's trip, we still know where Trump stands: an **immigration** plan that would deport 16 million people, end birthright citizenship, repeal DACA/DAPA and build a $25 billion wall and stick the American taxpayers with the bill." He later added, "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it." That's not far off, but with one caveat that  should always apply to Trump: Whatever he says today may be repudiated tomorrow.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Only the naive have ever believed that democracy is solely a noble contest over competing ideas, proposals and solutions. Emotion looms large in every human decision, including how we cast our ballots, and smart politicians have always blended appeals to the heart and the gut with their entreaties to reason.

We cherish what might be called the Lincoln-Douglas approach to politics, inspired by the 1858 debates between Honest Abe and "The Little Giant," Stephen Douglas, when the two candidates went from place to place in Illinois arguing with great eloquence about the future of slavery. But we forget that even in those debates, emotion was often in the saddle. Racism was at work, and so was a passionate anger at "the Slave Power," the popular term in the North for the domination of the federal government by Southern planters.

For decades, political scientists have blasted away at electoral models based primarily on the idea of rational choice. In the most recent and sophisticated entry in the field, "Democracy for Realists," Christopher Achen and Larry Bartels argue that even well-informed and politically engaged voters mostly choose candidates based on their social identities and partisan loyalties. Judging from the 2016 polls, that theory looks pretty good.

And in a brilliant article for Vox, Lee Drutman of the New America Foundation shows how Donald Trump, far from being an aberration from the trajectory of Republican politics, is instead "a historical culmination " of a strategy rooted in racial feeling. The irony for Republicans, he notes, is that "this strategy reached its full completion at precisely the moment when it was no longer a winning national strategy."

In an increasingly nonwhite country in which the younger and better educated are relatively liberal on matters of diversity, Trump has divided voters on race and **immigration** in a way that worked in the Republican primaries but is failing him with the broader electorate.

Drutman's insight explains Trump's whirls and twirls over his approach to **immigration**, as well as his sudden visit to Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto and his evasively anodyne statement afterward. Trump is asking some to believe that he is an authentic nativist and racist who really thinks Mexican **immigrants** are "rapists," and more middle-of-the-road voters to see him as a fake nativist and racist willing to adjust to whatever position will make them breathe easier.

One way or the other, how can anyone with strong commitments on any issue now support Trump? Rarely has a candidate embarked upon such an extended public negotiation with himself over the core promise of his campaign — and Trumpism has been about **immigration** if it has been about anything. Imagine the campaign manager for any other candidate saying what Kellyanne Conway said this month about Trump's position on his signature issue. It was, she said, "to be determined."

What would have happened to Ronald Reagan's campaign manager if, at this point in the 1980 campaign, he had said that the Gipper's views on communism or taxes were "to be determined"? Or if a top Barack Obama aide had said the same in 2008 about his view of the Iraq War?

Have a candidate's political strategists ever before treated their candidate like a rambunctious child and spoken of their pride that they finally coaxed him to "stay on message"? The high-spirited boy may send out the offensive tweet now and again, but look how much better he's being! And don't you have to admire his gift for large gestures, like suddenly throwing a trip to Mexico on his schedule?

Trump's indifference to truth and consistency is what happens when the honest efforts of political scientists to grapple with the balance between the rational and irrational in politics become an excuse for absolute cynicism — about voters, their attention spans and democracy itself. Return to Lincoln and Douglas: Yes, they used emotion, but each also had carefully considered, strongly held views about slavery and the Union. The politicians we most respect try to persuade their fellow citizens not simply to vote for them but also to share at least some of their view of the world.

Political realists are right to challenge purely idealistic views of politics that mislead us into ignoring the role of power, group interest and the imperfections of all of us who vote. But the democratic idea is in grave jeopardy when citizens simply shrug over being manipulated and don't expect more from their political leaders than posturing, positioning and captivating media circuses.

ejdionne@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump delivered his long-awaited speech outlining his **immigration** policy on Wednesday night in Phoenix, the city where he launched his campaign on the same issue last year. A transcript of Trump's speech is below. Sections in yellow have been annotated by The Fix team and will offer more information when clicked.

Thank you, Phoenix. I am so glad to be back in Arizona.

The state that has a very, very special place in my heart. I love people of Arizona and together we are going to win the White House in November.

Now, you know this is where it all began for me. Remember that massive crowd also. So, I said let's go and have some fun tonight. We're going to Arizona, OK?

This will be a little bit different. This won't be a rally speech, per se. Instead, I'm going to deliver a detailed policy address on one of the greatest challenges facing our country today, illegal **immigration**.

I've just landed having returned from a very important and special meeting with the President of Mexico, a man I like and respect very much. And a man who truly loves his country, Mexico.

And, by the way, just like I am a man who loves my country, the United States.

We agree on the importance of ending the illegal flow of drugs, cash, guns, and people across our border, and to put the cartels out of business.

We also discussed the great contributions of Mexican-American citizens to our two countries, my love for the people of Mexico, and the leadership and friendship between Mexico and the United States. It was a thoughtful and substantive conversation and it will go on for awhile. And, in the end we're all going to win. Both countries, we're all going to win.

This is the first of what I expect will be many, many conversations. And, in a Trump administration we're going to go about creating a new relationship between our two countries, but it's going to be a fair relationship. We want fairness.

But to fix our **immigration** system, we must change our leadership in Washington and we must change it quickly. Sadly, sadly there is no other way. The truth is our **immigration** system is worse than anybody ever realized. But the facts aren't known because the media won't report on them. The politicians won't talk about them and the special interests spend a lot of money trying to cover them up because they are making an absolute fortune. That's the way it is.

Today, on a very complicated and very difficult subject, you will get the truth. The fundamental problem with the **immigration** system in our country is that it serves the needs of wealthy donors, political activists and powerful, powerful politicians. It's all you can do. Thank you. Thank you.

Let me tell you who it does not serve. It does not serve you the American people. Doesn't serve you. When politicians talk about **immigration** reform, they usually mean the following, amnesty, open borders, lower wages. **Immigration** reform should mean something else entirely. It should mean improvements to our laws and policies to make life better for American citizens.

Thank you. But if we're going to make our **immigration** system work, then we have to be prepared to talk honestly and without fear about these important and very sensitive issues. For instance, we have to listen to the concerns that working people, our forgotten working people, have over the record pace of **immigration** and its impact on their jobs, wages, housing, schools, tax bills and general living conditions.

These are valid concerns expressed by decent and patriotic citizens from all backgrounds, all over. We also have to be honest about the fact that not everyone who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully assimilate. Sometimes it's just not going to work out. It's our right, as a sovereign nation to chose **immigrants** that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us.

Then there is the issue of security. Countless innocent American lives have been stolen because our politicians have failed in their duty to secure our borders and enforce our laws like they have to be enforced. I have met with many of the great parents who lost their children to sanctuary cities and open borders. So many people, so many, many people. So sad. They will be joining me on this stage in a little while and I look forward to introducing, these are amazing, amazing people.

Countless Americans who have died in recent years would be alive today if not for the open border policies of this administration and the administration that causes this horrible, horrible thought process, called Hillary Clinton.

This includes incredible Americans like 21 year old Sarah Root. The man who killed her arrived at the border, entered Federal custody and then was released into the U.S., think of it, into the U.S. community under the policies of the White House Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Weak, weak policies. Weak and foolish policies.

He was released again after the crime, and now he's out there at large. Sarah had graduated from college with a 4.0, top student in her class one day before her death.

Also among the victims of the Obama-Clinton open-border policy was Grant Ronnebeck, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk and a really good guy from Mesa, Arizona. A lot of you have known about Grant.

He was murdered by an illegal **immigrant** gang member previously convicted of burglary, who had also been released from federal custody, and they knew it was going to happen again.

Another victim is Kate Steinle. Gunned down in the sanctuary city of San Francisco, by an illegal **immigrant**, deported five previous times. And they knew he was no good.

Then there is the case of 90-year-old Earl Olander, who was brutally beaten and left to bleed to death in his home, 90 years old and defenseless. The perpetrators were illegal **immigrants** with criminal records a mile long, who did not meet Obama administration standards for removal. And they knew it was going to happen.

In California, a 64-year-old Air Force veteran, a great woman, according to everybody that knew her, Marilyn Pharis, was sexually assaulted and beaten to death with a hammer. Her killer had been arrested on multiple occasions but was never, ever deported, despite the fact that everybody wanted him out.

A 2011 report from the Government Accountability Office found that illegal **immigrants** and other non-citizens, in our prisons and jails together, had around 25,000 homicide arrests to their names, 25,000.

On top of that, illegal **immigration** costs our country more than $113 billion a year. And this is what we get. For the money we are going to spend on illegal **immigration** over the next 10 years, we could provide 1 million at-risk students with a school voucher, which so many people are wanting.

While there are many illegal **immigrants** in our country who are good people, many, many, this doesn't change the fact that most illegal **immigrants** are lower skilled workers with less education, who compete directly against vulnerable American workers, and that these illegal workers draw much more out from the system than they can ever possibly pay back.

And they're hurting a lot of our people that cannot get jobs under any circumstances.

But these facts are never reported. Instead, the media and my opponent discuss one thing and only one thing, the needs of people living here illegally. In many cases, by the way, they're treated better than our vets.

Not going to happen anymore, folks. November 8th. Not going to happen anymore.

The truth is, the central issue is not the needs of the 11 million illegal **immigrants** or however many there may be -- and honestly we've been hearing that number for years. It's always 11 million. Our government has no idea. It could be 3 million. It could be 30 million. They have no idea what the number is.

Frankly our government has no idea what they're doing on many, many fronts, folks.

But whatever the number, that's never really been the central issue. It will never be a central issue. It doesn't matter from that standpoint. Anyone who tells you that the core issue is the needs of those living here illegally has simply spent too much time in Washington.

Only the out-of-touch media elites think the biggest problems facing America -- you know this, this is what they talk about, facing American society today is that there are 11 million illegal **immigrants** who don't have legal status. And, they also think the biggest thing, and you know this, it's not nuclear, and it's not ISIS, it's not Russia, it's not China, it's global warming.

To all the politicians, donors, and special interests, hear these words from me and all of you today. There is only one core issue in the **immigration** debate, and that issue is the well-being of the American people.

Nothing even comes a close second. Hillary Clinton, for instance, talks constantly about her fears that families will be separated, but she's not talking about the American families who have been permanently separated from their loved ones because of a preventable homicide, because of a preventable death, because of murder.

No, she's only talking about families who come here in violation of the law. We will treat everyone living or residing in our country with great dignity. So important.

We will be fair, just, and compassionate to all, but our greatest compassion must be for our American citizens.

Thank you.

President Obama and Hillary Clinton have engaged in gross dereliction of duty by surrendering the safety of the American people to open borders, and you know it better than anybody right here in Arizona. You know it.

President Obama and Hillary Clinton support sanctuary cities. They support catch and release on the border. They support visa overstays. They support the release of dangerous, dangerous, dangerous, criminals from detention. And, they support unconstitutional executive amnesty.

Hillary Clinton has pledged amnesty in her first 100 days, and her plan will provide Obamacare, Social Security, and Medicare for illegal **immigrants**, breaking the federal budget.

On top of that she promises uncontrolled, low-skilled **immigration** that continues to reduce jobs and wages for American workers, and especially for African-American and Hispanic workers within our country. Our citizens.

Most incredibly, because to me this is unbelievable, we have no idea who these people are, where they come from. I always say Trojan horse. Watch what's going to happen, folks. It's not going to be pretty.

This includes her plan to bring in 620,000 new refugees from Syria and that region over a short period of time. And even yesterday, when you were watching the news, you saw thousands and thousands of people coming in from Syria. What is wrong with our politicians, our leaders if we can call them that. What the hell are we doing?

Hard to believe. Hard to believe. Now that you've heard about Hillary Clinton's plan, about which she has not answered a single question, let me tell you about my plan. And do you notice - -

And do you notice all the time for weeks and weeks of debating my plan, debating, talking about it, what about this, what about that. They never even mentioned her plan on **immigration** because she doesn't want to get into the quagmire. It's a tough one, she doesn't know what she's doing except open borders and let everybody come in and destroy our country by the way.

While Hillary Clinton meets only with donors and lobbyists, my plan was crafted with the input from federal **immigration** offices, very great people. Among the top **immigration** experts anywhere in this country, who represent workers, not corporations, very important to us.

I also worked with lawmakers, who've led on this issue on behalf of American citizens for many years. And most importantly I've met with the people directly impacted by these policies. So important.

Number one, are you ready? Are you ready?

We will build a great wall along the southern border.

And Mexico will pay for the wall.

One hundred percent. They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for it. And they're great people and great leaders but they're going to pay for the wall. On day one, we will begin working on intangible, physical, tall, power, beautiful southern border wall.

We will use the best technology, including above and below ground sensors that's the tunnels. Remember that, above and below.

Above and below ground sensors. Towers, aerial surveillance and manpower to supplement the wall, find and dislocate tunnels and keep out criminal cartels and Mexico you know that, will work with us. I really believe it. Mexico will work with us. I absolutely believe it. And especially after meeting with their wonderful, wonderful president today. I really believe they want to solve this problem along with us, and I'm sure they will.

Number two, we are going to end catch and release. We catch them, oh go ahead. We catch them, go ahead.

Under my administration, anyone who illegally crosses the border will be detained until they are removed out of our country and back to the country from which they came.

And they'll be brought great distances. We're not dropping them right across. They learned that. President Eisenhower. They'd drop them across, right across, and they'd come back. And across.

Then when they flew them to a long distance, all of a sudden that was the end. We will take them great distances. But we will take them to the country where they came from, OK?

Number three. Number three, this is the one, I think it's so great. It's hard to believe, people don't even talk about it. Zero tolerance for criminal aliens. Zero. Zero.

Zero. They don't come in here. They don't come in here.

According to federal data, there are at least 2 million, 2 million, think of it, criminal aliens now inside of our country, 2 million people criminal aliens. We will begin moving them out day one. As soon as I take office. Day one. In joint operation with local, state, and federal law enforcement.

Now, just so you understand, the police, who we all respect -- say hello to the police. Boy, they don't get the credit they deserve. I can tell you. They're great people. But the police and law enforcement, they know who these people are.

They live with these people. They get mocked by these people. They can't do anything about these people, and they want to. They know who these people are. Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone.

And you can call it deported if you want. The press doesn't like that term. You can call it whatever the hell you want. They're gone.

Beyond the 2 million, and there are vast numbers of additional criminal illegal **immigrants** who have fled, but their days have run out in this country. The crime will stop. They're going to be gone. It will be over.

They're going out. They're going out fast.

Moving forward. We will issue detainers for illegal **immigrants** who are arrested for any crime whatsoever, and they will be placed into immediate removal proceedings if we even have to do that.

We will terminate the Obama administration's deadly, and it is deadly, non-enforcement policies that allow thousands of criminal aliens to freely roam our streets, walk around, do whatever they want to do, crime all over the place.

That's over. That's over, folks. That's over.

Since 2013 alone, the Obama administration has allowed 300,000 criminal aliens to return back into United States communities. These are individuals encountered or identified by ICE, but who were not detained or processed for deportation because it wouldn't have been politically correct.

My plan also includes cooperating closely with local jurisdictions to remove criminal aliens immediately. We will restore the highly successful Secure Communities Program. Good program. We will expand and revitalize the popular 287(g) partnerships, which will help to identify hundreds of thousands of deportable aliens in local jails that we don't even know about.

Both of these programs have been recklessly gutted by this administration. And those were programs that worked.

This is yet one more area where we are headed in a totally opposite direction. There's no common sense, there's no brain power in our administration by our leader, or our leaders. None, none, none.

On my first day in office I am also going to ask Congress to pass Kate's Law, named for Kate Steinle.

To ensure that criminal aliens convicted of illegal reentry receive strong mandatory minimum sentences. Strong.

And then we get them out.

Another reform I'm proposing is the passage of legislation named for Detective Michael Davis and Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver, to law enforcement officers recently killed by a previously deported illegal **immigrant**.

The Davis-Oliver bill will enhance cooperation with state and local authorities to ensure that criminal **immigrants** and terrorists are swiftly, really swiftly, identified and removed. And they will go face, believe me. They're going to go.

We're going to triple the number of ICE deportation officers.

Within ICE I am going to create a new special deportation task force focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants** in America who have evaded justice just like Hillary Clinton has evaded justice, OK?

Maybe they'll be able to deport her.

The local police who know every one of these criminals, and they know each and every one by name, by crime, where they live, they will work so fast. And our local police will be so happy that they don't have to be abused by these thugs anymore. There's no great mystery to it, they've put up with it for years, and no finally we will turn the tables and law enforcement and our police will be allowed to clear up this dangerous and threatening mess.

We're also going to hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents. Who gave me their endorsement, 16,500 gave me their endorsement.

And put more of them on the border instead of behind desks which is good. We will expand the number of border patrol stations significantly.

I've had a chance to spend time with these incredible law enforcement officers, and I want to take a moment to thank them. What they do is incredible.

And getting their endorsement means so much to me. More to me really than I can say. Means so much. First time they've ever endorsed a presidential candidate.

Number four, block funding for sanctuary cities. We block the funding. No more funds.

We will end the sanctuary cities that have resulted in so many needless deaths. Cities that refuse to cooperate with federal authorities will not receive taxpayer dollars, and we will work with Congress to pass legislation to protect those jurisdictions that do assist federal authorities.

Number five, cancel unconstitutional executive orders and enforce all **immigration** laws.

We will immediately terminate President Obama's two illegal executive amnesties in which he defied federal law and the Constitution to give amnesty to approximately 5 million illegal **immigrants**, 5 million.

And how about all the millions that are waiting on line, going through the process legally? So unfair.

Hillary Clinton has pledged to keep both of these illegal amnesty programs, including the 2014 amnesty which has been blocked by the United States Supreme Court. Great.

Clinton has also pledged to add a third executive amnesty. And by the way, folks, she will be a disaster for our country, a disaster in so many other ways.

And don't forget the Supreme Court of the United States. Don't forget that when you go to vote on November 8. And don't forget your Second Amendment. And don't forget the repeal and replacement of Obamacare.

And don't forget building up our depleted military. And don't forget taking care of our vets. Don't forget our vets. They have been forgotten.

Clinton's plan would trigger a constitutional crisis unlike almost anything we have ever seen before. In effect, she would be abolishing the lawmaking powers of Congress in order to write her own laws from the Oval Office. And you see what bad judgment she has. She has seriously bad judgment.

Can you imagine? In a Trump administration all **immigration** laws will be enforced, will be enforced. As with any law enforcement activity, we will set priorities. But unlike this administration, no one will be immune or exempt from enforcement. And ICE and Border Patrol officers will be allowed to do their jobs the way their jobs are supposed to be done.

Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation. That is what it means to have laws and to have a country. Otherwise we don't have a country.

Our enforcement priorities will include removing criminals, gang members, security threats, visa overstays, public charges. That is those relying on public welfare or straining the safety net along with millions of recent illegal arrivals and overstays who've come here under this current corrupt administration.

Number six, we are going to suspend the issuance of visas to any place where adequate screening cannot occur.

According to data provided by the Senate Subcommittee on **Immigration**, and the national interest between 9/11 and the end of 2014, at least 380 foreign born individuals were convicted in terror cases inside the United States. And even right now the largest number of people are under investigation for exactly this that we've ever had in the history of our country.

Our country is a mess. We don't even know what to look for anymore, folks. Our country has to straighten out. And we have to straighten out fast.

The number is likely higher. But the administration refuses to provide this information, even to Congress. As soon as I enter office I am going to ask the Department of State, which has been brutalized by Hillary Clinton, brutalized.

Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to begin a comprehensive review of these cases in order to develop a list of regions and countries from which **immigration** must be suspended until proven and effective vetting mechanisms can be put in place.

I call it extreme vetting right? Extreme vetting. I want extreme. It's going to be so tough, and if somebody comes in that's fine but they're going to be good. It's extreme.

And if people don't like it, we've got have a country, folks. Got to have a country. Countries in which **immigration** will be suspended would include places like Syria and Libya. And we are going to stop the tens of thousands of people coming in from Syria. We have no idea who they are, where they come from. There's no documentation. There's no paperwork. It's going to end badly folks. It's going to end very, very badly.

For the price of resettling one refugee in the United States, 12 could be resettled in a safe zone in their home region. Which I agree with 100 percent. We have to build safe zones and we'll get the money from Gulf states. We don't want to put up the money. We owe almost $20 trillion. Doubled since Obama took office, our national debt.

But we will get the money from Gulf states and others. We'll supervise it. We'll build safe zones which is something that I think all of us want to see.

Another reform, involves new screening tests for all applicants that include, and this is so important, especially if you get the right people. And we will get the right people. An ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people.

Thank you. We're very proud of our country. Aren't we? Really? With all it's going through, we're very proud of our country. For instance, in the last five years, we've admitted nearly 100,000 **immigrants** from Iraq and Afghanistan. And these two countries according to Pew Research, a majority of residents say that the barbaric practice of honor killings against women are often or sometimes justified. That's what they say.

That's what they say. They're justified. Right? And we're admitting them to our country. Applicants will be asked their views about honor killings, about respect for women and gays and minorities. Attitudes on radical Islam, which our president refuses to say and many other topics as part of this vetting procedure. And if we have the right people doing it, believe me, very, very few will slip through the cracks. Hopefully, none.

Number seven, we will insure that other countries take their people back when they order them deported.

There are at least 23 countries that refuse to take their people back after they've been ordered to leave the United States. Including large numbers of violent criminals, they won't take them back. So we say, OK, we'll keep them. Not going to happen with me, not going to happen with me.

Due to a Supreme Court decision, if these violent offenders cannot be sent home, our law enforcement officers have to release them into your communities.

And by the way, the results are horrific, horrific. There are often terrible consequences, such as Casey Chadwick's tragic death in Connecticut just last year. Yet despite the existence of a law that commands the Secretary of State to stop issuing visas to these countries.

Secretary Hillary Clinton ignored this law and refused to use this powerful tool to bring nations into compliance. And, they would comply if we would act properly.

In other words, if we had leaders that knew what they were doing, which we don't.

The result of her misconduct was the release of thousands and thousands of dangerous criminal aliens who should have been sent home to their countries. Instead we have them all over the place. Probably a couple in this room as a matter of fact, but I hope not.

According to a report for the Boston Globe from the year 2008 to 2014 nearly 13,000 criminal aliens were released back into U.S. communities because their home countries would not, under any circumstances, take them back. Hard to believe with the power we have. Hard to believe.

We're like the big bully that keeps getting beat up. You ever see that? The big bully that keeps getting beat up.

These 13,000 release occurred on Hillary Clinton's watch. She had the power and the duty to stop it cold, and she decided she would not do it.

And, Arizona knows better than most exactly what I'm talking about.

Those released include individuals convicted of killings, sexual assaults, and some of the most heinous crimes imaginable.

The Boston Globe writes that a Globe review of 323 criminals released in New England from 2008 to 2012 found that as many as 30 percent committed new offenses, including rape, attempted murder and child molestation. We take them, we take them.

Number eight, we will finally complete the biometric entry-exit visa tracking system, which we need desperately. For years Congress has required biometric entry-exit visa tracking systems, but it has never been completed. The politicians are all talk, no action, never happens. Never happens.

Hillary Clinton, all talk. Unfortunately when there is action it's always the wrong decision. You ever notice? In my administration we will ensure that this system is in place. And, I will tell you, it will be on land, it will be on sea, it will be in air. We will have a proper tracking system.

Approximately half of new illegal **immigrants** came on temporary visas and then never, ever left. Why should they? Nobody's telling them to leave. Stay as long as you want, we'll take care of you.

Beyond violating our laws, visa overstays, pose -- and they really are a big problem, pose a substantial threat to national security. The 9/11 Commission said that this tracking system would be a high priority and would have assisted law enforcement and intelligence officials in August and September in 2001 in conducting a search for two of the 9/11 hijackers that were in the United States expired visas.

And, you know what that would have meant, what that could have meant. Wouldn't that have been wonderful, right? What that could have meant?

Last year alone nearly half a million individuals overstayed their temporary visas. Removing these overstays will be a top priority of my administration.

If people around the world believe they can just come on a temporary visa and never, ever leave, the Obama-Clinton policy, that's what it is, then we have a completely open border, and we no longer have a country.

We must send a message that visa expiration dates will be strongly enforced.

Number nine, we will turn off the jobs and benefits magnet.

We will ensure that E-Verify is used to the fullest extent possible under existing law, and we will work with Congress to strengthen and expand its use across the country.

**Immigration** law doesn't exist for the purpose of keeping criminals out. It exists to protect all aspects of American life. The work site, the welfare office, the education system, and everything else.

That is why **immigration** limits are established in the first place. If we only enforced the laws against crime, then we have an open border to the entire world. We will enforce all of our **immigration** laws.

And the same goes for government benefits. The Center for **Immigration** Studies estimates that 62 percent of households headed by illegal **immigrants** use some form of cash or non-cash welfare programs like food stamps or housing assistance.

Tremendous costs, by the way, to our country. Tremendous costs. This directly violates the federal public charge law designed to protect the United States Treasury. Those who abuse our welfare system will be priorities for immediate removal.

Number 10, we will reform legal **immigration** to serve the best interests of America and its workers, the forgotten people. Workers. We're going to take care of our workers.

And by the way, and by the way, we're going to make great trade deals. We're going to renegotiate trade deals. We're going to bring our jobs back home. We're going to bring our jobs back home.

We have the most incompetently worked trade deals ever negotiated probably in the history of the world, and that starts with NAFTA. And now they want to go TPP, one of the great disasters.

We're going to bring our jobs back home. And if companies want to leave Arizona and if they want to leave other states, there's going to be a lot of trouble for them. It's not going to be so easy. There will be consequence. Remember that. There will be consequence. They're not going to be leaving, go to another country, make the product, sell it into the United States, and all we end up with is no taxes and total unemployment. It's not going to happen. There will be consequences.

We've admitted 59 million **immigrants** to the United States between 1965 and 2015. Many of these arrivals have greatly enriched our country. So true. But we now have an obligation to them and to their children to control future **immigration** as we are following, if you think, previous **immigration** waves.

We've had some big waves. And tremendously positive things have happened. Incredible things have happened. To ensure assimilation we want to ensure that it works. Assimilation, an important word. Integration and upward mobility.

Within just a few years **immigration** as a share of national population is set to break all historical records. The time has come for a new **immigration**commission to develop a new set of reforms to our legal **immigration** system in order to achieve the following goals.

To keep **immigration** levels measured by population share within historical norms. To select **immigrants** based on their likelihood of success in U.S. society and their ability to be financially self- sufficient.

We take anybody. Come on in, anybody. Just come on in. Not anymore.

You know, folks, it's called a two-way street. It is a two-way street, right? We need a system that serves our needs, not the needs of others. Remember, under a Trump administration it's called America first. Remember that.

To choose **immigrants** based on merit. Merit, skill, and proficiency. Doesn't that sound nice? And to establish new **immigration** controls to boost wages and to ensure that open jobs are offered to American workers first. And that in particular African-American and Latino workers who are being shut out in this process so unfairly.

And Hillary Clinton is going to do nothing for the African-American worker, the Latino worker. She's going to do nothing. Give me your vote, she says, on November 8th. And then she'll say, so long, see you in four years. That's what it is.

She is going to do nothing. And just look at the past. She's done nothing. She's been there for 35 years. She's done nothing. And I say what do you have to lose? Choose me. Watch how good we're going to do together. Watch.

You watch. We want people to come into our country, but they have to come into our country legally and properly vetted, and in a manner that serves the national interest. We've been living under outdated **immigration** rules from decades ago. They're decades and decades old.

To avoid this happening in the future, I believe we should sunset our visa laws so that Congress is forced to periodically revise and revisit them to bring them up to date. They're archaic. They're ancient. We wouldn't put our entire federal budget on autopilot for decades, so why should we do the same for the very, very complex subject of **immigration**?

So let's now talk about the big picture. These 10 steps, if rigorously followed and enforced, will accomplish more in a matter of months than our politicians have accomplished on this issue in the last 50 years. It's going to happen, folks. Because I am proudly not a politician, because I am not behold to any special interest, I've spent a lot of money on my campaign, I'll tell you. I write those checks. Nobody owns Trump.

I will get this done for you and for your family. We'll do it right. You'll be proud of our country again. We'll do it right. We will accomplish all of the steps outlined above. And, when we do, peace and law and justice and prosperity will prevail. Crime will go down. Border crossings will plummet. Gangs will disappear.

And the gangs are all over the place. And welfare use will decrease. We will have a peace dividend to spend on rebuilding America, beginning with our American inner cities. We're going to rebuild them, for once and for all.

For those here illegally today, who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and one route only. To return home and apply for reentry like everybody else, under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined above. Those who have left to seek entry --

Thank you. Thank you. Those who have left to seek entry under this new system -- and it will be an efficient system -- will not be awarded surplus visas, but will have to apply for entry under the **immigration** caps or limits that will be established in the future.

We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. We will break the cycle. There will be no amnesty.

Our message to the world will be this. You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country. Can't do it.

This declaration alone will help stop the crisis of illegal crossings and illegal overstays, very importantly. People will know that you can't just smuggle in, hunker down and wait to be legalized. It's not going to work that way. Those days are over.

Importantly, in several years when we have accomplished all of our enforcement and deportation goals and truly ended illegal **immigration** for good, including the construction of a great wall, which we will have built in record time. And at a reasonable cost, which you never hear from the government.

And the establishment of our new lawful **immigration** system then and only then will we be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain.

That discussion can take place only in an atmosphere in which illegal **immigration** is a memory of the past, no longer with us, allowing us to weigh the different options available based on the new circumstances at the time.

Right now, however, we're in the middle of a jobs crisis, a border crisis and a terrorism crisis like never before. All energies of the federal government and the legislative process must now be focused on **immigration** security. That is the only conversation we should be having at this time, **immigration** security. Cut it off.

Whether it's dangerous materials being smuggled across the border, terrorists entering on visas or Americans losing their jobs to foreign workers, these are the problems we must now focus on fixing. And the media needs to begin demanding to hear Hillary Clinton's answer on how her policies will affect Americans and their security.

These are matters of life and death for our country and its people, and we deserve answers from Hillary Clinton. And do you notice, she doesn't answer.

She didn't go to Louisiana. She didn't go to Mexico. She was invited.

She doesn't have the strength or the stamina to make America great again. Believe me.

What we do know, despite the lack of media curiosity, is that Hillary Clinton promises a radical amnesty combined with a radical reduction in **immigration**enforcement. Just ask the Border Patrol about Hillary Clinton. You won't like what you're hearing.

The result will be millions more illegal **immigrants**; thousands of more violent, horrible crimes; and total chaos and lawlessness. That's what's going to happen, as sure as you're standing there.

This election, and I believe this, is our last chance to secure the border, stop illegal **immigration** and reform our laws to make your life better. I really believe this is it. This is our last time. November 8. November 8. You got to get out and vote on November 8.

It's our last chance. It's our last chance. And that includes Supreme Court justices and Second Amendment. Remember that.

So I want to remind everyone what we're fighting for and who we are fighting for.

I am going to ask -- these are really special people that I've gotten to know. I'm going to ask all of the "Angel Moms" to come join me on the stage right now.

These are amazing women. These are amazing people.

I've become friends with so many. But Jamiel Shaw, incredible guy, lost his son so violently. Say just a few words about your child.

SPEAKER: My son Ronald da Silva (ph) was murdered April 27, 2002 by an illegal **alien** who had been previously deported. And what so -- makes me so outrageous is that we came here legally.

Thank you, Mr. Trump. I totally support you. You have my vote.

TRUMP: Thank you, thank you.

SPEAKER: God bless you.

TRUMP: You know what? Name your child and come right by. Go ahead.

SPEAKER: Laura Wilkerson. And my son was Joshua Wilkerson. He was murdered by an illegal in 2010. And I personally support Mr. Trump for our next president.

SPEAKER: My name is Ruth Johnston Martin (ph). My husband was shot by an illegal **alien**. He fought the good fight but he took his last breath in 2002. And I support this man who's going to change this country for the better. God bless you.

SPEAKER: My name Maureen Maloney (ph), and our son Matthew Denise (ph) was 23 years old when he was dragged a quarter of a mile to his death by an illegal **alien**, while horrified witnesses were banging on the truck trying to stop him.

SPEAKER: Our son Matthew Denise, if Donald Trump were president in 2011, our son Matthew Denise and other Americans would be alive today.

SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Kathy Woods (ph). My son Steve (ph), a high school senior, 17 years old, went to the beach after a high school football game. A local gang came along, nine members. The cars were battered to -- like war in Beirut. And all I can say is they murdered him and if Mr. Trump had been in office then the border would have been secure and our children would not be dead today.

SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Brenda Sparks (ph), and my son is named Eric Zapeda (ph). He was raised by a legal **immigrant** from Honduras only to be murdered by an illegal in 2011. His murderer never did a second in handcuffs or jail. Got away with killing an American. So I'm voting for trump. And by the way, so is my mother.

SPEAKER: My name is Dee Angle (ph). My cousin Rebecca Ann Johnston (ph), known as Becky, was murdered on January the 1st, 1989 in North Little Rock, Arkansas. Thank you. And if you don't vote Trump, we won't have a country. Trump all the way.

SPEAKER: I'm Shannon Estes (ph). And my daughter Shaley Estes (ph), 22 years old, was murdered here in Phoenix last July 24 by a Russian who overstayed his visa. And vote Trump.

SPEAKER: I'm Mary Ann Mendoza, the mother of Sergeant Brandon Mendoza, who was killed in a violent head-on collision in Mesa.

Thank you.

I want to thank Phoenix for the support you've always given me, and I want to tell you what. I'm supporting the man who will -- who is the only man who is going to save our country, and what we our going to be leaving our children.

SPEAKER: I'm Steve Ronnebeck, father of Grant Ronnebeck, 21 years old. Killed January 22, 2015 by an illegal **immigrant** who shot him in the face. I truly believe that Mr. Trump is going to change things. He's going to fight for my family, and he's going to fight for America.

TRUMP: These are amazing people, and I am not asking for their endorsement, believe me that. I just think I've gotten to know so many of them, and many more, from our group. But they are incredible people and what they're going through is incredible, and there's just no reason for it. Let's give them a really tremendous hand.

That's tough stuff, I will tell you. That is tough stuff. Incredible people.

So, now is the time for these voices to be heard. Now is the time for the media to begin asking questions on their behalf. Now is the time for all of us as one country, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative to band together to deliver justice, and safety, and security for all Americans.

Let's fix this horrible, horrible, problem. It can be fixed quickly. Let's our secure our border.

Let's stop the drugs and the crime from pouring into our country. Let's protect our social security and Medicare. Let's get unemployed Americans off the welfare and back to work in their own country.

This has been an incredible evening. We're going to remember this evening. November 8, we have to get everybody. This is such an important state. November 8 we have to get everybody to go out and vote.

We're going to bring -- thank you, thank you. We're going to take our country back, folks. This is a movement. We're going to take our country back.

Thank you.

Thank you.

This is an incredible movement. The world is talking about it. The world is talking about it and by the way, if you haven't been looking to what's been happening at the polls over the last three or four days I think you should start looking. You should start looking.

Together we can save American lives, American jobs, and American futures. Together we can save America itself. Join me in this mission, we're going to make America great again.

Thank you. I love you. God bless you, everybody. God bless you. God bless you, thank you.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This post has been updated.

Over the past 14 months, Donald Trump has been telling anyone within shouting distance that he will not only build a big, beautiful border wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, but also that Mexico would somehow be made to pay for it.

It's among the most brazen claims he has made as a presidential candidate — the idea that a foreign country would fund the construction of a wall built mostly to protect the United States. And yet, Trump said that this did not come up during Trump's meeting Wednesday with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto.

Trump said that the small matter of who pays for his massive border wall — at an estimated cost of between $15 billion and $25 billion, per The Washington Post's Glenn Kessler — somehow wasn't mentioned during his meeting with the man whose government would be footing the bill.

"We did discuss the wall," Trump said during a brief Q&A session. "We didn't discuss payment of the wall. That'll be for a later date. This was a very preliminary meeting." In what was otherwise a positively received visit — drawing praise even from some Trump critics such as Bill Kristol and former Hillary Clinton spokesman Howard Wolfson — it stuck out like a sore thumb.

There's just one catch: Peña Nieto tweeted out that the subject did come up -- and that he'd raised it.

"At the beginning of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall." https://t.co/0hXHfX4oH2[https://t.co/0hXHfX4oH2]

MORE from President Peña Nieto: "From that point forward, we moved on to other topics in a respectful fashion." pic.twitter.com/hFHT6mMEWe

It's not clear who's telling the truth here. Peña Nieto could have corrected Trump's comments during the Q&A, but didn't. But it makes sense (as we explain below) that he would have raised the subject, and Trump does have something of a reputation for contradicting other people's accounts of meetings he was in.

The wall holds a special place for Trump, even as he is clearly softening his stance on illegal **immigration**. The wall is not negotiable, and he has said Mexico will pay for it about as often as he has brought it up. It's a call-and-response line at his rallies — maybe his most iconic pledge.

Given the frequency with which he has used this line, the idea that he wouldn't bring it up when he is given the chance suggests a softness we haven't seen before.

Trump, over and over, at rallies: "Who's gonna pay for that wall?" "MEXICO!"

Trump's signature line is that Mexico will pay for a border wall.

Trump supporters will say that this meeting is merely the first step in a relationship between Trump and Mexico, just as Trump himself did.

Update: A Trump aide with knowledge of meeting indeed says, "Both parties knew each other's positions going into today, and we didn't think it was appropriate to start negotiating during this meeting."

But for a guy whose proposal to have Mexico pay for the wall has largely been dismissed as a ridiculous assertion, not bringing it up in a meeting with the Mexican president will only further that perception.

This wasn't the first time that Peña Nieto has said Mexico will not pay for the wall. "There is no way that Mexico can pay [for] a wall like that," he told Fareed Zakaria last month.

It was probably inevitable that Peña Nieto would raise the topic. The potential next U.S. president, who has labeled illegal **immigrants** from your country as "rapists" and "criminals," is in your country, and you have the chance to talk to him about anything. It's perhaps understandable that you wouldn't get into a back-and-forth over the "rapists" and "criminals" comment — keeping things cordial, after all — but Trump has been saying for more than a year that he is going to force you to pay for something very, very expensive that your citizens will probably not like having to pay for.

What's more, the method by which Trump has said he would force Mexico to pay for the wall — by preventing **immigrants** from sending billions of dollars home to Mexico — would have serious economic consequences. As Bob Woodward and Robert Costa reported:

The proposal would jeopardize a stream of cash that many economists say is vital for Mexico's struggling economy. But the feasibility of Trump's plan is unclear both legally and politically, and it would test the bounds of a president's executive powers in seeking to pressure another country.

This is a serious economic threat with big-time consequences, should Trump become president. It made sense for Peña Nieto to reiterate where he stands on this and urge Trump to knock it off (in a diplomatic way, of course).

What's more, this was a moment of strength for Peña Nieto: Trump's **immigration** proposals have been wavering.

Trump will detail his latest **immigration** policy in a speech on domestic soil Wednesday night, and reporters will be watching like hawks for what he says about the wall.

There are two options: If he doesn't say Mexico will pay for it, it will look like another flip-flop — as though he is backing off that signature promise, too. If he does bring it up, it risks overshadowing whatever diplomatic progress he might have been made during this meeting — progress being credited to Trump.

Hard when you're a challenger to seem presidential. Trump standing there--for all the awkwardness--looks presidential. Good day for Trump.

If you believe Trump needed to pivot, moderate and look more Presidential, that event was a home run.

Trump's over-the-top rhetoric, of course, is what put him in this position. He is being made to either deliver on a promise that could cause serious strain on diplomatic ties between the United States and a neighbor, or to look like a guy who talks a big game but can't close the deal.

And with the late accusation by Peña Nieto, Trump is looking like something even worse: A politician.

Update: The Clinton campaign's John Podesta sent out two responses to Trump's meeting, one before and one after Peña Nieto's statement that the wall had come up. The first one said that Trump "choked" by not raising the subject. The second, after the Mexican president weighed in, was even less generous: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

Update: Peña Nieto's spokesperson explains the discrepancy.

EPN spox to @davidluhnow: EPN told Trump no wall $$, Trump didnt react. "Mr. Trump was not lying ... because there was no discussion."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Would-be U.S. president Donald Trump and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto are two of the most despised and hated politicians by Mexicans on both sides of the border. Peña Nieto has been accused of corruption and plagiarism — charges that he denies — and, so far, more than 52,000 Mexicans have been violently killed during his presidency. Trump, meanwhile, has centered his presidential campaign around attacking undocumented Mexican **immigrants** and on building a 1,900-mile wall along the southern U.S. border.

So they made for a strange couple Wednesday in Mexico City: It was the meeting of the most unpopular.

The numbers are staggering. Sixty-six percent of Mexicans think that Peña Nieto has done a bad job as president. It's the worst showing for any Mexican president since the newspaper Reforma started polling in 1995. Trump, for his part, is not doing any better with Latinos in the United States: 80 percent of Hispanics have a negative opinion of the Republican candidate, according to a recent Washington Post/ABC News poll. With such poor support from Latinos, nobody — not even Trump — can win the White House. (A disclosure I've made before: My daughter, Paola Ramos, works for the campaign of Hillary Clinton, Trump's Democratic opponent.)

The timing for the hurried meeting was completely off: It was just hours before Trump's speech on **immigration** in Phoenix, and just one day before Peña Nieto's State of the Union address. Not only that; Mexicans are still mourning the death of a musical legend, Juan Gabriel.

The meeting was never going to be easy, no matter what. Trump had tweeted Feb. 24, 2015, that Mexico had a "corrupt court system." A few months later, when he announced his presidential campaign, he infamously said about Mexican **immigrants**: "They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people."

Peña Nieto took 265 days to respond. But when he did, the Mexican president criticized Trump's "strident rhetoric" and compared Trump to two tyrants, saying "that's how Mussolini got in, that's how Hitler got in."

So why did they meet for more than an hour? Because both of them thought they could win. But, in the end, only Trump did.

Trump didn't change his **immigration** proposals one bit. He still wants a wall. "We recognize and respect the right of either country to build a physical barrier or wall on any of its borders to stop the illegal movement of people, drugs and weapons," he said after the meeting. Who will pay for the wall? "That will be for a later day," he responded. (Later on, Peña Nieto insisted that he did tell Trump in the meeting that Mexico wouldn't pay for it.)

Trump also showed he is a doer; a meeting that would ordinarily have taken months to arrange by the U.S and Mexican bureaucracies was put together in just a few hours. Like it or not, he is imposing his own agenda on news organizations and forcing Clinton's campaign to react to it.

He left Mexico City with his **immigration** plan still intact and without offering an apology to the Mexican people. Not only that, he took full control of the news conference, taking a few questions in English, while his host, Peña Nieto, waited patiently.

When his turn came, Peña Nieto said that his "responsibility is to defend the people of Mexico." Without addressing Trump directly, the president said Mexicans are "honest and hard-working people . . . and deserve everybody's respect." But he neither challenged Trump nor told him publicly, as former Mexican presidents Vicente Fox and Felipe Calderón have, that Mexico would not pay for Trump's wall.

Peña Nieto was not ready for Trump. His indirect public statements after the meeting were weak and insufficient. He needed a big, defining moment confronting Trump to change the narrative of his failing presidency. However, he couldn't pull it off. He is the loser. Again.

Last week Peña Nieto was accused of plagiarizing 28 percent of his college thesis — a charge confirmed by his university, Universidad Panamericana — and questions remain about a murky transaction in which his wife, Angélica Rivera, bought a $7 million home from a government contractor. Patriotism is, usually, the last resort of mediocre governments. Peña Nieto tried to use it during Trump's visit. "My priority is to protect Mexicans wherever they are," he said. But not even that worked.

And with the meeting over, Trump crossed the border again, an American problem once more.

[interstitial\_link url="https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/03/23/donald-trump-should-really-be-running-for-office-in-mexico/?utm\_term=.c6b5db939e5b&tid=a\_inl"]Trump[https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/03/23/donald-trump-should-really-be-running-for-office-in-mexico/?utm\_term=.c6b5db939e5b&tid=a\_inl"]Trump] should be running for office in Mexico[/interstitial\_link]

A year ago this past week, I went to a Trump news conference in Dubuque, Iowa, to tell him that he couldn't deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. But his bodyguard threw me out. Trump says I didn't wait for my turn. I say he didn't like my questions.

The fact remains that Trump is still proposing the largest mass deportations in U.S. history, far more than the 2.5 million **immigrants** already deported by President Obama. Trump insists on building a wall, denying citizenship to 4.5 million children who have at least one undocumented parent and canceling Obama's executive actions to defer deportation for some undocumented **immigrants** (already partially blocked by a Supreme Court ruling).

It is too late for Trump to soften his **immigration** stance, and in Phoenix later Wednesday evening, he didn't try. The damage has been done. He might have the lowest Hispanic support in decades. Mitt Romney lost in 2012 with 27 percent of Latinos and John McCain with 31 percent in 2008.

So maybe Trump won the meeting of the unpopular in Mexico City. His real test will come Nov. 8 in the United States. Unlike Peña Nieto, Latinos here won't stay silent.

Read more:

Why Trump went to Mexico

I'm Mexican-American, and I was a judge. What Trump did to Curiel was appalling.

A.J. Delgado: Latinos should vote for Trump

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the 1980s, the Southern Poverty Law Center — an organization born of the civil rights movement — began tracking extremist organizations they deemed "hate groups" in the United States.

At the time, most were white supremacist organizations finding renewed footing after a resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan.

They called it Klanwatch, then eventually the Intelligence Project.

In the nearly 40 years since, hundreds of groups that ascribe to varying brands of inflammatory ideology — Neo-Nazi, anti-gay, anti-Muslim, anti-**immigrant**, Holocaust-denying or black separatist groups — have been lumped into the list. There is even a "general hate" category.

The center's definition of hate groups -- "those that vilify entire groups of people based on immutable characteristics such as race or ethnicity" -- mirrors the one used by the federal government when prosecuting hate crimes.

Although the news media routinely cites SPLC hate group designations as if they were definitive, some categorizations have in fact been controversial.

The law center is left-leaning, a nugget conservatives and even moderates have used to deem some SPLC distinctions illegitimate — especially when it labeled the Family Research Council, a conservative organization, a hate group for its stance on people's being gay.

But the center's most recent critique came this summer from some conservatives after ambush shootings killed eight police officers in Dallas and Baton Rouge, days after Black Lives Matter protests erupted across the country to denounce the deaths of Alton Sterling and Philando Castile at the hands of law enforcement.

Thousands signed Change.org petitions, the center received direct requests and conservative commentators joined the chorus of critics demanding a hate group designation for Black Lives Matter, claiming its rhetoric was inflammatory.

The SPLC refused.

This month, the organization announced the latest additions to its Hate Map tracker.

Black Lives Matter is not on the list.

White Lives Matter is.

The major difference:

Separated in name by just one word, the organizations are rooted in far different ideologies and end goals, according to the SPLC, which is why the center claims one is founded in hateful principles and the other is not.

Neither group has a singular, concentrated leadership structure. Most commonly, the phrases that define them are used in a symbolic way, to represent a school of thought, not all that different from the catchphrases of the antiwar protests decades ago.

"Make love, not war," meant something to those who said it, but it didn't necessarily have an attached organization, unlike, for example, the political slogans of presidential nominees. "Make America Great Again" is linked to a political ideology but also to a specific politician.

These movements are more diffuse and at times amorphous.

In mid-July, SPLC President Richard Cohen wrote a blog post titled "Black Lives Matter is Not a Hate Group" with a nuanced explanation for that declaration.

"We have heard nothing remotely comparable to the NBPP's bigotry from the founders and most prominent leaders of the Black Lives Matter movement and nothing at all to suggest that the bulk of the demonstrators hold supremacist or black separatist views," Cohen wrote, referencing the New Black Panther Party. "Thousands of white people across America — indeed, people of all races — have marched in solidarity with African Americans during BLM marches, as is clear from the group's website. The movement's leaders also have condemned violence.

"There's no doubt," he added, "that some protesters who claim the mantle of Black Lives Matter have said offensive things, like the chant 'pigs in a blanket, fry 'em like bacon' that was heard at one rally. But before we condemn the entire movement for the words of a few, we should ask ourselves whether we would also condemn the entire Republican Party for the racist words of its presumptive nominee — or for the racist rhetoric of many other politicians in the party over the course of years."

Black Lives Matter was born in 2014 after George Zimmerman was acquitted in the shooting death of Trayvon Martin in Florida. It first surfaced as a trending social media hashtag, then grew to a nationwide political movement. Its leaders have called for increased scrutiny of police brutality against racial and ethnic minorities, an end to mass incarceration in the United States and a heightened awareness of institutional racism.

Black Lives Matter, the organization, has more than 20 chapters across the United States and Canada, but the broader movement is not limited by those structured groups. The phrase itself has been used by protesters and online activists across the country who feel solidarity with the movement but may not be specifically tied to the organization in a traditional, membership-based sense.

While variations of the "Lives Matter" concept has been used by a variety of individuals and activists, SPLC sees White Lives Matter as a definitively dangerous iteration, calling it "a radical counter-movement" with "racist activists working hard to spread its claims."

"Its main activists, to put it plainly, are unvarnished white supremacists," Sarah Viets wrote in a blog post.

It's a hate group, SPLC argues, because the message has been co-opted by a handful of proven white supremacists. Two such groups, the Aryan Strikeforce, a skinhead group, and the National Socialist Movement, America's largest neo-Nazi group, largely inspired the designation, Heidi Beirich, director of the Intelligence Project, told the Boston Globe.

The law center identified Tennessean Rebecca Barnette, a leader in both groups, as one of White Lives Matter's "key leaders, if not the leader."

"Barnette, who describes herself as a 'revolutionist' who is working to 'create a new world' for white people, appears to run both the WLM website and the movement's Facebook page," Viets wrote on the law center's blog.

Here's the problem with "White Lives Matter"

The group's website promotes the idea that a "white genocide" is sweeping the United States, caused by "mass third world **immigration**, integration by force and 24/7 race mixing propaganda."

"It supports breeding practices that improve fitness, opposes dysgenic **immigration**," the website continues, "and takes a libertarian stance on other right wing gripes that don't directly turn the population non-White."

White Lives Matter is not a white supremacist or anti-Semitic group, the website claims, but it believes "ethnic Europeans are worth preserving" and that, though "Jews are generally likeable," it opposes "Jewish aggression."

The Texas-based Aryan Renaissance Society, another group of which SPLC alleges Barnette is a member, claims to be "the leading force behind the WLM Movement," according to the law center. And researchers linked the ARS to a protest that was held outside the Houston headquarters of the NAACP last week.

Men and women waved Confederate flags, criticized the Black Lives Matter movement and called the NAACP "one of the most racist groups in America."

One sign read "14 words," a reference to the white supremacist motto: "We must secure the existence of our people and a future for white children."

In reaction to the SPLC hate group declaration, a YouTube channel labeled White Lives Matter posted a video this week of a white man outside a BP gas station inserting so-called "Black on White crime" fliers into the free coupon box.

"While groups such as the Southern Poverty Law Center say we are terrorists and we are a hate group, at the grass-roots, small-town America, just normal, casual USA, everybody knows the truth," the man says. "White Lives Matters. Black Lives Matters is the largest terrorist organization in America, right now, today. They riot, they loot, they pillage."

On Wednesday, NBC News published a statement it said came from White Lives Matter, albeit without saying specifically which group or person issued it:

White Lives Matter is really about recognizing the contributions that people of European descent have made to civilization, and that we as a people and culture are worth preserving. We reject the notion that it is morally wrong for people of European descent to love and support their own race. We value Western civilization and believe that at the very least, **immigrants** should not make us dumber or poorer.

White Lives Matter is not the only "lives matter" counter-movement. As law enforcement began receiving increased scrutiny from the public over officer-involved shootings and a lack of accountability for them, police supporters used the phrase Blue Lives Matter. Another iteration, All Lives Matter, was created by those who think focusing on only the black and brown victims of police brutality is divisive and distracts from the larger issue.

More from Morning Mix:

An Ariz. school banned her Black Lives Matter T-shirt. So she boycotted her school.

After losing suit against former boss at top med school, a scientist shoots him, police say

'Abe vs Adolph': Abraham Peck, survivor of 9 Nazi concentration camps, dies at 91

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump gave his long-awaited speech on **immigration** in Phoenix on Aug. 31. Here's a round-up of some of the more interesting claims he made in the lengthy address; we expect we will dig deeper into some of his other statistics in the coming days. As is our practice, we do not award Pinocchios in speech round-ups.

"Illegal **immigration** costs our country more than $113 billion a year. And this is what we get. For the money we are going to spend on illegal **immigration** over the next 10 years, we could provide 1 million at-risk students with a school voucher."

Trump states this $113 billion figure as an undisputed fact, but it comes from a report by the Federation for American **Immigration** Reform, which seeks to dramatically reduce legal **immigration**. So you immediately have to look at the numbers with skepticism.

Digging into the numbers, you see that burden on the federal budget is estimated to be just $29 billion, whereas $84 billion is supposedly borne by state and local governments. Why is that? The group counts the cost of educating the children of illegal **immigrants**, even if they are born in the United States and, thus, are U.S. citizens. "The birth of these children and their subsequent medical care represent a large share of the estimated Medicaid and Child Health Insurance Program expenditures associated with illegal **alien**," the report says.

The report, however, says it tries to account for the taxes collected by federal and local governments from illegal **immigrants**, but the services used by undocumented **immigrants** outweigh revenue collections. We should note that because the federal government is currently running a deficit, U.S. citizens also receive more in government benefits than they pay in taxes.

"Hillary Clinton has pledged amnesty in her first 100 days, and her plan will provide Obamacare, Social Security and Medicare for illegal **immigrants**, breaking the federal budget."

Trump falsely says Clinton's plan will provide Social Security to illegal **immigrants**. We awarded this claim Four Pinocchios. In general, people in the United States illegally are not eligible to collect Social Security benefits. They must be granted some type of lawful status — either by obtaining legal status or being granted deferred action.

Even those who are granted deferred action through Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) or Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) are not granted "Obamacare" benefits through the Affordable Care Act. They are, however, eligible for Social Security retirement and Medicare benefits with 10 years of work history, after paying income taxes, and once they reach retirement age.

Clinton supports "comprehensive **immigration** reform" and has vowed that within her first 100 days in office, she will introduce a plan to overhaul the **immigration** system with a pathway to full citizenship (which Trump calls "amnesty"). Clinton also supports President Obama's executive actions on DACA and DAPA. DAPA is pending in court under litigation, and DACA went into effect in 2012.

Clinton does support expanding Obamacare to all families, regardless of **immigration** status and allowing them to buy into the health exchanges, according to her **immigration** proposal.

But DACA grantees will not yet reach retirement age if Clinton becomes president and serves two terms in office. DACA grantees must have been under 31 as of June 15, 2012, and meet several other criteria to be eligible. So if Clinton serves two terms and leaves office in 2025, the oldest DACA grantees would be 43.

Trump says her plan would break the federal budget, but the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget found that the **immigration** reform component of Clinton's plan would save the federal budget $100 billion over ten years.

"This includes her plan to bring in 620,000 new refugees from Syria and that region over a short period of time."

Trump has used this number before, but it stems from the unverified assumption that Clinton, who has called for 55,000 additional refugees from Syria, would continue at that pace for every year of her first term, on top of the Obama administration's proposal for 100,000 refugees for fiscal year 2017. The committee then multiplies 155,000 times four years to reach 620,000 refugees. Clinton has never proposed such a "plan," so this is an invented figure. Clinton only has proposed an increase of 55,000 refugees for one year.

"We will restore the highly successful Secure Communities Program. Good program. We will expand and revitalize the popular 287(g) partnerships, which will help to identify hundreds of thousands of deportable aliens in local jails that we don't even know about."

Trump lauded these two Department of Homeland Security programs, but both have been widely scrutinized and it's questionable how effective they are.

DHS targeted **immigration** enforcement to those who committed serious crimes through efforts like Secure Communities, rolled out per county from 2008 through 2012. But a 2014 study showed that increased enforcement didn't lead to decreased crime, calling into question whether serious crimes were prevalent.

Secure Communities was billed as a crackdown on **immigrants** who committed serious crimes. But researchers found Secure Communities did not result in a meaningful reduction in the FBI's overall index crime rate or in rates of violent crimes. There were modest reductions in burglary and motor vehicle theft, not serious crimes like homicides or violent crime.

The program is being phased out, as local agencies are ending or scaling back their participation. Secure Communities was meant to be a complement to the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement's 287(g) program, through which ICE gave authority to certain state and local law enforcement officers to carry out the functions of federal **immigration** agents.

The 287(g) program was scrutinized by **immigration** advocates for diverting local resources to do federal enforcement work, and the potential for racial profiling, without proper federal oversight.

In fact, local law enforcement officers carrying out **immigration** enforcement under 287(g) authority led to a federal racial profiling case against Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Arizona, a Trump surrogate who delivered one of the opening speeches Wednesday night. The Department of Justice found that the sheriff's office engaged in systemic racial profiling of Latinos. DHS removed the 287(g) authority of Arpaio's agency, and a federal judge imposed a series of reforms.

"It's always 11 million. Our government has no idea. It could be 3 million. It could be 30 million. They have no idea what the number is."

Trump says the number of unauthorized **immigrants** in the United States — which is estimated at 11 million — could be anywhere between 3 million or 30 million. A number of independent organizations researching **immigrant** flows and the federal government have arrived at the 11 million estimate for the population of undocumented **immigrants**, using calculations of Census data.

Our friends at PolitiFact and FactCheck.org have found Trump's 30 million figure to be bogus. A range of experts who study this issue say the margin of error for the 11 million figure may be plus or minus 1 million, but no serious research supports Trumps claim it could be as high as 30 million.

"For instance, in the last five years, we've admitted nearly 100,000 **immigrants** from Iraq and Afghanistan. And these two countries, according to Pew Research, a majority of residents say that the barbaric practice of honor killings against women are often or sometimes justified."

Actually, between 2009 and 2014, the United States has admitted 120,000 **immigrants** from Iraq and and 18,000 from Afghanistan, according to Department of Homeland Security statistics. So this is a rare case where Trump lowballs a number.

It goes without saying that the United States has fought two long wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, having invading both countries. In fact, special visa programs were enacted by Congress to expedite the processing of Afghans and Iraqis who worked for the U.S. government.

Trump correctly cites a Pew Research study which surveyed attitudes in various Muslim countries. "In only two countries — Afghanistan (60%) and Iraq (60%) — do majorities say honor killings of women are often or sometimes justified, while only in Afghanistan does a majority (59%) say the same about executing men who have allegedly engaged in pre- or extra-marital sex," the report said.

President Obama and Hillary Clinton "support visa overstays."

The Department of Homeland Security has a visa overstay identification process. According to DHS, there were nearly 45 million nonimmigrant visitors in fiscal 2015, with an overstay rate of 1.17 percent, or 525,127 people. That was the first time DHS provided an estimate of foreign visitors who overstayed.

But the Obama administration — and previously, the Bush administration — has been criticized by Congress, law enforcement officials and advocates for failing to fix loopholes in the visa program.

Clinton's **immigration** proposal does not address visa overstays. The only mention of visa issues in her proposal is to"fix the family visa backlog," but it does not offer any specifics. According to the pro-**immigrant** group National **Immigration** Forum, there is an administrative backlog of processing visas for spouses, children and parents of U.S. citizens. Clinton has said her "comprehensive **immigration** reform" proposal with a pathway to citizenship would fix the family visa backlog.

"There are at least 23 countries that refuse to take their people back after they've been ordered to leave the United States. Including large numbers of violent criminals, they won't take them back."

Trump is right about this, according to a letter written by Sen. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa), who in June 2016 urged the Department of Homeland Security and the State Department to stop granting visas to countries that refuse the deportation of U.S. citizens. The letter said such action has only been take once, against Ghana in 2001. Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.) has said he would seek legislation that would sanction countries that refuse to take back their nationals.

The Supreme Court ruled in 2001 that the United States can only hold convicted criminals for six months in detention if a country refuses to accept them. More than 100 **immigrants** released from detention have later been charged in homicides.

"Countless innocent American lives have been stolen because our politicians have failed in their duty to secure our borders and enforce our laws like they have to be enforced."

Trump likes to use anecdote as evidence for associating violent crimes with illegal **immigration**, telling stories of victims of homicide by undocumented **immigrants**. He often talks about the deaths of Jamiel Shaw, Kate Steinle and Sarah Root, all killed by people in the country illegally.

Clearly, stories like this exist. But as we've noted numerous times, there are two important data points to remember when Trump talks about this.

First, the vast majority of unauthorized **immigrants** do not fit Trump's description of aggravated felons, whose crimes include murder. U.S. Sentencing Commission data show homicides are a small percentage of the crimes committed by noncitizens, whether they are in the U.S. illegally or not.

Second, illegal **immigration** flows across the Southern border in fiscal 2015 were at the lowest levels since 1972, except for in 2011. Earlier this year, there were upticks in border apprehensions of unaccompanied children and their families, compared to 2015.  The apprehensions in fiscal 2016 so far have exceeded fiscal 2015, but still indicate an overall decline.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump had a private meeting with President Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico on Wednesday, after which each man offered a brief statement recapping what had been discussed. A transcript of that conversation is below. Sections in yellow have been annotated by The Fix team and will offer more information when clicked.

Peña Nieto

Through a translator.

Next November 8th, the United States people will elect a new president of the United States. I am sure that the electoral process will continue being intense debate -- idea -- contrasting all of these characteristics of the grand democratic tradition of the U.S.

Just as well, Ms. Hillary Clinton, as well as Mr. Donald Trump, have publicly expressed my respect. As has been with the president and friend, Barack Obama, the next president of North America will find in Mexico and its government a neighbor that wants to work constructively to strengthen even more the relationship among our nations and to confront together all the challenges that we face together in common.

We -- I believe that there's great opportunities for both countries if we decide to take advantage of this (inaudible) good friends, allies and strategic allies, beginning from a relationship based in mutual respect. Even though we may not agree on everything, I trust that together, we will be able to find better prosperity and security without losing sight of security and independence are the most important and (inaudible) value.

Any close relationship needs to be visited and renewed from time to time. We always need to be open to discuss what has worked and what has hasn't. How can we improve things on both sides of the border? How can we clear misunderstandings and understand each other better?

So keeping that in mind, a few days ago, I sent a letter to both presidential candidates, both to Mrs. Hillary Clinton and to Mr. Donald Trump, asking them to have a meeting and to have a constructive meeting of the shared future of our countries. I have met today with Mr. Donald Trump, and in the near future, I hope to do so with Ms. Hillary Clinton, with whom I have been pleased to have discussions over here (inaudible) in the past.

We may not agree on certain topics, but his presence here, Mr. Trump, demonstrates that we have a fundamental coincidence (ph). Our respective countries are very important, one for the other. The U.S. is very important for Mexico just the same as Mexico is very important for the United States. We share the most travelled border through which every day, legally, more than a million people cross it and over 400,000 vehicles.

Commerce between our countries was over $500 billion a year. We innovate and produce together. As far as national security, the daily cooperation amongst our governments is ever more important to face all the challenges of a complex world.

So I had a very open and constructive discussion with Mr. Donald Trump. The objective of this meeting was to meet each other and to know about the bilateral relations. As far as commercial issues, I shared with Mr. Trump my conviction that the free trade of North America has done a lot of good to both the U.S. as well as Mexico. U.S. exports to Mexico are close to $200 billion a year. And according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, more than six million jobs in the U.S. rely on the exports to Mexico.

Our country buys more from the U.S. than Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Japan, and the U.K. together. A lot of jobs in the manufacturing industry in the U.S. were not moved to other areas of the world precisely because together, we have developed a manufacturing platform competitively (ph) in the North American continent together. Forty percent of the content -- of the Mexican content is made in the U.S.

As partners, we need to work together to avoid all of the jobs leaving our region. However, this doesn't mean that the free trade agreement -- North American Free Trade Agreement may not be improved to benefit both parts. (inaudible) is an agreement that was signed over 22 years ago. The next president of the U.S. will find in my government a partner willing to build the route to modernize telecom (ph) so that it will become more effective and to generate more higher quality jobs and better paying jobs in both countries.

I don't think that commerce must be considered a zero sum game, so that only one wins and the other one loses. On the contrary, it must be seen as an effort that generates value to both parts and makes our North American region the most competitive and innovative in the world.

With regards to border issues, I have a very clear vision. The border must transform itself in (ph) an asset for our region. We have great advances in the last few years, working very closely with the Obama administration. And with the next administration, we must accelerate these efforts so that the Mexican/United States border is more efficient and safe.

However, an important number of U.S. citizens chases (ph) the border as a real problem because undocumented persons and illegal drugs cross the border onto the U.S. Undocumented **immigration** - **immigration** from the Mexico to the U.S. had it highest point ten years ago, and it has slowed down consistently, even to the point of being negative in a net effect at this point.

Even so, we know that it continues to be a shared challenge, including the increasing number of non-Mexicans that cross our country to go to the U.S. which create in fact a great humanitarian crisis. However, this is a clearly incomplete vision of the border wishes (ph) because it doesn't account for the illegal flows that come in south bound, including weapons and cash.

Every year thousands of dollars - billions of dollars and weapons come in from the North, which strengthen the cartels and other criminal organizations that generate violence in Mexico, and obtain gains from the drug sales in the U.S. This flow must be stopped.

What we need is an integral (ph) focus regarding the border that serves the challenges of undocumented people and illegal drugs and weapon flows as cash all (ph) the same. Many lives may be saved in both sides of our borders if the criminal organizations stop receiving all the weapons and cash that today allow them to pursue their criminal endeavors.

Illegal weapons, drugs, and cash flows in both directions, have multiple negative consequences on both sides of the border. Our border must be seen as a joint opportunity. Both countries must invest more - more infrastructure, more people, and more technology to make it more - safer, and more efficient.

I do admit that the - recognize that the natural right that every country has to protect its own borders. I also believe that a real collaboration effort between friends and allied is the best route to obtain this. All the while, I express this to Mr. Trump to make a better border with Mexico, and all the friends from Central America.

It's vital - of vital importance to both Mexico and the U.S. Equally, as far as national security, both Mexico and the U.S. work together to confront all the challenges that a complex world poses. Every day the security advances (ph) of both countries are exchanging information and coordinate both (ph) actions (ph).

Independent of their results of the North American election, the next presidency of the U.S. may count on the continuing integrity of the Mexican government to make similar with the U.S.

Mr. Trump, I'd like reiterate right now what a (inaudible) I expressed to you privately. My priority as the Mexican president and of my government is to protect Mexicans wherever they may be. That is my responsibility, and I will continue to comply with it my heart.

In the United States, the Mexican population continues (ph) to with talent and creativity to development of both Mexico and the U.S. Mexican nationals in the United States are honest people, working people. They're people of (ph) good (ph) that respect family, they respect the life in the community, and they are respective of the law.

As such, Mexicans deserve everybody's respect. Let's continue working to solidify the relationship between Mexico and the United States based on the mutual respect, trust and the joint attention to all the common challenges that we have.

My conclusion's (inaudible) that the Mexican government will be totally respectful of the electoral process of the United States. I recognize its position to sustain a constructive dialogue. A (ph) dialogue is the route that gets people closer to people who think differently. This is the route that allows for a better understanding.

Thank you very much. Let's listen to the words from the Republican candidate, Mr. Donald Trump.

Trump

Thank you. It is a great honor to be invited by you, Mr. President. A great, great honor, thank you.

We had a very substantive, direct and constructive exchange of ideas over quite a period of time. I was straight forward in presenting my views about the impacts of current trade and **immigration** policies on the United States.

As you know, I love the United States very much and we want to make sure that the people of the United States are very well protected. You equally expressed your feelings and your love for Mexico.

The United States and Mexico share a 2,000-mile border, a half a trillion dollars in annual trade and one million legal border crossings each and every day. We are united by our support for democracy, a great love for our people and the contributions of millions of Mexican Americans to the United States.

And I happen to have a tremendous feeling for Mexican Americans not only in terms of friendships, but in terms of the tremendous numbers that I employ in the United States and they are amazing people, amazing people. I have many friends, so many friends and so many friends coming to Mexico and in Mexico. I am proud to say how many people I employ.

And the United States first, second and third generation Mexicans are just beyond reproach. Spectacular, spectacular hard-working people. I have such great respect for them and their strong values of family, faith and community.

We all share a common interest in keeping our hemisphere safe, prosperous and free. No one wins in either country when human smugglers and drug traffickers prey on innocent people, when cartels commit acts of violence, when illegal weapons and cash flow from the United States into Mexico or when migrants from Central America make the dangerous trek -- and it is very, very dangerous -- into Mexico or the United States without legal authorization.

I shared my strong view that NAFTA has been a far greater benefit to Mexico than it has been to the United States and that it must be improved upon to make sure that workers, and so important, in both countries benefit from fair and reciprocal trade.

I expressed that to the United States and in -- that of the United States, that we must take action to stem this tremendous outflow of jobs from our country. It's happening every day, it's getting worse and worse and worse, and we have to stop it. Prosperity and happiness in both of our countries will increase if we work together on the following five shared goals.

Number one, ending illegal **immigration**, not just between our two countries, but including the illegal **immigration** and migration from Central and South Americans, and from other regions that impact security and finances, in both Mexico and the United States.

This is a humanitarian disaster. The dangerous treks, the abuse by gangs and cartels and the extreme physical dangers and it must be solved, it must be solved quickly. Not fair to the people, anywhere world wide, you can truly say, but certainly not fair to the people of Mexico and the people of the United States.

Number two, having a secure border is a sovereign right and mutually beneficial. We recognize and respect the right of either country to build a physical barrier or wall on any of its borders to stop the illegal movement of people, drugs and weapons. Cooperation toward achieving the shared objective, and it will be shared of safety for all citizens is paramount, to both the United States and to Mexico.

Number three, dismantling drug cartels and ending the movement of illegal drugs, weapons, and funds across our border. This can only be done with cooperation, intelligence and intelligence sharing and joint operations between our two countries. It's the only way it's going to happen. Improving NAFTA, number four. NAFTA is a 22 year old agreement that must be updated to reflect the realities of today.

There are many improvements that could be made that would make both Mexico and the United States stronger and keep industry in our hemisphere. We have tremendous competition from China and from all over the world. Keep it in our hemisphere. Workers in both of our countries need a pay raise, very desperately. In the United States, it's been 18 years, 18 years wages are going down. Improving pay standards and working conditions will create better results for all and all workers in particular. There's a lot of value that can be created for both countries by working beautifully together. And that I am sure will happen.

Number five, keep manufacturing wealth in our hemisphere. When jobs leave Mexico, the U.S. or Central America and go over seas, it increases poverty and pressure on social services as well as pressures on cross border migration. Tremendous pressure. The bond between our two countries is deep and sincere. And both our nations benefit from a close and honest relationship between our two governments.

A strong prosperous and vibrant Mexico is in the best interest of the United States and will keep and help keep, for a long, long period of time, America together. Both of our countries will work together for mutual good, and most importantly for the mutual good of our people. Mr. President, I want to thank you. It's been a tremendous honor and I call you a friend. Thank you.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**French exceptionalism is under fire. While the United States sees itself as the Earth's last, best hope, leading the world for the better, France has long viewed itself as the world's beacon of enlightenment, illuminating the planet with the sheer power of its conceptual and literary achievements. The irony is that the country which also gave the world Brigitte Bardot and the Vichy-checkered bikini is now fuming over the burkini issue. Our particular vision of secularism is under strain, and it is a source of misunderstanding among those who wonder how the motherland of human rights has become so oppressive.

Stringent secularism, supported to this day by a vast majority of French, stems from the bloody fight at the beginning of the 20th century between the government and the Catholic Church, which eventually lost control over the political, social and educational systems. Freedom of thought cannot be constrained, but for the French, religion is a private matter that has no say in the public space. It always comes as a surprise to us that in the United States, where the same distinction is enshrined in the Constitution, every coin is engraved with "In God We Trust" and every public oath is taken on the Bible.

In our lexicon, "La République" is one and indivisible. So is the Nation. It is therefore illegal to question a French citizen about his or her ethnic origin or religious beliefs, if any. As a result, there are no statistics about the number of Muslims — the estimate is that they represent roughly 8 percent of the population. Uncomfortable with our colonial past, oblivious to the demographic consequences of massive labor imports from North and Sub-Saharan Africa to sustain the economic boom of the 1960s, all governments, right and left, saw no harm in letting Arab regimes train and pay for foreign imams to shepherd the **immigrant**population.

Our elites have long shared the self-serving view that French values being universal, all children born in the country are bound to believe the Gauls are their common ancestors. Communitariansm, as practiced in "Anglo-Saxon" democracies, is considered evil, contrary to the very spirit of "La République." Public policies have been based on "integration," not on "assimilation," and hammered into the culture like a healing mantra. Convinced like most of our politicians that once the right phrase has been coined, the problem is somehow solved, we have been horrified to discover that most of those murderers claiming to fight on our soil for radical Islam are French citizens — second- or third-generation children of **immigrants** whose religious beliefs were kept to themselves, and largely ignored by the authorities.

The country is reeling from a succession of terrorist attacks: The vision of a truck crushing bodies in Nice on Bastille night, and the old priest's throat slashed in his church less than two weeks later are still on people's minds. Until this summer, there had been few incidents with racial overtones against French Muslims. Tension has risen. Eight months ahead of the next presidential election, politics have come into play. The conservative opposition is eager to seize upon security as a key issue of the campaign. Most of the 30 mayors who have decided to ban the burkini on their beaches belong to Nicolas Sarkozy's party. The former president has seized upon the burkini issue, labeling it a national identity crisis, trying to deprive the far right of its main argument to voters.

Manuel Valls, the Socialist prime minister, considers the burkini to be an Islamist provocation conveying "the idea that, by their nature, women are immodest, impure, that they should therefore be completely covered. It is not compatible with the values of France and the republic." Previously the mayor of a surburban community near Paris where he witnessed the creeping influence of Salafist islam, Valls reflects a majority of French public opinion. But the burkini ban is against the law. The Conseil d'État, the highest administrative court in the country, ruled last Friday that local mayors have no right to decide what kind of clothing is appropriate or not, as long as the clothing does not pose a threat to public order.

The rule of law has prevailed. What remains at stake is the difficulty for French society, diverse as it has become, to accept multiculturalism and to adjust to it whilst maintaining its secular tradition. Ostentatious religious symbols have been banned from classrooms since 2004, and full-face veils have been forbidden since 2010 for public security reasons. Muslims should be protected from any risk of stigmatization just like other law-abiding citizens. But we have also fought long and hard for women to achieve the same rights as men — in any Western democracy, the burqa, or the burkini or any other attire imposed upon a woman's body to deny her sex can hardly be seen as a token of progress.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Much is being made of this quote from Donald Trump at a rally late yesterday:

"The Republican Party is the party of Abraham Lincoln. Not bad," said Trump, speaking at a rally in the Seattle suburb of Everett. "Not bad. It's also the party of freedom, equality and opportunity."

The Post account notes that Trump was reading from a prepared script when he said this. Which brings up a point I've been looking to make: After a year during which Trump seemed to be lurching off in all sorts of unconventional directions, his new handlers are actually having some success in morphing him into a somewhat more conventional Republican.

As Ed Kilgore explains, this sort of "Jim Crow" rhetoric is fairly standard issue conservative boilerplate:

Its heart is familiar to those accustomed to conservative agitprop on race: Black folks are dupes for a Democratic Party that has enslaved them on a "plantation" where they give up their freedom and any chance at dignity or equality in exchange for the idle life of welfare beneficiaries. According to this revisionist theory, the modern welfare state is just a continuation of slavery and Jim Crow, with the Democratic Party serving as the continuous oppressor from antebellum days until now, and Republicans offering a continuous option of liberation via self-sufficiency and capitalism.

Indeed, this is part and parcel of a more conventional indictment of liberalism that we're hearing from Trump these days. It's true that you hear loud echoes of Trumpism in his constant claims that crime is skyrocketing and that our cities are "war zones," which represent a continuation of Trump's efforts at the convention to portray the country as existentially threatened by crime, **immigration** and terrorism. But Trump is also starting to make a bit more of a concerted -- and conventional sounding -- case that liberal Democratic rule has badly failed the country, particularly with regard to minorities, who (goes this narrative) have been consigned to crime-ridden cities, failing schools, and lives of dependency, whereas the GOP promises liberation and opportunity via economic freedom and unshackled growth. For one example, see this recent speech in Milwaukee.

Something similar is happening on that other issue where Trump badly needs a makeover: **immigration**. Yes, there are loud echoes of Trumpism in his continued depiction of the southern border as overrun by dark hordes, and in substance, he is sticking by his position that all the 11 million will be subject to removal and will not ever have a meaningful path to legalization But his rhetoric is slowly being shaded into something more conventionally Republican. His campaign is dropping the talk of "deportation forces" and now supplanting it with various versions of that standard GOP platitude, i.e., that we have to "enforce the law" to deal with the undocumented population, which keeps it vague on whether that means they all will have to be removed. Trump's speech tonight on **immigration** is likely to showcase some form of this approach, with perhaps a bit more overt xenophobia thrown in there so the magic of Trumpism does not dissipate entirely.

The obvious target audience of this morphing is college educated white swing voters, majorities of whom think either that Trump is biased against minorities or is running a campaign fueled by bigoted appeals. The answer Trump's brain trust has hatched is to move him away from a nativist, nationalist approach that seemed designed to push the message that white identity and white America are under siege, and towards a more standard -- and subtle -- Republican playbook on issues such as crime and **immigration**.

And so, you can see why the Hillary Clinton campaign has redoubled its efforts -- for instance, in Clinton's remarkable speech on Trump and the "alt-right" -- to make the case that Trump's candidacy has become a vehicle for the racist, hate-mongering fringe. If Trump can make himself over with some of the constituencies who appear to have recoiled at Trumpism, he can perhaps start rising into the mid-40s in national polling, tightening the race.

Given the clarity and vividness of Trump's proposals and pronouncements over the last year -- the mass deportations, the ban on Muslims, the disgusting insults directed at millions of Mexican **immigrants**, the lies about thousands of American Muslims celebrating 9/11, the battle with the Khan family, and so forth -- Trump has probably branded himself indelibly with educated white swing voters as the genuine article, as an authentic trafficker in bigotry and hate. So morphing him into a more conventional Republican could prove a tall order. But his campaign is trying to pull it off. Watch for more of it.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
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